

the *De viris illustribus* attaches the name to the *cloaca maxima* built by Tarquinius Superbus.<sup>1</sup>

From this conflicting evidence we may infer that there was no continuing association of the name with any definite place. But the name was handed down and had to be explained. The antiquarians of the late Republic may have inherited a tradition which connected it with Ancus Marcius, but not with any particular event. The main achievements of Ancus Marcius in the tradition were the incorporation of the Aventine and of the Janiculum at Rome and the foundation of Ostia. All provided a suitable context: the various attributions may be no more than guesses. Unless we can prove the superiority of Festus' source this passage cannot be regarded as independent confirmation of the main literary tradition concerning Ostia.

4. I have accepted the evidence of Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus for Roman corn imports by sea in the early Republic because I see no good reason to question them. The primary document, however, concerning Rome's interest in the sea routes is her first treaty with Carthage, quoted in full by Polybius and dated by him to the foundation of the Republic.<sup>2</sup> This dating has been repeatedly attacked, but Polybius is well aware that his date will surprise his readers: he is explicit and deliberate. The new situation created in Latium by the expulsion of the Etruscan dynasty from Rome provides a sound historical context. Polybius' dating should be accepted.<sup>3</sup> Rome, though not yet a sea power, already had interests at sea. Ostia is not mentioned in the treaty, but that does not affect our problem. If, as we think, a settlement already existed, it was little more than a salt-workers' village on Roman territory, controlled by Rome; it needed no independent guarantee against Carthaginian interference.

Apart from the tradition of the foundation by Ancus Marcius only one passage in literature mentions Ostia explicitly before the fourth century, and that is the story of Sp. Maelius, sketched briefly by Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus.<sup>4</sup> There was a serious famine in 440 which L. Minucius, specially appointed *praefectus annonae*, was unable to relieve. Sp. Maelius, a rich knight, seized the opportunity to buy corn privately on a large scale in Etruria and Campania and sell it cheaply to the people. This brought him wide popularity which led him to hope for the consulship; it might even be necessary, since the senate's opposition could be expected, to become king. He became the storm centre of a popular party threatening the constitution. The senate in alarm appointed Cincinnatus dictator. Servilius Ahala, *magister equitum*, was sent to summon Maelius; he resisted arrest and was put to death.

<sup>1</sup> *De viris illustribus*, 8. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Polybius iii. 22.

<sup>3</sup> H. Last, *CAH* vii. 859; J. H. Thiel, *A History of Roman Sea-power before the Second Punic War* (1954) 6 n. 10; a review of the controversy, F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, i (1957) 337.

<sup>4</sup> Livy iv. 13-16; Dion. Hal. xii. 1-4.

There is probably a core of truth in the story and we may accept the famine and the import of corn. But the political colouring is affected by later events, and particularly by the conflict between the senate and the Gracchi. Dionysius says that the corn from Etruria and Campania was brought to 'Ostia, Rome's harbour'; this too might be a reflection of later conditions. But, if we are right in believing that ships were coming up the Tiber in the early Republic, it is reasonable to infer a settlement of some kind near the river mouth to provide water, food, and other services for ships' crews. In our view a settlement already existed.

5. The tribal affiliation of Ostia may not be irrelevant. Ostia was enrolled in Voturia, one of the original rural tribes. The precise date of the formation of these rural tribes remains controversial, but it is at least agreed that they precede the conquest of Veii in the early fourth century. If Roman territory had not extended to the coast before the fourth century we should have expected a new tribe to have been created when the new territory was won. The enrolment of Ostia in Voturia suggests that Ostia was established before the fourth century.

Such arguments from Ostia's tribe, from the history of the Via Salaria, from Rome's early trade, add a little support to the tradition of a regal settlement, but they are by no means decisive. The rejected rubbish of a small hut of the regal period would carry more weight than any such inferences from our literary sources. Doubts will remain until unambiguous archaeological evidence is found. It should be sought not on the firm sands where the Castrum was built in the fourth century, but in the alluvial soil deposited by the Tiber, north of the salt-beds.

An important argument is added on p. 566 (add. p. 481). For more recent evidence see p. 579.

## Appendix II

### VIRGIL AND OSTIA

IN Virgil's *Aeneid* Aeneas lands at the Tiber mouth. It is there and in Laurentine territory to the south of the river that the action of the last six books of his *Aeneid* unfolds. The legend was not yet fixed, but in most accounts the landing was placed farther south.<sup>1</sup> It is reasonable to ask whether Virgil had any purpose other than a literary purpose in elaborating his version of the legend, whether he was influenced by what he knew of the Ostia of his day, and whether his account can throw light on geographical and historical problems that concern the development of Ostia.

A great deal has been written on these topics; most of the writing is singularly unconvincing. There is little doubt that Virgil was generally familiar with the landscape, but it is dangerous to press his verses rigorously for topographical detail. It is outside the scope of this book to examine his description of Laurentine territory, but certain opinions on his use of Ostian material require examination.

Tenney Frank believed that Virgil in his description of Aeneas' building of a new Troy at the mouth of the Tiber was strongly influenced by what he saw of the walls of the fourth-century Castrum.<sup>2</sup> These are 'the very walls, in my opinion, which Virgil, with a slight license, intended the reader to have in mind when he mentioned Aeneas' first city in Latium'. Aeneas' city, unlike the Castrum, was unwallled on the river side. The discrepancy can be explained, because 'most of the north wall has disappeared down to a very low level, . . . presumably torn down before Virgil's day'. This reconciliation is forced. A substantial stretch of the north wall can still be seen incorporated in the south wall of the Piccolo Mercato, which was not built until Hadrian's reign. Before this rebuilding more of the wall may well have survived. Aeneas' foundation, like the Castrum, has walls, ditches, and towers. But these are the normal Roman means of defence, though they would not be found in Italy as early as the days of Aeneas. There is no good reason to believe that Virgil's description was influenced by what he saw at Ostia.

Miss Tilly attached more importance to the sacred area west of the theatre. When she wrote, its four tufa temples were thought to have been preceded on the same site by earlier temples in more perishable materials. The traditional sanctity of the area, she thought, may have made a deep impression on the poet, and its cults may be reflected in his *Aeneid*.<sup>3</sup> A later examination of the

<sup>1</sup> Carcopino, 392.

<sup>2</sup> Tenney Frank, *AJP* 45 (1924) 64.

<sup>3</sup> B. Tilly, *Virgil's Latium*, 21 (Virgil's Ostia background, 1-30).

archaeological evidence has made it much more probable that the temples we now see were the first temples on the site; in Virgil's day they were still comparatively modern.<sup>1</sup>

More important is the comprehensive and coherent hypothesis elaborated by Carcopino. One central aspect of this hypothesis has already been considered (p. 339 f.). His view that pre-Roman Ostia was a federal centre of the Latins focused on the cult of Vulcan should be regarded as unproved and unlikely; no support can be legitimately drawn from Virgil on the nature or antiquity of Vulcan's cult. It remains to consider the topographical arguments that have a bearing on Ostia's history. The central argument<sup>2</sup> may be briefly summarized:

It is clear that the advance of the coastline at the Tiber's mouth is not a modern problem. It has advanced more rapidly since the sixteenth century, but the measurable annual advance from the late Roman Empire to the sixteenth century was 1.50 metres. If this average measurement be applied to the Roman period, the river mouth in Augustus' day was not far from the so-called *navale* just west of the 'Imperial Palace'. Primitive Ostia must have been considerably farther to the east. There are indications in Virgil's *Aeneid* and Ostian buildings that pre-Ostian Ostia was sited by the bend of the river.

This bend is attested in Ovid's account of the journey of Cybele to Rome:

fluminis ad flexum veniunt: Tiberina priores  
atria dixerunt, unde sinister abit.<sup>3</sup>

Today the river turns northward considerably to the west, but this is the result of a flood in 1557. Before that date the bend was farther east. Early maps and drawings show the river's course before the flood, turning to form a loop by the fifteenth-century castle in the modern village; the *fiume morto*, which was not filled in until the nineteenth century, marked its course. This line, however, was not the river line in Roman days, but was the result of changes that resulted from the neglect of embankments after the collapse of Rome. That it was not the Roman line is proved by the fact that had the river followed the course shown in the earliest maps, the Decumanus, emerging from the Porta Romana as the Via Ostiensis, would have had to cross the river. The bend was farther west, not far from the line of the Porta Romana. Here on the north side of the Decumanus in Virgil's day were republican *horrea*, which, through a further four centuries of adaptation, preserved their original tufa piers and some of their original reticulate walls. The obvious reason is that they were regarded with veneration as marking the site of the original Ostia. It is in this neighbourhood that the temple of Vulcan should be found.

Virgil's *Aeneid* shows that it was at this bend of the river that Aeneas built his city and protected his ships. He emphasizes the harbour in his account; it was here that ships coming into the Tiber first won shelter from the west and south-west winds. The siting is confirmed by the description of the city when Turnus attacks and the

<sup>1</sup> p. 538.

<sup>2</sup> Carcopino, 391-780.

