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Abstract

This dissertation provides the first combined analysis of how Roman municipal freedmen and their descendants navigated the social, economic, and political landscape of imperial society. The municipal freedmen (*liberti publici*) had been owned and manumitted by towns in Italy, where they constituted the *familia publica* and performed many day-to-day functions for the municipal administration. They are not to be confused with freedmen of private individuals of local origin. Their status is often assumed to have conferred on the freedmen and their descendants a high degree of prestige that helped to advance their careers.

The study first addresses two demographic issues in order to estimate the volume of municipal freedmen and descendants one can expect to document in the epigraphic record. A heterogeneous approach is employed to argue that the *familia publica* in most towns was small. The practice of manumitting slaves in the *familia* is also reconstructed in light of universal practices observed in other slave households. I propose that towns tended to be cautious in manumitting their slaves, especially those with technical skills.

Next, the evidence for the municipal freedmen is analyzed. While some had the opportunity to forge links to the municipal elite and accumulate a large *peculium* that enhanced
their social capital, they also lacked a personal patron whose financial backing and connections would have provided a push up the social ladder after manumission. Only a limited number of the freedmen known to us achieved any meaningful social or economic advancement. It is suggested that the lack of a patron made it difficult for most freedmen to break away from the _familia publica_ and enter into other spheres of the local economy and social hierarchy.

The study concludes by analyzing the activities of the municipal freedmen’s descendants across multiple generations. They, too, experienced only marginal success. A small number ascended to the senatorial or equestrian order or the ranks of the municipal elite, and another narrow segment joined local occupational and voluntary associations. Yet the vast majority never advanced socially or economically and are known to us as little more than a name on an epitaph.
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INTRODUCTION

There are few areas in the study of Roman history and culture in which the researcher is not confronted with the theme of social mobility. Whether one looks at the ancient evidence from a philological standpoint, from a legal framework, or from an archaeological perspective, questions about upward or downward social and economic movement frequently lie below the surface. While the hierarchical social strata of Roman imperial society remained rigid, opportunities for upward mobility were often available, under the right conditions and with the right patronage connections.¹ One social group that has persistently fascinated scholars in this context consists of ex-slaves and their families. This is unsurprising, since such individuals often came from the lowest rungs of society and had a far greater distance to cover than other groups in their pursuit of social and economic advancement. Attesting to this interest is the substantial coverage devoted to freedmen and their descendants in the major works on the structure of Roman society.² As Henrik Mouritsen framed the discussion in a recent monograph on Roman freedmen, these ex-slaves ‘[have] become the defining figures of the Roman empire, its society and economy.’³

Our picture of the freedman has evolved over time. Scholarship in the early twentieth century, often influenced by contemporary attitudes, regarded the continual promotion of large numbers of ex-slave family lines into the citizen body and ultimately its upper echelons as a corrupting feature in Roman social structures. The works of Tenney Frank and Arnold Duff, which focused heavily on the demographic impact of manumission, are good examples.⁴ Scholars of the 1970s and 1980s emphasized the economic role of ex-slaves, often characterizing

¹ The standard works on the structure of Imperial society include Hopkins 1965: 12-26; Saller 1982: 80-94, 119-43 (with a focus on the role of patronage ‘from above’ in upward mobility); Hopkins and Burton 1983: 120-200 (examining movement in and out of the senatorial order from the first to third century CE); Alföldy 1985: 98-150 (labeling Roman society in the early Principate an ‘orders-strata’ society), 150-6 (on social mobility); Garnsey and Saller 1987: 107-43, 148-59; and Jacques and Scheid 1990: 301-75. See also Hopkins 1968: 63-79 and Hopkins 1978: 74-96 on the concept of ‘structural differentiation’ and the formalization of social orders and institutions during the Principate. Among the most important discussions of specific aspects of the social mobility of ex-slave families are Weaver 1967: 3-20 (imperial freedmen); Purcell 1983: 125-73 (on freedmen and their sons in the *apparitores*); Eck 1999: 5-29 (on cases of entry into the equestrian order); and López Barja de Quiroga 1995: 326-48 (a statistical analysis of the descendants of freedmen in the municipal council of decurions). I will discuss the scholarship on issues related to advancement into specific social groups in the following chapters, for instance, the advancement of ex-slaves into the *Augustales* (pp. 136-52), and freeborn descendants into the senatorial order (pp. 192-205), the equestrian order (pp. 218-29), and the municipal elite (pp. 229-46).
⁴ Frank 1916; Duff 1928. See also Gordon 1927: 182; and Treggiari 1969: 231-2.
them as an energetic economic ‘middle class.’ They have been conceived of as prime operators of businesses and manufacturing activities that drove much of the urban economy, perhaps sometimes as independent entrepreneurs, but more often integrated into their patrons’ economic networks.\textsuperscript{5} Another focus of scholarship has stressed the status of freedmen as outsiders in Roman society, since they were marked by the \textit{macula servitutis}, the ‘stain of slavery.’ According to this concept, which was primarily articulated in literary sources, the experience of slavery left an indelible mark that supposedly impeded the social advancement of the ex-slave.\textsuperscript{6} Surviving passages in Roman literary works of a philosophical nature, as well as legal texts, display the persistent idea that once a person had been held in servitude, his or her moral character was irreversibly damaged.\textsuperscript{7} The experience of slavery made the former slave, in Moses Finley’s terms, an outsider in Roman society, and it inflicted ‘social death’ on him or her in Orlando Patterson’s conception.\textsuperscript{8} As Paul Veyne envisioned, such newcomers could never fit properly into the community of freeborn Roman citizens (\textit{ingenui}).\textsuperscript{9} The classic literary depiction of the fictional freedman Trimalchio of Petronius’ \textit{Satyricon} looms large in this paradigm, and it has been suggested that the \textit{macula} may have been more of a narrow literary \textit{topos} than a widespread social conception. This characterization of the ex-slave’s identity, as Thomas Wiedemann pointed out, may have been largely a response to the Roman elite’s attitudes toward the institution of slavery and its anxiety over the problematic legal and social category of the \textit{libertus} and his place in free society.\textsuperscript{10}

The keen interest in Romans with servile origins has given rise to various strands of scholarship, each focusing on specific types of evidence in order to estimate the demographic scale of manumission and its impact on Roman society. The purpose has been to better understand how often and how rapidly the descendants of freedmen managed to climb the social ladder in the municipal and wider imperial landscape.


\textsuperscript{6} \textit{Dig.} 40.11.5 (Modestinus); \textit{Cod. Iust.} 7.16.9 (Diocletian and Maximian); \textit{Cod. Iust.} 10.32.2 (Diocletian and Maximian). In general, see Mouritsen 2011: 10-35, especially p. 25 n. 84, for a discussion of the inconsistencies in the Roman legal and cultural conceptualizations of the moral condition of \textit{liberti}.

\textsuperscript{7} E.g., Terence \textit{Andr.} 35-9; Cic. \textit{Cat.} 4.16; Val. Max. 6.8.7.

\textsuperscript{8} Finley 1980: 75; O. Patterson 1982: 35-76.


A first strand takes literary sources as its point of reference. In some segments of Roman literature, the idea of throngs of ex-slaves crowding urban centers is a frequently encountered topos. For example, the world of Plautus is full of such figures, and already in the second century BCE Roman ideology had fixed an array of stereotypes of both slaves and freedmen. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, writing in the late first century BCE, launched an invective against masters who recklessly freed entire households of slaves in their wills (*Ant. Rom.* 4.24.6). His underlying complaint was that too many ‘undesirable’ ex-slaves were being allowed to enter the body of Roman citizens. This concern also seems to be reflected in the Augustan legislation that imposed stricter regulations on testamentary and other forms of manumission. Cicero once even implied that diligent and well-behaved slaves could expect manumission after six years in servitude, though his use of the theme of slavery for a fixed period of time was surely only a metaphor for the condition of the Roman elite during and after the dictatorship of Caesar (*Phil.* 8.32). There were allegedly so many freedmen by the later first century CE, largely of non-Italian stock, thatJuvenal’s interlocutor could complain about the number encountered on the streets of Rome (e.g., *Sat.* 1.95-102). This type of anecdotal evidence has sometimes been taken as a reliable measuring stick for the prevalence of freedmen in Roman society. On the basis of this argument, it follows that rates of manumission must have been extremely high in the late Republic and Principate. Yet historians tend to agree that one should not generalize too much from such passages, and that direct correspondence should not be sought between these literary depictions and the demographic reality.

One of the most frequently cited literary notices of social advancement ‘from below’ is Tacitus’ acerbic claim that a large number of the senators and equestrians under Nero were the

---

12 Documented in, for example, Stewart 2012: 132-55.
13 The *Lex Fufia Caninia* of 2 BCE restricted the number of testamentary manumissions a slave-owner could perform in proportion to the overall size of his *familia* (*Dig.* 40.4.1-61). For example, in smaller households consisting of less than 10 slaves, a master could manumit half the slaves, while in a large household consisting of over 100 slaves, only one-fifth could be manumitted in the master’s will. The *lex Aelia Sentia* of 4 CE codified the formal criteria that had to be met for a manumitted slave to become a full Roman citizen (*Gaius Inst.* 1.13, 19-20). For example, the slave had to be at least 30 years of age and the manumittor normally had to be at least 20. For slaves manumitted informally, the *lex Iunia* of c. 17 BCE ascribed the status of *Latinus Iunianus* (*Gaius Inst.* 1.22-24; 3.55-56).
14 Cf. Alföldy 1972: 97-129 on the theory that manumission was nearly automatic around the age of 30 (the argument is revised yet reaffirmed in Alföldy 1986). See, however, the discussion of this metaphor in Wiedemann 1981: 46-7; and Mouritsen 2011: 137.
15 See, for example, Duff 1928: 12-21, 29-35; Treggiari 1969: 11-20; and Dumont 1987: 41-82.
16 See above, n. 9.
descendants of ex-slaves (Ann. 13.27: et plurimis equitum, plerisque senatoribus non aliunde originem trahi). The context for this remark was a debate in the senate over how to deal with ingrati liberti, freedmen who failed to observe the customary deference to their former masters.\(^{17}\) There is often a tendency to take such remarks as little more than rhetorical, and perhaps lurking behind Tacitus’ statement is the tension between Romans with a long aristocratic pedigree and various types of social newcomers in imperial society.\(^{18}\) The substantial influence wielded by imperial freedmen under the Julio-Claudians fits well into such a context.\(^{19}\) Against this background, however, Tacitus prefaces his observation on the origins of the elite by also pointing out that many magisterial attendants (ministeria magistratibus et sacerdotibus) and members of the urban cohorts (cohortis etiam in urbe conscriptas) were recruited from among ex-slaves or their sons. He also shows an awareness of both legal manumission that granted Roman citizenship and the informal type of manumission that produced Junian Latins,\(^{20}\) which he claims could be revoked. Taken together, this discussion seems to ground Tacitus’ remarks in reality, which means that we may have to take him seriously.

Legal evidence from the early Principate has also been adduced in order to comprehend the impact of manumission and freedmen’s families on Roman society. Augustus enacted several pieces of legislation on manumission, such as those fixing a minimum age for a slave’s manumission,\(^{21}\) restricting the volume of testamentary manumission in large familiae,\(^{22}\) and reinforcing the rights of patrons.\(^{23}\) Similarly, the lex Visellia was passed under Tiberius in 24 CE, officially prohibiting freedmen from holding public office or joining the decurionate in Roman society.

---

\(^{17}\) Mouritsen 2011: 53-7 notes the obscure legal apparatus that allowed patrons to sue freedmen to uphold this principle, including a law that permitted re-enslavement.


\(^{20}\) According to the lex Iunia of 17 or 19 CE (Gaius Inst. 1.22-24; 3.55-6), these freedmen had been manumitted without adhering to the formal protocols, which gave them a liminal status. They had juridical freedom while they lived (ius Latii), but were stripped of any testamentary rights at death. The fifth-century Christian writer Salvian characterized their lot this way: ut vivant scilicet quasi ingenui et morantur ut servi (Eccl. 3.7.31). Junian Latins could be promoted to full Roman citizenship if they were manumitted again by their patron, this time formally, and were then over 30 years of age (iteratio); if they married a Roman or Latin citizen and produced a child that survived to age 1 (anniculi probatio); or if they performed an act for which the emperor granted promotion. See Crook 1967: 43-5; and López Barja de Quiroga 1998: 145-6. Junian Latins constitute an intriguing and problematic category in the study of Roman freedmen, not least because they are so difficult to identify in our sources. On this topic, see Weaver 1990: 275-305; López Barja de Quiroga 1998: 133-63; and de Ligt and Garnsey 2012: 69-94.

\(^{21}\) Lex Aelia Sentia of 4 CE. With few exceptions, the minimum age was thirty years.

\(^{22}\) Lex Fufia Caninia of 2 BCE. See Dig. 40.4.1-61.

\(^{23}\) Lex Papia of 9 CE. See Dig. 38.16.
towns. Such measures are often viewed as a response to large-scale manumission, and based on the elite’s concerns over an ever-increasing number of new ex-slaves entering the citizen body. Like the literary material, this type of evidence is important, to be sure, even if it is anecdotal and offers few specific details about the careers of any freedmen or their descendants.

From a different perspective, a third strand of analysis has focused on the rich epigraphic evidence from Rome and the towns of Italy in order to grasp the position of ex-slave families and how they moved through the urban social and economic landscape. This area of research has been particularly popular in recent times, as the tools of analysis have become more refined. It is often possible through various methods to identify freedmen and their recent descendants in personal inscriptions, such as epitaphs or votive offerings, and in the rolls of urban associations. It has been pointed out that Romans from ‘servile’ backgrounds are overrepresented in funerary epigraphy, a feature that was likely a product of their eagerness to display their status as new Roman citizens. Even so, the epigraphic evidence attests the large-scale practice of manumission, and shows that freedmen’s descendants frequently had a consequential footprint in the Roman economy and society. The group features prominently in the rosters of professional associations in the Italian cities, and for some commentators these documents are a more promising indicator of their impact than the impression given in sepulchral epigraphy. For example, of the hundreds of members of the professional collegia attested at Ostia, ex-slaves may have comprised around one-third of the rosters of these associations. Moreover, the Iucundus and Sulpicius archives, both recovered in Pompeii but pertaining to

---

24 Mentioned in Cod. Iust. 9.21 (Diocletian and Maximian).
25 Alföldy 1985: 140. See an analysis of the Roman juridical writings and the relevant scholarship in Mouritsen 2011: 80-92, who disagrees that Augustus’ legislation was truly aimed at curbing the demographic impact of new ex-slave citizens.
26 On factors that point to ‘servile’ origins, see Garnsey 1975: 167-80; and an updated discussion in Mouritsen 2011: 123-41.
27 Taylor’s (1961: 113-32) classic study of the epitaphs from Rome and the surrounding area, which are published in the volumes of CIL VI, found that approximately three-quarters of the persons with an explicit indication of status were ex-slaves, and she believed that at least three-quarters of the large group of incerti were either ex-slaves or persons with close familial connections to them. Likewise, scholars hold that a large proportion of the tomb owners in the Porta Romana and Via Laurentina necropoleis in Ostia and the necropoleis in Pompeii were freedmen or their children (on Ostia, see Meiggs 1973: 189-208; Heinzelmann 2000: 104-12; and Mouritsen 2005: 40-44; and on Pompeii see Mouritsen 2001: 30-5; Mouritsen 2004: 281-304; and Mouritsen 2005: 45-55.
28 Cf. Jongman 2003: 116-17; contra Mouritsen 2005: 42-3, who notes that the freeborn members of associations may provide some insight into the plebs ingenua that is largely absent from the funerary epigraphy at places like Ostia.
29 Mouritsen 2005: 42-3 n. 25. Cf. Liu 2009: 175-6, who suggests a smaller proportion of freedmen in the collegia centonariorum in many towns in Italy and the Gallic provinces.
business transactions in that city and in nearby Puteoli, have shown that up to three-quarters of persons acting as agents for their principal were slaves or freedmen. The prominence of freedmen may also be found in a fragmentary *album* from Herculaneum that may be from a citizen registry (*CIL X 1403a-1*). A recent analysis suggests that citizen freedmen or Junian Latins account for as much as 40% of the extant sections of the list, a figure that in turn implies very high manumission rates in the town.

Important epigraphic research has also sought to reconstruct the participation of the freedmen’s descendants in the ranks of the municipal elite by quantifying their success in entering their local council of decurions. The entrenched local aristocracies that controlled these councils to some degree always needed to bring in new blood from below, and the descendants of rich freedmen comprised an attractive source. Studies of inscriptions from towns with a large epigraphic patrimony, such as Ostia and Puteoli, suggest that by the second century CE upwards of 15% of local decurions known to us descended from ex-slave ancestors, while at sites like Pompeii and Beneventum the figure may have reached as high as one-quarter. This sort of quantitative analysis pointed earlier scholars toward the idea of a freedman ‘social revolution’ in many Roman towns, according to which the descendants of ex-slaves who became rich through commercial activities eventually displaced long-entrenched aristocratic families for control of the council of decurions. A more nuanced view of this evidence has now become more widely accepted. It has been argued that the prevalence of decurions with ‘servile’ origins in funerary inscriptions, the medium by which freedmen’s sons and recent descendants were eager to advertise their achievements, distorts their actual presence. Another interpretation suggests that

---

31 de Ligt and Garnsey 2012: 69-94; and now also Garnsey and de Ligt 2016: 72-94.
32 Mouritsen 1997: 57-78. The high level of prosperity among the ex-slave population in Beneventum, an inland city, is somewhat surprising. It is worth noting in this context this city’s role as a crossroads for overland trade in southern Italy and the concomitant local economic opportunities that could have supported social mobility among the freedmen. The application by de Haas 2017: 51-82 of Central Place Theory to Roman Italy offers useful insight into the market capabilities of sites like Beneventum.
33 Meiggs 1973: 189-213, 217-24 (on Ostia); and Castrèn 1975: 92-124 (on Pompeii). Cf. Heinzelmann’s 2000: 104-12 analysis of the proportion of tombs in the necropoleis of Ostia thought to have been built and owned by freedmen or their recent descendants. Mouritsen 2011: 275-8 applies the term ‘contest mobility’ to this sort of social ascent.
the traditional aristocratic families’ hold on the upper echelons of the council may have been largely untouched by newcomers ‘from below.’

Common to most of these ideas are assumptions about how the cycle of social mobility for freedmen’s families was supposed to work. The most fortunate slaves, those who had properly ‘matured,’ managed to gain their freedom through manumission. These ex-slaves then expanded their economic roles, ideally backed by a rich patron, and worked hard to build up their own small fortune. Barred from holding public office themselves, the most ambitious ex-slaves kept their eye on promoting the careers of their freeborn sons. The ideal outcome was for these newcomers to be absorbed fully into freeborn society and, for a select few, eventually to advance into the local or imperial aristocracy. Another frequently cited corollary to this picture is that ex-slaves could expect greater chances of advancement than the freeborn poor, who lacked a patron to watch out for them. The ancient evidence frequently offers glimpses of different stages of this model, yet there remain many gaps in our knowledge that hinder reconstructions of how this social mobility actually worked from the ground up, how it played out in the families of ex-slaves in both the short and the longer term.

0.1 THE FAMILIES OF ROMAN MUNICIPAL FREEDMEN AS A CASE-STUDY OF SOCIAL MOBILITY

One promising but neglected segment of Rome’s ‘servile’ population provides fertile ground for studying each of the scholarly interests outlined above, and, in fact, offers the chance to reconstruct a more comprehensive picture of the social ascendancy of Roman families of sub-elite origin than can often be undertaken. The group consists of persons who bear a family

---

35 Other types of epigraphic evidence, such as alba and fasti, point to a lower participation by decurions who descended from ex-slaves. See, for example, Camodeca 1996a: 171-8 (on Herculaneum); and Mouritsen 1997: 57-78 (Pompeii, pp. 62-8; Ostia, pp. 68-70; Puteoli, pp. 70-2; Beneventum, pp. 72-3). See also Kleijwegt 1993: 45-53 on the divisions between upper and lower echelons in the town council and the varying degrees of turnover in both groups. Mouritsen 2011: 275-8 applies the term ‘sponsored mobility’ to explain this method of promoting newcomers into the local council.

36 Mouritsen 2011: 261-78 assesses the most important evidence and scholarship on this picture of social mobility.

37 On the sociological idea that masters infantilized their slaves and that some slaves ‘matured’ sufficiently to be considered candidates for manumission, see Mouritsen 2011: 29-34.

38 More significant levels of advancement were probably a reality for the grandsons or great-grandsons of freedmen far more often than for their first-generation ingenui sons.


40 By the descriptor ‘sub-elite’ I mean individuals and families below the equestrian order and, in the municipal context, below the class of decurions and their families. I include in this category the municipal freedmen who were able to gain membership in the *Augustales, whose ranks across towns in Italy and the provinces overwhelmingly consisted of ex-slaves. It should be emphasized, however, that these *Augustales occupied a liminal position in
name (*nomen gentile* or *gentilicium*) that corresponds to their hometown. This phenomenon turns up time and again in the study of inscriptions from Roman towns. For example, around the beginning of the third century CE, the council of decurions in the small Umbrian town of Sentinum erected what was probably a statue with its base to honor a local man, L. Sentinas Verus, who had reached the two highest magistracies in his town’s administration. He belonged to the town’s voting tribe, Lemonia, a further indication of his local origin (*CIL XI 5761*):

\[L(ucio)\] Sentinati / L(uci) f(ilio) Lem(onia) Vero / IIIlvir(o) quinquennali, / iur(e) dic(undo), / dec(urionum) decr(eto).

To L. Sentinas Verus, son of Lucius, of the voting tribe Lemonia, *quattuorvir* with censorial powers, and with juridical powers, by decree of the town councilors (this monument was erected).

On the face of it, Verus’ career may seem unremarkable among a multitude of others illustrating various degrees of social advancement in Roman towns. Yet his success becomes more intriguing when one considers the potential implication of his unusual *gentilicium*, Sentinas. One obvious explanation for a *gentilicium* derived from a town’s name occurred to the first-century BCE antiquarian Varro, who was familiar with this onomastic system from personal experience. He thought that persons with such names were the public freedmen of Roman towns (*liberti publici*). These ex-slaves had been owned and eventually manumitted by their eponymous town. In the following, I will refer to them by the term ‘municipal freedmen,’ which is a necessary shorthand that captures their function. Individuals with these names derived from towns could also be these ex-slaves’ descendants.

One encounters in the epigraphic evidence municipal freedmen like C. Saepinius Albanus *municipi(i) [l(libertus)]* from the small town of Saepinum in Samnium (*CIL IX 2533*), or P. Ostiensis Acutus *coloniae libertus* from Ostia (*AE 1939, 148*). In other towns, the decurions bestowed on their freedmen the *gentilicium* Publicius (or Poblicius), which was formed on the municipal society. Given the social origins of most members, they rightly belonged to the municipal sub-elite. Yet they also tended to be very wealthy, and in the view of some scholars they constituted a *nobilitas libertina* (e.g., D’Arms 1981: 127-8). Equally, their wealth and civic activities meant that in many towns they formed a sort of ‘second *ordo,*’ complementing the official *ordo decurionum*. I will discuss the *Augustales* in greater detail below, pp. 136-52. On the advanced social standing of some *Augustales*, see Mouritsen 2011: 255-61; and Vandevoorde 2014: 33-43.

41 Verus was also commemorated in Sentinum by his mother, a freeborn woman named Satria Vera, in *CIL XI 5761*. On the voting tribe of Sentinum, see Kubitschek 1889: 75-6.
42 Obviously, ‘municipal freedmen’ are not to be confused with freedmen of local, i.e., municipal origin, who had been manumitted by private individuals.
43 Varro *LL* 8.82-3. I will discuss this passage below, pp. 26-8.
adjective *publicus* and meant something like ‘son of the public.’ Many municipal freedmen and freedwomen from cities in northern Italy bore this name, such as the freedman couple Q. Publicius Faustus and Publicia Quinta from Brixia (*CIL* V 4686). A survey of the Roman epigraphic record turns up over a thousand persons with a municipal *gentilicium*, and each of them likely had a direct or distant familial connection to the eponymous town. Indeed, the list of explanations for possessing such a *gentilicium* is short, and it will become clear that Varro’s assertion of ex-slave origins is often the most plausible. In this context, then, this group of Romans with family names derived from town-names constitutes a useful corpus for studying social and economic mobility among the lowest strata of Roman society.

There are several features that distinguish this group from other ‘servile’ families. One meaningful way of differentiating between different types of slaves and ex-slaves in the Roman world is to focus on whether a slave had been owned by a private party, by the emperor, or by a Roman civic institution. Slaves in the latter category are often referred to as *servi publici*, ‘public slaves.’ It is important to recognize that within the group of public slaves a further distinction must be made, between those owned by the Roman state (formally, by the Roman people), the *servi publici populi Romani*, and the public slaves owned by towns of various status in the Roman world (i.e., *coloniae* or *municipia*), who can be called ‘municipal slaves.’

Organized into the municipal *familia publica*, these slaves performed a variety of administrative tasks for the towns that owned them. They formed a skilled bureaucracy for the day-to-day workings of the municipal administration, serving as clerks and accountants, religious functionaries, manufacturers of lead pipes and bricks, and bathhouse attendants, to name just a few of the occupations that turn up in their inscriptions. Our evidence also records the presence of female municipal slaves (*servae publicae*), whose role in perpetuating the *familia* may have been supplemented by other duties as well. While these slaves are known almost entirely through the study of the inscriptions they left behind, traces of their presence in municipal society are found in Latin literature. In one dramatic episode in Petronius’ *Satyricon* the

---

44 Additionally, a few towns gave their freedmen a *gentilicium* derived from an element in the city’s official titulature, such as Venerius from Pompeii, officially known as *Colonia Cornelia Veneria Pompeianorum*, and Concordius from Beneventum, known as *Colonia Iulia Concordia Augusta Felix Beneventum*.

45 On their competences, see Weiss 2004: 29-36 (attendants for magistrates), 37-84 (municipal treasury and archives), 84-101 (infrastructural work), 102-17 (security personnel), 117-34 (technical posts such as *plumberii*, brick-makers, and surveyors), 135-58 (assisting in *sacra publica* and temple maintenance).

protagonist Encolpius tries to hide the runaway slave Giton from the local authorities of Puteoli at an inn. The praeco in charge of the search, himself an apparitor presumably attached to a local magistrate, is accompanied by a municipal slave who performs the dirty work of the search, breaking a door off its hinges and peering under beds to find the runaway (97.1-98.1). The scene underlines the policing function of this servus publicus. Municipal slaves also turn up in the world of Apuleius, such as in an amusing scene at a town in Thessaly in which a local fishmonger scams the novel’s traveler Lucius. The situation is only remedied when Lucius runs into a friend who happened to be holding the aedileship in the town. As the administrator of the marketplace, this magistrate rebukes the offending vendor, even instructing the municipal slave he was with (officialem suum) to overturn the cart and smash all the fish (Met. 1.24-5).

Many of these municipal slaves performed even higher-level administrative and technical functions for the local administration, and in return at least some of them enjoyed a high status and privileges normally not shared by private slaves. For example, one slave vilicus ab alimentis owned by the town of Urvinum Mataurense amassed sufficient wealth to own three personal under-slaves (vicarii) (CIL XI 6073), while yet another slave, of Cales in southern Latium, enjoyed testamentary rights over a portion of his peculium, a privilege unheard of for a regular slave (CIL X 4687). One municipal slave of Ostia was permitted to form an informal marriage with a free woman, and the couple’s son was permitted to take his mother’s free status (AE 1996, 298). Some of these slaves also had the opportunity to rub shoulders with the municipal elite whom they served, and perhaps even to form social bonds that might assist them later in life.

The most fortunate among them were manumitted, and the chances that such a freed slave would leave evidence to posterity, in the form of an inscription, is normally much greater than is the case with the men and women who lived out their lives in servitute. Yet these

---

49 Halkin 1897: 166-7 argued that the officialis should be identified this way, though others have interpreted him as a lictor, pointing to the reference in 1.24 that Lucius’ friend was accompanied by lixas et virgas (see Weiss 2004: 106 n. 216). Keulen 2007: 437-8, 448-50 rightly points out that Lucius’ friend was an aedile, and therefore should not have possessed any lictors. This point is confirmed by Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae 62 and Lex Irnitana 19. Municipal slaves are also mentioned in their search and seizure capacity in Met. 9.41, where they assist lictors (lictoribus ceterisque publicis ministeriis).
50 Ulpian 20.16; Dig. 40.3.3 (Papinian). See Halkin 1897: 196-8; Barrow 1928: 131; and Weiss 2004: 194 no. 3. For objections to this argument, see Buckland 1908: 328-9.
51 AE 1996, 298: D. M. / Sergio (H)ellanico / vixit m(enses) VII d(ies) V / (H)ellanicus colonorum / et Sergia Hygia / parentes fecerunt. Sijpesteijn 1996: 283 no. 1. Since we cannot precisely determine Sergia Hygia’s status, she must be classified as an incerta. She could have been freeborn, or she could have been a freedwoman from a local private familia. It is clear, however, that the child was born after she had attained free(d) status.
freedmen were something of a paradox among their ex-slave counterparts. Despite whatever benefits they had received as slaves, the conditions of their manumission put these freed slaves at a significant disadvantage. Instead of being manumitted by a personal master like private slaves, these municipal slaves relied on the council of decurions (on behalf of the local citizenry) to enact their manumission. Chapter 72 of the *Lex Irnitana*, a version of a municipal law issued under the Flavians to towns in the province of Baetica (and other parts of Spain), outlines the procedure,\(^{52}\) and individual epitaphs offer a practical illustration of the phenomenon. A first-century CE votive offering by a municipal freedman of Mediolanum is a good example (*CIL* V 6630):

\[
I(ovi) \ O(ptimo) \ [M(aximo)] , \ / \ C(aius) \ Poblicius \ / \ municipum \ / \ Mediolanens<\text{-}\>u[m] \ / \ l(ibertus) \ Aleksander \ / \ v(otum) \ s(olvit) \ l(ibens) \ m(erito).$
\]

To Jupiter Optimus Maximus, C. Poblicius Alexsander, freedman of the municipal citizens of Mediolanum, willingly and deservedly discharged his vow.

This form of impersonal manumission meant that the newly enfranchised freedmen had no personal patron, and therefore lacked the ready-made *clientela* networks, legal protections, and social and economic benefits that accrued to their private counterparts. In turn, this inhibited status also must have impacted on the advancement of their freeborn sons and descendants as they made their own way in Roman society.\(^{53}\)

There are important reasons to concentrate my study on these particular ex-slave families. For one thing, they constitute a valuable case-study of the process of assimilation into free society. Many scholars assume that their high status as slaves naturally translated into an implicit guarantee of success as a municipal freedman.\(^{54}\) Some ex-slaves of Roman towns did fare well after manumission. Among those who gained membership in the *Augustales*, an achievement

---

\(^{52}\) This municipal charter will be discussed below at length. The fragmentary inscription from Duratón (near Segovia) that del Hoyo 1995: 140-4 identified as pertaining to the Flavian *lex municipalis* issued under Domitian shows that the statute benefitted not only Roman communities in Baetica, but also in the other Spanish provinces as well.


\(^{54}\) See, for example, Halkin 1897: 107-36; Tassaux 2000: 400-1; Giorcelli Bersani 2002: 60; Buonopane 2004: 53-7; Weiss 2004: 163-79; and Tran 2006b: 128-9. Some scholars are quick to compare the prestige of these municipal freedmen to that of imperial freedmen, albeit to a somewhat lesser degree (e.g., Weaver 1967: 3-20). Yet the connections to imperial power cultivated by ex-imperial slaves was surely unique on many levels. Weiss 2004: 165-6 likens both the municipal slaves and freedmen to municipal apparitors, in their pay, social standing, and self-confidence in their place in society.
requiring both wealth and social connections, one finds M. Veronius Epaphroditus of Verona
(CIL V 3439). A similar example comes from Volsinii in Etruria, where an epitaph records that
Volsinius [V]ictorinus reached a leadership position (quinquennalis) in the powerful local
collegium fabrum (CIL XI 2710a). Another freedman, of Cremona, seems to have been a
potential heir to a local fortune in the Julio-Claudian period, even drawing the animosity of a
rival who cursed him in the following defixio (AE 1975, 449):55

Q(uintus) Domatius C(ai) f(ilius) bonum tempus / mihi mea(e)que aetati; / id ego mando
remandata / quo(d) i(i)s apud deos i(n)feros ut pereant / et defigantur quo ego heres sim:
/ pupillus C(ai) Grani C(ai) f(ili)ii, C(aius) Public(ius) populi l(ibertus) / Aprod(is)i(us),
L(uci)us Corneliu(s); meo sum(pt)u / defig[o] illos quo pereant.56

I, Q. Domatius, son of Caius, [wish for] good circumstances for me and my lifetime.
Therefore, I entrust this request to those among the infernal gods, that [the following
persons] die and be stricken, so that I should become heir: the ward of C. Granius, son of
Caius; C. Publicius Aprodius, a freedman of the people; and L. Cornelius. At my own
expense, I strike them so that they may die.

It is necessary to test assumptions about this group through a more systematic study of all
recoverable municipal freedmen in the epigraphic record in order to see how they fared as a
larger group. The methodology that will be introduced in the following chapter explains how the
group of secure and potential municipal freedmen available for study can be expanded. When
evaluating the position of the municipal freedmen in Roman society, it is imperative also to study
the successive generations of their descendants, in order to gain a longer-term perspective on
their family’s ascent. There is a host of methodological problems here. The well-known fact that
in Roman inscriptions individuals rarely cite their full name and give all the relevant information
about his or her status is a major obstacle to any study of social advancement. A scholar faces
problems of identification that require the creation of methodological tools that allow for
conclusions to be drawn while being fully aware of the limits of the evidence at hand.

A second important aspect of the study of municipal freedmen and their descendants
pertain to their capacity to be tracked in Roman epigraphy, in discrete groups based on common

55 Weiss 2004: 240. Weiss also collects numerous Greek inscriptions recording public slaves from Athens, Delos
and other poleis in the Greek world dating from the fourth to first centuries BCE (pp. 221-235). Moreover, the
earliest dated libertus publicus from the Greek world comes from Thasos in the late-second century BCE (Dunant-
56 Solin 1987: 130-3 no. 118; and Solin 2004: 123-6 no. 4 suggests the possibility that the gentilicum of the foster
parent Granius should be read as Corani(us), which is itself a municipal gentilicum corresponding to the Latin town
of Cora.
gentilicia that were derived from towns and cohered through generations. For most of the freedman population in Roman society, historians have tended to study individuals in comparative isolation on account of the sporadic nature of the ancient evidence.\footnote{Two exceptions to this trend would be the familia Caesaris and the freedman population of a handful of towns with a large epigraphic patrimony.} Freedmen and persons with servile origins can sometimes be identified through various onomastic criteria. Yet it is hardly possible to connect such freedmen in family lines unless an inscription explicitly records multiple generations and includes a familial progenitor, the libertus, a feature that is almost always missing.\footnote{On factors that point to freedman origins, see Garnsey 1975: 167-80; and Mouritsen 2011: 123-41, on status indicators in epigraphy. Mouritsen 2011: 262-3 notes some of the problems involved in identifying freedmen’s descendants.}

The possession of a Greek cognomen, for example, has been frequently adduced as a sign that a person was the recent descendant of ex-slave parents. This remains a useful rule of thumb for suggesting a person’s origin, but several studies have highlighted the problems encountered in using this onomastic feature too rigidly. Moreover, it is often assumed that use of such cognomina tended to be filtered out after a few generations of descent from the ex-slave, presumably because of the ‘servile’ connotations they contained.\footnote{Mouritsen 2011: 123-7. See also Bruun 2013: 19-42. The album recording the council of decurions in the town of Canusium in the year 223 CE provides an interesting case-study in this regard. Several of the decurions, designated under various rubrics indicating their rank, bore Greek cognomina. It is sometimes assumed that they were the recent descendants of local freedmen, which would allow for inferences to be drawn about social mobility. Yet it has been suggested that in such areas of southern Italy there was a higher incidence of Greek names in circulation among the general population, namely, in both families with a long freeborn pedigree and ex-slave families (see Mouritsen 2011: 126 n. 30). This explanation for the Greek cognomina would undercut assumptions about the origins of the decurions in question.}

Another method for identifying the descendants of ex-slaves is to connect the two groups based on common praenomena and gentilicia. For instance, studies have attempted to track the frequency with which an ex-slave who entered the *Augustales, the preeminent freedman association in Roman towns, corresponded to a local decurion whose career is dated to a later period.\footnote{D’Arms 1981: 126-40; Mollo 2000: 347-71; Silvestrini 2000: 431-55.} Such a connection would indicate a measurable degree of social mobility within a family. Yet such an approach is generally limited to only the local context.\footnote{Cf. Bruun 2015c: 107-31.} Identifying the geographical origins of potential freedmen and their descendants is yet another challenge.

In contrast, the nomenclature acquired by the municipal freedmen opens up new possibilities, functioning as a rare methodological tool for tracking a family’s progress in
inscriptions across multiple generations and across geographical boundaries. It will thus be possible to observe the long-term activities and successes of branches of these families, and to shed light on some key aspects of the broader Roman freedman experience, which we normally have few opportunities to explore. For one, the capacity to track a family’s origin through its municipal gentilicum affords the chance to observe migration patterns, namely, where freedmen and their descendants pursued opportunities for social and economic advancement. What is more, this group constitutes a fruitful case-study because of the likelihood that the familia publica in every Roman town persisted over time and continued producing new generations of municipal freedmen who themselves initiated new family lines. These numerous branches thus had the chance to maintain a presence in the epigraphic record for two and a half centuries or more. An important qualification should be made here. Ideally, one could trace family lines consisting of branches of blood relatives and private freedmen descending from the ex-slaves of Roman towns, and all bearing the same municipal gentilia. Yet the nature of the epigraphic evidence rarely presents such opportunities. Even in cases in which an individual bore the same combination of praenomen and gentilicum as a municipal freedman, there is no guarantee that the two were actually related; for it is often difficult to establish a precise chronological relationship between such epigraphic attestations, and the limited number of praenomina in use means that the occurrence of similar names was sometimes coincidental. The focus of my research, therefore, is on the family lines of municipal freedmen which, although not necessarily biologically related, originated from a common social milieu, their local familia publica.

The municipal freedmen, and in particular the topic of the social advancement of their descendants and familiae, have received relatively little attention from Roman historians in the form of systematic study. Léon Halkin’s (1897) pioneering study identified this category of slave in the Roman world. He collected all of the epigraphic evidence available at the time and worked out some aspects of the function and status of public slaves, focusing heavily on their apparent privileged status. Alexander Weiss in 2004 produced a comprehensive monograph aimed at reconstructing the administrative occupations and social standing in the municipal familia publica, analyzing an expanded catalogue of some 305 Greek and Latin inscriptions

---

62 This is not to imply that these freedmen can be studied in specific families in se. Rather, a collective group of family lines all deriving from the same town can be compiled and analyzed as a group.
63 One should also note Eder’s 1982 important work on the public slaves of the Roman state (servi publici populi Romani). Many of the principles he described of the acquisition, ownership, and deployment of these state slaves continue to inform our study of the municipal slaves.
recording municipal slaves and freedmen. One of the major strengths of Weiss’ work is how deeply he contextualized the activities of municipal slaves and freedmen with those of private slaves and freedmen and with evidence from a host of legal sources. Yet his discussion of the municipal freedmen focused almost entirely on those who continued working for their town, and little attention was given to the lives of the freedmen outside the local administration, and less still to their descendants.

A series of studies on municipal slaves and freedmen with a narrower focus has also enriched our knowledge of their position in municipal society. Noel Lenski (2006) sought to supplement Weiss by tracing the usage of servi publici in Late Antiquity and down to the fifth century CE, particularly in the Eastern Empire. He argued that, although municipal slaves continued to play a role in this later period, their use declined sharply as towns increasingly preferred to employ free(d) labor. Elena Cimarosti (2005) treated the topic of servae and libertae publicae by offering a nuanced reading of the evidence in order to understand the wider function and status of these women beyond their capacity to bear slave-children. She proposed that these women had the capacity to contribute to some economic activities undertaken by their town. Christer Bruun (2008) explored the organization and social status of the familia publica of Ostia, and illustrated how the ex-slaves of the colony and their descendants had a difficult time fitting into wider Ostian society. Finally, Franco Luciani (2010) analyzed occupational inscriptions from towns in northern Italy in order to understand how a town’s slaves and freedmen performed their competence alongside other administrative personnel. Luciani (2017) has also recently examined the ongoing social and economic connections municipal freedmen maintained with their towns, particularly through benefaction toward the local infrastructure and cultic associations. He proposed that such contributions may have been tied to the conditions of their manumission by the local council of decurions.

Much of the discussion of the municipal freedmen in these works assumes that they necessarily attained a high status in municipal society. Yet such a conclusion is based more on impression than on focused case-studies. The tendency has been to generalize from a few well-known cases of municipal slaves showing substantial wealth and ex-slaves achieving remarkable

---

64 Bruun 2008: 551-3 calls this idea into question.
social and/or economic success.\textsuperscript{65} Another persistent problem is that scholarship often views the status of the municipal freedmen through the same lens as the much better documented imperial freedmen, even though the latter group’s connections to imperial authority indeed afforded exceptional status.\textsuperscript{66} These assumptions warrant a closer look, and crucially, one based on an analysis of the full corpus of epigraphic evidence now available.

It is also the case that surprisingly little attention has been given to the important step of carrying this study forward to an analysis of the descendants of the municipal freedmen. For the most part, one encounters only passing references in larger prosopographical works to a person with a municipal \textit{gentilicium}, with just a few comments on their potential family origin. To my knowledge there has not yet been any systematic attempt to collect all the persons with these peculiar \textit{gentilicia}. The methodological tools introduced below aspire to creating an apparatus for understanding whether such persons were connected to municipal freedman family lines, and for assessing how they navigated the Roman social hierarchy.

There are two central aims of the thesis. The first is to present a prosopographical catalogue which includes both all recoverable municipal freedmen from Italy and their descendants. This catalogue will constitute the core material for the study. To that end, it is necessary to establish a series of heuristic tools for identifying members of this group and placing them into their various status categories as municipal ex-slaves, the children of these ex-slaves, private freedmen, and the descendants.

The second aim of the thesis is to analyze how these families fit into the Roman social and economic landscape under the Principate. Utilizing a larger body of epigraphic evidence than has ever been collected for this group, it will become clear that, despite the prestigious position some of them may have held as municipal slaves, only a very restricted group of the freedmen themselves ever achieved a high social standing or noteworthy economic success in their hometown or elsewhere. Similarly, only a small percentage of the documented freedmen’s descendants left any consequential mark on the municipal or imperial landscape, such as reaching the decurionate in their town or rising to the equestrian or even the senatorial order, or achieved economic success in an occupational association.

\textsuperscript{65} For example, Tassaux 2000: 400-1; Giorcelli Bersani 2002: 60; Buonopane 2004: 53-7; Tran 2006b: 128-9; and Schumacher 2011: 597-8.
\textsuperscript{66} Weaver 1967: 3-20.
The following table gives a preview of the scope of my project, listing the full group of municipal freedmen and descendants that will be analyzed in the thesis. The columns provide the towns or origin, their corresponding gentilicum or multiple gentilicia, and a breakdown of how many freedmen and descendants have been identified in my research. Those sites marked with an asterisk belong to the categories of Group II or Group III towns, meaning that no definite attestation of municipal slaves or freedmen in the town can be cited. The significance of this distinction will be explained in the following chapter. Accompanying the table is a set of two maps indicating which Italian towns produced municipal freedmen, and from which towns the descendants originated, based on their names.

Table 0.1 Municipal freedmen and their descendants from sites in Italy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City (Region)</th>
<th>Gentilicia of municipal freedmen and descendants</th>
<th>Secure mun. freedmen</th>
<th>Probable mun. freedmen</th>
<th>Attested servitus publica in town</th>
<th>Desc. with gentilicum of town, found in hometown</th>
<th>Desc. with gentilicum of town, found elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aeclanum (II)</td>
<td>Aeclaniaus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aequiculi (IV)</td>
<td>Aequiculus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesernia (IV)</td>
<td>Aeserninus/Publicius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afilae (I)*</td>
<td>Afilanus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alba Fucens (IV)</td>
<td>Publicius (?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altinum (X)</td>
<td>Publicius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ameria (VI)</td>
<td>Amerius/Publicius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiternum (IV)</td>
<td>Amiternius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antinum (IV)</td>
<td>Antinius</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antium (I)*</td>
<td>Antinas</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aq. Vescinae (I)*</td>
<td>Vescinius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia (X)</td>
<td>Aquileiensis/Aquileius/Publicius</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquilonia (II)*</td>
<td>Aquilonius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aricia (I)</td>
<td>Ar(ecin)i(us)/Ar(ecin)i(us)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arretium (VIII)*</td>
<td>Arretius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67 The sizes of towns in the first map are based on de Ligt’s 2012: 289-339 of the physical space of these sites. An attempt has also been made where possible to check how the physical size of a town corresponds to its administrative features portrayed in local epigraphy. These features include the number of decurions identified and the record of administrative activities indicated by decrees of the council.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name(s)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asisium (VI)</td>
<td>Publicius/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asisienus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asculum Pic. (V)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ateste (X)</td>
<td>Atestas/</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atestius/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publicius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atina (I)*</td>
<td>Atinas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atria (X)</td>
<td>Publicius</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auximum (V)</td>
<td>Publicius (?)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aveia (IV)*</td>
<td>Concordius (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barium (II)*</td>
<td>Publicius (?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneventum (II)</td>
<td>Concordius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bononia (VIII)</td>
<td>Publicius/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bononius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovianum (IV)*</td>
<td>Publicius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovillae (I)</td>
<td>Bovillanus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixellum (X)</td>
<td>Concordius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixia (X)</td>
<td>Publicius/</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brixienus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brundisium (II)</td>
<td>Publicius (?)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cales (I)</td>
<td>Calenius/</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caletius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canusium (II)</td>
<td>Publicius/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canusius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capua (I)</td>
<td>Campanius/</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publicius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carsulae (VI)</td>
<td>Publicius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casinum (I)*</td>
<td>Casin(e)ius</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comum (XI)</td>
<td>Publicius (?)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cora (I)</td>
<td>Coranius/</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publicius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corfinium (IV)</td>
<td>Corfinius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona (X)</td>
<td>Publicius/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cremonius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumae (I)</td>
<td>Cumanius</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupra Maritima (V)*</td>
<td>Publicius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabrateria (I)*</td>
<td>Fabratern(i)us</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falerii (VII)</td>
<td>Falerius/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faliscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feltria (X)</td>
<td>Publicius (?)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formiae (I)*</td>
<td>Formianus/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publicius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadria (V)</td>
<td>Venerius/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publicius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herculaneum (I)</td>
<td>Publicius (?)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name(s)</td>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispellum (VI)</td>
<td>Hispellas/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispellatus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industria (X)*</td>
<td>Industrius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interamna Lir. (I)</td>
<td>Interamnius / Publicius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavinium-Laurent. (I)</td>
<td>Lavinius/Laurentius/Publicius</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liternum (I)*</td>
<td>Liternius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luceria (II)</td>
<td>Lucerinus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum (XI)</td>
<td>Publicius</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mevania (VI)</td>
<td>Mevanas/Meviani</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minturnae (I)</td>
<td>Minturnius/Publicius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolis (I)</td>
<td>Neapolitanus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nola (I)*</td>
<td>Nolanius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomentum (I)*</td>
<td>Nomentanus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novaria (XI)*</td>
<td>Novarius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuceria (I)</td>
<td>Publicius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opitergium (X)</td>
<td>Publicius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia (I)</td>
<td>Ostiens(is)u)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostra (VI)*</td>
<td>Ostrius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paestum (III)</td>
<td>P(a)estanius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma (VIII)</td>
<td>Parmensius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patavium (X)</td>
<td>Publicius(?)/Patavin(i)us</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petelia (III)</td>
<td>Petelius</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisae (VII)*</td>
<td>Pisanius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisaurum (VI)</td>
<td>Pisaurensis/Publicius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia (VIII)</td>
<td>Publicius/Placentius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pola (X)</td>
<td>Pollentius/Publicius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompeii (I)</td>
<td>Venerius/Publicius(?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentia (III)</td>
<td>Potentin(i)us</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praeneste (I)</td>
<td>Primigenius/Praenestinus/Publicius(?)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privernum (I)*</td>
<td>Privernius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puteoli (I)</td>
<td>Puteolanus/Publicius</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna (VIII)*</td>
<td>Publicius</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reate (IV)</td>
<td>Reatinus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saepinum (IV)</td>
<td>Saepinius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sassina (VI)</td>
<td>Sassinas/-atius</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturnia (VII)</td>
<td>Saturnius/ Publicius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentinum (VI)</td>
<td>Sentinas/ Sentinius</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarvisium (X)</td>
<td>Publicius/ Tarvisius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegianum (III)*</td>
<td>Tegeanensis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telesia (IV)</td>
<td>Telesinius</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tergeste (X)</td>
<td>Publicius</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terventum (IV)</td>
<td>Terventinius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum (XI)*</td>
<td>Publicius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tifernum Tib. (VI)*</td>
<td>Tifernius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trebula Suff. (IV)</td>
<td>Trebalanuus/ Suffenas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tridentum (X)</td>
<td>Publicius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuder (VII)</td>
<td>Tuderti us/ Publicius (?))</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tusculum (I)</td>
<td>Tusculanius/ Publicius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urvinum Mat. (VI)</td>
<td>Urvini(us)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veii (VII)</td>
<td>Veien(i)us/ Veian(i)us</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veleia (VIII)</td>
<td>Velleius/ Publicius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venafrum (I)</td>
<td>Venafranius/ Publicius</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venusia (II)</td>
<td>Venusius/ Venusenus/ Publicius</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vercellae (XI)</td>
<td>Vercellius/ Publicius</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona (X)</td>
<td>Veronius/ Publicius</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicetia (X)</td>
<td>Publicius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vobarno (X)</td>
<td>Publicius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volaterrae (VII)</td>
<td>Volaterrius/ Publicius</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volceii (III)</td>
<td>Volceius</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volsini (II)</td>
<td>Vol(us)sius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Publicii, Concordii, and Venerii</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 0.1 Italian sites producing secure and probable municipal freedmen
Figure 0.2 Italian sites producing descendants of secure and probable municipal freedmen
In the analysis that follows, I seek to explore the boundaries of social mobility in the Roman world by reconstructing how this distinctive group of ex-slaves and their families from a sub-elite background navigated the social and economic landscape of imperial society. The thesis consists of four chapters, followed by the conclusion. Chapter I establishes the methodology for identifying municipal freedmen and their descendants among persons who bear a municipal *gentilicium*. This identification is primarily based on onomastic features, but there are other elements as well, such as what can be discerned from social relationships or occupations. This task necessarily also means entering into a discussion about how my own analysis of these rare *gentilicia* accords with larger studies of Roman onomastics. I lay out in detail which town names are most relevant to my thesis, namely, those that are more likely than not to be connected to municipal freedman family lines.

Chapter II provides a demographic background for this study. I begin by considering the size of the municipal *familia publica* of different Italian towns. In doing so, it is necessary to work through a range of indirect evidence to arrive at estimates for smaller towns, which probably required only a modest number of slaves, and larger cities like Ostia, whose infrastructure demanded considerably more slaves. I then analyze the evidence for how manumission was practiced in the *familia publica*, with an eye toward contextualizing it within what is known about Roman manumission practices in general. Understanding the size of the *familia publica* and the probable scale of manumission of municipal slaves enables me to anticipate how many municipal freedmen may turn up in the epigraphic evidence, as well as how numerous their descendants may have been.

Chapter III turns to an analysis of the municipal freedmen themselves. Working from a catalogue of 268 of these ex-slaves, I analyze the level of social and economic mobility they attained by measuring such factors as settlement patterns, marriage patterns, occupations, membership in urban associations, and a general impression of wealth. Where possible, I compare this group’s success with that of known groups of freedmen for whom similar studies of social mobility have been undertaken.

Chapter IV examines cases of social and economic advancement from among approximately 600 descendants and *familiae* of the municipal freedmen. I measure their position in Roman society through their impact in the senatorial order, the equestrian order, the municipal
decurionate, the Roman army, and urban occupational and other associations, in Rome itself and in the towns of Italy and the provinces.
CHAPTER I: METHODOLOGY

This first chapter deals primarily with issues connected to my methodology. The task is to explain the type of evidence that will be utilized in the study of the municipal freedmen and their descendants. This includes discussing the provenance and chronology of the evidence, and the various criteria used when analyzing the sources. In particular, it is necessary to discuss how personal names and other features can be used to identify those persons with a municipal gentilicium who are most relevant for the thesis.

1.1.1 METHODOLOGY AND ORGANIZATION OF THE EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE

This thesis focuses on municipal freedman family lines with origins in the towns of Italy. To that end, 265 municipal freedmen and 609 descendants and familiae have been catalogued. The evidence for the study is overwhelmingly epigraphic, and at the core are over 700 inscriptions recording the freedmen and their descendants. These texts represent a variety of epigraphic genres. We are mostly dealing with epitaphs, while in other texts the persons of interest are found performing a votive offering or are listed in the rolls of an urban association. Another category represented here is the honorific inscription, a type of text used to honor several persons with a municipal gentilicium, especially those who achieved a high status in their hometown. Finally, in a handful of cases, one finds members of this group in military diplomata, and in two collections of wax tablets from Pompeii.

A large proportion of these inscriptions lend themselves mostly to quantitative study. Many of the persons in the catalogue are simply a name on an epitaph or in an album, but even these can convey important information about family groups and social and economic activities. When the exact provenance of an inscription is known, it can tell us about where the person settled and ended his or her life. The more elaborate inscriptions contain many additional features, such as indications of success that can be quantified through references to a particular occupation, membership in certain organizations or priesthoods, or attainment of office in the municipal or imperial system. Such inscriptions supply the building blocks for case-studies that create a narrative that adds crucial material to the statistical conclusions drawn from analysis of the larger catalogue. Literary evidence, especially juridical writings, and municipal charters also provide essential information that helps to contextualize the analysis of the epigraphic material.
The chronology for this study is necessarily broad. A small set of inscriptions dates to the Late Republic, and it is worth emphasizing that the practice of manumitting municipal slaves was current enough for Varro to discuss it in the first century BCE (LL 8.82-3). State slaves (servi publici populi Romani) are attested in Rome as early as the fourth century BCE,¹ but the earliest concrete evidence in a municipium consists of a municipal slave of Minturnae in the first half of the first century BCE (AE 1988, 229).² The earliest evidence for slaves of a colonia is a reference to municipal slaves in the Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae (Ch. 62), a charter from the town of Urso in Baetica whose original version belongs to the Caesarian or triumviral period.³

Some evidence dates to the Julio-Claudian period, including the earliest securely dated evidence of a municipal freedman in the West, named in the curse tablet from Cremona (AE 1975, 449).⁴ The majority of the epigraphic evidence, however, dates from the later first to the early third centuries CE, the main period of the Roman ‘epigraphic habit.’⁵

The next methodological issue to discuss pertains to the criteria for identifying the municipal freedmen and their descendants. The first and most important point of reference in my collection of examples is the possession of a gentilicium derived from a town in Italy. This identification is more complex than a simple search for certain names in the epigraphic databases. To begin with, two sources show us what onomastic patterns to expect. One is a contorted passage in Varro’s De Lingua Latina (8.82-3), and the other is the set of inscriptions recording the names of the self-identified freedmen of Roman towns.

Varro furnishes an explanation for how municipal freedmen acquired their new nomenclature, a rare description of such processes. On the one hand, Varro is indeed an important source simply because he knew first-hand the onomastic system he was writing about.

¹ Recalling events that allegedly occurred in the early fourth century BCE, Livy tells the story of how the Roman siege of the citadel of the Volscian city Artena succeeded with the help of a local slave who revealed a crack in the defenses (4.61). As a reward for this assistance, the Romans granted this slave freedom and property in Rome and assigned him the name Servius Romanus, perhaps a reflection of how the Romans once named freedmen of the state. Schulze 1966: 524 notes that imperial inscriptions attest several Romaniti. As a more substantive example from Roman historiography, Polybius reports that Scipio Africanus appropriated 2000 craftsmen from New Carthage during the Second Punic War and sent them back to Rome as servi publici (δηµόσιοι τῆς Ῥώµης), and he even envisioned their eventual manumission (10.17).
² Weiss 2004: 196.
⁴ Weiss 2004: 240. Weiss also collects numerous Greek inscriptions recording public slaves from Athens, Delos and other poleis in the Greek world dating from the fourth to first centuries BCE (pp. 221-35). The earliest dated libertus publicus from the Greek world comes from Thasos in the late second century BCE (Dunant and Pouilloux 1958: 35-7 no. 173; Weiss 2004: 244).
On the other hand, he is clearly presenting only a partial picture of the naming system, while perhaps also distorting it to fit a priori categories based on his philosophical-linguistic perspective of the Analogist versus the Anomalist positions on etymology.\(^6\) This latter point should caution against our basing too strong an argument on Varro’s portrayal alone. Nevertheless, his explanation represents a significant starting point for thinking about the gentilicia the municipal freedmen acquired (LL 8.82-3):

\[\text{in hoc ipso analogia non est, quod alii nomina habent ab oppidis, alii aut non habent aut non ut debent habent. [83] habent plerique libertini a municipio manumissi, in quo, ut societatum et fanorum servi, non servarunt proportione[m] rationem, et Romanorum liberti dehuerunt dici ut a Faventia Faventinus, ab Reate Reatinus sic a Roma Romanus, † ut nominentur libertini orti <a> † publicis servis Romani, qui manumissi ante quam sub magistratus nomina, qui eos liberarunt, succedere c<o>eperunt.}\(^7\)

In this very matter, then, there is no analogia, because some have names from towns, others either have names from other sources or have names from which they ought not get them. [83] Most freedmen set free by a municipium get their names [from the town]; in which, as slaves of colleges and temples, they have not observed the theory with proper relation; and the freedmen of the Romans ought to have got the name Romanus from Roma, like Faventinus from Faventia and Reatinus from Reate. In this way the freedmen whose parents were state slaves would be named Romanus, who had been set free before they began to take the names of the magistrates who set them free.\(^8\)

The main content of Varro’s discussion yields two central features for the study of the nomenclature of municipal freedmen. First and foremost, Varro points out the importance of the gentilicum. He reports explicitly in Chapter 83 that most of these municipal freedmen acquired their gentilicum from the name of the town where they had been slaves (habent plerique libertini a municipio manumissi). This type of naming constitutes a one-to-one parallel between town and freedman’s name, corresponding to Varro’s category of analogia, a morphology of words related to one another based on ratio, or regularity and grammatical rules.\(^9\) One piece of

---


\(^7\) The text is from the edition by Goetz and Schoell 1910, except for two emendations given in Kent’s 1938 text - the insertion of the line beginning filius. nam in 81; and the reading by transposition of ut nominentur libertini orti <a> publicis servis Romani for Goetz and Schoell’s ut nominantur a libertinis orti publicis servis Romani in the corrupted phrase in 83. The latter reading, based on a manuscript in which numerous textual conjectures have been identified (MS B of the sixteenth century, followed by M. Vertriani Maurus), indeed eases translation and sense, but it fails to confront the lectio difficilior.

\(^8\) Trans. Kent 1938, with my minor modifications. The content of the passage and other material in LL make clear that Varro’s nomen is the nomen gentile.

\(^9\) As I will show below, the examples of Faventinus and Reatinus correspond to evidence for freedmen bearing town names from both municipia and coloniae, but the basis of the formulation of this nomenclature was clearly more complex than this simple correlation.
documentary evidence may offer a unique glimpse of this naming process in action. *CIL* XIV 255 from Ostia, a lost inscription likely dating to the second century CE, reportedly displayed the rubric *familia publica* in large letters in its first line, a title which calls attention to the identity of the individuals listed therein. According to the earliest recension of the tablet, by Visconti, this document registered the names of 21 men with a single name, an indication of slave status, and four of these listed an occupation that points to their identity as *servi publici* of the colony. There are also 35 men who bear the *gentilicium* corresponding to the name of the colony, *Ostiensis/Ostiensius* or the abbreviated form *Ost.*, which the Ostian decurions assigned to their freedmen.

Dessau observed that the stonecutter had imposed a careful alignment in two columns of the *gentilicia*, for those who had one, and the accompanying *cognomina*. Within this strict organization, the empty space to the left of each of the slaves’ names was sufficient for the future entry of the full or abbreviated *gentilicum* of the colony. It is therefore plausible that these *servi publici* were awaiting eventual manumission, at which time they, too, would receive the colony’s standard *gentilicum* just as their *liberti* colleagues in the *familia* before them.

Turning to the other category in Varro’s passage, the opposite of *analogia* is *anomalia*, or lexical relationships produced not by rules, but only by *consuetudo*, that is, popular usage. Such dissonance can also be observed in the *gentilicia* of municipal freedmen, signaling alternative patterns for identifying examples of the group. One variant that has a bearing on this research was the practice by local decurions who performed the manumission ritual of conferring their

---

10 Visconti’s drawing is reproduced by Dessau in *CIL* XIV (1887: 49).
11 The first three roles are listed in c. 1, ll. 1-3 in their own uniform column, while in the case of the fourth man with an occupation (c. 2, l. 30), his individual name Dativus is aligned with the column of *gentilicia* and his occupation *vilicus* is thus attached like a *cognomen*.
12 *CIL* XIV 255. The list also includes the names of 25 individuals with a private *gentilicum*.
14 See various discussions by Meiggs 1973: 174, 182, 226, 335; Weiss' 2004: 159-62, 167-8; Bruun 2008: 538-43; Sudi-Guiral 2007: 421-3; and Cébaillac-Gervasoni, Caldelli, and Zevi 2010: 173-5. There remain numerous problems in the interpretation of this document, but these cannot be discussed at any length here. One outstanding issue is the actual function of the document, namely, whether it was a published album of the association or a group dedication, for example to an emperor or local deity. Each idea brings with it different sets of problems pertaining to the character of the membership and the arrangement of the text. See the discussion in Weiss 2004: 159-62, 167-8, who has argued that the inscription is actually a roster of one of the city’s *collegia* and that its membership just happened to include several slaves and freedmen connected to the city’s administration. It would seem that the alleged rubric of the text, *familia publica*, is strong evidence against such an interpretation. Cf. Meiggs 1973: 174, 182, 226, 335. Other references to *familiae publicae* occur at Tarracina (*CIL* X 6332); Brundisium (*CIL* IX 32); Venafrum (*CIL* X 4856); and Corduba (*CIL* II 315). It was suggested to me by John Bodel that the individuals with private gentilicial names could have been *liberti Orcini*, private slaves who were freed in the will of their masters but had their *operae* bequeathed to the town (i.e., through participation in the *familia publica*).
own name on the municipal freedmen, a custom also observed among the freedmen of the
Roman state (liberti publici populi Romani).\footnote{Eder 1981: 115-16} A reflection of this can be found in an epitaph from Asculum Picenum, dated to the later first century CE (ILS 6565):

\begin{quote}
D(is) M(anibus). / M(arco) Valerio col(oniae) l(iberto) / Vernae sexvir(o) / Aug(ustali) et 
Tib(eriali), / Ianuarius [c]ol(oniae) di[sp(ensator)], / qui fuerat [arc]arius / eiu[s, i]tem / 
Vibia Primil[la] uxo[r] / [s]ib[i]t po[ste]ris eorum.\footnote{I follow Weiss 2004: 238 in reading Vernae as a cognomen. Cristofori 2004: 146 suggests that the name could have a dual purpose here, being both a cognomen and an indication of the man’s status as a home-born slave of the colony. On this cognomen, see Kajanto 1965: 82, 105, 134, 314; and Solin and Salomies 1988: 420. The three other examples of ex-municipal slaves with a private gentilicium are, from Italy: Clodius Fortunat\(i\)us \(r(ei) \ p(ublicae) \ Reatinorum\) of Reate (CIL IX 4701a-b); and from the provinces: Sex. P\(u\)nic\(i\)us colon. A\(q\)[uens(is)] libertus Antenor of A\(q\)uae Sextiae (CIL XII 523) and P. Tenac\(i\)us Gemellinus Aug\(u\)stalis colon. Apul\(e\)ns(is) libertus of Apulum in Dacia (CIL III 1481 = AE 1972, 467). Although there is much to discuss about these examples, there is no space to do so in the present study.}
\end{quote}

To the departed spirits. To Marcus Valerius Verna, freedman of the colony, a sevir Augustalis and Tiberialis, Ianuarius, dispensator of the colony, who had been arcarius of that (same colony) (erected this monument); likewise, Vibia Primilla, his wife, (erected this monument) for herself and for their descendants.

The municipal freedman Verna’s former position as a municipal slave was probably in the town’s treasury, as implied by the current municipal slave and co-dedicator Ianuarius, who claims to have been his subordinate in the position of arcarius.\footnote{Weiss 2004: 206.} What is most interesting here is that Verna has the gentilicum Valerius, which is not part of the official name of the colony of Asculum Picenum. The most likely explanation for his name thus seems to be that the magistrate who performed the manumission conferred his own gentilicum on the ex-slave.\footnote{It is also possible that Verna had been a private slave of a Marcus Valerius who gave him to the town as an act of euergetism or bequeathed him to the town in his will. In this case, perhaps the ex-slave chose or was given his original master’s nomenclature. In most cases of such slaves, however, one finds them with a second cognomen ending in -ianus and corresponding to their original master’s gentilicum (e.g., \AE 1939, 148, Ostia: Phileros publicus Cartilianus).} The Marci Valerii were, in fact, well entrenched in the aristocracy of the town.\footnote{Cristofori 2004: 139-40.} Yet this interpretation raises questions about the virtual patron-client relationship that could have ensued between an individual decurion and municipal freedman in such a scenario, an issue I will return to below.\footnote{See below, pp. 100-2.}

For now, one must concede that without the sort of explicit identification as an ex-municipal slave ascribed to Verna (col. l.), there is no way to grasp the potential presence of such a group.
of municipal freedmen in the epigraphic record, because they would be impossible to
differentiate from bearers of these names among the rest of the population.

Varro tells us only part of the story. For the rest, we need to consider a second source for
understanding the nomenclature of municipal freedmen, namely, the epigraphic evidence for the
self-identified ex-slaves. Inscriptions reveal two additional patterns of nomenclature. The first is
the gentilicium Publicius, or its variant Publicius. This is by far the most well documented
gentilicium borne by attested municipal freedmen, since it was not tied to any particular town.
It is a fitting name for municipal freedmen in that it corresponds to the adjective publicus, as in
servus publicus and libertus publicus. The morphology of the gentilicium also agrees with a
typical early gentilicium formation in Latin on the pattern of a patronymic name, that is, 
attaching -ius to a father’s name. The gentilicium Publicius was widespread in Italy, and was
particularly prevalent in towns in the north, accounting for nearly three-quarters of self-identified
municipal freedmen’s nomenclature in Regions VIII, X, and XI.

A second pattern consists in the gentilicium being obtained from a component in a town’s
official titulature, from the region in which a town was particularly important, or even from a
prominent deity with a local sanctuary. For example, municipal freedmen of Pompeii were given
the gentilicium Venerius after the colony’s connection with the goddess Venus, whose name also
appeared in its official title Colonia Cornelia Veneria Pompeianorum. Similarly, the freedmen
of Beneventum were given the name Concordius after the official title of the colony, Colonia
Iulia Concordia Augusta Felix Beneventum. The ex-slaves of Capua took their name, Campanius, after the region of which Capua was a major urban center, and those of Falerii
were primarily named Faliscus after the town’s territory. Finally, at Praeneste, where the

---

21 There is also one case of a second variant attested in Bononia, read as Poplicius (CIL XI 696 = ILS 4313).
22 Cf. Halkin 1897: 150.
23 Solin 1998: 133. There are 25 examples.
24 CIL IV 3340, 138 (March 53 CE), 139 (April 60 CE). Castrén 1975: 205-6 no. 314 noted the possibility that the
gentilicium Pompeius originated in Pompeii, therefore raising the possibility that it could have been carried by some
municipal freedmen from there. Yet there is not sufficient evidence to place the name’s origin in Campania, and
furthermore, the gens Pompeia is so geographically diffuse in Italy and spread across the social spectrum that
making this connection would pose methodological challenges that are beyond the scope of the present study.
25 CIL IX 1538 = ILS 4185 (238 CE).
26 CIL X 3940 = ILS 6318 (first century CE).
principal sanctuary of the goddess Fortuna Primigenia was located, the municipal freedmen evidently assumed the *gentilicum* Primigenius.\textsuperscript{28}

Focusing on persons with what appears to be a municipal *gentilicum* is thus essential to my study. The next step of the methodology is to separate the ‘certain’ or ‘probable’ municipal freedmen and freedwomen from their descendants. As with all types of Roman freedmen, there are several useful indicators that reveal or imply a person’s status as an ex-slave, and some of these are applicable to my group as well.\textsuperscript{29} Some freedmen assert their status by giving a libertination instead of a filiation, that is, placing their patron’s name where freeborn Romans would give their father’s name. One thus finds examples of freeborn persons (*ingenui*) presenting a name like *M. Tullius M(arci) f(ilius) Cicero*, and freedmen a name like *C. Minatius C(ai) lib(ertus) Onesimus* (*AE* 1966, 40). The municipal freedmen who provide such information differ in that their libertination refers to their town or the collective local citizenry, as in the case of *Sex. Menturnius colon(iae) lib(ertus) Felix* of Minturnae in southern Latium (*CIL* X 6044). The practice of citing a filiation or libertination was never standard, and the disclosure of this information declined even further by the later first century CE. Accordingly, one often must look for other indicators to ascertain a person’s status.\textsuperscript{30}

Having a Greek or a so-called Latin ‘servile’ *cognomen* is also considered a strong indicator of a freedman or the recent descendant of one, even though some studies remind us not to push this assumption too far.\textsuperscript{31} In the set of 75 securely identified municipal freedmen whose *cognomen* can be read, in fact, c. 62% (*N* = 47) bear a Latin *cognomen*, although it should be noted that in the *familia publica* of Ostia (*CIL* XIV 255), 60% (*N* = 21) of the colony’s freedmen have a Greek or other non-Latin *cognomen*.\textsuperscript{32}

Another frequently applied indicator of freedman status is having a spouse with the same *gentilicum*. Since free Roman women kept their father’s *gentilicum* when they married, cases of a woman with the same family name as her partner often suggest that the two were *colliberti* of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{28} *CIL* XIV 3044 (= XV 7883); *CIL* XIV 3044a (= XV 7884); *AE* 1095, 209 (= EE 9, 794); *CIL* XV 3814-3816.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Cf. Garnsey 1975: 167-80.
\item \textsuperscript{30} Bruun and Edmondson 2015: 15. Many freedmen in fact may have stopped using the libertination in imitation of freeborn Romans who began citing their filiation less often.
\item \textsuperscript{31} Mouritsen 2011: 123-7. For studies pointing out that the Greek *cognomen* is not always to be taken as an indication of ‘servile’ origins, see, for example, Thylander 1952: 124-5; and Bruun 2013: 19-42.
\item \textsuperscript{32} On the nomenclature of the Ostienses in *CIL* XIV 255, see the comments of Bruun 2008: 538-42.
\end{itemize}
the same patron. In most cases, such unions probably began when one or both partners were still slaves.

In addition to these more general patterns, there are specific reasons to ascribe to persons with a municipal gentilicium the status of municipal freedman based on scrutinizing other factors. A familial or social connection to a secure or probable municipal slave or freedman or freedwoman is suggestive. For example, when a parent with a municipal gentilicium has a child who is a municipal slave, the child must be a verna born before the manumission of his/her parent by the ordo, thus making one or both of the parents a municipal ex-slave. No examples of such a relationship occur among the self-identified municipal freedmen, but numerous likely cases are found among the probable ex-slaves of towns, such as the following case from Brixia (CIL V 4686):

\[
Q(uno) \text{ Publicio} / \text{ Fausto et} / \text{ Publiciae Q} \text{uint} \{i\}ae, / \text{ Faustinus Brixiano} [\text{rum}] / \text{ parentib(us) / [---]TIA PAL frat(r)ib(us) . . .}
\]

To Q. Publicius Faustus and to Publicia Quinta, Faustinus, (slave) of the Brixiani, (erected this monument) for his parents . . . for (his) brothers . . .

Certain occupations can also offer a clue to the status of municipal freedman. For example, slaves and freedmen of towns were frequently employed as plumbarii, casting lead pipes that they stamped with their own names. An instructive case is from the small municipium of Reate in Samnium, where a pair of pipes indicates that the same man performed this occupation both as a slave and later as a freedman of the town. Membership in the more prestigious urban associations that an ex-slave could enter can sometimes prove a useful indicator that someone was a municipal freedman. For example, it is often thought that the *Augustales, a sort of ‘second ordo’ made up of the richest and most respected freedmen in Roman towns, would have recruited heavily from among a town’s ex-slaves. Finally, residence

---

33 It is also possible that the husband was also the woman’s patron, having manumitted her in order to marry her, therefore giving her his gentilicium in the former role.
36 The man’s name as a freedman of Reate was Q. Reatinus Sallustianus (CIL IX 4699a-e: Q(uinus) Reatinus Sallustianus lib(ertus) r(ei) p(ublicae) R(eatinorum) f(ecit)), while the pipe recording his work as a slave of the town was recorded by Lanciani 1879-80: 423-520 no. 438: Sallustianus rei p(ublicae) R(eatinorum) s(ervus) f(ecit). See also Bruun 1992: 333, 342-6; Weiss 2004: 122-5, 205 no. 88, 238 no. L25; and Luciani 2010: 257-95.
37 Tassaux 2000: 400-1; Tran 2006b: 128-9. The question of whether the *Augustales of any town were ever considered a formal ordo, alongside the ordo decurionum and plebs, is hotly debated. Mouritsen 2015: 239-40
in the very town that corresponds to one’s gentilicium, along with other factors, is a strong indicator of status as an ex-slave of that town.

I.1.2 IDENTIFYING MUNICIPAL FREEDMEN AND FREEDWOMEN

Following these guidelines, I have divided the municipal freedmen and freedwomen into two categories. The first consists of self-identified ex-slaves of their town, and those persons for whom specific factors in their inscriptions make it clear that they shared this status. These secure municipal freedmen are crucial for establishing a post-manumission profile against which other possible municipal freedman can be measured in Chapter Three. The following two examples illustrate how this category has been compiled:

AE 1911, 205, Interamna Lirenas, second century CE
Iovi Optimo / Maximo sacr(um), / C. Interamnius Cres/centio libert(us) et tabu/lar(ius)
r(ei) p(ublicae) aram ius(s)u / numin(is) restituit.

Dedication to Jupiter Optimus Maximus, C. Interamnius Crescentio, freedman and tabularius of the res publica, restored the altar by order of the divine spirit.

CIL IX 2676, Aesernia, late first-second century CE

Aesernina Syntyche, while still alive, (erected this monument) for herself and her husband M. Aeserninus Ampliatus, a sevir Augustalis, and for her brothers Ampliatus and Silvester, municipal (slaves), and for her son Expertus, a municipal (slave).

The identity of the municipal freedman in the first example is self-evident. In his votive offering he explicitly records his municipal gentilicium and both his status as libertus rei publicae and the position he held while serving the municipal administration. In the second example, from Aesernia in Samnium, the status of the municipal freedman couple is not stated, but is implicit in the onomastic features and relationships presented in the text. The dedicator Syntyche and her husband Ampliatus both possess the local municipal gentilicium, while her Greek cognomen and his membership in the local Augustales are typical markers of freedman status. The case for making them a municipal freedman and freedwoman is settled by the fact that her brothers and

---

summarizes the evidence and various scholarly interpretations of it (see Mouritsen 2006: 237-48; and Mouritsen 2011: 249-60 for a longer analysis).
(their?) son were still slaves of Aesernia, the latter being a verna who was born into the local familia publica.

For the individuals in the second category, which I label probable municipal freedmen, the identification as such is somewhat less certain. This group naturally consists of incerti who possess a municipal gentilicium, but they lack both a reference to status as a municipal freedman (or as a private freedman) and the criteria by which they can be securely identified as such. Even though they lack the indicators used to identify the secure group, they exhibit many features of ex-slaves in the Roman world, and they fit the profile of municipal freedmen reconstructed in the secure group: they possess a municipal gentilicium; they often have a spouse with the same gentilicium; their familial or social connections suggest some link to the local familia publica; and their epigraphic attestation is located in the eponymous town. The choice has also been made to include in this group those incerti bearers of a municipal gentilicium who were *Augustales. Such membership, of course, is not a foolproof criterion for identification, since an *Augustalis with a municipal gentilicium equally could have been the private freedman of a municipal freedman or, particularly in northern Italian cities, even a freeborn son.38 The same cautionary point should be mentioned for the probable group in general. In reality, some of the subjects included in this group actually may have been the children or recent descendants of municipal freedmen or even their own ex-slaves, in which case they could equally belong to the group of descendants.39

Aside from other factors, the analysis of the cognomina occurring in this group will be useful for identifying someone’s origin. Those incerti bearers of municipal gentilicia with the best claim to being ex-slaves of their town are valuable for this study in order to see whether they confirm or contradict the conclusions drawn from the secure group. As an example of the freedmen in the probable category, a second-century CE epitaph from Venafrum in Latium illustrates how the decision has been made to categorize these ex-slaves (CIL X 4983):

D(is) M(anibus) S(acrum). / Prisco / Farnaces et / Venafraniae / Festae fil(io) / parentes / piissimo, vi/xit ann(is) XVI.

Dedicated to the departed spirits. For Priscus, son of Farnaces (?) and Venafrania Festa, his parents (erected this epitaph) for their most devoted son, who lived 16 years.

38 Abramenko 1993: 44-76.
39 A different set of criteria has been used to catalogue these groups.
In this example, the co-dedicator Venafrania Festa bears the nomenclature of a free woman, a *gentilicium*, corresponding to the name of her hometown, and a Latin *cognomen*, but one that was not infrequently borne by slaves and freedwomen. Yet she lacks any other clear onomastic reference to her status, let alone to any status as a municipal freedwoman. Identifying her position thus relies on discerning the legal status of the other persons listed in the epitaph, and a bit of inference. She and her co-dedicator Farnaces give their names in the genitive case, dependent on the dative *Prisco…fil(io)*, and in the next line identify themselves as the *parentes* of the deceased teenager. The father and son both have only single names, an indication that they were probably slaves. The likelihood that Festa was herself an ex-slave is reinforced by another local epitaph she erected for her sister, where the sister bears only a single name (Calliope), indicating her probable servile status (*CIL X 4932*). Farnaces and Venafrania Festa therefore must have been in an informal marriage between a slave and a free(d) person, called a *contubernium*.

The most plausible interpretation of this family is that the son Priscus had been born while Festa was still a slave along with her spouse Farnaces and her sister. After her own manumission, she naturally retained her familial connections. The only uncertainty is whether Venafrania Festa and her partner in fact were a municipal freedwoman-municipal slave couple or the private slave and ex-slave of a local municipal freedman, who could have given Festa her municipal *gentilicium*. Nevertheless, the combination of Festa’s likely ex-slave status, municipal

---

41 The father’s name is problematic. It is attested in numerous inscriptions in the forms Farnaces (e.g., *CIL X* 6615, Velletri) and Pharmaces (e.g., *CIL VI* 4909, Rome), and of course one should also note the kings of Pontus in the second and first centuries BCE. Yet apart from our inscription the ending–*es* is only found in the nominative, unlike the genitive required here. Perhaps the stonemason simply made a mistake, and the name should be emended to a more recognizable Latinized genitive, *Farnaci’s* (cf. *CIL VI* 18883, Rome). Adams’ 2003: 473-90 study of the exchange between Latin speakers and Greek speakers in Roman Italy may offer another interpretation. The ending–*es* (=–*ēs*) may, in fact, be a transliteration of the Greek first-declension genitive ending –*η*, which would make this slave’s name in the nominative *Farnace*, the equivalent to the Greek nominative ending –*η*. Only one parallel of this nominative form can be cited, A. Herennuleius [---] Pharmace in a dedication of the *magistri vicorum urbis regionum XIII* of Rome (*CIL VI* 975 = *ILS* 6073). A similar orthography may also lie behind the use of the –*ē* (=–*ē*) ending for the dative in an epitaph erected in Velletri for P. *Postumio Farnace…patri…patrono* (*CIL X* 6624), where the ending may be an assimilation of –*ei* from the Greek dative –*η*. Venafrum in the Apennines in southern Latium, where our inscription comes from, was not a particularly heaving Greek-speaking area, but the type of Greek morphological influences described by Adams can be found in the epigraphy of numerous sites in Latium, including at Ostia. Moreover, Farnacis (?) himself, a slave, may have been a native Greek speaker. Solin 1996: 254-5 lists attestations of the name in various cases.
gentilicum, and roots in the eponymous town make her a strong candidate for inclusion in the
catalogue of municipal freedmen and freedwomen.42

Also part of this probable group are individuals who express in their inscriptions no
discernible family groups or close social relationships that suggest a clear connection to the local
familia publica. At the same time, however, there are features that support their identification as
municipal freedmen: they are incerti, without any claim to a filiation or a reference to status as a
municipal or private freedman; they possess a municipal gentilicum; they often have a
cognomen that could indicate servile origins; they often have a spouse who could be a private (or
imperial) freedman or freedwoman; and they are present in their eponymous town. Moreover, as
will be seen below, the probable freedmen in this group are sometimes also observed in activities
similar to those performed by secure freedmen, such as making individual votive offerings or
being members of the *Augustales or a local collegium. For example, L. Lucerinus Homoeus
erected an epitaph for his wife Appuleia Soteris in his hometown of Luceria in Apulia (AE 1996,
449), while M. Antias Andro[---] was enrolled in an unidentified association in his eponymous
town Antium (CIL X 6713). These probable individuals of course could have been the sons or
private freedmen of a municipal freedman, but it is equally plausible to consider them municipal
freedmen, and it is important to cast the widest possible net for my research on this group of ex-
slaves.

I.1.3 IDENTIFYING DESCENDANTS AND FAMILIAE

A different approach must be employed to identify the descendants and familiae of the
municipal freedmen. The task primarily consists of isolating their freeborn children and private
freedmen in the epigraphic evidence, and then discerning family branches within the larger
category of descendants. The latter category comprises the largest in the entire epigraphic
catalogue. These descendants and familiae who bear a municipal gentilicum are either freeborn,
private freedmen, or incerti.

The main methodological problem that one encounters when studying this group of
descendants is the inability in most cases to discern how many generations removed an
individual was from a municipal freedman progenitor. Given the more general pattern among
freeborn and freed Romans of omitting filiation from the epitaph by the later first century CE, it

is unsurprising that the commemorations of municipal freedmen’s descendants also frequently omit generational information. This shortcoming of the documentary evidence means that one must approach the trajectories of family lines on a broader, rather than an individual, scale. Yet there is a way to differentiate generations in a few important cases of descendants who assert their freeborn pedigree as first- or second-generation *ingenui* or whose *ingenuitas* can be deduced from their polyonymy, such as a senator of the mid-second century CE from Aquileia named C. Quinctius Certus Publicius Marcellus. He was honored with the following inscription (*AE* 1934, 231):^{43}

\[
C(aius)\ Quintius / C(ai) f(ilius)\ Vel(ina) / Certus\ Publicius / Marcellus\ co(n)s(ul), / augur,\ legatus\ divi / Hadrian(i)\ provinc(iarum) / Syriae\ et\ German(iae) / superior(is), / ornament(is) / triumphalibus.
\]

C. Quinctius Certus Publicius Marcellus, son of Caius, of the voting tribe Velina, consul, augur, *legatus* of the Divine Hadrian of the provinces of Syria and Germania Superior, (honored) with the *ornamenta triumphalia*.

Marcellus’ voting tribe Velina indicates that Aquileia was indeed his hometown. His nomenclature exhibits the pattern of *gentilicium-cognomen + gentilicium-cognomen*, and since his father’s name was likely C. Quinctius Certus, our man was either the product of marriage with a local line of Aquileian Publicii on his mother’s side or testamentary adoption into the local *gens Publicia*.^{44} One can speculate that if the status of his mother’s family was high enough for her nomenclature to be commemorated in his name, Marcellus must have been at least a few generations removed from her municipal freedman ancestor. In all, there are 104 *ingenui* who provide a filiation,^{45} but just three who mention their grandfather, and five whose nomenclature shows signs of polyonymy. Along with those persons who are clearly the first-generation freeborn children of municipal freedmen, these descendants with a filiation are particularly useful for reconstructing a generational map of their families and their social advancement.

The documentary evidence for *servitus publica* in the municipal context seems to emerge no earlier than the Late Republic and becomes much more substantial in the first century CE, while the inscriptions recording municipal slaves or freedmen taper off significantly in the third

---

43 Alföldy 1984: 99-100 no. 89; Brusin 1991: 236-7 no. 499. This consul also received another honorific inscription in Aquileia, *CIL* V 1354.

44 We should note his lack of an *agnomen* with the suffix –*ianus* that frequently indicated adoption.

45 The status of the other *ingenui* in the set is implied by relationships, positions, and associations with other persons.
century CE.\textsuperscript{46} This pattern closely follows the chronology of the Roman ‘epigraphic habit,’ the central period of which runs from at least the beginning of the second to the early third century CE.\textsuperscript{47} Therefore, the epigraphic evidence for the municipal freedmen and their descendants should fall primarily into a period of roughly 150 years. There is thus a strong likelihood that the evidence we have pertains to a maximum of five generations or so between a theoretical municipal freedman progenitor and a later descendant in his family line. This premise enables us to envision an approximate chronology when considering each individual case.\textsuperscript{48}

\textbf{1.2.1 ROMAN ONOMASTICS AND MUNICIPAL FREEDMEN}

Analyzing the \textit{gentilicia} that correspond to the names of Italian towns is an important part of the present task. A more detailed discussion of this topic will prove useful, both to understand how these municipal \textit{gentilicia} fit into the broader field of Roman onomastics, and to establish why my research focuses on a select group of names for this study.

Historical-linguistic studies provide a starting point for understanding the development of the \textit{gentilicium} among the peoples of central Italy and, in particular, of those family names derived from towns or regions. From about the seventh or sixth century BCE, a binomial system of nomenclature that entailed an individual name, originally the \textit{praenomen}, and \textit{gentilicium}, originally formed as a patronymic designation, was in place in Rome, as it was among other peoples in central Italy.\textsuperscript{49} There has long been a debate about which group within the central Italic milieu introduced this gentile system, which has focused primarily on different cultural-morphological traditions.

One school holds that the use of the \textit{gentilicium} was initially an elite Etruscan behavior that the Romans and others soon acquired. Wilhelm Schulze, for example, compiled lists of Etruscan and Roman family names in the epigraphic evidence from the fourth century BCE down to the Imperial period, and through meticulous analysis of morphology traced a large

\begin{itemize}
\item This computational model works if one considers a generation to be approximately 30 years, combined with the theoretical expectation that a municipal slave would not be freed and begin producing freeborn children until manumission around age 30. Demographic studies have suggested that the typical age of freeborn males at the birth of their first child is in the late-twenties (e.g., Bagnall and Frier 1994: 111-18).
\item The history of the formation of the \textit{gentilicium} in the central Italic and Etruscan cultures entails a massive bibliography, encompassing numerous studies of both the linguistic and cultural features of the development. In the confines of the present essay, what follows is only reference to some of the seminal works.
\end{itemize}
proportion of the aristocratic gentilicia encountered in Rome to original Etruscan family names.\(^{50}\) Schulze’s work continues to be influential, though subsequent scholarship has pointed out that he may have exaggerated the influence Etruscan nomenclature had on Roman onomastics, not to mention making numerous errors.\(^{51}\) Alternatively, others such as Bonfante have ascribed the development of the gentile system to the Sabine culture.\(^{52}\) In a more recent systematic treatment of the epigraphic and literary material, Helmut Rix has argued that although the gentilicum perhaps did not originate in Latium, it took on new and more powerful connotations in the Latin-Faliscan culture, as a corollary to the strict paterfamilias system best observed in early Roman culture.\(^{53}\) There is no space here to rehearse the merits of each position. Suffice it to say that the consensus in current scholarship is that this binomial system of nomenclature was probably the product of symbiotic, cross-cultural influences, rather than a unilateral process.\(^{54}\)

The origin and spread of family names derived from place-names is just one strand within this larger development. In an update to Schulze’s work on names formed as toponyms (Ortsnamen),\(^{55}\) Rix analyzed the earliest epigraphic material from the Etruscan, Sabine, and Latin-Faliscan regions and later Roman literary and epigraphic sources, and discerned essentially three categories of the gentilicum in the central Italic system of nomenclature: patronymic names; toponyms; and gentile names taken from unaltered individual names (praenomina).\(^{56}\) In Etruscan onomastics, the patronymic accounts for the majority of gentilicia, while examples of the unaltered praenomina are few. The toponymic names, the most important category for my

\(^{50}\) Schulze 1904: 62-421, in particular pp. 331-99. See also Pulgram 1948: 163-87. Attribution of the development of the gentile system to elite Etruscan behavior also aligns with the early stratification in Etruscan society in which an aristocracy emerged by the seventh century BCE. Such sites as the necropoleis at Caere reveal this pattern (see, for example, Izzet 2007: 87-121).

\(^{51}\) For example, Kaimio 1975: 26; Solin and Salomies 1988: vii-ix.

\(^{52}\) Bonfante 1948: 43-59.


\(^{54}\) Already argued by Solmsen 1905: 1757; Battisti 1927: 327-49; Ribezzo 1927: 313-26; and Fraenkel 1935: 1652-60. They pointed to a more complex system than simply unilateral Etruscan influence. Meillet 1933: 79 proposed that the gentile system was derived by the Italic and Etruscan peoples mutually from Indo-European prototypes It may also be useful in this context to consider the Liber de praenominibus, an epitome of several earlier texts, but with particularly heavy reliance on the linguistic and etymological work of the antiquarians Varro and Verrius Flaccus. Although the text of the Liber itself is preserved at the end of the three separate manuscripts of Valerius Maximus, authorship has been attributed to the fifth-century CE author C. Titius Probus. In particular, Chapters 1-2 support the theory that the Romans were late recipients of the binomial system of nomenclature, allegedly under the influence of the Albans, Sabines and Etruscans.

\(^{55}\) Schulze 1904: 535-82. Despite its age, this work remains an essential starting point for the study of the Roman gentilicum.

\(^{56}\) Rix 1972: 714-40.
Such a gentilicum obviously expresses its bearer’s connection to a town or region, but the precise nature of this connection is not always certain.

In morphological terms, it is also important to note that there is some parallelism between the suffixes of Etruscan and Latin toponymic gentilicia: Etruscan -ane-, -ine-, -the-, -te-, and -a- correspond to Latin -ano- (-anus), -ino- (-inus), -ati-, and -iti-, while the suffix -ensi- (-ensis) was apparently unique to Latin. A handful of comparisons of an Etruscan gentile name found in epigraphy with a central Italian place name will be illustrative of this category of gentilicia: Atinate => Atina; Cusiθe => Cosa; Manθvate => Mantua; Sentinate => Sentinum. Direct correspondence between such gentile names can be seen in Etruscan Cauθial (CIE 3989) and Latin Caudinus (a senator in 74 BCE; InscrIt 1 1, 45 from Salernum; and CIL IV 7074 from Pompeii), in Etruscan Atinate (CIE 1787) and Latin Atinas (CIL X 345 from Atina; and CIL XII 6014 from Narbo), and in Etruscan Tarχvetena (or Tarχvete, CIE 4922) and Latin Tarquinius (cos. 509 BCE). These examples attest to the continuity between Etruscan antecedents and later Roman bearers of these particular gentile names. Even so, the evidence is scanty for Romans of the Republican period bearing a gentilicum derived from a town, which signalled a person’s familial origin in the eponymous town. Only a handful of examples can be adduced, all found in the consular fasti. Since the reality of the Republican political system meant that only a small percentage of the senatorial ordo in any generation in the Republic ever attained the top magistracies and were therefore recorded in our sources, it is reasonable to expect that there were some ingenui with municipal gentilicia among the lower nobility, not to mention among the freeborn plebeians as well. These families, of course, produced various branches, and their descendants with these same gentilicia continued on under the Empire. The more affluent among them could afford to erect an inscription, and therefore entered the epigraphic record.

60 Schulze 1904: 95-6, 528, 534, 551, 560, 564-5; Rix 1972: 733, 736. See Broughton 1952: 544 on C. Caudinus. See the index in Broughton 1952: 524-636. Cf. Hübner 1875: 74-82; and Schulze 1904. It is worth pointing out the correlation between entry into the Roman polity and the appearance of bearers of certain regional municipal gentilicia. Most of the senators bearing a gentilicum from Latin and Campanian towns appear within a century of the Latin War (341-338 BCE) and Rome’s extension of citizenship to these towns, while those bearing a gentilicum from towns in other regions appear in the decades following the Social War (91-88 BCE) and the promulgation of the lex Iulia of 90 BCE and ultimately the lex Plautia Papiria of 89 BCE.
1.2.2 POSSESSING A MUNICIPAL *GENTILICIAM*

It is imperative at this point to understand the most plausible reasons why a person would have possessed a family name derived from a town.\(^{62}\) Two explanations are most relevant here. First, when a freeborn person who did not already possess a gentile name settled in a new community, the name of his town of origin provided an expedient source for an appellative. During the Early and Middle Republic, this scenario applied to some elite newcomers to the Roman polity from the surrounding regions. A well-known example found in Roman tradition is Rome’s fifth king Lucius Tarquinius Priscus. Before immigrating to Rome from his hometown of Tarquinia, this Etruscan bore the single name *Lucomo*.\(^{63}\) When ‘Romanizing’ his name in the new social environment, however, he drew on his geographical origin to formulate his new nomenclature.\(^{64}\) Given the early chronology implied by this practice and the history of Rome’s grants of citizenship in central Italy, this explanation for new names really only applies to the regions in close proximity to Rome itself, namely, Latium, Campania, Etruria, Umbria, and Samnium. The practice must have ended before the Late Republic.\(^{65}\)

Second, manumitted slaves became new citizens, and thus also took a *gentilicium*. Private slaves customarily took the name of their master-turned-patron, while imperial freedmen received theirs from the reigning emperor who freed them. The municipal freedmen also fall into this category. The citizen body of their town collectively owned them, with the council of decurions making such decisions as granting manumission when the time came.\(^{66}\) Without a personal patron, then, the ex-slaves normally received their *gentilicium* from the name of the town itself, or from one of its official titles.\(^{67}\)

---

63 This is a ‘speaking name’ corresponding to the Etruscan word for king, *lauchume*. See Ogilvie 1965: 142-3 (on Livy 1.34); and Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 71.
64 Livy 1.34. The attribution of a *cognomen* to the king’s name is clearly anachronistic, inserted by later Roman historiography in order to distinguish him from his son or grandson Tarquinius Superbus.
65 I will discuss below the implications of *gentilicia* from towns within the orbit of Rome itself. Torelli 1995: 43-56 discussed the evidence for elite Etruscans with private gentiliciums who entered into the Roman senate in the Republic and early Empire, a process that was sporadic in the Middle Republic but that seems to have increased somewhat in the triumviral period and under Claudius before waning sharply thereafter.
66 The ownership by the town is signaled both by the numerous examples of liberation mentioning *populi libertus* (e.g., *CIL XI 396*: C. Publicius p[o]l[bi] lib. Eros; Canusium) or *libertus* with a corresponding genitive of possession indicating the townspeople (e.g., *CIL XI 5411*: C. Publicius muni[c]ipum Asisium liv[er]tus Verecundus; Asisium), and by such legal documents as *Dig.* 38.3.1 (Ulpian), which indicates that the townspeople themselves had access to their municipal freedman’s *operae* and testamentary rights over his estate (see Johnston 1985: 106-12).
It is also conceivable that other newly enfranchised persons could receive a municipal gentilicium. One group consisted of freeborn peregrini for whom a current Roman citizen or town sponsored citizenship, and freeborn peregrini in a community that received a block grant of Roman or Latin citizenship. Yet in such cases, the new citizens normally chose the gentilicium of the sponsoring magistrate or emperor in gratitude for acquiring their new status. Similarly, discharged auxiliary soldiers had the opportunity to coin a gentilicium, when they received Roman citizenship after their military service, but it is difficult to expect any of them picking the name of a town to which they had no authentic connection. In either case, it seems unlikely that these ever constituted a significant source for persons bearing a municipal gentilicium.

Another set of problems surrounds the origin of a person with the gentilicium Publicius or Poblicius. It is true that many self-identified municipal freedmen of Roman towns bore this name, making it clear that it was widespread among their number. Yet there was also a senatorial family of Publicii which is attested in the literary and epigraphic evidence even before the Second Punic War, and which remained consequential in Roman politics through the Late Republic. Furthermore, the Roman state held public slaves as early as the fourth century BCE, the servi publici populi Romani, and when these state slaves were manumitted some of them took the gentilicium Publicius. These liberti publici populi Romani, however, likewise do not seem to have been so widespread in the epigraphic record.

Aside from the explanations described above, one can also envision more arbitrary reasons for coining a municipal gentilicium. Such exceptions must remain outside the scope of my thesis, however, since there is no methodology that can truly account for them. One useful

---

68 There is some debate about whether entire communities ever received the ius Latii versus full Roman citizenship. For a summary of the two positions, see Fear 1990: 149-66.

69 For example, one can point to cases like that of A. Licinius Archias, who acquired Roman citizenship through the town of Heraclea (through the lex Plautia Papiria of 89 BCE), but took the name of his patron L. Licinius Lucullus (cos. 74 BCE).

70 It was far more common for these veterans to choose the name of the reigning emperor or some famous Roman gens, or to coin a gentilicium based on their father’s personal name. In other cases, they may have imitated the gentilia of officers, who themselves may have had a municipal gentilicium through a family origin in the eponymous town. Cf. Holder 1980: 51-5; and Salomies 1996: 167-86.

71 Cf. Weiss 2004: 191-2. For the list of known Publicius magistrates, see Broughton 1952: 609. One would have to assume in both scenarios, however, that there was no substantive difference between the rendering of the gentilicium as Poblicius and as Publicius; the latter form is the one attested for public freedmen of Rome and the senatorial family. If the version Publicius is a regional preference, its persistent use for the municipal freedmen of towns in the north of Italy should be noted.


73 Cf. Eder 1980: 116; and Varro’s explanation of manumitting magistrates bestowing their own gentilicium on ex-slaves (LL 8.83).
proviso in this context is the role of the municipal censors. Every five years in the Roman municipia and coloniae, a special set of annual senior magistrates were elected, or adlected, in order to conduct the local census. These duoviri or quattuorviri attached the title quinquennalis as an indication of their enhanced position. Focusing primarily on the censors in Rome, Patrick Bruun once pointed out the important role they played in recording names during the census registrations.⁷⁴ At the stroke of the stylus they had the power either to Latinize non-Latin gentilicia or to preserve these non-Latin names in their original forms. As a corollary to this observation, it is easy to imagine that municipal censors, too, exercised extensive power at the local census. Given their knowledge of family connections in their hometown – not least who was and was not connected to the families of the local municipal freedmen – it is difficult to imagine that one could have claimed a municipal gentilicium without an authentic connection to these families. At any rate, the family lines descending from municipal freedmen would have retained these peculiar gentilicia, and these names provide us with the opportunity to trace specific groups as long as family members continued to engage in the Roman ‘epigraphic habit.’⁷⁵

I.2.3 IDENTIFYING THE MOST RELEVANT MUNICIPAL GENTILICIA FOR STUDY

The main outcome of this survey is that persons with a municipal gentilicium from Italian towns, under the Empire, were most likely connected either to a continuation of an elite family line dating back to the Republic or to a family line beginning with municipal ex-slaves. It is thus imperative for my thesis to devise a strategy for isolating those gentilicia that were most plausibly derived from a municipal freedman family line.

The towns themselves and their corresponding gentilicia are organized into three groups. Group I consists of those Italian towns where there is testimony of servitus publica, in the form of a securely identified municipal slave or freedman or a local familia publica. The gentilicia derived from these towns are thus mostly unencumbered by possible Etruscan or Republican Roman antecedents. There are a few exceptional cases within this group where both an early

⁷⁵ Mouritsen 2004: 287 suggests that the evidence from Ostian funerary epigraphy demonstrates that the first- and second-generation ingenui of freedman parents were involved in commemoration, but that from the third generation these ingenui descendants largely disappear from this genre of funerary epigraphy. At the same time, these later generations of descendants can be expected to appear in other genres of epigraphic commemoration if they attained a high social or political status in their community. We can expect to find these bearers of municipal gentilicia in votive, honorific, or dedicatory inscriptions.
bearer and a municipal freedman bearer of the same municipal gentilicium can be cited. Yet in most of these cases, it is possible to ascertain the person’s ultimate origin through additional evidence. The gentilicium Campanius from Capua is a good example. On the one hand, Schulze points to possible earlier orthographic versions of the name, such as Campasius or Campatius, attested in Italy in the Late Republic, and perhaps also an attestation from a tomb in Clusium of the morphologically related Etruscan family name campinei or campinei (CIE 2284). On the other hand, there are cases of self-identified municipal freedmen of Capua with this name starting in the first century CE, such as C. Campanius Ursulus col(oniae) lib(ertus) (CIL X 3940). Focusing on the gentilicia from these Group I towns is naturally the best way to control the evidence, and it puts me in an optimal position to study persons who can confidently be connected to municipal freedman family lines.

Group II contains towns without evidence of servitus publica and where, from an early phase in the development of the binomial and trinomial system in Italy and Rome itself down to the Late Republic, there existed elite family lines with a gentilicium taken from the name of their hometown. These names likely became well entrenched throughout their home region and beyond. Therefore, given the methodological uncertainties involved, the gentilicia derived from these towns have only marginal value for this thesis, except for comparative purposes. Even in cases where these elite lines disappear from the sources in the Late Republic and only resurface in inscriptions under the Empire, one cannot discern whether the latter family lines correspond to earlier families or to hypothetical newly formed municipal freedman families. In theory, every Roman town in Italy had the capacity to own municipal slaves and therefore also to produce freedmen. This feature is clear from references to municipal slaves in the Lex Coloniae

76 Schulze 1904: 115, 352, 357, who notes a few other variant orthographies apparently connected to the same gentilicium. For examples of Campatii, see the epigraphy of Caere: CIL I 2729; CIL XI 3610, 3611, 3644. D’Aversa 1984: 178, 270 dates the inscription broadly to the fifth-first centuries BCE. Perhaps the difference in orthography between Campatius and Campasius was a distinction between patrician and plebeian branches of a larger gens, similar to the case of the gens Claudia and gens Clodia which is most well-known from the tribune P. Claudius Pulcher’s transference into the plebeian branch in 59 BCE, at which point his gentilicium was changed to Clodius. In fact, among the Campatii and Campasii only the former show particular signs of elite status in the Etruscan cities (see Torelli 1995: 45, 52-3).

77 See Schulze 1904: 525, 532 on this name for municipal freedmen.
Genetivae Iuliae and Lex Iritana from Baetica, which reflect standard institutions present in both Italian and provincial colonies and municipalities.⁷⁸

Group III consists of the towns which lack direct evidence of servitus publica, but which are also unencumbered by the numerous problems that undercut the methodological value of the towns in Group II. Many of the towns in this group were located in Latium and other regions close to Rome, such as Albanum, which corresponds to the gentilicum Albanius. Schulze long ago suggested a correlation between the prevalence of such municipal family names and the eponymous towns’ early entry into the Rome state.⁷⁹ Therefore, many of these gentilicia from Latin towns naturally had connections to elites migrating to Rome in the Republican period, regardless of whether the extant evidence supports this theory. Most of the names taken from Group III towns thus will be utilized here only for comparative purposes.

Suspected descendants bearing the gentilicum Publicius, who were widespread in Italian towns in all three groups (I, II, III), pose additional challenges for the methodology. To be sure, numerous towns are known to have bestowed this name on their municipal freedmen, as is indicated by the presence of both secure and probable examples in the catalogue. This makes it a crucial category of nomenclature for my research on other possible ex-slaves of towns and their descendants. Yet the name could be acquired by other means as well. At Rome, it was assigned to public slaves freed by the state (liberti publici populi Romani), and a senatorial family that produced consuls in 232 BCE and 120 CE also bore this gentilicum.⁸⁰ The fact that all three sources of Publicii are potentially in play when dealing with the epigraphic evidence makes it necessary to restrict which of these Publicii to count in the catalogue.

All Publicii are included who are found in towns in the Group I category, where servitus publica is attested. In most cases these individuals correspond to a local self-identified or probable municipal freedman who bears the name Publicius, making their origin in the town secure. In some other cases Publicii are found in a town where no municipal freedmen have been

---

⁷⁸ On the other side of this coin, it is worth noting the argument from silence that although the towns in Groups I and III lack evidence for early elite family lines with a municipal gentilicum, elite lines naturally could have existed just as they did in the towns of Group II.
⁷⁹ Schulze 1904: 526-33.
⁸⁰ Namely, M. Publicius Malleolus and C. Publicius Marcellus. Weiss 2004: 191-2 doubts that the former descended from a line of a libertus publicus populi Romani. One might also note the Publicii family, represented by a denarius dated to 80 BCE minted by C. Publicius Malleolus (Crawford 1974: 82, 334-6, 396 no. 380), and possibly also the Populicii of the Middle Republic, known from the First Punic War quaestor M. Populicio(s) whose name is inscribed on two bronze rostra recovered from the sea near the Aegates Islands (AE 2012, 635-636; see Prag 2014: 33-59). See Broughton 1952: 609 for the list of known senators and magistrates of this gens Publicia.
identified, and therefore we do not know what *gentilicium* was given to municipal ex-slaves, or where the only *gentilicium* known to be in use corresponds to the name of the town itself (i.e., Aquileiensis from Aquileia). In such instances there is a sound basis for accepting the name Publicius as a local *gentilicium* for municipal freedmen’s families.\textsuperscript{81}

The Group I towns of Comum, Patavium, and Puteoli offer useful case-studies on this issue. Municipal slaves are known from each town, but no self-identified municipal freedman can be cited.\textsuperscript{82} Since all three towns were centers of economic activity, one may expect that each had a relatively substantial *familia publica*, which in turn would have increased the chances of their producing freedmen. On the one hand, persons with a *gentilicium* taken from these towns are certainly valid for study, and although rare, a few turn up in the evidence, like ‘C.’\textsuperscript{3} Put(eolanius) Fortunatus of Puteoli (*CIL* X 8204).\textsuperscript{83} On the other hand, the Publicii were well represented in each town. The seven Publicii attested at Comum include L. Publicius Thalamus, whose best friend (*optimo amico*) was enrolled in the local voting tribe Oufentina, suggesting a local origin (*AE* 1995, 618);\textsuperscript{84} the five at Patavium include T. Poblicius Crescens, who made a fitting votive offering to the town’s *Lares publici* (*CIL* V 2795); and the five at Puteoli include Sex. Publicius Bathyllus, an *ex-apparitor* and *Augustalis* in two towns (*CIL* X 1889). The southern port city of Brundisium gives an even more pointed illustration of this issue. It is a Group I town where no individual municipal freedman is named, but which shows evidence of five individual municipal slaves and a college of *lib(erti) [et] famil(ia) pub(lica)*. This signals that the city must have maintained a substantial number of municipal slaves,\textsuperscript{85} and the reference to *liberti* in the *familia publica* makes it certain that it produced freedmen. I have not identified any probable (*PL*) municipal freedmen of Brundisium, based on the criteria described above, but

\textsuperscript{81} There are towns where the name Publicius is attested for self-identified municipal freedmen, but where there is also evidence for persons bearing the municipal *gentilicium*, for example, Bononia, Canusium, and so on.
\textsuperscript{82} Examples of municipal slaves at Comum: *CIL* V 5318, 5668; at Patavium: *CIL* V 2803, 2886; and at Puteoli: *CIL* X 2052; *TPSulp* 56 (= *AE* 1992, 272 = *AE* 1973, 147), 114 (*AE* 1988, 330).
\textsuperscript{83} On the *gentilicium* Puteolanus (or Potiolanus), see Schulze 1904: 526. Only three persons are attested with the *gentilicium* Patavinius/-a, all in the provinces: A. Patavinius and (Patavinia) Navina (father and daughter, *CIL* III 9871 = III 13990, Rider in Dalmatia); and Patavinia Romana (*CIL* XIII 1196, Avaricum Biturigum in Aquitania). No bearers can be cited with a *gentilicium* corresponding to Comum. Schulze does not see correspondence between the *gentilicium* Comatius and the town, though it should be noted that this name occurs in two inscriptions relatively close by Comum, at Mediolanum (*CIL* V 5867) and Aquileia (*InscrAqu* 1, 97), and a town in Noricum (*CIL* III 5417 = *ILLPRON* 1192).
\textsuperscript{84} Kubitschek 1889: 119.
\textsuperscript{85} *CIL* XI 59; *AE* 1964, 134; *AE* 1964, 138; *AE* 1978, 194; *AE* 1978, 217; *CIL* XI 32 (reference to the *familia publica*).
there is a strong likelihood that the three incerti Publicii I have included as descendants belonged to a municipal freedman family line originating in the port city.\textsuperscript{86}

An even stronger indication that the choice to include these Publicii is sound is epigraphic evidence for the practice of towns using both the municipal gentilicium and the name Publicius for their ex-slaves. At Venafrum, two self-identified freedmen of the town bear the name Venafranius, \textit{Sex. Venafranius col. l. Primogenius} and \textit{Q. Venafranius col. l. Felix} (\textit{CIL} X 5012),\textsuperscript{87} while another has the name Publicius, \textit{M. Publicius coloniae l. Philodamus} (\textit{CIL} X 4984).\textsuperscript{88} Likewise, an epitaph recording two separate burials at Saturnia appears to refer to a municipal freedwoman’s gentilicium as both Publicia and Saturnia, the former when she commemorated her deceased daughter, and the latter when she herself was commemorated (\textit{CIL} XI 2656).\textsuperscript{89} While this evidence does not permit asking larger questions about the process by which individual municipal freedmen received their gentilicium, it is reasonable to expect that a degree of variation was possible in any town.

