72-12,862

VAN HOUTE, Samuel, 1932-
THE FREEDMEN AT POMPEII.

University of Maryland, Ph.D., 1971
History, ancient

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

THE FREEDMEN AT POMPEII

by
Samuel van Houte

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of the University of Maryland in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
1971

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPROVAL SHEET

Title of Thesis: The Freedmen at Pompeii

Name of Candidate: Samuel van Houte
Doctor of Philosophy, 1971

Thesis and Abstract Approved: Wilhelmina F. Jashemski

Wilhelmina F. Jashemski
Professor
Department of History

Date Approved: June 15, 1971

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ABSTRACT

Title of Thesis: The Freedmen at Pompeii

Samuel van Houte, Doctor of Philosophy, 1971

Thesis directed by: Wilhelmina F. Jashemski, Professor

By focusing on one small part of the Roman world, this study seeks to make a small contribution to the body of knowledge about freedmen in the Roman Empire. By concentrating on Pompeii we are able to take advantage of the unique evidence preserved for us there by the eruption of Mt. Vesuvius in A.D. 79. Evidence from Herculaneum, much less plentiful, is brought in where appropriate.

In order that the freedmen of Pompeii may be seen in their proper context, an introductory chapter deals with the freedmen of the Roman Empire in general. The reasons for and the methods of manumission are discussed, as are the numbers of freedmen and the relationship of freedmen to society. Attention is given to the identification of freedmen, which is an important part of the study of freedmen in Pompeii. Those who were certainly freedmen at Pompeii are distinguished from those who were probably freedmen.

Freedmen played a significant role in the religious life of Pompeii. Sometimes they appeared in official positions, as, for example, priests of Augustus or Fortuna Augusta, Augustales, magistri vicorum or magistrates of the suburb Pagus Augustus Felix. All of these positions were apparently concerned with the imperial cult, in which the highest official function of freedmen at Pompeii is to be found. In that connection we

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

find a number of instances of recognition by the city officials. Honors for freedmen often took the place of the office a freeborn man could hold. One freedman also seems to have been head of a Jewish synagogue in Pompeii. Other evidence shows the participation of freedmen in worship of genius or Lares or of one deity or another.

Freedmen also had an important place in the economic life of Pompeii. They were engaged in respected occupations as well as in work of a lowly nature. A number were wine producers who apparently owned their own farms and thus had entered into an area that had always been considered respectable for freeborn Romans. Other freedmen managed estates.

Freedmen and probable freedmen were found among the teachers, physicians, architects, actors, gladiators, bankers, business agents, producers of garum, wine merchants, caupones, proprietors of food shops, holders of concessions at the amphitheater, fullers, dyers, felt makers, spinners and weavers, ship owners, managers of baths, proprietors of pottery shops and other shops, perfumers, public swineherds, jewellers, flower dealers and oil producers and dealers.

Many freedmen had humble positions in the economic life of Pompeii, but others are found throughout the entire range of economic activity, from small business to business ventures involving considerable wealth. Gifts to the city or to some temple, or the provision of gladiators for shows give evidence of wealth. Tombs, elaborate or simple, give indication of the economic position, status and tastes of freedmen. Some freedmen, like Petronius' Trimalchio, were ostentatious, seeking every honor, deserved or not. Others were simple, unassuming citizens. Numerous

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

election notices show that freedmen in Pompeii were active in recommending candidates for office. Inscriptions identify many other freedmen about whom little is known.

The social position of freedmen was fixed first of all by their servile birth. Yet, largely by wealth or service to the city or its inhabitants, many sought to advance in social status. The lower classes, including the freedmen, were increasingly taking over at Pompeii. The freedmen were slowly succeeding in making a new place for themselves.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

PREFACE

Freedmen make up an important segment of the population of the Roman Empire, but we still do not have a clear and accurate picture of that part of Roman society. Susan Treggiari has recently brought the subject up to date for the earlier period in her work Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic (Oxford, 1969), which has been well received. For the imperial period A.M. Duff's pioneering work, Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire (Oxford, 1928), has still not been superseded. However, a great amount of evidence has come to light since it was written, and the work now needs to be brought up to date. Neither book mentions the freedmen of Herculaneum; Duff mentions the freedmen in Pompeii, but only twice.

The eruption of Mt. Vesuvius in A.D. 79 covered Pompeii and Herculaneum, thus preserving in a unique way the evidence of freedmen there along with many other aspects of Roman civilization. At Pompeii the many painted inscriptions which are preserved are a valuable source of information about freedmen.

A detailed study of the evidence at Pompeii can considerably enlarge and clarify our knowledge of the whole subject of freedmen in the Roman Empire. Such work must, of course, be done in the light of the knowledge we already have about the Empire in general. In the present study we utilize information not available to Duff, including unpublished materials.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Although the study of freedmen at Pompeii poses many problems, yet there we can examine the information in a context lacking in other places. Not enough is known about the freedmen of Herculaneum to deal with them separately, but what is known will be drawn on at appropriate places in our investigation.

The writer would like to express his gratitude to Dr. Wilhelmina Jashemski for her generous advice and able assistance.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE ii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION: FREEDMEN IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE 1

II. THE FREEDMEN IN RELIGION 36

III. THE OCCUPATIONS OF THE FREEDMEN 70

IV. THE PLACE OF FREEDMEN AT POMPEII 110

Appendices

A. NAMES OF FREEDMEN ASSOCIATED WITH RELIGION 129

B. NAMES OF FREEDMEN BY OCCUPATIONS 133

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY 139

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: FREEDMEN IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE[1]

The Romans divided men into three classes: freeborn men, slaves, and freedmen who had been slaves but were no longer in that bondage.[2] However, although a freedman was set free, in actual fact he was still subject to certain obligations and restrictions remaining from his former servile status. He was still in many respects not free but only on the way to freedom. Master had now become patron. As a son owed respect and the faithful discharge of certain obligations to his father, so the freedman owed these to his patron. In Rome especially, and to a lesser extent in the Italian towns and the provinces, there was a considerable prejudice against freedmen. The freedmen were restricted in the areas of the family, criminal law and public life, and did not have the rights of freeborn men as regards, for example, the municipal offices, the army and the priesthoods.

Manumission

Manumission was very common in the Roman world. Cicero indicates that slaves generally looked forward with some expectancy to a time when

---

[1]Arnold Mackay Duff, Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire (Oxford, 1928), and Susan Treggiari, Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic (Oxford, 1969), were very helpful in the preparation of this chapter.

[2]Justinian, Institutes 1.5. pr.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

they would be set free.[1]

Reasons for Manumission

Slaves were freed for various and numerous reasons. They were often allowed to accumulate property (peculium) which they might later use for the purchase of their freedom.[2] Some saved and sold part of their personal allowance of grain.[3] Servants in attendance at banquets might be permitted to sell the remains for their own profit.[4] Porters might receive gifts for arranging speedy audience with their masters.[5] Slaves might steal from their masters.[6] A slave might engage in business for his master or with capital borrowed from his master, and so receive the profits or perhaps presents or wages.[7] Sometimes the peculium of the slave might include land, mortgages, or even slaves.[8]

So that they might have a sufficient number of clients in attendance as they went about the city, many aristocrats freed enough slaves to put on a show of importance. Some masters, when about to die, freed many slaves by their wills so they would be honored by many freedmen at their funerals.[9]

---

[1]Cicero, Oratio pro Rabirio Perduellonis Reo 15; Orationes Philippicae in M. Antonium 8. 32.

[2]Dionysius of Halicarnassus 4. 24. 4; Suetonius, De Gram. 13.

[3]Seneca, Epistulae 80. 4; Terence, Phormio 43 ff.; Dionysius of Halicarnassus 4. 24. 5. Cf. Dio Cassius 39. 24. 1.

[4]Apuleius, Metamorphoses 10. 13, 14. Cf. Petronius, Satyricon 67.

[5]Juvenal 3. 188-89. [6]Dion. of Hal. 4. 24. 4.

[7]Digest 2. 13. 4. 3; 14. 3. 1. 4; Justinian, Institutes 4. 7. pr.-5.

[8]Dig. 15. 1. 7. 4-5; 15. 1. 57. [9]Dion. of Hal. 4. 24. 6.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Often slaves, especially those from the East, were superior to their masters in culture and ability and were set free as an expression of gratitude or in reward for faithful service, either in industry or in some domestic capacity.[1] Naturally the slave who had some reason to suppose he would be rewarded with freedom would be more anxious to please than one who did not look forward to such a reward. Frequently nurses[2] and teachers[3] were granted manumission by grateful masters.

Many slaves were freed because of the affection of their masters and this was perhaps especially true for slaves born in the household.[4]

When manumission was a gift there was sometimes also a proposal of marriage, especially in the freeing of a female slave, since marriages between slaves and free people were not recognized by the law.[5] At other times the gift of manumission might be accompanied by a gift of money,[6] or by promotion in the service of the master. Sometimes we find

---

[1]Cicero, Epistulae ad Familiares 14. 4. 4. Cf. Dion. of Hal. 4. 24. 4.

[2]CIL. 3. 4260; Just., Inst. 1. 6. 5; Dig. 40. 2. 13.

[3]Suetonius, De Grammaticis throughout, but especially 5, 12, 15. 19, 23; Dig. 40. 2. 13; Just., Inst. 1. 6. 5; Gaius 1. 19. 39.

[4]Hermann Dessau, Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae, 6163: dis manibus/ L. Calpurnius Chius sevir Aug./ et quinquennalis,/ idem quinq. corporis mensor./ frumentarior. Ostiens. et curat./ bis,/ idem codicar./ curat. Ostis et III honor.,/ idem quinquennal. collegi Silvani/ Aug. maioris quod est Hilarionis/ functus sacomari, idem magistro ad Marte/ Ficanum Aug., idem in collegio dendrofor.,/ fecit sibi et/ Corneliae Ampliatae coniugi suae/ carissimae, cum qua vixit annis XXXI,/ Calpurniae L. lib. Pthengidi libertae/ carissimae, L. Calpurnio Forti vern., lib.,/ L. Calpurnio Felici lib., L. Calpurnio Adaucto vern., lib.,/ Calpurniae L. f. Chiae vern., Calpurniae L. f./ Ampliatae vern., L. Calpurnio L. f. Felici vern.,/ L. Calpurnio L. f. Pal. Chio Felicissimo,/ libertis libertab. posterisq. eorum b. m. Cf. Dig. 40. 2. 9.

[5]Dig. 40. 2. 13, 19; Just., Inst. 1. 6. 5. Cf. Gaius 1. 19.

[6]Cf. Martial 5. 70; Dig. 33. 5. 21; 34. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

that a freed slave was also a procurator, one who supervised the household slaves and represented his master in legal affairs, as the following inscription shows: "Fabatiae Luci/ filiae Pollae/ Fabiae Domi/tiae Gelliolae/ consulari fe/minae lampa/ diferae,/ M. Fabatius Do/mitius, Pan/cratius li/bertus et/ procura/tor patro/nae piissime."[1]

In conclusion, we find many reasons for manumission--vanity, gratitude, interest, affection, and the initiative of slaves themselves--and many examples of them.

Methods of Manumission

There were in general two types of manumission that were common in Rome: formal manumission (manumissio iusta) and informal manumission (manumissio minus iusta).

Informal manumission took place in three forms: inter amicos, per mensam and per epistulam.[2] In such manumission no part was played by government officials and the act was not recognized as legally binding on the master until the early Empire period, so, although the slave was set at liberty to all intents and purposes, he did not at the same time receive citizenship, as did the slave freed by formal manumission. Furthermore, his children remained slaves, and his peculium was still under the control of his former master. When the state began to recognize informal manumission officially, these differences between freedmen

---

[1] ILS. 1200. Further evidence is provided in Dig. 40. 2. 13; Gaius 1. 19; ILS. 1137, 3018, 3530, 7387-88, 8379, 9173; Just., Inst. 1. 6. 5.

[2] Just., Inst. 1. 5. 1; Dig. 40.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

disappeared and all were granted not only freedom but also citizenship.

Manumissio inter amicos, the most popular form of informal manumission,[1] was a declaration of freedom for a slave by a master in the presence of friends acting as witnesses. The only Latin deed of manumission of this type which we have is an Egyptian deed from the third century A.D.[2]

Manumissio per mensam took place when a master had his slave sit at table for dinner with him and then rise to liberty, but since witnesses must have been present this form of manumission was perhaps often also inter amicos. In contrast, manumissio per epistulam was accomplished by the writing of a letter from master to slave, granting liberty to him and making known the terms.

Formal Manumission.

Formal manumission was also found in three forms: manumissio vindicta, manumissio censu, and manumissio testamento. All of these forms seem quite ancient and conferred not only freedom but also Roman citizenship.

In manumissio vindicta, which according to tradition dates back to the beginning of the Republic[3] and may well have been the oldest form of manumission,[4] the ceremony, before any magistrate with imperium,[5]

---

[1]Cf. Gaius 1. 41, 44.

[2]Seymour De Ricci, "A Latin Deed of a Manumission of a Slave," reprinted from Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology (May-June, 1904). The deed is found also in P.F. Girard, Textes de droit romain (5th ed., 1923), p. 854, and the translation of De Ricci appears in Duff, p. 22.

[3]Livy 2. 5. 9.

[4]Cf. Treggiari, p. 24.

[5]Livy 41. 9. 11. Cf. Dig. 40. 2. 7, 17, 21.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

could take place at almost any time.[1] In this ceremony, as the master and the slave appeared before the magistrate, possibly in a simulated law-suit, a champion of the slave (adsertor libertatis) seems to have touched the slave with a rod (vindicta), the symbol of property in general, declaring him free, and when the master made no defense, the magistrate pronounced the verdict and officially freed the servant.[2]

Manumissio censu, dated by tradition from as early as Servius Tullius,[3] could take place only when the census was being taken, which occurred not more frequently than every five years. But although theoretically the census was taken every five years, actually it was quite irregular in the last century of the Republic (after Sulla). Since this form of manumission took place in the presence of the censor, it must have ceased with the abolition of the censorship.[4] When a slave was freed by a censor it is not certain whether his liberty began immediately or at the completion of the lustrum, eighteen months after the taking of the census had begun,[5] which might mean a considerable delay in manumission, and in the years 89, 65, 64, 55, and 42 B.C. the lustrum was not completed at all. It is possible that only this form of manumission originally granted citizenship, and that explains whatever popularity manumissio censu had.[6] In the practice of this type of manumission the slave of a Roman citizen, usually with his master's consent, appeared

---

[1]Just., Inst. 1. 5. 2. Cf. Varro, De Lingua Latina 6. 30.

[2]Dig. 40. 12.

[3]Dion. of Hal. 4. 22. 4.

[4]Gaius 1. 140.

[5]Cicero, De Oratore 1. 183.

[6]Cf. Treggiari, pp. 25-27.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

before the censors.[1] The placing of his name on the census rolls indicated not only citizenship but also freedom, since the former did not exist apart from the latter.

Manumissio testamento,[2] which goes back at least as far as the Twelve Tables,[3] has been called the most popular form of manumission,[4] since by granting liberty in that way it really cost a master nothing to show generosity or gratitude or to satisfy his vanity, but that opinion is subject to some doubt since poor citizens often found it more to their advantage in the late Republic to have clients than slaves.[5] For the will to be legally binding a proper wording was necessary: a word meaning "to order" had to be used (as liberum esse iubeo) or a verb in the imperative mood (as liber esto), but not simply a word expressing a wish (as liberum esse volo).[6] Manumissio testamento often depended on certain conditions, for example the payment of a certain sum to someone[7] or the performance of certain services.[8] At times a slave manumitted in this way might receive a bequest.[9]

---

[1]Cicero, De Oratore 1, 183. For a complete discussion see D. Daube, "Two Early Patterns of Manumission," Journal of Roman Studies, 36 (1946), pp. 63 ff.

[2]See Dig. 40. 4 on this subject.

[3]A.C. Johnson, et. al., Ancient Roman Statutes (Austin, 1961), document 8. 7. 12 (p. 11).

[4]Duff, p. 25; W.W. Buckland, The Roman Law of Slavery: The Condition of the Slave in Private Law from Augustus to Justinian (Cambridge, 1908), p. 460; Alan Watson, The Law of Persons in the Later Roman Republic (Oxford, 1967), p. 194.

[5]Cf. Dio Cassius 39. 24. 1. [6]Cf. Gaius 2. 267.

[7]Johnson, 8. 7. 12; Dig. 40. 7. 3. 11-12. Dig. 40. 4 mentions many different kinds of conditions.

[8]Dig. 32. 30. 2. [9]Cf. Dig. 33. 5. 21; 34. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Closely connected with the latter type of manumission was fideicomissary manumission, the expression in a will of the desire that an heir should free a slave (liberum esse volo). Such a wish was not legally binding until the second century A.D., though the heir might consider that he had a moral obligation to carry out the wish expressed in the will.[1]

Restrictions Placed on Manumission

There was a manumission tax of five percent of the value of the slave who was freed, but whether this had as its purpose the discouragement of manumission or was just a means of obtaining revenue is not certain. At least the tax does not seem to have had a significant effect on the number of slaves freed.[2]

It was to try to slow down or stop certain changes in Roman society that Augustus sought to restrict manumission.[3] Lucan and Juvenal tell us that Rome was filled with Easterners of low estate[4] and Dionysius of Halicarnassus says that many criminals were ex-slaves freed by masters anxious to gratify their vanity by having many freedmen at their funerals.[5] In 2 B.C., by the Lex Fufia Caninia, Augustus limited, according to a sliding scale, the number of slaves that might be freed by a master by testament: in a household of from two to ten slaves one-half might be set free, in one of between ten and thirty one-third might be set free,

---

[1]Gaius 2. 263-67; Just., Inst. 2. 24. 2.

[2]Livy 7. 16. 7; 27. 10. 11-12. Cf. Duff, pp. 28-29.

[3]Suet., Divus Augustus 40.

[4]Lucan 7. 405; Juvenal 3. 58 ff.

[5]Dion. of Hal. 4. 24. 6.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

in one of between thirty and one hundred one-fourth might be freed, and in one of from one hundred to five hundred one-fifth might be set at liberty (though a larger household was not limited to fewer manumissions than a smaller household). No will could free more than one hundred slaves.[1]

Further restrictions on manumission were made by Augustus in the Lex Aelia Sentia in A.D. 4.[2] This law annulled all manumissions by which debtors sought to cheat those whom they owed money.[3] Slaves under thirty could not be freed except by the approval of a special council, made up of five senators and five knights in Rome, or of twenty Roman citizens in the provinces.[4] Young masters under twenty could not free slaves unless a special council approved.[5] In this way Augustus sought to prevent slaves who would be undesirable citizens from taking advantage of weak or immature masters and thus entering into free society. But Augustus did not seek to keep masters from rewarding good service or giving expression to genuine affection.[6] A master might free a slave to make him his procurator, or a slave girl in order to marry her,[7] though it was not ordinarily considered to be a good enough reason if a mistress wanted to free a male slave to marry him, unless she had

---

[1]Gaius 1. 42-46; Just., Inst. 1. 7.

[2]See Gaius 1. 13-44; Just., Inst. 1. 5. 3; 1. 6; Dig. 40.

[3]Gaius 1. 37, 47; Dig. 40. 9. 27. pr.; Just., Inst. 1. 6. pr.

[4]Gaius 1. 18, 20. [5]Gaius 1. 38-40; Just., Inst. 1. 6. 3-6.

[6]Dig. 40. 2. 16.

[7]Gaius 1. 19; Dig. 40. 2. 13; Just., Inst. 1. 6. 5.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

earlier been a fellow slave with him, and he had been left to her with the intention that they should marry.[1] A master was also permitted to free blood-relatives.[2]

Augustus sought to restrict the influx of undesirable elements into Roman society, but at the same time care was exercised to allow the proper expression of the gentler instincts and feelings.

Numbers of Freedmen

That there were large numbers of freedmen not only in Rome, but also elsewhere cannot be disputed.[3] In Pompeii we find evidence of many slaves, not only in the inscriptions, some of which we note below, but also in the physical remains, as for example accommodations for slaves. The fulleries at I. vi. 7, VI. xiv. 21-22, and VII. xii. 22-25 may have been operated at least in part by slave labor.[4] Many gladiators at Pompeii were slaves, as we see below.

However, attempts to determine the proportion of freedmen to freeborn or to the total population meet with great difficulties. Even for Rome itself there is no certainty. We have no sure knowledge of its total population. The freedman population seems to have fluctuated considerably. Caesar took away many colonists, of whom a considerable proportion was made up of freedmen.[5] Sulla freed ten

---

[1] Dig, 40. 2. 14. 1. [2] Gaius 1. 19; Just., Inst. 1. 6. 5.

[3] Cf. Tacitus, Annals 13. 25; 14. 43.

[4] Cf. Walter O. Moeller, "The Woolen Industry at Pompeii" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of Maryland, 1962), pp. 47, 61, 78.

[5] Suet., Divus Iulius 42; Strabo 8. 6. 23.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

thousand Cornelii.[1] Grain distributions at the time of Pompey in particular,[2] but also generally,[3] resulted in many manumissions, since a slave became eligible for the grain dole when he was freed, and thus the household would benefit.

Probably there was a relatively high proportion of freedmen in Rome. In other trade centers and among the country towns there were many freedmen working as merchants and shopkeepers, but, except for Rome and perhaps a few other important cities, there is no evidence that freedmen made up the larger proportion of the population (at least during the late Republic). Tenney Frank thinks that only a small proportion (perhaps ten percent) of the inhabitants of Rome were freeborn Italians or immigrants, and that the rest were of servile origin,[4] but he bases this figure on the erroneous assumption that the proportion of freedmen which he thinks he finds in the epitaphs of Rome was the same as that in the population in general. Duff makes some estimates of percentages of freedmen in inscriptions from various towns of Italy and the Roman Empire, in which the percentage of freedmen runs from twelve to forty-eight percent, but, as he himself warns, such estimates have only a relative value and, since they are select, do not allow any certain conclusions about the percentage of freedmen in the total population.[5]

---

[1]Appian, Bella Civilia 1. 100, 104.

[2]Dio Cassius 39. 24. 1. [3]Dion of Hal. 4. 24. 5.

[4]Tenney Frank, "Race Mixture in the Roman Empire," American Historical Review, 21 (1916), 689 ff.

[5]Duff, pp. 197-200.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Attempts to determine numbers of freedmen on the basis of the revenues from manumission taxes are of doubtful value. Livy's report of the amount of revenue in the years from 357 to 209 B.C., a total of about 4,000 pounds of gold,[1] might be helpful if we knew the average value of a slave and if we were sure that the taxes which raised these revenues included taxes on informal as well as formal manumission. Unfortunately we are not sure of either of these matters, and Duff's estimate of an average of 1,200 formal manumissions a year for each of the 148 years in the above-mentioned period is far from certain.[2] Duff's assumption of a slave's average value as being somewhere between 500 and 1,000 denarii or drachmae cannot be proved to be accurate.[3] Horace speaks of the price of a servant, presumably an ordinary one, as 500 drachmae,[4] and Petronius speaks of a slave whose purchase price was 1,000 denarii.[5] Pliny the Elder mentions some extraordinary prices ranging from 700,000 to 50,000,000 sesterces.[6] Even if we could say with certainty that the average value of a slave was between 500 and 1,000 denarii, the exceptionally high prices of a few would make estimates difficult.

Besides, the average value of a slave did not always remain the same. The value of money changed. Some slaves bought their liberty for amounts less than their actual value, but others were forced to pay more. Extraordinary prices for slaves at times raised the total manumission

---

[1]Livy 7. 16. 7; 27. 10. 11-12.

[2]Duff, p. 29. Duff, p. 29, n. 3, assumes that informal manumissions were not taxed during the Republic.

[3]Duff, pp. 17-18.

[4]Horace, Satires 2. 7. 43.

[5]Petronius, Satiricon 57.

[6]Pliny, Natural History 7. 128-29.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

taxes. For most periods we are unable to give either the average value of a slave or the total amount of manumission taxes, so we cannot use such figures to determine the number of slaves freed. Thus Frank's estimate of 16,000 manumissions a year between 82 and 49 B.C. is unacceptable, since he bases his conclusion on an average value for a slave and an assumed total of the manumission taxes during that period.[1]

Frank's attempt to determine the proportion of the people living in Rome who were of foreign extraction fails to give much more certain conclusions. There are various reasons why freedmen might be more inclined than freeborn to leave commemorative inscriptions.[2] Inscriptions represent only part of the picture and it is not safe to form too dogmatic conclusions of the whole from them. We do not know how large a part of his life remained to a freedman after manumission. Furthermore, extreme care must be used in concluding from the name alone that a particular individual was a freedman.

We simply do not have enough evidence to make an educated guess as to how many freedmen there were. About all we can say is that they were very numerous.

The Place of Freedmen in Roman Society

Relationship to Patron

Although the freedman had been set free and was not under the authority of his old master in the sense he had been previously, never-

---

[1]Tenney Frank, "The Sacred Treasure and the Rate of Manumission," American Journal of Philology, 53 (1932), pp. 360 ff.

[2]Cf. Treggiari, pp. 32-34; Lily Ross Taylor, "Freedmen and Freeborn in the Epitaphs of Imperial Rome," American Journal of Philology, 82 (1961), 113 ff.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

theless that master, now his patron, did retain considerable power over him. As was mentioned above, the freedman owed certain obligations to his patron as a son did to a father.[1] It is difficult to say precisely what a freedman owed to his patron. Terms such as obsequium and officium are vague and indefinite, and may refer more to respect and honor than to any particular duties. The operae, as will be seen, were not duties that belonged to the freedman by virtue of his being a freedman but were imposed in addition, however common they might have been. It might be said that the privileges of the tutela resulted from the responsibilities of that office, but, however it is described, the truth is that they were privileges of the patron which he had as a result of his relationship to the freedman. Whatever might be said about the freedom of the freedman, in his relationship to his patron he was definitely a second-class citizen.

