

SERVI PRIVATI IN THE DEMOGRAPHIC STRUCTURE OF ROMAN AFRICA

MALGORZATA PAWLAK

This paper aims at verifying a generally accepted view of a limited importance of the slave labour force in agriculture of Roman Africa which is believed to have been based on work of *coloni* and seasonally of hired hands, in particular in large private and imperial domains. For years this has been the prevailing view of scholarly literature. Among its followers were e.g. S. Gsell and G.C. Picard, who noticed that slaves were replaced in agriculture by free labour especially in the aftermath of the massive confiscation of land by Nero¹. J.-M. Lassère in his monumental work on the population of Roman Africa emphasized a low proportion of slaves in it², while Ph. Leveau did the same in the case of Mauretania Caesariensis³. A. Chastagnol noticed clear signs of a crisis in slavery-based economy, particularly in the third century A.D.⁴. Also J. Carlsen's study of slave-managers of real estates (*vilici* and *actores*) has resulted in conclusion of a limited role of slaves in agriculture⁵. Beginning with an assumption that the *actores* were collecting rent from *coloni*, while the *vilici* were overseeing slaves at work, he noticed much higher frequency

of the *vilici* than of the *actores* in epigraphic sources and drew a conclusion of the dominant role of economy based on land lease and tenant farmers. Carlsen's inference conforms to theories of the paramount position of tenant farming in agriculture of Roman Africa⁶. A salient point against overestimating of the importance of slavery in Roman Africa was made by C.R. Whittaker who noticed that this land had been densely populated and cultivated well before the Romans. There was, therefore, no need to introduce there the Roman, slavery-based production system, since that one already in existence was productive enough⁷.

A minority view is that of E.M. Shtaerman. In her opinion slaves played an important role in medium-size estates and were quite numerous in cities as household servants⁸. According to E. Matilla privately owned slaves used to be quite numerous in Roman Africa until the second century A.D. when free rural labour force came to the fore due to olive cultivation⁹. On the other hand,

1. PICARD, G.C., *La civilisation de l'Afrique romaine*, Paris 1990, 148-149. He basically agrees with G.C. Starr ("An Overdose of Slavery", *Journal of Economic History* 18, 1958, 17-32) who thinks that slavery was "primarily industrial and commercial, not agricultural as in modern times". But the importance of slavery in African craft and commerce is doubtful.

2. LASSÈRE, J.-M., *Ubique populus: peuplement et mouvements de population dans l'Afrique romaine de la chute de Carthage à la fin de la dynastie des Sévères, 146 a.C. - 235 p.C.*, Paris 1977, 426-437.

3. LEVEAU, PH., *Caesarea de Maurétanie, une ville romaine et ses campagnes*, Rome 1984, 691 f.

4. CHASTAGNOL, A., *L'évolution politique sociale et économique du monde romain, 284-363*, Paris 1982, 318-322.

5. CARLSEN J., "Estate management in Roman North Africa. Transformation or Continuity?", *L'Africa romana. Atti dell'VIII convegno di studio, Cagliari 14-16 dicembre 1990*, Sassari 1991, 624-637.

6. For tenant farming in early Imperial Africa the basic work is KOLENDÓ, J., *Le colonat en Afrique sous le Haut-empire*, Paris 1991.

7. WHITTAKER, C.R., "Rural Labour in three Roman Provinces", *Non Slave Labour in the Graeco-Roman World*, Cambridge 1980, 79. E.M. Shtaerman ("Rabstvo v africanskikh provintsijakh", SHTAERMAN, E.M.; SMIRIN, V.M.; BELOWA, N.N.; KOLOSOVSKAJA, I.K. (edd.), *Rabstvo w zapadnykh provintsijakh Rimskoj imperii v I - III vv.*, Moscow 1977, 11) admitting our inadequate knowledge of Carthaginian slavery thinks that its model was identical with the Roman one. Even if so, it was limited to Carthage and its immediate neighbourhood.

8. SHTAERMAN, E.M., "Rabstvo ...", *o.c.*, 7-35. WHITTAKER, *o.c.*, 78, on the other hand, notices that difference between medium size villas and latifundia was not in fact that big, because large estates were split into smaller units. Therefore S's classification seems artificial to him.

9. MATILLA V.E., "Surgimento y desarrollo de la esclavitud Cartaginesa y su continuacion en epoca romana", *Hispania Antiqua* 7, 1977, 99-123.