One exception to this criterion is comprised of Publicius family lines in a Group I town whose origin seems to lie elsewhere based on a stated \textit{origo} or voting tribe that corresponds to another site. One case in particular illustrates the impact of this methodological choice on my research. Families of Publicii had a substantial footprint in Ostia. Fifteen Publicii are attested in numerous epitaphs and votive offerings, but in particular, their presence is observed in two \textit{alba} of the \textit{corpus lenuncularior(um) tabularior(um) auxiliar(iorum) Ostiensium}, perhaps an association of tugboat crews whose job was to lead larger transport ships to the docks in the busy harbor area (\textit{CIL} XIV 250 (152 CE); XIV 251 (192 CE)).\textsuperscript{90} In total, the two rolls list one Lucius Publicius and 33 Marci Publicii, along with two equestrian L. Furii Publicii who were patrons of the college and one of their own private freedmen.\textsuperscript{91} In demographic terms, among the 6900 Ostians with a known gentilicium whom Salomies counted, the Publicii represent the fortieth

\textsuperscript{86} \textit{AE} 1978, 179; \textit{AE} 1980, 276; \textit{CIL} IX 51.
\textsuperscript{88} Capini 1999: 134-5 no. 170.
\textsuperscript{89} I will discuss this case from Saturnia in greater detail below, pp. 90-1. How an ex-slave’s gentilicium was selected remains an open question. Did the decurions decide? Did the freed slave have a say in the matter? It is worth adding in this discussion of variation in naming practices examples of self-identified municipal freedmen who bore a private gentilicium, presumably corresponding to the nomenclature of the municipal magistrate who performed their manumission. Note, for example, M. Valerius Verna col(oniae) l(ibertus) from Asculum Picenum (\textit{ILS} 6565).
\textsuperscript{90} Meiggs 1973: 297-8. Their role in supplementing other types of lenuncularii may be signaled by their additional title auxiliariorum.
\textsuperscript{91} On this connection, see Royden 1988: 100-2; Herz 1994: 320-2; and Tran 2006b: 435. On the wider practice of patrons packing their occupational associations with their own freedmen, see Tran 2006b: 409-518.
most prevalent *gentilicum* in the colony. By comparison, there are 70 persons with the colony’s eponymous *gentilicum* Ostiensis, who were secure municipal freedmen and their descendants, making this name about the eighteenth most prevalent in the colony. It is often suspected that the Publicii were descended from lines of the colony’s ex-slaves, but decisive evidence for this is lacking.

For my purposes, the Ostian Publicii have been excluded from this study based on the case of Sex. Publicius Maior, who was commemorated by the following statue base dated to the second century CE (*CIL* XIV 4143):

```
Sex(to) Publicio / Sex(ti) fil(io) Coll(ina) / Maiori / equo publico exornato, /
[---] decurio(ni) / [---]
```

To Sex. Publicius Maior, son of Sextus, of the voting tribe Collina, honored with the *equus publicus*, . . . decurion . . .

Maior had received the *equus publicus* and was apparently adlected into the council of Ostia. The latter feature seems to place his career in Ostia itself, but his voting tribe Collina presents problems for such an interpretation. The main tribes in Ostia were Voturia and Palatina, and only Maior and three other men in the colony list the tribe Collina, making it unlikely that they originated here. In fact, Kubitschek did not list Collina as the principal voting tribe of any city in Italy except for Rome itself, where it was one of the four urban tribes. All the same, Ostia’s proximity to the capital and the allure of its economic opportunities made it a frequent destination for migration. It therefore seems plausible to place Maior’s origin in Rome, connecting him either to a senatorial or state freedman family line. Perhaps he had migrated to

---

92 Salomies 2002: 135-40. His method of calculation is used to rank the prevalence of these *gentilicia*. The Publicii constituted 0.29% of all Ostians with a known *gentilicum*.

93 The Ostienses thus account for 1.01% of Ostians with a known *gentilicum*. Cf. Bruun 2008: 538-9.


95 Meiggs 1973: 514 is surely correct that *DECURIO* should be resolved in the dative, matching the case of Maior’s name. See also discussion in Salomies 2002: 156-7.

96 Dessau 1887: 484, Tran 2006b: 256-7 thinks the *COLL* between Maior’s filiation and *cognomen* could actually be a reference to a local *collegium*, of which he could have been a patron and which might have been responsible for erecting this inscription. This reading does not seem to work, however, since this phrase was placed precisely where the voting tribe was normally given, and it was inscribed with letters exactly the same size as the filiation and *cognomen*.

97 Kubitschek 1889: 26-7, 266. The three others in the voting tribe Collina: *AE* 1920, 122; *Tribu* p. 165 (two men).

98 Kubitschek 1889: 1-8. A search of the *Epigraphik-Datenbank Claus-Slaby* confirms his earlier view. Outside of Rome, men registered in the voting tribe Collina occur only in a handful of towns in Regions I, III, VII, and X in Italy and in some provincial towns, but never in the sort of concentration that would support making it a principal tribe at any site.
Ostia and then advanced to the local council, or as an equestrian he had economic ties to the colony and accordingly received an honorary decurionate. It is possible that some of the other Publicii found in the colony’s epigraphy did in fact originate there, but, given that the most tangible evidence for the origin of any of them places them elsewhere, the soundest methodological approach is to omit them from my catalogue.

Many additional Publicii also turn up in towns in the Group II and Group III categories, both of which are characterized by the absence of direct evidence for the institution of servitus publica. Yet it is reasonable to assume that these towns did own municipal slaves and, consequently, did produce freedmen. As for the municipal gentilia obtained from these towns, those from Group II are methodologically problematic in light of elite Etruscan and early Roman family lines bearing the names, while those from Group III remain valid for my research. In this environment, however, it is also likely that many of the people in these towns bearing the gentilicium Publicius were municipal freedmen or the descendants of one. The best way to deal with this probability is to include only cases where a Publicius – whether a freedman or descendant – can be securely linked to the town by his origo or the local voting tribe. A good example is the equestrian procurator C. Publicius Proculeianus of Ravenna, who was active in the early third century CE. The following bilingual inscription on a statue base erected by the boule of Delphi demonstrates his origin in the Italian city (AE 1948, 51):


Good fortune. To C. Publicius Proculeianus, from Ravenna, primipilars, procurator of Pannonia (?) and Achaea, the holy city of the Delphians erected (this monument), by a decree of the council. // To C. Publicius Proculeianus, son of Caius, of the voting tribe Camilia, from Ravenna, . . . // Good fortune. To Numerius (? . . .

The text names Proculeianus’ origin as Ravenna, and his voting tribe Camilia confirms this identification. He also set up an epitaph there for his foster son. Schulze points to a series of

---

100 Cf. Salomies 2001: 78, 84.
102 The origo in the Latin text C. Publicio C. f. Cam. [Raven]na Proculeiano is restored from the accompanying Greek Γ. Πουβλικίῳ Προκοουλημάω Ραβεννήτη.
Etruscan *gentilicia* showing the root *rav-* that may correspond to a toponym from the city, such as *Ravonius*, and for this reason the town is in the Group II category. Nevertheless, Ravenna was a busy port city, and it seems more than likely that it would have maintained a *familia publica*. It thus can be envisioned that the *gentilicum* Publicius would have been a logical choice for any municipal freedmen it might have produced. Accordingly, since Proculeianus’ case demonstrates that a line of Publicii did originate there, it is sensible to add to the catalogue any who turn up in the town.

The decision has also been made to exclude the Publicii who are found in inscriptions in Group II or Group III towns but whose origin cannot be securely placed there. This means omitting intriguing cases like that of C. Publicius Antero(s) and L. Publicius Pe[re]nnis of Acelum in the northeast of Italy, who honored their *patronus* with the following inscription in the first century CE (*ZPE* 196, 257):

```
L(ucio) Horatio Longo / tr(ibuno) c(o)hor(tis) II vigil(um), / IIIvir(o) i(ure) d(icundo), / C(aius) Publicius Antero(s), / L(ucius) Publicius Pe[re]nnis patrono.
```

To L. Horatius Longus, tribune of the Second Cohort of *vigiles*, quattuorvir *iure dicundo*, C. Publicius Antero(s) and L. Publicius Pe[re]nnis (erected this monument), for their patron.

These two dedicators bear a different *gentilicum* than their so-called patron Horatius, and they do not share the same *praenomen*. Both features cast doubt on the possibility that they were the freedmen of any private patron. Instead, as Luciani has suggested in his recent publication of this inscription, they may have been municipal freedmen of this northern Italian town. As a former quattuorvir *iure dicundo*, Horatius had been in the position to perform the manumission ritual for his town’s slaves, which in theory could have included Antero(s) and Pe[re]nnis. It is possible that this ex-magistrate formed an impersonal *clientela* relationship with the two of them, and in return they regarded him the way private freedmen would their formal patron. Be that as it may,

---

104 CIL XI 207: *Publici C(aii) f(iliii) Ampliati, qui vix(it) an(nos) VI, d(ies) XXVII, / C(aius) Publicius Proculeianus alumno suo posuit, / curantibus Publicio Dionysio et Aurelia Tyche parentibus, / tempera iam genitor lacrimis tuque, optima mater, / desine iam flere. poenam non sentio mortis, / poena fuit vita, requies mihi morte parata est.* If one assumes that the biological parents are freed slaves, which their nomenclature suggests, the father (C.) Publicius Dionysius was perhaps Proculeianus’ own freedman.

105 Schulze 1904: 568; and see pp. 219, 245. No examples of such a *gentilicum* turn up in Latin inscriptions of the Late Republic or Principate. Moreover, there are no uses of Ravenna’s principal adjectival form, *Ravennas* (or *Ravennatius*), as a family name.

106 Luciani 2015: 257-60.
there is no direct attestation of *servitus publica* in Acelum, and the origins of these two Publicii cannot be securely placed in the town.

Two final methodological choices on the family lines of Publicii should be noted here. Numerous individuals bearing this name are found in provincial Roman towns. Yet the epigraphic evidence in many of these towns also record the creation of local municipal freedmen named Publicius, such as C. Publicius Fortunatus *liber[t]us m(unicipii) F(lavii) Nesca[n(iensis)]* of Nescania in Baetica (*CIL II* 2009). There is simply no way to determine whether the origin of such provincial Publicii was in the province or back in Italy without their providing this explicit information. I therefore also exclude this provincial group from the catalogue. Likewise, any Publicius found in Rome itself are excluded, since the two sources of this nomenclature described above complicate their identification as well. These decisions mean missing out on potential Publicii from Group I, II, or III towns in Italy who migrated to the capital or to the provinces, but, in keeping with my methodology, it also ensures a more secure sample for study.

A similar issue is also encountered in studying persons named Concordius and Venerius, two *gentilicia* that were derived from official titulature shared by several *municipia* and *coloniae* in Italy. In these cases, however, the range of origins is far more limited. For example, in addition to the town in Region X called Concordia, three other towns incorporated *Concordia* into their titles: Beneventum in Region II, Nursia in Region IV, and Brixellum in Region VIII. As for the municipal title *Veneria*, Pompeii and Abellinum in Region I and Hadria in Region V used this name. Some towns in the provinces also used *Concordia* or *Veneria* in their titulature, and the local epigraphy frequently shows concentrations of persons with the corresponding *gentilicia* in those towns. In theory, both Concordius and Venerius could also be classified as theophoric *gentilicia*, indicating a connection to a deity rather than any town, but such examples are hard to come by in the epigraphic record. In light of the relatively limited range of possible origins for a person bearing these family names, the most sensible approach is to count the Concordii and Venerii in Italian towns, including in Rome, unless a person’s voting tribe or *origo* implies that they were actually from another place.

---

107 For example, at Carthage, where the official title of the Roman colony was *Colonia Concordia Iulia Karthago* (with additional imperial titles later on), one finds an A. Concordius Acorisius (*AE* 2011, 1724) and a Concordia *Quieta* (*CIL VIII* 1043). Both persons surely originated in Carthage.

108 Cf. Kajanto 1965: 57-8, 214 (Venerius), 255 (Concordius) on the use of these names as theophoric *cognomina*. 
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Finally, the identification of the Publicii, Concordii, and Venerii from the sites outlined above as either probable municipal freedmen (i.e., not self-identified, secure freedmen) or descendants is based on applying the same criteria as for persons with a municipal gentilicum.
CHAPTER II: DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND IN THE MUNICIPAL FAMILIA PUBLICA

This chapter will address two important demographic issues that must be understood more fully before turning to the study of the social and economic mobility of municipal freedmen and their descendants. The first task is to estimate how large a familia publica was necessary to meet the administrative needs of Roman towns of varying sizes. The second issue to be dealt with here is the scale of manumission in the typical municipal familia publica. The study of the manumission of all types of Roman slaves is fraught with methodological problems, and one of the challenges here will be to find ways to utilize the range of evidence available. The epigraphic evidence and a handful of literary sources provide insight into the probability that a Roman slave might be manumitted. Two other methods have also been used to supplement our understanding of manumission: calculations of how specific legal and demographic factors would have governed the decision by the council of decurions to manumit a town’s slaves; and a series of complex statistical models that reconstruct plausible manumission patterns. Both of these must be taken into consideration.

Bringing together these two strands of discussion, with a focus on how they played out in the municipal familia publica, is a crucial step toward estimating the number of freedmen the towns of Roman Italy may have produced over time, and the legal status of their own children. Most important for the following chapters, this analysis will also useful for establishing the number of the freedmen’s descendants we should expect to find in the epigraphic record.

II.1 THE SCOPE OF MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION

The first step toward understanding the scale of manumission in the familia publica is to estimate the size of the familia itself, which has proven problematic. The epigraphic evidence provides little quantifiable data that allow us to advance reliable figures. It is necessary to comment on the few pieces of evidence that offer insight into specific numbers in the familia publica of a few Roman towns, as there is some value in briefly making a calculation of the size of a familia publica based on this quantifiable evidence. There is a dearth of such evidence in the inscriptions recording the familia publica of towns around the Roman Empire. One late first-century CE inscription honoring a Q. Veranius Philargus in Kibyra in Asia Minor credits this

1 See discussion in Weiss 2004: 159-62.
local official with returning 107 municipal slaves (δηµόσιοι δούλοι) who allegedly had either fled after an earthquake or had been illegally seized by a local landowner (IKibyra 41 = IGR IV 914). Kibyra was not a particularly large city, but if this case were representative of other towns, it would imply that the standard familia contained well over 100 slaves. Weiss argues that this number of slaves is exceptional, and it, therefore, must not be taken as typical. The fact that the slaves were working on a public estate, which municipalities generally rented out to private owners, calls into question whether they were truly the property of the city.

There is also a second-century honorific inscription from Nola in Campania that enumerates the sportulae distributed by a local patron to certain local social groups (AE 1969/1970, 106 = AE 1971, 85). The decurions received a lump sum of 30,000 HS, and the Augustales 20,000 HS. The next recipients in the sequence are called ministr(i), who seem likely to have been municipal slaves, or perhaps a subsection of them. They were to receive a sum of 12,000 HS. Assuming that Nola had a council of 100 decurions and a body Augustales also numbering 100, the endowment gave each decurion 300 HS and each Augustalis 200 HS. This hierarchy of donatives may imply that each of the ministri would receive 100 HS. This amount would put the number of ministri at 120. Again, it is not certain that this group was a body of servi publici, and it is also difficult to imagine Nola maintaining such a large familia publica.

Finally, it is worth considering the alleged album of the familia publica of Ostia in this context (CIL XIV 255). This document, likely dating to the second century, lists the names of 21 slaves and 35 freedmen of the colony. Setting aside the uncertainties surrounding this document

---

3 Weiss 2004: 162. Robert 1937: 375-8 proposed that these had been private slaves working on a private estate that passed into the hands of the municipal administration either through confiscation or through a bequest in the owner’s will.
4 Ferrua 1971: 102-4, who suggests that these ministri may have been assigned to the cult of Venus to which the benefactor and dedicant of the inscription was also a patroness.
5 The ministri here may be parallel to those managing the ministeria publica in another endowment inscription from Forum Clodii in Etruria, dating to 165 CE (CIL XI 7556). The title is often ascribed to municipal slaves who assisted magistrates in searches and seizures and performed religious functions for official priests. See Dig. 11.4.1.6 (Ulpian); Pliny Ep. 10.31-32; Appuleius Met. 3.2; 9.41; 10.10. Cf. Fuhrmann 2012: 64-6.
6 A council of 100 decurions is only a hypothetical standard size, since the evidence shows great variation in the size of the ordo in towns in Italy and the provinces. See Duncan-Jones 1982: 283-7; Nichols 1988: 712-19; Mouritsen 1998: 247-8; and Patterson 2006: 222-4. On a standard number of *Augustales of approximately 100, see D’Arms 2000: 126-44.
7 Cf. CIL XI 7556 (= ILS 6584 = AE 1889, 98) from Forum Clodii in Etruria. This late second-century record of an endowment lists only cash handouts to the local patrons and decurions and to the ministerii publicis, who were likely municipal slaves. In this case, the inscription lists individual amounts (singulis), and allots to each minister publicus exactly half the amount (50 HS) it gives to each patron and decurion (100 HS).
8 See Duncan-Jones 1982: 283-7 for a similar use of sportulae for calculating the size of civic groups.
that were noted in the previous chapter, it may represent our best chance to estimate the size of a *familia publica*. Weiss thinks that this *album* was only listing an association that happened to have at its core municipal slaves and freedmen, along with other persons likely of private freedman status. In his estimation, the most it can do is provide a snapshot of the minimum number of municipal slaves and freedmen of Ostia at the time.\(^9\) Yet even more interesting is to consider what this number of freedmen may suggest about manumission practices, and about the total size of the Ostian *familia publica* to which they belonged.

Let us assume that the 35 Ostienses in this snapshot were representative of the total number of municipal freedmen who resided in the colony at the time. Applying to this group the range of manumission rates that demographers have proposed produces some interesting results.\(^10\) If a higher rate of 30% were assumed, the *familia publica* that produced the 35 freedmen in our snapshot would have consisted of approximately 117 members, that is, 82 slaves and the 35 ex-slaves.\(^11\) If a lower rate of 10% were assumed, the *familia* would have consisted of approximately 350 members, of which were 315 slaves and 35 ex-slaves.\(^12\)

In these models, the 35 freedmen of the colony cannot be taken as the total number freed during the 25-year period. Other ex-slaves would have left Ostia or died. Since all 35 Ostienses are males, moreover, this model does not take into account female slaves and freedwomen or children, whose role in the *familia* in not entirely clear. Nonetheless, each estimate serves as a baseline for thinking about how large the *familia publica* may have been. It is noteworthy that the higher manumission rate (30%), with its implication of a *familia* of around 117 slaves and freedmen, corresponds to the evidence cited above from Kibyra and Forum Clodia. Yet it must be recognized that Ostia was probably an exceptional case. Its large population and expansive infrastructure must have demanded a larger *familia publica* than most towns. In this scenario, either the commentators who doubt the reliability of the reported size of the *familia* in the other towns are correct, or the application of the lower manumission rate (10%) resulting in a much

---

\(^9\) Weiss 2004: 159-62. For example, it is self-evident that the 21 slaves of the colony underrepresent the actual number, especially when the corresponding number of freedmen is 35. Only a select few of the most privileged municipal slaves would have been allowed, or had the personal funds, to join this unidentified association (cf. Tran 2006b: 128-9).

\(^10\) I will examine the scholarship on manumission rates in the next section.

\(^11\) A (crude) manumission rate is calculated as the percentage of freedmen among the total population of slaves and ex-slaves in any given period. Here, the formula is: \(35 = 0.3x \Rightarrow 116.67 > 117\), consisting of all the slave (82) and ex-slave (35) members of the current servile population of the *familia*.

\(^12\) \(35 = 0.1x \Rightarrow 350\), consisting of all the slave (315) and ex-slave (35) members of the current servile population of the *familia*. 
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larger *familia* in Ostia is closer to reality. In any case, the models proposed here should be taken only as a frame of reference, with which other methods of estimating the number of slaves and freedmen can be compared.

It is also useful to speculate about the number of annual manumissions implied by the 35 Ostienses listed in the *album*. As a computational range, they all may have been between the ages of 30 and 55. This range is based on two theoretical arguments. First, the legal age of manumission was 30, which in theory suggests that all of these ex-slaves were at least that age.\(^\text{13}\) There are plenty of epigraphic examples showing that private slaves were manumitted well before this legal age, but it is possible that the provisions of the *Lex Aelia Sentia* were followed more stringently when dealing with municipal slaves.\(^\text{14}\) Second, two of the life tables of Coale and Demeny that are often adduced as possible parallels for the mortality regime of the Roman world, Model West Levels 3 and 4, hold that from the age of 30 a male might expect to live about 24-25 additional years.\(^\text{15}\) A rounded computational upper age expectation of 55 is useful for this calculation for our group. Arguably, then, these 35 Ostienses represent a minimum of all the municipal freedmen manumitted in a 25-year period up to the time when the *album* was inscribed. The result of this calculation suggests that the *ordo* of Ostia may have manumitted only one or two of their municipal slaves per year.\(^\text{16}\) As noted above, this figure would only be a minimum, since Ostia has surely freed other slaves during this hypothetical period who for various reasons do not appear in the *album*.

*Spheres of municipal administration*

As the foregoing discussion demonstrates, the direct evidence for numbers in the *familia publica* is scarce, and merely provides an approximate picture of the situation. To remedy this shortcoming, this section inverts previous approaches to the issue, which focus on the lacunose numerical evidence, by instead evaluating the level of support the municipal administration

---

\(^{13}\) Gaius Inst. 1.13, 19-20, on the *Lex Aelia Sentia* of 4 CE.

\(^{14}\) For a discussion of the evidence for the manumission age of municipal slaves, see below, pp. 83-9.

\(^{15}\) Coale and Demeny 1983: 43. Saller 1994: 22-5 prefers Model West Level 3 (cf. Scheidel 2004: 2 n. 2), while Bagnall and Frier 1994: 99-102 prefer Model West Level 4. Several studies have called into question how well we can understand the Roman mortality regime through a comparison with any of Coale and Demeny’s life tables, though as Hin 2013: 109-10 notes, the handful of possible parallel models continue to be one of the first points of reference for Roman demographic study and in the end are probably not too far away from the Roman reality. See also the critique of Scheidel 2001b: 1-26, in which he points out that the standard model life tables do a poor job of accounting for fluctuations over time and difference geographical locations.

\(^{16}\) 35 freedmen ÷ 25 years = 1.4 manumissions per year.
needed for its activities. In doing so, it will also be necessary to contrast the role of the municipal slaves with the administration’s use of other local sources of manpower, such as the population of private slaves and freedmen and freeborn citizens. Three main questions guide this analysis: 1) What were the actual day-to-day engagements of the magistrates and the council of decurions? 2) Where do the municipal slaves fit into this structure? 3) Using this *familia publica* typology as a guide, what support needs can be estimated for each of the administrative competences?

A large number of municipal slaves from numerous towns are known from the epigraphic evidence, along with many of their functions. Weiss has analyzed their titles and shown the various spheres of the municipal administration where these slaves tended to be employed. His reconstruction demonstrates the crucial role they played in the day-to-day running of the local administration, but it gives little information about actual numbers of any particular type of slave, or about the total number of slaves of any town. One way of fleshing out this aspect of the *familia publica* is to evaluate the volume of administrative work in the municipalities to which these slaves may have been assigned. To that end, one can explore such sources as the municipal statutes, Book 50 of the *Digest* on municipal administration, and Book 10 of Pliny’s letters recording his correspondence with the emperor Trajan, which throw light on municipal administration in the province of Bithynia-Pontus. In these sources, six primary spheres of competence can be identified.

A first sphere of activity entrusted to municipal slaves is the management of civic religion, a topic that receives careful attention in the extant portions of the municipal statutes. One of the principal tasks of a town’s senior magistrates was to ensure the local community’s positive relationship with the gods. The specific character of this religious function and what it entailed on a day-to-day basis are complex issues. The two duovirs seem to have had a performative role in civic religion. This role is signalled by the presence on their staff of religious functionaries such as the *accensus*, *haruspex*, *praeco*, and *tibicen*, whose role must

---

17 Weiss 2004: 29-36 (attendants for magistrates), 37-84 (municipal treasury and archives), 84-101 (infrastructural work), 102-17 (security personnel), 117-34 (technical posts such as *plumbarii*, brick-makers, and surveyors), 135-58 (assisting in *sacra publica* and temple maintenance). Cf. Rodríguez Neila 1997: 221-6.
18 Galsterer 1988: 79. My use of ‘civic’ and ‘official public’ religion follows Rüpke’s 2007: 24-9 definition of public religion as those institutions and practices devised and maintained by the senatorial class in Rome during the Republic and also established as the official civic religion by municipal and colonial statutes in Roman towns and funded by public money. See, for example, *Lex Irnitana* 81 for the role of the *ordo* and the duovirs in setting the religious calendar each year, or *Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae* 69-72 on the staging of public sacrifices. 19 The religious competence of the consuls in Rome during the Republic is a useful parallel. See Pina Polo 2011: 21-57.
have entailed assisting in sacrificial rituals and guiding the magistrate through the proper recitations. There is some evidence to suggest that municipal slaves also assisted the magistrates in these tasks. For example, one slave from Capua gives his occupation as colon(iae) [a] sacris (CIL X 3941), and another from Brundisium is called pub(l)ic(us) victimarius and had a sacrificial knife carved on his epitaph (AE 1964, 134). It is worth noting in this context a second-century relief from an altar to Hadrian in Rome depicting scenes of bull sacrifice that shows bare-chested victimarii wearing a long apron that may well be the limus, a special apron also worn by some municipal slaves to denote their high rank. At least one slave, from the provincial town of Colonia Agrippinensium, was styled a limocinctus in his epitaph (CIL XIII 8334).

In addition to the work performed by the duovirs, the personnel of the local priestly colleges staged many of the civic religious activities mentioned in the municipal statutes. For example, Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliea Chapter 128 regulates the appointment of the annual magistri whose job was to maintain local temples and organize various dies festi. Municipal slaves surely played a supporting role in these functions. There is evidence for municipal slaves and freedmen occupying the position of aedituus, which seems likely to have been a custodial (or perhaps accounting) role in a temple (e.g., AE 1895, 156; CIL XIV 32), or even a more specific role like cymbalista, which a female slave of Beneventum performed under the guidance of the augur and sacerdos of a local cult (CIL IX 1538).

A second area of administrative activities for the magistrates and decurions involved their meetings in the curia. To judge from the municipal statutes and the numerous epigraphic copies of official decrees, which provide only a glimpse at the scale of this activity, this competence may have occupied much administrative time. The statutes frequently refer to issues requiring

23 In Lex Irnitana 19-20 and possibly also in the fragmentary third-century charter from Lauriacum in Noricum the municipal slaves attached to magistrates are designated as limocincti, an apparent reference to this special apron. Servius Auctus mentions that the person who actually struck the sacrificial victim (popa or victimarius) wore a limus (Aen. 12.120.16-17). A pair of well-known second-century reliefs depicting scenes of bull sacrifice shows bare-chested victimarii wearing the long apron that appears to be the limus. See Moede 2011: 168-9, fig. 12.2; Fless and Moede 2011: 250, 257-9, fig. 18.1; and Horster 2011: 332. Cf. Weiss 2004: 29-33.
24 Weiss 2004: 218 no. 199.
25 Cf. Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliea 64; and Lex Irnitana 77.
the duovirs to consult the curia, while the regulations given in other chapters were also likely predicated on decisions of the *ordo*. Some sources imply real debate in the curia. This is predictable since most issues known to us entailed allocating public funds, an occasion which required the decurions to give their official consent. There was the added likelihood that the outcome of any decision could affect the reputation of certain decurions or their clients. Ulpian, for example, acknowledges that controversies could arise in discussions about granting public land for the erecting of a statue of a prominent citizen (*Dig.* 50.10.5).

It would be useful to know just how often the typical curia met. Although the evidence does not provide a clear picture, it is worth considering some indirect evidence on the matter. One question is the availability of the decurions to attend regular meetings. The decurions had far fewer official obligations that would keep them away from their hometown than, say, some Roman senators had with respect to their role in the imperial administration. We are also told in Chapter 91 of the *Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae* that decurions had to reside within their hometown or its surrounding territory. It therefore seems plausible that the council could count on most decurions being in or around the town for most of the year. The contents of the municipal statutes also seem to be informative here. Both the wide range of issues that required the curia’s attention and the demand for a quorum point to regular sessions, since it is difficult to envision that single, infrequent sessions could accommodate such a variety of different tasks.27

The Roman senate conceivably offers an analogy, though we must keep in mind that the volume of business demanding its attention made its workload unique. Talbert’s reconstruction of the frequency of sessions under the Principate suggests a busy calendar consisting of both fixed and special meetings and certain sessions that carried over into subsequent days.28 Even if the practicalities of municipal administration did not demand such frequent meetings of the council of decurions, we should not discount the symbolic and social aspect regular meetings may have held for gatherings of the decurions. As the leading social and political body of their town, it must have been important for them to be seen to meet and keep close tabs on public business.29 There was probably also a social dimension to consider here. Regular meetings would

---

27 Cf. Talbert 1984: 189-95 on the length of sessions in the Roman senate, which under normal circumstances probably lasted between six and eight hours, with periodic breaks built in. Talbert’s reconstruction provides useful insights into how the different tasks on the agenda may have fit into the timeline of the sessions.

28 Talbert 1984: 200-16.

29 At least some of their work, after all, was spent in performing symbolic actions, such as dispensing honors, approving dedications, and the like.
have provided the decurions with an occasion for conviviality among their fellow elite. Although the evidence does not permit any precise estimate, it seems reasonable that the typical council met at least once per week.

These sessions in the curia demanded some level of support staff. For example, it is easy to envision the need to review documents such as land and revenue records, organize citizens for local elections, and examine public contracts. Preserved decrees demonstrate the important role a town’s scribes played in these sessions. Not only were they responsible for keeping minutes of the sessions, but they were also required to retrieve necessary records as directed and to produce copies of decisions for the archives following votes in the council. A good example is a decree by the ordo of Caere in the year 113 CE (CIL XI 3614), quoted in part on a building inscription for a meeting-house of the local Augustales. Its proem records that the text had been copied from an official version of a decree (descriptum et recognitum) kept in an archive that contained the daily minutes from meetings of the curia (commentarium cottidianum municipi). Much of this scribal work must have been handled not by municipal slaves, but by the apparitorial scribae attending to the duovirs. These functionaries occupied an important position in the state administration in Rome as well as in towns throughout Italy and the provinces, and their elevated social status is illustrated by the scribes, who sat atop the apparitorial hierarchy. Yet municipal slaves themselves surely played some complementary role as well. Weiss remarks that the municipal slave tabularii could have performed less technical duties, such as retrieving requested materials, though there is some evidence to suggest their role also in copying texts in the public archives.

---

30 See Dig. 50.8.2.2 (Ulpian), Lex Malacitana 51-9 and Lex Irnitana 60, and Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae 69, respectively, on these topics.
31 Sherk 1970: 46-8 no. 51, 65; Papi 2000: 138-9; Parma 2012: 230-6. This document has drawn scholars’ attention not only for the issues it raises about the town council’s internal management of public land and taxes, but also for the role the curator rei publicae Curiatius Cosanus, who was evidently a former decurion of the town, played in giving his approval. See Eck 1979: 209-10.
32 The second of the two decrees passed by the council of Pisae establishing honors for Augustus’ deceased grandsons (CIL XI 1421) concludes with a reference to the process by which a scriba publicus would deposit the original text (on papyrus or another medium) in the town’s archives: ...ea omnia quae supra scripta sunt ex decret(o) / nos[tro]...per scribam pu/b[a]c[um i]n tabulas publicas referenda curren / censuer(e) (ll. 58-60). On this document, see below, pp. 66-7.
33 Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae 62; cf. Lex Irnitana 73. See discussion in Purcell 1983: 154-61; and David 2008: 391-404. The scribae show the greatest success in advancement to the municipal elite, either themselves or their sons.
34 Weiss 2004: 70-84. Rodríguez Neila 1991-92: 145-74 fleshed out our picture of the range of work the typical municipal archives managed. An inscription from the sanctuary of Zeus near the modern village of Dereköy in northwestern Turkey may offer a good example of how the municipal slaves fit into the operations of the tabularium.
A third area of competence that the municipal evidence ascribes to the magistrates consisted of diplomatic duties. It was necessary on occasion for Roman towns to engage in official communications with neighboring towns, the emperor and other Roman authorities, and potential patrons. In this instance, the *ordo* typically enlisted decurions to undertake diplomatic missions (*legationes*). This duty is outlined in three of the municipal statutes, the first-century BCE *Tabula Heracleensis* (ll. 142-156, intended to deliver local census records to Rome), the *Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae* (92, prescriptions on fulfilling this same task), and the *Lex Irnitana* (F-I, a general overview of the system for selecting representatives of the town). Such activities are also found in other evidence. The *ordo* of Peltuinum targeted the wife of a Roman senator as patroness of their town, and the current *aediles quinquennales* and two *primores viri ordinis nostrae* were dispatched to deliver a bronze plaque and invitation to the woman (*tabula patronatus*; *CIL* IX 3429). 35 The municipal councils appear at times to have spent freely on these missions. For example, Pliny complained to Trajan that the council of Byzantium had fallen into the habit of annually drawing excessive sums from the public treasury to send representatives to greet the emperor (12,000 *HS*) and the governor of Moesia (3000 *HS*). 36

Although the sources do not divulge who accompanied these emissaries, one can surmise that such missions would have required porters, bodyguards, and scribes to assist the town’s delegation. When magistrates were dispatched on these missions, their staff of apparitors probably served many of these functions. Yet when decurions not currently holding office were sent, it is possible to envision these functions being assigned to the *familia publica*. It is also true that both current magistrates and decurions could have brought along their own retinue of private slaves and freedmen to assist them.

Municipal magistrates also seem to have spent a substantial amount of time in a fourth area of work, judicial proceedings. The duovirs were the chief administrators of justice in their town, frequently bearing the title *iure dicundo*. 37 In general, the statutes devote much space to the

---

35 Sherk 1970: 27, no. 20. The potential patroness was *Nummia Varia c(larissima) f(eminam) sacerdos Veneris Felicis*.

36 Pliny Ep. 10.43-44.

37 In some towns, the aediles also bore this title (e.g., *PomPIn* 76 from Pompeii). *Lex Irnitana* 19 and 84 also ascribe a minor judicial role to the aediles. See González and Crawford 1986: 201-2.
numerous offenses that could trigger court trials and the procedures involved in carrying out these trials.\(^{38}\) These activities required both clerical and scribal work, from either the magistrates’ apparitors or from the municipal slaves. One intriguing example is an honorific inscription from Verona, in which the *apparitores et limocincti* (municipal slaves who wore the *limus*) commemorated a former *IIIvir iure dicundo* by referring to their role in his *tribunal* (*CIL V* 3401).\(^{39}\)

An important corollary to this discussion has to do with the value limits of lawsuits stipulated in the municipal statutes. Chapters 21-22 of the Veleian copy of the *Lex Gallia Cisalpina*, dated to the mid-first century BCE, ascribed to *Iiviri*, *IIIiviri*, and *praefecti* jurisdiction over private lawsuits up to 15,000 HS, while Clause A of the Este fragment of the same law gave to a municipal *iudex* power over suits worth up to 10,000 HS.\(^{40}\) Yet in *Lex Irnitana* 19, issued under the Flavians, the value-limit is set at just 1000 HS. Scholars have attributed this discrepancy to the fact that in the intervening century between the late-Republican and Flavian municipal laws, Roman authorities had become increasingly interested in intervening in local jurisdiction, with imperial agents playing a greater role in Italy and the provincial governor playing a similar role in the provinces.\(^{41}\) The outcome of such restrictions meant, of course, that higher-value lawsuits were taken away local jurisdiction and assigned to provincial or imperial agents.

The fifth area of competence that can be discerned is the supervision of construction projects, maintenance of local infrastructure, and managing the environmental resources of the town. These functions fell primarily to the municipal aediles. For example, these magistrates had to ensure the water supply, maintain local stretches of roads, and manage the local grain supply.\(^{42}\) They were also in charge of public building or repair projects.\(^{43}\) These tasks clearly demanded a substantial labor force, as well as administrative and technical assistance. While the

---

\(^{38}\) See, for example, Rodger 1991: 74-90.

\(^{39}\) Weiss 2004: 30-4. *CIL* V 3401: *honori / M(arii) Gavi M(arii) f(iliii) / Poh(lilia) Squilliani / eq(uo) pub(lico), IIIiviri(i) i(ure) dicundo, / IIIiviri(i) a(edilicia) p(otestate), v(iri) b(onii), / curator(i) Vicetinorum, / apparitores et / limocincti / tribunalis eius.*


\(^{42}\) *Lex Irnitana* 19, 82.

\(^{43}\) *Lex Irnitana* 83.
aediles had a staff of both apparitors and municipal slaves, another sources of manpower were also available. These will be discussed below.

A sixth area of administrative focus known from the sources on municipal government is the management of the public treasury. The magistrates and decurions had to deal with a wide range of issues of spending and collecting public money. To cite just a few examples from the *Lex Irnitana*, the duovirs or aediles were responsible for letting out contracts for various activities (Chh. 63, 83), supervising the sale or rental of public land (Ch. 64), and, under their judicial competence, levying a variety of fines for numerous offenses (e.g., Ch. 67). These activities imply a busy public treasury. The apparitorial scribes seem to have played some role in managing funds, as is indicated by the fact that they were required to swear an oath to deal faithfully with public money. In addition, many of the municipal slaves whose titles are known were attached to their town’s treasury. In the wax tablets from the archives of L. Caecilius Iucundus, moreover, two different municipal slaves of Pompeii are observed issuing receipts for the fees they collected from Iucundus for his lease of the colony’s property (*CIL* IV 3340, 139, 141-8, 151). Several slaves also held the position of *arcarius* or *dispensator* working with public money, including a *disp(ensator) arc(a)e summar(um)* of Asculum Picenum (*CIL* IX 5177) and an *arcarius* assigned to the *ratio alimentaria* in Sipontum (*CIL* IX 699).

*Municipal administration in decreta decurionum*

So far the focus of this chapter has been on analyzing sources that are conducive to reconstructing a theoretical picture of municipal administration. It is now time to weigh these ideas against a focused study of epigraphic evidence that offers the best chance to grasp the inner workings of municipal government in practice.

The evidence consists of sets of municipal decrees from six towns in Italy that, according to demographic and territorial studies by Luuk de Ligt, represent small-, medium-, and large-sized towns. The large towns are Ostia and Pompeii in Region I, and Brixia in Region X; the medium town is Praeneste in Region I; and the small towns are Canusium in Region II and Sentinum in Region VI. Several factors led to the selection of these sites. For one, municipal

---

44 *Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iulieae* 62; *Lex Irnitana* 19.
45 *Lex Irnitana* 73.
47 On the work of the municipal slaves in the town treasury, see Silvestrini 2005: 541-54.
48 On estimates of the town sizes, see Appendices I-II in de Ligt 2012: 289-303, 304-36.
slaves or freedmen are attested in each of these towns. The sites also present a relatively wide geographical range of towns in Italy, covering four different regions, and there is a fairly clear understanding of their demography and territorial size. Above all, the epigraphic patrimony of each town is sufficient to undertake this study. The decrees were reproduced in honorific inscriptions, building inscriptions, or funerary epitaphs commissioned by private individuals.⁴⁹

This material was collected by examining the sections in the regional volumes of CIL corresponding to each town. The result is a total of 300 decrees for analysis, subdivided as follows: 106 from Ostia (CIL XIV; XIV, Suppl. Ost.); 78 from Pompeii (CIL IV; X, 1); 49 from Brixia (CIL V, 1); 41 from Praeneste (CIL XIV); nineteen from Canusium (CIL IX); and seven from Sentinum (CIL XI, 2, f. 1).⁵⁰

The methodology for collecting the decrees follows the one Camodeca employed in his study of the decrees by the town councils of Campania.⁵¹ First, common expressions used to denote the actions by the ordo were d(ecreto) d(ecurionum), d(ecurionum) s(ententia), s(enatus) s(ententia), ex s(enatus) c(onsulto), and ex d(ecurionum) c(onsulto). The persons inscribing the decrees included such authorizations as proof that the council passed the measure in question. Second, when the decurions voted to assign public land to someone for the erection of a statue or funerary monument, the preferred phrase was l(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum), or a slight variation of this formula. A third method of referring to an official decree is a citation of the town or its inhabitants, through the popular assembly, as the agent authorizing an act. This was often conveyed in the nominative or ablative forms of the following terms: populus, cives, or coloni; municipium, colonia, or res publica (including the use a town’s formal title); or an adjectival term for the townspeople, for example, Brixiani. Caldelli has rightly pointed out that even in inscriptions where only the consent of the popular assembly is cited (e.g., populus, cives, coloni), this was surely a perfunctory endorsement of a resolution already passed in the curia.⁵²

The fourth type of reference that is considered here is arbitratu, iussu, or permissu along with a reference to the ordo or to an individual magistrate’s name in the genitive case. Finally, the term publice or a reference to the use of pecunia publica signals that the corresponding act derived from the ordo, and sometimes also the assembly.

⁵⁰ These inscriptions are generally dated from the first century BCE to the third century CE.
The results of this survey reveal municipal decrees of seven kinds, categorized as shown in the following table.

Table II.1 Decrees by the municipal council of decurions of six select towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adlection</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votive offerings</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorific dedication to emperor, local patron, vel sim.</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant of public land</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public building projects</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorization of munera, banquets, vel sim.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorizing alimenta program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first category consists of decrees authorizing adlection to the decurionate, a magistracy, or a public priesthood, and authorizing adlection to the *Augustales or other local associations. In the second set are decrees authorizing votive offerings or dedications to public deities. The third category contains the largest number of decrees, those that record the council’s approval of dedications to the emperor or members of the imperial family, to local patrons, to prominent local privati, and to imperial and municipal officials. These include honors like a statue, a public funeral, or the ornamenta decurionalia. The fourth category consists of decrees by which the ordo assigned public land to a private individual or association to use for a statue, sepulcher, votive offering, or a building project, as indicated by the inclusion of the formula *l(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)*. These were particularly important measures, since they entailed the potential loss of the solarium gained from that land. This was a tax paid for the temporary or long-term use of public land. The fifth category of decrees includes ten that approved public building or repair projects benefitting the town’s infrastructure. In the sixth set are decrees that authorized local citizens to stage games or public banquets. Finally, one decree from Canusium sanctioned the colony’s alimenta program.

---

53 Ostia: 27; Pompeii: 2; Brixia: 3; Praeneste: 3; Canusium: 0; Sentinum: 1. The total for Ostia excludes the over seventy adlections into the local *Augustales listed in the fragments of the fasti Augustalium (CIL XIV 4562, 1-4, 6-8, 11).
54 Ostia: 3; Pompeii: 26; Brixia: 0; Praeneste: 0; Canusium: 0; Sentinum: 0.
55 Ostia: 44; Pompeii: 21; Brixia: 25; Praeneste: 18; Canusium: 12; Sentinum: 3.
56 Ostia: 29; Pompeii: 22; Brixia: 19; Praeneste: 18; Canusium: 2; Sentinum: 3.
57 Caldelli 2008: 278-84.
58 Ostia: 3; Pompeii: 2; Brixia: 2; Praeneste: 2; Canusium: 1; Sentinum: 0.
59 Ostia: 0; Pompeii: 5 (including dipinti); Brixia: 0; Praeneste: 0; Canusium: 3; Sentinum: 0.
The administrative activities observed in the municipal decrees primarily reflect the *ordo*’s supervisory role in distributing local honors and utilizing public land and money. In fact, official recognition for public honors constitute around 40% of all the decrees of which we are informed, and another one-fifth pertain to approving adlections or votive offerings to deities. It is also the case that nearly one-third of the decrees granted the use of public land for a variety of reasons. The analysis shows an Italian urban administration active in various spheres. Distributing honors and allotting public land and money required the services of clerical and accounting municipal slaves, who are well documented in the evidence for slave positions. Likewise, the reference to a local *alimenta* program matches other evidence of municipal slaves’ management of these programs alongside the quaestors or other magistrates. The public building projects referred to in ten decrees suggests some need for slaves working under the direction of the local aedile, while the staging of games and banquets also demanded logistical work performed by the administration’s slaves. Finally, at least some of the decrees authorizing cultic activities involved public sacrifices, and municipal slaves were needed to assist the magistrates in this context.

It is also important to bring into this discussion Camodeca’s observation regarding the activities of the *ordo decurionum* in towns in Campania. He argued that the nature of the publication and preservation of municipal *decreta* and *acta* means that the vast majority of the day-to-day activities of the council and magistrates are lost to us. After voting on a decree, a small committee of decurions, assisted by a scribe, composed an official copy to place in the archives. This process is reflected in the copy of two well-known decrees of the council of Pisae establishing rituals in honor of Augustus’ deceased grandsons (*CIL* XI 1420, 1421). The later text mentions twelve men, likely decurions, who helped prepare the document (*scribendo adfuerunt*), and concludes with a prescription that the quaestors and a *scriba publicus* enter the

---

60 Weiss 2004: 37-59 (on the municipal treasury), 70-84 (on the municipal archives).
61 Weiss 2004: 92-8. *Lex Irnitana* 20 assigns municipal slaves to the staff of each of the quaestors.
62 Weiss 2004: 128-34. *Lex Irnitana* 19 enumerates the duties of the aediles, and attaches to each of them a retinue of municipal slaves (*servos communes municipum eius municipii qui is appareant limo cinctos*).
64 Camodeca 2003: 173-86.
65 Marotta D’Agata 1980: 21-3; Segenni 2011: 20-3. Rowe 2002: 102-19 notes that the decree was issued to reaffirm the town’s long-standing loyalty to the Julii, in the earlier decree (for Lucius, XI 1420) by following an official honorific decree issued by the Roman senate, and in the later one (for Gaius, XI 1421) by spontaneously declaring honors through a municipal decree. Both texts seem to have imitated the format and language of honorific decrees of the Roman senate.
decree into the public archives as soon as possible. The official decrees tended to be copied on velum or papyrus or perhaps wooden slats, perishable material that has not survived. Consequently, nearly all of the extant decrees were preserved because private individuals borrowed official copies from the archive and had them inscribed in whole or in part on personal stone monuments. This explanation accounts for the preponderance of honorific decrees, adlection records, and so on. Such decrees were naturally those that private individuals interested in self-aggrandizement chose to inscribe on an epitaph or statue base. Our overall picture of the decrees is thus distorted, though a small group of more unusual ones signal a wide range of administrative activities.

There are certainly some aspects of the work the familia may have performed that remain ambiguous and would add an additional need for slaves. For example, many towns owned land in the hinterland outside the civic center, and such estates had to be managed. Once in a while, we are informed of a municipal slave or freedman who held the post of saltuarius, presumably a caretaker of a piece of land. A good example comes from an epitaph from Carsulae in Umbria (AE 2012, 466).

\[ D(is) \ M(anibus). / Primitiv(u)s \ p(ublicus) / saltuarius \ Car(sulanorum) / Quint(iae) R[e]stitu/tae Car(sulanorum) / b(ene) m(erenti). \]

To the departed spirits. Primitivus, municipal (slave) saltuarius of the Carsulani, (set up) this epitaph for the well-deserving Quint(ia) R[e]stituta (freedwoman) of the Carsulani.

Other towns in Italy seem to have maintained territories further abroad, from which they could draw revenue from local taxes. The northern towns of Luca and Placentia are named as landholders in neighboring Veleia in the tablet recording Trajan’s alimenta program there (CIL 66).

---

66 The wooden slats may have resembled those discovered along Hadrian’s Wall and in London (cf. Tomlin 2016).
68 Roscini 2013: 445-50 no. 4. The epitaph dates the epitaph to the second or early third century on paleographical grounds, and notes the large open territory around Carsulae that the town may have controlled and a saltuarius like Primitivus could have managed.
69 Roscini 2013: 447-8 argues that the first name given for the female dedicatee, QUINT., should be read as the cognomen Quinta instead of the gentilicium Quintia. While she is correct that some municipal slaves bore two cognomina, the second cognomen normally designated previous ownership and took the adjectival form ending in -ianus (e.g., AE 1939, 148, Ostia: Phileros publicus Cartilianus). Roscini also seems to overlook the evidence from other Italian towns for manumitted municipal slaves who took the gentilicium of the magistrate who enacted their manumission, instead of one derived from the town or the gentilicium Publicius/Publicia (e.g., ILS 6565, Asculum Picenum: M. Valerius col. l. Verna). I have categorized this woman as a municipal freedwoman named Quint(ia) R[e]stituta (liberta) Car(sulanorum). For the gentilicium Quintius/Quintia, see Solin and Salomies 1988: 153.
Capua received land on Crete during the triumviral period, and a remarkable first- or early second-century Capuan inscription records that a municipal slave reached the position of *tabularius* in that city, while his father remained an *arcarius* in the estate holding on Crete (*CIL* X 3938).

*Alternative sources of manpower*

Another issue that must be discussed in this analysis of the needs of Roman municipal administration is the availability of manpower other than the *familia publica* for carrying out the work described above. In this context belong the aforementioned local apparitors, a group that features prominently in the municipal statutes. The municipal statute from the Roman colony at Urso in Hispania Baetica, called *Colonia Genetiva Iulia*, prescribes that each duovir was to receive a retinue of two lictors, one *accensus*, two scribes, two *viatores*, one *librarius*, one *praeco*, one *haruspex*, and one *tibicen* (Ch. 62). The following chapter of the statute assigns to each aedile one scribe, one *praeco*, one *haruspex*, one *tibicen*, and four municipal slaves (Ch. 63). The importance of these *apparitores* is reflected by the stipulation that they had to be free local citizens (*coloni*), and by the fact that they had a high pay-grade and received exemptions from certain civic obligations. The *Lex Irnitana* contains a requirement that the *scribae publici* who would be handling public money take the same oath as the magistrates (Ch. 73). Some of these *apparitores* in the municipal context may have been the private freedmen of the current magistrates, which seems to have been one pattern of appointment until the second century when the apparitorial *decuriae* became more formalized with the development of a standard *cursus honorum*. The competences signaled by the titles of these *apparitores* imply potentially wide-ranging functions, especially in assisting the local magistrates in their administrative and cultic duties.

A second type of manpower was the local citizenry itself. On the one hand, *Lex Irnitana* 83 states that whenever the council of decurions voted to undertake a public building project,

---

71 *CIL* X 3938: *Alexander / colon(iae) tab(ularius) / Privati arc(arii) / Cretae f(ilius)*. See Weiss 2004: 24-7, 46-7; and Chioffi 2011: 31-2 no. 29. See also a boundary dispute between a Capuan colony and the colony at Knossos that was settled under Domitian’s procurator in 84 CE and inscribed on a *cippus* (*AE* 1969/70 635 = *ILGR* 3).
73 Cf. *Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae* 81.
74 Purcell 1983: 138-42, whose focus is on the Roman state, where the apparitorial colleges show the most complexity; Di Stefano Manzella 2000: 223-43.
every *municeps* and *incola* between the ages of 15 and 60 owed five days of work (*operae*) each year.\(^75\) There were exemptions for some citizens, and the local elite could give funds in place of their labor.\(^76\) On the other hand, another form of local labor that is often overlooked in this context consisted of private construction firms. As has been noted above, managing public building projects was one of the principal functions of the *ordo decurionum*. The municipal aediles were put in charge of the logistics of such projects.\(^77\) Yet references in juridical sources and epigraphic evidence suggest that it was probably just as common for the municipal administration to let out contracts so that private firms could take on public building projects. For one thing, builders had a strong presence in every Roman town. This workforce can be identified through the various local associations (e.g., *fabri*, *fabri tignarii*), and through individual epitaphs which cite a range of general and skilled occupations such as builder or carpenter (*faber*), stonecutter (*lapidarius*), marble mason (*marmorarius*), and so on.\(^78\) Larger firms can also be inferred from this evidence. Kehoe points out that the construction trade was one of the most important wage-earning opportunities available to sub-elite Romans.\(^79\) A significant part of the workforce of these companies probably consisted of the private freedmen and slaves of owners and managers.\(^80\)

The process whereby the council could let out contracts was covered under the Roman law on *locatio*.\(^81\) In such a scenario, the town itself became the lessor (*locator*) and the building company the contractor (*conductor* or *redemptor*). The municipal statutes address the letting out of contracts for some issues, but they lack a direct reference to contracting for public building projects.\(^82\) Nonetheless, such a process can be inferred. In many ways, it would have made more sense for the town administration to contract public building projects rather than maintain their own crews of workmen, so long as the administration retained a degree of control over the


\(^{76}\) Cf. Pliny *Ep.* 10.37, 39, commenting on both new decurions’ *summa honoraria* and private liturgies.

\(^{77}\) *Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae* 98; *Lex Irnitana* 83.


\(^{79}\) Kehoe 2012: 123-5.

\(^{80}\) Cf. Brunt 1980: 86-93, on the social status of laborers on public projects in Rome; and DeLaine 1997: 175-94, who enumerates the divisions of labor in building firms in the context of a massive project like the Baths of Caracalla in Rome. A *constitutio* of Marcus Aurelius granted to associations the privilege of legally manumitting their slaves. See *Dig.* 40.3.1-2 (Ulpian); and *Dig.* 2.4.10.4 (Ulpian).


\(^{82}\) For example, *Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae* 69 describes the procedure for contracting for the performance of public religious rituals. See also Lamberti 1993: 96-8 on such provisions in the *Lex Irnitana*. 
A well-known contract preserved in a late second-century BCE building inscription from Puteoli offers a rather detailed glimpse at such an arrangement (CIL I² 698 = ILS 5317). The colony’s duovirs played the key role in letting out the contract, giving final approval of the work, and releasing payment to the builders.84

Characterization of municipal administration

Studies of the administration of Roman municipalities sometimes tend to reduce the role it played in civic life.85 The work of municipal government is often simplified as providing basic supervision of public order and juridical issues, collecting of (vectigalia) taxes and managing public expenditures, and controlling the distribution of local honors and patronage. Local administration was often the target of the satirists. Juvenal, for example, ridiculed the petty role played by decurions in towns like Gabii and Fidenae, such as regulating market transactions (Sat. 10.99-102).86 Some members of the municipal elite even held the decurionate in more than one town at the same time, as was the case for M. Aemilius Coelius Coelianus in Mediolanum and Novaria (CIL V 5658). This phenomenon of holding multiple decurionates seems to support the notion that a council seat entailed few substantive functions that took up the decurions’ time.87

Yet less attention is usually paid to what these administrative activities actually entailed, and to the type of support required for carrying them through.88 The analysis above draws out the complexities of municipal administration and makes it possible to comprehend the sort of workforce based in the familia publica that may have been required. Overall, it can be inferred that, within certain boundaries, the decurions maintained a robust administrative reach over their town, even if the apparatus of the administration was limited in scale. These activities demanded a significant level of personnel from the familia, as well as from the alternative sources of

83 The terminology employed in many building inscriptions reflects the role of the municipal magistrates in letting out construction contracts (faciendum curaverunt) and approving the final work (probaverunt). For example, AE 1948, 102, a late first-century BCE building inscription from Hispellum, reads as follows: Q(uintus) Statius P(ubli) f(ilius), / P(ublius) Sufenas T(itii) f(ilius), / IIvir(i) ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) faciun(dum) / coer(averunt), / idemq(ue) pro(baverunt).

84 See Martin 1989: 103, 131; Bodel 2001: 53-5 (who points out that the extant copy of the inscription may be a recarving dating to the early Empire, given the letter-forms and use of Luna marble); and Horster 2015: 522-3. Horster 2001: 123 n. 11 cites this lex as a key example of the autonomy the local administration of Roman colonies enjoyed in such matters as public building projects prior to the Late Republic.


86 Cf. Apuleius Met. 1.24-5.

87 A similar practice can be cited among some *Augustales who held membership in the college of multiple towns, such as M. Atilius Eros, who was a sevir at both Dertona and Libarna in the first century (CIL V 6425).

88 Cf. Talbert 1984: 221-2, on the Roman senate under the Principate.
manpower outlined above. All the same, in most towns a moderately sized *familia* should be assumed. The evidence shows that there were various levels of specialization required for certain positions. Considerable administrative responsibility probably rested in the hands of a small group of skilled senior municipal slaves (and some freedmen), particularly in the financial and clerical spheres, while higher-ranking slaves also filled technical and apparitorial posts. On the other hand, a less skilled section of the *familia* was also essential for performing more menial tasks for which little training was required, and these slaves were probably rarely assigned to a single discrete competence. As a baseline, it can be suggested that approximately twenty municipal slaves were assigned to the staffs of the annual magistrates; four municipal slaves for each duovir, four for each municipal aedile, and two for each municipal quaestor. In addition to this fixed slave personnel, the wider *familia* in smaller towns like Sentinum or Canusium may have brought the total number up to around forty or fifty municipal slaves. Larger towns like Brixia or Pompeii may have demanded closer to 75, while an exceptionally large town like Ostia obviously required more slaves, perhaps as many as 100, to meet the administrative and infrastructural demands. The female municipal slaves and children are not considered in this calculation, and it is unclear how their presence may modify the overall picture of the *familia* in towns of different sizes.

---

89 There were many variables based on the specific infrastructural needs of certain towns. For example, a town with an extensive water supply system, lots of amenities, and extensive territorial holdings beyond its walls obviously would have demanded more municipal slaves. Cf. *Lex Iritana* 78 on the annual assignment of *negotia* to the municipal slaves, a clause that seems to imply that some slaves lacked a specialization.

90 Liebenam 1900: 256-79; Reid 1913: 443-5.

91 *CIL* V 3401, an honorific inscription from Verona, indicates that the senior magistrates there, *quattuorviri iure dicundo* in this case, did possess municipal slaves (*limocincti*) on their personal staff. *Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae* 62 does not assign any municipal slaves to the duovirs at Urso, and the corresponding passage on the duovirs in the *Lex Iritana* at Irni is not preserved. It seems probable they would have had at their disposal at least as many slaves as the aediles.

92 *Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae* 62.

93 *Lex Iritana* 20 stipulates that quaestors were to receive municipal slaves, though the number is not specified. For the sake of this model, we can infer that each quaestor commanded fewer than the duovirs and aediles.

94 These estimates consider a small number of slaves in the higher-level administrative posts like in the treasury (*actor* or *arcarius*). This choice is based on such evidence as the receipts in the Iucundus archive from Pompeii. For example, in the extant tablets the household seems only to have dealt with a single municipal slave name Privatus during the period 55-62 CE (twelve receipts). It is unclear whether Privatus was the only such slave issuing receipts from the municipal treasury or whether he may simply have been responsible for a region of the town where Iucundus operated. See Weiss 2004: 59-69, 197-200. The number of slaves involved in infrastructure and technical and temple positions are much more difficult to estimate.

95 The additional role played by the municipal freedwomen in the *familia publica* will be discussed in Chapter III.
II.2 QUANTIFYING ROMAN MANUMISSION

These estimates of the number of municipal slaves in Roman towns provide a framework for a broader discussion of the evidence for the practice of manumission in the *familia publica*. Ex-slaves were widespread in Roman society, featuring prominently in literary works, juridical writings, and epigraphic evidence. The position of freedmen and the process of manumission that produced them have long been points of fascination for students of Roman social and legal history. The issue of manumission in the *familia publica* is tied to wider studies of this practice among the general population of slaves in the Roman world.

Formal manumission was performed primarily in three ways. The *vindicta* method called for the master and his slave to act out a fictive legal case in front of a magistrate in which a representative of the slave pleaded that he was a free man and the master acquiesced. This was the most public form of manumission. The fact that embedded in the ritual was the assertion that the slave had really always been free and was wrongly enslaved provided a fiction for Roman slave owners to justify manumission.

A second form was *manumissio testamento*. This practice of manumitting slaves in a will was in many ways the easiest, and therefore probably the most popular, form of manumission. Excessive testamentary manumission was the target of one piece of Augustan legislation, the *Lex Fufia Caninia* (2 BCE), while social pressures imposed by other Roman slave owners might also have discouraged the freeing of large numbers of slaves this way.

The third method of manumitting slaves was *manumissio censu*, which was perhaps the earliest form of manumission in Republican Rome, and could of course only occur when the censors were in office. This practice is closely associated with one of the peculiarities of Roman manumission, namely, the freed slave’s acquisition of Roman citizenship. In this process, in fact, the censors simply enrolled the slave as a free citizen, rather than formally granting

---

96 See discussion above, pp. 1-6.
97 Duff 1928: 21-8 is still a useful introduction to the methods of manumission. See also Buckland 1908: 437-551; Treggiari 1969: 162-207; and Mouritsen 2011: 141-205 for a detailed discussion of the types of manumission and the motivations behind them.
98 Dig. 40.2.1-25.
99 Dig. 40.4.1-61. In many cases, the patron’s will included a *fideicommissum* instructing his heir to free the slave after fulfillment of certain obligations (Dig. 40.5.1-56).
100 Mouritsen 2011: 180-5, who describes a series of problems involved with this type of manumission.
101 Gaius Inst. 1.140.
manumission. This form subsided as performance of the census became more intermittent during the Late Republic and under the Principate.\footnote{Many emperors conducted the census, sometimes on multiple occasions during their reign, and fragmentary census records exist from various towns in Roman Egypt from the first to third century CE, which provide some insight into how the census was conducted on the local level during the imperial period (see Bagnall and Frier 1994: 1-30).}

Roman slave owners always had the option of informal manumission as well. Such practices would result in the freed slave’s taking on the status of \textit{Latinus Iunianus}, which provided the slave with juridical freedom and the \textit{ius Latii} while he lived, but stripped him of any testamentary rights at his death.\footnote{According to the \textit{lex Iunia} of 17 or 19 CE (Gaius \textit{Inst.} 1.22-24; 3.55-56). The fifth-century Christian writer Salvian characterized their lot this way: \textit{ut vivant scilicet quasi ingenui et morantur ut servi} (\textit{Eccl.} 3.7.31). Junian Latins could be promoted to full Roman citizenship if they were manumitted again by their patron, this time formally, and were then over 30 years of age (\textit{iteratio}), or if they married a Roman or Latin citizen and produced a child that survived to age one (\textit{anniculi probatio}), or performed an act for which the emperor granted promotion. See also Crook 1967: 43-5.}

Junian Latins constitute an intriguing and problematic category in the study of Roman freedmen, not least because they are so difficult to identify in our sources.\footnote{Weaver 1990: 275-305; López Barja de Quiroga 1998: 133-63; de Ligt and Garnsey 2012: 69-94.} Informal manumission was probably attractive for many reasons, such as dodging the \textit{vicesima} tax on manumission, manumitting slaves below the legal age, including deathbed manumissions of young slaves, avoiding the inconvenience of traveling to find a magistrate to grant formal manumission, and even guaranteeing the master’s access to the Junian Latin’s \textit{peculium} after his death.

Several theories have been advanced to explain what motivated owners to manumit their slaves, and each theory has some bearing on our perception of the scale of the practice. Manumission after long and loyal service may have functioned as both a reward and an incentive to ensure diligent work by younger slaves.\footnote{Fenoaltea 1984: 640-3, 667-8; Bradley 1994: 107-31.} Elite owners of large urban households sometimes may have used manumission to display their generosity to those both inside and outside the household, while owners who freed multiple slaves in their will probably hoped that they would bolster the ranks of mourners in their funeral procession.\footnote{Treggiari 1969: 11-20. This type of elite slave owner probably had little concern over the demographic challenges of sustaining a slave \textit{familia} over time, since they could simply afford to purchase new slaves as needed.} There were also cases where slaves who had accumulated the necessary \textit{peculium} were able to purchase their freedom, a model of
manumission that makes sense from an economic standpoint.\textsuperscript{107} Finally, some owners were occasionally known to free their female slaves in order to marry them.\textsuperscript{108}

One aspect of manumission that has received much attention from Roman historians is the scale of the practice, which is also the theme in this section. No ancient source ever informs us how frequently the Romans manumitted their slaves at any time during the Republic or Principate, nor do juridical and literary discussions of the forms of manumission give any clear indication of what percentage of slaves could expect such an outcome during their lifetime. For their part, there has been no shortage of scholars attempting to quantify the pervasiveness of freedmen in Roman society, in order to get a sense of manumission rates.

\textit{Epigraphic evidence}

As noted above, ex-slaves are ubiquitous in the epigraphic record, at sites all over the Roman Empire. These epigraphic attestations of Roman freedmen constitute invaluable documentary evidence for numerous aspects of their lives. In regard to demographic issues, they demonstrate that ex-slaves comprised a substantial part of the Roman population, especially in the cities. Yet in the same way that literary testimony of the ubiquity of freedmen should be taken with a pinch of salt, epigraphic evidence can also misrepresent demographic realities simply because of the way certain groups in the Roman world practiced the ‘epigraphic habit.’\textsuperscript{109}

As an illustration of this incongruity, Géza Alföldy and James Harper independently studied the ages of death recorded in the epitaphs of slaves and freedmen in and around Rome and found that the typical age of death of both male and female slaves was just under 20, while for freedmen and freedwomen it hovered around age 25. What is more, their samples pointed to the impression that nearly 90\% of all the deceased whose age was approximately 30 years were freed. Each scholar therefore concluded from his analysis that, at least in an urban setting, manumission must have been almost automatic for a slave who reached adulthood, and even more certain at the age prescribed in the \textit{Lex Aelia Sentia} (4 CE).\textsuperscript{110} Alföldy interpreted these

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{107} Mouritsen 2011: 166-80.
\textsuperscript{108} Perry 2013: 54-5.
\textsuperscript{109} For comments on the problems encountered in using epigraphic data to estimate demographic realities of different Roman slave and freedman populations, see Trenggari 1969: 31-6; Wiedemann 1985: 162-3; Harris 1994: 69; Mouritsen 2011: 131-6; and Bruun 2015c: 605-7.
\textsuperscript{110} Alföldy 1972: 97-129, who restated his argument in 1986, adding that frequent manumission was primarily an urban phenomenon. This claim is based on circular reasoning, however, since most of our epigraphic evidence comes from urban centers. J. Harper 1972: 341-2. Weaver 1972: 199-281 arrived at a similar conclusion of near-automatic manumission in the \textit{familia Caesaris}, arguing that the typical practice – at least for slaves in positions in
\end{footnotes}
findings as an indication that slavery was merely a waypoint for most slaves before they would be integrated into free Roman society through manumission.\textsuperscript{111}

These studies provide a case in point about the pitfalls of not applying an analytical approach to the epigraphic evidence. For one thing, it has been estimated that only about one-quarter of all epitaphs record the age of the deceased.\textsuperscript{112} This means that one must assume that the age distribution in this small group of epitaphs reflected both the other three-quarters of deceased persons recorded in epitaphs and the unknown number of persons who left no commemoration at all. It must also be recognized that certain segments of the population, such as men in general, cherished children and youngsters, and young adults show a stronger tendency of displaying ages in their epitaphs. In large part, these were the groups which Alföldy (1972) and J. Harper (1972) studied. Erecting an epitaph was also expensive, and therefore only the most well-off slaves and freedmen were able to leave a mark of their existence. Both features put the demographic details of the vast majority of the servile and ex-slave population out of our grasp, and they make demographic judgments from this evidence alone highly problematic.\textsuperscript{113}

It should also be pointed out that the notion that manumission was an expected outcome has serious consequences for the long-term sustainability of the use of slave labor and the survival of the servile population. On the one hand, if a slave were guaranteed to receive his or her freedom at some point, the motivation for working hard would be removed. On the other hand, if female slaves were being removed in large numbers from the slave population during their reproductive years, the slave population’s capacity to reproduce itself each generation would be at risk. What is clear is that the institution lasted for many centuries with no signs of any serious demographic crisis.\textsuperscript{114}

\textsuperscript{111} Alföldy 1972; 1986. His thesis has been widely criticized, for example, by Wiedemann 1985: 162-3, 169-74; and Mouritsen 2011: 131-6.
\textsuperscript{112} Hopkins 1987: 113.
\textsuperscript{113} Mouritsen 2011: 131-6.
\textsuperscript{114} Scheidel 1997: 159-60; and Scheidel 2005a: 64-71; contra Lo Cascio 2002: 62, who thinks a combination of less access to slaves from outside the borders of the Empire and the inability of natural reproduction in slave \textit{familiae} to keep up the numbers must have resulted in a significant decline in the slave population during the three centuries of the Principate. He also advocates the ‘high counter’ argument that the population of Roman Italy amounted to around 12-14 million in the early Principate with as many as 2.5 million slaves.
Finally, concerning inferences about the dominance of freedmen in the population in general, it is not a necessary corollary that the epigraphic evidence reflected the demographic realities in Roman cities. Although freedmen were so pervasive in certain spheres of the epigraphic medium, it does not follow that they vastly or even slightly outnumbered the freeborn sub-elite population, the plebs ingenua, many of whom seem not to have participated much in epigraphic commemoration.\textsuperscript{115}

Demographic modeling

A third method for studying Roman manumission is based on demographic modeling of the number of slaves and freedmen in the Roman population through increasingly sophisticated mathematical calculations. Starting from hypotheses about the size of the total population of Italy and the Roman Empire, demographers seek to estimate the proportion of slaves in the population based on various factors, and then to calculate what level of manumission the slave system could bear while still sustaining itself. More recently, Roman demographic studies have begun to focus on the means of replacing slaves, a topic that has engendered lively debate on how Roman slave-owners met this challenge. The most intense discussion revolves around the role of natural reproduction in sustaining slave populations, an issue that will be discussed below.\textsuperscript{116} This demographic approach to Roman manumission depends on fundamental assumptions about the size of the Roman population in general, and the long-running debate between the ‘low counters’ and ‘high counters’ has loomed large in this context.\textsuperscript{117}


\textsuperscript{117} These two groups attempt to explain the increases in population reported between Polybius’ count of 770,000 men of military age in Italy in 225 BCE (2.24), the 86 BCE and 70/69 BCE census counts of Roman citizens (463,000 and 910,000; Phlegon \textit{FGrHist} 257, fr. 12.6; Livy \textit{Per.} 98), and finally the Augustan census figure for Italy in 28 BE of 4,063,000 (\textit{RG} 8). Fundamentally, the ‘low counters’ argue that Augustus changed the method of conducting the census by including women and children in the count (\textit{civium capita}), thereby minimizing the supposed population increase of the previous two centuries. They also argue for a decrease in the citizen population after the Hannibalic War, a larger proportion of slaves in the population and higher manumission rates. See, for example, Beloch 1886: 507 (2 million slaves in a total population of 5.5-6 million in Italy, or 33-36%); Brunt 1971: 121-5 (3 million slaves in a total population of 7.5 million in Italy, or 40%); Hopkins 1978: 68-9 (c. 30%); and Scheidel 1997: 156-69. On a high rate of manumission, see, for example, Brunt 1971: 62, 69-74, 376-82, who proposed that many owners must have freed their slaves in order to gain a larger portion of the congiaria in the late Republic. These estimates also ascribe a high concentration of the freed population to Rome itself and other large cities (e.g., Treggiari 1969: 35-6, discussing the late Republic and early Empire).

The ‘high counters’ maintain that Augustus continued the old Republican practice of counting only adult male citizens, which means that the report of 4 million simply forms a basis from which the ‘high counters’ can expand their estimates of the overall population by hypothesizing the size of other demographic categories such as
Hypotheses of manumission rates based on these models have varied, but currently the most widely accepted theory prefers a low estimate, revising the slave population in Italy to approximately 1.5 million and suggesting that around 10% for slaves aged 25-30 could expect manumission, with some fluctuation in the rates among other age groups of slaves. On the basis of the proposed total population in Italy of 6 million argued by the ‘low counters,’ this manumission rate would imply that freedmen comprised a far lower proportion of the total population of Italy in the early Principate. This low estimate stands in stark contrast to the idea of frequent manumission emerging from literary sources and some analyses of epitaphs.

It may be useful to add to this discussion two promising sets of evidence of manumission rates observed in a more defined demographic group. The first consists of the Egyptian census declarations, which are particularly useful since they provide a more random sampling of a local servile population than the epigraphic evidence. These declarations came from private households spread across urban centers and villages primarily in Middle Egypt and date from the

---

117 Slaves, Roman citizens living outside Italy, and the population of the provinces pose equally tricky problems for these demographic models. The ‘low counters’ fix the total population of Italy at 5-8 million in the early Principate, while the ‘high counters’ propose a total of 12-14 million inhabitants. Prominent ‘high-counters’ include Frank (1924); Wiseman (1969); Lo Cascio (1994; 2001), Harris (1980; 1999), and Morley (1996). Scheidel 2005a: 64-71; and Scheidel 2011: 288-92. The hypothetical rate increases to 33-55% for slaves starting in their thirties. By reexamining the needs of slaves in the urban and rural sectors, he argues that less agricultural slaves were required than is normally assumed, proposing a maximum 750,000 rural slaves working alongside the free(d) dependent workforce. He then calculates that there were approximately 600,000 urban slaves in Italy, by taking account of the likely slave-owning patterns of senators, equestrians, and municipal decurions, a portion of slaves for sub-equestrian owners based on the evidence for household slaves in the Egyptian census returns, and a small amount from the familia Caesaris and municipal slaves. In all, Scheidel suggests that the total slave population in Italy probably remained constant through the Principate at between 1 and 1.5 million slaves, or about 15-25% of the overall population of 6 million. He ventures a further estimate that only about 10% of the provincial population was made up of slaves. Wiedemann 1985: 163-7 rightly points out that as each slave reached a new age-bracket, his or her chances of manumission seem to have increased. A low rate of manumission is essential to Scheidel’s (and others’) argument that natural reproduction was the primary means of sustaining the Roman slave population, accounting for as much as 80% (1999: 112-14).

118 The ‘low count’ is now generally preferable as more representative of the real ancient population, mostly because, as de Ligt points out, the position adopted by the ‘high counters’ contradicts many of the widely accepted theories of Roman social, political, and economic structures during the late Republic and early Empire (2012: 5-10). He points out, for example, that the carrying capacity of Italian agricultural land and the Roman economic system as we understand it would hardly have been able to feed a population of nearly 14 million inhabitants, while that large a population would make rates of military participation far too low in light of our perception of the Roman military ethos.

119 Bagnall and Frier 1994: 40-52, who discuss the overall usefulness of the census returns for demographic inquiries in this part of Egypt, despite such problems as the incompleteness of individual census sets, possible inaccuracies in declarations or recording, and the fact that nearly three-quarters of the documents come from the same small area of Middle Egypt, undermining their usefulness for generalizing about Roman Egypt as a whole.
early first to the mid-third century CE. These documents reveal that slaves comprised around 11% of the aggregate population, with a higher concentration in the district-capitals (c. 14%) and a lower presence in villages and rural areas (c. 8%). It is possible to calculate a Crude Manumission Rate derived from the total number of slaves (102 = 34 servi and 68 servae) and ex-slaves (21 = 9 liberti and 12 libertae) registered with an explicit status in the census returns. This calculation suggests what percentage of the ‘servile’ population was freed at any given time. The results show an overall rate of manumission of 17% (projected 170.73 freedmen/freedwomen per 1000 slaves in the total servile population at any given moment), with a rate of c. 21% among the male servile population (209.30 per 1000) compared to 15% among the female servile population (150 per 1000). The overall manumission rate in the urban context is c. 18% (N = 13), and in the rural villages 16% (N = 8). These are useful results, but it is important to recognize that the demography of Egypt may have little relevance for Italy.

A second set of often-cited manumission data comes from the columbaria of two elite Roman households, the Statilii Tauri and Volusii Saturnini. According to a small sample size of household members whose status and age can be determined, the manumission rates in the two families may have been substantially higher than Walter Scheidel’s most recent estimates. Among the Volusii, the proportion of ex-slaves in the age groups of 21-30 and 31-40 was 57% (N = 4) and 33% (N = 2), respectively, and among the Statilii, c. 39% (N = 7) and c. 46% (N = 7), respectively. Female slaves appear to have been manumitted at an even higher rate overall, 56%

121 Hombert and Préaux 1952 and Bagnall and Frier 1994 are the standard treatments of these census returns.
122 Bagnall and Frier 1994: 70-1 point out that instead of large rural estates being worked by slaves in this part of Egypt, tenancy farming and wage-labor by free(d) persons is more prevalent in this sample.
123 The figures quoted here are taken from Bagnall and Frier 1994: passim. For this calculation, it can be assumed that freedmen or freedwomen counted as ‘non-kin lodgers’ in the recorded households were either ex-slaves of that household still living with their patron or at least were ex-slaves from the community or surrounding area. This method of calculation also has drawbacks, since it assumes that this snapshot represents a stable population rather than a high or low point in a fluctuating population and takes the figures in aggregate across a two hundred year period, and it assumes that all the slaves in the towns have been declared.
124 For a discussion of some of the methodological issues involved in using the Egyptian demographic material for comparison with Italy and other parts of the Roman Empire, with a focus on features of urbanization, see Tacoma 2006: 21-68. Cf. Scheidel 2001a: 57-9.
125 CIL VI 6213-6640 (Statilii Tauri) and 7281-7393 (Volusii Saturnini). On these households, see Caldelli and Ricci 1999: 43-68; and Hasegawa 2005: 52-61, who also analyzes the domestic occupations performed by the slaves and ex-slaves (pp. 30-51). Buonocore 1984: 57-188 presents a useful catalogue of the inscriptions recording members of the Volusii household.
126 The fact that these columbaria belonged to elite Roman households may account for these higher rates. Treggiari 1975: 48-77 has argued, for example, that in this elite context the practicalities of slave-owning mattered little, for keeping numerous slaves for very specific and sometimes trivial roles and later manumitting them freely was a display of the wealth and high status of elite owners.
among the Volusii ($N = 56$) and 36% among the Statilii ($N = 64$). Scholars who have analyzed these *columbaria* are quick to remind us how incomplete the picture may be, since ex-slaves were generally more likely than slaves to possess the means to commemorate themselves, and an unknown number of them may have left the household context and been commemorated elsewhere. In reality, the probability of receiving manumission must have been somewhat lower than is suggested by the family members present in this small sample.\textsuperscript{127}

It is important to emphasize that the hypotheses on which the demographic models are formulated have been derived from small numerical sample sizes and based on inferences from perceived demographic outcomes and comparative data from other historical slave-holding societies. These are thus ‘computational’ figures only. Such models, moreover, often must rely on the assumption that a population remained stable over generations, since they cannot easily account for substantial demographic changes over time.

The various research approaches outlined above are instructive for any study of Roman manumission. They demonstrate how different kinds of ancient evidence can be used to reconstruct manumission behaviors and establish the parameters of plausible manumission rates. Yet, for all their usefulness, these studies also alert us to the fact that the ancient evidence inevitably falls short of allowing any firm conclusions to be drawn regarding the demography of Roman slavery and manumission. Perhaps the most that can be stated is that the Romans manumitted their slaves frequently, probably more frequently than any other historical slave-owning society, and they did so for a variety of reasons.\textsuperscript{128}

As with other groups of Roman slaves and freedmen, the demographic record for the municipal *familia publica* and its practice of manumission is limited. An awareness of the shortcomings of the evidence is important for shifting the focus of research away from numerical calculations alone to other methods of gaining a deeper understanding of how manumission was practiced in the *familia*.

\textbf{II.3 DEMOGRAPHY AND THE MUNICIPAL \textit{FAMILIA PUBLICA}}

The demographic picture presented in the epigraphic material allows us to shape our perceptions of how manumission was carried out in the *familia publica*. The epigraphic record of the municipal *familia publica*, containing some 352 self-identified slaves and 158 self-identified

\textsuperscript{127} Mouritsen 2013: 51-3, 65 n. 26.
\textsuperscript{128} Mouritsen 2013: 53.
freedmen and freedwomen, makes it possible to analyze various demographic features of the group, including age-data, sex ratio, and family groups.\textsuperscript{129} Two methodological problems face the scholar in this field of study. First, a shortcoming of this evidence in the context of demographic study is the fact that it is necessary to take material from towns spread across Italy and the provinces. There is simply not enough material from any one town or even one region for a more focused study. Local conditions would have produced variations in the composition and use of the \textit{familia publica} of any given town.\textsuperscript{130} Nonetheless, there is justification for taking the epigraphic material in aggregate. The principles that guided how the municipal council in Italian and provincial towns approached the use of municipal slaves and manumission were probably more systemic than locally based, and the known municipal laws pertaining to the municipal \textit{familia publica} were apparently applicable to all Roman towns.\textsuperscript{131} Moreover, the role of each town’s council as the steward of the municipal slaves, acting on behalf of the local citizenry as impersonal owners, meant that each council independently faced common social and demographic challenges that emerged from maintaining such a servile group.

A second issue that must be noted is that just over one-third of the total number of inscriptions considered in this study consists of non-funerary inscriptions.\textsuperscript{132} Whereas epitaphs offer the best opportunity for observing family groups, the inscribing of a person’s name in a votive offering, in an official document, or as a signatory to a transaction rarely includes a reference to family members and demographic information. Nevertheless, these other genres of inscriptions contain other information of value to this study.

\textit{Sex ratio}

The sex ratio in the epigraphic record of the municipal \textit{familia publica} is the first area where one can begin thinking about how demographic analysis may be useful for advancing hypotheses about manumission practices. As expected, male municipal slaves and freedmen

\textsuperscript{129} These up-to-date figures supplement the material collected by Weiss 2004. I also include in these totals municipal slaves and freedmen whose status is implicit through other factors in their inscriptions.

\textsuperscript{130} It is true, however, that almost 60\% of all the individuals being studied are from a town in Italy, which offers a substantial regionally focused group.

\textsuperscript{131} Galsterer 2006: 42-56. For example, \textit{Lex Irnitana} 72 equates the testamentary rights of the Irnitani over their former municipal slaves with those enjoyed by Italian towns.

\textsuperscript{132} This problem is particularly acute in the eastern provinces, where 72\% of the inscriptions studied are other than sepulchral inscriptions. The material from this region thus provides only a tiny sample of the family groups of local municipal \textit{familiae publicae}. 80
dominate the inscriptions of the *familia* in the towns of Italy and the provinces.\(^{133}\) They account for over 90\% among the slaves, and c. 86\% of the ex-slaves.\(^{134}\)

The imbalance of these figures raises questions about the demographic realities of the *familia publica*. It is often assumed that males would have comprised the bulk of slaves in most private Roman households. This was probably more accurate for rural households than urban ones, and for sure was the case in such industrial contexts as mining and workshops. In an often-cited passage, Columella recommends that the most cost-effective strategy for farming an estate was to maintain crews of male slaves without *coniuges* and families (*RR* 2.12). This theory of male-dominated slave households partially stems from the difficulty of identifying the roles female slaves may have filled for the household, outside the bearing and rearing of slave children.\(^{135}\) Although historians tend to eschew the notion of a slave-breeding mentality in the Roman world, there is plenty of evidence that owners were eager to utilize female slaves for this function.\(^{136}\) For instance, Columella implies that slave women could only expect manumission after they had borne four *vernae* (*RR* 1.8.19). In the Egyptian census returns, moreover, it is evident that owners routinely kept female slaves in slavery until well into their forties, presumably for the sake of obtaining as many children as possible during the period when these women were fertile.\(^{137}\)

Despite the challenges of defining their precise role, the epigraphic record confirms the presence of *servae publicae* in various Roman towns, and along with them some manumitted *libertae publicae*. Weiss has argued convincingly, moreover, that these female slaves were legally part of the *familia*, as suggested by their use of the title *serva publica* and the like.\(^{138}\) The most logical conclusion thus is that these women constituted a substantial segment of the *familia*

---

\(^{133}\) This count includes eighteen implied *servi* and fourteen implied *servae*. The overrepresentation of males in all segments of Roman society is a typical feature of Roman epigraphy. See discussion in Parkin 1992: 6-7, 15-17, 165 n. 43. See also Mouritsen’s (2013: 49-53) discussion of the sex ratios in the *columbaria* of the Statilii Tauri (*CIL* VI 6213-6640) and Volusii Saturnini (*CIL* VI 7281-7393) in Rome.

\(^{134}\) This count includes two implied *liberti* and one implied *liberta*.

\(^{135}\) See, for example, Dumont 1987: 73-5. *Contra* Mouritsen 2013: 59, who cautions against the assumption that the lack of a formal title necessarily meant that the only function of *servae* was for natural reproduction. See Cébeillac-Gervasoni 2009: 23-30 on the possibility that *servae publicae* were involved in banausic and other production activities for their towns. See also Herrmann-Otto 1994: 196-205; Weiss 2004: 24-8; and Cimarosti 2005: 447-56. Hopkins 1978: 139-41; Bradley 1987: 42-64; 1994: 50-1. The most commonly cited theory is that slave owners encouraged family groups among their slaves in order to provide stability. Cf. *Dig.* 5.3.27, where Ulpian states that *ancillae* were not normally acquired in order to breed children; and *Dig.* 33.7.12.7, 31-3, where Ulpian expresses the necessity of keeping slave parents and children together when fulfilling testamentary legacies and *fideicommissa*.

\(^{137}\) Bagnall and Frier 1994: 38-9, 342-3 (Table D).

\(^{138}\) Weiss 2004: 24-8. *Contra* Eder 1980: 6-32 on *familia publica populi Romani*, who argued that a slave only counted as a *servus publicus* when he took up an official competence in the state administration.
publica, and that their apparent paucity can be ascribed to the selective nature of epigraphic commemoration.\textsuperscript{139}

The presence of the servae and their role in natural reproduction speak directly to the capacity of any familia publica to replace its slave population across generations.\textsuperscript{140} In turn, this concern certainly would have impacted on how the ordo decurionum approached the practice of manumission. Slave replacement in the familia also could have been achieved from a variety of sources, including from the targeted purchase of new slaves to fill specific positions, the confiscation of a local citizen’s slaves, testamentary gifts of slaves, and the acquisition of slaves through the euergetism of local benefactors.\textsuperscript{141}

Nevertheless, the long-term necessity of natural reproduction seems both self-evident and is affirmed in some of the evidence, particularly the presence of vernae in the familia publica.\textsuperscript{142} Elisabeth Herrmann-Otto and Weiss are probably correct that the primary function of servae, their negotium, was to produce children for the familia.\textsuperscript{143} In one epitaph, the partner of a municipal serva actually celebrated her as an ancilla publica (CIL XIII 603, Burdigala in Aquitania). Scheidel has recently reiterated his argument for natural reproduction among the general Roman slave population, hypothesizing that it alone may have accounted for nearly 80%
of replacement. Even if this estimate is exaggerated, one is surely on solid ground in concluding that natural reproduction was more important than any of the other methods.

**Age data**

A second area where useful demographic information can be gathered is the age data presented in a selection of the epitaphs. The inclusion of a person’s age at death occurred in perhaps as few as one-quarter of all Roman epitaphs. What is more, dedicators were more likely to inscribe the ages of certain groups of the deceased over others, primarily noting the ages of children, young adults and the exceptionally old. It should also be recognized that since erecting an epitaph entailed significant expense, the wealthiest and most privileged persons of any particular social group are the ones most likely to be captured in such evidence. These common problems connected to the ‘epigraphic habit’ also occur in our set of municipal slaves and freedmen. An age at death was documented for only about 12% of the *familia publica*. This narrow group is comprised primarily of males, and predictably these seem to represent the most privileged slaves in the *familia publica*.

These limitations notwithstanding, there is value in juxtaposing these slaves’ and freedmen’s age at death and status, in order to establish a point of reference for thinking about manumission practices. Age-data can be ascertained for 44 *servi publici*, seven *servae*, five *liberti*, and eight *libertae*.

**Table II.2 Ages at death of municipal slaves**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Status/position</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soter</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL X 3941</td>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>colon. [a] sacris</td>
<td>33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL X 3941</td>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>verna</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

144 Scheidel 1999: 112-14; and Scheidel 2005a: 75. Of all the well-documented historical slave-owning societies, the Antebellum South was the only other example that was able to sustain itself for several generations through natural reproduction alone.

145 Hopkins 1987: 113. For discussion of some of the problems with age data in inscriptions, see Bodel 2001: 35-7; and Edmondson 2015: 561-2.

146 This paucity of information is most pronounced in the female slave population.

147 For instance, this group contains 5 *arcarii* (*CIL* IX 3845, Antinum; *AE* 1978, 194, Brundisium; *CIL* VI 2197, Laurens Lavinium; *CIL* IX 699, Sipontum; *CIL* X 410, Volcei); 1 *dispensator* (*CILA* III 596, Villarodrigo in Tarraconensis); 1 *tabularius* (*CIL* II 5, 1176, Astigi) and 1 *adiutor tabularius* (*CIL* IX 1664, Beneventum); and 2 *vilici* (*CIL* IX 59, Brundisium; *AE* 1985, 314, Petelia).

148 These consist of both persons who give their age and those whose age can be estimated from such information as children’s ages and length of marriage. I have ascribed approximate ages by employing Bagnall and Frier’s 1994: 36-8, 99-102, 145-6, 340-1 (Table C) reconstruction of ages in the Egyptian census returns, including average ages of first marriage, first childbirth, life expectancy, and so on. Cf. Weaver 1972: 105-11 on marriage ages in the *familia Caesaris*. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Original Location</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sedatus</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL X 4334</td>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>col.</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seberianus</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL XIV 2470</td>
<td>Castrimoenium</td>
<td>rei pub. ver.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primio</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL X 3710</td>
<td>Cumae</td>
<td>publicus</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optatus</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL IX 1664</td>
<td>Beneventum</td>
<td>col. adiutor [t]a[b]ul. [of]ici a r[ati]o[n.] lanae</td>
<td>40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermas</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL IX 6281</td>
<td>Beneventum</td>
<td>verna (?)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpus</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL IX 6281</td>
<td>Beneventum</td>
<td>coloniae</td>
<td>45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxim(us)</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL IX 59</td>
<td>Brundisium</td>
<td>publicus vil. Br.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eros</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>AE 1964, 134</td>
<td>Brundisium</td>
<td>pub(l)i(c. victimarius</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescen[s]</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>AE 1978, 194</td>
<td>Brundisium</td>
<td>publ. arca[rius]</td>
<td>22, 23, 24, or 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalis</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL IX 699</td>
<td>Sipontum</td>
<td>col. col. Sip. ser. arkar. qui et ante egit rationem alimentariam sub cura praefector. annis XXXII</td>
<td>52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augurinus</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL IX 699</td>
<td>Sipontum</td>
<td>rei p. ser. verna me(n) sor</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euctus</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>AE 1985, 314</td>
<td>Petelia</td>
<td>publicus Petelinorum vilicus</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolis</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL X 163</td>
<td>Potentia</td>
<td>verna</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nymphicus</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL X 410</td>
<td>Volcei</td>
<td>Volc. ark.</td>
<td>49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesperis</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>CIL IX 3995</td>
<td>Alba Fucens</td>
<td>verna (?)</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montanus</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL IX 3845</td>
<td>Antinum</td>
<td>populi Antinatium Ma[r]sor. ser. arcarius</td>
<td>47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aemilianus</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>AE 1961, 110</td>
<td>Corfinium</td>
<td>rei pub. Corf.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ianuarius</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>AE 1961, 110</td>
<td>Corfinium</td>
<td>municipal slave*</td>
<td>46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trophime</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>AE 1961, 110</td>
<td>Corfinium</td>
<td>municipal slave*</td>
<td>43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>AE 1994, 562</td>
<td>Cures Sabini</td>
<td>act. ser. pub[b.]</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primenia</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>CIL IX 2900</td>
<td>Histonium</td>
<td>[r. p.] Hist.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secunda</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>CIL XI 2656</td>
<td>Saturnia</td>
<td>publica</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primitivus</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL XI 2656</td>
<td>Saturnia</td>
<td>c(oloniae) S(aturniae)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertius</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL XI 2656</td>
<td>Saturnia</td>
<td>c(oloniae) S(aturniae)</td>
<td>45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbicus</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL XI 1751</td>
<td>Volaterra</td>
<td>vilicus publicus</td>
<td>64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellicos</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL V 1127</td>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>colo[nor. A]quileiens.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontiscus</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL V 8190</td>
<td>Parentium</td>
<td>col.</td>
<td>32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogatus</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL X 7903</td>
<td>Tharrus (Sardinia)</td>
<td>ser. pub.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graecinus</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>CIL II² 5, 1176</td>
<td>Astigi (Baetica)</td>
<td>colon. Aug. Fir. ser. tabul.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table II.3 Ages at death of municipal freedmen and freedwomen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Status/position</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicia/Saturnia Fortunata</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>CIL XI 2656</td>
<td>Saturnia</td>
<td>municipal freedwoman</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fortunatus        male    CIL II² 5, 277  Ipolcobulcula (Baetica)  m. m. Ipolcobulculensium ser.  43
Maternus          male    CILA III 596  Villarrodrigo (Tarracoensis)  ser. pub.  70
Paternus          male    CILA III 596  Villarrodrigo (Tarracoensis)  d'i\spensator  97
Hermia            male    CIL II 3181  Valeria (Tarracoensis)  s(ervus) r. p. Val.  47*
Albanus           male    ILGN 375  Alba Helvorum (Gallia Narb.)  ser(v)us publ.  40
Valentinus        male    CIL XII 1755  Valenta (Gallia Narbonensis)  [pu]blicus (or vilicus) c(oloniae) Va(lentinae)  21
Nemetogena        female  CIL XIII 603  Burdigala (Aquitania)  ancilla publica  21*
Batro             male    CIL III 5235  Celeia (Noricum)  Celeian.  70
Servatus          male    CIL III 5235  Celeia (Noricum)  Celeian.  35
Insequens         male    CIL III 5235  Celeia (Noricum)  Celeian.  70
Successus         male    AE 1980, 673  Celeia (Noricum)  Celeianor.  40
Successus         male    AE 1980, 673  Celeia (Noricum)  Cel.  25
[E]xoratus        male    AE 1980, 673  Celeia (Noricum)  [Ce]leianor.  25
Ἐπαφρόδιτος        male    I. Byzantion (IK 58) 313  Byzantium  Buzantivn  25
Cresce(n)s        male    CIL VIII 5711  Sigus (Numidia)  publicus  70
Secundula         female  AE 1972, 737  Sitifis (Numidia)  pub. ser.  25
Amaranthus        male    IRBrindisi  Brundisium  serv. p. topiar.  50
Olympus           male    CIL VI 2197  Laurens-Lavinium (Rome)  Laurentium Lavinatium arcarius  38
[O]ptata          female  AE 2010, 382  Terventum  Terventi[n]a[tium]  65*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campania Phronime</th>
<th>female</th>
<th><em>CIL X 4334</em></th>
<th>Capua</th>
<th><em>verna and liberta or ingenua illegitima</em></th>
<th>26*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Secunda</td>
<td>female</td>
<td><em>CIL III 5228</em></td>
<td>Celeia (Noricum)</td>
<td>municipal freedwoman</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex. Publicius</td>
<td>male</td>
<td><em>CIL III 5235</em></td>
<td>Celeia (Noricum)</td>
<td>municipal freedman</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fronto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Suavis</td>
<td>female</td>
<td><em>CIL XIII 1914</em></td>
<td>Lugudunum (Gallia Lugudunensis)</td>
<td><em>colonor. lib.</em></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulpicia</td>
<td>female</td>
<td><em>CIL II 353</em></td>
<td>Collipo (Lusitania)</td>
<td>municipal freedwoman (?)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collippone(n)sis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Cocceius</td>
<td>male</td>
<td><em>AE 1972, 714</em></td>
<td>Sitifis (Maur. Caes.)</td>
<td><em>lib. col.</em></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>male</td>
<td><em>CIL III 5282</em></td>
<td>Celeia (Noricum)</td>
<td><em>Celeian. l.</em></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicia Acirtilla</td>
<td>female</td>
<td><em>CIL II 6027</em></td>
<td>Saguntum (Tarracoensis)</td>
<td><em>m(unicipii) (Saguntinorum) l.</em></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicia Ebora</td>
<td>female</td>
<td><em>CIL II 504</em></td>
<td>Emerita (Lusitania)</td>
<td><em>Eme[r.] l.</em></td>
<td>56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Publicius</td>
<td>male</td>
<td><em>CIL VIII 19521</em></td>
<td>Cirta (Numidia)</td>
<td><em>coloni(a)e lib.</em></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicia</td>
<td>female</td>
<td><em>AE 1972, 733</em></td>
<td>Sitifis (Mauretania Caesariensis)</td>
<td>municipal freedwoman</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Terventin[us]</td>
<td>male</td>
<td><em>AE 2010, 382</em></td>
<td>Terventum</td>
<td>municipal freedman</td>
<td>65*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The core group of male municipal slaves shows an average age at death of 35 years, which is beyond the legal age of manumission prescribed by the *Lex Aelia Sentia* of 4 CE. In fact, well over half of all the *servi* analyzed (*N* = 26) were over the age of 30 and still enslaved. In particular, many of the slaves in the higher clerical and supervisory positions remained in their slave-posts for a long time. For example, the five *arcarii* were still slaves after the age of 40, and three of them died in their late forties or early fifties. Similarly, of the three *vilici* analyzed, one died at age 50 (*CIL IX 59*), and another at age c. 64 (*CIL XI 1751*). It is worth pointing out

---

149 With few exceptions, the *lex Aelia Sentia* of 4 CE recorded the minimum legal age of manumission at 30 years. There is plenty of epigraph evidence that demonstrates that this guideline was not always observed. See Gaius Inst. 1.13, 19-20.

150 *CIL IX 3845* (Antinum, age c. 47); *CIL X 410* (Volcei, age c. 49); *CIL IX 699* (Sipontum, age c. 52).
here Weaver’s conclusion that in the *familia Caesaris* it was evidently normal for the imperial slaves in the elite bureaucratic sections not to receive manumission until around the age of 40.  

The ages of the municipal freedmen in our set provide little clarity as far as age at manumission, since one was aged 40 and the other three over 60, and there is no way to know how long they had been free.

Fundamentally, these ages seem to suggest a low probability of manumission for many municipal slaves. Yet it may have been the case that these higher-ranking slaves were retained longer than slaves who performed less skilled competences. There is a significant lack of slaves reporting death ages in their thirties, perhaps an indication that it was common for one segment to receive manumission in their later twenties or at the legal age of 30. Since there are several slaves who lived into their fifties and beyond, it could be argued that manumission in the age range 30-39 better explains the gap in the age data.

The other noteworthy feature of this analysis pertains to the aforementioned slaves who lived beyond middle age. Almost one-quarter of the male slaves with an age ($N = 11$) were over the age of 50. Four of these were in their seventies, and one reports that he died at age 97. Certainly, these slaves’ exceptional ages may be the reason this information was recorded. Yet in the case of one late first-century CE funerary monument erected by the *familia publica* in Celeia in Noricum, two slaves who died at age 70 were listed alongside one who died at age 35 and a probable ex-slave of the *municipium* who died age 60, suggesting that the former ages played less a role in the local recording practices than may be expected (*CIL* III 5235). Nevertheless, even if the ages of the older municipal slaves were inflated or if they represent only exceptional cases, the fact of the matter is that some municipal slaves remained in that status for a very long time. This weakens any argument for automatic manumission in the *familia*. Since maintaining slaves was expensive, one must therefore ask why the *familia* retained these older slaves after they left their forties and then fifties and were unlikely to play any productive role in the

---

151 Weaver 1972: 97-104.
152 These results are mostly aligned with the ages of slaves and freedmen commemorated in the *columbaria* of the Statii Tauri and Volusii Saturnini in Rome (see Mouritsen 2013: 52-3, 61-2), and with the (living) ages declared by households in the Egyptian census returns (see Bagnall and Frier 1994: 36-8, 342-3 (Table D)). See also Wiedemann 1985: 163-7.
153 *IRBrindisi* 41; *CIL* IX 59 (Brundisium); *CIL* X 4334 (Capua); *CIL* XI 2656 (Saturnia); *CIL* IX 699 (Sipontum); *AE* 2010, 382 (Terventum); *CIL* XI 1751 (Volaterra); *CILA* III 596 (two slaves; Villarodrigo); *CIL* III 5235 (two slaves; Celeia).
154 Age-rounding has probably occurred in this monument.
municipal administration. What combination of factors prevented them from receiving manumission at some point earlier in their lives? As an alternative, perhaps the valuable experience the slaves had gained in their occupations motivated the ordo to keep them around.

The age data for the female slaves and freedwomen are only available for seven and eight women, respectively. Yet these few examples show an intriguing pattern. The average age at death for the servae is 27, and for the libertae around 35. What is more, 75% (N = 6) of the freedwomen were under the age of 35. It is thus possible that manumission for these servae publicae could be expected earlier than for their male counterparts, when they were in their late twenties or early thirties. Perhaps they only received manumission after they had produced approximately three vernae who reached the age of three years (cf. Columella RR 1.8.19), or the evidence is reflecting a high mortality rate during childbirth. Yet the possibility that these servae were obtaining their freedom while still in the peak years of fertility would have limited the number of vernae they were able to produce for the familia publica. In regard to manumission practices, this may suggest either that the overall probability of manumission was low or that the decurions frequently relied more heavily on different methods to replace the familia population than through natural reproduction. It may also be that there were simply more servae than we think, or that female slaves were manumitted along with their male partners, as a reward for the latter.

Although this evidence for ages is not necessarily based on a true cross-section of the familia publica, the results may hint at some demographic realities. The provisional conclusion that can be advanced here is that manumission may have been less widespread than expected, at least for the female slaves in the familia Caesaris. Taking into account the prescriptions of Columella (RR 1.8.19), it is also worth considering that these women may have met some childbearing quota before receiving manumission. This pattern runs counter to that suggested in the Egyptian census evidence (see Bagnall and Frier 1994: 36-8, 342-3 (Table D)). Cf. Alföldy 1972: 124-5; Wiedemann 1985: 163-7; and Scheidel 2011: 306-8.

155 Servae: CIL IX 2900; CIL IX 3995; CIL XI 2656; CIL XIII 603; AE 1961, 110; AE 1972, 737; AE 2010, 382. Libertae: CIL II 353; CIL II 504; CIL II 6027; CIL III 5228; CIL X 4334 (= L 3); CIL XI 2656 (= L 73); CIL XIII 1914; AE 1972, 733.
156 Weaver 1972: 97-104 suggested a similar trend among the female slaves in the familia Caesaris. Taking into account the prescriptions of Columella (RR 1.8.19), it is also worth considering that these women may have met some childbearing quota before receiving manumission. This pattern runs counter to that suggested in the Egyptian census evidence (see Bagnall and Frier 1994: 36-8, 342-3 (Table D)). Cf. Alföldy 1972: 124-5; Wiedemann 1985: 163-7; and Scheidel 2011: 306-8.
157 Amundsen and Diers 1970: 79-86 have shown that Greek and Roman conventional wisdom placed the average age of menopause between 40 and 50 years.
158 M. Perry 2014: 58-9, citing the jurist Q. Mucius Scaevola’s record of a master who manumitted his female slaves along with their partners (Dig. 32.41.2).
least as far as the more highly skilled slaves were concerned. In turn, the opportunities for these municipal slaves to produce freeborn children and descendants would also have been limited.\textsuperscript{159}

\textit{Family groups}

Analyzing family groups within the \textit{familia publica} can also shed light on manumission practices. Approximately 100 ‘marriages’ can be documented in this material involving at least one municipal slave or freedman or freedwoman.\textsuperscript{160} Where a slave was a spouse, the union was not recognized as a formal marriage under Roman law, but was classified as a \textit{contubernium}. The record of family groups in these inscriptions, too, was subject to the selective commemorative practices that constitute an ‘epigraphic habit,’ but it offers a useful avenue for asking questions about how an \textit{ordo decurionum} managed the population of its town’s \textit{familia}. The main topic of concern in the following discussion is the legal status the children of the municipal slaves and freedmen held.

The marriages of municipal slaves can be placed broadly into two categories, those within the \textit{familia}, namely, between two slaves or two ex-slaves or between partners of mixed status, and those to partners outside the \textit{familia}. Most noteworthy is the lesser proportion of endogamous marriages within the \textit{familia}, which account for only 37\% ($N = 37$) of all identifiable unions. It is possible that the marriages involving ex-slaves began while one or both partners were still slaves.\textsuperscript{161} Corresponding to the discussion above about the role of natural reproduction in replacing the \textit{familia}’s population, these endogamous unions were counted on to contribute the \textit{vernae} for each new generation. It is therefore striking that the evidence reveals so few examples of this type of marriage.\textsuperscript{162} Moreover, only 24 of these couples record children, and these can be categorized as follows.

\begin{footnotes}
\begin{itemize}
  \item [160] The various terminology for formal and informal marriages in the epigraphic evidence has no legal basis. I employ the term ‘marriage’ (or ‘union,’ \textit{vel sim.}) as a general, rather than technical legal, term.
  \item [161] For example, the case from Saturnia described below (\textit{CIL} IX 2656).
  \item [162] A comparable pattern in the evidence consists of municipal slaves for whom a friend or co-slave or even a local association erected a sepulcher, such as Zosimus, a slave of Saepinum whose friends in a local cult dedicated his epitaph (\textit{CIL} IX 2483), or C. Campanius Ursulus, a freedman of Capua whose \textit{amicus optimus}, a slave of the town, erected his epitaph (\textit{CIL} X 3940). This absence of a spouse as dedicand implies that some slaves never formed any \textit{contubernium}. Yet the lack of a slave family did not preclude their role in fathering children in the \textit{familia}. See Bradley 1987: 54-9; and Herrmann-Otto 1994: 203-5.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotes}
Table II.4 Status of children born from endogamous familia publica unions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vernae</th>
<th>Vernae, manumitted</th>
<th>Freeborn</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined, this sample implies that the 48 partners in the 24 marriages barely replaced half their own number for the next generation of municipal slaves. The case of the following municipal freedwoman of the town of Saturnia in Etruria and her municipal slave partner seems to be atypical among the family groups known to us (CIL IX 2656).

\[
\text{D(is) M(anibus). / Secundae / [servae] publicae, / vixit a(nnos) VII, / m(enses) X, / Tertius et / Publicia For/tunata par(entes) / filiae karis(simae) j(ecerunt). / Saturniae For/tunatae, v(ixit) a(nnos) XXXIII, / Primitivo c(oloniae) s(ervo), v(ixit) a(nnos) XIIIX, / m(enses) IV, d(ies) VII, coniugi / et fil(io) Tertius c(oloniae) s(eus).}
\]

To the departed spirits. To Secunda, a municipal [slave], who lived seven years and ten months, Tertius and Publicia Fortunata, her parents, erected (this epitaph) for their dearest daughter. To Saturnia Fortunata, who lived 33 years, and to Primitivus, a slave of the colony, who lived eighteen years, four months, and seven days, Tertius, a slave of the colony, (erected this epitaph) for his spouse and son.

