

Trimalchio's World

Gregory Rowe

Giuseppe Camodeca, *Tabulae Pompeianae Sulpiciorum (TPSulp)*. Edizione critica dell'archivio Puteolano dei Sulpicii, *Vetera* 12. 2 vols. Rome: Quasar, 1999. 685 pp. + figures + folding map (the second volume is a collection of photographs and apographs). ISBN 88 7140 145 X.

The Murecine archive (*TPSulp*) reveals the world of Julio-Claudian freedmen.¹ It shows their language, their place in society, their economic role, and their relations with the Roman state and its legal system. Camodeca has edited these private financial and legal documents impeccably. This review will therefore focus on surveying the scholarship that *TPSulp* and kindred sources have stimulated and sketching what remains to be done.

TPSulp is one of three collections of wooden tablets from pre-Vesuvian Campania. The work under review contains:

— *TPSulp* (1-127). The archive of the Sulpicii. Found in the Agro Murecine outside Pompeii (though the tablets concern affairs in Puteoli). A.D. 26-61, esp. A.D. 35-55. In 1992 Camodeca published half the archive with full commentary.² Now in the present volumes he publishes the entire archive with an introduction treating the tablets' discovery and publication and the identity of the Sulpicii, 15 indexes and concordances, photographs and drawings of all documents, and a fold-out map of ancient Puteoli. He promises a third volume with further commentary, addenda, and corrigenda; until this appears, readers should consult his 1992 publication for additional commentary and bibliography.

TPSulp also has two sister collections, *TPomp* and *TH*, which are not in the volumes under review.

¹ The preparation of this review article was underwritten by the Swiss National Science Fund under the supervision of Jean-Jacques Aubert. Jean Andraeu, Marguerite Hirt Raj, and Fergus Millar commented on drafts. My thanks to all.

² Camodeca 1992.

— *TPomp* 1-153. The archive of L. Caecilius Iucundus. Pompeii. A.D. 15-62, esp. A.D. 52-62. *TPomp* 154-5. The archive of Poppaea Note. Pompeii. A.D. 79. *TPomp* was definitively published by Zangemeister (*CIL* 4, 3340).³

— *TH*. Some 150 documents from seven different archives; the three principal archives belonged to L. Cominius Primus, L. Venidius Ennychus, and Calatoria Themis. Herculaneum. ca. A.D. 55-75. From 1946 to 1961 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz published documents from the three principal archives in what had seemed to be tolerable editions, but Camodeca, in a series of articles, has begun reediting the entire corpus, with dramatic results. A list of published documents is given in the Appendix below.⁴

But the closest relative of *TPSulp* is literary. The Murecine archive documents the same Julio-Claudian Puteoli as Petronius' *Satyricon*; the archive's protagonist, C. Sulpicius Cinna, is a real-life Trimalchio. The publication of the archive should now awaken interest in the pronounced social, economic, and legal themes of the novel (both in the *Cena Trimalchionis* and elsewhere).⁵

Scholars in different domains have been studying the Campanian archives for some time already. In economic history, Andreau used the archive of Iucundus (*TPomp* 1-153) for his work on Roman finance and Jongman used it for his inquiry into how the ancient city fed itself. In legal history, Arangio-Ruiz sorted out the problems arising from *TH*, Wolf has been sorting out the problems arising from *TPSulp*, and Metzger and others have been combining the evidence from *TPSulp* and the *Lex Irnitana* to revise the picture of Roman civil procedure.⁶ Several scholars (all with ties to the University of Cambridge) have cited the archives in works for broader audiences. In legal history, Crook employed all the documents then available in his *Law and Life of Rome* (still the Roman historian's favorite book of Roman law),

³ A representative selection of 20 documents from the archive of Iucundus is given in *FIRA* 3, 128-30; the two documents from the archive of Poppaea Note are given in *FIRA* 3, 91.

⁴ Four documents from Herculaneum were included in the Appendix to the second edition of *FIRA* 3 (1969) as 5bis (*TH* 5, 89), 20bis (*TH* 87), and 25bis (*TH* 88). Note also *FIRA* 3, 134, a tablet from a triptych recording the sale of a female slave from second-century A.D. Ravenna.

⁵ For the most serious historical consideration of Petronius see Bodet 1984.

⁶ Arangio-Ruiz 1974; Wolf 1979a (non vidi), 1979b, 1982, 1985a, 1985b, 1993, and Crook and Wolf 1989; Metzger 1997, 1998a, 1998b, and the works cited by Camodeca (pp. 53 and 100).

and, in a similar volume, Johnston now uses *TPSulp* to explain commercial law.⁷ In economic history, Andreau takes a characteristically circumspect look at *TPSulp* in his new book on banking.⁸ In social history, Wallace-Hadrill turned to *TH* to people the buildings he studied in *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum*.⁹ But it is Camodeca who is bringing the study of the Campanian archives to maturity, both through his matchless editions of the texts and through his contributions to diplomatics, prosopography, and social, economic, and legal history.

The documents are wooden tablets, waxed on one side, engraved or inked on both sides, bound together in diptychs or triptychs, and sealed with wax and witnesses' names (witnesses to what — transaction, drafting, or sealing?). Some (chirographs) are phrased in the first person and sealed by three or more persons of any status and twice by their authors. Others (*testationes*) are phrased in the third person and sealed by seven or more Roman citizens. Camodeca has noted that the diptychs disappear in the early A.D. 60s, and he has proposed backdating the Neronian SC ordaining a new closure-system to the first half of 61 (unnecessarily?), with compliance becoming universal only by 63/4.¹⁰ He also observes, interestingly, that Herculaneum lagged behind the bigger cities both in abandoning diptychs and in adopting the new closure-system.

The sealed documents thus carry two copies of the text, an inner version and an outer version, and this distinction can be useful philologically. In the sub-archive of C. Novius Eunus (*TPSulp* 45, 51-2, 67-8), for example, the inner texts were written by Eunus himself. Together, these 88 lines constitute 'probably the earliest extended piece of subliterate Latin from a single hand extant' and an invaluable source for the spelling, pronunciation ('per Iobe optumm maxumu', *TPSulp* 68), morphology, and syntax of vulgar Latin.¹¹ The outer texts were written by scribes. As Flobert shrewdly notes, 'Le copiste ... applique strictement le code du bon usage; cela prouve au moins qu'il existait'.¹² Other areas of philological interest remain to be explored, for instance the documents' legal style.¹³

⁷ Crook 1967; Johnston 1999.

⁸ Andreau 1999.

⁹ Wallace-Hadrill 1994.

¹⁰ For full discussion of diplomatics see Camodeca 1995.

¹¹ Adams 1990, 247.

¹² Flobert 1995, 144.

