

Aemilia Pudentilla: or the wealthy widow's choice

Elaine Fantham

I suspect that most modern readers at least begin with a false picture of society in Roman North Africa, one both less urban and less wealthy than the attested realities of Africa Proconsularis and Tripolitania from the first to the third centuries of our era.

In fact the fertile maritime regions had come early under Roman control, after the fall of Carthage in the mid-second century BC, and received many settlements of Roman veterans in the following centuries. If we consider the Roman families who descended from these veterans, the local magistrates and their citizen descendants, and the influential commercial residents who formed the *conventus* or core of the metropolitan Roman and Italian elite, the Africa of the early and middle empire was at least as Romanized as southern Gaul or Mediterranean Spain, its nearest neighbour.¹

This high level of civilization and wealth is confirmed by the inscriptions of Proconsular Africa and Byzacena (northern and southern Tunisia) and of Tripolitania with its cities of Leptis, Oea (Tripoli) and Sabratha, communities that sprouted *fora*, public buildings and theatres even before the patronage of the African Emperor Severus and his dynasty. My concern is with the women of the most privileged families in these communities in the second century of our era: unfortunately outside the single literary text that is my primary source, the texts or inscriptions that mention such women do so chiefly in connection with male provincial or municipal leaders; even when named they are essentially identified through their kinsmen. Indeed the fullest recent prosopography of elite women in the imperial period can offer virtually no information beyond the offices held by their fathers, brothers, husbands and sons.² The record probably represents the reality of power: the wife or daughter of a senator, *vir clarissimus*, was by this period herself a

femina clarissima but inevitably limited in what she could achieve outside the influence she wielded with and through her husband and family.

However the inscriptions of Africa do add some personal details: inscriptions can illustrate not only the virtues for which women were praised but the ways in which they enjoyed public status. These are essentially two—by priestly office or by benefaction—and occur in three types of inscription: sepulchral, dedicatory and honorific, on tomb, altar or statue-base. Funeral inscriptions attest women's tenure of priesthoods—either the priesthood of the woman's cult of the Ceres goddesses³ (plural in post-Carthaginian Africa) or the Flaminicate of the imperial cult, which would usually be held by the wife or widow of the Flamen, a prominent man, often the head of the community's leading family.⁴

Thus in a typical elite family, the Flavii of the Vespasianic colony of Thelepte, the funeral monuments of their mausoleum (*CIL* VIII, 211–216^b) show that the veteran soldier T.Flavius Secundus, one of the founding colonists, had a son of the same name, who became Flamen of the imperial cult for life, and erected the mausoleum for his parents and family. Two women of the family held the position of Flaminica: the son's first wife Aemilia Pacata, Flaminica for life, who died at sixty, and another family member, Flavia T.filia Pacata, who died at the age of fifteen. A later inscription on the right wall of this mausoleum shows that T.Flavius Receptus, perhaps the veteran's grandson, was Aedile or mayor of Thelepte before he died aged thirty-six.⁶

Family and well placed munificence earned women these priesthoods. The base of a statue erected by the citizens of Thugga to Asicia Victoria records that she bought the office of Flaminica for her daughter Ulbia Asiciane with a gift of 100,000 sesterces, from which to finance stage games and hampers for the town councillors.⁷ The principle of exchanging money for status is confirmed by another pair of inscriptions *CIL* VIII, 12317 shows that Modia Quinta of Turca, herself daughter of the Flamen Q.Modius Felix, paid an unrecoverable amount of sesterces in return for her flaminical office; other inscriptions from the same town (12353, 12354) show that her brother P.Modius Primus and his widow, Gallia Optata, received honorific statues for his benefaction in financing a new market building and her generosity in completing it after his death.

In rarer cases benefactors' wives and daughters were actually named by their communities as *patronae*.⁸ More instances are known

from Africa than from any other province, but all eleven African *patronae* are wives or daughters either of local men who had reached the Roman senate, or of proconsular governors of the province, from whatever origin. This paper now moves from epigraphic evidence for the lives and status of these elite women to a single woman, the earliest individual north African woman whose life we can recover in any detail.

