

THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE ANCIENT FAMILY: METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS*

By DALE B. MARTIN

A remarkable new consensus, recognized even by its critics, has emerged among classical historians that 'the normal Roman family seems to have been a "nuclear family" like our own'.¹ The consensus is remarkable because practically all historians who support it admit that the portrait of the Roman family that emerges from many literary accounts and is enshrined in Roman law and language is nothing like the modern nuclear family. Saller demonstrates that the Romans had no term equivalent to 'family' in the modern sense, that is, the father-mother-children triad of the 'nuclear family'. The English word 'family' has almost no relation to Roman concepts of *familia* and *domus*. As Saller explains, '*Domus* was used with regard to household and kinship to mean the physical house, the household including family and slaves, the broad kinship group including agnates and cognates, ancestors and descendants, and the patrimony'.² The Latin *familia*, while usually narrower in reference than *domus*, also had little relation to anything meant by the English 'family'. *Familia* was both broader than 'family', in that it included reference to slaves, and sometimes narrower, in that it might be used with marked exclusion of the free members of the household: 'While *familia* is frequently used for the group of slaves under a dominus, to the exclusion of the free members of the household, *domus* is often rather broader, including the wife, children, and others in the house'.³ Alluding to a famous passage from Cicero (*De officiis* 1.58), Saller explains that, at least ideologically, Romans recognized a 'hierarchy of family obligations': 'First comes the husband-wife bond, then the parent-child, and third the bonds of those within the *domus*. This ranking would make no sense if the Romans usually thought of *domus* as the mother-father-children triad'.⁴

Saller concludes his study of the Roman conception of the family by pointing out what he sees as a paradox:

Neither *familia* nor *domus* has as a regular meaning the nuclear family, and yet much evidence suggests that this was the dominant family type. Funerary inscriptions and literary evidence, such as Cicero's statement about the hierarchy of kinship bonds, seem to show that though the Romans had no word for it, they drew a conceptual circle around the mother-father-children triad and made it the center of primary obligations.⁵

According to Saller, epigraphic evidence should be used to correct the linguistic portrait of the extended Roman family.

The epigraphic evidence referred to by Saller was published the same year in an article co-written with Brent Shaw. In this important and influential article, which

* I would like to thank Elizabeth A. Clark and Mary T. Boatwright for suggestions toward the improvement of this article. Many thanks are due also to my research assistants Dwight Peterson and John Brogan. Funds were provided by the Duke University Research Council, for which I am grateful. The dissertation of Valerie Hope, *Reflections of Status: A Contextual Study of the Roman Tombstones of Aquileia, Mainz and Nîmes* (Ph.D. thesis, University of Reading, 1994) came to my attention too late to be used for this article; Dr Hope informs me, however, that her research, based on Latin inscriptions, leads her to very similar conclusions to those posited here. I am appreciative to Dr Hope for her reading of and comments on this article.

¹ J. A. Crook, *Law and Life of Rome* (1967), 98, quoted in K. R. Bradley, *Discovering the Roman Family: Studies in Roman Social History* (1991), 125; see also S. Treggiari, *Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian* (1991), 410; E. Champlin, *Final Judgments: Duty and Emotion*

in Roman Wills, 200 B.C.-A.D. 250 (1991), 193-4; D. I. Kertzer and R. P. Saller (eds), *The Family in Italy from Antiquity to the Present* (1991), 10, 72-3; A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum* (1994), 92. Bradley's several articles on the Roman family, it should be noted, have attempted to question and destabilize, though not entirely reject, the consensus.

² R. P. Saller, 'Familia, Domus, and the Roman conception of the family', *Phoenix* 38 (1984), 336-55, at 342; for fuller discussion of the definitional issues, see R. P. Saller, *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family* (1994), 74-88.

³ *ibid.*, 343; see also D. H. Herlihy, *Medieval Households* (1985), 2-4; M. Corbier, 'Constructing Kinship in Rome: Marriage and Divorce, Filiation and Adoption', in Kertzer and Saller, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 127-44, at 129.

⁴ *ibid.*, 344.

⁵ *ibid.*, 355.

contains an original analysis of thousands of tombstone inscriptions, Saller and Shaw conclude 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*'.⁶ Saller and Shaw record who provided funerary inscriptions (that is, who were the commemorators) for whom (the commemorated), entering each relationship onto a grid that includes the categories 'family', 'amity', and 'dependence', with the 'family' category broken down into 'nuclear' and 'extended' family commemorations. Most of the tombstones contain rather simple relationship patterns, with only one or perhaps two persons providing the inscription for another person. In cases where multiple relationships of the same sort occur (for example, when two sons provide an inscription for their father), Saller and Shaw register that as one relationship assigned to the 'son-to-father' category (nuclear family). In more complicated inscriptions, however, Saller and Shaw break the data down into several different relationships. For instance, when a man provides for himself, his father, his mother, his wife, and his freedman, Saller and Shaw enter five different relationships on their grid. Thus, Saller and Shaw's method counts individual relationships between pairs of persons, not tombstones.⁷

Saller and Shaw note that nuclear family relationships (some member of the father, mother, children configuration commemorating some other member of that group) account for the vast majority of commemorations when commemorators can be ascertained, ranging from 75 per cent to 90 per cent of the civilian commemorations from different geographical locations.⁸ Commemorators from the 'extended family' (grandparents, uncles, aunts, cousins, and *alumni*) are substantially less, represented by only 5 per cent, and even less if *alumni* are excluded. Saller and Shaw conclude: 'All these facts point away from the patriarchal family [here meaning the extended family under the *paterfamilias* as found in the legal sources] being a common reality in the population of the western empire erecting tombstones'. Instead, 'the nuclear family was the main type of familial organization' in the Roman Empire.⁹

Having initially been convinced by Saller and Shaw's case, I attempted to test their conclusions by an analysis of tombstone inscriptions from cities in Asia Minor. What began, however, as an attempt to apply Saller and Shaw's questions to different *data*, led to a more fundamental dissatisfaction with their *method*. Based on examination of 1,161 funerary inscriptions collected in *Tituli Asiae Minoris* from seven different cities or regions in Roman Asia Minor, this article critiques the method of selecting and organizing the data used by Saller and Shaw.¹⁰ My primary purpose is not to offer substantial new data on the ancient family, although I do intend to draw attention to material that may invite further investigation. I also do not intend to argue the opposite of Saller and Shaw's conclusion, to maintain, that is, that extended families were more numerous than nuclear families. My rather limited goal is to demonstrate that Saller

⁶ R. P. Saller and B. D. Shaw, 'Tombstones and Roman family relations in the Principate: civilians, soldiers and slaves', *JRS* 74 (1984), 124-56, at 145. See also B. D. Shaw, 'Latin funerary epigraphy and family life in the later Roman Empire', *Historia* 33 (1984), 457-97.

⁷ Saller and Shaw, *op. cit.* (n. 6), 131. I concentrate on the civilian population of Saller and Shaw's study. Their entire study is more complex and thorough than can be portrayed in this paper; they give much attention, for example, to a comparison of civilian, servile, and military commemorations and geographical differences that are not relevant for my purposes here.

⁸ *ibid.*, 134.

⁹ *ibid.*, 137, 145-6. It should be noted that in his recent book, Saller tends to use more images of continuum from inner to outer family than a strict dichotomy of nuclear/extended (*Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family* (1994), 100). I will argue in this article that a continuum rather than dichotomy should be used even more so.

¹⁰ As to the rationale for choosing these inscriptions from *Tituli Asiae Minoris* (hereafter *TAM*) rather than studying the more numerous and more recently edited inscriptions from somewhere like Ephesus, there are a few reasons. By using *TAM* I was able to compare inscriptions that came from several locations but were collected, organized, and edited similarly. Moreover, after reading around in different corpora of funerary inscriptions, I became convinced that a certain style of inscription, which I here call the 'familial' inscription, offered greater possibilities for familial analysis. The Ephesus corpus, for example, contains fewer inscriptions conforming to this style. Finally, by selecting inscriptions from different places and in smaller numbers, I was able to divide the analysis into smaller, more manageable 'chunks', thereby making it easier for others to check my method and conclusions without having to work through the entire body of evidence.

and Shaw's method renders their results useless for ascertaining familial *structures* in the Roman period: the problematic method utilized by Saller and Shaw calls into question the social-historical conclusions that they (and scholars following them) draw.

I. METHOD OF COLLECTING DATA

Using a different method than Saller and Shaw and concentrating initially on 218 funerary inscriptions from Olympus (in eastern Lycia, southern coast of Asia Minor), I counted not individual relationships (that is, pairs of individuals), but tombstones themselves.¹¹ This seems a viable approach since these inscriptions are almost all 'family' inscriptions, which is to say that they include family members together in the tomb or inscription and the form of the inscription is structured to reflect a familial social unit. The basic model may be illustrated by a typical inscription: 'Aur(elios) Moukianos, praetorianos [member of a praetorian cohort?] built the tomb for myself and my wife Aur(elia) Sebazia and our children; but it is permitted to no other to bury someone (here), or the one forcing (entry) will pay to the sacred treasury 2,500 (denaria)'.¹² Sometimes grandchildren or even further removed progeny will be included: 'Aur(elios) Klaros Damas, Olympene, built the tomb for myself and wife and children and grandchildren; it is permitted to no other to bury, or the one forcing (entry) will pay to the god Hephaestos 1,000 (denaria), of which the person who brings the charge will receive a third'.¹³ In some cases, extended family members (parents of the parents, in-laws, cousins; i.e. anyone related by blood or marriage not included in the father-mother-children triad) are included in the inscription; in many inscriptions slaves or freedpersons, sometimes along with their own spouses and children, occur; and in still others, persons who seem unrelated by any legal or blood connection at all are included, again sometimes along with their own 'immediate families'. Aurelios Diskos II, for example, erected an inscription for himself, his wife Kratea, 'children' (whom he does not name), and a man named Epiktous, who is said to be 'of' a woman named Neikenete 'also called Berneike', possibly indicating that Epiktous is a slave of a woman (apparently not related to Diskos). Later, it seems, Kratea allowed burial to a 'hierodoulos' (sacred slave) Seneka, his wife Rhoda, Seneka's son Helenos and daughter-in-law Drakontis, and then, mentioned last, Rhoda's son Leon.¹⁴ As this example indicates, many of the inscriptions are complicated, and figuring out the precise relationships is seldom easy and often impossible.¹⁵ The inscriptions nevertheless follow a 'familial' format and organization; even the order of names generally follows the ideological construction of the patriarchal family, though for that very reason the exceptions are interesting and may reward further study.