¹³ For a good beginning see Wolf 1993, 80-1, on synonymous terms in *TPSulp* 48 ('rogasse ... mandasse'; 'iussu, rogatu, mandatuve').

The Campanian archives are also important for chronology and topography. Documents are dated by the Roman consuls — not by the *ordinarii* who took office on 1 January, but by the *suffecti* rotating through office the rest of the year — which has enabled Camodeca to correct or supplement the consular *fasti* from Tiberius to Nero in a dozen places.¹⁴ This dating system, whereby Campanians, like others further away, followed the turnover of *suffecti*, typifies the intimate communications with the capital found in the archives. Among the documents are several *vadimonia*, commitments with bail to appear at a stated hour, place, and date before proceeding to the tribunal of a magistrate (local duovir or Roman praetor) that defendants offered to plaintiffs summoning them to court. The *vadimonia* to Rome all foresee meeting-places in the Forum Augustum, incidentally bringing to light several monuments (statues of Diana Lucifera, the father of Gracchi, and Cn. Sentius Saturninus [cos. A.D. 41]).¹⁵ A document recently reedited by Camodeca cites the edict of the urban praetor ‘posted at Rome in the Forum Augustum under the Porticus Iulia’, giving a name to the NW portico that housed statues of the *gens Iulia* (*TH* 89, translated below). What these documents all reflect is that, undoubtedly under Augustus, the tribunals of the urban praetor and the peregrine praetor had moved from their historic place in the Forum Romanum to the new Forum Augustum. Hitherto virtually unattested as a site of human activity, the Forum Augustum now appears to have been filled daily with magistrates, judges, and litigants and advocates from all Italy. At the same time, the local *vadimonia* show that monuments to the first emperor similarly encumbered the forum of Puteoli, which contained both Hordionian and Suetian Altars of Augustus. Yet several topographical questions remain. Was the unclassifiable building in the Agro Murecine where *TPSulp* was found an inn, a villa, a *schola*, or something else? What were documents from Puteoli doing near Pompeii? Was the urban house where *TPomp* was found the banker Iucundus’ storefront, or would Iucundus have conducted his business in the forum? To what does ‘domo’ in accounts from Herculaneum and Puteoli refer?

The archives also illustrate some of the fundamental themes of social history, such as social mobility, social relations, the family, and the history of women. In *TH*, the Junian Latin Venidius Ennychus seeks first Roman citizenship, then membership in the Augustales,¹⁶ and succeeds on both counts, as can be seen from his performance of *sponsiones*, the solemn

¹⁴ Camodeca 1991. W. Eck plans to produce a new edition of the consular *fasti* to replace Degrassi 1952.

¹⁵ Carnabuci 1996.

¹⁶ Arangio-Ruiz 1959a; cf. Camodeca 1996, 1999c.

promises restricted to Roman citizens, and from the inclusion of his name among the local Augustales (*CIL* 10, 1403; *AE* 1978, 119). In *TPSulp*, two documents state that one of the archive's protagonists, C. Sulpicius Faustus, was patron of the other, C. Sulpicius Cinnamus (*TPSulp* 72, 74). Without these documents, their relationship could not have been guessed. Indeed, another document has Cinnamus as principal in a contract and Faustus as one of his agents, along with several slaves — which might reasonably have suggested that Cinnamus was Faustus' superior (*TPSulp* 48, translated below). In *TH*, the household of Calatoria Themis must count as the best-known non-imperial Roman family. One member, Petronia Iusta, seeks to establish that she was freeborn.¹⁷ Witnesses for and against her come forth, two of them testifying that they 'heard Petronius Stephanus, the husband of (Calatoria) Themis, say to Petronia Vitalis (Iusta's mother), "Why are you angry with us about the girl when we treat her as a daughter?"' (*TH* 19-20). In *TPSulp*, women, though formally under *tutela*, participate fully in business. But women never draw up chirographs, perhaps not because they were illiterate or legally incapable, but because, needing authority to form contracts, they chose to leave the paperwork to men (patrons, tutors, slaves).¹⁸

The principal economic activity attested in the archives is moneylending. In *TPomp*, Lucundus advances money to the buyers of goods at auction.¹⁹ In *TPSulp*, the Sulpicii lend money through different instruments, through receipts for loans (*mutua*) with the words *scripsi me accepisse et debere (mutua)*,²⁰ and through a group of third-person documents that have the following form:²¹

¹⁷ Arangio-Ruiz 1948, 1951, 1959b.

¹⁸ So Gardner 1999, one of the most rewarding historical studies of the archives.

¹⁹ *TPomp* 1-137. Though the Sulpicii redeemed securities through auctions, they do not seem to have conducted auctions themselves, and were therefore not 'bankers' (*coactores argentarii*) in the strict sense; cf. Andreau 1999, 76-7; for the opposite view see Camodeca's commentary on *TPSulp* 82. Bruce Frier also points out to me that, in suing for a sum of money (*TPSulp* 31), Cinnamus uses the traditional formula for a specific sum owed, not the special formula for *argentarii* (*FIRA* 1, 65 §50).

²⁰ *TPSulp* 50-9. In order to emphasize the simplicity of the formulas used in the documents, I have refrained from using the technical names assigned by ancient and modern jurists (*apochae, nomina arcaria*, etc.), and instead reproduced the wording of the documents themselves.

²¹ *TPSulp* 60; cf. *TPSulp* 61-5; *TH* 1, 67-75.

Accounts of Titinia Antracis.

Paid out to Euplia the Melian, daughter of Theodorus, HS 1,600, with the authority of her tutor, Epichares the Athenian, son of Aphrodisius.

She requested and received in cash from the chest at home.

Received for the chest HS 1,600.

Here, Camodeca envisages a loan between two parties without the intervention of a banker, while Gröschler proposes a transaction through an unnamed banker, represented by the chests.²²

The loans are guaranteed by securities. Oddly, Andreau has cited *TPSulp* to demonstrate the predominance of real security, and Crook has cited the archive to demonstrate the predominance of personal security.²³ In fact, both real and personal securities are well represented.²⁴ More remarkable are two documents in which loans are guaranteed by the borrower's oath to repay (*TPSulp* 63, 68). Repayment could be full or partial. In the former case, creditors wrote out receipts with the words *scripsi me accepisse / habere / percipere* (*TPSulp* 70-77, *TH* 8, 39-43, 90). In the latter, borrowers acknowledged their outstanding debts with the words *scripsi me debere* (*TPSulp* 66-9). If the borrower defaulted, the creditor seized the securities and sold them at auction.²⁵ *TPSulp* contains a number of documents relating to auctions (*TPSulp* 81-93), as well as a pact for the creditor to return any surplus to the borrower (*TPSulp* 79) and an example of this being done (*TPSulp* 77).