Weiss takes Publicia Fortunata and Saturnia Fortunata as one and the same woman, appearing in the two sections of text inscribed at different times.\(^{163}\) If this interpretation is correct, she presents a unique case in bearing two different gentilicia corresponding to her status as a liberta publica of the town.\(^{164}\) She also had at least these two children during her life as a slave, her son Primitivus when she was age of fourteen, and by inference her daughter Secunda not after the age of 21. At age 33, there is no way to know when she was manumitted, but perhaps this occurred only after she had provided the familia with multiple vernae who survived to the age of three years.\(^{165}\)

It is not inevitable that the two different gentilicial names refer to the same woman. The fact that such oscillating nomenclature would be unique is one objection, initially raised by Halkin.\(^{166}\) It is plausible to interpret two different women, both of whom bore the cognomen

---

\(^{163}\) Weiss 2004: 239 no. L35, following Herrmann-Otto 1994: 198. The latter’s suggestion that the different gentilicia can be explained by subjecting her to the SC Claudianum seems implausible. The SC only governed relationships with an alienus servus (the slave of another master: Gaius Inst. 1.84, 91), and if this woman was originally a municipal freedwoman of Saturnia, her and her partner’s master/patron were the same body, the town and its decurions.

\(^{164}\) I discussed her case with other variations on nomenclature above, p. 47.

\(^{165}\) Cf. Columella’s prescription that female slaves only be manumitted after having given birth to a certain number of vernae (RR 1.8.19).

\(^{166}\) Halkin 1897: 245.
Fortunata, which was common among female slaves and ex-slaves.\textsuperscript{167} Perhaps Tertius simply had these children with two different municipal freedwomen. It is also possible that the text records two different generations of Tertii municipal slaves, a father and son, each of whom married a freedwoman of the town named, respectively, Publicia Fortunata and Saturnia Fortunata.\textsuperscript{168} As was shown above, there is evidence for the use of both a municipal \textit{gentilicum} and the name Publicius at the same site.\textsuperscript{169}

There is nonetheless also support for the idea that Fortunata was the same woman with two different \textit{gentilicia}. Both inscriptions indicate a strong and affectionate family bond. Even if one discounts the formulaic language of epigraphy, the family group was close-knit enough for Tertius to enlist Fortunata as his co-parent in the first text and as his \textit{coniunx} in the second. Since the inscription clearly marked the family’s tomb, which was used for at least two separate burials, it would be strange for the first Fortunata’s death not to be commemorated if she had died before Tertius theoretically began a new \textit{contubernium}. It is possible that she had not died but had simply left the family group at some point. Keeping the focus on the possibility of a single family group involving just one Fortunata, the children’s names suggest a birth order.\textsuperscript{170} The son Primitivus’ name indicates that he was the oldest child, and the text supports this idea by indicating that he was born when his mother was fourteen years old. His younger sister Secunda may have been the couple’s second-born child. This theory does not exclude the possibility that Fortunata gave birth to an intervening child or children who did not survive infancy. On the issue of this woman’s dual nomenclature, moreover, it is important to keep in mind that a private epitaph was not an official document, so we may be dealing with a case of selective self-representation. Leaving aside these uncertainties, the case of Fortunata and Tertius seems to provide evidence for an important, albeit underrepresented, type of marriage for municipal slaves.

The other type of union observed among the municipal slaves and freedmen, exogamous marriage, accounts for 45% ($N = 45$) of the set.\textsuperscript{171} The most important part of this group consists of the 32 slaves and eleven freedmen who were married to a woman of free status. Some of these

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{167} Kajanto 1965: 273.
  \item \textsuperscript{168} Note the two different methods of self-representation: the first reference to Tertius contains no title, while the second carries the title \textit{c(oloniae) s(ervus)}.
  \item \textsuperscript{169} For example, at Venafrum (\textit{CIL} X 4984, 5012).
  \item \textsuperscript{170} Kajanto 1965: 73-8.
  \item \textsuperscript{171} The remaining eighteen marriages in this set involve municipal slaves and freedmen with \textit{incerti/incertae}.
\end{itemize}
unions involving freedmen partners surely began when they were still slaves. The legal status of the women in these unions is rarely made clear. Just three indicate that they were freeborn, and three others give their status as freedwomen. For the rest of these spouses, the incertae, there are few definitive indicators of status, though the implication of their nomenclature is that most of them were also ex-slaves.

Regardless of these women’s status, it is remarkable that the municipal slaves were permitted to enter such marriages outside the familia, particularly with ingenuae. As Halkin pointed out, along with such other privileges as an increased peculium and partial testamentary rights, marriage to free(d) women outside the familia publica would have enhanced their already high status among the servile population in municipal society. This notion of prestige marriages can be pressed even further. Of the 32 slaves married to women with free status, seventeen (53%) list a senior familia position in the municipal administration, including the arcarius Restitutus of Bovillae, who set up the following epitaph along with his spouse in the first or early second century (CIL XIV 2414).

D(is) [M(anibus]. / Restitu[tus] / r(ei) p(ublicae) B(ovillensium) ar[carius], / [A]cilia Ach[---] / [s]ibi et su[i]s fece[runt].

To the departed spirits. Restitutus, arcarius of the res publica of the Bovillenses, and [A]cilia Ach[---] erected (this epitaph) for themselves and their (household).

Weaver identified a similar marriage pattern among the senior clerical slaves in the familia Caesaris based in Rome. These examples demonstrate a connection between privileged

---

172 CIL VI 2307; AE 1974, 346; AE 1914, 221. The latter ingenua seems likely to be the daughter of a municipal freedman of Minturnae.

173 CIL V 3139; CIL V 4194; ILGN 241.

174 Twelve women have a Greek (or toponymic) cognomen, often a strong indicator of libertus/liberta status (cf. Solin 1971: 121-58); and six women bear an imperial gentilicium, which may indicate that they were themselves ex-slaves of the familia Caesaris or the descendants of imperial freedmen.


176 The full list of senior municipal slaves with coniuges of free status is as follows: arcarii: CIL XIV 2414 (Bovillae); CIL X 1495 (Neapolis); CIL VI 2307 (Tusculum); CIL X 486 (Paestum); CIL IX 3845 (Antinum); CIL X 410 (Volcei); Antiqua Beneventana p. 487; vilici: CIL XII 1755 (Valentia); CIL V 4503 (Brixia); CIL XI 1231 (Placentia); CIL IX 59 (Brundisium); tabularius: CIL IX 1664 (Beneventum); AE 1952, 73 (Vienna); actores (rei publicae): CIL X 2714 (Volsciini); CIL IX 5859 (Auximum); CIL X 4904 (Venafrum); and dispensator: AE 1971, 199 (Santacris/Navarra). It is also possible to add the case of M. Valerius Verna, a municipal freedman from Asculum Picenum who seems to have been a dispensator when he was a slave (ILS 6565).

177 Weaver 1972: 112-36 argues that as many as two-thirds of the imperial slaves stationed in Rome and Italy were married to free(d) women. Cf. Mouritsen 2011: 297-8, who points out some of the problems involved in Weaver’s use of the incertae married to imperial slaves.
marriage and the prestige of municipal slaves, making it possible to regard this type of marriage as characteristic of the upper echelons of the familia publica.178

It is important to recognize that this picture of marriages is far from complete. Several factors may be skewing our view of the demographic reality behind these marriage and family group results. For one thing, the slaves recorded in these inscriptions were likely from the privileged segment of the familia, since erecting an epitaph was expensive. There is a good chance that most of the contubernia of the lower-ranking municipal slaves were taking place within the familia, but that this group was simply never commemorated. These slave unions certainly would have produced vernae. It is also possible that the practice of capturing only a single familial relationship between the dedicatee and dedicand of an epitaph caused the omission of the children.179 For example, coniuges probably frequently considered their relationship to be paramount. Similarly, since municipal slaves had the rare privilege of bequeathing half of their peculium to anyone they chose, perhaps the single heir to a slave’s estate, often a spouse, inscribed only his or her name as the person responsible for erecting the monument.180

These uncertainties notwithstanding, the issue most relevant for the current inquiry concerning these exogamous marriages is the fate of the children they produced. Normally, the child of any ‘mixed status’ marriage not recognized under Roman law (i.e., without the right of conubium) acquired the status of its mother, according to the ius gentium.181 Yet this tradition was supplanted in 52 CE by the SC Claudianum, allegedly devised by Pallas, one of Claudius’ most trusted freedmen.182 Some confusion exists about the original conditions of this law and the chronology of its subsequent emendations over the following three centuries.183 The original version seems to have stated simply that if a civis Romana knowingly engaged in a sexual relationship with another master’s slave without that master’s consent, both she and any children born from the union became his slaves.184 A later modification to the law permitted the woman

179 Saller and Shaw 1984: 138-9 explain some possible factors behind the prevalence of conjugal commemorations among the lower classes in Roman society.
180 Cf. Saller and Shaw 1984: 126-7, 132 on patterns of dedication by a deceased person’s heir.
181 Gaius Inst. 1.80-2, 84.
183 See the chronological scheme devised by Evans-Grubbs 1993: 125-54.
184 She could be exonerated only if she could show that she had no knowledge of her partner’s slave status. Cf. Evans-Grubbs 1993: 125-54. See also Buckland 1908: 412-18, who argues that libertae were subject to the same
to strike a pactio with her slave partner’s master whereby she could continue the relationship and either retain her own free status or be reduced only to the status of his liberta. The cost of this pactio, however, was that her children from the union would be seized as the master’s slaves. Hadrian briefly intervened with a rescript that restored the conditions of the ius gentium, stipulating that if an agreement were reached concerning the free status of the woman, her children must also be free, acquiring the status of ingenui illegitimi. This was a short-lived measure, however, since epigraphic evidence and juridical writings confirm that the SC continued to be widely applied as late as the third century in the context of private familiae. The jurists also interjected a later proviso that a master could not enslave the woman or her children until after she had ignored three warnings to cease her relationship with his slave. An even harsher addendum to the law, mentioned only by the early third-century jurist Paulus, states specifically that a free woman who knowingly entered a relationship with a municipal slave was to be enslaved by the ordo decurionum without any warning whatsoever (Sent. 2.21.14). This law must have come into effect at some point in the second century CE. The law was only abolished under Justinian.

Roman commentators on the SC generally framed it as a poena. It has been suggested that the modification and application of the law beginning in the fourth century, particularly under Constantine, were part of an ideological program to prevent the Roman institution of marriage from being ‘tainted’ by unions between persons with such disparate social statuses.

Yet a more practical explanation for enacting the law may also be advanced. Since the SC emanated from the imperial household, Weaver argued that it resolved the tension between

---

185 Gaius Inst. 1.84.
187 This proviso may have come as late as the reign of Constantine (Cod. Theod. 4.12.1-4).
188 Paulus Sent. 2.21.14: mulier ingenua quae se sciens servo municipum iunxerit etiam cita denuntiationem ancilla efficitur. non - item, si nesciat. nescisse autem videtur quae comperta con dicione contubernio se abstinuit, aut libertum putavit.
189 Evans-Grubbs 1993: 141. See also Harper 2010a: 610-38, who analyzes later and more far-reaching emendations to the law in the fourth century CE by considering both the contemporary historical-cultural context for their enactments and the process of their inclusion in the Codex Theodosianus.
190 Tacitus (Ann. 12.53.1) uses the participle prolapsae (from prolabor) to describe the women’s alleged degradation. Gaius (Inst. 1.80-2, 84) claims that Hadrian, and Vespasian before him, had been troubled by the iniquitas and inelegantia of such a violation of the ius gentium.
191 Evans-Grubbs 1993: 126-30; Harper 2010a: 610-38. Sirks 2005: 139-49 argues that the law was meant as a tool for the master to reaffirm his authority over his male slave, who risked growing arrogant because of his marriage to a free woman.
rewarding high-ranking imperial slaves with privileged marriages and sustaining the population of the *familia Caesaris*. The slaves could enjoy their honors, while the imperial household could recruit the resulting children as *vernae*, to be groomed by their fathers as the next generation of bureaucrats. Such an explanation may help us to understand why the *ordo* in a Roman town permitted so many of its slaves to form *contubernia* outside the *familia*. This scenario can be envisioned for *CIL X* 3938 from Capua, an epitaph erected by a son, a *verna* and municipal *tabularius* in the local administration, to his father, a municipal slave *arcarius* in the administration of Crete, where Capua owed territory. The identity of his mother is unknown. The most plausible interpretation of their situation is that the son was born and trained in Crete at his father’s side, and was later promoted to a position in the home administration in Capua.

The epigraphic evidence shows inconsistency in the towns’ application of the law in practice. In the majority of cases, in fact, it does not seem to have been enforced. The 43 wives of the municipal slaves were apparently not subjected to the harshest version of the *SC*, enslavement, since their *gentilicia* indicate that they remained free individuals. Another productive line of inquiry is to analyze the status of the children of these exogamous unions. Since over three-quarters of the couples reported no children, the sample size available consists of only nine children whose status can be determined. In three cases the outcome of marriage between a municipal slave and a free woman was the enslavement of their children. A good illustration is found in a second- or third-century epitaph from Valentia in Gallia Narbonensis (*CIL XII* 1755).

\[D(is) M(anibus) / Valentini / [pu]blici c(oloniae) Va(lentinensium), / [L]inus [e]t Attia / Victori[na] fil[i]lio p/iiss(imo), qui vix(it) ann(os) XXI, / m(enses) V, d(ies) VIII, s(ub) a(scia) d(edicaverunt).\]

To the departed spirits of Valentinus, municipal (slave) of the colony of the Valentinenses, [L]inus and Attia Victor[na] dedicated (this monument) under the *ascia* to their most dutiful son, who lived 21 years, five months, and eight days.

---

192 Weaver 1972: 112-69. See also Weaver 1964: 137-9; and Weaver 1986: 150-4. As an added benefit, if the *SC* had reduced the free woman to the status of *liberta Augusti*, the imperial household also would have acquired patron’s rights over her property. Cf. *lex Papia Poppaea* of 9 CE.


194 *CIL X* 7903 (Thurrus in Sardinia); *CIL XII* 1755 (Valentia in Gallia Narbonensis); *AE* 1894, 114 (Vienna in Gallia Narbonensis).

195 Weiss 2004: 217 no. 193. An alternative reading of Valentinus’ title is *vilici* instead of *publici*. 
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Valentinus’ father bears a single name, a strong indicator of slave status, while his mother’s nomenclature indicates that she was free, either a freeborn or freed woman of the gens Attia. The fact that Valentinus was a slave of the colony clarifies that his father shared the same status. The most plausible explanation for this ‘mixed status’ family is that the decurions of the colony permitted Linus’ relationship with Victorina, but enslaved their son in the familia publica.

By contrast, the local council seems to have overlooked the SC in the cases of the children born in the other six marriages. In each of these couples, the father was a municipal slave (or freedman), and the mother a woman of free status. The council, however, chose not to enslave any of the children born into these unions. Instead, the sons and daughters possessed freeborn status, as ingenui illegitimi, and took the gentilicium of their free mothers. A second-century epitaph from Ostia presents just such a case (AE 1996, 298).

D(is) M(anibus). / Sergio Ellanico, / vixit m(ensibus) VII, d(iebus) V, / Ellanicus colonoruni / et Sergia Hygia / parentes fecerunt.

To the departed spirits. To Sergius Ellanicus, who lived seven months and five days, his parents Ellanicus, (slave) of the colonists, and Sergia Hygia erected (this monument).

While the child of this union took his father’s cognomen, he acquired his mother’s gentilicium and freeborn status. One key to understanding this case is the fact that the Sergius Ellanicus died in infancy. On the one hand, his age makes it highly unlikely that he was born from a previous marriage of Sergia Hygia, as does the fact that she and Ellanicus clearly refer to themselves as the parentes. On the other hand, the child was old enough for the Ostian council to have claimed him as a verna, if it had wished to do so.

It is difficult to draw substantive conclusions from so few examples, but one observation that may be important for understanding the application of the SC is that the three children known to have become vernae were male. This might be construed as reflecting the council’s preference for subjecting male children to the SC. Among the six children of the ‘mixed status’ marriages not taken by the law, however, three were boys. Following the idea that these

---

196 CIL II 3181; CIL IX 3845; CIL X 410; CIL X 1495; AE 1974, 346; AE 1996, 298. One possible alternative interpretation in CIL X 410 (Volcei) is that the child in question was from the mother’s previous marriage. Yet since in this example mother and son bear the same gentilicium, such a scenario meant that she likely would have been a freedwoman who married a collibertus of the same household, with the child being born after their manumission.

197 Sons took their praenomen presumably from one of their mother’s nearest male relatives.


199 The gens Sergia held some prominence in Ostia, producing at least two duovirs (CIL XIV 244; XIV 411-412) and several prominent members of local collegia (e.g., CIL XIV 250).
marriages were granted to the municipal slaves as an honor, Herrmann-Otto has pointed out that the only way to guarantee that such an honor retained value was to protect the free status of a slave’s wife and children.²⁰⁰ Such a policy indeed may have played some role, though we cannot rule out the possibility that being recruited into the familia was actually regarded as an honor for the children.²⁰¹ Some insight into the esteem home-born status held can be garnered from a dedication by a municipal slave arcarius of Sipontum to his son, whom he pronounced rei p(ublicae) ser(vus) verna (CIL IX 699 = ILS 6476, mid-second century CE).²⁰²

Herrmann-Otto may be correct, but a more practical explanation for the lack of uniform application of the SC can also be advanced here, and one that directly impacts on our understanding of manumission practices in the familia publica. If circumstances had demanded it, the ordo in most towns certainly would have enforced the law, especially since imperial authorities evidently offered a provision to seize the women and children without any forewarning.²⁰³ One possibility is that some town councils, contrary to what is often proposed about slave households, were not always overly concerned about replacing the familia’s population through natural reproduction. The many slaves who were permitted to join exogamous marriages and who reported no children at all further underline such a premise.²⁰⁴ Yet it is also true that maintaining the ranks of municipal slaves was essential for ensuring continuity in the administrative functions of the familia publica, especially in the higher-level, skilled positions. A consequence of such a model is either that the frequency of manumission was relatively low or that towns relied on other means to acquire replacement slaves, including through purchase on the open market, through the beneficence of local testators, or through the confiscation of local property.²⁰⁵

²⁰¹ As far as imperial slaves were concerned, the title verna was widely advertised as a badge of honor in the imperial household. See Weaver 1972: 167-9, 199.
²⁰³ Paulus Sent. 2.21.14.
²⁰⁴ Even if selective commemorative practices account for some of this impression, surely some of the couples actually had no children. It is worth noting in this context Treggiari’s (1969: 35) theory that Roman ex-slave families were often quite small, given that they might not expect manumission until the age of 30, as well as the high infant mortality rate assumed for the Roman world. It is also possible that some of these municipal slaves fathered children in the familia publica without forming a family group, or entered their exogamous unions at a later date.
²⁰⁵ The market price of slaves is thought to have steadily increased starting in the early Principate, especially when it came to slaves who were skilled in an occupation or technical competence. Many of the slaves desired by the familia publica would fall into this category, thus making purchase a potentially expensive proposition. See Hopkins 1978: 126-7, 169-70; Scheidel 2005b: 1-17; and Scheidel 2008: 105-26. Duncan-Jones 1982: 348-50 collects a useful array
II.4.1 THE PRACTICE OF MANUMISSION IN THE MUNICIPAL *FAMILIA PUBLICA*

Building on the observations made above in the demographic analysis, it is now necessary to unpack some of these ideas by looking at the evidence for manumission in the *familia publica* and weighing it against broader theories on Roman manumission. The aim is to understand which theories of manumission best fit the practice in the *familia* of different towns, which in turn will provide insight into the scale of manumission in these places.

*The authority of Roman towns to manumit municipal slaves*

A fundamental aspect of manumission in relation to the *familia publica* must be dealt with at this stage of the analysis. Scholars have puzzled over the precise date when Roman towns in Italy first acquired the legal authority to manumit their slaves. Towns were classified as a form of corporation and, as such, specific legislation was required to extend to these entities the rights and privileges afforded to private owners under Roman law. The most specific documentary evidence that provides a date for when Italian towns received the authority to manumit municipal slaves is the following rescript issued by Diocletian and Maximian in c. 290 CE to a municipal freedman named Philadelphus who came from a provincial town (*Cod. Iust. 7.9.3.1*).206

> si itaque secundum legem †Vetti Libici†, cuius potestatem senatus consulto Iuventio Celso iterum et Neratio Marcello consultibus facto ad provincias porrectam constitit, manumissus civitatem Romanam consecutus es, post vero ut libertus tabularium administrando libertatem quam fueras consecutus non amisisti, nec actus tuus filio ex liberis ingenuo suscepto, quominus decurio esse possit, obfuit.

If, then, after being manumitted you acquired Roman citizenship according to the *lex †Vetti Libici†*, the authority of which is held to have been extended to the provinces by a *senatus consultum* passed during the consulship of Iuventius Celsus, for the second time, and Neratius Marcellus (129 CE), then indeed afterwards you did not lose the freedom you had attained by performing the work of a *tabularius* as a freedman, then your activity did not prevent your son, born as an *ingenuus* from free (parents), from being able to become a decurion.

As Paul Krüger’s edition and Lenski’s new edition of the text indicate, the text is corrupt in the key phrase naming the original law that served as the precedent for the *SC* of 129 CE that

---

206 Corcoran 2000: 79, 109-10 dates the rescript to 293 CE. He also believes this rescript belongs with *Cod. Iust.* 6.8.1, which notes that only the co-Augusti could restore a petitioner’s *ingenuitas* (*ius ingenuitatis...sed a nobis peti potuit*).
extended the authority of manumission to provincial towns.\textsuperscript{207} The reading of the genitive *Vetti Libici* presumably refers to the consul under whom the law was passed, though no consul by that name can be identified. One suggested emendation ascribes the original law to M. Vettius Bolanus (i.e., *legem Vetti Bolani*), an ordinary consul in 111 CE.\textsuperscript{208} If, however, the law regarding Italian towns was enacted as late as the reign of Trajan, it would imply that all the municipal freedmen known from the Late Republic and first century CE in Italy were informally manumitted.\textsuperscript{209} Yet it is possible to advance counterarguments that undercut this idea. For one thing, the *Lex Irnitana*, with its protocols for manumitting municipal slaves in a provincial town (Ch. 72), would predate an original Italian law of the early second century, as it was actually in place even before the *SC* of 129. What is more, in their commentary on the *Lex Irnitana* González and Crawford observed that the municipal freedmen of Irni possessed a *hereditas*, which seems to constitute definitive evidence that the freed slaves covered by the *lex* became full *coloniarii Latini*, rather than informally manumitted Junian Latins.\textsuperscript{210} It should also be recognized that Varro discussed the manumission of municipal slaves in Italy as if a matter of course already in the mid-first century BCE (*LL* 8.82-83). Finally, it is difficult to envision that an informal practice would have been enshrined in a statute issued to *municipia* in Baetica, as the key chapter of the *Lex Irnitana* stipulates that manumission had to be effected through an official decree of the decurions.

A more plausible solution may be found in one of the earliest commentaries on the passage in Book 7 of the *Codex*. Mommsen proposed that the textual crux should be restored as *legem veteris reipublicae*.\textsuperscript{211} This suggestion indeed sorts out the problems imposed by other readings. If Mommsen was correct, the municipal slaves who received manumission dating back to the Late Republic must have been ascribed a formal status as Roman citizens since this was the status possessed by *municipes* in Italian towns from the end of the Social War.\textsuperscript{212}

\textsuperscript{207} Krüger 1877: 641; Lenski 2016: 1806-7.
\textsuperscript{208} Halkin 1897: 142-3; Fear 1990: 159.
\textsuperscript{209} Fear 1990: 159-60 suggests that the practice Varro mentioned of the manumitting magistrates bestowing their own *gentilicium* on municipal freedmen is a signal of the informal nature of the earlier manumissions.
\textsuperscript{210} González and Crawford 1986: 223. *Contra* Halkin 1897: 142-3, who assumed that the manumissions in the earlier period resulted in Junian Latin status.
\textsuperscript{211} Mommsen 1904: 39 n. 1. As a parallel supporting this application of an adjective to *reipublica*, Tacitus used the phrase *veteris reipublicae* to periodize earlier Roman history (*Ann.* 1.7; 11.23).
\textsuperscript{212} Based on the *lex Iulia* of 90 BCE and the *lex Plautia Papiria* of 89 BCE.
Despite these uncertainties about the origins of the legislation authorizing Italian towns to manumit, we might also envision that the earlier law that substantiated the Hadrianic SC, whenever it was enacted, simply added official imperial affirmation to a practice that had been taking place for a long time.\(^{213}\) In this case, the municipal decrees granting manumission may have had the force of law in themselves even before the development of imperial recognition.\(^{214}\) It is also important to bear in mind, as Harrill notes, that Justinian’s *Codex* did not include much material from before the reign of Hadrian.\(^{215}\) Therefore, there may have been an earlier *lex* in place that, for some unknown reason, the one mentioned in *Cod. Iust.* 7.9.3.1 aimed to supplement or expand or replace.

*The practice of manumission*

As a next step, the actual methods used to free municipal slaves ought to be considered, since an awareness of this issue will help focus the subsequent discussion of the different theories. Of the three legal methods, the *vindicta*, which was the most public form of manumission, seems to be the most appropriate.\(^{216}\) This ritual entailed freeing a slave before a magistrate who arbitrated a fictional lawsuit that ended with the slave’s alleged freedom being upheld.\(^{217}\) In Roman towns, the duovirs were the associated magistrates, as is signaled by the prescriptions of *Lex Irnitana* 28 for manumitting private slaves.\(^{218}\) *Lex Irnitana* 72, moreover, uses formulaic language that corresponds to what is reported about the *vindicta* ritual. An *adsertor*, representing the slave’s claim to freedom, declares, *hunc ego hominem liberum esse aio ex iure Quiritium*, to which the owner responds simply, *hunc ego hominem liberum esse volo.*\(^{219}\) The introductory line in Chapter 72 picks up on this language (*si quis [duumvir] servum publicum servamve publicam manumittere volet*), and in the third-person imperatives instructing the duovir to perform the manumission: *tum {i}is Ilvir{is} i. d. eum servom eamve servam*

\(^{213}\) It is tempting to draw a similar conclusion from the rescripts that precede this one in the *Codex* (7.9.1-2). Issued by Gordian III, both rescripts assert that for the manumission of a municipal slave by a municipal council to be considered legal, the consent of the governor of a province was required, either a *praeses* or *rector*. See also Corcoran 2000: 117-18.

\(^{214}\) For this interpretation, we must compare Harrill’s (1998: 152-7) discussion of a similar grant of the privilege to manumit by Marcus Aurelius to another form of corporation, *collegia* (*Dig. 40.3.1-2* (Ulpian)).

\(^{215}\) Harrill 1998: 152-5. See the list of imperial rescripts in Frier 2016: 3088-176.

\(^{216}\) *Contra* Fear 1990: 156-7.

\(^{217}\) *Dig. 40.2.1-25.*

\(^{218}\) *Lex Irnitana* 28: *si quis munc[eps] municipi Flavi Irniti[ani], qui Latinus erit, aput Ilvirum iure dicundo eius municipi, ser[v]um suum servamve suam ex ser[v]iute[m] in libertatem manumiserit, l[i]b[er]eum liberamve e[s]se iuss[erit].* Note the similar language used here and in Chapter 72 on manumitting municipal slaves.

\(^{219}\) See Mouritsen 2011: 111-12.
manumittito, liberum liberamve esse iubeto. Moreover, the public aspect of the manumission of municipal slaves and the involvement of a magistrate points to the vindicta as the best explanation.

Within the murky juridical situation just discussed about towns having the right to manumit, ascribing a direct connection between the manumitting duovir and the municipal slave would circumvent certain legal problems prior to the reign of Hadrian. Since the vindicta required a magistrate to carry out the act and the duovir’s role in Chapter 72 is so prominent, the idea that the duovir actually manumitted the municipal slave has some attraction. One can note again Varro’s claim that in some cases, the magistrate gave to a new freedman his own gentilicium (LL 8.82-83). This situation seems to imply a personal connection between the duovir and slave, and one that suggests a type of patron-freedman relationship.

Yet theoretical problems arise from attributing the primary role in manumission to one of the duovirs. To begin with, one must note the Roman concept that a manumittor and manumitted slave should have possessed the same legal status. At Irni, since most duovirs probably already had Roman citizenship, this would imply that the municipal freedmen they manumitted would acquire Roman instead of Latin citizenship, which Fear rightly concludes would have been an unacceptable outcome for the Irnitani. A second problem is that if the duovir were filling the role of patron in this manumission process, the freedman would technically owe him obsequium and opera, yet another seemingly impractical proposition, since the Lex Irnitana (Ch. 72), an opinion by Papinian (Dig. 40.3.3), and a rescript of Gordian III (Cod. Iust. 7.9.2) explicitly assign this privilege to the munipes.

As an alternative, the duovir’s role can be minimized. The use of the verb volet to describe the beginning of the manumission process in Lex Irnitana Chapter 72 does not

---

220 The underlined emphases are mine. Also worth noting in this context is Eder 1980: 117-18 on the hypothetical procedure for manumitting servi publici populi Romani. Eder points to Livy’s (2.5.9-10) example of a state slave named Vindicicus who helped the Roman authorities uncover a conspiracy and received manumission and citizenship as a reward. This freedman’s name was held the etymology behind the vindicta ritual, since he was allegedly the first to be manumitted through this method. Eder thinks Livy applied to this Roman legend the contemporary procedure by which the consuls, in consultation with the senate, performed the manumission of state slaves.

221 Eder 1980: 114-25, discussing the roles of the Roman senate and consuls in manumitting slaves in the familia publica populi Romani, offers a useful discussion of the complex legal issues at play when the Roman state needed to manumit a servus publicus.


223 Mouritsen 2011: 30.

224 Fear 1996: 156-8, 161. This would have been less a problem in Italian towns, where the municipal slaves would acquire Roman citizenship anyway.

225 Eder 1980: 121-2, in the context of the consuls and the familia publica populi Romani.
necessarily mean that the duovir initiated the process. For example, the verb is used generically throughout the statute to denote when someone might take on a lawsuit, where a better translation may be ‘to be willing to’ or ‘to be prepared to.’

Moreover, the real decision-making power rested with the decurions, and, when a pair of imperial rescripts of the third century CE are brought into the discussion, the approval of the provincial governor or the curator rei publicae had to be obtained for the manumission to become official. The passing of a decretum decurionum was behind the decision to manumit a municipal slave, as is implied by the vote of two-thirds of the decurions in the curia. This more critical reading of Chapter 72 therefore implies that the duovir was just carrying out the orders of the decurions (and imperial authorities), as is also signaled by the third-person imperatives manumittito and iubeto. An attractive solution is that the method of manumission was the vindicta, but that the duovir was simply the only representative who could stand in to perform the ritual on behalf of the ordo and the municipes it represented.

Practical and legal concerns of manumission

The municipal council must have viewed the decision to manumit its slaves as more complex than simply losing workers from the local administration. The manumission guidelines established in Lex Irnitana 72 imply a real debate in the curia about this decision. The task in this section thus is to fill in some of the gaps in the content of such debate by reconstructing from the lacunose sources the range of concerns that the ordo had to deal with in regard to manumission in the familia publica, and how these must have impacted on the frequency of the practice.

A major concern for the management of any slave household was the issue of how the population would be replenished from generation to generation. Unlike the families of freeborn or freed Romans, slave households were not natural groups in regard to demographic planning, since slaves regularly entered and exited the ranks through both biological (i.e., birth and death) and non-biological (i.e., purchase, sale, and manumission) means. The familia publica was no different. Yet in the familia the decurions also had to ensure that skilled and technical posts in the administration always remain filled. The decurions could estimate how many vernae might be born each year, and they could regulate the sale and purchase of slaves. They could not,

---

226 OLD, ‘volo,’ pp. 2098-9 no. 5.
227 Cod. Iust. 7.9.1, 2, issued by Gordian III.
228 Eder 1980: 121-2 suggests a similar situation between the Roman senate and the consuls in the process used to manumit state slaves during the Republic.
however, plan for cases of premature death that could significantly diminish a slave population. In the face of these factors, the decurions had to weigh various outcomes in their consideration of how frequently to manumit the municipal slaves.

Differently from private slave households, however, the municipal *familia publica* had numerous ways of acquiring slaves, and the epigraphic evidence allows us to grasp some of these methods. First and foremost, a component of sustaining the population of the *familia publica* must have been natural reproduction, as has already been mentioned above. The inscriptions provide two direct sources for diagnosing the role of natural reproduction. Approximately 22 *vernae* can be identified either by explicit status indication or by the reconstruction of status through age and family relationships.\textsuperscript{229} This number makes natural reproduction the most visible of any of the forms of replacement in the evidence for the *familia*. Yet whether this reflects the prominence of natural reproduction over the other means or an overrepresentation of the *vernae* in the inscriptions cannot be determined. The other evidence for natural reproduction comes from *contubernia* between municipal slaves or between slaves and *liberti/-ae*, which account for over one-third of all unions involving a municipal slave or freedman. Although many couples do not mention children, these unions may have produced *vernae* for the *familia*.\textsuperscript{230}

As well represented as natural reproduction is, this method of replacement may have played a less central role than is often assumed.\textsuperscript{231} As seen above, a higher-ranking group of municipal slaves, those in the more skilled positions, were frequently permitted to marry outside the *familia*, and there is a strong possibility that their children were not frequently recruited into the *familia*.\textsuperscript{232} Replacement of those fortunate enough to be manumitted from this segment may have been achieved through other means.

A second method of slave replacement documented in our sources was purchase on the open market. The last two centuries of the Republic saw a steady influx of slaves into the slave market from Rome’s conquests in the eastern Mediterranean. It is likely that many towns received slaves this way.\textsuperscript{233} *Lex Irnitana* 79 cites a provision permitting the town, as if it were a


\textsuperscript{230} See Scheidel 1999: 112-14; and Scheidel 2005a: 75 on the importance of natural reproduction in slave *familiae*. In his most recent work, Scheidel has hypothesized that up to 80% of replacement in most Roman slave households was achieved through natural reproduction.


\textsuperscript{232} This outcome means that the *ordo decurionum* probably often ignored the *SC Claudianum*.

\textsuperscript{233} Eder 1980: 6-14, attempting to refine the legal definition of a *servus publicus populi Romani*, argues that war-captives coming into the possession of the Roman state initially were held in a temporary status before some were
personal entity, to purchase slaves for the familia.\textsuperscript{234} Towns could also purchase slaves from private households. There is evidence that nine municipal slaves may have been purchased this way.\textsuperscript{235} Many acquired the second cognomen (agnomen) ending in –ianus that was taken from their former master’s cognomen in order to indicate their origins.\textsuperscript{236} For example, a municipal slave from Asisium dedicated a shrine to a local deity, referring to himself as Successus publicus municipum Asisinatium ser(vus) Amoenianus (CIL XI 5375). In this case, his personal name was Successus, while his original owner must have borne the cognomen Amoenus.\textsuperscript{237} For towns purchasing replacement slaves, it is easy to envision a practice of targeted purchase of slaves with specific skills in order to fill vacant familia posts. Such a scenario seems to account for the career of a municipal freedman of Volsinii who held the archival position of tabularius (CIL XI 2710a).

Victorinus claims to have held his position at both Ferentium and Volsinii, which ultimately manumitted him and gave him his gentilicium. The most plausible explanation for this move is that Volsinii had purchased him from his original familia publica, probably in order to acquire his administrative skills.\textsuperscript{238}

This discussion of purchase raises the question of how economical it would have been for towns to rely on this method as opposed to others at their disposal. The documentary sources provide sufficient material for Roman historians to approach the question of the cost-sold into the open markets and others being assigned to specific competences for the state, at which point the latter group legally became servi publici.

\textsuperscript{234} See discussion in Weiss 2004: 19-22. The Lex Irnita was not available when Eder 1980: 14-15 proposed (following Mommsen) that the Roman state could not legally purchase servi publici populi Romani, but could only rent their opera through a legal fiction involving a locatio arranged with the censors. This restriction was also thought to apply to Roman towns.

\textsuperscript{235} Examples with an agnomen ending in –ianus: AE 1939, 148 (Ostia); AE 1985, 226 (Ostia); CIL XI 5375 (Asisium); CIL II 2229 (Corduba; also containing a reference to ser. [emptu]; ILGN 375 (Alba Helvorum). Examples with a reference to a servus emptus: CIL X 1453 (Herculaneum). Example with a listing of multiple towns as owners: CIL XI 2710a (Volsinii). Examples interpreted through the nomenclature of siblings: AE 1994, 562 (Cures Sabini); CIL XII 4450 (Narbo). It is also possible that private owners gave these slaves as gifts to their town.

\textsuperscript{236} Kajanto 1967: 18-19. See also Weiss 2004: 20-1.

\textsuperscript{237} Kajanto 1965: 64, 73, 134 notes that this was a fairly common cognomen among both males and females. It was also popular among slaves, carrying the meaning 'agreeable.'

\textsuperscript{238} Weiss 2004: 72.
effectiveness of raising *vernae* versus purchasing trained slaves on the open market. The comments presented by both Varro (*RR* 2.1.26) and Columella (1.8.19) seem to imply that it was more economical for a rural estate to have more home-born than purchased slaves, though elsewhere in their handbooks it is implied that a significant proportion of estate slaves was purchased. From a qualitative standpoint, *vernae* may have been preferred for certain slave positions that demanded a high level of trust between master and slave, such as managing household finances or conducting business transactions as the master’s proxy.  

There are numerous price data from various periods that give insight into how much a new slave might cost on the open market. One early point of reference is the Delphic manumission inscriptions, which record how much freed slaves paid to their masters for their release, in the guise of a fictional sale to the god Apollo. The transactions date primarily to the second and first centuries BCE. These were instrumental in Keith Hopkins’ formulation of the ‘self-purchase’ or ‘cost-transactional’ model of manumission, according to which the key factor motivating masters to free their slaves was to exact a fee that they could then reinvest in new, younger slaves purchased on the open market. The price paid for full manumission – that is, to receive full juridical freedom – increased over time, a development Hopkins attributed to a short supply of available slaves in central Greece because of the movement of slaves to markets in Italy. One noteworthy feature of these documents is that the freed slaves who self-identified as *vernae* comprised almost 30% of group. This is an important observation, even if various factors may make the Delphic material too distinctive for this picture to be applied to other regions of the Roman Empire. It is also important to emphasize that the price a slave paid for manumission did not necessarily correspond precisely to the market price of a new slave.

Richard Duncan-Jones also contributed to the discussion through his collection of slave prices gathered from literary, legal, and epigraphic sources. These references cover such a wide chronological span and show such a huge range of different prices, however, that it is difficult to find any systematic patterns based on skill level, sex, and age. For instance, Columella mentions paying as much as 8000 *HS* for a vine-dresser in the mid-first century CE.

---

239 Duncan-Jones 1982: 50.  
241 Hopkins 1978: 133-70.  
242 Hopkins 1978: 139-41.  
243 See the critique by Mouritsen 2011: 159-80.  
244 Mouritsen 2011: 168.  
(3.3.8), while in the same period at Herculaneum a man pledge a young female slave (*puella*) as surety for a loan of only 600 *HS (TH 74)*. As Kyle Harper has stressed, moreover, such surveys of slave prices are rarely able to account for specific regional factors that affected market prices, including supply and demand.\(^{246}\)

Diocletian’s Price Edict is another important source for slave prices, indicating what was deemed the fair market price for different types of slaves in the late third century. In it, male slaves are considerably more expensive than their female counterparts in most age groups. Harper thinks this was a reflection of the high demand for males to perform agricultural work. Nevertheless, the price for female slaves became equal when they were in their peak childbearing years, a clear sign of the importance of producing *vernae* in slave households.\(^{247}\)

An additional useful point of reference for this discussion of the cost-effectiveness of *vernae* versus purchased slaves can be found in the ancillary debate about the costs of slave and free labor during the Principate. Scheidel’s opinion is currently the most widely accepted on this issue. Based on an analysis of labor practices in Classical Athens, Late Republican Rome, and Imperial Rome, he argues that in relation to the other two periods maintaining slave labor in Imperial Rome became increasingly expensive compared to the periodic hiring of wage laborers.\(^{248}\) On the one hand, the source that had so effectively supplied Rome’s slaves in the Middle and Late Republic, large-scale military campaigns that acquired captives, became less important under the Principate. Other sources such as self-sale, enslavement of exposed children, and the slave trade from outside the Empire may have helped,\(^{249}\) but by and large the Roman slave system had to rely on natural reproduction to maintain its population.\(^{250}\) On the other hand, many Roman slaves were becoming more skilled in intellectual and technical occupations, which also drove up their value. A corollary to this argument is that slave-owners increasingly preferred maintaining a supply of home-born slaves, even in consideration of the cost of raising them, to having to pay high prices on the open market. It should be recognized that in the context of the *familia publica*, these were just the types of skilled slaves that the municipal council was likely

interested in acquiring. Frequently doing so through purchase, then, may have become an
expensive proposition. Another consequence of this model was a low rate of manumission.

In the face of potentially high market prices for slaves, towns also had the capacity to
acquire slaves from benefactors, a type of patronage that came in a couple of forms. In some
cases, local citizens gave slaves to the city as a form of euergetism. One documented case comes
from a Roman town in Gallia Narbonensis on Lake Geneva, where a local patron built a
horologium for his town in the first century and donated a slave worth 4000 HS to maintain it
(CIL XII 2522). In other cases, local inhabitants could institute the town as heir to all or part of
their estate. One example that may fit this category is CIL III 4152 from Savaria in the
province of Pannonia Superior, which records a municipal slave named Daphnus assigned to the
kalendarium Septimianum. Weiss hypothesizes that this estate was a testamentary gift to the
town by a certain Septimius, and that a private slave was also bequeathed in order to administer
it. The slave in question may have already been a municipal slave and was simply reassigned to
this accounting post when the town inherited the estate. At Herculaneum, two patrons, a father
and son, bought a municipal slave for the stated purpose of managing the market weights and
measures they had donated to their town (CIL X 1453). Although it is not reflected in these
examples, it is possible that such gifts of slaves also account for some of the municipal slaves
known to have carried the characteristic agnomen ending in -ianus.

A fourth way in which towns could acquire new slaves for the familia publica was
through the confiscation of the property of local criminals. Although there are no clear examples
of such a scenario, the aforementioned Savarian estate (kalendarium Septimianum) could have
come into the possession of the town by a seizure of some local person’s property.

Access to operae and hereditas

A second aspect of manumitting municipal slaves that must have factored into the
decision of the ordo was the probability of retaining their services in the form of operae and of

---

252 See Dig. 38.3.1 (Ulpian); and Cod. Iust. 6.24.12. See also Johnston 1985: 106-12.
255 Weiss 2004: 22-3. As context for this possibility, note the numerous large fines imposed by the Lex Irnitana for a
range of crimes or failures to meet contractual obligations to the city. It is easy to envision that some convicted
persons may have paid such fines through forfeiture of their property. For example, the praedia often put up as
security for engaging in public works would have been seized by the ordo when contracts were not carried through.
See, for example, Lex Irnitana 62-64.
claiming a portion of their hereditas. Operae, or days of labor owed by the freedman to the patron or the patron’s son, were normally arranged through the stipulatio before manumission and confirmed by an oath afterwards. These obligations were intended to enable the patron to retain some economic benefit from his or her ex-slave. Lex Irnitana Chapter 72 guarantees that the Roman municipalities had rights to the opera of its freedmen and freedwomen. The next chapter will explore how opera may have been utilized in the municipal familia publica.

An additional area of concern for the municipal ordo was its access as a pseudo-patron to the property of its freedmen. Municipal slaves had testamentary rights over half of their peculium, an exceptional privilege for slaves, and Papinian maintains that those manumitted legally (iure) retained this sum after manumission unless the ordo had explicitly taken it away (Dig. 40.3.3). At least some municipal slaves at the time of their manumission must have accumulated a substantial peculium, making this undoubtedly an important issue for the decurions.

Roman testamentary law normally guaranteed a share of a freedman’s estate to his patron, or his patron’s son, even when the freedman had natural children. The application of the Praetor’s Edict enlisted patrons as valid heirs and granted them the right to sue for a portion – eventually up to half – of a freedman’s estate through the action of bonorum possessio contra tabulas, even if the freedman left a valid will. The lex Papia Poppaea (9 CE) made it even easier for patrons to take a share of larger estates when their freedmen had fewer than three natural children. Lex Irnitana 72 grants these same patron’s rights to the collective citizens of Roman towns, as if a corporation of munifices or coloni. Ulpian concludes that, whereas a municipium possessed the full rights of a patron over its freedman’s estate (bona), and whereas a SC granted that a municipality could succeed to a freedman’s estate when instituted as heir by him, the town could in fact sue via bonorum possessio for a portion of its freedman’s estate (Dig. 38.3.1).
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256 Buckland 1908: 370-1 provides a useful survey of the juridical discussions of opera owed to a patron. On the stipulatio and oath, in particular, see Dig. 38.1.7 (Ulpian); 40.12.44 (Vellusius); and 44.5.2.2 (Paulus). See also Wiedemann 1981: 54-6. The topic of opera is treated in Book 38.1 of the Digest.

257 The slaves of the Roman state, called servi publici populi Romani, also seem to have gained this privilege.

258 See also the legal opinions in Dig. 38.16.

259 Gaius Inst. 3.7.

260 Ulpian’s case is built on the fact that a SC under Marcus Aurelius had granted the legitima hereditas to legal associations (collegia legitima), which as corporations constitute a parallel to Roman towns (Dig. 40.3.1-2). Cf. Johnston 1985: 106-12 on the special privilege afforded to a municipality to receive an inheritance from its citizens.
That the town normally received a share of its freedman’s *hereditas* is further supported by a rescript Gordian III issued confirming this right to a female petitioner concerned with the status of her daughter by her municipal freedman husband (*Cod. Iust.* 7.9.2). The emperor assures the woman that if the provincial governor had approved the local council’s decision to manumit him, thereby making it legal, and if the two had contracted a legal marriage after he had been freed, a daughter born to the couple would be a Roman citizen and legally in the *potestas* of her father.\(^{261}\) Giménez-Candela thinks that this natural child *in patris potestate*, thus a *sui heres*, meant that the *ordo* would have no claim to the estate by civil law.\(^{262}\) It is important to note, however, that while this rescript does guarantee the child’s right to inherit from her father, it does not exclude the *ordo* from also gaining a share.

From an economic perspective, if the municipal *ordo* had the opportunity to recover a portion of its freedmen’s estates, this factor should not have constituted an obstacle to granting manumission.

*Municipal slaves’ preference for manumission*

One final area of inquiry into the manumitting of municipal slaves touches on the extent to which the slaves desired to be manumitted. This question may seem counterintuitive at first, since it would seem that a slave’s desire to attain his freedom must have been paramount and probably universal across slave societies. The majority of evidence from the Roman world indeed supports the idea that free status, and the acquisition of Roman citizenship that often accompanied it, was coveted. For example, it is still generally agreed that a principal reason why freedmen were so active in funerary epigraphy was their eagerness to advertise their new status.\(^{263}\) Yet in the Roman world dependent labor was a normative condition for the sub-elite classes, and it came with various statuses. One theory in current scholarship maintains that

---

261 *Cod. Iust.* 7.9.2: *si decretum ordinis auctoritas rectoris provinciae comprobavit, quo is libertatem acceperat, cui postea fueras, ut proponis, matrimonio copulata, natam ex huiusmodi matrimonio et civem Romanam esse et in patris potestate non est incertae opinionis*. The adverb *postea* refers syntactically to the marriage occurring after the husband’s manumission, but its real force should be transferred to the birth of the daughter, which is really the legal status issue in question here.


263 Taylor 1961: 113-32. Zanker 1975: 267-315 traced a similar eagerness among Roman freedmen to celebrate their new status among the citizen population in the portraits on their funerary monuments. He analyzed tomb reliefs in order to sketch a picture of a sort of freedman artistic *koine* that drew on an amalgam of portrait styles and aimed to express a series of values.
manumission was in many cases merely a promotion from one type of dependent labor to another, particularly if the conditions of *operae* were as prevalent as is sometimes assumed.\textsuperscript{264}

It is important to recognize that any inquiry into the attitudes of Roman slaves and freedmen must be hypothetical, since almost no slave or freedman narratives have survived from the Roman world.\textsuperscript{265} The elite authors who were responsible for the only literary depictions of slaves and ex-slaves were more interested in constructing stereotypes than in presenting the group’s genuine attitudes.\textsuperscript{266} Considering some elements of these literary versions of slaves and ex-slaves alongside certain evidence from the *familia publica* can be useful for addressing this question.

The various patronage benefits that accrued to a freedman were often great.\textsuperscript{267} The ex-slave, now a citizen and therefore entitled to the *tria nomina*, added his master’s *praenomen* and *gentilicium* to his own personal name, a signal of the close bond between the two. Deeper entry into the family of the patron was made possible by manumission, and cases can be cited of a freedman being designated as his patron’s heir or even marrying one of his freeborn daughters.\textsuperscript{268}

Perhaps the greatest advantages offered by a patron involved his financial support. Masters normally gave their slaves a stipend called a *peculium*, and it is generally thought that at manumission the patron granted this *peculium*, perhaps along with a bonus, as a nest egg to his new freedman.\textsuperscript{269} Without a doubt, many freedmen continued working for their patrons in their former slave occupations, since having an occupation and steady wage was often more attractive than trying their luck on the urban labor market. In some cases, patrons might put up the funds to back the business ventures of their ex-slaves, as seems to have happened with the Decimi Caecilii and their freedmen in the oil trade in the middle of the second century CE.\textsuperscript{270} It is also possible to cite examples of patrons packing the occupational associations where they had an

\textsuperscript{264} See, for example, discussion in Hopkins 1978: 108-15; and Mouritsen 2013: 60-1.
\textsuperscript{265} One exception is Epictetus, the freedman of an imperial freedman who lectured on Stoic philosophy from the Flavian period to the reign of Hadrian. Arrian recorded some of his lectures in four books. See a discussion of the main points of Epictetus’ dictums in Millar 1965: 141-8.
\textsuperscript{266} See, for example, Wiedemann 1985: 163-7; and Joshel 2011: 223-40.
\textsuperscript{267} See Mouritsen 2011: 36-65 for a discussion of the social and legal features of the patron-freedman relationship.
\textsuperscript{268} Mouritsen 2011: 36-65.
\textsuperscript{269} Mouritsen 2011: 174-80. Cf. Hopkins 1978: 117-118, 133-170, who argued that the *peculium* was mostly spent on buying the slave’s freedom.
\textsuperscript{270} Members of the family are recorded in a series of *tituli* and inscriptions: *CIL* XV 3751-3761, 3788-3790. See discussions of this evidence by Broekaert 2016: 243-9; and Tchernia 2016: 54-7.
economic interest with their own ex-slaves. A good example is the association of the *lenuncularii tabularii auxiliarii* in Ostia (*CIL* XIV 215). The roster of members in 192 CE lists two lifetime officers named M. Publicius Ianuarius and M. Publicius Ostiensis Sen(ior). The two must have been deeply invested in the trade, perhaps even owning the tugboats used in their operations. The clearest sign of their grip on the association is the likelihood that the 26 rank-and-file Marci Publicii members, many of whom bear a Greek *cognomen*, were their own freedmen.

The importance of a patron’s financial support is also signaled by cases of patrons helping their own freedmen enter prestigious urban associations like the *Augustales*, which required not only large sums of money, but also a high social status among their fellow ex-slaves. A first-century CE epitaph from Nola illustrates this phenomenon (*AE* 1971, 83):

\[D(\text{ecimo}) \text{ Septumuleio } D(\text{ecimi}) \text{ l(iberto)} / \text{ Athenioni magistr(o) August(ali),} / \text{ Septumuleiae } D(\text{ecimi}) \text{ l(ibertae) Daphne,} / D(\text{ecimus}) \text{ Septumuleius } D(\text{ecimi}) \text{ l(ibertus)} / \text{ Atticus magist(e)r August(alis) viv\textcircled{s} sibi et patrono et conlibertae fecit.}\]

To D. Septumuleius Athenio, freedman of Decimus, *magister Augustalis*, and to Septumuleia Daphne, freedwoman of Decimus, D. Septumuleius Atticus, freedman of Decimus and *magister Augustalis*, erected (this epitaph) while living, for himself, for his patron, and for his fellow-freedwoman.

The patron and co-dedicatee of this epitaph, D. Septumuleius Athenio, himself a freedman, was sufficiently well off to join the local *Augustales* and become an officer of the group, and he then seems to have helped his own freedman enter the organization and achieve this same high rank.

Yet such benefits were not always available for all freedmen. An ex-slave without the benefits bestowed by a rich patron or, in the case of testamentary manumission, a freedman with no patron or patron’s heir probably found his new independence in the urban labor market difficult. In the plays of Plautus, one finds the popular theme of the new freedman lamenting the fact that he must now make his own way in the world. There may have been some kernel of

---

271 See, for example, Tran 2006b: 461-518.
273 On this connection, see Royden 1988: 100-2; Herz 1994: 320-2; and Tran 2006b: 435. The rank-and-file member named Marcus Publicius Ostiensis is probably the son of one of the *quinquennales perpetui*, signaled by the latter’s name M. Publicius Ostiensis Sen(ior). Combined, these 27 Marci Publicii ordinary members constituted 10.5% of the entire membership.
275 Sources in Mouritsen 2011: 152-3.
truth behind such portrayals. In this context, some slaves may have viewed the prospect of manumission with some ambivalence. Mouritsen is probably not far off the mark in suggesting that, at least for slaves in the comparatively ‘comfortable’ elite urban households, life as a slave may have been preferable to making his or her own way as a freedman or freedwoman.

Municipal freedmen fit into this latter category of those lacking a personal patron and the many benefits afforded by the latter’s clientela network. There is evidence that a narrow segment of these freedmen achieved the type of success enjoyed by their well-placed private counterparts, but, as will be shown in the next chapter, such success was not typical of the ex-slaves of Roman towns. The municipal slaves were considerably more numerous than freedmen, and therefore have left a larger amount of evidence. Yet their enthusiastic commemorative activities signal their own high degree of wealth derived from their position. Roman legal sources single out the high status of the servi publici by enumerating the many privileges they enjoyed.

Given the choice, then, between a position that was already rich in status and privileges and the uncertainties of a post-manumission life without a patron, it is plausible that some municipal slaves would have elected to remain enslaved in the familia rather than seek manumission. The familia publica was, in fact, a community in its own right, with a hierarchy, family groups and friends, and opportunities for meaningful social interaction in the town. It also should not be overlooked that municipal slaves received a stipend for their work, a factor that surely would have impacted on the choice of whether to leave the familia.

This hypothesis rests on a debatable presupposition, namely, that slaves could assert their preference in the issue of manumission and that institutional factors such as promotion or replacement did not fully take the process out of their hands. From the perspective of the slave-owner, in this case the decurions as representatives of their town, manumitting slaves at a certain point in their lives had its advantages. The decurions may have been motivated either to create legally autonomous agents whom they could still control or to cut loose older slaves whose
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278 On the privileges and social standing of municipal slaves, see Weiss 2004: 163-79.
279 Cf. Mouritsen 2013: 60-1, on private elite slave households.
280 On the topic of pay for municipal slaves, see Lex Irnitana 79. See also Weiss 2004: 165-6.
281 If, for example, a new municipal freedman continued on in a clerical or accounting occupation, he was required to swear the same oath to perform his role honestly as magistrates and apparitores swore (Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae 81; Lex Irnitana 25-6, 73).
usefulness in clerical and manual labor positions would have become increasingly limited. The incentive to manumit might also have been increased by new generations of municipal slave functionaries who acquired the necessary skills to take over their older colleagues’ occupations.

At the same time, if, as Mouritsen thinks, impersonal slave households like the familia publica needed a standardized system of manumission such as a cost-transaction system, the onus would have been placed on the slave to possess and be willing to spend the funds to pay for his or her freedom. The description of manumission in Lex Irtitana Chapter 72 indeed makes the manumission fee a central component of the process. The older municipal slaves observed above in the demographic analysis also bear on this discussion. Among the male slaves whose epitaphs record ages, nearly one-quarter \( (N = 10) \) were 50 years or older, and another one-third \( (N = 16) \) were between 30 and 49 years. This is significant, even in light of the well-known problems one encounters in trying to make demographic arguments based on the limited picture presented by tombstones with recorded ages. It is also unclear to what extent these older slaves were exceptional or reflective of a larger pattern in the familia publica, but one-quarter is suggestive of the latter possibility. How can these cases be explained? The slaves in question may have lacked the resources or connections to obtain manumission, or perhaps their continued presence on the town’s payroll, so to speak, was a reward for their service, though manumission would seem to have been a greater reward. Yet it is worth considering in this context whether any of these older slaves may have remained in the familia publica by choice.

II.4.2 EVIDENCE FOR THE MUNICIPAL FAMILIA PUBLICA AND THEORIES OF ROMAN MANUMISSION

Even if manumission rates cannot be precisely quantified, the Romans seem likely to have manumitted their slaves on a large scale, and historians have advanced numerous theories to explain the behaviors of Roman masters who did so. Using the literary and epigraphic
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282 Cato famously recommended selling off old as well as sickly slaves (RR 2.7). Note also Hopkins’ (1978: 117-18, 133-70) theory of ‘recapitalization’ as one rationale for the practice of manumission by Roman slave-owners. I will discuss this model below, pp. 114-16.


284 One common motif in the world of Plautus was of the slave who harmed his chances of manumission through self-purchase by squandering his peculium on short-term gratification (e.g., Poen. 842-4). It is nonetheless important to recognize that many of the sentiments and motivations ascribed to slaves in Roman comedy sprang from the ideology of the slave-owning elite.

285 See the tables above on the age-data of municipal slaves and freedmen, pp. 83-6.

evidence as a basis, these explanations focus on the legal, economic, and social implications of manumitting slaves in order to interpret what factors motivated the practice. In this final section of the chapter, it will be useful to consider how well the three most influential theories of Roman manumission relate to the evidence for the *familia publica* in any given period, and what each theory can suggest about the frequency of manumission in the context of municipal slaves.\(^ {287}\)

*Self-purchase manumission*

A first theory of manumission is the ‘self-purchase’ or ‘cost-transactional’ model developed by Hopkins through his study of the manumission commemorations at Delphi.\(^ {288}\) Their peculiarity lies in the degree of freedom the slaves were to receive. The inscriptions demonstrate that slaves could purchase their freedom outright for a higher fee, thereby severing their ties with their master, or they could secure a partial release, through the *paramone* contract. While this latter form was more affordable, it also put the freed slave in a liminal state: he or she had juridical freedom but was contractually obligated to continue service to the master for an agreed upon length of time before receiving full release.\(^ {289}\)

This transactional manumission heavily favored the slave owner. Hopkins points out that the owner could recapitalize his original investment in the slave being manumitted by using the manumission fee to purchase a replacement slave on the market. In strict economic terms, this advantageous arrangement provides a compelling rational explanation for why manumission on any scale ever would have been palatable for Roman owners.\(^ {290}\) Additionally, the owner retained patron’s rights over his ex-slave, possibly including access to his *operae*.\(^ {291}\) From the perspective of some slaves at least, this practice may have made slavery a sort of ‘medium-term labor contract.’\(^ {292}\)

It is important to recognize that this model of manumission was developed in a specific time and place, central Greece in the Late Republic. Accordingly, the practice was subject to local social and economic realities.\(^ {293}\) There is little evidence that the sort of manumissions

\(^{287}\) Some additional explanations for manumission have been omitted here, since they are less applicable to the *familia publica* and aspects of some of these already play a role in the three principal models being discussed here.

\(^{288}\) Hopkins 1978: 117-18, 133-70. See also the comments of Westermann 1955: 32-4.

\(^{289}\) Hopkins 1978: 128.


\(^{291}\) Hopkins 1978: 179-80 on the issue of freedmen severing ties with their patron.

\(^{292}\) Hopkins 1978: 159-80. Cf. Hopkins’ (1978: 158-63) own qualifications to the argument. The realities of the new slave market that served the emerging Roman Empire may have compelled local slave owners and slaves in
covered by ‘divine law’ were typical outside central Greece and a handful of other sites in the eastern provinces. Critics of the model have also noted that self-purchase effectively would have removed the ex-slave’s obligations to his former master that were central to the Roman institution of manumission. Mouritsen points out that in Roman literature, the ‘independent’ freedman is often portrayed as a rather detestable character, possibly because he lacked a patron to keep him in line. There is also a general perception from the sources that it made little sense to allow slaves to build up a *peculium* only to have them exhaust it by purchasing their freedom. It may in fact be better understood as a protected fund to assist the ex-slave in his new life and sometimes as an investment in his potential to earn money for the patron’s business activities.

Yet conceptually the self-purchase model contains three features that make it attractive for understanding manumission in the *familia publica*. First, it has already been noted that in cases of impersonal ownership, a more regulated path to gaining freedom was required. Reducing the manumission of municipal slaves to a mere economic transaction would remove many of the problems with a more selective, personal, form of manumission. The second connection is the availability of the necessary financial resources for some municipal slaves. Several slaves accumulated substantial personal wealth, such as a slave *arcarius* of Aequiculi who had the funds to renovate a temple and erect a shrine to local cults in the late second century CE (*CIL* IX 4109-4110, 4112), or a *vilicus* of Urvinum Mataurense who evidently possessed three personal *vicarii* as part of his *peculium* (*CIL* XI 6073). A corollary to such prosperity would be a sizeable enough *peculium* to pay for manumission. Third, from the standpoint of a cost-transaction that primarily benefitted the owner, it makes sense that the *ordo* could either reinvest the manumission payment by purchasing a new slave on the market, or keep the money and train a *verna* from within the *familia*.
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294 Zachos 2007: 115-24 describes the civil law that lay behind the protection of such manumissions by the deities at whose sanctuaries they took place. He focuses on Elateia, but also analyzes material from a range of other sites.
297 See the discussion above on slave prices on the open market, pp. 105-7.
Selective manumission

The duovir’s role in manumitting municipal slaves is also important for the second theory of manumission, selective manumission.\textsuperscript{299} This model maintains that certain slaves who achieved a level of trust with their master through loyal and diligent service could receive manumission as a reward. According to the Roman paternalistic conception of institution, such slaves had attained in the eyes of their master a level of ‘maturity’ necessary to take control of their own existence as free persons.\textsuperscript{300} The idea of selective manumission rests on the slave’s opportunity to maintain a close personal connection with his master – or perhaps a \textit{vilicus} – in order to demonstrate his contribution and be singled out for manumission. It must therefore have been primarily a feature of urban slave households, where such opportunities for close contact would have been easier than on a rural estate. It should also be recognized that granting manumission to slaves for good service functioned as a positive incentive for younger slaves to work hard to attain a similar outcome, perhaps an even more effective tool to ensure productivity than the threat of punishment.\textsuperscript{301}

How might this model of selective manumission apply to the municipal \textit{familia publica}? If indeed the duovirs played the key role in initiating manumission, it is easy to envision that they themselves may have proposed favorite slaves based on a personal relationship.\textsuperscript{302} A degree of trust between a slave and magistrate certainly could have developed in the course of their administrative duties, with a result that the latter endorsed manumission. Yet the epigraphic evidence yields no clear traces of gratitude to substantiate any examples of such a relationship.\textsuperscript{303} To be sure, the possibility that magistrates championed certain slaves would seem to fit an important criterion of selective manumission. Yet this practice also could have given rise to such problems as disputes between different decurions putting up their favorites freedmen the hope of gaining clients.

A related problem with the idea of selective manumission is that it often had to be obtained as a reward, implying a merit-based system. It is worth asking how a municipal slave

\textsuperscript{299} Mouritsen 2011: 186-202 discusses this model in detail.
\textsuperscript{300} Mouritsen 2011: 203-4.
\textsuperscript{301} Fenoaltea 1984: 640-3, 667-8, drawing on material from numerous historical slave-owning societies. See also Bradley 1994: 107-31.
\textsuperscript{302} Giménez-Candela 1981: 50-2.
\textsuperscript{303} Luciani’s (2015: 257-60) argument about a pair of possible municipal freedmen of Acelum who honored a former magistrate as their ‘patron’ may constitute an exception, though I have not included them in my catalogue (ZPE 196: 257). See above, pp. 50-1.
could ever really distinguish himself or perform exceptional service beyond doing his assigned job. In fact, only negative examples of performance are cited in our sources, such as in a votive offering from Tuder in the Flavian period. It credited Jupiter Optimus Maximus with saving the decurions from a sceleratissimus servus publicus who had stolen public money and inscribed their names on a curse tablet (CIL XI 4639).

On behalf of the safety of the colony and the council of decurions and the people of Tuder, and to Jupiter Optimus Maximus, Guardian and Preserver, because with his divine power he rescued the names of the council of decurions, cursed on a monument by the unspeakable robbery of that most wicked municipal slave, and he defended them; and (because) he liberated the colony and the citizens from the fear of danger, L. Cancrius Primigenius, freedman of Clemens, a sexvir and Augustalis and Flavialis, the first of all to have been invested in those ranks by the council, willingly fulfilled his vow. (Dedicated) in the consulship of C. Vibius [---] and Iulius [---].

Lenski enumerates other evidence of crimes perpetrated by municipal slaves, typically involving misappropriation of public money. In general, it is difficult to envision municipal slaves having the chance to do anything beyond fulfilling their prescribed duties, though perhaps this was a sufficient prerequisite to earn manumission as a reward for a job well done.

A case against the selective manumission model in the familia publica has also been made from a practical standpoint. In theory, the decurions, on behalf of their town, should be categorized as impersonal owners. It has been argued that in an impersonal context, there was little room for the one-on-one contact needed to manumit a slave based on his personal qualities and behavior. Instead, access to manumission had to be offered through more standardized
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304 Contra Halkin 1897: 22-32, whose interpretation relies heavily on legendary manumissions of servi publici populi Romani from the Early and Middle Republic.
305 Weiss 2004: 12, 207-8 no. 109. See also Eck 1993: 172 no. 259.
306 Lenski 2006: 351-2. The drafters of the Roman municipal statutes were well aware of the potential for embezzlement by public servants and magistrates working with public money. For example, Lex Irnitana 26 and 73 demanded an oath from anyone handling the town’s money, to be sworn by Jupiter and the Divine Augustus, Claudius, Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian. Yet municipal slaves had no legal personality, so they were incapable of swearing this oath.
The governing criteria for such a system may have included time served, level of wealth, rank or administrative position, and so on.

Despite these conceptual problems, in practice the decurions of most towns, especially smaller ones, probably had the opportunity to take a more hands-on approach to managing their municipal slaves than is often envisioned. Perhaps the most compelling case for selective manumission can be made by turning once more to *Lex Irnitana* 72 and its protocols of manumission. There are grounds to argue that the decurions considered each potential freedman’s record on a case-by-case basis. The procedure implies that a real debate took place in the council, during which presumably the slave’s ‘fitness’ to join the local citizen body was examined. In this scenario, the decurions could play the role of personal slave owners in determining whether the municipal slave had sufficiently ‘matured’ to make this social leap. It is also worth noting that the decurions were themselves private slave owners, and thus they brought this mentality to their dealings with the *familia publica*.

Promotional model of manumission

The third manumission scenario is based on promotion and replacement. The best illustration of this model is the bureaucracy of the *familia Caesaris*. Weaver, with a large number of careers available for study, envisioned a *cursus honorum* system in the imperial bureaus in which an imperial slave employed in clerical duties could expect to be manumitted and promoted to a higher administrative position by his mid- to late thirties or somewhat later. After his promotion, a *vicarius* whom he had trained would move into his former position. One other feature of this system was that the imperial freedmen normally remained in the emperor’s employ after their manumission-promotion, in some cases entering a procuratorship at the head of one of the bureaus. In nearly all the cases where imperial slaves of the various clerical grades possessed *vicarii*, Weaver found that they had only a single *vicarius*, evidently indicating that this under-slave was intended as an occupational replacement.

There is a limited set of evidence that seems to support such a model in the municipal *familia publica*. The case of the municipal freedman M. Valerius Verna from Asculum Picenum
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308 See, in particular, Tablet VIIIB, lines 10-11.
310 Weaver’s 1972: 97-104, 224-81 model remains widely accepted. See, for example, Garnsey and Saller 1987: 25.
311 Weaver 1972: 200-6. Imperial slaves owned a single *vicarius* in c. 90% of cases (N = 59).
has already been cited above (ILS 6565).\textsuperscript{312} The municipal slave *dispensator* who erected his epitaph seems to indicate that he had previously served as *arcarius* under Valerius, who in turn may have filled the slave position of *dispensator* before his manumission.\textsuperscript{313} Additional evidence may be found in the wax tablets from the archive of L. Caecilius Iucundus in Pompeii, where it seems that the career advancement of one municipal slave can be traced in a pair of receipts recording lease payments. The first one dates to March 53 CE and was issued by a slave of the colony named Secundus, whom Weiss identifies as an *actor publicus* tasked with collecting the rents on behalf of the colony (*CIL* IV 3340, 138).\textsuperscript{314} In a separate payment receipt issued seven years later by a different municipal slave (*CIL* IV 3340, 139), Secundus seems to reappear as a witness to the transaction, now bearing the *tria nomina* M. Venerius Secundus. It is likely that he attained a more senior position in the public administration after his manumission. In the treasury at Aquileia, there is evidence of a municipal freedman in the position of *vilicus summarum* (*CIL* V 737), and apparently a slave as *actor summarum* (*I. Aquileia* 556).\textsuperscript{315} These titles imply a hierarchy in the grades, and the identification of the senior man as a freedman and the subordinate man as a slave suggests a pattern of promotion and replacement.\textsuperscript{316} One can add that numerous municipal slaves owned *vicarii*.\textsuperscript{317} Many of these appear to have been personal *vicarii*, but in a few cases a municipal slave was associated with only a single under-slave who may have been his occupational *vicarius*. The following example from Telesia in Samnium likely falls into the latter category (*CIL* IX 2244):

\begin{quote}
Epitynchano / Telesinorum / ser(vo) ar\tilde{c}(ario) / Adiutor / vicar(ius).
\end{quote}

To Epitynchanus, slave *arcarius* of the Telesini, Adiutor, his under-slave, (erected this epitaph).

Another important piece of evidence for a possible career track inside the *familia publica* can be cited. One example is a rescript issued by Gordian III, which confirms that a municipal freedman

\begin{footnotes}
\item[312] See above, pp. 28-30.
\item[313] Weiss 2004: 40-2; Cristofori 2004: 139-40, 146.
\item[315] Brusin 1991: 259 no. 556; Weiss 2004: 210 no. 134. It is possible that the illegible line above this man’s *cognomen* contained a *gentilicium*, which would make him a freedman, though the line also may have listed the recipient of a votive offering.
\item[316] Weiss 2004: 42-6. Similarly, *CIL* IX 1664, an epitaph commemorating a slave assistant in the archives of Beneventum (*adiutor tabularius*), suggests grades within that municipal office, though it must be noted that this man was approximately 40 years of age when he died still holding this apparent subordinate position.
\item[318] I follow Weiss’ 2004: 206 no. 91 reading of the epitaph.
\end{footnotes}
had ‘given’ (*dedera*) a *vicarius* to the local *familia* in order to secure his own freedom (*Cod. Iust. 7.9.1*).³¹⁹

Such evidence points to a promotion system in some localities, a system that answers the need of a standardized avenue to freedom in the context of an impersonal ownership.³²⁰ Yet problems also arise from imputing this model to the *familia publica*. From the standpoint of manumission rates, this system would have produced only a small number of freed slaves and only infrequently, restricting this path to a narrow segment of the *familia* population who performed high level administrative tasks. For the lower group of municipal slaves performing less skilled work, a promotion model using trained *vicarii* as replacements makes little sense. On this basis, one must envision either that these lower-ranking slaves had limited chances of obtaining manumission, or that another type of manumission was used with them.

The biggest disadvantage for this theory, however, is the lack of evidence for the systematic use of such a model. Weiss rightly points out that no consistent scheme of grades or promotion can be found in any individual town.³²¹ For instance, towns often used different titles for clerical slaves who seem to have been exercising the same functions, and there was apparently no consistent distinction between many slave and freedman positions. Nor does the evidence for ages of municipal slaves and freedmen offer any clarity on a career path and promotion. One slave of Petelia was already a *vilicus* at age 24 (*AE* 1985, 314), while two others remained as slaves in this position for a remarkable length of time: one from Brundisium was still a *publicus vilicus* at age 50 (*CIL IX 59*), and another aged approximately 62 years from Volaterra claimed to have performed this *actum* for 44 years (*CIL XI 1751*). Two *arcarii* were still slaves after having turned 50 (*CIL IX 699, Sipontum; CIL X 410, Volcei*), while another achieved this post in his early twenties (*AE* 1978, 194, Brundisium). An even more extreme case is presented in an epitaph from a town in Hispania Tarraconensis that records a municipal slave who died at the age of 97 without ever progressing beyond the rank of *dispensator* (*CILA III 596*).

³¹⁹ The emperor’s response was intended to assure the municipal freedman petitioner that he would not be returned to slavery if the *vicarius* he arranged were to flee from the local *familia publica*. Cf. *Cod. Theod. 4.8.7* (Constantine); and *Cod. Iust. 6.46.6* (Justinian).
³²¹ Weiss 2004: 45-6. He argues that the different sequences of titles in towns could be the product of local variation rather than a standard *cursus honorum* for municipal slaves.
Two final points should be made. First, some portion of the municipal slaves in Roman towns probably had no fixed position or competence. Apart from those possessing more technical skills, many slaves performed tasks in various administrative areas, which is implied by the instructions in *Lex Irnitana* 78 to assign jobs (*negotia*) annually to the slaves. Such cases scarcely leave room for ascribing a standardized career path. A second, related point is that in most towns the *familia publica* was probably small. In this environment, in which the decurions could engage in a more hands-on style of management, there was little need for the level of organization envisioned for the *familia Caesaris*, which indeed operated on a far larger scale.

These three models provide important insight into how manumission may have functioned within the municipal *familia publica*, and seem to offer a mixed result. Perhaps the self-purchase model offers the best explanation. It fits both the need for a standardized path toward manumission in the context of an impersonal *familia* and the profile of a select group of slaves that evidently possessed substantial funds to pay for their release. At the same time, the possibility remains that selective manumission played some role in the process, especially in smaller towns where the more senior municipal slaves could have experienced closer connections with individual decurions. These two forms also may have worked in tandem. Once a candidate for manumission had acquired the necessary funds, the decurions still had to discuss whether he was worthy of manumission. In any event, both methods must have resulted in a low rate of manumission, primarily restricted to the higher-level slaves who accumulated a large *peculium* or managed to forge the informal connections. In practice, moreover, slaves probably had to remain in their posts for a minimum period, at least until around the legal manumission age of 30, and it must have taken time for them to amass the necessary funds to purchase their freedom. On this basis, one could expect that in many years no slaves were manumitted at all.

II.5 CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has analyzed a wide range of evidence in an attempt to answer the two crucial questions posed at the outset concerning municipal slaves. First, how large did the typical *familia publica* need to be in order to carry out its support of the municipal administration? Second, how frequently did the typical municipal council manumit its slaves?

An empirical analysis of the evidence describing the day-to-day activities of the council and magistrates of select Roman towns demonstrates a clear need for maintaining a substantial
familia. Furthermore, it makes sense that a limited number of highly skilled senior slaves were probably able to handle many of the demands of their town’s clerical, technical, and cultic activities. Then there was the handful of municipal slaves fixed to the staff of the magistrates. In addition to these higher-ranking municipal slaves, another group of slaves without specific training probably worked to maintain the municipal infrastructure under the supervision of the local aediles. The number of lower-ranking slaves is more difficult to estimate, though we know that they were necessary to perform some of the work alluded to in the evidence for municipal government.

The familia publica differed in many ways from private slave familiae, and these differences meant that a distinctive set of demographic, social, and legal concerns governed the way the municipal ordo decurionum practiced manumission. By focusing on the most meaningful demographic patterns found in the inscriptions recording municipal slaves and freedmen, the disparate legal notices on manumitting municipal slaves, and scholarly theories of Roman manumission, it has been possible to reconstruct how the ordo may have responded to the challenges of maintaining the ranks of the familia.

The analysis presented above points to a low rate of manumission. To sustain the lower levels of the familia, the primary means of replacement must have been natural reproduction, and therefore it was necessary for the ordo to cultivate slave families to bring up new slaves. The presence and role of female municipal slaves is more difficult to assess, since they are poorly represented in the epigraphy. There was surely a substantial female component in the familia, as is suggested by one type of marriage pattern in the familia. In addition, the lower-ranking servi would have had fewer opportunities to be manumitted, unless the decurions simply cut them loose at a certain age, perhaps around 30 years or after they had fathered vernaes, preferring not to continue with the expense of supporting them as slaves. For the higher-ranking municipal slaves, those performing clerical, scribal, and technical roles, there was greater accessibility to manumission, perhaps sometimes through a standardized method like self-purchase. Whereas in some cases these slaves may have been replaced by vernaes who were trained to fill their positions, the council may have had a preference for the targeted purchase of replacements on the market who already had training in accounting literacy and scribal skills, or relied on receiving such slaves through gifts and bequests.

---

322 Cf. Lex Irnitana 78 on the annual assignment of negotia to municipal slaves at Irni.
Several factors would have compelled the *ordo* to manumit its slaves only infrequently. For example, the minimum legal age of manumission of 30 years, the ever-present threat of the death of slaves, the likely high expense involved in purchasing new skilled slaves on the open market, the time involved in training home-born replacements, and the need to keep key positions constantly filled all would have aligned to create a cautious approach to manumission. It would be surprising if more than 10-15% of municipal slaves were manumitted in any given five-year period. All the same, such a rate would have been sufficient to introduce multiple new family lines of municipal freedmen into Roman society in each generation over several centuries, and many of these families left a record of their social and economic activities in the epigraphic evidence. Such production should have made available for study a substantial epigraphic record of the various generations of these ex-slave families.

\[323\] This estimate is based on both the lower end of Roman demographers’ hypotheses about the rates of manumission among the general Roman slave population.
CHAPTER III:  
SOCIAL MOBILITY AND THE MUNICIPAL FREEDMEN OF ITALIAN TOWNS

The theme of this chapter is to understand to what degree the municipal freedmen achieved social and economic mobility and by what means they accomplished this. As a corollary, it will be possible to gauge the position in which these freedmen collectively left their sons and other descendants. The chapter seeks to examine two key issues that are unique to the ex-slaves of Roman towns.

The first issue has to do with the alleged high status of municipal freedmen and how their connection to the local authorities impacted on their post-manumission social and economic success. The condition of their status is, in fact, often regarded as similar, albeit inferior, to that enjoyed by the freedmen of the emperor.\(^1\) How well prepared for their post-manumission lives did this status make municipal freedmen, along with the large *peculium* some of them seem to have amassed? An ancillary question is to what extent their status as ex-slaves of their town shaped their identity in their municipal environment. Does the evidence support the notion that this status was truly advantageous in practical terms? If so, how might these freedmen have exploited it? If this status did not procure certain rewards, how much of an impact did it have on the freedmen’s chances for success?

The second issue covered in this chapter pertains to the freedmen’s lack of a patron, a principal feature of their manumission that must have presented challenges. Unlike their well-placed private counterparts whose chances for advancement benefitted from the economic and legal advantages of a rich patron, how much of a detriment did this lack of support from above have on the municipal freedmen’s advancement? What alternative strategies and what local institutions enabled the municipal freedmen to achieve social and economic success? The securely identified and probable municipal freedmen in the catalogue below offer a good chance to test assumptions about the position of these ex-slaves, and to deepen our understanding of how they dealt with the particular conditions of their manumission.

In order to assess their post-manumission success, the epigraphic evidence for these municipal freedmen will be analyzed according to four categories, or markers, with the intention

\(^1\) This assumption is largely built on an analogy with the freedmen of the imperial household. See, for example, Halkin 1897: 116-20; and Weaver 1974: 121-40. Cf. Mouritsen 2011: 297-8. In this context, one may compare Purcell’s 1983: 125-73 study of apparitors in the Roman world, many of whom have been identified as freedmen or their sons, and the ways in which their position as attendants on powerful Roman magistrates sometimes advanced their and their descendants’ social status.
of evaluating the social and economic mobility of the group. The first two sections pertain to factors that had the capacity to enable upward mobility. First, the freedmen’s settlement patterns after manumission will be explored in order to establish how well entrenched their social and economic lives truly were in their town of origin, and what insights this may provide into their post-manumission strategy. Second, the intersection of marriage and social connections will be examined, in order to see how the municipal freedmen’s marital relationships reflected their post-manumission success. The third section analyzes the presence of these freedmen in local associations and their rank within the hierarchies of these groups. This analysis is fundamental for the reconstruction of their position in municipal society. The fourth section deals with occupational evidence. One of the key components of their post-manumission success would have been their capacity to retain their wage-earning positions with the municipal administration or to seek other employment in their town or elsewhere.

III.1 THE SECURE AND PROBABLE MUNICIPAL FREEDMEN

The table below lists the secure and probable municipal freedmen of Italian towns according to the designation of groups discussed in Chapter One. Group I towns are those where the institution of servitus publica is securely attested, making these sites a primary focus of this analysis. The towns in Group II show no direct evidence for municipal slaves and freedmen, and there is a strong possibility that persons with the municipal gentilicia corresponding to these towns were linked to early family lines of the local elite who probably coined their names long before their communities began owning and manumitting municipal slaves. Many of these old elite lines continued to appear in inscriptions under the Principate. Yet at least at one of these Group II sites, Ravenna, it seems that the Publicii originated locally, and therefore they are included in the analysis. Likewise, there is no trace of a familia publica in Group III towns, but the municipal gentilicia corresponding to these sites were unencumbered by earlier elite family lines. The Publicii whose origins seem to be in Group III towns are also included. A similar approach is taken with persons bearing the gentilicia Concordius and Venerius. Only Italian towns in Groups I, II, and III with Concordia or Veneria in their official titulature are

2 Also see Chapter I for specific examples of how the municipal freedmen are placed in the secure and probable categories. A complete list of the secure and probable municipal freedmen is given in Appendices II-III. These lists significantly expand the number of freedmen available for study with which Halkin (1897) and Weiss (2004) were working.
considered, and only Concordii and Venerii whose connection to these sites can be established through an *origo* or voting tribe are counted.

*Table III.1 Municipal freedmen and freedwomen (268 total)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of towns</th>
<th>Status of municipal freedmen</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>Probable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td><em>Liberti</em></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Libertae</em></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td><em>Liberti</em></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Libertae</em></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td><em>Liberti</em></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Libertae</em></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total *liberti*: 211
Total *libertae*: 57

The overall number of freedmen outnumber freedwomen more than three to one, which is not surprising, in light of the demographic analysis of the ranks of the *familia publica* in Chapter II. Among the secure group, the ratio is over six to one in favor of freedmen. Another notable feature here is the paucity of probable freedmen in the towns of Group III, where only eleven of the 268 individuals listed in Table III.1 belong to this group (c. 5% of the total). Since the same tools have been used to identify the probable municipal freedmen in both Group I and Group III, it is unlikely to be an anomaly of the methodology. There is no clear explanation for this disparity in the representation of probable municipal freedmen bearing a municipal *gentilicium* derived from the latter category of towns. It seems likely that every Roman town would have maintained some municipal slaves, regardless of the category in which they have been placed in this study. There is no reason to believe that sites in Group III tended to keep a smaller *familia publica*, or that they practiced less frequent manumission. It could therefore be the case that these towns bestowed the *gentilicium* Publicius on their freedmen, and these ex-slaves left their hometown and are hidden among the Publicii I have omitted from this analysis. Otherwise, we may simply be dealing with fewer inscriptions in some regions.³

There is also a subset of these inscriptions from *instrumentum domesticum* that capture the involvement of secure and probable municipal freedmen in the production and installation of

³ Cf. Beltrán Lloris 2015: 137-41, whose survey of the epigraphic record in Italy shows particular concentrations of inscriptions from Regions I, IV, and X. A large proportion of the total number of inscriptions recording secure and probable municipal freedmen (222) also come from these regions. See the map indicating sites that produced municipal freedmen in the Introduction above, Fig. 0.1, p.20. The additional inscriptions recording municipal slaves or a *familia publica* (142) follow the same pattern.
water pipes. Although only two *plumbarii* self-identify as municipal freedmen – Q. Reatinus Sallustianus *lib(er tus) r(ei) p(ublicae) R(eatinorum) (CIL IX 4699a-e) and Clodius Fortunatus* (*r(ei) p(ublicae) Reatinorum (CIL IX 4701a-b)*, both from Reate in Samnium – an additional seventeen names of probable freedmen were stamped on these objects in their eponymous hometowns in the Group I category, which indicates their role in the trade.\(^4\)

### III.2 SETTLEMENT PATTERNS

A first aspect according to which one can begin evaluating the position of municipal freedmen in municipal society is their post-manumission settlement patterns. This topic is an important one in the study of all Roman freedmen, touching on questions of the freedman’s settlement choices in the face of his formal obligations to his patron, and on the usefulness of the various benefits and protections afforded by the former master. In the study of municipal freedmen, this important issue has an even more pointed function, since their settlement choices may reveal something about their strategy for social advancement. It also speaks directly to the level of prestige and wealth opportunities these former municipal slaves had to look forward to in their hometown, given their paradoxical post-manumission conditions.

The set of inscriptions recording the 268 municipal freedmen and freedwomen makes it possible to track the hometown and the site where a person either died and was commemorated or was active in the local social and economic scene to the extent of leaving behind a mark in an inscription. The following table presents their settlement patterns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Inscription in hometown/assumed origin</th>
<th>Inscription in a different location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group I</strong></td>
<td><strong>Secure (114)</strong></td>
<td>112 (98.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Probable (120)</strong></td>
<td>120 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group II</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Probable (5)</strong></td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group III</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Probable (14)</strong></td>
<td>14 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plumbarii</strong></td>
<td><strong>Secure (2)</strong></td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Probable (13)</strong></td>
<td>13 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals (268)</strong></td>
<td>266 (99.3%)</td>
<td>2 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) See below for a discussion of these *plumbarii*. There are additional *plumbarii*, as well as some brick-makers, with municipal *gentilicia*, but their sets of *instrumentum* are found away from their hometown. I have categorized these men as descendants, who will be analyzed in Chapter IV.
The consistency with which these municipal freedmen and freedwomen remained in their town of servitude after manumission is remarkable. Even the two examples where an ex-slave’s inscription was found outside the hometown are problematic for assuming actual migration. The inclusion of the ex-slaves from the probable category further underscores this settlement pattern, even if their role in the calculation is a bit deceiving. One of the primary criteria for identifying them as municipal freedmen is their presence in the town where they had been slaves, which risks circular argumentation. Nevertheless, the key self-identified group makes it clear that these ex-slaves overwhelmingly tended to remain in their hometown after manumission. It is also worth pointing out that a similar practice of remaining in the hometown is also found among the secure municipal freedmen from Roman provincial towns.

General studies of the movement of private freedmen after their manumission are hard to come by. It is normally difficult to connect isolated freedmen in the documentary evidence to a specific origin and patron unless the context is a sepulchral group or household *columbarium*. This presents problems in advancing any large-scale quantitative arguments about whether ex-

---

5 One case involves a ‘mixed-status’ couple likely from Capua, but who set up an epitaph for their son at Formiae in the second or early third century (*AE* 1911, 156: *Dextro Dextri / aeditu et Campaniae / Albinae filio Duronio / a basilica / cum suis xixit anni / XXVI mensib(us) III diebus XIX; see Chioffi 2005: 91-2 no. 85). The mother bears the *gentilicium* derived from Capua, Campania, and the father and son both seem to be slaves working in a sanctuary, bearing the titles *aeditus* and *a basilica*, respectively. Solin 1985: 175-6 argued that they were part of the Capuan *familia publica*, perhaps assigned to the cult of Diana Tifatina whose sanctuary was located just north of the city. Weiss 2004: 142-4 cautioned against assuming a connection to the *familia publica*, citing that such cultic positions are not explicitly attested outside the ranks of the *servi publici populi Romani* in Rome. Nevertheless, one can point to examples of temple slaves and freedmen who are explicitly linked to their local *familia publica* (e.g., *CIL* XIV 32, Ostia: *A(ulus) Ostiensis Asclepiades aeditu<s Capitoli*). The question is thus what this family – or at least their son – was doing in Formiae, which was about fifty miles away from their putative hometown of Capua. Perhaps the son was in Formiae performing some task connected to his role in Capua, for example, at a local cult center, and on this occasion the he died and was interred on the spot. Alternatively, the woman Campania Albina may have been a freedwoman from Capua, or even the freeborn daughter of an ex-slave of the town, and later moved to Formiae where she began her relationship with her municipal slave *aeditus* partner. In this case, the father and son may have been associated with the *familia publica* at this coastal city. One also cannot rule the possibility that this inscription was moved from Capua after antiquity. On the work of municipal slaves in the official cultic sphere in Roman towns, see Halkin 1897: 68-70; and Weiss 2004: 135-58.

The second case involves a couple consisting of a municipal freedman and current slave of Volsinii (*CIL* XI 3419, late first-second century CE: *D(is) M(anibus) / Charis Vols(iniensium) / coniugi bene / meranti, p(ius) p(osuit) / Dida<sup>s</sup> libertus Vol(siniensium)*). The epitaph is from Tarquinii, which is approximately 25 miles north of Volsinii. Although neither partner reveals their title, given the close proximity between the find location and their hometown, the same possibilities posed above about the case from Capua also apply here. See Weiss 2004: 209 no. 119.

6 See Weiss 2004: 236-45 for a full list.

7 See, for example, Tacoma 2016: 131-2.
slaves tended to remain in the place of their servitude or went elsewhere.\textsuperscript{8} Two frequently cited test cases are the \textit{columbaria} belonging to a pair of elite households in Rome, the Statilii Tauri and the Volusii Saturnini. The evidence from both sites could be taken as confirmation that a large number of the ex-slaves never left the confines of the household, though it must be conceded that an unknown number of freedmen may have left the \textit{familiae} and been commemorated elsewhere.\textsuperscript{9} Close demographic studies such as the one carried out by Luuk de Ligt and Peter Garnsey on Herculaneum may also shed some light on the settlement patterns of private ex-slaves. Their onomastic study of a fragmentary \textit{album} that, according to the current consensus, records a snapshot of the citizenry at some point in the mid-first century CE suggests that as many as two-thirds of the free(d) adult male population consisted of freedmen or their recent descendants. Their aim was to demonstrate that such a presence of newly freed local laborers would have diminished the economic opportunities in the town for migrants from elsewhere. Yet one underlying assumption required by this model is that the vast majority of all the freedmen produced by Herculanean families must have settled in their hometown.\textsuperscript{10}

Most studies prefer to approach this question from a different perspective, emphasizing the factors that kept freedmen close to their former \textit{familiae}. There was the series of obligations they owed to their patron, namely \textit{obsequium} and \textit{operae}, the economic advantages afforded by continued contact with their patron, such as a readymade occupation in some cases, and the informal ties that functionally kept freedmen nearby, such as family members and friends still held in slavery.\textsuperscript{11} The expectation that freedmen would remain close to their patron is also supported in the legal sources. In the discussion of \textit{operae} in \textit{Dig.} 38.1, for instance, there exists little room for distance between a patron and his ex-slave. The only real ambiguity is the assurance that \textit{operae} must not impede a freedman’s capacity to make his own living,\textsuperscript{12} which in

\textsuperscript{8} Holleran 2016: 95-119 assembles the epigraphic evidence from Spain for persons with a discernible \textit{origo} in order to assess how labor migration may have worked in the Spanish provinces. A substantial portion of her cases show laborers moving sometimes long distances to both urban centers and mining sites in search of work. As she notes, it is difficult to account for freedmen and freedwomen in such a study, though many of her examples were surely ex-slaves. It remains unclear under what circumstances, or obligations, they migrated.

\textsuperscript{9} Mouritsen 2013: 43-68.

\textsuperscript{10} Garnsey and de Ligt 2016: 72-94 (esp. pp. 81-4). They concede that some of the ex-slaves identified in the citizen rolls may have been voluntary migrants from elsewhere, but point out that there is no way to support the idea of large-scale ex-slave migration as voluntary laborers (p. 82 n. 35).

\textsuperscript{11} Mouritsen 2011: 233-45. There is also the issue of what some Roman historians have interpreted as ‘independent’ freedmen. This is a problematic category that is difficult to define, much less identify examples of in the ancient sources. See D’Arms 1971: 140-6; Brunt 1983: 314-15; Veyne 1990: 15-23; and Caldellli and Ricci 1999: 55-68.

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Dig.} 38.1.19 (Gaius); 38.1.22.2 (Gaius); 38.1.50 (Neratius).
theory could take place away from the patron, and two assertions that when a freedman had to travel to perform his services for the patron, the time on the road should be counted toward the *operae*.\(^{13}\)

Perhaps, then, it should not be surprising that these municipal freedmen and freedwomen were compelled or simply chose to remain in their hometown after the local decurions manumitted them. In this way, they were behaving just like other Roman freedmen are assumed to have done. The various formal and informal incentives that obliged these ex-slaves to remain have been discussed above.\(^{14}\) These included their presumed *operae* obligations and the fact that many of them left behind family members and close friends who were still slaves in the *familia publica*. What is more, the possibility of retaining a job with the municipal administration that provided a stable income, surely a coveted advantage for all sub-elite Romans, should not be underestimated. Additionally, it is only logical that a freedman’s hometown was probably the best place – if not the only place – where he could have hoped to benefit from his links to municipal authority and any economic connections he had forged during his time as a municipal slave.

These incentives to remain in the hometown notwithstanding, what happens when the ties of patronage become severed or when there was never a personal patron at all? This theme is a point of emphasis for municipal freedmen, who in important ways constituted a separate category of freedman. Not having a patron’s assistance easily could have played into a decision to pursue opportunities elsewhere. In this same context, the demographic realities of a freedman’s hometown should also be considered, specifically, what opportunities for social and economic advancement may have been available locally. For example, considering that these ex-slaves were without a *clientela* network, larger urban centers and port cities surely would have presented far greater chances for entering the labor market than smaller inland towns. The choice by the ex-slaves of such towns as Ostia or Brixia to remain in their hometown thus makes perfect sense. For example, Bruun points out how the building boom in second-century CE Ostia seems to have fostered a relatively thriving participation by Ostienses in the production of water pipes.\(^{15}\) Moreover, at a site like Ostia, where at least from the later first century CE there are signs of significant turnover in the social order, some freedmen may have anticipated greater

---

13 *Dig.* 38.1.20 (Paulus); 38.1.21 (Iavolenus).
possibilities for their freeborn sons to break into the political elite class. A good economic footing by a freedman father would have been essential before contemplating such a rise among his close descendants.

By contrast, the smaller towns conceivably offered fewer advantages. For one, established aristocratic families in smaller towns may have hampered the future prospects of the freedmen’s sons or grandsons of entering the decurionate. Likewise, the non-land based economic activities in smaller towns were probably less diverse and expansive than in cities. It would make sense that both perceived disadvantages might have compelled the ex-slaves to migrate elsewhere. Yet the evidence for the settlement of the secure municipal freedmen demonstrates that precisely the opposite seems to have happened. Smaller towns, in fact, may well have been more open to coopting new blood into the existing political structure as a way of replenishing the ranks of the local council that had lost members because old elite families died out or because new generations of these families had pursued equestrian careers. The sons or recent descendants of local freedmen who had managed to accumulate the requisite wealth, perhaps including some sons of the allegedly high status municipal freedmen, were probably a fruitful source for targeted adlection. Such prospects may have induced the freedmen to try their luck in a place they knew, rather than venturing to an unknown site.

On one level, these findings on the settlement patterns of a niche group of freedmen makes a useful addition to the study of the post-manumission lives of Roman freedmen in general, offering some quantitative support for assumptions about the settlement choices of ex-slaves in Roman society. This material also tells us something about how local demographics and real or perceived social and economic opportunities may have played into the municipal freedmen’s strategies, since it offers the chance to track a person’s town of origin and post-manumission dwelling simultaneously. It remains to be seen at this point in the discussion how much credit for these freedmen’s choice to remain in their town should be given to their potential high status and which factors were predominant in the decision to remain. Yet even if it is not possible to single out status as a principal factor, this settlement information at least permits us to

---

16 It is necessary to note in this context interpretations of a ‘social revolution’ in such towns as Ostia (e.g., Meiggs 1973: 196-211) and Pompeii (e.g., Castrén 1975: 108-21), even though a closer consideration of the epigraphic evidence and the ties between entrenched local elite families and local novi homines does not entirely bear out these arguments. See, in particular, the critique of Mouritsen 2005: 57-80.


19 Mouritsen 2005: 57-78.
state that their lack of a patron did not outweigh other incentives for remaining that will be brought into greater focus below.

III.3 MARRIAGE PATTERNS

A second area in which the municipal freedmen’s social mobility can be studied is their marriage patterns. The status of a person’s marriage is a useful indicator of whether a certain level of social status has been achieved. For example, whether these ex-slaves ‘married up’ with a freeborn woman or remained within their own status group by marrying a fellow ex-slave can provide insight into their position in municipal society. Whereas Chapter II dealt in part with the marriage patterns of municipal slaves and a handful of secure freedmen, some of whom were permitted to enter privileged unions, this section shifts the focus to this latter group and expands the analysis by including the category of probable freedmen. There are 92 freedmen and freedwomen for whom it is possible to recover patterns of ‘marriage,’ whether in the form of a legal or informal marriage or of concubinage. The following table represents a quantitative analysis of the known marriages of the secure and probable ex-slaves of Italian towns.

Table III.3 Marriage patterns of municipal freedmen and freedwomen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure libertus (18)</td>
<td>4 (22.2%)</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
<td>3 (16.7%)</td>
<td>6 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
<td>1 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure liberta (11)</td>
<td>4 (36.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7 (63.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable libertus (42)</td>
<td>11 (26.2%)</td>
<td>3 (7.1%)</td>
<td>3 (7.1%)</td>
<td>21 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (2.4%)</td>
<td>3 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable liberta (21)</td>
<td>11 (52.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>8 (38%)</td>
<td>1 (4.8%)</td>
<td>1 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals (92)</td>
<td>30 (32.6%)</td>
<td>5 (5.4%)</td>
<td>6 (6.5%)</td>
<td>35 (38%)</td>
<td>11 (11.9%)</td>
<td>5 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes secure and probable municipal libertus/liberta partners

The secure ex-slaves constitute the best source for understanding the contours of this group’s marriage patterns. The probable freedmen and freedmen are a useful supplement to the study, though their marriage profile may to some extent skew the results. One of the criteria for

---

21 For the sake of concision, I generally use the word ‘marriage’ to cover both formal and informal unions.
classifying them as probable ex-slaves of Italian towns is the presence of a partner who bears the same municipal gentilician and who is likely freed. This criterion therefore could suggest a higher proportion of marriages within the familia publica when examining the entire set of ex-slaves. Yet it is worth pointing out that the only major variances between these probable ex-slaves and their secure counterparts are in unions with freeborn women and incertae, though with respect to the latter case, a high number of incerti/incertae partners is expected in any study of Roman marriage. In the key area of partners within the familia publica, there is actually close correspondence between the secure and probable examples, a feature that suggests overall picture may be fairly accurate.22

This sample size for the marriage patterns is limited, particularly in the important ‘secure’ category, which makes it difficult to draw firm conclusions. Yet some useful observations can be made that address the issue of the municipal freedmen’s social status in their hometowns. The first noticeable feature is the high number of endogamous marriages within the familia publica, listed in Columns 1 and 5 in the table. Slightly less than one-third of all the freedmen selected a partner who was either a serva or liberta publica.23 The prevalence of this type of union raises important issues regarding the social mobility of municipal freedmen and the apparent lack of a strategic marriage to advance their social position. Existing personal familial and emotional bonds, some perhaps formed while they were still slaves, may be one explanation for this endogamous pattern. This behavior coheres with a strong tendency observed in much of the evidence known for the family groups of private Roman freedmen as well. According to one sampling of nearly 400 couples of freedman or suspected freedman status from Rome, only about one-third possessed different gentilicia, an indication that the partners were from different slave familiae.24 In the large number of samples provided by necropoleis in Ostia and Portus, about 27% and 32% of ex-slaves, respectively, appear to have married within their own household,25 and the columbaria inscriptions recording two large elite households in Rome, a context in which male and female slaves and ex-slaves probably had plenty of potential partners to pair off with, nearly 86% of the unions were endogamous. Although the high proportion

22 The secure freedmen selected a partner within the familia one-third of the time (N = 6), while the probable freedmen did so around 29% of the time (N = 12). All of the secure freedwomen had a spouse from within the familia (N = 11), though their probable counterparts had familia partner in approximately 57% of cases (N = 12).
23 Secure freedmen: AE 2010, 382; CIL V 83; 3832; 4686; CIL IX 2676; 3419. Probable freedmen: AE 1968, 132; CIL V 3439; 3699; 3831; 4193; 4685; CIL IX 1200; 1204; CIL X 316; 317; 2897; CIL XI 6580.
25 Mouritsen 2011: 152-3, 192-4. In Beneventum, an inland city, only 14% of freedman unions were endogamous.
observed in the latter cases is partly owing to the fact that all of the recorded unions are from exclusive monuments, they stand as strong evidence for this trend in conjugal relationships among private households.\textsuperscript{26}

Turning to the exogamous marriages listed in Columns 2, 3, and 4, nearly two-thirds of both the secure\textsuperscript{27} and probable\textsuperscript{28} freedmen selected a partner from outside the \textit{familia publica}. Five of these women can be identified as private freedwomen from other households,\textsuperscript{29} and six of them can be identified as freeborn women.\textsuperscript{30} The rest of the municipal freedmen’s partners are \textit{incertae}, and while it is possible that some of these \textit{incertae} partners were actually freeborn, one must accept that the bulk of these women of uncertain status were probably freedwomen.\textsuperscript{31}

The most important type of union for this analysis are those consisting of a municipal freedman and a partner of freeborn status (an \textit{ingenua}), which account for less than 7\% overall ($N = 6$). Considering the high status often ascribed to municipal freedmen because of their (former) associations with municipal authority, one may anticipate more marriages with \textit{ingenuae} as a reflection of this position. Social mobility and marriage patterns are often implicitly linked, and therefore marriages involving upward mobility like these are a key indicator of social advancement.\textsuperscript{32} Marriage to the freeborn daughter of a local elite family could bring the status and the benefits of patronage for the \textit{parvenu} himself, while the freeborn sons produced by the union would also acquire a useful boon in municipal society.

\textsuperscript{26} The \textit{columbaria} of the Statilii Tauri and Volusii Saturnini. See discussions of this evidence by Caldelli and Ricci 1999: 55-68; Edmondson 2011: 337-61; and Mouritsen 2013: 43-68. Mouritsen 2011: 192-4 notes that we cannot know whether some successful ex-slaves from these two households may have left and been commemorated with exogamous \textit{coniuges} elsewhere. Cf. Hasegawa 2005: 63-71.

\textsuperscript{27} 11 of 18 partners (61\%).

\textsuperscript{28} 27 of 42 partners (c. 64\%).

\textsuperscript{29} \textit{CIL} V 3139; \textit{CIL} IX 396; 6326; \textit{CIL} X 1889; 5011.

Exogamous marriages with private freedwomen constitute an important category in their own right. Those municipal freedmen who selected as a partner another ex-slave from outside their own \textit{familia} were following a typical pattern. Epigraphic evidence from Rome and Italian towns demonstrates the prevalence of such unions (see Mouritsen 2011: 152-3, 192-4). One can only speculate, but perhaps the common experience of slavery created a bond between \textit{colliberti}, a form of group solidarity, even among ex-slaves from different households. On this topic, see Fabre 1981: 166-70; Lintott 2002: 555-65; and Mouritsen 2011: 297-9. Cf. O. Patterson 1982: 240-61, whose discussion includes comparative examples from various historical slave-holding societies. None of this is meant to imply that freedmen ever constituted any distinct ‘class’ in the social or economic sense of the concept.

\textsuperscript{30} \textit{AE} 1914, 221; \textit{AE} 1974, 346; \textit{CIL} VI 628; 3701; \textit{CIL} IX 1201; \textit{CIL} XI 126.

\textsuperscript{31} \textit{AE} 1922, 111; \textit{AE} 1992, 475; \textit{AE} 1996, 449; \textit{AE} 2001, 691; \textit{CIL} V 715; 1351; 3022; 3829; 4676; 5321; 6556; 8357; \textit{CIL} IX 4231; 5020; \textit{CIL} X 5010; 6454; \textit{CIL} XI 1205; 5760; 6568; 6588; \textit{CIL} XIV 1432; 1737; \textit{ILS} 6565; Inscr.Aqu. 1, 833; Inscr.It. 10\textsuperscript{3}, 248; Inscr.It. 10\textsuperscript{2}, 495; NSA 1920, 288.

From a legal and social perspective, sub-equestrians like the municipal ex-slaves were surely free to pursue ‘mixed-status’ marriages unencumbered by legal obstacles introduced by the Augustan marriage legislation or even the intense social pressures suggested by scholars such as Judith Evans-Grubbs. Yet Thomas McGinn has pointed out the rarity in our sources of marriages between self-identified private freedmen and ingenuae. A more typical pattern was for the freeborn sons of successful ex-slaves to marry freeborn women, ideally fulfilling their fathers’ ambitions by marrying into local elite families. In viewing cases of marriage between the privileged freedmen who did manage to marry a freeborn woman, scholars often impute a tension between the freedman’s prestige and wealth on the one hand, and his low social origins on the other hand. Yet these marriages still seem to have occurred in our documentary evidence, often for special groups of ex-slaves. Perhaps the clearest example of such ex-slaves – and perhaps an exception that proves the rule about most freedmen’s marriages – are the liberti Augusti in the higher clerical positions of the imperial bureaucracy, as many as two-thirds or whom, according to some estimates, were married to ingenuae. The small group of liberti publici of Roman towns who formed contubernia, either prior to or after their manumission, can be added to this short list as well.

This set of evidence contains a handful of cases that offer clues to the social and economic connections that the municipal freedmen may have forged through marriage. Yet a prosopographical study of the potential links shows that none of the relevant examples can support a direct correlation between a freedman’s success and marriage to a well-connected

---

33 Evans-Grubbs 1993: 125-54 discusses the social pressures discouraging freeborn women from marrying (their own) private freedmen. One notable exception to this indifference towards sub-equestrian marriage patterns was the senatus consultum Claudianum of 52 CE, along with its subsequent modifications. As the evidence treated in Chapter II showed, however, town councils seem to have been inconsistent in applying the law even in its harshest version. See also McGinn 2002: 46-93; McGinn 2004: 200-8; and Mouritsen 2011: 91, 103-7.

34 McGinn 2002: 64-5.

35 See Wiseman 1971: 53-64, mainly interested in elite practices in the late Republic; Weaver 1991: 189-90; and Gardner 1998: 136-45. Castrén 1975: 99-100, 118-21, focusing primarily on adoptions, but also considering the role of marriage between established elite and freedman families in Pompeii, reconstructs a different pattern, namely, one of elite sons’ being taken into the families of wealthy freedmen as a way of advancing the status of the latter. See Salway 1994: 131-3 on the use of polyonymy to discern intermarriages between different families.


37 Weaver 1972: 126-9, who primarily has liberti publici populi Romani in mind here.

38 Cf. Weaver 1972: 126-9, who primarily has liberti publici populi Romani in mind here.

39 One particularly intriguing example is from Veleia, dating to the late first or early second century CE (CIL XI 1205). The coniunx of an ex-slave of the municipium, herself probably a freedwoman, may have been connected to the wealthy Aebutius family, three of whose members were listed as large landowners pledging property to the local alimentaria program initiated under Trajan (CIL XI 1147).
freeborn or freed woman. One impression that emerges from this quantitative and qualitative analysis is that marriage is not a substantial indicator of social advancement for the municipal freedmen.