I organized the inscriptions into the following categories (see Table 2): (A) those too fragmentary to divulge useful information about family structure; (B) those containing only one name with no information about any relationship; (C) those mentioning spouses only (conjugal couple); (D) those including either whole or partial nuclear families only; (E) those including non-immediate family members (i.e.

¹¹ Although none of these inscriptions is dated, most are likely to be from the second or third century C.E., judging from archaeological evidence, names of the persons mentioned in the inscriptions, and the forms of the inscriptions. For the second and third centuries as a time of growth in the 'epigraphic habit' of the Roman Empire, see R. MacMullen, 'The epigraphic habit in the Roman Empire', *American Journal of Philology* 103 (1982), 233-46. Of course, the inscriptions probably come from a wide range of dates, but we will probably not be far off by placing them in this general time.

¹² *TAM* II.949 (vol. 2, fasc. 3, inscription number 949). The various words I have taken to refer to 'spouse', 'husband', or 'wife' (σύμβιος, or often simply

ἄνῆρ, or γυνή) do not indicate whether or not the couple was *legally* married or not. Since slaves, who could not legally marry, often use the same terms as free persons to refer to their relationships, we should never take the terms to imply necessarily a legal relationship. The question is not one addressed by my organization of the data.

¹³ *TAM* II.1008.

¹⁴ *TAM* II.1000, see also II.1159.

¹⁵ Even in Latin inscriptions it is often difficult to discern relations, and this even though Latin has many more precise terms for specific familial relations than Greek; for a discussion of such difficulties and possibilities in Latin inscriptions, see Corbier, *op. cit.* (n. 3), 130-2.

'extended' family members and anyone not related by blood or marriage) within an inscription that contains at least some members of the 'nuclear triad'; (F) those containing names of more than one person about whom the nature of the relationship cannot be ascertained. The above Category E was taken to represent extended family inscriptions; Categories C and D combined represent nuclear family inscriptions. Of the 218 inscriptions from Olympus: (A) eleven were too fragmentary; and (B) two contained only one name. Of the remaining 205 inscriptions (the 'multiple person' inscriptions): five mentioned only husband and wife (Category C); forty six mentioned only nuclear family members (Category D); 154 contained immediate family members and included others from outside the immediate family (Category E). If Categories C and D are combined, the result is fifty one inscriptions (23 per cent of all inscriptions, 25 per cent of 'multiple person' inscriptions), compared with 154 'extended family' inscriptions (71 per cent of all inscriptions, 75 per cent of 'multiple person' inscriptions). In other words, the relation of extended family inscriptions to nuclear family inscriptions is 75 per cent to about 25 per cent, the reverse of Saller and Shaw's results.¹⁶

The data base thus far examined is too small to merit a serious challenge to Saller and Shaw's much more extensive and thorough study, but the striking disparity of results demands some explanation. One could suggest that geographical and cultural differences account for the discrepancy, that extended families and multiple-family households were much more numerous in Roman Asia Minor, or even in Olympus in particular, than in the western regions surveyed by Saller and Shaw. I have no desire to deny the possibility of regional differences in family structures.¹⁷ But in my opinion the significant differences between the results of the two studies are due to differences between the methods employed, thus making unnecessary (and unverifiable) any hypothesis about regional differences. In other words, it is important to take into account such regional differences, but until we have more reliable methods for discerning family structures from funerary inscriptions, such regional comparisons will be misleading if not absolutely useless.

The discrepancy between the two samples is attributable, in my view, mainly to the methods employed and the kinds of inscriptions studied, as a close comparison between the two methods of counting shows. As mentioned above, Saller and Shaw counted not families or tombstones, but pairs of relations reflected in commemorations. An inscription erected by a father for his son would count as a 'nuclear family' commemoration, one by a man for his cousin as an 'extended family' commemoration. Thus an inscription in which a father provided for his wife, son, daughter, son-in-law, and cousin would render five different commemorations, three nuclear and two non-nuclear.¹⁸ According to my method, on the other hand, this inscription would be taken not as representing three nuclear plus two extended relationships, but simply as one extended family. Similarly, if the example given by Saller and Shaw of a man providing for himself, his father, his mother, his wife, and his freedman is analysed according to pairs of relationships, it renders one commemoration for self, one for son-for-father (nuclear), one for son-for-mother (nuclear), one for husband-for-wife (nuclear), and

¹⁶ It must be remembered that when I give percentages in this study I am referring only to percentages of *inscriptions*, which is *not* to be taken as making any claim about percentage of the population. Numbers of inscriptions must not be simply extrapolated to represent numbers within the population. Thus my claim that 75 per cent of these inscriptions reflect extended family funerary commemorations is not intended to suggest that 75 per cent of the households of the population were extended. I do believe that a substantial number of inscriptions reflecting a certain social formation can be taken to imply a substantial number of such formations in the society, but the proportions and percentages remain unknown.

¹⁷ Although believing that geographical differences in family structures cannot account for the extent of

the discrepancy in this case, I do not want to imply that regional differences are unimportant; such variables should be taken into account more often than they usually are. See, for example, the warnings by J. Bellemore and B. Rawson, '*ALVMNI*: the Italian evidence', *ZPE* 83 (1990), 1-17, at 2-3. Note also the findings of R. S. Bagnall and B. W. Frier, *The Demography of Roman Egypt* (1994), indicating that families in villages tended to be larger and more complex than those in the metropoleis (49). It should be noted, however, that their findings overall agree much more closely to mine (that extended and multiple-family households were, if not in the majority, significant and numerous) than to Saller and Shaw's (see 59-60).

¹⁸ Saller and Shaw, *op. cit.* (n. 6), 131-2.

one for man-for-freedperson (non-nuclear), suggesting a three to one nuclear to non-nuclear proportion. According to my reckoning, the inscription would be taken as evidence of one extended family. Even more telling is the application of my method to an extended family inscription such as *CIL* v.2.5899 (Regio XI). Here a man supplies an inscription for himself, his father, mother, brother, sister, wife, and a freedman. According to Saller and Shaw's method, this inscription would be taken as evidence of: one conjugal relationship (nuclear); two 'ascending nuclear' relationships; two sibling relationships (nuclear); and one patron for freedman relationship (servile). That is, the inscription is taken as providing five nuclear family relationships and *no* evidence of the extended family at all. According to my method, the inscription would be taken as representing one extended family structure. The multiplication of this kind of methodological discrepancy by only a modest number of similar cases would render obviously significant differences in final results.

This comparison can be turned the other way round. By applying Saller and Shaw's method to even a small amount of my data we can discern the significance of the difference in method. While interesting results might be obtained by applying their method to a large number of my inscriptions, that sort of scope is not necessary to demonstrate these methodological issues. If one applies their method to ten inscriptions from Olympus (*TAM* II.950–959, chosen because Olympus renders the *highest* percentage of extended family structures), one ends up with opposite conclusions using their method rather than using mine. According to my method, these ten cases provide evidence for seven extended or multi-family inscriptions and three nuclear family inscriptions. Some are rather small extended families: a man including his own mother within his immediate family (II.959); a man including his brother along with his immediate family and 'descendants' (II.954). Others are more 'traditional' looking extended families: two men providing for themselves, their immediate families, and their 'trophimos', (thus, this might fit the category of the *frèreche* structure¹⁹). And still others include perhaps non-kin persons along with the provider's immediate family, such as the woman who provides for herself, her husband, daughter, son, their children, and four other 'Olympenes' of uncertain relationship (II.952). All of these seven inscriptions, in any case, would be counted according to my method as non-nuclear structures compared with the three nuclear structures (II.955, 957, 958).

The same ten inscriptions analysed by Saller and Shaw's method, insofar as I have been able to replicate it, render thirty four different relationships: twenty five nuclear; five extended; two of uncertain relationship (*amici* ?); and two that appear to be *θρεπταί* (either servile or more probably something more like the *alumni* of Saller and Shaw's study).²⁰ If we combine all the non-nuclear relationships together we have nine of thirty four relationships as non-nuclear compared to twenty five nuclear; the percentage of nuclear relationships is 74 per cent (of 34), precisely the sort of result found by Saller and Shaw using their own method on their own inscriptions.²¹ Thus, whereas my method rendered a 70 per cent non-nuclear to 30 per cent nuclear proportion, Saller and Shaw's rendered a 74 per cent nuclear to 26 per cent non-nuclear proportion, diametrically opposed conclusions.

¹⁹ See, for example, instances of the *frèreche* form in Roman Egypt: Bagnall and Frier, *op. cit.* (n. 17), 64–6.

²⁰ It should be remembered that two occurrences of the same kind of relationship in one inscription (two sons for their father, for example) is counted as one relationship. Thus, I suppose that when the one woman provides for four persons of uncertain relationship, but who seem not to be kin, that should be counted as one non-nuclear relationship (*amicus*?) rather than as four (II.952). Counting all four persons, in any case, would raise the number of non-nuclear relationships in comparison to nuclear, but not so as to alter the overall picture substantially, in which the nuclear family relationships predominate. For the meaning of *θρεπτός* see n. 25 below.

