

SUSAN TREGGIARI

THE OBJECT of this paper is to examine the status and, as far as possible, the lives of those people commemorated in the inscriptions of the City of Rome as *contubernales*, in the sense of partners in a quasi-marital relationship.¹ The word was also used in epitaphs and other inscriptions in its original sense of "tent-companion" for comrades in the army and occasionally for slave messmates of the same sex. These two usages are

¹The foundations of work on this area were laid during tenure of a Leave Fellowship from the Canada Council (now the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada) in 1976-1977 and work on the present topic was greatly aided by a Minor Research Grant from the same generous patron in the summer of 1978. My thanks are also due to inspiring audiences at the University of Victoria in 1977, at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of Canada in 1979 and at the Vassar conference on "Women in the Roman empire" in 1980, as well as to members of seminars at Ottawa. Particular acknowledgement must be made to the published work of Beryl Rawson and P. R. C. Weaver and to the penetrating criticism and generous help of E. Badian, S. Dickison, M. K. Hopkins, B. Rawson, A. N. Sherwin-White, C. M. Wells, and the *Phoenix* readers.

The following works were checked but found to be unhelpful to the present discussion: C. Costa, "Le nozze servili," *Archivio giuridico* 42 (1889) 210-220; Pier Silviero Leicht, "Il matrimonio del servo," *Scritti . . . C. Ferrini* 1 (Milan 1947) 305-316 (mostly on post-classical law); Elemér Pólay, "Il matrimonio degli schiavi nella Roma repubblicana," *Studi . . . G. Grosso* 3 (Turin 1970) 77-99; Orlis Robleda, *Il diritto degli schiavi nell'antica Roma* (Rome 1976) 69; S. Solazzi, "Il rispetto per la famiglia dello schiavo," *SDHI* 15 (1949) 187-192 (on the post-Constantinian period).

The following abbreviations are used: Buckland = W. W. Buckland, *The Roman law of slavery. The condition of the slave in private law from Augustus to Justinian* (Cambridge 1908); Boulvert, *EAI* = Gérard Boulvert, *Esclaves et affranchis impériaux sous le haut-empire romain. Rôle politique et administratif* (Naples 1970); Boulvert, *DF* = Gérard Boulvert, *Domestique et fonctionnaire sous le haut-empire romain. La condition de l'affranchi et de l'esclave du Prince* (Paris 1974); Chantraine = Heinrich Chantraine, *Freigelassene und Sklaven im Dienst der Römischen Kaiser. Studien zur ihrer Nomenklatur* (Wiesbaden 1967); Mañaricua = Andres E. De Mañaricua y Nuera, *El matrimonio de los esclavos: estudio historico juridico hasta la fijacion de la disciplina en el derecho canonico* (Rome 1940), the fullest account; Mangas Manjarres = Julio Mangas Manjarres, *Esclavos y libertos en la España romana* (Salamanca 1971) especially 51, 130-132; Rawson = Beryl Rawson, "Roman concubinage and other *de facto* marriages," *TAPA* 104 (1974) 279-305; Weaver, *FC* = P. R. C. Weaver, *Familia Caesaris. A social study of the emperor's freedmen and slaves* (Cambridge 1972).

Inscriptions from *CIL* 6 are cited without the prefix "*CIL* 6", other volumes without "*CIL*".

Columbaria are abbreviated as follows: *M* = *Monumentum*; *MIAL* = *Monumenta inter Appiam et Latinam*; *ML* = *Monumentum Liviae*; *MM* = *Monumentum Marcellae*; *MPPP* = *Monumentum prope Portam Praenestinae*; *MS* = *Monumentum Statiliorum*; *MV* = *Monumentum Volusiorum*.

excluded here.² In literature, *contubernalis* is *vox propria* for a slave "wife" or "husband" in Columella and Petronius; this is also the usual sense in the jurists and the commonest sense in the inscriptions.³ But *contubernium* is also a quasi-marital relationship involving one slave partner rather than two. The Elder Seneca has this sense,⁴ as do the jurists: *Inter servos et liberos matrimonium contrahi non potest, contubernium potest.*⁵ It was unnecessary for lawyers to point out that valid Roman marriage was impossible between slave and slave. The word *contubernalis* is used in the *Digest*, however, in the context of *contubernium* of slave with slave, rather than of a slave with a free person.⁶ A relationship which attracts the attention of jurists and is recognised or promoted by *domini* and acknowledged by slave or free on their epitaphs is remote from the lightning liaisons recommended in Horace's second *Satire* and has rightly been attracting the attention of recent scholarship.

Conubium existed only for Romans and certain favoured non-Romans who had been given the *ius conubii* with citizens; it meant that children took their father's status and were *in patria potestate*. Other races continued to marry and be given in marriage under their own laws. Slaves, not being citizens of any city, clearly were incapable of legal marriage, and there was no *conubium* between slave and citizen. *Contubernium* existed by permission of the slave-owner and was not protected by the law, for it was sanctioned by custom only.⁷

²See *ThLL*, OLD. The epigraphic instances from *CIL* 6 which I exclude are, for *commilitones*, 2483, 3333, 3418, 3569, 3593, 32798, 32811, 33043a; for slave messmates, 6357, 9923, 22738; also 13161.

³Colum. 1.8.5; 12.1.1, Petr. *Sat.* 57.6, 61.9; Pliny *HN* 36.82. Cato uses *uxor* (*Agr.* 143.1); Varro had resorted to the periphrasis *coniunctas conservas* in a similar context (*Rust.* 1.17.5) a usage which continues. Plautus *Mil.* 184 applies to Philocomasium's fellow-slaves of opposite sex, but with no sexual innuendo apparent to me. For the jurists, see *Dig.* 32.41.2, Scaev.; 33.7.12, 33, Ulp.; 35.1.81 pr., Paul.; 40.4.59 pr., Scaev.; 40.7.31.1, Gaius.

⁴*Controv.* 7.6.12: *in contubernium deducta servi domina est.* (*Servi* is rhetorical, since the man has been freed.)

⁵Paulus *Sent.* 2.19.6, cf. *Tit. Ulp.* 5.5, 5.9. The lack of interest on the part of ancient jurists in an extra-legal relationship is reflected by moderns, e.g., P. Jörs, *Römisches Privatrecht* (Berlin 1975) 272 n.5, which is commonly cited.

⁶Literary authors also use *contubernium* more loosely in a sexual sense (*ThLL* s.v.B). *Dig.* 34.9.14, Pap. (. . . *mulierem quae stupro cognita in contubernio militis fuit* . . .) and 48.5.12.1, Pap. (*Militem, qui sororis filiam in contubernio habuit, licet non in matrimonium (sic) adulterii poena teneri rectius dicetur*) seem to be the only instances of looser usage, no doubt influenced by the military context, in the classical jurists. (Cf. *CodIust* 5.27.11 pr., A.D. 530).

⁷Thus, for instance, a female *contubernalis* could not be guilty of adultery (*CodIust* 9.9.23 pr., A.D. 290) but for alleged modification of the legal position see *HA Aurel.* 49.4. Strictly, dowry was not possible, but in practice slave women did give it to their mates (*Dig.* 23.3.39 pr., Ulp; 23.3.67, Proc.). For the emulation of legal marriage by

It is impossible to say what proportion of Roman slaves lived in *contubernium* at some point in their lives as slaves. But for city slaves we have a considerable body of evidence in the inscriptions. It is my purpose here to discuss only those who are actually described as *contubernales* in the inscriptions of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* 6. These have recently been made accessible by the computer index compiled by E. J. Jory.⁸ I have excluded those which refer to other types of *contubernales* than the quasi-husband and quasi-wives⁹ and discarded 56 inscriptions which were fragmentary or incomplete (referring to only one partner, for instance). 260 couples remain, in which one partner is described as *contubernalis*: since the relationship was reciprocal, this means that the other partner was also *contubernalis*. As we have seen, *contubernium* is strictly the relationship between slave and slave or a slave and a free person (whether freed or free-born). A major theme of this paper is that the word *contubernalis* is not used in the inscriptions except when at least one partner had been a slave *during the union*.¹⁰

The 260 couples may be classified in 17 categories, which I group in three larger classes, couples where both partners are slaves, couples where at least one partner has been freed and couples where at least one partner is free (see Tables 1 and 2). Although statistics tell us nothing about the status of *contubernales* in the total slave or slave and free population of the City, the breakdown is given here in order to sharpen our picture of the data given by the 260 couples whose monuments have survived to our time—an unknown proportion of the tomb inscriptions which such people originally set up, who themselves were a fraction and probably a favoured fractions of the population. In what follows, reference will constantly be made to couples listed by capital Roman and Arabic numerals in the Appendix.

slaves cf. Mañaricua 83–104, Mangas Manjarres 131. We may note in passing that not all Roman citizens had *conubium* with each other; fewer still could meet the Augustan marriage requirements.

⁸*CIL* 6.7.1–6 (Berlin 1974–1975). People referred to as *contubernalis* or *contubern.* or *contub.* were collected, just over a dozen examples of *cont.* excluded.

⁹Even the jurists, like Cato (above, note 3), occasionally slip into the language of legal marriage (*Dig.* 33.7.12.7, Ulp.; Paulus *Sent.* 3.6.38). Here I shall use “husbands,” “wives” and “partners,” as well as “*contubernales*.”

¹⁰Cf. Rawson 293: “. . . it may well be that a term which was more appropriate when first applied continued to be used of people or their relationship even after their official status had changed;” Boulvert, *DF* 284: “. . . le mot *contubernium*, désignant normalement l’union de fait de deux esclaves ou d’un esclave et d’une personne libre, employé à propos d’affranchis impériaux désigne une union antérieure à l’affranchissement et se prolongeant après lui.” But I do not agree with him that it is “concubinat” (at least in the sense of *concubinatus*). My approach also differs from that of Rawson although we are working with the same material (almost—she has 270 couples). I usually agree with her classification; in what follows I refer to her discussion chiefly when my opinion diverges.