About fifty years before Septimus Severus became emperor, before the Christian Tertullian wrote on the proper behaviour of women,⁹ and the educated and well-born Christian wife Vibia Perpetua was imprisoned and martyred in the arena at Carthage in 202,¹⁰ the wealthy widow Aemilia Pudentilla of Oea suffered a different kind of humiliation—from the scandal and accusations raised by her sons over her second marriage to Apuleius of Madaura, the future author of the *Golden Ass*. Her story would never have been known if Apuleius had not already been famous as an orator, philosopher and polymath, or if he had not been accused of practising magic, for our only source for Pudentilla's tale, Apuleius' *Apology*, is the *post eventum* version of his defence against the charge of using magical arts to seduce Pudentilla into marriage.

In a defence speech one naturally assumes manipulation of the facts, and we shall see that while Apuleius' defence depends on asserting Pudentilla's independence, he may falsify her situation in other respects. Just as it helped his case to maximize her autonomy and sound judgement, so it was crucial to minimize the socio-economic gap between their positions.¹¹

We learn that Aemilia Pudentilla came from a wealthy family, whose property Apuleius gives as 4 million sesterces: when she married Sicinius Amicus, her dowry was commensurately large—300,000 sesterces. Amicus died young, leaving her with two sons: at his death the elder, Pontianus, was about eight or nine, the younger, Pudens, three or four years old. No doubt Amicus' family was also fairly well off, but it is understandable that Pudentilla's father-in-law would want to keep the widow's wealth within his family, and to protect his grandsons' financial future. According to Apuleius, old Sicinius repeatedly urged her to marry another of his sons, Sicinius Clarus, but although she signed a betrothal contract she managed to prevaricate until the death of the old man. As head of his own descent family old Sicinius would have had no legal control over Pudentilla, since she would be married without *manus*. It would seem that widows at this period enjoyed considerable de facto independence, and could

even function as guardians for their children, although they had no status in law.¹² Yet Roman families tended to keep male descendants under their control; though Pudentilla had the wealth to live independently, she may have stayed in the household of the Sicinii, at least while her sons were minors. This would certainly reinforce their pressure to prevent her remarriage outside the family or impose marriage within it; it is possible too that there was a local custom of widows marrying their husband's next of kin, like that which married Ruth to Boaz,¹³ since we hear of the same pressures being applied to Pudentilla's younger son.¹⁴ If Pudentilla did not feel free to marry whom she chose, custom or emotional blackmail could be a stronger factor than any legal issue.¹⁵

Fourteen years into her widowhood Pudentilla was freed by the old man's death, and indicated to her now adult son Pontianus, currently studying at Rome, that she would like to remarry, since he would soon be married and his brother would soon put on the toga of manhood. Again we see the sons' interests taking precedence. Pontianus, we are told, hurried back from Rome, afraid that some future husband might steal his inheritance (*Apol.* 69–71). It was at this time that the mature Apuleius visited his young student friend Pontianus on his way to Alexandria, fell ill and had to stay at Oea for some months. According to Apuleius, Pontianus himself urged him to move into his family home—where Apuleius lived for a year—and encouraged him to propose marriage to Pudentilla (*Apol.* 73). Since Pontianus was dead by the time of the trial we have only Apuleius' word for his attitude. It is somewhat difficult to reconcile with later events.

Within a year of introducing Apuleius into his home, Pontianus had married the daughter of Herennius Rufinus, had changed his mind about his mother marrying Apuleius, had quarrelled with and been reconciled to Apuleius (*Apol.* 94), had gone to Carthage to train as an orator, and died (96). With him perished not only a key witness, but the one man whose support of Apuleius could have forestalled the prosecution—and whose hostility would have damned him. After Pontianus' death his brother, Sicinius Pudens, now of age, was taken up by Herennius Rufinus, with whom he went to live, and looked likely to marry Pontianus' widow. Meanwhile Apuleius had married Pudentilla quietly at one of her country estates, ostensibly to avoid the expense of a more public occasion,¹⁶ and became the subject, first of scandal, then of legal charges spread by

Pontianus' father-in-law Herennius in association with young Sicinius Pudens and his uncle Sicinius Aemilianus.

Obviously the Sicinii would be alarmed at this marriage of the wealthy widow to a stranger, and it is hardly surprising that they used whatever means they could find to eliminate the interloper.

What I hope to do in the remaining pages is to enhance and correct Apuleius' picture of Pudentilla's rank and circumstances as a widow, to highlight prejudices about widows and other older women that emerge from Apuleius' self-justification, and to examine the situation from the widow Pudentilla's point of view.