**III.4.1 MEMBERSHIP IN URBAN ASSOCIATIONS**

Another useful means of evaluating the social mobility of the municipal freedmen is to analyze how well integrated these ex-slaves were in local urban professional and voluntary associations, what role they played within these groups, and what impact they had on the local social and economic environment through their activities.

The voluntary and professional urban associations comprised one of the most important pillars structuring the civic life of towns throughout the Roman world. These groups frequently formed around common business interests as a social, funerary, and cult organization, and they offered to persons below the class of the municipal elite a meaningful way of engaging in the social and economic life of their community. For ex-slaves, who were barred from a formal political career, such associations were especially important, often representing the only attainable avenue for civic prominence. In addition to social interaction, one of the primary aims of Roman associative life for ex-slaves was to make connections in society at large in the hope of laying the groundwork for the social ascent of their freeborn sons.

**III.4.2 THE *AUGUSTALES***

The organization of *Augustales* in Roman towns provides a good starting point for this discussion.\(^{40}\) Local versions of this association initially may have been conceived as the promoter of the emperor cult, though its function in municipal society has been a matter for debate.\(^ {41}\) Several important studies of the *Augustales* focusing on both their membership and activities have shown that they emerged in the course of the first century CE as a crucial component in the

---

\(^{40}\) I follow Duthoy 1978, Abramenko 1993, and subsequent scholars, in using the shorthand *Augustales* to include the range of titles employed by different local versions of this college. Taking Ostia as a guide, the title *Augustales* seems to have been normal prior to the Flavian period, while from the early second century onward one finds an increasing preference for the title *seviri Augustales*. See Meiggs 1973: 217-19; Scheid 1997: 291-2; and Bruun 2015c: 109 and n. 9. The great variation in local titles has long been a source of debate among scholars. See, for example, Taylor 1914: 231-53, Duthoy 1978: 1254-1309; Abramenko 1993: 13-37; J. Patterson 2006: 242-6; Mouritsen 2006; and Mouritsen 2011: 252-9. I include in this group one freedman who was both an *Augustalis* and a *Tiberialis* (ILS 6565, Asculum Picenum) and another freedman who was a *C(audialis) M(aior)* (CIL V 3438, Verona). See Abramenko 1993: 37-8, 89, 134, 151.

\(^{41}\) See, for example, Mouritsen 2015: 239-40.
municipal social landscape. It was mainly freedmen who occupied the ranks of the organization in the towns of Italy and the western provinces, accounting for around 85-90% of known members.\textsuperscript{42} Since these ex-slaves were barred from holding the municipal magistracies,\textsuperscript{43} the *Augustales provided a sort of alternate ‘career’ path for the richest of them, as well as an outlet for engagement in their town.\textsuperscript{44} In fact, their internal organization and public activities in many ways resembled those of the ordo decurionum. The *Augustales paid entry fees and dues (summa honoraria), held internally elected magistracies bearing similar titles to those of the official municipal ones, and sometimes passed internal decrees. As public benefactors in many towns they were expected to stage banquets and games and to fund building projects.\textsuperscript{45} As this latter description of their activities makes clear, moreover, some historians link the rise of the *Augustales to their role as an additional source of civic munificence.\textsuperscript{46} According to Andrik Abramenko’s formulation, the *Augustales virtually developed into a distinctive order in municipal society (Mittelschicht), between the ordo decurionum and the populus (i.e., plebs ingenua).\textsuperscript{47}

Given their essential role in civic euergetism and social function as an important locus for freedmen in Roman towns, the associations of the *Augustales surely had to seek recruits from the wealthiest local freedmen, probably for the most part the well-placed ex-slaves with the richest patrons who could give them a push into the college.\textsuperscript{48} The epigraphic evidence for the *Augustales occasionally reveals a member who was exempted from the entry fees (gratuito), but this situation was not commonplace.\textsuperscript{49} Moreover, in at least one town in southern Italy, in

\textsuperscript{42} Abramenko 1993: 44-76. The main exception seems to have been in towns in northern Italy, where one can cite freeborn members of the Augustales. It has been argued that in many of these towns there were too many rich and qualified freeborn men for the limited number of seats in the ordo decurionum, and therefore these ingenui entered the Augustales as a consolation ‘second ordo,’ displacing some of the qualified local ex-slaves.

\textsuperscript{43} Under the lex Visellia of 24 CE.

\textsuperscript{44} Mouritsen 2011: 250-2.


\textsuperscript{46} Mouritsen 2011: 258-61 sees their role as benefactors as central to their formation. Cf. J. Patterson 2006: 250-1.

\textsuperscript{47} Abramenko 1993. Note the objections outlined in Mouritsen 2006: 237-48; and Mouritsen 2011: 249-61. He argues that the great variety in the local evidence for *Augustales groups seems to defy any uniform organization, and precludes the notion that they were ever conceived of as a formal ordo. Mouritsen 2015: 239-40 views them as a corpus, with members frequently referring to themselves as corporati. Cf. D’Arms 2000: 126-44.

\textsuperscript{48} Cf. D’Arms 2000: 126-44, on different levels of membership. The corporati seem to have been the full members, while the other group comprised a ‘reserve’ pool from which to draw future members.

\textsuperscript{49} For example, CIL IX 5301 (= ILS 6566), Cupra Maritima, first century CE: L. Caecilius Proculus, / L. Caecilius Cinnamus / pater / pecunia sua, / ob hoc August(alitas) et VIvir(atus), / d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) gratis dat(us) est / memor[---].
Petelia, the *Augustales apparently had a difficult time finding members with sufficient wealth, and had to admit recruits at a subsidized rate.\textsuperscript{50} One also should not forget that the fabulously wealthy freedman Trimalchio of Petronius’ Satyrica was supposed to have been an Augustalis in Puteoli. Such examples imply that joining the *Augustales was an expensive prospect.\textsuperscript{51} Yet what is also clear is that entry into this association represented the pinnacle of an ex-slave’s public life. They were in many ways, as John D’Arms and others labeled them, a libertina nobilitas, a sort of ‘freedman elite’ in the municipal environment.\textsuperscript{52}

The general view in scholarship holds that the municipal freedmen of Roman towns were particularly well positioned for social and economic advancement, and that this position made them ideal recruits for the *Augustales, giving them an inside track into their local college. This impression is based largely on a few well-known examples of prosperous ex-slaves, and, following Halkin and Weiss, even more on assumptions about the accumulated wealth and social prestige thought to accrue from their links to the municipal elite.\textsuperscript{53} This notion is also influenced by scholars’ preference to liken this to imperial freedmen, albeit with a lesser status, an idea found among other places in Paul Weaver’s study of the social mobility of the freedmen of the emperors.\textsuperscript{54} Others, such as Francis Tassaux and Nicholas Tran, have suggested that municipal freedmen must have enjoyed privileged access to the *Augustales as a reward for their faithful service as slaves of their town.\textsuperscript{55} From a wider perspective, this assumed access to the *Augustales becomes a central pillar in the larger argument about the lofty social position municipal freedmen supposedly occupied.

If this model is correct, it ought to be possible to confirm it in our sources. Indeed, some of the municipal freedmen fared quite well. For example, one probable freedman named Sex. Publicius Bathyllus managed to gain the Augustalitas in two different towns in the early first century CE. The epitaph he set up for himself and his family is from Puteoli in Campania, so we can surmise that this was his hometown (CIL X 1889).

\textsuperscript{50} CIL X 114 (= ILS 6469), mid-second century CE. See commentary by Bossu 1982: 155-65; and J. Patterson 2006: 251.
\textsuperscript{51} Mouritsen 2011: 130-1.
\textsuperscript{52} D’Arms 1981: 127-8.
\textsuperscript{53} Halkin 1897: 107-36; Weiss 2004: 179.
\textsuperscript{54} Weaver 1967: 3-20; Weaver 1972: 213-15.
\textsuperscript{55} Tassaux 2000: 400-1; Tran 2006b: 128-9.
Sex(tus) Publicius Bathyllus / accensus consuli, Augustalis / Puteolis et Venafri, sibi et /
Urvineiae L(uci) l(ibertae) Modestae uxorii suae, / et L(ucio) Urvineio Adiutori, et /
C(aio) Iulio Aucto fratri.

Sex. Publicius Bathyllus, accensus to the consul, Augustalis at Puteoli and Venafrum, 
(erected this epitaph) for himself and for his wife Urvinæa Modesta, freedwoman of 
Lucius, and for L. Urvinæius Adiutor, and for his brother C. Iulius Auctus.

One can also point to a remarkable case from the small town of Liternum on the northern 
coast of Campania, dating to the last quarter of the second century (AE 2001, 854). An album of 
of the local Augustales inscribed in the year 180 lists one Liternius Felix as a corporatus, a full 
member. He was likely an ex-slave of the colony, bearing the gentilicium derived from the town 
name. One feature of the membership of the Augustales in Liternum appears to be unique in 
Italy: a handful of municipal slaves gained entry to the college in two different periods. In an 
earlier album, probably dating to the 160s, the names of three municipal slaves are inscribed on 
the upper right margin.56 While that placement may suggest only a peripheral, supporting role in 
the college, the album of 180 registers two additional municipal slaves as actual members, both 
corporati, including one slave belonging to neighboring Puteoli.57 No one has been able to 
explain this feature of the Liternum college, apart from the observation that membership by the 
slaves must have reflected an unusually high status in the town. Most relevant here, however, is 
Giuseppe Camodeca’s idea that that our Augustalis Liternius Felix may have been the same man 
as the municipal slave Felix colonorum registered in the earlier album, having kept up his 
membership in the local college after he made the transition from slave to freedman.58

Yet such cases notwithstanding, a more systematic analysis is needed of the whole group 
of municipal freedmen who can be recovered in the epigraphic record from all Italian towns. My 
expanded catalogue of secure and probable municipal freedmen provides adequate material to 
explore this issue in greater detail. The following table lists the secure and probable municipal 
freedmen who attained the *Augustalitas.

---

56 For the dating, see Vandevoorde 2013: 143-6.
57 See D’Arms 2000: 126-44 on the corporati and the internal organization of the Augustales at Misenum.
58 Camodeca 2001: 173-4, 177. He does not offer an explanation of the role of these servi publici in the college at 
Liternum, noting only that their placement on the right margin of the earlier album suggests some peripheral role 
(pp. 164, 173 n. 44; cf. Silvestrini 2005: 552, who notes that this was an exceptional case, but offers no explanation).
Table III.4 Secure and probable municipal freedmen who became *Augustales (29 freedmen)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Aeserninus Ampliatus</td>
<td>Aesernia (IV)</td>
<td>sevir Aug.</td>
<td>CIL IX 2676</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>later-I-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Antias Andro[---]</td>
<td>Antium (I)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>CIL X 6713</td>
<td>alb.</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---] Aquileiensis [---]ntus</td>
<td>Aquileia (X)</td>
<td>IIIIIIvir</td>
<td>CIL V 8212</td>
<td>vot.</td>
<td>late I-early II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Campanius Sosimenes</td>
<td>Capua (I)</td>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>CIL X 3944</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>I-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Concordius Primus</td>
<td>Brixellum (VIII)</td>
<td>VIvir Aug. gr. d.d.</td>
<td>AE 1931, 10</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Fabraternus Primitivus</td>
<td>Fabrateria (I)</td>
<td>Augustalis</td>
<td>CIL X 5592</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>late I-early II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lerninus Felix{is}</td>
<td>Liternum (I)</td>
<td>Aug. corporatus</td>
<td>AE 2001, 854</td>
<td>alb.</td>
<td>c. 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---] Ostiensis I[---]</td>
<td>Ostia (I)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>CIL XIV 4560, 2</td>
<td>fasti</td>
<td>late II-III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Ost[iensis ---]</td>
<td>Ostia (I)</td>
<td>q.q.d.d.</td>
<td>CIL XIV 4562, 6</td>
<td>fasti</td>
<td>late II-III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Ostiensis Thallus</td>
<td>Ostia (I)</td>
<td>sevir Aug.</td>
<td>CIL XIV 290</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>late I-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicius Se[ninus]</td>
<td>Veleia (VIII)</td>
<td>Aug. VIvir</td>
<td>CIL XI 1205</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>I-early II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Publicius Valens</td>
<td>Vicetia (X)</td>
<td>IIIIIIvir</td>
<td>CIL V 3139</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>mid-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Publicius Philetus</td>
<td>Bononia (VIII)</td>
<td>Claud(ialis)</td>
<td>CIL XI 6829, 6840</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>Jul.-Cl. (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Poplicius Modestinus</td>
<td>Bononia (VIII)</td>
<td>[VIv]r et Claud.</td>
<td>CIL XI 696</td>
<td>vot.</td>
<td>Jul.-Cl. (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Publicius Carpophorus</td>
<td>Comum (XI)</td>
<td>VIvir et Aug.</td>
<td>CIL V 5301</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>late I-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Publicius Philo</td>
<td>Comum (XI)</td>
<td>VIvir et Aug.</td>
<td>CIL V 5302</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>late I-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Publicius Verecundus</td>
<td>Asisium (VI)</td>
<td>VIvir [Aug.]</td>
<td>CIL XI 5411</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>II-early III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Publicius Metrodorus</td>
<td>Tridentum (X)</td>
<td>VIvir Aug.</td>
<td>AE 1977, 285</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>I-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Publicius Philemon</td>
<td>Comum (XI)</td>
<td>VIvir Aug.</td>
<td>Pais 752</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>late I-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Publicius Symphorus</td>
<td>Brixia (X)</td>
<td>VIvir Aug.</td>
<td>CIL V 4193</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>late I-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Publicius Priscianus</td>
<td>Brixia (X)</td>
<td>VIvir Aug.</td>
<td>Insr. It. 10^5, 248</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>late I-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex. Publicius Bathyllus</td>
<td>Puteoli (I); Venafrum (I)</td>
<td>Augustalis</td>
<td>CIL X 1889</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>early I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Saepinius Orins</td>
<td>Saepinum (IV)</td>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>CIL IX 2472</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>100-150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Valerius Verna</td>
<td>Asc. Pic. (V)</td>
<td>sexvir Aug. et Tib.</td>
<td>ILS 6565</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>II-III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---] Venerius Felix</td>
<td>Hadria (V)</td>
<td>mag. Aug.</td>
<td>CIL IX 5020</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>later-I-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Veronius Carpus</td>
<td>Verona (X)</td>
<td>VIvir C(audialis) M(aior)</td>
<td>CIL V 3438</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>100-150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Veronius Epaphroditus</td>
<td>Verona (X)</td>
<td>VIvir Aug.</td>
<td>CIL V 3439</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>late I-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---] Volsinius Victorinus</td>
<td>Volsinii (VII)</td>
<td>Augustalis</td>
<td>CIL XI 2710a</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The municipal freedmen in the catalogue had a modest footprint in the *Augustales in several Italian towns. Of the 208 secure or probable municipal freedmen known to us, 29 entered their local college (c. 14%). It is worth considering how this picture of representation in the *Augustales would stand up in light of the larger number of municipal freedmen who once existed, but who for various reasons do not appear in the extant epigraphic record and therefore are unknown to us. Yet this argument from silence must be left aside for now. Instead, a theoretical maximum participation of around 14-15% is a useful point of reference for trying to understand the social and economic status of these ex-slaves in municipal society, and it can help us to put into context their presence in this prominent voluntary association.

A first step in this process is to evaluate what segment of the familia publica these municipal freedmen *Augustales represent. This can be done in the ‘secure’ group by considering the correlation between a freedman’s previous (or perhaps current) rank in the municipal administration and his membership in the *Augustales. Weiss has proposed that the freedmen who had been treasury or archival slaves likely had the best chance to join their local college.59 These were the ex-slaves of towns who had amassed the largest peculium and through their occupation had an opportunity to forge connections with the decurions, and perhaps also with local businessmen and tradesmen. These factors would seem to have imparted the best chance for upward mobility among any group within the familia, and it should also be recognized that they are the group expected to have been most active in epigraphic commemoration. Yet a clear correlation between freedmen with such an occupation and entry into the *Augustales is difficult to make in the epigraphic evidence, apart from two or perhaps three examples.60 The first is an epitaph from Asculum Picenum, dated to the later part of the first century CE (ILS 6565).


To the departed spirits. To M. Valerius Verna, freedman of the colony, a sexvir Augustalis and Tiberialis, Ianuarius, dispensator of the colony, who had been his (?)

60 A possible third example comes from Saepinum in the early second century CE (CIL IX 2472). L. Saepinius Oriens was a former municipal slave who joined his local college of Augustales. Although he does not record his own slave occupation, his older son, a current municipal slave, held either a clerical or accounting position attached to the town’s alimenta program. It is possible that Oriens had also been in a senior position.
arcarius, and likewise his wife Vibia Primil[la], (set up this epitaph) for themselves and their descendants.

It is likely that Verna’s slave occupation had been that of dispensator, which in the administration of Asculum seems to have been the most senior position in the treasury. We can infer this from the fact that one of the co-dedicators of his monument, the current slave dispensator Ianuarius, claims to have been Verna’s subordinate, in this case, an arcarius (qui fuerat [arc]arius ei[s]).61 Another freedman, Volsinius [V]ictorinus, held the senior archival position of tabularius in two different towns, first at Ferentium and later after being sold to Volsinii, where he was eventually manumitted and achieved the Augustalitas (CIL XI 2710a).62 A third case can be made from a second-century epitaph recording a family group in the small town of Saepinum in Samnium in which the father was enrolled in the Augustales (CIL IX 2472).

D(is) [M(anibus)]. / L. Saepinio Orienti Aug(ustali), / et L(ucio) Saepinio Oresti / IIIvir(o), aed(ili), et Felicul(a)e / filiae, Oriens aliment(arius) / Saepinati(um) patri et fratr(i) / et Thalia conserva eius / b(ene) m(erenti bus) f(ecerunt).

To the departed spirits. To his father L. Saepinius Oriens, an Augustalis, and to his brother L. Saepinius Orestes, a quattuorvir aedile, and to his daughter Felicula, Oriens, alimentarius of the Saepinates, and his co-slave Thalia set up (this epitaph) for these well-deserving ( dedicatees).

The identification of L. Saepinius Oriens as a municipal freedman turns on his possession of the local municipal gentilicium and the status of his older son, also named Oriens, who remained a slave in the familia publica, as indicated by his title and his wife’s epithet conserva eius. The younger Oriens was probably in an accounting position connected to the administration of the town’s alimenta program, which at Saepinum fell under the jurisdiction of the magisterial post of quaestor pecuniae alimentariae, known from another local inscription. It is tempting to ascribe a similar accounting position to the elder Oriens, following the reasoning that in some towns municipal slave fathers may have trained their sons to follow in their footsteps.

No additional cases of familia publica occupations can be deduced for the *Augustales. In fact, there are numerous examples of ex-slaves of towns who did hold high-level occupations, but evidently never entered the *Augustales or were unable to do so before they died. Two

---

examples are (Pollentius) Valerianus, a *summarum dispensat(or) of Pola (CIL V 83), and C. Interamnius Crescentio, a *tabularius rei publicae of Interamna Lirenas (AE 1911, 205). Although a background in the treasury or the archives does seem like a logical springboard for attaining the *Augustalitas, the evidence does not quite confirm such an implicit link. This may suggest that rank in the *familia publica in itself, and the prestige and financial boost it may have conferred, afforded less practical benefits for social advancement than is often assumed.

A second way of evaluating the social position of the municipal freedmen *Augustales is to consider where they were positioned alongside their fellow members in the hierarchy of the local college. Yet, here again, the evidence does not yield much information. Just four men mention a specific role within their college’s administration. One probable freedman of Ostia named L. Ost[iensis ---] (CIL XIV 4562, 6) is registered in one of the fragments of the *fasti Augustalium dating from the last decade of the second to the early third century. The entry of his name carries the designation *q.q.d.d. The first abbreviation indicates the rank of *quinquennalis, normally an elected officer in the association. The meaning of the second abbreviation, *d.d., has been disputed. Abramenko has argued convincingly that, rather than interpreting this as *decreto decurionum, which would indicate that the town council had approved his ascension to the post of *quinquennalis, the phrase probably means *dono dato, meaning that this man simply purchased his position among the colony’s seviri Augustales. Moreover, the expression of the *quinquennalitas at Ostia may indicate only general membership.63 There are also two epitaphs from northern Italian towns that illustrate municipal freedmen in leadership positions. Venerius Felix, an ex-slave of Hadria (CIL IX 5020), records in his epitaph that he was a *mag(ister) Aug(ustalium), an indication that he had once held an annual senior magistracy in the local Augustales.64 From Verona comes an attestation not of an Augustalis, but of a sevir Cl(audialis)

63 Abramenko 1992: 153-7; Abramenko 1993: 91-5. Meiggs 1973: 217-19 points out that the purchased *quinquennalitas may have been relatively easy to obtain, given how widespread the notation is in official documentation of the seviri Augustales, not to mention that this form of the position probably lies behind many of the *q.q. recorded in individual epitaphs. Laird 2015: 26-8 notes that the numbers of seviri Augustales idem *q.q. found in private epitaphs could never have been accommodated in the actual hierarchy of the association at Ostia. Instead, many such individuals probably attempted to conceal the fact that they had purchased their presidency, rather than been elected to it.

64 Evidence that the title *magister Augustalis indicated leadership rather than general membership is found in Brixellum, where one member of the local college records his ranks as *Vtivir Aug(ustalis) mag(ister) Aug(ustalis) bis (CIL XI 1029).
The epithet *M(aior) seems to denote an officer of this local version of the college, since another *Vivir Claudialis from the town does not bear the title *Maior (*CIL V 3433). A fourth example can be found in the small town of Trebula Suffenas in Samnium. A fragmentary set of *fasti dated to the early years of the town’s *Augustales in the period 14-23 CE lists [T. Trebulanus Fe]lix as a *praeco, in this context an annual official of the college, apparently assisting four senior officers appointed to stage the annual *Augustalia festival (*AE 1972, 154).

It is important to recognize that this picture of the municipal freedmen *Augustales in leadership positions is probably incomplete. Most of the evidence is from epitaphs, and only one of these provides an ex-slave’s age at death. This makes it impossible to estimate whether the other freedmen had a full career in the college and failed to advance, or whether they had died before having the chance to do so. The picture provided by the other type of evidence for our group, *alba or *fasti, is also limited, since documents like these represent only a snapshot of a moment in a college’s history. Nevertheless, the evidence signals that few of the municipal freedmen who managed to enter their local college succeeded in reaching its upper echelons.

Up to this point the evidence suggests that the municipal freedmen played only a modest role in the *Augustales, but it is important to substantiate this view through quantitative analysis at a handful of sites where the epigraphic record permits it. This can be done by contextualizing the freedmen’s presence in the college on two different levels, in order to understand whether or not the representation by the group can be considered particularly impressive. The first approach aims to understand what the c. 14% internal success rate of joining the *Augustales among the entire group of known municipal freedmen may actually mean for their social and economic

65 The local variations of *seviri named for the living emperor may have been separate groups, but for this discussion of municipal freedmen in local colleges, I include them alongside the *Augustales. The epigraphic evidence, moreover, reveals that they were often connected to the *seviri Augustales. See, for example, C(aio) Pomponio / Rufi lib(erto) / Felici / Vivir(o) Aug(ustali) / Claudi(ali) (*AE 1946, 210, Regium Lepidum); and L. Auffillenus / Ascanius / Vivir II / Clau(dialis) et Aug(ustalis) (*CIL V 4008, Avio). Cf. C(aius) Valerius / ((mulieris)) l(ibertus) / Sceptus / Vivir Aug(ustalis) Flavi(ali) (*CIL V 7511, Aquae Statiellae). See also De Ruggiero 1895: 844-5, who notes the prevalence of evidence for this *collegium in northern Italian towns; Taylor 1914: 241; and Duthoy 1978: 1300.

66 Granino Cecere 1988: 178-80 no. 43 supplied his fragmentary name by identifying him as the same man in a later set of *fasti corresponding to the *Augustales of Trebula Suffenas but found in Rome (*CIL VI 29681; see Buonocore 1992: 46-7 no. 23 for the text). The document in which Felix is listed is now accepted as a series of *fasti listing officers in the local *Augustales in at least three different years. Yet the *communis opinio is that these men were not necessarily the fixed leadership of the college, but rather members or officers appointed to stage the annual games. See Taylor 1956: 9-30; and Abramenko 1991: 589-96; and see a summary of subsequent opinions on *AE 1972, 154 in Linderski 2007: 379-84. Citing our example as important evidence, van Haaperen 2016: 135-46 has recently argued that the funding and staging of the *Ludi Augustales were central to the original function of the *Augustales in the early Principate.
position. This proportion represents a composite of all identifiable examples from every Italian town and from every period represented in the epigraphic record, and therefore the ideal comparison for such a group should be other discrete *familiae* of ex-slaves with a substantial presence in the epigraphic record over time. The following table presents an analysis of twelve local *gentes* from four towns that were selected because their various family groups include a substantial number of males recorded in the local epigraphy (Column 3), and because they produced among the largest number of known local *Augustales* (Column 4).67 These men include both self-identified freedmen and *incerti*, persons who are free but whose legal status is uncertain (freeborn or freed). For Aquileia, Brixia, and Mediolanum sub-elite freeborn males are also counted, since the occasional presence of freeborn men is a feature of the *Augustales* particularly in northern towns.68 Column 5 lists the rate of internal success in contributing to the *Augustales*, which establishes a useful frame of reference for this study. The last row in the table records the combined participation in the association among all known municipal freedmen from towns in Italy.

*Table III.5 Internal success rate of local gentes contributing to the *Augustales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Town (Reg.)</th>
<th>2) <em>Gentes</em></th>
<th>3) Total eligible members</th>
<th>4) # of members in <em>Augustales</em></th>
<th>5) % of members in <em>Augustales</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ostia (I)</td>
<td>Cornelii (A., C., Cn., L., M., P., Q., Sex., T.)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>c. 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Egrilii</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>c. 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Livii</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>c. 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manlii (A., D., L., M., P., Q., T.)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonii (A., C., D., L., P., Q.)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>c. 16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia (X)</td>
<td>Caesernii (Sex., T.)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statii (C., L.)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>c. 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valerii (C., L., M.)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>c. 12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67 For this section and the one following, I have considered all possible variations of the titles for the *seviri*, *Augustales*, etc., as well as the *Tiberiales*, *Claudiales*, and *Flaviales*.

68 Some of the *incerti* were probably freeborn, but they remain valid for this calculation because of the practice in several northern Italian towns of freeborn men joining the *Augustales* instead of the council of decurions. On this issue, see Abramenko 1993: 18-20.
Some comments on the selected family lines will be helpful. The Auli Egrilii were one of the most prestigious Ostian families, consistently contributing decurions over multiple generations and permeating the ranks of important local associations. The branch also produced senators and three consuls in the first half of the second century.\(^69\) The Ostian Cornelii included here represent various family lines with different combinations of *praenomina* and *gentilicia*. In particular the Marci Cornelii and Publii Cornelii demonstrate local success, with the former family producing an equestrian who bears the local voting tribe Palatina. The Aulus Livius and Nonius families also contributed several local decurions, and branches of the two families seem to have been joined through marriage and produced a man who also received the *equus publicus* from the emperor Marcus Aurelius. Similarly in Aquileia, the status of the Caesernius and Statius families is indicated by three men from the town who rose to prominent positions in the imperial administration, the equestrian T. Caesernius Statius Quinctius Macedo\(^70\) and two senators who were probably his sons.\(^71\) Their polyonymy indicates that this family’s Caesernius-Statius branch was the product of intermarriage between these two local families.\(^72\) The Aquileian Valerii, too, may have been connected to equestrian and senatorial family lines. Such connections imply that these families had the social connections and economic backing also to succeed in producing members for the Augustales in their hometown.\(^73\)


\(^70\) *PIR*\(^2\) C 181. He was procurator of Mauretania Caesariensis in 107 CE. See Brusin 1991: 220-3.

\(^71\) *PIR*\(^2\) C 182 and *PIR*\(^2\) C 183, respectively. Their careers date to the reign of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius.

\(^72\) Salomies 1992: 112 no. 7. On their identification and the evidence for their careers, see Groag 1897: 1309-10 (= *RE* 3.1: 1309-10); and Alföldy 1999: 288-9 no. 13, 14, 17. See Tassaux 2000: 393-9 on the links between the elite family and the local *Augustales*.

\(^73\) Bruun 2015c: 107-32.
According to this analysis, the three senatorial families of the A. Egrilii, Caesernii, and Statii comprised a category of their own when it came to the success rate within their households of reaching the Augustales, and the same can be said for the A. Livii. They clearly represent the upper tier of success. On average, right around 20% of all eligible males in these lines accomplished this feat ($N = 37$). Aside from the Corneli of Ostia and the Corneli and Valerii of Brixia, the remaining familiae in the table show a strong proportion of Augustales relative to their known households, at an average of around 14% ($N = 28$). The group of identified municipal freedmen, who for this exercise can be considered part of a single familia, fall in line with this second grouping, with their internal success rate of c. 14% of freedmen reaching the college ($N = 29$). An important expansion of this analysis obviously would be to focus on municipal freedmen family lines in individual towns, but the problem is that sparse evidence that can be compiled from this perspective. Ostia, the site that produced the largest total of secure and probable municipal freedmen in my catalogue, provides a glimpse. The three ex-slaves of the colony who joined the seviri Augustales represent less than 6% of the 53 freedmen bearing the gentilicium Ostiensis.

A second way of estimating the municipal freedmen’s success in this prestigious college is to determine the percentage of all known *Augustales that select local families contributed in individual towns. This information is provided in the following table.

*Table III.6 Representation by local familiae among the *Augustales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Town (Reg.)</th>
<th>2) Total known local <em>Aug.</em>†</th>
<th>3) Total fam. in <em>Aug.</em></th>
<th>4) Families</th>
<th>5) # of <em>Aug.</em></th>
<th>6) % of known local <em>Aug.</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ostia (I)</td>
<td>c. 365$^{74}$</td>
<td>153+</td>
<td>Cornelius</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. Egrilius</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. Livius</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manlius</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonius</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ostiensis</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>0.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bononia (VIII)</td>
<td>25$^{75}$</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ostorenus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Papuleius</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Publicius</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

$^{74}$ At least fifty additional *Augustales with uncertain gentilicia. Cf. Bruun 2008: 548; and Bruun 2015c: 107-32.

$^{75}$ Two additional *Augustales with uncertain gentilicia.
Aquileia (X) | 102<sup>76</sup> | 67 | Aquileiensis | 1 | 1%  
| | | | Caesernius | 4 | 4%  
| | | | Statius | 5 | 5%  
| | | | Valerius | 6 | 6%  
Brixia (X) | 88<sup>77</sup> | 61 | Publicius | 3 (+1) | 4.5%  
| | | | Vettius | 4 | 4.5%  
| | | | Four local fam. | 3 each | 3.4%  
Verona (X) | 63<sup>78</sup> | 43 | Veronius | 2 | 3.2%  
| | | | Two local fam. | 4 each | 6.3%  
| | | | Four local fam. | 3 each | 4.8%  
Comum (XI) | 57<sup>79</sup> | 36 | Publicius | 3 | 5.3%  
| | | | Secundienus | 4 | 7%  
| | | | Valerius | 5 | 8.8%  
| | | | Three local fam. | 3 each | 5.8%  
Mediolanum (XI) | 78<sup>80</sup> | 58 | Publicius | 0 | 0%  
| | | | Valerius | 5 | 6.4%  
| | | | Two local fam. | 4 each | 5.1%  
| | | | Two local fam. | 3 each | 3.8%  

† Only cases where a *gentilicium* can be (mostly) discerned are counted

Here again, it is necessary to be broad with the chronology, examining all of the evidence synchronically. Seven towns have been selected for this exercise, on the basis that each one contains a large enough epigraphic patrimony to study a substantial number of *Augustales* and are the only sites where multiple municipal freedmen are recorded as members (one exception is Mediolanum). The *familiae* listed in each town were chosen because they have a high representation in the association among their peers. It is perhaps best to think about these figures as representing proportions or patterns, rather than focusing so much on the real quantities. For this analysis I have only included examples of *Augustales* whose *gentilicia* can be ascertained, with the number of additional members from unknown families given in footnotes. Column 2 shows the total number of local members counted, and Column 3 gives the total number of different families contributing members. Column 5 lists the number of *Augustales* from each family, and Column 6 gives the percentage each family contributed overall.

As it often does, Ostia offers the most detailed picture of local issues like this. The Auli Egrilii stood out among their fellow Ostians, contributing over 5% of all known *Augustales* in

---


<sup>77</sup> Twelve additional *Augustales* with uncertain gentilicia.

<sup>78</sup> Twelve additional *Augustales* with uncertain gentilicia.

<sup>79</sup> Eight additional *Augustales* with uncertain gentilicia.

<sup>80</sup> Nine additional *Augustales* with uncertain gentilicia.
the colony. Their next closest competitors, the Auli Livii and lines of the Corneli, contributed significantly less. In this milieu, the three municipal freedmen of the colony, the Ostienses, are situated among numerous other local families showing a considerably lower rate of success. At Aquileia, where the second highest number of *Augustales is recorded, the single attested Aquileiensiis makes the local municipal freedmen substantially more poorly represented than the successful families.

The impression from the extant evidence for the *Augustales from three other northern towns, Bononia, Verona, and Comum, is that membership in the association may have been more open to a variety of local families, since no single family’s ex-slaves seem to have been particularly dominant in the periods represented in the epigraphy. Perhaps this feature had something to do with the numbers of freeborn individuals who joined the *Augustales in some northern Italian towns, a situation that may have created a more even distribution among all eligible candidates. In any case, the municipal freedmen from these three sites seem to have experienced somewhat better advancement in the college than at Ostia, but they remained below the more successful families.

The two exceptional cases are found at Brixia and Mediolanum. At Brixia, three municipal freedmen, along with one of their own private freedmen, attained the *Augustalitas. Their presence in the association is among the best recorded for any local family, accounting for almost 5% of all known members. On the other hand, at Mediolanum, a particularly large urban center that was the focal point of lots of intra-regional economic activities, no municipal freedmen Publicii are recorded among the 58 local families contributing a total of 78 seviri Augustales.

In this discussion, an awareness of the relationship between the number of a town’s eligible ex-slaves and the number of available seats in the local college is also essential. This issue can only be approached on hypothetical grounds, but it nonetheless adds a useful dimension for interpreting these municipal freedmen’s participation in the *Augustales. As a computational figure, non-slave adult males may have comprised about 20% of a Roman town’s

---

83 See an overview of the local economy in Garnsey 2009: 45-62. Only one municipal slave (CIL V 5858) and three secure municipal freedmen (AE 1974, 346; CIL V 5881; 6630) are known from the city.
total population. Of this group, between 10% and 30% was made up of freedmen, based on theories about manumission rates. When applied to estimates of the total number of a town’s inhabitants, this calculation provides a rough approximation of how many male ex-slave competitors may have been vying for a spot among the *Augustales in any given period. On this issue of available spots in the college, much of the evidence comes from *sportulae distributions handed out at banquets staged by local benefactors. These distributions often suggest a correspondence between the number of local decurions and *Augustales, though there were some notable exceptions. Richard Duncan-Jones estimated, for example, that in the early third century Ostia had approximately 110 decurions but more than 200 seviri Augustales, while a similar disparity can be derived from the evidence from Puteoli.

For the sake of illustration, it will be instructive to apply this formula to two examples from our material. Ostia at its height in the second century may have had, according to a low estimate, approximately 40,000 inhabitants, who theoretically included about 20%, or 8000, non-slave adult males. A middle estimate that 25% of these were freedmen allows us to propose a theoretical figure of 2000 eligible candidates for the colony’s seviri Augustales at any given time. A 150-member college would imply that c. 7.5% of local ex-slaves could enter, or about one in thirteen ex-slaves, while the estimated 200-member college of the third century would imply that 10% could enter, or about one in ten. Of course, not all 2000 hypothetical candidates actually met the financial requirements to pay the entry fees or had the right social connections. Therefore, the chances of entry for those who did qualify may have been considerably higher.

---

84 It is difficult to ascertain a scholarly consensus on this issue. Lo Cascio 1994: 38 suggested the improbable scenario of non-slave adult males making up as much as 30% of the population of a typical town, though this figure must assume a very small slave population and far fewer males below the age of maturity than seems realistic. Hin 2013: 286-8 suggests a figure of closer to 25% for early Augustan Rome itself. My choice of 20% is a conservative estimate, but one that works well as a computational figure.

85 For estimates of 10%, see Bagnall and Frier 1994: 70-1 on the evidence from the Egyptian census returns; and Verboven 2014: 91, basing his calculation on Duncan-Jones’ (1982: 286) study of *sportulae at Spoletium. For estimates of between 20-30%, see Gregori 1999: 18-19 on the proportion of secure freedmen in the epigraphy of Brixia; Scheidel 2005a: 64-71; and Scheidel 2011: 288-92. For a higher calculation of up to 40% in Herculaneum based on the citizenship rolls, see de Ligt and Garnsey 2012: 69-94; and Garnsey and de Ligt 2016: 72-94.

86 For this calculation the possibility of local *ingenui entering the *Augustales is disregarded.


88 The more typical size of the Ostian seviri Augustales may have been around 150 members. Duncan-Jones 1965: 215; Duncan-Jones 1982: 285-6. On Puteoli, see also Camodeca 1996: 165; and D’Arms 2000: 133-4. Meiggs 1973: 218 notes that the Ostian *Augustales may not have admitted new members every year. He also notes evidence for annual intakes of eight in 193, five in 201, and four in 239.

A second example is Brixia, which was also a large city, with an estimated 15,000 inhabitants. Of its approximately 3000 non-slave adult males roughly 750 freedmen may have been eligible for appointment as seviri Augustales. There is no direct evidence to estimate the size of the college, but if we assume that it reflected the nominal size of the town’s council of decurions, 100 members, it probably contained around the same number. This means that potentially c. 13% of local ex-slaves could join, or about one in eight. Similar calculations could also be made to understand the competition in smaller towns in Italy, where even less seats were available, perhaps as few as 30-50 in some towns.

These calculations seem to provide a basis for what may be a self-evident point: the competition was considerable, and entering the college was not always an easy task even for qualified freedmen. Being counted among the membership was thus something of an achievement in itself. Combined with the qualitative analysis above, this quantitative analysis involving nearly 800 *Augustales from the seven select cities allows us to form some provisional conclusions. The fifteen municipal freedmen from these sites collectively represent less than 2% of all known local members. This is an important number for two reasons. First, these cities provide lots of epigraphic material for studying social issues, and as centers of economic activity they were favorable for large numbers of *Augustales, namely, there was lots of wealth to be made from non-land-owning activities for sub-elite families and a greater demand for benefactors like the *Augustales to help build up and maintain the public infrastructure. A second and related point is that these cities maintained the largest familiae publicae, and therefore they must have consistently produced numerous municipal freedmen over many generations who had the chance to make good and perhaps record their success on an inscription that survives. This context makes the municipal freedmen’s consistently low turnout among the known *Augustales all the more noteworthy. In this regard, Ostia, which contributes almost half of the evidence, deserves special attention. It was close to Rome, had a booming economy, and seems to have experienced significant fluctuation in its social structures particularly over the course of the second century. The case can be made, then, that the experience of the municipal

——-

90 Gregori 1999: 320-1 n. 20, applying the hypothesis that a typical urban center contained approximately 300 inhabitants per hectare of civic space. See Camodeca 1977: 88-90, who applies this figure to analyses to a series of cities, including Ostia, Pompeii, and Puteoli.
freedmen of this colony was exceptional, so perhaps we should be careful not to generalize too much from it. All the same, the evidence from the large northern city of Aquileia conforms to the situation in Ostia, which may not be surprising given its own role as the major port city at the head of the Adriatic. There are also arguments from silence one could make about how additional evidence might modify the model suggested by the existing epigraphic record. For instance, perhaps the municipal freedmen would be shown to have a much greater role in the local associations. Equally, however, more material could hold to the same pattern that emerges here.

These issues notwithstanding, this analysis gives the impression that the Italian municipal freedmen’s presence among the local *Augustales was probably in line with that of the majority of local families who contributed their ex-slaves to the college, but it fell well short of the level of success exhibited by the more elite families. Perhaps it is unfair to expect the municipal freedmen to rival the level of success of families with senatorial connections. Moreover, there are other ways to evaluate social and economic success among ex-slaves outside this one institution. Yet the *Augustales indeed loom large in the way we view social mobility among the ex-slave populations of Roman towns. Contrary to the assumptions drawn by some scholars, then, this analysis makes it difficult to single out the municipal freedmen as men with a special path into the ranks of the *Augustales. One factor in their low participation, as Bruun has suggested in the context of Ostia, was the municipal freedmen’s lack of a patron to give them a push toward advancement. Indeed, a narrow segment of them managed to overcome this disadvantage and rose into the upper crust of local freedman society, perhaps by utilizing informal connections gained in their slave occupations that aided them in their business activities and social life after manumission. Yet these cases were surely limited. The vast majority of municipal freedmen were apparently not so fortunate, either because they lacked an avenue for entry or because they never accumulated the necessary wealth. Thus, there are grounds here to argue that these ex-slaves’ connections to municipal authority were not so consequential as is often thought.

---

III.4.3 PROFESSIONAL AND CULTIC ASSOCIATIONS

While admittance to the Augustales was the most sought after condition for freedmen, gaining access to other local collegia could also prove a lucrative social and economic boon in the municipal environment. The available evidence offers a glimpse of these ex-slaves’ membership in both professional and cultic associations.

The focus of scholarly attention when studying these other Roman associations has been on the essential function they played in society and how this function motivated their membership. Scholars have often preferred to impose a rigorous taxonomy on collegia, arguing that associations were either an economic and occupational organization or a convivial social club or a funerary club. Others have observed in the epigraphic evidence a pattern of holding membership in multiple associations simultaneously, whether for the purpose of reinforcing various economic interests, collecting ‘social capital,’ or satisfying different collegial needs. It has also been suggested that these associations constituted an institutional link between the sub-elite of Roman towns, who filled the ranks of the collegia, and the municipal elites, who served as their patrons. More recently, a number of scholars, focusing on the role of professional associations in the Roman economy, have reasserted that economic interests were the central animus for their formation and operation. Despite what one views as the fundamental reason behind the foundation of these urban groups, the widely accepted current theory is that life in a collegium always consisted of a balance of economic and social interests. Likewise, cultic collegia would have had the dual function of both venerating a particular deity and serving as a convivial club, as Andreas Bendlin’s study of the collegium salutare Dianae et Antinoi at Lanuvium shows.

---

98 For example, Verboven 2011: 187-95; and Broekaert 2011: 221-56.
99 See, for example, Liu 2013: 352-68.
100 See Bendlin 2011: 207-96 on the lex collegii of the collegium salutare Dianae et Antinoi at Lanuvium, dated to 136 CE (CIL XIV 2112). He points out that this association, originally organized as a group of worshippers, maintained a leadership hierarchy and membership fees structure, provided for members’ funerary arrangements, and had a regular communal dining schedule.
A related issue in studying Roman professional associations is to what extent members actually practiced or had an economic interest in the occupational trade around which an organization ostensibly had formed. In the context of associations made up of \textit{cultores}, this would mean distinguishing between initiates of a particular cult and outsiders who simply donated money to a college.\footnote{Liu’s 2009: 57-75, 203-212 discussion of this issue is useful, even though she is primarily interested evidence from the \textit{collegia centonariorum}.} This question must be answered by piecing together a membership dossier from the epigraphic evidence for a particular cult, which is often a difficult task. On the one hand, some of the more specialized occupational associations, such as the \textit{negotiatores eborarii aut citriarii} (dealers of ivory and citrus wood) from Rome (\textit{CIL VI} 33885), seem to have been composed mostly of practitioners of the trade.\footnote{See Verboven 2009: 160-1; and Liu 2013: 360-1, who notes that some groups probably guarded membership more strictly because of the legal privileges it could offer. On these restrictions, see \textit{Dig.} 50.6.6.12 (Callistratus).} On the other hand, associations whose titles otherwise may have suggested involvement in a specific trade frequently admitted members without a clear connection to the stated occupation. For example, three of the most common and apparently largest \textit{collegia} in Rome and in the municipalities, the \textit{centonarii}, \textit{dendrophori}, and \textit{fabri} (with their various designations), had a quite diverse membership, with some members belonging to other associations as well.\footnote{Liu 2009: 57-75, 203-12. Cf. Pearse 1974: 124-39, citing the membership of the \textit{collegium fabrum tignariorum} in Ostia at the end of the second century CE, who suggests that most of those in the association were builders or had close economic interests in the trade; and Royden 1988: 25-30, who discusses the personnel of this same group.} In some cases, these may be explained as investors with an interest in numerous local trades or as persons collecting affiliations to enhance their social status. Perhaps the multipurpose social activities offered by these large groups also had wide appeal. It could also be the case that local members of the sub-elite with involvement in multiple \textit{collegia} were simply acting as patrons to various groups, in the hope of spreading their reputation through their munificence, but for the most part remaining outsiders of the association.\footnote{Cf. Hemelrijk 2008: 115-62, though it is important to emphasize that her study focuses on the evidence for the liminal role of the female \textit{matres collegiorum}, whose experience surely differed from that of males.}

These insights into the function and nature of membership in urban associations are useful for evaluating the participation of municipal freedmen in these groups. Turning first to the professional \textit{collegia}, just four municipal freedmen demonstrate a connection to local colleges.\footnote{Group I, secure: \textit{CIL XI} 2701a, Volsinii (date uncertain): [---] Volsinius Victorinus, \textit{quinquennalis} of the \textit{collegium fabrum}. Group I, probable: \textit{CIL V} 3439, Verona (date uncertain): M. Veronius Epaphroditus, \textit{magister} of the \textit{collegium centonariorum}. Group II, probable: \textit{AE} 1977, 265a, Ravenna (later second-early third century CE):}
Two of these freedmen deserve some attention. Volsinius Victorinus of Volsinii reports that he held the post of *tabularius* at Volsinii (and previously at Ferentinum), a high-ranking clerical position exercised by municipal slaves and freedmen.\textsuperscript{106} His epitaph records that he was not only an *Augustalis* in the town where he was manumitted, but that he also held the position of *quinquennalis* in the local *collegium fabrum*, one of the two senior officers of the Volsinian organization, elected for a five-year term (*CIL XI* 2710a).\textsuperscript{107}

```
[---] Volsinio / [V]ictorino / q(uin)q(uennali) coll(egii) fabr(um), / Augustal[i], / tabul(ario) rei publ(icae) /[V]olusiniens(ium), /[i]t(em) Ferenti/ensium.
```

To [---] Volsinius Victorinus, *quinquennalis* of the *collegium* of the builders, an *Augustalis*, *tabularius* of the *res publica* of the Volusinienses, and likewise of the Ferentines.

The local *fabri*, as well as the *centonarii*, were not very active in commemorating their activities. Less than a dozen inscriptions from Volsinii refer to their group or its members, and this paucity of evidence makes it difficult to grasp many details about the college. Nevertheless, they must have occupied an important position in the town. One of their few inscriptions is a patronal tablet dated to 224 CE which reveals that they maintained a headquarters (*schola*) and were able attract as their patrons an equestrian ex-soldier and his wife (*CIL XI* 2702).\textsuperscript{108}

Victorinus himself must have been a consequential man in the town, and he stands out among his municipal freedmen peers in reaching the status of an elite local freedman. He is one of only three members of the *collegium fabrum* that is known from local epigraphy, and all three were *quinquennales*. His position in the association and in the local *Augustales* demanded considerable wealth and social connections. Both memberships came with entry fees and ongoing financial obligations to the town. Perhaps his high-level clerical position had provided him with a substantial *peculium* and enabled him to cultivate business connections, including the local building trade. The manner of his self-identification is also worth noticing. He boasts of his

\textsuperscript{106} Weiss 2004: 70-84.

\textsuperscript{107} In the context of the *collegia*, at least in some towns, the title *quinquennalis* probably denoted an official with a five-year term, rather than a special censorial official elected for a single year every fifth year, which is how the term was applied in the *ordo decurionum*. See Meiggs 1973: 314-15; and Royden 1988: 12-17, 207, 217-18 no. 330. See also Weiss 2004: 239 no. L38. Victorinus is classified as a secure municipal freedman.

connection to municipal authority, namely, his former position, alongside his membership in the local associations.

Victorinus’ *cursus honorum* raises questions about his role in these associations and provides a good case-study of the questions posed above about the function and membership of Roman professional *collegia*. One may ask whether he was actually a builder, or someone who had an interest in a building company, or whether he simply bought his way into the presidency of the college for the sake of improving his social standing. It is also possible that he joined the *collegium* simply to take advantage of its social aspects and any civic benefits that may have accrued to members. As a former *tabularius* of the town, his background primarily would have entailed clerical and perhaps even accounting training. It thus seems unlikely that he would have acquired any technical construction skills during his time as a municipal slave. At the same time, it could be argued that he utilized his scribal skills, serving the *collegium* administration in a clerical role. This type of service is well attested in professional *collegia* in Rome and Italian towns. For example, in addition to a list of patrons, decurions and plebeian members, a partial *album* of the *fabri tignarii* of Luna records a *scriba* alongside three other subordinate positions (CIL XI 1355a). As a *quinquennalis*, it is possible that Victorinus had risen from the rank-and-file of the organization.

A related issue is where his entry into the *Augustales* fits into his career. Lindsey Vandevoorde has recently studied cases of *Augustales* who also held positions in professional associations and found that many of them had ties to the building trades (over 40%). Her interpretation of the evidence for such *Augustales* also suggests that membership in associations like the *fabri* may have functioned as an audition for entry into the *Augustales*, allowing the most fortunate local freedmen who managed to join the ranks of the builders first to establish their status as benefactors before eventual promotion to the more prestigious college.

---

109 The possibility cannot be ruled out that Victorinus was also still a *tabularius* working for the town. Weiss 2004: 70-84 notes that over half of the known municipal *tabularii* were freedmen, indicating either that they had simply remained in their previous post after receiving their freedom, or that in some towns they may have been promoted to *tabularius* along with their manumission.

110 Royden 1988: 17; Tran 2006b: 141-55. The other three subordinate staff include a *haruspex* and two *medici*.


A second noteworthy case involves a probable freedman who shared a similar post-manumission career to that of Victorinus. In Verona, M. Veronius Epaphroditus erected an epitaph for himself and for a Veronia Calliste, presumably his spouse (*CIL V 3439*).\(^{113}\)

\[
v(ivus)\ f(ecit) / M.\ Veronius\ /\ Epaphroditus\ /\ \textit{VIvir\ Aug(ustalis), / mag(ister)\ [c]ol[le]gi(i)\ c[e]nt(onariorum), / Veroniae\ Calliste.}
\]

M. Veronius Epaphroditus, *VIvir Augustalis, magister of the collegium of the centonarii* (cloth-dealers), erected this monument, while still living, for Veronia Calliste. Epaphroditus’ position as a *magister* in the important college of cloth-dealers of this northern town indicates a high level of wealth, as does his role among the local *seviri Augustales*.\(^{114}\) Nothing is known about what *familia publica* position he once held, evidence that would be useful for evaluating the prospects for social and economic mobility once he acquired his manumission.

These two examples are important for understanding how some municipal freedmen navigated the social and economic landscape of their post-manumission lives. Regardless of their actual occupational ties to the professional colleges, they were clearly well integrated into their communities. The overlap between membership in the *Augustales* and important professional *collegia* was not a widespread phenomenon among the municipal freedmen. It marks them out for their unusual level of social mobility and local status.\(^{115}\) A clearer, and more noteworthy, conclusion to this discussion is the recognition that only four out of 208 ex-slaves of Italian towns, or just under 2%, had any apparent connection to a local professional *collegium*. As with the *Augustales*, the nature of the epigraphic evidence makes it difficult to estimate what percentage of freedmen from any household entering a *collegium* would be considered impressive. Yet if this statistic points to an actual trend among this group of ex-slaves, it is reasonable to conclude that most of them were less well equipped to penetrate the ranks of local professional associations than their private counterparts who typically benefitted from some level of social and economic support from their own patrons. Scholarship has shown that one of the key factors in the social advancement of ex-slaves, including reaching the *Augustales*, was

---


\(^{115}\) Cf. Tran 2006b: 49-88, 140-203.
through commercial and other occupational activities. One may wonder whether a lack of access to such commercial activities played a role in the municipal freedmen’s modest presence in the upper echelons of local freedman society. Few, in fact, demonstrate an occupation outside those linked to their former slave positions in the *familia publica*. Underscoring this overall meager participation in professional associations by the municipal freedmen in their hometowns is the near total lack of Ostienses appearing among the extraordinarily large number of inscriptions recording these groups in Ostia. This was the very context in which one might expect aspiring freedmen to have been able to make inroads into the local economy and leave their mark in the epigraphic evidence.

Another outlet for the municipal freedmen’s ambitions for civic engagement was in local associations dedicated to the cult of a particular deity, which either aimed primarily to venerate the deity or performed cultic activities alongside a social agenda. For the purpose of analyzing the municipal freedmen’s involvement in local institutions, it is useful to treat the cult associations separately from the professional associations such as the *collegia fabrum* and *centonariorum* and the Augustales, even if many of their social activities overlapped. Among the municipal freedmen catalogued here, four belonged to a ‘cultic’ association, while twelve others making votive offerings could plausibly have a similar affiliation.

Two *alba* record the membership of municipal freedmen in cult associations. From Sentinum there is an inscribed marble plaque of the association of the *cultores d(ei) S(olis) I(nvicti) Mithrae* (*CIL* XI 5737). Most likely dating to the 260s CE, the *album* lists 36 names, organized in three columns and corresponding to at least three groups. Schematically, the initial names in the left column appear to be the *patroni* of the group, Line 5 of Column I seems to record a senior priest (*pater leonum*), and the remaining names in Columns I, II, and III seem to pertain to regular rank and file initiates. Yet there is much debate about how to interpret the organization of the names and the identification of the *cultores* of Mithras listed here. Noting the

117 See below on the continuation of *familia* occupations.
118 Bruun 2008: 547-8 identified only two exceptions (*CIL* XIV 4569, *fabri tignarii*; Tribu p. 165, *fabri navales*). I have categorized both men as *incerti* descendants of municipal freedmen of the colony.
120 Vermaseren 2012: 251 no. 688.
121 The dating relies on the identification of a handful of these *cultores* who appear in three other association *alba* in Sentinum which are dated to 260-261 CE. See Tran 2006b: 262-6; and Liu 2009: 186-91.
numerous grades of membership in the Mithraic cult spread throughout the Roman world, Clauss argues that the men registered in this Sentinum *album* were only the patrons and the higher-ranking or full members, likely referred to as *leones*, which explains the presence of a single *pater leonum*.\(^{122}\)

The membership list of this cult includes two men classified as probable municipal freedmen of Sentinum. Sentin(as) Januarius was the high priest *pater leonum* recorded in Column I, Line 5, and then among the larger group of members was Sentin(as) Valentin(us) in Column II, Line 10.\(^{123}\) Besides the fact that they have the municipal *gentillicium* of Sentinum, their identification as ex-slaves of the town is strengthened by the presence of a current municipal slave in Column III, Line 3, Januarius, whose entry reads *Januarius Sent(inatium)*. In fact, Bormann proposed that this slave could be the son of the *pater leonum* Sentin(as) Januarius, since the two share the same cognomen.\(^{124}\) It is somewhat striking to find a slave among these free(d) members, especially if they represented the most senior *cultores* in the association. Certainly, there are parallels for municipal slaves belonging to local voluntary associations, such as Zosimus of Saepinum, for whom the *cultores Flaminiani* erected an epitaph (*CIL* IX 2483), and, even more remarkably, the two municipal slaves, from Puteoli and Liternum, who were listed as *corporati* in the *Augustales* at Liternum (*AE* 2001, 854).\(^{125}\) How widespread such membership was among slaves cannot be determined. Tran has pointed out that this phenomenon of slaves entering local associations was for the most privileged among them a form of social mobility within an otherwise severely restricted life.\(^{126}\)

The participation of these current and former municipal slaves is not unusual, because initiates with servile origins were heavily involved in cultic associations of Mithras like the one at Sentinum.\(^{127}\) In its roster, for example, one can point to several Greek and Latin ‘servile’ *cognomina* and the recurrence of several *gentilicia* among multiple *cultores*, a feature that seems

\(^{122}\) Clauss 1990: 183-94; 2000: 135-6. Useful in this interpretation is the work of the third-century CE philosopher Porphyrius, who noted features of the Mithraic cult and its activities. Also from Sentinum and dating to the third century is an altar base dedicated to Mithras by two men who refer to themselves as *leones* (*CIL* XI 5735). Cf. Beck’s 2000: 144-79 analysis of the hierarchy in the Mithraic cults through their visual imagery.

\(^{123}\) Weiss 2004: 246 also lists them as probable municipal freedmen, noting that they do not claim to be freedmen at all.

\(^{124}\) Bormann 1901: 839.

\(^{125}\) See the discussion of this case of municipal slaves in the *Augustales* at Liternum above, p. 139.

\(^{126}\) Tran 2006b: 49-65 (esp. 53-5, on municipal slaves in associations).

\(^{127}\) Clauss 2000: 33-41 recognizes that slaves and freedmen are among the most visible members of the cult in towns around the Roman Empire. One should note that freeborn Romans, and in particular soldiers, were also frequent members of local Mithraic cults.
to indicate that a handful of local households placed multiple freedmen in the group.\textsuperscript{128} The social status of the membership notwithstanding, Liu has noted that a handful of the \textit{cultores} were also enrolled in the \textit{collegia fabrum} and \textit{centonariorum} at Sentinum, so it is plausible that there was some degree of wealth among the cult members.\textsuperscript{129} Even so, the epigraphic record for the members’ activities shows little interest in using their wealth to benefit the wider community, since dedications were directed entirely toward their own cult.\textsuperscript{130}

The next example comes from Venafrum in southern Latium, in the form of a fragmentary \textit{album} of the \textit{cult(ores) Iovis Cae(lestis)}, dating from the later first or second century CE (\textit{CIL X} 4852). Local associations devoted to Jupiter under various guises indicated by different epithets were widespread throughout central Italy and a few sites in the provinces. In Venafrum itself, cult associations in general are prevalent in the local epigraphic record, including the \textit{cultores Bonae Deae Caelestis} (\textit{CIL X} 4849) and the \textit{cultores Saturni} (\textit{CIL X} 4854).

The list preserves the partial names of sixteen members of the cult, though without any indication of hierarchy. The reconstructed \textit{cognomina} show a mixture of Latin and Greek names, so one can speculate that at least a portion of the members were ex-slaves.\textsuperscript{131} One name that is well preserved is that of [---] Venafranus Dio[g]en[e]s in Line 4. His Greek \textit{cognomen} suggests freedman status, and he bears the municipal \textit{gentilicium} of Venafrum. I categorize him as a probable municipal freedman. As with the previous example, it is difficult to establish whether wealthy members managed this cult. Notably, among all the associations in Venafrum identified in \textit{CIL X} there seems to have been limited displays of wealth in the form of public benefaction.

A third case of a municipal freedman’s involvement in a local association is a votive offering from Aricia, just south of Rome, of uncertain date (\textit{CIL XIV} 2156).

\begin{quote}
\textit{Dianae Aug(ustae) / colleg(ium) lotor(um) / sacr(orum?), / Primigenius r(ei) p(ublicae) / Aricinorum ser(vus) arc(arius) / curator II, cum / M. Arrecino Gelliano / filio curatore I, / d(ono) d(edit).}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{128} Among the initiates with a Greek \textit{cognomen} are Ligurius Theodotus, Carfan(ius) Achille(s), and Aduren(ius) Theseus, and among those with a Latin ‘servile’ \textit{cognomen} are Plotius Fortunatus, Licinius Faustus, and Helvenat(ius) Celer. In addition, four initiates bear the \textit{gentilicium} Coiedius, two the \textit{gentilicium} Aetrius, and two the \textit{gentilicium} Helvenatius.
\textsuperscript{129} Liu 2009: 186-91.
\textsuperscript{130} For example, \textit{CIL XI} 5735, 5736, 5738. It should be noted as well that there is very little visible euergetism by other groups, including by the \textit{Augustales}, whose epigraphic presence in Sentinum is small.
\textsuperscript{131} Kajava 2015: 412-14.
To Diana Augusta, (on behalf of?) the collegium of sacred ritual bath-attendants, Primigenius, slave arcarius of the res publica of Aricia, as curator for the second time with his son M. Arrecinus Gellianus, curator for the first time, made this dedication."132

The function of the colleg(ium) lotor(um) (sacr(orum)?) has been disputed. The group is sometimes connected to the work of fullonicae, specifically as washers of wool using urine.133 Yet Bruun has argued convincingly on linguistic as well as topographical grounds that these lotores were washing attendants at bathhouses.134 Pairing this votive offering with a reference to the colleg(ium) lot(orum) Nemorensium (ILS 9421), he suggests that these groups of lotores from sites near the sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis on Lake Nemi must have played a role in ritual bathing for visitors to the cult center. On a foundational level, then, the association seems to have had a cultic rather than a professional or occupational focus.

The father and son making this dedication were members of the familia publica of Aricia. The son’s status as a municipal freedman is implied by both his municipal gentilicum and the fact that his father is still a slave arcarius in the town. A less likely possibility is that he was born an ingenuus illegitimus to a municipal freedwoman mother who bore the gentilicum Arrecina, in which case the decurions had chosen not to enforce the SC Claudianum to enslave him. Municipal freedman status seems the best explanation, though why he received manumission by the Arician ordo and his father did not remains an open question. The role of this pair of curatores in the collegium lotorum is another matter.

Primigenius records his municipal slave position of arcarius, making him an accounting slave in the town’s treasury. It is possible that the son, too, served in this same capacity, as an argument can be made that in the familia publica fathers would have trained their sons to exercise the same positions, especially in more skilled sections of the familia.135 The question is why an accounting municipal slave and his freedman son would have joined a ritual bathing association. To begin with, it should be emphasized that there is no reason to connect these lotores directly to the municipal administration of Aricia.136 There are no clear administrative connections between the ordo of Aricia and the sanctuary, and moreover, the presence of both

---

132 Weiss 2004: 236 no. L1. My translation follows Bruun’s 1993: 227-8 suggestion that sacr. should be read as the adjective sacr(orum) modifying colleg(ium) lotor(um), rather than sacr(um) denoting the votive offering itself. Bruun points out that separating sacr(um) from the dative recipient would be unnatural in the syntax of Roman votive offerings.
this *collegium lotorum* and the *collegium lotorum Nemorensium* seem to imply that these were independent associations without direct links to the operation of the cult, even if they provided essential support services. Both associations, in fact, appear to have had their own internal hierarchies, separate from any offices in the cult center and municipal administration. For example, these Arician *lotores* had the office of *curator*, while the group mentioned above that was based at Nemi was led by a *quinquennalis*.

A related question is whether municipal slaves were employed in bathhouses, which is often assumed to have been the case. Weiss has explored the possible role these slaves could have played in public bathhouses under the administration of the municipal government, but he notes the lack of any clear evidence that any municipal administration used its slaves in such a capacity.\textsuperscript{137} The only possible case comes from Patavium, where a dedication was made to the *domini* of the *familia thermensis thermarum urbaniarum* (CIL V 2886). Weiss speculates that these *domini* could be the citizens, the Patavini, which in turn would suggest that the baths were publicly administered (*urbaniarum*), though the term *domini* could equally designate the supervisors (i.e., *vilici*) of the subordinate slaves.\textsuperscript{138} Pliny and Trajan’s well-known correspondence about the municipal slaves in Nicomedia and Nicaea is also relevant to this discussion (Ep. 10.31-2). Pliny seeks advice on how to deal with criminals who had absconded from their penal labors and taken up the work normally assigned to municipal slaves. The emperor responds that the older offenders should instead be placed in more menial tasks, including working in the bathhouses. Using this exchange, Weiss envisions that bathhouse work could easily fit into the purview of the *familia publica*.\textsuperscript{139} Yet it is Pliny and Trajan’s own language that seems to contradict this idea. Pliny suggests that the criminals were too humble to perform the work of municipal slaves (31.3: ... *et in publicis officiis retinere damnatos non satis honestos putabam*), a sentiment that imparts a degree of respectability to the latter. Far from equating the two types of labor, moreover, Trajan’s recommendation to apply the criminals to lesser work (32.2: ...*distribuamus illos in ea ministeria, quae non longe a poena sint. solent enim eius modi ad balineum, ad purgationes cloacarum, item munitiones viarum et vicorum dari.*) draws a direct contrast between the type of work fit for municipal slaves and that fit for

\textsuperscript{137} Weiss 2004: 125-8.
\textsuperscript{138} Weiss 2004: 126-7.
\textsuperscript{139} Weiss 2004: 126-7.
men of lower status. This piece of evidence thus implies that municipal slave labor in the bathhouses would only be exceptional.

Returning to the question of why Primigenius and his son Arrecinus Gellianus joined the collegium lotorum outside their official positions in the familia publica, it is possible that they played some active role as bath attendants. Or, the two may have joined the organization to engage in its social or religious activities and to enjoy any benefits that were granted to members. Another explanation could be found in their official role in the town treasury, where the father, at least, served as an arcarius, and in their stated role in the college, curatores. The office of curator is attested in a wide variety of associations in the Roman world, and it always seems to be a position connected to managing a group’s finances.\textsuperscript{140} An album of an association in Mediolanum made up of both fabri and centonarii makes this identification clear, registering its curatores arcae (CIL V 5612). The fact that a municipal slave arcarius also held the position of treasurer in this collegium lotorum on two different occasions creates an interesting overlap. Tangentially, it may also be suggestive of his son Gellianus’ background in the familia publica at Aricia. Of course, this connection of the pair’s skill-set with their position in the college raises the issue of whether they had been recruited by the lotores or whether their entry was a separate matter, and their selection as curatores only incidental. The fact that this curatorship had a restricted term, as indicated by their notation of holding the post once and twice, tends to support the latter possibility.

Regardless of how and why these two entered the collegium lotorum, their membership represented a level of social mobility, both for the municipal slave and for his son who has been categorized as an ex-slave of Aricia. They held official positions in an association that may have had considerable wealth, given that it maintained an arca and engaged in dedications.\textsuperscript{141} Judging from the status of this father and son, the membership was probably mostly persons of servile origin.\textsuperscript{142} This factor, along with its apparently ancillary function for the cult center, may suggest that the collegium lotorum was not among the most prestigious in the town, but it sufficed to give its members an opportunity to interact with their town and engage in euergetism.

\textsuperscript{141} Liu 2009: 108 notes that sometimes the internal dating systems of collegia were based on eponymous curatores, a clear mark of their importance to an association.
\textsuperscript{142} The quinquennalis of the lotores of Nemi, L. Antonius Ionicus, was likely a former slave, as was his wife Cornelia Thallusa (ILS 9421 = AE 1912, 92).
III.4.4 THE *FAMILIA PUBLICA* AS A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION

An additional aspect of municipal freedmen’s participation in the collegial life of Roman towns has largely been overlooked in scholarship, but may be central to understanding their position.\(^{143}\) Whereas the focus up to this point has been on analyzing how well integrated the ex-slaves of towns were into the local array of associations, there is ample epigraphic evidence to make the case that some municipal freedmen met their associative needs by exploiting their official organization in service to the town, the *familia publica*, as an informal *collegium* organization.

As noted above, one of the key movements in recent scholarship on Roman voluntary associations has been to move away from the taxonomic approach of viewing *collegia* as occupational, religious, funerary, convivial, etc., and instead to try to understand how individual *collegia* could incorporate all of these functions for their members.\(^{144}\) The documentary evidence for the *familia publica* shows its members exhibiting the collective behaviors of more formal associations, and gives the impression that it may have functioned in the multipurpose way described in recent scholarship. The purpose here is to draw attention to how the *familia publica*, if we view it as a ‘professional association’ and not just as a crew of slaves and freedmen who performed services for the citizens of a town, reflects the structural features and activities observed in the other, more well defined, associations in Roman towns.

From a legal standpoint, it should be noted that none of the seven epigraphical references to an organization of the *familia publica* finds the group citing an official authorization from the Roman senate or emperor to form a *collegium*.\(^{145}\) Scholarship on Roman associations has long debated whether the senate ever passed a ‘blanket’ *senatus consultum* granting the *ius coeundi* to groups wishing to form an association (including those attributed to the probably spurious category of *tenuiores*),\(^{146}\) though more recent scholarship has called into question the extent to which the senate ever would have been comfortable with such legislation, at least not before the

---


\(^{145}\) References to a *familia publica* are found in Ostia (*CIL* XIV 255; *CIL* XI 32 = *ILS* 6152; *ILOP* 7); Venafrum (*CIL* X 4856 = *ILS* 6153, 1); Ameria (*CIL* XI 4391); Brundisium (*CIL* IX 32); Capua (*CIL* X 3942 = *ILS* 6319; referred to as *familia limata*); Segobriga in Hispania Citerior (*AE* 1903, 186 = *Ep.Eph.* 8\(^2\), 182); and Corduba in Baetica (*CIL* II\(^3\) 315 = II 2229).

reign of Hadrian, and then perhaps only for so-called collegia necessaria or licta. The alternative of having the imperial authorities grant this privilege to associations on a case-by-case basis surely would have become quite cumbersome, and also may not reflect actual practice.\textsuperscript{147}

In reality, it was not all that common for an association to cite its official sanction to form by an SC or the emperor’s permission, celebrated in some inscriptions with formulae such as ex s. c. coire licet, at least not outside the three major, and ubiquitous, collegia of the fabri, centonarii, and dendrophori.\textsuperscript{148} The question of legal permission may not be so crucial. It has been argued, for example, that numerous association groups at Pompeii, which formed around a variety of interests, thrived without ever receiving any official recognition, a legal development Liu thinks post-dated the town’s destruction in 79 CE.\textsuperscript{149} The evidence below will show the municipal slaves and freedmen of Roman towns acting in a similar way with regard to the familia publica.\textsuperscript{150}

In fact, the apparent lack of official permission also did not prevent the associations of municipal slaves and freedmen from using the explicit language of Roman associations to describe their college. In total, at least nineteen inscriptions can be identified in which the broader familia or smaller subsections within it are cited while performing a task outside their official capacity in service to the town’s administration.\textsuperscript{151} At Ostia, for example, the dedicator of a statue and base, himself an ex-slave of the colony, refers to the corpus familiae publicae libertorum et servorum (CIL XIV 32).\textsuperscript{152} Another example, also from Ostia, offers an outsider’s perspective on the familia in its unofficial collegial capacity. The son of Cn. Sentius Felix, a
wealthy and politically successful member of the Ostian elite, erected a statue and base for his father in which he enumerated the latter’s patronage activities (CIL XIV 409). Among the local associations that received his favor was the corpus...libertor(um) et servor(um) publicor(um).\textsuperscript{153} Remarkably, the collective organization of Ostia’s slaves and freedmen seems to be placed on equal footing with more than a dozen other local associations, including some of the more well known professional and necessaria collegia at Ostia.

Another illustrative example comes from Venafrum. Dated to the first century CE on the basis of the letter forms, the text is inscribed on a stele that is broken off just below the third line, but the first three lines can clearly be read as collegio / familiae / publicae (CIL X 4856 = ILS 6153).\textsuperscript{154} Collegio is inscribed in larger letters and its case may be debated. On the one hand, it could be ablative and dependent on a preceding ex. A well known parallel would be an epitaph from Rome dedicated by a free or freed daughter to her freedman father in which she refers to herself as ex collegio familiae Sergiae Paulinae (CIL VI 10263). Yet there is visible blank space on our stone cippus above collegio, which seems to rule out the presence of an ex. On the other hand, it is more likely that collegio is dative, and therefore familiae publicae is genitive and dependent on it. It therefore should be assumed that a dedicator or list of dedicators in the nominative would have followed in the missing portion of the stone below Line 3. Perhaps the dedicator was an affiliated municipal slave or freedman of Venafrum, or the decurions or local citizenry, or another association. Additionally, from the town of Ameria in southern Umbria there is a second-century CE foundation inscription establishing funds for an annual banquet for the local collegium centonariorum in honor of a prominent local woman who was their patroness (CIL XI 4391).\textsuperscript{155} The text stipulates that if the annual banquet and cash-handouts in her honor were not carried out according to the guidelines of the foundation, the money would be given instead to the familia publica: pertineb(it) omn(is) summa ad familiam publicam. There is no

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item CIL XIV 409 (= ILS 6146), later first or early second century CE: (excerpted) Cn(aeo) Sentio Cn(aei) fil(io) / Cn(aei) n(epoti) Ter(etina) Felici, / dec(urionum) decr(eto) aedilicio adl(ecto), d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) d(ecurioni) adl(ecto) / q tuaestori) a(erarii) Ostiens(ium) Ilvir(o) (quaestori) iuvenum / hic primus omnium quo anno dec. adl(ectus) est, et / q tuaestor) a(erarii) fact(us) est, et in proxim(um) annum Ilvir designat(us) est, / ... patrono decuriae scribar(um) cerarior(um) / et librario(um) et lictor(um) et viator(um) ... item corpor(is) / scapharior(um) et lenuncularior(um) traiect(us) Lucull(i) et / dendrophorum et togator(um) a foro et de sacomar(io) et libertor(um) et servor(um) publicor(um) ... Cn(aeus) Sentius Lucilius / Gamala Clodianus (filius) patri indulgentissimo. Meiggs 1973: 200-1; Weiss 2004: 159-62, 167; Cébeillac-Gervasoni, Caldelli, and Zevi 2006: 276-9 no. 81; and Bruun 2008: 545, 552-3.
\item Capini 1999: 43 no. 16.
\item See the full text below, p. 171.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
obvious connection between this freeborn woman and the *familia publica*, but her instructions seem to envision the *familia* as being an important group in the social milieu of this Umbrian town, on the same footing as the *collegium centonariorum* and deserving of her patronage.

This appropriation of the terminology associated with formal *collegia*, by both internal members of the *familia* and outsiders, is important for two reasons. First, it implies that the slaves and freedmen of towns were thinking in terms of a collective group, and one that could function outside its official role in serving the municipal administration. Second, through the terminology the *familia* seems to be expressing a self-identity in the milieu of local civic life, perhaps even in imitation of the many other colleges that were so pervasive in Roman municipal society. The fact that outsiders recognized the *familia* in this role serves as a confirmation that the group was successful in this attempt.

Turning now to the evidence itself for the associative features exhibited by the *familia publica*, it is possible to observe five categories. To begin with, receiving patronage was of course a principal concern of any Roman association, since donations from wealthy benefactors probably funded their activities as much as membership fees. The most prized targets for a potential patron were members of the imperial family or local elites. The examples adduced above for the group identity of the *familia* associations also demonstrate their position as targets for local benefactors. It should be emphasized once more that the patronage seen in these examples regards the *familia* in its unofficial role. Another inscription can be cited here to illustrate the *familia* college or its subsections specifically being targeted for participation in dining activities and receiving cash handouts, both of which suggest a clearer link between patron and association. At Forum Clodii in southern Etruria a member of the local elite named L. Cascellius Probus celebrated his adlection as *duovir quinquennalis* in 165 CE by dedicating a statue of the *genius* of the town and staging a public banquet with cash handouts (*CIL* XI 7556).  

The list of those receiving this benefit, in descending order with regard to amount of *sportula*, included the town’s patrons, perhaps Roman senators, the local decurions, the

---

ministeria publica (in the dative form ministeris publicis), and the citizens of the town. The interpretation of ministeris publicis is challenging. Its literal meaning is ‘for the public services,’ which would suggest that the benefactor was funding some unnamed civic task. It is equally plausible that actual individuals are implied by the phrase, the functionaries who would perform these services, such as ministri. This would make more sense given that they are listed between two other social groups, the decurions and munifices. Literary sources often apply this title to municipal slaves, specifically those serving official priests in public rituals or assisting magistrates in searches and seizures, and the adjective publicus is also frequently employed by itself to denote municipal slaves. Perhaps the stonemason mistakenly inscribed ministerii for ministris, though no editors have noted this possibility. Ministri publici, if they are implied in this inscription, may have been a subsection of the local familia publica, or the municipal slaves at Forum Clodii simply may have been referred to this way. Why Probus directed his generosity toward them is unclear, but this event may well be another instance of such a group’s receiving patronage in an entirely social context.

A second feature of collective behavior that can be traced in the evidence for the familia publica consists of communal activities, which fulfill the important social dimension of a voluntary association. We have already observed groups of municipal slaves and freedmen in the public dining context alongside other local colleges, but there is no record of a familia staging its own banquet or setting up a foundation with annual dining events, which indeed was a typical behavior of Roman associations. This theme, however, can be approached from an indirect angle. It is possible to envision that the dedications of statues, structures, etc. made by members of the familia, such as at Ostia and Sarmizegetusa, and perhaps also at Venafrum, also entailed staging banquets and distributing cash to familia members, their patrons, and invited members of their community.

The familia publica shared a third key component with voluntary associations as we know them, an internal hierarchy. For example, at Capua a municipal slave arcarius was also commemorated as magister of the familia limata (CIL X 3942). This designation of limata

---

157 For example, Dig. 11.4.1.6 (Ulpian); Pliny Ep. 10.31-32; Appuleius Met. 3.2; 9.41; 10.10. Cf. Fuhrmann 2012: 64-6.
158 Bruun has made this point in recent publications.
159 CIL X 3942 (= ILS 6319), late first or early second century CE: Macedoni / Euphrosyni arc. <et> / magistri / familiae / limatae [servo] / Salvilla Mamma. For the emendation of magister to magistri and the supplement of [servo], see Chioffi 2011: 76 no. 85. See also Weiss 2004: 34, 167, 246.
would seem to suggest that this slave was part of the subsection of the town’s slaves who attendend more directly to the municipal magistrates and were entitled to wear the *limus*, the garment that may have signaled their high status within the *familia publica*.\textsuperscript{160} It is unlikely that the title *magister* indicated any official role in the *familia publica*, and therefore the most obvious alternative is that this corresponded to the associative side of the *familia*. In another example from Corduba in Baetica, a municipal slave erected the following epitaph for an ex-slave of the colony (*CIL* II\textsuperscript{7} 315).\textsuperscript{161}

\begin{quote}
\textit{A(ulo) Publicio / [Ge]rmano sacerdoti / [fa]miliae publicae / [c(olonorum) c(oloniae)] P(atriciae), perpetuo mag(istro) II, / [Tr]ophimus c(olonorum) c(oloniae) P(atriciae) ser(vus) / [e]mpt(icius) Germanianus / d(e) s(uo) d(edit).}
\end{quote}

To A. Publicius [Ge]rmanus, perpetual sacerdos of the *familia* publica of the coloni of the colony Patricia and twice *magister*, [Tr]ophimus Germanianus, slave of the coloni of the colony Patricia, having been purchased (from Germanus?), erected (this epitaph) with his own money.

This text speaks directly to the internal hierarchy of this *familia* association. Not only was Germanus a perpetual priest within the college, he held what was likely its highest position, *magister*, on two occasions. This latter position indicates, moreover, that the offices were annual, perhaps elected, offices, while the former of sacerdos implies a cultic aspect to the *familia* association.

A fourth important function of Roman collegia was caring for members’ burial rites. This practice, too, seems to have been satisfied in the *familia* association. There are three epitaphs that document such activities in three different Roman towns. The first example comes from Tarracina on the coast of Latium, where the *libe*\textsuperscript{r}ti et officiales Tar[ri]cinensium, the town’s freedmen and slaves, erected an epitaph for a deceased municipal slave (*CIL* X 6332).

\begin{quote}
\textit{D(is) M(anibus) . / Proculo rei / public\textless a\textgreater , libe\textsuperscript{r}ti et officia/les Tar[ri]cin/ensium f(ecerunt).}
\end{quote}

To the departed spirits. To Proculus, (slave) of the *res publica*, the freedmen and officiales of the Tarracimenses erected (this epitaph).

A heavily restored epitaph from Segobriga in Hispania presents a similar case (*EE* VIII 182 = *AE* 1903, 186).\textsuperscript{162}

\textsuperscript{160} Weiss 2004: 29-35. On the municipal slaves who were permitted to wear the *limus*, see above, pp. 57 n. 23, 60-1.
\textsuperscript{161} Weiss 2004: 166-70, 214 no. 171. The epitaph dates to the first or second century CE.
\textsuperscript{162} The reading follows Weiss 2004: 216 no. 182.
To [--]ra, slave of the res publica of the Segobrigenses, the familia publica erected (this epitaph).

A more problematic epitaph is from Miliana in Mauretania Caesariensis, dated to the second or third century CE (AE 1984, 948).

--- ann XXXV coll(egae?) / [servi et liberti] publ(ici) fecer(unt).

To (their) colleague/fellow freedman [--- who lived] 35 years, the municipal [slaves and freedmen] erected (this epitaph).

Here, the key element for identifying the dedicators is illegible, but the presence of the adjectival publ(ici), which indicates a connection with municipal slaves and freedmen, and the plural fecer(unt) lends support to the supplement of servi et liberti publ(ici). If this is correct, the next issue is how to interpret coll. in line 1. It may indicate coll(iberto), making him a municipal freedman, or it could be coll(egae), expressing his membership in the group. It is possible to imagine that these municipal slaves had no immediate coniuges, family members, or close friends to erect their epitaphs, and that these examples represent atypical cases of the familia publica performing burial rites for its slaves as a courtesy. Yet when interpreting these epitaphs alongside the associative features of the familia outlined here, one can envision that the familia’s associative functions also encompassed that of a so-called collegium funeraticium. This type of activity by the familia resonates with the actions of funerary associations, and also with the evidence for some slave households of the elite, such as the household of Livia and the Statilii Tauri in Rome, both of which show slaves and freedmen forming informal burial associations.

Finally, a fifth important feature of Roman voluntary associations is the maintenance of a common treasury for the collegium, from which funds could be spent on a variety of activities and tasks of the association. In fact, it must not be forgotten that behind the practice of making dedications and burying deceased members was a common fund for the group. An even more concrete example can be seen in the aforementioned second-century CE foundation inscription


164 Caldellli and Ricci 1999: 55-68; Mouritsen 2013: 43-68. It was the owner’s responsibility to bury a slave, but others may have been welcome to take care of the task.
from Ameria, in which the local *familia publica* was designated as the substitute recipient of a local woman’s euergetism (*CIL XI* 4391). It is worth quoting the text in full.\(^{165}\)

To Iulia Felicitas, daughter of Marcus, wife of C. Curiatius Eutyches the (municipal) quattuorvir, (to her) *magistra* of Fortuna Melior, the association of cloth-dealers (dedicated this monument), on account of her beneficence. She, pleased by the honor, repaid the whole cost (of the monument), and on the occasion of (the statue’s) dedication she gave to each (member) 20 HS, and on top of this she put into their treasury 5000 HS, so that on her birthday, the fifth day before the Ides of May, they might divide up the annual interest of that sum for dining, in perpetuity. But if the division shall not have been celebrated on the day stipulated above, then the entire sum is to belong to the *familia publica*.

Two overlooked aspects of this inscription are what the *familia* was actually set to receive and how they were to receive it. First, unlike the original beneficiaries, the *collegium centonariorum*, the *familia* would not be awarded a lavish dinner at a fixed value, but rather the *omnis summa* itself, that is, the whole sum of 5000 HS originally left in the legacy. Importantly, Iulia Felicitas envisioned the sum going into a common treasury. It is possible to infer that she was thinking in these terms from a clause earlier in the passage, where it is reported that she gave the original 5000 HS into the treasury of the *centonarii* (*arcæ eorum intul(it) HS V m. n.*). The second point to recognize in this dedication is that, unlike in so many Roman endowments where individual members of an association received cash handouts, normally expressed through Latin distributive numerals, here Iulia grants the money to the *familia publica* as a whole.\(^{166}\) In this case, how could a group receive funds if not into a common treasury?

These examples of specific collective behaviors closely resemble those of formal Roman voluntary associations. While it is not possible to match every feature of Roman voluntary associations with evidence from the various *familiae* we know of, this analysis suggests a real and active social organization operating outside the confines of these slaves’ and freedmen’s

---

\(^{165}\) Asdrubali Pentiti 2000: 230; Asdrubali Pentiti 2008: 211 no. 10.

\(^{166}\) The designation of such alternative recipients was envisioned as a check to ensure that the conditions of the endowment were maintained over time.
official capacity in service to their local municipal administration, and that this organization apparently had a multipurpose function for its members. Moreover, it is likely that this type of association and the links to the local municipal elite it cultivated helped shape the members’ identity within their town.

These types of collective behaviors were not all that uncommon in Roman slave households, particularly in the large urban elite slave *familiae*. This is understandable since the social and economic base of any large group of slaves and ex-slaves was anchored in their household. In this way, then, it would have been natural for the municipal slaves and freedmen to exploit their household, the *familia publica*, to meet a wider set of needs for social and economic interaction within the wider community. Yet this evidence for the structural features of the associations of municipal slaves and freedmen suggests that it may have offered a more developed and comprehensive set of functions than the average large private household. It should also be added that the scenario laid out here does not imply that membership in the *familia* association had to be exclusive. Some municipal slaves and freedmen could and probably did belong to other local groups, while still interacting in the *familia*.

It remains to consider why the *familia* associations developed as they seem to have done. We have already seen that municipal freedmen were for the most part poorly integrated into the recognizable social and economic venues that urban associations offered to ex-slaves. Their lack of a personal patron and the corresponding benefits that accrued to private freedmen surely impacted negatively on their chances to gain entry into the higher profile local associations. In this context, it makes sense that the *familia* developed like a professional association because it was the best many municipal slaves and freedmen could hope to attain. Yet more than being just a viable alternative to other associations, an argument can be made that the *familia* was a desirable and profitable destination for a town’s slaves and freedmen to join – or to remain in, as it were. In fact, the social activities of the *familia* suggest a degree of wealth, and there was surely an element of prestige attached to it, given its official links to the local elites serving in the magistracies and council of decurions. Even local private slaves and freedmen may have been

---

attracted to the *familia* association, a scenario that may in fact explain the private freedmen in the alleged Ostian *familia publica*.\footnote{Weiss 2004: 159-62 points out that it could be an independent *collegium* called *familia publica* that had numerous slaves and freedmen of the colony at its core.}

Regardless of why they formed, the presence of the associations of municipal slaves and freedmen in Roman towns may provide one explanation for why the municipal freedmen in my catalogue were not more engaged in the wider collegial life of their towns. In addition to the social interaction, one of the primary aims of Roman associative life, particularly for ex-slaves, was for a member to make social and economic connections and put his name in the public eye in the hope of laying the groundwork for the social advancement of his freeborn sons. The *familia* professional association probably provided a convenient outlet for just such ambitions.

**III.5 OCCUPATIONS**

One final area that needs to be considered here is the presence of municipal freedmen in local occupations. It turns out that such cases were primarily connected to the work of the *familia publica*. Pure economic success is different from social success, but it still signals a degree of social mobility. In one of the sections above I examined the presence of these ex-slaves in the occupational associations of their towns. This group includes only four examples, an indication that the municipal freedmen collectively had a difficult time entering other segments of the local economy.\footnote{Secure freedman: Volsinius Victorinus of Volsini, *quinquennalis* in the *collegium fabrum* (*CIL* XI 2710a). Probable freedmen: [...] Aquileia, *coactor argentarius* (CIL V 8212 = *InscrAqu* 1, 128); M. Veronius Epaphroditus of Verona, *magister* in the *collegium centonariorum* (*CIL* V 3439). Group II, probable freedman: Publicius Hilarus, *faber* (*AE* 1977, 265a).

The majority of the evidence suggests instead that a more typical career path for municipal freedmen was to continue in their former slave positions.\footnote{For a general assessment of this continuity between municipal slave and freedman positions, see Luciani 2010: 257-95.} Four of the ex-slaves held positions in their town treasury.\footnote{M. Venerius Secundus of Pompeii (*CIL* IV 3340, 139); Veientius Ianuarius of Veii, *lib(ertus) arcarius* (*CIL* XI 3780 = *ILS* 6580); C. Aquileiensis Felix of Aquileia, *vilicus summarum* (*CIL* V 737 = *ILS* 4869 = *InscrAqu* 1, 129); Valerianus of Pola, *summarum dispensator* (*CIL* V 83 = *ILS* 6677 = *Inscr.It.* 101, 104).} One from Aquileia erected the following inscription to commemorate his votive offering to a local deity in the second century CE (*CIL* V 737):\footnote{Alföldy 1984: 88 no. 45.}

\[
\text{Apollini / Bele[no], / C. Aquileiens(is) / Felix / quod vilic(us) / summarum / [---}
\]

To Apollo Belenus, C. Aquileiensis Felix, because he was *vilicus summarum* [erected this...}
Felix’s offering raises questions about where he previously and currently fit into the financial administration of Aquileia. The title *vilicus* normally implies a supervisory position, such as managing an estate or a specific financial account. The clarification of his field of competence as *summarum* must refer to the colony’s treasury. Felix was perhaps involved in administering local tax collection. It is tempting to envision his role as a *vilicus* as a promotion from an earlier slave post in the treasury. In another inscription from Aquileia, for instance, we find a municipal slave in the position of *actor summarum*. The use of the titles *vilicus* and *actor* linked to this treasury could suggest a local hierarchy. Since the former was a freedman and the latter a slave, it is possible that Felix’s manumission had meant promotion to a higher position. Yet Weiss emphasizes that there is simply not enough consistent evidence from Roman towns to impute such a hierarchy from titles alone. In fact, from other towns nearby Aquileia, one finds municipal slaves in the role of *vilicus* in the local treasury.

At any rate, the important aspect to note here is Felix’s continued employment with his town after his manumission. Similar cases can be cited in two other departments of municipal administration. The position of *tabularius* entailed work in the municipal archives, and in the west was evidently filled by both slaves and freedmen. There is one case from Interamna Lirenas in the second century CE of a municipal freedman remaining in this post after gaining his freedom from the town, C. Interamnius Crescentio, who identifies himself as *libert(us) et tabular(ius) r(ei) p(ublicae)* (*AE* 1911, 205).

Another competence where municipal ex-slaves continued their work was in positions overseeing components of their town’s infrastructure. In Aquileia (*CIL* V 715) and Vobarno (connected administratively to Brixia; *AE* 2010, 592) in Region X two freedmen held the rank of *saltuarius*, the latter with the specific designation of *saltuarius pagi Veneris*. These men either administered or guarded a wooded territory (*saltus*) or estate in the possession of their towns. Still another ex-slave seems to have exercised a role in the public warehouses of Aquileia (*ex*...
horreo), perhaps with some connection to the local grain distribution network (Inscr.Aqu. 1, 567).  

In this analysis of continuity between municipal slave and freedman occupations, another essential body of evidence consists of lead water pipes stamped with the names of their producers. It is possible to identify nineteen men who cast these pipes (plumbarii) and who bear a family name derived from their town. Only two of them self-identified as municipal freedmen, including the plumbarii of Reate named Q. Reatinus Sallustianus, who evidently cast pipes for the town as both a municipal slave and a freedman (CIL IX 4699a-e), and Clodius Fortunatus, who actually bears a private gentilicium but declares his status as r(ei) p(ublicae) Reatinorum (CIL IX 4701a-b). A third example from Saepinum may involve a plumbarius who also performed his occupation as both a slave and a freedman of the town (Altilia p. 120). Given the role of the familia publica in this trade, attested principally by numerous examples of municipal slaves, the combination of a municipal gentilicium and a role as a plumbarius makes a strong argument for municipal freedman status, especially when the person is found performing this work in the eponymous town.

The following table presents this group.

**Table III.7 Secure and probable municipal freedmen plumbarii (19 total)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amiternum (IV)</td>
<td>Q. Amiternius Primigenius</td>
<td>CIL IX 4223 (and IX 4224?)</td>
<td>fec(it) (and ex officina?)</td>
<td>Probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia (X)</td>
<td>Aq(uileiensis) Demet(rius)</td>
<td>CIL V 8117, 2b, d-e</td>
<td>f(ecit)</td>
<td>Probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia (X)</td>
<td>Aq(uileiensis) Iuvenal(is)</td>
<td>CIL V 8117, 3a-b</td>
<td>f(ecit)</td>
<td>Probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bononia (VIII)</td>
<td>L. Publicius Asclepius</td>
<td>CIL XI 736</td>
<td>vilico</td>
<td>Probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falerii (VII)</td>
<td>C. Faliscus Felix</td>
<td>AE 1982, 278</td>
<td>f(ecit)</td>
<td>Probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia (I)</td>
<td>Os(tiensis) Her(mes?)</td>
<td>CIL XIV 1980</td>
<td>ex officina</td>
<td>Probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia (I)</td>
<td>Ost(i)ensis Praetorinus</td>
<td>CIL XIV 2004</td>
<td>ex officina</td>
<td>Probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia (I)</td>
<td>A. Ostiensis Trophimus</td>
<td>AE 1977, 168</td>
<td>f(ecit)</td>
<td>Probable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

183 The servi publici populi Romani played a similarly important role in the maintenance of Rome’s water supply. They formed the familia aquaria, and are among the best-documented state slaves in the literary and epigraphic evidence. See Eder 1980: 26, 88-9, 96-7, 164-71; Bruun 1991: 190-4; and Weiss 2004: 122-5.  
185 L. Saepinius Abascantus may well be the same man whose name appears on another fistula as Abastantus Saepin(atium) f(ecit) (Campobasso p. 201 no. 415). This identification would confirm his status as a freedman of the town, though it should be noted that Abascantus was a fairly common name among slaves and freedmen.  
187 Luciani 2010: 276-8 interprets AQ as an abbreviation of the gentilicium Aquileiensis.  
188 Luciani 2010: 276-8 interprets AQ as an abbreviation of the gentilicium Aquileiensis.  
189 On this identification, see Aubert 1993: 175; and Carlsen 1995: 38.
The evidence in a few towns demonstrates just how involved the *familia publica* was in this trade. A total of three freedmen *plumbarii* of Reate manufactured nine different lead pipes among them, which gives some indication of the volume of material they were producing.\(^{190}\)

From the abundance of *instrumentum domesticum* uncovered at Ostia, the impact of the Ostienses in this niche of the local economy is also well illustrated. At least six persons with this *gentilicium*, all likely freedmen of the colony, stamped their names on the pipes they cast and perhaps also installed.\(^{191}\) Bruun notes that they constitute about 15% of all the *plumbarii* known to be working in Ostia.\(^{192}\) The situation was even more pronounced in the small town of Saepinum in Samnium. Only five stamped *fistulae* have been recovered there, and aside from the probable municipal freedmen L. Saepinius Abascantus, three of the other four known *plumbarii* are securely identified as slaves belonging to the town.\(^{193}\) Judging from examples like these, a large proportion of the pipe casting in many towns must have taken place in municipal facilities or in workshops connected to municipal freedmen and their recent descendants.\(^{194}\)

These freedmen seem to be a mixture of manufacturers and managers of workshops. Thirteen *plumbarii* indicate their role as manufacturers by placing their name in the nominative with the accompanying verb *fecit*, and one gives only his name in the nominative, in which case

\(^{190}\) *CIL* IX 4699a-e, 4700a-b, 4701a-b; Lanciani *Silloge* no. 438.

\(^{191}\) *AE* 1977, 168; *CIL* XIV 1980; *CIL* XIV 2002; *CIL* XIV 2003a-b; *CIL* XIV 2004; *CIL* XIV 5309, 41.


\(^{193}\) *Campobasso* p. 201 no. 414 (*Verus Saepin. fec.*); *Campobasso* p. 201 no. 415 (*Abascantus Saepinat. f.*); *Campobasso* p. 201 no. 41; *Altilia* p. 120 fig. 88 ([---] public(us?) Saepin.). The one domestic *plumbarius*, evidently a slave because he possesses only a single name, is *CIL* IX 2474 (*Fortunatus tubo[---]*).

the verb indicating that he produced the pipe is implied. The other six men indicate that they managed a workshop producing *fistulae* through the phrase *ex officina* followed by their name in the genitive, or simply their name in the genitive case, while one man is designated as a *vilicus*. I will return below to the possible significance of these different roles.

The key question to ask about the prevalence of municipal freedmen who continued performing their various slave positions has to do with the nature of this work, and there seem to be two possible explanations. The first is that their continuing work had to do with the *operae* they may have owed to their town as a condition of their manumission. An initial point that must be recognized is that Chapter 72 of the *Lex Irnitana*, which outlines the protocols for manumitting municipal slaves, grants a town access to *operae* from its freedmen. A strong argument can be made that if Roman law granted such rights, the beneficiary undoubtedly would have claimed them. Mouritsen in his recent analysis of legal issues arising from the imposition of *operae* in the *Digest*, moreover, proposes that these *operae* make the most sense in the context of impersonal slavery or when a freedman had acquired from his patron a particularly lucrative set of skills, such as physicians or performing artists. In structures like the *familia publica* a standard set of manumission protocols may have been in place, including a systematic application of the manumission fee and assignment of *operae*. In practical terms, as Wolfgang Waldstein points out, it would have been advantageous for the towns to retain some control over their ex-slaves who were proficient in a specific field (*operae fabriles*), such as the technical skills of the *plumbarii*. One can envision the decurions relying on such freedmen’s *operae* to perform essential work. Neratius, in fact, confirms that freedmen with a specific set of skills should perform *operae* in their field of expertise (*Dig*. 38.1.50).

The situation may have been more complex in practice. It was suggested above that in many towns the decurions may have been able to approach the manumission of municipal slaves on more of a case-by-case basis than is normally assumed. The seemingly rigorous procedure

---

195 *AE* 1977, 168; *AE* 1982, 278; *AE* 1992, 502; *Altilia* p. 120 fig. 88; *CIL* IX 4223; *CIL* IX 4699a-e; *CIL* IX 4700a-b; *CIL* IX 4701a-b; *CIL* XIV 2003a-b; *CIL* XIV 3044a.
196 *CIL* XI 736; *CIL* XIV 1980; *CIL* XIV 2002; *CIL* XIV 2004; *CIL* XIV 3044; *CIL* XIV 5309, 41. A possible sixth case may involve one of the *plumbarii* of Amiternum whose name appears in one stamp as with *fecit* and possibly another in which a man with his same *praenomen* and *gentilicium* appears in the genitive along with the name of another man whose nominative name indicates that he actually produced the *fistula* in question (*CIL* IX 4224).
200 Cf. *Dig*. 38.1.7.5 (Ulpian); and 38.1.49 (Gaius).
outlined in *Lex Iritana* 72 actually leaves room for such ad hoc decisions. Two intriguing pieces of evidence also offer a glimpse at how *operae* may have related to manumission in the *familia publica*. The first is an imperial rescript issued by Severus Alexander to a municipal freedman petitioner named Urbicus (*Cod. Iust.* 11.37.1).

> si, ut proponis, decreto ordinis ad libertatem ductus es, non debere te invitum actum rei publicae administrare curator rei publicae non ignorat, praesertim cum servi eiusmodi officia administrare debeant.

If, as you state, you have been brought to liberty by a decree of the town council, the *curator* of the municipality will not ignore that you ought not unwillingly to administer a transaction for the municipality, especially since slaves ought to administer offices of this type.

There are two ways to interpret the petitioner’s original complaint and the emperor’s response. The first assumes that the *actum* and *officia* refer to *operae* that Urbicus owed to his town. In this case the ex-slave may have been objecting to the council’s demand that he perform work beneath his status, specifically, the work normally assigned to municipal slaves. Perhaps he had once been a senior municipal slave working in a clerical role, and he was now being compelled to do more menial tasks as part of his ongoing obligation to the town.

Another possible meaning of the complaint envisions that no *operae* had been agreed to on the occasion of Urbicus’ manumission. This idea focuses on the specific language the emperor used to craft his response, starting with the generic terms *actum* and *eiusmodi officia*. The two are not directly correlative to one another, in the sense of ‘transaction for the *res publica* of the sort (*officia*) slaves should do,’ referring to a specific task. Instead, by placing more emphasis on the subordinating *praesertim cum*, the terms may simply be two different ways to refer to *any* work performed for the *ordo*. The sense could be rendered as, ‘transaction for the *res publica*...especially since slaves should do work (*officia*) of this sort (i.e., for the *res publica*).’ On this basis, it is possible that the freedman was objecting to being forced into public work at all. The use of *invitum* also seems to support the idea of forced labor. In this case, the council’s imposition of work may have been a violation of the patron-freedman relationship disallowed by

---

201 See the discussion above, p. 118.
202 Translation by Kehoe 2016: 2709.
203 Weiss 2004: 164-5 notes one of a handful of cases where municipal freedmen seem to have voluntarily continued to work in their previous positions. Neratius maintains that the *operae* of a freedman with specific technical skills should encompass these skills (*Dig.* 38.1.50).
Modestinus (Dig. 1.38.31).\textsuperscript{204} Specifically, the council may have attempted to take advantage of its ex-slave’s continued presence in the town by conscripting him for public work.\textsuperscript{205}

The question of \textit{operae} also arises in a second rescript, this one issued by Diocletian in around 290 CE (\textit{Cod. Iust.} 7.9.3).\textsuperscript{206} In it, the emperor assures a municipal freedman petitioner named Philadelphus that his ongoing work in his former position of \textit{tabularius} would neither endanger his own free status nor impair his freeborn son’s chances of becoming a decurion. It is difficult to understand the precise nature of this ex-slave’s anxiety. On the one hand, it would seem obvious that if this work had been arranged as \textit{operae} as a condition of his manumission, there should never have been any concern over his work impinging on his free status. Similarly, even if a promotion model were in place in which the man’s manumission essentially meant promotion to a higher administrative grade, such a standardized form of service never would have given rise to fears of re-enslavement.\textsuperscript{207} Teresa Giménez-Candela may be correct that this rescript was only meant as a guarantee against a perceived threat and perhaps even as a proactive incentive to retain the services of future municipal freedmen.\textsuperscript{208} This explanation fits nicely with the emperor’s reassurance that the social mobility of Philadelphus’ freeborn son would not be frustrated, especially since the legal right of an \textit{ingenuus} to obtain a decurionate should never have been in question. The freedman’s concern thus was probably for his voluntary continuation of his former position, meaning that \textit{operae} would have played no role in this case. Interestingly, his apprehension may imply that working for the town after manumission was not so prestigious as is sometimes thought.

We must be careful not to generalize too much from these rescripts, since by nature requests for imperial intervention reflect exceptional situations. Instead of signaling any standard practice, they may have been addressing individual cases. Perhaps the freedmen had received an

\textsuperscript{204} An alternative interpretation would be that this was a specific case in which this particular municipal freedman had been released from any \textit{operae} at his manumission and was later forced into working for the town anyway.

\textsuperscript{205} Giménez-Candela’s 1981: 48, 54-5 observation on this rescript should be noted as well. Since the \textit{curator rei publicae} was empowered to intervene in the affairs of the local \textit{ordo}, such measures may have been a product of the imperial authorities’ increasing control over local matters, a trend the started at least by the later second century CE.

\textsuperscript{206} \textit{Cod. Iust.} 7.9.3: \textit{si itaque secundum legem \textit{Vetti Libici}, cuius potestatem senatus consulto Iuventio Celso iterum et Neratio Marcello consulibus facto ad provincias porrectam constitut, manumissus civitatem Romanam consecutus es, post vero ut libertus tabularium administrando libertatem quam fueras consecutus non amisisti, nec actus tuus filio ex liberis ingenuo suscepto, quominus decurio esse possit, obfuit. DIOCL. ET MAXIM. AA. ET CC. PHILADELPH. \textless A 290 VEL 293 D. XV K. APRIL. RAVENNAE AA. CONSS. \textgreater

\textsuperscript{207} See the discussion of the problems involved with this model in Weiss 2004: 45-6.

\textsuperscript{208} Giménez-Candela 1981: 53-6. Weiss 2004: 77 n. 188 dismisses Halkin’s (1897: 179) idea that this rescript marked a change in which the duties of the municipal \textit{tabularius} were transferred from municipal slaves and exclusively to municipal freedmen.
exemption from *operae*, or the local *ordo* simply did not require the ongoing formal services of its ex-slaves. Luciani has observed that both rescripts were issued somewhat late with respect to much of the evidence for municipal freedmen of the first and second centuries CE, and therefore they may not have applied to earlier conditions. Yet both ideas have consequences for our understanding of how *operae* were arranged, and they seem to contradict any *pro forma* imposition of freedmen’s obligations at manumission. If these two rescripts reflect more frequent practices, they may suggest that the imposition of *operae* was not always done in the process of manumitting municipal slaves. It is also worth questioning whether claiming an occupational title, as some of the municipal freedmen do, fits with *operae*, which by definition were not a long-term employment. Additionally, it is difficult to see the logistics behind using the *operae* of, for example, former municipal slave accountants or clerks or scribes for short stretches of time. Would they have been called on for a few days in order to help balance the town’s books or to work in the archives? Manufacturing occupations would seem to be an exception from this perspective. It is much easier to envision a situation in which a town utilized occasional *operae* from freedmen who were *plumbarii* or brick-makers, for example, in order to have them produce their material during peak building periods.

It may also have been the case that these municipal freedmen voluntarily continued working for their town. The *plumbarii* constitute a useful case-study in this regard. Some of them may well have managed workshops supervising municipal slaves who did the casting and installing of the pipes. This scenario fits the examples of municipal freedmen whose stamps indicate their role as managers (*ex officina*). It is also tempting to envision some sort of promotional model whereby municipal slave *plumbarii* received manumission and appointment

---

209 Luciani 2010: 279.
210 Cf. Dig. 45.1.54.1 (Iulianus), which suggests that a freedmen may have been able to buy his way out of *operae*. This notion that a slave who paid for his or her manumission could actually buy out of any ongoing obligations and effectively sever ties with the master is a central thread of the theory of the ‘independent’ freedman in the Roman world. Yet this idea seems to overlook the importance of the patron-freedman relationship, not to mention the possibility that a patron who severed occupational and economic ties with his freedman, especially one skilled in a specific trade, effectively would have been creating a competitor in the local economy. On this concept of the ‘independent’ freedman who cut ties with his patron while the latter was still living, see D’Arms 1981: 146-8; and Garnsey 1981: 359-71; and a recent discussion of the evidence and scholarship in Mouritsen 2011: 228-47. On the suggestion that municipal freedmen could substitute euergetism toward their town for the manumission fee and perhaps also obligations to the town, see Luciani 2017: 42-50. Eder 1980: 121-2 made the argument that exemption from *operae* were yet another privilege granted to municipal freedmen, but the guidelines given in Lex Irnitana 72, which were not yet known when Eder published his monograph, invalidate this assumption.
212 Cf. Aubert 1994: 241-2, who describes a similar scenario in the role of municipal workshops in the local brick and tile production industry.
as a supervisor (*vilicus* or *institor*) of a public workshop, as an agent of the town itself; 213 though as Weiss has noted, there is little evidence for such a system among *familia* posts in any Roman town. 214 Of course, municipal freedmen *plumbarii* had acquired a technical expertise and needed to ply their trade to make a living, and towns often may have been a willing employer. One issue that requires further thought in this context is whether it would have been more cost effective for a town to pay such freedmen a wage or simply to maintain a steady supply of slave *plumbarii* in the *familia publica* to do whatever lead working was required for repair work or public contracts. 215

The second possibility that may explain these freedmen’s ongoing work in their slave occupations, once again, particularly involving the *plumbarii*, is that they had taken their technical skills and set up independent workshops producing *fistulae* for the open market. It would be useful to observe the larger networks behind their work, such as identifying other individuals named on the pipes they produced, but the stamps provide little useful information in this regard. In one example at least, from Ostia, the *plumbarius* Ostiensis Her(mes) evidently managed a workshop but was producing *fistulae* for an imperial residence under the supervision of an imperial freedman procurator (*CIL* XIV 1980 = XV 7743): 216

---

213 Aubert 1993: 175-80 and Carlsen 1995: 37-8 suggest the possibility of a *vilicus*-system of management.

214 Weiss 2004: 124-5. He also notes a municipal slave of Verona who held the position of *vilicus* *plumbarior(um)* (*AE* 1946, 136), though he concedes that his role may have been more administrative than technical, for example, keeping track of inventory and activities rather than providing technical supervision.

