

Alumni.

Legal Status in Roman Dalmatia (The Dalmatian Evidence)

by Antonija SMODLAKA KOTUR
(*University of Split*)

1. I dealt with the matter of *alumni* from the legal point of view in 1985/86 and published the results in my article "Alumni — The Position of Foster Children in Roman Law" in *Essays in honor of prof. A. Romac* (1). I became interested in this topic way back in 1972 when as a postgraduate I started studying Roman epigraphical material in Dalmatia as a source for the Roman legal history. At the time when I studied *alumni* relevant literature at my disposal was very scarce so that I relied almost exclusively upon legal sources and Roman inscriptions. I also got acquainted with Roman literature.

1) A. SMODLAKA KOTUR, "Alumni - Društveni i pravni položaj hranjenika u rimskom pravu", *Zbornik Pravnog fakulteta u Zagrebu*, 37 (5-6), 1987 (*Spomenica prof. dr. Anti Romcu*), p. 723-734.

I wondered why legal historians have so little interest in this subject. Neglect of this matter as a legal problem is probably the result of a normative approach. Although this category (*alumni*) had significant legal repercussions, which I tried to prove in my above-mentioned article, it was not fully normatively regulated. Therefore, from the formal legal point of view, it would really not represent a special legal institute.

Those who took note of *alumni* mostly considered that an *alumnus* was the same as an *expositus* (foundling) (2). E. VOLTERRA casually, but resolutely rejected this in his paper "*L'efficacia delle costituzioni imperiali emanate per le provincie e l'istituto dell'expositio*" dating from 1939 (3). However, he claimed that *alumni* are not a category with a special legal position. I propose that after a thorough analysis of all legal texts, VOLTERRA himself would most probably have been of the opinion that *alumni* were a category with special legal position. As he stated himself, he only made "un rapido spoglio delle fonti giuridiche". The relationship between an *alumnus* (*alumna*) and the fosterparent, by its contents very similar to adoption, certainly had legal effects, as some matters concerning this relationship have become a subject of legal regulation (various matters of the

2) MAU, "Alumnus", *PW* I, col. 1706; H. LECLERCQ, "Alumnus", *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et liturgie*, publ. par F. CABROL, Paris, 1907, vol. I, 1, col. 1288; E. WEISS, *Pfandrehtliche Untersuchungen*, I, Weimar 1909, p. 62; E. COSTA, *Storia del diritto romano privato*, Torino 1925, p. 73; BACHI, "L'alumnus", *Scritti*, 1925, p. 145.

3) *Studi in onore di Enrico Besta*, I, Milano, 1939, p. 455.

legal position of *alumni*, as well as the right to *alimenta*, etc. according to the will of the *nutritor* as *de cuius*).

Meanwhile I got acquainted with B. RAWSON's study on *alumni* in the city of Rome (1986) (4) and the paper by the same author and J. BELLEMORE about *alumni* in Italia published in 1990 (5). Also, with the work on *alumni* by H.S. NIELSEN, published in 1987 (6). I was glad to come across the results of work of those who devoted their attention to the same problem as I, but using Italic inscriptions. So, after a long and almost complete neglect, we were dealing with the same subject at the same time. I am pleased that studying simultaneously the same matter (although, as far as I have been informed, we are of different professions) we have nevertheless come to the same conclusion, that it is a matter of a specific relationship which represents a quasi-familial relationship, with legal effects. In my article I called it quasi-adoption, and it gave me much pleasure to find that H. NIELSEN used the identical term.

As my approach is primarily that of a jurist, I consider it significant that such factual adoption reflected itself in the legal world within the fragments of contemporary classical jurists who discussed it as a controversial matter (Gaius, Cervidius Scaevola,

4) *The Family in Ancient Rome (New Perspectives)*, edited by B. RAWSON, Ithaca, New-York, 1986. (Ch. 7 - B. RAWSON, "Children in the Roman Familia", pp. 173-186).

5) J. BELLEMORE - B. RAWSON, "Alumni: The Italian evidence", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 83 (1990).

6) H. Sigismund NIELSEN, "Alumnus: A Term of relation denoting Quasi-adoption", *Classica et mediaevalia*, vol. 33, 1987.

Ulpianus, Paulus, Papinianus, Marcianus). However, besides the legal regulation of this relationship, I share the opinion with B. RAWSON and R.P. SALLER (7) that it is necessary to study this relationship in various regions (provinces) of the Roman empire and not only in the city of Rome.