First a word about Pudentilla's class and standing. We know that she was immensely wealthy and can surmise that her natal and marital families headed the local elite. Among the sparse epigraphical evidence from Oea in *Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania*¹⁷ three inscriptions honour Aemilii who may have come from her side. *IRT* 230, in particular, from the entablature of the temple of the *genius* of the colony of Oea, reports the benefaction of a younger kinsman, L.Aemilius Frontinus, consul and proconsul of Asia a generation later. Another inscription attests a senator from her husband's family, L.Sicinius Pontianus, perhaps the son of the young Sicinius Pudens. Pudentilla can be compared with the benefactresses discussed on p. 221 in the lavishness of her public gifts of 50,000 sesterces on the occasion of Pontianus' marriage and Pudens' coming of age (*Apol.* 88).

It is not in Apuleius' interest to overs stress the importance of Pudentilla's own family, but her inheritance of 4 million sesterces in her own right (as well as the unspecified share of her husband's wealth that would go to her sons) would make her by far the most important woman of the community. Pudentilla's income is derived largely from her many estates, with revenues in corn, oil, wine and stockbreeding of horses and cattle, plus additional revenue from money placed at interest. In turn the size of her household and estates can be measured by the gift she was able to make to her sons of 400 slaves (*Apol.* 93). She can fairly be compared with the Domina seen in the luxurious fourth-century AD Dominus Julius mosaic from Carthage receiving homage and first fruits from loyal tenants, and in another vignette reclining at ease in her garden enclosure.¹⁸

Yet even Pontianus' supposedly disreputable father-in-law had inherited by Apuleius' admission 3 million sesterces (*Apol.* 75)—a fortune comparable with that of Pudentilla—and provided a dowry, as we later learn (92), of 400,000 sesterces. At over an eighth of his property this is indeed generous, and so Apuleius initially (76)

suppresses the amount, alleging instead that it was money borrowed on the expectation of Pudentilla's death.

How does the outsider Apuleius compare? Apuleius first defends his financial standing by the claim that he and his brother were left 2 million sesterces by their father, but that he had reduced his share by studies, travel and acts of generosity (*Apol.* 23). Then his social standing: he is not some half-Numidian, half-Gaetolian native, but the son of a Duumvir or joint mayor of the colony of Madaura (*Apol.* 24), who has himself served as a member of the Curia. However the speed with which Apuleius returns to attack Pudentilla's brother-in-law, the landholding Aemilianus, strongly suggests that unlike these settled landowners Apuleius has reduced his million sesterces considerably and can point to no property held in his own name. He does not, and presumably cannot, cite the sources of his present income. However fluent his public lectures, he may well have looked like a fortune hunter once he addressed himself to Pudentilla.

Pudentilla deserves our sympathy on other counts. The prosecution had challenged Apuleius to explain (*Apol.* 67) why this free woman married him after fourteen years of widowhood and why, being a much older woman, she accepted a young man? We know his answer to the first question. Next he considers her age and widowhood. The accusers have said she was sixty—most unlikely, given the age of her children. Appealing to public and private records (*Apol.* 89) Apuleius argues that she is 'in *not much more* than her fortieth year of life' (emphasis added).¹⁹ This seems to be confirmed by the clause in the marriage contract that allowed for redistribution of her dowry to any child she might have by him.²⁰ Up to what age would we accept that diagnosis or this expectation? Hardly more than forty-five, I suspect. In fact Apuleius has already suggested Pudentilla's relative youth by his tales of the physical illness induced by sexual abstinence (*Apol.* 69) that drove her to announce her intention of remarriage.

Whatever his original hopes, in court Apuleius is able to show documentation that he has accepted as dowry a mere 300,000 sesterces and ensured that this will pass on to Pudentilla's sons. At his urging she has also made them immediate gifts of substantial parts of her estate and 400 slaves from her slaveholdings (*Apol.* 93). But he precedes this financial accounting by a prejudicial account of his generosity in considering marriage to a widow with such a modest dowry.

