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INTRODUCTION

How do you give the right amount of justice to a child who has died prematurely? What aspects of a girl’s life are portrayed on her funerary inscription? How does one judge the accomplishments of a child’s life? These are all questions I asked myself concerning the death of a child in ancient Rome. Adult tombs and inscriptions are more common and there is more epigraphic evidence of them, and so I was curious to know what the inscriptions of children looked like. Inscriptions typically describe adults in terms of their virtues, but what virtues were attributed to children? If virtues tend to be mentioned more often on epitaphs of adults, then how were children described on their tombstones? I also wanted to look at female children in particular because Roman society was dominated by males, and almost all Roman literary and historical documents which have survived view the world from a male perspective. In this thesis, I will show that Roman funerary inscriptions describing girls under the age of 20 follow patterns based on age and traditional values of Roman society. I will specifically be looking at characteristics in the inscriptions such as descriptors, dedicators, and other unusual qualities.

Mourning

The life expectancy for a female child in ancient Rome was relatively low. The mortality rate for girls by age one was between 23-30%: an additional 16-21% died by
age 5, so by the time all female newborns reached age 10, 39-51% had already died.¹

The causes of the high mortality rate included poor nutrition, the spread of contagious disease, unsanitary living conditions, especially in densely populated areas, and gastrointestinal sicknesses.² Due to the possibility of death many parents distanced themselves from their children. “… this distance may also have served as a kind of collective defense mechanism, whereby the emotional burden in the case of a child’s death (a common occurrence in ancient Rome) did not fall on the parents’ shoulders alone.”³ Despite the tendency to distance themselves, nevertheless some parents still chose to memorialize their child’s short life with a tomb inscription.

It would appear, though, that children are seriously underrepresented in these epitaphs. On the basis of estimated infant death rates, we would expect almost 20 per cent of epitaphs to be in memory of young children, while in reality just 0.4 per cent are. But an entirely different picture emerges if one considers only those epitaphs that specify the age of the deceased person … Approximately 27 per cent are intended for children under the age of 10. Moreover, the age of such young children is often specified meticulously, down to the month and the day, and sometimes even the time of death. … What is more, on the limited space that the stone offered, the statement of an exact age publicly expressed the care that the parents had shown their child. It was a brief and ossified

³ Laes 2011, p. 100.
expression of their grief and unfulfilled expectations.\footnote{Laes 2011, p. 104.}

The inscription was the commemoration to the child by grieving parents. In the catalog of inscriptions I deal with here, the grief experienced by some parents was clearly spelled out on the inscription. “The reality is that we find thousands of testimonies on tombstones for children, spread out across the Empire, regarding the material and emotional investment of parents in their prematurely deceased children.”\footnote{Laes 2011, p. 102.} Many inscriptions contained expressions of grief from the dedicators who survived.

\begin{verbatim}
D(IS) M(ANIBUS) 
IUL(IUS) VICTOR MARTIAL(IS) F(ILIUS) 
OB(ITUS) AN(NORUM) LV 
BEssa IUVENIS F(ILIA) UX(OR) 
(ObITA) AN(NORUM) XLV 
NOVELLA ESSIBNI F(ILIA) OB(ITA) A(NNORUM) XVIII 
VICTORINUS PARENTIB(US) 
ET CONIUGI ET VICTORINAE 
FIL(IAE) FECIT 
QUI PER LUEM VITA FUNCTI SUNT MAMERTINO ET RUFO 
CO(N)S(ULIBUS) 
ET AUR(ELIO) IUSTINO FRATRI MIL(ITI) 
LEG(IONIS) II ITAL(ICA)E STIPEND(IORUM) X (OBITO)
\end{verbatim}
"To the spirits of the dead; Julius Victor, son of Martialis, died at the age of 55; Bessa, daughter of Juvenis, his wife, died at the age of 45; Novella, daughter of Essibnus died at the age of 18; Victorinus made this for his parents, and his wife and his daughter Victorina who through the plague their lives were ended during the consulship of Mamertinus and Rufus and to Aurelius Justinus his brother a soldier in the 2nd legion Italica, served for 10 years died at the age of 30.” This inscription is dedicated to 5 people within one family. The naming of several family members on one tombstone is fairly common; many left room to add additional members when they died since building a new monument was costly. This inscription, however, is different because they all died during a plague in the year 182, the great Antonine Plague. Two daughters are listed on this inscription; Novella is the wife of Victorinus, but their daughter Victorina also died during the plague. Victorina’s age is not given, but it is very likely that she was very young since her mother was only 18; she may not even have reached her first birthday, which would also explain her mother’s death, since both would have been more susceptible to illness in the days and months after delivery. Victorinus was clearly struck by the grief at losing most of his family, and wished to memorialize them and their unfortunate cause of death.

Another inscription to an Iunia Procula, aged 8 years, 11 months and 5 days, describes her bereaved parents, “miseros patrem et matrem in luctu reliquit,” “she left

---

her miserable father and mother in mourning.” It is interesting that, although the infant mortality rate was high and life expectancy low, people still grieved for dead children and had the notion that they died before they should have. It is part of the recovery process for the survivors to mourn, and of course, a parent is normally going to grieve the death of a child or several children.

“To his son Bonus, who lived 10 years, whom blameless, cruel Genesis stole away from me from school; and to his daughter Iusta who lived 5 years, who had begun to bestow the sweetest part of her life on her parents.” The children’s father, Bonus, had the misfortune to have lost his children and his wife. He mentioned that his son was in school, and his daughter was the sweetest, and so he was a father stripped of his children before their time. Another inscription for a daughter alone reads, “…her father who will weep for the rest of his life, for whom, being taken away, her mother constantly pines with mourning.”


On the opposite side of this inscription shows an example of damnatio memoriae as Iunia Procula’s mother ran off with a slave after Iunia died and so her father had her name scratched off the inscription and cursed her on the back of the small monument.

8 CSIR-OE-01-04, 00517 = AEA 2006, +00003: D(is) i(nferis) M(anibus) / Aurelii(a)e Aureliani / a(nnos) n(atae) XXXV et Bono fil(io) /a(nnos) n(ato) X quem mihi / crudelis Genesis / abstulit de sco[la(?)] / immentem et / [ada] / fil(i)a e a(nnos) n(atae) / V /qua (a)e erat ingressa / a<∂=T>min<∂=E>strare pa/rentibus dulcissim/um aetate(m) Bonos /us Firmani imm/uni spec(u)lariarius / leg(ionis) XIII G(eminae) qui ipse / contiugi et fil(i)s sui[s] / fecit

9 CIL 02, 02295. D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Melitine ann(orum) VIII m(ensium) VI di(ermun) VIII hic sita est infans patri per / saecula flenda quam raptam / adsiduae mater maerore requirit / gratia blandit[if]is quales quisque / sibi cupiat producere natos hanc an/n<∂=U> s X privavit munere lucis casum quisque legat fato maledicat iniquo / s(it) t(i) t(erra) levis Carpophorus / pater et Felicula mater filiae
child, showing how she was lucky to have such parents, and how unlucky her parents were to have lost her.  

Inscriptions had several typical elements: an address to the spirits of the dead, the name of the deceased, the age at death, a descriptor describing the deceased, and the person who was dedicating the tombstone. The address to the spirits of the dead was normally abbreviated to D·M·S for Dis Manibus Sacrum, “sacred to the spirits of the dead.” It was also seen as just D·M and could be plural if the inscription was dedicated to more than one person. The name of the deceased was typically put in the dative.  

If a descriptor was used, it normally would have been a superlative adjective describing the person being “the best” of some quality. The dedicator of the inscription was usually a close relative, normally a parent for children, or the spouse or child for older individuals. 

The tombstones to children were generally not separated from those of adults and were in full view in the necropolis along the main streets leading into the cities. The commemoration on stone to a child was meant to keep their memory alive and help the parents grieve. While there is evidence that some deceased children were cremated at night and interred before morning, thereby preventing unwanted attention paid at the family’s loss, this practice does not reflect the number of inscriptions to children that were created for the purpose of commemoration. A Roman custom that did affect the commemoration of very young children was the dies lustricus, when the child had been born socially and officially named; this was done for female children on their 8th day of

\[ \text{pientis/simae} \]

\[ ^{10} \] A few additional examples of parents explicit mourning of their children on the child’s epitaph: AE 1968, 00236 = AE 1999, +00913; CIL 11, 03273 (p 1331); CIL 05, 05343; CIL 06, 13321 = CIL 11, *00156,19. 

\[ ^{11} \] If the actual name did not appear the deceased was described as the son or daughter of “father’s name.” 

life. If the child was not yet named, then the child essentially did not exist, and so if a
girl died before reaching her 8\textsuperscript{th} day of life, her death would not be commemorated in any
way. In my catalog of inscriptions the youngest daughter remembered on an inscription
was 15 days old. The daughters in the catalog under a month old are not remembered
with any words or phrases describing the girl, but those inscriptions were broken and
only fragments have been preserved; so the grief of the parents implied by the descriptors
they chose may have been present on the missing pieces. It is clear by the
commemoration of children by grieving parents, that children were remarkable and
highly valued.

\textbf{The Public and Private Value of Children}

Despite the high risk of infant mortality, the Romans nevertheless placed a high
value upon children. “Children were symbols of Italy’s future, not only as soldiers to
protect her frontiers, as citizens to hold office and contribute to a productive workforce,
but also to populate Italian towns and work on the land.”\textsuperscript{13} Augustus encouraged the
marriage of his senators and chastised those who would try to dodge their marital
responsibilities. Augustus was trying to make his senators examples for their subjects by
encouraging not only marriage, but also the production of legitimate children.\textsuperscript{14} Marcus
Aurelius stated that “… the important thing about a child is that it is a gift from the divine
intelligence.”\textsuperscript{15} Children, as images of hope for the future, were also depicted in the
propaganda of Roman emperors who wished to advertise the prosperity their reign and

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{13} Rawson 2003, p. 61.  \\
\textsuperscript{14} Suetonius 1957, p. 67-68.  Augustus: 34.  \\
\textsuperscript{15} Wiedemann 1989, p. 8.
\end{flushleft}
that of their descendants would bring to the empire. In this capacity, they appear on coins, statues, and paintings. In their propaganda, Roman emperors were able to give their citizens a sense of stability and continued prosperity through their own lineage as depicted on coins, as well as statues and paintings.

To ensure one’s well-being in later years, “… children were thereby represented as a social good to be encouraged.”16 Augustus’ push on the senatorial class to marry and have children is one example of this.17 Although he could not directly require marriage or children, he did however reward those who married and had children and justified his actions by claiming that those who were not married were not men in their own right without begetting heirs to carry on their names.

How otherwise can families continue? How can the State be preserved, if we neither marry nor have children? For surely you are not expecting men to spring up from the ground to succeed to your goods and to the public interests, as the myths describe! And yet it is neither right nor creditable that our race should cease, and the name of Romans be blotted out with us, and the city be given over to foreigners – Greeks or even barbarians. Do we not free our slaves chiefly for the express purpose of making out of them as many citizens as possible? … How, indeed, could I be a good ruler over you, if I could endure to see you growing constantly fewer in number? How could I any longer be rightfully called father by you, if you rear no children? Therefore, if you really hold me in

---

16 Rawson 2003, p. 70.
affection, … be eager now to become both men and fathers, in order that
you may not only share this title yourselves but may also justify it as
applied to me.¹⁸

Augustus used the children of Germanicus to stress his point and show the unmarried
senators what a good Roman man did for his country in providing the state with future
senators, generals, and mothers of Roman citizens.

Although there is some evidence from the second century AD that
there was a predisposition in the law to expect children to support parents,
there is no evidence of this for the republican period. The deep-seated and
long-standing ideals of pietas in Roman society suggest that there were at
least moral expectations of such support from an early period, but there
were no formal provisions.¹⁹

So beginning with Augustus, Romans were encouraged to beget legitimate children, as
Romans began to realize the need for a son or daughter to look after elderly parents, and
more importantly to strengthen Rome’s power through numbers.

Moving ahead several emperors, to the time of Trajan, the author Pliny the
Younger discussed the motives behind Trajan’s similar policy promoting the birth of
legitimate children, “the birth of new citizens is encouraged ‘as resources for wars, and as
the ornament of peace (subsidiun bellorum ornamentum pacis)’. ‘They learn to love
their country not only as their country but also as their nurturer (altricem).’”²⁰ Here

¹⁸ Dio Cassius 56.7-9 (E. Carey, trans. 1900), p. 18-23.
Pliny reinforced Trajan’s motives encouraging Romans to procreate; essentially to have a sufficient army and provide for the state.

Another role that children had was to provide for their parents as they became old. Since the infant mortality rate was so high in ancient Rome, adults were encouraged to make offerings to numerous gods and goddesses for their child’s safe birth and protection. Every care was to be given to the health of the child, especially in wealthier households. Wet-nurses were frequently employed and remedies to make the infants stronger were used. During the Roman Empire, as it was not too long ago in the United States, there was no form of social security or old age benefits. Healthy children that survived their parents were essential. Parents depended on their children to take care of them in old age. There are numerous inscriptions reflecting the fact that parents were left without heirs and should be pitied since they lost their child. The future reciprocation of care was an important aspect of raising children.

While it may have typically been the son’s job to care for his elderly parents, as he would become the next pater familias, if there were no surviving sons, this job could have fallen on a daughter. Some scholars have stated that the life of a female infant is less important and less valued than a male child. Other scholars debate this “fact.”21 When thinking in terms of the ability to care for an elderly parent, it would seem that a female child would be better equipped, because a woman would have had a more active role in caring for her children than the father. One scholar, Beryl Rawson, has stated that

---

21 See Hallett 1984, p. 76-110, for a detailed discussion on the value of daughters in society. In general, girls were compared to boys in their early years and once they reach their teens they were compared to married women.
there is not enough evidence to indicate that female rates of infanticide or exposure were higher than that of males although, “…second-born or female children might sometimes have suffered some neglect in their upbringing, so ‘sexually biased child care’ might have acted against the survival chances of girls.” She goes on to say that if girls had been valued less by the Romans, there would have been more substantial evidence proving that by the “dysfunctional” effects on the society, which would have been caused by the sex ratio imbalance. In a monogamous society like Rome, the total population would have suffered if there was a disparity between the male and female population. This imbalance would not have gone unnoticed by the emperors, and gender preference did not fit into Augustan marital legislation. While the limited epigraphic evidence regarding infants does not reflect the higher infant mortality rates, what we have still demonstrates that girls were seen to have at least been close to the value of boys.

Children in general ensure the continuity of the family, regardless of their gender. “…their existence gives a sense of security both to individuals and to a whole family.” Without children a family would not be able to carry on their line; the memory and posterity of a Roman family was very important. When Romans had children, the knowledge that the child might not live to adulthood was always present, as was the possibility that the child might have a defect warranting exposure. Although it was thought that some girls might have been exposed, Hoffer speculates about the possible reasons behind male infanticide.

“The effects of even a small amount of intentional limitation of

---

22 Rawson 2003, p. 117.
23 Wiedemann 1989, p. 91.
upper-class family size could have been compounded by a sort of natural selection by which men who happened to have few or no children tended in fact to be more successful. And if childlessness is ideal, daughters are almost as good, allowing one to make useful marriage alliances while avoiding the political threat of building one’s own family dynasty. One might half-seriously suggest that if upper-class infants were exposed, it was the *male* infants.”\(^\text{24}\)

So Hoffer says that not only would they try not to have children, but suggests that they actually might kill male children to limit the break-up of inheritance. Not only that, but as a tool to consolidate power, girls were more desirable.

The sons of Decuriones were drafted into public life and public philanthropy; their daughters volunteered. If the system possessed any virtues, we may say that they were more likely to be present when women played the role of public-minded citizens, that their gifts were more often inspired by worthy motives, and that they more truly deserved the gratitude of their communities.\(^\text{25}\)

So it was the girls who would grow up not only to be mothers but also quite possibly valuable contributors to Roman society.

**Traditional View of Women**

The traditional Roman male view of women centered on her life in the home.\(^\text{26}\)

---

\(^{24}\) Hoffer 1999, p. 231.

\(^{25}\) Mohler 1932, p. 117.

\(^{26}\) Harvey 2004, p. 127.
Roman women were to keep the house in order, produce children, and be faithful to their husbands. The first and most important job of a Roman woman was to give her husband legitimate heirs. When it came to begetting children, women were to try and produce as many children as possible. This was partly due to the high infant mortality rate, and often a woman might have 5-8 children born to her, but only one or two survive to adulthood.

Keeping the house in order involved several things. It was the job of the wife to keep the slaves in order when the husband was not present, make the preparations for meals, and supervise the raising of any children. For each of these tasks, a competent slave was capable of doing the work, but it fell upon the Roman wife to do so, or at least organize the slaves who would be doing the work. However, these aspects of family life were not as important as being faithful to one’s husband.

Within the label of ‘faithfulness’ I have collectively joined several aspects concerning the virtues of Roman women. First and foremost is chastity, which was sexual fidelity to one’s husband, and implied within that is not shaming him in any way. Part of this was the avoidance of going out into public without one’s husband. “…the notion of chastity is linked with staying at home, away, that is, from the eye of men other than husbands. Women who voluntarily offer themselves to public view raise doubts, it is suggested, about their morals.” 27 If a woman went out without her husband it could have been taken as a sign that she had gone out without his knowledge, and so she might have been committing adultery. Although this might not be the case, it was frowned upon by male authors for a woman to be seen in public without her husband.

A Roman wife’s dress should also reflect her chastity and faithfulness to her husband. This is because every aspect of not only a woman’s behavior, but also her apparel, was a direct reflection of her husband. A woman should be modest in her dress; the Latin word *pudor,* “was used in relation to those parts of the female body that must be covered in respectable Roman society.” A Roman matron should not want to advertise her ‘goods,’ as they should not be a pleasing sight to anyone but her husband. Even a woman’s self-control should be monitored. “The Roman feminine virtue of ‘chastity’ or ‘self-control’ … *prudentia.* … This was the virtue that epitomized the discreet matron and was lauded on the tombstones of women.” A woman’s *pietas* was also frequently seen on tombstones memorializing the woman as ‘most pious’ or ‘most dutiful’.