Obsequium et Officium

In the earlier days of the Republic freedmen were usually accustomed to doing agricultural or domestic work. Lack of capital for the purchase of land must have meant remaining in the homes of former masters, and life must have gone on to a large extent unchanged even after manumission. Duff finds the later customs of obsequium and officium in these circumstances, asserting that such traditions of respect for patrons continued in effect even after there were considerable changes of circumstances. He goes on to distinguish between obsequium as a principle involving what a freedman may not do in regard to his patron and officium as the principle

---

[1] Dig. 37, 15. 9.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

concerned with what is required of the freedman in connection with his patron.[1] On the other hand in the late Republic obsequium, if it was truly a legal concept, apparently took its force from a specific agreement between freedman and patron at the time of manumission, and did not exist where that agreement was absent.[2] Obsequium seems ordinarily to have referred to nothing more than an attitude of respect, and was just a common word for "allegiance," used most often in regard to political loyalty.[3]

Under the Principate, in keeping with the reforms of Augustus, the state took official note of the disloyalty of many freedmen, an increasingly common occurence in the last decades of the Republic, and so in A.D. 4 the Lex Aelia Sentia made provision for the punishment of freedmen who failed to show the proper respect to their patrons.

There were various actions that were violations of obsequium. In the sphere of civil law, the freedman could not, unless he had suffered very serious injury, bring a lawsuit against his patron, or sue his patron or children of his patron, and in case of serious injury he could do so only with special permission from the praetor.[4] In criminal law the freedman could bring no other charge against his patron than that

---

[1]Duff, pp. 37-40.

[2]Dig. 38. 1. 36; 38. 2. 1; 44. 5. 1. 7. Cf. Treggiari, p. 70; Watson, pp. 228-29.

[3]Dig. 37. 15; Cicero, Epistulae ad Familiares 10. 15. 1; 10. 11. 3. Cf. Treggiari, pp. 71-73.

[4]Dig. 2. 4. 4. 1; 37. 15. 2; 37. 15. 7. 2; 47. 10. 7. 2, 3, 11. 7; Gaius 4. 46. Cf. Duff, pp. 37-40.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of maiestas,[1] nor could he be forced to bring evidence against his patron if he was not willing (nor could the patron against his freedman).[2] The patron who caught his freedman in the act of adultery with his wife could kill him on the spot,[3] but if the freedman caught his patron in the same situation he could not mete out like justice.

Thus obsequium appears to be concerned with the respect of a freedman for his patron, and in particular with any act that fails to recognize or that might injure the dignity of the patron. Some of the violations of obsequium are apparently prohibited because of the family type of relationship that existed between freedman and patron. Just as it would be improper for a son to take certain actions against his father, so that would be improper for a freedman in regard to his patron. That sort of filial regard by a freedman for his patron seems to be involved in obsequium. Therefore, even though there is no specific definition of obsequium, and though there is no precisely spelled-out law, yet it does seem to be generally applicable to the freedmen as a class in their relationship to their patrons. Either it was very commonly, perhaps almost universally, included in the agreement at the time of manumission (with the possible exception of manumissio testamento), or it was a common assumption of Roman society. There seems to be no real evidence for the former possibility, but there does seem to be a tradition of freedmen showing respect to their patrons, and that customary way of behavior surely indicates the nature of the freedman's relationship to

---

[1] Dig. 48. 4. 7. 2; Codex Theodosianus 9. 6. Cf. Tacitus, Ann. 15. 54-55.

[2] Dig. 22. 5. 4.

[3] Dig. 48. 5. 25. pr.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

his patron, whether the nature of that relationship is established by law or not.

Officium apparently included various services which the patron might require of his freedmen.[1] For example, he might demand that the freedman take care of, protect, or teach his children, or that he become his procurator or steward, or he might expect him to perform the duties of a client or to support the patron when in need.

The severity of the punishment which might properly be meted out to erring freedmen indicates at least that in the eyes of society and the state the freedman did owe certain duties and obligations to his patron. Thus Claudius ordered that ungrateful freedmen (presumably those unfaithful in regard to obsequium and officium) be returned to slavery,[2] and in Nero's time the Senate debated whether manumission ought to be made revokable, apparently at the discretion of the patron.[3] Repeated offenses of insult or vocal abuse might result in a period of exile, but any physical attack or conspiracy against a patron resulted in one of the most severe of punishments, forced labor in the Roman mines.[4]

Susan Treggiari concludes that the rights and obligations involved in the relationship between patron and freedman were based on fides as a moral concept.[5] In any event, those rights and obligations were

---

[1]Cf. Dig. 37. 14; Duff, p. 40. [2]Suet., Divus Claudius 25. 1.

[3]Tacitus, Ann. 13. 26-27. [4]Dig. 37. 14. 1.

[5]Treggiari, p. 8.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

enforceable by the state if necessary, and to that extent had the force of law. The relationship between patron and freedman was clear enough and definite enough to insure punishment for those who violated it.

Operae

At the time of manumission the freedman might take an oath to provide a certain number of days of service (operae) in the house or factory of his patron.[1] That understanding may have been joined to most manumissions.[2] There were two types of operae, domestic (officiales) and skilled labor (fabriles), such as the work of physician, artist, architect, or that of manufacturing. The latter type could be transferred by the patron to others, but the former could not be transferred. There was some attempt to protect the rights of freedmen, and so examples of the amount of work that might reasonably be expected are given as one hundred or one thousand operae.[3] The operae could not be such a heavy burden that the freedman would have no time to earn his own living[4] or to attend to his own affairs.[5] The freedman could sometimes arrange to pay a certain amount of money in place of working out the operae, but that amount was not to be made so large that it would cause a severe hardship or that the freedman would be in debt for the rest of his life.[6] He could not be required to perform any operae that would put him in

---

[1] In general see Dig. 38. 1. Cf. 37. 14.

[2] Dig. 38. 1. 31. Cf. Duff, pp. 44-48, and Treggiari, pp. 75-78.

[3] Cf. Just., Inst. 4. 15. 1. [4] Dig. 38. 1. 15, 24.

[5] Dig. 38. 1. 19. [6] Dig. 38. 1. 32; 38. 2. 1. pr.; 44. 5. 1. 5.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

danger or disgrace.[1] On the other hand, as we saw above, the failure of a freedman in the performance of his proper duties could bring punishment. Some examples of the ways in which a freedman might be asked to perform his operae are as calculator, nomenclator, histrio,[2] librarius,[3] pictor,[4] medicus, pantomimus,[5] and vestiarius.[6]

Tutela

Freedmen under twenty and all freedwomen were under the guardianship (tutela) of their patrons. The patrons were to watch over and protect them and their interests. With this responsibility a privilege also accrued to the patron: by a development starting as early as the Twelve Tables he sometimes inherited part or all of the estate of the freedman.[7] The patron's descendants could inherit these rights.[8] Only if the freedman had descendants, natural or adopted, could the patron then be prevented from inheriting half of the estate. The Lex Papia Poppaea of A.D. 9 stated that if there were not three descendants, and the estate was worth 100,000 sesterces, the patron shared equally with whatever descendants there were, but if the heirs were not descendants the patron continued to inherit one-half of the estate.[9] In the late Republic the patron inherited the full estate of a freedwoman unless he permitted other bequests. After A.D. 9 freedwomen with four children

---

[1] Dig. 38. 1. 38.

[2] Dig. 38. 1. 7, for this and the two preceding.

[3] Dig. 38. 1. 7, 49.

[4] Dig. 38. 1. 24.

[5] Dig. 38. 1. 27, for this and the preceding one.

[6] Dig. 38. 1. 45.

[7] Gaius 3. 40; Just., Inst. 3. 7. pr.

[8] Gaius 3. 45-46.

[9] Just., Inst. 3. 7. 1-2; Gaius 3. 41-42.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

were so far freed from the tutela that the patron received only an equal share.[1]

The freedman differed, then, from the freeborn in the particular relationship that he sustained to his patron. That relationship at times provided benefits, but it restricted the liberty of the freedman in various ways. Some of the mutual advantages of a family existed in this relationship, but they remained as relics of slavery and were not new benefits that came with freedom.

Relationship to Society

In relation to his patron the freedman was libertus; in relation to the freeborn he was libertinus.[2] The freedman belonged in a lower social class than the freeborn. No matter how wealthy the freedman was and how poor and lowly the ingenuus was, the freeborn man was a step higher on the social scale. The stigma of slavery still clung to the freedman. The efforts of freedmen to hide their servile descent on inscriptions or to avoid Greek or servile names for their children, or sometimes even for themselves after manumission or after the end of close association with their patrons, shows the low esteem in which Roman society held freedmen and gives evidence of the taint of servile ancestry.

---

[1]Gaius 3. 44.

[2]Gaius 1. 11; Dig. 1. 7. 46; 2. 4. 10. 4; 40. 11. 2; 40. 11. 5. 1; Just., Inst. 1. 5. Cf. Seneca, De Vita Beata 24; De Beneficiis 3. 28; Tacitus, Ann. 12. 53; Suet., Divus Augustus 25; Varro, De Lingua Latina 8. 82-83; Cicero, In Verrem 2. 1. 47; Plautus, Miles Gloriosus 961-62; Livy 39. 9-13; 45. 15; 45. 44. 19; ILS. 1200. In Pompeii no instances of the word libertinus are noted in the inscriptions. The abbreviations l and lib. seem to stand for libertus. That libertus has in mind the relationship to patron is borne out by CIL. 4. 2455, 7542, 9970; CIL. 10. 861. 1030, 1049; Notizie degli scavi di antichita (Rome), 1919, p. 235, n. 32; 1958, p. 144, n. 347.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The clear inferiority of freedmen to freeborn men is illustrated by the case of Petronia Iusta, which is preserved on tablets from Herculaneum.[1] There was a question as to whether Iusta was freeborn or born in bondage and set free. Some of the documents are concerned with an appointment to appear before the praetor in Rome, and others are statements of the witnesses on the two sides. The outcome, if the case was ever settled, is unknown to us. Iusta sought freeborn status, but the alleged patroness, Calatoria Themis, wanted a ruling that Iusta was born in bondage and so was a freedwoman. There would have been no point to such a contest if freedmen were completely free, but Themis expected to gain somehow if Iusta were declared a freedwoman, no doubt by the normal privileges of patron over freedwomen, which we shall discuss below.

Freedmen were required to wear the close-fitting cap of the libertus (pilleus) at least at the funerals of their patrons and probably at other times when they attended their patrons as clients.[2]

Slave marriages (contubernia) were not legally recognized. Before the second century A.D. no one who had become a member of a family while the father was a slave was, either before or after the manumission of any

---

[1]The Herculanean Tablets were published by V. Arangio-Ruiz and G. Pugliese Carratelli in La Parola del Passato, 11 (1946), 373 ff. (nos. 1-12), 3 (1948), 165 ff. (nos. 13-30), 8 (1953), 454 ff. (nos. 31-58), 9 (1954), 54 ff. (nos. 59-75), 10 (1955), 448 ff. (nos. 76-87). The case is discussed in John Crook, Law and Life of Rome (Ithaca, 1967), pp. 48-50, where translations of nos. 16, 20, and 24 may be found.

[2]Livy 45. 44. 19; Polybius 30. 18. 3; Appian, Mithridateius 2; Dion. of Hal. 4. 24. 6.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

or all concerned, under his patria potestas. Those bought and freed by their father were his freedmen, not his children.[1]

During the Republic marriage between freedmen and freeborn was seldom permitted,[2] but Augustus made such unions much easier, except for the senatorial class.[3] However, marriages between freeborn women and freedmen were less encouraged and much less common than those between freeborn men and freedwomen, until they were finally prohibited under Septimus Severus.[4]

In order that the population should not diminish in number the production of children was encouraged. Yet the state indicated that though freedwomen were useful for that purpose, in the case of aristocrats it was better to take freedwomen as concubines than as wives,[5] and even emperors did so at times.[6] Marriage of freedwomen by senators was expressly forbidden. Before the time of Marcus Aurelius, when a senator married a freedwoman his whole family lost its senatorial status, though the marriage was allowed to stand. In the time of Marcus Aurelius such a marriage was not legally recognized.[7] On rare occasions freedmen might be permitted by the emperor to marry into senatorial or even imperial families, but that was an exception to the rule.[8]

---

[1]Just., Inst. 1. 10. 10; Dig. 23. 14. [2]Cf. Livy 39. 19.

[3]Dig. 23. 2. 44. [4]Codex Justinianus 5. 4. 3.

[5]Dig. 24. 1. 3. 1; 25. 7. 1. pr. [6]Suet., Divus Vespasianus 3.

[7]Dig. 23. 1. 16; 23. 2. 16. pr.

[8]Tacitus, Histories 5. 9; Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Verus 9.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

As we have seen above, citizenship as well as liberty came to be associated with manumission, but though the law protected the Roman citizen from being tortured, freedmen could be tortured if they were suspected of some crime,[1] though not ordinarily to derive from them information about patrons who were on trial[2] (perhaps a privilege granted more out of respect for the patron than for the freedman).

When a master died by the hand of one of his slaves, all the slaves paid with the death penalty.[3] Freedmen of the same household were spared that penalty unless their guilt was proved, though the Senate might propose banishment. At the time of Trajan they were tortured in the search for the culprits. Pliny speaks of some senators who felt that all freedmen in the household of a murdered patron should be put to death while others preferred a penalty of exile for them and a third part (larger than either of the other two) voted for acquittal.[4] Such attitudes and actions of the state and the senatorial class give some indication of the prejudice of Roman society against freedmen. The state did not apply the same punishments to ingenui as to freedmen. Practices that might bring a warning for freeborn men might result in immediate harsh punishment or even death for freedmen.

That Roman society was prepared to accept harsher punishment for freedmen than for freeborn Romans is not surprising when we consider how

---

[1] Dig. 29. 5. 3. 16; 29. 5. 10. 1; 29. 5. 11.

[2] Dig. 48. 18. 1. 9.

[3] Cf. Tacitus, Ann. 14. 42-45.

[4] Pliny, Epistulae 8. 14. 12-26.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

very harshly slaves could be treated. Pompeii provides us with an illustration of this at such places as VII. ii. 42, where we find ergastula with fetters which we would today consider cruel and inhumane instruments of punishment for any human being.[1] In the matter of punishment as in other respects the freedman was still an ex-slave.

Freedmen were denied the best military posts[2] and could not become priests of the old Roman gods or enter the senate, even in Italian or provincial towns, except in the colonies of Julius Caesar.[3] Even the sons of freedmen could not achieve equestrian status at times,[4] although there were exceptions[5] and some even became senators and one, Pertinax, was an emperor.[6] A man born in slavery was regarded as not having been born at all.[7] At banquets freedmen occupied the lowest places and received the poorest food, and Augustus excluded them completely.[8]

It seems that freeborn people of the lower classes often accepted freedmen more fully than those of the upper class did. In the trade collegia freedmen and freeborn associated as equals. Nor were freedmen

---

[1]Matteo Della Corte, Case ed abitanti di Pompei (3rd ed.; Naples, 1965), p. 179. For other descriptions of ergastula furnished with fetters see NS 1910, pp. 259-60; 1922, pp. 462-63; 1923, p. 277. A picture of fetters is found in Pio Ciprotti, Conoscere Pompei (Rome, 1959), p. 142. Cf. p. 15, fig. 8.

[2]Cf. Appian, Bella Civilia 1. 49. 2.

[3]Strabo, 8. 6. 23; Dio Cassius 53. 27; Suet., Divus Augustus 25; ILS. 5320, 6087.

[4]Suet., Nero 15.

[5]Dio Cassius 53. 27; 54. 23; Appian, Bella Civilia 1. 33; Pliny, Epistulae 3. 14.

[6]Diodorus 20. 36. 3; Plutarch, Pompey 13. 7; Livy 9. 46. 10-11; Dio Cassius 71, 73.

[7]Cf. Martial 10. 27; 11. 12. [8]Suet., Divus Augustus 74.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

scorned so thoroughly even by the aristocrats in the provinces and the Italian municipalities, where they might even receive considerable honors.[1] As we shall see in the following chapters, Pompeii provides us with a picture of this more favorable treatment of freedmen. In the early Empire, Italians of the freedman as well as freeborn classes, since they were Roman citizens, were above the conquered peoples of the provinces. Italian citizens, even though they might be of servile origin, were not subject to the poll-tax and the land-tax to which the provinces were subject.

So we see that freedmen were set apart from freeborn Romans as an inferior class, and the customs, practices, attitudes, feelings and laws of Roman society bore witness to that. The fact that freedmen might have certain advantages over provincials does not really change the situation. The provincials had been conquered and were really subject peoples, and to that extent were below freedmen, who had been in good part liberated from subjection to their former masters. But more particularly Italian freedmen were closer to Rome and Roman culture, so their superiority over provincials was superiority, in part at least, by association as well as by citizenship, in spite of the fact that it was inferior citizenship. The fact remains that compared with the freeborn Roman the freedman was lower on the social ladder, and though ingenui of the lower classes might associate freely with freedmen, these ingenui by virtue of their occupations and low class were often themselves despised, but to a lesser degree, by the aristocratic Romans. The

---

[1] ILS. 1678, 6295, 6915; CIL. 2. 1944; 3. 1079; 14. 415. Cf. Duff, pp. 69-70.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

freedmen were therefore the lowest of the low, always excepting the slaves themselves.

Relationship to Other Freedmen

So far in our treatment the freedmen have been grouped together in one general class, but there were really three classes of freedmen: Roman citizens, Latini and dediticii.[1] The freedman of a Roman citizen ordinarily became a Roman citizen, the freedman of a man with Latin rights received Latin rights himself, and if the patron was a foreigner the freedman would have that status. But even this is a generalization that did not apply to all freedmen, since for one reason or another some freedmen of Roman citizens might not be considered good candidates for Roman citizenship.

Dediticii

By the Lex Aelia Sentia of A.D. 4 Augustus decreed that any freedmen who had been condemned for crime when they were slaves, or who had been punished by fetters or by transfer from domestic work to that of the mill or the country, were to be consigned to a special class of freedmen, that of the dediticii, the lowest of all freedmen.[2] They had no rights of commercii or conubii, nor rights of bequest or inheritance,[3] and they were not permitted to live within one hundred miles of Rome on pain of irreversible return to slavery.[4] Apparently freedmen of this

---

[1]Gaius 1. 12; Just., Inst. 1. 15. 3.

[2]Just., Inst. 1. 5. 3; Gaius 1. 12-15, 25-27; 3. 74-76.

[3]Gaius 1. 25.

[4]Gaius 1. 27.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

type were never very numerous.

Latini Iuniani

A somewhat higher class of freedmen, though below the regular libertinus, was that of the Latini Iuniani,[1] with the partial Latin franchise in accordance with the Lex Iunia of about 17 B.C.[2] This class was reserved for those freedmen who were not yet deemed ready for complete Roman citizenship, though civic rights were granted to them and the possibility of obtaining citizenship was open to them. Before 17 B.C. freedmen manumitted informally did not receive citizenship and were legally still slaves, although such manumission could not ordinarily be easily annulled by their patrons. The Lex Iunia gave official recognition to their liberty and thus re-enslavement of those informally manumitted, which before was unusual due to custom, was now prohibited by law.

By the Lex Aelia Sentia of A.D. 4 the manumission of slaves of under thirty years provided Latin rights, except that those specially approved by the Manumission Council received Roman citizenship.[3]

The Latini Iuniani could buy and sell property and function as witnesses of wills, but not make their own wills (except fideicommissary wills) or receive bequests.[4] They could exercise the tutela but not the privilege of succession connected with the tutela, nor could they appoint tutores by will. The patron inherited the entire estate on the death of a Latin freedman, and the patronage of Latin

---

[1]Gaius 3. 56.

[2]On the date see Duff, pp. 75, 210 ff.

[3]Gaius 1. 18.

[4]Gaius 1. 23-24; 2. 275.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

freedmen could be transferred (by gift, sale, or will) to any Roman citizen.[1]

Latin freedmen might advance to Roman citizenship by testimonials from their patrons (if the freedmen were not under thirty years of age), often by a repetition of the manumission ceremony,[2] or by military, social, or economic services for the state that gave evidence of fitness for Roman citizenship.[3] If a Roman wife bore a child to a Latin freedman (who prior to A.D. 75 had been freed before the age of thirty, after A.D. 75 also one informally freed), the child immediately became a Roman and the father received the franchise when the child became one year old. If the wife was a Latin citizen all three became Roman citizens when the child reached his first birthday.[4]

Ius Anuli Aurei

To certain freedmen the Emperor gave the right to wear the golden ring (ius anuli aurei). This class was above the ordinary Roman freedmen. Such freedmen were still freedmen of their former masters but were considered to have been freeborn,[5] so they were eligible for the offices the freeborn could hold: Roman priesthoods, municipal offices, the legions, or the praetorian guard.[6] The relationship to patrons remained as before.[7] The ius anuli aurei was granted to considerable

---

[1]Gaius 3. 56. [2]Pliny, Epist. 7. 16; 10. 5, 104-105.

[3]Gaius 1. 33-34; Suet., Divus Claudius 19. [4]Gaius 1. 29.

[5]Dio Cassius 48. 45; Dig. 40. 10. 6. Cf. 27. 1. 44. 3; 38. 2. 3. pr.

[6]Dig. 2. 4. 10. 3. [7]Dig. 2. 4. 10; 38. 2. 3. pr.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

numbers of freedmen in the first two centuries.[1]

Restitutio Natalium

If a man had been illegally enslaved, legal recognition of the wrong might take place in restitutio natalium (restoration of birth).[2] For other slaves also fictitious ceremonies might seek to remove the stigma and penalties of servile birth by providing ingenuitas.[3] For example, Nero rewarded the actor Paris with free birth.[4] Such a "restoration" was at least sometimes an imperial act and seems to have been a rare occurrence.

The Legal Status of Freedmen as Citizens

Freedmen were generally assigned to the urban tribes. They were prevented from holding office in the Italian municipalities and Roman colonies (except those of Caesar) as they were in Rome itself, though it seems that the reason is not to be found in any formal law barring them from that but in mos.[5] Sons of freedmen were apparently admitted to office increasingly in the Republic.[6] Freedmen could vote, and at Pompeii we find many notices in which freedmen recommended candidates for office, but they were essentially second-class citizens. When a freedman had reached a certain point, political advancement for him had

---

[1]Pliny, N.H. 33. 32-33; ILS. 1899.

[2]Cf. Pliny, Epist. 6. 25; Suetonius, Divus Augustus 32; Tiberius 8; Codex Theodosianus 6. 4. 16.

[3]Suet., Divus Augustus 74.

[4]Tacitus, Ann. 13. 27; Cf. Dig. 12. 4. 3. 5. [5]Cf. Livy 4. 3. 7.

[6]Livy 9. 46. 1, 3, 10 ff.; Diodorus 20. 36. 3; Suet., Divus Claudius 24; Plutarch, Pompey 13. 7; Appian, Bella Civilia 1. 33.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

really come to an end, and the most he could do beyond that was to seek further benefits for his sons. If the freedman had prospered financially, as many did, some of his wealth could be put to good use to insure various benefits for his son that the father could never have for himself. Thus in Pompeii N. Popidius Ampliatus rebuilt the Temple of Isis in the name of his son who was then elected to the city council.[1] Expenditures by freedmen for the public benefit often brought to the freedman himself special honors that were essentially consolation prizes because the freedman was kept from other more desirable honors and offices. In Pompeii, as we shall see in the following chapters, the freedmen were often found among the Augustales or the ministri Augusti and were sometimes given the privilege of sitting on seats of double width at the theater or amphitheater as though they were city officials. The honors the freedmen received were better than nothing, and were in fact often honors that the freedmen were proud of. Such honors might often be an indication of true esteem as well as gratitude on the part of a town or some special group in the town. Yet the very nature of the honor frequently emphasized the low station that resulted from servile origin.

The Identification of Freedmen

Sometimes in an inscription the word libertus, or an abbreviation of that word, is added to the name of a man to show that he was a freedman: M. AFILLIVS. M. L. PRIMOGENES.[2] That is the most certain means

---

[1] See below, p. 45.

[2] CIL. 10. 1047.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of identification of freedmen. But since that evidence is often lacking we must then look for other clues.

A freedman did not record the name of his tribe on an inscription, and, since legally his patron took the place of his father, he was supposed to inscribe his patron's name instead of his father's name. Yet a patron's name might be forgotten on inscriptions as conveniently and easily as the word libertus or its abbreviation.

The names of individuals are often of great value in identifying them as freedmen. The freed slave usually took his patron's nomen and praenomen and used his own servile name as his cognomen.[1] A freedwoman ordinarily added the nomen of her patron to the name she had had as a slave. Thus if a man's cognomen is servile we may suspect servile descent. For examples we may note cognomina listed as servile by Duff: Agilis, Amandus, Amatus, Apparatus, Auctus, Communis, Dama, Donatus, Eros, Faustus, Felix, Fortunatus, Ianuaris, Lascivus, Marinus, Optatus, Possessor, Primativus, Primigenius, Primio, Restitutus, Rufio, Salvius, Successus, Vitalis, and Vividus.[2] Cognomina of Eastern origin, especially from Greece, indicate a possibility of freedman status. So Duff says that in Rome seventy percent of the slaves had Greek names, and that there were many more freedmen and descendants of freedmen with Greek names in Rome than foreigners from the East with Greek names, and of this class of freedmen and their descendants about twice as many were freedmen as

---

[1]Some exceptions are mentioned in Duff, pp. 52-54. Instances of them have not been noted in Pompeii.

[2]Duff, pp. 56, 110.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

descendants of freedmen.[1] Yet we must remember that a naturalized foreigner also ordinarily adopted the nomen and praenomen of the one to whom he owed his citizenship and kept his old name as cognomen. Thus an Eastern cognomen could in certain individuals be due to that factor.[2] Furthermore, there were many Greeks in Campania and thus it is somewhat more likely that others besides freedmen had Greek cognomina there than was the case in Rome. Freedmen with Latin cognomina were liable to have cognomina more common to slaves than to freeborn Romans. Merchants often gave their slaves names suggestive of luck, success or profit.[3]

In spite of this, the cognomen alone is never conclusive proof of freedman status, since sons of freedmen, or even freeborn Romans, might have servile names. We may illustrate this with the cognomen Felix, which is commonly regarded as servile.[4] We find that it appears not only among men of servile origin, but also among freeborn men. Because they had this cognomen Mary Gordon thinks it is likely that the two Pompeians T. Terentius Felix Maior and Julia Felix were freedmen.[5] Yet Felix Maior was an aedile at Pompeii and the name of his father appears on the inscription with his name,[6] so we must regard him as freeborn, and the mention of the father of Julia Felix on her inscription compels the same conclusion in her case.[7] Other inscriptions at Pompeii show

---

[1]Duff, pp. 56, 110, 112. Cf. Lily Ross Taylor, AJPh, 82 (1961), 126-27.