Here we meet the standard negative arguments against marriage to older women, whether widowed or divorced. Such wives lack the

chief dowry, that of virginity; they are difficult to control (*minime docilis*) and contemptuous of their new household. If they are widowed they should be suspect for not having kept their husband alive; if divorced they lose both ways: either the woman was so unbearable that she was divorced, or so arrogant that she initiated the divorce. That these prejudices were generally held has recently been argued by Peter Walcot.²¹ To stress these notions rather than Pudentilla's many virtues of character (briefly mentioned along with her *mediocris facies* at *Apol.* 73) is certainly more in his interest than hers.

Pudentilla cannot, of course, be her own witness. For all her wealth and her capacity, as we hear it, to keep the accounts and run the affairs of her stock farms, she still has to have a tutor, Cassius Longinus, for legal purposes, and has used Apuleius himself as her advocate in a lawsuit against the Granii at Leptis.²² Can we hope that at least she did not hear how she was treated in the case? According to Apuleius, one of his enemies' main charges was a letter written by Pudentilla *in Greek* to her son Pontianus begging him to come and save her while she was still in her senses because Apuleius was a magician and had bewitched her. Such claims if false could hardly have been made in her presence.

To us the correspondence cited in court carries additional interest for its evidence of levels of bilingualism and for the variety of languages in use in Roman North Africa.²³ Admittedly the Hellenism of Roman Africa may have been exaggerated in the past simply on the basis of Apuleius' extraordinary education, or Pontianus' library. But both Pudentilla's letter to her son and the letter she allegedly received from Apuleius are in Greek, whereas Aemilianus' letter to Pontianus (*Apol.* 70) is in Latin. Apuleius derides the Latin-speaking Aemilianus as a rustic, and insults the younger son, Sicinius Pudens, claiming he barely speaks even Latin, 'only Punic and whatever bits of Greek he can still remember from his mother's teaching'.²⁴ Pudentilla's literacy and bilingualism alike confirm her elite standing.

THE WIDOW'S CHOICE

We return now to Pudentilla's letter, and her real attitude to the man we know her to have married. Was she infatuated or did she know what she was doing when she accepted the hand of Apuleius in marriage, and, if she freely chose him, why did she do so? By quoting at length from Pudentilla's letter Apuleius is able to show that the very words cited to demonstrate her admission of folly and witchcraft

are in fact an allegation of her enemies that she is repudiating: this is his supplemented if not emended text:

Pontianus, when I wanted to marry for the reasons I mentioned, you yourself urged me to take this man before all others, out of your admiration for him and eagerness to bind him to you through the link with me. But now *as our illnatured accusers want to persuade you*, Apuleius has suddenly become a wizard and I am bewitched by him and in love. Come then to me while I am still sane. I tell you that I am neither bewitched nor in love. But fate...etc.

(*Apol.* 82, 3–4; emphasis added)

Were these her own words? It is not beyond our very clever advocate to have concocted this version of Pudentilla's letter, with or without her cooperation, to invalidate the document displayed by his enemies.²⁵ The handwriting would not be questioned, since well-born men and women like Pudentilla used slave secretaries to write letters they dictated.²⁶ But this was hardly a letter to entrust to a scribe; thus let us assume the letter, or the sentiments it attributes to Pudentilla, are genuine.

What Apuleius has given us is a picture of a very self-possessed and shrewd woman—as she must have been to protect herself from all the men attracted by her fortune. Like other elite women of North Africa, whether Vibia Perpetua or the Empress Julia Domna or Monica the mother of Augustine, the Pudentilla we meet in the text shows both strength of character and independence of judgement.²⁷ She was certainly in her right mind. She may well have taken Apuleius with her eyes fully open to his self-interest, but aware too of his attractions of youth, wit and person, and the fact that her outsider husband would remain dependent upon her in ways that she could not have expected from a local magnate. It is often wiser for a pre-eminent woman to take an outsider as her consort, and social history from comparable societies such as medieval England and Europe affords parallels for this situation of 'the widow's choice'.²⁸

Let me quote from a sample of treatments and circumstances. In the chapter 'The Widow and Her Lands' of *The English Noblewoman*, Ward describes the inconvenience to families when rich widows continued to outlive their husbands in the enjoyment not only of their own estate but of the lands and property in their dower and jointure: it was presumably in part for their protection that noble widows had to have royal permission to remarry, but protection

from whom? Ward notes that they were put under pressure to remarry 'from families, friends, prospective husbands and the Crown'.²⁹ In fact their freedom of choice over a second husband was the subject of more than one clause of the Magna Carta.³⁰

In most respects the position and estates of these ladies might be compared to Pudentilla's. Ward concludes that although many of these noble widows remarried, older ones might remain unmarried because they enjoyed the independence which widowhood gave to them: 'although they were not completely free of outside pressures ...they had more say in making decisions affecting their own lives, households and estates than they had as wives' (Ward 1992:48).