A standard model holds that the Roman economy was agricultural and that Roman society was divided into rentiers and subsistence-farming dependents. When dependents made good, the model holds, they inevitably invested their capital in land and were absorbed into the superior social orders.²⁶ This model is contradicted by the archives on every point. In the archives, one glimpses imperial, senatorial, and decurial landholders and dependents of all conditions.²⁷ But the archives' protagonists do not fit the

²² Gröschler 1997; cf. Mrozek 2000. For difficulties with Gröschler's thesis see Camodeca (pp. 151-2).

²³ Andreau 1994, 48; Crook 1996, 35.

²⁴ Real security: *TPSulp* 45-6, 55, 79-85, 87-90; personal security: *TPSulp* 48, 54, 57, 60-2, 64, 78, 99, 100; both: *TPSulp* 51-2, 79.

²⁵ Are the slaves sold in *TPSulp* 42-4 also securities?

²⁶ Cf. e.g. Veyne 1960.

²⁷ There are three indicators of social status: explicit statements ('Hesycho Ti. Iuli Augusti l(iberti) Eueni ser(vo)', *TPSulp* 45), onomastics (esp. Greek *cognomina*), and the witness-lists, where persons are ranked by social status. The last principle was discovered by Andreau 1974, 170-6, and confirmed by

two-tier model; they form a *Mittelschicht* (Abramenko), a middle layer.²⁸ Though freedmen, the Sulpicii and their clients do not seem to have been business agents of absent patrons; they appear to be independent businessmen.²⁹ The Sulpicii are financiers, and their clients are traders handling the tribute grain from Egypt.³⁰ Some of the loans that the Sulpicii made to their clients were probably commercial, as Andreau holds, though there is no positive proof.³¹ What is clear is that the Sulpicii are not rentiers. Hardly a speck of land appears in *TPSulp*.³² Land does appear, however, in *TH*, notably in the archive of Cominius Primus. The reason is simple. Freedmen who made good *chose* whether or not to invest their capital in land, and the Sulpicii chose not to do so.³³ Over the years covered by *TPSulp*, initiative passes first from Faustus to his freedman Cinnamus and then to Faustus' son or brother Onirus, but the Sulpicii remain moneylenders throughout (pp. 22-5). Though their numbers seem to have been growing in proportion to the rest of society, the specificity of the antique world is that such men would never compete with the rentiers for wealth and political power.³⁴ Though they constituted a bourgeoisie, they were never the dominant class.

Camodeca 1993; cf. Mouritsen 1990. The theoretical corollary is arresting: when any two members of Roman society met, they should have been able to discover their respective rank, one above the other.

²⁸ Abramenko 1993; cf. Gradel 1994.

²⁹ Pace Andreau (1994, 47-8), who cites *TPSulp* 45, 47-8, 51-2, 67-9, and 73 as evidence for imperial and senatorial families placing funds with local bankers through their freedmen, none of the documents says that the freedmen or their slaves are acting on behalf of upper-class patrons. On independent freedmen see e.g. Garnsey 1981; D'Arms 1981, 121-48.

³⁰ That is, the traders were working for the publicans, which helps to bear out Polybius' seeming exaggeration (6, 17, 3), that nearly everyone had an interest in public contracts and the profits from them.

³¹ Andreau 1994, 46; cf. Camodeca (pp. 25-6), emphasizing that commercial loans were probably the minority.

³² *TPSulp* 88 relates to the auction of at least three estates (*fundi*).

³³ Using statistical arguments (persons named in the archives compared with estimates of the total populations of the towns), Camodeca 1993b argues that while *TH* accurately reflects the society of Herculaneum, *TPomp* and *TPSulp* over-represent the merchants and financiers of Pompeii and Puteoli. But it may be that social and economic life differed there.

³⁴ For sons of freedmen as decurions, and the proportionate rise in the number of freedmen this implies, see Abramenko 1993 (general pattern) and Camodeca 1996a (Puteoli).

The Campanian archives are now the best source for Roman legal practice — one might almost say the first source. Crook writes, ‘Most important of all is the evidence [TPSulp] supplies that Roman private law in the Julio-Claudian age was not just a professional mystique’.³⁵ The Campanian freedmen knew the law, and they seem to have learned it directly from edicts of the Roman magistrates.³⁶ Thus a document of sale cites a ‘formula of the edict of the curule aediles, which has been established and included this year for the purchase and sale of slaves’ (TH 60, cf. TH 62; TPSulp 42, 44). A document relating to Venidius Ennychus’ efforts to become a Roman citizen cites the edict of the urban praetor as it was posted before his tribunal at Rome:³⁷

Copied and checked from the edict of L. Servenius Gallus, praetor, which was posted at Rome in the Forum Augustum under the Porticus Iulia on the column before his tribunal in which was written that which is written below: ‘L. Servenius Gallus, praetor, says: “M. Ofillius Macro and Ti. Crassus Firmus, duovirs ...”’

The Murecine archive also provides the first documentary attestation of working judicial formulas, one for an action arising from a third-party *sponsio*, the other for an action to recover a specific sum (TPSulp 31):³⁸

This affair concerns a solemn promise. Let C. Blossius Celadus be judge. If it appears that C. Marcius Saturninus ought to give C. Sulpicius Cinnamus the

³⁵ Crook 1994, 261.

³⁶ Contrast the situation in the provinces, where copies of the album of the provincial governor were posted in each town; *Lex Irnitana* 85. For examples of such local templates see the *Lex de Gallia Cisalpina (Lex Rubria)*, RS 28, ch. 20 and the *Formula Baetica, FIRA* 3, 92; cf. P. Yadin 28-30. On the whole subject see now Eck 1999. The common notion that ordinary men necessarily consulted professional jurists (Wolf 1993, 87: ‘Der Kautelarjurist, der von den Kontrahenten zu Rate gezogen wurde’; Camodeca p. 92: ‘consigliato da qualche *iusperitus*’) is surmise.

³⁷ TH 89: following the procedure outlined in Gai. *Inst.* 1, 29, the Junian Latin fulfilling certain conditions (witnessed marriage to a Roman citizen, child surviving to first birthday) seeks the praetor’s approval to become a citizen. It is not clear why individual approval is couched in the form of an edict. The edict is presumably to be understood as an occasional one, whose contents future praetors may or may not have included in their annual edicts. For another citation of the praetor’s edict see Camodeca 1993a, 525 (unpublished document from Herculaneum); cf. TH 85, citing a ‘formula tralacticia’, and TPSulp 101, citing *leges* (public contracts?).

³⁸ Compare the model formulas from the archive of Babatha, P. Yadin 28-30.

HS 6,000 in question, then let the judge C. Blossius Celadus condemn C. Marcius Saturninus in favor of C. Sulpicius Cinnamus for the HS 6,000. If it does not appear so, let him absolve.