[2]See James C. Egbert, Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions (New York, 1896), p. 102.

[3]See Mary Gordon, "The Freedman's Son in Municipal Life," Journal of Roman Studies, 21 (1931), 76.

[4]Duff, p. 110.

[5]Gordon, JRS, 17 (1927), 179.

[6]CIL. 10. 1019.

[7]CIL. 4. 1136.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

that A. Vettius Felix was a candidate for the office of aedile[1] and that A. Vettius Caprasius Felix ran for the office of duovir.[2] These men too must have been freeborn.

Sometimes only a single name is given for an individual, in which case we do not know whether he was a slave, a freedman, or a freeborn man. On the other hand, freedmen are at times found with names that are commonly considered to be almost entirely ingenuous, and certain names can be found regularly among both freedmen and freeborn men.

Occasionally we find a number of people with servile cognomina who have the same nomen and praenomen. The possession of the same nomen and praenomen by some who were surely or probably freedmen indicates a likelihood that others who have the nomen and praenomen were freedmen.[3] In fact, except for freedmen or naturalized foreigners, the same nomen and praenomen are not liable to be found except in the case of a man and one son. In a freeborn Roman family the cognomen of sons is liable to be the same as that of the father, since it was an indication of the family and sometimes also a mark of distinction.[4] Thus a variety of cognomina with the same praenomen and nomen is often indicative of servile status, and if those cognomina are servile the probability is greater still. In the following chapters we shall see instances of this. For example two Lucii Ceii were definitely freedmen and another was a minister of Augustus and probably a freedman. There were at least four other Lucii Caecilii in Pompeii besides Felix and Iucundus. As we shall

---

[1] CIL. 4. 7167. [2] CIL. 4. 204-5.

[3] Cf. Taylor, AJPh, 82 (1961), 123. [4] Egbert, p. 93.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

see, the evidence indicates that these four were probably freedmen of Iucundus. In the case of Iucundus, the son of Felix, the reason for his name seems clear. That one son should have had the same praenomen as the father is not surprising. That he should have had a different cognomen is to be explained by an attempt of the father to put away any indication that the son had servile ancestry.

A name derived from the emperor indicates that its possessor was probably a freedman. The combination of a servile cognomen with imperial nomen and praenomen is especially convincing. Yet a naturalized foreigner who owed his citizenship to the emperor took his name in the same way. So a king of Britain bore the name Ti. Claudius Cogidubnus.[1] The son of a freedman or another freeborn man could also have such a name, as is seen in the case of Ti. Claudius Verus, who was a candidate for the office of duovir in Pompeii.[2]

A freedman sometimes had a second cognomen ending in -anus, taken from a master to whom he had belonged before the man who freed him, or from a slave for whom he had been an under-slave (vicarius).

A freedman of some importance or prominence might have had a fourth name which he took for added respectability, or, as in the case of an actor, for an advertisement.

Nomina such as Fabricius or Fullonius that are formed from names of towns or trades may indicate that their possessors or their ancestors were formerly slaves of municipia or collegia.

---

[1] CIL. 7. 11.

[2] CIL. 4. 367. 3820.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

There are still other clues that sometimes help to identify freedmen. Certain priesthoods, as we shall see in the following chapter, either were made up in large part of slaves or freedmen or contained many freedmen. Freedmen were often granted honorary memberships in municipal senates as a substitute for the office which freedmen were not permitted to hold. Freedman parents might give large sums of money to gain for their sons honors that were denied to freedmen themselves, as we noted above.

An accumulation of such clues for any particular individual increases the probability of his being a freedman, but we must remember that some of these clues might point to descendents of freedmen as well as to freedmen themselves. Often conclusive identification of an individual as a freedman is impossible.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER II

THE FREEDMAN IN RELIGION[1]

Freedmen played a significant role in the religious life of Pompeii. In some cases we know that they were officially connected with the worship in temples or other public buildings. At times we can see that freedmen were members of religious colleges. Now and then we get a glimpse of the private religious practices of freedmen.

Sometimes the freedmen are specifically identified as such. In other instances their names or other evidence help to identify them as such. It is our aim in this chapter to learn as much as we can about the various connections of freedmen with religion in Pompeii.

Worship in Temples

Temple of Apollo

A number of inscriptions have been found in Pompeii which indicate that there was a cult of Mercury and Maia in the city. These inscriptions, none of which were found in their original locations, were dedications attached originally to votive offerings in the Temple of Apollo.[2] A votive offering was made each year by a college of priests referred to in the inscriptions as *ministri*. The word *minister* indicates that

---

[1]See Appendix A, a table which lists the freedmen whose religious associations are known.

[2]*CIL*. 10, p. 109; August Mau, *Pompeii: Its Life and Art*, trans. Francis W. Kelsey (New York, 1904), p. 89.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

they belonged to a low order of priesthood. Mommsen and Mau believe that these inscriptions (CIL. 10. 884-923) continue down at least to A.D. 40. Inscription number 904 can definitely be dated to the year A.D. 40: ...S. ADEPTUS/ ...SIUS. FELICIO/ c. caesare. M. EPIDIO. FLACCo/ QVINQ. M. HOLCONIO. MACRO/ PRAEF. I. D. L. LICINIO. C. ADIO/ VIR. V. A. S. P. PROC. Another is from the year 14 B.C., so there is evidence for the existence of this priesthood for at least fifty-four years.[1]

It has been generally believed that the priests of this college were slaves and freedmen,[2] and there seems to be good reason to believe that this was the case.

The minister who set up the inscription and votive offering in 14 B.C. which was mentioned above was M. Sittius Serapa, who is specifically called a freedman there: M. SITTIVS. M. L/ SERAPA/ MERC. MAIAE/ SACRVM. EX. D. D/ IVSSV/ P. ROGI. P. F. VARI/ M. MELSONi F. ITER/ D. V. I. d/ N. PACCI. N. F. ChILONIS/ M. NINNI. M. F. POLLion/ D. V. V. A. S. P. P./ M. CRASSO. CN. LENTVLO (cos).[3]

A similar inscription from the same year, but partially missing, was set up by M. Sittius Papia, also a freedman and a minister of Mercury and Maia.[4] P. Sittius Suneros and Niger are likewise identified as freedmen in an inscription.[5] Both of these were ministers of Mercury

---

[1]CIL. 10. 886; Gertrude Grether, "Pompeian Ministri," Classical Philology, 27 (1932), 59.

[2]Cf. Theodore Mommsen, CIL. 10, p. 109, Mau, p. 89, Grether, p. 59, Mary Gordon, "The 'Ordo' of Pompeii," Journal of Roman Studies, 17 (1927), 179, Giovanni O. Onorato, Iscrizioni Pompeiane: La Vita Pubblica (1st ed.; Florence), pp. 146-47.

[3]CIL. 10. 886. [4]CIL. 10. 885. [5]NS. 1895, p. 215.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and Maia. Another inscription simply describes P. Stallius Agatho as a minister.[1] Thus of the five men listed in these inscriptions as priests of Mercury and Maia, four are designated as freedmen. The fifth minister, P. Stallius Agatho, probably was a freedman also. Agatho seems to be a Greek cognomen. Besides this, another Publius Sittius was an Augustalis and may have been a freedman. Since the other priests of this college seem all to have been slaves or freedmen, that gives additional support for that identification for Agatho too.

Some time after 14 B.C. the worship of the emperor was added and the priests were called Ministri Augusti Mercuri Maiae.[2] An inscription dated somewhere between 14 B.C. and 2 B.C. lists as priests of Augustus, Mercury and Maia two slaves and a Roman citizen with the name Messius Arrius Inventus.[3] The fact that so many Arrii, including another Messius Arrius, were freedmen or probable freedmen would suggest that that may have been true of Inventus too. As we note below, Messius Arrius Silenus and a Quintus Arrius were also ministers of Augustus. The freedman M. Arrius Diomedes was a magistrate of the suburb Pagus Augustus Felix. Arrius Hermes may have been a freedman.[4] C. Arrius

---

[1] CIL. 10. 884. See Mommsen's discussion, CIL. 10, p. 109.

[2] Grether, pp. 59-65, ably discusses the evidence for interpreting the inscriptions which we are about to consider as indicating a development from the worship of Mercury to the worship of the emperor. In most of these inscriptions the name of Augustus is abbreviated, but in CIL. 10. 892 we find the full word "Augusti," so the proper meaning of the abbreviation is made plain: MESSIVS. ARRIVS/ SILENVS/ M. DECIDIVS. M. M. L/ⅢAVSTVS. VNG/ MIN. AVGVSTI/ M. NVMISTRIO. FRONTONE/ Q. COTRIO. Q. F. D. V. I. D./ M. SERVILIO . L. AELIO/ LAMIA. COS. Cf. Mau, p. 89, Onorato, p. 147.

[3] CIL. 10. 888.

[4] N.S. 1946, p. 129. The fact that this was found on the tomb of M. Arrius Diomedes may suggest some connection, since the two had the same nomen.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Primus was an Augustalis.

No later than 2 B.C. we find that the names of Mercury and Maia were omitted from the inscriptions and the priests were called simply ministri Augusti. Men with the following three-fold Roman names are identified in the inscriptions in that way: A. Arellius Graecus,[1] Q. Arrius Hieronymus,[2] Messius Arrius Silenus,[3] L. Caecilius Felix,[4] M. Decidius [F]austus,[5] Q. Lollius Felix,[6] T. Mescinius Amphio, N. Popidius Moschus and A. Veius Phylax.[7] Of these M. Decidius Faustus is specifically called a freedman. T. Mescinius Amphio has a Greek cognomen and Mescinia Veneria is designated as a freedwoman on an inscription found on a tomb outside Porta Marina showing that another person with this nomen was of servile origin.[8] It seems likely that these were all freedmen. The cognomen of A. Arellius Graecus, joined to his Roman nomen and praenomen, suggests that he may have been a freedman. Another Arellius, with the servile cognomen Successus, but with a different praenomen, a wine producer whom we consider in the following chapter, may have been a freedman. Messius Arrius Silenus, as we noted above, shared nomen and praenomen with another man who seems to have been a freedman and shared his nomen with still more freedmen or probable freedmen. Besides L. Caecilius Felix, whose cognomen is servile, we are concerned with four other Lucii Caecilii in this study: a wine producer and an estate manager whom we will treat in the next

---

[1] CIL. 10. 901-2. [2] CIL. 10. 891. [3] CIL. 10. 892.

[4] CIL. 10. 891. [5] CIL. 10. 892. [6] CIL. 10. 891.

[7] CIL. 10. 890, for the last three in this list. [8] CIL. 10. 1054.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

chapter, a man who was probably a minister of Augustus, and one who was connected with the Temple of Isis. All of these were probably freedmen of Lucius Caecilius. Not only is the cognomen of Q. Lollius Felix servile, but Lollia Successa, a shop-keeper whom we encounter in the next chapter, was probably a freedwoman. The cognomen Moschus suggests the possibility of Eastern origin, and we see that two other Numerii Popidii were probably ministers of Augustus.[1] Phylax is a Greek cognomen, and it may indicate that A. Veius Phylax was a guard or guardian of some kind in a former servile condition. Below we note an A. Veius Atticus who was an Augustalis and probably a freedman.

A number of other men, known from inscriptions of the same type, are for that reason identified by Mommsen as ministers of Augustus, and Mau, Mary Gordon, and Gertrude Grether seem to agree with that identification.[2] Among them are Cn. Alleius M..., L. Ceius Doryp(horus),[3] M. Helvius Iustus, L. Numisius Felicio,[4] Adeptus and Felicio.[5] The presence of nomina, of which the final letters remain in the inscription, indicate that Adeptus and Felicio were free citizens rather than slaves. The Greek cognomen Doryphorus, joined to the Roman nomen and praenomen, is suggestive of possible freedman status, and two other Lucii Ceii are

---

[1] As noted below, it is possible that one of these, of whose cognomen only the initial letter "M" remains in CIL. 10. 922, may actually have been Moschus himself.

[2] CIL. 10, p. 109. CIL. 10. 904, which is dated from the year A.D. 40, is one of those with which we are concerned here. For the other references, see p. 2, n. 4.

[3] CIL. 10. 909, for this and the preceding name.

[4] CIL. 10. 900, for this and the preceding name.

[5] CIL. 10. 904, for this and the preceding name.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

called freedmen in the inscriptions: the banker Serapio whom we consider in the following chapter, and Lucifer.[1] Not only is Felicio a servile cognomen, but two others with the same praenomen and nomen were ministers of Fortuna Augusta, as we see below. Another inscription, found after the publication of Mommsen's list in the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, allows us to add the name of the imperal freedman Gratus to the list.[2]

There are other inscriptions that list men that Mommsen feels may have been ministers of Augustus because the inscriptions seem to be the same kind, but he is not completely sure that they belong there since similar inscriptions give the names of the ministers of Fortuna Augusta and the pagus officials of Augustus.[3] Roman citizens found in those inscriptions are L. Caecilius Cer...,[4] C. Cor..., Q. Loll...,[5] N. Popidius Amp(liatus?)[6] and N. Popidius M....[7] If they were ministers of Augustus they were almost certainly freedmen. If they were ministers of Fortuna Augusta or pagus officials of Augustus that would also suggest some probability that they might have been freedmen. Ampliatus is considered servile. Furthermore, we noted above that the Lucii Caecillii and the Numerii Popidii were probably freedmen. It is possible that the present

---

[1] CIL. 10. 1040; Della Corte, Case, p. 101, n. 2.

[2] NS. 1890, p. 44; ILS. 6387.

[3] CIL. 10. p. 109.

[4] CIL. 10. 921.

[5] CIL. 10. 919, for this and the preceding name.

[6] CIL. 10. 921. Cf. Gordon, JRS, 17 (1927), 180, for the expansion of the cognomen and the statement that it is considered servile.

[7] CIL. 10. 922.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

N. Popidius M... was the same person as the N. Popidius Moschus mentioned earlier, though without more evidence we cannot assume that. Moschus was a priest of Augustus, and this man might have been also. We see, then, that at least three of these five men were very likely freedmen.

Of the six men clearly designated as freedmen in the inscriptions considered thus far in this chapter (M. Decidius Faustus, M. Sittius Papia, M. Sittius Serapa, P. Sittius Suneros, Gratus and Niger), all but one were definitely priests of Augustus, some in the early development of the college. Gratus could have been a priest of some other order. Of the twenty-one other men who were or may have been priests of this college, the evidence shows that most of them were probably freedmen. In addition the inscriptions list the names of twenty-five ministers of Augustus who were slaves[1] and four more slaves who may have been ministers of Augustus.[2] Thus the evidence seems to support the view that the priests of Augustus were either slaves or freedmen.

We ought not to be surprised to find the association of Augustus with the Temple of Apollo. Augustus chose Apollo as his tutelary divinity, attributing to him his victory at Actium. The Julian family was thought to have descended from Venus, who was also worshipped in the Temple of Apollo.[3] Augustus himself was believed to be the incarnation

---

[1] CIL. 10. 887. 888, 890, 895, 899, 900, 901, 902, 907, 908, 910.

[2] CIL. 10. 906. The inscription is fragmentary and does not call them priests of Augustus.

[3] The assigning of the deities mentioned here to the Temple of Apollo depends not only on the inscriptions cited, but also the remains found there, which are reported by Mau, pp. 86-90.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of Mercury. It is difficult to imagine a more appropriate center than this temple for the worship of the emperor.

Temple of Fortuna Augusta

An inscription informs us that this temple was devoted to Fortuna Augusta.[1] It seems most reasonable to suppose that the Fortuna Augusta of this temple was the goddess who guarded the fortunes of Augustus and protected the imperial family, or perhaps simply a personification of the fortune of the imperial family.

A college of priests apparently made up of four slaves or freedmen, called Ministri Fortunae Augustae, functioned as the official guardian of the worship of Fortuna Augusta. Mommsen and Mau say that these priests were all slaves or freedmen, and the evidence seems to support that statement.[2] Each year the college seems to have set up a small statue in which an inscription was placed. Only five inscriptions mention these ministers,[3] who were all slaves except for those considered in the treatment below. An inscription from the year A.D. 3 contains the names of the first priests of Fortuna Augusta, all slaves.[4] Other inscriptions come from as late as A.D. 56.[5]

---

[1] CIL. 10. 820.

[2] Mommsen in CIL. 10, p. 100, and Mau, p. 132.

[3] CIL. 10. 824-28.

[4] CIL. 10. 824. Mau, p. 132, dates the inscription 3 B.C., but P. Silius and L. Volusius Saturninus were consules suffecti in the year A.D. 3, as we see from the Fasti Consulares.

[5] CIL. 10. 826.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The following Roman citizens were ministers of Fortuna Augusta: L. Melissaeus Plocamus, L. Numisius Optatus, L. Numisius Primus,[1] Manius Salárius Crocus,[2] L. Statius Faustus,[3] Naevius Ph... and M. Naevius.[4] Plocamus is a Greek cognomen, and we find a freedwoman with the nomen Melissaea.[5] We have noted a Lucius Numisius who was a minister of Augustus and apparently a freedman, and Optatus and Primus were often found among slaves. The nomen Salárius may give some hint that its possessor had servile origins connected with the salt business, especially since Crocus is a Greek cognomen.[6] Not only is Faustus a servile cognomen, but the nomen Statius belonged to two other freedmen, one of whom we discuss in connection with the Augustales and another who also has the praenomen Lucius.[7] The fact that two priests of Fortuna Augusta shared the nomen Naevius suggests the possibility that the missing praenomen of the one was also Marcus and that they were freedmen.

Thus there is in the names and their associations strong evidence in support of identifying as freedmen those priests of Fortuna Augusta who had three-fold Roman names. The fact that six of the priests of Fortuna Augusta, all of the names not listed above, were slaves gives further support to the view that the priests of this college were either slaves or freedmen.[8]

---

[1] CIL. 10. 827 for this and the preceding two. [2] CIL. 10. 826.

[3] CIL. 10. 825. [4] CIL. 10. 828, for this and the preceding name.

[5] CIL. 10. 1010.

[6] Duff, p. 56; Taylor, AJPh, 82 (1961), 125.

[7] CIL. 4. 3990. [8] CIL. 10. 824, 826.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Temple of Isis

The worship of Isis was early associated with the mysteries and the hope of immortality that they promised, which must explain at least in part the popularity of that cult in Pompeii and the existence of the Temple of Isis there.

After the earthquake of A.D. 62 Numerius Popidius Ampliatus rebuilt the temple from the foundation in the name of his son, whom the town councillors elected to their order on account of that liberality, as we learn from an inscription found there: N. POPIDIVS. N. F. CELSINVS/ AEDEM. ISIDIS. TERRAE. MOTV. CONLAPSAM/ A FVNDAMENTO. P. S. RESTITVIT. HUNC. DECVRIONES. OB. LIBERALITATEM/ CVM. ESSET. ANNORVM. SEXS. ORDINI. SVO. GRATIS. ADLEGERVNT.[1] We can only understand this as an act of the father in behalf of his son. The father by his generosity paved the way for the son to enter public office. There would have been little reason for a freeborn man to spend so much money for something for which not only his son was eligible, but also he himself. A freedman, however, was barred from such public office, and it is not uncommon to find such a man investing large sums of money to obtain for a son what is denied to the father. Ampliatus is considered a servile name, as we saw above. We have noted in connection with the priests of Augustus another N. Popidius Ampliatus and two other Numerii Popidii who were very likely freedmen. All together the evidence heavily favors the identification

---

[1] CIL. 10. 846.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of Ampliatus as a freedman.[1]

Ampliatus, at his own expense, set up a statue of Bacchus in a niche in the outside rear wall of the temple.[2] That is fitting since Bacchus was identified with Osiris. In the stucco beside the niche two ears are molded, a symbolic indication that the god was listening to the prayers of his worshippers.[3] The names of the father, mother and son were placed in the mosaic of the floor of the Hall of Mysteries, the room behind the temple.[4]

Inside the cella in the rear stood the statues of Isis and Osiris. Just outside the cella in two large niches were statues of two other deities, very likely Anubis and Harpocrates. Harpocrates was probably worshipped also at a shrine in the east wall of the court.[5]

Two pedestals for statues stood against the west wall of the colonnade. The statue of Isis was on the right, with an inscription showing that it had been set up by L. Caecilius Phoebus.[6] We saw above that the Lucii

---

[1]V. Tran Tam Tinh, Le culte d' Isis a Pompéi (Paris, 1964), p. 41, thinks Ampliatus was an aristocrat rather than a freedman, but his conclusion assumes that the sharing of a nomen with Popidii who were aristocrats shows that Ampliatus was also an aristocrat. This reasoning fails to take into account the way in which freedmen got their names.

[2]CIL. 10. 847.

[3]Mau, pp. 175-76.

[4]CIL. 10. 848. Mau, p. 170, thinks the names are those of the mother and two sons, but it is more reasonable to believe that the name N. Popidius Ampliatus that is found there is the name of the father, as Della Corte, Case, p. 261, thinks. It is not probable that a father who sought great benefits and prestige for one son, and who thus gave him a cognomen that seeks to avoid the taint of servility, would have given his own servile cognomen to another son, nor would we ordinarily expect brothers to have the same praenomen, as we find in the two names of the males here.

[5]Mau, p. 172.

[6]CIL. 10. 849. For the details of the site see Mau, p. 176.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Caecilii were probably freedmen. The Greek cognomen Phoebus supports that assumption here. The statue on the left was Venus, who was identified with Isis.

Near the statue of Venus was a herm of C. Norbanus Sorex, who was described in the inscription as an actor and a magister of the suburb Pagus Augustus Felix: C. NORBANI/ SORICIS/ SECVNDARVM/ MAG. PAGI/ AUG. FELICIS/ SVBVRBANI/ EX. D. D/ LOC. D.[1] It is possible to interpret the inscription as naming Sorex as a dedicator of the portrait rather than the subject, but such an interpretation leaves unanswered the question as to why such prominence should be given to a dedicator in the inscription with no mention of the person to whom the dedication was made.[2] A duplicate herm was set up in the Eumachia. The fact that Sorex was an actor makes it probable that he was a freedman, as we will see in the following chapter. The magistrates of the suburb Pagus Augustus Felix were made up at least in part of freedmen. The recognition by the city council may, if the herm was one of Sorex, be a further indication that Sorex was a freedman, since the council often gave honors to deserving citizens who were not eligible for office. All together the evidence is heavily in favor of the identification of Sorex as a freedman. The placing of his bust in the temple, if that was the case, probably indicates generous support of the temple.

---

[1] CIL. 10. 814.

[2] See Onorato, pp. 120-121.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Worship in Other Public Buildings

The Macellum

There are two rooms that show that the Macellum had a specifically religious connection.[1] A chapel on the east side and a room to the left of the chapel were devoted to the imperial cult. It is impossible to determine to what college the priests here belonged. The fact that the building was used as a market might suggest that the priests were Augustales, although that can be no more than conjecture.

A room on the front of the Macellum (at the southwest corner) was too shallow to be used as a shop because of the difference in direction between the front of the Macellum and the east side of the Forum. That room was made into a shrine. Mau thinks the Street Lares may have been worshipped there.[2]

At the left of the steps on the southeast corner of the building is a small niche under which two serpents were painted, probably dedicated to the Genius Macelli, the presiding divinity of the building.

Here we have no explicit identification of particular freedmen with the building and its religion, but one can hardly doubt that freedmen were involved in the business with which the Macellum was concerned. We may be assured that as the freedmen participated in the worship of the emperors in the Temple of Apollo and the Temple of Fortuna Augusta, so too they were involved in the imperial cult in the Macellum.

---

[1]Mau, pp. 98-100, describes these rooms.

[2]Mau, pp. 100-101.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The Eumachia

An inscription found on the entablature of the portico and over the side entrance from Via dell' Abbondanza tells us that Eumachia, the patroness of the fullers, had erected the Eumachia building and dedicated it to Concordia Augusta and Pietas, thus putting it under the protection of the imperial house.[1] In a niche in the wall at the rear of the Eumachia stood a marble statue dedicated to Eumachia by the fullers.[2]

Inscriptions have been found that belong to two of the missing statues from the small niches in the front wall of the Eumachia, behind the portico.[3] The statues represented Aeneas and Romulus. The inscriptions give a short list of their great deeds. Apparently the statues were copies of a well-known series in Rome, where Augustus set up in his Forum statues of famous Roman generals with inscriptions relating the deeds which had made them famous. That was certainly in accord with the policy of Augustus and would fit in well here with the consecration of the Eumachia to Concordia Augusta and Pietas and with the encouragement of reverence for the old virtues together with the imperial family in which they were supposedly embodied.

Here, as with the Macellum, we can scarcely suppose that freedmen were not concerned in the activity of the house. On the contrary, the fullers who dedicated the statue to Eumachia their patroness, and who were engaged in the business of the Eumachia, included many freedmen,

---

[1] CIL. 10. 810. Mau, pp. 110-18, describes the building and its remains.

[2] CIL. 10. 813.

[3] CIL. 10. 808-9.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

We have thus a second large public building used for business and dedicated to the worship of the imperial family.

We have here, however, a more direct connection with a specific individual who seems to have been a freedman. There is here a duplicate of the herm of C. Norbanus Sorex which was found in the Temple of Isis. Sorex may well have given a contribution here as he probably did to the Temple of Isis.

The Large Theater

The head of a satyr projected from the keystone of the arch at the outer end of one of the passages that lead to the orchestra. This suggests the possibility that the theater was at least nominally associated with the worship of Dionysus which we find in Greek drama and in Greek theaters.[1]

We have already come into contact with one actor, the probable freedman C. Norbanus Sorex, in the Temple of Isis and the Eumachia. Other actors must have been freedmen also, as we note in the following chapter.