TABLE 1
CATEGORIES*Couples*

I	Husband and wife slave	6	} 68
II	Husband slave, wife probably slave	15	
III	Husband probably slave, wife slave	14	
IV	Husband probably slave, wife probably slave	33	
V	Husband and wife freed	14	} 27
VI	Husband slave, wife freed	2	
VII	Husband probably slave, wife freed	5	
VIII	Husband freed, wife probably slave	6	
IX	Husband slave, wife free	35	} 165
X	Husband probably slave, wife free	30	
XI	Husband free, wife slave	3	
XII	Husband free, wife probably slave	15	
XIII	Husband free, wife freed	6	
XIV	Husband freed, wife free	14	
XV	Husband and wife free	57	
XVI	Husband free, wife freeborn	2	} 3
XVII	Husband freeborn, wife free	3	
		260	

TABLE 2
STATUS OF HUSBANDS AND WIVES

WIFE ↓	HUSBAND →	SLAVE Certainly or probably	FREED	FREE Freed or freeborn	TOTALS
SLAVE	Certainly or probably	68	6	18	92
FREED		7	14	6	27
FREE	Freed or freeborn	65	14	62	141
TOTALS		140	34	86	260

I

A mere half-dozen couples (2% of the total sample) fall into the category of definite slaves (I). These bear the master's name in the genitive, sometimes followed by *servus/a* or the abbreviations *ser./s.* or indicate

slave status by the word *conservus/a*.¹¹ The six include two couples of *conservi* whose owners are unknown (I.1, 3); one couple belonging to Octavia the daughter of Claudius (I.6), and, more interesting, three couples where husband and wife have different owners. Of these, Philadelphus (I.5) belongs to the emperor Nero and his wife to Philadespotus, presumably another slave or a freedman of the emperor, so that they belong to what we might regard as "the extended *familia*" of the palace. Felix (I.2) belongs to M. Satellius Tychius and his wife Hygia to Flavia Antiochis. Festus (I.4) belongs to M. Septimius Gallus and his wife to Alpionia Quinta. Probably these two pairs of owners are married to each other.

Other features will show up more clearly if we add to this very small category the next two, where one partner is known to be a slave and the other is presumed to be because he bears only one name. Omission of status may be partly accounted for by emphasis on other features or on the person to whom the memorial is dedicated. It is striking that all but two of the inscriptions where the wife's status is attested but not the husband's were set up by the husband to the wife. Half of those where the husband's status is known and the wife's not were set up by the wife to the husband. So the dedicator may keep himself or herself slightly in the background and not think it necessary to specify his status (particularly if it is the same as his partner's). The omission in some of the other cases may be partly accounted for by emphasis on the husband's job (II.5, 10, 12, 13) or the wife's virtues (II.12) or the husband's precise age (III.4). Many of these inscriptions are in fact of substantial length, but space and money were not unlimited.

We may also add 33 couples who give the bare single names (IV). Slave or freed status is confirmed by domestic posts held by Charitinus, a *dispensator*, normally a slave's job (IV.3) or Irene, a wool-weigher (IV.20) or an *ornatrix* and an *ad speculum* (IV.26, 27) and by provenance from *columbaria*. Such ages at death as are mentioned for the presumed slaves in II, III and IV, all but three 30 (the normal legal minimum age for manumission) or below, cause no uneasiness with the presumption. But it must be emphasised that it is only a working hypothesis and some individuals who are given only one name (particularly if they are neither the dedicator nor the person primarily commemorated) may not have been slaves. Because owners are not mentioned at all in IV and only mentioned sometimes for one partner in II and III, we cannot discover if these *contubernales* are mostly *conservi* or slaves or members of the same household or family. But the owners represented are, not surprisingly,

¹¹This, admittedly, is less conclusive, for the word is occasionally used of *libertini*, but the single name also supports slave status.

often from the upper classes.¹² They may be named partly because of their superior status.¹³

If we include all the *contubernales* in I–IV, it is clear that jobs, where mentioned, are of the more desirable type. Husbands work as steward (I.4; II.3, 12; IV.3), *ab argento* (I.6), *tabularius* (II.1), gardener (II.4), actor (II.5), *cubicularius* (II.10), *vestiarius* (II.11), *ab hospitibus* (II.13), *a veste munda* (II.14) a glazier (probably, III.11) or *in horrea* (I.5; III.14). “Wives” are *ornatrices* (I.4, 6; III.7; IV.26), a mime actress (III.11) *ad speculum* (IV.27), *obstetrix* (III.2) and *lanipenda* (IV.20). Slaves with jobs like these were more likely to want to mention them on their inscriptions.

A certain continuity of family life is shown by, for example, this inscription:

D.M./Trophime/Aug(usti) n(o)stri verna/vixit ann. xxi mens. ii dieb. xxviii/Martiales tres pater/et contubernalis et filius/b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecerunt). (III.9)

Since Trophime was a *verna*, her mother was a slave of the emperor at the time she was born. Her son certainly (because of her status) and her father and husband probably were imperial slaves too. It appears to have been merely a pleasing coincidence that her husband bore the same name as her father (unless the eldest Martialis was really her father-in-law), but obviously the child’s name was chosen to commemorate his father and grandfather. It does not much matter whether the parents or the administrators of the household chose the name: in either case the slave family was regarded as a unit.

¹²Possibly a Statilius Taurus (II.1); L. Aponius, who is thought to appear on a fragment of the *Fasti Cuprenses* and to be the probable owner of a number of slaves and freedmen, mostly buried in a tomb between the Via Salaria and the Via Pinciana (II.3, *PIR*² A 933); L. Volusius probably the consul of A.D. 3, the earliest owner in the Volusian *columbarium* (II.10); Sex. Carminius Vetus, from a line of consuls of the late 1st and early 2nd centuries (II.11, *PIR*² C 436–438; Q. Glitius Atilius Agricola, *cos.* II 103 (III.13, *PIR*² G 181); Minicius Faustinus *cos. suff.* 116 (III.4, *RE* 15 (1932) 1812 no. 10). Elpis is buried in the tomb on the Via Cassia used by dependants of Ti. Catus Caesius Fronto *cos. suff.* 96. Her owner, Nepotilla, was probably his daughter or sister (III.12, *PIR*² C 194, 208). The imperial family is also represented (II.4, ?5, 14; III.8, 9). Flavia Sabina is probably the wife of Caesennius Paetus (possibly the consul of 61) and the daughter of a Titus, presumably T. Flavius Sabinus, Vespasian’s brother (III.2, *PIR*² F 440), not just any lower-class Flavia Sabina (cf. 9433, 18051, 18420, 18422, 34429).

¹³Others are less eminent but may show the cohesiveness of the *familia Caesaris*. There is one certain freedman of an emperor, Aegisthus (II.7–8) who might be Ti. Claudius Aegisthus (14904) or M. Aurelius Aug. 1. Aegisthus (33136), but the name is not uncommon (cf., e.g., IX.10). Claudius Secundus (III.6), Iulia Seonis (III.7) and Iulia Epiphania (III.14) are likely to be *liberti* or children of *liberti* of the imperial house.

II

Next, pairs of *contubernales* in which at least one partner has been freed. These fall into four categories: where both partners are of freed status (V), where the husband is certainly (VI) or probably (VII) still a slave but the wife is a freedwoman, where the husband is freed but the wife probably a slave (VIII). Marriages of freed husband and explicitly slave wife are unrepresented. In this group, we are looking either at couples where both partners had been slaves when the *contubernium* began (that is, we are catching the same type of *contubernia* as those in our first group at a later stage and, probably, age) or at couples in a "mixed marriage" where one partner was already of freed status. A third possibility, that both partners were already *libertini* when the *contubernium* began, will be excluded.

To take the first category (V), where both partners are definite *libertini*, we find without surprise that marriages between *colliberti*¹⁴ and between *patronus* and *liberta* are well represented. *Contubernales* who were *colliberti* must (with rare exceptions) have shared the same environment as slaves. Only in one instance is there evidence of a time-lag between manumission of husband and wife: Iulia Primigenia must have been freed after Ti. Claudius Epictetus (V.4).

When the husband owned his wife, he controlled her manumission. We have three instances here. Two of the husbands were imperial freedmen, of Augustus or Gaius (V.11) and of Claudius or Nero (V.10). Claudia Stepte died at 72 and the marriage had lasted 46 years, so it began when she was 26. Weaver assumes (*FC* 109) that this means that the husband, already a freedman, freed her when she was 26 *matrimonii causa*. But it is also possible that they were both still slaves when the relationship began. She may have been a *conserva*, whom Nymphodotus subsequently bought or acquired by other means, as his *vicaria* if he was

¹⁴*Colliberti* strictly should have the same manumissor or (where they had had joint *domini*) manumissors. In the latter case the *nomen* might derive from either owner, so variation of *nomen* of *collibertus* and *colliberta* might occur. Chantraine (119–120) documents some loosening of strict usage, which I only partly accept. Against Chantraine I think that the pair in V.2 are genuine *colliberti* and that, because an Aelius is mentioned at the end of the inscription, they were probably freed by joint Augusti (not an Augustus and an Augusta) either M. Aurelius and L. Aelius Aurelius Commodus (138–161) or M. Aurelius and L. Aurelius Commodus (177–180). The wife might have been freed by only one of her husband's two patrons. I would hold that Ti. Claudius Epictetus and his *colliberta* of different *nomen*, Iulia Primigenia (V.4), were probably freed by Tiberius before and after his adoption into the Julian house in A.D. 4. (*Contra*, Chantraine 119). Atimetus Pamphili Ti. Caesaris Aug. 1.1. Anterotianus and his *colliberta* Claudia Homonoëa (V.3), should also trace the origins of their status to Tiberius Caesar when he was still a Claudian (through the other freedman Pamphilus). (*Contra*, Chantraine 119 and 93 n. 30).

still a slave, as his slave if he had by then been freed, or she may have been his *vicaria* before she became his *contubernalis*. She may have come from outside the interlocking *familiae* of the emperor's family or from inside. Since she was 26, Nymphodotus was probably not her first *contubernalis*. My reason for preferring this explanation to Weaver's is my insistence on the legal definition of *contubernium*; if Weaver is right, both partners were free before the *contubernium* began, but if so, it should have been *matrimonium iustum*. Lastly, two examples again illustrate the possibility of the intermarriage of slaves belonging to owners of different *gentes* and their subsequent manumission by different *patroni*. This would often occur when the slaves belonged to a husband and wife, which may be the explanation for T. Caesius T.1. and his *contubernalis* Gallia O.1. Secunda (V.13) and for L. Ovius L.1. Apollonius and Ennia O.1. Secunda (V.14).

Where the husband was also *patronus*, he was freed first. But in VI and VII, the wife has been freed, but the husband is certainly or probably still a slave. So Actus Aug(usti servus) Gamianus (VI.1) was retained in the service probably of Claudius or Nero, who had already freed his wife. As the ex-slave of an imperial slave, a *vicarianus* to adopt Weaver's late-imperial term, Actus would have excellent chances of promotion but would probably remain a slave into his forties. Of 47 wives whom Weaver (FC 220–221) has found recorded for *vicariani* (29 still slaves and 18 freedmen), none were slaves, which suggests either that wives of such men were manumitted with such celerity that they never show up as slaves or that *vicariani* regularly “married” women who were already free. So in this example we may have a marriage which was “mixed” from its inception: slave man and imperial freedwoman (probably freed under 30).¹⁵

Lastly in this group, the “husband” may be freed but the “wife” still a slave. My six examples are all of “wives” whose slave status is presumed because they are given only one name. The husbands' patrons are the emperor (VIII.2, 4, 6), an imperial freedman (VIII.3) and freedmen or a member of the family of the aristocratic Volusii and Arruntii (VIII.1, 5).