Let C. Blossius Celadus be judge. If it appears that C. Marcius Saturninus ought to give C. Sulpicius Cinnamus the HS 18,000 in question, let the judge C. Blossius Celadus condemn C. Marcius Saturninus in favor of C. Sulpicius Cinnamus for the HS 18,000. If it does not appear so, let him absolve.

A. Cossinius Priscus, duovir, ordered the judgement. Transacted at Puteoli in the consulship of Faustus Cornelius Sulla Felix and Q. Marcius Barea Soranus (June-Oct. A.D. 52).

Crook is right that these documents generally vindicate ancient and modern jurisprudence; but the archives also contain some surprises.

In substantive law, some features of the archives are notably primitive: the oaths serving as guarantees (*TPSulp* 63, 68), or loans (*mutua*) reinforced by formal stipulations (*TPSulp* 50-9), when the transaction itself was theoretically enough to give the creditor a legal claim against the borrower. Other features of substantive law in the archives are wholly unexpected: a ship-captain's assumption of liability for goods he transports (*TPSulp* 78), or an agreement between client and banker (*TPSulp* 48). In this agreement, the client, C. Iulius Prudens, assumes liability for all transactions between his staff and the staff of the banker, Cinnamus. The agreement has two parts. The first part establishes that transactions between all parties are to be treated as personal between Prudens and Cinnamus. The second part is a stipulation in which Prudens agrees to repay the resulting loans:

Under the consuls ... Vitellius and L. Vipstanus Poplicola on the day before the Nones (Jan.-June? 48) ... I, C. Iulius Prudens, have written that I have asked and commissioned C. Sulpicius Cinnamus (to pay as much) as he or his slaves Eros or ... us or Titianus or Martial or C. Sulpicius Faustus or anyone else under the order, request, or commission of any of them, has paid, lent, promised on their behalf, solemnly promised, stood surety for, or for any other reason is obliged, once or many times, to my freedman Suavis or my slave Hyginus or anyone else under their order.

Whatever the sum that will thus have been given or entrusted or whatever the sum for which an obligation, for any reason as provided for above, shall have been formed, that so great a sum be paid; and that fraud is and will have been absent from this matter and this promise on the part of me, my heir, and all those who pertain to the matter in question; and in the amount that fraud is not absent and will not have been absent, however much it will have been, that so great an amount be paid; that these things thus duly be paid and done, C. Sulpicius Cinnamus stipulated and C. Iulius Prudens solemnly promised. (seal) Transacted at Puteoli.

Wolf has declared that the first part of the agreement had no legal force.³⁹ He interprets the first part as a *mandatum*, or commission — not a *mandatum* to lend (a known type), but a *mandatum* to arrange payments after the individual loans (a novelty). Such a *mandatum*, Wolf argues, would be superseded by the individual loans, and would be superfluous in transactions involving slaves, who were already under mandate to their masters. Yet surely it is not for us, with our derivative and imperfect knowledge of Roman law, to declare that an actual document of practice is flawed. We should be wary of dismissing the unfamiliar, of adjusting the reality to suit the theory. Besides, as Wolf himself shows, the purpose of the agreement is clear, and the stipulation is valid, which should have sufficed to make the agreement enforceable. Such agreements were probably common — a matter of opening a business account; *TPSulp* 49 may be another example. Carefully read, they are important new sources for Roman business organization and legal agency.

In procedural law, a striking number of disputes — including one ‘sub iudice’ (*TPSulp* 34) — go to an arbiter, who was not obliged to apply ‘the law’ (*TPSulp* 34-9, *TH* 76-83). Another dispute ends when the defendant pays the plaintiff to swear an oath that he will abandon his claim (*TPSulp* 28-9). And when disputes do come before a magistrate, the magistrate might find that the litigants have already named the *iudex* and drafted the formula (*TPSulp* 22, 31), leaving the magistrate nothing to do but to read the litigants’ determinations aloud.⁴⁰

Roman law was not a professional mystique, but was Roman law fair? Under the Roman legal system, could a socially or physically weaker plaintiff win a claim against a stronger defendant? Did Roman law mark an advance over self-help? These questions, posed by Jhering, were pessimistically answered by Kelly.⁴¹ The debate may not be advanced by the Campanian archives, where, if anything, plaintiffs seem socially superior to defendants.⁴² But the *vadimonia* do at least prove that even strong plaintiffs could not always bring defendants to court immediately, and sometimes had to settle for commitments to appear later (*TPSulp* 1-15, *TH* 6, 13-15). However, a related group of documents, declarations of appearance by plaintiffs,

³⁹ Wolf 1993, 86: ‘Es liegt auf der Hand, daß dieser Auftrag keine rechtliche Wirkung hatte’.

⁴⁰ Wolf 1979.

⁴¹ Kelly 1966.

⁴² In *TPSulp* 13-14, the plaintiff is Cinnamus and the defendant is a peregrine.

reveals an ambiguous sequel: once they had offered commitments to appear, the defendants might not show up (*TPSulp* 16-21).⁴³

Université de Neuchâtel

Appendix: Published Documents from Herculaneum

The tablets were originally published in Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz in *Parola del Passato*.⁴⁴ Camodeca is at work on a new edition of all the tablets, which he has indicated will not appear for several years. To date, he has provided new texts in a series of six articles.⁴⁵ In addition to the archives subsequently published, several other archives of tablets have been found at Herculaneum.⁴⁶ Two groups of six and 23 documents, reported found at Villa of Papyri in the eighteenth century, were never published and are now apparently lost. The archives awaiting publication are as follows: two groups, one a wooden box of triptychs, the other a cache of tablets deposited at the foot of a bed under pavement from the Casa del Larario di Legno; others from the Casa dell'alcova and the Casa dei due atri; and six triptychs from ins. IV, 17-18.

Published documents are organized by reported provenience (archive). The following information is given: Document number. Place of publication. Triptych or diptych: extant edges, pages, columns of page 4 (photograph or drawing if any). Description of contents. Place of transaction (if any). Date (if any). Additional references and notes.

Note that, though all the documents were found at Herculaneum, many record transactions elsewhere (Neapolis, Atella, 'Pompeian estate, Arrian pottery shop of Poppaea Augusta', Surrentum, Nola); for this reason no place of transaction has been supplied when not explicitly stated.

⁴³ Or is it the plaintiff who has failed to appear? In *TPSulp* 28, the plaintiff 'has a *vadimonium* with' the defendant; but in *TPSulp* 27, it is the *cognitor* of the defendant who 'has a *vadimonium* with' the *cognitor* of the plaintiff; so in *TPSulp* 18, 20-1, it remains uncertain whether it is the plaintiff who 'has a *vadimonium* with' the defendant or vice-versa; cp. Camodeca (pp. 49-50).