215 There has been much scholarship trying to understand the cost-effectiveness of investing capital in and outlaying the cost to maintain slaves versus hiring free laborers on the open labor market. The broad consensus is that during the Imperial period hiring free labor may have been the somewhat cheaper option, particularly when the project or work involved was not seen as requiring long-term investment. Hawkins 2016: 167-89, studying artisan workshops in the urban environment, proposes that it was most effective for masters to free their slaves and call up their *operae* at peak times during production, a practice he calls ‘labor-hoarding.’ Temin 2013: 137-8 argues that questions of labor costs had less to do with the free/unfree binary than with the level of skill a potential slave or free(d) worker possessed. For other analyses of this topic, see Hopkins 1978: 126-7, 169-70 (on the recapitalization theory of manumission); Brunt 1980: 94-6 (on somewhat circumstantial grounds, making the case for a large free labor force on major building projects in Rome); Scheidel 2005b: 1-17; and Scheidel 2008: 105-26 (on estimates of slave prices and upkeep costs from scattered documentary evidence, comparing Imperial Rome to Classical Athens and Republican Rome). One additional aspect of this discussion of labor costs, specific to the municipal *familia publica*, is that towns had the capacity to inherit or confiscate slaves, including skilled ones, in addition to having to purchase them on the local market or train up *vernae* born into the *familia* (Weiss 2004: 17-28). One additional piece of evidence that should be noted here is an edict issued by the Roman governor Paullus Fabius Persicus to the city of Ephesus in around 44 CE (*IEph* 17-19). Among other instructions, he demands that the city stop employing free laborers in the maintenance of the sanctuary of Artemis and instead use their municipal slaves (δηµόσιοι δοῦλοι). Yet as Dignas 2002: 153 has pointed out, this may have less to do with labor cost issues, since the governor was simply demanding that the city utilize the resources it already possessed (see also Weiss 2004: 81-2; and Harris 2011: 43-6).

216 On the identification of the procurator Flegon (or Phlegon), see Bruun 1991: 295-6, 327 n. 23.
Another potentially instructive example comes from a stamp on a fistula from Amiternum (CIL IX 4224):

\[ Q(\text{uintus}) \text{ Piens} \ Q(\text{uinti}) \text{ Amiter[ni} \ ---\] / \text{Alba} \ldots

There are some interpretive problems with this inscription. To begin with, Q. Amiter[nius] may be the same plumbarius named on another pipe from the town, where his full name is given as Q. Amitemius Primigenius, but this identification is not certain.\(^{217}\) Another issue is what to make of the apparent gentilicium of the manufacturer of the pipe whose name appears in the nominative case. The name Piens is not known as a family name in any other inscriptions. It is possible that it is a cognomen, and that this plumbarius has given only his praenomen and cognomen. Iiro Kajanto’s study of Latin cognomina does not list the name, but he does have what would be its superlative form, Pientissimus.\(^{218}\) If this interpretation is correct, one would need to supply his gentilicium, and in this context the local municipal gentilicium Amitemius could make sense.\(^{219}\)

These onomastic uncertainties notwithstanding, the most important aspect of the stamp is the apparent relationship between Q. Piens and Q. Amiter[nius]. Given its position, resolving the name of Amiter[nius] as genitive is appropriate, and thus this form should be understood as corresponding to an unstated ex officina. If, in fact, Q. Amitemius was the manager of a workshop, the possibility that Q. Piens came from a private family is significant. It would indicate that a municipal freedman plumbarius was managing a workshop staffed by other than municipal slaves and freedmen, likely pointing to an independent workshop.

It is also possible that independent plumbarii could simultaneously produce for the open market and do work for their former owner, the town itself, even outside the constraints of operaee obligations.\(^{220}\) The prevalence of municipal freedmen among all known lead-workers in

\(^{217}\) The meaning of Alba in the second line is also uncertain. Although the spacing does not quite match up, perhaps it could be the cognomen of Amiter[nius]. The form Alba is an attested Roman male cognomen, perhaps derived from an Etruscan a-suffix masculine name (Kajanto 1965: 105; cf. Schulze 1904: 417-21). Otherwise, it could even form part of the name of another officinator.\(^{218}\) Kajanto 1965: 104, 251.\(^{219}\) Such a case might resemble another Bruun 2007: 9-11 identified at Ostia (CIL XIV 440 = AE 2007, 284).\(^{220}\) Weiss 2004: 124-5 envisions a scenario in which municipal freedmen operating independent workshops occasionally could have performed repair work to help out the municipal facilities run by municipal slaves. This idea seems to fit the ‘labor-hoarding’ model of operaee proposed by Hawkins 2016: 167-89, which argues that
many towns, and the high volume of pipes they seem to have contributed, also seems to point to work for the open market. As a side note, another group of *plumbarii* whom I classify as descendants adds an interesting dimension to this discussion. The names of several *plumbarii* with a municipal *gentilicum* have been found in towns far from the eponymous hometown of their families. This seems to indicate that these *plumbarii* had learned the technical skills from a municipal freedman father or grandfather or patron, and then established themselves in other towns to practice their trade.\(^{221}\) These descendant *plumbarii* also suggest that this trade constituted a real occupational niche for municipal freedmen and their families.

The occupational continuity between slave and ex-slave position shown by the municipal freedmen in our evidence makes perfect sense, even if the precise nature of these ongoing roles is not always clear. Many of the freedmen in our sources were specialists and needed a place to apply their occupational talents, and the town often needed their skills. Performing an occupation they knew, and earning a salary for it, was surely an important advantage to maintaining their local links. These interests probably aligned with the fact that many of the freedmen continued to socialize in the *familia publica*, which provided another, informal incentive to remain in their hometown. A strong argument can be made that ongoing employment in the town administration constituted a frequent career path in itself among other options potentially available to these freedmen. From a broader perspective, this behavior is not surprising. It fits the well-known model of ex-slaves whose economic activities after manumission were a continuation of those they had performed as slaves within their patron’s economic network, but perhaps often with the reward of greater responsibility (e.g., becoming a *procurator*).\(^{222}\)

### III.6 CONCLUSIONS

This analysis of the municipal freedmen suggests that, contrary to often-held assumptions, they were not well embedded in the wider municipal economy and social structures, at least not in the higher echelons available to ex-slaves. It is true that a number of them joined their local *Augustales*. Yet as the above calculations have sought to demonstrate, these probably represented only a very narrow segment of the most senior municipal freedmen patrons, at least in the context of private artisan workshops, may have called up their freedmen’s *operae* only at peak times of need and only for short-term work.


from any town. Underlining this point are cases of the few most prominent examples of freedmen holding membership in both the *Augustales and a professional association. For the rest of the freedmen, even finding a spot in local professional or voluntary associations seems to have been difficult. This group’s social and economic trajectory thus was unlike that observed among many well-placed private freedmen, who normally could count on a patron’s support, and imperial freedmen, many of whom carried into their post-manumission lives a level of prestige based on links to imperial authority that was unparalleled in imperial Roman society.

The social and economic activities of the ex-slaves about whose activities we are informed seem to have played out in large part within the boundaries of their former lives as municipal slaves, a behavior that generally comports with that of other former slaves in the Roman world. Socially, the majority of freedmen maintained contubernia within the familia publica, or they married within their own status group, to fellow ex-slaves from private households. Likewise, there was a tendency to socialize within the familia publica itself, making it a sort of professional association, rather than within the collegial life offered in the wider municipal society. The evidence for occupational activities, too, suggests that most of the freedmen continued to perform the work they had done as slaves, perhaps in some cases advancing in their profession.

Apart from some limited success, the majority of the municipal freedmen that we can identify come down to us only as a name on an epitaph. This group apparently never achieved the success of their more fortunate counterparts, but they had still accumulated enough money to leave their mark in the epigraphic record. The ex-slaves who were commemorated, however, probably represent only a portion of all those who once existed. To what can this lack of demonstrable success for the larger part of Italy’s familiae publicae be attributed? Aside from the conclusion that advancing in society was a challenge for any type of ex-slave, the absence of a personal patron for these freedmen surely played a significant role in the equation. One even clearer conclusion from this analysis seems to be that, given their limited collective success, these municipal freedmen’s connections to their town administration did not count for as much as is sometimes thought. It is thus difficult to speak about them as a particularly privileged group of freedmen.

This status was unlikely to place their freeborn sons and other descendants on a strong footing. For instance, unless the familia publica offered the municipal freedmen a particularly
prestigious outlet for promoting themselves and their sons, the latter generation would not have benefitted as much as having an ex-slave father in such associations as the *Augustales. From an economic perspective, the fact that many of these freedmen’s occupations seem to have been based within the *familia itself probably did not bode well for their sons. Inheriting occupational or professional links provided a big advantage for navigating the Roman economic landscape. Yet it is difficult to imagine how municipal freedman fathers who worked in *familia positions in the town administration could ever pass these positions down to their sons or grandsons, since the *familia publica was continually able to fill them by replenishing its ranks of slaves and freedmen.
CHAPTER IV:
SOCIAL MOBILITY AND THE DESCENDANTS OF MUNICIPAL FREEDMEN

The study of the social and economic mobility of the descendants and *familiae* of the municipal freedmen is an essential step for expanding the picture of the overall success of these ‘servile’ families over time. The epigraphic evidence for this group in the catalogue allows us to explore the question of how far the descendants of the ex-municipal slaves were able to advance in the social, economic, and political spheres of municipal and imperial society.

Understanding the level of social mobility achieved by the descendants of all types of freedmen has long been a key area of interest for Roman social historians. The principal obstacle for this investigation is the difficulty of identifying such descendants in the epigraphic evidence. Since a series of seminal articles have developed several onomastic indicators for detecting the sons and descendants of ex-slaves, it has been possible to trace, with some confidence, the social successes of putative families of freedmen. In this context, one should note the use of such techniques in Castrén’s analysis of the entry by freedmen’s descendants into the local *ordo decurionum* at Pompeii, or in López Barja de Quiroga’s attempt to quantify the need of local *ordines* to bring in new blood from among the descendants of successful freedmen to replenish the political class. Yet as useful as these methodological tools are, particularly for identifying the initial freeborn generations descending from private freedmen, the group available for study often remains narrow, since our capacity is limited in discerning the later generations of private ex-slaves’ descendants as they slowly climbed the social ladder in Roman society.

The choice to focus on the descendants of municipal freedmen based on their possession of the select municipal *gentilicia* thus provides one possible way of negotiating this methodological barrier. In addition to directing attention to the inscriptions recording the sons and private freedmen of the municipal freedmen themselves, the catalogue also makes it possible to trace the longer-term trajectories of family lines whose origins are likely to be found in the *familiae publicae* of Roman towns in Italy. In doing so, it will also be possible to measure to what degree these descendants made their way into the ranks of the local elite or left their

---

1 Castrén 1975: 92-124, and *passim* in the index of local families; López Barja de Quiroga 1995: 326-48. See Eck’s 1999: 16 n. 51 critique of López Barja de Quiroga’s study, including the observation that municipal decurions promoted into the equestrian order could still have retained their seat in the local council, and that the identification of ‘reliable decurions’ of servile origin lacks precision. Note also Franklin 2001: 204-12. For an interpretation of the epigraphic material that rebuffs the notion of a freedman ‘social revolution’ in towns like Ostia and Pompeii, see Mouritsen 1997: 57-78; and 2005: 38-63.

2 Note the discussion of some of these methodological issues in Eck 1999: 8-16.
eponymous towns and gained access to positions in the Roman army, the ranks of the imperial administration, or even the equestrian and senatorial orders.

The epigraphic catalogue for the descendants consists of 608 individuals. Their names and status allow them to be categorized as follows.

Table IV.1 Nomenclature and status of descendants (608 individuals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nomenclature</th>
<th>Children and private ex-slaves</th>
<th>Freeborn descendants</th>
<th>Ex-slave descendants</th>
<th>Incerti descendants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal gentilicium</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicii</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordius/Venerius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private gentilicium</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This set includes family groups like that of a municipal freedman of Bononia, whose three private ex-slaves honored him with the following epitaph (CIL XI 6840):

\[D(is)\ M(anibus) / M(arci) Poblici Phileti / Claud(ialis), / [M(arcus)] Poblicius Zosimus / libert(us) / [b(ene)] m(erenti) fecit, / et / M(arcus) Poblicius Ianuarius / delicatus et / Poblicia Chreste / lib(erta).\]

To the departed spirits of M. Poblicius Philetus, a Claudialis, M. Poblicius Zosimus, his freedman, (erected this epitaph for him), who was well deserving, and likewise, M. Poblicius Ianuarius, his delicatus, and Poblicia Chreste, his freedwoman, (erected this epitaph).

A small group of the municipal freedmen’s own children or ex-slaves possess a private gentilicium that was derived from the nomenclature of a free(d) mother or other relative or a co-patron. A mid-second-century case of an ex-slave of Mediolanum provides a good illustration of this category (AE 1974, 346).

\[C(ai) Publicio / m(unicipi) M(ediolanensium) lib(erto) / Eutycheti, / et Pomponiae / C(ai) f(iliae) Daphn(a)e / coniugi eius, / et Potiriae C(ai) f(iliae) / Aulae fil(iae) eorum, / Q. Ingen<ui>us / Maximinus / ob mult(a) benef(icia) / et aditum sibi / familiarem / domus eor(um).\]

---

3 M. Poblicius Philetus’ identification as a municipal freedman of Bononia is based on his appearance in another epitaph, CIL XI 6840. See Weiss 2004: 239 no. L39.
4 Dating based on the period when Mediolanum transitioned from a municipium to a colonia in the reign of Hadrian. See Weiss 2004: 241 no. L55.
5 The epitaph records the dedicatory’s gentilicium as Ingenus. Solin and Salomies 1988: 96 list as gentilicia Ingenus, Ingenuus, Ingenuius, and Ingenuvius.
To C. Publicius Eutyches, freedman of the *municipium* of the Mediolanienses, and his wife, Pomponia Daphne, daughter of Caius, and their daughter, Potiria Aula, daughter of Caius, Q. Ingenius Maximinus (erected this monument) on account of their many favors and his welcome access to their household.

Potiria Aula, one of the dedicatees of this epitaph, was the daughter of this union between a municipal freedman and freeborn woman, as is made clear by the phrase *Potiriae C. f. Aulae filiae eorum*. Yet she shares neither her father’s nor her mother’s *gentilicium*. The most likely reason for not taking her father’s nomenclature is that she was born while he was still a slave but was permitted to retain her mother’s free status, an indication that the council of Mediolanum did not enforce the *SC Claudianum*. In such a scenario Aula may have been expected to assume her mother’s *gentilicium*, though she bears a different family name altogether. Perhaps the couple had given her up for adoption into the gens Potiria, or she may have been the daughter of her father’s first wife, whose *gentilicium* she acquired.

One feature of the catalogue deserves comment here, namely, some noteworthy patterns in the proliferation of certain families. As expected, some of the larger cities with a large *familia publica* produced numerous descendants, both in their eponymous hometowns and elsewhere. There are 36 descendants of the Capuan secure and probable municipal freedmen bearing the *gentilicia* Campanius or Publicius, while the descendants of the Veronii and Publicii from Verona add up to 26 individuals located mostly in their hometown and throughout Italy. The families of municipal slaves of Puteoli, too, produced numerous descendants, sixteen, most of whom remained in their city of origin.

The catalogue also holds some surprising cases. While Ostia produced sixty secure and probable municipal freedmen, we can point to only ten descendants from the family lines they established. It also seems that several smaller towns produced outsized number of descendants in relation to what is known about the scale of their administration and *familia publica*. Two small towns in Latium, Aricia and Cora, each gave rise to over twenty descendants bearing the local municipal *gentilicia*, even though Aricia produced only two municipal freedmen and Cora

---

6 She also has a filiation, *C. f.*
7 On the application of this law in cases of relationships between municipal slaves and free or freed woman, see above, pp. 93-7.
8 Cf. Weaver 1972: 144-5. It should be noted that the *gentilicium* Potirius/a is not otherwise attested in the epigraphy of Mediolanum or the Transpadane region.
9 In theory, some of the Ostienses I have identified as ex-slaves of the colony could be descendants.
Two other small towns furnish even more extreme cases. Volceii in Lucania produced 25 descendants bearing the gentilicium Volceius/a, and Urvinum Mataurense in Umbria produced 45 descendants with the name Urvin(i)us/a. The Urvinii were particularly dispersed around Italy and the Roman Empire. Although neither town produced municipal freedmen in our evidence, both maintained a body of municipal slaves. In the case of each of these small towns, the local epigraphic patrimony is small, which concomitantly signals a limited municipal administration. It follows that the familia publica of each town also must have been relatively small, thereby restricting the number of freedmen each could produce.

It is difficult to advance definite explanations for such incongruities in the evidence. On the one hand, one can envision individual members of these families settling in certain regions and establishing local lines that fared well enough economically to find their way into the epigraphic record. On the other hand, it is possible that some of the individuals with these municipal gentilicia traced their origins back to Republican elite family lines from the eponymous towns, rather than from municipal freedmen’s lines. The chronological relationships needed to make such cases, however, are frequently difficult to determine. In any case, the incongruity between small towns and the large number of descendants they produced may simply be ascribed to caprice of the epigraphic habit or the accident of survival of epigraphic evidence.

IV.1 SETTLEMENT PATTERNS

In analyzing the social mobility of the descendants, an understanding of where a person settled is in some ways as important as knowledge of what activities he or she was engaged in. The epigraphic catalogue provides ample information for an examination of this feature of the descendants’ settlement patterns. It is possible to track both a person’s town of origin, through a gentilicium, and the site where he or she ultimately settled, based on where they left their mark in an inscription. This method reveals information about how location factored into the decision by municipal freedmen’s families of where to pursue economic and social advancement, which in

---

10 There is one municipal slave found in Cora (CIL X 6514: ...us pop(uli) s(ervus).
11 I have omitted four cases of the gentilicium Urbinius/a, which Salomies 1996: 181 n. 54 suggested may be an alterative orthography of the same name. See Solin and Salomies 1988: 195.
12 Volceii: CIL X 410 (= ILS 2071 = Inscr.It. 3¹, 20); Urvinum Mataurense: CIL XI 6073.
13 On this issue, particularly in the context of towns in Latium and the regions in close proximity to Rome, see above, p. 41.
turn can inform us about the status of the family lines in their hometown and elsewhere. From a wider perspective, this analysis can shed light on questions about the movement of populations of non-elite origin throughout Italy and the Roman world, a phenomenon that is often difficult to grasp in the epigraphic evidence.  

It will be useful to begin this analysis with the set of inscriptions recording the children and private ex-slaves of the municipal freedmen. The following table presents the settlement patterns of this group. The focus is on the size of the town of origin and eventual settlement, with town size based on de Ligt’s assessment of the physical space of Italian towns in the early Principate. The settlement town is assumed from the site where a person was commemorated after death and, in a handful of cases, from the place where a municipal career or some economic activity occurred. Tacoma has recently discussed some of the problems involved in using epigraphic sources to reconstruct origins and migration patterns. Yet he is mostly concerned with inscriptions that provide a person’s origo explicitly or contain cognomina that may suggest regional origins. These methods are fraught with problems. Focusing on someone’s municipal gentilicium, however, is a meaningful way of limiting these problems of identifying ultimate origins, even when precise estimates of generational gaps are not possible. 

Table IV.2 Settlement patterns of freeborn children and ex-slaves (40 individuals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Same town as mun. libertus/a parent/patron</th>
<th>Different town than mun. libertus/a parent/patron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeborn son</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeborn daughter</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male ex-slave</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female ex-slave</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 As discussed by Tacoma 2016: 12-20.  
15 Freeborn children: *CIL* XIV 3442, Afilae; *NSA* 1920, 288, Aricia; *CIL* X 5293, Casinum; *AE* 1914, 221, Minturnae; *CIL* XIV 1737, Ostia; *CIL* X 8204, Puteoli; *CIL* XIV 2637, Tusculum; *AE* 1968, 134, Beneventum; *CIL* IX 3945, Alba Fucens; *CIL* IX 2472, Saepinum; *CIL* XI 5760, Sentinum; *CIL* XI 5411, Asisium; *CIL* XI 5940, Tifernum Tiberinum; *CIL* XI 1091, Parma (2); *CIL* V 929, Aquileia; *CIL* V 1085, Aquileia; *InscrAqu* 1, 833, Aquileia; *CIL* V 3701, Verona (2); *CIL* V 3189, Vicetia; *AE* 1974, 346, Mediolanum. Private ex-slaves: *CIL* XIV 5084, Ostia; *CIL* X 4984, Venafrum; *CIL* IX 2533, Saepinum (2); *AE* 1972, 154, Trebula Suffenas (3); *CIL* X 8386a, Fabrateria; *CIL* XI 6829, Bononia (3); *AE* 1931, 10, Brixellum (2); *Epigraphica* 2012, 202, Ravenna; *InscrAqu* 1, 833, Aquileia; *CIL* V 4193, Brixia; *CIL* V 628, Tergeste; *CIL* V 3139, Vicetia; *CIL* V 5881, Mediolanum.  
16 de Ligt 2012: 289-339. It is also possible to adduce epigraphic evidence for the numbers of a town’s local decurions and administrative activities in order to understand whether this activity matches the picture suggested by its physical character.  
18 See Bruun’s 2013: 21-5 discussion of some of the pitfalls involved in using cognomina in order to establish geographical origins.  
The most revealing feature is that nearly all of these children and all of the private ex-slaves remained in their hometown with their municipal freedman parent or patron. It is possible that in some cases some of the sons and daughters had migrated elsewhere and were simply commemorated in their hometown. Such a case can be made for the freeborn son of one probable municipal freedman from Afilae in Latium (CIL XIV 3442):

\[
L(ucio)\ Afilano\ L(uci)\ f(ili) /\ An(iensi)\ Provinciali /\ equo\ p(ublico)\ ornat(o) /\ Luperco \ design(ato) /\ huic\ ordo\ statu/am\ decrevit; /\ L.\ Afilanus\ Verecundus\ h(onore)\ u(sus)\ s(umptum)\ r(emisit). /\ l(ocus)\ d(atus)\ d(ecreto)\ d(ecurionum).
\]

To L. Afilanus Provincialis, son of Lucius, of the voting tribe Aniensis, granted the public horse, designated as a Lupercus, to this man the ordo decreed a statue. L. Afilanus Verecundus, accepting this honor, remitted the payment (for the statue). The spot was granted by a decree of the decurions.

Provincialis’ position as an equestrian in theory may also have entailed an administrative post, though his inscription does not mention one. This possibility, and his (forthcoming) membership in the priesthood of the Luperci, imply that his social activities were largely based in Rome, but that at his death the ordo of Afilae chose to bestow on him the honor of a statue in his ancestral home.\(^{20}\) Since this inscription was likely attached to an honorific statue, however, there is no guarantee that Provincialis was deceased at this point or that he was actually buried in his hometown.\(^{21}\) The one case in which a freeborn son settled away from his hometown is found in Aquileia in the later second or early third century (CIL V 929):

\[
D(is)\ M(anibus) /\ Publiciae /\ Corinthiae, /\ C(aius)\ Bassius\ Corinthian(us) /\ ((centurio))\ cohor(tis)\ XIII /\ urb(anae), /\ matr(i)\ pientiss(imae). /\ loc(us)\ dat(us)\ a\ Tul(l)io\ Posidonio.
\]

To the departed spirits of Publicia Corinthia, his most dutiful mother, C. Bassius Corinthianus, centurion of the Thirteenth Urban Cohort, (erected this monument). The spot was given by Tullius Posidonius.

\(^{20}\) Also noteworthy in this discussion is that Provincialis apparently never held a municipal post, which further points to a career away from his hometown. At any rate, Afilae is not far from Rome, so it is conceivable that he lived in the town and could have traveled to the capital as necessary. It is also important to recognize that this picture of settlement patterns by the freeborn children may be skewed by the nature of the epigraphic evidence. After all, the small number of freeborn children documented here, just 24, is known to us simply because they maintained their proximity to their parents’ household. Many others may have left the family group and were either not commemorated at all or were concealed in the set of inscriptions recording the more distant descendants and familiae of municipal freedmen that will be examined below.

\(^{21}\) Scheid and Granino Cecere 1999: 131 no. 7, 145.
C. Bassius Corinthianus bore a *cognomen* derived from that of his mother, a probable municipal freedwoman, but he presumably adopted his father’s *gentilicum*. Given Corinthianus’ senior position in one of the urban cohorts in Rome, his unknown father likely had social connections with consequential people in Aquileia. In any case, this centurion’s service would have demanded his relocation to the capital, if not service in a provincial town, and one can envision that he returned to his hometown of Aquileia for the occasion of performing funerary rites for his mother.\(^{22}\)

It may come as no surprise that these children of municipal freedmen remained in their hometown. Even though the pattern of children staying close to their roots should not be taken as given in the Roman world, an argument could be made that the social status their parents had achieved through links to municipal authority played some role in their choice to stay.\(^ {23}\) Yet the main problem with this argument is that only three of these sons demonstrate any measurable success in their hometown, as will be discussed below, and the actual success of the municipal freedmen themselves seems to have been limited to begin with.\(^ {24}\)

Like the freeborn children of the ex-slaves of Italian towns, their freedmen also remained in their hometown with their patrons. Given the importance of *operae* obligations and informal ties to their former masters, it was natural for them to do so. Two cases in these inscriptions also demonstrate the social and financial benefits that could accrue from staying near a former master. One private freedman of an ex-slave of Brixellum followed his patron into the local *VIViri Augustales* (*AE* 1931, 10), and three private freedmen of a probable ex-slave of Trebula Suffenas were members of an unknown urban association alongside their patron (*AE* 1972, 154).

Turning to the larger category of descendants and *familiae*, the following table presents the results of an analysis of the settlement patterns of 402 persons with a municipal *gentilicum* which signals where their family line originated.\(^ {25}\) The focus here is on the course of family lines

---

\(^{22}\) Freis 1967: 34, 61, 94, 129-30; Brusin 1992: 976 no. 2855; Hope 2001: 142. In some periods, the Thirteenth Urban Cohort was also deployed outside Rome, including in Carthage in the earlier first century, and along the Rhine under Domitian. Members of the cohort are found later in Lugudunum.

\(^{23}\) On the problems with assuming little migration in the Roman world, see Moatti 2013: 77-81 in the context of Rome; and Tacoma 2016: 1-16 on migration in Italy in general. Most demographers assume that movement across Italy and the Roman world was somewhat widespread. Cf. Kolb 2015: 664-6; and Woolf 2016: 439-61.

\(^{24}\) Cases of local prestigious occupations include *CIL* IX 2472 (= *ILS* 6519), Saepinum: L. Saepinius Orestes, *IIIvir aed.*; *CIL* XI 5760, Sentinum: C. Sentinas Iustus, *scriba publicus*; *CIL* IX 3945, Alba Fucens: C. Publicius Artemidorianus *aed(iliae) IIIvir(iure) d(icundo)*. Three cases of a Publicius whose origin can be determined are also included in this analysis: *CIL* V 338 (= *AE* 1948, 51), C. Publicius C. f. Cam. [Raven]na Proculeianus (from Ravenna); *CIL* VI 2924, C. Publicius C. f. Pap.
extending back to a putative municipal freedman progenitor, based on the site where a person left a mark in the epigraphic record, normally an epitaph, and the family origin based on the person’s gentilicium. This method means that we are really only observing the beginning and the outcome (or outcomes) of a family line’s migration, and therefore potential intermediate stages of settlement cannot be identified.

Table IV.3 Settlement patterns of descendants (403 individuals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of origin size</th>
<th>Same town</th>
<th>Same reg. of Italy (size)</th>
<th>Different reg. of Italy (size)</th>
<th>Rome</th>
<th>W. prov.</th>
<th>E. prov.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Larger</td>
<td>Smaller</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Larger</td>
<td>Smaller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (107)</td>
<td>17 (16%)</td>
<td>6 (5.5%)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>9 (8.5%)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (66)</td>
<td>7 (10.5%)</td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
<td>7 (10.5%)</td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
<td>17 (26%)</td>
<td>3 (4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (230)</td>
<td>12 (5%)</td>
<td>10 (4%)</td>
<td>8 (3.5%)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>27 (12%)</td>
<td>57 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals (403)</td>
<td>36 (9%)</td>
<td>17 (4%)</td>
<td>15 (3.5%)</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
<td>53 (13%)</td>
<td>60 (15%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of interesting patterns can be identified in Table IV.2. The first pattern that must be emphasized is how few of the descendants remained in their family’s town of origin, just 9% ($N = 36$). This phenomenon sharply contrasts with the near universal practice of the municipal freedmen themselves and their freeborn children remaining in the eponymous hometown. This figure can be dissected further. The descendants from larger cities tended to choose their hometown at a much higher rate than those from smaller towns, 16% ($N = 17$) compared to just 5% ($N = 12$). Ostia provides a good example of this trend. Of eight descendants

Quietus (from Ticinum); and CIL V 8321, Veronensis C. Publicius Datus (from Verona). Cases where the provenance of the inscription is unknown are omitted from this analysis, as are a handful of cases where a legionary or an auxiliary officer or soldier with a municipal gentilicium is registered in a diploma or recorded making a votive offering at a particular site, since linking the soldier’s eventual settlement with such an act is methodologically tenuous. There are, however, eight such cases where a soldier in these contexts provides his origo, and these are included in this analysis. For example, one may cite T. Venusius T. f. Men. Aper, whose gentilicium signals family origins in Venusia in southern Italy, while his voting tribe Menenia matches his origo of Praeneste (AE 1937, 181). The other seven examples include the following: CIL VI 2379 (= AE 1968, 26), Q. Campanius Crescens (Capua) from Mediolanum; CSIR Oe 14, 472, C. Aquilonius Statutus (Aquilonia) from Patavium; CIL VI 3282, Q. P rotentinus (Potentia in Region III) from Raetia; CIL XIII 6985, Potentinus Victor (Potentia in Region III) from the Taunus region in Germania Superior; CIL XVI 154 (= XI 373), [L. A]merinus L. fil. Semp(ronia) and [L. Am]erius Sempronia[nus filius eius (Ameria) from Ateste; CIL XIII 6884 (= ILS 2261), and P. Urvinus P. f. Pol. (Urvinum Mataurense) from Forum Fulvii (tribe Pollia matches this site). Descendants listed in the documentation for the praetorian or urban units and the vigiles in Rome are counted, since these men’s position placed them in the capital. Finally, examples of persons with a municipal gentilicium found inscribed on instrumentum domesticum have also been omitted from this analysis of settlement patterns.
bearing the *gentilicium* Ostiensis, six remained in the colony and the other two migrated to Rome.\(^{26}\) No Ostienses are found anywhere else. If this trend is representative of the migration realities of all the Ostienses that once existed, it lends support for the economic and social lure of this vibrant port city during the Principate.\(^{27}\) Surprisingly, this trend of the Ostienses staying home is contrasted by the fact that the colony seems not to have been a common destination for descendants from other towns. Only two other individuals in this set, an *ingenuus* and an *incertus* with the *gentilicium* Falerius, from Falerii Novi, can be located there.\(^{28}\)

The second notable feature is a corollary to the one just described. In the cases where migration away from a person’s town of origin has occurred, which account for over 90% of all the cases analyzed here, there was a tendency to move to a larger town or a town of at least the same size as the eponymous town. Focusing on the 173 descendants from large cities and medium-sized towns, only thirteen cases (7.5%) can be cited of an individual migrating to a town in Italy that was smaller than his or her family origin. To press this point even further, out of the 230 descendants with origins in a small town, 28% (\(N = 65\)) migrated to a larger town, and this figure does not even include another one-half of this group who migrated to Rome (\(N = 56\)) and the provinces (\(N = 60\)). Among the best case-studies of this tendency are the 45 descendants from the small Umbrian town of Urvinum Mataurense. The evidence does not provide a single example of an Urvin(i)us who settled in the family’s eponymous hometown.

An additional feature of the overall group’s migration patterns, and one that should come as no surprise, is the high proportion of descendants found in Rome, nearly one-quarter (\(N = 96\)). The *ingenui*, private freedmen, and *incerti* from towns of all sizes show considerable numbers in the capital. Similarly, persistent migration to the western provinces can be observed, accounting for one-fifth of all discernible settlements by the descendants (\(N = 79\)). Whereas economic activities may in large part account for this intense settlement of these families in the western

---

\(^{26}\) Cf. Salomies 2002: 149 n. 77. In Ostia: *CIL XIV* 244, *AE* 1954, 221; *CIL XIV* 858; *CIL XIV* 1429; *CIL XIV* 1430; *CIL XIV* 4569; *Tribu* p. 165. In Rome: *CIL VI* 23591; *AE* 1998, 240.

\(^{27}\) The 117 descendants bearing the *gentilicium* Publicius who are omitted from this analysis – because their identification is based on their presence in a particular town – seem to confirm this attraction to larger cities. Nearly 60% (\(N = 74\)) of those found in their hometown were from large cities.

\(^{28}\) *CIL XIV* 4554: *L*ucius *Faler[ius] ---* (*ingenuus* inferred from position); and *CIL XIV* 5379: *Faler[ius] O*ptatus (*incertus*). The Publicii at Ostia pose a dilemma in this context. As has been noted above, since this *gentilicium* was so widespread among municipal freedmen from different Italian towns and among freedmen of the Roman state, it is possible that some of the Ostian Publicii came to the colony from other areas. Cf. Salomies 2002: 135-60, who notes that, according to the what can be gleaned from studies of nomenclature, Ostian society was characterized by significant immigration from other parts of Italy and the provinces.
provinces, another possible explanation may be military service. Perhaps after serving in provincial garrisons, many ex-soldier descendants settled and established family lines that took root in the provinces.

Each feature highlighted above seems to point to one persistent theme, namely, continuous migration over time from smaller to larger towns in Italy, and to a lesser extent to the western provinces. The roots established by the municipal freedmen themselves and their freeborn children in their hometown, then, do not appear to have run very deep. These results raise important issues about the possible correlation between town size and opportunities for social, economic, and political advancement. The draw of greater economic opportunities and the free labor market in larger urban centers must have played a role. The heavy migration to Rome also points to such a scenario. It is possible that the pedigree of the grandsons or more distant descendants of a municipal freedman was not enough to make inroads into local aristocracies even for members of the second or later freeborn generations. Similarly, hereditary links to local economic networks may not have been strong enough to guarantee financial success. Such barriers probably often compelled these descendants to try their luck elsewhere. While this quantitative analysis alone cannot resolve these issues, it can provide a broad framework for a more detailed, qualitative analysis of specific examples to better understand what these descendants were doing in their chosen place of settlement.

**IV.2 MUNICIPAL FREEDMEN’S SONS**

We can now turn to situating these descendants in Roman society by measuring their social and economic mobility through more concrete indicators, starting with the fourteen freeborn sons recorded among the municipal freedmen’s families. They are particularly important for the insight they provide into the social advancement of first-generation *ingenui*. According to the settlement patterns discussed above, all but one and perhaps two of these sons remained in their hometown. Therefore, the primary focus here should be on their ascent within that local context.

---

29 Tacoma 2016: 6-8 recently examined the role of urbanization and open labor markets in the geographical mobility of a population in the pre-modern world.

30 The analysis in Chapter III, moreover, established that measurable economic and social success among the secure and probable municipal freedmen was limited to a relatively small group.

31 It should be noted that a number of the sons and daughters of the municipal freedmen remained slaves in their local *familia publica* or eventually obtained their own manumission from the *ordo decurionum*. Their social mobility has been covered to a large degree above in Chapter II and Chapter III.
The most noteworthy cases involve two sons of municipal freedmen who reached a position in their local decurionate. One epitaph of the first half of the second century CE records the family of L. Saepinius Orestes from Saepinum (CIL IX 2472).\(^{32}\)

\[
D(is) \ [M(anibus)], \ / L(ucio) \ Saepinio \ Orienti \ Aug(ustali), \ / \ et \ L(ucio) \ Saepino \ Oresti \ / \ IIIIvir(o) \ aed(ili), \ et \ Felicul(a)e \ / \ filiae, \ Orensi \ aliment(arius) \ / \ Saepinati(um) \ patri \ et \ fratr(i), \ / \ et \ Thalia \ conserva \ eius \ / \ b(ene) \ m(eren)ibus \ f(ecit)(erunt).
\]

To the departed spirits. To L. Saepinius Oriens, Augustalis, and to L. Saepinius Orestes, quattuorvir with aedilician authority, and to his daughter Felicula, Oriens, (municipal slave) alimentarius of the Saepinates, erected (this epitaph) for his well-deserving father and brother, along with his fellow-slave Thalia.

A second example of a first-generation ingenuus son of a probable municipal ex-slave who achieved the decurionate occurred at Alba Fucens, and his career probably dates broadly to the same period as that of L. Saepinius Orestes (CIL IX 3945).\(^{33}\)

\[
D(is) \ M(anibus) \ s(acrum). \ / \ Publiciae \ Marsill(a)e \ matri \ / \ piissimae, \ / \ C. \ Publicius \ Artemido/rianus \ IIIIvir \ aed(ili) \ et \ Concordia \ / \ fili(i) \ b(ene) \ m(eren)ip(osuerunt).
\]

Dedicated to the departed spirits. To Publicia Marsilla, a most devoted and well-deserving mother, C. Publicius Artemidorianus, quattuorvir aedile, and Concordia, her children, erected (this monument).

Alba Fucens maintained municipal slaves, and it is likely that Publicius was the gentilicium in use for its freedmen and freedwomen.\(^{34}\) The identification of the dedicatee of this epitaph as a probable municipal freedwoman turns on her nomenclature and the observation that her daughter Concordia was apparently still a slave. The identity of the father in this family is unknown, but it is likely that he, too, had been a slave of the colony. At any rate, a similar family group to the one cited at Saepinum makes sense here. The daughter Concordia seems to have been born while her mother was still a slave, which accounts for her own slave status, while Artemidorianus was born after Marsilla’s (and perhaps also his father’s) manumission. The social distance covered by Orestes and Artemidorianus in just one generation is remarkable, but their rise should be understood within the social and political system of their respective hometowns.

The case from Saepinum offers fruitful ground to contextualize their ascent. The office-holding pattern in the small epigraphic patrimony of Saepinum is complex, not least because we

---

\(^{32}\) Gaggiotti 1982c: 36-8; Scivoletto 2009: 348-9 no. 13.

\(^{33}\) This chronology can be posited based on paleographical features in the text.

\(^{34}\) CIL IX 3995 is an epitaph erected by Urbicus (servus) popul[i].
find decurions claiming in the same *cursus honorum* an array of both duovirates and quattuorvirates that include designations of judicial authority (*iure dicundo*) and censorial authority (*quinquennalis*).35 The normal order in which the offices were held seems to be IIIIvir quaestor, IIIIvir aedilis, and IIVir i.d. (or IIVir q.q. every five years).36 Yet in numerous cases decurions evidently bypassed lower offices before proceeding to the more senior posts. Such cases indicate that by the second century in Saepinum a progression through a fixed series of offices through popular election had yielded to the process of adlection.37

It would seem that the council of decurions themselves co-opted, or adlected, local men directly into the *ordo* first and thereafter appointed them to magistracies. Sometimes the newcomers were recruited as *pedani*, who as non-office-holding decurions occupied a lower segment in the council, while it is also possible that some new decurions were adlected directly at an office-holding rank.38 Most scholars think that the transition from election to adlection probably began in the late first century CE. For instance, the electoral *programmata* found in Pompeii, mostly dating to the last decade and a half before the town’s destruction, and the Flavian *lex municipalis*39 give the impression that popular election was still the norm.40 Yet the epigraphic evidence from towns such as Ostia shows that by the early second century, the process of adlection was taking hold.41 The *album* recording the town council of Canusium a century later, in the year 223 CE, is often thought to offer a glimpse at the full adlection system at work (*CIL* IX 338). It registers 68 decurions who were former office-holders and 32 *pedani* who had not yet held any office.42 It should be noted that at least in some parts of the Roman Empire the popular election of candidates seems to have endured. Fragments of the *lex*

---

35 See, for example, *AE* 1927, 119 (IIIvir, IIVir i.d., IIVir q.q.) and *AE* 1930, 121 (IIVir q.q., IIVir i.d., IIIIvir q.).
36 This sequence comports with Scivoletto’s 2009: 348-9 no. 13 interpretation of the *cursus honorum* at Saepinum. Cf. Degrassi 1962: 155, 182, who noted that use of the qualifiers aedilis or aedilicia potestate distinguished between the juridical and aedilician magistrates when a college of four quattuorviri was in place.
37 The epitaph of one councilor at Saepinum lists his status as praefectus and decurio, suggesting that he had been adlected, and only held office as a replacement magistrate (praefectus). His career dates to the second century (*CIL* IX 2470).
39 For example, *Lex Malacitana* 51-9.
40 Franklin 1980: 119-24; Jongman 1988: 312-17; Biundo 2003a: 53-116; Chiavia 2002: 227-58. Cf. Mouritsen 1999: 515-23. At Pompeii, where the evidence ends with the town’s destruction in 79 CE, adlection seems to have been quite rare. The debate about the function of the electoral *programmata* revolves around whether they were genuine, ‘grassroots’ expressions of democratic elections or simply expressions of loyalty by the clients of the local elite who would hold office.
municipalis of the town of Troesmis near the Black Sea (Chapters 27-28), which dates to the late second century CE, outline electoral procedures that closely align with the regulations found in the Flavian lex Malacitana and lex Irnitan.a

Adlection was an important development in municipal government, satisfying the decurions’ need to fill vacancies among their ranks in the council with qualified recruits. While the elite may have had to cast a wide net, it follows that the newcomers not only had to possess the requisite wealth to enter the decurionate, but they also had to be socially acceptable. In the case of L. Saepinius Orestes, then, the decurions of Saepinum found the son of one of their ex-slaves to be a suitable candidate. Since Orestes was probably adlected and later attained the office of quattuorvir with aedilician authority, one wonders whether, despite his entry into the council, he was simply unable to penetrate the highest ranks as a quattuorvir with full juridical authority (jure dicundo), or whether he died before he had the chance to advance further. The obvious question here, however, is what factors made him an attractive candidate for adlection.

One means of evaluating Orestes’ position is to consider his family credentials. For one thing, his father’s connections to municipal authority may have served Orestes well. Oriens was able to join the Augustales, which normally required a large sum of money. It is plausible that his position in the administration of Saepinum had been high, perhaps in one of the financial or clerical offices. In support of this idea is the position of Oriens’ older son, also named Oriens, who lists his municipal slave position as alimentarius. This post in the familia publica must have involved financial transactions connected to the administration of the town’s alimenta program, and it would not be surprising if the elder Oriens had exercised an equally technical post during his own time as a municipal slave. At any rate, the younger Oriens had his own links to municipal authority, since he clearly would have worked alongside the municipal quaestor pecun(iae) alim(entariae) who is attested in Saepinum in the second century. It is thus possible that the ex-slave L. Saepinius Oriens had amassed the wealth necessary to promote his

---

43 Eck 2013: 204-6, 209-11; Eck 2016: 588-96.
44 On the financial importance of retaining a full council of decurions, see below, pp. 200-2.
45 See Mouritsen 2011: 276-8 on the idea that less established newcomers to the decurionate likely had a more difficult path to the higher echelons of the council.
46 Weiss 2004: 92-8. A possible parallel is the case of a father and son pair of municipal slaves, the latter a tabularius in Capua, and the former an arcarius on Crete, presumably in the territory Capua possessed on the island (CIL X 3938 = ILS 6317). See Weiss 2004: 46-7, 194 no. 5; and Chioffi 2011: 31 no. 29.
47 NSA 1929, 218. On this office, which is attested in several towns in Italy, but may not have been standard, see Weiss 2004: 92-8.
freeborn son, a task for which his membership in the *Augustales* would have been ideal. After all, securing his son’s position in the *ordo* would have required that the family maintain a property of at least 100,000 *HS*. Moreover, in the absence of a personal patron, Oriens could have actively cultivated his contacts in the municipal elite in order to lay the groundwork for his son’s public career.

It is worth considering in this context how the internal dynamics of the council of Saepinum may have played a role in Orestes’ promotion. Saepinum was a small inland town, and its epigraphic evidence for administrative and economic activities is very limited. Only fourteen decrees by the council (and *populus*) can be identified, mainly for the authorization of public honors and donations for public buildings or renovations. Similarly, the list of known decurions of the town is short: inscriptions reveal the names of only fourteen families contributing eighteen decurions from the Julio-Claudian period through the second century. The town probably maintained a small council of less than fifty seats, akin to the situation observed at towns like Castrimoenium in Latium and Petelia in Bruttium in the Antonine period. It is also likely that the local aristocracy consisted of a small number of entrenched families that in any given period led a council that probably had only around fifty seats to begin with. Such a

48 Cf. Silvestrini 2000: 431-55, who is more pessimistic about a direct link between a freedman’s participation in the *Augustales* and his freeborn son’s entry into the municipal council.


50 There are also some cases of individual magistrates making dedications *sua pecunia*, but it is unclear whether these were *summa honoraria* paid out when they entered office (*ob honorem*), or whether they were simply private benefactions. In either case, it is possible – perhaps even likely – that the council issued its authorization of such projects through a decree, even when the inscriptions omit this information. By comparison, the survey of the epigraphic evidence in Chapter II revealed approximately 78 decrees by the *ordo decurionum* in Pompeii, 106 in Ostia, 48 in Puteoli, nineteen in Canusium, and seven in Sentinum. The best known administrative text from Saepinum, a series of three letters between imperial officials in about 170 CE warning the local authorities in Saepinum and nearby Bovianum to stop harassing shepherds driving imperial flocks through the region, was not a decree by the town council at all (*CIL* IX 2438). On this letter, see Corbier 1983: 126-31; and Fuhrmann 2012: 39-41.

51 Duncan-Jones’ (1982: 269-72, 283-6) analysis of *sportulae* distributions at banquets suggests town councils of between thirty and fifty seats in the two small towns. We can add to this list the town of Irni in Hispania Baetica, where the local charter stipulates a 63-seat council of decurions. On the size of the *ordo decurionum* in Roman towns, see also Liebenam 1900: 229; Nichols 1988: 712-19; and Mouritsen 1998: 229-54. One inscription recording a one-time distribution of *sportulae* by a newly-adlected *Augustalis* is available from the early second century, but while the text lists the amount each decurion, *Augustalis*, and plebeian was to receive, it omits any mention of the overall sum donated (*CIL* IX 2440). See Gaggioti and Matteini Chiari 1979: 35-8; and Buonocore 2009: 257 no. 13.

52 The size of the *ordo decurionum* varied widely from town to town. Whereas 100 decurions may constitute a general rule of thumb (cf. the *ordo* at Veii (e.g., *CIL* XI 3801, 3808) and Canusium (*CIL* IX 338)), there is plenty of evidence for councils as small as forty-five members. Given the demographic profile suggested above, the *ordo* of Saepinum most likely would have fallen nearer the lower end of the scale. On the sizes of the *ordo decurionum* in Roman towns, see Liebenam 1900: 229; Duncan-Jones 1982: 284; Nichols 1988: 712-19; and Mouritsen 1998: 229-54.
scenario is hinted at by local families contributing multiple decurions,\textsuperscript{53} and by careers like those of N. Naevius Pansa, who was \textit{IIIvir} (aedile?) once, \textit{Ilvir i.d.} three times, and \textit{Ilvir q.q.} twice,\textsuperscript{54} and C. Ennius Marsus, who was \textit{IIIvir quaestor} three times, \textit{Ilvir i.d.} four times, \textit{Ilvir q.q.} once, and \textit{praefectus i.d.} twice (as a replacement for a \textit{Ilvir} or in place of an honorific election of the emperor) (\textit{AE} 1930, 121).\textsuperscript{55} Furthermore, the number of freeborn male Saepinates eligible for the decurionate was probably low,\textsuperscript{56} and the non-land-owning economic opportunities so useful for sub-elite families to build up their financial resources were likely limited in this area.\textsuperscript{57}

While this demographic picture of Saepinum is far from conclusive, it does permit us to envision two possible effects. The first is that such an aristocracy was just the sort of group that would have been susceptible to demographic decline through the families’ dying out or having their members drawn off to serve in the imperial administration. Consequently, it would have been imperative that new families be pulled up into the ruling class in order for the council to be replenished and the system of compulsory euergetism that municipal government so heavily relied on, the \textit{summa honoraria}, to continue to run smoothly. These fees were assessed to all decurions when they were adlected and installed in an office in the \textit{cursus honorum}.\textsuperscript{58} Such financial demands may provide the context for the expansion of one small southern Italian town’s council in the first part of the third century. The aforementioned \textit{album} recording the decurions of Canusium in 223 CE is useful for understanding one reason why the established elite sought to recruit newcomers with ‘servile’ origins into the council (\textit{CIL IX} 338). The 100-man regular membership of this \textit{ordo} was comprised of both those decurions in office and those

\textsuperscript{53} Afinius: \textit{AE} 1927, 119; \textit{AE} 2014, 394; Badius: \textit{CIL IX} 2465; \textit{NSA} 1929, 218, 3; Naevius: \textit{Altilia} p. 135; \textit{CIL IX} 6308; \textit{Epigraphica} 2009, 346.

\textsuperscript{54} Gaggiotti and Matteini Chiari 1979: 33, 79; Buonocore 2009: 346 no. 3.

\textsuperscript{55} Both careers date to the Julio-Claudian period. On C. Ennius Marsus’ huge mausoleum, see Cappelletti 1982: 179-83.

\textsuperscript{56} The primary civic territory of Saepinum covered approximately 12 hectares, and the calculation that there were roughly 300 inhabitants per one hectare would imply a total population of 3600. On this calculation, see Storey 1997: 973-5; and de Ligt 2012: 291, 326. An estimate that non-slave adult males comprised approximately 25% of the total population would derive a figure of 900. A conservative estimate that around 20% (180) of these males were ex-slaves who were ineligible to enter the council would leave approximately 720 eligible freeborn candidates. If the council of Saepinum consisted of around fifty seats, approximately one in fourteen eligible men could enter (c. 7%). Given the high financial requirement to join, presumably 100,000 \textit{HS}, only a small number of these men were truly candidates for recruitment.

\textsuperscript{57} Cf. Segenni 1990: 23-32 on the role of land in economic mobility in another small town in Samnium, namely, Amiternum.

\textsuperscript{58} Cf. \textit{Lex Irimiana} 31, which emphasizes that the full allotment of decurions in the \textit{ordo} must be kept up, and \textit{Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae} 70-71, which stipulate that those entering the duovirate and aedileship must fund a public spectacle during their term.
who had formerly held the ranks of duovir quinquennalis, duovir (iure dicundo), aedile, and quaestor. In addition, another group is listed under the rubric pedanus, a term denoting a council-member who had not yet held any office. It has been argued that the function of the pedani was simply to enlarge the council to 100 members. Listed among the Canusian pedani was P. Publicius Maximus, whose son, P. Publicius Maximus Iun(ior) (CIL IX 338), was placed in the pool of praetextati, young recruits with familial links to the decurions and perhaps destined for full membership in the future.

The council of 100 decurions seems to have been far too large for the population of a small town like Canusium, where the original structure probably consisted of considerably fewer seats. The expanded version observed in the early third century thus may have been artificial. Increasing financial constraints that supposedly hit many Italian towns starting in the Severan period, and which worsened in the third century, may have created a deficit in the number of wealthy individuals willing to take on the burdens of administration. Therefore, new sources of revenue for the towns were needed. On the one hand, the amount of the summa honoraria seems to have increased in many cities, perhaps because the practice of voluntarily adding cash to the fixed fee had become institutionalized. On the other hand, the decurions were expected to make up shortfalls in local revenues. Exacerbating these increasing financial burdens was more systematic intervention in local government by imperial authorities, and the combination of these factors drove many eligible men away from the decurionate.

The leadership of Canusium may have implemented a two-tier council of full office-holding members and lower-ranking pedani for the sake of receiving entry fees from a larger number of people. Jacques suggested that most of these pedani would never enter the formal cursus honorum, and while this may have been true depending on their ages and the number of openings, we lack the evidence to

59 The former office-holders are listed as quinquennalicii, duoviralicii, aedilicii, and quaestoricii. For recent discussions of the album and what it may tell us about Roman municipal councils, see Silvestrini 1990: 595-602; Mouritsen 1998: 229-54; and Salway 2000: 115-48. The document also lists a group of senatorial and equestrian patrons of Canusium and a body of praetextati; the latter group will be discussed below.
63 Garnsey 1974: 229-52 and Carrié 2005: 293-309 provide a useful summary of the main points of this theory. See also Capogrossi Colognesi 2014: 303-19. On the idea that the municipal councils continued to operate largely independent of imperial control in this period, see Jacques 1984: 321-78.
64 Alföldy 1985: 129-33.
65 Kleijwegt 1992: 131-42; Mouritsen 1998: 248-50. The surprisingly large list of senatorial and equestrian patrons of the town may reveal that recruiting patrons was seen as another remedy for a diminishing local treasury.
understand whether they faced any different obstacles to future office-holding from other decurions.\(^{66}\) It also remains unclear whether this strategy of opening the lower ranks of the council to newcomers was more widely implemented. Although the practice was clearly never standardized, Mouritsen presents some scattered evidence from other Italian towns in the later second century that may support its broader application.\(^{67}\)

The second effect that may have played a role was the limited recruiting pool for new decurions. The smaller population – and perhaps also the town’s limited economic opportunities – created less competition for seats in the council. These conditions may have offered a path to men with a pedigree like that of Orestes. By contrast, in a larger urban center like Beneventum or Ostia, more council seats indeed were available, but the number of eligible candidates and the greater opportunities for economic success also guaranteed far more intense competition.

If this reconstruction were to apply to the case of Orestes in Saepinum, one can envision that it was the decurions themselves selecting him for adlection. The forces propelling this exslave’s son into the ordo thus were perhaps not so much based on his own or his father’s reputation – though this was surely an advantage – as on the aristocracy’s own needs. In this way, the families of freedmen would have been promoted on an ad hoc basis and through existing elite channels. Such a scenario does not much resemble the paradigm of a class of successful freedmen’s sons displacing the old elite entirely based on their own merits.\(^{68}\) Instead, it fits well with the model of individual freedmen’s families utilizing informal patronage in order to climb the social ladder, yet always operating within existing power structures.\(^{69}\)

The rapid social ascent of these two sons, out of a group of fourteen sons we know about, merits further consideration. As Mouritsen noted, finding the first-generation ingenui sons of exslaves among the decurions is not rare in the epigraphic record.\(^{70}\) This observation should be qualified, however, by the likelihood that such newcomers are overrepresented in municipal epigraphy, since they were particularly eager to advertise their leap in status using the epigraphic medium.

\(^{66}\) Jacques 1984:478-83. Nonetheless, these pedani presumably received the various honors of the decurionate even if they never held office.

\(^{67}\) Mouritsen 1998: 244-7.

\(^{68}\) On this idea of a freedman ‘social revolution,’ see Castrén 1975: 92-124; and less forcefully, Meiggs 1973: 203-11. See the recent criticisms by Mouritsen 2011: 206-47.

\(^{69}\) Mouritsen 2011: 275-8, who labels the opposing concepts ‘contest mobility’ and ‘sponsored mobility.’ See also Camodeca 1996b: 99; and Mouritsen 2015: 243-4.

\(^{70}\) Mouritsen 2015: 243-4.
Two other types of success for the freeborn sons of municipal freedmen can be cited. The merits of a freeborn son of a probable municipal freedman from Afilae were recognized in Rome (CIL XIV 3442).\textsuperscript{71} Sometime in the second century CE, L. Afilanus Provincialis received the equus publicus, an honorary elevation to equestrian status, and secured a position in the college of Luperci in Rome.\textsuperscript{72} In response to this success the decurions of Afilae honored him with the statue and inscription noted above. He owed his new equestrian status to an imperial decision, as indicated by the phrasing equo publico ornato, but it is unclear how he caught the eye of the emperor.\textsuperscript{73} Curiously, the honorific inscription does not mention whether Provincialis had first held any municipal position in Afilae, or whether he had served in the Roman army, both typical precursors to receiving the public horse.\textsuperscript{74} Perhaps his father’s connections to the municipal elite and access to informal patronage aided in his ascent, or perhaps his unnamed mother possessed influential familial connections. The only trace of imperial interest in the region of Afilae comes in the form of three lead pipes bearing stamps with the emperor Trajan’s name in the genitive, and found not far from the town (CIL XV 7895a-c). Bruun has identified these as belonging to the emperor’s palace at the site.\textsuperscript{75} A possible imperial freedman of Trajan also made his home in Afilae, M. Ulpius Primillus (AMST 1998, 159).\textsuperscript{76} These clues notwithstanding, it is not possible to reconstruct precisely what factors contributed to Provincialis’ success.

Another interesting case is represented by the son of a probable municipal freedman of Sentinum who attained a local apparitorial position as scriba publicus in an unknown period (CIL XI 5760).\textsuperscript{77}

---

\textsuperscript{71} Scheid and Granino Cecere 1999: 131 no. 7, 145. Although from a Group II town, L. Afilanus Verecundus is one of the few who fits my criteria for a probable municipal freedman. His origin in Afilae is further supported by his son’s voting tribe Aniensis.

\textsuperscript{72} Scheid and Granino Cecere 1999: 84-5 note that until the Severan period the Luperci were comprised only of equestrians, mostly drawn from the municipal elite of Italian towns. In contrast to what we are told about Provincialis, most evidence for the Luperci suggests that they had first enjoyed a successful local career. See also Rüpke 2005: 743.

\textsuperscript{73} Salomies’ 1996: 23-127 survey of senatorial and equestrian families from Latin towns points out that there is no indication of other senatorial or equestrian families in Afilae, and there are very few in the surrounding urban centers, such as Trebula Suffenas.

\textsuperscript{74} Saller 1982: 170-2.

\textsuperscript{75} Bruun 1991: 276-7. For a discussion of the most recent archaeological work at the site of the villa, near modern Arcinazzo, see Mari and Fiore Cavaliere 1998: 153-64.

\textsuperscript{76} Cesa 1987: 17-19; Mari and Fiore Cavaliere 1998: 159.

\textsuperscript{77} As Iustus’ voting tribe Lemonia indicates, he and his family were indeed from Sentinum. See Kubitschek 1889: 75-6.
To C. Sentinas Iustus, son of Caius, enrolled in the voting tribe Lemonia, public scribe C. Sentinas Anfiomeus and Maria Saturnina (erected this epitaph) for their most devoted son, who lived 24 years, 10 months, and 15 days.

Perhaps more local competition for the decurionate in Sentinum prevented Iustus from pursuing the career path enjoyed by the first-generation ingenui decurions from Saepinum and Alba Fucens. All the same, being an apparitor also carried a degree of prestige, not to mention a regular salary. An important study by Purcell, moreover, has illustrated how such a post could itself be used as an avenue of social mobility for its holder and his sons.78 Iustus’ selection as a local apparitor was probably based on a personal appointment by a municipal magistrate, and if so, his father’s connections as a municipal freedman may have played a role: Chapter 62 of the Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae shows that apparitores and municipal slaves served together in the retinues of municipal magistrates. The advancement of Iustus, then, seems to represent an upward move toward a higher social status. Surely this type of social mobility was more common than is suggested by a single example in the surviving evidence.

The documentary evidence for the sons of municipal freedmen is limited, but the existing record suggests that this first freeborn generation enjoyed limited demonstrable success, socially or economically. The four examples treated above were probably exceptional. One should also recognize the conspicuous lack of the type of advancement often expected from the freeborn sons of ex-slaves, such as membership in urban occupational or voluntary associations, and of examples of votive offerings or other dedications that would signal some level of personal wealth.79 This apparent lack of success by the sons corresponds to what was seen regarding their municipal freedmen fathers in Chapter III above. On the whole, the latter group evidently did not place their sons in a particularly favorable social and economic position, including in professional associations, which had an impact on the sons’ chances of entering such groups. It also seems that if credentials as a municipal freedman had conferred particularly high status, one

---

78 Purcell 1983: 130-1, 136-8, 154-61. For the salary of a scriba publicus (in the Baetican colony of Urso), see Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae 62. The high status of the position is also implied in Lex Irnitana 73, where the charter stipulates that public scribes must take the same oath as the municipal magistrates who would be dealing with public money and records.

79 That is, aside from having the means to erect an epitaph, which in itself may separate this entire group of sons from the larger number who once existed.
would expect to find more than two of their sons reaching the decurionate.\textsuperscript{80} In the vast majority of cases, it would take multiple freeborn generations for families to build up the necessary wealth, social connections, and social capital to realize advancement into the local aristocracy, and, in a few cases, beyond.\textsuperscript{81}

**IV.3.1 THE DESCENDANTS OF MUNICIPAL FREEDMEN**

The remainder of this chapter shifts the focus from the sons of the municipal freedmen to their descendants. Just as the analysis of the municipal freedmen themselves established a foundation for their own freeborn sons, so too, the findings above on the limited success of these first-generation *ingenui* sons serve as a basis for understanding the position of their descendants. As noted above, this group consists of freeborn descendants, private freedmen and freedwomen produced by descendant branches of the families, and a large category of *incerti*. In order to trace the social, economic, and political impact of these descendants, their role can be explored in several key areas of Roman society that serve as expedient markers for measuring social mobility.

**IV.3.2 SENATORIAL ORDER**

Entry into the senatorial order under the Empire, and with it the holding of one of the traditional offices in the senatorial *cursus honorum* or a position in the expanded imperial administration, represented the pinnacle of any family’s rise in Roman society. The formalized imperial senate was never truly a hereditary body. This meant that any man who met the property and status qualifications, stringent as the former may have been, and managed to get access to imperial favor stood a chance of admission to the initial levels of the senatorial career path that could ultimately lead to attaining the consulship.\textsuperscript{82} Appointment to a senatorial post invariably also required that a candidate demonstrate at least some administrative competency to go along

\textsuperscript{80} While there is a counterargument to be made by pointing to the paucity of the epigraphic evidence as unreliable for the sons’ success, one way I have attempted to combat this has been to cast a wider net by including in my analysis the category of probable municipal freedmen’s sons. Given that this choice could produce an overcount, the rarity of success is all the more underscored.

\textsuperscript{81} I omit from this analysis the private freedmen of the municipal freedmen. Just one of these private ex-slaves, from Brixellum, shows any advancement (*AE* 1931, 10). He followed his municipal freedman patron into the local *Viviri Augustales*.

with his social credentials. Some sources on the imperial senate give the impression of significant social and ethnic fluctuation in the order, and suggest a frequent turnover in its ranks. This in theory could imply a certain degree of social mobility in the first three centuries CE. Whether senatorial families dropped out of the order because of demographic factors, financial burdens, or simply political disinterest, there was likely a steady need to recruit new senators from outside the traditional aristocracy, which included bringing in elites from the provinces and persons with origins in the lower classes of Italy, normally after the families of such recruits had reached the equestrian order.

Roman literary sources show a certain fascination with the descendants of ex-slaves and lower-class families who ascended to the highest levels of society within just a few generations. The remark by Tacitus that many senators and equestrians under Nero had ‘servile’ origins has already been discussed above (Ann. 13.27: non aliunde originem trahi). In another example, much has been made of the origin of A. Vitellius, who rose to the senate and enjoyed a brief stint as emperor even though his great-grandfather had been an ex-slave. Vespasian and his older brother similarly had low-born origins, and it seems that their father was the first in his line to advance to the equestrian order. The short-lived emperor Pertinax presents an even more extreme example. His own father was reportedly a freedman, and he relied on a successful military career and strategic patronage to enter the senate, and eventually put himself in the position to be acclaimed emperor after the assassination of Commodus.

Yet for the most part social mobility would have been confined within the hometown of the freedmen’s descendants and within sub-elite social circles. The highest aspiration for most of their recent descendants in the municipal environment probably would have been to reach the

---

83 Saller 1982: 80-94 provides a summary of scholarly arguments on competence and seniority as prerequisites for promotion into the higher levels of the senatorial career.
84 For example, Hopkins and Burton 1983: 129-200. Challenged by Alföldy 1977b: 128; Alföldy 1985: 115-22, 150-6; and Hahn and Leunissen 1990: 60-81. These latter scholars argued for considerably less fluctuation in the higher, office-holding, echelons of the senatorial order (namely the consules ordinarii), which may have remained more stable for a longer period than the model of Hopkins and Burton allowed. Hahn and Leunissen also question the efficacy of using statistical methods to clarify such issues. See also the discussion of the evidence and scholarship in Bruun 2015: 274-6.
85 Hopkins and Burton 1983: 120-200 are more optimistic about how much of the senatorial class may have been recruited from below, while Alföldy 1985: 115-22, 150-6 cautions against assuming too much of this sort of vertical mobility.
86 See above, pp. 3-4.
87 Alföldy 1985: 150-6. The alleged family origins of Vitellius are recounted in Suetonius (Vit. 2).
local decurionate. The sort of vertical mobility that enabled one to reach the senatorial, or even the equestrian, class would have remained far beyond the reach of the vast majority of families. In fact, the examples cited above and others like them were probably considered noteworthy by the ancient authors because they were exceptional. Many obstacles stood in the way of emerging families rising to the municipal elite, then getting onto an equestrian administrative or military career path, and finally reaching the offices that could lead them into the senate.\(^{90}\) This trajectory required building up great wealth and cultivating extensive patronage connections.\(^{91}\) Even then, a series of bottlenecks existed within the senatorial cursus that meant that only a portion of those who entered it could ever hope to ascend beyond the quaestorship, and fewer still, to the consulship.\(^{92}\)

This outline of levels of social mobility during the Principate thus puts into greater focus the level of achievement of the family lines that produced the seven senators in the catalogue who either bear a municipal gentilicium from a town in Group I or the name Publicius. A discussion of three case-studies will illustrate how this group can be useful for advancing our understanding of the social ascent of the municipal freedmen’s families.\(^{93}\) A discussion of the evidence for these individuals will focus on their possible links to municipal family lines, and on what factors may have enabled them to reach the senatorial order.

\(^{91}\) Saller 1982: 141-3.
\(^{92}\) Hopkins and Burton 1983: 120-200.
\(^{93}\) The four senators not be discussed here are P. Falerius (Falerii Novi in Etruria), who left a votive offering in Verona (CIL V 3248); P. Trebu[lanus] (Trebu[la] Sufenas in Latium), who is listed as an urban praetor in a fasti from Rome dated to the Augustan or early Julio-Claudian period (AE 1987, 163); T. Haterius Nepos Atinas Probus Publicius Matenianus (Atina in Latium), who was honored in a monument in Fulginiae (CIL XI 5212); and C. Quintius Certus Publicius Marcellus (Aquileia in Venetia; tribe Velina), who received an honorific monument in his hometown of Aquileia (AE 1934, 231; CIL V 1354). There is some uncertainty surrounding the identity of Falerius, including the possibility that his gentilicium should be rendered as Valerius (Mommsen 1872: 331; cf. attestations of the gentilicium Falerius in Schulze 1904: 565 n. 4; and Solin and Salomies 1988: 76). In addition, an eighth senator could be added, bearing the gentilicium Corfinius from the Samnite town of Corfinium. His existence is established by his probable son Corfin[i]us Felix, who is listed among the pueri senatores celebrating the ludi saeculares in 204 CE, recorded in the Acta Fratrum Arvalium (AE 1932, 70; EA 1932, 70; Barbieri no. 189).

I have omitted from this group the case of the senator, evidently from Hispellum in Umbria, named C. Hispellae Gavius Saturninus and designated c(\(\text{larissimae}\)) m(emoriae) v(iri) (CIL XI 5270, late second or early third century CE: …C(ai) Hispellae Gavi Saturnini c(\(\text{larissimae}\)) m(emoriae) v(iri)). The proper gentilicium borne by municipal freedmen and their descendants is Hispellae (gen. Hispellatis) or Hispellius (Solin and Salomies 1988: 93). Kajava 1988: 135-9 has argued convincingly that Hispellae is in fact an otherwise unattested male cognomen, and that in this case Gavius omitted his first (original?) gentilicium because it was less prestigious than the gentilicium Gavius, presumably inherited from his mother’s family. Even so, it is worth speculating whether Hispellae in this inscription could be the result of the stone-cutter’s erroneous rendering of the genitive of Hispellae, one of the attested forms of the gentilicium. If this were the case, this man would be a ninth example of a descendant of a municipal freedman who reached the senatorial order.
Table IV.4 Municipal freedmen’s descendants in the senatorial order (7 individuals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of origin</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location of inscription</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aricia</td>
<td>M. Arrecinus Clemens</td>
<td>AE 1947, 40 (et al.)(^9^4)</td>
<td>hon. (et al.)</td>
<td>Flavian</td>
<td>Pisaurum</td>
<td>co(n)s(ul) II; praet(or) urb(anus); [leg(atus Aug(usti) p)ro praet(ore) provinc(iae) [Hispani]ae c[il]t]ioris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>T. Campanius Priscus Maximianus</td>
<td>CIL XII 137</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>late III</td>
<td>Drusomagus</td>
<td>vir cons(ularis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falerii</td>
<td>P. Falerius P. f.</td>
<td>CIL V 3248</td>
<td>vot.</td>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>co(n)s(ul)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trebula Suff.</td>
<td>P. Trebul[i anus]</td>
<td>AE 1987, 163</td>
<td>fasti</td>
<td>Jul.-Cl.</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Member of the Fratres Arvales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atina</td>
<td>T. Haterius Nepos Atinas Probus Publicius Matenianus</td>
<td>CIL XI 5212</td>
<td>hon.</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Fulginiae</td>
<td>co(n)s(ul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>C. Quinctius C. f. Certus Publicius Marcellus</td>
<td>AE 1934, 231; CIL V 1354</td>
<td>hon.</td>
<td>mid-II</td>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>co(n)s(ul); augur; legatus divi Hadrian(i) provinciarum Syriae et Germaniae superior(is)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona (?)</td>
<td>Q. Publicius Q. f.</td>
<td>AE 1965, 148</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>leg(atus) pro pr(aetore)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The case of M. Arrecinus Clemens

The first useful case-study is that of M. Arrecinus Clemens (AE 1947, 40), whose gentilicium signals a connection to the Latin town of Aricia.\(^9^5\) Clemens was well connected within the Roman aristocracy. His father (AE 1976, 200), of the same name, had enjoyed an

---

\(^9^4\) The career of M. Arrecinus Clemens is recorded in various evidence: CIL VI 199; CIL XI 428; CIL XII 3637; CIL XIV 244, 2242; CIL XV 7278; Tac. Hist. 4.68.2.

\(^9^5\) PIR\(^2\) A 1072. Schulze 1904: 428, 525 noted the morphological issues with this form Arrecinus and its correspondence to the town name Aricia, even though the connection is supported by the case of M. Arrecinus Gellianus of Aricia, whose father was a municipal slave (Primigenius r(ei) p(ublicae) Aricinorum ser(vus) arc(arius)) and whom I have categorized as a secure municipal freedman (CIL XIV 2156). The double rr can be explained as a case of gemination, but Schulze suggested the possibility that Gellianus’ gentilicium Arrecinus could have been adapted from an already existing gentilicium and have nothing to do with the town of Aricia. This seems a very unlikely interpretation of the case of Gellianus and his father. See discussion above, Chapter III, pp. 160-3.
equestrian career that culminated in the position of praetorian prefect under Caligula, and his sister had been the first wife of the emperor Titus.\textsuperscript{96} As proof of this family’s ascendency, the younger Clemens reached the senate in the mid-60s, and, although a senator, served in the same prestigious equestrian post as his father, praefectus praetorio, in 70.\textsuperscript{97} He later received suffect consulships in 73 and in 83 or 84.\textsuperscript{98} Some features of his advancement have puzzled scholars, who point to inconsistencies in the trajectory of this senatorial career. In addition to his unusual appointment to the equestrian post of praefectus praetorio, there is a noticeable ten-year gap between his two consulships in 73 and 83/84 during which he seems to have held only a single governorship, of Hispania Citerior, and this may have been assigned several years later than expected for an ex-consul.\textsuperscript{99} The publication in 1947 of a fragmentary dedicatory inscription from Pisaurum, erected sometime after his second consulship, added one previously unattributed office to his \textit{cursus}.\textsuperscript{100} The text of the inscription records this post as \textit{PRAET URB} (= praetor urbanus), which would represent a step down for a consular. Citing a pair of parallel examples, Jones and Develin argue that the stone-cutter may have mistaken \textit{PRAEF} for \textit{PRAET}, and that the position Clemens actually held was that of \textit{praefectus urbi}, the highest administrative office available to a former (suffect) consul, and one more fitting for his close association with the Flavians.\textsuperscript{101} These issues notwithstanding, a consulship – and perhaps also an urban prefecture –

\textsuperscript{96} For the elder M. Arreccinus Clemens’ career (\textit{PIR}² A 1073; \textit{RE} 2.1: 1226), see Tac. \textit{Hist.} 4.68.2; and Suet. \textit{Tit.} 4.2.
\textsuperscript{97} Similarly, Vespasian placed his son Titus in this role of praefectus praetorio even while he also held a series of ordinary consulships in the early and mid-70s (Suet. \textit{Titus} 6).
\textsuperscript{98} Tac. \textit{Hist.} 4.68.2. His career is recorded in the following inscriptions: \textit{CIL} XII 3637; \textit{CIL} XV 7278; \textit{CIL} XIV 244; \textit{CIL} XIV 2242 (= \textit{Inscr.It.} 13¹, 2, 7a); and \textit{AE} 1947, 40. Clemens was also \textit{praefectus urbi} and held at least one governorship, of Hispania Citerior. Tacitus also claims that Clemens was a close personal friend of Domitian. See Cresci Marrone and Mennella 1984: 211-14.
\textsuperscript{99} Mennella 1981: 205-8 thinks this unusual appointment was made because Clemens was such a trusted ally of the Flavians and could be counted on to preserve their interests in the city.
\textsuperscript{100} \textit{AE} 1947, 40 (see Mennella 1981: 205-8: [\textit{M(arci)} \textit{Arreccinus M(arci) f(ilius) Cam(ilia)} / [\textit{Clemen}s co(n)s(ul) II \textit{praet(or) urb(anus)} / [\textit{leg(atus)} Aug(usti) \textit{p(ro) praet(or) provinc(iae)} / [\textit{Hispani}ae C[it]e[rioris p(ecunia) s(ua)} f(ecit).]
\textsuperscript{101} Jones and Develin 1976: 79-83. Eck 1974: 208 proposed that instead of a single senator named M. Arreccinus Clemens, there may have been a father and son pair of senators. This could potentially explain the odd sequencing of the \textit{cursus honorum}, and it could also resolve some issues with Clemens’ age, based on the idea that he may have started his career as early as the 50s or even the 40s CE. For example, Gentili 1976: 51-8 no. 1 connects our M. Arreccinus M. f. Clemens to the man with the same name found in a votive offering in Ariminum, who is still in an equestrian career after having held (honorary?) municipal posts, and whose military postings suggest a date in the 40s (\textit{AE} 1976, 200). Such a timeline is indeed difficult to reconcile. For a different view, see Demougin 1978: 317-30, including discussion below. The name M. Arreccinus Clemens also turns up in the genitive on a lead pipe in Ariminum (\textit{CIL} XI 428), and it has been suggested that Clemens may have had a villa in the town. See discussion in Bruun 1991: 238-9.
represented the most senior honor possible in the imperial system, and marks the achievement of the Marci Arrecini Clementes. His achievement stands, despite his ultimate demise: Suetonius reports that after Domitian discovered Clemens’ role in an alleged conspiracy, he had him executed despite their friendship (Dom. 11.1).102

A more pressing question for the present analysis concerns the origin of Clemens’ family line. Authoritative prosopographical studies give his equestrian father’s origin as Pisaurum.103 It was here that the younger Clemens funded the unidentified public building project noted above (AE 1947, 40). In this dedicatory inscription, moreover, he gives his voting tribe as Camilia, which is the main voting tribe of the town. Demougin hypothesized that there were two distinct branches of the Marci Arrecini Clementes in the north, one based in Pisaurum and the other in Ariminum.104 In this case, both lines were highly successful, the latter producing equestrians and the former both equestrians and senators.105 In the case of the Pisaurum line, it has been suggested that it was in this area of Umbria that the Arrecini first forged connections with the Flavii. Vespasian’s father Flavius Petro, from the Sabine territory, may have maintained a base for his business activities in northern Italy here.106 If correct, this hypothesis would add an important dimension to our understanding of how the equestrian M. Arrecinus Clemens’ family enjoyed such advancement. In addition to these two Umbrian towns, other branches of the Arrecini are found in Latium, Apulia, Sardinia, and Germania Superior.107 Yet it is not clear if and how these branches fit into the senatorial line from Pisaurum.

The most intriguing Arrecinus branch, however, is that found in the eponymous town itself, Aricia. This town, in theory, would be the point of origin for all these family lines, and over twenty descendants are recorded in inscriptions still in close proximity to the town.108 In

102 Townend 1961: 56-8 wonders whether Clemens was actually exiled instead, citing another instance in which Suetonius mistakenly claimed that an exiled person had been executed. In this context, Townend adduces an epitaph from Rudiae in Apulia, dated to the same period, erected for M. Arrecinus Clemens by a woman called Cornelia Ocellia (Eph. Ep. 81, 79). One should wonder, however, why a high profile exile would be permitted to remain within the confines of Italy. See a recent discussion of the evidence of exile in the Late Republic in Kelly 2006: 100-7.


105 The equestrian line from Ariminum is recorded in AE 1976, 200 and CIL XI 428. These will be discussed below.


107 In Latium: CIL VI 12307 (Rome), CIL XIV 2408 (Castrimoenium), CIL XIV 3488 (Fanum Vacunae), CIL XIV 2679 (Tusculum); in Apulia: CIL IX 6182, 6183 (Rudiae); in Sardinia: AE 2007, 692 (Senorbi); in Germania Superior: CIL XIV 36 (Mogontiacum).

this case, there is clear attestation of a local familia publica, and of the practice by the town’s administration of bestowing the gentilicium Arreclus on its ex-municipal slaves.\textsuperscript{109} The case of M. Arreclus Gellianus has already been discussed above in Chapter III (\textit{CIL XIV} 2156, date uncertain). He and his father, a self-identified municipal slave of Aricia, made a votive offering to the local cult of Diana. Gellianus therefore can be classified as a secure municipal freedman. Additionally, it is possible to cite one other Arreclus who fits the criteria of a probable municipal freedman, M. Arreclus Augustinus (\textit{NSA} 1920, 288).\textsuperscript{110} Moreover, the name of an officinator called L. Aricus Chrestus appears on two brick stamps, from Tibur and Rome (\textit{CIL XIV} 4092, 5); the connection between the municipal familia publica and the brick production industry has been noted above.\textsuperscript{111}

It is safe to assume that at least some of the Marci Arreclus in the epigraphic record were recent descendants from the familia publica of Aricia, particularly in the cases of those found in the area around the town itself. Less clear, however, is how to connect the municipal freedman lines of Marci Arreclus to the equestrian-senatorial line of the Marci Arreclus Clementes of Pisaurum. It is clear enough that this successful family’s gentilicium signals an origin in Aricia. Yet how far back might such an origin have reached? As was established in the above methodological discussion, some uses of a municipal gentilicium correspond to early elite families who coined their name based on their town of origin when they entered the Roman polity and its onomastic system.\textsuperscript{112} These lines, of course, would precede municipal freedman lines bearing the same gentilicium. A brief glance at the gentilia of magistrates during the mid-Republic suggests that this practice was most common in the towns of Latium that were closest to Rome, from which local elites entered the equestrian and senatorial orders in an early period.\textsuperscript{113} Although there is no attestation of an Arreclus among the Roman elite in the Republican period, it is not inconceivable that such a family line did exist, but never achieved a level of success that was documented in our sources.

Assuming for the moment that we are only dealing with a municipal freedman line of Arreclus, it is easy enough to envision the sons and grandsons of former slaves of the town (or

\textsuperscript{109} Variations in spelling include Arricinus and Aricinus (gemination absent). See Schulze 1904: 428, 525.
\textsuperscript{110} This inscription, whose date is uncertain, was found in Rome. His wife bears a name that seems to indicate that she, too, is an ex-slave. Her gentilicium is an imperial one, Flavia, and her cognomen is Greek, Beronice.
\textsuperscript{111} See the occupational analysis in Chapter III above.
\textsuperscript{112} This is particularly true of some towns in Group III, as well as some in Group II.
\textsuperscript{113} See, for example, the list of careers in Broughton 1952: 524-636. Cf. Schulze 1904: 526-33.
the freedmen themselves) spreading across Italy, including to Pisaurum. Successful economic activities and the cultivation of links to informal patronage then may have helped the family place the equestrian (elder) M. Arrecinus Clemens on his career path. The main problem with this scenario, however, is the underlying chronology. First of all, building up wealth and connections, especially the sort needed to place a family member in the equestrian order, normally would have taken multiple generations, a likelihood that would push Clemens further and further away in time from a putative municipal freedman progenitor from Aricia. Clemens can in fact be placed in an even more precise chronology. The post of praefectus praetorio was at the very top of the equestrian career ladder, and therefore it took time for one to move through the lower ranks to reach this point. In this context, Clemens must have been at least 40 years old when he acquired this post, and likely even considerably older, since Josephus has him claim that he was too old to participate in the plot to assassinate Caligula in 41 CE (Ant. Iud. 19.7: ‘αὐτὸν μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ γήρως ἀφῃρῆσθαι τὴν ἐπὶ τοιοῦτος τόλμαν’). He was thus probably born during the reign of Augustus or as early as the triumviral period.

This timeframe is important because it places any potential municipal freedman ancestor of Clemens as far back as the middle or even the early first century BCE. Roman towns indeed already maintained public slaves in the Late Republic, and Varro describes the practice of manumitting them already in the 50s or early 40s BCE (LL 8.82-3). Yet the earliest specific evidence for a town’s manumitting of a slave does not appear until the Julio-Claudian period. From a procedural perspective, moreover, if Aricia had been freeing its slaves in this period, their practice likely would have predated even the alleged ‘Republican’ law (lex veteris reipublicae) authorizing municipalities to legally free their slaves. In essence, it does not seem that sufficient time would have elapsed between the manumission of a slave of Aricia and Clemens’ rise to the equestrian order to make such a connection likely. Perhaps Clemens’ hypothetical municipal freedman progenitor had enjoyed an accelerated ascent similar to other

---

114 For comparison, the ages at appointment of three notorious Praetorian prefects can be calculated: Sejanus was 34; Pertinax was 67; and Macrinus was 52.
116 For example, a defixio from Cremona of the Augustan or Julio-Claudian period mentions a municipal freedman (AE 1975, 449). There are, however, attestations of municipal slaves from the Late Republic, for example, from Cora (CIL X 6514) and Minturnae (AE 1988, 229). See discussion in Weiss 2004: 182-90.
117 This early law is given as the precedent for a senatus consultum in 129 CE granting to provincial towns the right to manumit their municipal slaves (Cod. Just. 7.9.3). See Buckland 1908: 588 n. 12; González and Crawford 1986: 222-3; and Fear 1990; and see discussion above in Chapter II.
freedmen during the tumultuous civil wars and triumviral period in the latter half of the first century BCE, thereby giving his son and grandson certain social and economic advantages.\footnote{118}{Cf. Mouritsen 2011: 92-4, 273-4.}

This idea, of course, must remain only conjectural. The question remains, then, whether a theoretical elite line of Arrecini with origins dating back to the mid-Republic comes back into play in the present argument: does it offer a better solution to understanding the high status of the Marci Arrecini Clementes in Pisaurum already in the early Julio-Claudian period?

The Campanii of Capua

A different set of issues can be found in the case of a senator who bore the municipal gentilicium Campanius, the name used by the municipal freedmen of Capua.\footnote{119}{Both a \textit{familia publica} at Capua and the use of the gentilicium Campanius for its freedmen are attested in \textit{CIL} X 3940 (= \textit{ILS} 6318, first half of the first century CE): \textit{C(aio) Campanio / col(oniae) lib(erto) / Ursulo Lupulus / col(oniae) Capuae arcar(ius) / amico optimo}. Cf. Sudi-Guiral 2010: 425-9. See discussion of the \textit{gens Campania} in D’Isanto 1993: 90-1.}
The senator T. Campanius Priscus Maximianus was commemorated in an epitaph erected near the ancient city of Sedunum in Alpes Poeninae (\textit{CIL} XII 137):\footnote{120}{\textit{PIR}² C 373; \textit{RE} 3.1: 1440; Walser 1980: 22-4 no. 254.}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Titi Campani / Prisci Maximi/ani viri cons(ularis), / omnibus hon/oribus in urbe / sacra functi, q(u)i / visit an(nis) XXXIII, / mens(es) V, Numidi/a [---] Opinda / Valeriana c(larissima) f(emin)ae, m/ater infelix filio / carissimo fieri / cura(vit), sub ascia / d(e)d(icavit).}
\end{quote}

(To the memory) of Titus Campanius Priscus Maximianus, a consular man, having performed all the offices in the \textit{urbs sacra} (Rome), who lived 43 years and 5 months, his unfortunate mother, Numidia [---] Opinda Valeriana, a senatorial woman, saw to it that (this epitaph) was erected and dedicated it under the \textit{ascia.}

Maximianus’ career is usually dated to the later part of the third century CE, based primarily on the formulae \textit{viri cons(ularis)} and \textit{c(larissima) f(emin)ae} in the epitaph, and on the possible connection between his mother’s family, the \textit{gens Numidia}, and the \textit{rector Italiae} of that name under Diocletian.\footnote{121}{Walser 1994: 73-5.} Walser, pointing to the collocation of the terms \textit{fieri cura(vit)} and \textit{d(e)d(icavit)}, thinks that Maximianus may have died in Rome and that his mother then transported his remains to Sedunum for burial and placement of the epitaph.\footnote{122}{Walser 1994: 73-5.} It is also possible that the epitaph in question was erected without transport of the remains. At any rate, it is unclear why the epitaph was placed in this town. Perhaps at some stage the ex-consul Maximianus had
played a role in governing the procuratorial province of Alpes Poeninae under the provincial reorganization by Diocletian, or he may have begun his career as an equestrian and entered the province as a legatus Augusti or procurator. Otherwise, it is possible to envision a family connection in Alpes Poeninae. An additional six different branches of Campanii were found spread throughout Gaul.\footnote{CIL XII 88 (two, Ebrodunum); CIL XIII 2249 (Lugudunum), CIL XIII 3148-50 (Condate), CIL XII 2678 (Alba Helviorum), CIL XIII 4509 (Mediomatrici).}

The epitaph omits any specific record of Maximianus’ \textit{cursus honorum}, providing only a general statement that he had held all the essential offices at Rome (\textit{omnibus honoribus in urbe sacra functi}). This idea is borne out by the attribution of the epithet \textit{vir cons(ularis)} to his name, indicating that he had reached the consulship. Beginning in the early third century, ex-consuls employed this epithet as a way of distinguishing themselves from the larger group of senators who had never achieved this office and who could only claim the title \textit{vir clarissimus}.\footnote{Pflaum 1970: 174-6; Salway 2015: 378-84.} Maximianus does not turn up in the preserved consular \textit{fasti}, but Degrassi assumed that he must have held the office sometime before the reign of Diocletian.\footnote{Degrassi 1952: 116, 163.}

The advancement of Maximianus’ career must have relied heavily on the social connections of his parents. His mother claimed to be of senatorial stock, as a \textit{c(larissima) f(emina)}, and since retaining this status required marriage to a man of more or less the same social rank, it is likely that Maximianus’ father was himself a senator or at least a high-ranking equestrian.\footnote{See \textit{Cod. Iust.} 5.4.10.286-93, which records a rescript issued by Diocletian and Maximian.} These familial links would have brought patronage, a necessary element for an aspiring senatorial family.\footnote{Such patronage was likely even more crucial during the tumultuous years of the Military Anarchy period leading up to Diocletian’s settlement.}

It remains to evaluate the status of the Campanii and where Maximianus may fit into the trajectories of these family lines. Campanii are among the more successful bearers of a municipal \textit{gentilicum}. As mentioned above, branches of them were widespread in the Roman Empire, particularly in Italy (14 persons) and the western provinces (13 persons).\footnote{Excluding the senator T. Campanius Priscus Maximianus, there are in total 16 \textit{ingenui}, 16 \textit{incerti}, and 2 private \textit{liberti} bearing the name Campanius/a.} There is also a concentration of nine Campanii in Region I where Capua is located, and two left their mark in the local epigraphy. In the second century CE, an equestrian from the town named M.
Campanius Marcellus, who belonged to the local voting tribe Falerna, received an honorific statue (CIL X 3847), while a L. Campanius Flaccus reached the local decurionate in the first century CE (CIL X 474).\(^\text{129}\) The chronology for these branches varies widely. Although they are concentrated in the first and second centuries CE, at least three probably date to the Late Republic or Augustan period.\(^\text{130}\) It has also been suggested that on the reverse of a coin dated to around 109 BCE, the name of the moneyer given as C. CAMP. should be resolved as C. Camp(anius).\(^\text{131}\) This would signal an elite line of the family probably dating back the mid-Republic, and Capua’s early entry into the Roman polity could support this possibility.\(^\text{132}\) Yet as an alternative, Syme pointed to the forerunners of the Augustan senatorial family Campatius from Caere as the possible origin of this monetalis.\(^\text{133}\)

Although T. Campanius Priscus Maximianus cannot with full confidence be connected to a municipal freedmen line of Campanii from Capua, there is a clear likelihood that he had this connection. The activities of the aforementioned other Campanii fit such a scenario. It is possible to see a gradual accumulation of their collective wealth and position throughout the first and second centuries CE, in various locations in Italy and the west, even though this ascent was accomplished by different branches. One can observe the success of the Campanii among the municipal elite, then in the Roman army and Praetorian Guard, and then in the equestrian imperial administration. The senatorial branch that produced Maximianus can be seen as the culmination of this process of social mobility.

**The case of Q. Poblicius**

The other senatorial descendant important for our discussion is Q. Poblicius, who was commemorated in a monument in Verona that bears the following brief inscription (AE 1965, 148):

\[
Q(uinto) Poblicio Q(uinti) f(ilio) / leg(ato) pro pr(aetore)
\]

\(^\text{129}\) This latter inscription used to be classified as falsa, until another manuscript of Latin inscriptions confirmed its antiquity (Panciera 1960: 23-4).

\(^\text{130}\) Late Republic: CIL IV 10769; Augustan period: CIL VI 764; AE 1987, 269.

\(^\text{131}\) Broughton 1952: 434.

\(^\text{132}\) Rome first intervened in the administration of Capua in the late fourth century BCE, during the Second Samnite War, by installing its own praefecti. Livy (9.20.5) reports that the motivation was alleged anti-Roman conspiracies among some of the ruling elite in the town. See the discussion in Oakley 2005: 266-8.

\(^\text{133}\) Syme 1964: 114.
It is unclear whether this stone, which was reused at some point after antiquity, was an epitaph or an honorific inscription, perhaps attached to a statue base. The dative of Poblicius’ name would support either genre. On the one hand, an epitaph would indicate that Poblicius likely came from Verona. On the other hand, an honorific inscription could indicate that the town was celebrating a local man who achieved success, or it could suggest that the town was simply responding to his role as an outside benefactor.

The date of the inscription, and with it the identity of Q. Poblicius, is also debated. The fact that he has no cognomen and that no specific province is ascribed to his position as legatus pro praetore suggests a date in the Late Republic. There has been an attempt to attach him to Caesar’s staff during his years of campaigning in Gaul, during which time he kept his winter quarters and some bases in the Transpadane region. A posting in the region may have allowed Poblicius to establish connections in Verona, and perhaps even a patronage relationship, a scenario that could explain an honorific inscription in the town. This explanation would place his origin elsewhere, perhaps as a member of the family of Publicii/Poblicii that produced monetales in 71 and 67 BCE. A different explanation, advanced by Wiseman, is that Q. Poblicius was part of the first generations of elite Transpadani who received Roman citizenship and in some cases entered the senate. According to this argument, Poblicius would have been honored in Verona with either a statue or an epitaph because it was his hometown. Wiseman points to ‘early’ epigraphic evidence recording Poblicii in Verona as support for his reconstruction of an early local elite line based in the town. Yet this evidence is hardly early, dating to the middle or later first century CE, and Wiseman does not seem to recognize the presence of families of ex-slaves of Verona who are attested in this period in the epigraphic record. Breuer, moreover, points

---

135 Wiseman 1965: 158 argues that it was probably an epitaph. Alföldy 1982: 341 no. 7 agrees, pointing to the ‘simple blocks’ as most indicative of a funerary context.
138 Wiseman 1965: 158-9. Whereas the lex Pompeia of 89 BCE granted the ius Latii to the Transpadani, the local elite which supplied the town’s magistrates, of which Poblicius’ family theoretically would have been a member, received full Roman citizenship. Later, in 49 BCE, the lex Roscia promoted the Transpadani to full Roman citizenship.
139 CIL V 3230, 3275, 3301, 3491, 3699, 3701, 3829, 3830.
out that the argument of a Veronese origin for Poblicius rests almost entirely on the uncertain identification of the stone as an epitaph.\footnote{Breuer 1996: 243-4 no. V8.}

The most logical origin for Poblicius thus would seem to be in an elite family in Rome.\footnote{Contra Wiseman 1965: 158-9; and Alföldy 1982: 341 no. 7.} For the purposes of this chapter on the municipal freedmen’s descendents, moreover, his case is of only marginal interest. Similar to M. Arrecinus Clemens, his career is too early to be relevant for our discussion of the manumission practices that produced municipal freedmen during the Principate.

Based on this analysis of possible senatorial descendents, three overarching points can be made. First, the small number who reached this status, relative to the entire catalogue of descendents, is not surprising. After all, it was difficult for any lower-class Roman family to acquire the necessary wealth and social connections to climb the social ladder to this point even after several generations. Moreover, even if all seven of these senators were to correspond to a municipal freedman family line, they would still constitute just 1.5\% of the 464 male descendents in the catalogue.

A second point is signaled by the polyonymy of several of these senators. In this context of so few descendents of municipal freedmen reaching the senatorial order, it is worth noting that the names of three of the seven show clear signs that their advancement was aided either by adoption, likely into an elite family, or by political marriage between two prominent families.\footnote{T. Campanius Priscus Maximianus; T. Haterius Nepos Atinas Probus Publicius Matenianus; C. Quinctius Certus Poblicius Marcellus. On the ancestral link between the Latin town of Atina and the family of T. Haterius Nepos Atinas Probus Publicius Matenianus, see Solin 2008: 20-1. Solin thinks the component Atinas Probus is one of three sets of praenomen + gentilicum, indicating strategic marriages among this man’s recent ancestors.} In both cases, this feature demonstrates how important informal patronage was to these descendents.

Finally, in two of the five examples of senators with an explicit municipal gentilicum, a family line not deriving from a municipal freedman may offer a better explanation for their origins.\footnote{T. Campanius Priscus Maximianus; C. Quinctius Certus Poblicius Marcellus.} Moreover, all five of these gentilicia were from areas in which elites entered the Roman political system in an early period.\footnote{That is, the towns of Aricia, Atina, and Capua (Latium et Campania), Trebula Suffenas (northern Samnium), and Falerii (southern Etruria).} Therefore, we may be dealing with elite families who never had anything to do with municipal freedmen. Similar issues emerge with the other

---

\footnote{Breuer 1996: 243-4 no. V8.}
\footnote{Contra Wiseman 1965: 158-9; and Alföldy 1982: 341 no. 7.}
\footnote{T. Campanius Priscus Maximianus; T. Haterius Nepos Atinas Probus Publicius Matenianus; C. Quinctius Certus Poblicius Marcellus. On the ancestral link between the Latin town of Atina and the family of T. Haterius Nepos Atinas Probus Publicius Matenianus, see Solin 2008: 20-1. Solin thinks the component Atinas Probus is one of three sets of praenomen + gentilicum, indicating strategic marriages among this man’s recent ancestors.}
\footnote{T. Campanius Priscus Maximianus; C. Quinctius Certus Poblicius Marcellus.}
\footnote{That is, the towns of Aricia, Atina, and Capua (Latium et Campania), Trebula Suffenas (northern Samnium), and Falerii (southern Etruria).}
two senators, those with the gentiliciun Publicius/Poblicius. In their case, their ancestors may be found among the senatorial Publicii in Rome, and possibly even among the liberti publici populi Romani.

IV.3.3 EQUESTRIAN ORDER

Gaining access to the equestrian order, too, required plenty of wealth and social connections, including senatorial or imperial patronage. Yet it would have been a more attainable goal than the senatorial order for the more prosperous families emerging from the lower strata of Roman society. The equestrian order was far larger and more diverse than the senatorial one, and several factors also made it less stable. This gives the impression of a far higher degree of turnover as well, an important aspect for this study of the social ascent of municipal freedmen’s descendants. Estimates of the total number of equestrians in the Roman Empire, which consisted of both those who had been appointed to the status through the emperor’s beneficence and those who simply qualified for the equestrian census, range from 20,000 in the Augustan period to up to 40,000 by the second century. There was a practical need to recruit new members in order to fill the expanding number of bureaucratic and military positions assigned to equestrians during the Principate. This particular need, however, should not be overstated, since at the height of the imperial administration in the second and early third century CE there were probably never more than approximately 135 procuratorial posts and 550 military appointments to be handed out. Such officials formed an exclusive group of equestrians who, along with the senatorial imperial officials, constituted a true ‘administrative aristocracy’ and accumulated wealth and social influence.

Apart from this narrower group, however, there existed numerous opportunities for advancement into the equestrian order for qualified Romans outside the traditional aristocracy, whether from the provincial elite or from the lower classes in Italian towns, including the

---

145 A good example is Pliny’s offer to a family friend, who was already a local decurion, of the funds necessary to reach the equestrian census (Ep. 1.19).
147 The role of the equestrians in the imperial administrative and military service may have increased even more during the course of the chaotic third century. See Potter 2004: 229-32, 258.
descendants of ex-slaves. Ordinarily, one was supposed to be at least a third-generation *ingenuus* to gain equestrian status, but as Eck has pointed out, this criterion was sometimes overlooked in practice. A good illustration of this is the example of the freeborn son of a probable municipal freedman of *Afilae* who received an *equus publicus* from an unknown emperor in the second century CE (*CIL XIV* 3442). In addition to a formal requirement of freeborn status, a rise to the equestrian class from below normally would have taken a few generations, since the family had to accumulate the necessary wealth and social ties. It is thus useful to analyze what sort of success the descendants of the municipal freedmen had in reaching this second order in Roman society. The following table lists the equestrians found in the catalogue of descendants.

Table IV.5 Municipal freedmen’s descendants in the equestrian order (16 individuals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of origin</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location of inscription</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aeclanum (II)</td>
<td>Q. Aeclanius Hermias</td>
<td><em>CIL II</em>2/7, 263</td>
<td>hon.</td>
<td>312-337</td>
<td>Corduba (Baetica)</td>
<td>v(ir) p(erfectissimus); a(gens) v(icem) praef. praet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aricia (I)</td>
<td>M. Arrecinus Clemens</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 1976, 200</td>
<td>vot.</td>
<td>30s-40s</td>
<td>Ariminum (Pisaurum?)</td>
<td>praefectus praetorio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aricia (I)</td>
<td>M. Arrecinus Gemellus</td>
<td><em>CIL XVI</em> 36</td>
<td>dipl.</td>
<td>90 CE</td>
<td>Italia153</td>
<td>praefectus coh. I Aquitanorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneventum (II)</td>
<td>C. Concordius Syriacus</td>
<td><em>CIL IX</em> 1663</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Beneventum</td>
<td>eq(ues) R(omanus); comm(entariensis) rei p(ublicae) Benevent(anorum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixia (X)</td>
<td>M. Publicius M. f. Fab. Sextius Calpurnianus</td>
<td><em>CIL V</em> 4459</td>
<td>hon.</td>
<td>c. mid-II</td>
<td>Brixia</td>
<td>[equo publico]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capua (I)</td>
<td>L. Campanius L. f. Flaccus</td>
<td><em>CIL X</em> 474</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>earlier I</td>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>tr. mil. leg. XV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

149 Eck 2000: 251 (equestrian procuratorial posts); Alföldy 1985: 122-6 (equestrian procuratorial and military posts).
150 Eck 1999: 5-22.
151 This man, L. *Afilanus Provincialis*, is discussed above in the section on the first-generation freeborn sons of the municipal freedmen, and therefore he is omitted from the current section.
152 Cf. De Carlo 2015: 76, on M. Campanius Marcellus of Capua below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capua (I)</td>
<td>M. Campanius</td>
<td>CIL X 3847</td>
<td>hon.</td>
<td>later II</td>
<td>Capua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. fil. M. nep. Fal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Marcellus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capua (I)</td>
<td>P. Campanius Geminus</td>
<td>AE 1972, 282</td>
<td>tess. hosp.</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Aquae Flaviae (Hispania Citerior)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capua (I)</td>
<td>P. Campanius Italicus</td>
<td>CIL VII 1064</td>
<td>vot.</td>
<td>mid-II</td>
<td>Praef. coh. I[1] Tun(grorum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cora (I)</td>
<td>Coranius Titianus</td>
<td>AE 1993, 1406</td>
<td>vot.</td>
<td>293-305</td>
<td>Photike (Achaia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentia (III)</td>
<td>Q. Prontentinus</td>
<td>CIL VI 3282</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>c. III</td>
<td>Raetia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna (VIII)</td>
<td>C. Publicius C. f. Cam.</td>
<td>AE 1948, 51</td>
<td>hon.</td>
<td>early III</td>
<td>Delphi (Achaia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Raven]na Proculeianus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urvinum Mat. (VI)</td>
<td>Q. Urvinus Crescens Livianus</td>
<td>CIL VIII 1440</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>c. III</td>
<td>Thibursicum Bure (Africa Proconsularis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>L. Publicius Apronianus</td>
<td>CIL IX 5842</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Auximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p(rimi) p(ilaris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>L. Publicius Florianus</td>
<td>CIL IX 5842</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Auximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>trib. coh. VIII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These sixteen examples of equestrians constitute just 3.5% of all the male descendants in the catalogue.\(^{155}\) Represented here are five different municipal *gentilicia* that correspond to a particular town, along with the Publicii who had origins in various towns. Tying each of these descendants to their eponymous town is a somewhat difficult task, but there are some promising leads. The possible links between the more successful Marci Arrecini and the Latin town of

\(^{154}\) I follow Sironen 2009: 185-6 no. 1, who reads this man’s *gentilicum* as *Coranius*, though Heil 1995: 159-62, noting that this governor probably erected separate statues to each of the four tetrarchs, suggested that the name should be emended to *Coronius* (see Solin and Salomies 1988: 61).

\(^{155}\) Again, the addition of L. Afilanus Provincialis of Afilae brings the total number of descendants registered in the equestrian order (i.e., sons and descendants) to seventeen.
Aricia have already been described above. An additional equestrian member of the gens, M. Arrecinus Gemellus, does not attest to the connection, since the inscription recording his position offers no information about an origin. In the case of the Campanii, two of the equestrians can be tied to Capua. M. Campanius Marcellus, who had an impressive equestrian career, maintained close links with his hometown, as indicated both by his enrollment in the voting tribe Falerna and by the fact that a group of Roman citizens from Cyprus, where Marcellus had once been governor, selected the town as the site for their honorific statue to him (CIL X 3847).156 L. Campanius Flaccus, who held a military tribunate in the XV Legion (Apollinaris or Primigenia), erected an epitaph for his deceased wife and for himself in Capua, and probably had a municipal career there before his appointment to an equestrian military post (CIL X 474).157

Among the equestrian Publicii, four men provide a voting tribe and show commemorative patterns that imply a local origin. The equestrian [L.] Publicius Consultinus was buried in Cupra Maritima along with his sister, in a separate monument, and he was enrolled in the local voting tribe Velina (CIL IX 5303).158 M. Publicius Sextius Calpurnianus received an honorific statue from the decurions of Brixia and two local collegia of which he was a patron, and he was registered in the local tribe Fabia (CIL V 4459).159 There is also the case of C. Publicius Proculeianus, who was honored in an inscription in Delphi that declared his origin as Ravenna and his membership in the local tribe Camilia (AE 1948, 51).160

For the rest of these equestrian descendants, it should be assumed that they (or their families) had left their eponymous hometown at some point before they entered the equestrian order, though in a few cases a descendant is only mentioned in an inscription in passing, with no indication at all of where he came from.

This dossier of equestrians offers the chance to observe some of the immediate factors that enabled these men to rise to the second order. Of the three equestrian Campanii, M. Campanius Marcellus is the most interesting in this regard (CIL X 3847). After a long military

156 Kubitschek 1889: 14-16.
157 Eck 1999: 15. De Carlo 2015: 74-6 proposes that the three men were from the same family line.
158 Kubitschek 1889: 63. Consultinus’ mother also commemorated his sister Publicia Bassilla (CIL IX 5304). Cupra Maritima is a Group II town, since there is no attestation of a familia publica there.
and administrative career in the Antonine or early Severan period, a grateful segment of Roman citizens from Cyprus erected a statue for him in his hometown of Capua.\footnote{\textit{PIR}\textsuperscript{2} C 372; Devijver 1976: 219-20 (\textit{PMI} C 71). The inscription is \textit{CIL} X 3847 (= \textit{ILS} 1398).}

\begin{verbatim}
\end{verbatim}

To M. Campanius Marcellus, son of Marcus, grandson of Marcus, of the voting tribe Falerna, procurator of the Augusti \textit{ad Mercurium} at Alexandria, procurator of the province of Cyprus, prefect of the Parthian wing of cavalry, tribune of the First Cohort of the Hemeseni, prefect of the Third Cohort of the Breuci, [the Roman citizens in the] province of Cyprus (erected this monument).

An overlooked yet important feature of his honorific inscription is the emphasis on his lineage in the family line of the Capuan Marci Campanii. The use of the filiation had long since become less fashionable, so when one encounters an inscription in which three generations are noted, there must be some intent behind the reference. On the one hand, if indeed Marcellus was the descendant of a municipal freedman of Capua, perhaps he was diffident about such an origin and was eager to boast of a freeborn pedigree in his more recent past. On the other hand, the reference to both his father and grandfather may signal that they, too, were prominent members of the elite in Capua, and that Marcellus was continuing such a tradition. Whether either of his ancestors were equestrians is unknown, but his own social ascent would have benefitted from such precursors.

Another feature that two of these equestrian descendants shared was a position in the municipal decurionate, apparently held before they reached equestrian status.\footnote{Mouritsen 2015: 236-8 notes the possibility that some men elevated to equestrian status may have tried simultaneously to continue holding their positions as decurons and, at times, also as magistrates in their hometown.} From the perspective of the decurionate as a tool of further social mobility, Duncan-Jones observed in a study of equestrians from towns in the North African provinces a typical pattern of a successful career in the municipal \textit{cursus honorum} leading to elevation to equestrian rank.\footnote{Duncan-Jones 1967: 152-86. He also cautions that the social landscape in North Africa in the second century CE may have been different from other areas of the Roman Empire, in that it was more difficult for prominent locals from these towns to catch the eye of the emperor or someone in the court. As a result, a more formalized, albeit unofficial, prerequisite of municipal office-holding may have become necessary for more impersonal grants of equestrian status. Cf. Saller 1982: 170-2; and on the phenomenon in Italy, Cébeillac-Gervasoni 1983; Cébeillac-Gervasoni 2000; and Mouritsen 2015: 236-9.} This interpretation is useful for making sense of otherwise confusing \textit{cursus} in personal inscriptions in
which the precise temporal relationship between a person’s municipal and equestrian career is ambiguous. Of course, there were some equestrian positions to be filled, and members of the municipal elite, with their wealth and honestas,\textsuperscript{164} were an obvious source for recruitment. Yet municipal office-holding was unlikely ever to have constituted any sort of formal prerequisite, and there are counter-examples of locals achieving the rank without completing the full municipal cursus or even entering it at all. At the same time, activities in local administration probably often served as a key indicator of how competent a man would be as an imperial official, and whether he was worthy to receive the honor of the equus publicus.

