

FILIASTER: PRIVIGNUS OR ‘ILLEGITIMATE CHILD’?*

The term *filiaster* (fem. *filiastra*), though quite unknown in classical Latin literature,¹ occurs with reasonable frequency in epitaphs from the 2nd century A.D. onwards.² It is generally³ defined as the every-day equivalent of *privignus/-a* (= stepson, stepdaughter), and it is this Vulgar word which comes down into the Romance languages (e.g. Italian *figliastro*).⁴

Not all scholars, however, have regarded *filiaster* as an exact synonym of *privignus*. P. Meyer included *filiaster/-tra* in his discussion of terms employed to denote a child born from an illegitimate⁵ relationship, whether *concubinatus* or a union between slaves (*contubernium*).⁶ According to this view, the word *filiaster* may sometimes be used to refer to a man's own (illegitimate) child rather than the child of his wife's former partner (the normal sense of *privignus*).⁷ Meyer's discussion is repeated almost verbatim in De Ruggiero's *Dizionario Epigrafico*,⁸ but is largely ignored by subsequent writers,⁹ though the hypothesis is accepted by Humbert in his work on re-marriage¹⁰

* I would like to thank Dr B. Rawson for reading a draft of this paper and offering helpful comments and encouragement.

¹ Both literary examples cited in *TLL* are Medieval: Schol. to Hor. *Od.* 3.24.18 (II p. 384k codd saec X and XI) and [Quint.] *Decl. Maior.* 2 p. 359.5 (from the late *Excerpta Monacensis*, included in G. Lehnert's 1905 Teubner edition). In both cases the word is synonymous with *privignus*.

² For numbers, see note 13 below. The earliest datable inscription is from the time of Hadrian (*CIL* 6.9041, an epitaph by P. Aelius Aug. lib. Telesphorus cf. also 6.3447), but the absence of status indication in most inscriptions indicates a date of the 2nd or 3rd century A.D.

³ e.g. *TLL*, *OLD*, C. T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1879), A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*⁴ (1959), etc. *TLL* also gives the alternative meaning 'granddaughter' found in late glossae (see further below, note 71) and refers to De Ruggiero (see below note 8) but without further comment.

⁴ cf. Spanish *hijastro*, Portuguese *filhastro*, Roumanian *fiastru*; see W. Meyer-Lübke, *Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*³ (Heidelberg, 1935), s.v. *filiaster*.

⁵ i.e. born from a relationship not legally sanctioned as *iustum matrimonium*.

⁶ P. M. Meyer, *Der römische Konkubinatus* (Leipzig, 1895), pp. 39–48, cf. G. Wilms on *CIL* 8.2848 (L. Cornelius Cato is probably called the *filiaster* of M. Cornelius Cato (a soldier) because, though his son, he was not the product of a legitimate marriage). On this see also L. R. Dean, *A Study of the Cognomina of Soldiers in the Roman Legions* (Diss. Princeton, 1916), p. 103; contra (= stepfather) M. Lambertz (*Glotta* 4 [1913], 101).

⁷ A man's *privignus* is his wife's child by a former relationship, whether legal marriage or some other kind of partnership: *Dig.* 38.10.4.6 'privignus est uxoris meae filius ex alio viro natus, ego sum vitricus'; Scaev. *Dig.* 38.9.7 'privignus etiam is est, qui vulgo conceptus ex ea natus est quae postea mihi nupsit, aequae et is qui, cum in concubinato erat mater eius, natus ex ea est quae postea alii nupta sit' (H. Stiegler, 'Konkubinenkind, "privignus", "parricidium"? in *Sodalitas: Scritti in onore di A. Guarino* [Napoli, 1984–5], viii.3191–3214, has recently attempted to demonstrate that the words 'equae postea alii nupta sit' are an interpolation by the compiler [writing after the inauguration of *legitimatio per subsequens matrimonium*] and that Scaevola's words mean that an illegitimate son born before marriage, either out of wedlock or in concubinage, can be termed *privignus*).

⁸ E. de Ruggiero, *Dizionario Epigrafico di antichità Romane* (Rome, 1922), iii.88f. s.v. *filius*.

⁹ e.g. B. Rawson, 'Roman Concubinage and Other *De Facto* Marriages', *TAPA* 104 (1974), 279–305 only considers children illegitimate if they have the mother's name and/or Sp. f. or Sp. lib.; P. R. C. Weaver, *Familia Caesaris: a Social Study of the Emperor's Freedmen and Slaves* (Cambridge, 1972) only uses the term in its sense stepson; cf. also the articles listed in note 65 below.

with significant repercussions for his discussion of step-relationships as revealed in the inscriptions: of a possible 72 examples,¹¹ 23 are discarded by Humbert because in these cases he does not understand the word *filiaster* in the sense 'stepson'.¹²

In the following paper, I propose to examine all¹³ the inscriptions in which *filiaster* occurs, in an attempt to determine whether or not Meyer's case can be proved. First, the inscriptions cited by him will be subjected to close scrutiny, then the evidence of other epitaphs not included in his discussion will be adduced to see if they cast any further light on the question.

I begin with the examples used by Meyer. These he classified according to the type of illegitimate relationship which, in his view, was involved. Five categories were isolated: (1) concubinage between (i) *ingenuus* and *ingenua*; (ii) *patronus* and *serva*; (iii) *libertus* and *ingenua*; (iv) *patronus* and his own *liberta*, and (2) *contubernium*. He also listed 5 cases where the nature of the relationship is unclear.

For purposes of this discussion, I will use all the examples mentioned by Meyer, but will not necessarily follow the order of his categories. For one thing, several of these categories need to be modified in the light of more recent scholarship: at the time when he wrote, persons bearing a Roman citizen name but without status indication were regarded as *ingenui*, nowadays they would be classed as *incerti*, often *liberti*.¹⁴ So, for instance, the epitaph (CIL 13.2073¹⁵) set up for his *filiaster* M. Aurelius Faustinus (age 9) by C. Julius Maximus and the boy's mother Aurelia Faustina (termed *parentes*), is interpreted by Meyer as showing *concubinatus* between two free-born citizens (his category 1i). Although the *filiaster* is young for manumission and thus likely to be freeborn, it is possible that one or both of the *parentes* is a *libertus* (or *liberta*).