A. Di Vita realized that even in the third century slaves were in high demand in Tripolitania supplied by its African hinterland¹⁰.

Literary sources seem to suggest an important role of slave labour in economy of Roman Africa. According to the *Apology* of Apuleius a rich widow Pudentilla, about to re-marry, carved for herself a dowry of HS 300,000 out of her estate of HS 4 mln¹¹. Among her riches were no less than 400 slaves. Since this was only a small part of what she owned, one might suppose that Pudentilla's land was tended by thousands of slaves, although some estimate the number of her slaves at 600¹².

In another telling passage in the *Apology* Apuleius addresses a man tilling his soil: *servosne tu habeas ad agrum colendum*¹³. Apuleius, as he describes himself, was puzzled by a strange situation in which he found his interlocutor deprived of the most basic tool in agriculture: slaves. He obviously perceived employment of slaves in agriculture as an obvious choice, fitting his every-day life experience.

The *Vita of Melania* contains information about massive numbers of slaves in late Roman Africa. The saint herself gave freedom to a few thousand of slaves¹⁴ working her fields and referred to as *servi agricultores*. On testimony St. Augustin slaves were a commonplace in Africa, to be found in almost every household: *Prima et quotidiane potestas hominis in hominem domini est in servum. Prope omnes domus habent huiusmodi potestatem*¹⁵. The much earlier *Satyricon* of Petronius

shows slaves scattered in the fields of Numidia, so numerous that they could take Carthage

... nam familiam quidem tam magnam
per agros Numidiae esse sparsam, ut
possit uel Carthaginem capere¹⁶.

Of course this piece of evidence ought to be approached with caution because of its rhetorical nature.

J. Kolendo has pointed out at the stereotypical pattern in Roman literature: a wealthy man = an owner of big domains in Africa. What follows is that a big landowner was to be a big slave owner at the same time. It is doubtful if this pattern was based on the first hand experience with Africa or if it rather reflected Italian perception of wealth projected on to Africa. The authors of African origin, although familiar with social relations of their native land, were writing for the broader audience, striving to give to their work a universal appeal. Therefore, it is not always easy to decide what was typically and uniquely African in their works.

For ancient authors the phenomenon of slavery was an inherent element of social landscape, so their evidence simply attests that it existed also in Africa. The problem, I have been trying to tackle in paper, is not the very existence of slavery in Africa but its magnitude. It cannot be solved on the basis of Apuleius' account of a few hundred slaves of Pudentilla because the single example needs to make a rule for all African provinces. Augustin's statement that slaves could be found in almost all African households is not only later than the scope of this paper but it also refers to domestic servants. This may in fact account for differences between epigraphic and literary sources: domestic servants were a sub-category of slaves numerous and easy enough to spot (especially in towns and cities) to have been perceived by the authors as a significant component of the whole population of Africa. For these reasons caution needs to be applied in handling literary sources which are of better use in studying every day life than population statistics. For this purpose epigraphic evidence is certainly more reliable.

The prevailing view of a numerical weakness of slavery in Roman Africa is based predominantly on epigraphic sources. In the West Africa is second only to Italy in number of extant ancient inscrip-

10. DI VITA, A., "Gli Emporia di Tripolitania dall' eta Masinissa a Diocleziano: un profilo storico-istituzionale", ANRW II, 10, 2, 1982, 49 f.

11. Apul., *Apol.* 93, 21: ...praeterea ex re familiari sua fructuosissimos agros et grandem domum opulente ornatam magnamque uim tritici et ordei et uini et oliui ceterorumque fructuum, seruos quoque haud minus CCCC, pecora amplius neque pauca neque abiecti pretii donaret, ut eos et ex ea parte quam tribuisset securos haberet et ad cetera hereditatis bona spei inuitaret.

12. See e.g. DUNCAN-JONES, R., *The Economy of the Roman Empire. Quantitative Studies*, Cambridge 1982, 254, 348; GUTSFELD, A., "Zur Wirtschaftsmentalität nichtsenatorischer provinzieller Oberschichten: Aemilia Pudentilla und ihre Verwandten", *Klio* 74, 1992, 252-254. On Pudentilla's social position see also: FANTHAM, E., "Aemilia Pudentilla: or the wealthy widow's choice", HAWLEY, R.; LEVICK, B., (edd.), *Women in Antiquity, new Assessments*, London, New York 1995, 220-232.