We may note in passing that the architect employed in the rebuilding of certain parts of the theater was a freedman, M. Artorius Primus.[2]

Thus we have seen freedmen definitely connected with the worship of three temples. Freedmen were priests connected with the worship of

---

[1]Mau, p. 142. John A. Hanson, Roman Theater-Temples (Princeton, 1959), pp. 98-99, and n. 30, thinks the theater in Pompeii may be used to show that the ludi at theaters had a religious nature. He believes that the many instances of close proximity between theaters and temples were not incidental, and regards as a meaningful example the location of the theater in Pompeii near three temples.

[2]CIL. 10. 841.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the Temple of Apollo and the Temple of Fortuna Augusta. In both cases the imperial cult was involved. In the latter temple that worship was associated with Fortuna; in the former it was associated with Mercury, Maia, Apollo and Venus. In connection with the Temple of Isis we see that a freedman rebuilt the temple and that several inscriptions connect his family with the worship of the deities there--Isis, Osiris, Bacchus, and Venus. One who was probably a freedman set up a statue of Isis there. Another probable freedman, C. Norbanus Sorex, very likely supported the temple.

In other public buildings we found some connection of freedmen with the Macellum and the Eumachia and the worship of the emperor in those places. The possible worship of Dionysus in the Large Theater provides another connection of freedmen with religion in a public building, since many actors were freedmen.

Of the six buildings we have considered four are concerned with the worship of the emperor, though not exclusively so in the temples. The connection of freedmen with the religion of the theater depends on their occupation, as is true also in connection with the Macellum and the Eumachia.

Other Public Religious Functions of Freedmen

Augustales

Our understanding of the Augustales is far from perfect. It seems that their function and their membership varied from place to place. The variety of titles makes the nature of the Augustales difficult to understand. The form Augustalis seems to have been common in the central

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and southern parts of Italy and to have stood for sevir Augustalis or magister Augustalis.[1] In her important study "'Seviri Equitum Romanorum' and Municipal 'Seviri,'" Lily Ross Taylor says:

> Side by side with these equestrian seviri in Mediolanum and doubtless in other towns there were freedmen seviri who had their part in games and ceremonies. Their office gave the freedmen positions of dignity and importance and enabled the municipalities to benefit by gifts, games, and public buildings from the wealth of a section of the community which was denied the right of holding regular city offices. When the cult of the genius of the ruler and the imperial Lares was officially established by Augustus, freedmen officials called Augustales, organized along the lines of the old freedmen organizations of Mercuriales, began to spring up all over Italy. Where the title sevir already provided an honour for freedmen, it was natural for the seviri and the Augustales to amalgamate, and the inscriptions of Mediolanum show how the amalgamation came about in one town. In time, the freedman sevir was regularly an Augustalis also, the term sevir et Augustalis or sevir Augustalis denoting his composite office. But the freeborn equestrian seviri were not excluded from association with the new cult. Indeed, with the lack of regularity that characterizes every municipal title and institution, sometimes they are the group that acquired the title Augustalis.[2]

As time passed freeborn men seem in many towns not to have held the sevirate.[3] Duff thinks that almost all of the Augustales, seviri Augustales and magistri Augustales and most of the seviri were freedmen.[4]

At Herculaneum, very close to Pompeii, an inscription shows that a freedman by the name of M. Claudius Hymenaeus was an Augustalis.[5] Another

---

[1]Duff, p. 133.

[2]Lily Ross Taylor, "'Seviri Equitum Romanorum' and Municipal 'Seviri': A Study in Pre-Military Training among the Romans," Journal of Roman Studies, 14 (1924), 169. Cf. Lily Ross Taylor, "The Augustales, Seviri Augustales, and Seviri: A Chronological Study," Transactions of the American Philological Association, 45 (1914), 231 ff.

[3]Taylor, JRS, 14 (1924), 171. [4]Duff, p. 133. [5]CIL. 10. 1448.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Augustalis from the same city, L. Mammius Maximus,[1] who must have been very wealthy, with his own money erected a Macellum building for the city,[2] and put up statues and inscriptions in honor of the imperial family.[3] These latter inscriptions do not make mention of the fact that Maximus was an Augustalis, but at least they are an illustration of reverence for an emperor on the part of one who was an Augustalis.

A very important discovery in the recent excavations at Herculaneum is the shrine of the Augustales. An inscription found in the hall says that the first corporate banquet was given by the Augustales Proculus and Julian at the time of the formal dedication of the building.[4]

Petronius' Trimalchio has an inscription at the entrance of his dining room, dedicated to him by his steward, which calls him sevir Augustalis: "C. Pompeio Trimalchioni, seviro Augustali, Cinnamus dispensator."[5] We find similar inscriptions at Pompeii. In the house of L. Caecilius Iucundus at V. i. 26 an inscription was found dedicated to the genius of Lucius by his freedman Felix: GENIO. L. NOSTRI/ FELIX. L.[6] In the house of M. Epidius Rufus at IX. i. 20 an inscription was found dedicated to the genius and lares of Marcus: GENIO. M. N̄. ET/ LARIBVS/

---

[1]CIL. 10. 1452. [2]CIL. 10. 1450. Cf. 1451.

[3]CIL. 10. 1413. 1415, 1417, 1418.

[4]Amedeo Maiuri, Herculaneum and the Villa of the Papyri (Novara, 1963), p. 13.

[5]Petronius, Satyricon 29.

[6]CIL. 10. 860. Amedio Maiuri, La Cena di Trimalchione di Petronio Arbitro (Naples, 1945), p. 157, points out the striking resemblance of this and the following inscriptions to that of Trimalchio.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

DVO, DIADVMENI/ LIBERTI.[1]

In considering the Augustales at Pompeii it seems best, for lack of evidence to the contrary, to accept the assumption that the Augustales were officials who functioned in emperor worship.[2] The question that concerns us is the extent to which the Augustales at Pompeii were freedmen.

In the necropolis of Via Nuceria is the tomb of the Augustalis P. Vesovius Phileros, who is called a freedman in the inscription.[3] In another inscription found on the tomb, Phileros calls down the curses of the Penates and Inferi on a friend who accused him falsely.[4] From another tomb an inscription found in 1858 outside the Nucerian Gate in the direction of Scafati tells us that the Augustalis M. Statius Suavis was a freedman.[5]

An inscription on a small marble tombstone discovered in 1928 shows us that C. Arrius Primus was an Augustalis.[6] In this chapter and the next we find two Arrii who are clearly identified as freedmen in the inscriptions and four others besides Primus who were probably freedmen. We are not sure that any of them had the same praenomen as Primus, since we do not know the praenomen of one of them. Primus is a name frequently

---

[1] CIL. 10. 861.

[2] Cf. Mau, p. 100; Duff, p. 133.

[3] Matteo Della Corte, "Notebook," (unpublished inscriptions from the Street of Tombs outside Porta Nuceria, 1952-56), p. 67, tomb 21 (1, a).

[4] Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 67, tomb 21 (2). Cf. Amedeo Maiuri, Pompeii, trans. V. Priestly (7th ed.; Rome, 1954), p. 87.

[5] CIL. 10. 1066.

[6] NS. 1929, p. 188.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

found among slaves.[1] There is a very definite possibility that C. Arrius Primus was a freedman.

In the street of tombs outside the Herculanean Gate an inscription on a tomb tells us that because of his generosity the city council granted the honor of a seat of double width to the Augustalis C. Calventius Quietus.[2] Sometimes freedmen gave large gifts for one cause or another in order to gain honors. The honor of the bisellium was sometimes granted to freedmen who were not eligible for membership in the city council. Thus the generosity of Quietus and the honor given him by the city council give him the appearance of a freedman. A Calventius Quietus was a candidate for the office of duovir, but he seems not to have been the same person as our Augustalis.[3]

Near the Herculanean Gate is the tomb of M. Cerrinius Restitutus, with a small altar in front. On the tomb and the altar were found almost identical inscriptions which tell us that Restitutus was an Augustalis and that a place of burial was granted to him by the city council.[4] Restitutus is a servile cognomen. Another Marcus Cerrinius, with the servile cognomen Euphrates, was a freedman.[5] In this case also the city council granted an honor as a reward, probably for a freedman's generosity.

The second tomb beyond that of C. Calventius Quietus is that of the freedwoman Naevoleia Tyche. An inscription on the tomb says that

---

[1] Taylor, AJPh, 82 (1961), p. 125. [2] CIL. 10. 1026.

[3] CIL. 4. 7604. See the note with this inscription.

[4] CIL. 10. 994-95. [5] CIL. 4. 3340. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

she built the tomb for herself and for C. Munatius Faustus, an Augustalis to whom the city council granted a seat of double width because of his distinguished services.[1] An inscription from the recently excavated and still unpublished necropolis outside the Nucerian Gate shows that she was the wife of Faustus and that he also built a tomb for himself and for her.[2] It would be too much of a coincidence to believe that we have here two different people by the name of C. Munatius Faustus. Not only does each inscription say that Faustus was an Augustalis and a paganus, but on his tomb Naevoleia Tyche is called his wife and on the tomb of Tyche that relationship, though not expressed, is almost certainly to be understood. For some reason husband and wife each built a tomb. This duplication poses an interesting question which we are not able to answer with the present state of the evidence. Perhaps the tombs were built before their marriage took place, and afterward each included the other on his tomb.

On the tomb of Tyche is a relief of a ship sailing into port. Mau interprets this as a symbol of a soul entering its rest in death,[3] and that is certainly a possibility, but it is also possible that there is a suggestion here of the source of the wealth of Tyche. When Trimalchio speaks of the ships to be carved on his tomb, his intent seems to be to make a display of his wealth.[4]

---

[1] CIL. 10. 1030.

[2] Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 77, tomb 30. Cf. p. 80, tomb 30.

[3] Mau, p. 423.

[4] Petronius, Satyricon 71. Cf. Maiuri, Cena, p. 211, where this interpretation of the tomb of Tyche is mentioned. Since another tomb was built by Faustus, it would seem that any reference to source of income that might be found on the tomb of Tyche must be understood of her rather than her husband.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The cognomen Faustus is servile, and the gift of the seat of double width as a result of his services suggests a typical honor given to a freedman in place of the office a freeman might hold. The fact that he was the husband of a freedwoman might be significant. Furthermore, the inscription also calls Faustus a paganus. The pagani, pagus officials, were apparently at least in part freedmen, appointed for religious functions, as we will see below. Thus it seems probable that Faustus was a freedman.

An inscription found on a cippus outside Porta Marina tells us that C. Novellius Natalis was a magister of the Augustales.[1] The Augustales seem to have had organizations similar to other colleges.[2] Duff thinks the magister Augustalis was very likely the magister Larum Augustorum, similar to the Roman magister vici, and that his concern was with the worship of the Lares of the imperial house.[3] If that is right it would suggest the possibility of freedman status for Natalis.

An inscription found on the Street of Tombs outside the Herculanean Gate gives us the name of another Augustalis, P. Sittius Diophantus.[4] We noted above three Sittii who were priests of Mercury and Maia who were sure freedmen, including one with the praenomen Publius. The cognomen Diophantus seems to come from a Greek origin. It would appear, then, that we have another freedman here.

We learn from a graffito found on the west side of the Palaestra that a physician who cared for youths injured there was an Augustalis.

---

[1] CIL. 10. 1055

[2] Cf. Dill, p. 217.

[3] Duff, p. 133 and n. 4.

[4] CIL. 10. 1034.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Although the poor state of preservation of the inscription prevents accurate determination of the name, it seems to have been P. Terentius Celadus.[1] In the following chapter we encounter two other Terentii who were probably freedmen, but they had different praenomina. Celadus is a Greek cognomen; if that is the correct restoration of the name it would indicate a possibility of freedman status. The fact that most physicians came from the class of slaves and freedmen gives us further reason to believe that this Augustalis was very likely a freedman.

An edictum found on the front of the large house at I. ix. 13 tells us that the Augustalis L. Valerius Primus furnished gladiators for a show.[2] In the following chapter we encounter three Marci Valerii who were probably freedmen. As we saw in the first chapter, the cognomen Primus was common among slaves. We learn from an edictum found outside the Nucerian Gate that the freedman Niger also provided gladiators for a show.[3] One wonders whether furnishing the gladiators had anything to do with an effort to gain distinction in a way open to freedmen. At the least we gain a strong suspicion that Primus was a freedman.

An inscription found on the large tomb of A. Veius Atticus in the necropolis outside the Nucerian Gate shows that Atticus was an Augustalis.[4]

---

[1] CIL. 4. 8810 and NS. 1939. p. 304, n. 399 give the inscription:

AVC PIER CI[illegible]DVS
PAPIRI AMANDV[illegible]VM
MEDICAVIT

In the notes in both of those places Della Corte suggests that the name of the physician is Pier(us) C[ela?]dus or C[lau]dus. Later, apparently after further study of the inscription, Della Corte, in Case, p. 403, restores the name as P. Ter(entius) Celadus. It seems best to follow Della Corte's most recent conclusion.

[2] CIL. 4. 9962.

[3] See below, p. 95.

[4] Della Corte, "Notebook," pp. 77, 80, tomb 31.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Another Aulus Veius, a minister of Augustus, was probably a freedman, as we saw above.[1] The cognomen Atticus is Greek. This Augustalis was very likely a freedman.

One of the electoral notices painted on the outside walls of the well-known house of the Vettii located at VI. xv. 1 shows that A. Vettius Conviva was an Augustalis.[2] The servile cognomen Conviva suggests the possibility of freedman status.[3] As we note in the following chapter, the close association of Conviva with the other occupant of this house, A. Vettius Restitutus, another probable freedman, makes the probability of servile origin more sure.

Thus we have seen that two of the Augustales of Pompeii were definitely freedmen. Eight others were probably freedmen and two more were, according to individual consideration, possibly freedmen.[4] As we look

---

[1]See above, p. 39.

[2]CIL. 4. 3509. The inscription is imperfectly preserved: VETTI CO[illegible] AVGVST\I. The most reasonable interpretation is that the Vettius to whom reference is made is A. Vettius Conviva. A seal with this name is found in the house. Cf. Della Corte, Case, p. 67.

[3]See Duff, p. 56.

[4]Onorato, pp. 30-31, 117, thinks M. Stlaborius Veius Fronto was also an Augustalis. He thinks the abbreviation AVG in CIL. 10. 806 stands for Augustalis: M. STLABORIO. VEIO FRONTONI. AVG. D. V. I. D. ITERUM. QVINQ. That interpretation seems unnecessary and unlikely to me. It seems much more likely that it stands for augur, as the index of CIL. 10 takes it. Fronto held the office of duovir twice and we find that another duovir in Pompeii is identified in CIL. 10. 820, 822 as an augur. That is true also in other Italian towns. Cf. CIL. 10. 1685 from Puteoli. The function of augur could well be joined to the particular responsibilities of office, though we need not necessarily assume that those who held both positions always held them simultaneously. It is clear that the Augustales in Pompeii were not a college of such a nature as to add prestige to a duovir, especially to one who twice held the office. On the contrary, it seems clear that among the Augustales no one was separated in any meaningful way from the freedmen in that college. It is difficult to imagine why a duovir or one who might become a duovir would seek, or even accept, a position as Augustalis.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

at the whole picture our conclusion must be that Augustales in Pompeii were very likely for the most part freedmen and that the identification of an individual as an Augustalis at Pompeii indicates a probability that he was a freedman.

Magistri Vicorum

The magistri vicorum were precinct wardens who were responsible for the worship and preservation of the guardian deities of the streets and of the street crossings (Lares Compitales) in their precincts. Augustus placed an image representing the genius of Augustus between the images of the Lares Compitales, and the three images together were known then as the Lares Augusti.[1] Around 7 B.C. the magistri vicorum were apparently instituted or reorganized at Rome to superintend that worship.[2] A valuable inscription has been found at Pompeii giving the names of the magistri vici et compiti for the years 47 and 46 B.C. It shows, then, that the magistri vicorum were found there at least as early as that time.[3]

Taeggiari thinks the office of the magister vici was given to freedmen in Republican times as well as in imperial times, though she shows that the inferior ministri were often slaves, and she directs our attention to Livy's portrayal of the scorn with which an early second century

---

[1]Ovid, Fasti 5. 145; Duff, p. 131.

[2]Duff, p. 131, thinks the institution of the magistri vicorum at Rome was around 7 B.C. Dio, 55. 87, speaks of that as the arrangement in effect in 7 B.C. Suetonius, Divus Augustus 30, says that under Augustus the city was divided into regions and wards. It seems to me that their statements could be interpreted as speaking of a reorganization as well as of a new institution or a re-institution.

[3]CIL. 4. 60. Magistri vicorum in the year of the second dictatorship of Caesar are listed. This inscription was painted in small black letters on a reused stone found at the side of the entrance of a house.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Roman viewed their low position.[1] In the fragment remaining from one Roman inscription listing magistri vicorum, we read the names of twenty-two freedmen and five freeborn men.[2] Duff suggests that the office was not restricted to freedmen, but was largely reserved for them and thinks that Romans of untainted ancestry would not seek such a position which was so largely given over to freedmen. In fact he thinks that very few freeborn men closer than two or three generations from servile birth would have been willing to enter such associations, since they were eager to be associated with those of pure Roman birth.[3]

Among the magistri vicorum at Pompeii who were listed for the years 47 and 46 B.C., four are identified as freeborn, and three are identified as freedmen: M. Oppius Aes..., M. Stronnius Nic... and M. Titius Plutus.[4] In the same inscription are found the partially preserved names of five others who may have been either freeborn men or freedmen: C. Cepidius, C. Corne(lius?), Q. Pra..., P. Ro... and M. Sepulius. There were Cornelii who were freedmen or probable freedmen, but we do not know of any with the praenomen Gaius. With regard to the others there is no evidence that would indicate whether or not they were freedmen.

Three others who were ministri vicorum are M. Maro Chius, C... Primogenius[5] and Stabilio.[6] Stabilio is identified as a freedman in

---

[1]Livy 34. 7. 2; Treggiari, p. 199. [2]ILS. 6073.

[3]Duff, p. 132. [4]CIL. 4. 60.

[5]NS, 1913, p. 479, for this and the preceding name.

[6]CIL. 4. 7807. The name appears ...L. STABILIO.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the inscription. The same inscription, which is only partially preserved, shows that at least three slaves were also ministri vicorum.

In another inscription found at IX. xi. 1, we have the names of four men who may have been slaves or freedmen and who were magistri vicorum in the last years of the city: Successus, Axclepiades (for Asclepiades), Victor and Cosstas (for Constans).[1] An inscription found at II. i. 6 gives the names of three slaves who were magistri vicorum.[2]

We find, then, among the ministri and magistri vicorum four freeborn men, four who were certainly freedmen, four who were very likely either slaves or freedmen, and six who were surely slaves, as well as seven who could have been either freedmen or freeborn. It would seem unlikely that Romans of good social standing would have been found among the slaves and freedmen of the ministri vicorum. When we find the name of a Roman citizen among the magistri vicorum it seems more likely that he was a freedman than that he was freeborn.

There are considerable differences of size and character between the various shrines of the street deities.[3] Some altars are small and others are large. A small altar is sometimes found against the side of a building, with two large serpents painted on the wall near it as personifications of the genius of the place. A complete corpus of all of the shrines, including the newly excavated ones, is being prepared by David Orr at the University of Maryland.

---

[1] CIL. 4. 7855.

[2] CIL. 4. 7425. The names are Primigenius, Stalbnus, and Chius.

[3] Mau, pp. 234-35, describes remains of such shrines.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Sometimes instead of an altar there is a niche in which an offering could be placed by people passing by (as in the wall at the southeast corner of the Central Baths, where the old altar was preserved at the time the Baths were built).

Sometimes there is a large altar, and the Lares and their offerings are painted on the wall above it. This is the case on the northwest corner of Nola and Stabian streets, between the fountain and the water tower. On the wall behind the altar an altar was painted together with four worshippers in togas and a fluteplayer (very common in Roman sacrificial scenes). The two Lares, pictured as youths, were at the sides, with a drinking horn lifted high in one hand, from which a stream of wine flowed into a small pail in the other hand. The genius of the emperor is not portrayed here or in other similar paintings in Pompeii.

Magistrates of the Suburb Pagus Augustus Felix

Mau thinks the suburbs of Pompeii had three classes of officials who had religious functions only, in connection with the worship of the emperor. Thus he speaks of a director (*magister*) of the pagus, attendants (*ministri*) and pagus officials (*pagani*).[1] Boak speaks of the pagus organization, under *magistri pagi*, as common not only in Campania, but generally throughout Italy, and he agrees that the *magister pagi* exercised mainly priestly functions, but thinks that he also had a more minor role in political and administrative activities.[2] It would seem, in the

---

[1]Mau, p. 14.

[2]A.E.R. Boak, "The 'Magistri' of Campania and Delos," *Classical Philology*, 11 (1916), 29, 45. He discusses *pagus Herculaneus* at Capua (*CIL*. 10. 3772) as well as other *pagi* in Rome and throughout Italy, Africa and Gaul.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

latter regard, more plausible to accept Mau's conclusion that the Pompeian suburbs would hardly have had separate organization. At any rate it seems quite likely that the functions of the magistri pagorum were largely religious.

An inscription found in the amphitheater indicates that the magistrates of the suburb Pagus Augustus Felix constructed seats instead of providing the games that would otherwise have been required of them.[1] That fits in well with the statement of Treggiari, that these officials were drawn from the ranks of the wealthy, and with the practice of granting honors to wealthy freedmen in order to stimulate generous expenditure of their wealth for the benefit of the city.[2]

Five magistrates of the suburb Pagus Augustus Felix are described as freedmen in the inscriptions: M. Arrius Diomedes,[3] L. Barbiolius Communis,[4] C. Cuspius Cyrus, C. Cuspius Lalv...[5] and Philomus.[6] Three others of the magistrates are not specifically called freedmen: M. Clodius Agatho, M. Mundicius Malchio[7] and C. Norbanus Sorex.[8] We saw above in our discussion of the Temple of Isis that Sorex was probably a

---

[1] CIL. 10. 853; MAG. PAG. AUG. F. S. PRO. LVD. EX. D. D.

[2] Treggiari, p. 197.

[3] CIL. 10. 1042-43. The former inscription, found on the Street of Tombs, says: M. ARRIVS. . L. DIOMEDES/ SIBI. SVIS. MEMORIAE/ MAGISTER. PAG. AVG. FELIC. SVBVRB.

[4] Della Corte, "Notebook," pp. 78, 80, tomb 35.

[5] Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 79, tomb 36, for this and the preceding name.

[6] ILS. 6377. Philomus is described as mag. pagi Felicis suburbani, but the reference is no doubt to the same suburb. The inscription was found outside Pompeii toward Scafati.

[7] NS. 1898, p. 499, for this and the preceding name. [8] CIL. 10. 814.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

freedman. The Greek cognomen of Agatho does not give enough evidence to say more than that he might have been a freedman. The name of Malchio gives us no clue in regard to his status. C. Minatius Iucundus was apparently also a magistrate of the suburb Pagus Augustus Felix, although the tomb inscription is not wholly preserved.[1] Neither the inscription nor the name tells us whether or not he was a freedman.

Thus we have seen that there were five magistrates of the suburb Pagus Augustus Felix who were clearly freedmen. One more was probably a freedman, and three are uncertain. Yet it seems that a magistrate of that suburb was liable to be a freedman, and so it is probable, in regard to some one particular individual, that anyone who was a magistrate of that suburb was a freedman.

Pagani and Ministri

We have the names of four individuals who are called *pagani* or *ministri*. *Pagani* must be pagus officials of some kind, though not necessarily of the suburb Pagus Augustus Felix. N. Istacidius Helenus is identified in one inscription as *paganus pagi Augusti* and in another simply as *paganus*.[2] It is possible that the pagus in mind was the suburb Pagus Augustus Felix, but we cannot be sure. The Greek cognomen Helenus suggests the possibility of freedman status, and the fact that with him in one inscription is mentioned another N. Istacidius, with the servile cognomen Ianuarius, increases the probability of that status. The probable freedman C. Munatius Faustus, whom we discussed above in connection with the Augustales, was a *paganus*. L. Laturnius Gratus was

---

[1]Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 64, tombs 11 and 14.

[2]*CIL*. 10. 1027, 1028.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a paganus and a minister.[1] Another Gratus, whom we mentioned above in connection with the Temple of Apollo and who was a minister, was an imperial freedman.[2] The cognomen of L. Laturnius Gratus may also suggest servile origin. In any case that status is probable in his case, since we have seen that the magistrates of the suburb Pagus Augustus Felix seem to have been freedmen in large part, and we do not expect pagani, who were of inferior position, to be of higher social rank than the magistri. In the case of L. Laturnius Gratus the term minister might well have reference to a function in a pagus. We cannot be sure of the association of the other minister Gratus.

Princeps Libertinorum

One inscription calls Fabius Eupor the chief of the freedmen (princeps libertinorum).[3] It is almost certain then that Fabius Eupor must himself have been a freedman. Della Corte thinks the office of Fabius Eupor was that of head of the synagogue of the Pompeian Jews.[4] He bases his argument on the reference to the Synagogue of the Freedmen in Acts 6:9. That is the most plausible interpretation yet advanced and should at least be regarded as a distinct possibility. The "House of the Hebrew," recently found at I. xi. 14, with its numerous inscriptions in Hebrew, is another evidence of a gathering place of the Jews. It might well have been a center for Jewish worship. Other evidence of Jews at Pompeii may be seen from tomb number 13 on the street that leads

---

[1] ILS. 6380.

[2] ILS. 6387.

[3] CIL. 4. 117.

[4] Della Corte, Case, p. 37.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

east from Porta Nuceria.[1] This suggests that not only was a freedman an official connected with the Jewish religion, but also that a number of freedmen were Jews.

When we turn to the specific public religious functions of freedmen, we see that in all those functions that we have definitely identified as religious freedmen are occupied as officials in the imperial cult. This may be the case also with the magistrates of the suburb Pagus Augustus Felix. Of the pagani not clearly identified with this suburb, it is probably also true, as is suggested by the case of N. Istacidius Helenus. Of those simply called ministri we can do no more than speculate. It seems probable that the princeps libertinorum was the head of the Jewish community at Pompeii. That then would be the only public religious function of freedmen we have definitely encountered that is clearly not associated with the imperial cult.