2. I have examined several thousands Dalmatian inscriptions (8). They are the most significant source for the history of Roman Dalmatia. There I found 70 inscriptions mentioning *alumni*. All the inscriptions date from the time of the Principate. They have mostly been conserved completely, or in fragments which can be used as a relatively reliable source. The letters *DM* undoubtedly prove pre-Christian time. All of the inscriptions are epitaphs, mostly for *alumni*, devoted by fosterers and in a smaller number those written by *alumni* for their foster-parents. The largest number of these inscriptions (except for 4) are from Salona, the capital of the Province of Dalmatia, and its nearest vicinity — the Salonitan *ager*. On the basis of an approximate evaluation I can state that these inscriptions amount to about 1,5

7) R.P. SALLER, Book Reviews (B. RAWSON, *Children in the Roman Familia* - see n. 4), *Classical Philology*, vol. 83, 1988, p. 268.

8) *CIL* III; *Bullettino di archeologia e storia dalmata*, Spalato [= *BD*]; *Vjesnik za archeologiju i historiju dalmatinsku*, Split [= *VAHD*]; *AE*; *Inscriptiones Latinae ...* by A. et J. ŠAŠEL, Ljubljana, 1963, 1978, 1986 (*Situla*, 19, 25). — There is an additional fund of 120 inscriptions from Salona (the largest and most important city and the capital of the Province) dating from the time of the Early Empire, which was discovered in 1986. Unfortunately, the Head of the Archeological Museum in Split has not allowed me to see it. (Those inscriptions are not exhibited for public).

per cent of all Salonitan inscriptions, i.e. some 6 per cent of Salonitan inscriptions from the time of the Early Empire. If we consider the whole of Dalmatia (and that was a vast Province with heterogenous geographical and social-economic and cultural environment, where in the regions other than the capital a small number of *alumni* was found) the percentage would be smaller, but still higher than 0,5. However, I consider that it is more appropriate to take Salona as a relevant milieu. BELLEMORE and RAWSON state that less than 0,5 per cent of Italic inscriptions (outside Rome) mention *alumni*. That applies to 11 Italic regions where 161 relevant inscriptions were found. In the city of Rome just over 1 per cent. Consequently, I deem that the relatively rich Salonitan fund may represent a significant entity regarding the inscriptions about *alumni*, and that this social relationship was typical of the town of Salona.

In these epitaphs *alumni* and *alumnae* are mentioned, that is to say foster-children of both sexes, of various age (predominantly younger people), of various legal statuses and social positions. In 66 inscriptions we recognize the sex of *alumni*, so that we find 42 males and 24 females.

The information about the age of *alumni* is obtained according to the year of death which is very often stated in the inscriptions (41 inscriptions). So, we learn that some of the *alumni* died in early childhood (before they reached the age of 3) and some were a little older. One *alumnus* died when he was 10 months old while another died when he reached his 42nd birthday. Within those limits there are all ages, but differently

represented. It is noticeable that the majority of the inscriptions mention younger *alumni* (12 of them are younger than 4, and 27 younger than 14). This confirms that the relationship between the foster-parent and the *alumnus* was established with a young child. There are 10 in the span between 14 and 25, and there are only 4 who were above 25 years of age (9). I consider that the data showing the age of death of older *alumni* do not tell us anything about the time of the establishment of a particular relationship. It is most probable that even they became *alumni* in their early age.

Who were Salonitan *alumni* according to their legal status? It is not always recognizable from the inscriptions. The same applies to the legal status of fosterers. However, we can often find out about that indirectly by closer analysis of an inscription (particularly the name formula). Naturally, sometimes in such cases the status remains under a question mark. The epitaphs which explicitly state the legal relation between the *alumnus* and the fosterer are exceptionally precious. The fosterer signed as *alumnus*' *DOMINUS, PATRONUS, PATRONA*, two *PATRONAE, MATER ET PATRONA* (10). Thus, *alumni* are of a different legal status: slaves, freedmen and *ingenui* as well (11). In Salona we recognize almost an equal number of *alumni* slaves and free men (*libertini* and *ingenui*). This could be of a scientific interest for the mere reason that it seems that the legal status did

9) *CIL* III, 2194, 2561, 8932.

10) This refers to one person. *CIL* III, 2404.

11) *CIL* III, 2012, 2450.

not have a significant influence on the position of a person being an *alumnus*. The fact that somebody is an *alumnus* becomes independent of his or her general legal status.