But the status of *incerti* is not as relevant to the question of the meaning of *filiaster* as are the names of the persons involved and whether the *filiaster* derives his name from the male or the female partner. In the majority of Meyer's examples, the *filiaster* is regarded by him as the illegitimate child of the couple or individual¹⁶ named on the epitaph because he bears the same *nomen* as the woman, or because he has a single name (i.e. is a slave).¹⁷ While those of servile status are by definition illegitimate, we will have to decide, in the case of *filiastri* who have apparently derived their name from their mother, whether their illegitimacy can be proved.¹⁸ Secondly, in both types

¹⁰ M. Humbert, *Le Remariage à Rome: étude d'histoire juridique et sociale* (Milan, 1972), p. 202 n. 46.

¹¹ Humbert (writing before the publication of the computer concordance to CIL 6) obtained his examples by checking words such as *privignus*, *vitricus*, *noverca* and *filiaster* in the indices to CIL and, in the case of Vol. 6, by examining nos 4600 to 29600 (see *ibid.* p. 200 n. 40).

¹² Humbert includes some examples of *filiaster* where the sense 'stepson' is probable, e.g. 6.9475, 11791, 7527; see below.

¹³ i.e. all I have found by consulting the indices to CIL, including the computer index to 6 (= CIL 6, part 7) by E. Jory and D. G. Moore (1974), and the TLL archives in Munich: a total of 39 inscriptions of which 25 contain the masculine form *filiaster*, 12 *filiastri* and 2 are unclear.

¹⁴ See Rawson, *art. cit.* (n. 9), 284, Weaver, *op. cit.* (n. 9), p. 84, L. R. Taylor, 'Freedmen and Freeborn in the Epitaphs of Imperial Rome', *AJP* 82 (1961), 113.

¹⁵ All inscriptions cited are from CIL unless otherwise specified.

¹⁶ In six examples, the *filiaster* and his two *parentes* are all named, in the rest only one parent (5 cases male, 2 female).

¹⁷ Illegitimate but freeborn children derived their *nomen* from their mother (cf. note 26 below); a slave would be illegitimate by definition, since *conubium* was only possible between free or freed citizens (see e.g. S. Treggiari, 'Contubernales in CIL 6', *Phoenix* 35 [1981], 42-69).

¹⁸ The fact that the *filiaster* has the same *nomen* as the mother does not necessarily mean he derived it from her: he may be the child of a former marriage of hers to a person of the same *gens* or to her *patronus*.

of example, the question will need to be addressed whether the fact that the child is illegitimate constitutes definite proof that he or she is the illegitimate child of the person to whom he stands in the relationship of *filiaster*.¹⁹

Before discussing these cases, where there is at least an indication that illegitimacy is involved, it will be convenient to dispose of several other instances where Meyer's assumption of illegitimacy is less solidly grounded. I refer to inscriptions in which a *filiaster* has a different name from the man by whom or for whom the tomb is set up, but where the man's wife is not named. In his zeal to discover cases of illegitimate unions, Meyer is forced to suppose in these cases that if the *filiaster* is not named after the male parent, he must have taken his name from his (unidentified) mother. While this is not impossible, it is obvious that the *filiaster* could just as easily have derived his name from his mother's first husband: whether *filiaster* means 'stepson' or 'illegitimate son', in neither case would he bear the *nomen* of his mother's current partner.²⁰

To take an example: at 10.7526, the imperial freedman Spatalus dedicates a tomb to his *filiaster* Scribonius Felix, who died at the age of 16. Meyer interprets this as a case where a freedman has an illegitimate son by *concubinatus* with a freeborn woman (presumably called Scribonia). The boy's age argues for free birth, in which case his mother was free when he was born, though she could have been a *liberta* rather than an *ingenua*.²¹ As to the relationship, Rawson has demonstrated that there is little evidence for *concubinatus* between free or freed persons unless some barrier to *matrimonium* exists;²² in this case, the obvious impediment would have been that Spatalus was still a slave at the time of his son's birth. Given, however, that Felix's mother is not named, we have no way of proving this hypothesis. It is equally likely that Spatalus is the stepfather, and that his *filiaster* is either the illegitimate son of a previous relationship on his mother's part or of a legitimate marriage between his mother and a Scribonius.

Similarly, at 14.3744, the *filiaster* of Ti. Claudius Chares is called Aelia Nebris. Since the mother is not named, Meyer has no grounds for assuming that Aelia Nebris is illegitimate; it is easiest to suppose that she is the legitimate daughter of an Aelius and the stepdaughter of Chares.

At 6.13101, the more elaborate wording of the epitaph offers clear proof that *filiaster* refers to a stepdaughter, rather than to the product of a non-marital union. The inscription reads 'd m / Aurelius Festus Furciae / Flaviae filiastrae bene / merenti et domine et pa/tronae quamdiu vivo co/lo te post morte nescio[.] parce / matrem tuam et patrem et soro/rem tuam Marinam ut possint tibi facere / post me sollemnina'. Clearly, the last part of the epitaph ('quamdiu...sollemnina') refers to one person only, and if that person is Furcia Flavia, the mention of her *patrem* as (hopefully) surviving the dedicator proves that Aurelius Festus is the stepfather. The difficulty lies in the words 'et domine et patronae': do these refer to a second (or third) person? If so, is the latter half of the inscription addressed to that person(s)? But it seems unlikely that half the inscription would be directed at an unnamed woman, especially as Furcia's name heads the epitaph. The phrase 'et domine et patronae', must, then, refer to Furcia Flavia. How is it possible that one's *filiaster*

¹⁹ i.e. whether the *filiaster* is the illegitimate child of the individual or couple mentioned on the tomb or whether he is the stepson of the person who calls him *filiaster* and the child of their partner by a former illegitimate union.

²⁰ Unless he had been adopted by him.

²¹ In that case she either bore the child late or was manumitted early, perhaps in order to marry her patron Scribonius (in which case her son derived his name from his father and Spatalus is the stepfather).

²² See Rawson, art. cit. (n. 9).

could also be one's *domina et patrona*? A solution was offered by L. Renier,²³ who suggested that the words are epithets expressing affection and respect, and can be explained if Aurelius is the freedman and second husband of Furcia's mother Aurelia, that is, Furcia's stepfather. If the young woman's mother is Aurelius' *domina et patrona*, then presumably these terms can be applied by extension to her daughter.

The final case where Meyer assumes illegitimacy without warrant is slightly different from the three inscriptions just discussed, in that not only does the *filiaster* not bear the dedicator's name, but he is clearly not named after the wife either. The epitaph (5.2998), on a family tomb set up by Q. Mustius Eusebes for himself, his wife Caetrona Procula and his *filiaster* Saufei Nigrinus, is interpreted by Meyer as showing an illegitimate relationship of uncertain type. Presumably he regards Saufei Nigrinus as the illegitimate son of Eusebes by a partner other than the wife mentioned on the monument, but this view is based on no evidence whatever, apart from the assumption that *filiaster* means 'illegitimate son'. There is no reason why Nigrinus could not be the son of Caetrona Procula by a former marriage and the stepson of Mustius Eusebes.