Private Religious Functions

Worship of Genius and Lares

The freedman Philoxenus, a temple keeper (aedituus), presented a gift to the household Lares.[2] We do not know the nature of his office as temple keeper, nor the original location of the inscription, which was found on a weight.

Felix, a freedman of the famous L. Caecilius Iucundus, paid his respects "to the genius of our Lucius," as we saw above.[3] Duplicate

---

[1] C. Giordano and I. Kahn, Gli Ebrei in Pompei, in Ercolano e nella città della Campania Felix (Pompeii), pp. 56-57, 75-88.

[2] CIL. 10. 8067. 12.

[3] CIL. 10. 860.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

herms of Iucundus were set up in the atrium of his house. The portrait is so realistic that one almost feels that he knows this man so honored by his freedman.

Worship of Other Deities

Sex. Pompeius Ruma, identified as a freedman in an inscription, paid a vow to Neptune,[1] something not at all surprising in a port town.

Two almost identical inscriptions found on weights from unknown locations tell us that the freedman Cataplus made an offering, but we have no knowledge of its nature.[2]

From this survey we receive the overwhelming impression that in public functions of religion the freedman is largely concerned with the imperial cult. That is not to say, however, that all other public religious functions of freedmen were insignificant. Various deities have prominent places in the Temple of Apollo and the Temple of Isis. It seems that freedmen were involved in the Jewish religion in Pompeii, since we have what appears to be the chief of the synagogue of the Jews. Furthermore, as individuals freedmen entered into many other public religious activities in Pompeii.

Probably the most important evidence for religion in Pompeii is found in the individual homes. Most homes had lararia, often with paintings and statuettes. We have not been able to locate any house that definitely belonged to a freedman, but the house of the Vettii seems quite surely to have been the home of a freedman. One of the

---

[1] CIL. 10. 8157.

[2] CIL. 10. 8067. 304.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

finest lararia at Pompeii was found there.[1] It was elaborately decorated and designed to look like a small temple.

In public functions of religion freedmen not only participated as individuals, but they also held various official positions, although they were limited by their servile past. In private worship, where their activity was not hampered by any of the obstacles of their relationship with the freeborn Romans, the freedmen were much more truly free in what they did.

---

[1]George K. Boyce, Corpus of the Lararia of Pompeii: Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome (Vol. 14, Rome, 1937), p. 54.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER III

THE OCCUPATIONS OF THE FREEDMEN[1]

Freedmen had an important place in the economic life of Pompeii. They were engaged in respected occupations as well as work of a lowly nature. Tenney Frank makes the point that freeborn Pompeian citizens, because of the influence of the many Greeks in the area, did not despise trade and industry as the upper classes at Rome did, but often engaged in such work.[2]

Since many slaves gained their freedom, and since the use of slaves in business was widespread, we may reasonably expect to find that many freedmen continued in the same kinds of work in which they had been engaged before manumission. Many freedmen operated their own businesses. Others had humbler roles. We know nothing about the occupations of still others. Our aim in this chapter is to learn as well as we can in what occupations the freedmen of Pompeii were engaged.

Work on the Land

Wine Producers

Some wine producers seem to have had relatively small farms, while others had very large estates. As might be expected with the rich land

---

[1]See Appendix B, a table which lists the freedmen whose names and occupations are known.

[2]Tenney Frank, An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome (Baltimore, 1940), 5, 253. See below.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

near Vesuvius, there was abundant production of wine, making possible supplies for export as well as for local consumption at Pompeii. On many of the farms, in addition to grapes, olives and other products were raised.[1] Many of the wine producers were probably also owners of the villas on which they raised the grapes.

In his valuable study, "Agriculture in the Life of Pompeii," J. Day lists the names of a number of men whom he designates as freedmen.[2] He believes that the names indicate that quite a few were imperial freedmen and that others are seen to be freedmen because of their servile cognomina. Viewed as a whole Day's lists do show that many freedmen were wine producers and owners of estates. However, taken singly, cognomina that were commonly found among slaves or freedmen are, even when they are part of the three-fold Roman name, by no means always guarantees that their possessors were freedmen.

Day says the cognomina of the following wine producers indicate that they were freedmen: M. Amullius Hermes,[3] L. Arellius Successus,[4] M. Aurelius Hermes,[5] M. Aurelius Soter,[6] L. Caecilius Hermes,[7] Cn. Domitius Auctus,[8] L. Eumachius Eros,[9] N. Fufidius Successus,[10] Gavia Severa,[11] M. Stlaborius Felix,[12] M. Valerius Ianuarius,[13] A. Vettius Conviva and

---

[1] J. Day, "Agriculture in the Life of Pompeii," Yale Classical Studies, 3 (1932), 172-76; Della Corte, Case, p. 413.

[2] Day, YCS, 3 (1932), pp. 206-8. [3] CIL. 4. 5771-72.

[4] CIL. 4. 5778. [5] NS. 1914, pp. 199-200. [6] CIL. 4. 2628.

[7] CIL. 4. 5755, 5895. [8] NS. 1899, pp. 392 ff.

[9] NS. 1929, p. 190. [10] CIL. 4. 5837. [11] CIL. 4. 5743-44, 5842-43.

[12] CIL. 4. 2665. [13] CIL. 4. 5908.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

A. Vettius Restitutus.[1] Names like Auctus, Hermes, Eros, Felix, Successus, Restitutus and Ianuarius were ordinarily shunned by freeborn Romans, whether of noble or lowly station.[2] While a servile cognomen alone does not, in any particular instance, prove that the individual was a freedman, yet in the above list the servile cognomina indicate a strong probability that some were freedmen.

In regard to some of the wine producers we have further evidence of freedman status. Thus it is very likely that the Aulii Vettii were freedmen. We saw in the first chapter that the existence of more persons than one with the same praenomen and nomen shows that they were probably freedmen. A Vettius Conviva was an Augustalis.[3] As we saw in the preceding chapter, the fact that Conviva was an Augustalis shows that he was probably a freedman. The cognomina Conviva and Restitutus are commonly regarded as servile.[4] There was a Restitutus who seems to have been a candidate for some office,[5] but the incomplete electoral notice with that information was found at IX. viii. 3, some distance from the house of Vettii at VI. xv. 1, and there is no evidence to show that it refers to A. Vettius Restitutus rather than to some other Restitutus. Among the occupations pictured in the house of the Vettii, we see Cupids gathering grapes and pressing them. That is significant, since it gives evidence that activities portrayed in the paintings in the house are

---

[1] CIL. 4. 5572-73, 5577. See the discussion of Della Corte, Case, pp. 67-71.

[2] Duff, pp. 53 ff., 110 ff.; Gordon, JRS, 21 (1931), 76.

[3] CIL. 4. 3509.

[4] See Duff, pp. 56, 110.

[5] CIL. 4. 7826.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

related to the activities of the Vettii.[1]

In the case of L. Caecilius Hermes the servile cognomen added to the praenomen and nomen L. Caecilius immediately makes us suspect that this might be a freedman of the banker L. Caecilius Iucundus. As we saw in the preceding chapter, there were a number of Lucii Caecilii at Pompeii. Furthermore, Hermes appears as a creditor[2] and three times as a witness[3] in the tablets of Iucundus. The obvious effort of the family to avoid such tell-tale marks makes it doubtful that Iucundus would have given servile cognomina to his children. Furthermore, there was a custom, perhaps even more pronounced in families of some prominence or distinction, of passing down the father's cognomen to succeeding generations. Finally, we would not expect more than one son to be given the same praenomen, since it was this name that distinguished members of the family from one another.

L. Arellius Successus seems to have been a wine producer and probably also the owner of villa Boscotrecase No. 23.[4] The initials of Successus were found on a wine amphora there and are expanded by Della Corte in the genitive case: L. A(relli) S(uccessi).[5] In the city were found two amphorae, the one inscribed Mnester Arelli[6] and the other

---

[1]See Mau, p. 336, and M. Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire (2nd ed.; Oxford, 1957), p. 92 and plate 14. For a fuller discussion see August Mau, Mittheilungen des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abtheilung, 11 (1896), 43-97.

[2]CIL. 4. 3340. 51. 1, 6, 9. [3]CIL. 4. 3340. 18. 8; 51. 23; 69. 13.

[4]CIL. 4. 5778; R.C. Carrington, "Studies in the Campanian 'Villae Rusticae,'" Journal of Roman Studies 21 (1931), 113; Day, p. 206; Della Corte, Case, p. 450.

[5]CIL. 4. 5778; Della Corte, Case, p. 450. [6]CIL. 4. 5863.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Eutycho Arelli.[1] Della Corte says these amphorae contained wine of the same producer but that they were inscribed with the names of two of his slaves,[2] and Day seems to imply the same thing.[3] R.C. Carrington, in his "Studies in the Campanian 'Villae Rusticae,'" is more cautious, but he also suggests that these inscriptions might have reference to the owner of the villa and believes that at least they indicate that the Arellian family of Pompeii had an interest in the wine trade.[4] It seems clear enough that Successus was a wine producer. His name is commonly taken as servile.[5] Without further evidence we can say no more than that he may have been a freedman.

Cn. Domitius Auctus was not only a wine producer[6] but also the owner or manager of villa Scafati No. 19.[7] His cognomen is generally accepted as servile, as Day says,[8] but in the absence of other evidence we may conclude only that it indicates a possibility that Auctus was a freedman.

Of the others whose names we have mentioned from the list of Day, we find that five share the same praenomina and cognomina with others who may have been freedmen. Thus M. Amullius Hermes has a servile cognomen, and we find among the proprietors of food shops another M. Amullius with the significant Greek name Cosmus. In the list we have two Marci Aurelii with servile cognomina. M. Stlaborius Felix has a

---

[1] CIL. 4. 2643. [2] Della Corte, Case, p. 450.

[3] Day, YCS, 3 (1932), 206. [4] Carrington, JRS, 21 (1931), 113.

[5] Duff, p. 110; Gordon, JRS, 21 (1931), p. 76.

[6] Day, YCS, 3 (1932), 207; Della Corte, Case, p. 447.

[7] Carrington, JRS, 21 (1931), 112. See NS. 1899, 392 ff.

[8] Day, YCS, 3 (1932), 207. Cf. Duff, p. 110.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

servile cognomen, and there is a M. Stlaborius Nymphodotus among the wine dealers. The Greek name of Nymphodotus is suggestive here. In connection with M. Valerius Ianuarius, in this chapter we encounter two other Marci Valerii, one a gladiator and the other a wine merchant with the Eastern cognomen Abinnericus. In each case these five men have at least two kinds of evidence that point toward servile origin. In the cases of M. Stlaborius Felix and M. Valerius Ianuarius, the men with the same nomina as theirs have associations suggestive of possible freedman status, which further strengthens the impression that the men presently under consideration were probably freedmen.

Of the thirteen individuals listed above whom Day identifies as freedmen on the basis of servile cognomina, we can say of eight that they were very likely freedmen. Of the other five we can only say that there is a distinct possibility that any of them might have been freedmen, and even a probability that some were, but in regard to any particular one of them we do not have enough evidence to make a more certain statement.

Day also lists as wine producers a number of men who were, according to his judgment, imperial freedmen of Tiberius Claudius with the following cognomina:[1] Aineicus,[2] Ana...,[3] Anicetus,[4] Antiochus,[5] Antiphilus,[6]

---

[1]Day, YCS, 3 (1932), 207.

[2]CIL. 4. 5535.

[3]CIL. 4. 6992.

[4]CIL. 4. 5805, 6399-6404, 6930, 6993, 9189, 10437.

[5]CIL. 4. 5751, 5806, 6403-4, 9760-61, 10439.

[6]CIL. 4. 6405.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Aparocha,[1] Atimetus,[2] Epaphroditus,[3] Euh[odus],[4] Euphronius,[5] Eurutus,[6] Hippo[litus],[7] K...,[8] Po[lybuis],[9] Secundus,[10] Sim[plex],[11] So...,[12] and Trophimus,[13] According to Duff, in regard to a group of inscriptions examined, of 859 sons whose fathers had Greek cognomina only 460 of the sons were themselves given Greek cognomina and 399 were given Latin cognomina.[14] The overwhelming number of Greek cognomina that we have among the names of wine producers in our list, together with the praenomen and nomen Tiberius Claudius, give valuable support for the assumption of Day that many of these must indeed be names of imperial freedmen. We must of course remember that there was a large Greek element in the population of Pompeii, as Day himself tells us,[15] and that not all Tiberii Claudii were necessarily imperial freedmen, since the name might have been held by descendants of imperial freedmen or by naturalized citizens who owed their citizenship to the emperor.[16] Yet descendants

---

[1]CIL. 4. 6406. [2]CIL. 4. 6407.

[3]CIL. 4. 5942b, 6408, 9764-65, 10443-44. [4]CIL. 4. 5807.

[5]CIL. 4. 6417-18. [6]CIL. 4. 6409-16. [7]CIL. 4. 6419.

[8]CIL. 4. 6420. [9]CIL. 4. 5808, 9487.

[10]CIL. 4. 5920, 6430-37, 6947, 9767. [11]CIL. 4. 5809.

[12]CIL. 4. 5760, 9425, 10327, 10327a. [13]CIL. 4. 5810-12. Cf. 9488.

[14]Duff, p. 57. Duff bases his observations here on the study of Tenney Frank, AHR, 21 (1916), 689-708.

[15]Day, YCS, 3 (1932), 178.

[16]A case in point in regard to naturalized foreigners who derived praenomen and nomen from the emperor is Ti. Claudius Cogidubnus, King of Britain, CIL. 7. 11. See Egbert, p. 102. The importance of the King of Britain does not detract from the significance of this example for our study. The important thing is to see that the name alone cannot identify an individual as an imperial freedman. Just as a slave might

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of freedmen were liable to have different praenomina, and we normally expect far fewer naturalized foreigners at Pompeii who owe their citizenship to the emperor than imperial freedmen. While it would not be warranted to insist in each case, or in any one individual case, that the name is that of a freedman, yet it seems logical to conclude that the majority of those in this list from Day were very likely freedmen and that the probability in regard to any particular one is that he was a freedman. Four of these wine producers who are more in doubt than the others are those with whose names the praenomen does not appear in the inscriptions that we have: Claudius Atimetus, Claudius Eurutus, Claudius Hippolitus and Claudius Trophimus. It may well be that these were Tiberii Claudii as the others. The fact that the cognomina are Greek suggests that that is probably the case and that these also were very likely freedmen.

Besides the above names six Tiberii Claudii had the following cognomina: Anauka,[1] Anthus,[2] Antimius,[3] Aparola,[4] Ariston[5] and Eutychus.[6] The inscriptions on the amphorae seem to indicate that these also were wine producers.[7] What we have said of the other Tiberii Claudii applies equally to these. In addition Eutychus, whom we will

---

profit from an imperial act, so might a foreigner of less (even far less) than regal status. Some Tiberii Claudii are also either town magistrates or candidates for municipal office, as Claudianus, Rufus and Verus, so it is clear that they were not freedmen. In this regard see Della Corte, Case, p. 413.

[1] CIL. 4. 10436. [2] CIL. 4. 9315b, 9483-85. [3] CIL. 4. 10438.

[4] CIL. 4. 10440. [5] CIL. 4. 9762, 10441-42. [6] NS, 1922, p. 460.

[7] See Della Corte, Case, p. 413.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

discuss more fully below in connection with the management of estates, is identified as a freedman in the inscriptions.

If we combine the twenty Tiberii Claudii and the four probable Tiberii Claudii with the thirteen wine producers discussed before, we have a total of thirty-seven wine producers, of which one is certainly a freedman and thirty-one are identified as probable freedmen. Of the remaining five it can be said that any one might have been a freedman, but taking these five together it is at least quite probable that some were freedmen.

Estate Managers

Sometimes it is difficult to say with much certainty whether or not an individual was a manager or owner of an estate. Day thinks many of the estates were managed by their owners.[1]

Of those who seem to have been managers of estates three are definitely identified on inscriptions as freedmen: on one estate Ti. Claudius Eutychus[2] and on another Q. Decius Hilarus and a freedman of Lucius whose name is illegible.[3] On the basis of two bronze seals found there, Eutychus is listed by Della Corte as the owner of villa Boscoreale No. 31,[4] but Carrington thinks instead that he was in charge of the villa at the time of the eruption.[5] Carrington points out that a former owner of the farm, Agrippa Postumus, the grandson of Augustus, was put to death by Tiberius at the beginning of his rule and infers

---

[1]Day, YCS, 3 (1932), 176-88. [2]NS, 1922, p. 460.

[3]CIL. 4. 3864. [4]Della Corte, Case, p. 415.

[5]Carrington, JRS, 21 (1931), 112.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

from this the confiscation of the farm by Tiberius and its continuation as an imperial possession. The name of the man in charge at the time of the eruption, Ti. Claudius Eutychus, might well be advanced in support of that reasoning. An able imperial slave could ordinarily expect early manumission, often followed by a position of some responsibility in the service of the emperor.[1] It would not be at all surprising if that were the case with Eutychus, and in the absence of any additional evidence it seems to be the most logical possibility.

Mau thinks Q. Decius Hilarus and the unidentified freedman of Lucius were very likely partners working a farm of the Mamii.[2] That supposition is formed on the basis of the inscription from which we learn of them, which advertises a lost mare with a small pack-saddle. The owner may claim the mare from Hilarus or the other freedman at the farm of the Mamii on this side of the bridge over the Sarno. It is clear that Hilarus and the freedman of Lucius did not themselves own the farm, for it is described as the farm of the Mamii. On the other hand the implication seems to be that they are in charge of the farm, although that is not expressly stated. The farm is very likely quite small and they may have been the only ones working there. Even if there were more people working there than the two of them, the parallel mention of the two names in the inscription suggests a certain equality. Mau's suggestion that they were partners is at least plausible.

Others who seem to have been managers of estates may also have been freedmen. One of these was Q. Poppaeus Eros. He managed the farm

---

[1]Crook, p. 63. [2]Mau, p. 436.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

section (where grapes were raised for making wine) of the villa of the House of Menander, which belonged to Q. Poppaeus Sabinus.[1] The similarity of the name of the manager to that of the owner of the estate demands attention. The possibility that Eros might have been the son of Sabinus is placed in some doubt by the difference in cognomina. It is possible for a son to bear a different cognomen than his father, as in the case of L. Caecilius Iucundus, but it would seem unlikely that a son of Sabinus would have been assigned a cognomen such as Eros, which, according to Duff, was the most common Greek name among slaves and freedmen.[2] The most plausible assumption is that Eros was a freedman of Sabinus. A man freed by Sabinus would have been more liable to be his manager than would a descendant of a freedman or a naturalized foreigner who owed his citizenship to Sabinus.

L. Caecilius Aphrodisius, Ti. Claudius Amphio, and L. Brittius Eros were very likely joint managers of villa Boscoreale No. 13.[3] The ownership of the villa is uncertain. According to Carrington, the residential part of the villa is designed for a single family rather than for three families, and so he concludes that it is improbable that the three owned the villa jointly and that it is more sensible to assume that they were managers.[4]

---

[1] NS. 1933, p. 295, n. 184. See also Della Corte, Case, pp. 293-94.

[2] Duff, p. 54.

[3] NS. 1895, pp. 210-11. Cf. Della Corte, Case, pp. 433-34.

[4] Carrington, JRS, 21 (1931), 113.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Della Corte thinks L. Caecilius Aphrodisius was clearly a freedman of L. Caecilius Iucundus.[1] Carrington agrees and points out that Eros is found among the witnesses in the tablets of Iucundus.[2] The fact that Aphrodisius was associated with someone connected with Iucundus gives support for the view that Aphrodisius was a freedman of Iucundus. Furthermore, we would be inclined to think that the Greek cognomen Aphrodisius would probably not have been given to someone of the family of Iucundus.

One would be inclined to think that the association of Eros and Amphio as joint managers of an estate with Aphrodisius, a probable freedman, would indicate at least a presumption in favor of the identification of the former two as individuals of that same status. Their Greek cognomina lend some weight to such a supposition. Amphio's full name suggests the probability that he was an imperial freedman. It is too uncertain to assume that he might have come from the imperial villa nearby, Boscoreale No. 31. The most that we can say about Eros is that there is a strong possibility, on the basis of name and association, that he was a freedman, but that the evidence is insufficient for more sure identification.

Publius Fannius Synistor probably managed villa Boscoreale No. 16 for its owner, Lucius Herius Florus.[3] Carrington thinks the Greek

---

[1]Della Corte, Case, p. 436.

[2]Carrington, JRS, 21 (1931), 113. CIL. 4. 3340. 96. 6.

[3]Carrington, JRS, 21 (1931), 112-14, is uncertain whether Synistor was owner or manager, but Day, YCS, 3 (1932), 202, and Della Corte, Case, pp. 430-31, agree in assigning the ownership to Florus.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

cognomen Synistor shows that he may have been either a freedman or a resident alien, but that the Roman gentilicium supports the suggestion that he was a freedman.[1] It is necessary to use great care in basing conclusions on the evidence of names. A naturalized foreigner, as well as a freedman, could well have a purely Roman praenomen and nomen. Our awareness of the numbers of Greek foreigners in Campania makes us hesitant to presume in favor of freedman status here, and the possibility that Synistor might have been a descendant of a freedman puts the issue even more in doubt. Della Corte's conclusion that he is a freedman seems to be based on insufficient evidence.[2] We can only say that he may have been a freedman.

Of the seven estate managers we have discussed here, two were certainly freedmen, three more were probably freedmen, and the other two may have been freedmen.

Professions and Service Occupations

In the time of the early empire freedmen were quite active in many kinds of work.[3] Not only did they engage in the meaner trades, where they, together with their descendants and the slave class, seemed to have pretty much a monopoly in Rome, but they were also found in the professions, although there they faced more competition from freeborn foreigners than they did in trade and industry.[4]

---

[1]Carrington, JRS, 21 (1931), 114. [2]Della Corte, Case, p. 431.

[3]On this general subject there are very interesting treatments in Duff, pp. 117-24, and Dill, pp. 100-103.

[4]Duff, p. 119.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Mau tells very clearly about the distinctions in regard to the occupations between those who were slaves and freedmen and those who were freeborn Romans:

> In antiquity there was no such distinction between trades and professions as exists to-day. In the Early Empire all activity outside the field of public service, civil and military, or the management of estates, was considered beneath the dignity of a Roman; the practice of law, which had received its impulse largely from the obligation of patrons to protect their clients, was included among public duties. The ordinary work of life was left mainly to slaves and freedmen. Not only the trades, as we understand the term, but architecture and engineering, --in antiquity two branches of one occupation,--the practice of medicine, and teaching, were looked upon as menial. A Roman of literary or practical bent might manifest an interest in such vocations, but it was considered hardly respectable actively to engage in them.
>
> This attitude of mind, especially toward the higher occupations, is only explicable in the light of the social conditions then existing. Men who kept slaves of every degree of intelligence and training, and were at all times accustomed to command, were not disposed to hold themselves in readiness to do another's bidding, excepting in the service of the State alone; and work committed to slaves and freedmen naturally came to be considered unworthy the employment of a gentleman.[1]

Teachers

It frequently happened that generous masters rewarded slaves who were teachers by granting freedom to them.[2] Thus there were many teachers who were freedmen, but there were also many aliens who settled in the towns of Italy as teachers. Julius Caesar had offered citizenship to foreign teachers who would come to Rome to practice their profession.[3]

---

[1]Mau, p. 383.

[2]See above, p. 3.

[3]Suet., Divus Iulius 42.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Many others, perhaps especially the abler ones, came to Rome and Italy from the Greek East because of the advantage they would hold over Romans in that work.[1] Therefore a teacher with a Greek cognomen cannot be assumed to have been a freedman. Yet because of the poor pay of one kind of teacher, the grammarian,[2] Duff thinks not many foreigners would have come to Italy to function in that capacity, so that profession must have been left largely to men of servile origin.[3] Because of the higher remuneration for rhetoricians[4] that field was not so much abandoned to the freedman and his descendants.[5]

Of a list of twenty distinguished Roman grammarians given by Suetonius, thirteen were freedmen[6] and another one or two were probably freedmen.[7] Nine of these grammarians lived in imperial times, and six or seven of those were freedmen.[8] An additional freedman is named to illustrate the high esteem in which grammarians were held.[9] Most of these were connected with the Greek East, either by origin or by

---

[1]Duff, p. 112, n. 119.

[2]Juvenal 7. 215-43. Cf. Dill, p. 92, Ludwig Friedländer, Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire, trans. Leonard A. Magnus (New York, 1907), 1, 160-61, and Jerome Carcopino, Daily Life in Ancient Rome, trans. E.O. Lorimer (New Haven, 1940), p. 104.

[3]Duff, p. 120.

[4]Juvenal 7. 186-87, 217. Cf. Friedländer, 1, 161-62.

[5]Duff, p. 121.

[6]The list is given in Suetonius, De Grammaticis 5-24. Freedmen are listed in chapters 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23. The grammarian mentioned in chapter 8 may not have taught.

[7]Suet., De Gram. 11, 21.

[8]Suet., De Gram. 16-24.

[9]Suet., De Gram. 3.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

culture.[1] Suetonius also lists five eminent rhetoricians, but only one of them is identified as a freedman.[2]

(C.?) Iulius Helenus was a grammarian who taught in the house of L. Albucius Celsus, the House of the Silver Wedding.[3] He was not overly respected by his students.[4] The combination of Greek cognomen with Roman nomen suggests the possibility of freedman status. If it is true that grammarians were usually men of servile origin, there is some probability that Helenus was a freedman.

Another teacher of elementary boys, Sema, held his school at the Forum.[5] Della Corte says that his Greek name shows that he was a slave or freedman.[6] We have seen that grammarians were very often freedmen. Since there was no private home or shop there, it seems that Sema was operating a school as his own business. It is more likely then that he was a freedman than a slave. Although he could have been a foreigner, we have seen that it is not likely that many foreigners came to Italy to be grammarians.

---

[1]Cf. Dill, p. 91.

[2]The list is given in Suet., De Rhetoribus 2-6. The name of the freedman is found in chapter 3.

[3]Della Corte, Case, pp. 105-6. Cf. Matteo Della Corte, "Scuole e maestri in Pompei antica," Studi Romani, 7 (1959), 626-29.