Jobs are very rarely mentioned in this group: we have only three freedmen, one a procurator,¹⁶ one probably *tabularius* (VIII.4) and the

¹⁵Similarly in VI.2 Primigenius is probably still a slave because he is a *dispensator*. But his wife Pitvania L.1. Phoebe comes from a *gens* different from that of his *domina* or her husband. Of the owners of the probable *servi* (VII) nothing is known, but among the patrons of the five wives Actus, Iulia Anthusa, Lollia Saturnina and Volusius Mena have names which strongly suggest *libertini*. Such owners may have been generous in manumitting (Weaver, FC 185–186).

¹⁶V.2. Boulvert, *EAI* 176 n. 581, discusses his exact job.

other an *a specularis* who was also a bigwig in a *collegium* (V.11), all in imperial employ.

The second group contained only 27 couples involving at least one freed partner (10%), a low total even compared with the 68 slave couples of the first group (26%), especially when we consider that free persons had more reason and probably more money to commemorate themselves. The explanation will be that there are many *libertini* in the last group, which contains 165 couples (63%) in which at least one partner is of free status, that is, either freed or freeborn (IX to XVII). Omission of status indication (outside the *familia Caesaris*) became increasingly common in the early Empire.¹⁷

III

In the first category of this last group (IX), where the "husband" is still a slave but the "wife" is free at the time they are commemorated, there is a high proportion of *servi Caesaris*, at least 16/35,¹⁸ and also four slaves of slaves or freedmen of the emperor,¹⁹ two belonging to women of the imperial family (IX.3, 21), and one *servus publicus* (IX.12). *Servi publici* were a privileged group and regularly, if not always, "married" free women.²⁰ Weaver has shown (*FC* 114) that slaves of the imperial civil service had a good chance of having free *contubernales*: 83% of the "wives" of slaves of the *familia Caesaris* in Rome have the *nomen* which indicates free status. Nor is it surprising for a slave of Nero's wife or Titus' widow. Of the slaves of imperial dependants, one is *dispensator* to a freed procurator (IX.1), one *vilicus* to an *a cubiculo* (IX.6), one either *dispensator* to a slave of Claudius or slave to a slave *dispensator* of Claudius (IX.35). Aristocratic families are also represented among the *domini*: the Volusii (IX.33, perhaps 32) and perhaps a slave of a Statilius Taurus (IX.23, whose "wife" may derive her name from the Scribonia who was briefly married to Octavian).

Of our sample of 16 "wives" with imperial slave "husbands," nine or ten have imperial *gentilicia* which suggests that they were either freedwomen of the emperor or descendants of *liberti Augusti*.²¹ There are four

¹⁷L. R. Taylor, "Freedmen and freeborn in the epitaphs of imperial Rome," *AJP* 82 120-123; Weaver, *FC* 80-86.

¹⁸IX.4, 5, 7, 11, 14-17, 19, 20, 25-28, 30, 34. In 8, a *scriniarius a libellis* is married to a Claudia: it is tempting to assume, as Boulvert does (*EAI* 94 n. 19), that this is an imperial post, but he is the only attested *scriniarius* in this bureau.

¹⁹IX.1, 6, 10, 35 (taking Halys to be a genitive. But it could be short for Halysianus; cf. Chantraine 317).

²⁰Buckland 319-320, Weaver, *FC* 133.

²¹Or *Augusti liberti libertae* or freedwomen or descendants of freedwomen of members

Iuliae, one freeborn but illegitimate (IX.16), one "married" to a slave employed in the *ab epistulis* bureau,²² one to a *dispensator* of Claudius (IX.17), the fourth to a slave whose *agnomen*, Semnianus (IX.14), unfortunately gives no clue to his date.²³ There are three Claudiae probably named for imperial Claudii (IX.4, 5, 7 and perhaps 8), a Sulpicia who might derive her name from Galba (IX.28) and a Flavia (IX.11). The *Caesaris servi servi* or *Caesaris liberti servi* show a similar pattern: a Claudia and a Flavia appear (IX.6, 10). So do the slaves of imperial ladies: the goldsmith of Nero's wife Octavia is married to a Claudia, who may derive her name from Octavia, Claudius or Nero.²⁴ In only one of these examples, that of the *dispensator* of Claudius married to a Iulia, do we have any firm clue about the date of the *contubernium* (IX.17). Since the *dispensator* was 37 when he died, it is possible that she was younger than he but still a freedwoman, even if she was freed at 30, for she could, for example, have been freed by Gaius in 41. Or she may—and this seems more likely—have been the freeborn daughter of a *libertus/liberta* of an earlier generation. The same two hypotheses no doubt apply to many of the other *contubernales* of imperial *nomen* who appear here. There are also "wives" whose *nomina* suggest *patroni* (of themselves or their parents) who were connected with the emperors.²⁵ One *Caesaris servus* is "married" to a Domitia (IX.9), who might derive her name from Domitian's wife, the daughter of Corbulo, or from Nero; a Pedia (IX.22) could derive hers from Augustus' kin; because there are no less than three Sextiliae, it is tempting to conjecture that Sextilia, the mother of L. Vitellius, *probatissima nec ignobilis femina*, had a greater

of the imperial family. E.g. Iuliae might trace their name back to Livia (Iulia Augusta from A.D. 14) as easily as to Augustus, Tiberius, or Gaius.

²²IX.15. Cf. Weaver, *FC* 259 on the subordnacy of his post. *Caesaris Aug(usti)* may, but need not, refer to Augustus (Boulvert, *DF* 31 and n. 164).

²³Hadrianic at latest (Chantraine 178, presumably because *agnomina* died out then); possibly 1st-century because of the formula *ser. Caesaris* (Chantraine 334, Boulvert, *DF* 78 n. 444), but Boulvert is wrong to date between Augustus and Gaius sc. on the basis of the wife's *nomen* (*DF* 17 n. 50).

²⁴IX.3. For Claudia as the *nomen* of a *liberta* of Octavia cf. 9015.

²⁵In IX.2 the husband is *Fulvi* (*ser.*). This, taken with his "wife's" name Boionia, implies her connection either with T. Aurelius Fulvus Boionius Arrius Antoninus, the future emperor Antoninus Pius, or with his maternal grandmother Boionia Procilla (*PIR*² A 1513, B 142). A *dispensator* of Boionia Procilla and her daughter's husband Aurelius Fulvus (*PIR*² A 1509) (unless her grandson is meant) is also commemorated by his mother, another Boionia, presumably a *liberta* of Procilla (9355). An L. Boionius Latro is found as the husband of Arria Briseis (12393). Other Boionii in Rome all bear the *praenomen* Lucius (13618–13621, cf. a *procurator* (*quadragesima*) *portuum Asiae* [*PIR*² B 141]): I would suggest that these all derive from Procilla and that Lucius was presumably her father's *praenomen*.

(though indirect) effect on the imperial staff than did her son, whose freedmen are not attested in the *familia Caesaris* at all.²⁶

In conclusion, as far as we can ascertain, the slaves who achieved "marriage" with free women, tend to be either imperial civil servants or *vicarii* in civil service jobs or slaves of imperial women or of the aristocracy. The "wives" are usually either *libertae* of the husband's owner or of a predecessor (e.g. a previous emperor or a parent) or, probably more often (because even a slave "husband" was normally older than his "wife") daughters of *liberti/libertae* of the family of the *dominus*. Two of the "wives" are explicitly *ingenuae* (IX.1, 16), but the second, *Sp(urii) f(ilia)* is perhaps the child of an *Augusti liberta* and a slave—the pattern repeating itself. The social standing and economic resources of these men are illustrated by the fact that 25 out of the 35 examples show husbands responsible for the commemoration and by the respectability of most of their jobs, which are mentioned more often than is usual in the sample. Apart from civil servants, there is a goldsmith (IX.3), a man *exs hortis Servilianis* (IX.27), a *specular(ius)* (IX.29), a *vilicus* and a *vilicus aquarius* (IX.6, 30) an *a frumento* (IX.32), a *topiarius* (IX.33).

We expect that the list of "husbands" who are *probably* slaves and "married" to free women will show similar characteristics (X). Here, among the "wives," the *gentilicia* Iulia, Claudia and Flavia are again represented, as are Livia and Octavia, (X.13, 6–10, 12, 14, 16), derived possibly from the imperial family and suggesting that the "husbands" may include *Caesaris servi* or slaves of dependants of the emperor. As in IX, the *cognomina* of the "wives" are often consistent with slave origin or descent: Helpis for instance, is strikingly frequent.²⁷ Calpurnia Pia, daughter of Calpurnia Phido (X.2), may derive her *nomen* from her mother or from a patron of the same *gens* as her mother's or from a father who, because he had the same name, would be likely to have been a *collibertus* of the mother: the nomenclature makes it likely that Pia is either a *libertina* or the daughter of a *libertina*. But her age, 20, makes the latter possibility more likely. "Wives" aged 30 or under (X.10–12, 16, 22, 23, 25, 28)

²⁶Sextilia: *RE* 2 A (1923) 2038 no. 32 (Fluss), Suet. *Vit.* 3.1. Vitellius' *liberti*: Weaver, *FC* 25. The husband in IX.25 served Trajan, so the wife ought to be the daughter of a freedman of Sextilia rather than a freedwoman herself. *Exs hortis Servilianis* in IX.27 gives a *terminus post quem* of Nero's reign, probably A.D. 59 (P. Grimal, *Les Jardins romains* [Paris 1969] 157).

²⁷X.4, 7, 23, 28. Cf. Tyche: X.12, 17. In IX, there is one Helpis (IX.23) and one Tyche (IX.31). These are the two commonest Greek *cognomina* for women (Heikki Solin, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der griechischen Personennamen in Rom* 1 [Helsinki 1971] 111). Solin finds only four freeborn women called Tyche (*ib.* 132). Greek names do not prove that the bearer was a slave, but suggest a slave background. Among the certain or probable slaves in my lists there are two (H)elpides (II.9, III.12) and three Tychai (II.11, IV.7, 23).

probably include a number of freeborn women. On the other hand, at least four of these inscriptions are from domestic *columbaria*, (X.1, 7, 10, 13) which suggests that the slave "husband" may not have been the only link with a slave household.