²¹ I have noted that often a relationship is mentioned without naming the person directly, thus leaving open the possibility that the persons (usually children or descendants) do not yet exist. If we count only *named* persons from these ten inscriptions, or persons we can be certain exist, we come up with percentages emphasizing the nuclear family a bit less: 64 per cent (fourteen out of twenty two relationships) to 36 per cent. While this percentage is lower than the usual results given by Saller and Shaw for their inscriptions, it nevertheless shows how their method tends to exaggerate the presence of the nuclear family structure.

The particular problems with Saller and Shaw's method can now be explained. In the first place, their method measures relationships between pairs of people, not family structures. Even if it is true that commemorative practice can be used as a gauge for closeness or importance of familial relationships, their study demonstrates only that most people depended on members of their immediate family for commemoration; it does not demonstrate, and should not be taken to imply, that other 'non-nuclear' relationships were absent. At most (and it may not even mean this), Saller and Shaw's study suggests that for most people immediate family members were *more* important than other people, perhaps even other members of their extended family. To argue, however, that a man relies socially and emotionally more on his wife than his cousin says nothing about the *existence* of the extended family or the perceived boundaries of the family; the cousin may still be considered a member of the household, but someone who is less intimate with the *paterfamilias* than the wife or children. Saller and Shaw's method may measure degrees of social intimacy and the importance of immediate family relations, but it cannot measure the boundary of the family; it thus can say nothing about the existence or non-existence or sociological prevalence of the extended family in comparison with the nuclear family.²²

Counting relationships rather than structures misleads in another way. As is evident from the examples given above, Saller and Shaw's method construes a three-generational extended family as a series of nuclear relations. A man who provides for his parents, his wife, his children, and his siblings does indeed have a 'nuclear relationship' with each person mentioned, but the *structure* here portrayed is a multi-generational and laterally extended family, not a nuclear family. Saller and Shaw's method hides the evidence for such three-generational structures as long as the commemorator is someone from the middle generation.

Furthermore, Saller and Shaw's method implies that the presence of a 'nuclear' family (that is, the occurrence of the father-mother-child triad) means the absence of the 'extended' family. This overlooks the fact that most extended families are built around immediate families. As my familial inscriptions show, where there is an extended or multi-family household structure, there is usually, though not always, some version of the 'triad' embedded in it.²³ But for classification purposes, one should count that structure as an extended family, not as one nuclear family and one extended family. In other words, for sociological comparative purposes, one counts a household as nuclear if it contains a nuclear family *only*. If even one or two non-nuclear members are included the structure becomes non-nuclear — even if there are several 'nuclear' family members within the household. The presence of the immediate family does not imply the absence of the extended family; on the contrary, the presence of *any* extended family members means that the *household structure* should be represented as extended.

This last point is borne out by noting how often these familial inscriptions contain more than one 'nuclear' family. The tombstone of Aurelios Diskos II cited above is one such case. Aurelios Pigres III also provides a burial place for himself, his wife, his three sons, their 'future' wives, children, and the future husbands and wives of his grandchildren.²⁴ Although Pigres obviously does not yet have such a large, patriarchal, extended family, his inscription reflects at least a hopeful expectation that it will comprise several immediate family units. In another instance, two men provide for themselves, their wives, their three children, and their 'trophimos', a woman named

²² I should emphasize that I am not disagreeing with the use of the inscriptions to establish the *existence* of relationships (which Saller does effectively, I believe, in his *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family*, 25–41), but only to the use of one-to-one inscriptions to say anything about the boundaries of the family.

²³ Even the traditional form of father, then mother, then child(ren), in that order, occurs in 119 of the Olympian inscriptions (well over 50 per cent of the family inscriptions), even when the inscription does not contain simply a 'nuclear family', thus demon-

strating the ideological ubiquity of the traditional triad even in more complex familial structures.

²⁴ *TAM* II.947. For another case of a multi-generational extended inscription, see *TAM* II.1129, in which a man provides for himself, his wife, his two sons, their wives, their grandchildren (unnamed), and great-grandchildren (unnamed). In this case also, the grandchildren and great-grandchildren probably do not yet exist, but their inclusion on the tombstone demonstrates what kind of family was expected to be appropriate — and possible.

Zenikete. These two men not only expect to have their own immediate families buried together; they also share a relationship as the 'rearers' of one woman.²⁵ Obviously, one could insist that in each of these cases several 'nuclear' family units exist; but to count each of them and then compare that number to the two 'extended' structures containing them would misrepresent the evidence. We do not have here evidence for two extended families and several nuclear families; rather we have evidence for two extended family *structures*, each of which may contain more than one 'triad' unit of husband, wife, and child(ren).

Saller and Shaw's discourse problematically slips between language about simple relationships to language about structures and their social prevalence. They repeatedly concede that they are supplying information only about the relationship between who commemorates and who is commemorated. But without noting the shift in subject, they then imply that such information indicates that the nuclear family *structure* was more common than the extended family structure. The presence of father-son, mother-daughter, etc., relationships does not in any way imply the presence of a nuclear family *structure* (which refers to a family structure of father-mother-children *without extended family members*); it only represents immediate family relationships apart from any structural contextualization.

Another theoretical problem with Saller and Shaw's study is the assumption implicit in their method that 'extended' families are 'large' families.²⁶ Indeed, the only way their method of counting *could* indicate a significant presence for the extended family is if they were to encounter quite large extended families in which the number of extended family members exceeded the number of immediate family members. For example, if a man provided an inscription for himself, his wife, his son, his daughter, and his father and mother, he would also have to provide for at least six other ('non-nuclear') persons before the extended commemorations would outnumber the 'nuclear' commemorations according to Saller and Shaw's reckoning. A quick survey of familial inscriptions, however, reveals that most of the structures, both nuclear and extended, are rather small.²⁷ For the Olympus inscriptions, arrangements regularly include no more children than two sons and one daughter, and if they include extended family members only a few individuals are involved, sometimes only one or two. One man, for

²⁵ TAM II.951 (see also II.1105, in which three brothers provide for themselves, their respective wives, and their mother). The translation of τροφιμος is uncertain (it could refer to their 'nurse'), but it probably refers to something like a 'nursling', that is, a person taken up by persons not biologically related. If so, τροφιμος would be basically equivalent to θρεπτος, a social role reflected many times in these inscriptions from Asia Minor. The precise social role indicated by the Greek θρεπτος is debated by scholars. In the end, it does not seem to be equivalent to the Latin *verna*, which would mean a home-bred slave. Rather, it probably refers to some (unofficial or quasi-legal?) practice of 'rearing' children not one's own, perhaps by taking in an exposed infant, buying a child with a view to rearing it in one's own family, or unofficially 'adopting' a child. See A. Cameron, 'θρεπτοι and Related Terms in the Inscriptions of Asia Minor', in W. M. Calder and J. Keil (eds), *Anatolian Studies Presented to W. H. Buckler* (1939), 27-62; T. G. Nani, 'ΘΠΕΠΤΟΙ', *Epigraphica* 5-6 (1943-1944), 45-84. I believe John Boswell's statement that θρεπτος meant 'slave born in the household' is contradicted, at least for Asia Minor, by the large number of such occurrences in familial inscriptions and the way they occur in the inscriptions. I take θρεπτος to be more like the Latin *alumnus* than *verna*, and that it did not, at least in these inscriptions, reflect a legally servile role. Of course, it may have been something *like* a servile role, and its lower status may be reflected in the fact that such persons' names are usually given in the latter part of the familial inscrip-

tion. See J. E. Boswell, 'Expositio and oblatio: the abandonment of children and the ancient and medieval family', *AHR* 89 (1984), 10-33, at 15 n. 8. For a survey of literary evidence on 'exposure' among Greeks, see L. R. F. Germain, 'Aspects du droit d'exposition en Grèce', *Revue historique de Droit français et étranger* 47 (1969), 112-20; see also P. Garnsey, 'Child Rearing in Ancient Italy', in Kertzer and Saller, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 48-65, at 51-6. For recent discussion of the exact meaning and status of *alumni*, see B. Rawson, 'Children in the Roman *Familia*', in Rawson (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome: New Perspectives* (1986), 170-200, at 173-86; H. S. Nielsen, 'ALUMNUS: a term of relation denoting quasi-adoption', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 38 (1987), 141-88. It is unusual, but not unknown, for two people to be 'co-rearers' of one person, as may be the case in this inscription; two apparently unrelated men call one girl their *alumna* in a Latin inscription, see P. R. C. Weaver and P. I. Wilkins, 'A lost alumna', *ZPE* 99 (1993), 241-4.

²⁶ Note terminology such as 'larger extended family units' (Saller and Shaw, *op. cit.* (n. 6), 124).

²⁷ This is also in line with other studies that emphasize the regular smallness of families, usually including no more than two sons and one daughter. See E. Eyben, 'Family planning in Antiquity', *Ancient Society* 11/12 (1981/82), 75; see also S. B. Pomeroy, *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity* (1975), 197-8; Bagnall and Frier, *op. cit.* (n. 17), 67-8.

example, provides for himself, his wife, his (unnamed) children and grandchildren, and a male *θρεπτός*.²⁸ In other cases a man provides for himself, his wife and children, and his mother and brother.²⁹ Thus, although we certainly have some large extended family inscriptions from Olympus, we also have many *small* extended family inscriptions. Small familial inscriptions will prove to be even more the rule in materials from other geographical locations, as I will point out below.

I propose that, in spite of the very small sample of inscriptions cited thus far, my study raises important questions about the method pursued by Saller and Shaw. Their procedure is methodologically biased to emphasize the nuclear family and de-emphasize the extended family from the outset. Given the kinds of inscriptions they were dealing with and the method of counting followed, their study was bound from the beginning to emphasize the nuclear over the extended family. It does not provide, therefore, strong social-historical evidence for the predominance of the nuclear family or the relative rarity of the extended family.