<sup>3</sup> Ovid, *Fasti*, iv. 329.



heads of Nisus and Euryalus, killed while trying to break through to recall Aeneas, are displayed to the Trojans:

Aeneadae duri murorum in parte sinistra  
opposuere aciem, nam dextera cingitur amni.<sup>1</sup>

The passage appears to give two sides only instead of four to the new Troy. This is explained by its setting on the bend of the river. Left and right are to be understood from the point of view of a spectator coming down-river from Rome. The left side, that is the south, was marked by a wall running eastwards from the river curve, and here alone defence was needed; for the northern side was protected by the river and the eastern side was protected by marsh. This marsh is implied by Virgil

huc turbidus atque huc  
lustrat equo muros aditumque per avia quaerit.<sup>2</sup>

There are fatal objections to this thesis. The real reason why the republican *horrea* were readapted rather than rebuilt has already been given (p. 339). It was the prosaic need for economy. The rebuilding of Ostia started in and near the centre; had prosperity lasted longer this area would also have been rebuilt at a higher level and to a greater height. Original walls were preserved because it was cheaper to reuse them. Nor were they of any great antiquity in Virgil's day; their near-reticulate shows that they were roughly his contemporaries. Nor did the river make its bend where Carcopino's thesis requires. After he wrote, boundary stones of the Julio-Claudian period were discovered farther east, showing that the Roman river line was little different from that shown on the earliest maps.<sup>3</sup>

We cannot even infer securely from Virgil that he visualized his city of Aeneas at the bend of the river. Carcopino's illustration of the river's bend comes from Ovid; in Virgil's account there is no word of it. The somewhat odd description of the camp in the passage quoted is quite insufficient to stand the weight imposed on it; poetic licence rather than detailed topography should be invoked. The marsh on the eastern side, regarded as a continuation of the river, is essential to Carcopino's thesis. It is not mentioned by Virgil, nor can it be inferred from the passage quoted: the simple meaning of 'aditumque per avia quaerit' is that Turnus 'sought for an entrance where no way could be found'. Livy is a better guide than Virgil for the siting of the earliest Ostia.

Carcopino has also given a positive answer to the other main inquiry provoked by the *Aeneid*.<sup>4</sup> He suggests that Virgil chose Ostia as the scene of the new Troy to popularize Augustus' plans to create a new harbour. The work, he thinks, was in fact begun, but was abandoned when Agrippa died in 12 B.C., and Claudius had to begin afresh. The evidence for this solution of the problem is unimpressive. There is no direct hint in the *Aeneid*, though an

<sup>1</sup> Virg. *Aen.* ix. 468.

<sup>3</sup> NS 1921, 258. See also p. 115.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. ix. 57.

<sup>4</sup> Carcopino, 729-54.

appropriate prophecy could have been fitted in without serious strain. The inferences drawn from other sources are invalid. The first is a comment on a passage in the *Ars Poetica*:

sive receptus  
terra Neptunus classes Aquilonibus arcet,  
regis opus, sterilisve diu palus aptaque remis  
vicinas urbes alit et grave sentit aratrum,  
seu cursum mutavit iniquum frugibus amnis  
doctus iter melius: mortalia facta peribunt.<sup>1</sup>

Carcopino is probably right in following those who see in these lines specific reference to historical works or projects rather than general illustrations of man's control over nature. We cannot follow him when he identifies Horace's allusions with works undertaken by Agrippa for Augustus. The argument from the date of the poem must remain very uncertain. Carcopino accepts 12 B.C., the year of Agrippa's death, and sees in these lines a lament for Agrippa.<sup>2</sup> But even if the date were right, the association of these lines with Agrippa would need to be independently established; in themselves they need not necessarily apply to recent works. The independent evidence is found by Carcopino in the scholiasts Acron and Porphyryon. Their record on the passage inspires no confidence, and Carcopino's interpretation of what they say is special pleading. We cannot follow him in finding in their comments evidence that Augustus built a harbour at Ostia.

Acron quotes Augustus as the creator of the harbour envisaged by Horace: 'Augustum dicit . . . divus Augustus res divinas fecit.' But he names 'portus Iulius' in Campania, not Ostia: 'portum Lucrinum munivit.' Porphyryon has a different interpretation: 'divus Caesar duas instituerat res facere: portum Ostiensem munire et Pomptinam paludem . . . emittere in mare'. According to Carcopino Porphyryon by 'divus Caesar' means Augustus; 'instituerat facere' means not that he had planned to build, but had begun to build. This is not the natural meaning of 'divus Caesar' nor of 'instituerat facere'. We should follow the majority of commentators, who see here a reference to Julius Caesar's project to build a harbour at Ostia.

The chronographer of 354 records: 'hoc imp(erator) (Octaviano Augusto) navis Alexandrina primum in portu Romano introivit nomine Acatu.'<sup>3</sup> This passage, Carcopino thinks, shows that Augustus' work at Ostia was sufficiently advanced for an Alexandrian merchantman to anchor in the new harbour. This interpretation would create more difficulties than it solves. If the work was so far advanced before it was abandoned, the complete silence of contemporary authors, particularly of Strabo, would be inexplicable. The continuation of the passage quoted shows beyond reasonable doubt that 'in portu Romano'

<sup>1</sup> Horace, *Ars Poetica*, 63-68.

<sup>2</sup> Carcopino, 732.

<sup>3</sup> Mommsen, *Chronica minora*, i. 145.

refers to Rome and not to Ostia: 'qui attulit frumenti modios CCCC, vectores MCC, piper, linteamen, carta, vitria et opoliscum cum sua sibi base, qui est in circo maximo, altum pedes LXXXVIII'. This was the ship that brought the great obelisk to Rome. Like its successor in the fourth century it came up river, as Pliny indicates,<sup>1</sup> and docked at Rome. \*

Carcopino finally infers that the name of the Claudian harbour, 'portus Augusti', was chosen to commemorate the initiative of Augustus in creating a new harbour. This explanation of the name would be probable enough if there were any other firm evidence that Augustus had begun the work. The name, however, need imply no more than that the harbour was an imperial construction.<sup>2</sup>

Further evidence of Augustus' active interest in Ostia is shown, according to Carcopino, by the establishment of a colony of veterans; but the only evidence for this colony derives from a doubtful interpretation of a passage in Pliny the elder. In his survey of Italy Pliny has been thought to be limiting the title of colony to Augustan foundations, and he includes Ostia. It seems clear, however, that in describing the coastal areas he follows a *Periplus* and includes colonies that were not Augustan; his obscure reference to Augustan colonies is associated with his description of the interior.<sup>3</sup> The establishment of veterans by Augustus at Ostia cannot be accepted without independent confirmation.

That Augustus, who fully understood the political importance of Rome's corn supply, was closely concerned with Ostia's efficiency is certain. That he began to realize Caesar's project of a new harbour is most unlikely. Suetonius implies that he did not. In his brief catalogue of the major works of Claudius he includes 'the outlet to the Fucine lake and the Ostian harbour, though he knew that the first of these schemes had been rejected by Augustus in spite of insistent appeals from the Marsi, and that the second had often been projected by the divine Julius but not tackled owing to its difficulties'.<sup>4</sup> The clear inference is that Augustus, while considering the drainage of the Fucine lake, had accepted the general judgment that the building of a new harbour at Ostia was not a practical proposition.

I do not believe that a minute scrutiny of Virgil's text or intentions will make any substantial contribution to our understanding of Ostia's history.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Pliny, *NH* xxxvi. 70.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Macellum Augusti, dedicated in A.D. 59: BMC Emp. I, Nero, 191-7, 335-7.

<sup>3</sup> Pliny, *NH* iii. 46 and 56. Mommsen, 'Die italischen Bürgercolonien von Sulla bis Vespasian', *Ges. Schrift.* ii (1908) 250; R. Thomsen, *The Italic Regions*, 41.

<sup>4</sup> Suet. *Claud.* 20. 1.

<sup>5</sup> See Addenda.

### Appendix III

#### TRAJAN'S CANAL AND THE DATE OF TRAJAN'S HARBOUR

IN the nineteenth century there was considerable dispute whether the present Fiumicino canal was in origin the work of Claudius or Trajan. I have followed Lugli in believing that this was a new canal cut by Trajan, replacing two Claudian canals which passed through what was to become Trajan's inner basin.<sup>1</sup> This thesis is supported not only by the alignments noted in the text, but also by a passage in Pliny's correspondence: 'Tiberis alveum excessit et demissioribus ripis alte superfunditur, quamquam fossa, quam providentissimus imperator fecit, exhaustus, premit valles, innatat campis, quaque planum solum, pro solo cernitur.'<sup>2</sup>

Trajan had cut a canal from the Tiber which, Pliny implies, was expected to reduce the danger of flood. A canal with this purpose should have been drawn from the upper river above Rome; but no trace of such a canal has ever been found. Claudius, as his inscription of 46 shows,<sup>3</sup> thought that canals near the mouth would be effective. Trajan seems to have shared the illusion. For Pliny's reference should almost certainly be associated with a monumental inscription now in St. Paul's monastery, which records Trajan's action in connexion with a canal.<sup>4</sup> The provenance of the inscription is unknown, but, since a large proportion of the inscriptions in St. Paul's come from Ostia, an Ostian origin is probable.