This category, then, is similar to that of certain slave "husbands" and free "wives," although it may contain a lower proportion of *servi Caesaris* (since they would probably mention their status) and perhaps a lower proportion of ingenuous "wives" compared with freedwomen. Once again the favoured position of these slave "husbands" with free "wives" is further indicated by the predominance of inscriptions set up by "husbands."

Compared with IX and X, the converse categories, XI and XII, where the "husband" is free but the "wife" certainly or presumably still a slave, are less significant. There are only three couples in the first of these: Merope, who is an imperial slave, is the "wife" of a 52-year-old Ti. Claudius Secundus, probably a freedman (XI.1), Pyrrhe, clerk to Rubria Helvia, is married to P. Rubrius Optatus, presumably a freedman of the same family (XI.3) and Hygia, midwife of Flavia Sabina, has as one of her two "husbands" an "outsider," Marius Orthrus (XI.2).

In XII, there is no *evidence* that the "husbands" of presumed slave women are freedmen. But for a free Roman to enter *contubernium* with a slave woman was highly improper. The lawyers assume that it would only happen when the man did not know she was a slave and thought they were legally married.²⁸ This situation is unlikely to be revealed by inscriptions and is excluded *ex hypothesi* from at least those epitaphs put up by a free husband to a slave *contubernalis*. A second possible situation is that a free man of humble status might want to marry a woman whom he knew to be someone else's slave. Then he ought to buy her, free her and marry her: she will be *uxor*, not *contubernalis*. Thirdly, a free Roman might entertain honourable intentions towards one of his own slaves. If he is of respectable social status, he should free her and make her his *concubina*:²⁹ again, she will not be *contubernalis*. If his status is not so respectable, he could even free her and marry her.³⁰ A *libertina* might also marry an *ingenuus* who was not her patron, as long as he was not of senatorial rank or near descent. But proper Roman marriages are out of court here. What is attested on inscriptions where a free man is described as the *contubernalis* of a woman who is apparently of slave status, or where

²⁸Gaius 1.85. C. Castello, "La condizione del concepito da libero e schiava in diritto romano," *Studi . . . S. Solazzi* (Naples 1955) 232–250, adds little. A free woman might also mistakenly unite herself with a *servus alienus* (Dig. 24.3.22.13, Ulp.).

²⁹Dig. 25.7.1 pr., Ulp. A man might also have an *aliena liberta* as *concubina* (Dig. 25.7.3 pr., Marcian., cf. 23.2.41.1, Marcell.).

³⁰E.g. Dig. 23.2.28, Marcian., 23.2.29, Ulp., 40.2.19, Celsus.

she is described as his *contubernalis*, is normally not cohabitation between a freeborn Roman and someone else's slave but a relationship which began when both partners were slaves and continued after the manumission of the husband, who is described on the monument as a free Roman without status-indication.³¹ This situation contrasts with *contubernia* between free women and male slaves, but the reasons for the distinction are clear. For a free woman of a certain class (e.g. the daughter of an imperial freedman) to marry an upwardly-mobile slave civil servant was to her advantage. A woman slave had no status connected with her job which would attract a free husband. (Women in the *familia Caesaris* usually married fellow slaves.)³² Secondly, there was a grave disadvantage of a slave wife. If a slave man "married" a free woman, the children were born free *iure gentium* (with exceptions introduced by the *Senatus-consultum Claudianum* and sometimes applied). But a slave woman with a free husband (with a few exceptions) bore slave children.

Two or perhaps three imperial *gentilicia* suggest the possible presence of *liberti* or *liberti liberti* from the imperial household (XII.7, 9, 12). Provenance from *columbaria* may also suggest that the husband was at home in the company of slaves and freedmen (XII.11, 14). One husband was a steersman, a job compatible with freed status (XII.5). The age of 22 is reasonable for a supposed *serva* (XII.6), as is 40 for a husband who might be a freedman (XII.2). Such couples should have slave children: we have here three who died very young (XII.3), two others who were also apparently slaves (XII.4, 9) and one son free, either freeborn (in which case his mother's status needs correcting, which it probably does anyway, as she is an heir) or freed (XII.10). There is nothing in any of this to shake the hypothesis that most, if not all, of the husbands had been slaves alongside their wives. We must also take into account the possibility of time-lag: sometimes the wife may have died while the husband was a slave, but it was not until later, when he had been freed, that he was able to commemorate her. When it happened, our apparent couple of free "husband" and slave "wife" never actually existed: the social disparity is between widower and dead wife, but during the *contubernium* they were equals. Finally, it must be stressed (especially as we have so many more presumed slaves than known slaves among the women with free "husbands") that at least some of these single *cognomina* conceal women of citizen status.

The same marriage seen at a later stage might produce the combinations of free husband and ex-slave wife. Some examples of couples where the husband was freed first and the wife later may appear in XIII, where

³¹Perhaps we should not rule out the possibility that some freedmen might *begin* a *contubernium* with a slave (e.g. in the patron's household) and be unable to buy her out.

³²Weaver, *FC* 170-178.

the husband is free but not attested as a *libertinus* and the wife is a *libertina*. (Examples of couples of two *libertini* were discussed above, under V.) In XIII, half the examples show the husband as patron of the wife, which is consistent with his having owned her as *vicaria* or having acquired and freed her after his manumission. These three husbands (XIII.1–3) include two with imperial *nomina*. The other three couples are a P. Aelius whose wife is an Aelia Aug. lib. (XIII.4) and two husbands and wives whose *nomina* differ (XIII.5, 6), which, if the husbands are, as I conjecture, freedmen,³³ means that the partners belonged to different owners (who might live together or not) during the *contubernium* or that one partner was transferred to a new owner (e.g., the wife changed hands and was subsequently freed).³⁴

When, on the other hand, it is the husband who is attested as a freedman and the wife who is free, the inscription sometimes represents the marriage of a slave and a free woman at a later stage. Characteristics which we noted in IX and X should therefore recur. Of my sample of fourteen, six husbands are certainly *Augusti liberti* and three probably are (XIV.1–9); one is a freedman of Paneros Aug. 1.,³⁵ another of C. Iulius Theophilus (XIV.11), a possible imperial freedman. Only three husbands (XIV.12–14) have no connection with the imperial house. In contrast with IX, these three cannot be shown to be dependants of the aristocracy, but otherwise the husbands are very similar to those in IX, the only difference being that we see them at a more advanced stage of their careers, after manumission. The wives, again, include many whose *nomina* suggest a connection with the imperial family. Two have the same name as their husbands, a Claudia and an Aelia (XIV.9, 1); others show the familiar time-lag which may suggest that they are children of freedmen rather than freedwomen themselves: Iuliae married to Claudii (XIV.3, 7), a Iulia aged 25 married to a freedman of Domitian,³⁶ an Antonia married to a freedman of a freedman of Antonia Drusi (XIV.10).

Like the inscriptions in IX and X, these were predominantly put up by the husband. Provenance from *columbaria* is rarely attested;³⁷ in this

³³Ti. Claudius Agathopus (XIII.2) was *immunis*, sc. in a *collegium*, probably of domestics.

³⁴We should allow for testamentary manumission of one partner and inheritance of the other, who was subsequently freed by the new *dominus*.

³⁵XIV.10, M. Antonius Paneros, freedman of Antonia Augusta. He is perhaps himself commemorated at Naples in IG 14.734 = IGR 1.437. His freedmen/women appear at Rome (4224 [ML]) and Ostia (14.581); a slave passed into the imperial service (4037 [ML]).

³⁶She could be *liberti liberta* (or *liberti liberti liberta* . . .) of an early Julio-Claudian, but it is easier to suppose her a daughter or grand-daughter of a freedman.

³⁷XIV.9. A *tabella* (XIV.4) and an urn or altar (XIV.5) may also come from communal tombs.

they resemble IX and differ from X. At least one couple put up a grand private tomb, to the wife's previous husband (XIV.6). Since the land was provided by a T. Aelius Asclepiodotus one would expect a date after Antoninus Pius was adopted by Hadrian and became T. Aelius in 138. Felix Aug. lib. paid for the tomb. His wife, Arria Rufina, may have been *ingenua*, (Bouvert, *DF* 284) but we cannot tell. Her *nomen* recalls Arria Fadilla, Antoninus' mother, so it is pleasant to conjecture that Felix was a freedman of that emperor and his wife the daughter of a freedman of his mother. Free birth would suit the wife of an *adiutor tabularius a rationibus*.³⁸

Finally, there are couples where both partners are free, with no indication of freed status (XV) and four free couples where one partner is explicitly freeborn (XVI, XVII). The former is by far the largest category of all, with 57 couples (22%). There are a number of indications which point to the original slave status of at least one of the partners, such as burial in domestic *columbaria* (XV.2, 10, 12, 13, 18, 19, 55, ?56) or references to *collegia* (XV.2, 4, 13, 21). Slave background is also strongly suggested by the shared *nomen* of 25 couples (XV.1–25). *Cognomina* are consistent with slave origin or descent, but this argument is not to be pressed. Children's names sometimes suggest a slave background for one parent or the other: two bearing the mother's *nomen* who were presumably born outside Roman marriage suggest that the father had been a slave, although the mother was free (XV.43, 56). Children mentioned by one name only might be slaves, which would prove slave status for the mother at the time of their birth (XV.20, 48). Ti. Iulius Dioga and his son Ti. Claudius Dioga are surely imperial freedmen (XV.41). But children with the same *nomen* as the father, who may be freeborn and legitimate, are also represented here (XV.16, ?45, 46, 57). So on the one hand there is evidence to support the hypothesis that at least one of the partners had been a slave when the *contubernium* began. On the other hand, these are couples who do not specify their legal status, may sometimes have freeborn children and must often have been comfortably established. Their inscriptions are often substantial and often come from substantial private tombs. It is striking how many of them contain the formulae *sibi et suis* (XV.34, 41), *posterisque suis* (XV.28, 34, 38, 45), *libertis libertabus(que) posterisque eorum* (XV.33, 37, 40, 53), which indicate a stable and often prosperous family, even if it was sometimes childless.

In the last two categories one partner is known to be freeborn. In XVI.2, Plaetoria L. f. Maximilla³⁹ is married to a P. Sulpicius Narcissus,

³⁸The *tabularius* might go on to a procuratorship (Weaver, *FC* 244–245) so his assistant could hope to follow.