The career of L. Campanius Flaccus from Capua, detailed in the first-century CE epitaph he commissioned for himself and his wife, presents a useful case-study (CIL IX 71).\textsuperscript{165}

\begin{verbatim}
L(ucius) Campanius L(uci) f(ilius) / Flaccus / tr(ibunus) mil(itum) leg(ionis) XV, Ilvir,
pont(ifex), / q(uaestor) II, aed(ilis), praef(ectus) fabr(um), et sibi / et Verae uxori ---
\end{verbatim}

L. Campanius Flaccus, son of Lucius, tribune of soldiers of the XV Legion, duovir, pontifex, quaestor on two occasions, aedile, praefectus fabrum, for himself and for his wife Vera, (erected this epitaph) . . .

There seems to be no chronological sequencing of Flaccus’ cursus honorum, but all the elements are here to understand his career. He held all of the municipal offices in his namesake town, and was even appointed as a local pontifex, an addition that marks him out as particularly prestigious among the Capuan elite.\textsuperscript{166} Given that his career is dated to the first half of the first century CE, a system of popular election was probably still in place in Capua. It is thus conceivable that such success on the local scene then caught the eye of a senator who was eager to offer his patronage by getting Flaccus promoted to equestrian status through appointment to the entry-level post of praefectus fabrum. Several studies have attempted to understand precisely what duties this position entailed, but given that the selection was based primarily on patronage (perhaps with imperial approval), it seems that these praefecti served as personal aides to the senatorial commander who appointed them.\textsuperscript{167} Assumptions that this post opened doors for further

\textsuperscript{164} Forbis 1996: 69-71.
\textsuperscript{165} Panciera 1960: 23-4; Devijver 1976: 218 (PME C 69).
\textsuperscript{166} On the official priestly colleges in Roman towns, and the role of municipal elites, see Jarrett 1971: 513-38 (esp. 526-36), who deals mostly with evidence from the third century or later; and González and Crawford 1986: 200.
\textsuperscript{167} See discussion in Jarrett 1963: 222-3; and Dobson 1966: 61-84. Castrén 1975: 95-7 proposed that in some cases these praefecti may have been imperial appointees directed to oversee building projects in important towns that were funded by imperial patronage. It is also possible that on occasion this praefectura was purely honorary. Other theories, based on the inherent meaning in the title praefectus fabrum, hold that the office (originally) entailed a
promotion to a higher equestrian military office do not seem to be borne out by the epigraphic evidence, but in Flaccus’ case it may have aided his eventual promotion to the position of *tribunus militum* of the XV Legion (Apollinaris or Primigenia).\(^{168}\) To have enjoyed a functional equestrian military career as implied by his *cursus*, one must envision that Flaccus entered his municipal career at an early age, perhaps even before the age of 25 years which was required for the quaestorship.\(^ {169}\)

A second descendant with municipal origins, whose career fell approximately in the middle of the second century CE, appears to have had a much shorter official career in his hometown of Brixia (*CIL V* 4459).\(^ {170}\)

\[
M(\text{arco}) \ P(\text{ublicus})[\text{o}] / M(\text{arci}) \ f(\text{ilio}) \ F(\text{abia}) \ S(\text{extio}) / C(\text{alpurniano}) / [e]q[uo \ p\text{ublico}], / f\text{lam(ini)} \ d(\text{ivis}) \ I(\text{lui}) / p(\text{raefecto}) \ a(i)\text{edil(icia) pot(estate)}, / q(\text{uaestor(i) a}e\text{rar(ii)}, / s(\text{acerd(oti) i})\text{uven(um) Brixianor(um)}, / d(\text{efensor)} \ r\text{ei p(ublicae) Brix(ianorum)}, / c(\text{ollegia) cent}o(\text{n(ariorum)} \ e)\text{t} f\text{abror(um)}, / l(\text{ocus)} d(\text{eatus}) d(\text{ecreto) d(ecurionum)}).
\]

To M. Publicius Sextius Calpurnianus, son of Marcus, of the voting tribe Fabia, a Roman knight, *flamen of divus Iulius*, *praefectus* with aedilician authority, quaestor of the treasury, priest of the *iuvenes Brixiani*, *defensor* of the *res publica* of the Brixiani, the associations of *centonarii* and *fabri* (erected this monument). The place was granted by a decree of the decurions.

M. Publicius Sextius Calpurnianus, too, was adlected into the *ordo* of Brixia. The first magistracy he won was *quaestor aerarii*, a position in the local treasury. After this, he held only the extraordinary position of *praefectus aed(ilicia) pot(estate)*, which, at the aedilician level, replaced a current aedile who died in office or was removed from his post for some type of misconduct.\(^ {171}\) Besides these political offices, Calpurnianus was also appointed as the local *flamen divi Iul(i)*, an important position in the local cult of the former dictator,\(^ {172}\) held another supervisory role over military or civilian engineering projects. Another mystery about this office is the frequency with which it is found on the municipal level.

\(^ {168}\) Saller 1982: 131-4.

\(^ {169}\) Dig. 50.4.8 (Ulpian). It is noteworthy in this context that he held the quaestorship on two occasions, presumably before advancing to the aedileship. Based on calculations from such places as Canusium, the average age of duovirs seems to have been approximately 41 years, though epigraphic evidence demonstrates that in some cases a man could become duovir by his mid-thirties. Flaccus must have fallen into this latter category. See Duncan-Jones 1990: 93-6.


\(^ {171}\) See Gregori 1999: 140-2, 316. Much more common in Brixia and elsewhere is the *praefectus iure dicundo*, who served as a replacement for a deceased or removed duovir, or was appointed as a stand-in when the local *ordo* elected the emperor or a male member of the imperial family as honorary duovir for the year. See also De Ruggiero 1895: 245; and Bandelli and Chiabà 2008: 26-7.

\(^ {172}\) These flaminates often help to date an inscription, with the most recently deified emperor normally corresponding to their title. Yet there are other instances in which a town retained a *flamen* of a deified emperor who
priesthood in the local association of *iuvenes*, and was active as a patron of the local colleges of *centonarii* and *fabri*. He also held the post of *defensor rei p(ublicae) Brix(ianorum)* at some point in his career.\(^{173}\) The man in this position represented his community in a lawsuit, either in the local context or at Rome. It is only attested epigraphically three other times in Italy, though in each of these cases the man selected as *defensor* had a full career in the local municipal *cursus honorum*.\(^{174}\)

What should one make of this equestrian’s erratic municipal career, which included only an entry position as a quaestor and a replacement aedileship? Calpurnianus was clearly a very wealthy man, as indicated by his patronage, and he seems to have been active in the civic life of Brixia, with his cultic and juridical activities. Moreover, his standing in the town was high enough to oblige the decurions to erect a statue and base for him (*l.d.d.d.*). Is it possible that his ascent to equestrian rank came early in his life, and that after an undisclosed career in administration, he returned to his hometown and enjoyed a series of honorary positions, both within and outside the official *cursus*? Yet in such a scenario, one assumes that instead of taking up a quaestorship or replacement office, he would have received the duovirate. Alternatively, did he begin a typical municipal career, but was drawn off into equestrian service before he could advance further? A better solution may be that there was simply so much competition for the upper offices within the *ordo* of Brixia that even a wealthy man like Calpurnianus failed to gain the topmost positions. In support of this theory are four other local career trajectories that make his own career seem much less an aberration. In each case, men whose wealth and standing are made clear by their associations and activities were only able to reach the position of *praefectus aedilicia potestate*, while one of them obtained equestrian status like Calpurnianus did.\(^{175}\) One must therefore wonder whether our man’s appointment as *flamen divi Iul(i)* and *defensor rei*

---

174 Ostian decurion defending nearby Vicus Augustanus (*AE* 2007, 285; second century CE (?); see Bruun 2007: 11-15); Alliae (CIL IX 2354 = *ILS* 6512; late second-early third century CE); Ameria (CIL XI 4389; second century CE). See Bruun 2007: 11-15 on the earlier version of this office, before the mid-fourth century CE.
175 *CIL* V 4468 = *ILS* 5607 = *Inscr.It* 10\(^5\), 257: M. Salvidien(us) Vettian(us); *CIL* V 4904 = *Inscr.It* 10\(^5\), 1127: M. Laetil(ius) Cassianus; *CIL* V 749 = *ILS* 4873: C. Pettius Philtatus; *AE* 1972, 206 = *Inscr.It* 10\(^5\), 194: M. Calpurnius Acilianus (perhaps a relative of Calpurnianus on his mother’s side, as signaled by his polyonymy). C. Pettius Philtatus (*CIL* V 749 = *ILS* 4873) also reached the equestrian order.
were meant as a form of compensation, since they would ordinarily accrue to a higher level decurion. In this context, then, Calpurnianus’ time in the decurionate of Brixia seems likely to have factored little into his receiving of the equus publicus. Instead, the hand of imperial or senatorial patronage emerges as the probable impetus behind his advancement into the equestrian order.

It is tempting to see a direct correlation between status as a decurion and elevation to equestrian rank. Indeed, it is logical that the municipal elites were a prime recruiting pool for new equestrians, since they were wealthy and often had gained some administrative skills. It is fair to say that many of the decurial descendants who entered the equestrian order were the cream of their local elite. Yet this correlation should not be pushed too far. Certainly, thousands of decurions around the Empire never managed to enter the order, or simply chose not to take up the trappings of the rank. Moreover, there were plenty of equestrians from the municipal ranks who held only a lower-level local office or no offices at all, including some of the descendants represented here. In some cases at least, a municipal résumé may have constituted a different avenue for promotion for decurions who lacked strong links to personal patronage.

One final example that seems to underscore the lack of a direct link between the municipal ordo and promotion to equestrian status comes from Beneventum in the third century CE (CIL IX 1663).

C(aius) Concordius Syria(cus) eq(ues) R(omanus), comm(entariensis) rei p(ublicae) / Benevent(anorum), munerarius / bidui, poeta Latinus co/ronatus in mune(re) pa/trieae suae, et vi(xy) us / sibi fecit, qui vixit / ann(os) LVIII, m(enses) VI, d(ies) XII, / hor(as) III. // <S>esterti, / primus / Beneventi / studi(or)um or/chestopales / instituisti.

C. Concordius Syriacus, eques Romanus, commentariensis of the res publica of the Beneventani, he staged games for two days, a champion Latin poet in a contest in his hometown, he erected (this monument) for himself while living. He lived 58 years, six months, twelve days, and three hours. (On the right side) (S)esterius, you were the first at Beneventum to institute the association of orchestopales (pantomimes?).

This man was probably a recent descendant of a municipal freedman of the colony. What is most remarkable about his case is that he seems to have made the leap to equestrian status from

---

177 The connection of the inscription on the right side to the main text is unclear, though Buonocore’s (1992: 72-3 no. 45) suggestion that it referred to Concordius Syriacus’ establishing of a local association of his fellow pantomimes makes sense. [S]esterius is an attested cognomen at Forum Iulii (CIL XII 267), but it may be a nickname ascribed to Syriacus here.
only a minor municipal post, *commentariensis rei publicae*, which was probably a clerical post in the colony’s administration.\(^{179}\) This example would seem to suggest that Syriacus’ municipal career played no role in his new status.\(^{180}\) Perhaps his renown as a poet brought him patronage, or he simply may have qualified for the equestrian census without a specific appointment.

It should also be noted that the army could function as a vehicle for social advancement, in select cases leading to entry into the equestrian order. A portion of the soldiers who were fortunate enough to obtain a legionary staff position among the *principales* or a high post in the Praetorian Guard or urban cohorts might hope one day to advance to the senior post of *primus pilus* centurion in a legion, which brought with it elevation to equestrian status.\(^{181}\) Our set of equestrians contains one example of this pattern in the form of a second-century CE epitaph from Auximum (*CIL* IX 5842).\(^{182}\)

\[
D(is) M(anibus) / L(uci) Publici Apro/nian(i) p(rimi) p(ili), / patroni / municipi(i) / Riciniensis, / [-----] / [--- ae]dilis, / L(ucius) Publicius / Florianus / trib(unus) / coh(ortis) / VIII.
\]

To the departed spirits of L. Publicius Apronianus, *primipilaris*, patron of the *municipium* of the Ricinienses, [------ ae]dile, L. Publicius Florianus, tribune of the Ninth Cohort, (erected this epitaph).

It is reasonable to suspect that Florianus was Apronianus’ son, given their shared *praenomen* and *gentilicium* and their relationship as dedicand and dedicatee in the text.\(^{183}\) The pair’s connection to Auximum is not entirely clear. It has been argued that Apronianus was actually from the Roman colony of Tarraco in Hispania Tarraconensis, based on an epitaph erected there by a Publicius Apronianus who identified himself as *hast(atus) leg. XXII Pr(imigeniae)* (*CIL* II 4146).\(^{184}\) After a successful career that culminated in his receiving the rank

\(^{178}\) Güterborck 1982: 155, pointing to his *cognomen* Syriacus as a potential indicator of his eastern origins, suggests that he could have been a *peregrinus* to whom Beneventum bestowed local citizenship. Cf. Bruun 2008: 545-7, 551-2 for a similar suggestion about P. Ostiensis Macedo, a decurion from Ostia in the early second century CE.

\(^{179}\) *Cod. Iust.* 1.27.1.8; *Dig.* 49.14.45.7 (Paulus). See Buonocore 1992: 72-3 no. 45. Some juridical writings imply that the *commentariensis* also may have had a role in administering a town’s prison. See, for example, *Cod. Iust.* 9.4.4; and *Dig.* 48.20.6 (Ulpian); and 48.3.8 (Paulus).

\(^{180}\) Cf. Torelli 2002: 242-3 n. 280.

\(^{181}\) Breeze and Dobson 1993: 201-17; Dobson 2000: 139-51; Bingham 2013: 60-6.

\(^{182}\) See Gentili 1955: 158 no. 9; Cecchi and Mozzicafreddo 1968: 212. On the son Florianus, see *PIR*\(^2\) P 1041.

\(^{183}\) It is also possible that the two men were brothers.

\(^{184}\) Richier 2004: 359-60 no. 315, 388, 636-9, 664-9. The reference to his wife using the superlative *rarissimae* may suggest a date of the late second or early third century CE, roughly coeval with our man in Auximum. On the typical second-century practice of legionary recruitment among Roman citizens in colonies in the provinces, see Mann
of *primipilaris* in an unknown legion, so this argument goes, the emperor set him up with a bonus and placed him in the Italian town of Ricina, where he was expected to engage in the kind of local patronage that is reflected in his epitaph.\(^{185}\) According to this scenario, Apronianus, and Florianus with him, would not be connected to a municipal freedman line from an Italian town.

This narrative makes several assumptions, and it hinges too much on unclear onomastic connections to be considered definitive. While it is true that the *gentilicium* Publicius and the *cognomen* Apronianus were well represented throughout the Spanish provinces, neither name is at all rare.\(^{186}\) In the towns of Picenum, too, one can point to numerous Publicii, and the *cognomen* Apronianus is found in inscriptions all over Italy. It should also be noted that the Tarraco epitaph contains no *praenomen*, which would make the identification more secure. All this is to state that we may be dealing with two different men.

It makes equal sense to locate Apronianus’ origin somewhere in Picenum, perhaps Ricina, and it is possible that he returned to his hometown to enjoy municipal honors after he had left the army. In this case, Apronianus could be connected to a municipal freedman line. Ricina is in the Group III category of towns, which means that there is no clear attestation of a *familia publica*, though one municipal slave is known from Auxium.\(^{187}\) Nevertheless, it is unknown whether potential ex-slaves of either town would bear the *gentilicium* Auximius, Auximas, Ricinius, Riciniensis, *vel sim.*, or the widely used name Publicius.\(^{188}\)

Regardless of his origin, the first important point to note about Apronianus’ achievement of the rank of *primus pilus*, and with it equestrian status, is that it not only conferred plenty of economic and social rewards, but it seems likely also to have paved the way for his son’s ascent into the ‘administrative aristocracy’ of the equestrian service, in the form of a command position of one of the praetorian cohorts.\(^{189}\) The second point of interest here is the entry of this *primus pilus* into the local elite in Auximum, whether it was his hometown or adopted town. He held the aedileship, and perhaps another office was inscribed in the lost portion of the text (duovir?).

---

183: 49-68, 192-3. Richier 2004: 359-60 no. 315 points out that the wife’s *gentilicium* Aufidia is fairly widespread in the Spanish provinces, including in the region around Tarraco.

185 Cf. Dobson 2000: 139-52. There is also one other *primipilaris* in Auximum who also had a municipal career there, though his voting tribe Velina place his origins in the town (*CIL* IX 5840 = *ILS* 2085).

186 Included in this list of Publicii/ae is a pair of municipal freedwomen from Saguntum, which is not far from Tarraco (*CIL* II²/14, 378 = *CIL* II 6027).


188 There is no epigraphic attestation of the *gentilicium* Auximius, *vel sim.*, but there are two men who bear the *gentilicium* Ricinius: *CIL* VI 6986 (Rome); and *CIL* XIV 2108 (Lanuvium).

Aside from the material rewards of legionary service, a veteran who settled in a Roman community was often in a strong position to join the ruling *ordo* in communities of Roman citizens, and there is plenty of evidence demonstrating this phenomenon, particularly from provincial zones.\(^{190}\)

These equestrians represent an important step in the success of a narrow segment of the families of the municipal freedmen. This success was, however, limited. While membership in the equestrian order was not hereditary, one may expect to find in the evidence signs of more continuity in this social rank across generations. In reality, however, many of these families probably failed to maintain their position for more than one or perhaps two generations, for various reasons, before falling out of the equestrian rank again.

**IV.3.4 MUNICIPAL ELITE**

Some of the evidence treated above hinted that a career in the municipal decurionate on occasion may have strengthened a person’s chances for further social mobility, such as entering the equestrian order. Yet for the vast majority of families from Roman *municipia* and *coloniae*, producing a freeborn son for the municipal council of decurions represented in itself the highest aspiration that could be entertained. Entry into the council, whether following popular election to office or through the later process of direct adlection, was after all the pinnacle of honors in the municipal context. Although local families with a long aristocratic pedigree often controlled the council and monopolized the highest offices for generations, demographic and social realities also made it necessary to recruit new members from below, and probably with some frequency.\(^{191}\) These newcomers certainly included the descendants of prominent local freedmen.

This theme of freedmen’s descendants in the *ordo* has received much attention from Roman historians. Using a variety of techniques to identify the descendants of all types of ex-slaves,\(^{192}\) standard estimates are frequently quoted to understand how successful such men were in their pursuit of the decurionate, primarily in the Italian towns that have left a large enough epigraphic patrimony for a systematic analysis. Studies of Pompeian decurions and candidates


\(^{191}\) Callistratus alludes to the acceptance of such recruitment, though he seems only to be thinking about merchants and criminals (*Dig. 50.2.12: eos qui utensilia negotiantur et vendunt, licet ab aedilibus caeduntur, non oportet quasi viles personas neglegi. denique non sunt prohibiti huiusmodi homines decurionatum vel aliquem honorem in sua patria petere: nec enim infames sunt*).

for office in the decades before the eruption suggest that just over 20% were the recent
descendants of freedmen, while slightly lower figures are found among the decurions at Ostia
(13%) and Puteoli (15%) in the late first and second centuries.\textsuperscript{193} Even at Beneventum, a large
inland urban center in southern Italy, as many as 25% of decurions in the second century show
typical onomastic features connected to ‘servile’ origins.\textsuperscript{194}

These findings indicate that the descendants of ex-slaves constituted a significant
recruiting pool for new decurions in most towns, but scholars have been divided on how to
evaluate their access to political power. The earlier model for interpreting these statistics
envisioned a ‘social revolution’ in these towns, whereby the families of local freedmen who had
amassed sufficient wealth and social standing forced their way into the municipal council and
supplanted many of the established aristocratic families.\textsuperscript{195} More recent scholarship, however,
has backed away from this theory, pointing out the ways that its assumptions are flawed.\textsuperscript{196} For
one thing, most of the data for the earlier studies come from epitaphs, the epigraphic medium in
which freedmen and their recent descendants were overrepresented.\textsuperscript{197} The overall effect of
quantifying such material is an inflated impression of what proportion of the \textit{ordo} these ‘new
men’ comprised. As an alternative, Mouritsen and others have theorized that social mobility
among freedmen’s descendants depended not so much on groups of newcomers systematically
advancing their cause armed with fresh social and economic stature, but rather on \textit{ad hominem}
promotion by the established elite seeking new blood for the council.\textsuperscript{198} On balance, while the
epigraphic record is too lacunose ever to reflect the full impact of freedmen’s descendants on the
decurionate, most historians agree that the leap from ‘servile’ origins to the municipal \textit{ordo}
within a few generations should not be considered a rare occurrence.

\textsuperscript{193} For Pompeii, see Gordon 1931: 69-70; and Castrén 1975: 96-121; for Ostia, see Meiggs 1973: 189-91, 196-211;
for Puteoli, see D’Arms 1974: 110-13; and D’Arms 1981: 139-40. In contrast to these figures, Segenni 1990: 30-2
found a much lower proportion of decurions from freedman families in Amiernun, a small town in Samnium where
economic opportunities were fewer than in larger urban centers, particularly port cities. Cf. López Barja de Quiroga
\textsuperscript{194} Garnsey 1975: 178.
analysis of ‘tomb-builders’ at Ostia.
\textsuperscript{196} See, for example, Mouritsen 2001: 30-5; Mouritsen 2004: 281-304; and Mouritsen 2011: 207-9.
\textsuperscript{197} Taylor 1961: 113-32. It has also been pointed out that the extant portions of \textit{alba} and \textit{fasti} recording decurions in
several towns, which constitute an official record, show a considerably lower proportion of descendants with
suspected ‘servile’ origins than is suggested by the evidence from personal epitaphs. On this issue, see Camodeca
1996a: 171-8 (on Herculanum); and Mouritsen 1997: 57-78 (Pompeii, pp. 62-8; Ostia, pp. 68-70; Puteoli, pp. 70-2;
Beneventum, pp. 72-3). See also Kleijwegt 1993: 45-53.
\textsuperscript{198} Mouritsen 2011: 276-8.
These analyses of the municipal elite provide essential context for my study of the descendants of municipal freedmen who managed to reach the decurionate. In some respects, these descendants’ nomenclature offers a greater chance to observe longer-term family trajectories, specifically after the first or second freeborn generations that often carried the more explicit markers of recent descent from a freedman. 199 This section seeks to understand the potential family connections between these decurions and the municipal freedmen known to us, and to estimate how these descendants’ participation in the municipal decurionate, in their hometown or elsewhere, compares to the more general picture of ex-slave families’ success quoted in the studies above.

We have already seen that two sons of municipal freedmen entered their local council, 200 and that two descendants achieved equestrian status as well as reaching the decurionate. 201 In total, the catalogue of municipal freedmen’s descendants includes 34 who reached the decurionate. They are recorded in the following table.

Table IV.6 Municipal freedmen’s descendants in the ordo decurionum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of origin</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location of inscription</th>
<th>Mun. rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aeclanum</td>
<td>C. Aeclanius Fortunatus</td>
<td>EE VIII 340</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>late II-early III</td>
<td>Aeclanum</td>
<td>decurioni Aeclanensi; IIviro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asisium</td>
<td>Q. Asisienus Q. f. Tro. Agrippa</td>
<td>CIL III 2920</td>
<td>hon.</td>
<td>I-early II</td>
<td>Iader (Dalmatia)</td>
<td>aed.; IIviro; pontifici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Campanius L. f. Tro. Varus</td>
<td>CIL III 8787</td>
<td>hon.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Salona (Dalmatia)</td>
<td>aedili; IIIviro i.d.; IIIviro iure dicund. quinquennal; auguri; flamini; praefecto fabrum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

199 Namely, having a Greek cognomen. See discussion of this onomastic feature in Mouritsen 2011: 123-7; and Bruun 2013: 22-5.
200 C. Publicius Artemidorianus (CIL IX 3945, Alba Fucens); L. Saeptius Orestes (CIL IX 2472, Saepinum).
201 L. Campanius Flaccus (CIL X 474, Capua); M. Publicius Sextius Calpurnianus (CIL V 4459, Brixia).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>CIL</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>L. Campanianus Celer</td>
<td>CIL III 5443a</td>
<td>vot.</td>
<td>mid-II-III</td>
<td>Flavia Solva (Noricum)</td>
<td>†sacerdos urbis Romae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>L. Campanianus L. f. Flaccus</td>
<td>CIL X 474</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>early I</td>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>Ilvir; pont.; quaestor II; aed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>Sex. Campanianus Reditus</td>
<td>CIL XI 2913</td>
<td>dedic.</td>
<td>Severan</td>
<td>Visentium</td>
<td>†curatore carrying out decreto decurionum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cora</td>
<td>Corani(us) Victor</td>
<td>ILAlg 2² 4523</td>
<td>vot.</td>
<td>II-III</td>
<td>Thibilis (Numid.)</td>
<td>[mag(ister) Thibil(itanorum)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Cremonius Albucius</td>
<td>CIL XII 18</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>later II</td>
<td>Vintium (Alpes Mar.)</td>
<td>dec(urioni) Vint(iensium); Ilvirali; sacerdotali; omnibus honoribus functo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispellum</td>
<td>L. Hispellatius Sabinianus</td>
<td>CIL XI 4212</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>I-II</td>
<td>Interamna Nah.</td>
<td>aed.; IIIrvir i.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>P. Ostiensis Macedo</td>
<td>CIL XIV 244</td>
<td>fasti</td>
<td>c. late I</td>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>†pontif. Volcani et aedium sacrarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bononia</td>
<td>C. Publicius</td>
<td>CIL XI 729</td>
<td>dedici.</td>
<td>early I</td>
<td>Bononia</td>
<td>quaestoribus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alba Fuc.</td>
<td>°C. Publicius Artemidorianus</td>
<td>CIL IX 3945</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Alba Fucens</td>
<td>IIIrvir aed(ilis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesernia</td>
<td>D. Publicius D. f. &lt;T&gt;rom. Ephebus</td>
<td>CIL IX 2666</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Aesernia</td>
<td>aed. pot.; IIIrvir i.d.; IIIrvir lege Petronia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auximum (?)</td>
<td>L. Publicius Apronianus</td>
<td>CIL IX 5842</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Auximum</td>
<td>[---]; [ae]dilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixia</td>
<td>*M. Publicius M. f. Fab. Sextius Calpurnianus</td>
<td>CIL V 4459</td>
<td>hon.</td>
<td>c. mid-II</td>
<td>Brixia</td>
<td>flam. divi Iul(i); praef. aedil. pot.; quaestor(i) aed(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canusium</td>
<td>P. Publicius Maximus</td>
<td>CIL IX 338</td>
<td>album</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>Canusium</td>
<td>(decurio) pedanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canusium</td>
<td>P. Publicius Maximus Iun(ior)</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> IX 338</td>
<td><em>album</em></td>
<td>223</td>
<td>Canusium</td>
<td><em>(decurio) praetextatus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puteoli</td>
<td>Puteolanus Demetrianus</td>
<td><em>EDCS</em> 224</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>mid-IV</td>
<td>Puteoli</td>
<td>†omnia honoribus functo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puteoli</td>
<td>C. Put[coelianus]] Flaccus</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 1996, 423</td>
<td>decree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Puteoli</td>
<td>†signatory to a decretum decurionum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puteoli</td>
<td>Q. Puteolanus Aquila</td>
<td><em>TPSulp 24</em></td>
<td>wax tabl.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Puteoli</td>
<td>praefectus (i.d.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saepinum</td>
<td>°L. Saepinius Orestes</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> IX 2472</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>earlier II</td>
<td>Saepinum</td>
<td><em>IIIvir(o) aed(ili)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentinum</td>
<td>L. Sentinas L. f. Lem. Verus</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> XI 5761-2</td>
<td>hon.</td>
<td>c. late II-early III</td>
<td>Sentinum</td>
<td><em>IIIvir(o) quinq. i.d.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentinum</td>
<td>Sex. Sentinas Maximus</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> III 7805</td>
<td>hon.</td>
<td>160-180</td>
<td>Apulum (Dacia)</td>
<td>†magistrate in first year of colony’s existence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarvisium</td>
<td>C. Tarvi(sius) A. f. Secundus</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 2006, 470</td>
<td>vot.</td>
<td>early I</td>
<td>Tarvisium</td>
<td><em>IIIvir a(edilicia) p(otestate)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urvinum Mat.</td>
<td>C. Urvinus Senecio</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 1994, 559</td>
<td>dedic.</td>
<td>early I</td>
<td>Trebula Mut.</td>
<td>†co-dedicand for honorific inscription ( arbitratu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veii</td>
<td>C. Veianius Maximus</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> XI 3805</td>
<td>decree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Veii</td>
<td>†signatory to a decretum decurionum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volceii</td>
<td>C. Volceius Magnus</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 1975, 142</td>
<td>dedic.</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Lanuvium</td>
<td>eponymous <em>IIvir</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These 34 descendants who reached the decurionate represent approximately 7% of all the male descendants in the catalogue. To the extent that such quantification can be illustrative, this is a relatively high figure to have joined the local elite from any cohesive social group in the municipal context. It must be emphasized about our group, however, that this picture of success is probably exaggerated, since the descendants who became part of the municipal elite were far more likely than their relatives in the lower classes to leave their mark in epigraphic commemoration. Furthermore, there are other, more nuanced, ways of measuring their impact.
Decurions and their family lines

The first point of interest in these decurions is establishing where they fit into the larger network of branches stemming from putative municipal freedmen. One method for estimating how many generations a decurion was removed from an ex-slave ancestor would be to survey the use of the filiation. In this case, however, no decurion cites a generation beyond his father. Another method takes into consideration these decurions’ cognomina and what this nomenclature may suggest about the identity of their parents. Though far from definitive, a good rule of thumb is that a Greek cognomen is more likely than a Latin one to indicate recent descent from an ex-slave couple, especially among Romans in the sub-elite population. Of the 32 descendants who reached the decurionate, just four bore a Greek cognomen, and there is no information on the nomenclature of the parents of any of them. It is also worth noting in this discussion that the two first-generation freeborn sons of municipal freedmen who reached the decurionate in their hometown both possessed a Greek cognomen: L. Saepinius Orestes of Saepinum (CIL IX 2472), and C. Publicius Artemidorianus of Alba Fucens (CIL IX 3945). Aside from what nomenclature may suggest, however, it is reasonable to assume that in most cases at least a few generations separated the municipal freedmen from their decurial descendants. This is suggested by, among other things, some descendants’ settlement away from their eponymous town of origin, particularly over long distances to the provinces. In practical terms, moreover, it took time for families to build up wealth and connections.

Another important way of putting the success of the decurions in context is to link them to municipal freedmen ancestors who built a useful social and economic base that aided their advancement. One such link that has received attention in scholarship is that between an ancestor who achieved the *Augustalitas and a descendant who entered the local decurionate. Only two potential cases present themselves in our evidence, based on shared praenomina and gentilicia by *Augustales and decurions. A probable ex-slave of Capua named L. Campanius Sosimenes entered the Augustales in the first or second century (CIL X 3944), but the only corresponding family member who reached the decurionate in their eponymous city, L. Campanius Flacus

---

202 M. Arrecinus Helius (AE 2007, 692); P. Ostiensis Macedo (CIL XIV 244; AE 1954, 221); D. Publicius Ephebus (CIL I 2666); Puteolanus Demetrianus (EDCS 224). This metric may be of only limited use for this group, however, since of the 265 secure and probable municipal freedmen themselves, the distribution of cognomina is c. 55% Latin and 41.5% Greek.

203 See, for example, the studies of Silvestrini 2000: 431-55 (whose evidence casts doubt on a clear connection) and Bruun 2015c: 3-20.
(CIL X 474), did so several generations before Sosimenes. One of the ex-slaves of Ostia, P. Ostiensis Thallus, joined the colony’s seviri Augustales probably at the beginning of the second century (CIL XIV 290), and he may be related to P. Ostiensis Macedo, the only family member known to have become a decurion (CIL XIV 244). Yet in this case, too, it is not possible to assume a strict chronological – or blood – relationship between the two men.

Other associations may hold similar analytical value. For instance, the probable municipal freedman Sentinas Ianuarius was a high priest in the cult of Deus Sol Invictus Mithras in his hometown of Sentinum sometime in the third century CE, a position that seems to signal prosperity (CIL XI 5737). If Ianuarius can be dated to nearer the beginning of that century, a temporal connection could be envisioned between him and L. Sentinas Verus, who held the offices of IIIvir quinquennalis and i(ure) d(icundo) in Sentinum in approximately the same period (CIL XI 5761-2). Occurring broadly in this same chronology was the career of another municipal freedman’s freeborn son, C. Sentinas Iustus, whose position as a scriba publicus of Sentinum signals upward mobility for his family (CIL XI 5760).

These possible cases notwithstanding, the most glaring feature of this prosopographical survey is that so few direct familial connections can be made between the municipal freedmen and the descendants who reached the decurionate. The evidence at our disposal thus does not seem strong enough to posit a direct correlation between the two groups, making it more difficult to offer explanations for why these descendants succeeded where the vast majority of their counterparts did not. Looking at the issue from the opposite perspective, an equally reasonable question to ask is why the group of prosperous municipal freedmen in the *Augustales and other urban associations, albeit a relatively small group to begin with, spawned so few successful descendants. This gap, of course, may be chalked up to the chance survival of inscriptions, but one other explanation is that for most of these ex-slaves success was short-lived, with little lasting impact on the lives of their descendants.

---

205 The dating of Thallus to about 100 CE is based on the use of formula D(is) M(anibus) with the genitive case. Likewise, the fragment of the fasti Ostienses that records L. Ostiensis Macedo seems to cover the early second century CE; he held the position of pontifex Volkani in about 105. See Cébeillac-Gervasoni, Caldelli, and Zevi 2006: 294-5. Note also Bruun’s 2008: 545-7 suggestion that Macedo could have been an elite peregrinus to whom Ostia offered citizenship and an honorary set of positions.
Status in the town council

A second indicator of these descendants’ impact on the decurionate is their standing within the hierarchy of the municipal council. A useful guideline for assessing their status is to focus only on epitaphs and honorific inscriptions commemorating a decurion, which tend to offer the most complete picture of that man’s career. In addition, any type of inscription that lists a decurion in the highest offices should also be counted. There are 22 such cursus honorum in our set. Six decurions whose careers date from the Late Republic to the first century CE show clear signs of holding a series of local offices, an indication that they reached the ordo through popular election to office and holding the aedileship. In these cases, it may be assumed that they were able to cultivate public favor with their fellow munipites or coloni.

In Italian towns where the system of direct adlection of new decurions seems to have become increasingly important in the late first and second centuries, a new set of factors came into play for a man’s promotion into the decurionate, through a process controlled by the established elite in the ordo. The majority of the descendants in this set (16) probably entered the council by this method, being admitted to the council without first holding office. For example, the epitaph commemorating C. Aeclanius Fortunatus records his status in his hometown of Aeclanum as decurioni Aeclanensium Ilviro munerari(o) sple(n)dido (EE VIII 340, later second or early third century).

D(is) M(anibus) / C(ai) Aeclani / Fortunati / decurioni(s) Aecl/anensium, Ilviro, / munerari(o) sple(n)dido, vixit annis / XXXV, men(sibus) XI, d(ie) I, / Aeclanius Iovanus / lib(ertus).

To the departed spirits of C. Aeclanius Fortunatus, decurion of the Aeclanenses, duovir, outstanding muneratorius, who lived 35 years, 11 months, and 1 day, Aeclanius Iovanus, his freedman, (erected this epitaph).

Unless he listed only the highest office he achieved, the implication of Fortunatus’ omission of lower positions is that he had been adlected into the town council and at some point thereafter he achieved the top honor of duovir, in response to which he probably staged the games noted in the text.

206 CIL I 3173; CIL III 2920; CIL III 8787; CIL X 474; CIL XI 4807; TPSulp 24.
207 AE 1975, 142; AE 1981, 238; AE 1988, 249; AE 2007, 692; CIL V 4459; CIL IX 284; CIL IX 2472; CIL IX 2666; CIL IX 5842; CIL XI 4212; CIL XI 5761-2; CIL XII 18: EDCS 224; EE 81, 340; ILAlg 22, 4523; ILAlg 22, 4653.
208 Evangelisti 2011: 46-7 no. 18. The inscription was found in Neapolis.
In all, approximately 60% \((N = 13)\) of our decurions reached the post of duovir or quattuorvir \textit{iure dicundo}, the highest ordinary position in the municipal or colonial structure,\(^{209}\) while an additional four men (c. 18%) were \textit{quinquennales}, the censorial senior magistrates appointed every fifth year.\(^{210}\) The main conclusion to be drawn from such cases is that the leading local decurions apparently found the municipal freedmen’s descendants in question worthy candidates to bring into the more exclusive section of the \textit{ordo}, whether their families originated in their hometown or elsewhere. This level of success by these descendants of ex-slaves challenges recent models suggesting that the traditional aristocracies of Roman towns frequently maintained a tight grip on the senior offices, while constraining newcomers from the lower classes in the lower-level offices or perhaps in a non-office holding category (\textit{pedanus}).\(^{211}\) Other descendants in the set who were adlected into their local \textit{ordo} fit this latter profile. Just less than one-quarter of them \((N = 5)\) only held lower-level offices or had no record of office-holding at any rank, but were evidently adlected into the council as \textit{pedani}.\(^{212}\) Decurions with this designation – whether or not it constituted an explicit rank – represented an inferior status within the \textit{ordo}.

Two examples are instructive for understanding what qualifications the council sought in the \textit{pedani}. The first case is C. Umbrius Concordius Secundus, who around the beginning of the third century CE was adlected into the \textit{ordo} of Beneventum, his hometown according to his nomenclature and voting tribe Stellatina (\textit{AE} 1981, 238).\(^{213}\)

\[
D(is)\ M(anibus)\ Sollerti\ //\ C(ai)\ Umbri\ C(ai)\ f(filii)\ Stel(latina)\ /\ Concordi\ Secundi,\ /\ adlect(i)\ in\ ord(inem)\ dec(urionum),\ /\ Concordia\ Prima\ mat(er)\ /\ b(ene)\ m(erenti)\ f(ecit).
\]

To the departed spirits of C. Umbrius Concordius Secundus, (nicknamed) \textit{Sollertius}, who was adlected into the council of decurions, his mother Concordia Prima erected (this epitaph) for her well-deserving (son).

His mother, who gave her son his second \textit{gentilicum}, was surely connected to one of the family lines of municipal freedmen of the colony who bore the name Concordius.\(^{214}\) Her own contemporary family must have enjoyed some prestige in Beneventum, considering that she

\(^{209}\) \textit{AE} 1975, 142; \textit{AE} 2007, 692; \textit{CIL} III 2920; \textit{CIL} IX 284; \textit{CIL} IX 2666; \textit{CIL} X 474; \textit{CIL} XI 4212; \textit{CIL} XI 4807; \textit{CIL} XII 18; \textit{EE} 8, 340; \textit{ILAlg} 2\(^2\), 4523; \textit{ILAlg} 2\(^2\), 4653; \textit{TPSulp} 24.

\(^{210}\) \textit{AE} 1988, 249; \textit{CIL} 13173; \textit{CIL} III 8787; \textit{CIL} XI 5761-2.


\(^{212}\) \textit{AE} 1981, 238; \textit{AE} 2006, 470; \textit{CIL} IX 338; \textit{CIL} IX 2472; \textit{CIL} IX 5842.

\(^{213}\) Secundus also bears the nickname \textit{Sollertius} in the epitaph.

seems to have married into the prosperous gens Umbria that provided a pair of local decurions and celebrated patrons in this same period. In this case, Secundus himself was therefore a suitable enough candidate for adlection into the council, but evidently not for advancement into ‘full’ decurial status, according to the cursus inscribed in his epitaph. Perhaps he was too recently linked to a municipal freedman on his mother’s side.

The album listing the decurions of Canusium in 223 CE may be able to shed even more light on this issue, offering a rare glimpse at some possible socio-political dynamics behind the ascent of two descendants with a ‘servile’ origin to decurial rank in the small town (CIL IX 338).

As discussed above, the council of Canusium seems likely to have undergone an expansion in the later second or early third century, possibly because the town needed to generate more funds through the addition of new decurions. The document reflects a formally stratified ordo in which the decurions are listed by the magisterial ranks they had achieved after first being adlected into the council: quinquennalicius, Iviralicius, aedilicius, quaestoricius, pedanus. Among those registered were the father and son P. Publicii Maximi, descendants of a freedman of the colony. The elder Maximus had been adlected into the council, and is listed among those with non-office-holding status (pedanus), while his son was recruited into what appears to be a reserve pool of future decurions, the praetextati, who were awaiting an actual seat. It has been suggested that these young praetextati were likely destined for full magisterial decurial careers when the time came, which is implied by the fact that the majority of them were related to older decurions listed in the higher ranks, with matching combinations of praenomina and gentilicia. Such a scenario would seem to hint at incremental generational advancement for the P. Publicii Maximi in the Canusian ordo. While the father was evidently a less acceptable recruit

---

216 Secundus’ career is included in his own epitaph, which can be expected to record his full cursus honorum. His age at death is not listed in the text, but unless he was a young man, one must conclude that he remained in the secondary group of decuriones adlecti.
217 See above, pp. 200-2.
218 Silvestrini 1990: 595-602. Cf. Salway 2000: 123-33, who argues that perhaps the only group to have received direct adlection from the outside were those listed among the quinquennalici with the designation allecti inter quinquennales.
219 One secure municipal freedman of Canusium is known, C. Poblicius Eros (CIL IX 396). His epitaph is dated to the first century CE. The father and son P. Publicii Maximi are not counted in the calculation above, since the album registering them provides only a snapshot, and we cannot know for sure whether one or both of them eventually advanced to a higher rank.
220 Cf. Jacques 1984:478-83, who speculates that many of these pedani might never have hoped to advance.
to become a ‘full’ decurion, perhaps because of more recent descent from a *libertus*, the council may have deemed his son as sufficiently removed from such origins to put him on the track to full status in the future.

**Setting for advancement to the decurionate**

This discussion of status within the *ordo decurionum* leads to a third area of inquiry into this group of municipal freedmen’s descendants, namely, where they reached the decurionate. In an earlier section of this chapter, settlement and migration patterns were quantified for the descendants whose town of origin can be ascertained, and it was shown that less than 10% of the descendants remained in their eponymous hometown. Within this narrow group, those with an origin in the larger cities of Italy tended to remain far more often than those from smaller towns, surely a byproduct of the greater non-agricultural economic opportunities to be found in the cities. Of those descendants who settled elsewhere, the most observable trends were persistent migration to larger cities in Italy and frequent migration to Rome and to the western provinces. This present section on the decurions allows me to flesh out these statistics with some practical examples, bringing into greater focus the ‘push and pull’ factors that compelled a person to remain in or depart the town of his family’s origin.\(^{223}\)

A first aspect that must be noticed is that over half of these descendants gained a seat on their hometown council, that is, at the site where their ancestors had been slaves (*N* = 18).\(^ {224}\) Given the local knowledge about their *gentilicia*, and perhaps even a recollection of their specific family background, this is the environment where their ‘servile’ origins were most perceptible. At the same time, this was the primary setting where they might have benefitted from their ex-slave ancestors’ links to authority.

Another fifteen of the descendants (44%) reached the decurionate away from their hometown, seven within Italy and eight in the provinces.\(^ {225}\) In most of the cases where a descendant settled within Italy, it occurred within his home region or in close proximity to it.

---

\(^{223}\) See a discussion of these ‘push and pull’ factors in relation to migration patterns above, pp. 195, 239-42.

\(^{224}\) *AE* 1981, 238; *AE* 1996, 423; *AE* 2006, 470; *CIL* V 4459; *CIL* IX 22; *CIL* IX 284; *CIL* IX 338 (two men); *CIL* IX 2472; *CIL* IX 2087; *CIL* IX 2153; *CIL* IX 2666; *CIL* IX 3945; *CIL* X 474; *CIL* XI 729; *CIL* XI 3805; *CIL* XI 5761-2; *CIL* XIV 244; *EDCS* 224; *EE* 8, 340; *TPSulp* 24.

\(^{225}\) Within Italy: *AE* 1975, 142; *AE* 1988, 249; *AE* 1994, 559; *CIL* I 3173; *CIL* XI 2913; *CIL* XI 4212; *CIL* XI 4807.

L. Publicius Apronianus from Auximum (*CIL* IX 5842) is not counted in these calculations, since his hometown cannot be securely determined. In the provinces: *AE* 2007, 692, *CIL* III 2920; *CIL* III 5443a; *CIL* III 7805; *CIL* III 8787; *CIL* XII 18; *ILAlg* 2, 4523; *ILAlg* 2, 4653.
Perhaps these intra-regional settlement patterns can be attributed to continuing social and economic links close to a family’s eponymous hometown.\(^{226}\) For instance, L. Hispellatius Sabinianus settled in Interamna Nahars and there held the aedileship and quattuorvirate \textit{iuere dicundo} around the beginning of the second century CE (\textit{CIL XI 4212}).\(^{227}\)

\[\text{Noniae T(itii) f(filiae) / Rufinae / pestlicl(ae?) sacr(ae), / L(ucius) Hispellatius / Sabinianus / aedil(is), IIIIvir i(ure) d(icundo), heres / ex testament(o), arbitrat(u) / C(ai) Obidi / Verecundi / mariti eius.}\]

To Nonia Rufina, daughter of Titus, custodian of the temple(?),\(^{228}\) L. Hispellatius Sabinianus, aedile, quattuorvir \textit{iuere dicundo}, her heir, (erected this monument), according to her will and on the instruction of her husband C. Obidius Verecundus.

His family’s town of origin, Hispellum, was nearby, and it is reasonable to theorize that Sabinianus’ ancestors had either migrated to the larger site looking for greater economic opportunities or maintained business interests in both towns. Although the descendants from Hispellum, bearing the \textit{gentilicium} Hispellas (or Hispellatius), are not well attested in the epigraphic record, one clue to the wider family’s intra-regional economic ties is the presence of a C. Hispellas Datus in an unknown association in another Umbrian town located on the Via Flaminia, Fulginiae (\textit{CIL XI 5228}). Sabinianus was also the heir of a Nonia T. f. Rufia, whose \textit{gens Nonia} enjoyed success in towns throughout Umbria, including in Hispellum. Perhaps his position away from his hometown thus was based on patronage links.

Emigration to the provinces is the other common feature found among these decurions, accounting for over half of the cases that involve a descendant’s departure from his eponymous hometown. The two most logical explanations for why branches of these Italian family lines migrated so far away were commercial activities or settlement after military service.\(^{229}\) There is insufficient evidence to ascribe any clear long-distance trade contacts to the families represented by this group of decurions. Yet some of the decurions’ presence in a particular provincial town is probably best explained by having an ancestor who had served in a military garrison and thereafter established his family line locally. The epigraphic record from provincial towns demonstrates how common it was for ex-legionaries who settled in Roman communities near

\(^{227}\) Andreani and Fora 2002: 68; Asdrubali Pentiti 2008: 204 no. 2.
\(^{228}\) On this gloss for the Osco-Umbrian word \textit{pestliclus/a}, see Asdrubali Pentiti 2008: 204 no. 2.
\(^{229}\) Hin 2013: 254-7; Tacoma 2016: 43-7.
their old garrisons themselves to become part of the local elite. Obviously, these veterans’ sons and descendants also would have been prime candidates for the local council. Following this line of argumentation in our set, four decurions from Italian towns achieved their rank in the same province where legions were garrisoned at a time when these legions were still being heavily recruited from Italy. For instance, D. Campanius Varus, with an origin in Capua, had a full municipal career in the first century CE at Salona in Dalmatia, and his enrollment in the local tribe Tromentina suggests that his family had been there for a generation or two (CIL III 8787). At least four different legions were based in Dalmatia from the Julio-Claudian to the Flavian period, and each one left a substantial epigraphic impact on Salona itself. It is thus possible to envision that Varus’ presence in the province was connected to a veteran ancestor who established the family line there.

Another important intersection between these descendants’ settlement patterns and social advancement has to do with the urban setting where some of them reached the decurionate. In this case, it does not matter whether such a site was a person’s hometown or place of relocation. The most intriguing result of this analysis is how few of the descendants managed to penetrate the municipal elite in the large urban centers of Italy, just 26% (N = 9). The other almost three-quarters of the descendants reached the decurionate in smaller towns in Italy or in the provinces (N = 25).

Arguments on social mobility often point to larger cities in Italy as the most favorable sites for sub-elite families, including ex-slave families, to climb the social ladder. Such sites, especially port cities, offered numerous economic benefits for ambitious local families in the form of non-agricultural business opportunities. Yet cities could also present obstacles for ex-

---

230 See, for example, Mócsy 1974: 158, 382 n. 160.
233 IV Flavia Felix, VII Claudia, VIII Augusta, and XI Claudia.
234 AE 1981, 238; AE 1996, 423; CIL I 3173; CIL V 4459; CIL X 474; CIL XI 729; CIL XIV 244; EDCS 224; TPSulp 24.
236 Cf. Meiggs 1973: 203-8; Castrén 1975: 92-124, and passim in the index of local families; and López Barja de Quiroga 1995: 326-48. In her study of private ex-slaves in Amiternum, Segenni 1990: 23-32 observes that in smaller inland towns much of the economic activity revolved around agricultural work, for which land ownership was essential to creating wealth. In such a context, there were fewer opportunities for economic success in the artisanal trades which were more accessible to freed slaves. It is also true that larger towns simply yield more epigraphic evidence, thus presenting a picture of more economic activity. In this context, we must consider the idea of ex-slave families constituting a sort of commercial ‘middle-class’ in Roman cities. Mouritsen 2011: 206-47 provides a good summary of the evidence and relevant strands of scholarship on this economic impression of Roman freedmen, with
slave families. The same economic advantages they might utilize also translated into an exponentially larger pool of eligible candidates for the decurionate, creating an atmosphere of stiffer competition for political advancement, among freeborn and freedman families alike. One possible illustration of such a scenario is found in Ostia, which probably produced as many or more municipal freedmen than any town in the Roman world and offered multifaceted economic opportunities. Among the large number of decurions recorded in the colony, the town council is known to have admitted only a single Ostiensis.237

Unlike the large urban centers, smaller towns are sometimes seen less compatible with freedmen’s descendants reaching the decurionate with any regularity. Various factors seem to have hindered such promotion: fewer seats in the ordo; greater concentration of political power over generations in the hands of a small yet entrenched group of aristocrats; less land and economic opportunities available to emerging freedmen’s descendants; and so on. Despite these deficiencies, however, the descendants in the small- and medium-sized towns of Italy and in the provinces had greater success than their counterparts in the larger cities. While the smaller towns surely presented certain drawbacks for aspiring parvenus, they also offered certain advantages that must have aided some descendants. For example, an important corollary to a smaller population would have been less overall competition for entry into the local council. It is also likely that the small aristocracies that had control over the councils in these towns could be more weakened by demographic factors that larger councils could better sustain, increasing the need to replenish the decurionate from below. In this environment of limited competition, then, a freedman family that had managed to acquire some degree of wealth and social position in a community may have stood as good a chance as lower-class freeborn lines of producing a decurion through adlection. This was especially true in small towns where the number of seats in the council may have been expanded in the late second or early third centuries CE.

A further reflection of this success in the smaller towns is the number of senior magistracies secured by the decurial descendants in such places. Of the seventeen instances in

\[\text{CIL XIV 244} (= \text{AE 1954, 221})\]. Cf. Bruun 2008: 545-7, who has pointed out how little integrated the Ostienses were in the colony’s social and economic life.

\[\text{237} \text{CIL XIV 244} (= \text{AE 1954, 221})\]. Cf. Bruun 2008: 545-7, who has pointed out how little integrated the Ostienses were in the colony’s social and economic life.
which a decurion held the duovirate or quattuorvirate or its equivalent (*iure dicundo* or *quinquennalis*), fourteen occurred in the smaller or provincial context (c. 82%).

It remains to put the status of these descendants into greater context by comparing their representation in the decurionate to other local families that contributed decurions.

*Table IV.7 Representation by local familiae in the decurionate*\(^2\)\(^3\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Town (Reg.)</th>
<th>2) Total known local decurions</th>
<th>3) Total fam. in decurionate</th>
<th>4) Familia</th>
<th>5) # of decurions</th>
<th>6) % of known local dec.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capua (I)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Campanius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ti. Claudius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pomponius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 local fam.</td>
<td>1 each</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia (I)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Ti. Claudius</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. Egrilus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fabius</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iulius</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naevius</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ostiensis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valerius</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Five local fam.</td>
<td>3 each</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puteoli (I)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Avianius</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caecilius</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clodius</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Granius</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iulius</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Puteolanus</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Three local fam.</td>
<td>2 each</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneventum (II)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>C. Caelius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. Ign[---]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Rutilius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Umbrius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(Umbrius)</strong> <strong>Concordius</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35 local fam.</td>
<td>1 each</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\)\(^3\) Quinquennales: *AE* 1988, 249; *CIL* III 8787; *CIL* XI 5761-2. *Iure dicundo* or equivalent: *AE* 1975, 142; *AE* 2007, 692; *CIL* III 2920; *CIL* IX 284; *CIL* IX 2666; *CIL* XI 4212; *CIL* XI 4807; *CIL* XII 18; *EE* 81, 340; *ILAlg* 2\(^{2}\), 4523; *ILAlg* 2\(^{2}\), 4653.

\(^2\)\(^3\) I have compiled these figures through a search of the *Epigraphische Datenbank Clauss-Slaby* using the typical terminology relating to office-holding and members of the decurionate. See also the lists of Gregori 1999: 134-49 (Brixia); Meiggs 1973: 511-17; and Bargagli and Grosso 1997: 21-53 (Ostia); D’Arms 1974: 122-4; and Camodeca 1996b: 106-7 (Puteoli).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Decurions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canusium (II)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentinum (VI)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixia (X)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. Abuccius</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T./P. Aelius</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Aurelius</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti./C. Claudius</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Flavius</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Iunius</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P. Publicius</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C./L. Vibius</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight local fam.</td>
<td>3 each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coretius</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullonius</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedius</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sentinas</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postumius</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publicius</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septumius</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten local fam.</td>
<td>2 each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This sample of all the decurions known from seven select sites is drawn from both larger cities and smaller towns. In all seven cases, moreover, the municipal freedmen’s descendants represent ‘new men’ in their hometowns. The most important results come from the five sites that provide evidence for a substantial number of decurions, namely, Beneventum, Brixia, Canusium, Ostia, and Puteoli. In four of the five cases, the municipal freedmen’s descendants contributed among the smallest proportion of decurions of any known family: Beneventum, 2.3%; Brixia, 1.5%; Canusium, 1.4%; and Ostia, 0.8%. These are indeed small shares of the theoretical rates of social mobility ascribed to places like Beneventum and Ostia, where studies suggest that, at least in light of the evidence from epitaphs, as many as 25% and 13% of the known decurions, respectively, rose from the families of ex-slaves.241 This meager representation is even more telling given that the lists of local decurions known to us derive from many generations. Whereas private familiae came and went over time, each town’s familia publica continually produced new municipal freedmen family lines that bore the peculiar gentilicia, and they were still only able to contribute so few decurions in the evidence.

---

240 I have included in this number the praetextati listed in the album of the town council for the year 223 CE. The accepted theory is that they were from elite local families and were likely to enter as full decurions whenever seats became available.

241 See Mouritsen 1997: 57-78.
Puteoli presents an exceptional case. The three Puteolani who entered the town council, including one probable father and son, represent 4.5% of all known decurions from the colony, right in line with many other local families recorded in the epigraphic evidence. The alleged father and son both date to the Julio-Claudian period, and Camodeca points out that they are among the only secure examples of social mobility in the port during this period, emphasizing that the aristocratic families of the ordo must have exerted careful control over the promotion of newcomers. If these Puteolani were, in fact, among the few ‘servile’ descendants elected (or adlected?) into the council, perhaps their descent from municipal freedmen proved advantageous. More puzzling, however, is why this and other municipal freedmen’s families disappeared from the evidence for the decurial class after the reign of the emperor Gaius, not to reappear for three centuries. The second century in particular is regarded as a prosperous age for the social advancement of ex-slave families in Puteoli, the very period in which we might expect to observe the emergence of the descendants of the freedmen of the colony among other newcomers.

This analysis of the municipal freedmen’s descendants who reached the decurionate permits me to advance some broader ideas about their impact on the municipal elite. While there are signs of success by some in this group, the sporadic nature of this accomplishment, in either a person’s hometown or elsewhere, must be emphasized. There are no grounds to believe that there was any systematic advancement of the municipal freedmen’s family lines in any communities in the Roman world. It is also likely that the favorable outcome of placing a family member in the ordo decurionum was, in most cases, ephemeral. The evidence implies that few of these new decurial families had a lasting presence in the council. It was probably the case that many of the new families that managed to reach the ordo fell out after only a generation or two. As a final point, it should also be noted that connections to municipal authority through descent from a former municipal slave evidently mattered little. If such a connection had counted for

---

242 Camodeca 1996b: 99 suggests that C. Put(eol(anus)] Flaccus, decurion in 7 CE (AE 1996, 423), and Q. Puteolanus Aquila, praefectus i.d. in 35 CE (TPSulp 24), could be father and son. The fact that they have different praenomina would match their early date, though in this case one might also expect that they would share a cognomen. They could just as easily represent two different family lines of Puteolani. The third decurion, Puteolanus Demetrianus, probably dates to the mid-fourth century CE, based on his title defensor pauperum.

243 Camodeca 1996b: 98-100. He also emphasizes the relative paucity of evidence for decurions in this period in general.

244 Camodeca 1996b: 99-100 suggests that approximately 30% of second-century decurions show signs of ‘servile’ origins. See also D’Arms 1974: 110-17; and Mouritsen 1997: 70-2.
more, one would expect to find more systematic advancement to the local decurionate than the evidence provides.

IV.3.5 ROMAN ARMY

The Roman army also opened up important avenues for social advancement in the Imperial period. For soldiers recruited into the legions, military service could be lucrative, bringing steady pay, the prospect of a pension and degree of wealth at discharge, and potentially even promotion to the centurionate. Likewise, Roman citizens could opt to enter the auxiliary units alongside freeborn *peregrini*, and private freedmen recruited into units such as the *vigiles* had the opportunity for a career and social advancement. For those men with the right connections, entry into the urban military units in Rome and Italy brought high pay and status.

The military constituted an appealing career path for all lower-class Romans, evidently including for the descendants of the municipal freedmen. The 39 descendants found in various military units represent 8.5% of the 464 total male descendants in the catalogue. My primary interest in this section is to illustrate how the overall social standing of the municipal freedman family lines is reflected in their posts in the army, and to understand how their service may have given their family branches the chance for further social ascent.

The first group to highlight is the Roman legionaries. The following table lists the ten descendants who were recruited into this segment of the military.

*Table IV.8 Descendants in the Roman legions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family origin</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location of inscription</th>
<th>Unit/Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

245 This calculation omits three ‘military’ descendants covered in previous sections: the son of a probable municipal freedwoman of Aquileia who entered an urban cohort in Rome (*CIL* V 929); the equestrian *primipilus* from Auximum (*CIL* IX 5842); and the equestrian *legatus* of Hispania Citerior (*AE* 1972, 282). My catalogue also contains nine additional examples of soldiers, but it is unclear into which branch of the army they were recruited. They are as follows: C. Aeserninus [---], *veteranus* (*IDR* 3, 2, 491 = *Mander* 807; I-III century CE; Apulum); [L. Amerinus L. fil. Sempronius], *ex librario sesquiplicarius* (*CIL* XVI 154 = III, p. 898 = XI 373; 249 CE; Ariminum; *origo* Ateste); [Amerinus Sempronia[nus fil]io eius (*CIL* XVI 154 = III, p. 898 = XI 373; 249 CE; Ariminum; *origo* Ateste); M. Ateste Priscus (*AE* 1996, 1185 = *AE* 2005, 1147 = *AE* 2005, 1148 = *AE* 2006, 961 = *AE* 2007, 1070 = *ZPE* 153, 99; early III century CE; Castra Regina in Raetia); C. Noln[nius Amandus, *centurio* (*CIL* III 6234, p. 1336; date uncertain; Moesia Inferior); Potentinus V[alens, *optio* (*Nesselhauf* 197; date uncertain; Bonna); Ptolemaios, *hastatus* (*Kayser* 114 = *Legio II Parth* 78; 171-230 CE; Alexandria); [P. Urvinus]us Pastor, *miles, Coh(ortis) XVIII voluntariorum* (auxiliary of Roman citizens?) (*AE* 2006, 1053; late II-early III century CE; Bratislava in Pannonia); T. Venusius T. f. Men. Aper, *optio valetudinarii* (*AE* 1937, 181 = *TitAq* 1, 30; 150-200 CE; Aquincum; *origo* Praeneste).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aquilonia/ Patavium</th>
<th>C. Aquilonius C. &lt;f.&gt; Fab. Statutus</th>
<th><em>CSIR Oe</em> 14, 472</th>
<th>epit.</th>
<th>91-115</th>
<th>Carnuntum (Pann. Sup.)</th>
<th><em>Legio XV Apol(linaris)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bononia</td>
<td>Bononius Vitalis</td>
<td><em>CIL III</em> 11024</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>131-170</td>
<td>Brigetio (Pann. Sup.)</td>
<td>†<em>Legio I Adiutrix Pia Fidelis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>C. Campanius Victor</td>
<td><em>CIL XIII</em> 7939</td>
<td>vot.</td>
<td>late I-II</td>
<td>Rovenich (Germ. Inf.)</td>
<td><em>Legio I Minervia Pia Fidelis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>L. Campanius L. f. Pol. [V]erecundus</td>
<td><em>CIL V</em> 8185</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>mid-I</td>
<td>Ruginium</td>
<td><em>Legio III Scythica; signifer; Coh. Cisipadensium</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casinum</td>
<td>L. Casin[ius ---]ivus</td>
<td><em>ILN</em> 1, 144</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Forum Iulii (Gall. Narb.)</td>
<td><em>Legio VII[†]; speculator</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentia</td>
<td>Potentinius Victor</td>
<td><em>CIL XIII</em> 6985</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>mid-I (?)</td>
<td>Mogontiacum (Germ. Sup.)</td>
<td><em>Legio XXII Primigenia Pia Fidelis; optio</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urvinum Mat./Forum Fulvii</td>
<td>P. Urvinus P. f. Pol.</td>
<td><em>CIL XIII</em> 6884</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>early I</td>
<td>Mogontiacum (Germ. Sup.)</td>
<td><em>Legio XIII (Gemina); speculator; stipendorium XII</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>M. Aurelius Veronius Verus</td>
<td><em>CIL XIII</em> 8630</td>
<td>vot.</td>
<td>II-III</td>
<td>Colonia Ulpia Traiana (Germ. Inf.)</td>
<td>†<em>Legio XXX (Ulpia); beneficiarius</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volsinii</td>
<td>P. Volusinius Sabinus</td>
<td><em>CIL XIII</em> 6623</td>
<td>vot.</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>Obernburg am Main (Germ. Sup.)</td>
<td><em>Legio XXII Primigenia Pia Fidelis; princeps</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Indicates that a man’s position in a military unit is inferred from indirect information in the inscription.

In the early Principate, legionaries were primarily recruited from Italy itself, yet from the late Julio-Claudian period on provincials with citizen status, coming mostly from Roman colonies, became an increasingly important pool for filling these ranks. This pattern is reflected in our set. One *speculator* in the *Legio XIII (Gemina)*, who was commemorated in an epitaph in Mogontiacum in the earlier period, was enrolled in the voting tribe Pollia and had an *origo* in Forum Fulvii in northern Italy (*CIL XIII* 6884), and another claims an *origo* in Patavium (*CSIR Oe* 14, 472). Besides these two, however, the legionaries in our set mostly date to the

---

246 Mann 1983: 49-68, 192-3. The process of recruiting legionaries from the provinces was accelerated under Trajan, when provincial recruits first seem to have outnumbered those from Italy.

247 On the voting tribe Pollia, see Kubitschek 1889: 271. On Verecundus’ likely Italian origin, see Forni 1992: 126; and Todisco 1999: 136-7 no. 112.
second century or later, and, apart from the place of family origin suggested by their *gentilicia*, there is no indication of a more recent hometown for their families.

It is plausible that some of these families had previously settled in the provincial zones where the legionaries were posted. It has long been observed that legions increasingly sought new recruits from the areas near their garrisons. In this scenario, branches of the municipal freedmen’s family lines may have migrated previously to these provincial zones in pursuit of commercial activities, or earlier descendants enlisting in the legions may have established their own families in these areas. These groups later may have given their sons and descendants as new recruits. There is some indirect evidence for familial bases in these areas. For instance, Bononius Vitalis, a soldier in the *Legio I Adiutrix Pia Fidelis* stationed in Brigetio in Pannonia Superior, died in the middle of the second century CE and was commemorated in an epitaph at the site of the legion’s garrison (CIL III 11024). Two additional Bononii can be found in this province in approximately the same period, both *incerti*, from nearby Emona (ILJug 1, 310) and Savaria (CIL III 4199). Similarly, an *optio* of the *Legio XXII Primigenia Pia Fidelis* of the mid-first century CE or after, Potentinius Victor, erected an epitaph for a fellow soldier at the site of his legionary base at Mogontiacum in Germania Superior (CIL XIII 6985). The epigraphy in the region records another *optio* named Potentinius V*[alens?] in an unknown unit in Bonna (Nesselhauf 197), and a man named P. Mogontinius V*[oc]torinus, whose own *gentilicum* corresponds to the town of Mogontiacum, erected an epitaph for his wife Potenti[a] Frontina at an unknown site (CIL XIII 8850). Of course, the relationship between these civilians and the legionaries also may have been the other way around: the civilians’ presence in the provincial zones may have been contingent on settlement by the legionaries themselves.

Whatever these legionaries’ more recent origins, a few inscriptions show signs of upward mobility within the army that certainly could have benefitted their own children and descendants. A good example is the epitaph of the Julio-Claudian period commemorating the *speculator* of the *Legio XIII Gemina*, which was still stationed at Mogontiacum on the Rhine in this period (CIL XIII 6884).

\[\text{P(ublius) Urvinus / P(ubli) f(ilia) Pol(lia) For(o) / Fulvi spec(ulator) leg(ionis) / XIII, stipendi(itorum) / XIX, an(n)or(m) / XXXV, h(ic) s(itus) e(st); / M(arcus) Aruntius Aruntius Aruntius / co(n)sob(rinus) cur(am) / egi(t).}\]

---

248 Le Bohec 2013: 74-93.
P. Urvinus, son of Publius, of the voting tribe Pollia, from Forum Fulvii, speculator of the Legio XIII (Gemina), (having served) 18 years and aged 35 years, lies here. M. Aruntius, his cousin, took care (to erect this monument).

Urvinus’ family origin was in Urvinum Mataurense in Umbria, far to the south of his own hometown of Forum Fulvii in Region IX. As a speculator, he was one of the few legionaries recruited into a staff position among the principales and attached either to a provincial governor or a legionary headquarters. These principales were selected for special administrative duties because of their high level of literacy and often accounting skills. In addition to the scouting duties implied by their title, the speculatores seem to have served as messengers, while a few sources ascribe to them a policing function or even the role of executioner.249 In their elevated position, they received one and a half times or double the pay of a regular legionary.250 Their contact with military authority probably also offered the chance to forge links to patronage with equestrian and senatorial officers.

It is also worth noting an epitaph from Ruginium in northern Italy that commemorates one of the two centurions among this group of descendants (CIL V 8185).

L(ucius) Campanius / L(uci) f(ilius) Pol(lia) [V]erecundus / [ve]teran(us) leg(ionis) IIII Scy[th(icae)], / [si]gnifer ((centurio)) c(o)ho(ritis) / [C]isipadensium / [tes]tamento fieri iussit.

L. Campanius Verecundus, son of Lucius, of the voting tribe Pollia, a veteran of the Legio IIII Scythica, signifer and centurion of the Cohors Cisipadensium, ordered (this epitaph) to be erected in his will.

Verecundus seems to have been from northern Italy or southern Gaul, the only areas where his voting tribe Pollia is well attested, though it is unclear whether his hometown was actually Ruginium.251 The success he experienced in his military career was rare. His progression indicates that he had not been directly appointed to the centurionate through patronage, but instead that he had begun his career as a miles enlisted in the Legio IV Scythica and thereafter climbed the ranks. After a successful period of service in the legion, perhaps rising to a special posting as one of the immunes, Verecundus was transferred to the auxiliary Cohors Cisipadensium as a signifer. This was one of the permanent staff positions for principales that

251 On the voting tribe Pollia, see Kubitschek 1889: 271. On Verecundus’ likely Italian origin, see Forni 1992: 126; and Todisco 1999: 136-7 no. 112.
brought a substantial pay raise (perhaps *duplicarius*, as in the legions) and put the holder on a more favorable track for possible advancement to the coveted centurionate. He then became one of the very narrow group of soldiers who managed to reach the centurionate. While it is tempting to ascribe his ascent to his own merit, the likely role patronage played should not be overlooked. At any rate, what is most notable about his case is the great social distance he covered from enlisted soldier to the centurionate.

Turning to the auxiliary cohorts of the Roman army, two descendants in the catalogue served in these units. Auxiliary soldiers were always primarily drawn from among the freeborn non-citizen *peregrini* inhabiting newly conquered areas of the Empire. Yet it is also possible to find Roman citizens, from both Italy and the provinces, serving in the auxiliary cohorts instead of the legions. The titles carried by auxiliary units originally gave some indication of where the soldiers were recruited, but as new recruiting pools became available and these units were moved to different locations around the Empire, recruits came from numerous provincial sites. It was also not uncommon for legionaries to earn an appointment to a staff position or to the centurionate of an auxiliary cohort after an exemplary career.

It is important to note that both auxiliary soldiers in our set were in such command positions. The fact that they were officers means they were probably Roman citizens, and this clarifies their connections to the family lines of municipal freedmen from Italian towns. One such soldier was C. Campanius Vitalis, who was commemorated by an epitaph in Certiae in Dacia in the later second or third century CE (*CIL* III 839).

---

*D(is) M(anibus). / C(aius) Campani(us) Vita/lis ((centurio)) coh(ortis) I Bat(avorum) / ((milliariae)), stip(endiorum) VIII, / vi(xit) an(nos) XXVII, / Florius Viri/lis vet(eronus) ex dec(urione) / nepoti p(ientissimo) p(onendum) c(uravit).*

To the departed spirits. C. Campanius Vitalis, centurion in the *Cohors I Batavorum milliaria*, (having served) nine years and aged 27 years. Florius Virilis, a veteran of the decurionate (of the cohort), saw to it that (this epitaph) was erected for his most dutiful nephew.

---


255 C. Campani(us) Vitalis, centurion in *Coh. I Batavorum* at Certiae in Dacia, late second or early third century CE (*CIL* III 839); and Volceius Saturninus, *optio* of the *III Trieris Venus* at Misenum, date uncertain (*CIL* X 3472).

256 See discussion of the advantages over legionary service in Haynes 2013: 63-5.


The auxiliary Cohors I Batavorum was originally comprised of Batavi from the region of Belgica along the northern Rhine, and it retained this strong ethnic component until it was disbanded in 70 CE for its role in supporting the revolt of Iulius Civilis. It was evidently reformed soon thereafter, and transferred to Pannonia and then to Dacia, though some Batavi continued to serve.\textsuperscript{259} Typically, the centurions of auxiliary cohorts were put in place through direct appointment to the post or were transferred from the legionary centurionate or a position in the principales.\textsuperscript{260} Since one would expect to read of legionary service in Campanius’ cursus honorum if he had held such a position, he must fall into the former category. Perhaps he had connections to this unit’s command staff through his uncle, the dedicand of this epitaph, who was a cavalry commander (\textit{ex dec(urione)}), presumably in this same unit. It is also possible that Campanius had benefitted from the patronage of the equestrian praefectus who commanded the cohort.

In addition to these regular military units, the municipal freedmen’s descendants also had a presence in the praetorian and urban cohorts that were stationed in Rome and the surrounding area, and at times were deployed to other cities in Italy and the provinces. The following two tables list this group.

\textit{Table IV.9 Descendants in the Praetorian Cohorts}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family origin</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location of inscription</th>
<th>Unit/Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>Campanius Verax</td>
<td>\textit{CIL VI 130}</td>
<td>vot.</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Coh. VI Praetoriae; miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capua/</td>
<td>Q. Campanius Crescens</td>
<td>\textit{CIL VI 2379}</td>
<td>album</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Centuria Maximini (Coh. III or VII Praetorian)\textsuperscript{261}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>Sex. Campanius Clemens</td>
<td>\textit{CIL VI 2776}</td>
<td>epit.</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Cornicularius praefecti praetorio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mevania/</td>
<td>Q. Mevanius Marcel(lus)</td>
<td>\textit{CIL VI 2383}</td>
<td>fasti</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>(Praetorian unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{259} Cheesman 1914: 72-3, 171-3; Haynes 2013: 112-16, 122-3.  
\textsuperscript{260} Rankov 2009: 53; Haynes 2013: 49.  
\textsuperscript{261} Inscriptions indicate that there was a \textit{centuria Maximini} in the Third Praetorian Cohort (\textit{CIL VI 2971}, Rome; \textit{CIL VIII 21021 = ILS 2038}, Caesarea) and in the Seventh Cohort (\textit{CIL VI 2631}, Rome; \textit{AE 2004}, 318, Rome).
Table IV.10 Descendants in the Urban Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family origin</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location of inscription</th>
<th>Unit/Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casinum/ Volsinii</td>
<td>L. Casinius L. f. Pom. Legitimus</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> VI 2382</td>
<td><em>fasti</em></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---/Aveia</td>
<td>Q. Concordius Q. f. Avei(a) Verecundus Vest(inorum)</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> VI 2384</td>
<td><em>album</em></td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td><em>Coh. XIII Urbana centuria Heliodori</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---/Ticinum</td>
<td>C. Publicius C. f. Pap. Quietus Ticino</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> VI 2924</td>
<td><em>epit.</em></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td><em>Coh. XII Urbana centuria Veri; miles</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The praetorian cohorts constituted one of the most prestigious branches of military service. Financially, a position in the guards brought at least three times the pay of the legionaries, bigger bonuses at retirement, and frequent donatives from the emperors.\(^{263}\) The praetorians in the handful of units stationed in Rome itself also benefitted from being near the center of imperial authority, which no doubt helped with their social advancement. Along with such benefits, beginning in the later first century CE there developed an identity and enhanced status for Italian soldiers joining the praetorians, since legionary service was apparently regarded as less desirable as more and more citizens from the provinces were being recruited.\(^{264}\)

Recruitment into a praetorian cohort invariably entailed a combination of administrative competency and links to patronage from elites. For example, in a rescript to a candidate seeking the emperor’s help in entering the praetorians, Hadrian advises the man instead to settle for a position in one of the urban cohorts.\(^{265}\) Imperial, senatorial, or equestrian patronage was

---

\(^{262}\) Cf. *CIL* XIV 224 (= *SdOstia* 3, p.138) from Ostia, which records a praetorian of the Second Cohort, *centuria Firmi* of the second century.

\(^{263}\) Rathbone 2009: 310-12.

\(^{264}\) Bingham 2013: 56, 189 n. 33.

\(^{265}\) Dositheus *Hermeneumata Leidensia, Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum III* p. 31 (see Purcell 2000: 421).
especially crucial for reaching the centurionate or the *principales* in the guard. This was probably the case for the one *principalis* in our set, a descendant from Capua named Sex. Campanius Clemens who held the rank of *cornicularius* on the staff of the *praefectus praetorio* sometime in the second century CE (*CIL VI 2776*). Aside from its connections to political power in Rome, the position of *cornicularius* put Clemens just one step away from the centurionate in either a praetorian cohort or a legion.\footnote{Speidel 2015: 328.}

\emph{D(is) M(anibus). / Sex(to) Campanio / Clementi cor(niculario) / pr(aefecti) pr(aetorio), vix(it) ann(os) / XXXII, m(enses) II, d(ies) XII.}

To the departed spirits. To Sex. Campanius Clemens, *cornicularius* of the *praefectus praetorio*, who lived 34 years, two months, and twelve days.

In the early Principate, praetorians were mostly recruited from just a few regions of central and northern Italy,\footnote{Tacitus \emph{Ann.} 4.5 notes that most recruits came from Latium, Etruria, and Umbria.} but by the late second century they were also drawn from the rest of Italy, Spain, Noricum, and Macedonia.\footnote{Cassius Dio 75.2.5.} Although all seven of the praetorians in our set date to this later period, all of them were likely from Italy. Two of them, in fact, give an *origo* in northern Italy, namely, Mediolanum (*CIL VI 2379*) and Mutina (*CIL VI 2383*).

Closely linked to the praetorians were the four urban cohorts stationed in Rome and sometimes in the port cities of Ostia and Puteoli and in the large provincial cities of Carthage and Lugudunum.\footnote{This arrangement was in place by the reign of Vespasian (see Freis 1967: 7-11, 36-8; Nicols 1978: 161-2; Rankov 2009: 48).} The duties of the urban cohorts were tied to those of the praetorians, while the locations of their postings imply a role in policing large urban centers.\footnote{Fuhrmann 2012: 113-18.} Although less prestigious than praetorian service, a posting in an urban cohort could still be more lucrative than service in the legions.\footnote{Rathbone 2009: 310-12.} These cohorts, too, were a preferable destination for recruits from Italy.

In our set, two municipal freedmen’s descendants attained a rank-and-file position in these units: Q. Concordius Verecundus (*CIL VI 2384, 198 CE*)\footnote{Freis 1967: 109-13.} and C. Publicius Quietus (*CIL VI 2924*).\footnote{In addition to these two descendants, note again the freeborn son of an *incerta* municipal freedwoman from Aquileia (*IL 39*) who entered the XIII Urban Cohort based at Lugudunum.} Both men were recruited from Italian towns. Q. Concordius Verecundus came from Aveia in Samnium, but his family connection to his stated hometown is not immediately clear.
There is one attestation of a pair of locals with the municipal gentilicium Aveius/a, though it is worth noting Schulze’s typical argument that the name’s morphology had an Etruscan derivation, which may link the gentilicium to an early elite line rather than to one of local municipal freedmen.274 This small Samnite town also provides no evidence that it bore the title Concordia that could have been the source of our man’s name. It thus seems plausible that Verecundus was the descendant of a municipal freedman from Beneventum, located to the south of Aveia, where the town’s ex-slaves took the gentilicium Concordius.275 The second man, C. Publicius Quietus, came from Ticinum in the Transpadane region, belonging to the local voting tribe Papiria.276 No evidence for municipal slaves or freedmen has been recovered from this town, but it is important to emphasize how pervasive the use of the gentilicium Publicius/Publicius was for municipal freedmen in the northern Italian regions.277 It makes sense to connect Quietus to one of these family lines.

A final category represented in the catalogue consists of descendants in the cohorts of the vigiles in Rome.278 These cohorts lacked the level of prestige of the praetorian and urban cohorts, and at least in the first century CE vigiles received less pay than legionaries, not to mention far less than their praetorian and urban cohort counterparts.279 This status satisfied Rome’s rigid

274 L. Aveius Hebenus and his wife (?) Aveia Hellas, both liberti (CIL IX 3614). See Schulze 1904: 348, 559, who pointed to the Etruscan family names avei, aveis, or aveina.
275 Another source for Verecundus’ gentilicium could be Nursia, which carried Concordia in its official titulature (AE 1996, 534 = AE 2006, 395 = Suppl. It. 13, N 30), though no familia publica has ever been attested there.
276 Kubitschek 1889: 271.
277 Only one other Publicius is attested in Ticinum, an incertus named Publicius Quintianus (AE 1992, 809 = Suppl. It. 9, T 45).
278 In addition to these vigiles, it makes sense to note here the subaltern magistri vicorum placed in charge of different regions of Rome. Two descendants held such a post, Cn. Campanius Logus, magister anni secundi in 6/5 BCE, the second year into Augustus’ new neighborhood administrative scheme (CIL VI 764; see Lott 2004: 188-9 no. 13), and L. Saturnius Nigrinus, magister Fontis under Antoninus Pius (CIL VI 159 = VI 30705e = VI 36746e). The ranks of the magistri were filled by freedmen, and these were assisted by slave ministri. Lott 2013: 176-87 points out that attaining a position in these neighborhood associations must have required a relatively high degree of wealth, especially judging from the many expensive votive dedications the magistri left behind. In addition to maintaining the neighborhood compital cults, these associations also seem to have played a role in caring for the local infrastructure, including fire prevention. They must have commanded considerable respect on the local social scene.
279 Watson 1969: 99; Sablayrolles 1996: 333-42; Le Bohec 2013: 211-12. For a thorough analysis of the duties of the rank-and-file vigiles, which primarily revolved around fighting fires, see Sablayrolles 1996: 315-407. The second-century jurist Paulus states that in the early years of their organization the vigiles worked closely with the servi publici populi Romani who were tasked with guarding Rome’s walls and gates at night (Dig. 1.15.1: erat autem familia publica circa portas et muros disposita unde si opus esset evocabatur). Dio (54.2.3-5) reports that in 22 BCE Augustus assigned 600 state slaves to the equestrian prefect in charge of the vigiles. See Eder 1980: 88-9; and Weiss 2004: 187 n. 18. Sablayrolles 1996: 22-3 wondered whether Augustus’ act was intended as a practical benefit for Rome’s fire prevention infrastructure or as a display of the emperor’s generosity in caring for capital (n.b., the liminal status of the state slaves in this period of transition to the imperial government).
social hierarchy, since the cohorts originally recruited only ex-slaves into their ranks.\textsuperscript{280} All the same, the vigiles’ stipend probably increased by the second century, and one should not dismiss the informal social connections these men could have forged with their equestrian officers and others close to imperial power. The status of these units seems to be reflected in some documented cases of freeborn vigiles who returned to their hometown on discharge and entered the local ordo decurionum.\textsuperscript{281}

Eight descendants can be found in the Fifth Cohort of the vigiles in Rome, recorded in an imperial dedication by their unit in the year 210 CE (\textit{CIL} VI 1057, 1058 = VI 31234 = \textit{ILS} 2157).

\textit{Table IV.11 Descendants in the Fifth Cohort of vigiles in Rome}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family origin</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location of inscription</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cales</td>
<td>L. Cal\textasciit&lt;br&gt;ti(us) Iovianus</td>
<td>dedic.</td>
<td>210 CE</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>\textit{Coh(ors) V vigilum}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cales</td>
<td>S\textasciit&lt;br&gt;Calet(ius) Felix</td>
<td>dedic.</td>
<td>210 CE</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>\textit{Coh(ors) V vigilum}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>C. Campan\textasciit&lt;br&gt;Maximian(us)</td>
<td>dedic.</td>
<td>210 CE</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>\textit{Coh(ors) V vigilum}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canusium</td>
<td>C. Canusius Hermes</td>
<td>dedic.</td>
<td>210 CE</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>\textit{Coh(ors) V vigilum}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>C. Concord\textasciit&lt;br&gt;Quintin(us)</td>
<td>dedic.</td>
<td>210 CE</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>\textit{Coh(ors) V vigilum}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>P. Concord\textasciit&lt;br&gt;Crassus</td>
<td>dedic.</td>
<td>210 CE</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>\textit{Coh(ors) V vigilum}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuder</td>
<td>M. Tudert\textasciit&lt;br&gt;Verus</td>
<td>dedic.</td>
<td>210 CE</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>\textit{Coh(ors) V vigilum}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>Q. Vener\textasciit&lt;br&gt;Romanus</td>
<td>dedic.</td>
<td>210 CE</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>\textit{Coh(ors) V vigilum}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While some of these descendants had likely settled in other towns in Italy, their municipal gentilicia signal a family origin within a limited geographical scope in Italy, namely, Latium, Umbria, and Apulia. All eight descendants are classified as incerti, and their presence in the vigiles in this period provides no clarification of their actual status. After being formed under Augustus, the vigiles were originally recruited from ex-slaves, but later increasing numbers of ingenui entered the ranks, and by the third century most of the vigiles found in the epigraphic

\textsuperscript{280} See below.

\textsuperscript{281} E.g., \textit{CIL} X 1617 (Beneventum; mid-second century CE).
evidence were of freeborn status.\textsuperscript{282} The municipal freedmen’s descendants fall into this later period.

Of interest here is the limited number of municipal freedmen’s descendants attested in the cohorts of the \textit{vigiles}, whether in unit dedications or in individual epitaphs. This is significant because some 7000 positions were available in these cohorts at any given time. Moreover, among those descendants from the catalogue who managed to become \textit{vigiles}, just one achieved a position in the \textit{principales}. C. Concord(ius) Quintin(us) was appointed to the tribune’s staff as \textit{codicillarius tribuni} (left tablet, col. 3, l. 7).\textsuperscript{283}

The evidence for municipal freedmen’s descendants in the Roman army suggests that this occupation offered them an avenue for social mobility. Only a handful of the descendants seem to have obtained or were on track for leadership positions in their units, the sort of promotion that had the best chance of offering greater social and economic advancement.\textsuperscript{284} Yet the nature of the evidence for these soldiers, largely consisting of votive offerings and dedications listing entire units, rarely discloses their ages.\textsuperscript{285} Therefore, drawing any larger conclusions on this point is not warranted. Similarly, the evidence does not permit us to know whether many of these soldiers experienced post-military success, such as winning a promotion to a different unit or obtaining a seat in the \textit{ordo decurionum} back in their hometown.\textsuperscript{286} It is also worth pointing out that the level of participation by the municipal freedmen’s descendants in the Roman army suggested by the surviving inscriptions may be exaggerated. The soldiers found in the various branches of military service, in fact, account for the largest proportion of descendants involved in any type of discernible social or economic activity, about 8.5% overall. In this context, it is important to remember that military service and the ideology of the ‘military community’ influenced its members’ decision to engage in epigraphic commemoration.\textsuperscript{287}

\textsuperscript{283} Sablayrolles 1996: 230-1, 660 no. 205, who notes that he was probably a descendant of a municipal freedman of Beneventum.
\textsuperscript{284} This short list can be supplemented by four cases from soldiers serving in an unknown military unit: \textit{CIL} III 6234 (p. 1336), centurion, Moesia Inferior; \textit{Nesselhauf} 197, optio, Bonna; \textit{AE} 1937, 181 = \textit{TitAq} 1, 30, optio valetudinarii (a physician?), Aquincum (\textit{origo} in Praeneste); and \textit{CIL} XVI 154 = \textit{III} (p. 898) = \textit{XI} 373, \textit{ex librario sesquiplicarius}, Ariminum (\textit{origo} in Ateste).
\textsuperscript{285} Only four men have a recorded age on their epitaphs. One died at the age of 30 without advancement (\textit{CIL} VI 2924), as did another at the age of 40 (\textit{CIL} III 11024). The two others died aged 32 (\textit{CIL} VI 2776) and 35 (\textit{CIL} XIII 6884) having already achieved an advanced rank.
\textsuperscript{286} Perhaps the fact that many of these careers are recorded in votive offerings or unit \textit{alba}, which means they represent only a snapshot in these soldiers’ lives, plays some part in this picture.
\textsuperscript{287} See the recent discussion in Speidel 2015: 319-26.
IV.3.6 URBAN ASSOCIATIONS, OCCUPATIONS, AND ROLE IN THE ECONOMY

It remains to evaluate the impact the descendants of municipal freedmen had on the Roman economy more generally, through their role in occupations and professional associations and voluntary urban associations. An analysis of the social and economic success of the sub-elite populations of Roman towns is an effective way to flesh out a more comprehensive picture of these descendants’ position in Roman society, and it can offer better contextualization to the foregoing study of the descendants who reached the higher orders. The catalogue contains 25 descendants with a link to a variety of occupations and professional associations, and another 24 men who were members of voluntary associations.

The most important group of those who entered voluntary and cultic associations is the *Augustales*. Ten descendants entered this association in their town. What is most noteworthy about this set is that four of the *Augustales* were freeborn. The phenomenon of freeborn Romans joining this primarily freedman organization was not exceptional, but was fairly rare. Examples tend to be concentrated in the larger urban centers of northern Italy, where, most scholars agree, there were probably not enough seats available in the ordo decurionum to satisfy all the freeborn locals who were financially qualified and eager to join. In this way, the *Augustales* became a consolation for these wealthy ingenui, a way for them to engage with their town through this second-tier, pseudo-ordo. One example from our set fits nicely with this paradigm (CIL V 4887).


Primio, son of Staius Arruntius, (erected this epitaph) for himself and for his mother Dugiava, daughter of Sextus, and for his wife, Atestatia Secunda, daughter of Sextus, and for his daughter [At]estatia Primula, and for his sons C. Atestas Quartio, sevir at Brixia, and C. Atestas Quintus, and for his own (?) for Dugiava [---] wife of [---]. Farewell, passerby, and you . . .

288 CIL III 1792, 1793 (Narona, Dalmatia); CIL V 1008 (Aquileia); CIL V 8830 (Ateste); CIL V 4876, 4887 (Brixia); CIL X 141 (Potentia); CIL XII 181 (Antipolis, Gallia Narbonensis); CIL XIV 3684 (two; Tibur).
290 Garzetti 1991: 181. The inscription was found to the northeast of Brixia, at a site on the northern bank of Lake Garda.
C. Atestas Quartio was freeborn, although perhaps an *ingenuus illegitimus*. His mother indicates her own *ingenua* status, and all three of her children took her *gentilicium*.²⁹¹ It is unclear why Quartio and his two siblings did not inherit their father’s *gentilicium*, since he was most likely a Roman citizen as well. The text indeed states that he was their father (ll. 6-7: *filiae*; l. 11: *fili(i)s*), so it does not appear that they were the children of an earlier marriage of their mother. Along with the omission of a *gentilicium*, the father’s Celtic *cognomen*, Primio,²⁹² and filiation could indicate the status of freeborn *peregrinus*. Yet, although no precise date can be assigned to this epitaph, it most likely dates after Augustus’ elevation of Brixia to the status of *colonia* in 27 BCE, or at least after the period when the *lex de Gallia Cisalpina* granted full Roman citizenship to the region (49 BCE).²⁹³ Primio therefore must have been a Roman citizen, a status that is also corroborated by the nomenclature of his own father, Staius Arruntius. Perhaps he was actually named Staius Primio, but for some reason he chose not to give his *gentilicium* in this dedication.²⁹⁴ This family’s hometown of Brixia was a large city with a robust economy, so there was surely no shortage of wealthy *ingenui* who wanted one of the only 100 or so seats in the local decurionate. In this context, Quartio was unable to penetrate this group, and had to settle for entry into the town’s *seviri*.

The other three freeborn *Augustales* in our set were not from particularly large towns. At Ateste in Region X [Pu]blicius C.³ f. [P]eregrinus became a *sevir* at an unknown date (*CIL* V 8830), and T. Trebulanus T. f. Cam. Nepos from Tibur, as indicated by his voting tribe,²⁹⁵ joined the local *Herculanei Augustales* in the first or early second century CE (*CIL* XIV 3684).²⁹⁶ Similarly, C. Venusius C. f. Andron became an ordinary *corporatus* in the *seviri*

---

²⁹¹ Their *gentilicium* Atestas/Atest(at)ia corresponds to the nearby town of Ateste.
²⁹² All three children, moreover, display ordinal *cognomina* that were evidently popular among families of Celtic origin in northern Italy. See examples from Brixia in Gregori 1999: 36-8. See also Kajanto 1965: 122.
²⁹³ The membership of Quartio in the local *Viviri* seems to point to a date in the early Principate, though one must be aware of the presence of municipal organizations bearing the title *seviri* (cf. *magistri*) in some northern Italian towns prior to the reign of Augustus (see Mouritsen 2011: 255-6). It is doubtful that the earlier office applies to this case. On the *lex de Gallia Cisalpina*, see Crawford 1996: 461-77.
²⁹⁴ Perhaps Primio was trying to stylize his identity in two different ways, on the one hand, indicating his Roman citizenship with the filiation and inclusion of his father’s *gentilicium*, while on the other hand, advertising his Celtic origin with his own nomenclature. Primio’s mother also bears a single Celtic name, Dugiava, which is only attested in inscriptions from the area around Brixia (e.g., *CIL* V 4883 = *Inscr.It.* 10⁷, 1046). See Gregori 1999: 33, 36-8, 156-60, 203-6. Cf. Mollo 1997: 282-3; Mollo 2000: 353-4; and Gregori 1999: 159-60 for other cases of freeborn Brixian *seviri* with *peregrini* fathers or recent ancestors.
²⁹⁵ Kubitschek 1889: 50.
²⁹⁶ On the possible incorporation of an existing cult of Hercules with the imperial cult at Tibur, see De Ruggiero 1895: 841-4; and Abramenko 1993: 134-42.
Augustales at Antipolis in Gallia Narbonensis in the late second or third century (CIL XII 181). Perhaps these three men ran into entrenched local aristocracies who controlled smaller councils with fewer seats, or their social standing prevented them from rising to the decurionate.

The remaining six *Augustales* in this set were all ex-slaves. For them, reaching the Augustalitas represented the highest social rank they could achieve in the municipal environment. Regardless of a person’s status, however, securing a position in this association required a great deal of wealth in order to pay the entry fees and engage in euergetism, such as that displayed by a freedman Augustalis of Potentia in Bruttium who seems to have borne the local municipal gentilicum [Potenti]nus (CIL X 141; date uncertain). In return for his entry into the Augustales and his obtaining the bisellium, he staged a banquet and distributed sportulae to the decurions, Augustales, and populus.

The descendants of the municipal freedmen also show a small presence in the local occupational collegia of their towns, some of which the Roman state regarded as performing necessaria opera. The incertus Bononius Mercurilis, with origins in nearby Bononia, was a member of the fabri in the large port city of Ravenna in the second or third century CE (AE 1977, 265a), while the freeborn C. Sassinas Polycarpianus held a position in the collegium centonariorum in his hometown of Sassina (CIL XI 6533).

Similarly, the equestrian M. Publicius Sextius Calpurnianus was also a collegiatus in the collegium centonariorum et

---

This fragmentary inscription has been heavily restored. The actual text runs as follows: 

[---]NUS DEC LIB DIGNUS / [ob ho]NOREM [b]SEL[l[o]] ET AUG / [cuius de]DICA[l]i[O]E DEDIT SINGU[li(is)] / [dec(urionibus) HS ---] AUG [HS] X [II] POPUL[O] [H]S I ORF / PANGA [---]N VVLUS AUGUSTUS. The main issue for my purposes is how to resolve the man’s fragmentary gentilicum and his libertination. Weiss 2004: 237 no. L20 (following Halkin 1897: 143-4, 244) restores the gentilicum to [Potenti]nus, based on his interpretation of DEC LIB to dec(urionum) lib(erus), which would indicate that the man was a municipal freedman with the town name. Yet this interpretation seems to be circular, and I can see no internal evidence in the actual text that clearly supports this idea. In fact, the earliest recording of this inscription is in a folio by Muratori (1732: 523, 1), who offers no resolution for either the gentilicum or the libertination. It would be exceptional for the decurions of Potentia to be listed as the patrons of this man, since such language is not found in any other occurrence of a self-identified municipal freedman. Moreover, the juridical sources emphasize that the municipes or coloni themselves were collectively the patron, owed opera and receiving testamentary rights to the freedman’s estate (Lex Irnitana 72; Dig. 40.3.3 (Papiniann); Cod. Just. 7.9.2). It should also be recognized that there are other examples of the private freedmen of a patron with the praenomen Decimus rendering their libertination as Dec(imi) (CIL VI 33106; Rome), D(ecimi) (e.g., AE 1964, 32; Trebula Mutuesca), or even Decini (e.g., CIL V 6807 = Inscr.It. 112, 30; Eporedia). In light of these ambiguities, I have classified this man as a private freedman of the descendants of the local municipal freedmen of Potentia, accepting his gentilicum as Potentinus.

Dig. 50.6.6 (Callistratus).

He was also enrolled in the local voting tribe Pupinia (see Kubitschek 1889: 75). That the ancient name of the town was Sassina, rather than Sarsina (cf. Greek Σάρσινα), is attested in two inscriptions mentioning local associations: the collegium dendrophorum fabrum centonariorum munici(ippi) Sassi(natis) (CIL XI 6520), and the collegium cent(onariorum) mun(ci)pi Sass(inatium) (CIL XI 6534). This formation is reflected in the municipal gentilicum Sassinas that is attested in the town.
fabrorum in his hometown of Brixia (CIL V 4459, approximately mid-second century CE).\textsuperscript{300} Whether they actually had economic interests in these trades or were involved for other reasons, membership in these major occupational associations is an indication of their elevated social and economic standing in their towns.

An additional pair of examples comes from Ostia, where members of the local family of the Ostienses appear in two trades. Among the rank-and-file members of the fabri navales (ship-builders) is found an incertus named C. Ostiensis Lucundus (Tribu p. 165; early third century CE).\textsuperscript{301} The list of colleagues in the fabri tignuarii (builders) who made a dedication to the emperor Septimius Severus in 198 includes Ost(i)e(n)s(is) Filumenu(s) (CIL XIV 4569). The most important observation to be made here is how poorly integrated the Ostienses were into the foremost and wealthiest occupational collegia of the colony, as well as in the smaller urban associations.\textsuperscript{302} This poor representation in local trades and associations stands out all the more in light of the particularly vibrant economy that characterized the colony in the first three centuries of the Principate.

Another group of descendants included here consists of the five men involved in the production of water pipes, bricks or tiles, and ceramic items. Marcus Arretius, whose name signals a family origin in Arretium in Etruria, stamped his name on ceramic basins (mortarium) found in two towns in Moesia Inferior (AE 1978, 711a; AE 1995, 1368). The names of four additional descendants appear in brick stamps with the phrase ex officina, indicating their management of production workshops.\textsuperscript{303}

\textit{Table IV.12 Descendants in the position of officinatores involved in brick production (4)}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of origin</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Find location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aricia (I)</td>
<td>L. Aricinus Chrestus</td>
<td>\textit{CIL} XV 2379, 1-2</td>
<td>Rome; Tibur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casinum (I)</td>
<td>C. Casinius Numidian(us)</td>
<td>\textit{CIL} XV 435, 1-7</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formiae (I)</td>
<td>L. Formianus</td>
<td>\textit{CIL} XI 6689, 107</td>
<td>Pisaurum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostra (VI)</td>
<td>C. Ostrius Serr(anus)</td>
<td>\textit{CIL} XV 1871</td>
<td>Rome; Ostia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presence of these descendants with a municipal gentilicium in such trades provides an important clue to the economic activities of the municipal freedmen’s families. Both Bruun

\textsuperscript{300} Calpurnianus was enrolled in the local voting tribe Fabia (see Kubitschek 1889:108-9). He was also an equestrian and had a short municipal career.\textsuperscript{301} See Cébeillac-Gervasoni and Zevi 2010: 163-4 on the identification of the Ostian association as the fabri navales. See also Meiggs 1973: 317, 324.\textsuperscript{302} Cf. Bruun 2008: 545-7.\textsuperscript{303} See an overview of the scholarship on the production of brick stamps and its terminology in Bruun 2005: 3-24.
and Luciani have emphasized how prevalent the municipal *familia publica* seems to have been in the production of these *instrumentum domesticum*, particularly water pipes.\(^{304}\) This link is particularly important in considering the overall poor participation by the descendants in other local occupations and professional associations. As was shown in Chapter III, the municipal freedmen themselves were unable to make significant inroads into these economic groups, and this failure in turn may have made it difficult for their descendants to break into them. For advancement into such associations, having a father or grandfather or patron who was already a member seems to have counted for much.\(^{305}\) These trades, particularly the production of water pipes, thus may have been one area of the local economy where the municipal freedmen’s descendants carried on niche occupations. While there is no way to know for sure, these descendants may have been operating independent workshops, since their *instrumentum* have been found away from their eponymous hometowns.\(^{306}\) Perhaps they learned the trade from their municipal freedmen fathers or grandfathers and then ventured out on their own. Finally, it is worth mentioning a handful of other descendants in the catalogue who exhibit indirect evidence of economic activities, even though no occupation is recorded for them. For instance, the tablet listing the local properties pledged to the Trajanic *alimenta* program in Veleia registers four different men with the local *gentilicium* Velleius as large landowners in the colony whose property abutted numerous other family tracts (*CIL* XI 1147).\(^{307}\) Similarly, the names of descendants of probable municipal freedmen of Puteoli, two bearing the *gentilicium* Publicius and the other the *gentilicium* Puteolanus, were recorded in contracts preserved in the Sulpician tablets found in Pompeii, but pertaining to business in Puteoli. C. Publicius Carus received a loan to pay his *vadimonium* fee to guarantee that he would appear for his trial in the Forum of Augustus in Rome in an unknown year (*TPSulp* 15),\(^{308}\) and in 44 or 45 a Q. Poblicius C[---] wrote up a contract on behalf of an illiterate man (*TPSulp* 98).\(^{309}\) An *incertus* named Q.

---

\(^{305}\) On the topic of sons following their fathers and freedmen following their patrons into occupations and professional associations, see Liu 2009: 161-212; Liu 2013: 352-68; and Hawkins 2016: 195-8.  
\(^{306}\) Given the mobility of these sorts of *instrumentum*, identifying the location of the workshop, source material, etc. is problematic.  
\(^{307}\) See Criniti 1991: 241-2. The four men are M. Velleius, Velleius Ingenuus, Velleius Proculus, and Velleius Severus. They are omitted from the number of descendants counted in occupations.  
\(^{308}\) Camodeca 1992: 82-4.  
\(^{309}\) Camodeca 1999: 209.
Puteolanus Alacer served as a witness for another contract in 53 CE (*TPSulp* 64). All three men must have played some modest role in the bustling economy of this port city.

**IV.4 CONCLUSIONS**

This analysis of the descendants of the municipal freedmen provides some clarity on their social and economic advancement in Roman society. The first-generation freeborn sons of the municipal freedmen were particularly limited in their mobility. Only five of them show any demonstrable success, one as a municipal scribe, one as a centurion in an urban cohort in Rome, two as municipal magistrates, and one as an equestrian.

The freedmen’s 464 male descendants fared only somewhat better. Seven men whose *gentilicia* suggest that they were part of municipal freedman family lines rose to the senatorial order. Yet two of these senators were perhaps descended from senatorial rather than municipal freedmen families. A further sixteen descendants achieved the rank of equestrian, with a few of these entering a career path in the imperial administration. In the municipal context, an additional 31 descendants entered the decurionate. Yet a number of them never penetrated the magisterial ranks dominated by the more entrenched decurions. Perhaps in some cases, the inclusion of these newcomers was part of a process of Roman towns expanding the membership of the *ordo* starting in the late second century CE. The municipal freedmen’s descendants enjoyed only a modest level of success in the various segments of the Roman army and in urban associations. The following chart brings their position into sharp focus.311

---

310 Camodeca 1992: 229-34.
311 Each descendant is counted only once, according to their highest rank achieved.
The steady progression of the descendants in this chart from the senatorial order to the Roman army, represented in the first four columns, is predictable. What is most surprising in this chart, however, is the downward curve in the descendants’ participation in occupations and professional associations, as well as voluntary associations, reflected in the fifth and sixth columns. One should expect that successful family lines in Roman society would, in addition to a modest presence in the elite orders, contain such a ‘middle’ group in this sub-elite urban context. This pattern indeed points to poor integration into the social and economic milieu of municipal society. Given how important hereditary links were in these colleges, especially in the professional associations, this may be explained by the municipal freedmen’s own inability to make inroads, which in turn diminished the opportunities for their descendants.\(^\text{312}\)

This reconstruction suggests limited social advancement by these sons and descendants. While it is only possible to speculate without more comparative data, the analysis does indicate that relevant to the collection of descendants in this set, demonstrable success was the exception.  

\(^{312}\) Meiggs 1973: 323, on the membership of the professional associations at Ostia.
The vast majority of the descendants known to us only left their name or family group on an epitaph, with few measurable social or economic achievements to boast about.
CONCLUSION

This thesis has sought to reconstruct the family histories of a particular group of Roman freedmen who in many ways constitute an exceptional category of ex-slaves. The preceding pages show how they and their descendants navigated the social and economic landscape of Roman imperial society in Italy, and, more generally, they also shed light on several aspects of how sub-elite Romans may have experienced social mobility across several generations.

The study has utilized a catalogue consisting of over 800 individuals who bear 83 different gentilicia and come from 106 different towns in Italy. Based on this evidence, I have argued that only a small portion of this group achieved any demonstrable success in either the municipal or the imperial context.

The analysis of the freedmen themselves in Chapter III suggests that they were not thoroughly integrated into either the social life of their community or its economic activities. The experience of these freedmen was unusual among the ex-slave population. On the one hand, there is evidence that as municipal slaves many of them enjoyed rare privileges, amassed substantial wealth, and had the opportunity to rub shoulders with the municipal elite. On the other hand, as freedmen they lacked a personal patron, since they were owned and manumitted by their town. Consequently, they missed out on the social and economic benefits that accrued to their private counterparts, who could rely on the assistance of often influential patrons. A small group managed to reach the highest social positions open to ex-slaves, such as entering the *Augustales or purchasing a membership in one of the other prestigious voluntary associations in their town. While a handful of other freedmen studied above displayed modest economic success as suggested by the acts of euergetism they carried out toward their hometowns, there are few indications that they experienced particular success in local professional associations or individual occupations.

An alternative path that was probably more common for these ex-slaves is also shown by this analysis. Many freedmen evidently maintained their ties with the familia publica. A number of them continued working for the municipal administration in the same occupations they had exercised as slaves. Concomitantly, a strong argument can be made that in some towns the familia publica, organized for official administrative duties, also functioned as a professional association or even a domestic familia through which the freedmen could enjoy aspects of

---

1 See Table 0.1 above, pp. 17-20.
collegial life and participate in the social and economic life of the wider community. Since these ex-slaves’ previous social and familial connections remained largely centered on the *familia*, and since wider municipal society may not have offered many promising opportunities, such a choice is understandable. In general, it is also likely that only the narrow group of former slaves who had been in the top-tier positions in the *familia publica* could ever hope to improve their lot after manumission. This conclusion can be understood beside the reconstruction of Roman freedman culture and self-representation in funerary monuments in a recent monograph by Rose MacLean. She examines how ex-slaves framed their own ‘biographies,’ the construction of which both drew on and, in turn, influenced commemorative motifs of the freeborn elite. Despite such dialogue with freeborn Romans, however, the ex-slave ideology looked simultaneously in two directions, as freedmen and freedwomen marked out a distinctive sub-culture that celebrated their common transition from slave to free citizen.

This is not the level of success one would expect from a group of ex-slaves that is often considered to have occupied a high status in local society. This impression becomes even more acute when one considers the possibility that the freedmen known from the epigraphic sources represent only a fraction of all those who once existed, but for various reasons did not leave behind a surviving epitaph or feature in other kinds of inscribed monuments. A plausible hypothesis would be that, if the post-manumission activities of this larger group could be recovered, we might expect that the resulting picture would confirm the limited success observed among the known municipal freedmen, or even make it more exceptional. This conclusion calls into question the assumption that the freedmen typically forged links to the municipal elite and local businessmen, or it may suggest that they were simply unable to exploit these links effectively after manumission. Perhaps they found it difficult to conduct business on their own, without the safety net of a rich patron behind them. There is a strong likelihood that their lack of a patron loomed large in this process, a deficiency that remains one of the most obvious obstacles they faced. The different process of integration into free Roman society these ex-slaves experienced, in comparison to other types of manumitted slaves, indeed had its drawbacks.

---

3 MacLean 2018 (especially pp. 131-69).
The descendants that may be traced in the epigraphic record seem to confirm this conclusion about their municipal freedmen ancestors. Freeborn sons represent a small group in the evidence, and they show few signs of success in their own right. Two attained the local decurionate, which was in itself noteworthy for first-generation *ingenui*. One other son received equestrian status through imperial beneficence, and another entered the apparitorial ranks in his hometown administration. Apart from these cases, however, there is no evidence of social or economic advancement that can be traced among the surviving inscriptions.