Very little of the inscription survives, but there can be no doubt about the restoration of the emperor's name, and 'fossam' is clear on the stone. Dessau in the *Corpus* adopted Mommsen's restoration: 'fossam [fecit | q]ua inun[da]tiones Tiberis | a]dsidue u[rbem] vexantes | rivo p]eren[ni] arcerentur.' Thylander rightly pointed out that 'fossam fecit' gives too short a line, and suggested 'fossam restituit'.<sup>5</sup> If this restoration were right, the inference would be that Trajan preserved and restored Claudius' canal. 'fossam [novam fecit]' is, however, a possible alternative and accords better with the language of Pliny. Mommsen's other restorations also are too long, but the general sense is probably right.

The inscription cannot be dated; Pliny's letter was probably written in 107; by that date the canal had been cut. When the rest of the work was begun and ended is less certain. Until recently it was generally thought that work was started on the harbour at the beginning of the reign and

<sup>1</sup> p. 159.

<sup>4</sup> 88.

<sup>2</sup> Pliny, *Ep.* viii. 17. 2.

<sup>3</sup> 85 = Thylander, B 310.

<sup>5</sup> Thylander, B 312.

completed by the middle.<sup>1</sup> This was primarily an inference from some of the commemorative coins which were dated to a year when Trajan was cos. V, from 103 to 112. A reference was also seen to the harbour in a passage from Pliny's *Panegyric*, delivered in 100. Pliny is praising Trajan for the flourishing state of the corn supply, and comparing his achievement with Pompey's: 'nec vero ille (Pompeius) civilius quam parens noster auctoritate, consilio, fide reclusit vias, portus patefecit, itinera terris, litoribus mare [litora mari] reddidit diversasque gentes ita commercio miscuit, ut, quod genitum esset usquam, id apud omnes natura videretur.'<sup>2</sup> Such commonplace flattery is too general to cover new construction. Had Trajan started work on a new harbour Pliny would not have missed the opportunity to make the contrast with Pompey. Nor can the coin evidence now be accepted. Strack has argued convincingly that cos. V is a misreading from a worn surface of cos. VI, which is clear on the best specimens.<sup>3</sup> Trajan was consul for the sixth and last time in 112. The coinage commemorating the completion of the work was issued between 112 and his death in 117, probably in 113.<sup>4</sup>

An inscription survives in part at Portus recording the bequest by Trajan probably of a building to the colony of Ostia in the year 101 or 102.<sup>5</sup> This need not be connected with his reconstruction of the harbour system. At the outset of his reign Trajan, while doing enough in Rome to consolidate his popularity, was preoccupied with frontier problems. Work on the new harbour was probably not begun until Dacia had been finally reduced in 106. By then Trajan had more time and more money for major schemes.

<sup>1</sup> R. Paribeni, *Optimus Princeps* (1927) ii. 108.

<sup>2</sup> Pliny, *Panegyric*, 29. 2.

<sup>3</sup> P. L. Strack, *Untersuchungen zur röm. Reichsprägung des zweiten Jahrhunderts* (1931) i. 212.

<sup>4</sup> 112 is excluded because the completion of the harbour is not recorded in the fully preserved entry for the year in the Ostian *Fasti*. Trajan left Rome for Parthia in 114.

<sup>5</sup> S 4342.



## Appendix IV

### A PASSAGE IN MINUCIUS FELIX

MINUCIUS FELIX, in his dialogue *Octavius*, gives a vivid picture of the Ostian shore. His language, however, is difficult and his meaning is not always clear.

II (3) . . . placuit Ostiam petere, amoenissimam civitatem, quod esset corpori meo siccandis umoribus de marinis lavacris blanda et adposita curatio: sane et ad vindemiam feriae iudiciariam curam relaxaverant. Nam id temporis post aestivam diem in temperiem semet autumnitas dirigebat. (4) itaque cum diluculo ad mare inambulando litori (litore)<sup>1</sup> pergeremus, ut et aura adspirans leniter membra vegetaret et cum eximia voluptate molli vestigio cedens harena subsideret, Caecilius simulacro Serapidis denotato, ut vulgus superstitiosus solet, manum ori admovens osculum labiis pressit.

III (2) . . . cum hoc sermone eius medium spatium civitatis emensi iam liberum litus tenebamus. (3) ibi harenas extimas, velut sterneret ambulacro, perfundens lenis unda tendebat; et, ut semper mare etiam positus flatibus inquietum est, etsi non canis spumosisque fluctibus exhibat ad terram, tamen crispis tortuosisque ibidem erroribus delectati perquam sumus, cum in ipso aequoris limine plantas tingeremus, quod vicissim nunc adpulsum nostris pedibus adluderet fluctus, nunc relabens ac vestigia retrahens in sese resorberet. (4) sensim itaque tranquilleque progressi oram curvi molliter litoris iter fabulis fallentibus legebamus. Haec fabulae erant Octavi disserentis de navigatione narratio. (5) sed ubi eundi spatium satis iustum cum sermone consumpsimus, eandem emensi viam rursus versis vestigiis terebamus, et cum ad id loci ventum est, ubi subductae naviculae substratis roboribus a terrena labe suspensae quiescebant, pueros videmus certatim gestientes testarum in mare iaculationibus ludere. . . .

IV (5) 'modo in istis ad tutelam balnearum iactis et in altum procurentibus petrarum obicibus residamus, ut et requiescere de itinere possimus et intentius disputare.'

We decided to visit Ostia, a most attractive town, since the sea baths would provide a soothing and fitting treatment for drying the humours of my body. The holidays for the vine harvest had brought an end to the anxieties of the courts; for after the summer heat the autumn was moving to a cooler mood.

<sup>1</sup> In II (4) the Teubner editor rightly prefers *litori* to the alternative manuscript reading *litore*. 'inambulando litore' would imply that the morning walk begins on the coast. It is clear later that the friends have to walk through the town before they come to the sea. The dative expresses purpose.

So daybreak found us making towards the sea to walk up and down the shore so that the breeze gently blowing might refresh our limbs and we might experience the great pleasure of feeling sand give way gently beneath our feet. Caecilius noticed an image of Serapis and, following the superstition of the common people, moved his hand to his lips and impressed a kiss. . . .

This talk brought us through the middle of the town and we had now reached the open shore. There the water was gently lapping the edge of the sand, as if it was levelling it for our walk; and restless as the sea is even when the winds have dropped, though it did not come in white and foaming waves, yet it trickled in, curling and winding, in a way which delighted us. We dipped our steps in the edge of the sea itself, which washed the waves against our feet and then withdrew them and sucked them back. Leisurely and peacefully we made our way along the gently curving shore with beguiling stories. These came from Octavius on the subject of sailing. But when we had walked as far as our talk took us, we turned and retraced our steps. When we came to the place where the little boats drawn up from the sea rested on their oak frames which raised them from the dangers of rotting that contact with the ground would bring, we saw some young boys competing eagerly at ducks and drakes. . . .

'Let us sit down on this breakwater built to protect the bathing place and running out to sea, so that we can rest from our walk and converse more seriously.'

I assume that the friends lodge in the town. At daybreak they walk, perhaps along the western Decumanus, to the coast, and proceed south along the curving shoreline away from Ostia towards Castel Fusano. They then retrace their steps to the point on the coast from which they started, where they sit on a breakwater built out to sea to protect bathers.

Le Gall<sup>1</sup> has drawn inferences from this passage which need reconsideration:

1. He thinks that the morning walk begins at the east end of the town near the Porta Romana. The friends first proceed along the Tiber bank until they come approximately to the Grandi Horrea; they then leave the river and cross the town by the western Decumanus. Since at the beginning of their walk they are treading on sand, he infers that the Tiber had no embankment east of the Forum. This interpretation rests on a different text in II (4): *itaque cum diluculo ad mare in amnis ambulando litore pergeremus*. For this text there is no manuscript authority and the order of words would be strained even for Minucius Felix. The existence of large Antonine *horrea* at the east end of the town makes it virtually certain that the embankment extended eastwards from the Forum.

2. He suggests that the *balneae* of the passage should be identified with

<sup>1</sup> Le Gall, *Le Tibre*, 333-7.

the small set of baths on the ancient shoreline immediately south of the Baths of Porta Marina. These baths, however, are almost certainly later than the date of the dialogue, and enclosed baths would not need a breakwater to protect them. The reference is presumably to bathing in the open sea.

3. He sees in the small boats evidence for tunny fishing. The inference is too specific. There is nothing odd in small fishing boats being drawn up on the sand in September.

For minor differences of interpretation see Becatti, *Scavi di Ostia*, vi, 51.