For 2 *alumni*, a boy and a girl of 3 and 4 respectively, it was stated explicitly that they were slaves (12). Regarding 5 older *alumni* we can say with certainty that they were their *nutritor*'s freedmen (13). This means that they also were *alumni* slaves earlier. As for a larger number of *alumni* we are not positive that they were slaves, but, according to the name we can take with some certainty that 18 of them were slaves (14). There is an almost equal number of men and women (8 and 10 respectively).

As we have already stated, there were 5 freedmen definitely. It is very possible that there were additional 12 freedmen, a conclusion which we made on the basis of the name formula. The same names (*nomen*, or more rarely *praenomen* and *nomen*, or *nomen* and *cognomen*) point out to manumission or blood kinship. It is possible that all manumissions were not carried out by fosterers, but that the *nutritor* and the *alumnus* were freed simultaneously. Still, the fact remains that a freedman is in question.

There are 4 cases of *ingenui alumni*, which we recognize thanks to *tria nomina*. They reached 3, 15, 23 and 25 years of age. One of them was a soldier, a standard-bearer. His wet-

12) *CIL* III, 2688, 2130.

13) *CIL* III, 14761, 2404, 8547, 2194 ; *BD* 6, p. 166, n. 73.

14) See e.g. *CIL* III, 2138, 2248, 2262, 2335, etc.

nurse, following his testament, erected an inscription for him (15).

3. In our inscriptions foster-parents are predominantly individual persons. 26 foster-mothers and 20 foster-fathers are distinctly recognizable. It is most probable that those persons were foster-parents alone without a spouse either because they did not have one, or because they took an *alumnus* alone. But, in 6 cases couples appear as *nutritores* of *alumni* (16).

I should like to point out that the title *nutrix*, which is known to legal sources, does not appear in these inscriptions. Only one inscription mentions the expression "*nutricius*" (17).

As far as it is possible to conclude, the number of cases where subjects in the foster relationship are of different sexes, prevails distinctly. The largest number are the cases where women are foster-mothers to boys. There is a smaller number of cases where the foster-parent and *alumnus* are of the same sex. The fewest are the ones where a woman adopted a girl.

We can get some information about who fosterers in Salona were. In 9 cases there are men with *tria nomina*. Most foster-fathers have a *nomen* and a *cognomen*: they were probably

15) *CIL* III, 2012.

16) *CIL* III, 8921, 2688, 8941, etc.

17) *CIL* III, 2507.

freedmen. We came across one *Augusti libertus* (18). Most women (18) have 2 names. Only a few have just one name, which might mean that they like their *alumni* were slaves. A "married" couple of slaves had an *alumnus* who was also a slave (19). There are two cases of *matrimonium legitimum*, while two additional cases of fosterers probably tell us about *concubinatus*. Thus, it seems that all fosterers did not belong to a homogeneous social group. By closer analysis of their names we could learn more about them.

It is noticeable from the inscriptions that this relationship is important for both its subjects. That is a relationship of closeness, sympathy and warmth. In a couple of cases *alumni* raised tombstones for their fosterers. The grateful *ALUMNA ET LIBERTA* raised a *monumentum* for her foster-mother whom she calls *MATER ET PATRONA PIENTISSIMA* (20). Scaevola's fragment (D. 33, 7, 27) reads "*Nutritori suo legavit*". Epitaphs devoted to children (often *INFANTES*) are particularly emotionally charged. There we often find the following expressions: *dulcissimus* or *carissimus*, and also those which are not that frequent: *PIISSIMUS*, *AMANTISSIMUS*, *OBSEQUIENTISSIMUS*, *INNOCENTISSIMUS*, *PIENTISSIMUS*. The master called Valentina who died at 4, "*alumna et delicata*"

18) *BD* 29, p. 150, n. 462.

19) *CIL* III, 2688.

20) *CIL* III, 2404.

(21). In two cases an *alumna* is called *ACCEPTA* (22), which could mean: dear, welcome, accepted, received. This could also mean that she was a foundling. One *alumnus* is called *THRE[PTO]* (23). This is possibly his name, which could be connected to *THREPTOI* in Roman Asia Minor, very similar to *alumni* (24).