A woman was typically thought of in terms of her adherence to the virtues of the day as valued by men. Although being ascribed with any virtue might have been achieved through a wide array of her actions centering on her role as a wife and mother, any virtues were essentially in the eye of the beholder: her husband. As Forbis says in works of ancient authors and various eulogies concerning women, “all praise their female subjects for one or more of the following: chastity, marital fidelity, wifely and motherly devotion, dedication to housework.” Even Ovid, whose love poetry did not always portray women in the best light, praised his wife for her uprightness, loyalty and referred to her as “the model of a good wife.” These were the attributes with which young girls were trained from an early age to value and emulate, and so they too were often described

29 Winter 2003, p. 102.  
30 Forbis 1990, p. 493.  
in terms of their achievements of these virtues.

**Methodology**

This thesis will demonstrate through examining inscriptions dedicated to daughters under the age of 20, that the inscriptions were formulaic in a variety of ways, and reflected expected virtues based on the age of the girl. In the first chapter, I discuss the method in which the inscriptions were found. I detail how the individual inscriptions were sorted, grouped, and categorized to form my catalog. The second chapter discusses how girls were described on their epitaphs with adjectives, the differing trends throughout the ages, and what this information can tell us about how the girl was viewed by her family and friends. In the third chapter, I discuss the use of superlatives on tomb inscriptions as a way to exemplify the deceased girl in terms of Roman virtues and values. The fourth chapter discusses the dedicators of the inscriptions. I detail who exactly was dedicating the inscriptions to the girls, and the reasons for less typical dedicators (who were not in the girl’s immediate family), to spend their money on a girl’s epitaph. The fifth chapter looks at an oddity I call “Age Overages,” and how, although the inscriptions were unusual with odd month or day counts, they followed normal trends and could have been set up for a variety of reasons. In my last chapter, I discuss girls who died after they had become engaged. Their inscriptions give an important insight into how girls were viewed by their family a short time before they became Roman women and began contributing to the future offspring of the empire. Finally, in the conclusion I will reiterate the different trends seen in the catalog of inscriptions, and discuss other possible paper topics this thesis has brought to light.
CHAPTER 1

INSCRIPTION INCLUSION DETAILS

As the main concern of this paper is to show how daughters were described on their epitaphs during the Roman period, the first step was to search for the word *filia*, or “daughter” in Latin epigraphy, to create a catalog of inscriptions that could be analyzed. Using *filia* as the criterion for the search guaranteed a significant number of results. While the total number of results was significant, the inscriptions that were within the scope of this work were a fraction of that number. Using *filia* as the search criterion does limit the scope, but the results still provide an important insight into daughters memorialized on epitaphs. Due to time constraints, I was not able to include examples of girls who were not described as “*filia*” on their tombstones. The database used for this search was the Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss / Slaby EDCS website, since it has inscriptions from not only the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (CIL), the *L'Année Épigraphique* (AE), but other publications of Latin inscriptions as well. The CIL and AE are the premier authorities of Latin inscriptions from the Roman world. The CIL volumes are arranged geographically and are meant to be a complete collection of inscriptions for the region; it was primarily a work of the 19th century, however new volumes continue to appear sporadically. The AE is an annually published collection of recently published inscriptions and new interpretations and editions of older inscriptions. While the other publications are not as inclusive as the CIL or AE, they do tend to collect
all the inscriptions from specific areas, creating regional collections, and often include more recent discoveries. This fills in many gaps in the CIL and AE, and gives this thesis a larger sample from which the statistics are drawn. The total number of inscriptions containing *filia* then is 17,978.\(^{32}\)

This thesis looks only at those inscriptions of girls under the age of 20 and who are unmarried. Of those 17,978 inscriptions, 14,835 were deemed outside the parameters of this paper. If the girl had died at the age of 20 or later, the inscription was not included, as this paper’s focus is on unmarried women. As they reach their late teens and twenties most girls were already married or engaged, and although they are still described as daughters, they are no longer girls but have assumed the responsibilities of women, and I wanted the focus to be on girls. Because life expectancy was so low and infant mortality rates were so high, girls tended to marry when they were quite young, usually just after puberty. The Roman life expectancy was relatively low compared to modern times, so the average age of marriage also was low. I found numerous inscriptions dedicated to girls between 15 and 19 who were married. If a teenage girl was married, typically her husband would have been the dedicator, but if the marriage had not lasted very long before her death, he was simply mentioned as her spouse by her parents dedicating the inscription. Sometimes the girl was not clearly indicated with a status as wife or the man as her husband, but rather the inscription contained the girl’s age and how many years she lived with the man, thus indicating they had been married. With the

\(^{32}\) This was after several duplicates were removed. The inscriptions that were removed were usually a result of two publications interpreting the inscription differently. In these cases where the CIL or AE had one of the inscriptions, that was the one that remained and the other publication was deleted as the duplicate.
criteria described, 3,143 inscriptions remained in the catalog.  

The catalog is stored in a SQL database created and maintained with Microsoft Access. This program was chosen because of its capabilities to work with a large quantity of data such as the almost 18,000 inscriptions I was using. Access is able to sort data with a few clicks of the mouse and can provide a look at subsets of data effortlessly. It also has features that allow the user to search for key words and then update fields based on the findings, which was extremely helpful in creating fields based on identifying components of inscriptions. Without Access this work would never have been possible without additional months of work looking through each inscription and filling in fields by hand.

The EDCS online database includes fields for publication, province, specific find spot, the inscription text, and a picture of the inscription if they have one available. From the website I copied and pasted the information into a word document and edited the format of the information from plain text to tables with columns for Publication, Province, Specific Find Spot, and the Inscription Text. The inscription text includes extensive editorial annotation to fill out abbreviations and text lost in lacunae. So if on the original stone D·M·S· was displayed, the website’s database fills in those blanks by giving D(is) M(anibus) S(acrum). EDCS also shows where there were breaks in the stone and, if a certain reconstruction is not possible, they try to calculate the number of spaces that are missing using brackets and numbers. For example “D(is) M(anibus) [3] neon Nepos f[3] / Nepotill(a)e filiae / suae bene mer(enti) / fecit vix(it) ann(os) II /

33 For the sake of time I did not look at the images of these girls, yet this could be an area for further investigation.
m(enses) IIII d(ies) XI.” Based on the length of the lines below the first and second they are able to estimate that three characters are missing from the first lines as given in the brackets [3]. The abbreviations are many and varied, for instance D·M·S· is also seen as D·M·SAC·, D·MAN·SAC·, etc. So in order to accommodate the searches I created a ‘clean’ version of the text without all of the editorial marks but left in place the added text. When those steps were complete, I saved the word document as a .txt file and then imported the file into Access. Saving it as a .txt file was a necessary step because there are limitations with importing data into Access from Word, one being that Access truncates any data field longer than 250 characters when a table is copied directly into an Access data table. Since the entire inscription was essential and many were significantly longer than 250 characters, I used the .txt file and imported that into Access circumventing the truncation when copying and pasting, creating a database with fields for every column described above. Using the Clean Inscription field, where I removed all parentheses and other editing marks leaving a clean copy of the text, I was able to search for additional inscription characteristics

In addition to the imported text fields, I also added the following fields as yes/no check boxes: DMS, Superlatives, Married, HSE, HNS, Heirs, Bones, Plot Size, In Pace, Calendar Reference, Odd Month/Day, and Age. For many of the searches one will notice that I truncated the words; this was done so as to allow for the different declension endings in Latin. I checked the DMS field if the inscription contained “Dis Manibus” or

---

34 CIL 10, 02770.
35 These missing characters also tell us something about the stone itself. Since only the first two lines were affected by the break, and only on the right side, an educated guess would tell us that the corner of the inscription had been broken off.
“Diis Mani.” Some of the DMS inscriptions did not contain the “S”, so by not including it in the search criteria I did not have to search for them in addition to the DM inscriptions. A check in the Superlative field indicates an inscription contained “issima,” thus providing a rough estimate of the number of superlatives found in the inscriptions since the vast majority of superlatives contain “issima,” those that did not were usually superlative that were misspelled on the inscription. Searching for “coniug” or “coiugs” and “uxor” provided a count on how many inscriptions contained marital statuses. The HSE, HNS, and Heirs fields indicate common inscription abbreviations. HSE for “hic sita est,” “she is buried here;” HNS for “heredum non sequetur,” “this does not follow to the heirs;” and Heirs for “sibi et suis,” “sibi suis,” or “posterisque,” “for him/herself and their own,” or “and to their posterity.” For each of these searches, I also added all the different combinations that could have been seen. For Bones, Plot Size and In Pace, the searches looked for key words such as “ossa,” for “bones,” “pedes” for “feet,” as the plot size was always given in feet, and “in pax/pace” for “in peace.”

The Calendar Reference field contained references to specific months and consular years, as many of the inscriptions had references not to the month but the year in which they died. The Odd Month/Day field allowed me to compile inscriptions with overages of months or days in the death number. Finally the Age Range field was the most complicated and so was broken down into 10 yes/no check boxes that indicated the girl’s age within two years. For example, if the girl lived between 1 second to 1 year, 11

---

36 There was an indication of a correlation of married status and plot size given, but this trend was only seen in the first few age ranges.
37 Although these fields were not utilized to their fullest potential, it is an area that could be expanded upon in future research.
38 The year reference was given by naming both consuls for that year.
months, and 31 days then the inscription would be grouped in the Age 0-1 group. So there were fields for 0-1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-7, 8-9, 10-11, 12-13, 14-15, 16-17, and 18-19. I also had age groups for ages from 20-100+, as I wanted to eliminate them when I ran queries to collect inscriptions without obvious ages. Once I separated the inscriptions by the age range, I then broke them down further and put their age at death into a numeric field. For example: the inscription “Dis Manibus Samniae Luci filiae Magiae Marcellae vixit annos VII menses VIII dies XIII Lucio Samnio Luci filio Quirina Magio Gallo”\textsuperscript{39} would be in the 7-8 Age Range and in the Age field, which was a text field, I added “07.08.13” for 7 years 8 months and 13 days.

Once the Age group field was filled in, I looked at every inscription that was not automatically placed into an age group. Of the close to 15,000 inscriptions that were not in an age group, only a handful were identified as being missed by the preliminary search, this was usually due to the fact that there was a spelling error, or the inscription spelled out the age instead of giving Roman numerals. Looking at all the inscriptions, I then eliminated an additional 60 inscriptions which fell into a category called “Unknown Age.” If the inscription had clear indicators of the age such as \textit{vixit} or a form of \textit{annus} then it was placed into this category, when the age of the girl was not clear. This usually was a result of a fragmentary stone on which some of the information had been lost. For example:

\begin{verbatim}
AURELIA F[ILIAE(?)]
BENE MER[E]N[TI]
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{39} CIL 06, 25859.
QUAE VI[XIT]
ANNIS X[ 40

In this example, one can see that at the end of each line there are brackets. These brackets indicate that the right side of the stone is missing since they appear at the end of each line. Normally it would be safe to say that the girl was 10 years old, but as the stone has broken off, and the only thing visible is the Roman numeral X, she could be 10, or in her teens, 20’s, 30’s, or older. In fact, she could even be in her 90’s as the missing fragment could indicate her age as XC. Thus when the age of the girl was uncertain due to a break in the stone, I erred on the side of caution and did not include those inscriptions, as they could skew the data. Thus the total number of inscriptions that comprise the basis for this work is 3,082.

When every inscription had been reviewed, I began to process them in subsets of three months. For example: in Age group 4-5, I looked at every inscription that was 4+ years, 4.01-4.03, 4.04-4.06, 4.07-4.09, 4.10-4.11, 5+, 5.01-5.03, etc. The #+ subset came as a result of the fact that there were numerous inscriptions that just gave the year and nothing else, but then there were also inscriptions that were clearly in that age range but the months/days were missing from the inscription, so to accommodate those unknown month/day inscriptions I looked at them with the inscriptions containing just the years. By grouping them in subsets of three months, I was able to identify possible trends within the age ranges, which then provided me with information regarding what trends I should be looking for across all the ages.

40 ICUR-01, 02540.
The last 4 fields I created were text fields titled D解脱ator, Occupation, Notes and Descriptors. I filled in each of these fields by hand, as I went through each inscription individually. The D解脱ator field contains the person who dedicated the inscription to the girl, if he or she was clearly named or described. The Occupation field listed any jobs that the various people on the inscriptions had. In this category I also denoted social status, the majority being freedmen. The Notes field was a catch-all field to which I added any unusual text within the inscription; notes on cause of death, unusual familial relationships, etc. Finally the Descriptor field contained the text of any words or phrases that described the girl in the inscription; this also included superlatives as well as comparatives. Although processing each inscription in the way described was time-consuming, taking several months, it also allowed me to see the trends and note interesting inscriptions that deserved further attention within specific subsets of data. My findings can be seen in the following chapters. Also, in order to provide a sample of typical inscriptions seen throughout the age ranges, I have compiled a table found in Appendix A: Typical Inscriptions Across All Age Ranges, of 3-5 inscriptions for each age range.
CHAPTER 2

DESCRIPTORS

BENE MERENTI ANTONIAE CYRIACETI QUAE VIXIT
ANNIS XVIII M II D XXVI ACCEPTA DEI GRATIA QUARTA DIE
VIRGO OBIT IULIUS BENEDICTUS PATER FILIAE DULCISSIMAE
ET INCO M N PARABILI POSUIT D XII KAL DEC
BENE MERENTI ANTONIAE CYRIACETI QUAE VIXIT
ANNIS XVIII MENSIBUS II DIEBUS XXVI ACCEPTA DEI GRATIA
QUARTA DIE
VIRGO OBIIT IULIUS BENEDICTUS PATER FILIAE DULCISSIMAE
ET INCO M N PARABILI POSUIT DIE XII KALENDAS
DEC(EMBRES)

“To the well deserving Antonia Cyriacete, who lived 19 years, 2 months, and 26
days, having been baptized on the 4th day before she died as a virgin; her father Julius
Benedictus placed this for his sweetest and incomparable daughter on the 12th day before
the Kalends of December.” This inscription has 4 unique characteristics that describe the
girl Antonia. One of the most interesting is that she was a Christian, having been
baptized only 4 days before her death. I find her baptism so close to her death unusual

---

41 ICUR-04, 11806 (p 535) = ICaRoma 00076.
42 Willis 2011, p. 105.
and I suspect that she may have been attending Christian meetings, but had not yet decided to be baptized. When she became sick, and her death was impending, it might have been the push she needed to get baptized, but without additional information this is all just speculation. The date of her death is also a note-worthy feature to this inscription, as only 5% of inscriptions in the catalog contained calendar references.\textsuperscript{43} The third interesting attribute is that at the age of 19, she was not married, and an engagement was not mentioned on her inscription. The last characteristic and the most important for this chapter are the descriptors used to describe her: \textit{virgo, dulcissima}, and \textit{incomparabilis}.

She was a virgin, the sweetest, and incomparable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Total Inscriptions</th>
<th>Pia</th>
<th>Virgo</th>
<th>Innocens</th>
<th>Incomparabilis</th>
<th>Dulcis</th>
<th>Multiple Descriptors</th>
<th>Other: Description Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3133\textsuperscript{44}</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjectives reveal characteristics about the girl that the dedicators wished

\textsuperscript{43} Out of the 3,082 inscriptions, only 162 contained clear calendar references. These references contained either a clear month name or the name(s) of the consul(s) which could then be verified with Broughton (1951), \textit{The Magistrates of the Roman Republic}.

\textsuperscript{44} This differs from the 3,082 because there were several inscriptions that contained multiple daughters.
everyone else to know. If one were to have said that Antonia Cyriacete died at age 19, it would have revealed nothing about Antonia other than the fact of her death. Personal qualities were reflected in the descriptors her father gave Antonia. Descriptors also reveal the value of a deceased girl to her family. If the dedicator used a superlative, then the girl was the epitome of some trait and she in that respect was irreplaceable. When descriptors were used, they reflected characteristics that were highly valued to Roman society. As seen in Table 1, the most common adjectives are superlatives, and the 3 most common adjectives are *pia*, *virgo* and *incomparabilis*. As superlatives were so frequently used, they will be discussed separately in the next chapter; this chapter will focus on the other forms of descriptors used.

![Figure 1: Percentage of Pia Used Across the Age Ranges](image)

*Pia*, which means “faithful, dutiful, conscientious, upright, devout, and loyal,” is the most frequently-used adjective, appearing on 4.3% of inscriptions. As seen in Figure

---

45 The good qualities of a person are exaggerated in death and may be for appearance’s sake, but because the dedicator used a superlative instead of a comparative, this still shows their belief that she exceed others.
1, the 14-15 age range is where this adjective most commonly occurs on 10% of the inscriptions, with a small peak in the 4-5 age range. *Pia* as the most prevalent descriptor is not surprising since it was one of the most important virtues for a Roman woman.\(^ {46} \)

Between the age of 14-15, girls were beginning to enter adulthood, with more responsibilities, including becoming betrothed (many girls were already married), so by using *pia* the dedicator is showing that the girl has taken any responsibilities with loyalty and will dutifully complete them. The superlatives of *pia, pientissima* and *piissima*, combined also are frequently seen on inscriptions.\(^ {47} \)

\[
\text{SILECA LAETI F(ilia) P(ia)} \quad \text{DIIS(!) MANIB(US) SACR(UM)} \\
\text{V(IIXIT)} \quad \text{SYRIA VIX(IT) AN(NOS) III} \\
\text{ANNIS XV} \quad \text{NYMPHAS PIAE FILIAE FEC(IT)}^{49}
\]

The above inscriptions can be translated: “Here lies Sileca, faithful daughter of Laetius, who lived 15 years.” And “Sacred to the spirits of the dead; Syria lived 3 years, Nymphas made this for her loyal daughter.” These are very short inscriptions, with the only descriptor used being *pia*. This perhaps was an indication of how important the word was to Roman society, because when the dedicators had to be choosy, many picked *pia* to commemorate both younger and older girls.