## Appendix V

### SOME OSTIAN FAMILIES

#### The Publī Lucilī Gamalae

AMONG the families which played a leading part in Ostia's public life the P. Lucilī Gamalae have a unique record. Before 1938 their history was based on eight inscriptions; each presented difficult problems. The excavations begun in 1938 added three further inscriptions; these introduced new problems without resolving the old.

CIL xiv. 375 (1) and 376 (2) are the key to the family history. They record in detail distinguished careers and they mention a large number of public buildings. Few Ostian inscriptions have been more often quoted, and many false deductions have been made from them. Lively controversy has continued intermittently since 1849 and the main issues are not yet resolved.

Though 1 is no longer extant, its genuineness has not been seriously questioned. It was discovered in the sixteenth century at Porto and there are too many divergences in the copies that have survived to suggest a forgery. Fea could find no trace of it at the beginning of the nineteenth century, but a hundred years earlier Fabretti had seen a large fragment from the stone.<sup>1</sup> It was then much worn; variations in the text show that it was always difficult to read.

Mommsen was the first to draw attention to this inscription, in 1849.<sup>2</sup> On grounds that still seem cogent he dated the career to the Augustan age, but, when he wrote, 2 was unknown to him. This second inscription had remained unnoticed in the Vatican until it was published by Visconti in 1857;<sup>3</sup> but it was almost certainly known in the sixteenth century, for Ligorio seems to have used it for two of his less successful forgeries.<sup>4</sup> In every respect it is a puzzling document. In spite of the distinction of the career recorded it is cut in small letters on a very narrow block of marble.<sup>5</sup> The letters of the opening lines are neat and regular; the rest of the inscription (from l. 12) is cut meanly on an erasure and by a different hand; these letters are even smaller, irregular, and influenced by cursive script. The first part of the inscription is studded with accents; the second has only one. 2 is clearly related to 1 and seems to be a conscious imitation.

<sup>1</sup> Fea, *Viaggio*, 38; R. Fabretti, *Inscriptionum Antiquarum . . . explicatio* (Rome, 1699) 529 n. 381.

<sup>2</sup> Mommsen, *Berichte königlich sächs. Gesell. des Wiss. zu Leipzig*. 1 (1849) 290.

<sup>3</sup> C. L. Visconti, *Ann. Inst.* 29 (1857) 325.

<sup>4</sup> CIL xiv. 13\*, 15\*.

<sup>5</sup> Width 19 cm., height preserved 54 cm. The bottom of the stone is lost, but the inscription seems to be almost complete. Pl. xxxviii d.

Visconti and Homolle<sup>1</sup> rejected the second part of the inscription as a forgery, possibly the work of Ligorio. We may safely follow Mommsen in accepting the whole text as we now see it. The meanness of the second hand is an argument against forgery; a forger would naturally have copied carefully the style of the opening lines. The content is decisive. An early forger is not likely to have known that Ostia had a Forum Vinarium (24). *Navale a L. Coilio aedificatum* (25) also has a genuine ring: the archaic spelling of the name and the absence of cognomen suggest that it is taken from the original monument. A learned forger such as Ligorio could have known from the emperor's biography that Antoninus Pius presented a *lavacrum* to Ostia. He might well have added a restoration after fire to make his text more circumstantial; he is most unlikely to have added *porticum reparavit* (18–20). Any lingering doubts are removed if, as is almost certain, these baths are to be identified with the Baths of Neptune on the Decumanus (p. 409). Brick-stamps provide evidence of reconstruction in the main wing of these baths under Marcus Aurelius.<sup>2</sup> Contemporary restoration in the portico on the Decumanus can also be seen.<sup>3</sup>

Mommsen revised his views in the light of Visconti's publication.<sup>4</sup> Emphasizing the close similarity of the texts he assumed that they referred to the same Gamala and could be regarded as complementary. He identified L. Caesar Aug. f. (2. 6) as L. Aelius Caesar, adopted by Hadrian at the end of 136. The *bellum navale* of l. 42 he referred to the fighting of M. Aurelius against the Marcomanni. According to Mommsen this Gamala's career stretched from the end of Trajan's reign to the reign of Marcus Aurelius.

It is a striking testimony to Mommsen's authority that his main conclusion held the field for more than fifty years, even surviving an attack which should have been fatal. It was accepted by Dessau<sup>5</sup> and by von Premerstein<sup>6</sup> and has been many times repeated. Seeck challenged briefly Mommsen's identification of the two careers, and returned to Mommsen's original Augustan date for 1.<sup>7</sup> It was Carcopino who made the detailed demonstration that the two inscriptions must refer to different men.<sup>8</sup>

There can be no doubt that Carcopino is right in rejecting Mommsen's revised view. As he points out, though the two careers are superficially very similar, there are important differences. The Gamala of 1 is aedile in the cult of Vulcan (1. 4); the Gamala of 2 is both aedile and praetor (2. 3–4). The first

<sup>1</sup> Homolle, *Rev. arch.* 34 (1877) 234–53, 301–15.

<sup>2</sup> Bloch, *Bolli laterizi*, 243.

<sup>3</sup> Most of the brick piers of this portico probably date from the fourth century, but two of the series are much earlier.

<sup>4</sup> Mommsen, *EE* iii (1877) 322 = *Ges. Schrift.* 8 (1913) 329.

<sup>5</sup> *ILS* 6147.

<sup>6</sup> von Premerstein, *Klio*, 12 (1912) 139.

<sup>7</sup> Seeck, *Gesch. des Untergangs der ant. Welt II*, 156 (with II. *Anhang*, 523).

<sup>8</sup> Carcopino, *Mélanges*, 31 (1911) 143.



is made a decurion *gratis* (1. 6); the second, *infans* (2. 5). The games of 1. 11 are a special occasion; those of 2. 23 are a series of games spread over a whole career. The first Gamala builds a new temple of Venus (1. 23); the second restores a temple of Venus (2. 21). Nor is there any valid reason why important benefactions mentioned in 2, such as the restoration of the temple of Castor and Pollux (2. 12) and of the baths of Pius (2. 18), should be omitted in 1 and why others equally important should be present in 1 and absent in 2. The inscriptions refer to two members of the family; it remains to date their careers.

The approximate date of 2 is determined by internal evidence. This Gamala restored a set of public baths after the death of Antoninus Pius in 160. A further clue should be provided in his appointment as *praefectus L(uci) Caes(aris) Aug(usti) f(ilius)* (2. 6). Mommsen and Dessau identified this Lucius Caesar with Lucius Aelius, Hadrian's adopted son. Carcopino challenged this identification on two grounds. He argued that, since Lucius is styled *Augusti filius*, his father should be living when the inscription was cut, especially since Antoninus Pius is described as *divus*. He also held that the appointment was in a censorial year, which excluded Lucius Aelius. The dates of censorial years are established by the Fasti; they fell in 131, 136, 141, but not between the end of 136, when Lucius was adopted, and his death in 138. Carcopino concluded that Lucius Caesar must be Commodus, and that the inscription was set up after 12 October 166, when he became Caesar, and before the death of M. Aurelius on 17 March 180.

Neither of these objections is decisive. If Lucius was the adopted son of the reigning emperor when he accepted the title of office at Ostia, *Augusti filius* could still be used after Hadrian's death, just as in the record of public careers emperors under whom a senator or knight has served are not necessarily styled *divus* if they are dead when the inscription is cut.<sup>1</sup> The second objection involves a difficult point of interpretation in the text (6-7): *iivir. praefecto L. Caesar. Aug. f. cens. q. a.* Carcopino suggests for the last three words *cens(um) q(uinquennalem) a(gentis)*. Such abbreviations are unparalleled and unacceptable; at the least we should expect *cens. quinq. ag.* The last two letters must stand for *q(uaestor) a(erarii)*. Carcopino resisted this solution on the ground that there was only one parallel at Ostia for the bare letters to describe the quaestor's office (5), and he thought that such abbreviations were incompatible with the recording of an important career in full. The parallel, however, is a good one, the career of Cn. Sentius Felix, adoptive father of a Gamala, whose distinguished career is also fully recorded. A further Ostian example has been added since Carcopino wrote.<sup>2</sup>

The use of *cens.* without qualification for the censorial duovirate is, as Carcopino emphasizes, unexpected. The full title of the office is *duovir censoria*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. ILS 986.

<sup>2</sup> S 4648.

*potestate quinquennalis*, often shortened to *duovir quinquennalis* or *quinquennalis*. The form *cens.* (whether *censor*, or *censorius*) is found early in the Principate,<sup>1</sup> but not, apart from this inscription, in the second century. More difficult is the problem of punctuation. It is formally possible that one, two, or three offices are concerned. Gamala could have been *duovir praefectus* for Lucius in a censorial year; he could have been *duovir*, and then subsequently *praefectus* in a censorial year; or he could have been *duovir*, then *praefectus*, and later censorial *duovir*. Normal usage strongly favours the separation of the offices of *duovir* and *praefectus*.<sup>2</sup> It is more difficult to decide whether *cens.* stands for *censoris* (*censorii*) or *censori* (*censorio*). The first usage is common; for the second a parallel can be found at Ostia (Bloch, 23). M. Acilius Priscus is described on his statue base as *iivir aedil. ii quinquennal. praef. ii*. It has been suggested earlier (p. 197, n. 5) that the office of aedile has been misplaced. Priscus was probably *duovir* twice, censorial *duovir* once, and *praefectus* twice. Similarly Gamala may have been *duovir*, *praefectus*, and, later, *quinquennalis*.