II. BROADENING THE SCOPE

As noted above, geographical or cultural differences may explain some of the discrepancies between Saller and Shaw's study and mine. In an attempt to test this possibility, I analysed 650 inscriptions from Termessus (in Lycia, inland from Olympus), 209 inscriptions from Bithynia (most from Nicomedia, northern Asia Minor), as well as small samples of inscriptions from other locations (20 from Apollonis; 21 from Magnesia/Sipyllum; 18 from Hierocaesarea; and 25 from Attalia — all in central western Asia Minor). The results of the different samples are mixed, as Table 1 shows.³⁰ Most noticeable, perhaps, is the fact that of the inscriptions from the two locations yielding the most data, Termessus and Bithynia, the majority reflect only a 'conjugal couple' (husband and wife alone) or a nuclear family. This majority, however, is well below the 80 to 90 per cent majority reflected in most of Saller and Shaw's results. In fact, in neither case do nuclear inscriptions reach 70 per cent. Furthermore, the number of extended family inscriptions is far above what one would expect on the basis of Saller and Shaw's consistent 5 per cent findings. For Termessus, 28 per cent of the 'multiple person' inscriptions fall into the extended category; for Bithynia the number is 25 per cent.³¹

As explained above, some inscriptions contain the names of more than one person but without designation of any familial relationship (my Category F). While it is *possible* that *some* of these inscriptions contain only immediate family members, many if not most of them certainly contain names of people who are simply friends, co-freedpersons or slaves, lovers, or persons involved in some other relationship not covered by traditional familial ties.³² In one, for example, four co-slaves provide a burial place for

²⁸ *TAM* II.979. For the explanation of the term *θρεπτός* see n. 25 above.

²⁹ *TAM* II.1009 and 1014.

³⁰ The numbers given for Apollonis, Magnesia/Sipyllum, Hierocaesarea, and Attalia are too small to be very helpful, so I do not discuss them in the text; they are offered in the table, however, for purposes of comparison. Although they are small samples, they all offer some evidence for the healthy presence of extended family structures, well exceeding the numbers one would expect given Saller and Shaw's study.

³¹ In Saller and Shaw's reckoning, servile and freed relations are not included in extended family counts. I have included them in my extended category, but excluding those inscriptions that are categorized as extended *only* because of inclusion of servile or freed dependents would not substantially alter the results.

The affected inscriptions would number only one or two for Termessus, one or two for Bithynia (some of the inscriptions are open to different interpretations), and two for Olympus. If *θρεπτοί/αί* are included as 'servile' relations (which they would not be if we consider them equivalent to Saller and Shaw's *alumni/ae*) the number of affected inscriptions grows to ten for Bithynia and six for Olympus. In other cases, servile persons are included in extended family inscriptions, but their exclusion would not mean categorizing the inscription differently.

³² I have no way of discerning if any of these people would correspond to the 'lodgers' identified as non-kin members of households in the Egyptian census papyri studied by Bagnall and Frier, op. cit. (n. 17), 65-6; but clearly that is one possibility.

themselves together.³³ I take it, therefore, that in most of these cases where the persons have not designated any familial ties, they are joining together with persons who are not nuclear family members but with whom they have constructed something like an 'alternative' structure to the traditional family. If these few inscriptions are combined with those that are explicitly extended family inscriptions, and the 'conjugal couple' inscriptions are combined with those that contain only members of a nuclear triad, the nuclear to non-nuclear inscriptions compare as follows.

TABLE I: NUCLEAR TO NON-NUCLEAR MULTIPLE-PERSON INSCRIPTIONS IN PERCENTAGES

	Olym.	Term.	Bihy.	Apo.	Mag/Si.	Hiero.	Attalia
nuclear	25	69	68	67	31	38	55
non-nu.	75	31	32	33	69	62	45

These numbers are striking in their difference from Saller and Shaw's results. In no case do the non-nuclear inscriptions fall below 30 per cent, and in no case do the nuclear family inscriptions rise even to 70 per cent. In some cases, the number of non-nuclear inscriptions exceeds those of nuclear inscriptions. At the least, this body of data suggests the existence of many more non-nuclear structures than one would expect on the basis of Saller and Shaw's study.³⁴

But how do we explain the differences between the inscriptions of Olympus, in which extended structures overwhelmingly dominate, and those from Termessus and Bithynia, in which some form of the nuclear structure, although not nearly as dominant as in Saller and Shaw's study, is in the majority? While it is possible that different kinds of families existed in different regions of Asia Minor (sometimes not very distant; Termessus is less than 100 kilometres from Olympus), I suggest that the main answer lies in different epigraphical styles and funerary customs. Indeed, when the Termessus and Bithynia evidence is examined more closely, the predominance of nuclear structures even there, I believe, becomes less pronounced.

I will initially concentrate on the inscriptions from Bithynia because they offer obvious and important differences in format and style from those of Olympus. First, I should point out that many more of the Bithynian (than the Olympian) inscriptions are fragmentary (44, or 21 per cent of 209) and many more contain only the name of the deceased, thus giving no clue about familial relationships (32, or 15 per cent; as compared with only one inscription in this category for Olympus). Thus, whereas most of the Olympian inscriptions (94 per cent) offer some information about relationships, only 64 per cent (133 of 209) of the Bithynian inscriptions do. Next, a remarkably greater number of the Bithynian inscriptions contain reference only to the conjugal relationship (husband and wife but with no mention of children): forty one (20 per cent of total inscriptions; 33 per cent of familial inscriptions) as compared to only five such

³³ TAM III.400. In III.495 two slave women (of different owners) are buried together. In some cases, two men or two women who do not seem to be siblings share an inscription (III.303, 320, 394, 635).

³⁴ These figures are in line with studies from other times and cultures. Even in those cultures which are categorized as 'extended family' cultures, the actual percentage of extended family structures compared to nuclear structures is seldom a majority. For example, Tsuneo Yamane, in a study on twentieth-century Japan, notes that 'in 1920, when the traditional family system in Japan was being enforced legally and when the lineally-extended household was preferred culturally, 55 per cent of the families were nuclear'. In 1970 the percentage of nuclear families had risen to 63.4 per cent. ('The Nuclear Family Within the Three-Generational Household in Modern Japan', in *Beyond the Nuclear Family* (1977), 79-95, at 80-1.) Note also the range of percentages of either extended or multiple

households for various parts of Europe from the seventeenth to early nineteenth centuries. Only in two cases listed by one study do extended-multiple-family households rise over 50 per cent, and those are only 52.5 per cent and 53.2 per cent (K. W. Wachter, with E. A. Hammel and P. Laslett *et al.*, *Statistical Studies of Historical Social Structure* (1978), 92-3; note also the figures from different studies compared in M. Segaline, *Historical Anthropology of the Family* (1986), 23-4, tables 1.3 and 1.4). Thus even in those societies where non-nuclear structures are quite common and even culturally preferred, they are seldom completely dominant or even the *majority* of households. For the ancient Mediterranean, therefore, we may be demanding too much to expect extended structures actually to outnumber nuclear structures. Even at only 30 per cent, they would represent an important social and cultural presence, and one quite uncommon in modern, Western experience.

inscriptions (2 per cent) for Olympus. But this does not mean, apparently, that these couples had no children. Often, in fact, an inscription says that a man and his wife provided the sarcophagus or tomb for themselves alone, and that no one else is allowed burial in the same location *unless their children permit it*.³⁵ We may be inclined to take this phrase as a mere formula, providing no evidence that the couple actually had any children when the inscription was set up.³⁶ But, in a few cases, the couple actually names a son or daughter who is given the responsibility of deciding later whether to inter another body in the tomb.³⁷ The occurrence of a husband and wife alone in an inscription in Bithynia, therefore, cannot be taken as evidence that they had no children, grandchildren, or other extended family members.

Does the exclusion of children from the funerary arrangements of these couples imply that the children are not 'important' or that they are not considered members of the family of the couple?³⁸ Surely not. The dominance of these couple-only inscriptions has to do with epigraphic fashion and funerary custom. The Olympus inscriptions look like inclusive, familial inscriptions; that is, they may not include every person of the family, but their form makes it look as if they do. The Bithynian inscriptions, on the other hand, give no pretence of familial inclusion. And one indication of this is that a third of the familial inscriptions contain reference only to the conjugal couple. The apparent dominance of the extended family in Olympus and its minority status on the other hand in Termessus and Bithynia may be due more to regional customs of funerary inscriptions than to regional differences in family structures.

III. PROBLEMS OF DEFINITION

This point, however, raises a possible objection to the method pursued thus far by myself. My rhetoric has slipped between speaking of these inscriptions as nothing more than funerary inscriptions to speaking of them as family structures. In my analysis of the Olympian inscriptions, I have taken the social relationship of inclusion in an inscription to indicate familial structure. But *should* we treat any of these inscriptions as a 'snapshot' of a family? What did it mean in Olympus, after all, to include someone — a cousin, a freedman and his wife, an acquaintance who was a 'sacred slave', or simply another 'immediate family' unit not related to oneself by blood or marriage — in one's own funerary inscription or tomb? Did that mean they were part of the 'family'?

These questions raise further theoretical problems. For example, if we decide that it is inappropriate to take the social configuration depicted by a funerary inscription to represent a 'family', what alternative do we have? What are we looking for when we look for a 'family' in Greco-Roman society? What definition of 'family' should we use for cross-cultural comparison? Anthropologists, ethnographers, and historians have increasingly recognized that 'family' and 'household' are artificial, conceptual categories, not things 'out there', defined or delimited by 'nature'. Given this situation of the contingency of categories, what are the deciding factors in delimiting 'family' for a study

³⁵ TAM IV.220; 231; 234; 238; 247; 249; 255; 260.