So much for the inscriptions that offer no clear evidence for taking *filiaster* in a different sense from that generally accepted. These I have dealt with first in order to clear the way for discussion, but Meyer's argument does not rest on such cases; three out of the four, in fact, are cited by him at a late stage in his discussion and depend for their interpretation on his having first established the meaning 'illegitimate child' on the basis of other examples where the illegitimacy of the *filiaster* is more clearly indicated. As stated earlier, these are cases in which the *filiaster* is either a slave, or else bears the same *nomen* as his mother.

First, the two inscriptions where the *filiaster* is of servile status. In the first example, an epitaph by L. Genucius Pancalus for his *filiastra* Calabrica (10.2201 = 6.14050), Meyer posits that the slave child is the offspring of Pancalus by one of his *ancillae* (category Iii). While this is not impossible, it could equally be the case that Calabrica is a child of Pancalus' partner, born of a previous (illegitimate) union, in other words, that Calabrica is his stepdaughter. All the inscription tells us for certain is that Calabrica's mother was a slave, at least at the time of her daughter's birth; that Pancalus was the father cannot be proved.

At 10.590, Flavia Chrysis sets up a tomb for her *filiaster* Anthio. Meyer suggests that the woman is a *liberta* whose son, Anthion,²⁴ was born while she was still a slave: hence she refers to the boy, who is of servile status and illegitimate, as her *filiaster* rather than her *filius*. It is also possible, however, that Flavia Chrysis' partner (probably deceased)²⁵ had a child by a former union with a slave. This would make Flavia the stepmother, and is much more likely in view of the improbability of a mother referring to her own child as *filiaster*: a man may talk of his illegitimate child, but would a woman do so? The whole point of illegitimacy is that no father of the child is recognised by law: hence the child belongs to its mother's family and takes

²³ *Révue archéologique* 9 (1852), 196.

²⁴ *Anthion* is the nominative form used by Meyer, though the index to *CIL* 10 lists it as *Anthio*. In the inscription it appears in the dative *Anthioni*.

²⁵ Otherwise why did he not set up the tomb himself? They are unlikely to be divorced, since the son would normally have gone with his father (cf. J. F. Gardner, *Women in Roman Law and Society* (London/Sydney, 1986), pp. 146f., B. Rawson, 'The Roman Family', in *The Family in Ancient Rome*, ed. B. Rawson (London/Sydney, 1986), pp. 35ff. Humbert (op. cit. (n. 10), pp. 295ff.) points out that the usual practice was not always adhered to, especially where the father re-married, though even here the child's education, and presumably also his burial, remained the financial responsibility of the father.

her name and status.²⁶ The child is not legally its father's *filius*, but it is most certainly its mother's.²⁷

Now to those inscriptions in which the *nomina* of the *filiaster* and a female dedicator/dedicatee are identical. First, an epitaph raised by a woman alone to her *filiaster* (6.15993). This inscription bears a resemblance to the last example discussed above, except that the child (T. Coesius Florus) has the *tria nomina*, and the same gentile name as the woman (Coesia Musa). If he is her illegitimate son, she could, as Meyer assumes, be freeborn along with her child; on the other hand, since Coesius Florus died at the age of 29, they could both be *liberti*, freed by the same patron. Given, however, the unlikelihood of a woman referring to her own child as *filiaster*, it is better to seek an interpretation which explains how a stepson could have the same name as his stepmother. There are several possible solutions: Coesius Florus may be the illegitimate son of Coesia Musa's husband and a former partner, also called Coesia (either a relative of Coesia Musa or a fellow-slave freed by the same patron). Alternatively, Coesius may not be illegitimate at all: he could have derived his name from his father Coesius, whose second wife Coesia Musa is a freeborn woman of the same *gens* as her husband, or perhaps his own *liberta*.

In this example, as in the other inscriptions examined thus far, we are not given enough information to enable us to assess with certainty the underlying family situation.

This problem does not occur in the next two inscriptions to be discussed: 9.4653 and 13.2073. Here, both partners and a *filiaster* are all named, and since the last of these bears the name of the wife rather than her husband, he is clearly not the legitimate offspring of the pair. But does it follow that he is their illegitimate child?

At 9.4653, P. Laelius Lucifer sets up a monument for himself and (among others) a P. Laelius P. f. Entellus, two *coniuges* (Egnatia C. f. Megiste and Antistia I. I. Sabina), and a *filiaster*, C. Egnatius Cerealis. It would seem that the last-mentioned is the son of Egnatia Megiste, born out of wedlock. Meyer cites this inscription as an example of concubinage *inter ingenuos*. If he is correct, it would be necessary to posit the existence of some barrier to marriage, given that concubinage was rare if the opportunity existed for *matrimonium*.²⁸ But it is also possible that P. Laelius Lucifer is a freedman²⁹ who was a slave at the time of his son's birth; in that case, we would have an unusual example of a union between slave and freeborn woman.³⁰ On the other hand, there is no reason why Cerealis could not be the illegitimate offspring of Egnatia and a former partner (in this case, his *praenomen* might be derived from the maternal grandfather). A second possibility is that he is legitimate, the son of Egnatia and a former husband from the same *gens*, in which case his *nomen* would be derived not from his mother but from his father Egnatius.

At 13.2073, the *parentes* of M. Aurelius Faustinus (age 9), C. Julius Maximus and

²⁶ cf. B. Rawson, 'Family Life among the Lower Classes at Rome', *CP* 61(1966), 76-7; W. W. Buckland, *A Textbook of Roman Law*³ (rev. by P. Stein, Cambridge, 1963), p. 105; Meyer, op. cit. (n. 6), pp. 34, 52ff.; *Inst.* 3.4.3, *D.* 38.17.2.1, *P.* 4.10.1.

²⁷ Also it must be borne in mind that the literal meaning of *filiaster* is not illegitimate son or stepson but 'a sort of son' (see below): would a mother describe her own child in this way?

²⁸ cf. Rawson, art. cit. (n. 9); Gardner, op. cit. (n. 25), pp. 31ff. The impediment could have been, among other things, the youth of Egnatia or the existence of a close family relationship.

²⁹ Especially as he lacks filiation, whereas the others have it: cf. Rawson, art. cit. (n. 26), 74.