This possibility should be kept in mind in the light of the opening two lines of the inscription recording the assigning of the site for the building of the temple of Bellona: 'A. Livius Proculus P. Lucilius Gamala f. iivir praef. Caesar.'<sup>3</sup> This Gamala was *praefectus Caesaris*; we have argued above that the Caesar he represented was L. Aelius (p. 201). It is an attractive economy to identify him with the Gamala of 2. That Hadrian's adopted son was called Lucius Caesar we know from literary and epigraphic sources;<sup>4</sup> the name is not attested for Commodus who, so far as our evidence goes, was called either L. Aurelius Caesar or Commodus Caesar.<sup>5</sup> I therefore incline to the view that the Gamala of 2 was born towards the end of Trajan's reign. In view of his family tradition he was probably elected to the duovirate early; his father was still alive when in 137 he represented L. Aelius, since in the inscription on the temple of Bellona he is distinguished as *f(ilius)*. He will have become *pontifex Volcani* probably under Antoninus Pius and continued his public benefactions into the reign of Marcus Aurelius. He will have died either under M. Aurelius or Commodus. If we accept Carcopino's identification of Lucius Caesar with Commodus he will have been born some twenty years later and have died not later than 180.

Carcopino, while dissociating 2 from 1 decisively, did not accept an Augustan date for 1. He based his view on the mention of *tribunal quaes(toris)* (39), the *bellum navale* (42), and the place of discovery, Portus. The discovery of the inscription at Portus suggested a date after the beginning of the Claudian harbour in A.D. 42; the *bellum navale* was the conquest of Britain; the inscription was set up between 42 and 44, when the quaestor was replaced by an imperial procurator.

<sup>1</sup> S 4710, Bloch, 61.

<sup>2</sup> RE, 'duovir' (Liebenam), 1819.

<sup>3</sup> 4.

<sup>4</sup> CIL xiv. 2486; SHA, Marc. Aur. 5. 1; Verus, 2. 1.

<sup>5</sup> PIR<sup>2</sup>, A 1482.

These controls are too stringent. It is doubtful whether important inferences should be drawn from the finding of the stone at Portus. The buildings and bequests of the inscription seem to concern Ostia and not the harbour area. If the inscription was originally set up by the harbours we should expect the fact and the reason to be stated on the stone. It is more likely that it once stood on the same site in Ostia as the other (2), which it seems to have closely resembled in form and style. In the fourth century and later, Ostia, in sharp decline, was the cheapest source of bricks and marble for the builders of Portus. Gamala's proud inscription may have been used to line a pavement or restore a wall.

The identification of the *bellum navale* with the British expedition should be rejected. It was well known that the tribes of Britain had no war fleet; no naval fighting can have been anticipated. Nor can we believe that the conquest of Britain was financed by Italian towns. Mommsen's view that the war in question was against the Marcomanni and that the money was needed to strengthen the Pannonian and Moesian fleets has the same weakness; in the northern campaigns of Marcus Aurelius the fleets played a very subordinate part and the war could not reasonably be described as a *bellum navale*. von Premerstein's identification with a war against the Moorish pirates in the western Mediterranean or against the Kostoboki under Marcus Aurelius,<sup>1</sup> or Mancini's with Commodus' projected expedition against the Moors,<sup>2</sup> suit the language better, but their attractiveness rests on the false assumption that 1 and 2 refer to the same Gamala. The fighting against the Moors falls within the career of the second; the *bellum navale* occurs during the career of the first.

In view of the striking similarity of the records it is tempting to assign both inscriptions to the second century. This was the view briefly stated by Wilson, who suggested that they commemorated father and son.<sup>3</sup> It was developed more fully by Miss Taylor in an interesting re-examination of 1.<sup>4</sup> Miss Taylor found an important clue in a piece of evidence not known to her predecessors. A fragment of the Fasti records the restoration of the temple of Vulcan in 112. This temple was restored by the elder Gamala, who was aedile in the cult of Vulcan and, later, *pontifex: idem aedem Volcani sua pecunia restituit* (21 f.). 'It seems very likely that this restoration (of 112) was identical with the one made by the *pontifex* P. Lucilius Gamala of no. 375.'

If this identification were right, *bellum navale* cannot mean a naval war, for there was no serious naval engagement under the Flavians, Trajan, or Hadrian. Miss Taylor revived a suggestion made long ago by Cavedoni that *bellum navale* is here used instead of the normal *naumachia* for a naval display.<sup>5</sup> She

<sup>1</sup> von Premerstein, *Klio* 12 (1912) 141.

<sup>2</sup> Mancini, *Atti Reale Acc. Nap.* 13 (1887-9) 170.    <sup>3</sup> Wilson, *BSR* 14 (1938) 152.

<sup>4</sup> L. R. Taylor, *AJP* 57 (1936) 183, followed by Thylander, *Étude sur l'épigraphie latine* (1952) 6-9.

<sup>5</sup> Cavedoni, *Bull. arch. Nap.* NS 6 (1858) 195.

suggested that Gamala's contribution to a *bellum navale* may have been made for the *naumachia* of Trajan recorded for 109 in the Fasti of Ostia: *III id. Nov. [i]mp. Traianus naumachiam suam dedicavit [in] qua dieb. VI pp. CXXVIIIS et consumm. VIII k. Dec.* The duration of the celebration for six days justified the use of *bellum* instead of *proelium*. Miss Taylor further suggested that the spectacle was held in Trajan's new hexagonal basin at Ostia, following the precedent of the great *naumachia* of Claudius on the Fucine lake. The contribution promised by the colony of Ostia was not for the expenses of the spectacle, which the emperor himself probably defrayed, but for the entertainment of the visitors who would have had to come from Rome and the surrounding towns for a stay of some days. His public-spirited contribution to the fund for the *bellum navale* caused the decurions of Ostia to vote Gamala a bronze statue at Ostia beside the quaestor's tribunal, and a gilded statue (I. 30), the location of which is not specified. Miss Taylor tentatively suggests that the lost inscription (I), found at Portus, may have been cut on the base of this second statue, set up near the scene of the *bellum navale*. Miss Taylor's conclusion is that this Gamala reached the peak of his career under Trajan and was probably grandfather of the Gamala of 2. Carcopino's point that the mention of a *tribunal quaes(toris)* sets a lower limit of A.D. 44 Miss Taylor meets by suggesting that the tribunal belonged to the chief officer of the local treasury, the *quaestor aerarii Ostiensis*.

These arguments are extremely vulnerable. It is very unlikely that a public *naumachia* would have been held in Trajan's harbour at least three years before the issue of the commemorative coinage celebrating the completion of the work, and Strack has shown convincingly that the coins were issued when Trajan was cos. VI, that is, in or after 112 (p. 489). It is also virtually certain that the entry in the Fasti for 109 records the dedication of a building in Rome.<sup>1</sup> This does not, however, rule out the possibility that a naval display was given in the harbour at Ostia in one of the later years of the reign not covered in detail by the Fasti; but would the town in those expansive days have sold its properties to raise the promised contribution? We are also still left with the difficulty of accepting *bellum navale* as an alternative for *naumachia*. *Bellum* is certainly used for *proelium* in poets and late prose, but I can find no convincing example of the use of *bellum* for a mock battle or series of mock battles.<sup>2</sup>

The argument on which the dating hinges, the date of the restoration of the temple of Vulcan, has now lost much of its force. A further fragment of the Fasti, unknown to Miss Taylor when she wrote, records that M. Acilius Priscus Egrilius Plarianus was made *pontifex Volcani* in 105; he was still alive in 118 (Bloch, 25). Gamala cannot have been *pontifex* when the temple was restored in 112. This does not exclude the possibility that he paid for the

<sup>1</sup> Degraffi, *Fasti*, 229 (on 109, l. 15).

<sup>2</sup> *Thesaurus ling. lat.* ii. 1824-7, 1851.

restoration, but it makes the suggestion much less convincing. Nor is it easy to fit in Gamala's period as *pontifex* in this period. We know that M. Acilius Priscus Egrilius Plarianus was immediately preceded by P. Ostiensis Macedo (*Fasti*, 105); by 128 (*S* 4445) the office was held by his nephew, A. Egrilius Plarianus the younger. Gamala was appointed *pontifex* before he became *duovir* (I. 7-8), presumably fairly early in life; he should have held the office a long time. Nor is it easy to accept Miss Taylor's suggestion that the Ostian quaestor had a special tribunal, unless other municipal parallels can be found. If the inscription was originally set up at Portus it was not on the base of Gamala's gilded statue. The stone is variously described as a *cippus* or a *columna quadrata*; it was not a statue base.