We are referred to such a close relationship also by the joint burial of the foster-parent and the *alumnus*. Valeria Euthycaia wrote: *ALUMNO POSUIT ET SIBI* (25). The *alumnus* mentioned in the first position was 17 years old and called Valerio after her. *Alumnus FORTUNATUS* was also mentioned in the first position by his *nutritor* who *ET SIBI VIVO POSUIT ET LIBERTIS LIBERTABUSQUE SUIS* (26). One of the closest formulations is that, written by Sextus Atilius for his 42-year old freedman Sextus Atilius Quartinus: *Alumno quem semper vice filii dilexit* (27). The foster-father buried the above-mentioned

21) *CIL* III, 2130. — See : H. Sigismund NIELSEN, "Delicia in Roman literature and in the Urban Inscriptions", *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici*, XIX, Rome, 1990, p. 79-88.

22) *CIL* III, 2138, 2339.

23) *CIL* III, 9361.

24) A. CAMERON, "Threptos and Related Terms in the Inscriptions of Asia Minor", *Anatolian Studies presented to W. Hepburn Buckler*, Manchester, 1939.

25) *CIL* III, 2573.

26) *VAHD*, 47-48 (1924-25) = *SITULA* 25, p. 219, n. 2193.

27) *CIL* III, 2194 : *DM / SEXTO ATILIO QUARTINO / DEFUNCTO ANN XLII / ET IVLIAE SECUNDINAE UXORI EIUS / SEXTUS ATILIUS MANUMS / ALUMNO QUEM SEMPER VICE / FIL DILEXIT VIVUS POSUIT LOCUS / CONCESSUS A CASSIA AFRODETE*. This

42-year old *alumnus* with dignity and love together with his (*alumnus*') wife (*uxori eius*). Although he was in his mature age and married, he was further referred to as *alumnus* with affection. There is an inscription devoted to an *alumna ingenua*, signed by her *MATER* and her *FRATER* — by the names that differ from hers (28). Once established, the relationship of fostering and nurturing left an indelible mark so that a lasting relationship remained even when the initial purpose was fulfilled and ceased. A sort of a familial relationship, a sort of blood kinship emerged. Paraphrasing another legal situation could we say: *semel alumnus, semper alumnus* ? After all, according to legal sources as well, an *alumnus* remains an *alumnus* even after the *nutritor* dies. In legal texts these are *minores*.

According to our inscriptions: Celionia died at 32 as *uxor* of Publius Celius Eutihes, who erected for her a *monumentum* upon which he stated that she was *alumna* of Titus Firmus (29). Therefore, although this inscription was not erected by a fosterer, but by a spouse, it still mentions the foster relationship. So, we may consider, that the fact that she was an *alumna*, was of significance not only for the *nutritor*. It was an important relationship which probably also had some external

is similar to the inscription from Rome (CIL VI, 8409 : "... *Quem pro filio habuerunt*").

28) *BD* 35, p. 29.

29) *CIL* III, 2561 : *CELIOI / NAE ALUMNAE / TITI FIRMI DEF / ANN XXIIIX / P COELIUS EVTYCHES / VXORI / B M P.*

repercussions. The inscription built by an *alumnus* to his fosterer's young son whom he calls "*nutricio suo*" (30), possibly also tells us about this relationship. The foster relationship lasts for a life time. When somebody became an *alumnus* he continued to be one during his whole life even after his death. Like other kinds of kinship, this one also reflects itself on the tombstones.

The relationship established in the *alumnus*' childhood resulted in the feelings which were similar to those of parents. The above-mentioned fact that *alumni* were mostly of a different sex could probably be explained psychologically — it is usually considered that sons are more attached to their mothers, and daughters to their fathers. Numerous *alumni* who initially had the status of a slave were subsequently freed already as children; some of them before they reached the age of 3, 4, 7, 8 and 9 (31). Our inscriptions cover *alumni* who were slaves mostly as young, and only one case mentions a slave girl who, although *alumna*, was 26 (32). This is fully in accordance with the legally privileged position of *alumni* in the case of an early manumission (*iusta causa manumissionis*) (33). The freeing of slave *alumni* in Salona was carried out to a somewhat greater extent by women. A fragment of Marcianus tells us that premature manumission was more appropriate for women (34). Consequently, it would

30) *CIL* III, 2507.

31) *CIL* III, 2453, 8547 ; *BD* 6, p. 166, n. 73.

32) *CIL* III, 2499.

33) Gai *Inst.* 1, 19; 1, 39; Just. *Inst.* 1, 6, 5; D. 40, 2, 13 (Ulpianus).

34) D. 40, 2, 14.

seem that it was considered that this relationship with foster-mothers included motherly feelings.