³⁰ Marriages between male slaves and *ingenuae* were rare unless the man was an imperial slave (Rawson *ibid.*, Weaver, op. cit. (n. 9), pp. 145ff.). But in such cases the woman's status was reduced to that of *liberta* or *ancilla* (following the *Senatus Consultum Claudianum*) while the children (at least until the time of Hadrian) were slaves; see J. A. Crook, *Law and Life of Rome* (London, 1967), p. 62, P. Weaver in *The Family in Ancient Rome* [cited above, note 25], p. 151.

Aurelia Faustina, set up a tomb for their *filiaster* and *filius* respectively. From the young age of the child and the use of the term *parentes*, it could be argued that C. Julius Maximus is the father of a freeborn but illegitimate son. On the other hand, *parentes* is a loose³¹ term and it might well be used of a stepfather and a mother, especially if the real father died when the child was very young. If *filiaster* means stepchild, a possible scenario is that Aurelia Faustina was the wife of an Aurelius, her son deriving his *nomen* from his father and his *cognomen* from his mother.³² Aurelius died not long after the child's birth; Aurelia was remarried shortly afterwards to C. Julius Maximus, who reared the child as his own until the boy died at the early age of 9 years.

In none of the cases yet discussed can *filiaster* be proved beyond doubt to have the meaning 'illegitimate child'. There are, however, three examples where the probability is much stronger.

At 6.15585, a freedman Faustus and a slave Castor set up a tomb to their *mamma* and *coniunx* respectively, namely Claudia Saturnina, who is described as the *filiastro* of Flavius Proculus and Claudia Syntyche. Now if *filiastro* has the meaning 'stepdaughter', it should refer to Claudia Saturnina's relationship with only one of the pair, but it is unclear with which of the two names it is to be linked. The obvious interpretation of the Latin is that *filiastro* refers to both. Since, in addition, Claudia Saturnina derives her *nomen* from her mother, the most likely explanation is that she is the illegitimate daughter of the pair.

Another case where the term *filiaster* appears to apply to both members of a partnership is 14.712: d.m. / A Caecili Restituti / vix ann XXI / M. Clodius Restitutus / et Caecilia Italice / filiastro benemerenti / fecerunt. Let us first attempt an explanation of the underlying situation on the assumption that *filiaster* means 'stepson'. To which partner does it refer? The word-order makes it unlikely that it is to be taken with M. Clodius Restitutus (we would expect the word to come immediately after his name and Caecilia to be designated separately as *mater*, as in 13.2073 '... C. Iul. Maximus filiastro et Aurelia Faustina mater unico filio'). As well, supposing that Caecilius is the stepson of Clodius and the illegitimate son of Caecilia, it is a curious coincidence that he bears the same *cognomen* as his stepfather.³³ If, on the other hand, *filiastro* goes with Caecilia Italice, a more natural interpretation of the Latin,³⁴ we need to explain why Caecilius bears the *nomen* of his stepmother, but not that of his apparent father. In view of the fact that Clodius Restitutus is not specified as *pater*, the most probable explanation in that case would be that Clodius is not the father of Caecilius, but the second husband of Caecilia Italice, who brought to their union a stepson acquired by a former marriage to a fellow kinsman or *patronus*, Caecilius. Thus Caecilius Restitutus would have derived his *nomen* from his father. In that case, we are still left with the question of why Caecilius has the same *cognomen* as Clodius. A way round this difficulty would be to suppose that Clodius is the father of Caecilius by an illegitimate union with another Caecilia, Caecilia Italice being his second wife.

³¹ B. Wilkinson (Rawson), 'A wider concept of the term *parens*', *CJ* 59 (1964), 358–61.

³² Given the popularity of the name Aurelius, it is not necessary to assume that the parents were related, though Aurelia may have been the *liberta* or the kinswoman of her husband. It is also possible that the son was illegitimate and derived his name from his mother.

³³ Though the coincidence may not be so great, given that Restitutus is a very common *cognomen*. I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* (Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum Vol 36.2, Helsinki, 1965), p. 356, has found 485 men called Restitutus and 175 women called Restituta in *CIL* (pagan examples) plus 45 men and 35 women in Christian inscriptions.

³⁴ cf. 2.871 (for Lucius Accius Reburrus by Accius Reburrus and Atilia Clara *privigno pio*).

It is clear that there are serious problems if *filiaster* is to be taken in the sense of 'stepson'. If, however, we understand the word as meaning 'illegitimate son', the situation is simple and clear-cut: Caecilius is the illegitimate offspring of Caecilia Italice, from whom he derives his *nomen*, and of Clodius Restitutus whose *cognomen* he adopts. H. Thylander³⁵ gives several examples of such cases, in all of which an illegitimate child has the *nomen* of the mother and the *cognomen* of the father. In most of these examples, the persons involved lack *praenomina*; in the one case where these are given, the son takes his *praenomen* as well as his *cognomen* from the father.³⁶ Although adoption of the father's *praenomen* was the normal custom, the fact that Caecilius, in the present inscription, has a different *praenomen* from his putative father need cause no concern.³⁷ An instructive parallel is offered at 10.1138, where the illegitimacy of the son is beyond doubt: 'd.m. / C. Mamercio Sp. f. / Ianuario q. aed. praet. / 11 vir q. alimentor... P. Paccius Ianuarius / filio naturali et Ma/mercia Grapte mater / infelicissimi filio... fecerunt.' Mamercius Ianuarius, illegitimate son of P. Paccius Ianuarius and Mamercia Grapte, has taken the *nomen* of his mother and the *cognomen*, but not the *praenomen*, of the father. In this case, it is likely in view of the son's career that the father is *ingenuus* rather than *libertus*. That need not be so, however, in the case of Caecilius, and if M. Clodius Restitutus is a *libertus*, then an alternative explanation of Caecilius' *praenomen* is possible, i.e. that the father was a slave (Restitutus) at the time of his son's birth, so that he could provide him with a *cognomen* but had no *praenomen* to pass on to him.

I have spent some time on this inscription because it is the first case encountered so far where the name of the *filiaster* has links with both of the couple who set up the monument. One further example of this type is cited by Meyer: 6.3447, in which a tomb is erected for P. Aelius Severus (nat. Bessus), an Augustan veteran, by his *filiaster* T. Claudius Severinus and his wife Claudia Elpis. Again, it is easiest to suppose that the *filiaster*, being the son of a soldier and thus illegitimate, took his *nomen* from his mother and derived his *cognomen*³⁸ from his father (who, as a Thracian recruit, would have taken the Roman name P. Aelius Severus on enrolling in the army, deriving his *praenomen* and *nomen* from the reigning emperor Hadrian).³⁹ Another possibility is that the mother was a slave at the time of her son's birth; he derived his name (Severinus) from his father and later both mother and son were manumitted by the same owner, Ti. Claudius.⁴⁰

³⁵ H. Thylander, *Etude sur l'épigraphie latine* (Lund, 1952), pp. 89–91. Examples include 10.2247 (an epitaph by Clodius Fructuosus and Ceionia Helias for their *filius*, L. Ceionius Fructuosus); cf. also 9.5932, 10.3031, 3395.