As the other common adjectives are used significantly less than *pia*, I will not be going into detail about them; however, it is notable that many common descriptors appear

\(^ {46} \) For a basic discussion of Roman virtues see Francese 2007, p. 217-228.
\(^ {47} \) See the Superlative chapter for additional information.
\(^ {48} \) CIL 08, 11873 (p 2372).
\(^ {49} \) ILAlg-01, 01699.
to peak in the 14-15 age range. These include not only *pia*, but also *virgo, incomparabilis* and inscriptions with multiple descriptors. The 14-15 age range does however contain the smallest percentage of superlatives, and one of the lowest occurrences of the descriptors *innocens* and *dulcis*, and other less common descriptors. The adjectives *innocens* and *dulcis* do however tend to be reserved for younger girls with the peak of their use in the 2-3 Age Range. As a girl aged, her innocence and sweetness would transform into the qualities that emulated those attributes typically seen in older women such as *pia* or *incomparabilis*.

**FILIAE INCOMPARABILI**

**CLUS(iae) AELIANETI CLUS(ius)**

A(E)LIANUS PATER ET AFRANIA

SABINA MATER FEC(ERUNT) VIRGINI IN CHR(ISTO) DEO

QU(A)E V(IIXIT) ANN(OS) X(IIII) Q(UIESCIT) IN PACE50

“To our incomparable daughter Clusia Aelianeta, Clusius Aelianus her father and Afrania Sabina made this for our maiden daughter in Christ our God, who lived 14 years, rest in peace.” This inscription depicts the girl Clusia, with only one descriptor about her personality, and focuses more on her membership in the Christian faith. There were only 7 inscriptions in the catalog that contained the word *Christus* and can be identified as dedicated to Christians; however as stated previously there are other inscriptions that contain the Latin words *in pace* or references to apostles or disciples that would also indicate a Christian context. The Christian inscriptions contain additional elements such

---

50 ICUR-04, 11863 = ILCV 03379.
as the “virgini in christo deo” or other references clarifying their dedication to Christianity, such as “in nomine domini Iesu Christi.” So although the people involved were Christian, they assimilated with some of the elements found on pagan funerary epitaphs.

Table 2: Other Descriptors Occurring More Than Once

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Anima</th>
<th>Bona</th>
<th>C/Kara</th>
<th>Casta</th>
<th>Delicata</th>
<th>Delicium</th>
<th>Digna</th>
<th>Domina</th>
<th>Immatura</th>
<th>Infans</th>
<th>Infelix</th>
<th>Innox</th>
<th>Nata</th>
<th>Naturalis</th>
<th>Neofita/fyta</th>
<th>Optima</th>
<th>Pietas</th>
<th>Prima</th>
<th>Papa</th>
<th>Pulga</th>
<th>Pulchra</th>
<th>Sancta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Yellow indicates peaks in the descriptors use.

In Table 2, I have broken down the occurrences of the unusual descriptors from Table 1’s ‘Other Descriptors’, which occurred more than once. An interesting finding was that once a girl reached the 8-9 Age Range, the frequency of unusual descriptors declined. It seems that when using adjectives, dedicators typically used less common ones more often for younger girls rather than older girls. This could be a result of several possible factors. One thought was that this could be a result of more superlatives being used, but as I will show in the next chapter, that was not always the case. The other thought was that the younger the girl, the more innocent she might have appeared, so the
dedicators (usually a parent or both) included more descriptors to reflect that, often appearing more complimentary to the younger girls. When adding up the occurrence of descriptors used for each age range in Table 2, 62% of the descriptors were used to describe a girl aged 0-9, so in essence it appears dedicators were more complimentary to younger girls. It could also be that there were fewer standard descriptors for girls of a younger age. Often descriptors were of a formulaic nature and did not necessarily reflect the actual qualities of the deceased, so unusual descriptors may have been a deliberate attempt by the dedicator to portray the girl as special. For example, girls aged 4-5 did not have the qualities of a domina, but there were 3 inscriptions where this adjective was present as an honorary quality ascribed to the girl. Another explanation is that as a girl aged it became more important to show how she exhibited the traditional Roman values and virtues. This is evident in descriptors such as casta, fidelis, optima, and pudica.

Table 3: Unique Descriptors in Each Age Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>dulcior rosa, femina, garrula bimam, matron, parva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>caritas, felix, infantula, inreparabilis, parvola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>contenta, feliciter, infirma, unica, vernacula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>melior, memoria, pisintula, pupilla, scholastica hilare, unieversis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>cor nimia, minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>animula, bene, conserva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>amor, cognata, inpar, praetextata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>amica, baccis, desperata, discipula, eloquentia, fidelis, inferor, sacra, subracta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>agens rapta, amabilis, copula, laudabilis femina, pudica pudens, securitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>hebraea, iuvenis, (2) privigna, sanctimonialis, securitate, virginitas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51 AE 1986, 00083; ICUR-04, 10889 = ILCV 03902; and ICUR-03, 07819 = ILCV 02288 (em).
pudens. Qualities, such as those listed, were deemed more important to Roman society as a whole, and were progressively more important as a girl grew up.

In Table 3, adjectives that were only seen in one age group are listed. In the 0-1 Age Range, the interesting ones are *dulcior rosa* and *garrula bimam*. These are both terms of endearment for the girl who was ‘sweeter than a rose’ or ‘a talkative girl with her first teeth.’ Several diminutives were used such as *animula*, *infantula*, *parvola*, *pisintula*, *pupilla*, and *vernacula* in the younger girls; diminutive use for older girls was not as common of an occurrence. The more frequent use of diminutives should not be surprising as it is a term of endearment that means “little,” and calling a girl “little” when she was under the age of 10 would have been a normal endearment just as it is today.

Looking at the older girls, the frequency of unique adjectives increases. There were 3 girls, between the ages of 15 and 18, described specifically with non-pagan religious descriptors, *discipula*, *hebrea*, and *sanctimonialis*. Over 52% of all the inscriptions within the catalogue had *Dis Manibus Sacrum* or a variation of it, so seeing epitaphs that had typical pagan words inscribed was not unusual, but the inclusion of other religious beliefs on inscriptions was an oddity.

HIC REQUI(E)S[CIT] IN
PACE CRISCENTIA FI

---

52 These descriptors can be translated many ways, but the gist of their use is as a term of endearment. For *dulcior rosa* it was very unusual to see a comparative, so translating it literally does not make much sense. For *garrula bimam* as the girl was not two years old yet, I took this as meaning that she had started talking like a two year old and may have already started teething.
53 ICUR-10, 26870.
54 ICUR-04, 12256 (p 535). Millin 1996, p. 246, provides additional information about *sanctimonialis* and defines the word as a nun.
55 I will discuss unusual religious inscriptions in the Special Attention chapter.
LIA PASCASI (H)EBREA

VIRGO QUI VIXIT

ANN< O = U >S P(LUS) M(INUS) XVIII

HEBR 56

“Here rests in peace Criscentia, daughter of Pascasus, a Hebrew maiden, who lived more or less 18 years. Hebrew. There were only two inscriptions with the phrase “HEBR,” but the inscription above also used the descriptor hebrea in reference to the girl Criscentia which makes it unusual. As those inscriptions with non-pagan religious descriptors were for girls over the age of 15, it is clear that type of epitaph was reserved for older girls as they were able to exhibit religious qualities.

"GR"

D(IS) M(ANIBUS)

CORNELIAE POMPO[NI]

ANAE QUAE VIX(IT) ANNO

UNO D(IEBUS) IIII CORNELI

US PAULINUS PATER FIL

IAE B(ENE) M(ERENTI) P(OSUIT)58

“Greek; To the spirits of the dead; to Cornelia Pomponiana, who lived 1 year, and 4 days; Cornelius Paulinus put this up for his well deserving daughter.” One unusual aspect of this inscription is that the year is written out in Latin instead of just using

56 JIWE-01, 00035.
57 See Appendix B: Inscriptions with “GR” or “HEBR” for additional inscriptions.
58 AE 1987, 00270.
Roman numerals; while it was much more common to see all Roman numerals, the use of the Latin for the number or a combination of both, as seen on this inscription, was not uncommon. However, there were only a few instances of inscriptions that contained the descriptor “GR” or “HEBR” which indicated that although the girl was memorialized in a Roman province, it was important to her or the dedicators that it be known she was of Greek or Hebrew origin. In the catalog, there were 11 total inscriptions that contained one of these phrases. There are other inscriptions that contained words or phrases that indicated a girl as a Greek or Hebrew, but they did not feature “GR” or “HEBR” on the inscription.59

MATER ET PATER
BASI<L=1>IAE <F=E>I<L=1>IAE DULCISSI
MAE QUAE VIX(IT) ANNIS V
MENS<E=(B)U>S XI DI<E=I>BUS VIII
BASI<L=1>ISSA IN PACE
"GR"

“The mother and father made this for Basilia their sweetest daughter who lived 5 years, 11 months, and 8 days; Basilissa in peace; Greek.” “GR” and “HEBR” always appeared at the beginning or the end of the inscription. The average occurrence of these

59 IGRavenna 00008 = Gummerus-01, 00259. “...[3]on em[athon ligyron melos on pote Hermes / [e]ure chelones metron ego de psallus aeido / pros zofon eairoenta chelidon ielon auden / ala me myr oloe catechi cai cera melena / hos men moe lethen pharechi / cae aphiliato phonen / [3] glyceron fa[os 3] / p[3]da filon aedidaxas aedoima grammata / phonin / caepegas enfanes aepoesu ptero / phoru psiche...” This is an example of an inscription that used the Latin alphabet, but is actually a transliteration of Greek text. It is an oddity that was not seen anywhere else in the catalog. See Vidman 1969, p. 266-267, for additional information.
descriptors was similar to others but most of the others were superlatives with the one exception of “hebraea” as described above.

There are several instances of characteristics of girls which could be linked to social expectations, such as praetextata, eloquentia, laudabilis femina, and pudica pudens. These types of descriptors were only found in older girls, specifically aged 12 or older, and were appropriate as the girls were coming into an age where their public participation and eventual marriages could take place. Girls with these unique descriptors were highly honored by their loved ones when the adjective was added to their inscriptions, as it reflected their adherence to traditional values as defined by the rest of Roman society. Individuality did not seem to be as important as reflecting traditional Roman values when describing a girl. The use of pia, virgo, and dulcis were dominant adjectives because of their value as seen by other Romans. Most adjectives used in girls over the age of 10 could be aligned with the typical Roman virtues, while descriptors for girls under the age of 10 tended to reflect terms of endearment rather than virtues.
CHAPTER 3

SUPERLATIVES

PAX AETERNA
DULCISSIMAE ET INNOCENT
TISSIM(AE) FILIAE CHRYSOGONE IU
NIOR(I) SIRICIO QUAE VIX(IT) ANN(IS) III
M(ENSIBUS) II DIEB(US) XXVII VALERIUS ET CHRY
SOGONE PARENTES FILIAE RARIS
SIMAE ET OMNI TEMPORE VI
TAE SUAE DESIDERANTISSI
MAE

“Eternal peace, to the sweetest and most innocent daughter Chrysogone Siricio the younger, who lived 3 years, 2 months, 27 days; Valerius and Chrysogone her parents made this for their rarest daughter and at all times her life will be greatly missed.”

This inscription is quite unusual for several reasons. Much of the Latin is written out with very few abbreviations. This could be an indication of the wealth of the family as the stone would have had to be larger and more letters needed to be engraved than an abbreviated inscription with the same message. Also there were no other inscriptions

\textsuperscript{60} CIL 12, 00782 (p 818) = AE 2005, +00994.
dedicated to daughters under the age of 20 that contain *pax aeterna*,\(^1\) it is slightly more common to see *memoriae aeternae*, but more common to see *pax aeterna* on official coins to well-known figure heads, such as on a coin with a representation of the emperor\(^2\). More important, however, was the use of superlatives used in this inscription. This inscription was the only inscription that used 4 superlatives referring to one daughter; actually finding three superlatives is fairly rare, so an epitaph containing 4 is not only noteworthy but also indicative of the love her parents must have felt to praise her so much at her death, especially considering the additional cost of a longer inscription.

### Table 4: Superlative Percentages Related to Total Superlatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Total Superlatives</th>
<th>Superlative Percentages</th>
<th>C/Karissima Percentages</th>
<th>Dulcisima Percentages</th>
<th>Infelicissima Percentages</th>
<th>Pientissima Percentages</th>
<th>Piissima Percentages</th>
<th>Other Superlatives Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-01</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-07</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averages</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Green indicates the age range with the lowest percentage of each superlative. Yellow indicates the age range with the highest occurrence of each superlative.

---

\(^1\) This could also be an indication that the girl was Christian, but without additional information that is unclear.

\(^2\) *PAX AETERNA AUG* was a common phrase indicating peace in the Empire and was used as a propaganda tool. “All forms of representation propagating eternal continuation of the reign of the emperor at that time, the existence of Rome, peace, hope, happiness, security, the invincibility of the emperor and the Roman Empire, deities, and of the concord within the imperial family.” (Manders 2012, p. 47).
Superlatives are frequently seen on epitaphs. In fact, when looking at all of the inscriptions dedicated to girls less than 20 years of age, superlatives occur on 47.7% of the inscriptions, as seen in Table 4. One can also see on the table that the age range that was the peak of superlative use is between ages 8-9. While there is no clear linear trend visible, the peak use of the superlatives *carissima/karissima, dulcissima, infelicissima,* and *innocentissima* occur between the ages of 0 to 5, with the lowest occurrences present in the later teen years. The superlatives *pientissima, piisima* and the other superlatives occur most frequently between the ages of 14 and 19, and are less commonly used for girls of younger ages. It seems clear looking at the percentages that certain superlatives were generally used to describe younger girls, and others were used more often to describe older girls. I will be discussing each of these in turn.

**Figure 2: Average Number of Superlatives Per Age Group**

- **C/Karissima, 26.5**
- **Dulcissima, 72.5**
- **Piissima, 13.7**
- **Pientissima, 22.1**
- **Innocentissima, 3.4**
- **Infelicissima, 4.5**
- **Other, 6.8**
*Dulcissima* is the descriptor seen most frequently throughout the age ranges and appears on 46% of inscriptions containing a superlative. As seen in Figure 2, on average it occurs 72 times in each age range, appearing almost three times as frequently as the second most common superlative *c/karissima*. But what does it relate about the girl it is describing? *Dulcissima* comes from the Latin word *dulcis*, which when referring to a person means: “delightful,” “agreeable,” “a source of enjoyment,” “held in affection,” “cherished,” “dear,” “kind,” “charming,” “sweet,” “gracious,” etc. As a term of endearment this superlative not only shows that the daughter was well loved, but also her temperament was one that all parents should envy. While younger children are often excitable and unpredictable, it is safe to say that their temperament was not necessarily always sweet or charming, but in death the good qualities of the person are the ones that are remembered and thus memorialized on stone.

![Figure 3: Dulcissima Percentages Related to Total Superlative Percentages](chart.png)
In Figure 3 *dulcissima* tends to be used more for the earlier ages than for the late teens with the peak of its use at age 2-3. Harrod (1909) states,

> Evidently *dulcissimus* was the term applied to children. The average age of the son to whom the epithet is applied is 9 years; the average age of the daughter, 8 years; … Everything points to the conclusion that *dulcissimus* is the particular epithet not only of children but of younger children.\(^\text{63}\)

While I would disagree with his calculation of the average age of *dulcissima* was for daughters at age 8, there is a notable drop in its use after the 8-9 age range, but I found the average age to be 6, not 8. Harrod restricts his sample, however, to Volume VI of the CIL (Rome). He may have also been calculating the average based on daughters of all age ranges rather than just those that were under 20, as the catalog used for this thesis. Also, in Table 4, the lower frequency of *dulcissima* and higher frequency of other superlatives could also be a result of his different findings. Table 5, supported by Table 4, shows the use of every superlative across the age ranges and the gradual increased use of other superlatives such as *pientissima*. It is also possible that other less common superlatives could be a factor in this declined use of *dulcissima*. Rawson (2005) states,

> Children who were commemorated as *dulcis/dulcissimus* (‘sweet, and ‘most sweet’) tended to be younger than those who were *carissimus* (‘very dear’) or *pientissimus* (‘very devoted’). Up to the age of about 5, children were most remembered verbally as sweet and playful, before they

\(^{63}\) Harrod 1909, p. 9-10.
Table 5: Occurrence of Superlatives Across the Ages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Total Inscriptions</th>
<th>C/Karissima</th>
<th>Dulcissima</th>
<th>Infelicissima</th>
<th>Innocentissima</th>
<th>Pientissima</th>
<th>Piissima</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 (Amabilissima, Amantissima, 2 Clarissima, Rarissima)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7 (2 Amantissima, 2 Desiderantissima, 2 Rarissima, Sanctissima)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4 (Desiderantissima, Rarissima, Sanctissima, Suavissima)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3 (Amantissima, Miserrima, Rarissima)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7 (2 Amantissima, Desiderantissima, Indulgentissima, Iucundissima, Merentissima, Sanctissima)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8 (Bellissima, Felicissima, Merentissima, 4 Rarissima, Sanctissima)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9 (Amantissima, 3 Desiderantissima, Pudicitissima, Rarissima, 3 Sanctissima)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7 (2 Amantissima, Merentissima, 2 Rarissima, Sanctissima, Unknown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10 (4 Amantissima, Fidelissima, 2 Rarissima, Reverentissima, Sanctissima, Securissima)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8 (3 Amantissima, Merentissima, 2 Rarissima, 2 Sanctissima)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64 CIL 06, 15412 = CIL 10, *01088,090 … 3simae …
began to take on the greater responsibilities inherent in *pientissimus* and *bene merens* (‘well deserving’).

I would agree that the younger a child was, the more likely the dedicator would be to include *dulcissima* in her epitaph, showing her child-like quality.

*Carissima*, sometimes seen as *Karissima*, is also a common superlative. It comes from the Latin word *carus* and suggests the person it describes is “beloved,” “dear,” or “regarded with affection.” Harrod states, “The average age of the daughter [to whom the epithet *carissimus* is applied is] 9 ¾. These averages are some 2 years higher than with *dulcissimus*…”

Although he was working with a smaller sample, his estimated peak age group for the use of *carissima* was similar to my finding in terms of the age gap between the use of *carissima* and *dulcissima*. I found that the average age of a daughter between the age 0-19, who was described as *carissima* was age 8, more specifically, in the early months of age 8. So with the average age of *dulcissima* at age 6 and *carissima* at age 8, there is a two year difference. Harrod also attests that this higher average is due to *carissimus* being used more for adults, and “it would quite naturally be more often applied to grown sons and daughters than *dulcissimus* which, as we shall see, is used particularly of children.”