13. Apul., *Apol.* 17.

14. *Vita Mel.* 34. See also Augustin, *Civ. Dei*, XXII, 8,6.

15. Augustin, *Enarr. in psalm.* CXXIV,7. GSELL, S., "Esclaves ruraux dans l'Afrique Romaine", *Mélanges Gustave Glotz*, I, Paris 1932, 400, quotes also another example: *Homo pauper est, quid aliqui conferat non habet; tamen de laboribus suis antequam esset clericus emerat aliquod seruos* (Sermons, CCCLVI, 6).

16. Petronius, *Satyricon*, 117.

tions, hence the study of African epigraphic sources often leads to reliable conclusions, not marred by the influence of accidental finds. There are telling results of demographic study of various cities and towns of Roman Africa. They show a low proportion of slaves and freedmen within whole population. H.G. Pflaum examining the area of Cirta has identified only one slave and one freedmen among 1271 known inhabitants of Castellum Celtianum¹⁷. In a small town, 16 km to the south-west of Cirta, Castellum Tidditanorum, there are two recorded slaves among 525 attested inhabitants¹⁸. Among 1309 recorded residents of Cirta itself are 11 slaves and among them, 9 imperial and one public slaves¹⁹. J. Marrion's estimates of 8% of slaves in the population of Volubilis²⁰, may be somewhat too high. One should disbelieve with J.-M. Lassère²¹ a hypothesis of R.P. Duncan-Jones for whom there were 3 thousand slaves among ca. 14 thousand inhabitants of Siagu, i.e. 21.4% of its population²². G.C. Picard accepts for the whole of Roman Africa the same the same proportion of slaves as Marrion estimated for Volubilis: 8%²³. One of his arguments is a low number of freedmen (just three out of 88) in a list of *iuvenes* recorded in an inscription of Mactaris of A.D. 88 commissioned by the *cultores Martis Augusti*²⁴. Among 65 extant names in this inscriptions there are: Victor, *Balsamonis l(ibertus)*, Mithumbal, *Rogati l(ibertus)*²⁵ oraz *Crescens, Baricis l(ibertus)*. This is less than 5 % of all dedicants in this inscription.

The examination of all epigraphic material of Roman Africa produces unequivocal outcome: *out* of the massive 30 thousand inscriptions only 147, i.e. less than 0.5%, with certainty refer to privately owned slaves. This figure is too low to reflect cor-

rectly the actual composition of population of Roman Africa. Other approaches are necessary to tackle the problem of slave to free ratio in Africa.

Whether the *cognomen* determines its owner's ethnic origin has been a matter of controversy for long time. The discussion of this issue started with T. Frank's²⁶ hypothesis of the Graeco-oriental origin of a substantial part of lower strata of the Roman society. His argument was based on the high proportion of Greek names among lesser members of the *populus Romanus*; he subscribed to the theory of a close link between one's name and ethnic origin. This way of thinking was soon assailed by M. Gordon who noticed Greek names of Roman slaves and freedmen of western origin²⁷. Ever since two conflicting views have been represented in the scholarship²⁸. Among critics of T. Frank's approach have been J. Baumgart²⁹, S. Treggiari³⁰, F. Meier³¹, A.M. Duff³², W. Westermann³³, among others. Much more sympathetic to T. Frank was H. Thylander who exactly 50 years ago remarked that slaveowners did not change names of their chattel in any systematic way, as a rule accepting the existing ones and if they decided to give new names to slaves, e.g. of Germanic origin, they were more likely to resort to Roman rather than to Greek onomastics³⁴. In more recent times I. Kajanto has taken the position that a Roman or non-Roman *cognomen* was related to the person's ethnic origin³⁵. To a degree H. Solin³⁶ has been in agreement with these views pointing out that the majority of slaves of eastern origin had Greek

17. PFLAUM, H.G., "Remarques sur l'onomastique de Castellum Celtianum", *Afrique Romaine (Scripta varia 1)*, 87-112.

18. PFLAUM, H.G., "Remarques sur l'onomastique de Castellum Tidditanorum", *Bulletin Archéologique du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques* 10-11, 1974-1975, 9-43.