³⁶ In many of these inscriptions, as with those from Olympus, the provider mentions 'children' or 'grandchildren', and sometimes even a σύμβιος (wife or husband) without naming them. In some cases, at least, I suspect that the person or persons may not actually (yet?) *have* those relations, but mentions them in the inscription due either to convention or to the expectation that such relations will materialize in the future, or both. For example, in TAM II.1128, two brothers provide an inscription for themselves and their wives and children; the wife of only one of the brothers, however, is named, which would be confusing unless the other brother does not yet have a wife. In another case, it appears that the text originally read, 'Eutyches Daphnionos, Olympene, built the tomb for myself and my wife and children'; the name

of the wife, however, seems to have been added after the words 'my wife' at some later time (TAM II.1036, and see editor's note). In other inscriptions, however, names of relations are not given even though they seem to have existed at the time of the erection. In TAM II.974, for example, Agathopous Hoplonos does not give the name of his wife and children, but he obviously did have a wife since he gives the name of the woman who 'reared' her (see also II.1068, 1096, 1119).

³⁷ TAM IV.215; 262; 314.

³⁸ This would be the implication of Saller and Shaw's logic when they construe fewer funerary commemorations for non-nuclear family members to provide evidence of the relative unimportance of the extended family.

of Roman society? Kinship? Co-residence? Economic symbiosis? Legally recognized unity? Regular and intense co-operation in the production or consumption of goods? All these criteria are notoriously problematic from a comparative perspective.³⁹ To assume that 'family' refers only to those persons related by blood or marriage is, of course, to beg the question and decide, *a priori*, that certain kinds of extended or 'multi-family' households do not exist. But what are the alternatives?

The Roman legal definition states, 'In strict law we define the family as the many persons, who by nature or law are set under the authority of an individual, such as the *paterfamilias*'.⁴⁰ This is inappropriate for our purposes, however. For one thing, it is uncertain how relevant Roman law would be for these communities in the Greek East, except for a small minority of persons. Moreover, even in a Roman context the legal definition would exclude the following: wives who are not *in manu* (most of the wives of our period, according to most recent opinion); parents who may occupy, practically speaking, subordinate roles as dependents in the household of a grown son or daughter; free dependents not legally *in patria potestate*; and indeed, as David Daube persuasively argued many years ago, practically the entire lower class, which made up the vast majority of the population of the Empire but which was relatively unaffected by much legislation, especially familial legislation.⁴¹

Co-residence, though a dominant way for modern sociologists and historians of other periods to delimit 'family', is also problematic for Greco-Roman society.⁴² As any reader of Cicero's or Pliny's letters may note, the large *familia* of the Roman upper class sometimes occupied several villas and apartments.⁴³ Their dependents, including grown children, grandchildren, slaves, and even some freedpersons, would likely be scattered throughout the city and countryside. Their slaves probably often slept and ate wherever they could, at a shop where they worked, in the kitchen or hall, or perhaps in actual slave-quarters.⁴⁴ This apparently did not prohibit slaves from believing that they had families ('households'?) of their own, sometimes including their own slaves and the wives or husbands and children of those slaves in their family tombs.⁴⁵

The upper class and its direct dependents aside, we should not imagine lower-class families as necessarily co-resident either. We certainly may not *assume* a more stable residency pattern for lower- than for upper-class families: urban crowding, which would have affected the lower class more than the upper class, was probably not conducive to

³⁹ See the discussion by J. Casey, *The History of the Family* (1989), esp. 14, 166, who suggests that definitions of 'family' should perhaps come at the end of such studies rather than at the beginning: 'It could be argued, indeed, that "definition" is what all family history is really about, the last chapter of the book rather than the first'. See also Bagnall and Frier, op. cit. (n. 17), 57 n. 19. For an excellent recent essay on theoretical issues in historiography of the family, see M. Peskowitz, "'Family/ies" in Antiquity: Evidence from Tannaic Literature and Roman Galilean Architecture', in S. J. D. Cohen (ed.), *The Jewish Family in Antiquity* (1993), 9-36.

⁴⁰ Ulpian, *Digest* L.16.195; see D. Herlihy, 'Households in the Early Middle Ages: Symmetry and Sainthood,' in R. McC. Netting *et al.*, *Households: Comparative and Historical Studies of the Domestic Group* (1984), 383-406, at 385.

⁴¹ D. Daube, 'Dodges and rackets in Roman Law', *Proceedings of the Classical Association* 61 (1964), 28-30; for wives married without being *in manu*: J. Gardner, *Women in Roman Law and Society* (1986), 76; G. Clark, 'Roman women', *Greece and Rome*² 28 (1981), 193-212, at 203-4; Treggiari, op. cit. (n. 1), 16-36.

⁴² For the assumption of co-residence as the defining factor in delimiting family, see, for example, D. H. J. Morgan, *Social Theory and the Family* (1975), 207; G. Masnick and M. J. Bane *et al.*, *The Nation's Families: 1960-1990* (1980), 25; Segaline, op. cit. (n. 34), 13.

These are just a few examples selected almost at random.

⁴³ See J. H. D'Arms, *Romans on the Bay of Naples: A Social and Cultural Study of the Villas and Their Owners from 150 B.C. to A.D. 400* (1970), 123-33; E. Champlin, *Fronto and Antonine Rome* (1980), 21-4; R. Duncan-Jones, *The Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Studies* (2nd edn, 1982), 18, 22-4, 323-6; idem, *Structure and Scale in the Roman Economy* (1990), 126-9, 141-2; M. T. Boatwright, 'Matidia the Younger', *Echos du Monde Classique/Classical Views* 36 (1992), 19-32, at 25.

⁴⁴ B. Rawson, 'Family life among the lower classes at Rome in the first two centuries of the Empire', *CP* 61 (1966), 70-83.

⁴⁵ Some of the slave inscriptions from Olympos are striking in their inclusion of (sometimes large) extended families. A female slave of a woman erects this one: 'Helenous, slave of Aurelia Artemeis, built the tomb for myself and husband and children and grandchildren and brother-in-law (?γαμβρός), Philoserapis, and my slave Melinne, and her husband, Harpokras, and their children' (II.967). For a fuller study of slave and freed familial inscriptions throughout Asia Minor, see my *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (1990), esp. 5-6. The percentages there given for slave families are little different from these for the general population.

family co-residence.⁴⁶ Many manual labourers in cities and towns probably slept in their shops or in small adjacent apartments. Even relatively young children may have worked — and slept and ate — elsewhere. If a wife and husband did not practise the same craft, they may have actually had little chance to eat or sleep together every evening. As anyone who has spent much time in a crowded, third-world city in a moderate climate can testify, much of life is spent out-of-doors, away from the cramped apartments that often constitute the only private space available for lower-class persons. These various musings suggest that 'co-residence' is an especially problematic criterion for the delimitations of 'family' in the ancient Mediterranean.

In the end, there is no definition of *family* for Greco-Roman society that is not arbitrary and problematic. In the case of the Olympian inscriptions, it seems excusable to take them as representing 'families' since they appear to make some attempt to be inclusive and they are organized on the model of the Roman ideological family as defined by the laws and reflected in traditional literary descriptions. In other words, since there is no better way to decide what we will mean by a 'family', we may as well take these 'familial' inscriptions to represent 'families'. This means, however, that if we want to use funerary inscriptions to ascertain the boundaries of the family, we must use those inscriptions that seem to include all those persons *considered* to be members of the family. Thus, the familial inscriptions of places like Olympus, by their very tendency towards inclusiveness, should be a more accurate source for discerning the perceived boundaries of the household than the non-inclusive inscriptions of some other locations.

This point is borne out by a closer analysis of the Bithynian inscriptions. For one thing, as I have already noted, the form of the Bithynian inscriptions is usually different. Whereas almost all of the Olympian inscriptions are inclusive, with the provider of the inscription including him or herself along with a list of other people in the funerary arrangements, many of the Bithynian inscriptions are provided by someone whose burial is not expected to be included in the burial space. Husbands, for example, provide inscriptions for their wives, and vice versa, without including themselves as future occupants of the burial place (e.g. *TAM* iv.105; 106; 109). In other cases, someone provides for burial for family members, sometimes including the spouse and/or children of *that* family member, without including him or herself. For example, a man, Apollonis, provides an inscription for his brother Kamolos and Kamolos' wife Tertia (iv.108). If we take all three persons into consideration, we have an extended family commemoration, a man providing for his brother and sister-in-law; if, on the other hand, we take into consideration only those people actually included in the tomb or particular burial place, we have only a conjugal couple.⁴⁷ In any case, my main purpose here is to point out that the 'household' style of funerary commemoration provides a better source for evidence of the perceived structure of the family than funerary inscriptions in general.

IV. PROBLEMS WITH THE 'NUCLEAR FAMILY' CATEGORY

In giving the figures for nuclear family inscriptions I have counted any inscription as 'nuclear' if it contains any combination of relationships of the immediate family triad (father, mother, child) to the exclusion of extended or non-familial relations. Examined more critically, however, this practice may be construed as over-emphasizing the presence of the nuclear family. For example, my category of 'nuclear inscriptions' includes all those in which one parent alone provides burial space for him or herself

⁴⁶ See Z. Yavetz, 'The living conditions of the urban plebs in Republican Rome', *Latomus* 17 (1958), 500-17.