Although his reasoning seems sound based on his findings, one must question why the peak of *carissima*’s use is in the 0-1 age range, appearing on 24% of inscriptions containing superlatives. When looking at daughters under the age of 20, with *dulcissima*’s use in the 2-3 age range if *carissima* truly was a term of

---

65 Rawson 2003, p. 51.
66 Harrod 1909, p. 6.
67 Harrod 1909, p. 6.
endearment reserved for older children why was it used so frequently in younger children.

D(ECIMUS) CORNELIUS HERMA ET CORNELIA TYCHE
DOMO RAVENNA PARENTES INFELICISSI
MI FILIABUS PIENTISSIMIS
CORNELIAE HELPIDI FIL(IAE) DEF(UNCTAE) ANN(ORUM) XVIII
CORNELIAE HELPISTE FIL(IAE) DEF(UNCTAE) ANN(ORUM) XVIII
RESTUTAE FIL(IAE) DEF(UNCTAE) ANN(ORUM) VII LIBERTIS
LIBERTABUSQUE SUIS POSTERISQUE EORUM

“Decimus Cornelius Herma and Cornelia Tyche, a native of Ravenna, unfortunate parents made this for their most dutiful daughters Cornelia Helpidis who died at the age of 18, Cornelia Helpiste who died at the age of 19, and Restuta who died at the age of 7, and for their freedmen, freedwomen and their posterity.” Having three daughters under the age of 20 on one inscription is rare, but this does show how a superlative could be used to describe all the daughters; the superlative pientissima will be discussed shortly. Inscriptions with 3 daughters only appeared 3 times. It was far more common to see two daughters or even a daughter with son(s) or other family members. On each inscription two of the daughters were within a year of each other with the third being several years older or younger.

In total there were 68 inscriptions in the catalog that were dedicated to more than

---

68 CIL 03, 02120.
69 The other inscriptions were CIL 06, 22013 = CIL 11, *00259,076; CIL 08, 14631.
one daughter. The ages of the daughters vary. In some cases, they are close in age as in the inscription above, but at other times, many years separate them. While on average superlatives were seen on 47.7% of all inscriptions in the catalog, only 39.7% of inscriptions featuring more than one daughter contained superlatives. Non superlative descriptors are only seen on 8 inscriptions for multiple daughters, on 5 of which was the adjective pia. Most of the time when descriptors of any kind appeared, they described every girl on the inscription, but occasionally each girl had a distinct descriptor.

Piissima and pientissima are both superlatives that come from pius, which means “faithful,” “dutiful,” “conscientious,” “upright,” “devout,” and “loyal.” While I find it highly unlikely that a child of two or three could be described as faithful and conscientious, that does not disregard the feelings of parents and siblings that their loved one would have become so, if only they had lived long enough. “The parent’s eye is keen to detect the first evidences of developing virtues in his child, but it seems that a child 4 years or under could not with strict propriety be called piissimus.” In book 5 of Memorable Doings and Sayings, Valerius Maximus gives examples of pietas through “two-way commitments and mixes vocabulary of affection with that of pietas.” Valerius Maximus’ mixed vocabulary concerning pietas and children would support what Harrod stated, that “pius piissimus and pientissimus are used much more often to express the tender love of a parent for child than the dutiful love of child for parent.” Harrod lists the average age of daughters described as piissima as 14 years old and as pientissima

---

70 See Appendix C: Inscriptions Featuring Multiple Daughters for the list of inscriptions.
71 Harrod 1909, p. 16.
72 Rawlson 2003, p. 223.
73 Harrod 1909, p. 16.
as 12 ½ years old, stating that “these averages are 4 years higher than with carissimus, 6 years higher than with dulcissimus.” I found the average age for both of these superlatives in children to be around age 11, and so just slightly above his estimation of 4 years higher than carissima and 6 years higher than dulcissima. As such, pia when used on a young girl’s inscription could more accurately reflect the feelings of her parents more than any sense of devotion the girl had. Yet his statement that the use of pientissima and piissima was improper for young children is not reflected in the evidence, since both descriptors appear around 80 times between the ages of 0 to 5 years old.

Although infelicitissima and innocentissima are present in every age group, their frequency is the lowest of all the common superlatives. Infelicitissima from infelix means “ill-fated,” “unfortunate,” “unlucky,” “unhappy,” etc. This superlative is seen on only 3% of inscriptions containing a superlative, but its occurrence throughout the age groups is fairly constant, with the exception that in the very early ages its frequency is higher. The higher frequency in infancy is not surprising since “30% of babies died in their first year,” and “probably half of all children born had died before the age of 10.” The peak of infelicitissima’s use was in the age 0 to 1 age group, with the low point at age 4 to 5. Harrod did not have a section for infelix alone, but rather, he included it in the section of Adjectives of Rarer Occurrence and only lists one inscription that used infelicitissimus. The inscription that used the superlative was referencing the unlucky father dedicating it

---

74 Harrod 1909, p. 16.
75 Perhaps this could be a topic for future articles, as 80 inscriptions do not qualify as a small number. It would be interesting to see if these superlatives were used with any other descriptors that would add to the discussion of if they were used improperly or not.
76 Rawson 2003, p. 104.
77 Rawson 2003, p. 126.
to his most *pius* daughter. 78 I found the average age for a daughter described as *infelicissima* was at the beginning of 8 years old.

*Innocentissima* from *innocens* means “blameless,” “innocent one who does no evil,” etc. I would have believed that along with *carissima* and *dulcissima* this superlative would have been more common, especially with the younger girls. Its peak in the 4 to 5 age group seems to have been an oddity, as the frequency of its use is fairly low except in the 16 to 17 age group. I suspect that its higher occurrence in the 16 to 17 age group is a result of girls dying before they were to wed, and so showing them as an innocent one could have a certain appeal to parents who wished to highlight their unwed daughter’s purity or virginity via this descriptor. Although Harrod mentions *innocentissima*, he observes only that the relationships present on the epitaph were less familial and more friendly. 79 The average age of *innocentissima*’s use is 6 years old and the point at which it occurs the least is in age group 18-19. It would seem fair to speculate that its decline in frequency would continue when looking at women over 20 years of age.

The following are the superlatives that appear only once in my catalog: *Amabilissima, Suavissima, Miserrima, Indulgentissima, Iucundissima, Bellissima, Felicissima, Pudicissima, Fidelissima, Reverentissima, Securissima*. A few make logical sense when thinking of how to describe girls, such as “the most beautiful,” “the happiest,” “the most loveable,” “the most charming,” “the most agreeable” or “the most

---

78 Harrod 1909, p. 44.
79 Harrod 1909, p. 40. “*Innocentissimus* is used with names of relationship 25 times. There appears to be a tendency to apply it more freely to husband, friend, slave and freedman.”
chaste.” However when thinking of young girls who died before their time, superlatives such as miserrima “most miserable” seem appropriate, given the effect on a household. The superlatives which seem like less obvious choices were indulgentissima, reverentissima, and securissima. Indulgentissima meaning “most indulgent,” “kindest,” “mildest,” etc; reverentissima means “most reverent” or “the shyest;” and securissima means that the girl had “the most untroubled life.” While the first two would make sense when describing a “perfect daughter,” the third securissima conveys a sense of privilege and wealth.

When superlatives are used, they not only describe the best attributes a person has, but also the grief that the family must cope with at the loss of their exceptional child. Rawson comments, “That children should have been commemorated in such numbers, and sometimes in such elaborate style, is a remarkable feature of Roman culture. There is no parallel for it in earlier or later societies before the twentieth century.” When a girl was described with a superlative it was an elaborate gesture by the dedicator to portray her as the best; by using a superlative they are also informing passersby that the loss of her was very great. The attribution of one or more typical Roman virtues indicate her value, as does the frequency with which superlatives occur on girls’ inscriptions. This frequency of superlatives, however, was also a typical convention of stereotyping a girl on her epitaph to conform to Roman values. While young girls were sweet and darling, older girls had to be portrayed with more appropriate descriptors and superlatives like piissima or carissima to reflect their entrance into womanhood and eventually marriage.

---

CHAPTER 4

DEDICATORS

One common element on inscriptions to girls is the dedicator, sometimes even appearing without the name of the deceased. The names of the dedicator or a phrase such as “mother,” “father,” “parents,” etc. appear on 71.9% of all the inscriptions within the catalog.

DIS MANIBUS

FELICULAE VIX(IT) ANN(OS) XII M(ENSES) III

COCCEIA MAGNA ET COCCEIUS

CHRESTUS PARENTES FILIAE

DULCISSIMAE FECERUNT81

“To the spirits of the dead; To Felicula who lived 12 years and 3 months, Cocceia Magna and Cocceius Chrestus, parents, made this for their sweetest daughter.” This inscription exemplifies the most common dedicator found, that of both parents. On average, 40.1% of inscriptions containing a dedicator are inscriptions dedicated by both parents. This is the average only for inscriptions with just the mother and father as dedicators; there are numerous others that are from both the parents and others, typically family relations or nurses, but those will be discussed separately. In Table 6, the percentages where father, mother and both parents are visible on the inscription are

81 CIL 06, 17831.
shown. When comparing each dedicator, as stated earlier, inscriptions dedicated by both parents occur the most, then the father as the dedicator appears 32.4% of the time, mother only 20.7% of the time, and others, as will be discussed later, occur 6.8% of the time.

Table 6: Most Frequently Seen Dedicators by Age Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Total Inscriptions</th>
<th>Father Totals</th>
<th>Father Percentage</th>
<th>Mother Totals</th>
<th>Mother Percentage</th>
<th>Both Parents</th>
<th>Parents Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-01</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-07</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not surprising that both parents were the most frequent dedicator, but it is notable that mothers, as the sole dedicator, appeared less frequently than the fathers, in fact by more than 10%. In the earlier ages the father as sole dedicator was significantly higher than the mother, but as a girl aged less fathers were the sole dedicators and mothers increased. The mother’s role in Roman society was to take care of the children and the house, but seeing fewer mothers than fathers appearing as the sole dedicator makes sense when one considers that the father was the head of the household,
controlling the finances and was the “owner” of the children.\(^{82}\)

Legitimate female children were purposefully named after their father to denote familial connections through each generation.

But a Roman father’s culturally prescribed situation of being, and having his blood family, associated with his daughter publicly, even after his death, regardless of who happened to be her husband or formal guardian, is significant in and of itself. For it appears to imply a symbolic pledge to his daughter’s welfare on a father’s part, and on the part of those men who also bore his nomen, most notably his sons.\(^{83}\)

Many of the girls in the catalog were named after their fathers, which is verified on the inscriptions where the father was mentioned. As the quote above describes, it was important for the father to give the girl a family name to indicate her status as legitimate, as well as instilling in her male relations a sense of obligation to protect her. This is also substantiated when looking at the length of the inscriptions dedicated by the father as compared to those dedicated by the girl’s mother. In a girl’s early years, inscriptions dedicated by the mother were often shorter and more abbreviated than those by the father. For example, in the 0-1 age range, of the 117 inscriptions with the mother or the father listed, calendar references, plot size, and \textit{hic sita est} were only found on inscriptions

\(^{82}\) The low percentage of mothers as sole dedicator could indicate that the father was deceased and thus she had to commission the inscription on her own. If this were the case then the male relative in charge of the mother’s money may have felt it was an unnecessary expenditure if the child was young. This seems to be plausible when one considers that the fewest occurrences of mothers as the dedicator appear between the ages of 0-3, and they are still low in the 4-7 age ranges. It also is possible that the father, on his own accord, dedicated it to the daughter and just did not include the mother on the inscription, especially if she was already deceased. With an examination of Table 6, this conclusion also makes sense because the years in which mothers appeared as dedicators were the same years that the father as dedicator was the highest.

\(^{83}\) Hallett 1984, p. 79.
dedicated by the father only. *In pace* appeared on 10.2% of inscriptions dedicated by the father, and only 3.4% of inscriptions by the mother. For other dedicators, such as both parents, the grandparents, or other relations, there was no visible trend in inscription length; however, often due to additional dedicators, the length obviously was longer.

Table 7: Break Down of Less Common Dedicators by Age Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Total Other Dedicators</th>
<th>Other Percentage</th>
<th>Father Plus</th>
<th>Mother Plus</th>
<th>Parents Plus</th>
<th>Grandparents</th>
<th>Grandfather</th>
<th>Grandmother</th>
<th>Brother</th>
<th>Sister</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-01</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-07</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 7, the less common dedicators are listed. The headings that indicate “Plus” mean that the common dedicator was joined with others when the inscription was dedicated. For instance, in the column “Father Plus” the dedicators could have been the father and sisters or brothers, the father and a grandparent, etc. All of these numbers are fairly low and together constitute only 6.8% of all dedicators. The only high occurrence that was surprising was in the 2-3 age range under the “Mother Plus” category. I found 4
inscriptions dedicated by the mother and at least one grandparent, and 3 inscriptions dedicated by the mother and at least one of the girl’s siblings, usually a brother. The brother makes sense as the more frequently seen sibling as it would be his responsibility, once his father died, to look after the welfare of his sister.

PRIMICENIA FILIA PRI
MVICENI LECTORIS ET ASEL
L(A)ES(!) PRONEP(TIS) V(IRI) S(ANCTI) CRESTMPI EPIS
COPI NEP(TIS) V(IRI) S(ANCTI) NAVIGI LECTORIS
VI<X=CS>IT ANNOS II ET (D)IES XXX
DECESSIT XIII <K=C>AL(ENDAS) NO<V=B>(EMBRES)

“Primicenia daughter of Primicenus a Christian lector, great-granddaughter of Asellaes Cresimus the holy bishop, granddaughter of the saint Navigus a Christian lector, she lived 2 years and 30 days; she died 13 days before the Kalends of November.” This girl is made famous not by her own deeds but by the fact that her family had a long heritage of being involved in Christianity as presenters of biblical text. Religious affiliations are not uncommon, but to have three family members labeled with a religious position within any religion was unusual.

D(IS) M(ANIBUS) SILVIAE VIX(IT) ANNI(S) III MENS(IBUS) II
DIEB(US) IX

---

84 See inscriptions CIL 06, 35323; CIL 06, 37902; CECapitol 00078; and CIL 06, 16845, for the mother and grandparent inscriptions.
85 See AE 1985, 00173; CIL 03, 04873; and CIL 03, 1373, for the mother and sibling inscriptions.
86 ICUR-06, 17293 = ICaRoma 00131.
CLAUDIUS PROTOMACHUS ET CLAUDIA DAMAL
FILIAE ET SALONIUS EPICTETUS TATA ET
APHRODISIA MAMMA FEC(ERUNT)88 89

“To the spirits of the dead; to Silvia who lived 3 years, 2 months and 9 days;
Claudius Protomachus and Claudia Damal made this for their daughter with her grandpa
Salonius Epictetus and her grandma Aphrodisia.” This is an unusual inscription because
it includes tata and mamma which are Latin terms with ambiguous meanings. Tata refers
to any male who had a role in the early upbringing of the child while mamma would be
any female, such as a wet-nurse. As tata and mamma are used together in this inscription
it is far more likely that they are terms of endearment meant for Silvia’s grandparents.90
Including the grandparents on an inscription connected the three generations and could
provide additional references to qualities the family might have been known for, and thus
implied qualities the girl probably exhibited.

It was not uncommon to see other people dedicating inscriptions to older girls,
either on their own or in addition to the immediate family. As seen on Table 7, the
number of dedicators who were not the parents increased in the later years of a girl’s life.
This makes sense because older girls would have been socializing publicly and would
have developed attachments to people other than their family members. The examples
below provide examples of how “Other Dedicators” sometimes were not close blood
relations, but close friends or relations.

88 CIL 06, 36353 (p 3920).
89 Harrod 1909, pg. 53-54, 57, 60.
90 For another example where mamma is used see CIL 06, 38638a. For tata see CIL 06, 20930 or CIL 06,
16578 (p 3519, 3914).
Examples of Other Dedicators

PU<Ε=Ι>(LLAE) DUL(CISSIMAE) KAR(ISSIMAE)
HONERATIAE SANCTIP(A)E
AMA<B=V>ILI QUI(!) DEC(E)S(SIT)
ANNORUM XVI
FILIA(E) LEPORI PISCATORIS
SCR(I)P(SIT) X KAL(ENDAS) OCT(OBRES) SATUR
NINUS AMATOR <FE=EF>(CIT)\(^\text{91}\)

“To the sweetest and dearest girl, loveable Honeratia Sanctipa, who departed after 16 years, Saturninus, her lover, composed this for the charming daughter of a fisherman and made it 10 days before the Kalends of October.” The Latin word *piscatoris* is a reference to Honeratia having been a Christian, the reference was done in this way to make her religious affiliation known to other Christians, but not necessarily to pagans. Although this is unusual, what is even more so is the fact that her lover, Saturninus, was the one who dedicated the inscription. This might be an indication that he intended to marry her as he used two superlatives and the descriptor *lepori* which means “charming.” There were other inscriptions with dedicators that might have been a fiancé or lover, as the man’s name did not indicate a familial relationship to the girl, but this was the only one that specified the man as *amator*.

DIS MANIBUS
CN(AEUS) DOMITIUS

\(^{91}\) CIL 06, 09800 (p 3470).
HELIO DOMITIAE
FELICITATI FILIAE
SUAE KARISIM(A)E
VIX(IT) AN(NUM) I M(ENSES) V D(IES) XVI
ET HELPIDI DOMITIAE
CON(IUGI) SUAE B(ENE) M(ERENTI) F(ECIT) ITEM
IULIUS EPAGATUS ET
TROPHIM(A)E NUTRIX⁹²

“To the spirits of the dead; Cnaeus Domitus Helius made this for his sweetest
daughter Domitia Felicitatas who lived 1 year, 5 months and 16 days and for Helpis
Domitia his well deserving wife, also Iulius Epagatus and Trophima her wet-nurse (made
this).” An inscription dedicated by a man to his wife and daughter is not remarkable, but
what makes this inscription strange is the addition at the end of the inscription of the
nurse as a dedicator. It appears that the mother of Domitia also died, but nothing is
known about her age. The nutrix, or wet-nurse, would have been a caregiver of very
young children in wealthier houses.⁹³ The father would have paid for the inscription, so
his inclusion of the nurse might have been done in honor of her attentive care towards his
beloved daughter.