⁴⁴ Pugliese Carratelli 1946, 1948, 1953; Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1954, 1955, 1961. Della Corte 1951 publishes unusable texts of 18 documents.

⁴⁵ Camodeca 1993c, 1993d, 1994, 1996, 1999c, 2000.

⁴⁶ Maiuri 1956, the only overview of the Herculaneum finds available.

*Ins. V, 19-22: The Archive of L. Cominius Primus*⁴⁷

TH 2 Pugliese Carratelli 1946. Triptych: 4 left and right col., 6. Declaration (*testatus est*) by Cominius Primus that his doors have been stoned. Herculaneum. 10 July 70 or 72. Cf. Camodeca 1993a, 526.

TH 3 Pugliese Carratelli 1946. Triptych: 1, 4 right cols. Promissory note from Cominius Primus (*chirographum ex nomine facto*). Neapolis. 14 July 62.

TH 7 Pugliese Carratelli 1946. Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*chirographum*). No place. No date. Unpublished rereading shows that this is a receipt from a slave or freedman of Ulpia Plotina to Cominius Primus (Camodeca 1993c, 115).

TH 8 Pugliese Carratelli 1946. Triptych: 2, 4 right col., 5. Receipt from a slave of Ulpia Plotina to Cominius Primus. No place. 7 Nov 71. For the date see Camodeca 1993c, 115 n. 38.

TH 9 Pugliese Carratelli 1946. Triptych: 4 right col., 6. Account entry (perscriptio) concerning Cominius Primus. No place. No date.

TH 11 Pugliese Carratelli 1946; cf. Camodeca 1999. Triptych: edge of tab. III. Mention of estate and forest. No place. Date uncertain (consuls unknown).

TH 12 Pugliese Carratelli 1946. Triptych: 3. Traces of figures. No place. No date.

TH 30 Pugliese Carratelli 1948. Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*testatio*). No place. No date.

TH 31 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 1. Promissory note (*chirographum*) for an estate from Cominius Primus. No place. No date.

TH 32 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 1. Promissory note (*chirographum*) for an estate from L. Antonius Coriscus. No place. No date.

TH 33 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 1, 4 right col. Promissory note (*chirographum*) from M. Calatorius. No place. No date.

TH 34 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 1 or 6. Promissory note (*chirographum*) from Cominius Primus. Herculaneum. Due Nov. of unknown year.

TH 35 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 1, 4 right col. Promissory note (*chirographum*) from Cominius Primus. Herculaneum. 1 Oct. 68.

TH 37 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 6. Promissory note (*chirographum*) from Cominius Primus. No place. No date.

TH 39 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 1, 4 left col. Receipt from Cominius Primus to L. Catulus Sabinus for delayed payment for wine. Herculaneum. Jan. of unknown year (consuls unknown).

TH 40 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 4 left col. Receipt from T. Comicius Severus to Cominius Primus. No place. 4 Dec. 62.

TH 41 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 1, 4 left col. Receipt from Cominius Primus. Atella. August 62?

⁴⁷ TH 2, 8, and 9, described as coming from the archive of Calatoria Themis in the ed. pr., are included here.

TH 42 Camodeca 1993c. Triptych: edge of tabs. i-ii-iii, 1, 4 (photos and drawings). Recognition of debt from D. Laelius Euphrosynus to Cominius Primus. Herculaneum. 4 Nov. 67. AE 1993, 460.

TH 43 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 4 left and right cols. Receipt from slave of Ulpia Plotina to Cominius Primus. Herculaneum. Second half of June 70.

TH 46 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: edge of tab. iii. Date and place only. Herculaneum. 2 March 62.

TH 47 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 1. Date and place only. Neapolis. 14 July 62. For the date see Camodeca 1993c, 110 n. 5.

TH 48 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*chirographum*). No place. No date. Unpublished rereading shows that this is a receipt from a slave or freedman of Ulpia Plotina to Cominius Primus (Camodeca 1993c, 115).

TH 49 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*testatio*). No place. No date.

TH 51 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*chirographum*). No place. No date.

TH 52 Camodeca 1993c. Triptych : 2, 3, 4 right col. (photo), 5 (as part of TH 90 in ed. pr.; photo and drawing). Receipt from slave of Ulpia Plotina to Cominius Primus. Herculaneum. 19 July 69. AE 1993, 461.

TH 53 see TH 77.

TH 54 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*chirographum*). No place. No date. Unpublished rereading shows that this is a receipt from a slave or freedman of Ulpia Plotina to Cominius Primus (Camodeca 1993c, 115).

TH 55 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*chirographum*). No place. No date.

TH 56 see TH 67.

TH 61 Camodeca 2000. Triptych: 1, 4 left and right cols. Sale of slave by P. Cornelius Poppaeus Erastus to Cominius Primus. Pompeian estate, Arrian pottery shop of Poppaea Augusta. 8 May 63.

TH 64 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1954. Triptych: edge of tab. i. Receipt from L. Antonius Coriscus for payment on an estate. No place. No date.

TH 65 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1954. Triptych: 1, 4 left col. Receipt from Cominius Primus for slave as security. Herculaneum. 20 Jan. 62. For the date and the link with TH 74 see Camodeca 1993d, 203.

TH 66 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1954. Triptych: 4 right col., 6. Return (*remancipatio*) of slave-securities from M. Nonius Crassus to M. Nonius Fuscus. No place. No date. Cf. Camodeca 1994, n. 48.

TH 67 + 56 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1954. Triptych: 4 right col. (as TH 56 in ed. pr.; see Camodeca 1993d, n. 57) 6. Accounts (*tabellae*) of loan to Nonia Successa. No place. 2 Nov. of unknown year.

TH 68 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1954. Triptych: 4 right col., 6. Accounts (*tabellae*) of loan to M. Nonius Fuscus. No place. No date.

TH 69 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1954. Triptych: 4 right col., 6. Accounts (*tabellae*) of loan to M. Nonius Ampliatus. No place. 31 Oct. of unknown year.

TH 70 + 71 Camodeca 1993d. Triptych: 1, 4 left and right cols. (photos and drawings). Accounts (*tabellae*) of a loan from Cominius Primus to Pompeia Anthis with personal surety. Herculaneum. 12 May 59. AE 1993, 462a

TH 71 see TH 70.

TH 73 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1954. Triptych: 1, 4 left col. Accounts (*tabellae*) of loan. Herculaneum. 4 Dec. 62.

TH 74 Camodeca 1993d. Triptych: 1 (photo), 4 left and right cols. (photo and drawing). Accounts (*tabellae*) of loan to M. Nonius Fuscus with slave-security. Herculaneum. 20 Jan. 62. AE 1993, 462b.

TH 75 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1954. Triptych: 6. Accounts (*tabellae*). No place. No date.