³⁹L. Plaetorii are not rare (e.g. 24238, 24240, 26211, 32691a).

of whom it can be said that his *cognomen* allows the suspicion of a slave past. Since she gives her own filiation and is commemorating him in affectionate terms on an elegantly decorated *cista*, it would be discourteous of her to omit his filiation if he was entitled to it. It is likely that this *contubernium* was originally between a slave and an *ingenua*, like that of Felix Caesaris and Iulia Sp. f. Mopsis (IX.16).

In XVI.1, we have even more reason to suspect that Ialysus had been a slave, perhaps *servus Caesaris*, because of the presence of a child born outside Roman marriage. The wife herself, like Mopsis, was *spuria*. *Contubernium* between a slave and a free woman (whether freed or free-born) has been shown to be fairly common. *Contubernium*, however, was rarely initiated between a man of free status and a slave woman. So our last three examples, of men of free birth and women who were free when commemorated but because they are described as *contubernaes* should, on the hypothesis which we have been using until now, have been slaves at one period of the relationship, may be expected to raise problems.

XVII.1 runs as follows:

Diis m(anibus) s(acrum)/L. Nonio/Sp(urii) f(ilio)/Cultiano/qui vixit/ann. xxii/et mens. ii/fecit/Manilia/Faventina/contuber(nali)/suo/carissimo/ et b(ene) merenti.

The husband was not born in *matrimonium iustum*, so he may have belonged to a level of society in which a *contubernium* with a woman slave was not unthinkable. Since he died young, if Manilia was a freedwoman she must have been freed very young. We might account for their situation by suggesting a history of the kind documented for Larcia Horaea in the late Republic. She was freed by a husband and wife, both *libertini*, and married their freeborn (and legitimate) son:

*... Boneis probata inveisa sum a nulla proba.
Fui parens domineis senibus, huic autem opsequens.
Ita, leibertate illei me, hic me decoraat stola ...*⁴⁰

Or, being young and rash, perhaps Nonius Cultianus may have committed the indiscretion of beginning a liaison with a slave who did not belong to his own family. In short, this instance may not clash with our definition of *contubernium*.

XVII.3 poses more problems:

Dis manibus/Publiliae Patiadios Dioge/nes Rhodonis f. Flaviopolitanus contubernali/et N. Publius Onesimus/patronae fecerunt sibi et/suis posterisq(ue) eorum.

The difficulty here is that although Diogenes uses Latin and apparently claims free birth, he does not use *tria nomina* nor proper Roman filiation.

⁴⁰CIL 1² 1570 = 10.6009 = ILLRP 977. Admittedly, there is no indication that Horaea began as a *contubernalis*. For the manumission of a future wife during pregnancy by an under-age owner cf. Dig. 40. 2.19, Celsus.

The balance of probability is that he is a *peregrinus*, as Rawson says (296). His wife *may* be a freedwoman. If *contubernalis* is used properly, then she was presumably a slave when the relationship began. But perhaps Diogenes was not familiar with Latin technical terms and this is an irregular example.

But what are we to do with a man of such social status as this?

Ti. Quaestorius Ti. f. Col. Secundus/pref(ectus) fabr(um) II sibi et/ Claudiae Anthemidi contubernali/ optimae. vix(it) ann. xx. (XVII.2)

Quaestorius, as *praefectus fabrum* (a post comparable to that of A.D.C., e.g., adjutant to a proconsul, held usually as a preliminary to an equestrian career)⁴¹ would hardly have intended even quasi-marriage with a woman who was someone else's slave. But there is no reason apart from the word *contubernali* (and her slightly suspect *cognomen*) to suspect her of being an ex-slave, freed by a person other than Quaestorius. The simplest solution is to suppose that *contubernalis* here has no juristic content. Moreover, it enabled him to avoid defining his relationship with a woman who had died prematurely. To distinguish whether a particular couple was living in marriage or *concubinatus* it would be necessary to discover the intentions of each partner: Quaestorius may have had reason to fudge the issue, or no reason to clarify it retrospectively.⁴²

However, these two or three instances seem to be the only exceptions to the general rule that in the inscriptions *contubernalis* has the meaning attached to it by lawyers, even though it may refer to a situation which no longer existed at the time of commemoration. For if one or both *contubernales* were of slave status and achieved manumission, then, if they continued their intention of being husband and wife, *constante coniunctione* as Ulpian puts it (*Dig.* 23.3. 39 pr.), the *contubernium* was automatically transmuted into valid marriage. This shift in the status of the relationship has been illustrated above. It will be useful to look at four examples where the language of legal marriage is used with the language of slave-marriage:⁴³

⁴¹His background was probably not aristocratic. He was enrolled in a city tribe and the derivation of his name is betrayed by the only other example in *CIL* 6: *L. Quaestorius Cinyra lib. librar(iorum) quaestor(iorum)* (1826).

⁴²Marriage existed if there was *affectio maritalis* on the part of both parties. For the difficulty of determining whether a relationship was marriage, see for example *Cic. de Or.* 1.183, Quint. *Decl.* 247 (*Ritter* 11.15), *Dig.* 23.2.24, Mod., 24.1.32.13, Ulp.; 39.5.31 pr., Pap.

⁴³33796 = VIII.6 also uses both *contubernalis* and *coniunx* but is omitted here because the interpretation could be in doubt. 16048 = XV.9 is interesting: *Cominiaie Psycharioni / contubernali P. Comini / Argi posit (=posuit) inventa liberta / et (sic) eius coniunx Serenus / M. Claudi Thetialisci ser.* Reading *inventa libertate* and applying it to Serenus, who must therefore be an ex-slave, one may find an apparent emphasis on

- (1) 15528: *D.M./Claudiae/Pallinae coniugi/karissimae b.m./vix. an. xxxv fecit/Suavis Caesaris n./ser. contubernali.*
- (2) 19629: *D.M./Ianuario coniugi optimo/fecit Prima contu/bernalis be/ne merenti.*
- (3) 15598: *Dis manibus/Claudiae Stepteni vix./annis lxxii fecit Ti./Claudius Aug. l. Nympho/dotus patronus et contub/ernalis coniugi suae kar/issimae bene meritae de se/cum qua vix. ann. xlv i sibi et suis/posterisque eorum.*
- (4) 38976: *D.M./Titaciae/Priscillae/coniugi cas/tissimae ac/sanctissimae/benemerenti/fecit Titacius/Valens patro/nus et contu/bernalis.*

One of the emperor's slaves calls his free "wife" both *coniunx* and *contubernalis* (1). A probable slave, Prima, commemorates her probably slave "husband" and calls herself *contubernalis* and him *coniunx* (2). Neither of these couples can be legally married. Claudius Nymphodotus calls his freedwoman *coniunx* and himself *contubernalis* (3) and Titacius Valens, *patronus et contubernalis*, dedicated to his *coniunx* (4). It is clear that *coniunx* may be used in a context of mere *contubernium* and that the partner whose status was at one stage legally superior (here the *patronus*) may, presumably out of courtesy, call himself the *contubernalis* and give the more honourable title to his partner. That *contubernales* equated their relationship with legal marriage is shown also in the adjectives which they apply to each other. The commonest formula for both *contubernales* and *coniuges* is *bene merenti* and its variants. For women *carissimae* (sometimes expanded, for instance *contubernali suae carissimae et fidelissimae* 26948) is also common, but *carissimo* only produces half a dozen examples among *contubernales*. *Piissimae/pientissimae* and less often the masculine equivalent, *optimae/optimo*, and more rarely, and only for women, *incomparabili* (9029), *rarissimae* (35565), *sanctae* (23743), *sanctissimae* (8833, 8843, 10899, 25090) and *dulcissimae* (34934, 38641a) all are used with no apparent distinction for *contubernales* of varying legal status, just as they are for *coniuges* in legal marriage and for people incorrectly described as *coniuges*.⁴⁴

This study of an admittedly limited sample of inscriptions, drawn only from Rome, may allow us to gloss Weaver's statement (*FC* 171) about the vocabulary used by slaves and freedmen:

The terms "vir", "uxor", "maritus" etc. are of no use to distinguish between *matrimonium* and *contubernium*. They are normal for all groups in the Familia Caesaris. Nor even does "contubernalis" always indicate that one or both partners are of slave status or origin.

coniunx: Serenus contrasts her first marriage, which at least started as *contubernium*, with her second. (For the name Argus cf. 7541; Argius is also possible: 6929, 12298, 20097.)

⁴⁴The overlapping in eulogy of *concubinae* and *coniuges* is probably less complete. The *mot juste* for *concubinae* seems to have been *amantissimae* (9375, 22293, 24441), which is not common for wives (e.g. 2902). On all this cf. *CIL* 6.7.

He is, of course, as is clear from many examples which he cites, right in saying that *vir*, *uxor*, *maritus* and, we may add, *coniunx* are commonly used for people who were in fact *contubernales*. But the converse is more doubtful. It is not proved by the *Thesaurus*⁴⁵ section to which Weaver refers and we cannot hope to find evidence for it in Weaver's own pages, since they are specifically on slaves and freedmen. Despite the odd instances in XVII and until firm evidence is found—for instance one or two inscriptions where partners both certified as *ingenui* call themselves *contubernales*—the negative hypothesis, that *contubernalis* is not used in epigraphic sources except when at least one partner has been a slave during the relationship, may be maintained.

IV

Can the scanty information which the inscriptions give us on the age at death of *contubernales* shed any light on the nature of *contubernium*? Our data may be summarised in Table 3:

TABLE 3

	HUSBANDS' AGES AT DEATH						Totals
	15-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41+	
Slaves and probable slaves	1	2	2	3	2	1	11
Freedmen	—	—	—	1	—	3	4
Free	—	2	—	1	1	2	6
Totals	1	4	2	5	3	6	21

	WIVES' AGES AT DEATH						Totals
	15-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41+	
Slaves and probable slaves	5	6	7	1	1	1	21
Freedwomen	1	—	2	—	1	2	6
Free	11	8	8	4	2	5	38
Totals	17	14	17	5	4	8	65

There is the usual tendency to mention ages which are pathetically young or impressively old and for husbands to mention the ages of their

⁴⁵S.v. *contubernalis* II A: "strictiore sensu, de coniugibus, praecipue de servis." None of the examples cited attests non-slave status or origin for *both* partners.

wives more often than vice-versa. The husbands' ages are not of much use, although the fact that two-thirds of the attested ages for free men are over the normal minimum manumission age, as are all the known *libertini*, will fit nicely with the conjectured freed status of some of them. The wives show slaves and presumed slaves neatly concentrated under 30, freed-women poorly documented and women of free status tending to die sadly young, which is consistent both with free birth and early manumission. The data tell us more about commemorative practice than about age at marriage. As far as they go, they are consistent with the broader picture of Roman marriage.