³⁶ 9.5932: L. Freius Saturninus dedicates a tomb to his parentes, L. Valerius L. F. Saturninus and Freia L. Liber. Chreste.

³⁷ Though Thylander is so certain that the son should have the *praenomen* of the father that he refuses to believe, in two cases, that the child is the man's son, even where he is called *filius* (e.g. he says that at 10.2046 L. Acilius Sosus must be the stepfather of M. Amulius Epinicus [son of Amulia Maximilla] because their *praenomina* differ. In that case, however, they do not have *cognomina* in common).

³⁸ For Severinus from Severus see Thylander, op. cit. (n. 35), p. 111 quoting *IPOA* 70 (Ti. Claudius Severus' son is Claudius Severinus) and cf. M. Leumann, 'Lateinische Cognomina auf -inus und -illa', *Romanica Helvetica* 20 (1943), 150–72.

³⁹ cf. E. Birley, *Roman Britain and the Roman Army* (Kendal, 1953), p. 121; R. Cagnat, *Cours d'épigraphie latine*⁴ (Paris, 1914), p. 78 and Th. Mommsen (*Hermes* 19 [1884], 88ff.).

⁴⁰ cf. 6.17438 where the daughter of L. Caecilius Successus' *contubernalis* is called Successa after her father. Perhaps the father bought freedom for his wife and son; cf. Rawson, art. cit. (n. 26), 74, who suggests this solution in the case of Q. Lucretius Q. f. Zeuxis, whose wife is Sornatia Arescusa and son C. Sornatius Indus (6.21650).

Two other cases cited by Meyer remain to be discussed. The first (EE 4.939 = *CIL* 6.32880), is an epitaph for M. Aurelius Sabinus, a former soldier of the Praetorian Guard (Evocatus Augusti), set up by several *heredes*, among whom is a *filiaster*, also called M. Aurelius Sabinus. Here, the mother's name is unknown, while the *filiaster* has the same name as the dedicatee. Meyer's explanation is that Aurelius Sabinus junior is the illegitimate offspring of *concubinatus* between his father, Sabinus senior, and his father's *liberta* Aurelia, from whom the son derives his name.⁴¹ This solution is acceptable, though there is no reason why Aurelia could not be a freeborn fellow-kinswoman of Aurelius: their offspring would still be illegitimate if born during the father's period of military service.

Although either of the above suggestions offers a satisfactory way of understanding the epitaph, we must also consider whether the meaning 'stepson' is possible in this case.

There are several ways in which a stepson could come to have an identical name to that of his *vitricus*. The most obvious explanation is adoption; indeed it was not uncommon for *vitrici* to adopt their *privigni*.⁴² If this is the answer, however, either the full name of the adopted son has not been given, or the usual rules of nomenclature have not been followed: under the empire, an adopted son would normally take the names⁴³ of his adoptive father, while retaining at least one of his original names as a *cognomen* (e.g. Pliny when adopted by his uncle C. Plinius Secundus became C. Plinius Caecilius Secundus, retaining his father's gentile name Caecilius).⁴⁴

If adoption is not the solution, then Sabinus must have derived his *nomen* either from his father, in which case his mother was formerly married to another Aurelius, or from his mother, an Aurelia, whose earlier union did not constitute a legal marriage. In either instance, a degree of coincidence must be assumed, in order to account for the fact that the *filiaster* and his stepfather share the same *cognomen*. If Sabinus derived his name from his father, then his mother's two partners had, by coincidence, the same *cognomen*. If, on the other hand, the name Sabinus was not taken from his father, we have the even stranger coincidence that his mother chose for her son a *cognomen* that was to prove identical with that of her second partner.⁴⁵

One way of circumventing this difficulty is to suppose that Sabinus' mother was the freedwoman and second wife of Sabinus senior, and that the younger Sabinus was the product of an earlier relationship undertaken when his mother was still Sabinus'

⁴¹ For another example of a union between a praetorian soldier and his freedwoman cf. 6.32678 (an epitaph for M. Varsilius Martialis the *patronus* and *coniunx* for 16 years of Varsilia Stacte); cf. G. R. Watson, *The Roman Soldier* (London, 1969), p. 212 n. 480.

⁴² The most famous case, of course, being Augustus' adoption of Tiberius. For less illustrious examples see 13.2036 (for Vireus Vitalis by Val. Maximus 'vitricus qui eum sibi filium adoptaverat'); 6.38831 (a possible example – P. Rubrius Felicissimus [age 4] is called the *alumnus* of his *vitricus* Rubrius Soter: the use of *alumnus* and the common *nomen* might suggest adoption, though Rubrius Soter may be the *tutor* of his stepson and a relative of the mother's first husband).

⁴³ Though he could retain his own *praenomen*; e.g. M. Annius Verus when adopted by T. Aelius Aurelius Antoninus became M. Aelius Aurelius Verus.

⁴⁴ Note that Pliny's original *cognomen* Secundus was the same as that of his adoptive father. This could be a relevant parallel to the inscription under discussion, except that even if Sabinus' *cognomen* was his original one, he still might be expected to have as a second *cognomen* his former gentile name. On rules for nomenclature in cases of adoption see Th. Mommsen, 'Zur Lebensgeschichte des jüngeren Plinius', *Hermes* 3 (1868), 59–70; Cagnat, op. cit. (n. 39), pp. 74–6.

⁴⁵ These coincidences would not be so great if Sabinus was the legitimate offspring of his mother and another Aurelius, as the name Sabinus might be in the family.

slave. Instead of naming the child after her first partner, she called him Sabinus in honour of her master; eventually the son was manumitted (perhaps along with his mother) and so became M. Aurelius Sabinus.

It is clear that the inscription just discussed can be interpreted in a variety of ways, and that the meaning of *filiaster* cannot be determined with any certainty. Although the same applied, as we saw, to the majority of Meyer's examples, there were at least three cases where it seems to me highly probable that the term refers to an illegitimate child, though in no instance can this be proved beyond doubt. On the other hand, if it is accepted that *filiaster* can on occasion refer to the child of a non-marital union, then it may also be that it has that sense in at least some of those cases which may be classed as uncertain, for instance in the inscription last discussed.