TH 76 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1955. Triptych: 1, 4 left col. Agreement (compromissum) by Cominius Primus and L. Appuleius Proculus to abide by ruling of arbiter Ti. Crassius Firmus. No place. No date. For the reading fundus Stlasanicianus see Camodeca 1994, 143 n. 24.

TH 77 + 78 + 80 + 53 + 92 Camodeca 1994. Triptych: edge of tabs. i-ii-iii (as TH 92 in ed. pr.), 1 (as TH 77-8), 4 left col. (as TH 80), 4 right col. (as TH 53). Interrogation of L. Appuleius Proculus by Cominius Primus, whether he had received boundary-markers from third-party depositary in keeping with arbiter's ruling. 26 Jan. 69. AE 1994, 416.

TH 78 see TH 77.

TH 79 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1955. Triptych: 1, 4 left and right cols. Ruling of arbiter. Herculaneum. 14-23 Jan. 69. For the date see Camodeca 1994, n. 33.

TH 80 see TH 77.

TH 86 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1955. Triptych: 1. Declaration by Cominius Primus during litigation? No place. No date.

TH 87 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1955. Triptych: 1, 4 left and right cols. Declaration by Cominius Primus in divorce regarding estate given as dowry. Herculaneum. 70. FIRA 3, 20bis.

TH 90 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1961. Triptych: 4 right col. (for p. 5 see TH 52). Receipt from slave of Ulpia Plotina to Cominius Primus. No place. 2-6 March 70. For an unpublished rereading showing that this is a receipt from a slave or freedman of Ulpia Plotina to Cominius Primus, and for the date, see Camodeca 1993c, 115 and 117.

TH 91 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1961. Triptych: 4 right col., 6. Voiding by M. Nonius Ampliatus of agreements with Cominius Primus? No place. No date.

TH 92 see TH 77.

TH 95 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1961. Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only. No place. No date.

Unpublished document. Extract quoted at Camodeca 1993d, 198 n. 8, Triptych. Accounts (*tabellae*) of loan from Cominius Primus to Herennia Pallas with personal surety. No place. No date.

Ins. VI, 11, Casa del Salone Nero: The Archive of L. Venidius Ennychus

TH 5 Pugliese Carratelli 1946. Triptych: 4 left col. Declaration (*testatus est*) by Venidius Ennychus of daughter's birth. No place. 24 July 60. FIRA 3, 5bis.

TH 38 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 1 or 6. Words 'Loan entered in accounts' (*nomen factum*) only. No place. No date.

TH 44 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 4 left col. Date only. No place. 8 March 52. Cf. Camodeca 1993c, 114.

TH 45 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Diptych: 4 left col. Receipt from A. Sallustius Avenius. No place. 22 April 59.

TH 50 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*testatio*). No place. No date. Cf. Camodeca 1994, n. 49.

TH 58 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*testatio*). No place. No date.

TH 62 Camodeca 2000. Triptych: 1 (photo), 6. Sale of slave by M. Nonius Hermerus to Venidius Ennychus. Herculaneum. 30 Nov. 47.

TH 72 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1954. Triptych: 4 left col. Accounts (*tabellae*) of Venidius Ennychus of loan with slave-security. No place. No date.

TH 81 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1955. Triptych: 1, 4 left col. Acceptance by Venidius Ennychus of arbiter L. Mammius and convocation. No place. No date.

TH 82 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1955. Triptych: 4 left col. Agreement preceding arbitration with solemn promise (*sponsio*) by Venidius Ennychus. No place. 52. For the date see Camodeca 2000, 73 n. 39.

TH 83 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1955. Triptych: 4 left and right cols. Declaration (*testandi causa*) by Venidius Ennychus to L. Annus Rufus that he choose arbitrator (*disceptator*) from candidates. No place. No date.

TH 84 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1955. Triptych: 1. Letter (?) agreeing to Festinius Proculus as *disceptator*. No place. No date.

TH 88 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1961. Triptych: 1 or 6. Naming of tutor Venidius Ennychus. Herculaneum. 31 Dec. 66. FIRA 3, 25bis. For the date see Camodeca 1993a, 527.

TH 89 Camodeca 1996, 1999. Triptych: 2 (photo), 5. Document relating to application for Roman citizenship with citation of praetor's edict. No place. 22 March 62. AE 1996, 407.

TH 96 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1961. Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*testatio*). No place. No date.

TH 97 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1961. Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*testatio*). No place. No date.

TH 98 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1961. Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*testatio*). No place. No date.

TH 99 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1961. Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*testatio*). No place. No date.

TH 100 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1961. Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*testatio*). No place. No date. Cf. Camodeca 1994, n. 49.

TH 101 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1961. Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*testatio*). No place. No date.

TH 102 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1961. Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*testatio*). No place. No date. Cf. Camodeca 1994, n. 49.

Unpublished document. See Camodeca 2000, 73 n. 39. Solemn promise (*sponsio*) by Venidius Ennychus.

*Ins. V, 13-16, Casa del Bicentenario: The Archive of Calatoria Themis*⁴⁸

TH 1 Pugliese Carratelli 1946. Triptych: 4 right col., 6. Accounts (*tabellae*) of gift from Calatoria to Primequus. No place. 55. For the reading Calatoria see Camodeca 1993c, 110.

TH 10 Pugliese Carratelli 1946. Triptych: 1, 4 right col. Promissory note (*chirographum ex nomine facto*) from L. Antonius Coriscus. No place. No date.

TH 13 Pugliese Carratelli 1948. Triptych: 3, 5 (photo). Commitments with bail (*vadimonia*) offered by Calatoria Themis and her tutor C. Petronius Thelesphorus to appear in Rome. No place. 7 Sept. 65?

TH 14 Pugliese Carratelli 1948. Triptych: 2, 3, 5, edge of tab. ii. *Vadimonia* to appear in Rome (apparently same content as TH 13). No place. 7 Sept. 65?

TH 15 Pugliese Carratelli 1948. Triptych: 2, 3, 4 right col., 5. Commitment with bail (*vadimonium*) offered by M. Calatorius Speudon to appear in Rome. No place. 12 March 75 or 76.

TH 16 Pugliese Carratelli 1948. Triptych: 2 (photo), 3, 4 left and right cols., edge of tab. ii. Sworn testimony (*testimonium*) of C. Petronius Telesphorus. No place. No date.

TH 17 Pugliese Carratelli 1948. Triptych: 4 left and right cols., 5. Sworn testimony (*testimonium*) of M. Vinicius Proculus. No place. No date.

TH 18 Pugliese Carratelli 1948. Triptych: 4 right col., 5. Sworn testimony probably of Ti. Iulius Sabinus. No place. No date.