⁴⁷ In the figures for family structures given already, I have taken into account all the persons mentioned in the inscription, whether or not the providers intend to be buried there or not. But even if we count only those people who are actually expected to be buried

there, we come up with rather similar proportions: thirty four cases of conjugal couples alone; about twenty one of nuclear families (if we include 'partial' nuclear families, that is, any nuclear family members together even if a complete 'triad' is not present); and about fourteen of 'extended' families. Again, as was the case in counting all relationships mentioned, we see the predominance of conjugal burials.

along with one or more offspring. Of the forty-nine 'nuclear' family inscriptions from Bithynia (that is, those that provide evidence for more than the conjugal couple but no extended family relations), twenty are such 'partial' nuclear structures, whereas twenty-nine contain evidence for a whole nuclear structure (that is, father, mother, and at least one child). When we can tell who was actually listed as included in the tomb, fifteen are 'whole' nuclear structures, and six are 'partial', compared with fourteen that include extended family relations (this excludes the thirty four tombs meant to be occupied only by the conjugal couple).

Both Saller and Shaw's study and mine have also counted as 'nuclear' those inscriptions in which (probably) adult children provide for their parents or siblings provide for one another (to the exclusion of other family members). Of the forty nine Bithynian inscriptions, seven (all sibling inscriptions) fall into such a category, and twenty eight of the 210 from Termessus. If these inscriptions are removed from the 'nuclear' category (Category D), the percentage of such structures decreases to 32 per cent for Bithynia and 35 per cent for Termessus (percentage of multiple-person inscriptions).

When we speak of 'nuclear families', therefore, we should be clear about the category: according to one way of measuring, a man and his son alone or a man and his mother might count as a 'nuclear family'. Is that what we mean by 'nuclear family'? Should we count as 'nuclear' an inscription in which an adult man provides burial arrangements for himself and his brother (IV.193)? If a man included a brother along with his own immediate family, we would classify it as an extended family; do we treat it as a nuclear family if the two adult brothers provide for themselves without either of them mentioning wives or children? Two adult brothers living together would not today be regarded as a nuclear family.

If we count only those inscriptions in which some form of a complete triad is present (father, mother, and at least one child to the exclusion of other relations), the percentage of nuclear family inscriptions shrinks significantly (Termessus: 139 or 27 per cent of all multiple-person inscriptions; Bithynia: 29 or 22 per cent). This observation should not be dismissed as overly minimalist. After all, in modern discourse about the family, a family is considered nuclear (and 'normal' or 'traditional') if it contains father, mother, and at least one *dependent* child.⁴⁸ Therefore, when a modern scholar says that the family of the Roman imperial period was normally a nuclear family 'like our own', it is precisely that kind of minimalist, complete nuclear family that comes to mind for most modern readers. Such a conception, however, is misleading given the evidence here presented.

Actually, a close study of different kinds of family inscriptions suggests that Roman family structures were remarkably diverse and complex. One generalization that holds true is that the families are regularly small. There are exceptions: one nuclear family from Olympus seems to include a father, mother, two daughters, and possibly five sons; one from Termessus includes a father, mother, three sons, and two daughters.⁴⁹ For the most part, however, the number of people mentioned or included in the burial place is small. Even for extended family inscriptions, only a few people are involved — although the structures are diverse: a man provides for himself, his mother, and someone else of uncertain relationship (IV.115); a man provides for his two sons and their nurse (possibly all killed in an earthquake, if my reading is correct; IV.134); a man provides for a son and two female *θρεπταί* (IV.191); a man provides for his *θρεπτός*, the wife of his *θρεπτός*, and his own wife, but does not include himself (IV.256); a man provides for his parents-in-law and his wife, but does not include himself (IV.301); a man provides for his father and mother and his own son (IV.312). In another case, two brothers provide for the burial of their 'offspring' without including themselves (IV.229); and in another, two men (apparently not brothers) provide for themselves and their two brothers (each of them

⁴⁸ See, for example, E. P. Martin and J. M. Martin, *The Black Extended Family* (1978), 2; Masnick and Bane, *op. cit.* (n. 42), 25.

⁴⁹ *TAM* IV. 126; III.601. Others have a mother, father,

daughter, and two sons; or a father, mother, and possibly three sons (IV.151; 265). Even families as large as two parents and three children are rare in the inscriptions.

seems to have one brother, IV.239); another man provides for burial for himself, his father, and his father's wife (probably, therefore, his stepmother, IV.257). These inscriptions do not paint a picture of large, extended families, but neither do they portray coherent nuclear families.⁵⁰

The inscriptions from Termessus and Bithynia evoke a portrait of diverse and unexpected combinations of familial relations: siblings and sometimes their offspring included together; slaves or 'threptoi' included along with one's blood relations; transgenerational burials; in-laws included with one's blood or married relations while excluding oneself.⁵¹ In these inscriptions, the nuclear family structure does provide something like a model form for the inscriptions, but the coherent nuclear family is not necessarily the dominant arrangement for burial. We might say that the nuclear family holds a 'gravitational pull' in the inscriptions. It provides the *nucleus* for a great variety of actual family structures.

V. FAMILIAL TOMBSTONES AS A DATA BASE

I have argued that when using funerary inscriptions to ascertain family structures one should keep in mind the kinds of inscription involved and the particular burial customs they reflect. Familial inscriptions, such as many of those examined in this study, provide better and more information about the family structure than one-to-one commemorations or inscriptions that include only a partial family or household. The familial inscriptions from Olympus, for example, provide one (certainly not the only possible one) 'snapshot' of different families — or, more precisely, a snapshot of how people wanted to present their families. Because the style of the inscription is inclusive — that is, a person includes him or herself and what seems to be an entire household — it probably more accurately reflects what the providers considered the boundaries of their families.

There are other advantages, however, in using this kind of funerary inscription. As I mentioned above, these inscriptions show a remarkable diversity of family types and sizes: one-parent households, multi-generational extended households, laterally extended households (those in which siblings or cousins and their own immediate families are included together but without parents or grandparents), and many households (again, if we may take the inscription as a 'household') in which persons of no blood or marriage connection are included sometimes along with their own immediate or extended families. This kind of recognition of the diversity of possible relations in funerary arrangements is not available from less 'inclusive' epigraphical styles.

Still another advantage in using familial inscriptions to study the family is the opportunity they provide for analysis of sex roles and positions in households. I will illustrate by noting only two issues: the disproportion between female and male dependents named in the inscriptions, and the phenomenon we might call 'female heads of households' reflected in many inscriptions.

I noted above that families in the inscriptions are regularly small, usually with children numbering — at the most — no more than two sons and one daughter. In fact, taking the body of inscriptions from Olympus and Termessus as a test case (those locations with the greatest number of familial inscriptions), sons outnumber daughters by two to one. When one counts the number of offspring actually named in the Olympus inscriptions, the disparity is forty three named sons to twenty one named daughters. For Termessus, sons are mentioned 179 times compared to eighty references to daughters. One might suppose that this discrepancy is due to the inclusion of daughters

⁵⁰ This accords with the conclusions of the study of Egyptian census papyri by Bagnall and Frier, *op. cit.* (n. 17), 67–8, 134.

⁵¹ David Herlihy remarks about late Roman

antiquity that households were too disparate to be easily categorizable by census-takers: 'No common net could catch them all' (*op. cit.* (n. 3), 5).

in the households of their husbands, and indeed the number of daughters-in-law mentioned is generally greater than the number of sons-in-law. But the comparison of sons-in-law to daughters-in-law does not present *enough* of a discrepancy to account for the striking two-to-one discrepancy of sons to daughters. The patrilineal gravitation of the household may explain some of the discrepancy of sons to daughters in household inscriptions, but that phenomenon is not sufficient to explain the *extent* of the discrepancy.

When we look at extended family relations (excluding immediate family members and people not related by blood or marriage but included in an extended family inscription) included in family inscriptions of Olympus (chosen here because that is the body of data providing most evidence for extended family inscriptions), moreover, we find references to forty men and thirty eight women. This suggests that the 'invisible' daughters are not disproportionately occupying positions as extended family members of other relatives' households. On the other hand, if we count those persons not related by blood or marriage but included in someone else's funerary inscription (eighty seven people in the Olympus material), the proportion is forty nine females to thirty eight males. Of these inscriptions, twelve (representing twenty nine people; fifteen women and fourteen men) present couples (and, in a few cases, their named children) who are included in another immediate family's inscription. Subtracting those numbers from eighty seven shows that fifty-eight people are included in others' inscriptions with no blood or marriage relationship evident for them, that is as 'single' individuals: thirty four females and twenty four males. This perhaps indicates that women were more likely than men to be single, 'marginal' members of the family structures built around others' immediate families. But it must be remembered that male-female couples could also occupy such positions — as could, in fewer cases, even couples with their children. Furthermore, single men could also occupy this position in substantial numbers, though less than single women.

Though there are other factors that may help explain the discrepancy between sons and daughters in the inscriptions (such as, for example, the possibility that some women are concubines or 'second wives' for some men), none of these suggestions suffices to explain the extent of the discrepancy.⁵² Some of the discrepancy, therefore, should probably be taken as evidence that infant mortality was greater for females and/or that family planning (through, for example, infant exposure and sale into slavery) often discriminated against daughters and in favour of sons.⁵³

⁵² In one inscription, a man provides for himself, his mother, his wives (!), both of whom are listed by name, his two sons, a woman named Ammia, and Ammia's husband (II.1101). One (or both) of the wives may be dead, but there is no indication on the tombstone, and given the inclination of inscriptions to avoid the niceties of precise, legal terminology, the reader could take one (or both) of the women to be a concubine. For such situations in Rome, note Jane Gardner's comments: 'From the city of Rome, 23 inscriptions have been found where a dead woman is commemorated by two living "husbands"' (op. cit. (n. 41), 82). For concubines in Classical Athens sometimes in the household along with the mistress of the house, see S. C. Humphreys, *The Family, Women, and Death* (1983), 63-4.