[4]CIL. 4. 4208. See the discussion of Della Corte, Case, p. 105.

[5]CIL. 4. 668. Cf. Della Corte, Case, pp. 223-24.

[6]Della Corte, Studi Romani, 7 (1959), 623.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Potitus had a school at IX. viii. 14.[1] The school of the Cornelii Amandus and Proculus at VII. xii. 14 seems to have been a grammar school.[2] We know too little about these teachers to say more than that they may have been freedmen.

Physicians

Not many Romans seem to have become physicians.[3] Those physicians at Rome who were free and had no servile past were mostly foreigners. Julius Caesar had granted citizenship to foreigners who practiced medicine at Rome.[4] Augustus had given them further privileges.[5] The greatest physicians were freeborn men who came from the Greek East, but the majority of the physicians, especially those in humbler circumstances, were drawn from the ranks of freedmen and slaves.[6] The medical profession seems not to have had a high reputation,[7] which we can easily understand when we see that many physicians had come from backgrounds in various lowly types of work and that unsuccessful physicians often turned later to such occupations.[8]

Considerable evidence for Roman medical practice has been found at Pompeii, but we have discovered the name of only one physician, P.

---

[1]Matteo Della Corte, "La scuola di Epicuro in alcune pitture pompeiane," Studi Romani 7 (1959), 129-145; Case, pp. 134-35. CIL. 4. 3732, 3736 are electoral notices of Potitus and 362, 3730, 3739 are recommendations of his students, all found at IX. viii. 2. Cf. 3735.

[2]Della Corte, Studi Romani, 7 (1959), 624-27; Case, pp. 183-84. Two electoral notices of the teachers were found at VII. xii. 14: CIL. 4. 634, 635. Cf. 1710.

[3]Friedländer, 1, 168; Dill, p. 92. [4]Suet., Divus Iulius 42.

[5]Suet., Divus Augustus 42. [6]Friedländer, 1, 167-68; Duff, pp. 119-20.

[7]Juvenal 10. 221; Martial 2. 16; 5. 9; 6. 31. Cf. Dill, p. 92.

[8]Martial 1. 31, 47; 8. 74. See Friedländer, 1. 170.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Terentius Celadus, who practiced in the Palaestra by the amphitheater.[1] In the preceding chapter we noted that he was an Augustalis and that he was probably a freedman.

Architects

Trajan wrote in a letter to Pliny that every province had trained architects and that Rome was accustomed to import them from Greece.[2] The only architect mentioned in Puteoli was a freedman,[3] and two of the four architects listed among the professions in the sixth volume of the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum were freedmen.[4] In the sixth volume of the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum we also find an imperial freedman who was an architect.[5] Thus we see that a number of freedmen were architects.

In Pompeii one architect who is definitely identified as a freedman, M. Artorius Primus, is listed in two inscriptions, one found in the Basilica in fragmentary form[6] and the other discovered in the large theater.[7] Primus was employed by the Holconii to rebuild parts of the theater in the times of Augustus.[8] It is interesting to note that his name is found among the witnesses in one of the tablets of Iucundus.[9]

---

[1] See above, p. 58, n. 1. [2] Pliny, Epist. 10. 40.

[3] CIL. 10. 1614. [4] CIL. 6. 9151-54. Cf. Duff, p. 123.

[5] CIL. 6. 8725. [6] CIL. 10. 807: M. ARTORIVS. M. L. PRIM.

[7] CIL. 10. 841: M. ARTORIVS. M. L. PRIMVS
ARCHITECTVS

[8] Duff, pp. 148-50. On the parts of the theater rebuilt at that time, see CIL. 10. 833-35.

[9] CIL. 4. 3340. 110. 4.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Actors

The Romans looked with contempt on acting and actors. Nero was thought of as disgracing himself when he acted, and when he forced nobles to act in public they felt that their dignity was brought low and their honor was damaged.[1]

According to Duff most actors were either slaves or freedmen and the most famous actors of Rome were freedmen of the imperial house. Names of famous actors, such as Pylades, Bathyllus or Paris, were often given to other actors by masters, patrons or friends, or assumed by the actors themselves out of desire to receive glory through borrowed names or because of an opinion that they had already attained a certain eminence.[2]

C. Norbanus Sorex, whom we encountered in the preceding chapter, is in one inscription identified as an actor and a magistrate of the suburb Pagus Augustus Felix.[3] The fact that he was an actor makes it probable that he was a freedman. The magistrates of the suburb Pagus Augustus Felix were made up at least in part of freedmen.[4] We have noted that a herm of Sorex, or perhaps one dedicated by him,[5] was set up in the Temple of Isis. We saw in the preceding chapter that Sorex was very likely a freedman.

---

[1]Tacitus, Annals 15. 67. Cf. Duff, p. 104.

[2]Friedländer, 1. 59-60, 2. 11-12, 4. 257-63; Duff, p. 104.

[3]CIL. 10. 814.

[4]See the discussion in the preceding chapter.

[5]See the discussion in the preceding chapter.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Many inscriptions with the name Paris have been found at Pompeii. Helen Tanzer thinks these refer to the famous and popular actor Paris who lived in the time of Nero.[1] It is clear that there was an actor named Paris in Pompeii.[2] Yet there were also other men called Paris in Pompeii besides the actor. We know that there was at least one gladiator by that name, and possibly there were more.[3] There was at least one Paris who recommended candidates for office.[4] It seems unlikely that an occasional inhabitant of the city would have taken such an interest in local politics, so that Paris was apparently not the famous actor from Rome. Della Corte thinks that one of these recommendations refers to the inhabitant of the house on which it was found,[5] and that another, found on the caupona at VII. xii. 15-16, is the plea of an innkeeper.[6] On the other hand graffiti wishing Paris well[7] or showing a fondness for him[8] seem to have reference to someone well-known and well-liked and are just the sort of statement admirers wrote for their favorite actors or gladiators. One graffito refers to the gladiator mentioned above. Others may refer to either gladiators or actors. We cannot be

---

[1]Helen Tanzer, The Common People of Pompeii (Baltimore, 1939), p. 70. Cf. Friedländer, 2. 113-14; Suet., Nero 54; Tacitus, Ann. 13. 21; Martial 11. 14; Juvenal 6. 87.

[2]CIL. 4. 3867.

[3]Pumidius Paris and another gladiator named Paris are treated below.

[4]CIL. 4. 821, 7051.

[5]Della Corte, Case, pp. 103-4, in connection with CIL. 4. 7051.

[6]Della Corte, Case, p. 202, in connection with CIL. 4. 821.

[7]CIL. 4. 148, 6899, 7056, 8484, 8696, 8746. [8]CIL. 4. 1294.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

sure that any actor of that name in Pompeii was the famous one from Rome. We must bear in mind the practice of actors in borrowing names from more famous actors. In regard to the actor Paris in Pompeii, we have at least the evidence of the occupation that Paris might have been a slave or freedman.

Gladiators

The origin of gladiatorial contests seems to go back to combats at funeral games.[1] After that came their use as entertainments at banquets and finally their use as popular public spectacles, which is what the term gladiatorial sports ordinarily suggests to our minds.[2] Gladiators were often men of servile origin.[3] In general the ranks of this profession were filled from condemned criminals, prisoners of war, slaves and volunteers. Men who were born free were at times compelled to fight, but in imperial times they often enrolled by their own choice.[4] Even Romans of the upper class took place in gladiatorial fights, but these must have been, for the most part, sham battles.[5] The size of the amphitheater at Pompeii and the many related graffiti give evidence of the popularity of the spectacle there.

---

[1]Livy, 16; 23. 30; 31. 50; 39. 46. Cf. Tanzer, p. 71.

[2]Res Gestae 22-23; Dio Cassius 59. 10; Suet., Divus Iulius 26, 39; Caligula 35. Cf. Tanzer, p. 71.

[3]ILS. 5105, 5129, 5282, 5286; CIL. 6. 10061, 10196, 10200. Cf. Duff, p. 105.

[4]Friedländer, 2, 43, 48.

[5]Juvenal 8. 200-201; Dio Cassius 51. 22; 56. 25. Cf. Suet., Divus Iulius 26.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

After three years a prisoner could receive a wooden sword, which showed his release from the arena, and after five years the hat might be given to him, as a symbol of manumission. Such freedmen sometimes continued to fight, for they were in demand and could thus gain fame and fortune, at least partly because volunteers were, as might be expected, more respected by the public than men who had no choice. A freedman could become a summa rudis, the first inspector of a gladiatorial division or troop, or occasionally an instructor (doctor).[1]

Twelve gladiators of Pompeii are identified as freedmen in the inscriptions: Actius Anicetus,[2] Tetraites Prude(n)s,[3] Albanus,[4] Aptonetus,[5] Arancitus,[6] Columbus,[7] Herennius,[8] Incitatus,[9] Oceanus,[10] Severus,[11] Severus,[12] and Tetraites.[13]

Actius Anicetus has been considered an actor,[14] but Della Corte thinks the evidence points more to the identification of Anicetus as a

---

[1]Friedländer, 2. 44, 48; 4. 170-71.

[2]CIL. 4. 1646, 2150, 2413 d, 2993 l, m, p.

[3]CIL. 4. 538. [4]NS. 1913, p. 222, n. 3.

[5]CIL. 4. 1474. [6]NS. 1913, p. 222, n. 1.

[7]CIL. 4. 2387. [8]CIL. 4. 1421. [9]CIL. 4. 4636.

[10]NS. 1913, p. 222, n. 1. Apparently this is not the same person as the Oceanus mentioned before, although it is possible that this graffito was written at another time in the career of the gladiator listed above.

[11]CIL. 4. 4870.

[12]NS. 1913, p. 222, n. 3. This seems to be a different person than the Severus mentioned earlier, although here also there is a possibility that this was simply recorded at a different point in the career of the same Severus.

[13]CIL. 4. 538. [14]Cf. Mau, p. 148, and Tanzer, p. 70.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

gladiator,[1] and his argument is quite convincing. Graffiti referring to Anicetus were found at I. iii. 23, where the famous painting of the riot in the amphitheater was discovered also.[2] Two of these graffiti seem to be electoral recommendations by Anicetus, which may indicate that this was his home. The house seems to fit ideally the description of a house of a gladiator. Furthermore, some of the graffiti that mention Anicetus use the word castre(n)sis, which is a much more suitable term to use in connection with a gladiator than with an actor.[3] In one inscription a man with the name Actius is called "Dominus scaenicorum,"[4] so it seems that there was an actor with the same nomen, but there is evidence to indicate that he was the same person as Actius Anicetus the gladiator. At least two graffiti wish Anicetus well,[5] and it may be that some of the others in which people wish Actius well have reference to the gladiator, although it is not possible to say definitely which Actius was in mind.[6] According to Della Corte's reconstruction of a poorly preserved inscription found at I. iii. 23, the freedman spoken of there is called Anicetus.[7] The name Anicetus is Greek; we have encountered it in a wine producer who is probably an imperial freedman. The occupation of Anicetus is a further bit of evidence for his identifi-

---

[1]Della Corte, Case, pp. 267-68. The present treatment of Actius Anicetus follows Della Corte.

[2]CIL. 4. 2150, 2155, 2993 l, m, p.

[3]CIL. 4. 1646, 2150, 2413d. [4]CIL. 4. 5399. Cf. 3877.

[5]CIL. 4. 2993m, 3891. 10535 from Herculaneum may have the same reference.

[6]CIL. 4. 1903, 1980, 3093, 4471, 4479, 4965, 5395, 5404, 6898.

[7]CIL. 4. 2993p. For Della Corte's reconstruction see Case, pp. 267-68.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

cation as a freedman.

Two other gladiators are probably identified as freedmen in the inscriptions, although it may be that the letter L is part of the numeral listing the number of fights rather than an abbreviation of libertus. Their names were Oceanus[1] and Speculator.[2]

The names of other gladiators who may have been freedmen are the following: M. Artorius,[3] L. or P. Asicius,[4] M. Attilius,[5] L. Demtus or Redemtus,[6] L. Fabius,[7] M. Gaius Prothymio,[8] O. Luscius Eros,[9] Rusticus Malius,[10] M. Ogulnius,[11] P. Ostorius,[12] Q. Petillius,[13] L. Petronius,[14] Q. Petronius Octavius,[15] Pumidius Paris,[16] L. Raecius Felix,[17] L. Sempronius,[18] L. Sextius Eros,[19] M. Terentius Colonus,[20] Sex. Treblius,[21] M. Valerius,[22] G. Venuleius,[23] L. Vitruvius,[24] Murtius,[25] Paris,[26] and Telephus.[27] Telephus is described in the inscrip-

---

[1]CIL. 4. 1422: OCIANEANVS LVI. See the note with the inscription.

[2]CIL. 4. 2508: SPECVLATOR LXIX. [3]CIL. 4. 2508.

[4]CIL. 4. 4287, 4329, 4374, 4426.

[5]NS. 1958, p. 151, nn. 380-81. It seems most reasonable to believe that both inscriptions have reference to the same person.

[6]CIL. 4. 4308. The inscription reads L DIIMTVS, which could be interpreted as L. Demtus or could be written for Redemtus. See the note with the inscription.

[7]CIL. 4. 2508. [8]CIL. 4. 4710-11. [9]CIL. 4. 4323.

[10]CIL. 4. 4302, 4352, 4360, 4366. [11]CIL. 4. 4309. [12]CIL. 4. 2508.

[13]CIL. 4. 2508. [14]CIL. 4. 2508. [15]CIL. 4. 4870.

[16]CIL. 4. 4338. [17]NS. 1958, p. 151, n. 380. [18]CIL. 4. 2508, 4794.

[19]CIL. 4. 4286. [20]CIL. 4. 4302, 4325, 4361, 4381, 4384, 4405.

[21]CIL. 4. 4291. [22]CIL. 4. 2468. [23]CIL. 4. 4413. [24]CIL. 4. 4316.

[25]CIL. 4. 4374. [26]CIL. 4. 1179. [27]CIL. 4. 7991.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

tion as summa rudis. That indicates a certain probability that he was a freedman. Mau thinks Q. Petronius Octavius may have been a freedman from the beginning of his gladiatorial career,[1] and he and Dill (who follows Mau's lead here) call P. Ostorius a freedman on the basis of his name.[2] Mau thinks he gained his freedom as a reward for his fighting. These assertions seem to be more positive than the evidence warrants. In neither of these two cases referred to by Mau and Dill is the name really indicative of freedman status. Below we encounter a weaver named M. Terentius Eudoxsus who was probably a freedman, and that suggests that the gladiator M. Terentius Colonus was very likely also a freedman. An architect who was a freedman with the same nomen and praenomen indicates the probability that M. Artorius was a freedman. The reading of the inscription which contains the name of M. Valerius is uncertain. It may be that part of the word libertus or of the word Iulianus was originally in the text, but it is impossible to be sure now. Yet the fact that he shares his nomen and praenomen with two probable freedmen, a wine grower and a wine merchant, makes it probable that this Valerius was a freedman. Murtius and Paris could have been slaves. Since most gladiators were freeborn foreigners or men of servile origin, it would seem that those in this list who have more names than one may have been freedmen. A number of the names in the list must almost certainly be the names of freedmen, but the probability is less strong when each is considered as an individual. Greek or servile cognomina suggest the possibility that their possessors were freedmen. Thus it seems

---

[1]Mau, p. 226.

[2]Mau, p. 224; Dill, p. 238.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

likely that O. Lucius Eros, L. Sextius Eros, Colonus, Felix, Pumidius Paris, Prothymio and Telephus were freedmen.

Thus we have twelve gladiators who are identified as freedmen in the inscriptions, including some with a great deal of experience. (Incitatus fought ninety fights,[1] and Columbus fought eight-eight times.[2]) Two more are probably, though not certainly, called freedmen in the inscriptions. Seven more besides these were probably freedmen. There are sixteen others whose names we have noted who may have been freedmen, although with two, Murtius and Paris, there seems to be less likelihood of that, since they could have been slaves. As a whole it seems that a number of these seventeen gladiators might have been freedmen, although it is not possible to make dogmatic statements in regard to the individuals considered separately.

In this connection it is interesting to note that a freedman by the name of Niger helped furnish gladiators for a show.[3] L. Valerius Primus also furnished gladiators for a show as we saw in the preceding chapter.[4] That he might have been a freedman is suggested by the fact that he was an Augustalis. That he shared his nomen with other Valerii cannot be pressed too much since he has a different praenomen. It is possible that he provided gladiators for a show because that was one way in which a freedman could seek distinction.

---

[1] CIL. 4. 4636.

[2] CIL. 4. 2387.

[3] CIL. 4. 9970.

[4] CIL. 4. 9962.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Business, Trade and Industry

The many shops and rooms for storage and work, the numerous graffiti, the paintings, and the remains of equipment and products bear witness to a great deal of activity in business, trade and industry in Pompeii.[1] Inscriptions tell us of barbers, perfumers, goldsmiths, fruit-sellers, dealers in garlic, dyers, cloak-cutters, pack-carriers, mule-drivers, fishermen and masons, to mention just a few which give us a taste of the daily life of Pompeii.[2] The Basilica, a general market-building at the southwest corner of the Forum, must have housed the activity of many freedmen.[3] The Macellum, at the northeast corner of the Forum, was a market where live animals, meat, fish, wine, bread, flour, garlands, fruits and vegetables were sold.[4] To the east of the Forum was the Eumachia, the cloth exchange.[5] Peddlers seem to have been busy everywhere. Many residences had shops in the front parts. One reason shops were not out of place in a residential district is that the living areas were mainly toward the backs of the houses, where the gardens and peristyles were.[6]

In our inquiry into the role of freedmen in Pompeii's commercial and industrial life, we are hampered by the fragmentary nature of the evidence. We can identify only a small proportion of the freedmen who were engaged in business, trade and industry. We can see only the upper

---

[1]See Mau, pp. 384-87, and Tanzer, p. 4.

[2]See indexes of CIL. 4. Cf. Mau, pp. 384-85.

[3]Mau, pp. 70 ff., describes the site. [4]Mau, pp. 94-101.

[5]Mau, pp. 110-13. [6]Cf. Tanzer, p. 4.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

fraction of the iceberg, but we know there is much more that cannot be seen. It is to this type of activity that the freedman might look with the greatest expectancy. To the end of the Empire the Senators rejected such occupations, in keeping with Roman law and the feelings of Roman aristocrats.[1] Even the freeborn Romans of lower social status preferred the welfare rolls (public or private) to such degrading occupations. The Roman traditionally spurned the meaner occupations in general.[2] For Pompeii this is apparently not an entirely accurate expression of the feelings of the freeborn of all classes. We must keep in mind the large Greek element in the population of Campania, not only among slaves and freedmen and their descendants, but also among freeborn individuals of untainted ancestry. A survey of the inscriptions in Pompeii makes it clear that many freeborn individuals were engaged in various types of work. In Pompeii the occupations so long scorned by the free Roman were an invitation, if not to riches, at least to livelihood, and a doorway to a more respected place in Pompeian life and society. Even allowing for the Greek element in the population of Campania, we must yet concede that a large segment of those engaged in business, trade and industry in Pompeii must have been freedmen.

Bankers and Business Agents

L. Ceius Serapio, clearly identified as a freedman in an inscription found on his tomb outside the Nucerian Gate, is there described as

---

[1]Dio Cassius 69. 16. Cf. Dill, p. 102.

[2]Cf. Juvenal 3. 32 ff.; Dill, pp. 100-103.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a banker (argentarius).[1]

L. Caecilius Felix, the father of Iucundus, was a business agent.[2] According to Mary Gordon freedmen business agents represented their patrons in the management of their financial affairs, and with the training derived in that way often managed to gain wealth and importance.[3] That helps to explain the position of Felix's son Iucundus in the life and business of Pompeii. As we noted in the preceding chapter, Felix was a minister of Augustus,[4] and thus it appears that he was a freedman.[5] As additional evidence of his status as freedman we note his servile cognomen and the praenomen and nomen which he shares with four other probable freedmen with whom we are concerned. It should be noted that Felix had a business large enough that he used some help, and so in the first of the wax tablets we see mention of a slave of Felix who assisted him in his work.[6]

Businesses Dealing With Food

Garum Producers

Ti. Claudius Martialis was an imperial freedman who worked for A. Umbricius Scaurus in the garum business, the production of fish sauce. An inscription tells us that he sent a jar of the finest garum from the shop of Scaurus.[7]

---

[1]Della Corte, Case, p. 101, n. 2. [2]CIL. 4. 3340. 1.

[3]Gordon, JRS, 17 (1927), p. 179. [4]CIL. 10. 891.

[5]See the treatment of the ministri Augusti in the preceding chapter.

[6]CIL. 4. 3340. 1. [7]CIL. 4. 9406. Cf. Della Corte, Case, p. 413.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Wine Merchants

Duff tells us that foreign merchants preferred not to engage in the task of distributing wine in Italy, but preferred to take their wares to the ports and there turn them over to local merchants who were often freedmen.[1]

Above we considered the Vettii as wine producers. Paintings in their house in Pompeii show that they were also wine dealers.[2] A buyer is shown sampling wine from a cup, while two slaves are busy getting another sample from an amphora.

The house and shop at IX. ix. 6-7 may well have been those of a wine merchant, if the amphorae found there are an adequate indication.[3] The identification of the merchant is not certain, but it may be that an inscription found in the dative case on an amphora gives his name as C. Caesius Restitutus.[4] This wine merchant was apparently also a caupo. As might be expected in such a busy shop, various kinds of wine were available.[5] It even seems quite possible that this caupo produced some

---

[1]Duff, p. 119.

[2]Mau, pp. 336-37.

[3]Wilhelmina F. Jashemski, "A Pompeian Vinarius," The Classical Journal, 62 (1967), 193-94. Cf. Sogliano, NS. 1889, p. 125; Mau, Röm. Mitt., 4 (1889), 14 ff. On the location of the house, Prof. Jashemski says in her first note, "The literature on this house is difficult to locate because the site was excavated before the numbering of houses at Pompeii had become stabilized. Sogliano gives the address as Region IX, Insula viia, Entrance 6; Mau as IX. vii. 6. CIL. refers to the house sometimes as IX. viii. 6, at other times as IX. vii. 6."

[4]CIL. 4. 5794. See Jashemski, CJ, 62 (1967), p. 194, and Della Corte, Case, pp. 137-38.

[5]Jashemski, CJ, 62 (1967), pp. 197-98.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

wine in his own garden.[1] Restitutus is commonly considered to be a servile cognomen.[2] The nomen Caesius was held by the freedman L. Caesius Logus,[3] although that is not as important as evidence for freedman status as instances of nomen and praenomen found together among freedmen. If Duff is correct in saying that Italian wine merchants were often freedmen, then that gives some additional support to the suggestion of the name that Restitutus may have been a freedman.

M. Fabius Euporus seems to have been a wine merchant.[4] His name was found on an amphora that contained Cnidian wine,[5] and appears more than once in the tablets of Iucundus.[6] The similarity of his name to that of Fabius Eupor, the chief of the freedmen whom we considered in the preceding chapter, suggests the possibility that this man also was a freedman. Another Fabius was a gladiator. Euporus is a Greek cognomen, which, in conjunction with the other evidence, shows that Euporus was probably a freedman.

M. Stlaborius Nymphodotus may have been a wine merchant.[7] His name was found on an amphora that held Cretan wine, though unfortunately it was abbreviated.[8] The name also appears among the witnesses in the tablets of Iucundus.[9] The cognomen is of Greek origin, which at least suggests the possibility that its possessor was a freedman. We considered

---

[1]Jashemski, CJ, 62 (1967), pp. 199, 202. [2]Duff, p. 110.

[3]Mau, p. 433. [4]Day, p. 189.

[5]CIL. 4. 5535. [6]CIL. 4. 3340. 37, 71, 92, 97.

[7]Day, p. 190. [8]CIL. 4. 5526.

[9]CIL. 4. 3340. 94, 114.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

above another Marcus Stlaborius, a wine producer and probable freedman. All together the evidence indicates that Nymphodotus was very likely a freedman.

M. Valerius Abinnerious was a wine merchant. Of the fifteen amphorae containing his name, three held wine from Etruria.[1] The Jewish or Syrian cognomen not only supports that identification, but, combined with his Roman nomen and praenomen, it also raises a suspicion that Abinnerious might have been a freedman. The name Marcus Valerius was borne by two others who may have been freedmen, a gladiator and a wine producer. In addition, an Augustalis who furnished gladiators for a show had the same nomen. As a whole the evidence suggests a very distinct probability that Abinnericus was a freedman.

Caupones

We have noted above that C. Caesius Restitutus, who seems to have been a wine merchant, probably also operated a caupona.

Ti. Claudius Epaphroditus, the wine producer, also operated a caupona at IX. vii. 23.[2] The name suggests the probability that he was a freedman.[3]

The wine producer N. Fufidius Successus had a caupona at I. viii. 15-16.[4] The servile cognomen shows a possibility that Successus was a freedman, but that is far from conclusive.

---

[1] CIL. 4. 2585, 2599-2601, 5611-20, 5764-65. Cf. Day, pp. 184-90.

[2] Della Corte, Case, pp. 197, 413, 511; Day, p. 206.

[3] See the discussion above in connection with the Tiberii Claudii who were wine producers.

[4] Della Corte, Case, pp. 107, 504.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Nymphius and Caprasia, perhaps husband and wife, operated a caupona at VI. x. 3-4, as an inscription found there shows.[1] Della Corte thinks they were freedmen.[2] The caupona of Hermes was located at II. i. 1. His recommendation in an election notice is taken as evidence that the caupona was his.[3] Euxinus had his caupona at I. xi. 10-12.[4] He perhaps produced some of the wine he sold in his own garden.[5] Many times only the cognomen of a freedman is given in a graffito, and as Nymphius, Euxinus and Hermes are Greek names that may be the case here, but we can not be sure of that. Rather than speculating on individual cases, it is safer to suppose that when there are a number of such instances, some of the individuals may well have been freedmen.

Proprietors of Food Shops

The name of M. Amullius Cosmus in the dative case on an amphora discovered at the taberna at VII. i. 7 is used as evidence that he was the tabernarius: M. AMVLLIO [CO]SMO.[6] The Greek Cognomen added to the Roman nomen and praenomen raise the question as to whether Cosmus might have been a freedman. We encountered the same nomen and praenomen with a wine producer who also had a Greek cognomen, Hermes. It is therefore probable that Cosmus was a freedman.