4. The *alumnus* in a way became a *filius* — of a somewhat lower status, disregarding his origin and legal status. The fact that legislature took into account a particular relationship of closeness is proved by a rescript of Septimius Severus (C. 8, 16, 1), which was commented by Ulpian and Paul: An *alumnus* slave cannot be a subject of general *hypotheca* obligation, the same as a *concupina* and her *filii naturales* (35). That an *alumnus* was considered a family member can be seen in a well-known fragment by Ulpian (D. 29, 5, 1, 10), which decides about the application of strict rules of the *SC Silanianum* where a slave kills an *alumnus*. Although Ulpian here differentiates an *alumnus* from the son of the family, and a real adopted child, I deem that the very treatment of this question as legal, proves that there were significant dilemmas. One should also bear in mind that it was a special situation, as we are dealing with an extremely brutal law, towards which even the Romans had reserve. So, Ulpian solved it in the direction of its restrictive application. Here is also of significance the fragment of Paul (D. 45, 1, 132), where a *pater familias* can give an *alumnus* and *cognatus* to somebody else, in the same way as his own son (*alienum filium suscipere*). Scaevola mentions "*patris affectus*".

35) D. 20, 1, 8; Paul. *Sent.* 5, 6, 16.

We cannot state with certainty why people decided to take *alumni* rather than to carry out an *adoptio legitima*. That could be explained in the case of women who could not perform an *adoptio legitima*. This was also the case with the slaves (on either side). In other cases also when an *adoptio legitima* was not viable, an *alumnus* was accepted. Some fosterers possibly did not wish to enter a legally strictly defined relationship which determined mutual obligations. In Roman law there were other similar institutions: those who wished to keep broader autonomy of decision-making instead of *commodatum* used *precarium*. Those who did not like formality, and preferred a simpler covering of different factual needs, decided to take an *alumnus*.

The motivations for such factual adoption were probably diverse as is the case with other forms of adoption in Roman society. As we have already mentioned, fosterers were mostly individual, predominantly women. They were probably people with no offspring or those who had brought up their own children in their early age. Some of them might have been widowers or widows. They were solving their emotional and other problems by accepting somebody else's child whose existence, regarding upkeep or rearing or both, was probably endangered for various reasons. In five cases we find married couples as foster parents. Two of those couples had their own sons for whom they made a common tombstone and also for their *alumnus*. Those were the only *alumni* whose names were not mentioned in our inscriptions.

According to our sources *alumni* were most often the children of slaves or free, but poor parents who let their children go, so that they would have a better life ensured. On 3 inscriptions we find the names of parents and nutritors together. In two cases parents were slaves. One inscription was erected by a master to an *alumna* who was a daughter of a *vilicus* (36). The inscription for a 5-year old boy was erected together by his slave parents and his foster-mother (37). The inscription for a brother and a sister, of 9 and 6 respectively, was put up by their parents who were free people and the fosterer Publius Horatius, "*alumnis suis*" (38). However, dominant are the cases where natural parents do not appear. This could mean that the relationship between parents and *alumni* was only exceptionally continued, the foster relationship becoming of prevailing significance. It is also possible that children without parents were often accepted (orphans and deserted children).

We cannot exclude the possibility that in addition to the motivations to protect and care, some other reasons influenced the decision about accepting a child as an *alumnus*. Naturally, one should not be carried away exclusively by the ideas of compassion and altruism. Adoption or fostering of other people's children today also often has an egotistic motivation, even such as the exploitation of labour. Still, we can hardly accept the idea that it was their exclusive or even predominant

36) *CIL* III, 2130.

37) *CIL* III, 2374.

38) *VAHD*, 47-48, p. 68-70.

reason, as it is considered by G. ALFÖLDY and J. WILKES, the distinguished experts in Roman Dalmatia (39). They are of the opinion that the frequent occurrence of *alumni* in Salona meant an introduction of a new form of slavery, by bringing up of a domestic slave. They regard the institution of *alumni* and *vernae* as identical.

Against such belief testify the numerous already stated facts which demonstrate the emotional character of this relationship. It manifested itself publicly by characteristic mutual warmth in addressing, which is not that easily found either in the inscriptions for other slaves or even freedmen. All privileged persons in addition to *alumni* in the case of premature manumission prove that this rule was introduced in order to benefit these slaves (to free them from exploitation), and not in order to bring a new way of exploitation of labour (which was the objective of some other manumissions) (40).