19. PFLAUM, H.G., "Onomastique de Cirta", *Afrique Romaine (Scripta Varia 1)*, 161-198.

20. MARRION, J., "La population de Volubilis à l'époque romaine", *Bulletin d'Archéologie Marocaine* 4, 1960, 133-187.

21. LASSÈRE, *Ubique populus ...*, o.c., 428.

22. DUNCAN-JONES, R.P., "City Population in Roman North Africa", *JRS* 53, 1963, 85-99.

23. PICARD, *Civilisation ...*, o.c., 133.

24. The inscription discussed in: PICARD, G.C., "Civitas Mactaritana", *Karthago VIII*, Paris 1957, 77-95.

25. Picard's reading is doubtful. The letter after Mithumbal Rogati is 'f' rather than 'l' (see *ibidem*, p. 78, drawing 4 with the text of the inscription and pl. XXIX). In this case Mithumbal was Rogatus' son. Given this, the proportion of freedmen drops to 3 %.

26. FRANK, T., "Race mixture in the Roman Empire", *American Historical Review* 21, 1916 689-708.

27. GORDON, M., "The nationality of slaves under the early Roman Empire", *JRS* 14, 1924, 93-111.

28. Discussion is related in: LASSÈRE, J.-M., *Ubique populus ...*, o.c., 429-430 and ŁOŚ, A., "Cognomen a pochodzenie etniczne niewolników i wyzwolenców. Studium inskrypcji pompejańskich", *Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis* 809 (*Classica Wratislaviensis XI*), Wrocław 1987, 55-66.

29. BAUMGART, J., *Die römischen Sklavennamen*, Diss., Breslau 1936.

30. TREGGIARI, S., *Roman freedmen during the late republic*, Oxford 1969, 7 f.

31. MEIER, F., "Bevölkerungsgeschichte und Inschriftenstatistik", *Historia* 2, 1954, 345 f.

32. DUFF, A.M., *Freedmen in the early Roman Empire*, Oxford 1928, 5f.

33. WESTERMANN, W.L., *The Slave System of Greek and Roman Antiquity*, Philadelphia 1955, 96.

34. THYLANDER, H., *Etude sur l'épigraphie latine*, Lund 1952, 145-167.

35. KAJANTO, I., "The Significance of non-latin cognomina", *Latomus* 27, 1968, 517-534.

36. SOLIN, H., *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der griechischen Personennamen in Rom (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum XLVII)*, Helsinki 1971, 150 f.

names, while majority of those from the West-Latin ones. Thus a Greek name of a slave indicates a higher probability of his eastern than western origin.

Greek names are quite numerous in Africa. Over 20 % of privately owned slaves (i.e. 37 persons³⁷) have Greek names, and even more, ca. 40 % (57 persons³⁸) of *liberti* who used to belong to private (non-imperial) slaveowners. Does it mean that this was the actual proportion of person brought from the eastern provinces of the Roman empire among African slaves and freedmen? This would have been, however, a rash conclusion. Solin's study of the Greek onomastic has shown that Greek names are not a sure indicator

37. *Agathocles* (CIL VIII, 5269); *Agathoclia* (CIL VIII, 5269); *Alcibiades* (CIL VIII, 939); *Aphrodisius* (CIL VIII, 9256) *Apollinarius* (CIL VIII, 11985); [*Arche*]la^s vel [*Nico*]la^s (CIL VIII, 13178); *Auxesis* (CIL VIII, 9375); *Callistus* (CIL VIII, 12974); *Callityche* (GSELL, S., *Inscriptions Latines de l'Algerie* II, Paris 1957, 133); *Charito* (AE 1971, 526); *Chorenius* (CIL VIII, 12624); *Demetria* (CIL VIII, 27481); *Diadumenus* (CIL VIII, 21331); *Dionysius* (CIL VIII, 12626); *Epaph(roditus)* (CIL VIII, 24739); *Eucharistus* (AE 1971, 526); *Eulal(i)us* (CIL VIII 10962); *Eutyches* (AE 1969-70, 654); *Glauce* (CIL VIII, 11985); *Helena* (CIL VIII, 24866); *Hermis* (ILAL II, 400); *Hyacinthus* (CIL VIII, 2767); *Hyginus* (CIL VIII, 3291); *Neritus* (CIL VIII, 9505); *Nicetes* (CIL VIII, 1044); *Periplus* (CIL VIII, 18362); *Philo* (CIL VII, 9508); *Prote* (AE 1969-70, 655); *Protogenia* (CIL VIII, 1816); *Semnos* (CIL VIII, 21101); *Stephanus* (CIL VIII, 21317); *Telite* (?) (AE 1969-70, 654); *Thalamus* (CIL VIII, 12925); [*Tha*]lia (CIL VIII, 24864); *Theodorus* (CIL VIII, 12833); [*Th*]repten (CIL VIII, 21322); *Trophimus* (CIL VIII, 9505)