The large group of descendants seems not to have fared much better. A small segment achieved remarkable social and political success by reaching the municipal decurionate, the equestrian order, and even the senatorial order. Yet it must be recognized that for some of the senators, for example, a clear connection to a municipal freedman family line cannot be assumed. In other words, the attestation of any senatorial descendants of municipal freedmen is uncertain. In addition to this limited success, it is equally striking that the descendants’ footprint among the local and imperial elite did not last long. To judge from the evidence we have, most families who reached such heights were unable to hold on to their social status for more than one or two generations. The Roman army, including the Praetorian Guard and urban cohorts, seems to have been a common career path for some descendants of municipal freedmen, and the inscriptions that record this group indicate the army’s value as a vehicle for social mobility.

From an economic standpoint, too, the descendants displayed limited advancement. In fact, it is not possible to point to any site with a concentration of descendants with a strong economic presence in any particular occupation or professional association. The vast majority of the sub-elite descendants in the catalogue come down to us only as a name on an epitaph. As was described in the conclusion of Chapter IV, prosopographical research on any discrete, successful social group should expect to uncover a few members at the top of the social hierarchy – among senators, equestrians, and the municipal elite – but a substantially larger group in the ‘middle,’ among the ranks of occupations, professional associations, and generally a significant foothold in the local economy. Such a ‘middle’ group is mostly absent in this study, which serves as an illustration of how the lack of an ancestor who gained a foothold in a trade could ripple down through a family’s trajectory. It also seems plausible to surmise that not many of these sub-elite

---

6 *CIL* IX 2473, Saepinum; *CIL* IX 3945, Alba Fucens.
7 *CIL* XIV 3442, Afilae.
8 *CIL* XI 5760, Sentinum.
descendants had acquired substantial land holding that could provide the financial resources to support their families’ advancement.\(^9\)

In the picture that takes shape here, it is important to keep in mind a peculiar characteristic of this group of freedmen and their descendants that underlines the conclusions about their place in Roman society. Unlike private families whose various branches of freeborn and freed members often died out after some generations and therefore disappeared from our evidence, the municipal freedman family lines were continually renewed with each new generation of municipal freedmen the towns produced through manumission. The probability of identifying such families in the epigraphic record over several centuries thus increases, and the fact that comparatively so few had any success to boast of is in itself significant.

It is difficult to evaluate how much the lack of a patron for their municipal freedmen progenitors impacted on the descendants’ own position, but this disadvantage seems to have had long-lasting consequences. Similarly, while the epigraphic record is not the most suitable place to study the effects of the *macula servitutis*, one wonders whether the descendants’ ascent, at least into the upper echelons of society, was impeded by their rare nomenclature and its connotation of their ‘servile’ origins. From a different perspective, the collective picture of social mobility presented by these family lines also brings to the fore the difficulties any lower-class Roman family must have faced in striving to gain meaningful and lasting social and economic advancement. There is a sufficient basis to argue that descent from a municipal freedman, sometimes regarded as enhancing a person’s status, was of marginal value in climbing the social ladder in municipal or imperial society.

This study also opens up new avenues for further research. An essential next step is to compare these findings with other defined sets of Roman freedmen’s families, in order to better understand how this group fits into other studies of social groups from sub-elite backgrounds over the long term. Future research can also include those persons with a municipal *gentilicum* from Group II towns, where the family names tended to have Etruscan antecedents and suggest that they were in use before municipal freedmen came onto the local scene. This category yields a large body of evidence, and though it also raises new methodological problems in sorting out

\(^9\) The four Velleii and three Publicii registered as landowners in the Trajanic *alimenta* land pledges from Veleia are an exception to this pattern (*CIL XI 1147*). One possible alternative, which points again to the selective nature of the epigraphic habit, is that some landowning descendants retired to the country and therefore disappeared from the epigraphic record.
which names were mostly likely connected to a municipal *familia publica*, it has the capacity to confirm or modify the conclusions drawn in this thesis. Moreover, a similar study can be done of the municipal freedmen families deriving from Roman towns in the provinces. A particularly intriguing aspect of this group is the extent to which they may have remained in their home regions or migrated to Italy in search of new opportunities.

From a broader perspective, it is worth thinking about how this study of the municipal freedmen can provide insight into the way other Roman ex-slaves and their families approached their post-manumission lives. For one thing, they overwhelmingly chose to settle near their former household, presumably for both formal (*operae*) and informal (familial connections, the *familia publica* ‘professional association’) reasons. Their post-manumission occupational lives were often also a continuation of their work in servitude. What is more, despite a small segment of municipal freedmen who ‘married up,’ the majority seems to have chosen a partner from within the same social group, either a municipal or a private freedwoman, thus strengthening the links within their own social status. In some ways, then, the lack of demonstrable success by these municipal freedmen is probably a reflection of the difficulties most Roman ex-slaves had in pursuing social and economic advancement for themselves and their sons.

The study of these freedmen’s descendants also has wider implications for Roman social history. They constitute a useful case-study on the limits of social mobility for the sub-elite population, in particular those with municipal origins who were trying to climb the ranks in local and imperial society. One of their most important contributions to freedman studies is the opportunity they offer to observe longer-term family trajectories, rather than only what can be gleaned from the first couple of generations removed from a freed slave. Their settlement patterns show a strong tendency to move to larger urban centers in the search to improve their economic prospects. Yet this sort of migration was not always successful.

This group is also useful for fleshing out our understanding of how successful the descendants of Roman ex-slaves were in reaching the political elite in the longer term. Our group’s marginal presence in the municipal decurionate and in the equestrian and senatorial ranks gives a more concrete form to suppositions drawn from literary and epigraphic sources. Tacitus commented on the prevalence of freedmen’s descendants in the ranks of the senatorial and equestrian order (*Ann. 13.27*), but we see that in the case of these families, their presence was indeed small. Likewise, the number of equestrians at any given time in the Roman Empire
numbered well into the thousands. Yet the collective families of the municipal freedmen managed to produce just sixteen equestrians across a period of some three hundred years. In light of the large body of research on ‘servile’ decurions among the municipal elite of Italy, our group also stands in contrast. In towns like Beneventum, Brixia, Ostia, and Pompeii, scholars have shown that over time ex-slaves’ descendants may have constituted between 15% and 25% of all of the decurions known to us. The municipal freedmen’s descendants from these sites, however, had a meager share of this local upward mobility. The Concordii (Beneventum), Ostienses, and Publicii (Brixia) each contributed only a single attested decurion in the entire period of their family histories that is captured in the epigraphic record. In other towns, too, the municipal freedmen’s families show only sporadic success in the decurionate, and there is almost no indication that any family line enjoyed this status in more than one generation.

The family lines of municipal freedmen illustrate that avenues for social ascent ‘from below’ were available to the lucky few. It is commonly assumed that sub-elite families like these encountered difficulties to build up the social connections and financial resources needed to place family members in the activities and social orders that serve as the most visible measuring sticks of success for the Roman social historian. In other cases, a rich patron had the ability to facilitate this process to a certain degree. Whereas this point may seem self-evident, it is often difficult to fully appreciate impressive examples of social mobility without elucidating the long-term processes behind them. It is my hope that the more nuanced model presented here can bring a fresh perspective to the broader study of how persons with ‘servile’ origins made their way in Roman society.

---

10 A useful next step to put this figure in greater context would be to understand how such representation fits in with all the equestrians known to us from the epigraphic record.
11 Mouritsen 1997: 57-78. But note the impression of local decurions’ origins from other types of epigraphic evidence, as discussed in Camodeca 1996a: 171-8 (Herculaneum); and Mouritsen 1997: 57-78 (Pompeii, pp. 62-8; Ostia, pp. 68-70; Puteoli, pp. 70-2; Beneventum, pp. 72-3).
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## APPENDIX I: DEMOGRAPHIC ESTIMATES OF SELECT CITIES IN ITALY

This table presents some basic demographic estimates for key features of cities in Italy that provide substantial evidence for this study. These estimates are intended as a frame of reference for the analysis presented in the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population(^1)</th>
<th>Council of decurions(^2)</th>
<th>Familia publica(^3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large cities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixia</td>
<td>15,000(^4)</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>c. 25,000-50,000</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>40,000-60,000(^5)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompeii</td>
<td>c. 12,000(^6)</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puteoli</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>c. 100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium towns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ameria</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praeneste</td>
<td>c. 10,000</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small towns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aricia</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>40-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentinum</td>
<td>c. 5,000</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>40-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urvinum Mataurense</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>40-50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Unless otherwise noted, the population estimates are based on the calculation of approximately 150-300 inhabitants per hectare (de Ligt 2012: 213-24). See ‘Appendices I-II’ in de Ligt 2012: 289-339 for estimates of inhabited space at each of these sites.


APPENDIX II: SECURE MUNICIPAL FREEDMEN

The town of family origin for each person is listed in parentheses, and the location of the inscription is listed after the colon. The notation * indicates that the inscription was found within the administrative boundaries of the town listed.

Group I Towns

Region I: Latium et Campania

M. Arrecinus Gellianus (Aricia): Aricia
CIL XIV 2156 (= ILS 3255), date uncertain
Dianae Aug(ustae) / colleg(ii) lotor(um) / sacr(um), / Primigenius r(ei) p(ublicae) / Arcinorum ser(vus) arc(arius), / curar II, cum / M(arco) Arrecino Gelliano / filio, curatore I, / d(edit) d(edicavit).

Campania Albina (Capua): Formiae
AE 1911, 156 (= AE 1987, 243), II-III century CE
Dextro Dextri / aeditui et Campaniae / Albinae filio Duronio / a basilica / cum suis, vixit annis / XXVI, mensib(us) III, diebus XIX.

Campania Phronime (Capua): Capua
CIL X 4334, II-III century CE
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / Sedato col(oniae) / Campania Phronime / patri, / vix(it) ann(os) LIII.

C. Campanius Ursulus (Capua): Capua
CIL X 3940 (= ILS 6318), I century CE

C. Interamnius Crescentio (Interamna Lirenas): Interamna Lirenas
AE 1911, 205, II century CE
Iovi Optimo / Maximo sacr(um), / C(aius) Interamnius Cres/centio libert(us) et tabu/lar(ius) r(ei) p(ublicae) aram, ius(s)u / numin(is), restituit.

Sex. Menturnius Felix (Minturnae): Minturnae
CIL X 6044, date uncertain
Sex(tus) Menturnius colon(iae) / lib(ertus) Felix sibi et suis fecit.

Minturnius Suc(c)e[ssus] (Minturnae): Minturnae
AE 1914, 221, II-III century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / Minturniai / M(arci) f(iliae) [---]aidi, / Minturnius / Suc(c)e[ssus] colon/iae lib(ertus) coniugi / optimae fecit.

[---] Phialus (Nuceria): Nuceria
CIL X 1090, I century CE

292
A. Ostiensis Asclepiades (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 32 (= CIL VI 479 = ILS 6152 = AE 2001, 690), II-early III century CE
Pro salute / Aug(usti) [---]. // A(ulus) Ostiensis / Asclepiades / aeditu(u)s Capitoli / signum Martis / corpori familiae / public(a)e / libertorum / et servorum / d(onom) d(edit).

L. (Ostiensis?) Euanthes (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 440 (= AE 2007, 284), II-early III century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / L(ucio) Euanthen(i) / liberto colo/niaes fecit / co(n)iugi san/ctissimo.

P. Ostiensis Acutus (Ostia): Ostia
AE 1939, 148, I century CE
P(ublius) Ostiensis coloniae / libertus Acutus, / Phileros publicus / Cartilianus.

Q. Ostiensis Felix (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 73, later I century CE
Imperio, / Q(uintus) Ostiensis / Felix / aedituus / aedis Romae et Aug(ustorum) / fecit.

35 freedmen with the gentilicium Ostiensis in the familia publica (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 255, II century CE (?)

M. Venerius Secundus (Pompeii): Pompeii
CIL IV 3340, 139, 60 CE
Idu[s(?) Feb(ruarias) / Privatus c(olonorum) c(oloniae) V(eneriae) C(orneliae) s(ervus) s[c]ripsi me acc[episse] / ab L(uicio) Caecili[o] Lucu[nd]o HS ((mille)) [---] / [ex r]eliq[i]um fundi [---]i / [---]i praef(ectus) i(ure) d(icundo). / [ // ] / D(ecimi) L[uc]re, Val[entis], / M(arci) Stronni Sec[undi], / M(arci) Veneri Sec[undi], / Privati c(olonorum) c(oloniae) [V(eneriae) C(orneliae) s ervi].

M. Publicius Philodamus (Venafrum): Venafrum
CIL X 4984, I century CE
viv(i) / M(arci) Publici / coloniae l(iberti) / Philodami et / Primae l(ibertae) et s(uorum).

(Venafranius/Publicius) Auctus (Venafrum): Venafrum
CIL X 5012, I century CE
Auctus l(iberti) col(oniae).

Q. Venafranius Felix; Sex. Venafranius Primogenius (Venafrum): Venafrum
CIL X 5012, I century CE
Sex(to) Venafrani(o) / col(oniae) l(iberto) Primogeni(o) / sibi et suis; / Q(uinto) Venafranio col(oniae) l(iberto) / Felici sibi et suis, / in fron(te) p(edes) XII, / in agro p(edes) XII.

Region II: Apulia et Calabria

Concordia Ianuaria (Beneventum): Beneventum
CIL IX 1538 (= ILS 4185), 238 CE
Attini sacrum / et Minervae Berecint(iae). / Concordia col(oniae) lib(erta) Ianuari[a] / c[y]mbal(istria), [l]oco secundo ob / criobolium factum M(atris) de(um) / Ma(gnae), tradentib(us) Septimio / Primitivo augure et sac(erdote), / Servilia Varia, et Terentia / Elisviana sacerd(ote), XVVir(ali), / praeuentae Mamio Secundo, / haec iussu Matris deum /
in ara taurobolica duo/dena cum vitula crem(ata), / sub die V Idus Aprilis, / Modesto II et Probo co(n)s(ulibus).

C. Poblicius Eros (Canusium): Canusium
CIL IX 396, I century CE

Region IV: Samnium

Aequicula Bassilla (Aequiculi): Aequiculi
CIL IX 4112 (= ILS 4381), date uncertain
pro salute ordinis et populi signa / Serapis et Isidis, cum ergaster(i)s suis, / et aediculam in scholam, permit/tente ordine, / Apronianus r(ei) p(ublicae) Aequicul(anorum) ser(vus) ar[rector](arius), / cum Aequicula Bassilla et Aequicu/ulo Apronio fil(io), pec(unia) sua fecit; / l(os) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

Aesernia S[y]n[t]eche; M. Aesernius Ampliatus (Aesernia): Aesernia
CIL IX 2676, later I-II century CE

M. Amiternius Iucundus (Amiternum): Amiternum
CIL IX 4231 (= ILS 6547), I century CE
M(arcus) Amiternius munici/pum l(ibertus) Iucundus et / Petronia Calliste, sibi / posterisque suis.

C. Saepinius Albanus (Saepinum): Saepinum
CIL IX 2533 (= ILS 6520), I century CE
Aucta sibi, / et C(aio) Saepinio / municipi(i) [l(iberto)] Albano / patrono, / C(aio) Saepinio Diomedi, / et Dion[y]siae matri.

L. Saepinius Oriens (Saepinum): Saepinum
CIL IX 2472 (= ILS 6519), early II century CE
D(is) [M(anibus)]. / L. Saepinio Orienti Aug(ustali), / et L. Saepinio Oresti / IIIvir(o), / et Aed(ili), et Felicul(ae) / filiae, Oriens aliment(arius) / Saepinati(um), patri et fratr(i), / et Thalia conserva eius / b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit/ecerunt).

Terventinia Calliste (Terventum): Terventum
CIL IX 2606, I-II century CE
---[no rei p(ublicae) / Terventin(atium) ser(vo) ar[rector](arius), / Terventinia / Calliste con(iugi) / / et / Arci[---

L. Terventin(ius) (Terventum): Terventum
AE 2010, 382, late II-early III century CE
D(is) M(anibus) [s(acrum)]. / L. Terventin[o, O]ptata Terventi[n]a[tium], marito / c[um q(uo)] vixit an/nis LVI, mensib(us) III, / dieb(us) XIII, s[tri]n[rector] ul/la controversia. / D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum).
Trebulana Iustina (Trebuila Suffenas): Beneventum
CIL IX 1542, 228 CE
Attini sac(rum) / et Minervae / Parcentiae. Trebulana Ius/tina [t]ym[pu]nis/tr(a), o[b

T. Trebulanus Albanus; Trebulanus Ferentin(ensis) (Trebuila Suff.): Trebula Suff.
CIL XIV 3513, I century CE
Cerviae filiae / Gulae matri / piissimae, / A(ulo) Cervio A(uli) f(ilio) Ani(ensi) / Plebeio
fratri, / C(aius) Cervius A(uli) f(ilius) Ani(ensi) / Flaccus fecit, / M(arco) Minervino, / T(ito) Trebulano munici(p(ii) / Albano, / ---]triliae [-]arini, / Trebulano munici(p(ii) Ferentin(ensi), / ---]andiae [-] maiori.

Region V: Picenum
M. Valerius Verna (Asculum Picenum): Asculum Picenum
ILS 6565, II-III century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / M(arco) Valerio col(oniae) l(iberto) / Vernae sexvir(o) Aug(ustali) et

Region VI: Umbria
C. Publicius Verecundus (Asisium): Asisium
CIL XI 5411, late II-early III century CE

L. Publicius Celer (Carsulae): Carsulae
AE 2000, 534, I century CE
L(uci)us Publicius Cel(e)r / munici[pum] Cars(ulanorum) / lib(e)rtus.

Quint(i)a R[e]stituta (Carsulae): Carsulae
AE 2012, 466, II-III century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / Primitiv(u)s p(ublicus) / saltuarius Car(ulanorum), / Quintae
R[e]stitutae Car(sulanorum) / b(en)e m(erenti).

Hispellatia Valentina (Hispellum): Hispellum
BSCF 2012/13, 292, II century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / Hispellatiae / Valentinae, / Ianuarius / r(ei) p(ublicae) c(oloniae)
His(pellatum) actor? / coniugi / b(en)e m(erenti).

P. Mevanas Faustus (Mevania): Mevania
CIL XI 5114, I century CE
P(ublius) Mevanas municip{i}um / l(ibertus) Faustus Meligerus / lib(ertus).

P. Pisaur(ensis) Achillas (Pisaurum): Pisaurum
CIL XI 6316, later I-II century CE
Silvani / signum / cum bas(e), / P(ublius) Pisaur(ensis) / col(oniae) lib(ertus) / Achillas / posuit.

Region VII: Etruria

Publicia/Saturnia Fortunata (Saturnia): Saturnia
CIL XI 2656, later II-III century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / Secundae / publicae, / vixit a(nnos) VII, / m(enses) X, / Tertius et / Publicia For/tunata par(entes) / filiae karis(simae) f(ecerunt). // Saturniae For/tunatae v(ixit) a(nnos) XXXIII, / Primitivo c(oloniae) S(aturniae), v(ixit) a(nnos) XIIIX, / m(enses) IV, d(ies) VII, coniugi / et fil(io) Tertius c(oloniae) S(aturniae).

Veientius Ianuarius (Veii): Veii
CIL XI 3780 (= ILS 6580), 249 CE
Dedicata / III Non(as) Ian(uarias) / Aemiliano II et Aquilino co(n)s(ulibus), / P(ublio) Sergio Maximo / M(arco) Lollio Sabiniano / Ilvir(is) q(uin)q(uannalis), / cura agente / Veientio Ianuario lib(rario) ar(c). // Victoriae / August(ae) / sacrum / restitutae post anti/quissimam vetusta/tem / ordo Veientium.

(Volsinius) Didas (Volsinii): Tarquinii
CIL XI 3419, late I-II century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / Charis Vols(iniensium) / coniugi bene / merenti, p(ius) p(osuit) / Dida[s] lib(ertus) Vol(siniensium).

[---] Volsinius [V]ictorinus (Volsinii; and formerly Ferentinum): Volsinii
CIL XI 2710a, date uncertain
[---] Volsino / [V]ictorino / q(uin)q(uennali) coll(egii) fabr(um), / Augustal[i], / tabul(ario) rei publ(icae) / [V]olusiniens(ium) / [i]t(em) Ferenti/ensium.

Region VIII: Aemilia

M. Poblicius Philetus (Bononia): Bononia
CIL XI 6829, date uncertain
Dis Manibus / M(archi) Poblici Phileti / Claud(ialis), / [M(arcus)] Poblicius Zosimus / libert(us) / [be]ne m(erenti) fecit, / et / M(arcius) Poblicius Ianuarius / delicatus, et / Poblicia Chreste / lib(erta).

CIL XI 6840, date uncertain
AE 1922, 111 (= NSA 1922, 59), II-early III century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / Flaviae / Pyrralid(i), / Publicius / Plac(entiae) lib(ertus) / Theseus / coniugi / rarissi/mae.
Poblicius Se[ninus] (Veleia): Veleia
   CIL XI 1205, later I-early II century CE

Region X: Venetia et Histria

Publicia Amabisilis (Altinum): Altinum
   AE 2001, 1049 (= AE 2010, 548), earlier I century CE
   Veneri Aug(ustae), / Publicia / Amabisilis et / Virili / m(unicipum) / A(ltinum) s(ervus) v(icens) a(erarii) / v(otum) s(olverunt) l(ibentes) m(erito).

C. Aquileiens(is) Felix (Aquileia): Aquileia
   CIL V 737 (= ILS 4869), II century CE
   Apollini / Bele[no], / C(aius) Aquileiens(is) / Felix / quod vilic(us) / summarum [/]

L. Aquileiensis Agathius (Aquileia): Aquileia
   CIL V 1084, late I-earlier II century CE

--- Aquileiensis [Eu]nus Maronianus (Aquileia): Aquileia
   Inscr.Aqu. 1, 567, I century CE
   [--- Aquileiensis) / [Eu]no / [ex ho]rreo / Maronian(o), / heredes dedere.

--- Aquileiensis [---]ntus (Aquileia): Aquileia
   CIL V 8212 (= Inscr.Aqu. 1, 128), later I-early II century CE

P. Public(ius) Ursio (Aquileia): Aquileia*
   CIL V 715 (= ILS 6682), later II-III century CE
   P(ublius) Public(ius) Ursio / v(ivus) s(ibi) f(ecit) et / coniugi kariss(ima) / Voltiliae Saturn(u), / dum saltus pub/licos cur/ro d[c]idi hoc in pri/vato agello.

C. Concordius Primus (Brixellum): Brixellum
   AE 1931, 10 (= AE 1933, 154 = AE 1975, 396), later I century CE
   C(ai) Concordio Brixil(lanorum) l(iberto) Primo / VIvir(o) Aug(ustalium) gr(atuito), d(creto) d(ecurium), / C(ai) Concordio C(ai) l(iberto) / Rhenio IIIIIvir / Augustali viro, / Concordiae C(ai) f(iliae) / Festae filiae, / Munatia C(ai) et / ((mulieris)) l(iberta) / Rufilla / v(iva) f(ecit).

Pub(licia) Quint{i}a; Q. Pub(licius) Faustus (Brixia): Brixia
   CIL V 4686, date uncertain
   Q(uinto) Pub(licio) / Fausto et / Pub(liciae) Quint{i}ae, / Faustinus Brixiano[rum] / parentib(us) / [---]TIA PAL frat(r)ib(us?) . . .

[P]ublicius Eu[t]ychius (Brixia): Brixia
   AE 1952, 133, date uncertain

C. Public(ius) Aprodis(ius) (Cremona): Cremona
Q(uintus) Domatius C(ai) f(ilius) bonum tempus / mihi me(a)que aetati; / id ego mando remandata / quo(d) i(i)s apud deos i(n)f eros ut pereant / et defigantur, quo(d) ego heres sim: / pupillus C(ai) Grani C(ai) f(ili), C(aius) Public(ius) populi l(ibertus) / Aprodis(ius), L(ucius) Cornelius meo sum(ptu) / defig[o] illos quo pereant.

[C.] Publicius Germanus (Opitergium): Opitergium
AE 2010, 544, later I-earlier II century CE
[C(aius)] Publicius m(unicipum) Op(riterginorum) l(ibertus) / Germanus v(ivus) f(ecit), / sibi et Secundae / [T. Publicius Crescens (Patavium): Patavium
CIL V 2795 (= ILS 3625), date uncertain
Genio dom(i)nor(um) Cereri, / T(itus) Publicius Crescens Laribus / publicis dedit imagines argent(eas) duas / testamento ex HS ((mille)) ((mille)).

Pollentia Processa; (Pollentius) Valerianus (Polia): Pola
CIL V 83 (= ILS 6677), II-early III century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / Pollentiae / Processae / col(oniae) Pol(ensium) lib(ertae), / Valerianus / summaram / dispensat(or) / collibertae / rarissimae / posuit.

L. Publicius Eutyches (Tarvisium): Tarvisium
CIL V 2109, date uncertain
Isid(i) Reg(inae), / L(u)cius Publicius / Eutyches / mun(icipii) Tar(visii) / lib(ertus).

C. Publicius Hermes; Q. Publicius Charito (Tergeste): Tergeste
CIL 519 (= ILS 4110), I-II century CE

L. Publicius Syntropus (Tergeste): Tergeste*
CIL V 488, later I century CE
L(u)cius Publicius / Syntropus / archigallus / v(ivus) f(ecit), sibi et [suis]. / h(oc) m(onumentum) h(eredem) n(on) s(equetur).

Q. Publicius Felix (Tergeste): Tergeste
CIL V 628 (= ILS 6683), early I century CE
Q(uinto) Publicio Tergest(inorum) l(iberto) / Felici, Septumia Sp(uria) f(ilia) / Sexta, Q(uintus) Publicius / Felicis l(ibertus) In genuus v(ivii) f(ecerunt).

M. Publicius Metrodorus (Tridentum): Tridentum
AE 1977, 285, I-II century CE
M(arco) Publicio / Trid(entinorum) lib(erto) / Metrodoro / VIviro Aug(ustali), Amphion / Trident(inorum) / bene m[erenti].

Veronia Caesia (Verona): Verona
CIL V 3470 (= AE 2007, 634), II-III century CE
Veroniae / Caesiae, / Heliodorus et / Caesianus fili(i) / matri pientissimae, / et Heliodorus / Veronensis coniugi / karissimae et sibi.

Veronia Chreste; Veronius Ce[l]sus (Verona): Verona
CIL V 3832, later II-III century CE

Veronia Trofima; C. Veronius Carpus (Verona): Verona
CIL V 3438, early II century CE
C(aius) Veronius / Carpus / VIvir Cl(audialis) Mai(or), / Veroniae / Trofim(a)e sacer(doti) / Matris deum / matri / sanctissimae / et Veronio Primo.

P. Poblicius Valens (Vicetia): Vicetia
CIL V 3139, mid-I century CE
P(ublio) Poblicio m(unicipii) V(icitinorum) l(iberto) / Valenti / IIVIIIvir(o), / Matienae Q(uinti) l(ibertae) / Rufae, Matiena P(ubli) et / ((mulieris)) l(iberta) Suavis / patronis et sibi / viva fecit.

Tib. Public(ius) Primitivos (Vobarno): Vobarno
AE 2010, 592, date uncertain
Juventuti, / Tib(erius) Public(ius) / Primitivos / saltuar(ius) pagi / Veneri / d(onom) d(edit).

Region XI: Transpadana

C. Poblicius Alex{s}ander (Mediolanum): Mediolanum*
CIL V 6630 (= CIL XII 18), I century CE
I(ovi) O(ptimo) [M(aximo)], / C(aius) Poblicius / municipum / Mediolaniens(i)u[m] / l(ibertus) Alex{s}ander / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).

C. Publicius Eutyches (Mediolanum): Mediolanum
AE 1974, 346, early II century CE
C(aio) Publicio / m(unicipium) M(ediolaniensium) lib(erto) / Eutycheti / et Pomponiae / C(ai) f(iliae) Daphne / coniugi eius / et Potiriae C(ai) f(iliae) / Aulae filiae eorum, / Q(uintus) Ingenu(iu)s / Maximinus / ob mult(a) benef(icia) / et aditum sibi / familiarem / domus eor(um).

C. Publicius Olym[us] (Mediolanum): Mediolanum
CIL V 5881, later I-II century CE
V(ivus) f(ecit) / C(aius) Publicius Olym[us] / sacerdos M(atri) d(eum), sibi et / Pobliciae T(h)isbe / lib(ertae) suae.

Plumbarii

Clodius Fortunatus (Reate)
CIL IX 4701a-b
Clodius Fortuna(tus) r(ei) p(ublicae) Reatinorum.
Q. Reatinus Sallustianus (Reate)
    CIL IX 4699a-e (also in Lanciani Silloge no. 438)
    Q(uintus) Reatinus Sallustianus lib(ertus) r(ei) p(ublicae) R(eatinorum) f(ecit).
APPENDIX III: PROBABLE MUNICIPAL FREEDMEN

Group I Towns

Region I: Latium et Campania

M. Arreccinus Augustinus (Aricia) Aricia
NSA 1920, 288, later I century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / Arreccinae M(arci) f(iliae) / Marcellae, vixit annis VIII, / men(sibus) XI, dieb(us) XVII, / M(arcus) Arreccinus Augustinus / et Flavia Beronice par(entes) / fecerunt.

Campania Felicissima (Capua): Capua
CIL X 4273 (= ILS 8459), later I-II century CE
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / L(ucius) Papinius Verus et / Campania Felicissima / vivi fecerunt sibi, qui / vixerunt inter se / annis LXVIII, d(iebus) X.

L. Campanius Sosimenes (Capua): Capua
CIL X 3944, I-II century CE

Ost(ienia) Eup[---]; L. Os(tiensis) Paulinus (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 1428, date uncertain
L(ucio) Ost(iensi) Fel(ici), / q(ui) vixit an(num) I, m(enses) VI, / d(ies) VII, L(ucius) Os(tiensis) Paulinus / et Ost(ienia) Eup[---] alum(no) / dul(cissimo).

Ostiensia Victorina (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 1433, III century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / Ostiensiae Victorin(a)e, / quae vixit ann(os) XXXXI, / m(enses) VII, d(ies) XVIII, L(ucius) / Combarisius Eutyches / co(n)iugi bene merenti

Ost(ienia) Marullus; Ost(ienia) Primus (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 1431, date uncertain

[---] Ostiensis I[---] (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 4560, 2, late II century CE

C. Ost(i)e(n)sis Eu[---]; C. Ost(i)e(n)sis Ter[---] (Ostia): Ostia
ILOP 92, II-earlier III century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / C(aius) Ost(i)e(n)sis Eu[---] / et C(aius) Ost(i)e(n)si Te[---].

Cn. Ostiensis Lu[---] (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 1435, date uncertain
L. Ost[iensis ---] (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 4562, 6 (= AE 1919, 65), 196 CE
This man appears in a fragment of the *fasti Augustalium* of Ostia.

L. Ostiensis Suntrofus (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 1432, later III-earlier IV century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / L(ucius) Ostiensis / Suntrofus / refecit, sibi et Cor/neliae Epictesi / co(n)iugi et libert(is) / libertabusque / posterisque eoro(m).

P. Ostien[sis ---]; P. Ostien[sis ---] (Ostia): Ostia
AE 2001, 691 (= AE 2006, 259), date uncertain

P. Ostiensis Epaphroditus (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 1737 (= CIL X 6189), II-III century CE
Vedia / Voluptas / fecit sibi et / Vediae Veneri et / P(ublio) Ostiensis Epaphrodito / parentib(us) / lib(ertis) libertab(usque) post(eresque) eorum; / in f(ronte) p(edes) XX, in ag(ro) p(edes) XX.

P. Ostiensis Thallus (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 290, II century CE (?)
D(is) M(anibus) / Agriae / Agath(e), / P(ublius) Ostiensis Thallus / tutor, sevir Aug(ustalis) et / Agria Tryphosa heredes, / de suo fecerunt / b(ene) et sibi m(erenti).

C. Venerius Epaphroditus (Pompeii): Pompeii
CIL X 1013, mid-I century CE
C(aius) Venerius / Epaphroditus.

Potiolana Tyches (Puteoli): Puteoli
CIL X 2886, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / Potiolinae / Tycheni, / M(arcus) Ulpius / Euangelus fec(it).

Publicia Liberalis; C. Publicius Donatus (Puteoli): Puteoli
CIL X 2897, mid-I century CE
C(aius) Publicius Donatus et / Publicia Liberalis, sibi / et suis libertis liberta/busque / posterisque / eorum omnium.

Sex. Publicius Bathyllus (Puteoli): Puteoli
CIL X 1889, early I century CE
Sex(tus) Publicius Bathyllus / accensus consuli, Augustalis / Puteolis et Venafri, sibi et / Urvineiae L(uci) l(ibertae) / Modestae uxorii suae / et L(ucio) Urvineio Adiutori et / C(aio) Iulio Aucto fratri.

C. Put(eolanius) Fortunatus (Puteoli): Puteoli
CIL X 8204, later II-early III century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / Ulpia Fortu/nata, vix(it) ann(os) / X ṭC(aius) Put(eolanius)
Fortu/natus filiae piis(simae) b(ene) m(ereni) fecit.

M. Tusculanius Amianthus (Tusculum): Tusculum
CIL XIV 2637 (= ILS 6215; also in CIL XIV 2620 = AE 2008, 286), date uncertain
M(arco) Tusculanio / Amiantho / mag(istro) aeditu(um) / Castoris Polluc(is), / Augustalium h(onore) f(uncto), / M(arcus) Tusculanius / M(ari) f(ilius) / Receptus / fratric.

Venafrania Festa (Venafrum): Venafrum
CIL X 4932, II century CE
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / Calliope, / vixit annis XXI, / Venafrania Festa / soror.

CIL X 4983, II century CE
D(is) M(anibus) S(acrum). / Prisco / Farnaces et / Venafraniae / Festae fil(i)o, / parentes / piissimo, vi/xit ann(is) XVI.

Venafranius Albanus (Venafrum): Venafrum
CIL X 5010, later I century CE
Venafranio Albano, / [L]uculan[a]e Specie[i], / v(ivis) f(ecerunt) sibi et suis; / in fr(onte)
p(edes) X, in agr(o) p(edes) XII.

[---] Venafranus Dio[gen]e[us] (Venafrum): Venafrum
CIL X 4852, later I-II century CE
Cult(ores) Iovis Cae(lestis) / C(aius) ---alus Iustus, / C(aius) Balbius Speratus / [---]
Venafranus Dio[gen]e[us], / [---]dius Cest[---], / C(aius) Distubuanus Ianuari[u]s, / [---]

Q. Venafr[anius] Hermaiscus (Venafrum): Venafrum
CIL X 5011, mid-I century CE
h{e}ic sita / sunt oss[a] / Q(uinti) Venafr[ani] / Hermaisci, / Vveia ((mulieris)) l(iberta) / Danais / de suo fecit.

Region II: Apulia et Calabria

Aecla(nia) Graph(e); Aeclanius Grap(?) (Aeclanum): Aeclanum
CIL IX 1203, II-III century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / Aecla(nia) Gr/aph(e), Aecla(nio) / Grap(?) filio / b(ene) m(ereni) f(ecit).

Aeclania Marcella; Aeclanius Maximianus (Aeclanum): Aeclanum
CIL IX 1200, III century CE
[---] Aeclanius / Maximianus / et Aeclania Marcella, de comuni labo/ri r\n\n\n\n\n\n\n
Aeclania Primitiva (Aeclanum): Aeclanum
CIL IX 1092, II-III century CE
Deo aeter/no, Aecla/nia Prim/itiva vot(um) / l(ibens) s(olvit).
Aeclania Spes; Aeclanius Ianuarius (Aeclanum): Aeclanum
CIL IX 1204, II-III century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / Aeclan/iae / Spenti, / Aeclanius / Ianuarius / coni(ugi) b(ene) m(erenti) / fecit.

Aeclaniu[s ---]scinus (Aeclanum): Aeclanum
CIL IX 1201, III century CE
Aeclaniu[s ---]scinus et S[---] / fil(iae) Martia[---] / [---]CON M . . .

Concordia Chrysogone (Beneventum): Beneventum
AE 1968, 134, II century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / C(ai) Iuli Gemelli, / C(aius) Iulius Gemellus / et Concordia Chryso/gone parentes et / sibi suisque vivi / fecerunt.

Concordia Rufina; Concordius Vitalis (Beneventum): Beneventum
AE 1968, 132, later II-earlier III century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / Concordia / Rufina, qu(a)e / vixit plus min/us annis XLV, / Concordius Vi/talis Concordiae.

Concordius Fortunatus (Beneventum): Beneventum
CIL IX 1797, II-III century CE (?)
D(is) M(anibus) / Concordi / Fortunati, / Lollius filius / patri b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit).

L. Lucerinus Homoeus (Luceria): Luceria
AE 1996, 449, earlier II century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / Appuleiae / Soteridi, / L(ucius) Lucerinus / Homoeus coniugi / b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit).

Region IV: Samnium

Aequiculus Apronianus (Aequiculi): Aequiculi
CIL IX 4112 (= ILS 4381), date uncertain
Pro salute ordinis et populi, signa / Serapis et Isidis cum ergasteri(i)s suis / et aediculam in scholam, permit/tente ordine, / Apronianus r(ei) p(ublicae) Aequicul(anorum) ser(vus) ar/r(eius) / cum Aequicula Bassilla et Aequi/culo Apronio fil(io) pec(unia) sua fecit; / l(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

Publicia Marsilla (Alba Fucens): Alba Fucens
CIL IX 3945, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / Publiciae Marsill(a)e matri / piissimae, / C(aius) Publicius Artemido/rianus IIIvir aed(ilis) et Concordia / fil(i)i b(ene) m(erenti) p(osuerunt).

Amiternius Capriolus (Amiternum): Amiternum
AE 1992, 475, II-III century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / Amiternius / Capriolus Sal/viae Iust(a)e co(n)iu/gi dulcissim rae/n / b(ene) m(erenti) / posuit.

C. Corfinius Natalis (Corfinium): Corfinium
CIL IX 6326, date uncertain
D(is) [M(anibus)] / Anniae L(uci) l(ibertae) / Largae, / C(aius) Corfinius / Natalis / p(osuit).

Saepinia Capriola (Saepinum): Saepinum
CIL IX 2442, I-II century CE
[Saepinia Capriola / [ex v]isu; / [l(ocus) d(atus)] d(ecreto) d(ecurionum). // Saepinia / Capriola / ex visu; / l(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

[T. Trebulanus Fel]lix (Trebuла Suffenas): Trebula Suffenas
AE 1972, 154, 14 CE
This man is listed in the album of an unidentified local association.

Region VI: Umbria

C. Amerinus Felix (Ameria): Ameria
CIL XI 4362, I-II century CE
rCфи(aio) Amerino / Felici militi / coh(ortis) III / vig(illum), / collegium.

Sassinas Secundus (Sassina): Sassina
CIL XI 6568, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / Murciae / Athenaidis, / Sassinas / Secundus /coniugi / b(ene) d(e) [s(e)] m( eritae).

Sassinatia Asia; L. Sassinas Facultalis (Sassina): Sassina
CIL XI 6580, later II-III century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / Sassinatiae / Asiae, / L(ucius) Sassinas / Facultalis / coniugi sanctis(simae), / et Chrysogonus / filius matri / pientissima re\e\ / b(ene) m(erenti).

L. Sassinas Deuter (Sassina): Sassina
CIL XI 6570, late II-III century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / Mutteiae / Legusae, / L(ucius) Sassinas / Deuter / m(atri) p(ientissimae) et / [Pos]tumia / []

L. Sassinas Thrasileus (Sassina): Sassina
NSA 1931, 29, later II-III century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / hic Secunda iaces / sanctissima co(n)iunx, / cuius ob insignem / scribitur hic titul(us), / quod pia vixisti / casteque pudica / hic tibi pro meritis / libet aurare sepulcrum / b(ene) m(erenti).

Sex. Sassinas Gratus (Sassina): Sassina
CIL XI 6579, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / Sex(ti) Sassinat(is) / Grati, / P(ublius) Petronius / Proculus et / Sex(tus) Tettius Stephan(?) / heredes / homini et amico / optimo.

T. Sassinas Onager (Sassina): Sassina
CIL XI 6588, late II-III century CE
C. Sentinas Anfiomeus (Sentinum): Sentinum
CIL XI 5760, late II-early III century CE
C(aio) Sentinati C(ai) fil(io) / Lem(onia) Iusto / scribae publico, / C(aius) Sentinas
Anfiomeus / et Maria Saturnina / filio piissimo, / vix(it) an(nos) XXIII, mens(es) X, /
d(ies) XV.

Sentin(as) Ianuarius; Sentin(as) Velentin(us) (Sentinum): Sentinum
CIL XI 5737 (= ILS 4215), III century CE
These two men are listed in the album of the local cultores dei Solis Invicti Mithrae.

Region VII: Etruria

L. Volsinius Primigenus (Volsinii): Volsinii
CIL XI 2808, I century CE
Dis Man(ibus) / L(uci) Volsini / Primigeni / [Region VIII: Aemilia]

Q. Poplicius Modestinus (Bononia): Bononia
CIL XI 696 (= ILS 4313), date uncertain
I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo) Dol(ichenio), / Q(uintus) Poplicius Modestinus / [VIvi]r et
Claud(ialis) cenatorium p(ecunia) s(ua) f(ecit). / [l(ocus)] d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

Parmensia Celerina (Parma): Parma
CIL XI 1091, late II-III century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / C(ai) Mattei Li[---] / Licentis, / Parmensia / Celerina co(n)/iugi
carissim(o), / cum quo vixit / ann(os) XXX, et / Mattei(us) Iustus / Celer et Sabina /
fil(i).

T. Publicius Pardalis (Placentia): Placentia
CIL XI 1255, date uncertain
Iuni Quiet(i), / T(iti) Publici Pardali.

Region X: Venetia et Histria

Aquilei(ei)siens Calendar(a): Aquileia
CIL V 1086 (= Inscr.Aqu. 1, 835), II century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / / Aquilei(ei)si / Calendariae, / a(nnorum) XXII, m(ensium) VI, /
Aquile(iensis) / Daramone / mater.

Aquilei(ei)siens Stratonicus (Aquileia): Aquileia
CIL V 1085 (= Inscr.Aqu. 1, 834), date uncertain
T(itus) Aquileiensis / Stratonicus, sibi et / Numisio Tiberino / Basileo filio piissimo, / qui
vixit ann(os) XXXVI, m(enses) V, / d(ies) XIIX.

Aquilei(ei)siens Urs(a) (Aquileia): Aquileia
CIL V 1088, date uncertain
] / et Ve[--] / Ianua[ria]--- / coniugi [---], / cum qua vixi(t) / ann(os) XVII, m(enses) VI,
/ et Aquileiensis / Ursa sorori optimae.
Aquileiensis Ursula (Aquileia): Aquileia
CIL V 1089 (= Inscr.Aqu. 1, 836), II century CE
Aquileiens(i) / Ursulae, / Cl(audius) Mettius / Evaristus / gener.

C. Aquileiensis Diadumenus (Aquileia): Aquileia
CIL V 736 (= Inscr.Aqu. 1, 105), I-II century CE
C(aius) Aquileiensis / Diadumenus / B(eleno) v(otum) s(olvit).

P. Aquileiensis Secundus (Aquileia): Aquileia
Inscr.Aqu. 1, 833, I-II century CE
P(ublius) Aquileiensis / Secundus v(ivus) f(ecit), / sibi / et Aspaniae Venustae con/iugi,
Venusto f(ilio), Aspaniae Eu/prosyne fil(iae), Eutyciae liber(tae), / lib(erti)
l(ertabus)q(ue) post(eri)q(ue) eor(um).

M. Publicius Eupor (Aquileia): Aquileia
CIL V 8357 (= Inscr.Aqu. 1, 969), mid-I century CE
Carfeniae / Callyrhoe / uxori opt(imate), / M(arcus) Publicius / Eupor.

Publicia Corinthia (Aquileia): Aquileia
CIL V 929 (= CIL V 429, 185 = Inscr.Aqu. 2, 2855), later II-earlier III century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / Publiciae / Corinthiae, / C(aius) Bassi
us / Corinthian(us) / ((centurio))
cohor(tis) XIII / urb(anae) / matr(i) pientiss(ime). / loc(us) dat(us) a Tullio / Posidonio.

D. Publicius Macco (Aquileia): Aquileia
CIL V 1464 (= Inscr.Aqu. 2, 1645), date uncertain
Vitalis / D(ecimi) Publici / Macconis, / amor(um) XXVII, / Pudens / conservus / dedit.

Publicius Fidelis (Aquileia): Aquileia
CIL V 1351 (= Inscr.Aqu. 2, 2457), date uncertain
L(ucus) m(onumenti) / Publicii / Fidelis et / Barbiae / Phoebatis; / [in fr(onte) p(edes)]
XVI.

L. Publicius Hebenus (Brixia): Brixia
CIL V 4676, date uncertain
L(uci)us P(ublicius) / Hebenus, / sibi et Optatae / Mulviae cont(um) b(ernali) / et Velliae
Firmae / Pisainae.

Publicia Afrodit(e); Publicia Valeriana (Brixia): Brixia
AE 1975, 436, late III-IV century CE
Publiciae Afrodit(a)e, / Publicia Valeriana / matri carissim(a)e / me(n)s(a)m de suo fecit.

Public(i)a Artemis; P. Public(ius) Dor[u]; P. Public(ius) Mag[ius]; Public(ia); P. Public(ius)
Brixian(us); (Publicius?) Onesimus (Brixia): Brixia
CIL V 4685 (= AE 1976, 259), date uncertain
P(ublius) Public(ius) / Brixian(us), / sibi et Public(iae) / uxori, / P(ublius) Public(io)
Dor[o(?)], / P(ublius) Public(io) Mag[io(?)], / Public(iae) Artemis[d?], / Doryphoridi /
Onesimo / VIviro Aug(ustali).

Pub(licia) Drosis; Publicius Symphorus; Pub(licius) Valerianus (Brixia): Brixia
CIL V 4193, date uncertain
P(ublio) Publicio / Symphoro / VIvir(o) Aug(ustali), / P(ublio) Pub(licio) Valeriano fil(io), / Pub(liciae) Drosidi uxori, / Public(ius) Abascantus / patronis et sibi et / Publiciae Chrisidi et [---

Publicia Melitin(a?); Publicia Valentina; L. Publicius Valentin(us) (Brixia): Brixia
AE 1991, 850 (= AE 1999, 740), II century CE
D(is) M(anibus). // Publiciae / Melitines, / L(ucius) Publicius / Valentin(us) et / Publicia / Valentina sorori.

Inscr.lt. 102, 495, date uncertain

Q. Pub(licius) Priscianus (Brixia): Brixia
Inscr.lt. 102, 248, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / Q(uinto) Pub(licio) Priscia/no VIvir(o) Aug(ustali), / Flavia Afrodisia / marit(o) ben(e) merent(i).

Publicia Pia; Publicia Primula (Feltria): Feltria
CIL V 2079, II-III century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / Publiciae / Piae matri / sanctissimae / et Publicae / Primulae sor(ori) / pientissimae, / Secundinus.

Publicia Felicitas (Patavium): Patavium
CIL V 2797, date uncertain
Isidi Reg(inae), / P(ublius) Postumi/us Heca/teus et / Publicia / Felicitas. / l(ocus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum). / n(umerus) CCCII.

A. Publicius Felix (Patavium): Patavium
NSA 1926, 352, I century CE
N(atali?) CCXXV, / A(ulus) Publicius Felix / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).

M’. Publicius Festus (Patavium): Patavium
CIL V 2810, I century CE
M(anius) Publicius / Festus, d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

T. Publicius Phronimus (Patavium): Patavium
CIL V 3022, date uncertain
v(ivus) f(ecit) / T(itus) Publicius / Phronimus, / sibi et / Cervoniae Galen(a)e / uxori; / h(oc) m(onumentum) h(eredem) n(on) s(equetur).

Poblicia Attica; M. Poblicius Linus (Verona: Verona
CIL V 3699, later I century CE
v(ivus) f(ecit) / M(arcus) Poblicius / Linus, / sibi et / Publiciai Atticai / uxori.

C. Publicius Quartio (Verona: Verona
CIL V 3701, I century CE
C(aio) Poblicio / Quartioni patri, / Remmiao C(ai) f(iliae) / Octaviai matri, / C(ai) Poblico C(ai) f(ilio) / Vero fratri, / Poblicia C(ai) f(ilia) / Severa et sibi / t(estamento)
f(ieri) i(ussit).

Publicia Veneria (Verona): Verona
CIL V 3491 (= AE 1984, 430), later I-earlier II century CE
L(uicius) Aquilius / Secundus, / L(uicio) Aquilio / Charitoni / et Publiciae / Veneriae
pa/rentib(us) pient(issimis) / libert(is) liber/tab(usque).

Veronia Callist(a); M. Veronius Epaphroditus (Verona): Verona
CIL V 3439, date uncertain
v(ivus) f(ecit) / M(arcus) Veronius / Epaphroditus / VIvir Aug(ustalis), / mag(ister)

Veronia Charita; Q. Veronius Pusittio (Verona): Verona
CIL V 3831, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / Veroniae Charitae, / quae vixit / ann(os) XXVIII, me(n)s(es) IIII, dies
VII, / Q(uintus) Veronius Pusittio coniugi / incomparabili.

Veronius Primus (Verona): Verona
CIL V 3438, early II century CE
C(aius) Veronius / Carpus / VIvir Cl(audialis) Mai(or), / Veroniae / Trofim(a)e
sacer(doti) / Matris deum / matri / sanctissimae / et Veronio Primo.

C. Veronius Servilianus (Verona): Verona
CIL V 3301, I century CE
Silvano Aug(usto) / sacrum, / C(aius) Veronius / Servilianus / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens)
m(erito).

L. Veronius Calais (Verona): Verona
CIL V 3230, II century CE
L(uicius) Veronius / Calais, / Isidi / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).

P. Veronius Amphion (Verona): Verona
CIL V 3829, date uncertain
v(ivus) f(ecit) / P(ublius) Veronius / Amphion, / sibi et / Magiae Festae / coniugi / bene
merenti / et suis.

P. Veronius Callistus (Verona): Verona
CIL V 3830 (= ILS 8214), II century CE
Veto / reliquias, / P(ublius) Veronius / Callistus / homo optim(us) / hic iacet.

Sex. Veronius Apelles (Verona): Verona
CIL V 3275; CIL VI 3676, date uncertain
Minerva[e], / Sex(tus) Veron(ius) / Apelles / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).

Publicia Serena; Publicius Paullus (Vicetia): Vicetia
CIL V 3189, late II-III century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / L(uici) Publici L(uici) f(iliis) Men(enia) / Valeriani iuven(is) / honestissimis, / vixit an(nos) XVI, d(ies) XXXIII, / Publicii Paullus / et Serena parentes / infelicissimi.
Region XI: Transpadana

Publicia Fortunata (Comum): Comum
   Pais 783, date uncertain
   Publiciae / Fortunatae.

Publicius Valerianus (Comum): Comum
   CIL V 5321 (= CIL V 330), date uncertain
   D(is) M(anibus) / Attiae / Fortunatae, / Publicius / Valerianus / coniug(i) in/comparab(ili).

Publicius Vitalio (Comum): Comum
   AE 1995, 616, date uncertain
   D(is) M(anibus) / Publicius Vitalio/nis, / Geminia co(n)iugi / carissimo.

C. Publicius Carpophorus (Comum): Comum
   CIL V 5301, date uncertain
   C(aius) Publicius / Carpophorus / VIvir et Aug(ustalis).

C. Publicius Philo (Comum): Comum
   CIL V 5302, date uncertain
   D(is) M(anibus) / C(ai) Publici / Philonis / VIvir(i) et Aug(ustalis).

L. Publicius Thalamus (Comum): Comum
   AE 1995, 618, date uncertain
   v(ivus) f(ecit) / Q(uintus) Secundienus Q(uinti) f(ilius) / Ou(f)entina Restitutus / VIvir, sibi et / Q(uinto) Secundieno Q(uinti) f(ilio) / Ou(f)entina Restituto / patri, VIvir(o), et / Russi
eae L(uci) f(iliae) / Secundae matri, et / L(ucio) Publicio Thalamo / amico optimo.

M. Publicius Philemon (Comum): Comum
   Pais 752
   M(arci) Publici / Philemonis / VIvir(i) Augu(stalis), / [q]ui vixit an(n)is XXII.

Plumbarii

A. Ostiensis Trophimus (Ostia): Ostia
   AE 1977, 168
   A(ulus) Ostiensis Trophimus fec(it).

C. Ostiensius Felicissimus (Ostia): Ostia
   CIL XIV 2003a-b (= CIL XV 7736b-c)
   C(aius) Ostiensius Felicissimus fec(it).

M. Ost(iensis) Asclepiad(es) (Ostia): Ostia
   CIL XIV 2002 (= CIL XV 7766); CIL XIV 5309, 40
   ex of(ficina) M(arci) Ost(iensis) Asclepiad(is).

M. Ost(iensis) Eutyches (Ostia): Ostia
   CIL XIV 5309, 41 (= AE 1954, 176b)
   ex of(ficina) M(arci) Ost(iensis) Eutychet(is).
Ostiensis Hermes (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 1980 (= CIL XV 7743)
[Imp(eratoris) A]ntonini Aug(usti), sub cur(a) Ele[gantis] / Aug(usti) lib(erti)
proc(uratoris), ex of(ficina) Os(tiensis) Her(metis) Gn[---].

Ost(i)ensis Praetorinus (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 2004 (= CIL XV 7767)
ex of(ficina) Ost(i)ensis Praetorini.

M. Primig(eni)us Abascantus (Praeneste): Praeneste
CIL XIV 3044 (= CIL XV 7883)
M(arci) Primig(eni)us Abascanti / M(arci) C(?) N(?).

M. Primig(eni)us Anteros (Praeneste): Praeneste
CIL XIV 3044a (= CIL XV 7884); AE 1905, 209 (EE 9, 794)
M(arcus) Primig(eni)us Anteros fec(it).

C. Tiburtius Verna (Tibur): Tibur
CIL XIV 3708 (= CIL XV 7909b); CIL XV 7909a
C. Tiburtius Verna fec(it).

Amiternius [A]ries (Amidernum): Amiternum
AE 1992, 502
Amiternius / [A]ries fec(it).

Q. Amiternius Primigenius (Amidernum): Amiternum
CIL IX 4223
Q(uintus) Amiternius / Primigenius fec(it).

CIL IX 4224 (same plumbarius?)
Q(uintus) Piens Q(uinti) Amiternius / Plumbarius? / Alba . . .

A. Reatin(us) Callimorphus (Reate): Reate
CIL IX 4700a-b
A(ulus) Reatin(us) Callimorphus / f(ecit).

L. Saepinius Abascantus (Saepinum): Saepinum
Altilla p. 120
L(ucius) Saepinius Abascantus fec(it).

C. Faliscus Felix (Falerii Novi): Falerii Novi
AE 1982, 278
C(aius) Faliscus Felix fec(it).

L. Publicius Asclepius (Bononia): Bononia
CIL XI 736
L. Public(io) Asclepio vilico.

Aq(uleiensis) Demet(rius) (Aquileia): Aquileia
Group II Towns

Region VI: Aemilia

Publicia Victorina (Ravenna): Ravenna
   Epigraphica 2012, 202, Julio-Claudian (?)

Publicius Basilides (Ravenna): Ravenna
   CIL XI 208, date uncertain
   D(is) M(anibus). / Publicio Valentino, / vix(it) a(nnos) XII, m(enses) VIII, d(ies) X, / Publicius Basilides / et Romania Valentina / alumno.

Public(ius) Hilaru(s) (Ravenna): Ravenna
   AE 1977, 265a, later II-earlier III century CE
   This man is listed in the *album* of a local association of *fabri*.

L. Publicius Italicus (Ravenna): Ravenna
   CIL XI 126, II-earlier III century CE
   Flaviae Q(uinti) f(iliae) Salutari coniugi / rarissimae, L(ucius) Publicius Italicus dec(urio) orn(atus) / et sibi v(ivus) p(osuit); hic coll(egio) fabr(um) m(unicipii) R(avennatis) HS XXX(milia) n(umnum) vivus dedit, ex quor(um) / reditu quod annis decurioni(um) [us] coll(egii) fabr(um) m(unicipii) R(avennatis) in aede Nept(uni), / quam ipse extru{c}xit, die Neptunali(um) praesentibus sport(ulae) ((denarii)) / bini dividerentur / et dec(urioni) XXVIII suae ((denarii)) centeni quinquageni quodannis darentur ut ex ea summa, sicut / soliti sunt, arcam Publiciorum Flaviani et Italic filium et arcam, in qua posita est Flavia / Salutaris uxor eius rosis exornent de ((denarii)) XXV sacrificentque / quasi de reliq(uis), ibi epulentur / ob quam liberalitatem coll(egii) fabr(um) m(unicipii) R(avennatis) inter bene meritos quodannis rosas Publiciis supra s(criptis), / et Flaviae Salutaris uxor eius mittendas ex ((denarii)) XXV sacrificiumque faciendum de ((denarii)) XII s(emis) / per magistros decrevit.

Q. Publicius Genialis (Ravenna): Ravenna
   CIL XI 6753 (= CLE 1326), date uncertain
   Jeli / et Caesiae Pr/i(migeniae) uxo(ri), / Q(uinto) Publicio Geniali / fratri, et / Peculiari matr(i), / Iuvenali lib(erto) / Modesti, / qui mortale genus / statuit animamque / creavit attribuit, / reddi corpora Elys/iis, hoc simul ut creda[s] / tu, moriture, legis.
Group III Towns

Region I: Latium et Campania

L. Afilanus Verecundus (Afilae): Afilae
CIL XIV 3442 (= ILS 4946), II century CE
L(ucio) Afilano L(uci) f(ilio) / An(iensi) Provinciali / equo p(ublico) ornat(o) / Luperco desig(nato), / huic ordo statu/am decrevit; / L(ucius) Afilanus Verecun/dus h(onore) u(sus) s(umptum) r(emisit). / l(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

M. Antias Andro[-] (Antium): Antium
CIL X 6713, date uncertain
This man is listed in the album of an unidentified local association.

Casinia Primitiva (Casinum): Casinum
AE 1971, 99, I-II century CE
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Casiniae / Primitivae / dulcissim(ae) / coniu[gi]/comparabili.

Casinia Synerusa (Casinum): Casinum
CIL X 5293, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / Staediae Syneru/sae, vixit mens(ibus) / X, diebus XIX, / Q(uintus) Staedius Chrysori{i}/as et Casinia Synerusa / parentes.

C. Casinius Fortunatus (Casinum): Casinum
CIL X 5187, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / C(aio) Casinio For/tunato mil(iti) coh(ortis) V / vi[g(illum)], qui vix(it) / ann(os) XXV, men(ses) / . . .

C. Fabraternus Primitivus (Fabrateria Nova): Fabrateria Nova
CIL X 5592; CIL X 8386a, later I-earlier II century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / C(aio) Fabraterno / Primitivo / Augustali.

Liternius Felix{s} (Liternum): Liternum
AE 2001, 854, c. 180 CE
This man is listed in the album of the local Augustales.

M. Privernius Cerialis (Privernum): Privernum
CIL X 6454, date uncertain
M(arcus) Privernius Cerialis / et Lollia Prima ol(las) II.

Region III: Bruttium et Lucania

M. Teg(eanensis) Crescens; Tegeanensis Prima (Tegianum): Tegianum
CIL X 317, later II-earlier III century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / Tegeanensi Pri/mae, quae vixit / ann(os) XXXIII, m(enses) VII, d(ies) / XII, M(arcus) Teg(eanensis) Crescens con(iugi) dulcissi/mae, cum qua vix(it) / ann(os) XX, men(ses) VIII, / b(ene) m(erenti) fec(it).
C. Tegiane(n)sis Syneros (Tegianum): Tegianum
   CIL X 316, Julio-Claudian period
   C(aius) Tegiane(n)sis Syneros / et Helena sibi et suis.

Region VI: Umbria

Tif(ernius) Prudens (Tifernum Tiberinum): Tifernum Tiberinum
   CIL XI 5940, date uncertain
   Venia P(ubli) f(ilia), / Tiferniae Sabinae / fil(iae) Tif(erni) Prudentis / ex testamento patris, / Aruntia Ampiana / neptis Ampi Dextri / heredis / posuit; / I(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

Region IX: Liguria

C. Industrius Verus (Industria): Industria
   CIL V 7474, later II century CE
   [D eo] l(nvicto) M(ithrae), / C(aius) Indus/trius / Verus / d(onum) d(edit).

Region XI: Transpadana

M. Novarius Pheidon (Novaria): Novaria
   CIL V 6556 (= AE 1998, 633), II century CE
   v(ivus) // f(ecit) // M(arcus) Novarius / Pheidon, sibi et / Valeriae Secundinae / uxori bene meranti, / perpetuae securitati.
APPENDIX IV: FREEBORN CHILDREN OF MUNICIPAL FREEDMEN

Region I: Latium et Campania

L. Afilanus Provincialis (Afilae): Afilae
   CIL XIV 3442 (= ILS 4946), II century CE
   Son of L. Afilanus Verecundus above.

Arrecina Marcella (Aricia): Aricia
   NSA 1920, 288, later I century CE
   Daughter of M. Arrecinus Augustinus above.

Staedia Synerusa (Casinum): Casinum
   CIL X 5293, date uncertain
   Daughter of Casinia Synerusa above.

Minturnia M. f. [---]ais (Minturnae): Minturnae
   AE 1914, 221, II-III century CE
   Daughter of a putative municipal freedmen; wife of Minturnius Suc(c)essus above.

Vedia Voluptas (Ostia): Ostia
   CIL XIV 1737 (= CIL X 6189), II-III century CE
   Daughter of P. Ostiensis Epaphroditus above.

Ulpia Fortunata (Puteoli): Puteoli
   CIL X 8204, later II-early III century CE
   Daughter of C. Put(eolanius) Fortu/natus above.

M. Tusculanius M. f. Receptus (Tusculum): Tusculum
   CIL XIV 2637 (= ILS 6215), date uncertain
   Son of a putative municipal freedman; brother of M. Tusculanius Amianthus above.

Region II: Apulia et Calabria

C. Iulius Gemellus (Beneventum): Beneventum
   AE 1968, 134, II century CE
   Son of Concordia Chrysogone above.

Region IV: Samnium

C. Publicius Artemidorianus (Alba Fucens†): Alba Fucens
   CIL IX 3945, date uncertain
   Son of Publicia Marsilla above.

L. Saepinius Orestes (Saepinum): Saepinum
   CIL IX 2472 (= ILS 6519), early II century CE
   Son of L. Saepinius Oriens above.

Region VI: Umbria

C. Publicius Allius Pr[imus] (Asisium): Asisium
CIL XI 5411, II-early III century CE  
Son of C. Publicius Verecundus above.

C. Sentinas Iustus (Sentinum): Sentinum  
CIL XI 5760, late II-early III century CE  
Son of C. Sentinas Anfiomeus above.

Tifernia Sabina (Tifernum Tiberinum): Tifernum Tiberinum  
CIL XI 5940, date uncertain  
Daughter of Tif(ernius) Prudens above.

Region VIII: Aemilia

(Matteia) Sabina; Matteius Iustus (Celer?) (Parma): Parma  
CIL XI 1091, late II-III century CE  
Daughter and son of Parmensia Celerina above.

Tib. Cl(audius) Felix Victorinus (Ravenna†): Ravenna  
Epigraphica 2012, 202, date uncertain  
Son of Publicia Victorina above.

Region X: Venetia et Histria

Aspasia Euprosyne (Aquileia): Aquileia  
Inscr.Aqu. 1, 833, I-II century CE  
Daughter of P. Aquileiensis Secundus above.

C. Bassius Corinthianus (Aquileia): Aquileia  
CIL V 929 (= CIL V 429, 185 = Inscr.Aqu. 2, 2855), later II-earlier III century CE  
Son of Publicia Corinthia above.

Numisius Tiberinus Basileus (Aquileia): Aquileia  
CIL V 1085 (= Inscr.Aqu. 1, 834), date uncertain  
Son of T. Aquileiensis Stratonicus above.

Poblicia Severa; C. Poblicius Verus (Verona†): Verona  
CIL V 3701, I century CE  
Daughter and son of C. Poblicius Quartio above.

Publicius Valerianus (Vicetia): Vicetia  
CIL V 3189, late II-III century CE  
Son of Publicius Paullus and Publicia Serena above.

Region XI: Transpadana

Potiria C. f. Aula (Mediolanum): Mediolanum  
AE 1974, 346, early II century CE  
Daughter of C. Publicius Eutyches above.
APPENDIX V: PRIVATE EX-SLAVES OF MUNICIPAL FREEDMEN

Region I: Latium et Campania

T. Pomponius Securus (Fabrateria Nova): Fabrateria Nova
CIL X 8386a, later I-earlier II century CE
Freedman of C. Fabraternus Primitivus above (?), who is also listed in CIL X 5592, and his wife.

(Publicia) Prima (Venafrum): Venafrum
CIL X 4984, I century CE
Freedwoman of M. Publicius Philodamus above.

Region IV: Samnium

(Saepinia) Aucta; C. Saepinius Diomedes (Saepinum): Saepinum
CIL IX 2533 (= ILS 6520), I century CE
Freedwoman and freedman of C. Saepinius Albanus above.

[M. Treb]ulanus M. l. Antioch[us]; [T. Trebul]anus T. l. Demetri[us]; T. Treb(u)lanus
T. l. [--] (Trebula Suffenas): Trebula Suffenas
AE 1972, 154, 14 CE
All three freedmen listed in the album of an unidentified local association alongside a probable municipal freedman patron of two of these men; the other is the freedman of a putative municipal freedman.

Region VIII: Aemilia

Publicia Chreste lib.; M. Publicius Ianuarius delicatus; M. Publicius Zosimus libert. (Bononia):
Bononia; CIL XI 6829, date uncertain
Freedwoman and freedmen of M. Publicius Philetus above, who is also recorded in CIL XI 6840.

Region X: Venetia et Histria

(Aquileiensis/Aspания) Eutychia (Aquileia): Aquileia
Inscr.Aqu. 1, 833, I-II century CE
Freedwoman of P. Aquileiensis Secundus above.

C. Concordius Rhenus; Munatia Rfuilla (Brixellum): Brixellum
AE 1931, 10 (= AE 1933, 154 = AE 1975, 396), later I century CE
Freedman and freedwoman of C. Concordius Primus above.

(P.) Public(ius) Abascantus (Brixia): Brixia
CIL V 4193, date uncertain
Freedman of Publicia Drosis and Publicius Symphorus above.

Q. Publicius Ingenuus (Tergeste): Tergeste
CIL V 628 (= ILS 6683), early I century CE
Freedman of Q. Publicius Felix above.
Matiena Suavis (Vicetia): Vicetia
   CIL V 3139, mid-I century CE
   Freedwoman of P. Publcius Vales above.

Region XI: Transpadana

Poblicia T(h)isbe (Mediolanum): Mediolanum
   CIL V 5881, later I-II century CE
   Freedwoman of C. Publcius Olymp[us] above.
APPENDIX VI: FREEBORN DESCENDANTS OF MUNICIPAL FREEDMEN

Region I: Latium et Campania

CIL X 4398, II-earlier III century CE
Dis Man(ibus) / sacr(um). / T(ito) Vescinio T(iti) f(ilio) / Fal(erna) Rufo patro[no] / et T(ito) Vescinio Sp(uri) f(ilio) / Rufo, / Vescinia Eleutheri(s) / sibi et suis.

Q. Aricinius Q. f. Bassus (Aricia): Rome
CIL VI 12307 (= CLE 1050), I century CE
Q(uintus) Aricinius Q(uinti) f(ilius) Bassus, / vixit ann(os) XXV, / debuit hoc patris natus duo corpora humare / corpora sen animes corpus inane colunt, / qui quia non possunt donis aequare merentem, / Basse, tuis meritis respondere queunt; / v(ivus) C(aius) Curtius C(ai) l(iberus) Antiochus pater, / debuit hoc natus nobis praestare duobus / ut cineres patrios dederet inferi(i)s / sed quoniam dirae genuerunt fata volucres / te, Basse, ereptum flevimus ante rogum; / v(iva) Aricinia Nais mater.

Arrecina P. f. Sedata; D. Arr(eci)nus P. f. Pap. [Vi]ndex (Aricia): Valentia (Gallia Narbonensis); AE 1976, 392, date uncertain
C(aio) Doio L(uci) f(ilio) Tro(mentina) Paolo / Arrecinae P(ubli) f(iliae) Sedatae, / D(ecimo) Arr(eci)no P(ubli) f(ilio) Pap(iria) Vindici / Do[a] C(ai) f(ilia) Tertia [f(aciendum) c(uravit)].

Arrecina (Aricia): Tusculum
CIL XIV 2679, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / M(arco) Arrecino Zo/simo patri Arre/cina tatis b(e) n(e) m(erenti).

L. Arrecinus [---] (Aricia): Volaterrae
AE 1982, 355, date uncertain
L(ucius) Tutilius C(ai) f(ilius), / Statiena Q(uinti) f(ilia) Prisc[a], / huic bene compositae lucem fo[--] / a'rbai stulit inmiti pernic[--], / et quam rite viro iunxit [---] / hanc prior infelix [---], / L(ucius) Arrecinus [---], / ann(orum) X, / L(ucius) Tutilius C(ai) f(ilius) Sab(atina) Modestus[s].

M. Arrecinus M. f. [---] Clemens (Aricia): Ariminum
CIL 12355; AE 1976, 200 (= AE 1978, 333 ), Julio-Claudian period
M(arcus) Arrecinus M(arci) f(ilius) [---] / Clemens trib(unus) mil(itum) leg(ionis) III Cyren(aicae), / et leg(ionis) XXII, praef(ectus) fabr(um), IIvir, IIIvir, aug(ur), / B(accho) et S(ilvano) v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).

M. Arrecinus M. f. Cam. [Clemens] (Aricia): Ariminum; Pisaurum; Nemausus; Ostia
AE 1947, 40 (= AE 1981, 336); CIL VI 199 (= CIL VI 30712d = ILS 6050); CIL XI 428; CIL XII 3637; CIL XIV 244; CIL XIV 2242; CIL XV 7278, late Julio-Claudian and Flavian periods
This man is the son of M. Arrecinus Clemens above. He appears in numerous inscriptions which list his senatorial career. One example is the following dedication he left in Pisaurum (AE 1947, 40):
M. Arrecinus Gemellus (Aricia): Mogontiacum (Germania Superior)
CIL XIV 36 (= CIL XIII 6821 = ILS 1998); AE 2003, 2056; AE 2004, 1910, 90s CE
This man is listed as an equestrian officer in three different military diplomata.

M. Arrecinus Helius (Aricia): Senorbi (Sardinia)
AE 2007, 692, date uncertain

T. Arri[cinus ---] (Aricia): Nemus Diana (administered by Aricia?)
CIL XIV 4195 (= CLE 875), date uncertain

T. Haterius Nepos Atinas Probus Publicius Matenianus (Atina): Fulginiae
CIL XI 5212 (= ILS 1058), 134 CE
T(ito) Haterio Nepoti / Atinati Probo / Publicio Mateniano / co(n)s(uli), pontif(ici), triumphalib(us) / [ornamentis honorato.

L. Calenius Aper (Cales): Mons Nigia (Dalmatia)
CIL III 1762, date uncertain
L(ucio) Calenio / Apro, / L(ucius) Calenius Ru/[fus] p(ater) f(ilio), ann(orum) V, / pos(uit).

Sex. Calenus Sex. f. Priscus (Cales): Amiternum
CIL IX 4457, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / Sex(to) Caleno Sex(ti) f(ilio) / Prisco / mag(istro) iuvent(utis), / Avaeae Felicitati.

Campania Blaesia Nertovali fil. (Capua): Ebrodunum (Alpes Cottiae)
CIL XII 88, date uncertain
v(ivus) f(ecit) L(ucius) Campanius / Clementinus, sibi et / Campaniae Blaesiae / Nertovali fil(iae) coniugi / pient(issimae), Vero e(t) Vettio f(iliis), / Laeto f(ilio), Sexto fil(io), et / nepotibus nuribus / omnibus suis / posterisq(ue). D(is) M(anibus).

C. Campanius Victor (Capua): Rovenich (Germania Inferior)
CIL XIII 7939, date uncertain
Gabiabus / C(aius) Campanius / Victor m(iles) l(egionis) I M(inerviae) P(iae) / F(idelis) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).

C. Campani(us) Vitalis (Capua): Certiae (Dacia)
CIL III 839 (= ILS 2598), date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / C(aius) Campani(us) Vita/lis ((centurio)) coh(ortis) I Bat(avorum), / ((milliariæ)) stip(endorum) VIII, / vix(it) an(nos) XXVII, / Florius Viri/lis vet(eranus) ex dec(urione) / nepoti p(ientissimo) p(onendum) c(uravit).

D. Campanius L. f. Tro. Varus (Capua): Salona (Dalmatia)
CIL III 8787, date uncertain
D(ecimo) Campanio / L(uci) f(ilio) Tro(mentina) Varo / aedili, IIIIviro i(ure) d(icundo), / IIIIviro iure dicund(o), / quinquennali, / auguri, flamini, / praefecto fabrum / publice.

L. Camp(anius) Celer (Capua): Solva (Noricum)
CIL III 5443a (= ILS 4852), mid-II-III century CE
I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo) / Arubi(a)no, / L(ucius) Camp(anius) / Celer / sacerdos / urbis / Romae / aeternae / et Iulia / Honorable / con(iux) pro se / et suis v(otum) s(olverunt) l(ibentes) m(erito).

L. Campanius L. f. Flaccus (Capua): Capua; Gnathia
CIL IX 71 (perhaps falsa); CIL 474, I century CE
L(ucius) Campanius L(uci) / fil(ius) / Flaccus / [L(ucius) Campanius L(uci) f(ilius) / Flaccus / tri(um) mil(itum) leg(ionis) XV, IIvir, pont(ifex), / q(uaestor) II, aed(ilis), praef(ecctus) fabr(um), et sibi / et Verae uxor[i]

M. Campanius M. fil. M. nep. Fal. Marcellus (Capua): Capua; Intercisa (Pannonia Superior)
CIL X 3847 (= ILS 1398); AE 1910, 140 (= AE 1968, 429), later II century CE
M(arco) Campanio / M(ari) / fil(io) / M(arci) nep(oti) Fal(erna) / Marcello / proc(uratorior) A[ug]ustor(umum) / ad Me[rc]urium / Alexandriac(iae), proc(uratoror) / provinc(iae) Cypr, / praef(ecto) eq(uitum) aalae Parth(iacae), / trib(uno) coh(ortis) pr(ima) Hemesen(or), / praef(ecto) coh(ortis) III Breucor(um), / c(ivis) R(oman) in provincia Cypro.


P. Campanius Geminus (Capua): Aquae Flaviae (Hispania Citerior)
AE 1972, 282 (= AE 1973, 295), 132 CE
C(aio) Iulio Serio Augurino, C(aio) Trebio / Sergiano co(n)s(ulibus), / Coelerni ex Hispania citeriore conventus Bracari, cum C(aio) An(tonio Aquilo Novaugustano / praef(eccto) coh(ortis) I Celtiberorum, / liberis posterisque eius hos/pitium fecerunt / C(aius) Antonius Aquilus, cum Coelernis liberis posterisque eorum, / hospitium fecit legatus egit / P(ublius) Campanius Geminus.
P. Campanius Italicus (Capua): Blatobulgium (Britannia)
CIL VII 1064, date uncertain

Q. Campanius Crescens (Capua): Rome (gives Mediolanum as his *origo*)
CIL VI 2379 (= CIL VI 32520 = CIL XI 618 = CLE 1670 = AE 1968, 26), 150 CE
This man is listed in the *album* of an unidentified military unit.

Sex. Campanius Clemens (Capua): Rome
CIL VI 2776 (= CIL X 697 = ILS 2472), II century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / Sex(to) Campanio / Clementi cor(niculario) / pr(aefectorum) / pr(ae)torii, vix(it) ann(os) / XXXII, m(enses) II, d(ies) XII.

Sex. Campanius Reditus (Capua): Visentium
CIL XI 2913 (= ILS 447), Severan period
cur(atori) / Sex(to) Campa(nio) Redito; // M(arco) Aurelio / Antonino / Caesari / destinato / Imp(eratorum) Aug(usti) f(ilio) / d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

T. Campanius Priscus Maximianus (Capua): Drusomagus (Alpes Poeninae)
CIL XII 137, late III century CE
Titi Campani / Prisci Maximiani viri cons(ularis), / omnibus hon/oribus in urbe / sacra Functi, qu(u)i / vixit an(nos) XXXIII, / mens(es) V, Numidi/a [---] Openda / Valeriana c(larissima) f(eminam), m/ater infelix, filio / carissimo fieri / cura(vit), sub ascia / d(e)o(icavit).

[Cam]pani(us [Mer]cator (Capua): Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium (Germania Inferior); CIL XIII 8294, date uncertain
[D(is)] M(anibus). / [Ca]mpani(o) / [Mer]cator(?) veterano / [leg(ionis)] XXX U(lpiae) V(ictricis).

Campanius Verax (Capua): Rome
CIL VI 130 (= ILS 2091), 241 CE
pro s(alute) Imp(eratoris) Caes(aris) M(arci) Antonii Gordiani Pii Felicis Aug(usti) et / Tranquillinae Sabinae Aug(ustae), venatores immuno(ves) / cum custode vivari(i), Pont(ius?) Verus mil(es) coh(ortis) VI pr(aetoriae), Cam/pianius Verax mil(es) coh(ortis) VI pr(aetoriae), Fuscius Crescens / ord(inarius) custos vivari(i) coh(ortum) p[r]ae(token) et urb(anorum), Diana Aug(usta) d(e) s(uo) ex v(otum) p(osuerunt). / dedicata XII Kal(endas) Nov(embres), Imp(eratoris) d(emonio) n(ostro) Gordiano Aug(usto) et Pompeiano co(n)s(ulibus).

L. Casinius L. f. Pom. Legitimus (Casinum): Aquilonia (gives Patavium as his *origo*)
CIL VI 2382 (= VI 32638 = AE 1964, 120), Severan period
This man is listed in an *album* of a unit of the Praetorian Guards.

L. Casin[ius ---] (Casinum): Forum Iulii (Gallia Narbonensis)
ILN 1, 144 (= ILGN 25), date uncertain
L(ucio) Casin[io ---]/IO[---]/ivo mil(itii) le[g(ionis)] / VII[1], speculat(ori), obito / an(norum) XXVIII.
(C.) Coranius C. f., Sa(lvius) (Cora): Nursia
CIL IX 4610 (= AE 2000, 397), date uncertain
Sa(lvius) Coran/ius C(ai) f(ilius).

CIL II 5000, date uncertain
L(ucius) Coranius L(uci) f(ilius) Gal(eria) / Bubbus hic s(itus) e(st).

L. Coranius [---] f. Qu(i)r. [---]nus (Cora): Thibilis (Numidia)
ILAlg 2², 5100, date uncertain
L(ucius) Coranius / [---] f(ilius) Qu(i)r(ina) / [---]nus [ ]

M. Coranius Successus (Cora): Thibilis (Numidia)
ILAlg 2², 4653, date uncertain
Victor[iae] / Aug(ustae) / sacrum, / M(arcus) Corani/us Suc(c)essus / mag(ister) pagi, / flam(en) divi Aug(usti), / ob honor(em) mag(isterii) d(e) s(uo) d(edit).

T. Coranius Sex. f. Nerva (Cora): Nursia
AE 1983, 296, date uncertain
T(iti) Corani Sex(ti) f(iliii) / Nervae.

Coranius Titianus (Cora): Photike (Achaia)
Fortissimo et Piis/simo Caesari d(omo) n(ostro) / Gal(ério) Val(ério) [[Maximino]] / P(io) F(elici) Inv(icto), / Coranius Titianus v(ir) p(erfectissimus), / praes(es) prov(inciae) vet(eros) Epiri, / num(ini) eorum dicatissi/mus.

Corani(us) Victor (Cora): Thibilis (Numidia)
ILAlg 2², 4523, II-III century CE
B(acaci) A(gusto) s(acrum), / Imp(eratore) / d(omo) n(ostro) Max[imino] / c(onsule)], / Corani(us) / Victor / [mag(isteri) Thibilitanorum].

L[a]vinia M. f. Paetina (Lavinium-Laurentium): Thubursicu Numidarum (Africa Proconsularis)
ILAlg 1, 1738, date uncertain
L[a]vinia / M(arci) f(ilia) Paeti/na T(iti) Flavi / Echionis / uxor p(ia), v(ixit) a(nnos) XXXV, / h(ic) s(itae) e(st).

C. Nol[n]ius Amandus (Nola): town uncertain
CIL III 6234, date uncertain
C(aius) Nol[n]ius A/mandus / ex ((centurione)), m(issus) h(onesta) m(issione).

L. Ostiensius Hilarus Samannario (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 1429, II-III century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / L(ucius) Ost(i)ensio Hilaro / Samannariioni, / qui vixit an(nos) VI, m(enses) VIII, / Convarisia Victorina / alumno bene / fecit.

P. Ostiensis Macedo (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 244; AE 1954, 221, early II century CE (?)
This man is listed as a pontifex Volkani in two fragments of the fasti Ostienses.
Ostiensis Chrysus (Ostia): Rome
CIL VI 23591, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / Ostiensii / Chrysso, / qui vixit ann(is) XV, / mens(ibus) VIII, die I.

(Praenestina) Silicia (Praeneste): Madauros (Africa Proconsularis)
ILAlg 1, 2700, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / Silicia / L(uici) Praenes/tini fil(ia) / pia, vix(it) a(nnos) XL, / h(ic) s(ita) e(st)

Potiolan[us ---] (Puteoli): Alexandria (Egypt)
Kayser 114, date uncertain
This man is listed in the album of an unknown legion.

C. Put[eol(anus)] Flaccus (Puteoli): Puteoli
AE 1996, 423, 7 CE
[Q(uinto) Cae[ci]lio Metell[o], A[u]l[o] Licin[i]o Nerv[a] ca(n)s(ulibus), / [--- II]vir(o), C(ai)o

Q. Puteolanus Aquila (Puteoli): Puteoli
TPSulp 24 (= AE 1978, 129), 35 CE

Puteolanus Demetrianus (Puteoli): Puteoli
EDCS 224, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / Puteolano Demetriano / ornato viro, omnibus / honoribus functo, / legati/onibus septe(m), defensori pau/perorum, omerita bening/nitate ipsius di{n}gno et / merito, qui vixit annis / LVIII, m(ensibus) VIII, Furmus, / homini bono o r3 se/quitum praebui, b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit).

Region II: Apulia et Calabria
C. Aeclanius Fortunatus (Aeclanum): Aeclanum (given as his origo; inscription found in Neapolis); EE 81, 340, later II-earlier III century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / C(ai) Aeclani / Fortunati / decurioni(s) Aecl/anensium, IIviro, / munerari(o) sple(n)d/ido, vixit annis / XXXV, men(sibus) XI, d(ie) I, / Aeclanius Iovanus / lib(ertus).
Q. Aeclanius Hermias (Aeclanum): Corduba (Baetica)
CIL II 263 (= CIL II 2203), earlier IV century CE
D(omino) n(ostro) Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) / Flav(io) Val(ernio) Constantino Max(imo) / Pio Felici Aeterno Aug(usto), / Q(uintus) Aeclanius Hermias v(ir) p(erfectissimus), / a(gens) v(ices) praef(ectorum) praet(orio), / iudex sacrarum, / cognitionum / numini maiestatiq(ue) / eius semper / dicatissimus.

Q. Aeclanius Proximus (Aeclanum): Interamna Lirenas
AE 1989, 249, date uncertain
Q(uintus) Aeclanius Pro/ximus et N(umerius) / Hernelius Fe/lix IIIIVir(i) q(uin)q(uennales), / aequitatem fa/ciendam [c]u/raverunt, / ex p(ecunia) p(ublica).

C. Aquilonius C. <f.> Fab. Statutus (Aquilonia): Carnuntum, Pannonia Superior (gives Patavium as his origo); CSIR Oe 1, 472, late I-early II century CE
C(aius) Aquilonius / C(ai) <f>(ilius) Fab(ia) Statutus / Præt(avius), mil(es) leg(ionis) XV / Apol(linaris), stip(endiorum) XVIII, / an(norum) XXXVI, h(ic) s(itus) e(st); / M(arcus) Antonius / {ius} Longus / h(eres) f(aciundum) c(uravit).

Q. Canusius Praenestinus (Canusium): Nomentum; Monte Rotondo
CIL XIV 3932 (= ILS 7940); AE 1993, 429, mid-II century CE
Q(uintus) Canusius / Praenestinus / maceriam et ol/laria libertis / libertab uis f(ecit).

L. Venusenus Deciminus (Venusia): Rome
CIL VI 2380 (= CIL VI 2381 = CIL VI 32522), 172 CE
This man is listed in an album of a unit of the Praetorian Guard in Rome.

M. Venuseus Decimus (Venusia): Rome
CIL VI 2379 (= CIL VI 32520 = CIL XI 618, 6 = CLE 1670), 150 CE
This man is listed in the album of an unidentified military unit.

Venusia Anthimilla; C. Venusius Andron (Venusia): Antipolis (Gallia Narbonensis)
CIL XII 181 (Andron is also listed in ILN 2 A, 120), date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / Venusiae / Anthimil/ae, / C(aius) Venusius / Andron sex/vir Aug(ustalis) corp(oratus), / filiae / dulcissim[ae].

T. Venusius T. f. Men. Aper (Venusia): Praeneste (given as his origo; inscription found in Aquincum in Pannonia Inferior); AE 1937, 181, date uncertain
Aesculapio et Hygi/ae Aug(ustis) sacrum, / T(itus) Venusius T(it) f(ilius) Mene(nia) Aper / Praene(sti), opt(io) valetudi(narii), v(otum) s(olvit) l(aetus) l(ibens) m(erito), / V Kal(endas) Octob(res), posuit.

Volceia Asclepias (Volcei): Luceria
AE 2006, 348, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / Volceiae Asclep(ia)/di, vixit m(enses) VIII, dies / XI, Septimia C(ai) l(iberta) / Chresime et C(aius) / Ummidius Ha/millus filiae s(uae) / fecerunt.

C. Volceius C. f. (Volcei): Alba Fucens
CIL IX 4042, date uncertain
C(aius) Volceius C(ai) f(ilius), L(ucio) Maro / P(ubli) l(iberto) Tiumo.

C. Volceius Magnus (Volcei): Lavinium (found in Tor Vaianica)
AE 1975, 142, 196 CE
Iuliae / Aug(ustae) / matri / castrorum, / Imp(eratoris) L(uci) Septimi Severi / Pii Pertinacis Aug(usti) / Arabici Adiabenic(i) p(atris) p(atrae), / q(uin)q(uennalitate) C(ai) Vibi Felicis Ilvir(atu), / C(ai) Volcei Magni, Q(uinti) Egrili / Ingenui cur(a), agentib(us) C(aio) Luceio Felice, M(arco) Mettio Modesto. // dedic(ata) Id(ibus) Sept(embribus), / Dextro II Pris[co] co(n)s(ulibus).

[L.] Volceius Max(imus) (Volcei): Treba
CIL XIV 3449 (= ILS 400), 192 CE
Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) L(ucio) Aelio Aurelio Commodo Aug(usto) / Sarratico / Germanico / Maximo Brit{t}annico, / pacator[or] orbis, Felici Invicto Romano Herculi, / pontifici maximo, tribuniciae potest(atis) X[V]III, / imp(eratori) VIII, co(n)s(uli) VII, patri patriae, / omnium virtutum exsuperant(issimo), / ordo decurionum Commodianor(um) IIIIC, / C(ai) Papi Capitonis [et L(uci)] Volcei Max(imis).

L. Volceius [---] (Volcei): Rome
CIL VI 209 (= ILS 2097), 150 CE
Gallicano et Vetere co(n)s(uliibus), / VII Id(us) Ian(uarias), coh(ors) I pr(aetoria) ((centuria)), / Satri Genio ((centuriae)), missi / honesta missione VII, / Hibero co(n)s(ule), / Sp(urius) Censorius Iustus Viruno, / [---] Severus Sestino, / L(ucius) Volceius [---], / Q(uintus) Sextilius Rufus Flanonna, / C(aius) Valerius Veranus, Tridente / Serviano III co(n)s(ule), / T(itus) Annius Crispinus Cupra Mar(itima), / T(itus) Antonius Primus Perintha.

Volceius Saturninus (Volcei): Misenum
CIL X 3472, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / Memmiae Ne/reidi ver(nae) Stabi(anae), / vix(it) ann(os) XX, m(enses) VIII, / d(ies) V, Volceius Sa/turninus optio / III(triere) Venere, co(n)iugi / opt|r|mae b(ene) m(erenti).

Region III: Bruttium et Lucania

C. Petelius Paternus C. Haerigi f. (Petelia): Clunia (Hispania Citerior)
AE 1906, 19, date uncertain
rCtri(aio) Petelio Pat/erno / rCtri(ai) Haerigi / f(ilio), anno(rum) / LVI, Ann/a Maluga ux/or marito.

T. Petel(ius) P. f. (Petelia): Altinum
AE 2005, 601, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / T(itus) Petel(ius) P(ubli) f(ilius) / se vivo / termin/av<i>t sepu/lcrum, / in fronte / p(edes) LX, / retro / p(edes) LXXX.

L. Potentin(ius) L. f. Severinus (Potentia): Saint-Didier-de-Formans (Lugudunensis)
AnalEpi p. 66, date uncertain
D(co) Silva/no Cons(ervatori), / pro s(alute) ux(oris), / L(ucius) Potenti/n(ius) L(ucius) f(ilius) Seve/rinus vo(tum) / retul(it).
Q. Pọtentius tentinus (Potentia): Raetia (given as his *origo*; inscription found in Rome)
CIL VI 3282, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / Q(uintus) Pọtentius tentinus eq(ues) sin(gularis) d(omi) n(ostri) / tur(ma)
Romani, na(tione) R(a)etus, vix(it) an(nos) / XXXX, mil(itavit) an(nos) XVII, Turnius
Peregrinus (h)er{r}es et Luli/a Casia cọq(u)iux cọq(nn)iux(n)iux cọq(n)ere(s) / b(ene) m(erenti)
f(e)cerni(t).

Potentinus V[alens] (Potentia): Bonna (Germania Inferior)
Nesselhauf 197, date uncertain
Numi n sancto, / Consortiae / Valentinae, / Potentinii / V[alens] optio / iussu eius
posuit.

Potentius Victor (Potentia): Mogontiacum (Germania Superior)
CIL XIII 6985, date uncertain
Favor(?) veteranus [le]g(ionis) XXI[P]r(ig(ionis)] [P(iae) F(idel)]is], / duplarius, qui
vi{x}it an(nos) LXVII, cives Tau(nensis)?, / coniu(n)x ei {i}ius, et Potentinius Victor /
optio leg(ionis) XXII Pr(ig(ionis)] P(iae) F(idel)is, Favorius Valentinus, et ma/ter eorum
(h)eredes) f(aciendum) c(uraverunt).

**Region IV: Samnium**

C. Aesernus [---] (Aesernia): Apulum (Dacia)
IDR 3, 5, 2, 491, date uncertain

Corfin[iu]s Felix (Corfinium): Rome
AE 1932, 70, later II century CE
This man is listed in the *acta* of the cult of Septimius Severus.

M. Trebulan(ius) Gaglius Telesforianus (Trebu Suffenas): Beneventum
CIL IX 2000, date uncertain
M(emoriae) / M(arci) Trebulan(i) / Gagli Teles/orian(i) inf(elicissimi) dul(iciissimi) / q(ui)
v(ixit) an(nos) VIII, m(enses) / VI, d(ies) XII, Trebu/lanus Telesfor(us) et Natria /
Gagilia parent(es).

P. Treb[ulanus] (Trebula Suffenas): Rome
This man is listed in the *fasti* of the *Fratres Arvales*.

CIL XIV 3684 (= ILS 6237), I-earlier II century CE
T(ito) Trebulo / T(it)obul(i) Cam(ilia) Nepoti / Herc(ulan)io Aug(ustali), / T(itu) / Trebula[nus]/ T(it)obul(i) lib(ertus) Nepos Herc(ulan)io / Aug(ustali), aedil(is) iuvenum
Tiburt(ium). / Publicia Saturnina coniunx.

**Region VI: Umbria**

Amerina C. f. Anulla (Ameria): Urso (Baetica)
CIL II² 1043 (= CILA 2³ 632 = AE 1976, 284c), date uncertain
Amerina C(ai) f(ilia) Anulla, / Aelii Hectoris (uxor), / annor(um) LXXVI, hic / s(ita) est. 
s(it) tibi t(erra) l(evis).

C. Amerius Proculus (Ameria): Saturnia
Prometheus 1982, 243, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). // C(aio) Amerio Pro/culo, paren/tes filio car(issimo) / fec(erunt), / q(ui) 
v(ixit) a(nnos) X, m(enses) III, / d(ies) XIII.

(given as his origo; inscription found in Ariminum); CIL XIV 154 (= CIL XI 373), 249 CE
These two men are listed as clerical staff in a military diploma.

Q. Asisienus Q. f. Tro. Agrippa (Asisium): Iader (Dalmatia)
CIL III 2920 (= CIL V 429, 256), I-earlier II century CE 
Q(uinto) Asisieno Q(uinti) f(ilio) / Tro(mentina) Agrippae / aed(ili), Ilviro, / pontifici, / 
ex aere conlato / decuriones et plebs.

L. Hispellatius Sabinianus (Hispellum): Interamna Nahars
CIL XI 4212, I-II century CE
Noniae T(iiti) f(iliae) / Rufiniae / pestlicl(ae?) sac(rae), / L(ucius) Hispellatius / Sabinianus 
/aed(ialis), IIIIvir i(ure) d(icundo), heres, / ex testament(o) arbitrat(u) / C(ai) Obidi / 
Verecundi / mariti eius.

Q. Mevanius Marcel(lus) (Mevania): Mutina (given as his origo; inscription found in Rome);
CIL VI 2383 (= CIL VI 32525), 208 CE
This man is listed in the fasti of a unit of the Praetorian Guard.

Mevanius Vi[talio] (Mevania): Asseria (Dalmatia)
CIL III 2855, date uncertain
Marica C(ai) [f(ilia) Se]/cunda, sibi et / [f]ili[io] Mevania / Vi[talio].

C. Sassinas C. f. Pup. Polycarpianus (Sassina): Sassina
CIL XI 6533, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / C(ai) Sas/sinati / C(ai) f(ilio) Pup(inia) / Poly/carpi/ano, / c(ollegium) 
c(entonariorum) m(unicipii) S(assinatium).

L. Sentinas L. f. Lem. Verus (Sentinum): Sentinum
CIL XI 5761-5762, early III century CE
L(ucio) Sentinati / L(uci) f(ilio) Lem(onia) Vero / IIIIvir(o) quinq(uennali), / iur(e) 
dic(undo), / ordo et ple(te) Senti(natium), / h(onore) a(cepto) i(mpensam) r(emisit), / 
Satria An(ni) f(ilia) Vera / fil(io) piissimo. / l(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

Sex. Sentinas Maximus (Sentinum): Apulum (Dacia)
CIL III 7805 (= ILS 7145 = AE 1996, 1276), later II century CE
C(ai)o Cervoni[o] / Pap(ria) Sabino q(uin)[q(uennali)] / col(oniae) Dac(icae), dec(urioni) 
mun[i]/[c]ipi(i) Apul(ensis), / patron(o) / [c]olleg(i) fabr(um) col(oniae) / [et 
m]unicip(i) / s(upra) s(criptorium) pa[tro]no causarum / [piis]simo(?) am[ico] / 
rarissimu[o], / Sex(tus) Sentinas Maxi/mus anno primo / [f]acti municipi(i) / posuit; // [ob]
cuius / [sta]tuæ dedi/[cat]ionem Lu/[ci]a Iulia uxor / [C]ervoni per / omnes balne/[as] populo pu/blice oleum / posuit. / l(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)

Sentinas Iusta (Sentinum): Pisaurum
CIL XI 6335 (= ILS 7218), 256 CE
This senatorial woman is honored with her husband by a local association.

[Sent]inia Decumina; T. Senti[n]ius T. f. Vol. [---] (Sentinum): Les Avenieres (Gallia Narbonensis); CIL XII 2385, date uncertain
T(ito) Senti[n]io T(it)i fil(i) Vol(tinia) / [---]SC[---]IA[---]EN / [---]C[---]ISI[---]INO / [Sent]inia Decumina / [---] parentibus et sibi f(ecit).

Urvina L. f. Exsomna (Urvinum Mataurense): Forum Fulvii
CIL V 7445, date uncertain
P(ublio) Cornelio P(ubli) f(ilio) / Solicio Pom(ptina), / Urvinae L(uci) f(iliae) / Exsomnae, / L(uicius) Cornelius P(ubli) f(ilius) / Solicius / patri et matri fecit.

Urv(inia) Mussa (Urvinum Mataurense): Bratislava (Pannonia)
AE 2006, 1053, later II-early III century CE
[D(is) M(anibus)]. / [P(ublio) Urvini]o / Pastori militi / co(ho)r(tis) XVIII vol(untariorum), / stip(endiorum) XII, an(norum) XXXV, et P(apis) / Elpidi, an(norum) XXXX, et Urv(inae) / Muss(a)e, an(norum) XXVIII, et P(ublio) / Urvino {et P} Marcellino, / an(norum) XXII, Papia Matercia mat(er) et P(ublius) / Urvi(nius) Messius et Iul(ius) Maior frat(res).

Urvina P. f. [---]secen[---] (Urvinum Mataurense): Reate
CIL IX 4743, date uncertain
] / Urvina P(ubli) f(ilia) [---]secen

[P(ublius)] Urvinus P(ubli) l(ibertus) Hilario, T(itus) Urvi/nus P(ubli) f(ilius) Mataurus, C(aius) Urvinus / P(ubli) f(ilius) Clarus, P(ublius) Urvinus P(ubli) f(ilius) / Seneca / t(estamento) f(ieri) i(ussert).

C. Urvinius Ephaestus (Urvinum Mataurense): Rome
CIL VI 7942 (= AE 1979, 21), date uncertain
Di{i}s Manibus / C(ai) Urvini Ephaesti, v(ixit) a(nnos) III, / m(enses) V, d(ies) VIII, fec(it) C(aius) Urvinius Crescens p(ater).

C. Urvinus C. f. Proculus (Urvinum Mataurense): Rome
CIL VI 7858 (= CIL X 1088, 374), date uncertain
Vigelliae / Tyche, v(ixit) a(nnos) XXIV, / C(aio) Urvino C(ai) f(ilio) / Proculo, / v(ixit) a(nnos) I, m(enses) III.

C. Urvinus Senecio (Urvinum Mataurense): Trebula Mutuesca
AE 1994, 559 (= AE 1997, 24), date uncertain
Q(uintus) Vibius P(ubli) f(ilius) Qui(rina) Kanio / VIIIvir Trebula, / P(ublius) Vibius P(ubli) f(ilius) Qui(rina) frater, arbitratu / C(ai) Urvini Senecionis et / T(it)i Sarreni Gem(i)ni.

C. Urvinus C. [f.] Silinus (Urvinum Mataurense): Augusta Taurinorum
CIL V 7126, date uncertain
C(aius) Urvinus C(ai) f(ilius) / Silinus, sibi et / [A]moenae uxori, / [---] filio, / [---]t[---] / v(ivus) f(ecit).

C. Urvinius C. f. Victor (Urvinum Mataurense): Lambaesis (Numidia)
CIL VIII 4176, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / C(aio) Urvinio / C(ai) f(ilio) Victorii, / v(ixit) a(nnos) XXX, / Urvinus / Secundus / fratri.

Urvinius C. f. [---] (Urvinum Mataurense): Vomano
CIL I 3295 (= AE 1979, 198), date uncertain
---ius Q(uinti) f(ilius), / [---] Urvinus C(ai) f(ilius), / [---], Caecius P(ubli) f(ilius), / mag(istri) {a}aram / faciundam / coeravere.

L. Urv[inius] L. Urv[ini f. ---] (Urvinum Mataurense): Thibursicum Bure (Africa Proconsularis);
CIL VIII 15312, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum)]. / L(u(ci) Urv[inius] / L(u(ci) Urv[ini f(ilius?)].

P. Urvinius P. f. Fortunatus (Urvinum Mataurense): Carnuntum (Pannonia Superior)
CSIR, Oe 1^4, 408, date uncertain
P(ublius) Urvinius P(ubli) f(ilius) / Fortunatus, / an(norum) XVII, h(ic) s(itus) e(st); / Suc(c)es(s)a (ma)ter / filio p(osuit).

AE 2000, 451, date uncertain
P(ublius) Urvinius Q(uinti) f(ilius) T(it)i n(epos) / Qui(rina) / Mago.

P. Urvinius Marcellinus; [P. Urv]inius Pastor (Urvinum Mataurense): Bratislava (Pannonia); AE 2006, 1053, later II-early III century CE
[D(is) M(anibus)]. / [P(ublio) Urvini)o / Pastori militi / co(ho)r(tis) XVIII / vol(untariorum), / stip(endi)orum XII, an(norum) XXXV, et P(apia) / Elpide, an(norum) XXXX, et Urv(inia)e / Muss(a)e, an(norum) XXVIII, et P(ublio) / Urvinio {et P} / Marcellino, / an(norum) XXII, Papia Matceria mat(er) et P(ublius) / Urvi(niius) Messius et Iul(ius Maior frat(res).

P. Urvinius Q. f. Arn. Vitalis (Urvinum Mataurense): Uchi Maius (Africa Proconsularis); CIL VIII 26388, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / P(ublius ) Urvini/us Q(uinti) f(ilius) Arn(ensi) / Vitalis p(ius), v(ixit) / annis XXXX / [---

P. Urvinius P. f. Pol. (Urvinum Mataurense): Forum Fulvii (given as his origo; inscription found in Mogontiacum in Germania Superior); CIL XIII 6884 (= ILS 2261), early I century CE
P(ublius) Urvinus / P(ubli) f(ilius) Pol(lia) For(o) / Fulvi spec/ulator leg(ionis) / XIII, stipend(iorum) / XIIX, an(n)oru(m) / XXXV, h(ic) s(itus) e(st); / M(arcus) Aruntius / c(s) ob(rinus) cur(um) / egi(t).

Q. Urvinus Crescens Livianus (Urvinum Mataurense): Thibursicum Bure (Africa Proconsularis); CIL VIII 1440, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / Q(undo) Urvinus Crecenti Liviano / equestri dignitate exornato, / nobili viro, piissimo adolescenti, / qui cum suis carus parentibus / [---

Region VII: Etruria

Faleria Valeriana (Falerii Novi): Verona
CIL V 3563, date uncertain
v(ivus) f(ecit) / C(aius) Clodi/us Firmin(us) / Faleriae, / Veneriae uxor/i b(ene) m(erenti) et Faleriae / Valerianae / filiae piissimae / et sibi.

[C.] Falerius C. f. Murru[s] (Falerii Novi): Venusia
CIL IX 515 (= CIL I 1705), date uncertain
] Falerius C(ai) f(ilius) / Murru[s]; / in fro(n)te p(edes) XII, / in agr(o) p(edes) XII.

C. Falerius C. f. Niger (Falerii Novi): Brundisium
CIL I 3173 (= ILLRP 558 = AE 1959, 272), date uncertain
This magistrate is honored by the local decurions and citizens.

C. Falerius S(p.) f. (Falerii Novi): Venusia
CIL IX 514 (= CIL I 1704), date uncertain
C(aius) Falerius / S(pur) f(ilius); / in fro(n)te p(edes) XII, / in agr(o) p(edes) XII.

L. Faler[ius ---] (Falerii Novi): Ostia
CIL XIV 4554 (= AE 1907, 219), 166 CE

P. Falerius P. f. (Falerii Novi): Verona
CIL V 3248, date uncertain
I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo), / P(ublius) Falerius P(ubli) f(ilius) co(n)s(ulibus).

L. Saturnius Hermes (Saturnia): Velitrae
AE 1984, 174, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / [-] Saturnio Her/metu patri, L(ucius) Saturnius Hermes be/ne merenti fecit.

M. Saturnius Cucundas (Saturnia): Rome
CIL VI 25937, date uncertain
D(\text{is}) M(\text{anibus}) / M(\text{arco}) Saturnio Cucundati, q(u) v(\text{ixit}) a(nnos) X, d(\text{ies}) XXVII, fe/cer(unt) Cucundas et Aur(elia) Fil[e] rari\text{issi(mo)} / b(ene) m(\text{erenti}).

Saturnius Mellitinens(is) (Saturnia): Theveste (\text{Africa Proconsularis})
CIL VIII 16596 (= ILAlg 1, 3359), date uncertain
v(\text{ixit}) a(nnos) VII // D(is) [M(anibus)] sac(rum). Saturnius / Mellitinens(is), v(\text{ixit}) a(nnos) V, m(\text{ensem}) I, d(\text{ies}) X, / [---]TE[

C. Veianius Maximus (Veii):
CIL XI 3805 (= ILS 6579), 26 CE
This man is listed as one of the \textit{centumviri} of Veii in an honorific decree.

Veienia T. f. Primigenia (Veii): Rome
CIL VI 5493, date uncertain
Veienia T(iti) f(ilia) Primigenia / Veieni Primi filia, / vix(\text{it}) a(nn(um)) I, mens(es) II.

CIL V 2724, date uncertain
C(ai) Veieni C(ai) f(iliu) / Rom(ilia) Vari.

C. Veienus C. f.; C. Veienus, C. f. (Veii): Spoletium
CIL XI 4807 (= CIL I 2107 = ILLRP 670), Augustan period
M(\text{arcus}) Lu{u}cius M(arci) f(ilius), / C(aius) Veienus C(ai) f(ilius) / IIIIvir(i) i(ure) d(icundo), s(enatus) c(onsulto) / pontem faciu(ndum) / cur(arunt) probaruntq(ue).

T(itus) Veienus T(iti) f(ilius) Hor(atia), / T(itus) Veienus T(iti) f(ilius) Hor(atia), / T(itus) Veienus T(iti) f(ilius) Hor(atia) / Longus.

P. Volusinius Sabinus (Volsinii): Obernburg am Main (\text{Germania Superior})
CIL XIII 6623 (= ILS 9119), 207 CE
in h(onorem) d(omus) d(ivinae), I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo) / Dolichenos \text{scrum}), / vexil(larii) leg(ionis) XXII / Pr(\text{imigeniae}) P(iae) F(idelis) agentium / in lignari(i)s, / sub princepe P(ublio) / Volusinio / Sabino et T(ito) Ho/noratio De/ntiliano opt(ione), / Apro et Maxi\text{mo} co(n)ulibus).

T. Volusinus Pollius Rufimi filius (Volsinii): Vicus Haterianus (\text{Africa Proconsularis}); ILAfr 78, 3, date uncertain
T(itus) Volusinus Pollius Rufimi filius.

\textit{Region VIII: Aemilia}

[\text{Bon}\text{onia} \text{Romana} (Bononia): Rome
BCAR 1923, 118, date uncertain
[D(\text{is})] M(\text{anibus}) / [\text{Bon}\text{oniae} Ro/\text{mana}, Bono/nius Synthrophus p(ater), / Corania Spes m(\text{ater}) / fil(iae) piiss(\text{imae}), v(\text{ixit}) a(nnos) XVII, d(\text{ies}) XXXII.

Bononius Vitalis (Bononia): Brigetio (\text{Pannonia Superior})
CIL III 11024, date uncertain

Parmensia Tacita (Parma): Parma
CIL XI 1100 (= CIL V 686), date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / Parmensiae / Tacitae / filiae et / Pontiliae / Crispinae / uxori, / Ti(berius) Parmensius / Tacitus / b(ene) m(erenti).

C. Placentios Her(i) f. (Placentia): Tibur
CIL XIV 3563 (= CIL I 47 = ILLRP 222 = ILS 3143), III-II century BCE
C(aius) Placentios Her(i) f(ilius), / Marte sacrum; // C(aius) Placentios Her(i) f(ilius) / Marte donu(m) dede(t).