What sort of people commemorate themselves as *contubernales*? As far as we can tell, predominantly the slaves and ex-slaves of the imperial family, the aristocracy and their dependants, that is, domestics from the city households and administrators in the service of the emperor or senators and *equites*. Prosperous freedmen of the class of *tabernarii* and *opifices*, who must have formed a substantial proportion of the slave and freed population of the capital, but who rarely appear linked with the great houses,⁴⁶ hardly show up here. There is a solitary fruiterer (XV.41) and that is all. Although we cannot tell if other tradesmen lurk among the rest of the *contubernales*, it may be that it was in the larger households of the upper classes (from which tradesmen hardly ever originated) that marriages were made between *conservi* and where, because the society was large, the label "*contubernalis* of so-and-so" might be most important. In the large, hierarchical but closely-knit society of the rich household, with its records of births, deaths, manumissions, and *contubernia*,⁴⁷ slave family life could often attain comparative security and dignity. Scraps of evidence, the commemoration of parents, brothers, sisters, and sometimes other relatives,⁴⁸ friendships close enough to be honoured after death,⁴⁹ *contubernia* which lasted a lifetime,⁵⁰ help to illustrate this.

v

Our present sample also contributes something to the problem of multiple *contubernia*:

- (1) X.18, 19: *Dis manibus/Serviliae Successae/Primus et Secundio/contubernales
benemer(enti)/fecerunt vixit annis xxx.*
- (2) X.26, 27: *D.m.s./Vettidia Cresimeni/contubernali carissi/mae fecerunt
Maior et/Thallus bene meren/ti pientissimae.*

⁴⁶A poulterer, Ti. Iuli Aug. lib., is a rare instance (EJ 155).

⁴⁷Cf. Petr. Sat. 53. 1-10; Dig. 32.99.1, Paul.; 33.7.27 pr., 40.4.59 pr., Scaev.

⁴⁸E.g. II.10, III.9, IV.10, IV.17, IV.25, V.6, IX.31, X.16, XIV.1, XV.14.

⁴⁹E.g. I.2, Nebris giving the niche to Hygia; II.3, V.9, VIII.1.

⁵⁰V.10 (46 years), VII.1 (46 years), XV.29 (38 years).

- (3) III.2, XI.2: *Hygiae/Flaviae Sabinae/obstetr(ix) vixit. ann. xxx/Marius Orthrus et/Apollonius contubernali/carissimae.*
 (4) IX.21, XV.30: *Dis manibus/Trophimus/Marciae divi T(iti)/Ogulniae Zmyrnae et Ti. Cl(audius)/Eutyclus/contubern(ali)/carissimae/et piissimae/b(ene) m(erenti) fecerunt.*

These examples are to be distinguished from those which clearly commemorate successive marriages.⁵¹ The difficulty here is that two men commemorate one woman and both call her *contubernalis*. We could get around the difficulty by conjecturing that *contubernalis* here does not mean "quasi-wife," but that runs counter to the usual practice for slaves of opposite sex and to the vocabulary of these inscriptions. Alternatively, we could follow Beryl Rawson in maintaining that these are polygamous relationships. But I think there is a third possible explanation, which maintains the respectability of *contubernium* unimpaired. Although in theory perhaps a husband could arrange for his wife to be commemorated although she survived him, I take it that all these husbands were still alive when they caused the monument to be erected and the wives dead.⁵² (Hygia and Servilia Successa certainly were.) The husbands co-operated. Roman manners were not ours, but it seems more believable that one husband was "divorced" than that these were overt bigamous unions. In slavery, a division between *contubernales* might not be willed by either of them. We notice that in (1) and (2) all the men are slaves but the women died free; the apparent slave Hygia had one free and one slave mate (3), as did the free Ogulnia Zmyrna (4). The changes and chances of slavery may have divided these women from their first *contubernales*, who bore no ill will and commemorated them together with their second husbands (one of whom, Ti. Claudius Eutyclus, was probably a legal husband). If this explanation is accepted, these funerary inscriptions, like most Roman funerary inscriptions, have little to tell us of the seamier or more eccentric side of Roman life, but reflect to the last those values of which slave and freed society approved.⁵³

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

⁵¹IV.26, 27 = 7297 (but Rawson 287 n. 26 takes this as simultaneous), XIV.6, XV.9 (see above, n. 43). I discount and omit 22738 (where perhaps only one of the three men dedicates *contubernali*) and the damaged 34351. In XV.25 = 28534 (. . . *Veraniae Thaumaste / piissimae contubernali bene de se merenti / Q. Veranius Pharnaces / et Agathemer(us) fecerunt* . . .) I am inclined to think Agathemerus may be a son, but Rawson may well be right.

⁵²The odd word order in (4) may cause doubt. On the whole, because of the division into lines, it seems that Eutyclus cannot have added his name later (and it would be odd that Trophimus should commemorate a live Zmyrna and then predecease her, leaving the memorial to be completed by her second husband). It is however, possible that *only* Eutyclus dedicates *contubernali*.

⁵³I hope to strengthen this case in a forthcoming paper on apparently bigamous *coniuges* (*Liverpool Classical Monthly*).

APPENDIX

CONTUBERNALES AND CHILDREN

In the following lists * marks the person who made the dedication; inscriptions where the interpretation given is doubtful are marked "(dub.);" ages are given in parentheses.

I HUSBAND SLAVE, WIFE SLAVE

- 1) 17359 = 37868: Eunutus (35) = Fortunata conserva*
- 2) 8022: Felix M. Satelli Tychii ser. (19) = Hygia Flaviae Antiochidis serva* + Primigenia f. (3) (Aulena Nebris) (*M ad viam Nomentanam*)
- 3) 38641a: *Felix = Moschis conserva
- 4) 9345: *Festus M. Septimi Galli dispen(sator) = Hamilla Alpioniae Quintiae ornatricx
- 5) 3971: Philadelpus Neronis Caesar(is) ex horreis Petronian(is) dec(urio) = Niphas Philadespoti (*ML*)
- 6) 5539: *Philetus Octaviae Caesaris Augusti f(iliae) ab argento = Paezusa Octaviae Caesaris Augusti f. ornatricx (18) (*MIAL*)

II HUSBAND SLAVE, WIFE PROBABLY SLAVE

- 1) 9922: Alexander Tauri tabul(arius) (25) = Prisca*
- 2) 12147: *Apollonius servos = Prima (23)
- 3) 9333: Calais L. Aponi dispensator (40) = Synerusa* (Ianuarius*)
- 4) 33745: *Carpus Caesaris topiarius ex hortis Peduceianis¹ = Philumene + Tertia filia
- 5) 9114: Felix actor M. Salvi Othonis ser. (60) = Oenanthe*
- 6) 25926: *Helles Privati Augusti = Saturnina
- 7-8) 25429: *Hermes et Mystes Aegisthi Aug. lib. ser(?vi) = Rhode et Rhodope (duae gemellae) (memoriae Flaviae Avitae)
- 9) 19617: *Hymnus q.n. (? Quinti nostri) = Helpis (Servaea cognata)
- 10) 7288: Iphis L. Volussi cubicularius = Anatole* (his nephew Carpos L. fili*) (dub.)
- 11) 9963: Onesimus Sex. Carmini Veteris servus vestiarius = Tyche*
- 12) 37791: *Philomusus C. Umbrici Melioris disp(ensator) = Sostrate
- 13) 9474: *Primigenius L(uci) n(ostri) ab hosp(itibus) = Charis
- 14) 8548: Synt[r]ophus Caesaris ve[r]na a veste mu[nda] = Euphrosine* (? brother etc.)
- 15) 2777b: Verna Hirriae Bassil[ae] servus = Quartilla*

III HUSBAND PROBABLY SLAVE, WIFE SLAVE

- 1) 29597: *Acratus = Ursula C.B.N. (? Gai B— nostri) serv. (26)
- 2) 6647: *Apollonius = Hygia Flaviae Sabinae obstet(rix) (30) (cf. XI.2)
- 3) 14116: *Ceanthus = Calityche (*sic*) C. Manili Calvini (23)
- 4) 16832: Diadumenus (33) = Secundilla Minic(i) Faustini ser.*
- 5) 22946: *Erastus = Nice Cassi ? Longini (21 or more)
- 6) 27152: *Hermes Callipian[?]us = Terentina Claudii Secundi serva (22)
- 7) 9729: *Hiceros = Euprosyne Iuliae Seonis ornatricx
- 8) 22895: *Lychius = Nebris Antoniae Drusi (35)
- 9) 27674: *Martialis = Trophime Aug. n. verna (21) + Martialis filius* (father Martialis*)
- 10) 23369: *Moschio = Ode C. Cassi Symphoniaci
- 11) 10112: Nothus speciariae (*sic*; ?speculariar.) = Thalassia mima C. Pisonis
- 12) 37321: *Secundus = Elpis Caesia Nepotillae serv. (*M. Caesiorum*)

- 13) 14740: *Soterichus = Chloe Atili Agricolae serv. (16)
 14) 37796: *Speratus ex horreis Faenianis = Soteris Iuliae Epiphaniae serv. (30)

IV HUSBAND PROBABLY SLAVE, WIFE PROBABLY SLAVE

- 1) 28522: *Abascantus = Venusta (30)*
- 2) 17839: *Carpus = Felicla
- 3) 9335: *Charitinus dispensator = Paezusa*
- 4) 17827: *Chrysanthus = Felicla
- 5) 19108: Corinthus (30) = Grapte* (*Vinea Amendola*)
- 6) 16500: Cosmus = Prima*
- 7) 27870: *Cratinus = Tyche (30)
- 8) 24985: *Dexter = Primitiva
- 9) 17231: *Epimachus = Pallas + L. Cornelius Epimachus fil. (5)
- 10) 34691a: *Eutycas = Bucilla (her parents Restitutus* and Eutychia*)
- 11) 38439: *Herma = Megiste
- 12) 19392: Hermes = Ionice* + Euphrosyne f.
- 13) 19378: *Hermes = Philotera
- 14) 7912 = 38463a: *Hymnus = Nemesis* (*M. Vin. Nariae*)
- 15) 19629: Ianuarius = Prima*
- 16) 22315: *Matutinus = Italia
- 17) 12705: Nedymus = Fortunata (15) (her parents Atticus* and Myrtale*)
- 18) 27366: *Nostimus = Thetis
- 19) 14112: Nostus = Calliste (*columbarium*)
- 20) 9497: *Olympus = Irene Ianipenda (28)
- 21) 26144: *Philippus = Trophime (18)
- 22) 23001: Phoebus (28) = Nome*
- 23) 27867: *Phoenix = Tyche
- 24) 26713: *Pothus = Spyche
- 25) 38529: *Rhodius = Lampas (? Iampas) (daughter of L. Laelius Aglaus*)
- 26) 7297: *Spendo = Panope ornatrix Torquate Q. Volusi (22)
- 27) 7297: *Spendo = Phoebe a speculum (37) (*MV*)
- 28) 26837: Stephanephorus = Primigenia* + filia*
- 29) 27395: *Sthacus = Thymele (19)
- 30) 24212: *Successus = Pipercla + Melanthus filius (7)
- 31) 36560: *Telesphor(us) = Vitalis (20)
- 32) 27685: Trypho = Nais*
- 33) 14056: Victor (35) = Cale*