Before turning to inscriptions containing the term *filiaster/tra* which are not mentioned by Meyer, we must turn our attention to one last example which is somewhat different from those so far examined, in that a *filiaster* appears to be named after the man setting up the epitaph for him. The epitaph, for a soldier from Lambaesis, reads 'd m s / L. Cornelio / Catoni leg III Aug / qui et Caligatus / stp XIII / M Cornel / Cato [qui] e[t] Aurassius fili/atrum (sc. filiastro)' (8.2848). If *filiaster* here means 'stepson' the problem arises of how to explain the similarity of names (see the discussion of 6.32880 above). If, on the other hand, Lucius is the illegitimate son of Marcus, the situation may be explained in the same way as suggested for the Aurelii Sabini, that is, that Aurelius' mother was a freedwoman of his father.

In this case, however, a different solution is made possible by the fact that the *filiaster*, L. Cornelius Cato, is a soldier. Now whereas freeborn but illegitimate sons would normally take their mother's name, with the filiation Sp. f. and (usually) the Colline tribe, there are many examples of soldiers, especially from second-century Lambaesis, whose *origo* (*castris*) shows that they were born when their fathers were in military service. They are thus technically illegitimate, yet they have the filiation and name of the father and the tribe Pollia.⁴⁶

It appears that sons of soldiers were granted special privileges (including citizenship) to encourage them to enrol in the army (they were in fact a fertile source of recruitment in the provinces). Whether or not these *Lagerkinder* were made legitimate on entering military service is questionable: since soldiers while serving in the army did not have *conubium*, at least until the end of the second century, it may be that their sons who joined the army were regarded as a superior class of *Spurii*, allowed to bear their father's name but not his tribe (as they might have been expected to do if regarded as legitimate).⁴⁷

In the inscription under discussion, although the father is not specified as a soldier, the son's alternative *cognomen*, Caligatus, is probably the equivalent of *origo castris*.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Being a rural tribe, this would suggest that they were of superior status to *Spurii* put in the urban Colline tribe. For examples, cf. 8.2565b2 (Cornelius C. f. Pol. Antulus Castr.); 8.3151, 3101.

⁴⁷ R. Cagnat, *L'Armée romaine d'Afrique et l'occupation militaire de l'Afrique sous les empereurs* (revised edition, Paris, 1912), pp. 300ff.; Meyer, op. cit. (n. 6), pp. 110ff.; E. Sander, 'Das Recht des römischen Soldaten', *Rh.M.* 101 (1958), 164; G. R. Watson, op. cit. (n. 41), p. 39, with note 77. Meyer (followed by Sander) distinguishes between *Lagerkinder* born from a marriage where the partners would have had *conubium* if the man were not in the army and those born of a couple not so qualified: in the former case, a son who has entered the army has the name of his father, in the latter he bears the mother's name, though he still has the tribe Pollia.

⁴⁸ Meyer, op. cit. (n. 6), pp. 47, 112f. Cagnat, op. cit. (n. 47), p. 301 n. 8 says the father was probably attached to the legion in some capacity and the son given the same privileges as sons of legionaries.

Thus the son on joining⁴⁹ the army has taken the father's name, but is referred to as *filiaster* because he is not legitimate in the eyes of the law.

This explanation, which is accepted by several writers,⁵⁰ seems possible, though it could be regarded as questionable whether a father would think of the son who bore his name as illegitimate:⁵¹ would it not be excessively pedantic to use the technically correct term *filiaster* (= illegitimate son) in preference to *filius*?

I have collected 28 inscriptions in which the term *filiaster* occurs, and which are not cited by Meyer. Of these, 8 must be dismissed as not completely legible.⁵² A further 5 cases are also irrelevant to this discussion, in that the meaning 'stepson' is unavoidable. At 6.9041, for instance, a family tomb is founded by the imperial freedman P. Aelius Telesphorus for himself, his *liberta* Aelia Fortunata, his *filius* P. Aelius Telesphorus, his wife Naevia Tyche, a second *filius* Naevius Telesphorus, a *filiaster*, Naevius Successus and a freedman P. Aelius Felix. The situation is clear-cut: Telesphorus, a slave of Hadrian, began a union with a freeborn or freed woman, Naevia Tyche, during which a son was born illegitimate and thus called Naevius Telesphorus. After Telesphorus gained his freedom and the union became legitimate, the couple's next son was born, called P. Aelius Telesphorus after his father. The *filiaster*, Naevius Successus, must be the son of Naevia from a previous union: this may have been non-marital, or Naevia may have been previously married to her patron. In any case, it is impossible that Naevius Successus is the son of P. Aelius Telesphorus, for he would hardly call one illegitimate son *filius* and the other *filiaster*.

At 6.26106, the *filiaster* of L. Seius Callinicus is called Seius Maior. The son, if freeborn and illegitimate, should be called after the mother, but we know that this was not the case (enough of the name is legible to determine this: ...uria Prima). If the mother was a slave at the time of the son's birth and he is a freedman, his name would indicate that he was brought up and freed in the family of his father, which would be highly unusual. It is thus preferable to assume that Seius Maior is the stepson of L. Seius Callinicus, his name being explained either by the fact of his mother's two spouses being members of the same family, or else that he was adopted by the stepfather.⁵³

In three inscriptions, a woman's *filiaster* does not bear her name, which he might be expected to do if he were her son, born illegitimate (e.g. *Not. degli scav.* (1925), p. 23 n. 3... Aeliane for *filiaster* M. Aur. Eum., son of M. Aurel. Eumel.).⁵⁴

Of the remaining epitaphs, many are parallel to cases discussed above, and the same arguments will apply to them. In some, for instance, the *filiaster* is a slave (e.g. 6.6713, an epitaph by Memmia Flora for her *filiaster* Vitalis; cf. 10.590 discussed

⁴⁹ Cagnat (op. cit. [n. 47], p. 300) says the children took their father's name on recruitment, just as other provincials (whose fathers weren't in the army) took the names of the reigning emperor.

⁵⁰ Wilmans ad loc.; Cagnat, op. cit. (n. 47), p. 301 n. 8; Mommsen (*Hermes* 19 [1884], 11 n. 2); Meyer, op. cit. (n. 6), p. 113. Contra (= stepfather) M. Lambertz (*Glotta* 4 [1913], 101).