These difficulties disappear if we return to Mommsen's original view that the elder Gamala is Augustan. The arguments may be briefly tabulated:

1. *Bellum navale* can have its natural meaning. It is the war against Sextus Pompeius of 38-36 B.C. This war, on which corn supplies depended, concerned Ostia vitally. Appian records that Octavian was promised help by friends and cities.<sup>1</sup> Ostia's promised contribution in such a context needs no explanation. The need to sell public property to raise money accords much better with the difficult years of civil war than with the great prosperity of the early second century. It must be admitted that after *pollicitatio* we should expect an objective genitive of the thing promised, but there is no great difficulty in understanding *belli navalis* as a substitute for a prepositional phrase which would have been less elegant, the promise arising from, associated with, or in the time of the naval war.<sup>2</sup>

2. *Tribunal quae(toris)* can also have its natural meaning. It is the tribunal from which the Roman quaestor stationed at Ostia administered justice. That he had powers of jurisdiction might be assumed from his function of controlling the passage through Ostia of corn for Rome. It is confirmed by the full title, *quaestor pro praetore*, recorded on two inscriptions.<sup>3</sup> The natural inference is that the inscription was set up before the quaestor was withdrawn in A.D. 44.

3. The colleague with whom Gamala presented weights to the Macellum, M. Turranius, has no cognomen. The absence of cognomen is common in the late Republic and under Augustus.<sup>4</sup> In the second century when the emphasis had shifted decisively to the cognomen it would have been a very strange anomaly.

4. Gamala shared in a presentation of weights to the Macellum (29-31).

<sup>1</sup> Appian, *BC* v. 92; cf. Dio xlviii. 49.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Cicero, *Tusc. disp.* i. 30, 'deorum opinio (= de deis)'; id. *Ad fam.* viii. 8. 4 (Caelius), 'expectatio Galliarum (= de Galliis quid decernatur)'. On this and other points of Latinity I owe much to my colleague, Mr. G. W. Williams.

<sup>3</sup> 3603, Bloch, 32.

<sup>4</sup> *Fasti*, 48, 47, 45 B.C.; 426, *S* 4710. See p. 477 f.



The entry comes towards the end of the inscription and therefore probably records one of his last benefactions. An inscription records the restoration of the Macellum under Augustus (Bloch, 67). This would have been a particularly suitable occasion for presenting new weights. Similarly the weights presented by the Gamala of 2 may have accompanied a large-scale restoration which can be dated in the later part of the second century (p. 549). There is, however, clearly no necessary association between new weights and new building.

5. It is unsatisfactory to argue from the form of an inscription that has never been described in detail and is now lost; but we can accept the length of line as recorded. The number of very short lines seems out of place in the second century, but much less surprising under Augustus.

6. There are not sufficient early forms in 1 to argue strongly from the spelling. *Ahenea* (38), *proxume* (39), *trichilinis* (17) would be unusual in the second century; but, since 2 has *peq(unia)* for *pec(unia)* (27), it would be dangerous to argue from such evidence.

7. The style of the Latin is perhaps closer to Caesar than to the second century. In particular the use of *propterea quod* is still common in Caesar and Cicero, but is very rarely used in the Empire.<sup>1</sup>

If these arguments are sound, the Gamala of 1 was born in the late Republic, probably between 80 and 60 B.C. He had reached maturity when Caesar crossed the Rubicon and was a leading figure in Ostia during the difficult years of civil war. He lived to see the new order established after Actium and deserved the public funeral that was voted to him when he died under Augustus. His descendant of the second century (2) was very conscious of the family tradition of public service and even the inscription that commemorated him was closely modelled in form and style on that of his Augustan predecessor.

Some further notes of interpretation which do not affect the central issue should be added:

1. 5-6. *aedili d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) allecto gratis decurioni*. His admission by the decurions might formally apply to the aedileship or the decurionate. For the first there is a rough parallel in Cn. Sergius Priscus, *ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) aedili adlecto* (412), but, since *gratis* almost certainly applies to his admission to the council, the preceding phrase should accompany it. The order of words is unusual, the standard formula being *decurionum decreto decurio adlectus*.

<sup>1</sup> K. Reisinger, *Über Bedeutung u. Verwend. Praep. propter*, i (Landau, 1897) 75, ii (Speyer, 1900) 60. The order of words in l. 12, 'in ludos cum accepisset public(um) lucar remisit', has more parallels in Caesar than in second-century prose. Mommsen originally held that *lucar* suggested an early date, but the word is still used by Tacitus (*Ann.* i. 77. 4).

9-12. *iivir(o) censoriae pot(estatis) quinquennal(i) in comitis facto curatori pecuniae publicae exigendae . . . . In comitis facto* might qualify what precedes or what follows. Normal usage favours the first alternative, but the close parallel in 2. 13-16, *idem curator pecuniae publicae exigendae et attribuendae in comitis factus*, favours the second. The office of *quinquennalis* was a normal magistracy; it is more likely that the form of appointment was specified in the financial office, which was an extraordinary appointment. The order of words resembles the entry in lines 5-6.

15-16. *idem sua pecunia viam silice stravit quae est iuncta foro ab arcu ad arcum*. All streets leading to the Forum have now been excavated and there are no arches at the Hadrianic level that fit this context. Tentatively I suggest that the street paved by Gamala is the Decumanus Maximus where it passes through the centre of the town and that the 'arches' are the original east and west gates of the fourth-century Castrum. These were probably not destroyed until the sharp raising of the level in the late first or early second century.

23 sq. This Gamala built temples of Venus, Fortuna, Ceres, and, later, of Spes. They have been tentatively identified with three of the four small temples on a common platform west of the theatre and the slightly later temple at the corner of the Decumanus and the Via dei Molini (p. 351).

43. It should be emphasized that the sum of money contributed by Gamala is variously recorded and must be regarded as most uncertain.

2. 25. *idem navale a L. Coilio aedificatum extruentibus fere collapsum restituit*. On the stone one can read EXTRU-NTIBUS. The spacing of letters in the second half of the inscription is irregular, and either one or two letters could be missing. Mommsen's *extruentibus* is to be preferred to *extrudentibus*; the *navale* was for the building of ships. Carcopino identified this *navale* with a building some 200 metres east of Tor Boacciona, but a limited excavation showed that this building did not extend to the river (p. 126).

The Gamalae remained prominent in the Julio-Claudian period. A P. Lucilius Gamala is recorded in the Fasti as 'iivir II' in A.D. 19, and two new inscriptions record members of the family in the early Principate. The first (3) honours a Gamala for pleading the case of Ostia in the Roman senate.<sup>1</sup> He had been aedile at Ostia, military tribune, decurion, duovir four times. The letters of the inscription are deep and carefully cut. They suggest an Augustan or early Julio-Claudian date. Other signs of an early date are the abbreviations *trib. milit.* without the name of the legion, and the archaic form *grateis*. The first two lines, recording the name, are on a lower level, suggesting that the original surface has been cut away, but there is no reason for dissociating the career from the man.

<sup>1</sup> This inscription was first published by F. Grosso in *Atti del III<sup>o</sup> Congresso internazionale di Epigrafia greca e latina*, 1959, 133.

This career has certain resemblances to the Augustan Gamala already considered (1). Both are co-opted to the council without fee; both are aedile before becoming councillor. It is not impossible that they refer to the same man; it is, however, unlikely. The Gamala of 1 becomes *pontifex Volcani* before he reaches the censorial duovirate; the Gamala of the new inscription is not yet *pontifex Volcani* when he has held the duovirate four times. In the career of the Gamala of 1 the military tribunate, having no Ostian reference, might have been omitted; but the pleading of Ostia's case in the Roman senate would have been included. The Gamala of 3 is better identified with the duovir II of A.D. 19.

The second new inscription of an early period is a mere fragment. Only the beginnings of four lines are preserved: 'P. Lucilio— | P. nep.— | Ga— | pon—'. This inscription would seem to honour a Gamala who is *pontifex Volcani*. The letters are good and early. This Gamala might be Augustan; he might even be the Gamala of the lost inscription (1).

The history of the family in the Flavian period and in the early second century is elusive. A Gamala was adopted by Cn. Sentius Felix, the wealthy patron of so many guilds, and became Cn. Sentius Clodianus Lucilius Gamala. It has been suggested that he may be the Cn. Sentius Clodianus, recorded in the Fasti as duovir for 102, and as patron with his adoptive father of an unidentified guild under Hadrian (p. 201). A bolder conjecture has also been made, that possibly his elder brother served as *praefectus* for Hadrian in 126, and that it was this man's son who served for Lucius Aelius Caesar in 137 (p. 201). Spanning the next half-century we have the detailed career of the last Gamala known to us (2).

For some 200 years at least the family had held high office in Ostia. Two at least of its members had been *pontifex Volcani*; they had built and rebuilt temples and been generous to the common people. Like M. Acilius Priscus Egrilius Plarianus (Bloch, 24) they were 'pii ac religiosissimi', loyal to their town and family, and upholders of the traditional cults. We have suggested that the family had no connexion with the east and that its roots were in Italy, but probably outside Ostia (p. 194). There is no evidence connecting them with trade, and their freedmen are not found in the guild rolls. They were probably landed gentry. Doubtless they could have made their way in the imperial service; it seems that they deliberately preferred the less anxious honours of local government.