V HUSBAND AND WIFE FREED

A) COLLIBERTI

- 1) 11125: *Sex. Aemilius Nedimus = Aemilia Auge colliberta
- 2) 9029: ---* (corrupt) Aug[g] lib. [procur]ator rationisacr --- = Aurelia conlibert.
- 3) 12652: *Atimetus Pamphili Ti. Caesaris Aug. 1.1. Anterotianus = Claudia Homonoëa conliberta (under 20)
- 4) 20629: *Ti. Claudius Epictetus = Iulia Primigenia colliberta
- 5) 21104: A. Larcus Epicuri lib. Fructus = Larcia Secunda collib. (90)* (two *liberti** of Secunda)
- 6) 21473a: M. Lollius Saturninae 1. Princeps (58) = Lolliia Saturninae 1. Urbana + Lolliia 1.1. Galatea* (and to Princeps' sister Lolliia Saturninae lib. Methe) (cf. VII. 4)
- 7) 24081: *M. Publicius Eurytus = Philema conliberta (30)
- 8) 28786: *C. Vibius Castor = Vibia Danae colliberta

B) PROBABLE COLLIBERTI OR PATRONUS = LIBERTA

- 9) 12806: Sex. Aveius Longinae 1. Schinus = Aveia Pithusa* (Phoebe conlib. of Pithusa)

C) PATRONUS = LIBERTA

- 10) 15598: *Ti. Claudius Aug. 1. Nymphodotus = Claudia Stepte (72) (Marriage lasted 46 years.)
 11) 9044: C. Iulius Aug. 1. Narcissus a specularis decu[r](io) = Iulia Narcissi 1. Egloge (probably from decurions)
 12) 25090: *Q. Propertius Secundus (freedman of Propertia Tryphosa) = Propertia Dynamis liberta

D) OTHERS

- 13) 35145: T. Caesius T. 1. = Gallia c. 1. Secunda*
 14) 18871: *L. Ovius L. 1. Apollonius = Ennia c. 1. Secunda (40) (Ovia Agile [26] added later)

VI HUSBAND SLAVE, WIFE FREED

- 1) 15350: Actus Aug. Gamianus = Claudia Aug. 1. Amanda
 2) 9361: *Primigenius Helviae Fufii Pollionis (uxoris) dispensator = Pituaniae L. 1. Phoebe

VII HUSBAND PROBABLY SLAVE, WIFE FREED

- 1) 27880: *Heracla = Tyche Acti 1. (Marriage lasted 46 years)
 2) 18975: Chrestus = Gellia L. c. 1. Prima*? + L. Gell. Sp. f. Hes --
 3) 20628: *Corinthus = Iulia Primigenia Iuliae Anthusae 1. (30)
 4) 21473a: Ursio = Lollia c. 1. Galatea (cf. V. 6)
 5) 7358: *Carpus = Volusia Mena[e lib.] Tyche (MV)

VIII HUSBAND FREED, WIFE PROBABLY SLAVE

- 1) 5935: L. Arruntius Dionysius = Similis* (Severus* *conseruo*) (M. Arruntiorum)
 2) 15015: Ti. Claudius Aug. 1. Elenchus = Verecunda*
 3) 18112: T. Flavius Hypanus Hymni Augusti liberti libertus (44) = Primigenia*
 4) 9069: M. Ulpus Aug. 1. Primio tab(ularius) = Dionysias*
 5) 7333: L. Volusius Elaini lib. Philoxenus (50) = Eutychia* (MV)
 6) 33796: *Hosius Aug. 1. = Vera

IX HUSBAND SLAVE, WIFE FREE

- 1) 8833: *Hyginus Haloti Aug. 1. proc. ser. disp. = Atreia L.f. Procula
 2) 13622: *Drosus Fulvi (ser.) = Boionia Fortunata (30)
 3) 8741: *Serapa Octaviae Augusti (uxoris) aurifex = [Claudia] Cypa[re] (22)
 4) 15479: *Hermodius Caes. servus = Claudia Isias
 5) 15528: *Suavis Caesaris n. ser. = Claudia Pallina (45)
 6) 8759: *Atticus Epaphroditi Aug. 1. a cubiculo vilicus = Claudia Prima
 7) 15604: *Agathangelus Caesaris ser. = Claudia Successa (30) (*libertus** and *heres**)
 8) 8617: Quadratus scriniarius a libellis = Claudia Tryphera* (dub.)
 9) 26586: Silvanus Caesar. n. ser. = Domitia Nereis*
 10) 18296: *Syntrophus Aegisthi Aug. servi vic. = Flavia Avita (23)
 11) 18424: Saturninus Caes. n. = Fl(avia) Successa* + Fl(avia) Saturnina fil(ia) (13)
 12) 2365: *Papus ser. publicus = Grania Faustina (relief shows infant as well as spouses)
 13) 4386: *Felix ser. M. Quintili Nymphae et sociorum = Herennia Eufrosine (M *liberorum* Drusi)
 14) 20433: Zethus ser. Caesaris Semnianus = Iulia Elate* (Cassia Blanda* nutricio)
 15) 8596: *Ianuarius Caesaris Aug. ab epistulis = Iulia Methe

- 16) 20572: *Felix Caesaris = Iulia Sp. f. Mopsis
- 17) 8839: *Primus Ti. Claudii Caesaris Aug. disp. (37) = Iulia Themis*
- 18) 12099: *Aper (space is left for insertion of *praenomen* and *gentilicium* which indicates that he is a slave) = Lusius Pyrrallis (18)
- 19) 16707: *Cycnus Ti. Claudii Caesaris ser. = Marcia Marulla (28)
- 20) 38003: Antiochus Galbianus Caesaris servus . . . act(or) vic(esimae) = Messia Tryphaena*
- 21) 36456: *Trophimus Marciae divi T(iti) = Ogulnia Zmyrna
- 22) 8593: Placidus Caesar(is) = Pedia Epictesis*
- 23) 26036: *Trophimus Cantri Tauri ser. = Scribonia Helpis (another slave*)
- 24) 8436a: *Saturninus Caesaris praesignator = Sextia Procula
- 25) 26515: *Genesiacus imp. Nervae Traiani Aug. Germ. Dacici = Sextilia Potita
- 26) 11390: *Alexander Caesar(is) ser. Atticianus (heres) = Sextilia Prisca
- 27) 8674: --- Cesaris servus exs hortis Servilianis = Sextilia Secunda*
- 28) 27007: *Tertullus Caesaris ser. = Sulpicia Melia (50) (and to Cusinia Firma)
- 29) 7299: *Botrys Q. n. specular(ius) = Tiburtia Anyte (*MP*)
- 30) 33733: Euporus servus vilicus Caesar(is) aquarius = Vestoria Olympias*
- 31) 10124a: *Zethus = Vipstana Tyche (55) + C. Vipstanus Eup(rius) filius (12) (and to Amphio C. Salari Capitonis citharoedus, Zethus' brother, and Crescens Zethi vicarius)
- 32) 9424: *Pallans Q. n. a frum(ento) = Volusia Arbuscula (permissu dec(urionum))
- 33) 7300: Cerdo L. Volusi Saturnini topiar(ius) = Volusia Aucta* (*MP*)
- 34) 29552: *Syntrophus Caesar(is) = Volusia Fortunata (*sic*)
- 35) 8843: *Thyrsus Halys Ti. Claudii Caesaris Aug. Germanici ser. dispens. = --- cia Pelagia (25)

x HUSBAND PROBABLY SLAVE, WIFE FREE

- 1) 5940: *Nicerus = Arruntia Flora (*M Arruntiorum*)
- 2) 14242-14244: *Charito = Calpurnia Pia (20)
(Calpurnia Phido mater*)
- 3) 14251: *Zosimus = Calpurnia Veneria
- 4) 38145: *Mercurius = Calventia Helpis (35)
- 5) 14550: *Atalicus = Cassia Mussa (*sic*)
- 6) 15451: Hilario = Claudia Gorge*
- 7) 15462: Dorio = Claudia Helpis* (*columbarium*)
- 8) 15537: *Threptus = Claudia Philete (45)
- 9) 34934: *Phoebus = Claudia Primitiva
- 10) 5646: *Nostus = Claudia Provincia (22) (*MIAL*)
- 11) 16013: *Thaliarchus = Comicia Hegematio (24)
- 12) 18451: *Alexander = Flavia Tyche (20)
- 13) 4587: *Cissus = Iulia Apollonia (*MM*)
- 14) 21420: *Diadumenus = Livia Dorcas
- 15) 24088: Phileros (25) = Manlia Primigenia* + Musa (11)
- 16) 38685: *Elegans = Octavia Arethusa (23; sister Sextia Blanda*)
- 17) 24893: *Ianuarius = Postumia Tyche
- 18) 26451: *Primus = Servilia Successa (30)
- 19) 26451: *Secundio = Servilia Successa
- 20) 28352: *Onesimus = Varia Amoebe
- 21) 28533: *Simo = Verania Plias (35)
- 22) 28535: *Catagraphus = Verania Trophime (26)
- 23) 28544 = 19240: *Philotheus = Veratia Helpis (27)
- 24) 28589: Elainus = Verginia Thallusa*

- 25) 28635: Pharnaces = Vestiaria Severa (30) + L. Vestiaris Suavis f. (5)
- 26) 33666: *Maior = Vettidia Cresime
- 27) 33666: *Thallus = Vettidia Cresime
- 28) 29464: *Acestes = Volcia Helpis (18)
- 29) 9620: Helix mensor = Volusia Fautina* (*sic*)
- 30) 7691: *[My]rtilus = -- nnia Calybe (20) (*M vin. Randaninia*)