⁵¹ cf. C. G. Starr, *The Roman Imperial Navy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1941), p. 92, who points out that soldiers and sailors tended to regard their sons as legitimate even though they were not legally so. He quotes two examples where the young child of a soldier has been given its father's name (6.3109, 10.3547), though it is possible that these children were born before the father entered military service (they died at the ages of 6 and 4 years respectively).

⁵² 6.5600, 13317, 13441, 16934, 19412, 19462, 25471 and 34064.

⁵³ For another case where the stepfather and stepson have the same *nomen*, cf. 10.2862, where the *privignus* of Sextus Pompeius Demetrius is called Sextus Pompeius Mercurius.

⁵⁴ cf. 6.23342: Octavia Faustina's *filiaster* is Sextus Cornelius Verus; also 6.7527 (Antonia Fortunata's *filiaster* is M. Clodius Satyrus). Relevant here is also the argument I used previously, that a mother would not refer to her (illegitimate) son as *filiaster*.

above).⁵⁵ Sometimes the child bears a different name from the man who dedicates the tomb, but in the absence of the mother's name we cannot tell whether the child is illegitimate (6.9475, 11791, 23968 and 13.1829).

At 6.26271, the *filiatra* of C. Volusius Eudaemon, Septimia Melinya, bears the same *nomen* as her mother Septimia Helpis. Eudaemon is most likely to be the stepfather since there is no link between his name and that of the *filiatra* (who could be the illegitimate daughter of Helpis and her *patronus/coniunx*).

A different type of case is met at 6.14047. Here two slaves set up an epitaph for a *filiaster* who bears a citizen name: 'd.m. / L. Caietio Ia/nuario / Hatenio / Caes. / filiastro suo / ben. m. p. / et Successa m. / vix. an XVII / die II.' Note that although Januarius is called Hatenio's *filiaster*, Hatenio is called his *pater*. Weaver's statement⁵⁶ that Januarius is specified as the *filiaster* of Successa cannot be right; the word order rules out taking *filiaster* with Successa's name rather than that of her husband. His view is based on the assumption that Januarius cannot be Successa's son, since his young age suggests free birth rather than manumission.⁵⁷ If this is so, the only possible way of having Successa as Januarius' mother is to suppose either that the son was transferred to another household where he was manumitted young,⁵⁸ or that Successa's *nomen* has been omitted, in other words, Hatenio's partner is a freeborn or freedwoman, Caetia Successa.⁵⁹ As to the important question, that is, the meaning of *filiaster*, there is no real way of telling whether Hatenio is the stepfather or father. The application to him of the term *pater* is not in itself conclusive evidence; it may express the affectionate relationship between a stepson and the stepfather who raised him (this would not of course work if the first scenario suggested above is accepted, i.e. that Januarius was transferred to another family). And the lack of connection between the names of the father and *filiaster* might also suggest that he is the stepfather.⁶⁰

I have kept till last two inscriptions which may be used with some degree of probability to corroborate our earlier conclusion that *filiaster* can occasionally refer to an illegitimate child. In each of these, the term *filiaster* applies to both members of a partnership.

The first is noted in *Not. degli scav.* (1917), pp. 303ff. no 51. Here, the name of the *filiatra* is not given, though the child is referred to as the *filiatra* of Juliana Saturnina and Julius Hermens. A clearer case is 6.8533, which reads 'd m / M. Ulpus Aug. lib. Felix Prae/co Familiae Castrensis / et Ulpia Artemidora fecer/unt sibi et liberis et libertis libertabusq. suis / posterisq. eorum item / Agricola Caesar. / n. ser. filiastro suo / et Ulpiae Felicissimae / filiae b m quae vixit ann / V diebus XXX.' Even allowing for the bad Latin often seen in inscriptions, it is impossible that *suo* refers to only one of the parents, indeed it is probably added to emphasise that Agricola is

⁵⁵ cf. 17243, 22308, 25726, 28519, *Inscr. Christ.* Diehl 2714 – in all these cases an *incertus* or slave dedicates a tomb to his *filiaster* (or *filiatra*) who bears a slave name.

⁵⁶ op. cit. (n. 9), p. 139 n. 1.

⁵⁷ As slave wives of imperial slaves were normally also from the imperial house (Weaver, op. cit. [n. 9], p. 138), Successa must belong to the familia Caesaris, and if Januarius is her son, he would belong to it as well. But it was rare for imperial slaves to be manumitted before the minimum age of 30 laid down by the Lex Aelia Sentia (see Weaver, op. cit. [n. 9], pp. 97ff., Rawson, op. cit. [n. 9], 285 n. 20; Rawson, art. cit. [n. 26], 78f. has cases of early manumission but these are outside the familia Caesaris).

⁵⁸ For cases of broken families see Rawson, *ibid.*

⁵⁹ Weaver (op. cit. [n. 9] [1972], p. 139 n. 1) suggests this solution in the case of Venuleius Proculus, son of Valentina (= Venuleia Valentina?) and the slave Proculus (3.4065).

⁶⁰ Contrast the example in the previous note, where the illegitimate child has its father's name as a *cognomen*.

the *filiaster* of both. The following situation may be suggested as probable: the epitaph commemorates a union between two slaves of Trajan, Felix and Artemidora, whose son Agricola, being an imperial slave, was born before the manumission of his mother. By the time their second child, Ulpia Felicissima, was born, the parents had won their freedom; their *filia* is legitimate, while their son is termed *filiaster* because he was born before the legitimation of their union.⁶¹

Of the cases discussed above, at least 6 offer persuasive evidence that *filiaster* can be used to refer to an illegitimate child. All these inscriptions display one or more of three factors: (1) the word *filiaster* appears to apply to the relationship with both parents; (2) the child bears the mother's *nomen*, implying illegitimacy, as well as the father's *cognomen*; (3) the *filiaster* (a soldier) has the same name as his (putative) father.⁶²

A useful yardstick for comparison is provided by those inscriptions that employ the terminology normally used to denote step-relationships.