38. 139 private freedmen have been identified in Africa; see PAWLAK, M., *Niewolnicy prywatni w Afryce rzymskiej w okresie wczesnego cesarstwa*, Wrocław 2002, list II. Those bearing *nomina graeca* are: *Achilleus* (CIL VIII, 3001); *Agatangelus* (AE 1937, 57); *Agathopus* (CIL VIII, 18893, AE 1972, 697-698); *Agathopus* (ILAL II, 4631); *Agathopus* (CIL VIII, 18898); *Alexa* (MERLIN A., *Inscriptions Latines de la Tunisie*, Paris 1944, 1063); *Anicenia* (?) (CIL VIII, 11713); *Anthia* (AE 1938, 41); *Asclepias* (CIL VIII, 14639); *Athamas* (AE 1962, 282); *Briseis* (CIL VIII, 20586); *Calippus* (AE 1985, 904); *Calliphorus* (CIL VIII, 2851); *Cerdo* (CIL VIII, 17643); *Charito* (AE 1934, 42); *Chresimus* (CIL VIII, 3006); *Chresimus* (AE 1980, 979); *Crysophe* (CIL VIII, 2922); *Daphne* (AE 1985, 970); *Diogenes* (CIL VIII, 24871); *Dodine* (AE 1946, 102); *Encarpus* (AE 1980, 980); *Epapra* (?) (CIL VIII, 21086); *Epictetus* (CIL VIII, 18317); *Epictetus* (AE 1959, 46); *Euchodus* (CIL VIII, 4008); *Eutices* (CIL VIII, 3021); *Eutyches* (CIL VIII, 2842); *Eutychides* (AE 1951, 52); *Eutycheis* (CIL VIII, 12915); *Eutycheus* (AE 1969-70, 734); *Helespontius* (CIL VIII, 13036); *Herma* (CIL VIII, 12770); *Hermes* (CIL VIII, 21132); *Hesperis* (CIL VIII, 9493); *Hygia* (ILT 1716); *Ygia* (CIL VIII, 21007); *Ionica* (?) (AE 1946, 104); *Irenaeus* (CIL VIII, 3006); *Myrinus* (ILT 720); *Onesimus* (AE 1938, 41); *Pandarus* (CIL VIII, 9448); *Pancratius* (CIL VIII, 8993); *Phileros* (AE 1925, 45); *Philumenus* (CIL VIII, 15677); *Poludeuces* (CIL VIII, 1236); *Rhodopa* (CIL VIII, 24971); *Seleucus* (CIL VIII, 14433); *Socrates* (CIL VIII, 7726); *Syneros* (AE 1971, 516); *Synerusa* (CIL VIII, 16993); *Themistocles* (CIL VIII, 12593); *Thiasus* (CIL VIII, 7806); *Trophimus* (CIL VIII, 2907); *Trypho[sa]* (CIL VIII, 21176); *Tyrannus* (CIL VIII, 26464, AE 1969-70, 651); *Zobicus* (?) (CIL VIII, 5014)

of the person's ethnic origin since they belonged to the canon of Roman personal names. A list in his book shows that 43% of *vernae* from the city of Rome had Greek names³⁹. Solin identifies other than oriental origin reasons of this state of things. One was the hellenophile posturing of educated Roman slaveowners⁴⁰. Of a certain importance was also the fact that many slave traders were of oriental origin and they frequently were renaming slaves⁴¹. A. Łoś noticed too that some among slaveowners in the city of Rome, e.g. numerous imperial freedmen, had come from Greece. He remarks too that Solin's conclusions are applicable to the city of Rome but less so to smaller cities in Italy, including Pompei⁴². Even more caution should be applied in drawing conclusions upon names outside of Italy, in that in Africa. An attempt to handle this issue was made by J.-M. Lassère, who performed a genealogical analysis of African inscriptions. His study of interdependence of names of parents and children among the *officiales* in Carthage shows frequent switching from Greek to Latin and the other way around in selecting names for offspring⁴³. His remarks are probably applicable in case of slave names too. Lassère supposes a religious explanation of giving Greek names to children of parents who themselves bore Latin names. Switching from the Greek to Latin onomastic could be a result of rejection of the surface-deep hellenization and return to earlier family tradition. Lassère further suggests a pressure of the romanized African society on parents decision concerning selecting names for their children. One of his argument is that tombstone inscriptions of slaves and freedmen who had bore Greek names were rarely written in Greek, quite differently than inscriptions for free-born foreigners⁴⁴. One needs to mention, however, a Latin tombstone inscription for certain Apollinarius and Glauce *servi gr(a)eci*⁴⁵. The language of tombstone inscriptions alone cannot therefore be a decisive argument in the discussion of a person's ethnic background. Nevertheless, Lassère's study has convincingly proved that there was no simple connection between a person's name and his or her eth-