XI HUSBAND FREE, WIFE SLAVE

- 1) 15258: Ti. Claudius Secundus = Merope Caes(aris)*
- 2) 6647: *Marius Orthrus = Hygia Flaviae Sabinae obstetrix (30) (*MPPP*) (cf. III.2)
- 3) 9525: *P. Rubrius Optatus = Pyrrhe Rubriae Helviae libraria

XII HUSBAND FREE, WIFE PROBABLY SLAVE

- 1) 27317: *L. Acilius Agathas = Thais
- 2) 12831: [A]ufidius Venustus (40) = [H]elpis*
- 3) 22424: *L. Baebius Thallus = Meroe (48) + Porphyris (1), Meroe (4), Septentrio (2)
- 4) 17438: *L. Caecilius Successus = Eutychia + Successa f.
- 5) 32777: C. Calentius Aristias gubernator = Ammia*
- 6) 38463: L. Colius (less probably Colus) Agathangelus = Hymnis (22)
- 7) 23743: *Fl(avius) Epictetus = Pancale (dub.)
- 8) 25246: *Fulvius Ianuarius = Pyralis
- 9) 19895: *C. Iulius Cerinthus = Musa + Primigenius filius
- 10) 22188: Marius Blastus = Soteris* + Marius Socrates filius* (Marius Hamillus lib.*, all three *heredes*)
- 11) 6618: *T. Statilius Trophimus = Chrotis (*MS*)
- 12) 26948: *C. Sulpicius Antiochus = Primigenia
- 13) 27848: *C. Tuticus (*sic*) Paris = Anthusa
- 14) 7332: *L. Volusius Philetus = Corinna (*MV*)
- 15) 22803: M. Iurius Xystus = Myrtale

XIII HUSBAND FREE, WIFE FREED

A) HUSBAND PATRONUS OF WIFE:

- 1) 10911: *P. Aelius Lucifer = Aelia Hedone liberta
- 2) 10321: Ti. Claudius Agathopus immunis = Claudia Xanthe 1. + Claudia Ilias f(ilia ?) e(ius ?)
- 3) 38976: *Titacius Valens patronus = Titacia Priscilla

B) OTHERS

- 4) 10899: *P. Aelius Hermes = Aelia Aug. lib. Felicula + Basilis and Euctus fili
- 5) 16542: *P. Attius Helius = Cossutia Cn. 1. Tryphera
- 6) 14450: T. Magnius Fructus = Cartilia Eutychia M. Cartili Clari lib.* + ?Magnia T. f. Aug

XIV HUSBAND FREED, WIFE FREE

A) AUG. LIBB.

- 1) 10775: *P. Aelius Primus Aug. lib. = Aelia Nice (and to brother Protus)
- 2) 15002: *Ti. Claudius Aug. 1. Diomedes = Lusia Primigenia (20)
- 3) 20389: *Ti. Claudius Aug. 1. Herma = Iulia Aura (38)
- 4) 8768: *Ianuarius Domitiani Caesaris 1. scrib(a) cub(iculariorum) = Iulia Sabina (25)
- 5) 17901: Festus Aug. 1. Genethianus = Antonia Laeta*
- 6) 8429: *Felix Aug. lib. adiut. tabul. a rat. = Arria Rufina (to Veturius Felix, her previous husband)

B) PRESUMED AUG. LIBB.

- 7) 32468: *Ti. Claudius --- Apollinaris minister Almae Veneris ex *hortis Sallustianis* = Iulia Thyas
- 8) 9918: *Tib. Claudius Auctus tabellarius a ripa = Popilia Callinice (and to Popilia Eutychia, ? daughter)
- 9) 4888: *Ti. Claudius Herm[es] strator peculiari[s] = Claudia Secunda (*MIAL*)

C) OTHERS

- 10) 10360: *M. Antonius Alexander dec(urio) Panerotis Aug. 1. 1. = Antonia Coetonis
- 11) 9328: *C. Iulius Anicetus *dispensator* of C. Iulius Theophilus = Iulia Tyche + Primigenia f.
- 12) 21869: P. Mallius Atimetus (35) (post patroni mort(em) vix(it) ann(is) i m(ensibus) xi) = Iulia Systasis*
- 13) 21938: *A. Manlius (*sic*) A. lib. Azbestus = Titiena Nape
- 14) 25951: *A. Saufeius o. 1. Asphales, freedman of Saufeia Tertulla = Vettia Secunda

XV FREE HUSBAND, FREE WIFE

A) WITH SAME *NOMEN*:

- 1) 34403: C. Annius Evaristus = Annia Iucunda*
- 2) 4054: *M. Antonius Beryllus decurio = Antonia Lacaena (18) (*ML*)
- 3) 11991: M. Antonius Felix = Antonia Moschis*
- 4) 10363: M. Antonius Myrtilus = Antonia Chariessa immunis* (and to M. Antonius Boethus dec(urio))
- 5) 12023: *M. Antonius Tyrannus = Antonia Arete (and nutricii M. Antoni Flori)
- 6) 13836: *Caecilius Felix = Caecilia Nice (19)
- 7) 14449: *M. Cartilius Clitus = Cartilia Apate
- 8) 15098: *Ti. Claudius Herma = Claudia Felicia
- 9) 16048: P. Cominius Argus = Cominia Psychario
- 10) 4935: Cn. Cossutius Tertius (35) = Cossutia Clara* (*MIAL*)
- 11) 19792: C. Iulius Abascantus (45) = Iulia Doxa* (and to friend C. Iulius Euschemus)
- 12) 5122: *C. Iulius Apollonius = Iulia Marina (*MIAL*)
- 13) 4223: C. Iulius Bathyllus immunis = Iulia Sedata (*ML*)
- 14) 19995: C. Iulius Felix = Iulia Ma* (Felix's brother Antigonus*)
- 15) 35565: *Iulius Primus = Iulia Epiclesis (20)
- 16) 20329: C. Iulius Urbanus = Iulia Optata + C. Iulius Peculiaris filius
- 17) 21403: M. Livius Orpheus = Livia Faceta*
- 18) 7871: *L. Octavius Prim--- (50 or more) = Octavia Spe--- (*M. vin. Nariae*)
- 19) 6955: *L. Passienus Victor = Passiena Arescusa (27) (*M. vin. Aquariorum*)
- 20) 6628: T. Statilius Dionicus = Statilia Donata* + Hermes parenti* (slave woman) (*MS*)
- 21) 10386: Statilius Mystis decurio = Statilia Storge
- 22) 27484: *Cn. Titinius Eutyches = Titinia Veneria
- 23) 15304: *D. Valerius Eutyches = Valeria Sophe (and to Ti. Claudius Ti. f. Qui. Valerianus)
- 24) 28436: *L. Vellenus Milichus = Vellena Bassilla
- 25) 28534: *Q. Veranius Pharnaces = Verania Thaumaste (40) (*Agathemerus**)

B) WITH DIFFERENT *NOMINA*:

- 26) 37939: A. Aemilius Successus = Iulia Pannychis*
- 27) 12328: L. Arius Abascantus = Allia Artemisia

- 28) 12237: *L. Atinius Eutyclus = Apronia Anthusa (and to Q. Caecilius Philetus)
- 29) 14911: Ti. Claudius Alcimius = Iulia Sperata* (Marriage lasted 38 years)
- 30) 36456: *Ti. Cl(audius) Eutyclus = Ogulnia Zmyrna
- 31) 18858: *T. Clodius Acus = Galeria Melitine (19)
- 32) 15963: M. Caelius Fortunatus (22) = Aquilia Syntyche*
- 33) 16514: *Cossutius --- = Lucia Florentina*
- 34) 37536: *Q. Dexius Ephagatus (*sic*) = Modia Modesta (50) (*columbarium ad viam Nomentanam*)
- 35) 18045: *T. Flavius Earinus = Luria Iusta (21) (her friend Amandus*)
- 36) 15430: T. Flavius Echus = Claudia Felix*
- 37) 35343: Cn. Fulvinius Philostorgus = Sontia Galene (dub.)
- 38) 13579: Gellius Onesimus = Betutia Nereis*
- 39) 9823: P. Herennius pomarius a po--- = Publilia Hesper---*
- 40) 37405: C. Herennius Probus = Clarenna Natalis* (Tomb X, Velodrome)
- 41) 14027: *Ti. Iulius Dioga = Claudia Saturnina (and to his previous wife Caesonja Atalante; son by her, Ti. Claudius Dioga*)
- 42) 10601: *Iulius Sabbio = Aebutia Spirusa (35)
- 43) 26514: *M. Iunius Maximus = Sextilia Nysa + Sextilia Polla f. (3)
- 44) 20813: *N. Iunius Onesimus = Novania Ide (35)
- 45) 20839: *M. Iunius Theangelus = Aemilia Prima (? + M. Iunius Epicurus (21) [and to L. Aemilius Macedo (18)])
- 46) 21264: *M. Licinius Herma = Tarquitia Felicula + M. Licinius Herma filius (16)
- 47) 13911: Licinius Primus = Caelia Maxima (two *liberti**)
- 48) 21815: L. Mevius Cliens = Faltonia Ephyre* + Successus filius
- 49) 21655: L. Piarius Cerdo = Lucretia Daphne*
- 50) 24024: P. Petronius Quartio = Iulia Citheris*
- 51) 24446: Q. Pompeius Cnidus = Herennia Urbana*
- 52) 23336: P. Pomponius Theophilus = Octavia Attice*
- 53) 14801: *C. Raecius Successus = Cicereia Vitalis
- 54) 26415: *L. Servilius Onesimus = [Ar]runtia Callityc[he]
- 55) 6203: T. Stertinius Capito = Claudia Faustilla* (*MPPP*)
- 56) 14243: *T. Vatinius Felix = Calpurnia Phido + Calpurnia Pia (20) (?*M Calpurniorum*) (also MM. Licini Phandes et Hesychus, nephews) (cf. X.2)
- 57) 29532: C. Volusius Inventus = Ostoria Paezusa* + C. Volusius Sabinianus and C. Volusius Fructus fili*

XVI HUSBAND FREE, WIFE FREEBORN

- 1) 34321: Ti. Claudius Ialysus = Aemilia Sp. f. Veneria* + Aemilia Sp. f. Pia
- 2) 26966: P. Sulpicius Narcissus = Plaetoria L. f. Maximilla*

XVII HUSBAND FREEBORN, WIFE FREE

- 1) 23015: L. Nonius Sp. f. Cultianus (22) = Manilia Faventina*
- 2) 3532: *Ti. Quaestorius Ti. f. Col. Secundus pref. fabr. II = Claudia Anthemis (20)
- 3) 25190: *Diogenes Rhodonis f. Flaviopoitanus = Publilia Patias (also her freedman N. Publilius Onesimus*)