Alliae 60, Julio-Claudian period
Cn(aeo) Placentio Q(uinti) f(ilio) S(etri el(latina)), / Cn(aeo) Placentio Cn(aei) f(ilio) Cordo, / Heriae C(ai) l(ibertae) Tertiae, / Heriae C(ai) l(ibertae) Venustae, / Heriae ((mulieris)) l(ibertae) Dignitati.

Q. Veleius Q. f. Ouf. (Veleia): Aquinum
RAL 1971, 424, 6, date uncertain
Q(uinto) Veleio Q(uinti) f(ilio) / Ouf(entina) / et heredibu[s]; / in fronte p(edes), X / in agro p(edes) X.

Region X: Venetia et Histria

Aquileia Octavia Aquili fil. (Aquileia): Aquileia
CIL V 1091 (= Inscr.Aqu. 1, 837), II century CE
Aquileiae / Octaviae / Aquili fil(iae), / quae vix(it) an(nos) V, / et Mercuriali / et Irenae fr(atribus) / eius, et Octaviae / Primitivae et / Aquilae / Felici, vi[x(it) ---].

C. Atestas Quartio; C. Atestas Quintus; [At]esta Primula; Atestatia Secunda (Ateste):
Brixia; CIL V 4887, date uncertain

C. Atest(as) Securus; C. Atest(as) Servand(us) (Ateste): Brixia
CIL V 4876, date uncertain
T(itus) [At]es[t(as)] Priscus VIvir Aug(ustalis) Brix(iae), / sibi et Verae Primulae coniugi / carissimae, et C(aius) Atest(as) Servand(us) / et C(aius) Atest(as) Securus parentib(us) b(ene) m(erentibus).

Cremonius Albucius; Cremonius Albuci fi. Aulinus (Cremona): Vintium (Alpes Maritimae); CIL XII 18, later II century CE
Cremonio Albuci fi(lio) / Aulino, immatura / aetate decepto, q/ui vi/xit ann(os) XII, et
Vinicio / Ingenui filio Aulino, / prima aetate [erepto(?)], / q(u)i vixit an[n(os) ---], / Vibia Mater[na filiis] / piissimis et dulci/cissimis fecit; // Cremonio Albucio / dec(urioni) Vint(iensisium), Ilvirali, / sacerdotali, et om/nibus honoribus fu/ncto, Vibia Mater na marito incom/parabilis fecit.

(Patavin(i)a) Navina A. Patavini filia (Patavium): Rider (Dalmatia)
CIL III 9871 (= CIL III 13990), date uncertain
Navina / A(uli) Patavi/ni filia, / an(n)o(rum) XXXX.

C. Tarvi(sius) A. f. Secundus (Tarvisium): Tarvisium
AE 2006, 470, Julio-Claudian period
C(aius) Tarvi(sius) A(uli) f(ilius) / Secundus / IIIIvir a(edilicia) p(otestate), / Iunoni Reg(inae) / d(onum) d(edit).

M. Aurelius Veronius Verus (Verona): Colonia Ulpi Traiana (Germania Inferior)
CIL XIII 8630 (= ILS 4782), II-III century CE
Matribus Arsacis Pa/ternis sive Maternis, / M(arcus) Aur(elius) LV(?) Veronius Ve/rus r 밋 e(neficiariorum) praefecti I, pro se / et suis v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).

Q. Veronius C. f. Ter. (Verona): Venafrum
CIL X 4890, Augustan or Julio-Claudian period
Q(uintus) Veronius / C(ai) f(ilius) Ter(etina) / aquam / de suo.

Veronius Sementivus (Verona): Ostrovica (Dalmatia)
CIL III 9899a, date uncertain
Veronia Pro/chne mater / infelicissima, / sibi et filio, / annor(um) XX, / Veronio Se/mentivo.

*For the Publicii, Concordii, and Venerii a town of origin is given in parentheses only in cases where one can be determined from affiliation in a voting tribe or an origo. It is unclear, however, whether these towns are sites of family origin or more recent resettlement. A family origin in a town where municipal freedmen are attested with these gentilicia is also assumed as one’s origin. In cases where these gentilicia might have been used alongside the local municipal gentilicia, though are not attested (i.e., undesignated Publicii), the possible town of origin is marked with the symbol †.

Region I: Latium et Campania

Publicius Q. f. Fal. (Capua): Capua
CIL X 3995, later I century BCE-I century CE
Liber[t]orum et / familiae Aerar[---]ae / Popilianaec, / Q(uinti) Publici Q(uinti) f(ilius) Fal(erna).

Publicia L. f. Similis: Praeneste
CIL XIV 2997 (= ILS 3489), I-earlier II century CE
Publiciae L(uci) f(iliae) / Simili / magistrae / Matris M[r]a[tu(ae)], / M(arcus) Aemilius M(arci) f(ilius) / Ulpianus / uxori / sanctissimae. / [l(ucus)] d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).
Publicia Ianuaria (Puteoli†): Puteoli
CIL X 2898, later II-earlier III century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / Publiciae / Ia/nuariae, q(uae) v(ixit) / ann(os) XVII, m(enses) V, / Publicius Ianuarius / et Valeria Felic(u)la paren/tes filiae dulcissimae.

Region II: Apulia et Calabria

P. Publicius P. f. C[lla]a. A(d)iuтор (Barium): Barium
CIL IX 284, II century CE
P(ublius) Publicius / P(ubli) f(ilius) C[lla]a(udia) A(d)iuтор / aed(ilia) [pot(estae)], IIIIVir i(ure) d(icundo), / vix(it) an(nos) XXXV, h(ic) s(itus); / mat[e]r scelest(a) / filio fecit.

P. Publicius Maximus; P. Publicius Maximus Iun(ior) (Canusium): Canusium
CIL IX 338 (= CIL XI 250, 2d = ILS 6121), 223 CE
This father and son are listed in the ordo decurionum of the town in 223 CE, with the rank of pedanus and praetextatus, respectively.

Region III: Bruttium et Lucania

C. Concordius Syriacus (Beneventum): Beneventum
CIL IX 1663 (= ILS 5179), III century CE (?)
C(aius) Concordius Syriacus eq(ues) R(omanus), comm(entariensis) rei p(ublicae) / Benevent(anorum), munerarius / bidui, poeta Latinus, co/ronatus in mune(re) pa/triae suae, et vi/vus / sibi fecit, qui vixit / ann(os) LVIII, m(enses) VI, d(ies) XII, / hor(as) III. // <S>esterti, / primus / Beneventi / studi(or)um or/chestopales / instituisti.

Q. Concordius Primus (Beneventum): Beneventum
CIL IX 1798, date uncertain
D(is) [M(anibus)]. / Q(uinto) Concordi/o Primo, qui / vixit annis / V, me(n)s(i)bus) VII, d(iebus) XX, / mater filio / carissimo / fecit.

C. Umbrius C. f. Stel. Concordius Secundus (Sollers) (Beneventum): Beneventum
AE 1981, 238, late II-early III century CE
D(is) M(anibus) Sollerti // C(ai) Umbri C(ai) f(ilius) Stel(latina) / Concordi Secundi / adlect(i) in ord(inem) dec(urionum), / Concordia Prima mat(er) / b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit).

D. Publicius D. f. <T>rom. (?) Ephebus (Aesernia): Aesernia
CIL IX 2666 (= ILS 6518), II-earlier III century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / D(ecimus) Publicius D(ecimi) / f(ilius) <T>rom(entina) Ephebus / aed(ilia) pot(estae), IIIIVir / i(ure) d(icundo), IIIIVir lege Pe/tronia, v(ixit) a(nnos) XL, / h(ic) s(itus) e(st), / patri pientissimo.

CIL IX 2575, date uncertain

Region IV: Samnium

Q. Concordius Q. f. Avei(a) Verecundus Vest(inorum) (Aveia): Rome
CIL VI 2384 (= CIL VI 3884 = CIL VI 32526), 198 CE
This man is listed in the *album* of the XII Urban Cohort in Rome.

**Region V: Picenum**

L. Publicius Apronianus; L. Publicius Florianus: Auximum

CIL IX 5842, I century CE

D(is) M(anibus) / L(uci) Publici Apro/nian(i) p(rimi) p(ili), / patroni / municipi(i)

Riciniensium, / [--------] / [--- ae]dilis, / L(ucius) Publicius / Florianus / trib(unus)

coh(ortis) / VIII.


CIL IX 503, I century CE

[L(ucio)] Publicio L(uci) f(ilio) Ve[l(in)] / Consultino / equo publico, iudici selecto
decuris / quinque, Procilla / mater.

Publicia L. f. Bassillae (Cupra Maritima): Cupra Maritima

CIL IX 5304, I century CE

Publiciae L(uci) f(iliae) / Bassillae filiae, / Procilla mater.

Sextus Publicius Sex. f. Mae. (Hadria): Hadria

CIL IX 5018, early I century CE

Sextus / Publicius / Sex(ti) f(ilius) Mae(cia) / scriba, / Publicia / Sex(ti) l(iberta)

Callipo/lis.

**Region VI: Umbria**

Publicia L. f[i][l][i][a][e] Honesta: Tuder

CIL XI 4660 (= AE 1985, 363), date uncertain

Publiciae / L(uci) f[i][l][i][a][e] Hone/stae matron(a)e / castissim(a)e et car(a)e / coniugi

Iuli Marci / Ani(ensi), ob merita ma/riti, cives ex aere / collato. l(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto)
d(ecurionum).

**Region VIII: Aemilia**

C. Publicius (Bononia): Bononia

CIL XI 729, date uncertain

P(ublio) Vettio, C(ai) Publicio q(uaestoribus).


AE 1948, 51 (= ILGR 154), earlier III century CE

άγ[αθη] [τύχη]. / Г(αίω) Πουβλικίω Προκού/λημάνω Ραβεννήτη. / πριμπειλαρίω,

έπιτροπο / Παυσίας και Άχαιας, Ἡ / ἱερά πόλις Δελφῶν / ἀνέστησεν / ψ[φισματί]

β(ουλής). // C(ai) Publicio C(ai) f(ilio) Cam(ilia) / [Raven]na Proculeiano / [--------] //

άγ[αθη] [τύχη] Νουμέρι.

C. Publicius C. f. Ampliatus (Ravenna†): Ravenna

CIL V 338 (= CIL XI 207 = CLE 507), early III century CE

C(ai) Publici C(ai) f(iii) Ampliati, qui vix(it) an(nos) VI, d(ies) XXVII, / C. Publicius

Proculeianus alumno suo posuit, / curantib(us) Publicio Dionysio et Aurelia Tyche
parentibus. / tempera iam genitor lacrimis tuque, optima mater, / desine iam flere. poenam non sentio mortis, / poena fuit vita, requies mihi morte parata est.

Region X: Venetia et Histria

D. P(oblicius) D. f. (Aquileia): Aquileia
CIL V 8110, 118 (= AE 1995, 546e), date uncertain
D(ecimi) P(oblici) D(ecimi) f(ili).  

CIL V 1354 (= Inscr.Aqu. 1, 500); AE 1934, 231 (= Inscr.Aqu. 1, 499), mid-II century CE
C(aio) Quinctio / C(ai) f(iilio) Vel(ina) / Certo / Poblicio / Marcello / [-------] / Mini[cius(?)] ---) / Nos[te]r(?)] amico.  

C(aius) Quinctius / C(ai) f(ilius) Vel(ina) / Certus Poblicius / Marcellus co(n)s(ul), / augur, legatus divi / Hadrian(i) provin(ciarum) / Syriae et German(iae) / superior(is),  
ornament(is) / triumphalus.

CIL V 8830, date uncertain  
[--- Pu]blicius r[C] (ai) f(ilius) / [P]eregrinus / [---], VIvir / [---]C V . . .

Poblicia M. f. (Brixia): Brixia
CIL V 4751, date uncertain
L(ucio) Valerio Sp(uri) f(ilio) / Nigro viro, // Poblicia M(arci) f(ilia) // L(ucio) Valerio  
L(ucio) f(ilii) Fab(ia) / Firmo f(ilio)

M. Publicius M. f. Fab. Sextius Calpurnianus (Brixia): Brixia
CIL V 4459 (= ILS 6715), date uncertain
M(arco) Publici[o] / M(arci) f(ilio) Fab(ia) Sextio / Calpurniano / [eq]u(o public[o], / flam(in)i) divi Iul(i), / praef(ecto) aedil(icia) pot(estate), / quaestor(i) aerar(ii), / sacerd(oti) iuven(um) Brixianor(um), / defensori rei p(ublicae) Brix(ianorum), / collegia / centon(ariorum) et fabror(um). / l(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

Poblicia Q. f. Festa (Verona†): Verona
CIL V 3702, date uncertain
Poblicia Q(uinti) f(ilia) / Festa, sibi et / C(ai) Bisio C(ai) f(ilio)  

Poblicia M. f. Max{s} ima (Verona†): Verona
CIL V 3805, date uncertain
Poblicia Q(uinti) f(ilia) / Pob(lilia) Oricloni, // Pobliciae M(arci) f(iliae)  
Max{s} ima, // Q(uinti) Valerius Q(uinti) f(iliis) Macer f(ecit).

Q. Publilius Q. f. (Verona†): Verona
AE 1965, 148, I century BCE (?)
Q(uinto) Publilio Q(uinti) f(ilio) / leg(ato) pro pr(aetore).

Region XI: Transpadana

Publicia L. f. Atilia (Comum†): Comum
CIL V 5303, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / Romatiae L(uci) f(iliae) / Severinae / filiae optimae, / quae vixit
ann(os) XII, / L(ucius) Romatius / Trophimus / VIvir et Aug(ustalis) Com(o), / VIvir
Mediol(ano), et / Publicia L(uci) f(ilia) / Atilia / parentes.

C. Publicius Atticus (Comum†): Comum
Pais 782, date uncertain
C(ai) Publici Attici, / q(uae) v(ixit) a(nnos) II, m(enses) V.

Publicia C. f. Pomponia (Mediolanum): Mediolanum
CIL V 5892 (= ILS 6731), II-III century CE
gen(io) et [h]on(ori) / P(ubli) Tutili / Callifontis / Vlvr(i) sen(ioris), / patr(on) /
((centuriarum)) XII coll(egii) / aerar(ii) c(oloniae) A(ureliae?) A(ugustae?) M(ediolani), /
eg(otiatoris) stip(is) arg(entarii) / splendid(issimi), et / iun(on) Publiciae / C(ai) f(iliae)
Pomponiaei / r(esta) f(iliae) P(omponiaei), / Constantii vivatis, / L(ucius) Romatius / Valerian(us) et /
Vocatia / Valeriam cum / fili(is) clientes.

C. Publicius C. f. Pap. Quietus Ticino (Ticinum): Rome
CIL VI 2924, date uncertain
C(aius) Publicius / C(ai) f(ilius) Pap(ricia) / Quietus / Ticinum, / mil(es) coh(ortis) XII 
urb(ana), / ((centuriae) Veri, / mil(itavit) a(nnos) XII, / vix(it) a(nnos) XXX, / C(aius)
Marius Maximus / commanipulari / amico pos(u)it.

Publicia C. f. Marcella: Vercellae
CIL V 6702, date uncertain
Publiciae C(ai) f(iliae) Marceliae matri piissimae, / L(ucius) Aurelius Marcellus.
APPENDIX VI: FREED DESCENDANTS OF MUNICIPAL FREEDMEN

Region I: Latium et Campania

Vescinia Eleutheri(s) (Aqua Vescinae): Capua
CIL X 4398, II-earlier III century CE
Dis Manibus / sacr(um) / T(ito) Vescinio T(iti) f(ilio) / Fal(erna) Rufo patro[no] / et T(ito) Vescinio Sp(uri) f(ilio) / Rufo, / Vescinia Eleutheri(s), / sibi et suis.

(Arrecina) Ianuaria (Aricia): Rome
AE 1967, 25, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / M(arci) Arrecini / Prosdicti, / Ianuaria lib(erta) / patrono/ b(ene) m(erenti) fecit.

Calena L. l. Aucta; L. Calenus L. l. Beryllus; L. Calenus L. l. Felix; L. Calenus C. l. A. l. Silo (Cales): Rome; CIL VI 14058, date uncertain
L(uicius) Calenus C(ai) l(ibertus) A(uli) l(ibertus) Silo, / Calena L(uci) l(iberta) Aucta uxor, / L(uicius) Calenus L(uci) l(ibertus) Felix, / T(itus) Antonius T(iti) l(ibertus) Chrestus, / T(itus) Antonius T(iti) l(ibertus) Coriscus, / L(uicius) Calenus L(uci) l(ibertus) Beryllus, / Antonia Corisci l(iberta) Anatole.

(Cn.) Calenus[s] Cn. Pompei (Cales): Rome
CIL VI 33523, date uncertain
Cale/rn³u[s] / Cn(aei) Pomp⁰⁶

Campania D. l. Saturnina (Capua): Canusium
AE 1987, 269, earlier I century CE
M(anio) Cornelio ((mulieris)) l(iberto) / Reparato, / M(anio) Cornelio M(ani) f(ilio) / Augurino, / Campaniae D(ecimi) l(ibertae) / Saturninae, / suisque.

(P.) (Campanus) Celer (Capua): Blatobulgium (Britannia)
CIL VII 1064, date uncertain

Corana ((mulieris)) l. Urbana; [C. Cor]anus C. et ((mulieris)) l. ---] (Cora): Rome
CIL VI 35003, date uncertain
[C(ai) Cor]ani C(ai) et ((mulieris)) l(iberti) / ---]atae, / Corana ((mulieris)) l(iberta) / Urbana.

Corania ((mulieris)) [lib ---] (Cora): Narbo (Gallia Narbonensis)
CIL XII 4719, date uncertain
Corania ((mulieris)) [lib(erta) ---], / Hymnis Frug[i

L. Coranius L. l. Euaristus (Cora): Rome
CIL VI 451 (= CIL VI 30769 = ILS 3619), 100 CE
Laribus Augustis et Genis Caesarum, / Imp(eratori) Caesaris divi Nervae filio Nervae Traiano Aug(usto) Germ(anico) pontifici maximo, trib(unica) pot(estate) III, co(n)s(uli) III, desi[g(nato) III], / permissu C(ai) Cassi Interamnnani Pisibani Prisci praetoris aediculam reg(ionis) XIII, vici censori, magistri anni CVI[I], / vetustate dilapsam

T. Coranius T. C. [---] (Cora): Nursia
CIL IX 4568, date uncertain
T(itus) Coranius T(itii) C(ai) [---] / pa[...

Region II: Apulia et Calabria

Aeclania M. l. Marta; (C.) Aeclanius C. C. l. Phileros; C. Aeclanius C. l. Q(u)artio (Aeclanum): Casinum; Casinum 1, 4, date uncertain
C(ai)o Aeclanio C(ai) C(ai) / l(iberto) Phileroti patri, / Aeclaniae M(arci) l(ibertae) / Martae matri, / C(aius) Aeclanius C(ai) l(ibertus) / Q(u)artio filius, sib[i] / et suis fe[cit].

M. Aecl[an]ius Chrysogonus (Aeclanum): Puteoli
CIL X 2984, date uncertain

Aeclanius Genialis (Aeclanum): Puteoli
CIL X 2438, date uncertain
T(itus) Flavius Paris fecit / Marciae Aurae co(n)iugi / bene me(renti), et Aeclanio / Geniali, et Tyche contube[rnali] suae, possidendum / mon[terium].

Aeclanius Iovanus (Aeclanum): Neapolis
EE 8¹, 340, later II-earlier III century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / C(ai) Aeclani / Fortunati / decurioni(s) Aecl/anensium, IIviro, / munera(r) o splen(d)ido, vixit annis / XXXV, men(sibus) XI, d(ie) I, / Aeclanius Iovanus / lib(ertus).

Venusia Fausta; [Venus]ius Proculus (Venusia): Rome
Epigraphica 2014, 443, date uncertain
[---]sio Proculo, / qui vix(it) an(n)is XXXXII, / Venusia Fausta / conservo bene / merenti, c[r]um / quo vixit annis X.

AE 1983, 842, date uncertain
[D(is)] M(anibus). / [Ve]nusia Rus[tica]/[na], / vix(it) an(n)os LX, / [Venus]ius R[u]s[tican]us, / vi[xit ann(os)] / [---]E[--] / [Iu]lia[nus?] parenti/[bus?] b[ene] m(erenti) pos{em}urunt.

P. Venusius P. l. Iucundio (Venusius): Aquileia
CIL V 8489 (= Inscr.Aqu. 2, 1638), date uncertain
P(ublius) Venu[s]ius / P(ubli) l(ibertus) / Iucundio, // Licovia / Q(uinti) l(ibert) / Primula.
**Region III: Bruttium et Lucania**

CIL X 141, date uncertain  

[V]olceia C. I. Aprodisia (Volcei): Rome  
CIL VI 37398, date uncertain  
C(aius) Volceius Mucapor, / [V]olceia C(ai) l(iberta) Aprodisia.

Volceia (mulieris) I. Viola; C. Volceius (mulieris) I. Syneros (Volcei): Rome  
CIL VI 8055, date uncertain  
Volceia ((mulieris)) l(iberta) Viola, / sibi et suis ollas III, / C(ai)o Antonio ((mulieris)) C(ai) l(iberto) Paridi et / C(ai)o Volceio ((mulieris)) l(iberto) Syneroti.

A. Volceius A. I. Demetr(i)us (Volcei): Minturnae  
CIL I 2703 (= ILLRP 743), I century BCE  
[s[---] / Bacchi[des] Metili M(arcii) [s(ervus)], / Theudor[us Graec]i L(uci) [s(ervus)], / Antioch(us) Ateidi P(ubli) s(ervus) Botry[yo], / Salvius Plauti(orum) A(uli) M(arcii) s(ervus), / Ph[i]lotimus Piranae s(ervus), / Sabda(s) Epide M(arcii) s(ervus), / Alexander Cami(di) M(arcii) s(ervus), / M(arcus) Popili(us) M(arcii) l(ibertus) Helia[des], / A(ulus) Volcei(us) A(uli) l(ibertus) Demetr(i)us, / Niceph(ore) salin(atorum) soc(iorum) s(ervus), / Licinio Caecili L(uci) s(ervus).

L. Volceius Cerdo (Volcei): Narona (Dalmatia)  
CIL III 1792, earlier II century CE  
Mercurio Aug(usto) sacrum, / M(arcii) Ulpius Aug(usti) lib(ertus) Nedymus, / C(aius) Pollius Albanus, / T(itus) Vetulenus T(it) l(ibertus) Abascantus, / Q(uintus) Cornelius Augustalis, / L(uci)us Volceius Cerdo, / IIIIIIvir m(onu)m(enti) ob hon(orem).

L. Volceius Pylas (Volcei): Telesia  
CIL IX 2256, date uncertain  

L. Volceius L. l. Silvester (Volcei): Narona (Dalmatia)  
CIL III 1793, earlier II century CE  
Mercurio / Aug(usto) sacrum, / L(ucius) Volceius L(uci) l(ibertus) Silvester IIIIIIvir / ob hon(orem).

**Region IV: Samnium**

L. Antinius L. l. Melito (Antinum): Rome  
CIL VI 38002, late I century BCE-early I century CE  
v(ivit) L(ucius) Antinius / L(ucius) l(ibertus) Melito, / o(biit) Psacas; / in f(ronte) [p(edes)] XII, / in ag(ro) p(edes) XII.
Suffenatia Saturnina (Trebla Suffenas): Rome
CIL VI 5291, date uncertain
M(arco) Suffenati Soso, / qui vix(it) ann(os) LXIV, / Suffenatia Saturnina / patrono suo
b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit).

CIL X 4378 (= AE 1980, 222), early I century CE
M(arcus) Trebul[anu]s / Philomusi l(ibertus) Faus[tus], / Deciria ((mulieris)) l(iberta)
Lais / ficerunt, sibi et / M(arco) Trebulano Philomus[so], / Deciriae ((mulieris))
l(ibertae)Secundae Faus[ti] (uxori), / M(arco) Trebulano Primogeni, [qui] vixit / [--],
Trebulano et frat[ri].

T. Trebulanus T. lib. Nepos (Trebla Suffenas): Tibur
CIL XIV 3684 (= ILS 6237), I-early II century CE
T(ito) Trebulano / T(iti) f(ilio) Cam(ilia) Nepoti / Herc(ulaneo) Aug(ustali), / T(itus)
Trebulanus T(itii) lib(ertus) Nepos Herc(ulaneus) / Aug(ustalis), aedil(is) iuvenum
Tiburt(ium), / Publicia Saturnina coniunx.

Region VI: Umbria

C. Amerinus P. l. Latinus(s) (Ameria): Narona (Dalmatia)
CIL III 1884, mid-I century BCE
C(aius) Amerinus / P(ubli) l(ibertus) Latinus(s) / s(itus).

L. Sentina{n}s L. lib. Septimius (Sentinum): Corduba (Baetica)
CIL II7 537, late II century CE
L(ucius) Sentina{n}s / L(uci) lib(ertus) Septimius, / ann(orum) XXXV, / pius in suis /
H(ic) s(itus) e(st). s(it) t(ibi) t(erra) l(evis).

(Sentinia) [--]enata (Sentinum): Sentinum
CIL XI 5789, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / [--]enatae, / L(ucius) Sentinas / Saturninus / libertae / b(ene) m(erenti).

Urvina C. l. Flora; C. Urvinus C. l. Agathamerus; C. Urvinus C. l. Stabilio (Urvinum
Mataurense): Aquae Cutiliae; CIL IX 4670, date uncertain
C(aius) Urvinus C(aii) l(iberto) / Agathamero, / Urvinae C(aii) l(ibertae) Floraes, / C(aios)
Urvinus C(aii) l(iberto) Stabilioni, / C(aius) Mucius C(aii) l(ibertus) Melanthus.

Urvineia L. l. Modesta (Urvinum Mataurense): Puteoli
CIL X 1889, earlier I century CE
Sex(tus) Publicius Bathyllos / accensus consuli, Augustalitis / Puteolis et Venafri, sibi et /
Urvineiae L(ucius) l(ibertae) Modestae uxori suae, / et L(ucius) Urvineio Adiutori, et /
C(aius) Iulius Aucto fratri.

Urvinia T. l. Tyche (Urvinum Mataurense): Ventippo (Baetica)
CIL II8 932 (= CILA II8 1184 = AE 1979, 344a), late I-early II century CE
Q(uintus) Vibius Q(uinti) l(ibertus) / Firmillo et / Urvinia T(itii) l(ibertas) Ty/che h(ic)
s(iiti) s(unt). s(it) v(obis) t(erra) l(evis).
L. Urwineius L. i. Philomusus (Urvinum Mataurense): Praeneste
CIL XIV 3015 (= ILS 6256), early 1 century CE
L(ucio) Urwineio L(uci) l(iberto) Philomuso / mag(istro) co'ri[l(egii) libert(orum), /
publice sepsulturae et statuae in foro locus / datus est, quod is testamento suo lavationem
populo gratis / per triennium, gladiatorumque paria X, et Fortunae Primig(eniae) /
coronam auream p(ondo) I dari, idemque ludos ex HS XL((milia)) per dies V fieri iussit; /
Philippus l(ibertus) monumentum de suo fecit.

Q. Urvinus Q. l. Callistus (Urvinum Mataurense): Uchi Maius (Africa Proconsularis); CIL VIII
26241 (= AE 1907, 153), date uncertain
Saturno Aug(usto) s[ac(rum)], / pro salute Imp(eratoris) Nervae, / Q(uintus) Urvinus
Q(uinti) lib(ertus) Callistus / templum a solo d(ecreto) d(ecurionum), p(ecunia) p(ublica)
f(ecit).

C. Urvinus [C.] Senecion(is) l. Antiocus (Urvinum Mataurense): Rome
CIL VI 7984, 1 century CE
C(aius) Urvinus / Senecion(is) / l(ibertus) Antiocus, / Clodia [---] / [---] Zosi[m]e.

C. Urvinus [C.] Menippus (Urvinum Mataurense): Rome
CIL VI 29601, 1 century CE
C(aius) Urvinus [C(ai)] / Sen[ecio]n(is) l(ibertus) / Menippus, / Lucretia ((mulieris))
l(iberta) / Erotis; / in f(ronte) p(edes) XI, in agr(o) p(edes) XI.

[P.] Urvinus P. l. Hilario (Urvinum Mataurense): Regium Lepidum
CIL XI 966, date uncertain
[P(ublius)] Urvinus P(ubli) l(ibertus) Hilario, T(itus) Urvinus P(ubli) f(ilius)
Mataurus,C(aius) Urvinus / P(ubli) f(ilius) Clarus, P(ublius) Urvinus P(ubli) f(ilius) /
Seneca, / t(estamento) f(ieri) i(uisserunt).

P. Urvinus P. l. Strabo (Urvinum Mataurense): Rome
BCAR 1941, 185 no. 125, date uncertain
L(ucius) Nasuleius / Teres / emit oll(as) II / a P(ublio) Urvino P(ubli) l(iberto) / Strabone.

Region VII: Etruria

Faleria C. l. Logas (Falerii Novi): Rome
CIL VI 17702, mid-I century CE
C(aius) Falerius Nymphodotus, / Faleria C(ai) l(iberta) Logas, / vixit ann(os) XXV.

Faleria L. l. Syntyche (Falerii Novi): Rome
CIL VI 20485, date uncertain
Iulia C(ai) l(iberta) Galatia[a], / Epaphroditii / coniunx, / vix(it) ann(os) XXX, // Faleria
L(uci) l(iberta) / Syntyche / mater L(uci) Faleri / Maritimi.

Faleria Tyrannis (Falerii Novi): Rome
CIL VI 17703, date uncertain
Dis Manibus. Q(uinto) F(a]l[erio] // Praeponti, Faleria Tyrannis pat[rono bene merenti
ollaria tr[ia a solo ad] / camaram, sibi et suis posteris[que eorum].
(Falerius) Hermes Anthusae [li]b. (Falerii Novi): Altinum
CIL V 2218, date uncertain
M(arco) Cocceio / Nepoti et / Faleriae Anthusae, / Hermes Anthusae / [li]b(ertus)
ponendum / curavit.

P. Falerius Trophimus (Falerii Novi): Verona
CIL V 3282 (= ILS 3767); CIL V 3302 (= ILS 3561), date uncertain
Parcis Aug(ustis), / P(ublius) Falerius / Trophimus, / ornamentis / decurionalib(us) / [

C. Veieni(us) ((mulieris)) l. Mam(a) (Veii): Rome
CIL VI 37522, date uncertain
P(ublius) Properti(us) P(ubli) l(ibertus) Alph(eus), / C(aius) Veieni(us) ((mulieris))
l(ibertus) Mam(a), / L(uclius) Suetoni(us) L(ucl) l(ibertus) Mam(a), / L(uclius) Suetoni(us)
L(ucl) l(ibertus) Alex(ander?), / L(uclius) Audieni(us) L(ucl) l(ibertus) Anter(os), / T(itus)
Tulli(us) T(itii) l(ibertus) Scurr(a), / L(uclius) Aufidi(us) L(ucl) l(ibertus) Pamph(illus?), /
L(uclius) Appulei(us) L(ucl) l(ibertus) Prim(us?).

C. Veienus C. l. Alexander (Veii): Rome
CIL VI 28419, date uncertain
C(ai) Veieni C(ai) l(iberti) / Alexandri.

C. Veienus ((mulieris)) lib. Trophimus (Veii): Tolentinum
CIL IX 5570 (= ILS 7847 = AE 2000, 488), date uncertain
C(aius) Veieni ((mulieris)) lib(ertus) / Trophimus / loca sepultur[i]s, / in fronte p(edes)
CC, / in agr(o) p(edes) CCLXXXIII, / inter ripam fluminis / et riv’u’m quidquid / in
eam demonstra/tionem loci est, / de finibus su[i]s / municipibu[s] / Tolentinatibus, /
donavit.

T. Veienus T. l. Surus (Veii): Nursia
CIL IX 4629, date uncertain
T(ito) Veieno T(itii) l(iberto) / Suro; / in ag(ro) p(edes) XII.

Region VIII: Aemilia

Sex. Bononius Iason (Bononia): Rome
CIL VI 13626 (= CIL V 672, 16), late I-II century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / Sex(ti) Bononi / Iasonis, / Iason Aug(usti) / lib(ertus) patri / bene
m(erenti) f(ecit).

Region X: Venetia et Histria

[Aquile]ia L. l. Nota (Aquileia): Rome
AE 2001, 491, date uncertain
[Aquile]ia / L(ucl) l(iberta) Nota; / in f(ronte) p(edes) XXII, / in ag(ro) p(edes) XXIV.

C. Aquileiensis Suavis Nemesini l. (Aquileia): Aquileia
CIL V 1249 (= Inscr.Aqu. 1, 1170), date uncertain
Ialysso coniugi, / et C(aio) Aquileiens i / Suavi / Nemesin(i) l(iberto), C(aio) Frenio
Secund(o). / Gramme.
CIL V 4876, date uncertain
T(itus) [At]es[tas] Priscus VIvir Aug(ustalis) Brix(iae), / sibi et Vetrae Primulae coniugi / carissimae), et C(aius) Test(es) Servand(us) / et C(aius) Test(es) Securus parentib(us) b(ene) m(erentiubis).

Atestia Ide (Ateste): Bergomum
CIL V 5148, late I-II century CE

Cremonia [L.] l. Syntyche (Cremona): Ravenna
CIL XI 172, date uncertain
Dis Manibus. / Cremonia [L(ucia)] l(iberta) Syntyche / filia Lucia] L(uci) Felicia[s].

Veronia [-] l. Statia (Verona): Rome
AE 1991, 94, date uncertain
Veronia / [-] l(iberta) Statia / [*

*For the Publicii and Venerii a possible town of origin is given in parentheses only in cases where one can be determined from their patron’s origin, or in cases where they are located in a town where municipal freedmen are attested with these gentilicia. In cases where these gentilicia might have been used alongside the local municipal gentilicia, though not attested (i.e., un-designated Publicii), the possible town of origin is marked with the symbol †.

Region I: Latium et Campania

M. Poblicius M. l. Primitivus (Interamna Lirenas†): Interamna Lirenas
AE 1996, 335, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / M(arco) Poblicio / M(ari) l(iberto) Primitivo, / C(aius) Vennius Firmus / alumno et contu/bernali / desiderantissimo, / v(ixit) a(nnos) XXIV, m(ensem) I, d(ies) XXIII.

Publicia ((mulieris)) l. Felicula: Minturnae
CIL X 6046, date uncertain
P(ublius) Ogulnius / Eutychu[s], / Publicia ((mulieris)) l(iberta) / Felicula.

(Ma.) (Poblicius) Apsurtus; Ma. Poblicius Clemens; Ma. Poblicius Dionysius (Puteoli†): Puteoli;
CIL X 1949, II century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / Ma(nio) Publicio / Dionysio, fecerunt / II fratres Publicius / Cleme(n)st et Apsurtus / alumni / b(ene) m(erenti) t(atee) s(uo). / D(is) M(anibus) / Ma(nio) Publici Dionysii / Ma(nio) Publici Nicerotis pediseq(ui) / bene {e}meranti, fecer(unt) / duo fratri tres Publici{us} Clemens et / Apsyrtus alumni / tate.

M. Poblicius M. l. Unio: Tusculum
CIL XIV 2605 (CLE 477), date uncertain
Dis Manibus / M(arcio) Publici M(arcio) liberti) Unionis, / te rogo: praeteriens fac / mora et perlege versus quos ego / dictavi et iussi scribere quendam. / est mihi terra levis merito

Region IV: Samnium

Publicia ((mulieris)) l. Arbuscula (Alba Fucens†): Alba Fucens
CIL IX 3944, date uncertain
Publicia ((mulieris)) l(iberta) / Arbuscula, / sibi et / L(ucio) Nonio Aescino / sevir(o).

Region V: Picenum

Publicia Sex. l. Callipolis (Hadria†): Hadria
CIL IX 5018, date uncertain
Sextus / Publici/us / Sex(ti) f(ilius) Mae(cia) / scriba / Publicia / Sex(ti) l(iberta)
Callipo/lis

Region VI: Umbria

Pob[i]c[i(a --- l.) Arbus[cula] (Carsulae): Carsulae
CIL XI 4618, date uncertain
Pob[l]i[cia --- l(iberta)] / Arbus[cula].

M. Publicius ((mulieris)) lib. Cerialis; M. Publicius [---]apho (Carsulae): Carsulae
CIL XI 4619, date uncertain

Publicia D. l. Muscinis; D. Publicius D. l. Charito (Pisaurum†): Pisaurum
CIL XI 6441, date uncertain
D(ecimus) Publicius D(ecimi) l(ibertus) Charito, / sibi et Publicae D(ecimi) l(ibertae) / Muscini, viv[r]u[s fecit.

Publicia A. l. Salvia: Tuder
CIL XI 4763, date uncertain
] / Publicia A(uli) l(iberta) / Salvia.

Region VIII: Aemilia

Publicia Chreste lib.; M. Publicius Ianuarius delicatus; M. Publicius Zosimus libert. (Bononia): Bononia; CIL XI 6829, date uncertain
Dis Manibus / M(arci) Publici Phileti / Claud(ia), / [M(arcus)] Publicius Zosimus / libert(us) / [be]ne m(erenti) fecit, / et / M(arcus) Publicius Ianuarius / delicatus et / Publicia Chreste / lib(erta).
C. Publicius ((mulieris)) lib. Epigonus (Placentia): Placentia
   CIL XI 1265, date uncertain
   Dis Manib(us) / C(ai) Publici ((mulieris)) lib(erti) Epigoni.

 Region X: Venetia et Histria

T. Poblicius P. l. (Altinum): Altinum
   AE 2000, 612, date uncertain
   T(itus) Pobl(icius) / P(ubli) l(ibertus); [p(edes)] XV, / r(etiro) [p(edes)] X]XX(?).

L. Poblicius L. l. Anteros (Aquileia): Aquileia
   Inscr.Aqu. 1, 570, late I century BCE-early I century CE
   L(ucius) Poblicius L(uci) / l(ibertus) Anteros, / [P(ublius)] Postumius P(ubli) l(ibertus)
   Felix, / P(ublius) Oppius P(ubli) l(ibertus) Atticu[s], / Capito Iuli Nason(is), / Urbanus
   T(iti) Helvi f(lii) s ervus), / Primus T(iti) Vocon[i], / mag(istri) l(ibentes) d(ederunt).

M. Poblicius ((mulieris)) l. Cruscillus (Aquileia): Aquileia
   CIL V 1072 (= Inscr.Aqu. 1, 800), date uncertain
   Annava ((mulieris)) l(iberta) / Helena, sibi / et M(arco) Poblicio / ((mulieris)) l(iberto)
   Cruscillo; / l(ocus) m(onumenti) q(uoq)uoversus) p(edes) XVI.

Publicius Terentia[--- Te]rentius (Aquileia): Aquileia
   CIL V 1043 (Inscr.Aqu. 1, 734), date uncertain
   Publicio / Terentia[---], / [Te]rentio / Iulio No[---], / [Te]rentiae / procur[ante? ---] /
   Annio [---] / Terent[ius?]

L. Publicius L. l. Secundus (Vicetia): Vicetia
   CIL V 3188, date uncertain
   L(ucio) Publicio L(uci) l(iberto) / Secundo, / h(eres) d(e) s(uo).

Uncertain origin

Vener(ia) L. l. Seia: Rome
   CIL VI 26115, date uncertain
   L(ucius) Seius Pilero, / Vener(ia) L(uci) l(ibertio) / Seia (h)eres v(iva) / emit duas / ol(l)as,
   sib(i) et patr(ono).
APPENDIX VIII: INCERTI DESCENDANTS OF MUNICIPAL FREEDMEN

Region I: Latium et Campania

Aricinia Callist[a] (Aricia): Rome
CIL VI 12308, Trajanic period
D(is) M(anibus) / Aricinae / Callist[ae], / M(arcus) Ulpius / [ Q(uintus) Aricinius Q(uinti) f(ilius) Bassus, / vixit ann(os) XXV. / debuit hoc patris natus duo corpora humare, / corpora sen animes corpus inane colunt, / qui quia non possunt donis aequare merentem, / Basse, tuis meritis respondere queunt. / v(ivus) C(aius) Curtius C(ai) l(ibertus) Antiochus pater. / debuit hoc natus nobis praestare duobus / ut cineres patrios dederet inferi(is), / sed quoniam dirae genuerunt fata volucres, / te, Basse, e ruptum flevimus ante rogum / v(iva) Aricinia Nais mater.

Aricinia Nais (Aricia): Rome
CIL VI 12307 (= CLE 1050), date uncertain
Q(uintus) Aricinius Q(uinti) f(ilius) Bassus, / vixit ann(os) XXV. / debuit hoc patris natus / duo corpora humare, / corpora sen animes corpus inane colunt, / qui quia non possunt / donis aequare merentem, / Basse, tuis meritis respondere queunt. / v(ivus) C(aius) Curtius C(ai) l(libertus) Antiochus pater. / debuit hoc natus nobis praestare duobus / ut cineres / patrios dederet inferi(is), / sed quoniam dirae genuerunt fata volucres, / te, Basse, e ruptum flevimus ante rogum / v(iva) Aricinia Nais mater.

Arrecina Felicula (Aricia): Rome
CIL VI 12356, II century CE (?)
D(is) M(anibus) / Arrecinae / Feliculae, / L(ucius) [---]onti[---]neu[s] / Posphor(us) / fecit / coniugi suae et / sibi poste/risque suis.

Arrecina Gnomes (Aricia): Rome
CIL VI 12357, II century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / Arrecinae / Gnomes, / Arrecina / Tertulla / delicio suo / fecit.

Arrecina Proba (Aricia): Rubi
CIL IX 6182, II century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / sacratis Arre/cines Probaes, / vixit annis XVIIIII, / pater fi(li)ae bene / merenti de suo / fecit.

Arrecina Telete (Aricia): Rome
CIL VI 12359, II century CE
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / Arrecina / Telete, Sex(to) / Titio Epitun/cano con/iugi suo / b(ene) m(erenti) fecit et / sibi.

Arrecina Tertulla (Aricia): Rome
CIL VI 12355; CIL VI 12357, II century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / M(ari) Arrecini / Melioris, / Arrecina / Tertulla / delicio suo / fecit, / v(ixit) a(nnos) VIII, d(ies) X.

M. Arrecinus; Q. Arrecinus; S(ex.) Arrecinus (Aricia): Fanum Vacunae
CIL XIV 3488, date uncertain
F(inis) Q(uinti) S(exti) M(arci) Arre(cinorum?).

M. Arre(cinus); Q. Arre(cinus); S(ex.) Arre(cinus) (Aricia): Fanum Vacunae
CIL XIV 3488, date uncertain
F(inis) Q(uinti) S(exti) M(arci) Arre(cinorum?).

This man is listed in a dedication by the tribus Sucusana in Rome.
M. Arrecinus Anteros (Aricia): Rubi
CIL IX 6183, Flavian period
D(is) M(anibus). / Flavia Hedo/ne, vix(it) an(nos) XXX, / M(arcus) Arrecinus / Anteros coniugi / b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit).

M. Areccinus Arapius (Aricia): Rome
CIL VI 12354, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / M(arcus) Areccinus / Arapius, / S<a>epinae / Successae / coniugi b(en)e m(erenti) / vixit annis XLII.

M. Arrecinus Cestus; M. Arrecinus Earinus (Aricia): Rome
PBSR 1961, 87a, II century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / M(arci) Arrecini / Cesti, / M(arcus) Arrecinus / Earinus / fatri optimo / 

M. Arrecinus Melior (Aricia): Rome
CIL VI 12355, II century CE
Dis Manibus / M(arci) Arrecini / Melioris, / Arrecina / Tertulla / delicio suo / fecit, / v(ixit) a(nnos) VIII, d(ies) X.

M. Arrecinus Prosdectus (Aricia): Rome
AE 1967, 25, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / M(arci) Arrecini / Prosdicti, / Ianuaria lib(erta) / patrono/ b(ene) m(erenti) fecit.

M. Arrecinus Zosimus (Aricia): Tusculum
CIL XIV 2679, II century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / M(arco) Arrecino Zo/simo patri, Arre/cina tatis b(e)n(e) m(erenti).

Arrecinus Priscianus (Aricia): Castrimoenium
CIL XIV 2408 (= CIL XI 294, 2 = ILS 5196), 169 CE
This man is listed in a company of mimes in an honorific inscription celebrating their archimimus.

[B]ovillanus [M]arcianus (Bovillae): Castrimoenium
EE 9, 677a, II century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / [B]ovillani / [M]arciani, / [v]ixit anni{d}s / [---]II, mensibus / [---],
die(bu)s XIII; / II Bovillan[i] / [---]iiss[

Calenia Iustina (Cales): Rome
CIL VI 14046, date uncertain
Calenia / Iustina.

Calenia Theophile (Cales): Cales
CIL X 4675, II century CE
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Caleniae / Theophil(a)e.

L. Calenius Ru[fus] (Cales): Mons Nigia
CIL III 1762, date uncertain
L(ucio) Calenio / Apro, / L(ucius) Calenius Ru/[fus] p(ater) f(ilio), ann(orum) V, / pos(uit).

L. Cal(e)i(us) Ioovianus; S(ex.) Calet(ius) Felix (Cales): Rome
CIL VI 1057 (= CIL VI 1058 = CIL VI 31234 = ILS 2157), Caracallan period
These men are listed in a dedication by the V Cohort of vigiles in Rome.

[Campania Faustina] (Capua): Augusta Vindelicorum (Raetia)
AE 2011, 850, date uncertain
[[D(is) M(anibus)]] / [[et perpet(uae) securit(ati)]] / [[Camp(aniae?) Faustinae coniugi]] / [[piissimae]], / [[C(aius) Frequent(ius) Saturninus]] / [[maritus f(aciendum) c(uravit)]].

Campania Geminia (Capua): Lugudunum (Lugudunensis)
CIL XIII 2249, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / et qui(e)ti aetern(ae). / Regini Mascelli/onis et Campa(niae Geminiae / coniugi eius / et Iovino lib(erto) / eorum, qui vi(xit) anni VI, m(ensibus) / VI, d iebus) XIII, vivi sibi / et posterisque / sui(s) ponendum / curaverunt, / et sub ascia dedi/caverunt.

A. Cam(panius) (Capua): Herculanoeum
CIL IV 10769, late Republic (?)
A(ulus) Cam(panius).

C. Campan(ius) Maximian(us) (Capua): Rome
CIL VI 1057 (= CIL VI 1058 = CIL VI 31234 = ILS 2157), Caracallan period
This man is listed in a dedication by the V Cohort of vigiles in Rome.

Cn. Campanius Logus (Capua): Rome
CIL VI 764, 6-5 BCE

L. Campanius Clementinus (Capua): Ebodunum (Alpes Cottiae)
CIL XII 88, earlier II century CE
v(ivus) f(ecit) L(ucius) Campanius / Clementinus, sibi et / Campaniae Blaesiae / Nertovali fil(iae) coniugi / pient(issimae), Vero e(t) Vettio f iliis), / Laeto f ilio), Sexto fil(io), et / nepotibus nuribus / omnibus suis / posterisq(ue). D(is) M(anibus).

L. Campanius Macer (Capua): Aquae Flaviae
AE 1974, 410, date uncertain
Lari Circei/abaeco P/roenetiae/go, L(ucius) Camp/anius Mac/er v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).

L. Campanius Priscus (Capua): Condate (Lugudunensis)
CIL XIII 3148-50 (= ILS 7053a = AE 1897, 40), date uncertain
in honorem / domus divinae / et pagi Matantis / Marti Mulloni, / L(ucius) Campanius Priscus / et Virilis fil(ius), sacer/dotes Romae et Aug(ustorum), / statuam cum suis or/namentis de suo posuerunt. / l(ucus) d(atus) ex d(ecreto) s(enatus).
M. [Ca]mpanius Per[vinc]u[s] (Capua): Friedberg (Germania Superior)
CIL XIII 7398 (= AE 1894, 134), date uncertain
Deabus Quadr[i]v[i]s, / M(arcus) [Ca]mpanius Per[v]i-c[u]s in s[uo] posuit.

M. Campanius Secundus (Capua): Aricia
CIL XIV 2184, II century CE
Dis Manibus. // Cerelliae Phoebe, / M(arcus) Campanius Secundus / maritus co(n)iugi optim(ae), / et M(arcus) Arrius Secundus / alumnus b(ene) m(erenti) fecer(unt).

M. Campanius Secundus (Capua): Alba Helviorum (Gallia Narbonensis)
CIL XII 2678, II century CE

P. Campanius Dexianus (Capua): Monte Tifata
AE 1997, 314, I century CE
pro salut{a}e / P(ubli) Campani Dexia/ni, I(o) O(ptimo) M(aximo) T(ifatino), / Aprilis ser(vus) / v(otum) s(olvit) m(erito) l(ibens). // pro salut{a}e / P(ubli) Campani / Dexiani, / I(o) O(ptimo) M(aximo) T(ifatino), Ap/rilis ser(vus) v(otum) s(olvit) / m(erito) l(ibens).

T. Campanius Cerialis (Capua): Aquileia
Inscr.Aqu. 1, 339, date uncertain
Silvano / Aug(usto) sac(rum), / T(itus) Campanius / Cerialis / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).

Campanius Acutus (Capua): Virunum (Noricum)
CIL III 4779 (= ILS 7305), II-III century CE
Genio / Aug(usti) sacr(um), / iuventutis / Manliensium / gentiles, qui / consistunt / in Manlia in hoc / donum dedit / Campanius Acutus / HS n(ummum) C.

Camp(anius) Marcianus (Capua): Blagaj (Dalmatia)
ILJug 3, 1479a, Trajanic period (?)
D(is) M(anibus). / Ulpio Nonn[a]tioni, an(norum) XL, / Camp(anius) Marcia/nus v(ivus) s(ibi) et / Iul(iae) Marcian[a] / paren(tibus?) pii[---] / IVET[---]

Campanius Materninus (Capua): Mediomatrici (Belgica)
CIL XIII 4509, date uncertain
Deo Merc(urio) / sacrum, / Campanius / Materninus / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) l(aetus) m(erito).

Casinia Hermiona; P. Casinius Senicio (Casinum): Italica (Baetica)
AE 1979, 341, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / Casinia / Hermiona, / P(ublius) Casinius / Senicio matri / post mort(em) f(aciendum) c(uravit).

Casinia Hermiona (Casinum): Salona (Dalmatia)
ILJug 3, 2150, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / Casinia Her/mione C(?) / her(es) C(?) D(?) / [---]

Casinia Quartilla (Casinum): Volcei
CIL X 8114 (=Inscr.It. 31, 35), later II-earlier III century CE
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Casinia Tallusa (Casinum): Volcei
CIL X 422 (= Inscr.It. 3¹, 80), II century CE
Ianuario con[duct]ori / C(ai) Titi Rufi [R]ecciani / servo, / vixit annos XXXVI, / fecit
Casinia Tallusa / pro meritis illius / carissimo contubernali.

C. Casinius Iauarius (Casinum): Rome
CIL VI 16480, date uncertain
Cornificia / Amoebe / C(ai) Casinio / Ianuario / bene merenti coniugi.

M. Casinius Firmus (Casinum): Volcei
CIL X 8108 (Inscr.It. 3¹, 34), later II-earlier III century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / M(arco) Casinio / Firmo, collegius / dendrofororum.

Corania Procula (Cora): Civitas Celtianensis (Numidia)
CIL VIII 19752, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / Corania Pro/cula, v(ixit) / a(nnos) LXXV; / o(ssa) t(ibi) b(e) q(uiescant).

Corania Spes (Cora): Rome
BCAR 1923, 118, date uncertain
[D(is)] M(anibus) / [Bon]oniae Ro/manae, Bono/nius Syntrophus p(ater), / Corania Spes
m(ater) / fil(iae) piiss(i)mae, v(ixit) a(nnos) XVII, d(ies) XXXII.

Corania Vera (Cora): Rome
CIL VI 16085, 1 century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / Coraniae Verae / uxoris carissimae, / Claudius Probus / et sibi.

Caius Coran[ius (Cora): Carnuntum (Pannonia Superior)
Hild 359, II-III century CE
Caius Coranius / Florus magist(er) / [figl]inarum(?)/ [

L. Coranius Tuscus (Cora): Arva (Baetica)
CIL II 1060 (= CILA 2¹, 220), Flavian period or later
Genio m(unicipii) F(lavi) A(rvensis), / L(ucius) Coranius / Tuscus I(ibens) p(on) i(ussit).

L. Coranius [---] (Cora): Munigua (Baetica)
CILA 2¹, 266, date uncertain
L(ucio) Coranio [---], / [huic ordo mun(icipum)] mun(icipii) Flav(i).

Q. Coran[ius ---] (Cora): Nursia
AE 1983, 293, date uncertain
Q(uintus) Coran[ius . . .

Coranius Felix (Cora): Ammaedara (Africa Proconsularis)
Haidra 6, 246, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / Somno (a)eterno, / Rubria Secunda, / vixit annis XXVII, / h(ic) s(ita) e(st) non meri/ta sic defun(c)ta, / Coranius Felix / maritus uxori / carissimae p(iae) p(osuit).

C. Cumanius Noetus (Cumae): Rome
CIL VI 12767, II century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / Attiae Nothidi, / C(aius) Cumanius / Noetus fec(it) / optima coniugi.

L. Lavinius (Lavinium-Laurentium): Carthago (Africa Proconsularis)
BCTH 1928/29, 173, date uncertain
L(ucio) Lavinio.

Q. Lavinius Marcellus (Lavinium-Laurentium): Rome
CIL VI 20607, date uncertain
Iulia Philume[ne], / Q(uintus) Lavinius Marcellus / aviae suae fecit.

C. Laurentius Asutor (Lavinium-Laurentium): Thugga (Africa Proconsularis)
CIL VIII 26989, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / C(aius) Laurentius / Asutor p(ius), v(ixit) a(nnos) / LXXXV, h(ic) s(itus) e(st).

M. Laurentius Silanus (Lavinium-Laurentium): Lepace Magna (Africa Proconsularis)
AE 1997, 1580, date uncertain
M(arci) Laurenti / Silani p(atris).

L. Neapolitanus Liberalis (Neapolis): Puteoli
CIL X 2767, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / L(ucio) Neapolitan/o Liberali, qui / vixit annis XL, / m(ensibus) VIII, Tannonia / Veneria mater / filio carissimo / et b(ene) m(erenti) fecit.

C[a]u[s] Ost(iensis) lan[uarios] (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 1430, date uncertain
C[aio] / Ost(iensi) lan[uario ---], / Claudia [---] / filio pien[tissimo], / vix(it) ann(os) [ nach oben]

L. Osti[ensis] (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 858, date uncertain
D(is) [M(anibus)]. / P(ublio) Cominio [Fla]/viano, qu[i vix(it)] / annis III, m(ensibus) [---], / dieb(us) X[---], / L(ucius) Osti[ensis].

Ost(i)e(n)s(is) Filumen(s) (Ostia): Ostia
CIL XIV 4569 (= NSA 1927, 381 = AE 1928, 123), 198 CE
This man is listed in a dedication by the caligati of the local association of fabri tignuarii.

C. Ostiensis Iucundus (Ostia): Ostia
Tribu p. 165, date uncertain
This man is listed in an album of the association of fabri navales.

Ostiens[is ---] (Ostia): Rome
AE 1998, 240, date uncertain
L. Praenestinus (Praeneste): Madauros (Africa Proconsularis)
ILA 1 2700, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / Silicia / L(uci) Praenes/tini fil(i)a / pia, vix(it) a(nnos) XL, / h(ic) s(ita) e(st).

Primigenius Camerius; Primigenius Oclatius (Praeneste): Vindonissa (Germania Superior)
AE 1946, 274, date uncertain
Pr{r}imigenio Oclatio / a Primigenio Camer/io. // Primigenius Camerius Primigenio
Oclatio fratri suo. / salutem. frater, si vales b[ene e]st vero ego valeo. / rogo et opto deos
u[t ---]EG S CODA[---] / quas nos [---] / [-----] / [---] / [---] verba / [-----] / [---]
QVATRES[

Q. Puteolanus Alacer (Puteoli): Puteoli (inscription found at PompeiI)
TPSulp 64 (= AE 1978, 126 = AE 1990, 174), 53 CE
Agathopus pro Fa[e]cia / Prima. / [actu]m Puteolis III Non(as) Fe[b]r(uarias), / [D(ecimo) Junio Si]lano Torquato / [Q(uinto) Haterio] Antonino co(n)s(ulibus). //
Q(uinti) Puteolani Alacr(is), / Cn(ae) Pompei Celeris, / C(ai) Vestori Felicis, / P(ubi)
Vedi Hermerot(is), / Cn(aei) Popei Blasti, / M(arci) Popidi Optati, / Q(uinti) Atti Icari, / Q(uinti) Atti Primigen(i), / N(umeri) Castrici Aga/thopodis.

Q. Venafranius Probus (Venafrum): Casinum
CIL X 5297 (= AE 1992, 248), date uncertain
Q(uinti) Venafra/ni Probi et Tampiae Venustae / contubern(alis); / in fr(onte) p(edes) X, / in ag(ro) p(edes) X.

Region II: Apulia et Calabria

Q. Aeclanius Pro[---] (Aeclanum): Rome
CIL VI 32099, date uncertain
Q(uinti) Aeclani Pro[

M. (A)eclanius Felicissimus (Aeclanum): Trevico
CIL IX 1402 (= AE 1994, 513), III century CE
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / M(arco) (A)eclanio Fe/licissimo, Clo/dia Silvana co(n)s(usit), / k(arissimo) b[ene e]nti p(osuit), / c(fum) qu[ro] vixit an(num) / I, m(enses) VI.

T. Aeclanius Pudens (Aeclanum): Forum Sempronii
CIL IX 6138, date uncertain
Dis Manibus / T(it)i Aeclani / Pudentis.

P. Aculanus Spinter (Aeclanum): Hadria
AE 1980, 391, II century CE
C. Canusius Hermes (Canusium): Rome
CIL VI 1057 (= CIL VI 1058 = CIL VI 31234 = ILS 2157), Caracallan period
This man is listed in a dedication by the V Cohort of vigiles in Rome.

Luceria Iusta (Luceria): Beneventum (Pagus Veianus)
CIL IX 1521, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / Lucerinae Iustae / qua viet / annos XXXII, quod Valerius / Veratius / vet(ernus) ex / b(ene)f(iciario) / co(n)s(ularis) / sibi et coniugi vi(vus) posuit, qui obitus est / ann(orum) LX, Aurelia Emerita heres / f(acientium) c(urator).}

Venusia Proculia (Venusia): Brigetio (Pannonia Superior)
RIU 2, 602, III century CE
D(is) M(anibus) / Venusiae Proculiae, qua viet / annos LX, quod Valerius Veratius / vet(ernus) ex b(ene)f(iciario) / co(n)s(ularis) / sibi et coniugi vi(vus) posuit, qui obitus est / ann(orum) LX, Aurelia Emerita heres / f(acientium) c(urator).}

Venus(ius) Victorinus (Venusia): Antipolis
CIL XII 234, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / Venusio Victorino bene / merenti, / L(ucio) Vibius Acilianus / et L(ucio) Verginius / Glaphyrius / heredes.

Volcea C[y]n[th]ia; Volcea Pylas; L. Volceius Celer; L. Volceius Natalis; L. Volceius Vernus (Volcei): Telesia; CIL IX 2256, date uncertain
L(ucio) Volceio Pyladi / seviro Augustae / Volceiae C[y]n[th]iae, / L(ucio) Volceio Verno, / L(ucio) Volceio Celeri, / L(ucio) Volceio Natali, / Volceiae Pyladi / p(edes) XII.

Volcea Victoria (Volcei): Thugga (Africa Proconsularis)
CIL VIII 1541 (= CIL VIII 27274), date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / Volceia / Victoria / p(ia), / v(ixit) an(nos) / LXV, / h(ic) s(ita) e(st). // D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / Q(uintus) Corneli/us Solutor / Sissaris / p(ius), / v(ixit) a(nnos) XXX[--]. // D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / Botuvi/a / victo[ria] / p(ia), / v(ixit) a(nnos).

C. Volc(eius) (Volcei): Minturnae
CIL I 2700 (= ILLRP 740), I century BCE
heisce mag(istreis) Spei / donum dant / Seno Carisi L(uci) s(ervus), / Heliodor(us) Crisp(i) T(itii) s(ervus), / Dio Peiranae s(ervus), / Diphilus Pacc(i) M(arci) s(ervus), / Antioc(hus) Publ(iorum) M(arci) L(uci), / Alexander Meti(li) M(arci) s(ervus), / C(h)arito Fouri Cn(aei) s(ervus), / Philemo Caecili L(uci) s(ervus), / Alexander Alen(i) C(ai) s(ervus), / Salvius Metili M(arci) s(ervus), / Apolloni(us) Luco(ni) M(arci) s(ervus), / Antioc(hus) Volc(ei) C(ai) s(ervus).

C. Volceius Mucapor (Volcei): Rome
CIL VI 37398, date uncertain
C(aius) Volceius Mucapor, / Volceia C(ai) l(iberta) Aprodisia.

C. Volceius Victor (Volcei): Thugga (Africa Proconsularis)
CIL VIII 27271, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / C(aius) Volcei/{i}us Victor [L. Volc(eius) (Volcei): Minturnae
CIL I 2682; CIL I 2690 (= ILLRP 731); AE 1996, 377, I century BCE
This man is listed as the owner of one slave in each of these three inscriptions listing the magistri and ministri of a local (cult?) association.

Volceius Ianuarius (Volcei): Vazanis (Numidia)
CIL VIII 17651, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / Volceius Ianu/arius, vixit an(n)is / LXXXXV, rq(uod) ma/ndasti fecimus.

Vulceia Felicitas (Volcei): Uchi Maius (Africa Proconsularis)
AE 2006, 1732, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / Vulceia / Felicitas / pia, vixit / annis XXV, / h(ic) s(ita) e(st).

Region III: Bruttium et Lucania

Paestinia Caletyches (Paestum): Aquinum
AE 1988, 269, early I century CE
P(ubli) Muci Lepid[i] / et Paestiniae / Caletycheni; / in f(ronte) p(edes) XII, / in a(gro) p(edes) XXI.

Pestania Sozusa (Paestum): Misenum
CIL X 3397, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / M(arcus) Aurelius {I} lettis armorum custos, / {N} natione Pontic(us),
lib(urna) Virtute stip(endiorum) XVI, / rq(uod) v(ixit) ann(os) XXXVIII, m(enses) II,
d(ies) XV, Pesta/nia Sozusa uxor bene merenti fecit.

Petelia Iusta (Petelia; origo in Nola?): Misenum
CIL X 3474, later II-earlier III century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / P(ublio) Sextilio / Marcello n(atione) / Italus, domu / Nol(a), optioni
cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) / M(isenensis)?, Sextil(ius) Felix et / Petelia Iusta patr(i) et mar(ito) /
dul[c]iss(imo) b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecerunt).

Petelia Qu(i)eta (Petelia): Castellum Tidditanorum (Numidia)
ILAlg 2¹, 3935, date uncertain
Petelia / Qu(i)eta.

rC(aius) Petelius (Petelia): Lara de los Infantes (Hispania Citerior)
ERLara 146, date uncertain
Arcea Ela/nioca Pate/ri f(ilia), an(norum) XXX, / rC(aius!) Petelius ux(ori) c(uravit).

Petelius Claudianus (Petelia): Rusguniae (Mauretania Caesariensis)
CIL VIII 9253, date uncertain
Memoriae / Memmi Secundi patris, b(onae) m(emoriae) v(iri), / et Petelii Claudiani
mariti, / et filiiis eius, Memmi/a Secunda coniux extru/xit et dedicavit.

Potentinia Frontina (Potentia, Region III): Town uncertain
CIL XIII 8850, date uncertain

Region IV: Samnium

S<ae>epina Successa (Saepinum): Rome
CIL VI 12354, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / M(arcus) Areinus / Ararius, / Sepinae / Successae / coniugi b(ene) m(eren) / fecit, / vixit annis XLII.

Telesinia Crispinilla (Telesia): Telesia
CIL IX 2228, 2229, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / P(ublio) Latio Gentiano / Victori eq(uiti) Rom(ano), rarae probi/tatis et sapientiae iuveni, / P(ublius) La/lius Modestus et Telesinia / Crispinilla parentes infeli/cissimi ac pientissim(i) / filio dulcissimo, vix(it) ann(is) / XXI, mens(ibus) XI, dieb(us) XVIII.

D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / Telesiniae Crisp/i/nllae coniugi sanctis/simae, quae ob desiderium / P(ubli) Latio Genti/i/cus / / Victoris / fili(i) sui piissimi, vivere / abominavit et post dies XV / fati eius animo despondit; / P(ublius) Latio Modestus maritus, / cum qua vixit ann(os) XXXVIII, m(enses) IIII, / sine ulla qu{a}erella.

C. Suffenas Phileros (Trebu/a Suffenas): Rome
CIL VI 26934 (= CIL V 672, 53), later I-earlier II century CE
C(aius) Suffenas Phileros, / Caelia Gnome.

M. Suffenas Sosus (Trebu/a Suffenas): Rome
CIL VI 5291, date uncertain
M(arco) Suffenati Soso, / qui vix(it) ann(os) LXIV, / Suffenatia Saturnina / patrono suo b(ene) m(eren) f(ecit).

P. Suffenas Chresimus (Trebu/a Suffenas): Rome
CIL VI 26933, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / P(ubli) Suffenae Chresimi, / qui vix(it) an(nos) LXXX, m(enses) II, d(ies) V, / Hermione cum fili(i) / coniugi suo bene merenti / fecit.

Suffenatia Prepusa (Trebu/a Suffenas): Rome
CIL VI 26936, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) Suffenatiae / Prepusae, fecit / Q(uintus) Mucius Ian(u)ariu(s) / coniugi bene merenti(ti).

Trebulana Agete (Trebu/a Suffenas): Rome
CIL VI 2521, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / M(arci) Picati Onesimi, / Trebulanae Agete / co(n)jugi, et / Picatius Neritus / patri piss(i)mo.

Trebulana Modesta (Trebu/a Suffenas): Beneventum
CIL IX 1940 (= AE 1998, 381), date uncertain
L(ucius) Pupius Primigenius restio, / sibi et Trebulanae Modestae, / Carpo, / L(uicio) Pupio, Hermeti, / Expectato.
M. Trebulanus Philomus[sus]; M. Trebulanus Primogenes; [-] Trebulanus (Trebula Suffenas):
Capua; CIL X 4378 = AE 1980, 222), early I century CE
M(arcus) Trebul(anus) / Philomusi l(ibertus) Faus[tus], / Deciria ((mulieris)) l(iberta) Lais / fecerunt sibi et / M(arco) Trebulano Philomu[so], / Deciriae ((mulieris)) l(ibertae) Secundae Fau[sti] (uxori), / M(arco) Trebulano Primogeni(o), [qui] vixit / [--], Trebulano et frat[ri].

Q. Trebul(anu)s (Trebula Suffenas): Pescina
Emarsi 101, date uncertain
Q(uintus) Trebul[anu]s / magist(e)r.

Trebulanus Telesfor(sus) (Trebula Suffenas): Beneventum
CIL IX 2000, date uncertain
M(emoryae) / M(arci) Trebalun(i) / Gagili Teles/oriani inf(eliciissimi) dul(cissimi), / q(ui) v(ixit) an(nos) VIII, m(enses) / VI, d(ies) XII, Trebul/anus Telesfor(us) et Natria / Gagilia parent(es).

**Region VI: Umbria**

Sex. Amerinus Salvitto (Ameria): Ocricum
CIL XI 490, date uncertain
Sex(ti) Amerini / Salvittonis; / in fr(onte) p(edes) XII, in ag(ro) p(edes) XI.

Ameria Ianuaria (Ameria): Saticula
CIL IX 2152, date uncertain
Sacreum) / D(is) M(anibus). / Q(uintus) Publicius / Priscinus, A/meriae Ianu/iae con(iugi) karissi/mae bene mer(enti) sibi q(ue) vi/vi s fecit.

C. Hispellas Datus (Hispellum): Fulginiae
CIL XI 5228 (= CIL XI 669 = AE 1989, 271), date uncertain
This man is listed in the *album* of a local association.

Hispellatia Procula (Hispellum): Puteoli
CIL X 2883, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / M(arci) Postumi Iuliani / fil(i) dulcis/im, / qui vixit an(nos) XIII, d(ies) XX, / fecerunt / M(arcius) Postumius Iulianus / et Hispellatia Procula / parentes infelicissimi.

P. Mevanas (Mevania): Mevania
CIL XI 5113, date uncertain
{R} P(ublius) Mevanas, / vix(it) a(nnos) LX, {vix(it) an(nos) XVIII} / {vix(it) V} Eleria Maxima / coniugi dulcissimo.

L. Sentinas Saturninus (Sentinum): Sentinum
CIL XI 5789, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / [---]enatae, / L(ucius) Sentinas / Saturninus / libertae / b(ene) m(erenti).

L. Sentinia Valeriana (Sentinum): Rome
CIL VI 26198 (= CIL VI 34171), early III century CE
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / L(uciae) Sentiniae Valerianae / coniugi karissimae, / Septimius Iul(ius) maritus / posuit.

Sentinius Ruf[us] (Sentinum): Saint-Savin (Gallia Narbonensis)
CIL XII 2359, II-III century CE
[---]i Ruf[i], L[uci] Ruf Catonis, Sentini Ruf[---] . . .

Urvinia Maximil(la) Successa (Urvinum Matarense): Uchi Maius (Africa Proconsularis); AE 2006, 1734, date uncertain
Urvinia / Maximil(la) / Suc(c)essa p(ia), / v(ixit) a(nnos) XXX, h(ic) s(ita) e(st).

C. Urvinius Abascantus (Urvinum Matarense): Aquileia
CIL V 1436 (Inscr.Aqu. 2, 1590), later I-earlier II century CE

C. Urvinius Crescens (Urvinum Matarense): Rome
CIL VI 7942 (= AE 1979, 21), date uncertain
Di{i}s Manibus / C(ai) Urvini Ephaesti, v(ixit) a(nnos) III, / m(enses) V, d(ies) VIII, fec(it) C(aius) Urvini Crescens p(ater).

C. Urvinius Sabinianus (Urvinum Matarense): Rome
CIL VI 29602, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / C(ai) Urvini Sabiniani, / fecerunt P(ublius) Calpurnius Brocchus et C(aius) Ca/tius Callistion tu/ores filiae{s} eius.

C. Urvinius Pyrrhus (Urvinum Matarense): Fulginiae
CIL XI 5228 (= CIL XI 669 = AE 1989, 271), date uncertain
This man is listed in the album of a local association.

(C.) Urvinius Secundus (Urvinum Matarense): Lambaesis (Numidia)
CIL VIII 4176, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / C(ai) Urvinio / C(ai) f(ilio) Victori, / v(ixit) a(nnos) XXX, / Urvinius / Secundus / fratri.

L. Urwineius Adiutor (Urvinum Matarense): Puteoli
CIL X 1889, I century CE
Sex(tus) Publicius Bathyllus / accensus consuli, Augustalis / Puteolis et Venafri, sibi et / Urwineiae L(uci) l(ibertae) Modestae uxori suae, / et L(ucio) Urwineio Adiutori, et / C(ai) Iulio Aucto fratri.

L. Urvinius Sabinus (Urvinum Matarense): Segusio (Alpes Cottiae)
CIL V 7317, date uncertain
v(ivus) f(ecit) / L(ucius) Urvinus / Sabinus, / sibi [et] / Corne[liae(?)].

L. Urvinius Thiasus (Urvinum Matarense): Mellea
CIL V 8110, 429, date uncertain
L(uci) Urvini Thiasi.

P. Urvin[u]s (Urvinum Mataurense): Mogontiacum (Germania Superior)  
CIL XIII 11817 (= AE 1905, 167), date uncertain  
in h(onorem) [d(omus) d(ivinæ)], / Li[b]ero / Patri, P(ublius) / Urvin[u]s / ex monit/u dei ar/am in suo / po[su]it / l(ibens) [l(aetus)] m(erito).

P. Urvi(nius) Messius (Urvinum Mataurense): Bratislava (Pannonia)  
AE 2006, 1053, late II-III century CE  
[D(is) M(anibus)]. / [P(ubliu) Urvinio] / Pastori militi / co(ho)r(tis) XVIII vol(untariorum), / stip(endiorum) XII, an(norum) XXXV, et P(apiae) / Elpidi, an(norum) XXXX, et Urv(iniae) / Muss(a)e, an(norum) XXVIII, et P(ubliio) / Urvinio {et P} Marcellino, / an(norum) XXII, Papia Matercia mat(er) et P(ublius) / Urv(inius) Messius et Iul(ius) Maior frat(res).

P. Urvinus Z[o]simus (Urvinum Mataurense): Puteoli (tablet from Pompeii)  
TPSulp 57 (= AE 1974, 270), 50 CE  
Q(uinto) [---] Q[--- co(n)s(ulibus)], / XII K(alendas) Maias, / P(ublius) Urvinus Z[o]simus scripsi me accepi / mut[u]a et debere C(aius) Sulpicio Cinnamo / sestertia duo mil{l}ia nummum præter / sestertia decem dua mil{l}ia nummum, / quae ei debo per chirographum / ali(is) tabellis, eaque HS dua mil{l}ia / nummum quae s(upra) s(crpta) s(unt) p(roba) r(ecte) d(ari) stipulatus / est C(aius) Sulpicius Cinnamus.  
spopondi P(ublius) / Urvinus Zosimus / isdem co(n)s(ulibus) XII K(alendas) Maias.  
L(ucius) Annius Felix sc[rip]si, / interrogante C(aius) Sulpicio Cinnamo, ea HS du[a] / m(ilia) n(ummum) q(uae) s(upra) s(crita) s(unt) fide et periculo meo esse ius[s]i, / pro P(ubliio) Urvino Zosimo, C(aius) Sulpicio Cinna[mo].

Q. Urvinius [---] (Urvinum Mataurense): Argentorate (Germania Superior)  
CIL XIII 11629 (= AE 1907, 75), date uncertain  

T. Urvinus (Urvinum Mataurense): Pompeii  
CIL IV 10243i, mid-I century CE  
T(itus) Urvinius scripsit nobis / notitia(m).

Region VII: Etruria

Faleria Anthusa (Falerii Novi): Altinum  
CIL V 2218, date uncertain  
M(arco) Cocceio / Nepoti et / Faleriae Anthusae, / Hermes Anthusae / [li]b(ertus) ponendum / curavit.

[Faleria Antonina] (Falerii Novi): Rome  
AE 2001, 431, date uncertain  
[[D(is) M(anibus)]] / [[Rutuleiae Paulinae]], / [[vix(it) ann(os) II, m(enses) VIII, d(ies) VIII]], / [[Rutuleius]] / [[Paulinus et]] / [[Faleria Antonina]] / [[filiae dulcissimae]].
Faleria Veneria (Falerii Novi): Verona
CIL V 3563, date uncertain
v(ivus) f(ecit) / C(aius) Clodi/us Firmin(us) / Faleriae / Veneriae uxori / b(ene) m(erenti)
et Faleriae / Valerianae / filiae piissimae / et sibi.

C. Falerius Nymphodotus (Falerii Novi): Rome
CIL VI 17702, date uncertain
C(aius) Falerius Nymphodotus / Faleria C(ai) l(liberta) Logas, / vixit ann(os) XXV.

C. Falerius Asyncritus (Falerii Novi): Brundisium
CIL IX 114, date uncertain
C(aius) Falerius / Asyncritus, / v(ixit) a(nnos) LX, h(ic) s(itus).

L. Falerius Maritimus (Falerii Novi): Rome
CIL VI 20485, date uncertain
Iulia C(ai) l(liberta) Galat[a] / Epaphrodit / coniunx, / vix(it) ann(os) XXX, // Faleria
L(uici) l(iberta) / Syntyche / mater L(uici) Faleri / Maritimi.

Q. Falerius Eros; Q. Falerius Pusillio (Falerii Novi): Ferentum
CIL X 5885, date uncertain
Titiae Chilae, / QQ(uintorum) Faleriorum / Erotis et Pusillionis.

Q. F[al]erius Praepons (Falerii Novi): Rome
CIL VI 17703, date uncertain
Dis Manib(us). Q(uinto) F[al]erio / Praeponti, Faleria Ty[rannis pat] / rono bene merenti
ollaria tr[ia a solo ad] / camaram, sibi et suis posteris[que eorum].

Falerius Falerianus (Falerii Novi): Iulium Carnicum
CIL V 1837 (= ILS 5589), 222-235 CE
ex indulgentia / sacra dom(ini) n(ostri) Invicti / Imp(eratoris) M(arci) Aureli Alexand(ri)
Aug(usti), / macellum restitutum, / curante Falerio Faleriano.

Falerius Optatus (Falerii Novi): Ostia
CIL XIV 5379, date uncertain
[N(umerio) Tre]bionio N(umeri) f(ilio) V[enerio], / [d(ecreto)] d(ecurionum) aed[ili]s
allectus sa[c(ris) Volc(ani) f(acundis)], / [q(uii)] vixi[t] annos XIII[---], / N(umerius)
Trebonius N(umeri) l(ibertus) Glenus pa[ter fecit, et] / Anniae L(uici) l(ibertae)
V[e]neriae ux{s}ori [---], / L(uicio) Anni[o ---] l(iberto) Hilar[iano, et] / Ann[iae ---
CIL V 223, date uncertain

[Saturnius] Hermes (Saturnia): Velitrae
AE 1984, 174, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / [-] Saturnio Her/meti patri, L(uicius) Satu/rnius Hermes be/ne merenti
feceit.
L. Saturnius Nigrinus (Saturnia): Rome
CIL VI 159 (= CIL VI 30705e = CIL VI 36746e), reign of Antoninus Pius
This man is listed in a dedication by the magistri vici Fontis in Rome.

Saturnius Basilius (Saturnia): Aeclanum
CIL IX 1320, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / Vibia Felicitas, / Saturnio / Basilio co(n)iu/gi, cum quo vi/xit annis XI, b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit).

Saturnius Cedo (Saturnia): Segodunum (Aquitania)
CIL XIII 1551, date uncertain
Aicovindo / Suoliccen(i), // Saturnio / Cedon[i] / f(ilius) / Cadurc(us).

Saturnius Eutyches (Saturnia): Rome
CIL VI 25938, date uncertain
nostro loca sarcofagi dua, quae tab[ulis] / marmo[reis] operta sunt, quae donata sunt / Saturnio Eutycheti libertisqu{a}e / posterisque eorum.

Saturnius Hilarus (Saturnia): Albanum
AE 1919, 73 (= AE 1968, 105), 200-250 CE
Vibius Marc[e]ll[u]s / m[il(es)] l(egionis)] II P(arthicae), ((centuria)) III, p(ili) [p]o[s(terioris)], / v(ixit) an(nos) [X]XVII, [mil(itavit) an(nos) ---], / Nummius Mer/curius et Saturni/us Hilarus hered(es) / b(ene) m(erenti) f(aciendo) c(uraverunt).

Saturnius Maximinus (Saturnia): Rome; Hr. el Bled (Africa Proconsularis)
ICUR 3, 9196; BCTH 1925, CCXXXIII, date uncertain
Saturnius Maximinus bene merenti coniugi / Valentinae, quae vixit mecum n(umero) an(nos) XXXV, / mens(es) III, deposita XIII Kal(endas) Sept(embres), in pace Chr(isti).

Saturnius ---us (Saturnia): Uxama (Hispania Citerior)
HEp 11, 507, date uncertain
Saturnius / [---] Mar(?) / [---] Q(uinti) Sex{s}(t)i se(rvus), / [---] P(ublius) Octaviu/[s - -- de] s(u)a p(ecunia) f(aciendo) c(uraverunt).

M. Tudert(ius) Verus (Tuder): Rome
CIL VI 1057 (= CIL VI 1058 = CIL VI 31234 = ILS 2157), Caracallan period
This man is listed in a dedication by the V Cohort of vigiles in Rome.

Veiena Tyche (Veii): Ricina
CIL IX 5783, date uncertain

Veienta Tusca (Veii): San Martin de Trevejo (Lusitania)
Espectaculos 2, Y, date uncertain
Togae, / Veienta / Tusca pro / victoria / Garici / Fuscini.

Veienius Primus (Veii): Rome
CIL VI 5493, date uncertain
Veienia T(iii) f(il(ia)) Primigenia / Veieni Primi filia, / vix(it) ann(um) I, mens(es) II.
C. Veienius Stabilio (Veii): Rome
   CIL VI 7459 (= ILS 8292), date uncertain
   This man is listed in the *columbarium* of a local association.

Veienus Cicero (Veii): Ficulea
   CIL XIV 4043, date uncertain
   D(is) M(anibus). / Veieno / Ciceroni.

Volaterria T(h)alia (Volaterra): Volaterra
   CIL XI 7074, date uncertain
   D(is) M(anibus). / L(ucius) Pompilius Aper et Aprilis et / Lar'c'ia Geminian(a),
   Volaterria/e T(h)aliae sorori carissimae b(ene) m(erenti).

L. Volusinius Maximus (Volsinii): Thala (Africa Proconsularis)
   CIL VIII 570, date uncertain
   D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / L(ucius) Volusini/us Maximus, / v(ixit) a(nnos) LV, / h(ic)
   s(itus) e(st).

Q. Volusinius Ianuarius (Volsinii): Bulla Regia (Africa Proconsularis)
   CIL VIII 14535, date uncertain
   D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / Q(uintus) Volusii/nius Ia/nuarius / p(ius), vixit an(n)is / LXXVII,
   / hic s(itus) e(st).

**Region VIII: Aemilia**

Bononia Metrodora (Bononia): Mutina
   CIL XI 837 (= ILS 2778), 270-330 CE
   D(is) M(anibus). / M(arco) Aurelio / Processano v(iro) e(gregio), / ex cent(urione)
   praet/oriae / cohort(is) VI, / prot(ectori), ducenario, / Bononia Metrodora / co(n)iugi
   karissimo, / cum quo vixit ann(os) XI, / m(enses) XI, dies XV, b(ene) m(erenti).

Bononia Secunda (Bononia): Rome
   CIL VI 34689, date uncertain
   D(is) M(anibus). / Bononia Secunda et P(ublius) / Aelius Mandanianus i/d / mon'u/mentum sibi,
   dona/tum a Ceionia Thallusa, / nomina sua i(n)scripse/runt et libertis liberta/busque posteresque / eorum.

C. Bononius A<hilleus (Bononia): Emona (Pannonia Superior)
   ILJug 1, 310, 70-130 CE
   D(is) M(anibus) / Tiberiae, / C(aius) Bono/nius A<c>/hilleus / gener.

L. Bononius Saturninus (Bononia): Sarmizegetusa (Dacia)
   AE 1914, 110, later II-earlier III century CE
   Numini Aug(usto) / Aesculapi / sacrum, / L(ucius) Bononius / Saturninus / ex viso
   lib(enter).

Bonon(ius) Crescens (Bononia): Savaria (Pannonia Superior)
   CIL III 4199, date uncertain
Titus Claudius Ursus vivus / fecit sibi et Valentinae coniugii, annorum LI, / et Titus Claudius Urso, annorum XX, / et Titus Claudius Ursino filis, / et Bononius Crescenti, annorum XX.

Bononi(us) Mercuril(is) (Bononia): Ravenna
AE 1977, 265a, II-III century CE
This man is listed in the *album of the fabri* of Ravenna.

Bononius Syntrophus (Bononia): Rome
CIL VI 39075a; BCAR 1923, 118, III century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / Volusiae Roma/nae matri piae, / vix(it) an(nos) LXX, / Bononius Syntroph(u)s / et Volusius Asclepiades f(ilius) / sibi suisq(ue); in a(gro) p(edes) VIII, in f(ronite) / p(edes) VIII.

[D(is)] M(anibus) / [Bon]oniae Ro/mana, Bono/nius Syntrophus p(ater), / Corania Spes m(ater) / fil(iae) piis(inae), v(ixit) a(nnos) XVII, d(ies) XXXII.

Bononius --- (Bononia): Carthago (Africa Proconsularis)
ILAf 375, date uncertain

Ti(b.) Parmensius Tacitus (Parma): Parma
CIL XI 1100 (= CIL V 686), date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / Parmensiae / Tacitae / filiae et / Pontiliae / Crispinae / uxor, / Ti(berius) Parmensius / Tacitus / b(ene) m(erenti).

N. Placens[tius] Atticus (Placentia): Pola
Inscr.It. 10, 22, date uncertain
Soli, / N(umerius) Placens[tius] / Atticus.

M. Velleius; Velleius Ingenuus; Velleius Proculus; Velleius Severus (Veleia): Veleia
CIL XI 1147 (= ILS 6675 = AE 1991, 710 = AE 1992, 38), Trajanic period
These men are listed as land owners registering property for the local *alimenta* program.

Region X: Venetia et Histria

M. Ateste (Priscus) Aemilius (Ateste): Castra Regina (Raetia)

Atestia Egnatia; Atestia Tertia (Ateste): Bergomum
CIL V 5148, late I-II century CE

Atestius Attius (Ateste): Ateste
Pais 546, date uncertain
L(uicius) Renestus [---]A Fl(avius) / Alforisio fratri, et / Fl(avius) Achario patrono / bene merentibus, / et Atestio Attio / filio cariss(imo), / inci(?) cur(avit).

Brixiena Mansu[ta] (Brixia): Mediolanum
CIL V 6066, date uncertain
L(uicius) Petronio Primus Pr[---] / consorti pientissimo, Di[---] / heredi, et Brixienae Mansu[ae(?)] / et L(uicius) Petronio L(uici) f(ilio) Ianuario f(ilio), / [---]atiae Posioni matr[i], / [---]liae Pollae eiusdem / [---]ri, / Primus f(aciendum) c(uravit).

A. Patavinus (Patavium): Rider (Dalmatia)
CIL III 9871 (= CIL III 13990), I-earlier II century CE
Navina / A(uli) Patavi/ni filia, / an(n)o(rum) XXXX.

Veronia Amanda (Verona): Rocca di Papa
LeS 6, 269, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / Veroniae / Amandae / isiaceae, / quae vix(it) an(nos) XXXIIIX, / men(ses) III, d(ies) XXI, / Q(uintus) Vibius Herma / coniugi optimae, / cum qua vixit / ann(os) VII, men(ses) III.

Veronia Prochne (Verona): Ostrovica (Dalmatia)
CIL III 9889a, date uncertain
Veronia Pro/chne mater / infelicissima, / sibi et filio, / annor(um) XX, / Veronio Se/mentivo.

C. Veronius Aetor (Verona): Asseria (Dalmatia)
AE 1969/70, 458 (= AE 1995, 1233), date uncertain
C(aius) Veronius Ae/tor v(ivus) f(ecit) sibi et Veturi/ae Aetae uxori et Ce(u) n/o f(ilio), / C(aio) Iulio nepoti.

C. Veronius Rufio (Verona): Rome
CIL VI 38904 (= AE 2001, 481), date uncertain

L. Veronius Sentinus (Verona): Vicetia
NSA 1908, 339, date uncertain
v(iva) f(ecit) / Caecilia P(ubli) l(iberta) / Secunda, / sibi et / Caeciliai Musai l(ibertae), / Caeciliai Tyc(h)e l(ibertae), / L(ucio) Veronio / Sentino.

L. Veronius Zosimus (Verona): Rome
AE 1993, 216, date uncertain
D(is) [M(anibus)]. / L(ucio) Atti[o ---], / Argaea Hal[---] / karissimo et [---], / L(ucio) Veronio Zosimo, [et libertis] / libertabusq(ue) posterisq(ue) [eor(um)].
M. Veronius Optatus (Verona): Verona
CIL V 8125, 28, date uncertain
M(arci) Veroni / Optati.

M. Veronius R[---]ns (Verona): Town uncertain
EDCS 397, date uncertain
v(ivus) f(ecit) / M(arcus) Veronius / R[---]ns et /

Q. Veronius Secund(i)o (Verona): Rome
CIL VI 35844, date uncertain
Memmi(a)e Pist(a)e, / Q(uintus) Veronius Secund(i)o / con(iugi) sanctiss(ima)e, cum / qua vixit an(nos) XXXXVI / sine querella, b(ene) m(erenti) p(osuit).

Q. Veronius Silvester (Verona): Altinum
CIL V 8821, date uncertain

Veronius Euhemerus (Verona): Philippi (Macedonia)
CIL III 633, 3, II century CE
This man is listed in an album of the local cult association of Silvanus.

Veronius Panun[---] (Verona): Andautonia (Pannonia Superior)
CIL III 14354, 24 (= AE 1901, 217), date uncertain
Silvan(o) / sacr(um), / Ve[r]on(ius?) / Panun(?).

Region XI: Transpadana

L. Vercellius Felicio (Vercellae): Nemausus (Gallia Narbonensis)
CIL XII 4008, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / L(uci) Vercelli / Felicionis, / Solisetia Se/rana uxor / marito ca/rissimo / posuit.

*For the Publicii and Venerii a possible town of origin is given in parentheses only in cases where they are located in a town where municipal freedmen are attested with these gentilicia. In cases where these gentilicia might have been used alongside the local municipal gentilicia, though are not attested (i.e., undesignated Publicii), the possible town of origin is marked with the symbol †.

Region I: Latium et Campania

Poplicia Parata (Capua†): Capua
AIPMA p. 137, date uncertain
Poplicia Parata.

M. Publcius Dionysus: Cora
CIL X 6522 (= ILS 1904), II century CE
Dis Ma[nib(us)] / M(arci) Publci Dionysi l[ict(oris)] / III decuriarum, qui Ca[es(ari)] / et magistratibus a[ppar(itor)], / Novia Victorina / coniug(i) optim(o) aram fecit.
P. Publicius Atticus: Formiae
CIL X 6146, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / Cominiae Fe/licissim(a)e, fe(cit) P(ublius) / Publicius Atti/cus b(ene) m(erenti).

M. Publicius Nymphicus: Herculanenum
CIL X 8058, 73, I century CE
M(arc)i Publici / Nymphici // H A A . . .

Ma. Publ[icius] Tyrrianus: Laurentum* (Vicus Augustanus)
CIL XIV 2049, I century CE
M(anius?) Publ[icius?] / Tyrrianus? --- / Aug(usti) C[---] / de sua pecu[nia ---] / cippos(?)]---] / posuit [...

Publicia Primilla (Nuceria†): Nuceria
AE 1994, 410, date uncertain
Publicia / Primilla, / v(ixit) a(nnos) XVIII.

Publicia Salvia (Pompeii†): Pompeii
NSA 1928, 375, mid-I century CE
Publiciae / Salviae.

L. Publicius Syneros (Pompeii†): Pompeii
JRA 2011, 186 (= PompIn 82), mid-I century CE
L(uicius) Publicius Syneros, / et Aebiae L(uici) l(ibertae) Faustae, / et L(uicio) Aebio L(uici) l(iberto) Aristoni patr/o(no), / et Aebiae L(uici) l(ibertae) Hilarae, / sibi et suis.

D. Poblicius Comicus (Praeneste†): Praeneste
CIL XIV 2864 (= ILS 3688a), date uncertain
Fortunae / Primigeniae / ex voto, / D(ecimus) Poblicius / Comicus / manceps aedis / per annos XIII, / Publicia Quinta f(ilia) / Fresidia Palmyrus uxor, / cellar[iis] / Amoeno, / Dionysio, / Lino.

Poblicia Lexis (Puteoli†): Puteoli
CIL X 2627, date uncertain
Dis Manibus. / Iunia D(ecimi) f(ilia) Salla, / vixit ann(os) XVIII, / D(ecimus) Iuniu(s) Donax, sibi / et Pobliciae Lexi et / suis.

Ma. Poblicius Niceros (Puteoli†): Puteoli
CIL X 1949, II century CE
D(is) M(anibus). / Ma(nio) Poblicio / Dionysio fecerunt, / II fratres Poblicius / Cleme(n)s et Apsyrtus / alumni / b(ene) m(erenti) t(atae) s(uo). // D(is) M(anibus) / Ma(nio) Poblicio Dionysi / Ma(nio) Poblici Nicerotis pediseq(ui) / bene {e}merenti, fecer(unt) / duo fratatres Poblici/us} Clemens et / Apsyrtus alumni / tatae.

Q. Poblicius C[---] (Puteoli†): Puteoli (tablet from Pompeii)
TPSulp 98, 44-45 CE
is negaret se] / litteras sc[ire eum accepisse?] / ab C(aio) Sulpici[o --- HS ---] / millia [numnum ---] / sibi quem [---] / eius stipulatus est(?) ---] / Philocom[us(?).

C. Publicius Carus (Puteoli†): Puteoli (tablet from Pompeii)
TPSulp 15 (= AE 1973, 154 = AE 1986, 182), 30-60 CE
CIL X 2898, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / Publiciae / Ia/nuariae, q(uae) v(ixit) / ann(os) XVII, m(enses) V, / Publicius Ianuarius / et Valeria Felic(u)la paren/tes filiae dulcissimae.

M. Publicius Felix (Tusculum†): Tusculum
CIL XIV 2605 (= CLE 477), date uncertain

Region II: Apulia et Calabria
"C.⁷ Publicius Thallus (Brundisium†): Brundisium
AE 1978, 179, date uncertain

L. Publicius (Brundisium†): Brundisium
CIL IX 51, date uncertain
L(ucio) Publicio / munific(its)

[Publicius] [---] Hil[arus?] (Brundisium†): Brundisium
AE 1980, 276, date uncertain
[Publicius?] / [---] Hil[arus(?)], [v(ixit)] a(nnos] [Publicius Demosthenes: Venusia
CIL IX 559, date uncertain
Q(uintus) Publicius / Demosthenes / hic situs est; / in fr(onte) p(edes) XII, / in agr(o) p(edes) XIV.

Q. Publicius Hermes: Venusia
   CIL IX 507, date uncertain
   Dubitata Q(uinto) Pub licio Hermet(i) / contubernal(i) / b(ene) m(erenti) p(osuit).

[Pub]licius Maximus: Venusia
   AE 2003, 497, date uncertain
   [--- Pub]lictius / Maximus, / annor(um) XIX, / Hermes pat(er), / [E]uticia mat(er) / f(ilio)
   b(ene) m(erenti) p(osuerunt).

Publicius Secundus or Secundinus; Publicia Secunda or Secundina: Venusia
   CIL IX 553, date uncertain
   Publincio Secu[---], / Titinio Secu[---], / Publiciae Sec[---] / f(aciendum) c(uravit).

Region III: Bruttium et Lucania

Concordius [S]uavis (Beneventum): Beneventum
   CIL IX 1799, date uncertain
   ) Concordius / [S]uavis, sibi et / [---]uriae Optatae, / [---] Quinto / [...

Region IV: Samnium

Publicia Reparata (Alba Fucens†): Alba Fucens
   CIL IX 4021; AE 1974, 306, later II century CE
   Publicia Reparat a / mihi et tibi, / Marco Allidio, / ob memoriam / fecit.

   Publicia Reparata / sibi et M(arco) Aurelio / Allidio [Ia]nuario / August[i l(iberto)],
   coniu[gi].

Region VI: Umbria

Publicia Secunda (Pisaurum†): Pisaurum
   CIL XI 6442, date uncertain
   D(is) M(anibus). / Publiciae Se/cundae, / Ancharius Aba/scantianus / coniugi.

Region VII: Etruria

Publicia Procula: (Asisium): Asisium
   CIL XI 5523, date uncertain
   D(is) M(anibus) / Publiciae Proculae, / Tettia C(ai) l(iberta) Forti(s).

A. Poplicius Malchio: Tuder
   CIL XI 4762, late Republic (?)
   A(ulus) Poplicius / Malchio.

Publicia Marcella: Volaterrae
   CIL XI 1789, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus). / Publici(a)e Mar/cell(a)e, Vetti/us Iulianus / coniugi be/ne meranti, / et Vettius Mar/cellus matri / piissim(a)e, vix(it) / an(nis) XXIII, men(sibus) / III, diebus XV.

Region VIII: Aemilia

Poblicia Priscilla (Ravenna†): Ravenna
CIL XI 239, date uncertain
Cuthio. // Q(uintus) Venerius / Q(uinti) f(ilius) Quir(ina) Fastus, / vix(it) ann(is) XVII, / mens(ibus) XI, dieb(us) VIII, / Q(uintus) Venerius Q(uinti) f(ilius) / Quir(ina) Manlius / Achaicus frater / et Poblicia Priscilla / heredes fec(erunt) // Sotericus.

P. Publicius Senex; Publicius Seninus; Publicius Stephanus: (Veleia): Veleia
CIL XI 1147 (= ILS 6675 = AE 1991, 710), Trajanic period
These men are listed as land owners registering property for the local alimenta program.

Region X: Venetia et Histria

L. Poblicius Gratus (Altinum): Altinum
CIL V 2259, date uncertain
L(ucio) Pobliciu[cio] Grato; / in fr(onte) p(edes) XXXX, / [ ]

C. Poblicius [---] [---]tro[---] (Aquoiseia): Aquileia
CIL V 8437 (= Inscr.Aqu. 2, 1378), date uncertain
C(aius) Poblicius [---] / [---]tro[

L. Poblicius Vitalis (Aquoiseia): Aquileia
CIL V 1008 (= Inscr.Aqu. 1, 617), I century CE
This man is listed on an epitaph with 21 other individuals.

M. Publicius Hister (Aquoiseia): Aquileia
CIL V 1052 (= Inscr.Aqu. 1, 667), late second century CE
This man is listed in the album of an unidentified local association.

Publicius Placidus (Aquoiseia): Aquileia
AE 1898, 85 (= Inscr.Aqu. 1, 148), date uncertain
Belino Aug(usto), / Publicius / Placidus / nego[tiator] / Romaniensis / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).

[P]oblicius Statutus (Aquoiseia): Aquileia
AE 1921, 71b (= Inscr.Aqu. 1, 205); NSA 1920, 100, date uncertain
[---]i sacr(um), / [--- P]oblicius / Statutus / v(otum) s(olvit).

L. Poblicius Communis: Atria
CIL V 2357, date uncertain
L(ucius) Poblicius / Communis.

M. Pobl[icius ---] Diosc[orius]: Atria
IIAdria 45, date uncertain
M(arco) Pobl[ici ---] / Diosc[orio ---] / Sintychi
Publicia Florentia (Brixia): Brixia
CIL V 4689, date uncertain
Publiciae Florentiae / coniugi carissimae / et incomparabili, Caecilius / Saturus m(emoriam) p(osuit).

Publicia Lucinia (Brixia): Brixia
CIL V 4690, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / Publiciae / Luciniae, / P(ublius) Laronius / [...]ilphai[

Publicia Pusinna (Brixia): Brixia
CIL V 4993; AE 1977, 298, date uncertain
Publiciae Pu/sinnae, M(arcus) Non/ius Cornelianus / coniugi carissimae. // D(is) M(anibus)
[M(arcus) No]nius Cornelianus v(ir) p(erfectissimus) / [dedit coll]eg(io) naut(arum)
B(rixianorum) praesent(ium) ((denariorum)) CL mil(ia), ut ex usu/[ris ---] IM QVAE COMP et ANN V [...] XVIII / REM AN / [...] X X q(uot)a(nnis) P(ublicia) Pusinna et f il(ia?) / [...] profusion(es) annuae(?) [...]POM / [...]IGIADAR[---] / DD[---] / [...]P[

C. Publicius Proculus (Brixia): Brixia
CIL V 4267, date uncertain
Mercur(io), / C(aius) Publicius / Proculus / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).

L. Publicius Gaius; L. Publicius October (Brixia): Brixia
CIL V 4687, date uncertain
D(is) M(anibus) / L(uci) Publici / Octobris, / L(uclus) Publicius Gaius / fratri pientissi[m(o)].

L. Publicius Primus (Brixia): Brixia
CIL V 4688, date uncertain
L(uclus) Publicius / Primus / et Secunda[e] / Turi f(iliae) uxor[i] / et L(uclio)
Se[pt(imio?)] Crescen[ti].

M. Publicius Clodian(us) (Brixia): Brixia
CIL V 4242, date uncertain
I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo) D(oliccheno), / ex iussu eius, / M(arcus) Publicius? Clodian(us) / candidat(us), / ne qu(is) in hac ara / setatu(m) sac(rificare) rit(e) v[e]li[t].

Publicius [...-] (Brixia): Brixia
AE 2010, 594, date uncertain
] / Caeciliu[s ---] / Ocratiu[s ---] / Sertiu[s] V[---] / Crispus Pa[---] / Varies Ap[---] / P ublicius [---] / Tertius [---] / Sertoriu[s ---] / Aemilius [---] / Valeriu[s] [---] / Blandiu[s

Pobl(icia) Phoeb[e] (Opitergium): Opitergium
AE 1979, 288, date uncertain
] / in fr(onte) p(edes) XX[-], / r(etro) p(edes) XXXX, / Pobl(icia) Phoeb[e].

C. [P]u[b]lici(us) [...] (Patavium): Patavium
CIL V 3021, date uncertain
C(aius) [P]u[b]lici(us ---] / [-----] / [-----] mater optima / [
P. Pobl(icius) Ae[---]; P. Pobl(icius) Anc[---] (Patavium): Patavium
CIL V 8110, 282, date uncertain

Publicius Myrinus (Pola†): Pola
CIL V 220, date uncertain
fjiliae / pien/tissimae, / Publicius / Myrinus / fecit.

M. Publicius Sec[un(dus)] (Tarvisium): Tarvisium
Suppl. It. 24 T, 10, date uncertain
] / Philositi l(iberta) / Acume viva / fecit sibi et / M(arco) Poblicio Sec[un(do)].

Publicia Primigenia; L. Publicius Iustus (Tergeste): Tergeste
CIL V 577, date uncertain
A(ulus) Barbius Epinicus, / A(ulus) Barbius Epaphroditus, / Q(uintus) Petronius
Parthenius, / Sex(tus) Cossut(ius) Euschemus, / L(ucius) Gallius Felix, / L(ucius) Usius
Lascivos, / L(ucius) Lopsius Clymenus, / L(ucius) Lopsius Aprio, / L(ucius) Publicius
Iustus, // Pontiena Peregrin(a), / Publicia Primigenia.

[P]oblicius Statutus (Tergeste): Tergeste
Inscr.It. 104, 320, date uncertain
[Font]i sacr(um), / [-- P]oblicius / Statutus / v(otum) s(olvit).

C. Publicius Datus (Verona†): Verona (inscription from Aquileia)
CIL V 8321 (= Inscr.Aqu. 2, 1611), 1 century CE
Veronensis / C(aius) Poblicius / Datus v(ivus) f(ecit) / s(ibi) et s(uis) libert[is] / libertab(us)q[ue] / l(ocus) m(onumenti) q(uoquo) v(ersus) p(edes) [---].

Q. Publicius LLG (?) Hippolytus (Vicetia): Vicetia
CIL V 3187a, date uncertain
Q(uinto) Poblicio LLG (?), / Hippolytus sibi et / Iomimus.

Publicia Prima (Vicetia): Vicetia
CIL V 3190, date uncertain
] qui vixit / [ann(os)] XXIII, m(enses) VIII, / Publicia Prima / mater.

Region XI: Transpadana

Publicia Mansueta (Comum†): Comum
CIL V 5364, date uncertain
Publiciae / Mansuetae / [C.

C. Publicius Tertullinus (Comum†): Comum
AE 1995, 612, date uncertain
Sextienae{s} / Tertullinae{s}, / C(aius) Publicius Tertullinus / matri pientissimae.

C. Publicius [It]alus (Mediolanum): Mediolanum
CIL V 6068, date uncertain
] / Secundae / et Plinia Q(uinti) f(iliae) Maxima[e], / Plinia Q(uinti) l(iberta) Donata / patrono idem viro / et fili(i)s suis, / et C(aio) Poblicio [It]alo / amico.
Q. Publicius Lucidus (Mediolanum): Mediolanum
   CIL V 5995, date uncertain
   C(aio) Coelio / Pudenti, // Q(uinto) Publicio / Lucido, // Phileto, / Ingenui, et Lucid[.]

Publicius Quintianus: Ticinum
   AE 1992, 809, date uncertain
   Publicio Quintiano / et Saffinia Triphaen(ae) / coniugi obsequentissim(ae) / et suis.

Publicia Marcell[a]: Vercellae
   CIL V 6703, date uncertain
   Publiciae Marcel/[ae?

_Uncertain origin_

Concordia He[---]: Rome
   AE 2004, 254, date uncertain
   D(is) M(anibus). / Concordia He/[ // p]osterisque {a}eoru[m] / [--- h(o)c] m(onumentum)
   / h(eredem) n(on) [s(equetur)].

C. Concord(ius) Quintin(us); P. Concord(ius) Crassus: Rome
   CIL VI 1057 (= CIL VI 1058 = CIL VI 31234 = ILS 2157), Caracallan period
   This man is listed in a dedication by the V Cohort of _vigiles_ in Rome.

Vener(ius) Clementia(nus): Ostia
   CIL XIV 4569 (= AE 1928, 123), 198 CE
   This man is listed in a dedication by the _caligati_ of the local association of _fabri tignuarii_.

Veneria Latina: Rome
   AE 2001, 580, date uncertain
   A(ulus) Mucius Faustus / v(v)a), Saenia Inventa, / T(itus) Gresius Surus / v(ivus),
   Q(uintus) Saenius Saturninus, // Veneria / Latina.

Veneria Spec(u)la: Rome
   CIL VI 28447, date uncertain
   Veneria Spec(u)la, / vix(it) ann(os) XX, sibi et / Titiae Secundae / mammae fecit.

Q. Vener(ius) Romanus: Rome
   CIL VI 1057 (= CIL VI 1058 = CIL VI 31234 = ILS 2157), Caracallan period
   This man is listed in a dedication by the V Cohort of _vigiles_ in Rome.

Venerius Vesidius: Rome
   CIL VI 28446 (= CIL X 1089, 208), date uncertain
   Venerius / Vesidius.

Veneria (H)elpis: Urvinum Mataurense
   CIL XI 6103, date uncertain
   Dis Man(ibus). / Veneria (H)elpis, / matri Iauariae, / et Fortunat[---] / Lascivis fratres / ob merita eius.
Plumbarii and officinatores of brick and tile production workshops

L. Aricinus Chrestus (Aricia): Aricia
CIL XIV 4092, 5 (= CIL XV 2379, 1-2)
L(uci) Aricini Chresti, / ex of(f)icina inusul(?) . . .

C. Casinius Numidian(us) (Casinum): Casinum
CIL XV 435, 1-7
op(us) dol(iare) ex fig(linis) Publilian(is), C(aius) Ca/sinius Numidian(us) fec(it).

L. Formianus (Formiae): Formiae
CIL XI 6689, 107
o(pus) d(oliare) e pr(aediis) L(uci) Formian(i), / Pr(a)es(ente) et Ext(ricato) co(nsulibus).

M. Nomentanus (Nomentum): Nomentum
CIL X 8053, 248
ex pr(aediis) Marci Nomentani.

Q. [P]rimigenius Hermes (Praeneste): Rome
CIL XV 3815, 3816
XXC s(emis) // [MM(arorum) Claud(iorum)] Senecionum; // [CCI s(emis)] // r(ecognitum?) XX CCI s(emis), / [Q]uinti [P]rimigeni Hermes, / Commodo et La[teran]o co(nsulibus).

Q. Primigenius Mas[---] (Praeneste): Rome
CIL XV 3814
[MM(arorum) Claud(iorum) Senecionum] // [---]III s(emis) // r(ecognitum?) f(iglinae)
Trebecianorum?) CXCV[--], / Quinti Primigeni Mas(?), / Praesente et Rufino
co(n)s(ulibus).

C. Ostrius Serr(anus) (Ostra): Ostra
CIL XV 1871 = Bloch 3
C(ai) Ostri Serr(ani), fig(linis) Albanian(is).

M. Arretius (Arretium): Arretium
CIL III 8077; AE 1978, 711a; AE 1995, 1368
Marcus A(r)etio fec(it).

L. Pis(anus) (Pisae): Pisae
CIL X 8056, 303b-c
L(uci) Pis(anii).