39. SOLIN, *o.c.*, 156. Out of 575 *vernae* 249 i.e. more than 43 % had *nomina Graeca*. One should mention here an inscription from Carthage (C. 24971) which lists *Publicia Rhodopa nationel-italic(ensi)*.

40. SOLIN, *o.c.*, 46-85.

41. ŁOŚ, *Cognomen ...*, *o.c.*, 61, 63 arguing with Solin partly accepts Frank's hypothesis.

42. ŁOŚ, *Cognomen ...*, *o.c.*, 63.

43. LASSÈRE, *Ubique populus ...*, *o.c.*, 431-435.

44. LASSÈRE, *Ubique populus ...*, *o.c.*, 435.

45. CIL VIII, 11985.

nicity. It reinforces rather Solin's hypothesis that Greek names, so popular among slaves, reflect the social position rather than the ethnic origin of people who bore them.

The realization of a close link between onomastic and the social position may be instrumental in determining the actual proportion of slaves within the whole ancient society. Let me quote a few figures established for the ratio of Greek *cognomina* in various districts of the Roman Empire:

established by
H. Thylander: Ostia - 40 %, southern Italy - 50 %
in that: Bari, Brindisi, Tarent - 51% villas of Campania - 49 %

established by
G. Alföldy: Tarraco - 28 % Noricum - 10 %

established by
R. Étienne: district of Seville - 15 %⁴⁶

According to A. Łoś, the ratio of non-Latin *cognomina* in Pompeii is 34.9%⁴⁷. In Africa a figure similar to Picard's suggested ratio of slaves in whole country has been established by Y. Thébert in the case of Bulla Regia⁴⁸. This figures are much lower in Africa in comparison with other parts of the empire, including Spain⁴⁹.

A comprehensive data analysis should allow us to check if these differences translate into a distinctive position of Africa within the Roman empire. It may be particularly interesting to compare Africa with Italy which has yielded the biggest epigraphic material thus allowing for reliable conclusions. I base this preliminary analysis on two representa-

tive Italian and two African cities selected on the basis of their geographical and economic position, as well as their comparatively rich epigraphic data. I have selected Puteoli, the principal harbour of Rome and, at the same time, a resort for the Roman elite, and Caesarea in Mauritania, the third largest harbour of Africa with attested wide-ranging trade links, from Claudius a veteran colony with population estimated at 100,000. The remaining two are smaller towns whose economic role was on much limited scale. Beneventum in southern Italy (*municipium* under republic, colony under the empire), was principally a military base and a road junction Madauros in Numidia used to be a tribal town of the Musulamii, later, under the Flavians settled by Roman veterans who drew their income mostly from olive cultivation. Madauros was a town of a strategic importance as well. This study is based on tombstone inscriptions published in *CIL*. I take into consideration persons (both dedicants and those buried under a tombstone) whose *nomen gentile* and *cognomen* are extant, i.e. free members of the Roman society. Among them there are freedmen listed separately in the table. The source basis thus refers principally to middle classes of these towns, because it is here where most ex-slaves can be traced.

The table shows much higher proportion of non-Latin, i.e. predominantly Greek, *cognomina* in towns in Italy than in Africa. 47.4% of all *cognomina* in Puteoli and only 25.9% in Caesarea are non-Latin⁵⁰. The difference between Beneventum and Madauros is even more pronounced: 34.2% to 12%. Markedly more freedmen whose legal status is clearly established are attested in Italy, while both in Italy and Africa the same pattern can be seen: foreign *cognomina* are much common among them than among the *ingenui* — i 53.8 % in Caesarea, 64.2% in Puteoli 64.2 %, 50.4% in Beneventum. These data seem clearly indicate a statistical connection between a person's name and his or her social background. They further show in Africa a much lower than in Italy ratio of people of slave origin in the society at large.