---

[1]CIL. 4. 171. [2]Della Corte, Case, p. 56, n. 3.

[3]CIL. 4. 7489. Cf. Della Corte, Case, pp. 366, 504.

[4]Wilhelmina F. Jashemski, "The Caupona of Euximus at Pompeii," Archaeology, 20 (1967), 37-39.

[5]Jashemski, Archeology, 20 (1967), 41.

[6]CIL. 4. 2626; Della Corte, Case, pp. 232, 508. Cf. CIL. 4. 737.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

It seems that Aemilius Fidelis operated a taberna at VII. v. 16, specializing in milk products.[1] The taberna at III. 5. 1 seems to have belonged to Pascius Hermes, judging by the election notices found there.[2] An election recommendation of the pomarius Felix discovered at the taberna at I. viii. 1 not only identified the owner of the taberna but also shows that the specialty of the shop was the sale of fruit.[3] These names suggest the possibility of freedman status.

Holder of a Concession at the Amphitheater

Cn. Aninius Fortunatus was given permission by the aediles to occupy a place at the amphitheater, apparently to conduct his business there, selling to the crowds.[4] We are not told what it was that he sold, but his business must have been such that he would expect to receive the patronage of the people who went to the amphitheater. It may be that he operated a refreshment stand, although that is conjecture.[5] Fortunatus is considered a servile cognomen.[6]

Businesses Connected with Cloth

Fullers

The small fullery at I. iv. 26 was operated by Dionysius, specifically identified in one inscription as a fuller.[7] Walter Moeller

---

[1]Della Corte, Case, pp. 173-74, 509.

[2]CIL. 4. 7218, 7221-22. Cf. Della Corte, Case, pp. 368, 505.

[3]CIL. 4. 7261; Della Corte, Case, pp. 323-24, 503.

[4]CIL. 4. 1096-97b; Della Corte, Case, pp. 398, 512.

[5]Cf. Frank, Econ. Surv., 5, 103, 257, n. 109; E. Magaldi, "Il commercio ambulante a Pompei," 60 (1930), 19-21.

[6]Duff, p. 110. [7]CIL. 4. 2966. Cf. Della Corte, Case, pp. 256, 503.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

thinks Dionysius specialized in wool washing, since he had a furnace and a soaking vat but no treading stalls.[1] In two inscriptions Dionysius is identified as a freedman.[2] Della Corte identifies him as a freedman of one of the Lucii Popidii, the owners of the house with which the fullery is connected, I. iv. 5-28.[3] These inscriptions are election notices in which Dionysius recommends L. Popidius Secundus for election as aedile.[4] In another inscription the name of the one recommending Secundus is not clear, though Della Corte restores the name as Popidius and understands Dionysius as the person intended.[5] Since we know that he was a freedman, that he operated a fullery in the house of L. Popidius Secundus and that he recommended Secundus in at least three election notices, it is quite likely that Dionysius was a freedman of Secundus, although we are not able to be absolutely certain.

According to paintings in their house, the Vettii also seem to have been involved in the fulling business.[6]

Passaratus and Maenianus seem to have operated, or perhaps worked at, a small fullery at I. iv. 7, if we may judge by an electoral recommendation which they placed at the entrance.[7] Della Corte thinks the

---

[1]Moeller, p. 73. [2]CIL. 4. 1041, 2966.

[3]Della Corte, Case, p. 256. [4]CIL. 4. 1041, 2966, 2974.

[5]CIL. 4. 1045. See Della Corte, Case, p. 256.

[6]Mau, pp. 335-36.

[7]CIL. 4. 995. Cf. Della Corte, Case, pp. 263-64, and Moeller, p. 39.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

unidentified fuller who left an electoral recommendation nearby worked at this fullery also.[1] The small fullery at VI. xv. 3 was operated by Mustius, who is identified as a fuller in an inscription.[2] Ovia, who was associated with him there, may have been his wife.[3] Moeller thinks this fullery was a one-family business that had little need of additional help.[4] The large fullery at I. vi. 7 is attributed to Stephanus on the basis of two election recommendations on the front of the building.[5] Moeller thinks this fullery was too large to be confined to cleaning and that the finishing of new cloth must have been done there also.[6] We can not be certain whether any in this list were freedmen, although we would ordinarily expect to find a number of freedmen among the fullers. The establishment of Stephanus seems too extensive to have belonged to a slave. The Greek name Stephanus suggests that Stephanus may have been a freedman. It is probable, but by no means certain, that the ending of the name of Maenianus indicates servile descent. The name Mustius may be a nomen rather than a cognomen,[7] which would at least indicate its possessor was not a slave, and probably that he was not a foreigner. When we consider the slight evidence, all we can say is that some of these fullers may have been freedmen, but we cannot be sure.

---

[1]Della Corte, Case, p. 264. [2]CIL. 4. 3529. Cf. 3527.

[3]CIL. 4. 3528; Della Corte, Case, p. 66. [4]Moeller, p. 63.

[5]CIL. 4. 7172, 7174. Cf. Della Corte, Case, p. 286, Moeller, p. 40.

[6]Moeller, p. 49. [7]Cf. Della Corte, Case, p. 66, n. 2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Dyer

Ubonius had his dyehouse at IX. iii. 1-2.[1] It is possible, though by no means sure, that the dyehouse across the street at VII. ii. 11 also belonged to him, as Della Corte thinks.[2] The name Ubonius is a nomen, so Ubonius seems to have been either freeborn or a freedman. It is not possible to determine which.

Felt Maker

O. Tettius Faustus may have been the proprietor of the shop at IX. iii. 16. A bronze seal with the initials C. T. F. was found in the shop.[3] Della Corte suggests that the owner of the seal may have been the C. Tettius Faustus, whose name was found in the tablets of Iucundus.[4] According to Moeller, this shop seems not to have been a dyehouse as Della Corte thought, but rather a felt shop.[5] The servile cognomen Faustus joined to the Roman nomen and cognomen Gaius Tettius suggest that Faustus may have been a freedman.

Spinners and Weavers

M. Terentius Eudoxsus seems to have used the peristyle of his house at VI. xiii.6 as a weaving factory.[6] Some graffiti give the names of seven male weavers:[7] Vesbius Tamudianus, Ephesus, Faustus, Felix, Florus,

---

[1]CIL. 4. 852, 858, 864; Della Corte, Case, pp. 156-57; Moeller, p. 87.

[2]Moeller, p. 86; Della Corte, Case, pp. 156-57.

[3]Della Corte, Case, p. 191; CIL. 10. 8058, 86.

[4]CIL. 4. 3340. 64; Della Corte, Case, p. 191. [5]Moeller, p. 93.

[6]CIL. 4. 4456; Della Corte, Case, pp. 120-21; Moeller, pp. 94-95.

[7]CIL. 4. 1493, 1495, 1497-98, 1503-6, 1509.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Successus and Xanthus. Others contain the names of eleven female spinners:[1] Amaryllis, Baptis, Damalis, Doris, Florentina, Heracla, Ianuaria, Lalage, Maria, Vitalis and ...rusa. The Greek cognomen Eudoxsus joined to the Roman nomen and praenomen shows some likelihood that the owner of the factory was a freedman. We have encountered a gladiator with the same nomen and praenomen, which increases the probability that both can be identified as freedmen. The servile names among the workers show that at least some of them were likely to be freedmen, although it is possible that all the workers at this factory were slaves.

Miscellaneous Occupations

Ship Owner

Ti. Claudius Orpheus was a ship owner and a seafaring merchant, to judge by an inscription on an amphora which was carried on his ship.[2] Not only does the name Tiberius Claudius indicate a strong probability that its possessor was a freedman, but the Greek cognomen Orpheus increases that likelihood.

We noted above the possibility that Naevoleia Tyche might have gained some of her wealth with ships, although we must remember that that is speculation.

Manager of Baths

An inscription in stone shows that a freedman named Ianuarius was the manager of the baths of M. Crassus Frugus.[3] Frequenters of this

---

[1] CIL. 4. 1507, 1510.

[2] CIL. 4. 5894. Cf. Della Corte, Case, pp. 412-13.

[3] CIL. 10. 1063.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

establishment could bathe in warm sea water or fresh water. Mau thinks the inscription was both an advertisement and a sign giving directions to the baths.[1]

Proprietors of Pottery Shops

Ti. Claudius Potiscus seems to have been the proprietor of a pottery workshop. His name is found on amphorae with the indication that he was an imperial freedman.[2]

Apparently Ti. Claudius Felix[3] and Ti. Claudius Sabinus[4] were also proprietors of pottery workshops. The cognomen Felix is considered servile. Since it is Latin it is not too likely that Felix was a naturalized foreigner. It seems most probable that he was a freedman. Sabinus is more likely a name a freeborn Roman would have chosen, but yet the combination of praenomen and nomen indicate that Sabinus was probably a freedman.

The shop at IX. i. 17-19 was in charge of Lollia Successa.[5] Her cognomen is servile, and we have noted a minister of Augustus, Q. Lollius Felix, with the same nomen. There is a good possibility that Lollia Successa was a freedwoman.

Proprietors of Other Shops

The taberna at IX. iii. 17, with the attached stall for donkeys or cattle, apparently belonged to Q. Sallustius Inventus.[6] Sergius

---

[1]Mau, p. 408. Cf. Della Corte, Case, pp. 29-30.

[2]CIL. 10. 8042, 36. Cf. Della Corte, Case, p. 413.

[3]CIL. 10. 8042, 35. [4]NS. 1921, 417. Cf. Della Corte, Case, p. 413.

[5]CIL. 4. 1053, 1062. Cf. Della Corte, Case, p. 242.

[6]Della Corte, Case, pp. 192, 511.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Felix is assumed, on the basis of an election recommendation found there, to have occupied the taberna at IX. vii. 4.[1]

Perfumers

M. Decidius Faustus is in the same inscription identified as a dealer in perfumes, a minister of Augustus and a freedman.[2]

Judging by a painting in the house of the Vettii, Conviva and Restitutus were also engaged in the perfume business.[3]

Swineherd

An inscription on a recently excavated tombstone outside the Porta Nuceria identifies Clodia Nigella as a freedwoman and a public swineherd.[4]

Jewellers, Flower Dealers, Oil Producers and Dealers

Paintings in their house indicate that the Vettii were concerned with jewelry, the flower trade, the production and processing of olives, and the sale of oil.[5]

In conclusion, we may safely say that freedmen were engaged in many of the occupations of Pompeii. They were not limited to one area of the work there, but might be found anywhere that their servile association did not exclude. The economic life of this bustling Campanian town was in large part dependent on the activity of freedmen.

---

[1] CIL. 4. 7829; Della Corte, Case, pp. 281, 511. [2] CIL. 10. 892.

[3] Mau, p. 334.

[4] Matteo Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 58, Tomb 4 (b).

[5] Mau, pp. 332-35; Röm. Mitt. 11 (1896), 43-97.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER IV

THE PLACE OF FREEDMEN AT POMPEII

Freedmen at Pompeii were not all poor and unimportant individuals who were despised by society in general and engaged only in menial work. Many were wealthy and important people. Some had entered into activities traditionally belonging to the Roman aristocracy, such as the ownership of land. Even though their status as freedmen made them a part of a despised segment of society, the wealth and economic standing of those who had carved a special place for themselves in Pompeii must have resulted in a degree of authority, respect and social acceptability, even among men outside the servile class among the common people.

The house of the Vettii suggests to us something of the many financial interests of Trimalchio. The wealth of this home of probable freedmen can be seen in the fine paintings and the decoration of the peristyle. On the other end of the spectrum can be seen the humble fullery of Dionysius, or the occupation of the swineherd, Clodia Nigella. But even these had a place, and without such people as these the business of Pompeii would not have flourished as it did.

The Tombs of Freedmen

Tombs, some elaborate and some simple, which are found outside the gates of the city were not just places of burial, but were often monuments intended to impress people or to provide places for family

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

or friends to gather. Frequently provision was made for worship of the dead. Tombs sometimes show us something of the status and tastes of those buried there.

There are no finer examples of the altar type of tomb at Pompeii than those of C. Calventius Quietus and Naevoleia Tyche.[1] Tyche was a freedwoman, as the inscription shows.[2] She must have been wealthy to build so fine a tomb with such elaborate decoration; the reference the inscription makes to her freedmen and freedwomen supports the conclusion. A desire to proclaim her elevated position seems to be indicated not only by the nature of the tomb as a whole, but also by the portrayal on the tomb of the bisellium of her husband, C. Munatius Faustus. In a large niche in the sepulchral chamber was an urn, apparently for the remains of Tyche and Faustus. In smaller niches and on benches along the sides of the chamber were more urns, in some of which were found, besides ashes and pieces of bone, a mixture of water, wine and oil. There were also lamps to provide light on anniversary days. So in this tomb we find indications of a freedman's wealth as well as desire for status in this life and veneration afterward.

The Augustalis C. Calventius Quietus was given the privilege of sitting on a bisellium at the theater and amphitheater. The inscription shows that this honor was a reward for the generosity of Quietus. Thus from this tomb we learn that Quietus was wealthy, which both the fine tomb and the generosity mentioned in the inscription above show, and

---

[1]Mau, pp. 421-24, describes these tombs.

[2]CIL. 10. 1030. See above, p. 55. [3]CIL. 10. 1026.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

that he had received honors. It seems likely that by his generosity he sought to gain distinctions otherwise denied to freedmen. There was no provision for making possible libations to his ashes, which may mean that this was just a memorial rather than the actual place of burial or that he had no relatives to pay respects to his ashes and memory.

On the Street of Tombs outside the Herculanean Gate, along the retaining wall, is a sepulchral tablet which M. Arrius Diomedes erected for Arria, daughter of M. Arrius, as well as for himself and his family.[1] Above is his tomb, with an inscription that shows that he was a magistrate of the suburb Pagus Augustus Felix.[2] The larger tomb of Arria lies behind.[3] Thus Diomedes chose for his own tomb a position of prominence. The desire for show can also be seen in the portrayal of fasces on his door jamb.[4] In each case there was a wish to be accorded honor that was not actually deserved, honor reserved for freeborn men, who alone could hold office with authority to give the death penalty. The location of the tomb of Diomedes in relation to that of Arria, the love of borrowed glory, and the official position of Diomedes all remind us of Trimalchio.[5]

---

[1] CIL. 10. 1043. [2] CIL. 10. 1042.

[3] The description is found in Mau, pp. 427-28.

[4] Petronius, Satyricon 30.

[5] Trimalchio, as we see from Petronius, Satyricon 30, has an inscription on prominent display with a statement that he was a sevir Augustalis.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The tomb of the freedman P. Mancius Diogenes, located on the east side of the amphitheater, was built in the form of a commemorative arch, with a low vaulted opening.[1] There were three niches on the top of the arch; originally each held a statue. The two statues that remain are of undistinguished quality. The tomb was large and shows that Diogenes must have been a fairly wealthy man.

The inscription on the modest tomb of M. Petacius Dasius says that Dasius had built the tomb for his sons Severus and Communis and for the freedwoman Petacia Vitalis.[2] The funeral urns were buried in the dirt floor of the burial chamber and the places were marked with bust stones. Since one of these stones contained the initials M.P.D., it seems that Dasius was himself buried there.[3]

The tomb of M. Cerrinius Restitutus is just outside the Herculanean Gate.[4] It is just a low niche with seats at the sides. A marble tombstone with an altar in front of it was at the rear wall. Almost identical inscriptions found on each show that Restitutus was an Augustalis and that the place of burial was given by the decree of the city council.[5] We noted in the second chapter that Restitutus was probably a freedman. Augustales were often wealthy, and the recognition by the city council shows that the city probably had some reason to be grateful. The nature of the tomb itself does not suggest wealth, though marble was not the cheapest material for tombstones, so perhaps the decree recognizes

---

[1]The tomb is described in Mau, p. 432. [2]NS, 1893, p. 333.

[3]The tomb is described in Mau, p. 430.

[4]The tomb is described in Mau, pp. 408-9. [5]CIL. 10. 994-95.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

his service as an Augustalis. The tomb was of a kind to which relatives could come to celebrate anniversaries and make libations to the dead.

The freedman L. Caesius Logus was buried in the tomb of someone else, probably his patron.[1] So in addition to freedmen who had large tombs and those with small tombs, we also find freedmen who did not have their own tombs at all and had to be provided for in the tombs of others.

It cost money to build fine tombs or tombs large enough to serve for others besides the builders. Sometimes inscriptions on the tombs show that freedmen themselves had freedmen. So Q. Cornelius Diphilus and Cornelia Heraes, freedman and freedwoman of Quintus, built a tomb for themselves and their freedmen and freedwomen.[2] The freedman M. Stronnius Meinius built a tomb for himself and his patrons and a freedwoman Stronnia Agatharcho.[3]

Between the tombs of Naevoleia Tyche and C. Calventius Quietus was an enclosure which contained the bust stones of N. Istacidius Helenus, N. Istacidius Ianuarius and Mesonia Satulla.[4] In the second chapter we saw that Helenus and Ianuarius were probably freedmen. That was very likely also the status of Mesonia Satulla. If she had been freeborn we would ordinarily expect some indication of the reason for her association with the probable freedmen. The bodies may have been

---

[1]Mau, p. 433.

[2]CIL. 10. 1049.

[3]Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 83, tomb 44.

[4]CIL. 10. 1027-28. See Mau, p. 421, for a description of the tomb.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

burned in the enclosure before burial of the ashes there.[1] In front of one of the stones a small jar was found which had been intended for offerings for the dead.

The tombs mentioned here show that freedmen might have elaborate or simple tombs or might even have been buried in the tombs of others. Elaborate tombs were indications of wealth. Other signs of wealth, as well as evidence of position, are given in the inscriptions on some of the tombs. Tombs might also show a freedman's desire for honors or they might show the ostentation of certain freedmen. The fact that large and small tombs, and tombs of freedmen and freeborn often appear side by side shows that in this important respect there was not discrimination against freedmen. The taint of servile birth which was such a hindrance in this life perhaps did not matter so much for the next. In any case the tombs show that freedmen might gain wealth, honors, and a certain status. They show too that the ostentation of Trimalchio was not wholly fiction.

Freedmen on the Land

At Pompeii freedmen made a large dent in the old aristocratic monopoly of agriculture. The Romans of the upper classes had for generations maintained an interest in the possession of land and had shunned trade and industry, and that seems to have been the picture in Pompeii to the end.[2] The entrance of freedmen into the aristocratic domain is very significant. In the preceding chapter we noted that one freedman

---

[1]W. Jashemski, "Tomb Gardens at Pompeii," The Classical Journal, 66 (1970-71), 104.

[2]Cf. Carrington, JRS, 21 (1931), 118.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and at least thirty-one probable freedmen were wine producers. Besides these we noted two freedmen and three probable freedmen who were estate managers, as well as two more managers who may have been freedmen. Day thinks the wine producers owned the estates on which they produced wine.[1] If that is so it shows that a sizable number of freedmen must have been landowners.

The freedmen did not take over the domain of the aristocracy, but the fact that they had entered into that domain, and had done so in meaningful numbers, speaks a great deal in connection with the place of freedmen in Pompeii. Conditions in Italy were changing, as they do everywhere, and, furthermore, not all of the freemen in Pompeii had so hearty a disdain for the trades and occupations as did those in Rome. Even if freedmen had risen to positions of wealth and influence only in those areas one could hardly deny that many freedmen were coming up in the world. But the fact that many freedmen now belonged in the old aristocratic occupations makes it clear that the situation in Pompeii does not reflect that in Rome in the days of former glory. The sacrosanctity of the aristocratic place in agriculture was no more. Servile birth did not prevent entrance into aristocratic territory. If, furthermore, the families of the wine producers and villa owners were, as Day says, the most prominent and wealthy at Pompeii as well as the elite in the city government,[2] the company into which many freedmen entered was even more distinguished.

---

[1]Day, YCS, 3 (1932), 177.

[2]Day, YCS 3 (1932), 177-78.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Wealth of Freedmen

That evidences of wealth may be seen in the tombs of freedmen we have noted above.

Membership in certain of the priesthoods open to freedmen is a sign of wealth. So the Augustales were apparently drawn from the ranks of men who were well-to-do, in order that the city might profit from their generosity. Since, as we concluded in the last chapter, Augustales at Pompeii must for the most part have been freedmen, that made it possible for the city to benefit from a source of gifts other than that of the freeborn office holders.[1]

There are also many other signs of wealth among individual freedmen. So some individuals show by their generosity that they were men of means. The freedman Niger and the probable freedman L. Valerius Primus furnished gladiators for shows. Three other generous men who were probably freedmen were the Augustalis C. Calventius Quietus, who was granted a seat of double width because of his generosity, N. Popidus Ampliatus, who rebuilt the Temple of Isis, and C. Norbanus Sorex, the magistrate of the suburb Pagus Augustus Felix who was very likely a benefactor of the Temple of Isis and the Eumachia.

The freedmen who were wine producers must have had a certain amount of wealth if it is true that they owned their farms. Some of them also engaged in other business activities. As we noted in the preceding chapter, the Vettii had various business activities and a fine house.

---

[1]Cf. L.R. Taylor, JRS, 14 (1924), 169; R. Meiggs, Roman Ostia (Oxford, 1960), pp. 220-21.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The probable freedman L. Caecilius Hermes apparently had other business activities, as we know from the mention of his name in the wax tablets.[1]

A number of freedmen and probable freedmen besides those mentioned above were involved in businesses or business deals that suggest a certain financial achievement. The business agent L. Caecilius Felix laid the foundation for the fortune of his son Iucundus. The freedman L. Ceius Serapio was a banker. Ti. Claudius Orphaeus, who was probably an imperial freedman, was a shipowner, as we saw in the preceding chapter. The freedman M. Decidius Faustus was a perfume dealer. The freedman Dionysius was a fuller who seems to have had his own business, small though it was. The freedman M. Cerrinius Euphrates received 520 sesterces for the sale of a mule to the freedman M. Pomponius Nico.[2] These show the range of financial success among freedmen, from small business to business activities involving considerable wealth, as we saw in the preceding chapter.

A number of freedmen themselves owned slaves or had freedmen, which is a further indication of wealth. We saw instances of that above in tomb inscriptions. The freedman Cataplus also had freedmen,[3] and Poppaea Note was a freedwoman of some means who owned slaves.[4]

The Social Position of Freedmen

The social position of freedmen was fixed first of all by their servile birth. Yet within the limits allowed to freedmen they might

---

[1] CIL. 4. 3340. 51.

[2] CIL. 4. 3340. 1.

[3] CIL. 10. 8068. 3, 4.

[4] CIL. 4. 3340. 154, 155.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

seek an advance in social status. It seems that the factors that affected the social advancement of freedmen were largely wealth and service for the city and its inhabitants. To a certain extent their industry and the types of work in which they engaged also had effect. Apart from the benefits gained by the financial rewards of work, the type of occupation which provided most status must have involved ownership of land, since that had traditionally been associated with freeborn Romans, and even aristocrats. Perhaps even here the benefit was largely in the mind of the freedman involved.

The evidence that we have in regard to freedmen in Pompeii seems to indicate that the highest official function of freedmen was a function in emperor worship. That is natural since it seems to be in large measure a substitute for office so much sought by the freeborn. It is in that connection that we have the most evidence of recognition of freedmen by the city officials. That can best be seen in the inscriptions of the ministri Augusti which we considered in the second chapter. In a way even more prestige and importance may have been attached to the connection with the name of the emperor and the imperial approval that was understood. Some of the major official positions of that kind were, besides those of the priesthood of Augustus, the positions of the priests of Fortuna Augusta, the Augustales, the magistri vicorum and probably the magistrates of the suburb Pagus Augustus Felix. Although it must often have been due to their wealth that freedmen were enrolled in the colleges concerned with the imperial cult, yet that wealth was also an important independent factor in social advancement. We have noted above the recognition by the city council of individuals because

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of their generosity, in the cases of C. Calventius Quietus and C. Norbanus Sorex. Furthermore N. Popidius Ampliatus rebuilt the Temple of Isis in the name of his son, N. Popidius Celsinus, who was rewarded with a seat on the city council at the tender age of six years. In a case like this a father could use his wealth to start his son on a political career that was denied to the father because of his servile birth.

Those freedmen who did not gain recognition by service or expenditure of money had to be content to remain in the inferior position of freedmen in general. While it is no doubt true that the large Greek element in Campania and the greater willingness of freeborn men to engage in work traditionally scorned by aristocratic Romans must have resulted in a greater acceptance of freedmen in society, yet the stigma remained. There is no other way to interpret the effort of freedmen to rid themselves or their posterity of servile cognomina, and Pompeii was certainly a part of the Roman Empire, as all the evidence testifies.

Political Activity of Freedmen

Freedmen could not hold office in Pompeii, but that did not prevent them from being active in politics. The election notices of Pompeii preserve a kind of evidence not available from other places. A survey of the inscriptions that mention freedmen and probable freedmen reveals that many of them recommended candidates for office.[1] So we read P.

---

[1]Besides the others listed below, see for example CIL. 4. 117, 207, 668, 737, 923, 994-95, 3529, 7051, 7172, 7231, 7235, 7257, 7305, 7308, 7900. Pompeii is unique. Because of the way the city was preserved we have many painted notices of individuals backing candidates for office.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

VEDIVM. NVMM.... AED. CERATVS. LIB. ROGAT,[1] or L. POPIDIVM. L. F. AED. O. V. F. DIONYSIVS. FVLLO. ROG. LIBER,[2] or L. ALBVCIVM. AED. THESMVS. LIBERT. ROG.[3]

There is no way to find out how many freedmen recommended candidates or what percentage of the recommendations came from freedmen. It may be that many of the candidates were patrons of the freedmen who recommended them. Perhaps at times the posting of election notices was a freedman's substitute for holding office. A freedman might even win a little reflected glory in that way. There is no indication that freedmen were discouraged in the practice of recommending candidates for office, or that the candidate was harmed by it. This in itself seems to give some evidence in regard to the social status of freedmen. No doubt electoral notices by freedmen helped influence at least other freedmen and perhaps others too, but we can only speculate on the effect of the recommendations. The notices, however, could hardly have escaped the attention of the people who passed by.