⁵³ Scholars have often supposed that such practices were prejudicial against daughters, but direct evidence has been hard to come by, and the subject has been debated (see Gardner, op. cit. (n. 41), 6). Literary evidence suggests that it was almost a common sense of the ancient world that girls would be exposed much more than boys. See Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* x.23; Dionysius Halicarnassus II.15 and XI.34.2; Stobaeus 77.7 (Poseidippos); and the famous papyrus in which a man tells his wife to rear her child if it is a son, but to expose it if it is a daughter: *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (Grenfell and Hunt) IV.744. For a survey of

literary evidence see L. R. F. Germain, 'Aspects du droit d'exposition en Grèce', *Revue historique de Droit français et étranger* 47 (1969), 177-97. Donald Engels has argued, on the basis of demographic theory, that there was no significant exposure of females in the Greco-Roman world; he argues, in particular, against the use of funerary inscriptions for such research: 'The problem of female infanticide in the Greco-Roman world', *CP* 75 (1980), 112-20. His arguments have been countered by W. V. Harris, 'The theoretical possibility of extensive infanticide in the Graeco-Roman world', *CQ* 32 (1982), 114-16; and M. Golden, 'Demography and the exposure of girls at Athens', *Phoenix* 35 (1981), 316-31; Emiel Eyben also rejects Engels's arguments, op. cit. (n. 27), 17, n. 44; see also Boswell, op. cit. (n. 25), 18-19. Golden agrees with Engels that funerary inscriptions are a problematic source for the study of this question. But Engels's objections are relevant only to certain kinds of epigraphic material. The nature of the evidence epigraphic material. The nature of the evidence provided by these familial tombstone inscriptions from Asia Minor, particularly the differences between them and Western inscriptions in the manner of recording names, renders his objections irrelevant for my use of these inscriptions. For supporting epigraphic evidence from Hellenistic Greece, see S. B. Pomeroy, 'Infanticide in Hellenistic Greece', in A. Cameron

In spite of the perhaps precarious position of daughters in the Greco-Roman household, women could sometimes occupy roles that resemble that of the *paterfamilias*.⁵⁴ In many of the inscriptions, women are the providers of familial inscriptions. Whereas this is probably most often due to the fact that the husband has already died and is thus included in the inscription as deceased, in some cases women are the providers of inscriptions without any mention of a husband. In one rather confusing inscription, a woman named Gamike says that she built a tomb in which she allows to be buried her children and those who would be born to Neike and Artemis (her daughters?) 'but none of those who are to be born from my male children'. She then also permits in the tomb her γαμβροί (sons-in-law?) Hieratikos and Zosimas. It would appear that Gamike is providing for the burial of her two daughters, their husbands, and their future children, but explicitly excluding any male children she might have, along with their descendants.⁵⁵

There is explicit evidence that in some cases women provide inscriptions even though the husband is alive. In II.975, for instance, Menipe builds a tomb for herself and her husband Artemeidoros and for their unnamed children and grandchildren (again, they may not actually have any). Later in the inscription Menipe gives Artemeidoros authority to permit other burials in the tomb, so he is obviously alive. Another woman seems to provide burial for herself, possibly her natural parents, and then, it seems, for her adoptive father; her husband is mentioned only as having authority (along with herself) to permit other burials, thus indicating, at the least, that he is alive.⁵⁶ These instances show, therefore, that although in some cases women are providers due to their husbands' deaths, in other cases they provide even though their husbands are alive.

In some cases women seem to be the providers for inscriptions because they enjoy higher status than their husbands. In Menipe's case (II.975) above, she, but not he, is said to be an Olympene (though this may not be much of a high status indicator); she is also said to be 'of Theophilos' and no 'origin' (either father's or owner's name) is given for him. Considering also that her name comes first and she is the one who 'allows' her husband some authority for future transactions, we may conjecture that she enjoys higher status than he, perhaps due to her status as an 'Olympene' or perhaps because he may be a slave (and hence the absence of a family name for him). Similarly, Licinnia, daughter of Publius (II.1046), is called an Olympene while her husband is named without any such designation and without mention of his father's name. These are sparse and few clues, but they may indicate that in many of these cases when women are the providers of inscriptions their names occur first because they enjoy higher status than their husbands.⁵⁷

In those cases in which husbands are simply absent or when the husband has less legal power than the wife (as when, for example, he is a slave though she is not, or when she enjoys higher official status than he for whatever reason) we may reasonably speak of these women as 'female heads of households'. But even in other cases when the wife is the provider of the tomb and her name comes first for reasons unknown to us we may

and A. Kurht (eds), *Images of Women in Antiquity* (1983), 207–22; Clark, *op. cit.* (n. 41), 195. See also the evidence from Roman Egypt: Bagnall and Frier, *op. cit.* (n. 17), 92, 101, 152–3. Interestingly, there is anthropological evidence from a different place and time that also shows a two to one ratio of boys to girls: see I. Bognár-Kutzian, *The Copper Age Cemetery of Tiszapolgár-Basatanya* (1963), cited in P. J. Úck, 'Ethnography and the archaeological interpretation of funerary remains', *World Archaeology* 1 (1969), 262–77, at 270.

⁵⁴ For one example of an élite woman in a rather independent position of control over her property, see Boatwright, *op. cit.* (n. 43), esp. 30.

⁵⁵ II.1148. The interpretation of this inscription is

not certain, but I think I have got the gist of it. It is uncertain, but likely, that Neike and Artemis are daughters of Gamike, and the two males mentioned their husbands. Finally, it is unclear why Gamike would explicitly exclude any male offspring she might have, if indeed she already has them. For other female providers of extended family inscriptions: II.1003, 1096, 1103, 1107, 1120.

⁵⁶ II.1070; see also 1046, 1070.

⁵⁷ See also III.365. M. B. Flory, 'Where women precede men: factors influencing the order of names in Roman epitaphs', *CJ* 79 (1983), 216–24; Flory's study is of Roman inscriptions, but the inscriptions here examined exhibit the same phenomenon for Roman Asia Minor.

consider that these women enjoy some kind of 'head of the household' position even if their husbands are alive and even though such a position is not ideologically or legally possible for them in the Roman Empire.⁵⁸ Such musings perhaps merit further study. At this point, my goal is merely to demonstrate the kinds of portraits available from such 'familial' inscriptions. A simple analysis of single commemorators and persons commemorated could not yield this sort of complexity.

A further advantage of familial inscriptions is the prospect they offer for diachronic analysis of families. Scholars of the family and household of more recent periods have urged that families be studied as they change over time.⁵⁹ Generally, this kind of analysis is quite difficult or even impossible for the ancient family; without the kinds of data used by scholars of other periods (such as census records), we have too little evidence to trace any but the most élite and famous families through time. Yet although too few of these funerary inscriptions are dated to allow for diachronic analysis of societal shifts in family structures, some limited use may be made of the familial style inscriptions for diachronic analysis of individual families. In the first place, by simply reading the inscriptions carefully, we can discern stages in the family (by noting deaths or marriages, for instance). More importantly, it seems that persons who put up funerary inscriptions were sometimes able to change the inscription to reflect changes in their family. A few examples must suffice here, offered merely to demonstrate the possibilities.

Often, it seems, men provide an inscription for themselves, their unnamed wives, children, and grandchildren. As noted above, it seems that such persons did not always have those relations when the inscription was commissioned. And indeed, in a few cases, a man apparently added a particular name only later, perhaps when he actually married. An Olympene named Eutuches, for example, seems to have added the name of his wife Laiene only after the original erection of the inscription (II.1036). Another man, after providing for himself, his wife, and his (unnamed) children and grandchildren, seems to have added after the traditional epigraphical closing matter a reference to three other people — a man and wife, and the provider's γαμβρός (son-in-law? note that the last man mentioned is said to be 'of Tinda', a woman's name, possibly indicating that the γαμβρός is a slave? II.1042). Another man also seems later to have added the names of his sons' two wives (II.1011). One freedman initially erects an inscription for himself and his female θρεπτή, whom he and someone else reared together; he later adds an inscription including his wife, *her* children (by another man? or were they born in slavery and thus are not legally 'his' children?),⁶⁰ and his freedman (II.1028). In this case, we may be witnessing a situation in which a freedman experienced one kind of 'family life', with another man and their female θρεπτή, and then another, with a wife, stepchildren, and freed dependents of his own. In a rather different situation, one inscription is set up by two women (apparently not sisters) for themselves, their children, their deceased husbands, and their young female slaves (II.1080). Do we have here two female heads of household who, upon the deaths of their husbands, have now pooled their resources?

Other inscriptions display a phenomenon we would expect to occur: 'serial' nuclear families, that is, family structures in which, because of death or divorce, more than one

⁵⁸ For women as providers of funerary arrangements for large, extended households, see II.1163 (a woman provides for herself, her husband, children, grandchildren, τρόφιμη, her father, mother, her second husband, who is an οἰκονόμος of the 'ethnos of Lycia', a man identified as her σύντροφος, and his wife); II.967 (a female slave of a woman for herself, husband, children, grandchildren, son-in-law, her *own* slave woman, and that woman's husband and children); II.984 (a woman, perhaps a slave of another woman,

for self, husband, children, grandchildren, sister and another woman of uncertain relation); II.990 (a woman for self, husband, another man she claims to have purchased, three women she has reared, her mother-in-law, and her mother-in-law's husband).

⁵⁹ See Segaline, *op. cit.* (n. 34), 24–7.