#### The Senatorial Egrilii

The chronology and relationships of the senatorial Egrilii have been much disputed since the middle of the nineteenth century. None of the earlier reconstructions, however, have withstood the crucial test of new discoveries. Further inscriptions found in the excavations begun in 1938 have provided

firm chronological controls and added much new evidence for the history of the family. These new inscriptions were admirably published by Bloch in 1953; what follows is based on his Italian commentary.<sup>1</sup>

M. Acilius Priscus A. f. Egrilius Plarianus was already known to have been *praefectus aerarii militaris* before his appointment as *pontifex Volcani* (S 4444). We now know from the Fasti that he became *pontifex* in 105. He was *praefectus aerarii Saturni* in 106 (Bloch, 25),\* and was still alive in 118 when, with his son, he set up a commemorative tablet to Hadrian (Bloch, 26). We do not know whether he reached the consulship; he will have been born about 70 or rather earlier. His adoptive father was a M. Acilius Priscus whom, following Bloch, we may identify with the M. Acilius Priscus of an inscription on a statue base found in 1938 (Bloch, 23 = 7). The lettering of this inscription suggests a date in or near the Flavian period. Priscus was dead by or soon after 100, because he was *pontifex Volcani*, and this post, which was held for life, was filled by M. Acilius Priscus Egrilius Plarianus from 105, and by P. Ostiensis Macedo before him (Fasti, 105).<sup>2</sup> His connexion with the Egrilii is established by the inscription itself, for Priscus left instructions in his will for his statue to be set up 'per A. Egrilium [?Primi]genium'. His adopted son, now rising in his senatorial career, may not have been in a position to act.

Before his adoption M. Acilius Priscus A. f. Egrilius Plarianus was an Egrilius Plarianus; his father, like the earlier Egrilii recorded in the Fasti, was an Aulus Egrilius. The cognomen Plarianus, which replaced Rufus in the main branch of the Egrilii, clearly comes from Plaria Q. f. Vera, *flaminica divae Augustae*, who is honoured as 'mater A. Egrili Plariani, patris, p(atroni) c(oloniae), co(n)s(ulis)' (399). Bloch is also probably right, following a suggestion made by Freeman Adams, in identifying her husband with an A. Egrilius Rufus whose career is recorded in a new inscription (Bloch, 22 = 6).<sup>3</sup> He was aedile, quaestor, duovir, and *flamen Romae et Augusti*. The style of the lettering seems to be too late to commend identification with A. Egrilius Rufus recorded in the Fasti as *praefectus* in 36.

Bloch rightly insists that, since M. Acilius Priscus Egrilius Plarianus is given all his names in the Fasti and in at least five other Ostian inscriptions, he cannot be identified with A. Egrilius Plarianus, pater, consul, son of Plaria Vera (399). He was probably his younger brother. The clue comes in a later Q. Egrilius Plarianus, who served as staff legate in Africa towards the end of Antoninus Pius' reign, when an Egrilius Plarianus, probably his father, was governor.<sup>3</sup> As Bloch points out, the praenomen Quintus, like the cognomen

<sup>1</sup> Bloch, NS 1953, 254-64.

<sup>2</sup> Priscus may not have been the immediate predecessor of Macedo. Barbieri (*Studi romani*, i (1953) 369) restores a probable fragment from the Fasti: 'in locum Q. Do[miti] P. Ost]iensis Ma[cedo pontif(ex)] . . . creatus est.'

<sup>3</sup> CIL viii. 110260; AE 1942-3, 85.

Plarianus, should have come to the family from Plaria Vera Q. f., and from this it is a logical step to infer that M. Acilius Priscus Egrilius Plarianus started life as Q. Egrilius Plarianus, younger son of Plaria Vera and A. Egrilius Rufus. Bloch offers an attractive restoration of an inscription which would make Plaria Vera honoured as his mother. Two friends, L. Vettius Felix and P. Novellius Atticus, who commemorated M. Acilius Priscus Egrilius Plarianus (155), also commemorated one of his relations (156): 'Plariae Q. f. Verae matri' would admirably fill the gap. It was probably his son, reverting to the father's original family name, Q. Egrilius Plarianus, who was governor of Africa in 158/9 after holding the consulship in 143 or 144.<sup>1</sup>

The elder son of Plaria Vera, A. Egrilius Plarianus, was, like his brother, prefect of the public treasury (Bloch, 27); he became consul in or near the early years of Trajan.\* In his inscriptions he is described as *pater* (399 and Bloch, 27) to distinguish him from his son, who was appointed to the military treasury before becoming consul in 128 (S 4445; Fasti, 128). The son was *pontifex Volcani* while he was at the military treasury (S 4445). Probably he directly succeeded his uncle, who held the office from 105 at least until 118.

We may have a record of a near relation of these senatorial Egrilii in an unpublished funerary inscription set up by an Ostian *procurator Augusti* who was also a patron of the colony (above, p. 208). His wife was Egrilia Pulchra, and the fine lettering of the inscription suggests the Flavian period or the early second century.

One inscription still remains very controversial. A fragment from a roll of the members of an Ostian guild, probably the *dendrophori*, includes distinguished names among its patrons (281): '[patr]oni | —cus Egril(ius) Plarian(us) | —f. Larcus Lepidus | —Plarianus | —Agrippinus.' It is tempting to restore the first name as M. Acilius Priscus Egrilius Plarianus, but the guild roll is firmly dated in the Severan period.<sup>2</sup> Bloch, following Wickert, believes that the name of M. Acilius Priscus Egrilius Plarianus was retained among the patrons owing to his special distinction long after his death, and with him his son, Q. Egrilius Plarianus, and C. Fabius Agrippinus, the Ostian consul of 148.<sup>3</sup> This is difficult to accept. There were other and better ways of honouring dead patrons than in listing their names on an active roll. The names should be those of living men.

The second patron on the list seems to be a Larcus Lepidus adopted into another family. The senatorial Larcii were not Ostian, but it is interesting to

<sup>1</sup> For the date of the consulship, Syme, *JRS* 36 (1946) 167; Degraffi, *Fasti consulari*, p. 41.

<sup>2</sup> If P. Claudius Abascantus qq II (281, col. 2, 15) is, as seems certain, to be identified with P. Claudius Abascantus qq II corp(or)is dendrophorum Ostiens(ium), honoured with a statue in 203 (324).

<sup>3</sup> Bloch, 264; Wickert, 'Zur Geschichte der Gens Egrilia', *Sitz. Preuss. Ak. Wiss.* (Berlin, 1928) 6.



note that A. Larcus Eutyches was manufacturing water-pipes at Ostia under Hadrian,<sup>1</sup> and the name is not uncommon in the town later. Perhaps the family had a villa in the neighbourhood. The association of the Larcii Lepidi with the Egrilii is probably reflected in the cognomen of A. Larcus Lepidus Plarianus, mentioned in the record of the Arval brothers for 145 (*ILS* 5038); and, more clearly, in the presence of a Larcus Lepidus on the staff of Q. Egrilius Plarianus when he was governor of Africa. The patron might be the son, of this Larcus Lepidus, adopted by Q. Egrilius Plarianus the governor's son, who served as his colleague on the staff in Africa.<sup>2</sup> The third patron could be a Q. Egrilius Plarianus, grandson of the governor of Africa. C. Fabius Agrippinus, if this is the right restoration, could be the son or grandson of the Ostian consul of 148. The first name is the most puzzling, but it might represent an association of the Egrilii with another branch of the Larcii, the Larcii Prisci: A. Larcus Priscus Egrilius Plarianus. Precise identification cannot be pressed. It is sufficient to show that there is no insuperable objection to regarding the Severan patrons of the *dendrophori* as living men. They witness the continued concern of the senatorial Egrilii for Ostia.

There are further tantalizing glimpses of the influential connexions of the Egrilii. An inscription on a statue base from Pisaurum commemorates Arria L. f. Plaria Vera Priscilla, *flaminica*, wife of M'. Acilius Glabrio, consul (*CIL* xi. 6333). She should be related to Plaria Vera, wife of A. Egrilius Rufus. The association of the Egrilii with the L. Arrii at a lower level is attested by an Ostian inscription set up to L. Arrius Hermes, *vascularius*, by an A. Egrilius Plarianus (467). It is also tempting to link a dedication by M. Acilius Priscus Egrilius Plarianus to Diana Nemorensis (*CIL* xiv. 2212) with the name of Arria Priscilla (? = Arria Plaria Vera Priscilla) on a water-pipe in Diana's sanctuary (*CIL* xv. 7830). The date of the Pisauran statue base is not recorded. The letters are well shaped, the organization of the text simple and severe. The identification of Priscilla's husband with M'. Acilius Glabrio, consul of 152, adopted by Groag<sup>3</sup> and commonly accepted, cannot be ruled out, but an earlier Glabrio, the consul of 91 or his son, the consul of 124, is to be preferred; such an earlier dating, better suited to the lettering of the monument, would have the additional advantage of bringing Arria Plaria Vera Priscilla nearer to Plaria Vera.