Freedmen not Discussed in Preceding Chapters

Often inscriptions identify individuals as freedmen but give little or no other information about them. Many of these inscriptions were found on tombs. Some inscriptions give no information about the occupations or religious connections of freedmen but provide some other information, such as evidence of financial standing, as we saw above.

---

[1] CIL. 4. 910. [2] CIL. 4. 2966. Cf. 1041, 2974.

[3] CIL. 4. 2983.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Those freedmen whom we have not considered in the preceding chapters are listed below.

Aebia Fausta

L. Aebius Aristo[1]

Alfia Servilla[3]

Avdia Statia[5]

L. Caesius Logus[7]

M. Caledius Libo[8]

A. Campius Antiocus[10]

L. Ceius Lucifer[12]

Cipia Optata[14]

P. Claudius Acapetius Elpephebius[16]

A. Clodius Faustus[18]

Cornelia Heraes

Aebia Hilara

M. Afillius Primogenes[2]

Arria Utilis[4]

Q. Caecilius Eros[6]

M. Caledius Antiochus

L. Caltilius Coll...[9]

Castricia Prisca[11]

M. Cerrinius Euphrates[13]

Claudia Laudica[15]

A. Clavius[17]

Commun(is) Celat(us)[19]

Q. Cornelius Daphilus[20]

---

[1]Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 74, tomb 24, for this and the preceding two names.

[2]CIL. 10. 1047. [3]NS. 1886, p. 337. [4]CIL. 10. 1044.

[5]CIL. 10. 1048. [6]NS. 1893, p. 334, n. 7.

[7]Mau, p. 433. [8]CIL. 10. 1048, for this and the preceding name.

[9]CIL. 10. 1046. [10]Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 83, tomb 42.

[11]Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 83, tomb 45 (twice). [12]CIL. 10. 1040.

[13]CIL. 4. 3340. 1. [14]Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 64, tomb 14.

[15]NS. 1893, p. 335. [16]CIL. 4. 5649.

[17]Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 54, tomb 4.

[18]Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 58, tomb 4.

[19]CIL 4. 5814. [20]CIL. 10. 1049, for this and the preceding name.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

A. Dentatius Celsus[1]

Flavia Agathea

P. Flavius Philamen[3]

P. Mancius Diogenes[4]

Mescinia Veneria[6]

Mutitia Salvia

Naevoleia Tyche[9]

Petacia Vitalis

Petilius Surus[12]

M. Pomponius Nico[14]

Q. Sempronius[16]

Stallia Haphe[18]

L. Statius Philadelphus[19]

L. Filex[2]

P. Flavius Acastus

Mancia Doris

Melissaea Asia[5]

P. Minicius Apollonius[7]

C. Muttius Capito[8]

M. Orfellius Faustus[10]

M. Petacius Dasius[11]

Pishia Rufilla[13]

Poppaea Note[15]

Sentius Celsus[17]

Ae. Statius

Stronnia Agatarcho

---

[1]Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 80, tomb 35. [2]CIL. 4. 1*.

[3]Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 54, tomb 3, for this and the preceding two names.

[4]Mau, p. 432, for this and the preceding name. [5]CIL. 10. 1010.

[6]CIL. 10. 1054. [7]CIL. 10. 1069.

[8]CIL. 10. 1073, for this and the preceding name. [9]CIL. 10. 1030.

[10]Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 67, tomb 20.

[11]NS. 1893, pp. 333-34, for this and the preceding name.

[12]CIL. 4. 2455. [13]Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 78, tomb 35.

[14]CIL. 4. 3340. 1. [15]CIL. 4. 3340. 154, 155. [16]CIL. 4. 1429.

[17]CIL. 4. 2324. [18]Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 67, tomb 20.

[19]CIL. 4. 3990, for this and the preceding name.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

M. Stronnius Meinius[1]
P. Vedius Ceratus[3]
Q. Vettius Barniaeus[5]
Celsa[7]
Faustus[9]
Laumerius[11]
Mythus[13]
Pamphilus[15]
Soterus
Thesmus[19]
Vitalis[21]
Tirania Repentina[2]
Vertia Philumenis[4]
Callistus[6]
Communis[8]
Halys[10]
Menomachus[12]
Nardus[14]
Pitamnus[16]
Surus[18]
Vitalis[20]

The names of a few other individuals, who were probably freedmen, follow. The names of two indicate that they were probably imperial freedmen. Some of the others we have mentioned earlier in the chapter.

---

[1]Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 83, tomb 44, for this and the preceding name.

[2]Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 54, tomb 4. [3]CIL. 4. 910.

[4]Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 62, tomb 11. [5]CIL. 4. 1865.

[6]CIL. 10. 1033. [7]CIL. 4. 2467. [8]CIL. 10. 8058. 24.

[9]CIL. 4. 3340. 109. [10]CIL. 10. 981.

[11]Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 78, tomb 35. [12]CIL. 10. 1037.

[13]NS. 1916, p. 303, n. 65. [14]CIL. 10. 1076.

[15]Della Corte, Case, p. 435. [16]CIL. 4. 8797. 8.

[17]NS. 1914, p. 294, n. 10. [18]CIL. 4. 2455.

[19]CIL. 4. 2983. [20]Mau, p. 430.

[21]Della Corte, "Notebook," p. 78, tomb 35.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ti. Claudius Agrius[1] Ti. Claudius C(h)ryseros[2]

N. Istacidius Ianuarius[3] Q. Licinius Saeianario[4]

Mesonia Satulla[5]

On the wall of the theater in Herculaneum was found an inscription, extant in six large fragments and five small ones, which preserves in whole or in part the names of 241 freedmen, nineteen freeborn men, and 140 others, from several fragments, who may have been freedmen.[6] Of this latter group twenty-nine are from the lists which otherwise contain men identified as freedmen. In this group are also a number of other names with servile cognomina such as Successus and Fortunatus, as well as names with ingenuous cognomina such as Rufus. We do not know why the names were placed on the wall of the theater, although the heading VENERIA over one column with names of freedmen shows some connection with Venus. Over a column with the names of freeborn men the word ADLEGERVNT appears.

As we look at the names of those at Pompeii who were certainly freedmen we may be surprised to find that there are not as many servile Roman cognomina as we might have expected. We do find instances of such names as Faustus, Felix and Communis as well as a considerable number of Greek names, including Eros, but we also find some instances of names generally considered ingenuous, such as Capito and Gratus.[7]

---

[1]Della Corte, Case, p. 413. [2]CIL. 4. 3340. 101.

[3]CIL. 10. 1027. [4]CIL. 4. 2143.

[5]CIL. 10. 1027. [6]CIL. 10. 1403.

[7]Cf. Duff, p. 110.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In the large fragments of the inscription from Herculaneum which we mentioned above, we also find ingenuous names such as Celer, as well as many servile names among the names of the freedmen.

As a class the freedmen in Pompeii had come a long way by the time of the eruption of Mt. Vesuvius in A.D. 79. Not all were wealthy or honored or influential, but neither were all freeborn men. In wealth it was possible for a freedman to surpass many freeborn men. Many freedmen had engaged in the aristocratic pursuits on the land. Although the highest priesthoods and honors a freedman could receive were not as great as those at the height of the career of a freeborn man, yet they were prized. Some of them freedmen shared with freeborn men. Some men who seem to have been freedmen, as the Vettii, took over big houses with elaborate gardens. Other houses were converted into a tannery, bakeries, and fulleries. Large new houses designed for elegant living were not being constructed in the last years of the city. All activity then was concentrated on rebuilding after the severe damage of the earthquake of 62. The lower classes, including the freedmen, were apparently taking over at Pompeii increasingly.

Freedmen at Pompeii seem to have depended for prestige largely on wealth or positions of importance in the function of emperor worship. There were exceptions, of course, as there are to many rules. Fabius Eupor, the Princeps Libertinorum, apparently occupied a position of some prominence which seems not to have been connected in any way with the imperial cult. Freedmen also, no doubt often for recognition of some

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

kind, used their wealth for the benefit of temples or organizations with religious connections. So we saw that C. Norbanus Sorex apparently made a gift to the Temple of Isis and the Eumachia. N. Popidius Ampliatus seems to have rebuilt the Temple of Isis after the earthquake of A.D, 62. Generosity need not always have been directed to ends specifically religious. The apparent gift of Sorex to the Eumachia need not have had a specifically religious purpose. Nor is there any indication that the generosity of the Augustalis C. Calventius Quietus was directed to an end connected with formal religion of any kind. This and other gifts very likely were for the benefit of the city or the people of Pompeii. That would explain the granting to Quietus of the privilege of sitting on the bisellium. The same thing is no doubt true of the Augustalis C. Munatius Faustus.

There is no evidence that the freedmen in Pompeii ever occupied the higher aristocratic religious positions. They had to be content with their own place and the offices of that place. Those positions were designed for people of their status and ambitions, and the freedmen were ambitious for those positions. Otherwise they would not have been so ready to open their purses to provide the gifts or services expected of people in those positions.

Freedmen in Pompeii might occupy lowly or elevated positions in the economy and among the occupations. Who would sneer at the accomplishments of the Vettii or L. Caecilius Felix, to mention only two names? Not all freedmen could claim such accomplishments, but we have seen the industry of the freedmen in a wide range of activities.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Freedmen were engaged in the work of Pompeii in the following occupations: wine producer, estate manager, architect, gladiator, banker, garum shipper, fuller, shop proprietor, perfumer, and swineherd. In the second chapter we saw more occupations in which probable freedmen were engaged.

Freedmen covered a large part of the spectrum of Pompeian life, but they were excluded from office and there is no evidence that freedmen were admitted to any of the aristocratic religious functions. Freedmen sought social standing, recognition, honors, and wealth. The nearer they could get to the appearance of freeborn standing the better. Even the ostentation of some was perhaps often only a part of the striving for a place of equality with the freeborn Roman.

The aristocracy may have been decaying, but the freedmen had not lost their vigor and their drive. They were working to make a new place for themselves, and there is some evidence that they were succeeding, though slowly. Their encroachment into the aristocratic domain of the land is a good indication. The road ahead was long, but they were plodding forward step by step.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX A

NAMES OF FREEDMEN ASSOCIATED WITH RELIGION

RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION	FREEDMEN	PROBABLE FREEDMEN	POSSIBLE FREEDMEN
WORSHIP IN TEMPLES			
Temple of Apollo	M. Decidius Faustus " Sittius Papia " " Serapa P. " Suneros Gratus (?) Niger	C. Alleius M... A. Arellius Graecus Q. Arrius Hieronymus Messius Arrius Inventus " " Silenus L. Caecilius Cer... " " Felix ". Ceius Doryphorus C. Cor... M. Helvius Iustus Q. Loll... " Lollius Felix T. Mescinius Amphio L. Numisius Felicio N. Popidius Ampliatus " " M... " " Moschus P. Stallius Agatho A. Veius Phylax Adeptus Felicio	
Temple of Fortuna Augusta		L. Melissaeus Plocamus M. Naevius " Ph... L. Numisius Optatus	

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX A - Continued

RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION	FREEDMEN	PROBABLE FREEDMEN	POSSIBLE FREEDMEN
Temple of Fortuna Augusta cont'd.		L. Numisius Primus Manius Salarius Crocus L. Statius Faustus	
Temple of Isis		L. Caecilius Phoebus C. Norbanus Sorex N. Popidius Ampliatus	
WORSHIP IN OTHER PUBLIC BUILDINGS			
Eumachia		C. Norbanus Sorex	
Large Theater		C. Norbanus Sorex	
OTHER PUBLIC RELIGIOUS FUNCTIONS			
Augustales	M. Statius Suavis P. Vesovius Phileros	C. Arrius Primus " Calventius Quietus M. Cerrinius Restitutus C. Munatius Faustus " Novellius Natalis P. Sittius Diophantes " Terentius Celadus L. Valerius Primus A. Veius Atticus " Vettius Conviva	
Magistri Vicorum	M. Oppius Aes...		C. Cepidius

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX A - Continued

RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION	FREEDMEN	PROBABLE FREEDMEN	POSSIBLE FREEDMEN
Magistri Vicorum cont'd.	M. Stronnius Nic... " Titius Plutus Stabilio		C. Cornelius M. Maro Chius Q. Pra... P. Ro... C... Primigenius M. Sepulius Axclepiades Cosstas Successus Victor
Magistri of the Suburb Pagus Augustus Felix	M. Arrius Diomedes L. Barbiolius Communis C. Cuspius Cyrus " " Lalv... Philonus	M. Clodius Agatho C. Minatius Iucundus M. Mundicius Malchio C. Norbanus Sorex	
Pagani and Ministri	Gratus	N. Istacidius Helenus L. Laturnius Gratus C. Munatius Faustus	
Princeps Libertinorum		Fabius Eupor	
PRIVATE WORSHIP			
Genius and Lares	Felix Philoxenus	A. Vettius Conviva " " Restitutus	

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX A - Continued

RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION	FREEDMEN	PROBABLE FREEDMEN	POSSIBLE FREEDMEN
Neptune General	Sex. Pompeius Ruma Cataplus		

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX B

NAMES OF FREEDMEN BY OCCUPATIONS

OCCUPATIONS	FREEDMEN	PROBABLE FREEDMEN	POSSIBLE FREEDMEN
WORK ON THE LAND			
Wine Producers	Ti. Claudius Eutychus	M. Amullius Hermes " Aurelius " " " Soter L. Caecilius Hermes Ti. Claudius Aineicus " " Ana... " " Anauka " " Anicetus " " Anthus " " Antimius " " Antiochus " " Antiphilus " " Aparocha " " Aparola " " Ariston " Atimetus Ti. " Epaphroditus " " Euhodus " " Euphronius " Eurutus " Hippolitus Ti. " K... " " Polybius " " Secundus " " Simplex " " So... " Trophimus	L. Arellius Successus Cn. Domitius Auctus L. Eumachius Eros N. Fufidius Successus Gavia Severa

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX B - Continued

OCCUPATIONS	FREEDMEN	PROBABLE FREEDMEN	POSSIBLE FREEDMEN
Wine Producers cont'd.		M. Stlaborius Felix " Valerius Ianuarius A. Vettius Conviva " " Restitutus	
Estate Managers	Ti. Claudius Eutychus Q. Decius Hilarus	L. Caecilius Aphrodisius Ti. Claudius Amphio Q. Poppaeus Eros	L. Brittius Eros P. Fannius Synistor
PROFESSIONS AND SERVICE OCCUPATIONS			
Teachers		(C.) Julius Helenus Sema	Cornelius Amandus " Proculus Potitus
Physician		P. Terentius Celadus	
Architect	M. Artorius Primus		
Actors		C. Norbanus Sorex	Paris
Gladiators	Actius Anicetus Tetraites Prude(n)s Albanus Aptonetus Arancitus Columbus Herennius Incitatus Oceanus	M. Artorius " Gaius Prothymio O. Luscius Eros Pumidius Paris L. Raecius Felix " Sextius Eros M. Terentius Colonus " Valerius Oceanus	L. or P. Asicius M. Attilius L. Demtus (Redemtus) " Fabius Rusticus Malius M. Ogulnius P. Ostorius Q. Petillius L. Petronius

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX B - Continued

OCCUPATIONS	FREEDMEN	PROBABLE FREEDMEN	POSSIBLE FREEDMEN
Gladiators cont'd.	Severus " Tetraites	Speculator Telephus	Q. Petronius Octavius L. Sempronius Sex. Treblius G. Venuleius L. Vitruvius Murtius Paris
BUSINESS, TRADE AND INDUSTRY			
Bankers and Business Agents	L. Ceius Serapio	L. Caecilius Felix	
Businesses Dealing with Food			
Garum Producers	Ti. Claudius Martialis		
Wine Merchants		M. Fabius Euporus " Stlaborius Nymphodotus " Valerius Abinnericus A. Vettius Conviva " " Restitutus	C. Caesius Restitutus
Caupones		Ti. Claudius Epaphroditus	C. Caesius Restitutus N. Fufidius Successus Caprasia Euxinus Nymphius

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX B - Continued

OCCUPATIONS	FREEDMEN	PROBABLE FREEDMEN	POSSIBLE FREEDMEN
Proprietors of Food Shops		M. Amullius Cosmus	Aemilius Fidelis Pascius Hermes Felix
Holder of Concession in Amphitheater			C. Aninius Fortunatus
Businesses Connected with Cloth			
Fullers	Dionysius	A. Vettius Conviva " " Restitutus	Maenianus Mustius Ovia Passaratus Stephanus
Dyer			Ubonius
Felt Maker			C. Tettius Faustus
Spinners and Weavers		M. Terentius Eudoxsus	Vesbius Tamudianus Amaryllis Baptis Damalis Doris Ephesus Faustus Felix

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX B - Continued

OCCUPATIONS	FREEDMEN	PROBABLE FREEDMEN	POSSIBLE FREEDMEN
Spinners and Weavers cont'd.			Florentina Florus Heracla Ianuaria Lalage Maria Successus Vitalis Xanthus ...rusa
Miscellaneous Occupations			
Ship Owner		Ti. Claudius Orpheus	
Manager of Baths	Ianuarius		
Proprietors of Pottery Shops	Ti. Claudius Potiscus	Ti. Claudius Felix " " Sabinus	Lollia Successa
Proprietors of Other Shops			Q. Sallustius Inventus Sergius Felix
Perfumers	M. Decidius Faustus	A. Vettius Conviva " " Restitutus	

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX B - Continued

OCCUPATIONS	FREEDMEN	PROBABLE FREEDMEN	POSSIBLE FREEDMEN
Swineherd	Clodia Nigella		
Flower Dealers, Oil Producers and Dealers, Jewellers		A. Vettius Conviva " " Restitutus	

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. SOURCES

Literary Sources

Appian. Historia Romana. Vol. I. 3rd ed. Edited by Viereck and Roos. Leipzig, 1938. Vol. II. 2nd ed. Edited by Viereck. Leipzig, 1905.

Cicero. Scripta quae manserunt Omnia. Edited by Mueller. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1904.

Codex Theodosianus. Edited by Mommsen and Kruger. Berlin, 1905.

Corpus Iuris Civilis. Edited by Hermann. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1843.

Diodorus Siculus. Bibliotheca Historica. Edited by Vogel. 5 vols. Leipzig, 1888.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Edited by Jacoby. Leipzig, 1883-1905.

Gai Institutiones. Edited by M. David. Leiden, 1914.

Justiniani Institutiones. Edited by E. Huschke. Leipzig, 1868.

Juvenal. Satirae. Edited by Hermann. Leipzig, 1914.

Livy. Ab urbe condita. Edited by Weissenborn. 4 vols. Leipzig, 1898.

Martial. Epigrammata. Edited by Heraeus. Leipzig, 1925.

Petronius. Satyricon. Edited by Buchler. Berlin, 1871.

Pliny. Naturalis Historia. Edited by Mayhoff. 5 vols. Leipzig, 1909.

Pliny the Younger. Quae supersunt omnia. Edited by Schuster. 3rd ed. Edited by Hanslik. Leipzig, 1958.

Plutarch. Vitae parallelae. Edited by Lindskog and Ziegler. 4 vols. Leipzig, 1914-39.

Scriptores Historiae Augustae. Edited by Peter. Leipzig, 1865.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Suetonius. De vitae Caesarum. Edited by Ihm. Leipzig, 1907.

Tacitus. Libri quae supersunt. Edited by Koestermann. Berlin, 1952.

Varro. De lingua Latina. Edited by Dahlmann. Berlin, 1940.

Epigraphic Sources

Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. Edited by Th. Mommsen and others. Berlin, 1863-.

Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae. Edited by H. Dessau. 3 vols. Berlin, 1892-1926.

Le iscrizioni di Ercolano. Edited by M. Della Corte. Naples, 1959.

Notebook of unpublished inscriptions from the Street of Tombs outside Porta Nucerina. Collected by M. Della Corte, 1952-56.

Archaeological Sources

Notizie degli Scavi dall' Antichità. Rome, 1876-.

Mittheilungen des Kaiserlich deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abtheilung. 16 vols. Rome: 1886-1901.

Spinnazola, V. Pompei alla luce degli scavi di Via dell' Abbondanza. 3 vols. Rome, 1953.

II. SECONDARY WORKS

General Studies

Barrow, R.H. Slavery in the Roman Empire. London, 1928.

Boak, A.E.R. "The 'Magistri' of Campania and Delos," Classical Philology, 11 (1916), 25-45.

Buckland, W.W. The Roman Law of Slavery: The Condition of the Slave in Private Law from Augustus to Justinian. Cambridge, 1908.

Carcopino, J. Daily Life in Ancient Rome. Trans. by E.O. Lorimer. New Haven, 1941.

Carrington, R.C. "Studies in the Campanian 'Villae Rusticae,'" Journal of Roman Studies, 21 (1931), 110-30.

Crook, J. Law and Life of Rome. Ithaca, 1967.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Daremberg-Saglio. Dictionnaire des antiquites Grecques et Romaines. Paris, 1877-1919.

Daube, D. "Two Early Patterns of Manumission," Journal of Roman Studies, 36 (1946), 57-75.

Dill, S. Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius. London, 1905.

Duff, A.M. Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire. Oxford, 1928.

Egbert, J.C. Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions. New York, 1896.

Frank, T. (ed.). An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome, vol. V. Baltimore, 1940.

_____. "Race Mixture in the Roman Empire," American Historical Review, 21 (1916), 689-708.

_____. "The Sacred Treasure and the Rate of Manumission," American Journal of Philology, 53 (1932), 360-63.

Friedländer, L. Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire. Trans. by L.A. Magnus. 4 vols. New York, 1907.

Garnsey, P. Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire. Oxford, 1970.

Gordon, A.E. "On the First Appearance of the Cognomen in the Latin Inscriptions of Freedmen," University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology, 1 (1935), 151-158.

Gordon, M.L. "The Freedman's Son in Municipal Life," Journal of Roman Studies, 21 (1931), 65-77.

_____. "The Nationality of Slaves under the Early Roman Empire," Journal of Roman Studies, 14 (1924), 93-111.

Johnson, A.C., Coleman-Norton, P.R., and Bourne, F.C. Ancient Roman Statues. Austin, 1961.

Maiuri, A. La Cena di Trimalchione di Petronio Arbitro. Naples, 1945.

Meiggs, R. Roman Ostia. Oxford, 1960.

Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll. Real Encyclopadie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Stuttgart, 1893-.

Rawson, B. "Family Life among the Lower Classes at Rome in the First Two Centuries of the Empire," Classical Philology, 61 (1966), 71-83.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Rostovtzeff, M. The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire. Oxford, 1957.

Taylor, L. R. "The Augustales, Seviri Augustales, and Seviri: A Chronological Study," Transactions of the American Philological Association, 45 (1914), 231-53.

_____. "Freedmen and Freeborn in the Epitaphs of Imperial Rome," American Journal of Philology, 82 (1961), 113-32.

_____. "'Seviri Equitum Romanorum' and Municipal 'Seviri': A Study in Pre-Military Training among the Romans," Journal of Roman Studies, 14 (1924), 158-71.

Treggiari, S. Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic. Oxford, 1969.

Watson, A. The Law of Persons in the Later Roman Republic. Oxford, 1967.

Weaver, P.R.C. "Augustorum Libertus," Historia, 13 (1964), 188-98.

_____. "Cognomina Ingenua. A Note," Classical Quarterly, 14 (1964), 134-39, 311-15.

_____. "Freedman Procurators in the Imperial Administration," Historia, 14 (1965), 460-69.

_____. "Irregular Nomina of Imperial Freedmen," Classical Quarterly, 15 (1965), 323-26.

_____. "The Slave and the Freedman (Cursus) in the Imperial Administration," Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, 10 (1964), 74-92.

_____. "The Status Nomenclature ofImperial Slaves," Classical Quarterly, 13 (1963), 272-78 and 14 (1964), 134-39.

_____. "Vicarius and Vicarianus in the Familia Caesaris," Journal of Roman Studies, 54 (1964), 117-28.

Special Studies on Pompeii and Herculaneum

Boyce, G.K. Corpus of the Lararia of Pompeii. Rome, 1937.

Ciprotti, P. Conoscere Pompei. Rome, 1959.

Day, J. "Agriculture in the Life of Pompeii," Yale Classical Studies, 3 (1932), 167-208.

Della Corte, M. Case ed abitanti di Pompei. 3rd ed. Naples, 1965.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

_____. "La scuola di Epicuro in alcune pitture pompeiane," Studi Romani, 7 (1959), 129-45.

Etienne, R. La Vie Quotidienne a Pompei. Paris, 1966.

Gordon, M.L. "The 'Ordo' of Pompeii," Journal of Roman Studies, 17 (1927), 165-83.

Grether, G. "Pompeian Ministri," Classical Philology, 27 (1932), 59-65.

Jashemski, W.F. "The Caupona of Euxinus at Pompeii," Archaeology, 20 (1967), 36-44.

_____. "A Pompeian Vinarius," The Classical Journal, 62 (1967), 193-204.

_____. "Tomb Gardens at Pompeii," The Classical Journal, 66 (1970-71), 97-115.

Magaldi, E. Il commercio ambulante a Pompei. Naples, 1930.

Maiuri, A. Ercolano, i scavi nuovi. Rome, 1958.

_____. Herculaneum and the Villa of the Papyri. Novara, 1963.

Mau, A. Pompeii: Its Life and Art. Trans. by F.W. Kelsey. New York, 1904.

Onorato, G.O. Iscrizioni Pompeiane: La Vita Pubblica. 1st ed. Florence.

Tanzer, H. The Common People of Pompeii. Baltimore, 1939.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

VITA

Name: Samuel van Houte.

Permanent Address: Sioux Center, Iowa 51250.

Degree and date to be conferred: Ph.D., 1971

Date of birth: July 3, 1932

Place of birth: Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Secondary education: Lisbon High School, 1950.

Collegiate institutions attended	Dates	Degree	Date of Degree
LeTourneau Technical Institute	1950-51		
Gordon College	1951-52		
Calvin College	1952-54	A.B.	June, 1954
University of Maryland	1965-71	Ph.D.	

Major: Roman History.

Minors: Greek History, History of Ancient Art, Latin.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.