D(IS) M(ANIBUS)
PAETILI[AE] / C(AI) CAECINAE

⁹² CIL 06, 35123.
⁹³ Another example of a nurse on the inscription is CIL 06, 10554 (p 3506). In that instance no family
relation is listed as a dedicator, just the nurses as dedicators.
MENELAI F(ILIAE)
P(UBLIUS) SILIUS
CRITON
AMICUS F(ECIT)
V(IXIT) A(NNOS) II M(ENSES) III
D(IES) XXV

“To the spirits of the dead; Publius Silius Criton, a friend, made this for Paetilia
the daughter of Caius Caecina Menelaus, who lived 2 years, 3 months, and 25 days.”
Paetilia’s father is mentioned in this inscription, and based on the fact that he had the
praenomen, nomen, and cognomen, he was a Roman citizen. What is unusual is that
Publius Silius Criton, the dedicator, marked himself as a friend. Paetilia was two years
old, and it seems unlikely that any two year old has the capacity to think of any person as
the term “friend;” so Publius most likely was a friend of her father. There may be several
plausible reasons why Publius made an epitaph for a friend’s daughter, such as: Caius
was dead or incapacitated at the time, he did it out of respect for his friend, etc. In any
event, he felt the need to commemorate a friend and his friend’s daughter, thus showing
that the death of Paetilia was felt by more than just her family.

HIC EST LOCUS FOR
TUNATI ET LUCI(A)E IN QUO
IACET FILIA EORUM GEM
MULA QUI(!) VI<X=S>IT AN(NOS) PL(US) M(INUS) X ET

94 CIL 06, 34149 = CIL 13, *00370.
QUI HUNC LOCUM <V=B>IO
LA<V=B>ERIT (H)ABET PARTE CUM IUDA$^{95}$

“This is the place in which Fortunatus and Lucia placed their daughter Gemmula who lived more or less 10 years and to whoever would violate this place may he serve his sentence with Judah.” In the catalog there were 3 inscriptions that contained warnings to passersby.$^{96}$ These inscriptions did not contain any descriptors at all, which is an oddity, but this lack of descriptors might be a result of the sample being so small. This one is unusual because the family appears not to be pagan by their reference to Judah, but possibly Christian. The reference to Judah, although not clearly stated, implies that they be damned until they repent their actions. These inscriptions are longer in length and only one contained the person, the girl’s mother,$^{97}$ who would curse them if they violated the grave. As shown above, the dedicators were a key aspect of the inscription and often their place on the inscription could provide additional information regarding the girl and her family’s status in Roman society. With inscriptions of warning, the girl’s family status would have been high to afford such a wordy inscription. It is also clear, on the warning inscription by the mother alone, that the lack of the father’s inclusion dedicating the inscription that he might have already been dead; and the mother had access to her own money.

While the limited epigraphic evidence indicates that the commemoration of children, especially younger ones, might have been neglected by some Romans (given the

$^{95}$ ILCV 03844.
$^{96}$ Inscriptions containing warnings within the catalog: AE 1937, 00041 = AE 1938, +00046; CIL 06, 18281; ILCV 03844.
$^{97}$ CIL 06, 18281.
high rate of infant mortality), it was nevertheless clearly important to many families to commemorate their loss. Without a relative or intimate friend willing to dedicate an inscription, the valuable information regarding younger girls would have been lost.

Having both parents dedicate an inscription shows that both parents were alive and mourning the girl’s death. Including family names in an inscription gives the girl’s death context and shows passersby who exactly is in mourning for her loss. A single parent most likely denotes that the girl’s other parent had died, or when it was the father dedicating the inscription, that he might not have included the mother. As other close friends or relations were generally not obligated to put up an epitaph, their willingness to do so was an indication of the girl’s importance. The dedicators taking the time and money to pay for an inscription clearly shows the loss felt at losing a female child.
CHAPTER 5

DEATH AGE OVERAGES

D(IS) M(ANIBUS)

LUCCIAE VER

NAE QUAE VIX(IT)

ANN(IS) III DIEB(US) XXXIII

LUCCIUS VER

NA FILIAE B(ENE) M(ERENTI) F(ECIT)\(^98\)

“To the spirits of the dead; to Luccia Verna who lived 3 years and 43 days, Lucius Verna made this for his well deserving daughter.” This inscription is an example of an oddity I call an Age Overage. The discovery of several inscriptions throughout the different age ranges which had 12 or more months or 32 or more days brought about special consideration for month/day overages. In total there were 60 inscriptions that exemplify these excesses.\(^99\) When deciding when the odd month/day inscriptions should qualify for this Overage category, the varied Roman calendars had to be taken into consideration. Any inscription with the month being 12 or above was added. The Intercalaris, which was the Roman’s 13\(^{th}\) month serving as their leap year and occurred every other year, was not included, as it was not seen in any of the inscriptions affected. In fact, there were only 5 inscriptions with clear calendar references and of those only the

\(^98\) CIL 10.02670.

\(^99\) See Appendix D: Inscriptions with Age Overages for the full list.
months February, March, and April were mentioned. Deciding on the range for the day surplus was more difficult as the days changed as well throughout the different calendar reforms. As the Julian calendars generally did not feature months with over 31 days, 32 was chosen as the starting point for adding inscriptions to the Overage category, based on the number of days depicted on the inscription.

Initially I suspected there could be four possible reasons for these age overages: first, a girl’s death may not come as quickly as her loved ones suspected and they had already started her inscription and had to make corrections when she did finally die; second, that an inscription with age overages was a way to save money, as there were less marks that had to be engraved; third, it may reflect a desire for nice round numbers; and fourth, that it was a common way to describe a girl’s age.

If a girl’s death seemed inevitable, her relations may have thought it best to begin inscribing her tombstone before her death. If she did not succumb to illness as quickly as they expected, and she survived for several more days, her lingering death made the inscription (which could have already been completed) inaccurate, thus there would be a need to add Roman numerals to the inscription. This scenario could be the simplest explanation, especially when looking at inscriptions where the day count was in the upper 30’s to 40’s. Although this possibility is probable, there were no inscriptions for which this was the clear explanation.

D(IS) MA(NI)B(US)
AURELIA VICTORI
NA MATER AURELI
AE LAFERETI FILIAE D
ULCISSIM(A)E BENE M
ERENTI QUAE VIXIT
ANN(IS) VIII MENS(IBUS) V
DIEBUS CL¹⁰⁰

“To the spirits of the dead; Aurelia Victorina, mother, made this for her well-deserving daughter Aurelia, daughter of Laferetus, the sweetest girl who lived 8 years, 5 months and 150 days.” This inscription would not fall into the lingering death category since it is hard to imagine that a girl could linger for almost 5 months with her parents already having her inscription completed. It also shows that my second explanation does not apply in all instances. If some inscriptions featuring age overages were made to save money, then this inscription shows the opposite. There are numerous abbreviations that could have taken place to save money such as: \(M(ater)\), \(F(iliae)\), \(B(ene)\) \(M(erenii)\), \(V(ixit)\), \(A(nnis)\), \(M(ensibus)\), \(D(iebus)\). In total this inscription could have been done with 32 fewer characters, so inscribing that a girl lived 150 days did not seem to be a result of saving money. This inscription is however, an example where the desire for nice round numbers affected how the inscription was engraved. By using CL for 150 days, the dedicator avoided writing 9 months, and an odd number of days.

D(IS) M(ANIBUS)
AEGNATIAE(!)
SEVERAE

¹⁰⁰ BCAR-1886-230 = BCAR-1823-85.
VIX(IT) A(NNOS) IIX D(IES) LIV

CO(N)SIDIA SEVERA

M(ATER) F(ILIAE) B(ENE) M(ERENTI)\textsuperscript{101}

“To the spirits of the dead; to Aegnatia Severa who lived 8 years and 54 days,
Considia Severa her mother made this for her well-deserving daughter.” The inscription
above is the only example found that demonstrates what could be an age overage for the
purpose of using fewer characters and thus saving the cost of unnecessary characters.
When this was engraved, they used IIX for 8 instead of VIII saving one space, but also D
LIV for 54 days instead of M I D XIII\textsuperscript{102} if this was a month with 31 days. One might
have thought that economic measures such as this would be really common, yet they are
quite unusual among the examples of death overages. The lack of additional inscriptions
where saving money was a key consideration provides an important insight into the
Roman belief that one should not skimp when it comes to memorializing loved ones.

Since there were many examples of anti-economizing in the Age Overages
inscriptions, I thought it might be worthwhile to look at the superlatives used on the
inscriptions. When looking at superlatives there were a total of 37 used, two of which
were on the same inscription.\textsuperscript{103} Of the common superlatives seen, dulcissima was used
21 times, carissima 6, pientissima and piissima were used 4 times each. The only
unusual ones used were merentissima and clarissima, and they only appeared once. So

\textsuperscript{101} CIL 06.17127.
\textsuperscript{102} Depending on the number of days in the month Aegnatia Severa died, the actual month and day count
could either be M I D XIV, M I D XV, or M I D XVI. Yet for each of these scenarios, D LIV
would still be the best way to use the fewest number of characters.
\textsuperscript{103} ICUR-07, 19264; This inscription used Dulcissima and Merentissima.
when comparing the age overage inscription superlative percentages to the entire catalog, the superlatives appear on the age overages 60% of the time compared to the 47% for the catalog. *Dulcissima*’s percentage is 11.9% higher than the average for the whole catalog, *piissima*’s percentage went up by 1.4%, but *carissima* was less by 1.3%, and *pientissima* was less by 4.5%. Since superlatives were used more frequently, it makes economic measures as a cause for age overage inscriptions less likely.

The last explanation for these overages that seems plausible is that some of the age overages are a common way to describe the age of a child. For instance, today if one buys clothing for a child that is 1 year and 6 months old, you will not find it in 1 year 6 months, but rather for 18 months. One might find clothing for a one year old labeled as one year, but it is also common to find the clothing labeled as 12 months. These types of overages can be seen in the two inscriptions below.\(^{104}\)

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
D(IS) M(ANIBUS) & SOSANAE FILIAE \\
LICINIA CLAUDIA & MATER BENE \\
DIA V(IIXIT) MENSES X & MERENTI FECI(T) \\
LUCIUS LICINIUS SPERATUS & <$V=B$I(XIIT) ME(N)SIBUS$^{106}$ \\
FILIAE PIAE$^{105}$ & XVIII$^{107}$
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The first translates, “To the spirits of the dead; Licinia Claudia lived 12 months, Lucius

\(^{104}\) Other examples: CIL 08.00485 (age is 1 year, 2 months written as 14 months); AE 1992, 00354 (age is 2 years, 6 months, but written as 30 months).
\(^{105}\) CIL 08.16615
\(^{106}\) <$V=B$I(XIIT) ME(N)SIBUS $^{106}$
\(^{107}\) ICUR-01, 02720; Another example of this is CIL 08.20485.
Licinius Speratus made this for his *pius* daughter.” In this inscription, saying that Licinia lived 12 months was not a space-saving issue, nor does it appear to be an example of her death lingering as it is a nice round number, but rather that saying she lived 12 months seemed to be a common way to refer to a one year old child. The second inscription translates, “To Sosana, her mother made this for her well deserving daughter who lived 18 months.” Again this epitaph gives the impression that 18 months was a common way to refer to a child who was 1 year and 6 months old. It was not a space saving issue, nor an issue of the child living past her loved one’s expectation, but an ordinary colloquialism that featured round numbers.\(^{108}\)

In order to better understand the features of these Age Overages, I thought it best to calculate the exact number of days/months that each inscription was over. In cases of inscriptions where the total day count was 10 days or less over, there were a total of 26 inscriptions. Inscriptions that had 11-20 days over totaled 11, and there were 12 inscriptions that had overages between 21 and 327 days. In total there were only 10 month overages, 4 of which would be considered in the common colloquialism category featuring only month counts, the others contained both months and days but only the months had overages. There was one inscription that did not follow into any of these categories because of the possibility that it might be either an incorrect interpretation or a possible forgery as the age is listed as *annum I diem I menses XIXV*!\(^{109}\)

While age overages occurred in less than 2% of the inscriptions, they still show important insights into the Roman world. When a child was losing the battle with an

\(^{108}\) Additional examples: CIL 08, 20485; and AE 1992, 00354.

\(^{109}\) CIL 08, 03048.
illness, it had to be hard for a parent or loved one to come to that realization and start making funeral preparations. I think this is even more evident when one considers that of the 60 inscriptions that contained age overages, 50 had clear dedicators present on the inscription. That is 83% of the inscriptions, which is 10% higher than the catalog’s inscriptions with dedicators. When looking at the dedicators of the inscriptions, the majority featured both parents inscribing it to their daughter, with 24 inscriptions being dedicated by either the father or the mother, and only one inscription was dedicated by the brother of the deceased. No matter what the reason for the age overage, it is apparent that the girl was still loved, and her family still took the time to commemorate her memory on stone in a way that was done featuring the unusual characteristic of an age overage.\textsuperscript{110}

\textsuperscript{110} Expanding this study to look at young boys and adults would provide additional evidence if this age overage oddity is more significant on children’s inscriptions or adults, and give a better insight into the causes of the age overages. Time did not permit me to look into these factors and the results would be another whole study.
CHAPTER 6

MARRIAGEABLE AGE

TREBIA C(AI) F(ILIA) SA
TURNINA VI
XIT ANNIS XIII
MUTATUM OFFICIUM EST ALIUM SPER[AVE]RAT USUM
FAX INFELICIS VIRGINIS HEU SUPERI
QUAE THALAMIS AETAS FUERAT IAM NUBILIS APTA
DESTITUIT SPONSUM FLEBILIS ET SOCEROS\textsuperscript{111}

“Trebia Saturnina, daughter of Caius, lived 13 years; what duty the wedding torch of the unlucky virgin had once hoped to fulfill was changed;\textsuperscript{112} oh you gods! The girl who had been of marriageable age and was ready for her wedding, has now, tearfully, abandoned her fiancée and parents-in-law.” The last 4 lines of this inscription were done in meter and used the imagery of the marriage torch as a way to convey the changing fates and its use now as her funeral torch. The poignant loss of a girl who had died before she entered that next phase of life as a bride was greatly felt and there were several inscriptions in the catalog that described such a loss.\textsuperscript{113} This same imagery is seen in Apuleius’ \textit{Metamorphoses}, when Psyche was prepared for her marriage.

\textsuperscript{111} AE 1974, 260; The last 4 lines of this inscription appear to be in meter.
\textsuperscript{112} The wedding torch had hoped for a different purpose other than to light her funeral.
\textsuperscript{113} See Appendix E: Inscriptions Featuring Daughters of Marriageable Age for the list.
The gear for the poor girl’s funereal bridal was prepared; the flame of the torches died down in black smoke and ash; the sound of the marriage-pipe was changed to the plaintive Lydian mode; the joyful marriage-hymn ended in lugubrious wailings; and the bride wiped away her tears with her own bridal veil. The whole city joined in lamenting the sad plight of the afflicted family, and in sympathy with the general grief all public business was immediately suspended.\textsuperscript{114}

The imagery here of the normal bridal enthusiasm and cheer was transformed into weeping over the loss of Psyche who was as good as dead to her family. On Trebia’s inscription, her family also wept, although the dedicator is unidentified, her father’s name was given as part of her filiation, and her betrothed and his parents are mentioned in the poem. Trebia was greatly honored by her family as she was on the cusp of a major life transition to becoming a Roman wife, and she was only 13 years old.

D(IS) M(ANIBUS) S(ACRUM)

CALLISTE VIXIT

ANNIS XVI ME(N)S(IBUS) III HOR(IS)

VI ET S(EMIS) NUPTURA IDIBUS OCT(OBRIBUS)]

MORITUR IIII IDUS OCT(OBRES) PV

AIS MATER PIA KAR(ISSIMAE) FIL(IAE) FE[CIT]\textsuperscript{115}

“Sacred to the spirits of the dead; Calliste lived 16 years, 3 months, and 6 and a

\textsuperscript{115} BCTH-1910-CCIII.
half hours; about to be married on the Ides of October [October 15th]; she died 4 days before the Ides of October [October 12th]; Puais her mother made this for her dutiful and dearest daughter.” As Calliste’s death was only a few days before her marriage, it was seen as especially distressing, so much so that her mother felt the need to include her upcoming nuptials on her inscription. Pliny the Younger writes to a friend about such a tragic ending of a friend’s daughter; “No words can express my grief when I heard Fundanus giving his own orders (for one heart-rending detail leads to another) for the money he had intended for clothing, pearls and jewels to be spent on incense, ointment and spices.” Pliny’s friend Fundanus went from preparing for a wedding to making the necessary decision about his daughter’s funeral.

There is no lack of emotion at the girl’s death, as Pliny’s emphasis on the girl’s affection for her family and servants shows. The sorrow is as much for the loss of her child-like qualities as for her potential as a scholar, her self-restraint in playing, or her respect for her elders. …her childish play and study were performed in a serious, adult way. Pliny’s emotion at this loss can be ascribed to the girl’s adult like qualities that would have made her an excellent wife. In total there were 5 inscriptions in the catalog dedicated to girls who were engaged. Inscriptions of this type provide an important insight into how girls were viewed at a critical point in their lives, right before their marriages.