5. This relationship, which was often present in life, could not be neglected by law. At the very time when most of our inscriptions were appearing, some outstanding lawyers dealt with it. By solving contested matters, they formally introduced it to

39) G. ALFÖLDY, "Die Sklaverei in Dalmatien zur Zeit des Prinzipats", *Acta Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, vol. IX, fasc. 1-2, Budapest, 1961, pp. 123-151; G. ALFÖLDY, *Bevölkerung und Gesellschaft der Römischen Provinz Dalmatien*, Budapest, 1965, p. 116; J.J. WILKES, *Dalmatia*, London, 1969, p. 236.

40) See n. 33.

law. Certain elements of the legal status of *alumni* were defined legally, particularly the legal situation which occurred *post mortem* of a *nutritor*.

Legal texts prove that the treatment of *alumni* in the testament of a foster-parent is in no case in accordance with the assumption that *alumni* were slaves or quasi-slaves. By the dispositions *mortis causa* the fosterer endeavoured to ensure the future for his *alumnus*. Thus an *alumnus* who enjoyed *alimenta* during his *nutritor*'s life, acquired *ius alimenti* on the basis of the *nutritor*'s testament. The moral duty — *officium pietatis* (41) — like in some other cases of provision of *alimenta*, was transformed into a legal duty (*alimenta praestare*), which strictly and extensively obligated the heirs, and legatees. In most cases *alumni* were legatees (*legatum alimenti*), sometimes *fideicommissarii*, but it is certain that they were heirs as well. Scaevola (D. 33, 2, 34, 1) tells us about an *alumnus* who was *heres institutus*, a co-heir 8/10, while Papinian (D. 34, 9, 16, 1) mentions an *alumna* co-heiress. The same applies to Scaevola's inscription (D. 31, 88, 6). In his testamental clauses the *testator* protects his minor *alumnus* heir, for instance in the way that he obliges the two co-heiresses to be his *nutrices*. By the way, this legal text (D. 33, 2, 34, 1) mentions an *alumnus* and *nutrices* together as subjects of the same fostering relationship. Indeed, a *nutrix* is mentioned with the same meaning, but independently, by Ulpian (D. 40, 2, 13) and in Iust. *Inst.* (1, 6, 5). Also by Ulpian (D. 26, 10, 1, 7).

41) D. 26, 10, 1, 7.

Scaevola mentions a *nutritor* as a *legatarius* (42). B. RAWSON states that a specific term to indicate the foster-parents of *alumni* was lacking in the legal evidence. She therefore concludes: "For the Romans the point of view was one-sided" (43). I am of a different opinion. By the relevant, previously mentioned sources, we know that *alumni* also cared for their foster-parents.

Several other fragments treat the legal situation after the death of a testator foster-father (parent), probably because of the disputes arising regarding the protection of the benefiting *alumnus* and the interest of other heirs or legatees. I therefore consider that the law has shown interest in this relationship and regulated it just at the time when it was necessary and to the necessary extent. The execution of the fundamental duty (*nutrire*) was probably not endangered in practice while the fosterer was alive, as the foster-child's right was protected sufficiently by his own good will and affection, as well as by his conscientious behaviour. After all, other claims for *alimenta* were not protected by a special *actio*, but only by *extra ordinem* process (44). By means of legal texts, primarily those by classical jurists, an *alumnus* as a factual adopted child and emotional relative, became a kind of a legal relative. I deem that the term *alumnus* in legal sources has become a *terminus technicus*.

42) D. 33, 7, 27.

43) B. RAWSON, "Children in the Roman Familia" (see n. 4), p. 178.

44) D. 34, 1, 3. See: E. ALBERTARIO, "Sul diritto agli alimenti", *Studi di Diritto romano*, vol. I, Milano, 1933, pp. 249-279.

Closing this report, I can say that I am of the opinion that Salonitan *alumni* could support the hypothesis of BELLEMORE and RAWSON that fostering an *alumnus* is an urban institute and "that there is a connection between the distribution of *alumni* and level of prosperity or urbanization". Salona as a political and administrative metropolis, economic and cultural centre of the Province, lead a very characteristic life of a Roman town. The level of romanization of Salona differed greatly from the situation prevailing in the interior of the Province. It is probable that in such Salona there were numerous poor and other children who needed family protection offered by richer inhabitants of the town, who were of different statuses. They on their part solved their family problems this way, at the same time taking humanitarian and social action, which probably brought them prestige and reputation in their milieu.