Although this general conclusion is most probably right, there are some additional factors

46. A rich selection of examples with bibliographical reference is in LEVEAU, *Caesarea ...*, o.c., 154.

47. ŁOŚ, A., *Wyzwoleńcy w Pompejach, Studium stosunków ekonomicznych w kampańskim mieście (Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis 1129, Historia, LXXVII)*, Wrocław 1991, 35.

48. THÉBERT, Y., "La romanisation d'une cité indigène d'Afrique, Bulla Regia", *MEFR* 85, 1973, 1, 271.

49. PEREIRA-MENAUT, G., "El número de esclavos en las provincias romanas del mediterráneo occidental en el Imperio", *Klio* 63, 1981, 373-399 points out to a much lower number of slave in Africa than in other parts of the Roman Empire. This author, however, refers in the first place to Numidia and Mauretania. L.A. CURCHIN'S ("Patrons et affranchis en Hispanie centrale", *AncSoc* 18, 1987, 75-88) indicate pronounced difference between Africa and Spain. He lists 79 slaves and 52 freedmen in some 900 inscriptions from central Spain.

50. This number is comparable with 26.6 % established by Ph. Leveau for Caesarea. A small difference is due to the fact that Leveau took into consideration all epigraphic material, not just tombstones, and *cognomina* of all recorded persons who did not have *nomen gentile*. Insignificance of the difference confirms soundness of my methodology throughout whole Roman Africa.

Tab. 1: *Cognomina* in selected towns in Italy and Africa

Town		<i>Cognomina</i>					
		Altogether		Latin		non-Latin	
		number	%	number	%	number	%
Caesarea	Alltogether <i>liberti</i>	243	100	180	74,1	63	25,9
		13	100	6	46,2	7	53,8
Puteoli	Alltogether <i>liberti</i>	1505	100	792	52,6	713	47,4
		193	100	69	35,8	124	64,2
Madauros	Alltogether <i>liberti</i>	641	100	569	88	78	12
		1	100	1	100	-	-
Beneventum	Alltogether <i>liberti</i>	485	100	319	65,8	166	34,2
		125	100	62	49,6	63	50,4

which modify it to a degree. African slavery most possibly mostly of autochthonous origin, which could account for a lesser proportion of Greek *cognomina*. Onomastics also reflect the latinizing trends; Ph. Leveau identified in first century B.C. and in first century A.D. Caesarea 52.2% Latin *cognomina*, while 73.4% in the same city of the second-third century. This trend, however, was not limited to Africa; on the contrary it can be traced everywhere throughout the western part of the Roman empire, including Italy. It may have stemmed from the natural flight from Greek and oriental onomastic, associated in the Roman eyes with a lower social status. This is not to say that every person with a Greek *cognomina* was an ex-slave. These *cognomina* can be found, albeit sporadically, in upper echelons of the Roman society too. Therefore the conclusion once drawn by A. Łoś, from his study of Pompei can be applied to Roman Africa as well "A *cognomen Graecum* should not be regarded as a certain indicator of a person's status. ... If other evidence is lacking, one can only conjecture that a person with a Greek name was probably a slave in the past"⁵¹.

What remains is to consider the substantial difference between ratio of non-Latin *cognomina* in Caesarea (25.9%) and in Madauros (12%). The ratio of potential ex-slaves in Caesarea is markedly higher than in other African cities and higher than Picard's 8% for the whole of Africa. The explanation seems obvious: Caesarea's position as a major harbour accounted for a more complex ethnic composition of its inhabitants. As an important trade center, Caesarea must have been attractive for affluent Romans who brought with them their chattel personnel, thus influencing the social structure of the city. The case of Madauros is more representative of the rest of Roman Africa; its 12 % of Greek *cognomina* better reflects reality of most provincial towns in African provinces. What has been said above, refers to the social composition of towns and cities in Roman Africa in which the ratio of slaves to free inhabitants was markedly lower than in their Italian counterparts. Our sources do not allow to tackle the problem of slaves to free ratio in African countryside. This ratio was probably lower in Africa than in Italy and in western provinces. This can be surmized from very scanty reference in epigraphic sources to *servi rustici*.

51. Łoś, *Wyzwolenicy w Pompejach ...*, o.c., 36.