Archer, more concerned with the damage that widows could do by their extravagance to the rights of succession of their husband's families, opens her paper, 'Rich Old Ladies', with an excerpt from a satirical report by an Italian visitor to the court of Henry VII:

no Englishman can...find fault with his mother for marrying again during his childhood, because from very ancient custom this license has become so sanctioned that *it is not considered any discredit to marry again every time that she is left a widow, however unsuitable the match may be as to age, rank and fortune*, (emphasis added).³¹

Matters may have changed by the fifteenth century and morality would probably be freer in court circles, but what widow would not take the opportunity, if she might, of marrying for her own pleasure the sort of 'unsuitable' younger man of whom her in-laws would disapprove, if not a former household servant, at least a man whose lower social standing would make him subservient to her?³² Since Apuleius clearly had a good opinion of himself, Pudentilla may have married him more for his youthful appeal than out of any expectation of controlling him; but he probably needed her financial support.

Let me bring in the last factor; the effect of a mother's remarriage on the interest of young children, especially sons. We have seen that the Italian diplomat thought in terms of a son's approval or disapproval of his mother's behaviour, and Ward (1992:43) notes that the King of England might on occasions authorize a mother to serve as guardian of her sons. Hanawalt speaks in terms of 'children whose property a new husband might hope to manage until the child reached the age of twenty-one'.³³ A whole chapter of Humbert's *Le remariage à Rome* deals with the separation of the wife's property from that of her next husband in the interest of her children by the

first marriage.³⁴ Such fears explain both the interference of Pudentilla's father-in-law with her free choice of a second marriage, and the age at which Pontianus began to encourage his mother to remarry.

A good parallel for Pudentilla from a more urban culture is the fifteenth-century Alessandra Macinghi Strozzi, the widow of a wealthy Florentine banker with three young sons.³⁵ The evidence of her letters suggests many ways in which she resembles our portrait of Pudentilla. These start when she is forty, and has been a widow some years. She is from a wealthy family, and has married into one, and she is a good businesswoman trained in reading, writing and accounting. Like Pudentilla, Strozzi had to manage her own lands and 'was involved in legal contracts for which she needed a male facilitator, but this could be a formality'.³⁶ Demographically the pattern of Florentine widowhood resembled the Roman one, in that women were on average married to men twelve years older than themselves, but differed in the likelihood of remarriage.³⁷ Strozzi lived at different times with many households of her husband's family, but she also lived some years as head of her own household and as she remained a widow, acted as guardian of her sons in their minority.

Later Alessandra Strozzi's sons went away on business, as Pontianus did to Rome and Carthage for his education. But whereas Alessandra's letters show that she looked forward to returning to live with her sons once they should marry, Pudentilla chose the other path, and now felt free to find herself a marriage. If Pontianus really did introduce his old friend Apuleius to his mother with this intention, he may have wished to keep her from joining his own new marital household, but he must also have felt no fear that he would lose financially from her remarriage. His new wife and father-in-law thought otherwise, and so, we are to believe, Pudentilla was once again subject to the interference of *adfines*, but now it was her son's *adfines* who saw her and her marriage as obstacles to their own enrichment.

Although Apuleius' portrait of Pudentilla's circumstances cannot be entirely trusted, it must have been plausible enough to convince the local community. Even as he emphasizes his own merits and generosity in settling to marry an older and relatively plain woman, we can see through his pleading why Pudentilla in turn may have seen through her fine young husband, and still expect a more free and pleasant life in his company. One is reminded of the young, dashing and ambitious Disraeli and his wealthy widow Mary Ann.³⁸

And one can only hope Pudentilla lived as comfortably with her famous and self-confident Lucius as Mary Ann with her Disraeli.