NAEVIA C(AI) F(ILIA) PONTIS

---

117 Wiedemann 1989, p. 93.
“Naevia Pontis, daughter of Caius, lived 18 years, 10 months, and 4 days experienced after her maidenhood a single marriage with Lucius Aemilius Regillus, her most unlucky father made this monument for his best daughter.” Naevia had been married, and while her inscription was excluded from the catalog due to her marital status, it provides an example of the change in how girls were viewed after marriage. She was not described as sweet or with any other childish adjective, but rather with optima, a quality typically associated with matrons. \[119\]

---

\[118\] CIL 06, 07732 (p 3432)

\[119\] Harrod 1909, p. 20. As optimus was seen as a term of admiration and not affection, it was not normally ascribed to children.
INFELICISSIMUS
QUI POS(UIT) DIES XX DESPEPO
NDIT\(^{120}\)

“To the spirits of the dead; To Gavia Quadratilla, daughter of Caius, who lived 17 years and 6 months; Caius Gavius Daphnus her most unhappy father put this up; she was betrothed for 20 days.” This inscription is relatively long, but reveals nothing about the girl herself except that she was engaged. Her father commemorated himself as *infelicissimus*, but did not use any descriptors for his daughter. The inscription also had very few abbreviations, which would have been a costly measure, but an appropriate one. Looking at Table 8, one can see that most of the girls were given at least one descriptor. A form of *virgo* was the most frequently used, and the only descriptor that appeared more than once. One girl, was honored with 5 descriptors, as will be seen below.

**Table 8: Descriptors and Dedicators Used for Engaged Girls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Deducator</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Infelicis, Virgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Desperata, Virgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.03.06</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>C/Karissima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.05.19</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Amantissima, Dulcissima, Innocentissima, Sanctae, Virgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPINIAE M(ARCI) F(ILIAE) NEPTIL\(<L=I>A\>E
ANNOR(UM) XIII VIRG(INI) DESP(ERATAE)
PROPE DIEM NUPTIAR(UM) DEF(UNCTAE)
M(ARCUS) OP[I]N[I]US RUFUS ET

\(^{120}\) CIL 06, 18937.
GELIA NEPTIL<l=I><A PARENTES121

“To Opinia Neptilla, daughter of Marcus, lived 14 years as a virgin, having become desperately ill close to the day of her marriage she died; Marcus Opinius Rufus and Gellia Neptilla her parents made this.” This inscription was the shortest in both lines and characters, but her parents not only gave her descriptors, but also explained that she was taken by a sudden and deadly illness. The average age of engaged girls on inscriptions in the catalog was a few days over 15 years and 5 months old, so I compared them to the 168 girls that were in the 15 age range. On average the inscriptions to girls who were engaged were just over 150 characters,122 the inscription to Opinia had only 92 characters, while girls aged 15 on average had just below 70 characters. When looking at the number of lines on each girl’s inscription, girls aged 15 had over 6 lines on average, Opinia had 5 lines, and the average within the engaged girls was over 8 lines. The comparison of the number of lines is not a significant difference, but it does show there was a marked increase in the lines of inscriptions to engaged girls due to a wish to express the tragedy of their deaths so soon before their marriage.

AURELIAE MARIAE

PUELLAE VIRGIN(I) INNOCENTISSIMAE

SANCT(A)E PERGENS AD IUSTOS ET ELECTOS

IN PACE

QUAE VIXIT ANNOS XVI ME(N)S E I S V

121 CIL 03, 02875
122 Character length was calculated by removing everything in parentheses and the corrections to spelling and adding any letters, or the count of letters, that were missing on some part of the inscription but scholars are sure that they would have been there on the original.
“To Aurelia Maria a virgin girl, the most innocent and pure, passing on in peace to the righteous and chosen [who had died before], who lived 16 years, 5 months and 19 days; having been engaged to Aurelius Damatius for 25 days; Aurelius Ienisireus a veteran and Sextilia the most unlucky parents made this for the sweetest and most beloved daughter contrary to their prayers will have the greatest sorrow as long as they live; holy martyrs, keep in mind Maria.” This inscription would most likely be dated later than the others in this chapter as it is clearly Christian. As described in Chapter 2, Christian epitaphs typically had other features associated with them and so this inscription being the longest, at 15 lines and over 300 characters, is not surprising when one takes into account the additional Christian references on it. It also was the most descriptive of the girl’s qualities, having 5 different descriptors to illustrate what a unique girl she was. It also describes her parents’ grief and provides a final invocation to

---

123 CIL 05, 01636.
Christians.

Inscriptions to betrothed girls were longer in length, and continued the Roman trend to include descriptors, even superlatives. These features were used to highlight the girl’s qualities, especially those related to the virtues deemed suitable for a girl before she became a Roman wife, such as her virginal status. Since the sample is so small, it is hard to compare the descriptors used to older girls, but it is clear by the dedicator’s inclusion of her engaged status that her duty in becoming a Roman wife was almost fulfilled, and so it would be safe to say that each girl possessed those qualities associated with becoming a wife, and so her family had entered into marriage contracts. The loss of a girl who was on the right Roman path to getting married, and had died before she was able to wed, was felt with even greater poignancy than other girls who had died before their time, and thus the commemoration of the girl needed to reflect that greater loss.
CONCLUSIONS

In this thesis I have shown that funerary inscriptions to Roman girls under the age of 20 tend to feature terms associated with traditional Roman values appropriate for the girl’s age. The formulaic nature of funerary inscriptions is exemplified by common descriptors used on girls’ epitaphs. Although dulcis, pia, and virgo are the most frequently seen adjectives describing a girl, there are many other words that convey virtues which were deemed important to Roman society. Other adjectives besides dulcis and pia, show the variety of adjectives that could be used, and the parents’ willingness to have their daughter be unique, even in death. In chapter 2, I showed that epitaphs of girls over the age of 10 have more descriptors that aligned with adult women’s virtues, and those of girls under the age of 10 frequently reflect a broader range of terms of endearment and fewer virtues.

Superlatives appear on almost half of the inscriptions within the catalogue and are used to describe the girl’s most revered qualities. When superlatives are used, they often infer the greater loss the parents had at losing their child. To include a superlative on a girl’s inscription could be interpreted as an elaborate gesture by her parents, or close relations or friends, as these words are longer and thus more expensive. The occurrence of superlatives reveals their use as a typical convention of showing how a girl conformed to Roman values. By looking at the trends based on age, it is clear that like other descriptors, younger girls were “the sweetest” or “dearest,” and had they lived longer, the superlatives that would have described them in their teens would have reflected more
their maturity and preparedness to become a Roman wife and woman.

The dedicators of a girl’s inscription were extremely important as they were not only the ones spending the money to have the epitaph carved, but they also were the ones that chose the elements on the inscriptions. As they were the ones that chose the specific wording of the inscription, it was their opinion about the girl’s value that we are seeing when examining the inscriptions. As it was most common to see parents as the dedicator, it is no wonder why girls are paid compliments on their inscriptions. Including family member’s names on the inscription gives passersby a sense of the degree of mourning that was taking place within the family. When the person who dedicated an inscription was not a close family member, it just shows the importance of the girl within a larger social sphere. Any dedicator that took the time and money to have an inscription made shows the loss that girls left in the Roman world.

Looking at inscriptions that contained age overages, descriptors, superlatives, and dedicators are all present. The descriptors and superlatives followed the trends shown in chapters 2 and 3, with dulcissima and dulcis or pia being the most common. The occurrence of dedicators is higher when comparing it to the catalog, showing the most frequent dedicators were the parents. Although there was one inscription dedicated by the girl’s brother, the father or mother appeared on over 40% of the inscriptions. It was the age overage that shows the girl’s epitaph to be unique to passersby.

Inscriptions to girls who were engaged, and died before they married their betrothed, demonstrate the loss to two families of a girl who had matured and was ready and willing to join the ranks of the Roman matron. The inscriptions meeting this criteria
were longer in both the number of lines and characters, and featured descriptors which reflect virtues and qualities that were both appropriate and desirable for a girl to possess when entering into her first marriage. The only descriptor seen more than once, virgo, exemplified this well. Although the sample is small, it still shows that the girl’s status as engaged was an important component to her inscription, and thus she was held in high regard. Other Romans would have thus pitied her family, and the family of her fiancé more due to such a great loss of a girl who possessed the qualities desired in Roman women.

Roman girls were clearly valued by many and the completion of an inscription at her death indicated how such a loss should be mourned by society as a whole. While researching this thesis, there were several aspects of the topic that I felt could have benefitted from more scholarly research. Elements such as inscriptions that contained specifics of the burial plot, or inscriptions containing cause of death were not discussed. There were other quirks within some of the inscriptions that I would have liked to explore more thoroughly. One example is the naming practices of Roman girls. I had numerous examples that did not conform to the typical practices of naming a girl after her father. It would also be interesting to compare the differences between Christian and pagan inscriptions. These are just a few examples of areas in which I would like to explore in more detail at a later date. Although there were some things that I will continue to research, the questions I posed at the beginning of this thesis about how girls were commemorated were answered fully, as their epitaphs showed not only their importance to Roman society, but the qualities they possessed before their deaths.
## APPENDICES

### Appendix A: Typical Inscriptions Across All Age Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICUR-01, 03831</td>
<td>Dulcissim(a)e filiae / Theodoten / qu(a)e vi{c}it m(enses) duos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 14249</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Calpurniae Sabinæ / qu(uae) v(ixit) m(enses) X / L(uci) Calpurnius Felix et Pompeia / Regilia parentes fil(iae) fecerunt / sibi posterisque suis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1944, 00117</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Aureliae Antiociae / quae vixit annum / M(arcus) / Aur(elius) Antiocianus / d(ecurio) mun(icipii) Brig(etionis) et Lonia / Lucilla parentes filiae dulcissimae f(aciem) c(uraverunt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICUR-01, 03740</td>
<td>Orfitianus / pater fecit / fili(a)e Quiriaceni / ann(iis) dulcis(dim)ae / filiae dulcissimae / quae vixit annis duobus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICUR-07, 19492</td>
<td>Possessor et Lea parentes / Victoriae filiae dulcissimae / quae vixit annis duobus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICUR-01, 00594</td>
<td>[Iuli]us Arsinus et Luceia Chreste / [Luceia)e Iulianeti filiae dulcissim(a)e / [et s]olori (a)eius Irenti qu(a)e vi(xit) a(nnos) II me(nses) VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1993, 00167</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / M(arcus) Aurelius He/raclida evoc(atus) Aug(usti) / n(ostri) Aureliae / Urbanae pientissi/mae et amantissi(mae) / filiae memori(um posu(it x)it ann(um) III mens(es) III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 03, 08729</td>
<td>Aur(eliae) Januaria[e] / infelicissimae / f Etiae quae vixit ann(um) III / m(enses) X Aur(elius) Januarius / mil(es) coh(ortis) VIII pat(er) / ei(us) Aur(elia) / Ursina mat(er) posu&lt;e=l&gt;ru/nt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1991, 01377</td>
<td>/ Rufae vix(it) an(nos) IIII Vale[ri]a / Rufa fil(i)a) et Coel(ius) Phil(eius) / h(eres) f(aciem) c(uravit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946, 00230</td>
<td>L(uci) Pompilius Eros negotiator / ab Roma ex horreis Cornific(ianis) / qui vocatus est ab suis conne/gotiatoribus Adigillus s(ibi) e(t) s(uis) / p(osuit) e(t) / Pompilia L(uci) f(ilium) Tertulla an(nor)um IV m(ensium) II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 2001, 00568</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Sulpicia Aspasia ma/ter et Placentinus / pater Sulpiciae Place/ntinae filiae cariss(imae) / memori(a)eis(!) grati/a fecerunt quae vixit annis quatt(u)or men/sibus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1993, 00198</td>
<td>Dulcisss[mae] fili(a)e inco&lt;m=N&gt;parably / Asteri(a)e qu(a)e vixit / annos V et m(enses) III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICUR-04, 10933</td>
<td>Luciferae innocentissim(a)e / fili(a)e qu(uae) vixit ann(os) V m(enses) VI / s(emis) / d(e)p(osita) VIII Kal(endas) Dec(embres)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIL 06, 27389

Dis Manib(us) / Threpe v(ixit) a(nnos VI m(enses) IIII / Threptus et Nice filiae / dulcissimae fecerunt / et sibi posterisque / eorum / in f(rente) p(edes IIII in agr(o) p(edes IIII

AE 1978, 00277

D(is) M(anibus) / Chariteni filiae / quae vixit annis / VI mens(ibus) X Margaris / mater bene meren/ti fecit

AE 1929, 00221

Petilliena / Ingenua an(norum) VII / h(ic) s(ita) e(st) / C(aius) Petillienus / L(uci) f(ilius) Lem(onia) vet(eras) eq(uitum) et / Cassia Modesta / filiae suae p(osuerunt)

CIL 06, 10679

D(is) M(anibus) / P(ublio) Aelio Elaino / Flavia Bassa coniugi / bene mer(enti) fec(it) vix(it) ann(os) XLVII m(enses) III / D(is) M(anibus) / Anniae Helvidiae / Flavia Bassa mater filiae / dulcissimae vix(it) a(nnos VII m(enses) III / et libertis libert

ICUR-01, 03309

[Integr]itat is ac benignitatis Appius / [et 3 p]arentes dulcissim(a)e fili(a)e / [3 quae vi]xit annis VIII me(n)s(e) uno / quescenti in pace

AE 1988, 00290

Geminiiae Marcianae dulcissi/m(a)e p(uellae) quae vixit annis VIII / d(iebus) XI requie<e>B>it III Kal(endas) April<e>T>s / consulatu{s} [Valentiniani / et Valentis ter(tium) Geminus / Felix pater filiae inco<m=N>pa/rabili

CIL 10, 05980

D(is) M(anibus) / Caeliae Q(uinti) f(iliae) No/bilianeti filiae / dulcissim(a)e quae / vixit ann(os) VIII m(enses) IIII

CIL 06, 35085

D(is) M(anibus) / Datibae fil(iae) qu(a)e vix(it) / a(nnos) VIII m(enses) VII b(ene) m(erenti) fec(it) / L(ucius) Iul(ius) Caricus et sibi / lib(ertis) liber(tabusque) eor(um)

CIL 02, 01692

Crespina Crespi / f(ilia) ann(orum) X Accitana / hic sita est / s(it) t(eri) t(erra) l(evis) in fro(nte) l(latum) p(edes) XIX / in ag(ro) p(edes) XI

CIL 08, 12119

D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Aelia Q(uinti) f(ilia) / Felicitas / p(ia) v(ixit) a(nnos) / X m(enses) II / h(ic) s(ita) e(st)

ICUR-06, 16580

[Dulcis]sim(a)e filiae Ursin(a)e q(uae) / [vixit] ann(os) plus m(inus) XI requ[i/escit] VI Kal(endas) Aug(ustas) in pace

CIL 06, 24972 (p 3531)

Primitivius pater / fecit Primitiv(a)e / fili(a)e su(a)e qu(a)e vi/xit ann(os) XI mens(es) VII // D(is) M(anibus) // "GR"

CIL 10, 06776

Dis M(anibus) / Batusi/us filiae / bene mer/enti fecit / qu(a)e vixit a(nnos XII me(n)s(is) / VII

ICUR-01, 01545

Bibia Crest(a)e ann(orum) / XII m(ensium) VIII Bibia Restu/ta filiae suae bene / merenti [p]osuit

CIL 08, 08873 (p 1950)

D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Furnia Q(uinti) / fil(ia) Fortuna / vix(it) ann(is / XIII mens(bis) II / h(ic) s(ita) e(st)

AE 1933, 00103

D(is) M(anibus) / Hedistes vix(it) an(nos) / XIII m(ens(es) V / Bithus et Successa paren/tes fil(iae) piissimae posue/runt provinci/ale[s] contubern(ali) carissim(ae) / faciund(um) curaver(unt)

CIL 06, 21910

Dis / Manibus / Mammulae / vixit / annis XIII / Marcia / Hellas / filiae / piissimae / posuit