⁶⁰ But note that slave couples do sometimes call their children jointly their own even when legally the father had no parental claim: III.541; 815.

spouse and different 'sets' of children are included.⁶¹ One man, for example, provides for himself, his wife, their children, and his deceased former wife (III.219). Another man provides for himself, his deceased wife, their children, his second wife, and 'her' children (his stepchildren, III.472; see also 752; 796). In one complicated inscription from Olympus, a woman provides an inscription for herself, her husband, their (unnamed) children and grandchildren (do they actually have any?), her 'sweetest', deceased *τρόφιμη*, her father, her mother, and her second husband, described as an *οἰκονόμος* 'of the people of Lycia' (perhaps a public slave in an official capacity). After the end matter, she also allows a man with whom she was 'reared' (*σύντροφος*) and his wife to be buried with the family (II.1163). We can only imagine the kind of varied 'family life' experienced by this woman and the other members of her rather diverse household. By means of this familial style inscription, moreover, we can imagine it changing over time, perhaps shifting from a rather traditional structure of conjugal couple headed by her first husband, to an extended structure including her own parents as well as other non-blood relations and headed by herself due to the lower status of her current husband. These kinds of glimpses into the complexities of familial relations would not be possible with simpler, one-to-one commemorative funerary inscriptions. Due in part to the more complex epigraphical style, a greater degree of complexity of familial structures may be discerned.

VI. CRITIQUE OF THE NUCLEAR/EXTENDED DICHOTOMY

Up to this point in my argument, I have for the most part assumed the nuclear/extended family dichotomy presupposed by Saller and Shaw's study. My analysis itself, however, has tended to deconstruct that dichotomy. This examination of the familial inscriptions from Asia Minor has demonstrated, by its very confusion, the problems with using the modern model of the nuclear family as an organizing rubric. Whole, apparently stable nuclear families are represented in only a minority of these inscriptions. Large extended families that follow the ideological image of the pyramidal household under a *paterfamilias* are also rare. The varied configurations of relationships that emerge from my study suggest that family structures could have a much greater variety of boundaries and *kinds* of boundaries than can be encompassed by the nuclear versus extended categories. Perhaps we should dispense with those categories and look for a new model for the construction of the Roman family.⁶²

In an archaeological study of Roman houses, Andrew Wallace-Hadrill criticizes the dichotomy between public and private space with which many scholars have categorized the social structure of Roman household architecture. He insists that, in contrast to classical Greek culture, in Roman society 'the home was a locus of public life. A public figure went home not so much in order to shield himself from the public gaze, as to

⁶¹ K. R. Bradley emphasizes the instability of the Roman family — due to deaths, divorces, remarriage, and questions of which household children would go with — in two articles ('Dislocation in the Roman family' and 'Remarriage and the structure of the upper-class family at Rome') now collected in his *Discovering the Roman Family: Studies in Roman Social History* (1991). As Bradley concludes, 'Because of these factors, the upper-class Roman family certainly has to be regarded as a dynamic entity, but one that in its life course had little regularity of shape. It was, rather, an extremely fluid organism, subject to constant interruption, disruption, and reconstitution. It embraced both kin and nonkin members within a single household and beyond, and combined elements of nuclearity with more extensive associations of vital

importance. Perhaps it is not altogether surprising, therefore, that the most common term of reference used by Romans to designate their families was not an abstract noun but simply, as Cicero so often wrote, the open-ended adjectival form, *mei*' (171–2). My study of the Asia Minor inscriptions, limited and impressionistic as it is, impresses me with the aptness of Bradley's description. See also Corbier, *op. cit.* (n. 3), 136.

⁶² For examples of others' dissatisfaction with the nuclear/extended dichotomy, see T. K. Hareven, 'Family time and historical time', *Daedalus* 106 (Spring, 1977), 57–70, esp. 69; E. A. Wrigley, 'Reflections on the history of the family', *Daedalus* 106 (Spring, 1977), 71–85, at 73.

present himself to it in the best light'.⁶³ According to Wallace-Hadrill, archaeologists have approached the study of the Roman upper-class house with a public/private antithesis that is too polar:

[W]e are dealing rather with a spectrum that ranges from the completely public to the completely private, and with an architectural and decorative language which seeks to establish relativities along the spectrum. One space is more or less open or intimate in relation to the other spaces around it, and it is contrasts of shape and decoration that establish such relativities. The pattern of Roman social life admitted numerous and subtle grades of relative privacy; in which, it must be apparent, greater privacy represented not a descent in the scale, but an ascent in privilege, an advance towards intimacy with the *paterfamilias*. There is a hierarchy of social occasions from the promiscuous morning salutation to the sought-after afternoon *cena*. The triclinium will be private relative to the main circulation and open reception areas; yet the cubiculum is private relative to the triclinium, and this is a place not only for rest ('bedroom') but for the reception of intimate friends and for the conducting of confidential business (imperial trials *intra cubiculum* come to mind).⁶⁴

Rather than positing a dichotomy of public or private, therefore, Wallace-Hadrill urges the image of a spectrum of intimacy.

I would argue that a similar model for family structure might usefully supplant — or at least modify — the modern nuclear/extended dichotomy for analysis of Greco-Roman households.⁶⁵ The families that emerge from my studies of Asia Minor inscriptions do not fit either the nuclear or extended structure well. The family of these inscriptions has a 'nucleated' centre surrounded by a spectrum of relations of more or less intimacy. The boundaries between the 'immediate' and 'extended' family members is discernible but permeable. The immediate family triad is ideologically (and perhaps emotionally, though that is not my concern) important, but not necessarily dominant from a social-structural point of view. The structures reflect the patron-client system, which of course included, at its centre, the *paterfamilias* surrounded by *uxor liberique*, but which continued outward through the *familia* (referring most often to the servile members) and the wider *domus*, which could include broadly extended family relations, freedpersons, and even clients and other dependents. To return to the terminological problem with which this article began, the Romans had no name for the 'nuclear family' as differentiated from the *familia* or *domus* not because the nuclear family did not exist in the sociological or biological sense (that is, in certain modernist discourses), nor because it was not important as a series of relationships, but because it was not important to them to distinguish those relations firmly from other, less intimate familial relations. The relationships existed for them, but the dichotomy did not. That being the case, it will be continually misleading for us modern scholars to construct our debate along the lines of an argument over whether the 'nuclear' or 'extended' family was more dominant.

VII. CONCLUSION

Whatever the outcome of that theoretical issue, I believe I have demonstrated that social historians of the Roman Empire must take a closer look at the methods and data previously used to ascertain family structures in the ancient Mediterranean. Saller and Shaw's study, as important and ground-breaking as it has been, should not be taken to have settled the question about the 'nuclear' family in Antiquity. Given their methods of counting relationships and the kinds of inscriptions studied, their conclusion

⁶³ A. Wallace-Hadrill, 'The social structure of the Roman house,' *PBSR* 56 (1988), 43–97, at 46; see also his 'Houses and Households: Sampling Pompeii and Herculaneum', in B. Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome* (1991), 191–227. For an interesting study of contrasting structures and familial ideology in the Classical Greek East, see M. H. Jameson, 'Domestic Space in the

Greek City-state', in S. Kent (ed.), *Domestic Architecture and the Use of Space: An Interdisciplinary Cross-cultural Study* (1990), 92–113.

⁶⁴ Wallace-Hadrill, *op. cit.* (n. 63, 1988), 58.

⁶⁵ For a similar critique, see K. Bradley, 'Remarriage and the structure of the upper-class Roman family', in Rawson, *op. cit.* (n. 63), 88–9.

emphasizing the strong predominance of the nuclear family was predetermined and therefore flawed. A more useful kind of evidence, I propose, is provided by those inscriptions that make some pretence of familial inclusivity.

APPENDIX

TABLE 2

This table organizes data from selections of funerary inscriptions from *Tituli Asiae Minoris* (*TAM*). The inscriptions are listed by geographical origin: Olympus (*TAM* II.947-1163); Termessus (III.214-863); Bithynia (IV.105-314); Apollonis (V.1209-1228); Magnesia/Sipyllum (V.1370-1392); Hierocaesarea (V.1278-1297); Attalia (V.831-854).

Explanation of categories:

A = Inscription too fragmentary to ascertain relations.

B = Only one person mentioned with no discernable relations.⁶⁶

C = Husband and wife only (conjugal couple).

D = Nuclear family members only (either a 'whole' or 'partial' family).

E = Persons outside the immediate family included in a familial inscription (extended).

F = Multi-person inscription about which relations are not ascertainable.

Numbers in parenthesis are percentages. The number before the solidus (/) is the percentage of *all* inscriptions from that location; the number after the solidus is the percentage of multiple-person inscriptions (familial inscriptions). Thus, under Olympus, Category D below, forty-six is 21 per cent of 218 (all inscriptions from Olympus) and 22 per cent of 205 (multiple-person inscriptions).

	Olympus	Termessus	Bithynia	Apollonis	Magnesia/ Sipyllum	Hiero- caesarea	Attalia
A	11	47	44	12	6	5	2
B	2	80	32	2	2	0	1
C	5 (2/2)	151 (23/29)	41 (20/31)	0	2 (10/15)	0	3 (12/14)
D	46 (21/22)	210 (32/40)	49 (23/37)	4 (20/67)	2 (10/15)	5 (28/38)	9 (36/41)
C+D	51 (23/25)	361 (56/69)	90 (43/68)	4 (20/67)	4 (19/31)	5 (28/38)	12 (48/55)
E	154 (71/75)	148 (23/28)	34 (16/26)	2 (10/33)	8 (38/62)	8 (44/62)	9 (36/41)
F	0	14 (2/3)	9 (4/7)	0	1 (5/8)	0	1 (4/5)
Total	218	650	209	20	21	18	25
Multi- Person	205	523	133	6	13	13	22

⁶⁶ The number for this category under 'Termessus' includes fourteen inscriptions in which a person provided burial for him or herself and included reference to 'his' or 'hers', but without giving any

more precise information about what kind of relations were meant. Since these inscriptions could not be categorized reliably by family type, they have been included in Category B.

TABLE 3

This table shows the totals for the different categories for all inscriptions.
(Percentages are rounded to nearest percentage point.)

A	127
B	119
C	202
	(17/22)
D	325
	(28/35)
C+D	527
	(45/58)
E	363
	(31/40)
F	25
	(2/3)
Total inscriptions	1161
Multi-person inscriptions	916

Department of Religion, Duke University