TH 19 Pugliese Carratelli 1948. Triptych: 5 (photo). Sworn testimony of P. Arrius. No place. No date.

TH 20 Pugliese Carratelli 1948. Triptych: 2, 3, 4 left and right cols., 5. Sworn testimony (*testimonium*) of Q. Tamudius Optatus. No place. No date.

TH 21 Pugliese Carratelli 1948. Triptych: 4 left and right cols. Testimony (*testimonium*) of Ti. Iulius Proclus. No place. No date.

TH 22 Pugliese Carratelli 1948. Triptych: 4 left and right cols. Testimony (*testimonium*) of M. Antonius Pyramus. No place. 74. For the date see Camodeca 1993d, 208 n. 62.

⁴⁸ See previous note.

TH 23 Pugliese Carratelli 1948. Triptych: edge of tab. ii (photo) 2, 3, 4 left and right cols. (photo). Testimony (*testimonium*) of Sex. Vibidius Ampliatus. No place. No date.

TH 24 Pugliese Carratelli 1948. Triptych: 2 (photo), 3, 4 left and right cols. Sworn testimony (*testimonium*) of M. Calatorius Marullus. No place. No date.

TH 25 Pugliese Carratelli 1948. Triptych: 4 left and right cols. Testimony (*testimonium*) of M. Stlaccius Sabinus. No place. No date.

TH 26 Pugliese Carratelli 1948. Triptych: 4 left and right cols. (photo). Testimony of C. Petronius Clitus. No place. No date.

TH 27 Pugliese Carratelli 1948. Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*testatio*). No place. After 62. For the date and the reading M. Caecili Potiti see Camodeca 1994, n. 37; cf. n. 49.

TH 28 Pugliese Carratelli 1948. Triptych: 4 left and right cols. Testimony (*testimonium*) of C. Petronius Atimetus. No place. No date.

TH 29 Pugliese Carratelli 1948. Triptych: 4 right col., edge of tab. ii. Signatures only (*testatio*). No place. Ca. 69. For the date see Camodeca 1994, n. 36.

TH 36 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 1. Promissory note (*chirographum nominis facti*) from M. Antonius (Pyramus?). No place. No date.

TH 57 Pugliese Carratelli 1953. Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*chirographum*). No place. No date.

Uncertain Provenience

The provenience of several documents was said to be uncertain or was not given in the ed. pr.

TH 4 Pugliese Carratelli 1946. Triptych: 4 left and right cols. Contract of Q. Iunius Theophilus with A. Tetteius Severus for the exploitation of an estate. Herculaneum. 2 Sept. 60.

TH 6 Pugliese Carratelli 1946. Triptych: 4 left col. Commitment with bail (*vadimonium*) offered by P. Marius Crescens to appear in Rome. No place. No date.

TH 59 Camodeca 2000. Triptych: 1 (photo). Sale of slave by slave of Vibidia Procula to Claudia Musa. Herculaneum. Before 63/4.

TH 60 Camodeca 2000. Triptych?: 1 (photo). Sale of slave by C. Iulius Phoebus to a Calatoria. Herculaneum. Before 63/4.

TH 85 Camodeca 1999. Triptych: 2, 3, 5. Ruling of *iudex* C. Manlius Tacitus between litigants and their legal representatives (*cognitores*). Rome? 30 March or 11 April 47.

TH 93 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1961. Triptych: edge of tab. ii. Mention of marriage. No place. (Prior inscription records transaction at Surrentum.) No date.

TH 94 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1961. Triptych: 1, 6. Accounts of loans, with amounts and periods? No place. No date.

Unpublished document. See Camodeca 1999. Receipt relating to estate acquired for HS 295,000. 12 June 64.

The Archive of Herennia Tertia

TH 63 Pugliese Carratelli and Arangio-Ruiz 1954. Triptych: 1. Sale of slave. No place. Before 43. For the date see Camodeca 1993a, 525.

DC 12 Camodeca 1999. Diptych: 4 left col. (photo and drawing). Declaration with stipulation of price for the produce of an estate. Nola. 16 Oct. 40?

Unpublished document. See Camodeca 1993a, 525. Gift of possession of hereditary goods in keeping with the praetor's edict. 43.

Della Corte 1951 published 18 documents, without giving the provenience for any of them. These texts are not usable; they are included for the sake of completeness.

DC 1 Triptych: 4 right col. Mention of heir, signatures (*testatio*). No place. No date.

DC 2 see TH 59.

DC 3 Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*testatio*). No place. No date.

DC 4 Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*testatio*). No place. No date. Cf. Camodeca 1993d, 208 n. 63-4.

DC 5 Triptych: 1, 2. Sale? Nola. Date uncertain (consuls unknown).

DC 6 Triptych: 3, 4 right col. Date and signatures only (*testatio*). No place. Oct. of unknown year (consuls unknown).

DC 7 Triptych: 2? Fragmentary. No place. 7 Jan. of unknown year.

DC 8 Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*testatio*). No place. No date.

DC 9 see TH 60.

DC 10 Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only (*testatio*). No place. No date.

DC 11 Triptych: 4 right col. Signatures only. No place. No date.

DC 13 see Arangio-Ruiz 1956. Triptych: 2. Naming of tutor Q. Vibidius Ampliatius by duovir in keeping with decree of decurions and *lex Iulia et Titia*. No place. No date.

DC 14 see TH 63.

DC 15 Triptych: 4 left col. Sale of ship? No place. No date.

DC 16 Triptych: 5? Regarding sale of ship? Part of preceding document? No place. No date.

DC 17 see TH 6.

DC 18 see TH 4.

Works Cited

- Abramenko, A. 1993. *Die munizipale Mittelschicht im kaiserzeitlichen Italien. Zu einem neuen Verständnis von Sevirat und Augustalität*. Frankfurt.
- Adams, J.N. 1990. 'The Latinity of C. Novius Eunus'. *ZPE* 82:227-47.
- Andreau, J. 1974. *Les affaires de Monsieur Iucundus*. Collection de l'École française de Rome 19. Rome.
- Andreau, J. 1994. 'Affaires financières à Pouzzoles au Ier siècle après J.-C.: les tablettes de Murécine'. *REL* 72:39-55.