AE 1987,

D(is) M(anibus) / Lottiae Dracontillae / Lott(eius Leo et Lott(i)a)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00813</td>
<td>Cere(ra) / filiae i(n)felic(issimae) qua(e) vix(it) / ann(os) XIII m(enses) IX parentes / posu(erunt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICUR-02, 06021</td>
<td>Aurelia dulcissima filia quae / de saeculo recessit / vixit ann(os) XV m(enses) III / Severo et Quinti(a)n(o) co(n)s(uli)bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 08144</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / L(ucio) Abuccio Meleagro et / Abucciae Myrtale patron(is) / ben(e) mer(entibus) et Abucciae Onesime / filiae v(ixit) an(nos) XV m(enses) X Abuccia Eutaxia / mater fecit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILAlg-01, 02640</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Nuciva / Fortun/ata Cai f(ilia) / p(ia) v(ixit) a(nnos) XVI / h(ic) s(ita) e(st) / D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Fl(avia) Urba/na pia / vixit an/nis XXXX / Cornelius / Arnensis pius / vixit an(nis) LXIII / h(ic) s(itus) e(st)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 08, 15624</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Paccia C(ai) f(ilia) / Maior/i ca p(ia) v(ixit) a(nnos) / XVI m(enses) V / h(ic) s(itus) e(st)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 03, 02167</td>
<td>Albucia / Felicula / Acte filiae annorum / XVII / et sibi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 13, 04352 (4, p 49)</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Cama[m]a(e) Celsi vil(ici) / lib(erta?) Ianuariae filiae annorum XVII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 08, 21338</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Ulpi(a)e Aviae / vixit annis / XVII m(ense) Ulp(ius) / Emeritus / filiae piae / annis / Ulpiae / h(ic) s(itus) e(st)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 13282</td>
<td>Aurelia T(iti) f(ilia) / Amanda / vix(it) ann(os) XIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 08, 23087</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Domitia L(ucia) f(ilia) / Concessa pia / vix(it) an(nos) XLIII / h(ic) s(ita) e(st) / D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / S[3] A L(ucia) fil(ia) For/tunata pia vixit / annis XVIII m(ensibus) II h(ic) s(ita) e(st)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 34208</td>
<td>Acte Caesiae T(itii) / f(iliae) Gallae ancilla / vix(it) ann(os) XIX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CIL 06, 35743 | Lu/ssi//ae / D(is) M(anibus) / Restituta / vix(it) ann(os) XIX / mens(es) XI fecit / P(ublius) Avilius Successus et / Avillia Apollonia pare/ntes filiae suae bene / merenti <i=Eecerunt>
## Appendix B: Inscriptions with “GR” or “HEBR”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CIG 06709 =  
IGUR-02-01, 00434 | D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Aureliana filia / Iusti vixit annos / VIII menses IIII / dies III // "GR" |
| ICUR-08, 22368 | Mater et pater / Basi<ae<ae dulcissi/mae quae vix(it) annis V / mens<is>bus VIII / Basi<ae<ae bus VIII // "GR" |
| ICUR-01, 02422 =  
ILCV 04464 | Bene merenti fili(a)e / Theodor(a)e qu(a)e vixit / me(n)s<e=I>s XI dies XVII // "GR" |
| CIL 06, 24972 (p 3531) | Primitivus pater / fecit Primitiv(a)e / fili(a)e su(a)e vixit ann(os) VI mens(ibus) VII // "GR" |
| ICUR-01, 02990 | Felicitati filiae dulcissim(a)e / Gemellinus qu(a)e vixit ann(os) V m(enses) VIII // "GR" |
| AE 1987, 00270 | "GR" // D(is) M(anibus) / Corneliae Pompo[ni]anae quae vix(it) anno / uno d(iebus) III Corneli/us Paulinus pater fili/a<ae> b(eine) m(erenti) p(osuit) |
| CIL 06, 10889 | D(is) M(anibus) / Aeliae Felicissimae filiae / dulcissimae quae vixit ann(is) II mens(ibus) II / diebus VIII Baebia Felicissima / mater cum Pegasio patre eupsy<ch>h(e)i / tecnon ud(e)<is> an<th>anatos // "GR" |
| CIL 12, 01918 =  
CIL 13, *00299 | Iuliae Felicissimae / scholasticae (h)ilarei(!) / quae vixit ann(os) VII m(enses) VI / P(ublius) Iul(ius) P(ubli) f(ilius) Gal(eria) Felix et Iul(ia) / Novella parentes filiae / dulcissimae et sibi vivi / fecurunt et sub ascia dedicaverunt // "GR" |
| JIWE-01, 00035 | Hic requi(e)s[cit] in / pace Criscentia fi/lia Pascasi (h)ebrea / virgo qui vixit / ann<o=U>s p<l(is) m<in> XVIII // "HEBR" |
| CIL 06, 28862 (p 3919) | "GR" // Vibiae Fuscianae / filiae kariss/mae qu(uae) v(ixit) a(nnos) IIII / Servilia / Venusta / mater |
| JIWE-01, 00137 | ] / bene [meren]/ti fili(a)e / defunct[ae an]orum V // "HEBR" |
## Appendix C: Inscriptions Featuring Multiple Daughters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMS-03-02, 00066 = ILJug-03, 01325</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Attedi(a)e Cres/centill(a)e vix(it) / an(nos) XVII et At/tedi(a)e C(a)ecili(a)e / vix(it) an(nos) VI At/tedius Cres/ce(n)s pater et / Val(eria) mater / filiabus / pos(uerunt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 24054</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / P(ublius) Pettius Primigenius / et Pettia Voluptas / fecerunt / Pettiae Rhodin(a)e / filiae pientissimae / vixit annis XII m(ensibus) III / diebus VIIIIII h(oris) III / et Pettiae Valeriae / vixit annis VI / m(en)s{s}(i)bus XI d(iebus) VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 20719</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) Iul(a)e / Tyrannidi / v(ixit) a(nnos) XVI / M(arcus) Iulius / Chrysophorus / et Marcia / Laverna [f(iliae)] / suae et po(steri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1992, 01442</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Ulpio Avito / vet(ernano) coh(ortis) I Ael(iae) / sag(ittariorum) a[nnorum] LXXV / et Victoriae / coniug(i) an(norum) X / et Emeri[t]o f(ilio) an(norum) VIII / et Supe[ria]e an(norum) VI /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 25020 (p 3531)</td>
<td>Prima Hilaraes(!) f(iliae) / vix(it) an(nos) VIII / Sponde Caeliae Hilarae / l(iberta) carissima suis v(ixit) a(nnos) IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 15624</td>
<td>Claudia Tryphae/na fecit Asiatica / filiae suae vixit annis / XIII m(ensibus) II item Corneliae / Tyche filiae suae v(ixit) an(nos) VIII / sibi et Felici patrono suo / isdem coniugi / sibi et posterisque suis / omnibus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1981, 00944</td>
<td>D(is) [M(anibus)] / L(ucius) Dom(itius) Felix qu[i et O] / mega vix(it) an(nos) XXXXVII / filia Cris(pina) vix(it) an(nos) XVI / m(ensibus) III et Sebosa vix(it) / an(nos) III Iul(i)a con(iugi) et f(iliis) b(ene) m(arentibus) f(ecit) / s(it) v(obis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 12, 02033 = CIL 13, *00299</td>
<td>Ego pater Vitalinus et mater / Martina scrip=B&gt;sumus non gran/dem gloriam sed dolum(!) filio/rum tres filios in diebus XXVII / hic posuimus Sapaudum filium / qui vixit annos VII et dies XXVI / Rusticam filiam / qui vixit annos / III et dies XX et Rusticul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 11, 01780</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Murtius Verinus pa/ter Murti(a)e Verin(a)e et / Murti(a)e Florianeni / filiabus male merentibus crudelis pater tit/ulum i(n)scripsit Verina /</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
percepit M() X victi(!) annos XII menses V Fl/orianes
percepit M() XII / victi(!) annis VII

ERPSalamanca 00089 = CIRPSalamanca 00228

Rebu/rrinae / Reburr/i ann(orum) XVII s(it) / t(ibi) t(erra) l(evis) // Firmanil(l)ae Fir/man/i f(iliae) an(norum) / VIII h(ic) s(ita) / s(it) t(ibi) t(erra) l(evis)

CIL 06, 07749 (p 3432)

D(is) M(anibus) / Sergiae Philumen[a]e / v(ixit) ann(os) IIII m(enses) VIII d(ies) [3] / Sergiae Helladi / v(ixit) ann(os) VIIIIII filiabus / pientissimis / A(ulus) Sergius Bithynicus et / Valeria Hygia parentes fecerunt(t) / sibi et su(s) lib(ertis) libert

CIL 06, 13146

D(is) M(anibus) / Aur(elius) Marcellinus et Messorina fili/abus suabus Irineti carissim(a)e / qu(a)e <v=B>ix{x}it mensibus duum(!) diebus XII / et Messorine carissim(a)e qu(a)e vix{x}it / me(n)s s(it) ibus quattuor et die(bu)s XX / bene merentibus posuit

CIL 06, 14569

Memoriae / Castriciae filiae dulcissimae et / piissimae et incomparabili quae / vixit ann(is) XV m(ensibus) IIII die I et Commu/ni filio qui post desiderium sororis / suae una die supervixit et vix(it) ann(is) VIII / dieb(us) XX / Communionis et Casta parentes

IMS-03-02, 00062 = ILJug-03, 01320

D(is) M(anibus) / Ael(ia) Crispin(nilla) vix(it) ann(is) / VIII m(ensibus) III T(itus) Ael(ius) / Mucianus / et Tullia Augus/ti fil(iae) dulcis(s)/im(a)e simul et / et Ael(iae) Crispin(a)e f(iliae) d/ulcis(s)imae) q(uae) v(ixit)

CIL 03, 06209

Q[3 Clau]dia c[oniugi] suae / vixit ann(is) XXX et / Claudiae Julia(n)ae filiae suae v[i]xit ann(is) V et / Domitiae Matro/nae filiae suae / vixit ann(is) III h(ic) s(ita) e(st)

AE 1906, 00107 = AE 2005, +01197

D(is) M(anibus) / Aureliae Barachae vixit / ann(os) XXXV et Aurlia(iae) / Ger/manillae vixit / ann(os) IIII et altera / filiae Aurelia Ger/manilla vi[x]it ann(os) / II et / Immostae matre su(a)/e vixit ann(os) XL German/ius / Valens mil(es) coh(ortis) |(milliari

CIL 03, 05262

Pompeius / Agilis v(ivus) f(ecit) sibi / et Pompeiae / Primigeniae con(iugi) / ann(orum) XXXV et / Pompeiae Spectatae / fil(iae) ann(orum) / XVII et / Couriae fil(iae) ann(orum) / XVI / et Sextiae Suputae ann(orum) / et / Vitali f(ilio) ann(orum) / XX