First, in connection with factor (1) above, I have found no cases where the (normal) term for stepchild, *privignus/-a*, is applied to both parents rather than one.⁶³

Second, of a possible 40 cases where the terms *privignus/-a*, *vitricus*, or *noverca* occur, very few display a similarity between the names of the persons who stand in a step-relationship. In three cases, a stepchild bears the *nomen* of his mother. In one of these (6.26211), both child and mother have filiation, indicating that the child is legitimate. In the remaining two, the child may well be illegitimate, but there is a difference between these cases and those involving a *filiaster*. In the latter, the significant fact was that the *filiaster* not only bore his mother's *nomen*, but had as well the *cognomen* of her husband, thus indicating that the child was the illegitimate son of the latter. In the two cases where a *privignus* has the *nomen* of his mother, there is no connection between his name and that of his mother's husband. Thus at 10.5687, the *privignus*, Antonius Priscus, has the *nomen* of his mother Antonia Paulina, whose husband, a veteran, is T. Aelius Marianus. Although Priscus may be illegitimate, there is no indication that Marianus is anything other than his stepfather. Similarly at 14.339, a freedman, C. Cornelius Isochrysus, has two legitimate sons and a *privignus*, C. Silius Faustus, who bears the name of his mother, Silia Tyrannus.

Finally, there are no cases similar to the example of the Catones, that is where a *privignus* and *vitricus* bear exactly the same name. Cases such as 6.15205 in which the *praenomen* and *nomen* are identical, but the *cognomina* differ, can be explained without difficulty.⁶⁴

⁶¹ It is theoretically possible that Ulpia Felicissima is freeborn and illegitimate (i.e. born after her mother had won her freedom but while the father was still a slave), or even slave-born and freed (but cf. note 57 above). In both these cases, however, we would need to explain why an illegitimate daughter is called *filia* but an illegitimate son *filiaster*.

⁶² In connection with (2) and (3), the anonymous referee points out that even the upper classes did not always stick rigidly to standard practice when naming their children, and that the lower classes who appear on most of the inscriptions discussed here may have been less likely to conform to the 'rules'. In other words, arguments based on nomenclature, though strongly suggestive, cannot be entirely conclusive.

⁶³ I have found 25 inscriptions to or by a *privignus* (-a).

⁶⁴ Ti. Claudius Onesmus [sic] is the *vitricus*, Ti. Claudius Phoebus (aged 38), the *filius*. Here, since the mother's name is Claudia Cara, the similarity between the names of the two men is explained if we assume either that all three are ex-slaves of the same patron Ti. Claudius, or else that Claudia's second marriage was to her patron, who also manumitted her son, Phoebus, born of *contubernium*. Other cases are 10.2862 (Sextus Pompeius Demetrius sets up a tomb for his *privignus*, Sextus Pompeius Mercurius: the latter could be either adopted, or the *libertus* of his *vitricus*) and 6.38831 (see above, note 42).

I will conclude this discussion with a few remarks on the nature of the word *filiaster*. The term belongs to a group of words terminating in the Vulgar suffix *-aster* or *-astrum*, whose origin and character has been much disputed.⁶⁵ Priscian (*Inst.* 3.26) includes two examples (*Catulaster* and *Antoniaster*) in a list of diminutives used to denote *adulatio puerorum*, but modern scholars generally regard the suffix as pejorative in tone, quoting for instance Cicero's *Fulviaster*⁶⁶ and *Antoniaster* (*Fr. Orat. pro Varreno* 2.10 p. 232 ed. Müller). Corroboration for the latter view is also found by some⁶⁷ in the fact that the suffix is applied to the words denoting step-relationships,⁶⁸ presumably on the basis that such relationships are never cordial. Certainly the French word for a wicked stepmother, *marâtre*, derives from the Vulgar Latin *matrastra*.⁶⁹

On the other hand, although the connotations of the suffix overlap with those of diminutive forms (cf. also *surdaster/calvaster* = a little deaf/balding) there are several examples where this does not apply. In the word *alabaster*, for instance, the suffix is merely denominative in force, while the botanical terms *liliastrum*, *alicastrum* and *apiastrum* denote, not a smaller version of lily, wheat or celery/parsley but a similar species. The basic force of the *-aster/astrum* termination is to designate something similar to another thing, or a variant of it. While this may entail criticism or mockery (as in Cicero's *Fulviaster*, see note 66 above), it does not necessarily do so.⁷⁰ The fundamental meaning of *filiaster*, then, is 'a sort of son', 'someone like a son'. Given this, it would be easy for the term to be used loosely of anyone who was close to but not technically a son, in other words, such a term could equally apply to a stepson or a son born from an illegitimate union and not legally acknowledged as *filius*.⁷¹

University of Sydney

P. WATSON

⁶⁵ See F. Seck and H. Schnorr von Carolsfeld, 'Das lateinische Suffix *aster*, *astra*, *astrum*', *Archiv f. lat. lex.* 1 (1884), 390–407; F. Cooper, *Word Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius* (New York, 1895), pp. 192ff.; M. Leumann, *Lateinische Grammatik* (München, 1926–8), i.220; F. Thomas, 'Le Suffixe latin "-aster/-astrum"', *Revue des Etudes Anciennes* 42 (1940), 520–8; cf. O. Hiltbrunner, *Gymnasium* 74 (1967), 304f.

⁶⁶ Cic. *Att.* 12.44.3. Shackleton-Bailey ad loc. reads *Favoniaster*, meaning 'a bad copy of Favonius', with reference to a man of pretensions who tries to ape Favonius, the type of republican zealot.

⁶⁷ cf. Seck, op. cit. (n. 65), 391; Cooper, op. cit. (n. 65), p. 193. For the contrary view, see Thomas, op. cit. (n. 65), 522 ('Ils ne comportent aucune nuance péjorative').

⁶⁸ As well as *filiaster*, the terms *patraster* and *matrastra* are also occasionally found. Meyer (op. cit. [n. 6], p. 48) includes one example of the former in his list of cases showing an unspecified extra-marital relationship: 'D. M. Titinius Claeus Felix bixit ann. XVI. Pelacisanus(?) Daximia mater et Ammonius Sabinus patraster filio b.m.' (10.3013). But the nomenclature offers no indication that Sabinus is anything other than stepfather. The same applies to the other examples of *patraster* that I have collected (*Inscr. Christ.* 2714; 6.14105, 13.1829 and 6.11753–4: in the last case [an epitaph by a *patraster*] the dedicatee is specified as the son of another man; Meyer [loc. cit.] takes *patraster* here as meaning fosterfather, as he does also at 10.6983 where the child [a slave] is referred to as *alumnus*).

⁶⁹ For *matrastra*, see 11.6730,4 (an inscription on an *opus artis musivae* beneath a picture of Hercules reads 'Hic est Hirculis qui/ amatrastra sua perivit'); cf. Meyer-Lübke, op. cit. (n. 4), s.v.

⁷⁰ cf. Thomas, op. cit. (n. 65), 520–2.

⁷¹ Further confirmation that the term was a loose one is provided by the fact that the term *filiaster* in later Latin was used also of a granddaughter (Gloss. II 329.41, III 254.14).