- Andreau, J. 1999. *Banking and Business in the Roman World. Key Themes in Ancient History*. Cambridge.
- Arangio-Ruiz, V. 1948. 'Il processo di Giusta'. In *Studi epigrafici e papirologici*, edited by L. Bove, 327-44. Naples 1974.
- Arangio-Ruiz, V. 1951. 'Nove osservazioni sul processo di Giusta'. In *Studi epigrafici e papirologici*, edited by L. Bove, 575-81. Naples 1974.
- Arangio-Ruiz, V. 1956. 'Due nuove tavolette di Ercolano relative alla nomina di tutori muliebri'. In *Studi ... De Francisci*, 1-17. Milan.
- Arangio-Ruiz, V. 1959a. 'Lo "status" di L. Venidio Ennico ercolanese'. In *Studi epigrafici e papirologici*, edited by L. Bove, 535-51. Naples 1974.
- Arangio-Ruiz, V. 1959b. 'Tavolette ercolanesi: il processo di Giusta'. In *Studi epigrafici e papirologici*, edited by L. Bove, 552-70. Naples 1974.
- Arangio-Ruiz, V. 1974. *Studi epigrafici e papirologici*, edited by L. Bove. Naples.
- Bodel, J.P. 1984. 'Freedmen in the "Satyricon" of Petronius'. PhD diss., University of Michigan.
- Camodeca, G. 1991. 'Novità sui fasti consolari dalle tavolette cerate della Campania'. In *Epigrafia ... Degrassi*, 45-74. Collection de l'Ecole française de Rome 143. Rome.
- Camodeca, G. 1992. *L'archivio puteolano dei Sulpicii*. Vol 1. Naples.
- Camodeca, G. 1993a. 'Novità sulla tavolette cerate di Pompei ed Ercolano'. In *Ercolano 1738-1988: 250 anni di ricerca archeologica*, edited by L. Franchi dell'Orto, 521-7. Atti del Convegno Internazionale Ravello-Ercolano-Naples-Pompei 30 ottobre - 5 novembre 1988. Rome.
- Camodeca, G. 1993b. 'Archivi privati e storia delle città campane: Puteoli ed Herculaneum'. In *Prosopographie und Sozialgeschichte: Studien zur Methodik und Erkenntnismöglichkeit der kaiserzeitlichen Prosopographie*, edited by W. Eck, 339-50. Koll. Köln 24.-26. Nov. 1991. Köln, Wien, Weimar.
- Camodeca, G. 1993c. 'Per una riedizione delle Tabulae Herculanaenses. I'. *CErc* 23:109-19.
- Camodeca, G. 1993d. 'Per una riedizione delle Tabulae Herculanaenses. II. I nomina arcaria TH 70+71 e TH 74'. *Ostraka* 2:197-209.
- Camodeca, G. 1994. 'Riedizione del trittico ercolanese TH 77+78+80+53+92 del 29 gennaio 69'. *CErc* 24:137-46.
- Camodeca, G. 1995. 'Nuovi dati sulla struttura e funzione documentale delle tabulae ceratae nella prassi campana'. In *Acta Colloquii Epigraphici: Helsingiae 3.-6. sept. 1991 habitis*, ed. H. Solin, O. Salomies, and U.-M. Liertz, 59-77. Helsinki.
- Camodeca, G. 1996. 'La ricostruzione dell'élite municipale ercolanese degli anni 50-70: problemi di metodo e risultati preliminari'. *CCG* 7:167-78.
- Camodeca, G. 1999. 'Nuovi dati dalla riedizione delle tabulae ceratae della Campania'. In *XI Congresso internazionale di epigrafia greca e latina: Roma, 18-24 settembre 1997: Atti*, 521-44. 2 vols. Rome.
- Camodeca, G. 2000. 'Tabulae Herculanaenses: riedizione delle emptiones di schiavi (TH 59-62)'. In *Quaestiones Iuris: Festschrift für Joseph Georg Wolf zum 70.*

- Geburtstag*, edited by U. Manthe und C. Krampe, 53-76. Freiburger rechtsgeschichtliche Abhandlungen. Neue Folge. Bd. 36. Berlin.
- Carnabuci, E. 1996. *I luoghi dell'amministrazione della giustizia nel foro di Augusto*. Istituto Adriatico per la Storia del Principato fra Adriano e Diocleziano 2. Naples.
- Crook, J.A. 1994. Review of *L'archivio puteolano dei Sulpicii*, by G. Camodeca. *JRS* 84:260-1.
- Crook, J.A. 1967. *Law and Life of Rome*. London.
- Crook, J.A. 1996. 'Legal History and General History'. *BICS* 41:31-6.
- Crook, J.A., and J.G. Wolf. 1989. *Rechtsurkunden in Vulgärlatein*. Abh. Heidelb. Akad. Wiss., Phil.hist. Kl. Heidelberg.
- D'Arms, J.H. 1981. *Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Degrassi, A. 1952. *I fasti consolari dell'Impero romano dal 30 avanti Cristo al 613 dopo Cristo*. Rome.
- Della Corte, M. 1951. 'Tabelle cerate ercolanesi'. *PP* 6:224-30.
- Eck, W. 1999. 'Öffentlichkeit, Monument und Inschrift'. In *XI Congresso internazionale di epigrafia greca e latina: Roma, 18-24 settembre 1997: Atti*, 2:55-75. 2 vols. Rome.
- Flobert, P. 1995. 'Le latin des tablettes de Murécine (Pompéi)'. *REL* 73:138-50.
- Gardner, J.F. 1999. 'Women in Business Life: Some Evidence from Puteoli'. In *Female Networks and the Public Sphere in Roman Society*, edited by P. Setälä and L. Savunen, 11-27. Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae. 22. Rome.
- Garnsey, P. 1981. 'Independent Freedmen and the Economy of Roman Italy under the Principate'. *Klio* 63:359-71.
- Gradel, I. 1994. Review of *Die munizipale Mittelschicht im kaiserzeitlichen Italien. Zu einem neuen Verständnis von Sevirat und Augustalität*, by A. Abramenko. *JRS* 84:259-60.
- Gröschler, P. 1997. *Die tabellae-Urkunden aus den pompejanischen und herkulanensischen Urkundenfunden*. Freiburger rechtsgeschichtliche Abhandlungen. Neue Folge. Bd. 26. Berlin.
- Johnston, D. 1999. *Roman Law in Context*. Cambridge.
- Jongman, W. 1991. *The Economy and Society of Pompeii*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam.
- Kelly, J.M. 1966. *Roman Litigation*. Oxford.
- Maiuri, A. 1946. 'Tabulae ceratae Herculaneses'. *PP* 1:373-9.
- Metzger, E. 1997. *A New Outline of the Roman Civil Trial*. Oxford.
- Metzger, E. 1998a. 'Evidence for Ladungsvadimonium'. Text of a paper given at the 52nd Session of the Société 'Fernand De Visscher' pour l'Histoire des Droits de l'Antiquité, Madrid, 29 September 1998, available at internet website: www.abdn.ac.uk/~law113/papers/lv.htm (15 Oct. 2000).
- Metzger, E. 1998b. 'Interrupting Proceedings in iure: vadimonium and intertium'. *ZPE* 120:215-25.
- Mouritsen, H. 1990. 'A Note on Pompeian Epigraphy and Social Structure'. *C&M* 41:131-49.