CIL 06, 28882

Dis Manib(us) / Vibiae Quietae / patronae / fecit / Hermione / liberta / item Veneriae / filiae suae / vix(it) / ann(os) VII m(ensos) X / et Helpidi fil(iae) / vix(it) / ann(os) XII d(ies) / XVII / fecit M(arcus) Varenus /
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERBeira 00003</td>
<td>Lucano an(norum) XXX Amoeneae an(norum) XVI Maxi/mae an(norum) XIII Cilius / Bouti f(ilius) pater et Sunua / Apanonis f(ilia) mater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 23876</td>
<td>[C(aius)] Pedanius C(ai) f(ilius) vix(it) a(nnos) II / C(aius) Pedanius C(ai) l(ibertus) /Corinthus / Pedania C(ai) f(ilia) / Phiale v(ixit) an(nos) XI / Pedania Prisca / Pedania C(ai) l(iberta) / Graphice / C(aius) Pedanius C(ai) f(ilius) / Archelaus /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 09, 00147</td>
<td>Myrine v(ixit) a(nnos) XVII / Eutychia quae / et Buttin(a) v(ixit) a(nnos) III / h(ic) s(it) s(unt) / Eros / uxori et filiae / karissimis(!) / posuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 08198 = AE 1999, +00024</td>
<td>Charis Epicharis / sorores duae f(iiae) / Q(uinti) Sallusti Hilari / Charis v(ixit) a(nnos) IX / Epicharis v(ixit) a(nnorum) I m(ensem) VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 03, 05947</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Cl(audia) Ursa vix(it) annos II dies X Ges/atia Lucia vixit an/nos III f(ecit) Cl(audius) Do/natus eq(ues) leg(ionis) III Ital(icae) / et Pedania Profutur,a parentes vivi filia/bus suis memoria / fecerunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRPPalencia 00087 = HEP-05, 00658</td>
<td>M(onumentum) / Anna Do/idena An(ni) / filia Horgen/omescum / an(norum) XIIIX Ara/[v]us Ara[u]co(?)/ f(aciendo) c(uravit) / M(onumentum) / Pento/vio Pes/aga Am(ae?) / f(ilio) Horgae/nomesc(um) / an(norum) XVII Ar/aus d(e) s(uo) po(suit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 13, 01825</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Valeriae Iuli/an(aes(!) quae vixit / ann(is) VIII / et Aureliae / Pompeiae / quae vixit an/nis XV filiab(us!) / dulcissim(is) / Aurel(ius) Calocae/rus Aug(usti) lib(ertus) tab(ularius) / ferrar iarum) p(onendum) c(uravit) et sub / asci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 08, 03519</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Cecin(a)e f(iliae) / v(ixit) a(nnos) XIII // D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Reduc[t(a)e] / v(ixit) a(nnos?) [3] / f(iliabus) p(ater) p(osuit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1991, 00190</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Flavia Saturnina Aelio Euty/chae co(n)iugi karissimo et be/ne merenti fecit qui me acce/pit a parentes(!) meos(!) anor(um) / XVI c&lt;um=ON&gt; quem(!) vixi anni / XX mensibus VI diebus XXIII / item Aelia Flaviane(!) et Aelia Au/gustiane(!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 03, 14136,1 (p 2294, p 2328,73)</td>
<td>Arphocra C(ai) Iuli Postumi / praefecti Aegy&lt;p=B&gt;ti libert(a) / Juliae Florae filiae suae / fecit / vix{s}it ann(os) XIII menses V / et Cassio Pudenti amico suo / et Restituta sodali Florae / vix{s}it annos VIII / et sibi et Sponsae coniugi suae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 15955 (p 3913)</td>
<td>Dis Manibus / Q(uintus) Coelius P(ubli) f(ilius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 08, 09462</td>
<td>B(ene) m(erenti) / Domitiai(!) / Honerata(!) / vixit a(nnos) VI / m(ensae) VIII d(ies) XVI / et Iulia Primosa / D(omitiae) Rusticaici(!) / vixit a(nnos) XVI / m(ensae) XI dies XXV / D(omitius) Honoratus p(ater) / filiabus pientissimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 24571</td>
<td>Diis(!) Man(i)bus / Pompeiae Cn(aei) f(iliae) / Spei v(ixit) a(nnos) VIII m(ensae) X d(ies) IX / Pompeiae Cn(aei) f(iliae) / Graphic(a)e v(ixit) a(nnos) III m(ensae) / VII d(ies) III / Cn(aeus) Pompeius / Graphicus / [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICUR-07, 17686</td>
<td>[B]ene merenti[i A]sapen[i] qu(a)e vi/[xit] an(nos) XIII et Lau[re]nti(a)e qu(a)e vixit / [a]n(nos) VII parentes fecerunt in pa/ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 14, 01731 (p 616)</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Varenes Blastenis coniugis bene merenti et sibi / fecit Antius Successus ite&lt;m=N&gt;que Antiae Success(a)e / filiae dulcissimae qua super matrem suam vixit / an(num) m(ensem) di(es) XXXX quae fuit at diem mortis suae annorum / VIII me(nor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 03, 14359, 19 = AE 1900, 00064</td>
<td>Venisa Domion/is f(ilia) ann(orum) III et Gaura / Domionis f(ilia) an(norum) III / h(ic) s(itae) s(unt) / Domio p(ater) p(osuit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 14139</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / L(ucio) Calpurnio Aeliano v(ixit) a(nnos) XVIII / d(ies) XVI L(ucius) Calpurnius Eutychus / et Anicia Euresis filio pientissimo parentes infelicissi/mi fecerunt lib(ertis) libertabusque / posterisque eorum / in f(ronte) p(edes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 08, 20774</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) [s(acrum)] / F(lavius) Paul(i)n(us) / Geminio / filio ka(rissimo!) tu/mulu(m) fec(it) / v(ixit) a(nnos) XXII / Fl(a)vi(us) Paulin(us) / Fl(a)v(i)a(e) Vic/torin(a)e f(i)l(i)a(e) kar(issimae) tu/m(ulum) fe(cit) vixit / an(n)is XVII / F(lavius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1984, 00347</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) [s(acrum)] / Antinoe et Phoebe / duae sunt conservae / sorores servae Vo/lusiorum Marci et Aemiliani / hic sunt postiae Phoebe vixit / annis VI m(ensibus) X d(ies) XV Antinoe / annum d(ies) XX P(h)oebus et Rhodope / filiabus pientissimis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICUR-04, 09422 = ILCV 04160</td>
<td>Mercurio co&lt;m=N&gt;pari et / Cornicul(a)e filiae qu(a)e vixit / annis VII et Co&lt;l=I&gt;nae fil(i)a(e) / qua vixit menses VIII / Crispina co&lt;m=N&gt;pari et filiis suis / ob amorem et a&lt;f=T&gt;ectionem / erga se posuit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| AE 1990, 00044 = AE 1993, 00279 | D(is) M(anibus) / Benuleius An/tonius Ben(u)iae Iust(a)e / fil(iae) car(issimae) b(ene) me(rita) / vixit ann(is) II /
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIL 08, 04268 = CIL 08, 18505</td>
<td>Flavius Verus pius pater / filiabus carissimis fecit Flavi/ae Ver(a)e v(ixit) a(nnos) XVIII et Flavia Sura v(ixit) a(nnos) / XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 08962</td>
<td>T(itus) Flavius Aug(usti) l(ibertus) Acraba / decurio ostiariorum / fecit sibi et / Hadriae Acrabillae / vix(it) ann(os) VII mens(es) VIII d(ies) XVII h(oras) X et / Provinciae vixit / annis XVIII / pater filiabus bene merentiibus et / libertis libertabu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICUR-08, 22557 = ILCV 04172</td>
<td>Parentes dolentes filiabus / sororibus Maxim(a)e qu(a)e vixit / annis XI me(n)s(i=E)(bu)s X die(bus) XXVIII Ma/ximin(a)e vixit annis V diebus / XVI b(ene) m(erentiibus) in pace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 08, 12602</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Primus Aug(usti) ser(vus) adiut(or) tab(ulariorum) / p(ius) v(ixit) a(nnos) XXXIII Victoria fil(ia) / p(ia) v(ixit) a(nnos) VIII Primigenia fil(ia) / p(ia) v(ixit) a(nnos) III Fortunata Aug(usti) lib(erta) / viro et fil(iae) me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 03, 02120</td>
<td>D(ecimus) Cornelius Herma et Cornelia Tyche / domo Ravenna parentes infelicissi/mi filiabus pientissimis / Corneliae Helpidi fil(iae) def(unctae) ann(orum) XVIII / Corneliae Helpiste fil(iae) def(unctae) ann(orum) XVIII / Restutaæ fil(iae) def(unctae) an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 26329</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Sergia Felic(u)l/a A(ulo) Sergio Fortun/ato filio dulcis/simo qui vixit an/nis XIII me(n)s(es(!) V di/ebus XIII et Roma/n(a)e sorori huìus / qu(a)e vixit annis / X/XII me(n)sibus VI / mater pientissi/ma dulcissima / filio et fili(a)e se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICUR-03, 06949</td>
<td>Valeria Isias [3] / Adventae [3 dul]cissimæ [quaæ vixit ann(os)] / V men(ses) II[3] // Thetidiano Aug(usti) lib(erto) marito q(u)i v(ixit) a(nnos) XXXVIII et Aeliae / Crescentinae fil(iae) q(uae) v(ixit) a(nnos) XI Aelia Secunda / et Gemino fil(io) q(u)i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 22013 = CIL 11, *00259,076</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Mansuetæ filiæ dulcis/simæ quæ vix(it) ann(is) IIII diebus[XVI] et Sedatae fil(iae) dulc(issimæ) v(ixit) a(nno) I m(ensibus) VIII et Mansuetinaæ fil(iæ) amabiliss(imae) v(ixit) a(nno) I m(ensibus) IIII d(iebus) VIII / Mansuets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 11186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1989, 00641 = AE 1990, 00866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 08, 00870 (p 1273)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 03, 03173 = CIL 03, 08877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTH-1899-182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 34110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 22424 (p 3528)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 11530 (p 3911)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1963, 00176</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Iul(ius) Eutyches / vix(it) ann(is) LX et / Valeria Iulia / vix(it) ann(is) XXV / et Valeria Ma/tra/a vix(it) ann(is) uno men(sibus) XI / filias Valeriae / [B]ona et Val(eri)us B[o]nus / [vixit a]nn(is) V / [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 08, 05390</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Aemilia / Saturnina / L(ucia) fil(ia) / vix(it) ann(is) / D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / L(ucius) Vibius / [3] fil(ius) Hon/oratus p(ius) / vix(it) an/nis / h(ic) s(itus) e(st) / D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Vibia Saturnina / [L(ucia)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 03, 12384 (p 2316,45, 2316,47)</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Anneus / S[alutini] / f(ilius) / vix(it) ann(is) XXX / Marcel(l)ina / Aenei f(ilia) vix(it) / an(nos) VII Iusta / Aenei f(ilia) vix(it) / an(nos) III titu[l(os)] / [p]ol[s(it)] Marce/ll[a] / V et Luciae filiae / vix(it) an(nos) III / f(acien)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 03, 11968</td>
<td>Cl(audius) Reticus / vet(eronus) ex leg(ione) III Ital(ica) / Aur(eliae) Lucinae / quondam con/iugi carissimae vix(it) an(nos) XXXV et / Ursioni f(ilio) vix(it) an(nos) XII et / Regulae / filiae vix(it) an(nos) V et Luciae filiae / vix(it) an(nos) III / f(acien)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 03, 05367</td>
<td>M(arcus) Laetilius / Laetiliae lib(ertus) / Pacci[ius] / vix(it) / sibi / et Iulii / Successae / [con/iugi] opt(ima) / et / Scipioni f(ilio) an(nor) / VI / et Iust(iae) f(iliae) / an(nor) / VI / et / Laetilia ev(ius) / [f(iilio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 05, 00231</td>
<td>Eu]sebi]ae ann(or) / V et Setti[s] Agrypne / filiae / pientissimae / Eu]sebi]ae ann(or) / V et Setti[s] Agrypne / filiae / pientissimae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1975, 00044</td>
<td>L(ucius) Pituanius Eros / scr(iba) / libr(a) / aedil(ium) / Pituaniae Helpis / vix(it) / / Pituaniae Heuresidi / vix(it) / an(nor) / XV / vix(it) / an(nor) / IV / vix(it) / an(nor) / / IV / vix(it) / an(nor) /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 08, 11616 (p 2359)</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Pomponia / vix(it) / an(nor) / VIII / h(ic) s(itus) e(st) / D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Pomponia / Celsina / vix(it) / an(nor) / VIII / h(ic) s(itus) e(st) / D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Aelia Tallusa / vix(it) / an(nor) / LXXIII / h(ic) s(itus) e(st) / f(iil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 08, 14631</td>
<td>Q(uintus) Domitius / Cn(aei) f(ilius) / [Quir(ina)] / / H]ospita / vix(it) / an(nor) / VIII / Domitia / Cn(aei) f(ilia) / Festa / / pia / vix(it) / an(nor) / V / L(ucius) Domi/tius / Cn(aei) / f(ilius) / Quir(ina) / vix(it) / vix(it) / an(nor) / XXVIII / h(ic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 08, 24885</td>
<td>Diis(!) Manibus / s(acrum) // M(arcus) Bruttius / Felix pius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vix(it) / annis LX h(ic) s(itus) e(st) / Bruttia M(arci) f(ilia) / Secunda pia vix(it) / an(nis) h(ic) s(it) e(st) // Bruttia M(arci) f(ilia) / Quarta pia / vix(it) an(nis) XVIII h(ic) s(it) e(st)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CIL 03, 01583 = CIL 03, 08018 = AE 2001, +01722</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Iul(ius) Herculanus / dec(urio) s(h)col(ae) fab(rum) i{i}mag(inifer) / vix(it) ann(os) LXXX Iul(ia) Viv/enia coniux Iul(ius) / Marcianus fil(ius) im/{m}ag(inifer) s(h)col(ae) fab(rum) vix(it) / ann(os) XXVII Aur(elius) Iuli/us mil(es) c(</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Inscriptions with Age Overages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Age Notes</th>
<th>Cleaned Inscription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICUR-01, 01571</td>
<td>00.13.08=01.01.08</td>
<td>Copriae filiae quae vixit menses XIII dies VIII quae periiit XI Kalendas Apriles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICUR-06, 15618</td>
<td>00.00.364=00.11.+</td>
<td>Iulianeti filiae dulcissimae quae vixit! dies CCCLXIII deposita Kalendis Aprilibus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICUR-07, 20487</td>
<td>05.00.37=05.01.+</td>
<td>Reginae filiae dulcissimae quae vixit annos V dies XXXVII deposita II Idus Martias bene merenti in pace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.09157</td>
<td>13.00.40=13.02.+</td>
<td>Locus Antonini argentarii ter candens quem se vivo comparavit a Petro et Fortunato praepositis basilicae beati apostoli Pauli in quo requiescent in pace Stefanus filius eius qui vixit annos XV et dies XI depositus sub die III Idus Februarias indictione VII et item post consulatum Basili viri clarissimi et Thecla filia eius qui! vixit annos XIII et dies XL deposita sub die Idus supra scriptus indictione supra scripta et Antoninus pater eorum depositus sub die pridie Kalendas Martias et item post consulatum et indictione supra scripta vixit annos plus minus LXV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 10.02670</td>
<td>03.00.43=03.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Lucciae Vernae quae vixit annis III diebus XXXXIII Luccius Verna filiae bene merenti fecit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1992, 00354</td>
<td>00.30=02.06</td>
<td>Dis Manibus sacrum Aeliae Maximinae vixit menses XXX iniquissimo fato hic iacet Vitalis Augustrorum libertus ex proximo memoriae filiae dulcissimae have vale posuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.18617</td>
<td>02.00.40=02.01.+</td>
<td>Fuficia Cnaei filia Prisca vixit annos II dies XL Cnaeus Fuficius Saturninus vixit annos VII et dies XVII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1975, 00277</td>
<td>02.00.40=02.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Valeriae Luci filiae Marianae vixit annos II dies XL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 13.01585</td>
<td>01.07.39=01.08+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus 3 filiae? dulcissimae quae vixit annum I menses VII dies XXXVIIIII mater? faciendum curavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 08.20485</td>
<td>00.18=01.06</td>
<td>Dis Manibus sacrum Safidiae Rogatianae vixit menses XVIII Safidius filiae dulcissimae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICUR-01, 02720 = ILCV 04118b</td>
<td>00.18=01.06</td>
<td>Sosanae filiae mater bene merenti fecit vixit mensibus XVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICUR-03, 07948</td>
<td>00.16.10.02=01.04.10.02+</td>
<td>Pater filiae dulcisimae quae vixit menses XVI dies X horas II3 in pace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1948, 00167 = AE 1956, +00237</td>
<td>01.00.113= 01.03.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus et memoriae aeternae 3 quae vixit annum I dies CXIII ut neque corde culpam acciparet? neque ore dolum loqueretur Lucilia Stratonice mater pia adfectione qua filiae dulcissimae debui sarcophagum cum basilica et fabrica eius omni simul et viva mihi posterisque meis ponendum curavi et sub ascia dedicavi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.28255</td>
<td>01.00.80= 01.02.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Valeriae Probandae parentes filiae carissimae fecerunt vixit anno uno diebus octoginta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.01334 (p 4682)</td>
<td>00.00.45= 00.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus sacrum Aemilia Cornelia Cai filia Scribonia Maxima clarissima puella vixit diebus XLV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICUR-01, 03556 = ILCV 04588</td>
<td>01.00.39= 01.01.+</td>
<td>Aerastos et Viola parentes Iolae filiae karissimae bene merenti fecerunt quae vixit annum et dies XXXVIII et horas duas diei in pace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.23552</td>
<td>04.00.45= 04.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Optata fecit Iunariae filiae suae bene merentae! quae vixit annum IIII dies XL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InscrAqu-03, 03242</td>
<td>01.00.53.02= 01.01.+02</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Victoriae filiae dulcissimae bene merenti quae vixit annum et dies LIII horas noctis II Felicissimus et Felicissima parentes fecerunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.28923 (p 3536)</td>
<td>01.00.52.02= 01.01.+02</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Victorinae filiae dulcissimae bene merenti quae vixit annum I et dies LII horas noctis II Felicissimus et Felicissima parentes fecerunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.26755</td>
<td>01.00.46= 01.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Titus Statilius Callistus et Dasumia Harmation Fabiae Daphne filiae dulcissimae fecit vixit annum I dies XXXVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.13897</td>
<td>01.00.38= 01.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Publi Caeli Iunarui vixit annis X diebus XXX Caelia Festa mater filio suo bene merenti fecit Sextus Pompeius Epagathus fecit Pompeiae Mac3e filiae suae vixit anno uno diebus XXXVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.13802</td>
<td>01.00.41= 01.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Caecilia Cleopatra vixit annus uno diebus XLI Quintus Caecilius Abascentus et Vettia Pyrriche parentes filiae piissimae fecerunt et sibi posterisque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.11119</td>
<td>01.00.40= 01.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Aemilia Aemiliiana vixit annos uno diebus XXXX Aulus Aemilius Tychicus pater filiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 08.03048</td>
<td>01.00.01</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Avidia Rufina vixit annum I diem I menses XIX! Caius Avidius Rufinus veteranus filiae dulcissimae ex Flavia Secunda uxore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 08.16615</td>
<td>00.12= 01</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Licinia Claudia vixit menses XII Lucius Licinius Speratus filiae piae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1997, 00350</td>
<td>00.00.96= 00.03.+</td>
<td>C3r3philus pater et Munia Comice mater filiae infelici vixit dies XCVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.10978 (p 3507)</td>
<td>00.00.41= 00.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Aeliae Publi filiae Secundillae vixit diebus XXXXI Publius Aelius Secundus et Flavia Secundilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 08.00485</td>
<td>00.14=01.02</td>
<td>Iulia Victoria vixit mensibus XIII Iulius Secundus filiae? piae? posuit hic sita est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 10.02522</td>
<td>07.00.35=07.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Honoratae Marcellinae quae vixit annis VII diebus XXXV Marcellinus filiae dulcissimae fecit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 13.03502</td>
<td>18.00.32=18.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus memoriae Modestae Modi filiae vixit annis XVIII diebus XXXII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECapua 00086</td>
<td>17.00.40=17.01.+</td>
<td>Barbiae Publi filiae Primae? vixit annis XVII diebus XXXX Barbius Venerianus frater soror pientissimae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAR-1923-118</td>
<td>17.00.32=17.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Bononiane Romanae Bononius Synthrophus pater Corania Spes mater filiae piissimae vixit annos XVII dies XXXII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.19276 (p 3915)</td>
<td>15.00.57=15.02.+</td>
<td>Memoriae Helviae Luci filiae Liciniae Hispanillae Publi Ciarti Sergiani privignae vixit annis XV diebus LVII Helvia Pia mater miserrima filiae piissimae fecit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.27311</td>
<td>14.14.15=15.02.15</td>
<td>bene merenti idem mater Tettia Nice filiae pientissimae vixit annos XIII menses XIII dies XV Asclepiades et Justina parentes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMS-02, 00070</td>
<td>15.00.36=15.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Albinae quae vixit annis XV diebus XXXVI Albinus Iuliorum servus vilicus et Irene parentes filiae carissimae posuerunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.11467 (p 3911)</td>
<td>13.00.42=13.02.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus sacrum Allidiae Sexti filiae Luciferae dulcissimae vixit annos XIII dies XLII Allidii Primitivus et Helpis parentes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 05.07539</td>
<td>13.00.50=13.02.+</td>
<td>Plotiae Marci filiae Primae annorum nata XIII nupta fuit dies C Marcus Plotius Cai filius pater et Egnatia Marci filia mater posuerunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.07772 (p 3432)</td>
<td>10.00.48=10.02.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Cameriae Syntyches Cameria Artemisia et Camerius Apollo filiae suae bene merenti fecerunt vixit annos X dies XXXVIII!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.23415 = CIL 11.*00100a10</td>
<td>10.00.45=10.02.+</td>
<td>Marcus Ogulnius Menophanes et Aufidia Felicula fecerunt sibi et Aufidiae Athenaidi filiae suae bene merenti vixit annis X diebus XLV et suis posterisque eorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.19196 (p 3523)</td>
<td>03.00.49=03.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Heliaedi filiae pientissimae fecerunt parentes vixit annos III dies XXXVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Line Numbers</td>
<td>Lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 14.01731 (p 616)</td>
<td>01.01.40= 01.02.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Varenis Blastenis coniugis bene merenti et sibi fecit Antius Successus itemque Antiae Successae filiae dulcissimae quae super matrem suam vixit annum mensem dies XXXX quae fuit at diem mortis suae annorum VIII mensorum VIII dierum XV AG acervam Ditis rapuit infantem domus nondum repletam vitae dulci lumine pulchram decoram quasi delicium caelitum flet pater et rogat tituli fidem ut omnis aetas optet aei terram levem hoc monimentum quot est in parte dextra intrantibus adiectis columbaris numero XII libertis libertabusque posterisque eorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 12.02033 = CIL 13.*00299</td>
<td>02.00.33= 02.01.+</td>
<td>Ego pater Vitalinus et mater Martina scripsimus non grandem gloriam sed dolum! filiorum tres filios in diebus XXVII hic posuimus Sapaudum filium qui vixit annos VII et dies XXVI Rusticam filiam qui vixit annos III et dies XX et Rusticula filia qui vixit annos III et dies XXXIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 12.03682 (p 839)</td>
<td>07.00.35= 07.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus 3iae Sergiae quae vixit annos VII dies XXXX Iulia Sergia filia piissima 3II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.26754</td>
<td>06.00.40= 06.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Titus Statilius Callistus Dasumiae Harmationi et Statiliae Faustinae filiae vixit annis VI dies XXXXX fecit et sibi et suis libertis libertabusque posterisque eorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1974, 00190</td>
<td>06.00.40= 06.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Appaliae Felicitati filiae dulcissimae bene merenti Appalius Felicissimus Appalia Nice fecerunt quae vixit annos VI dies XXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 10.00192</td>
<td>05.12.04= 06.00.04</td>
<td>Pactumeius Primus MPVRCLCERVLL3ius Pactumeiae Primaet filiae MIICEX ERVRI quae vixit annus V mensae XII dies III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.28264</td>
<td>05.00.33= 05.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Valeriae Rufinae quae vixit annis V diebus XXXIII Valerius Thallion et Valeria Charite parentes filiae carissimae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 08.08037 (p 1879)</td>
<td>05.00.35= 05.01.+</td>
<td>Clodia Luci filia Serena vixit feliciter in quam? diem decessit nata annos V dies XXXX hic sita est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.25154</td>
<td>05.00.42= 05.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Publiciae Briseidis Caius Publicius Abascanus et Publicia Secundina filiae suae karissimae bene merenti de suo fecerunt quae vixit annis V diebus XXXXVII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 08.28045</td>
<td>04.12.17.07= 05.00.17.07</td>
<td>Memoria dulcissimais! filiais! mea Flabana pater fecit vixit annis IIII mensibus XII diebus XVII horis VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICUR-08, 20720 = ILCV 04117f</td>
<td>04.00.32= 04.01.+</td>
<td>Bene merenti filiae Agapeni qui! vixit annos III et dies XXXII fecerunt parentes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.21708</td>
<td>04.00.46=04.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Lusius Maximus Agneti filiae dulcissimae quae vixit annis IIII diebus XXXXVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 05.02254</td>
<td>19.00.35=19.01.+</td>
<td>Percenniae Sabinae quae vixit annos XIX dies XXXV Marcus Percennius Mursensis filiae dulcissimae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06.18388</td>
<td>09.00.38=09.01.+</td>
<td>Dis Manibus Flaviae Olympinae Flavius Pantagathus et Flavia Primitiva parentes filiae pientissimae vixit annis VIII diebus XXXVIII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E: Inscriptions Featuring Daughters of Marriageable Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 18937</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Gaviae C(ai) f(iliae) Qua/dratae vixit / annis XVII / mensibus VI / C(aius) Gavius Da/phnus pater / infelicissimus / qui pos(uit) dies XX despepo/ndit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 06, 07732 (p 3432)</td>
<td>Naevia C(ai) f(ilia) Pontis / vixit annis XIX mens(ibus) X / dieb(us) III unum ab virgini/tate L(uci) Aemilli Regilli matrimo/nium experta hunc titulum / pater infelicissimus filiae / opt&lt;i=U&gt;mae fecit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1974, 00260</td>
<td>Trebia C(ai) f(ilia) Sa/turnina vi/xit annis XIII / mutatum officium est alium sper[ave]rat usum / fax infelicis virginis heu superi / quae thalamis aetas fuerat iam nubilis apta / destituit sponsum flebilis et soceros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 05, 01636</td>
<td>Aureliae Mariae / puellae virgin(i) innocentissimae / sanct(a)e pergens ad iustos et electos / in pace / quae vixit annos XVI me(n)s&lt;s=e=I&gt;s V / dies XVIII sponsata Aurelio Da/mati diebus XXV Aurel(ius) Ienisireus / veteranus et Sextilia parentes / infelic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL 03, 02875</td>
<td>Opiniae M(arci) f(iliae) Neptil&lt;l=I&gt;ae / annor(um) XIII virg(i)i) des&lt;e=I&gt;s(erae) / prope diem nuptiar(um) def(unctae) / M(arcus) Op[i]n[i]us Rufus et / Gellia Neptil&lt;l=I&gt;ae parentes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTH-1910-CCIII</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Calliste vixit / annis XVI me(n)s(ibus) III hor(is) / VII et s(emis) nuptura Idibus O(ctobribus) / moritur III Idus Oct(obres) PV/AIS mater pia kar(issimae) fil(iae) fe[cit]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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