NOTES

- 1 On the civilization of Roman North Africa in the first two centuries of our era consult P.Garnsey 'Rome's African Empire under the Principate', in P.Garnsey and C.R.Whittaker (eds.) *Imperialism in the Ancient World*, Cambridge 1978:223–254; Susan Raven, *Rome in Africa*, rev edn, London 1993; and the introduction of A.R.Birley, *Septimius Severus: The African Emperor*, London 1975, which also has a chapter specifically on the trial of Apuleius.
- 2 See M.-T.Rapsaet-Charlier, *Prosopographie des femmes de l'ordre senatorial (I^{er}–II^e s.)*, Louvain 1987, reviewed by R.J.A.Talbert in *American Journal of Philology* 111, 1990:123–127.
- 3 For example, *CIL* VIII, 579, the tomb of Fortunata, Priestess of the Cereres (Ceres Goddesses), 11306 Numisa, priestess of the Cereres, 1623 an altar dedicated by Valeria Saturnina, the senior priestess and lifetime priestess of the Cereres: or 591, a *cippus* from Hr Djenim with a relief of a woman sacrificing: the inscription shows that it was erected 'To Helvia Severa, most chaste priestess: she lived 85 years with wise judgement; she reached a deserved old age and an exemplary death. *Here is honour for piety; gratitude persists for the past service?*' The final phrases, both drawn from the African books of the *Aeneid* (1.253, 4.539) reflect local education.
- 4 Compare the funeral inscriptions of *CIL* VIII, 211–213 and two honorific inscriptions on bases of statues erected to benefactresses: VIII, 1495 and VIII, 12317 cited and discussed on p. 221.
- 5 All inscriptions cited are my own translation from *CIL* VIII, North Africa.
- 6 *CIL* VIII, 216 gives his career in the usual reverse order as 'T.Flavius Receptus of the tribe Papiria, ex-Aedile, secretary of the treasury and councillor of the colony of Thelepte.'
- 7 *CIL* VIII, 1495: *Asiciae Victoriae/C Thuggenses ob munificentiam et singularem liberalitatem eius/in rem p. quae ob flamonium/ulbiae Asicianes fil. suae HS C/mil. N pollicita est quorum red/itu ludi scaenici et sportulae/decurionibus darentur d.d./utriusque ordinis posuerunt.*
- 8 See J.Nicols, 'Patrona Civitatis: Gender and Civic Patronage', in *Studies in Latin Literature and History Presented to Charles Deroux*, vol. 5, Brussels 1983:117–142.
- 9 Besides books advocating male chastity and commending monogamy, Tertullian wrote two books 'To His Wife', two on women's dress, one on the veiling of virgins, and an influential book on female chastity (*De Pudicitia*).
- 10 See now Brent Shaw, 'The Passion of Perpetua', *Past and Present* 139, 1993:3–45.
- 11 A good, if brief, socio-economic assessment is offered by Pavis d'Escurac 1974.
- 12 On the position of propertied widows in general see Treggiari 1991b:

- 500–503. Clark 1993:59 (following I.Thomas, ‘La division des sexes en droit Romain’, in C.Duby and M.Perrot (eds), *Histoire des femmes en Occident*, Paris 1990) points to widows (and divorcees) left in control of their children from the late Republic but dates their effective control of the property which their children would inherit ‘from the late second century [AD]’. But if Pudentilla had effective control of her own dowry and estate, it is not so clear that she would have controlled that of her husband so long as his father lived.
- 13 In the book of Ruth, Ruth, the Moabite widow of Naomi’s son insists on following her mother-in-law to Judah, although Naomi declares *she has no other sons to marry Ruth* and is too old to conceive new ones. Later Naomi’s kinsman Boaz tells Ruth that if a nearer (and younger) kinsman of her late husband is not willing to take responsibility for her, he will do so. When the young kinsman declines on grounds of poverty, Boaz publicly declares that he has made Ruth his wife; Like *epikleros-marriages* in Greece, these marriages may have imposed a duty to protect poor single women but offered a privilege where there was wealth.
 - 14 As alleged in *Apologia* 97: the dead Pontianus’ father-in-law Rufinus pressured his younger brother to marry Pontianus’ widow ‘thrusting into the face and bed of the poor boy a woman quite a bit older and his brother’s widow’.
 - 15 On Pudentilla’s delayed remarriage see Treggiari 1991b: 499 and n. 116; on the remarriage of widows/widowers at Rome in general, see Humbert 1972; and Treggiari 1991b: ch. 14, esp. 499–502.
 - 16 *Apol.* 88, on which see Treggiari 1991a: 166, 169–170.
 - 17 Cf. J.Guey ‘L’apologie d’Apulée et les inscriptions romaines de Tripolitanie’, *Revue des études Latines* 32, 1954:115–120.
 - 18 On the Dominus Julius mosaic see K.Dunbabin, *Roman Mosaics from Tunisia*, Oxford 1983:119–120, pl. 109; A.Merlin, ‘Le mosaïque du Seigneur Julius’, *Bulletin archéologique* 1921, 95–114; W.Raeck, ‘*Publica non despiciens*: Ergänzungen zur Interpretation des Dominus Julius Mosaik aus Karthago’, *Römische Mitteilungen* 94, 1987:295f.
 - 19 The vague *hand multo amplius* is surely suspicious. How many years have been subtracted?
 - 20 *Apol.* 91; cf. Treggiari 1991a: 393, citing parallel evidence from *Digest* 32, 37, 4 and 31, 67, 10.
 - 21 Walcot 1991. Compare also Bremmer 1994.
 - 22 *Apol.* 87 (accounts), 101 (Cassius Longinus), and 1 (suit against Granii).
 - 23 See F.Millar, ‘Local Cultures in the Roman Empire: Libyan, Punic and Latin in Roman Africa’, *Journal of Roman Studies* 58, 1968:126–134.
 - 24 *Loquitur numquam nisi punice et si quid adhuc a matre graecissat: enim Latine neque vult neque potest* (*Apol.* 98, cited by Millar, ‘Local Cultures’: 130).
 - 25 Can we really believe either that Rufinus carried round only a copy of these words, or showed only these few phrases of the letter on the writing tablets he was carrying round? This is the claim of *Apol.* 82.
 - 26 Compare the surviving letter dictated by the Roman officer’s wife Sulpicia Lepidina described in A.Bowman and J.D.Thomas, ‘New Texts from Vindolanda’, *Britannia* 18, 1987:125–142.
 - 27 Cf. Treggiari 1991b: 136.

- 28 Compare B.Hanawalt, 'The Window's Mite', and A.Moston Crabb, 'How Typical was Alessandro Macinghi Strozzi' in *Mirror* 1992; Archer, 'Rich Old Ladies', in Pollard 1984; and Ward 1992.
- 29 Ward 1992:42. Compare Hanawalt, 'The Widow's Mite': 35–36.
- 30 J.Loengard 'English Dower in the Year 1200', in Kirschner and Wemple 1985:235–236 cites Magna Carta 7: 'a widow after the death of her husband shall at once and without difficulty have her marriage portion and inheritance, nor shall she give anything for her dower, nor for her marriage portion nor for her inheritance'. Chapter 8 provided that a widow should not be compelled to remarry so long as she preferred to remain without a husband, but give security not to marry without the consent of the king if she was a widow of a tenant-in-chief or of her immediate lord otherwise.
- 31 Archer, 'Rich Old Ladies', citing *A Relation or Rather a True Account of the Island of England*, ed. C.A.Sneyd, Camden Society XXVII, London, 1847:26–27.
- 32 Cf. Archer, 'Rich Old Ladies': 27–28, citing Joan of Acre, Elizabeth Fitzalan and others.
- 33 In *Mirror* 1992:36.
- 34 Humbert 1972:197f. Neglect of children in a mother's will is a standard ground for the *querela inofficiosi testamenti*.
- 35 See Crabb 'How typical': 47–68.
- 36 Crabb, 'How Typical': 51.
- 37 Crabb, 'How Typical': 49 notes that 'two thirds of women widowed in their twenties [like Pudentilla?] never remarried, and nine tenths of those widowed at thirty or older,...good mothers were discouraged from remarrying for their children's sake'.
- 38 Our rosy picture of Disraeli's marriage (cf. A.Maurois, *Disraeli*, Paris 1927:125–138; R.Blake, *Disraeli*, London and New York 1967:150–161) stems from the words of Mary Ann Disraeli herself: although he had money troubles which he tried to conceal from her, Disraeli did not disappoint Mary Ann, and was essentially a kind and considerate husband.