

Alison JEPPESEN

Discrepancies in Wifely Virtues: *Pudicitia*, *Castitas*, and *Univira* among Different Spousal Categories

Hanne Sigismund Nielsen has, in a number of articles, demonstrated that the ideals of *pudicitia*, *castitas*, and *univiratus* are not particularly visible in the funerary commemoration of wives in Rome. She reveals that spouses actually commemorate each other as *carissimus/a*, *dulcissimus/a* or *bene merens*. Despite her findings, the view that husbands commemorate wives as chaste and virtuous is still prevalent in modern scholarship. Building on the work of Dr. Nielsen, I wish to present some preliminary results of my research into the use of epithets in Roman spousal commemoration. More specifically, I will demonstrate how that usage varied depending on the term used to describe the spousal relationship (*coniunx*, *uxor*, *maritus*, *concubina*, and *contubernalis*), and what those differences may indicate about spousal relationships in Rome.

Beryl Rawson has looked extensively at *de facto* marriages. Her work has been central in the classification of marital relationships; however, she does not go into detail on the use of epithets to describe the partners in these *de facto* relationships. Susan Treggiari's book *Roman Marriage*, in which she discusses the emotional relationship between spouses, has been highly influential in the works of subsequent scholars on marital relations in Rome. In her discussion of epithets used to describe spouses, she has overlooked evidence for marital relationships outside of those referred to by the terms *coniuges* (for husbands or wives) and *uxores* (for wives). Dr. Nielsen has studied the use of epithets on all epitaphs. Her work has discussed the frequency of epithet usage on epitaphs, the meaning of those epithets, and has delineated epithet usage between various categories of relationship (e.g. parent-child, patron-client, and husband-wife). In her discussion of spousal commemoration, she has not delineated between spouses based on the specific marital term of reference.

My intention is to present my findings on the usage of epithets on spousal epitaphs. I then relate these epithets and their meanings, as discussed in Dr. Nielsen's work, to the terminology used in order to see if there were differences in spousal relationships and the conduct considered worthy of commemoration. What actions did a Roman husband think were particularly attractive in his wife? What was important enough that he would place it for eternity on her tombstone? Is that ideal different depending on the terminology he used to define his wife? The same questions can be asked about the commemoration of husbands. Is a *concubina* commemorated with the same terms as an *uxor*? Is a *coniunx* commemorated with the same terms as a *maritus*? When one looks at the epitaphs, one finds that husbands commemorate wives referred to as *coniuges* with different epithets, or at different usage rates, than *uxores*. Variations are also seen in the commemoration of husbands. Clearly, the usage of epithets is more complicated than it first appears and many factors need to be taken into account when discussing the usage of epithets in epitaphs.

E-mail: adjeppe@ucalgary.ca

Webpage: <http://www.fp.ucalgary.ca/adjeppe/>