An inscription from Rome suggests that an Egrilia married into the Vibii Maximi (*CIL* vi. 1538): 'C. Vibio, C. fil. Maximo Egriliano laticlavio'. This Maximus may be descended from C. Vibius Maximus, friend of Statius, prefect of Egypt in 104 (*PIR*<sup>1</sup> V 389), and, perhaps before that, *praefectus*

<sup>1</sup> 1996.

<sup>2</sup> The town of Gighi set up three statues to patrons, the proconsul (whose name is only partly preserved), his son Q. Egrilius Plarianus, and – Larcus Lepidus. *CIL* viii. 11030, 11026, 11027.

<sup>3</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 73, A 1120.

*annonae*.<sup>1</sup> The marriage of a *praefectus annonae*, whose work will have taken him to Ostia, or of his son to an Ostian Egrilia is an attractive hypothesis. Two other inscriptions may probably be dismissed. In Parma was discovered an inscription set up to his wife Asicia Frontine by O. Aegrilius Plarianus (*CIL* xi. 1075). Perhaps the cutter should have written Q, but the Asicii were not, so far as we know, socially distinguished or politically prominent; it is unlikely that this is a senatorial Q. Egrilius. Similarly A. Egrilius A. f. Plarianus, *decurialis scr(iba) cer(arius)*, married to a Claudia Hermione (346), must, in spite of his name, be descended from a freedman of the family.

The senatorial Egrilii may have acquired philosophical interests in their rise to imperial distinction. Among Fronto's letters addressed to his friends is one to an Egrilius Plarianus;<sup>2</sup> Groag has also suggested that Q. Aelius Egrilius Euactus, *philosophus* (*ILS* 7776), the friend of Salvius Junianus, may have derived his citizenship from Q. Egrilius Plarianus, governor of Africa, or his son (*PIR*<sup>2</sup>, E 49).

The Egrilii and the Lucilii Gamalae are the two outstanding families in Ostia's local history during the early Empire. They were both well established by the time of Augustus and they maintained their pre-eminence in the town through the second century. Both families proudly emphasize their long line of free ancestors. Both respected Ostia's religious traditions, providing each at least two members who became *pontifex Volcani*. Both accepted the informal responsibilities of public generosity attached to public office. But the contrast between them is sharp. The Gamalae confined their ambitions to Ostia; the Egrilii seized their chances when further opportunities were given to new men under the Flavian and second-century emperors, and gave distinguished service to the empire, without forgetting their town of origin. The contrast may be explained by the background of the two families. We have suggested that the fortunes of the Egrilii were based on trade. This is an inference from the wide distribution of their freedmen in the trade guilds and their own accumulation of treasury posts. It may be significant that of the few Ostian bankers recorded three are freedmen of the Egrilii.<sup>3</sup> The Gamalae were probably conservative landowners.

Against this background the adoptions from the two families in or near the Flavian period have an air of irony. The conservative Gamalae give one of their members to Cn. Sentius Felix, a rich trader, who has probably only recently come to Ostia. From the progressive Egrilii Q. Egrilius Plarianus is adopted into an old Ostian family by M. Acilius Priscus, who gave up imperial ambitions for a long period of public office in Ostia, and who seems to

<sup>1</sup> Syme, 'C. Vibius Maximus, Prefect of Egypt', *Hist.* 6 (1957) 483 f. The Roman inscription is probably not earlier than the late Antonine period (Syme, art. cit. 487 n. 40).

<sup>2</sup> Fronto, *Ad amicos*, I. 4 (MS. Accri[lio Pl]ariano).

<sup>3</sup> S 4644, Bloch, 53 (referring also to a third, unpublished, inscription).

have had no connexion with trade. Perhaps the unexpected alliance of the Gamalae with business interests was dictated by financial stringency. As the standard of living rose and the cost of public benefactions increased, their land revenues may have proved inadequate. The Egrilii, on the other hand, were wealthy; their main concern in the adoption was to increase their social prestige.

### The Acilii

That M. Acilius Priscus, the Flavian knight (Bloch, 23), assumed to be the adoptive father of M. Acilius Priscus Egrilius Plarianus, was an Ostian living in Ostia can be regarded as certain in view of his long record of local office. It is natural to associate him with M. Acilius, duovir of 48 B.C. (Fasti). To the same family should belong M. Acilius M. f. Caninus (153). As Roman quaestor he was honoured with a statue at Ostia by the *negotiatores ex area Saturni*. We may infer that he was an Ostian and that he held the quaestorship when quaestors still presided over the public treasury, that is, before 28 B.C. He is probably not to be identified with the duovir of 48 B.C. since the latter has no cognomen in the Fasti and the lettering of Caninus' inscription seems later; there should, however, be some relationship. He should also be related to M. Acilius, legate of Caesar in 48 B.C. and proconsul of Sicily in 46/45, whose cognomen is variously given by different manuscripts as Caninus, Caninius, Caninianus.<sup>1</sup> No M. Acilii during the Empire rose to imperial distinction, and the M. Acilius Priscus who adopted Q. Egrilius Plarianus may be the last of the line. Freedmen of the family and their descendants, Aciliae and M. Acilii, are not uncommon in Ostia.

Very different were the Manii Acilii. Two brothers, Glabrio and Aviola, were raised by P. Scipio Africanus to the consulship at the beginning of the second century B.C.<sup>2</sup> A M'. Acilius Aviola was consul in A.D. 239; M'. Acilii Glabrones also held consulships in the third century. They weathered the storms of civil war and avoided dangerous prominence under the Julio-Claudians. The consul of 91 and his father were both members of Domitian's *consilium*;<sup>3</sup> the son, a too successful performer against wild beasts at the emperor's Alban villa, was killed in 95 on suspicion of plotting revolution.<sup>4</sup> He had been consul with the future emperor Trajan and would have been one of the leading figures of his reign. But his son survived him to be consul in 124, and consulships came to his descendants in 152 and 186 (for the second

<sup>1</sup> For Caesar's legate of 48 B.C. the manuscripts give only the cognomen and record it differently. The Oxford text (1900) and the Teubner text (1950) print M'. Acilius; that his praenomen was Marcus is shown by Dio xlii. 12. 1. As governor of Sicily he was hard pressed for favours by Cicero (*Ad fam.* xiii. 30-39).

<sup>2</sup> F. Münzer, *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien*, 91.

<sup>3</sup> Juv. iv. 94-98.      <sup>4</sup> Dio lxvii. 14. 3; Suet. *Dom.* 10. 2; Juv. iv. 94 with schol.

time). The Manii Acilii had been a new family when they rose to the consulship; by the end of the second century few could match their nobility. The consul II of 186 boasted descent from Aeneas, and was offered the throne by Pertinax.<sup>1</sup>

This great family had associations with Ostia. 'Glabrio p(atronus) c(oloniae)', who set up a statue of Hygia outside the Porta Romana to *salus Caesaris Augusti* (S 4324), is clearly a M'. Acilius Glabrio, recalling in the form of his dedication his family's association with the introduction of Greek medicine to Rome;<sup>2</sup> but his identification is uncertain. Groag, emphasizing the title Caesar Augustus, which, though still found under Claudius and Nero,<sup>4</sup> points more naturally to Augustus, suggested identification with the proconsul of Africa of 25 B.C. (PIR<sup>2</sup>, A 71). The lettering of the inscription seems to me too mature for this date,<sup>3</sup> and M'. Acilius Memmius Glabrio, Tiber curator under Tiberius (PIR<sup>2</sup>, A 75), perhaps his son, is to be preferred. M'. Acilius Aviola, consul in 54 A.D., who may also have been called Glabrio (PIR<sup>2</sup>, A 62), cannot be ruled out. The level of the base shows that it is earlier than the rebuilding of the Porta Romana under Domitian or Trajan and virtually excludes the consul of 91 or any later member of the family. The economy in material also confirms an early date. The marble base rests on two steps in travertine. While the higher step projects on all four sides, the lower step is flush with the upper step at the back; such an economy would be surprising in the Flavian period or later.

Arria L. f. Plaria Vera Priscilla, wife of M'. Acilius Glabrio, consul (CIL xi. 6333), should be related to Plaria Vera, wife of A. Egrilius Rufus.<sup>5</sup> We have suggested that her husband may be the consul of 91 or his son (p. 505). A later connexion of the family with Ostia is attested by an inscription found near Acilia and now in St. Paul's monastery: *Thiasus Acili Glabrio(is) imperatu aram fecit dominae* (74). The script is mean and difficult to date. It probably belongs to the second century, and perhaps to the latter half.

There are also traces of freedmen and descendants of freedmen of this branch of the Acilii in Ostia, one not later than the early second century.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Herodian ii. 3. 3 f.

<sup>2</sup> Pliny, *NH* xxix. 12; cf. coinage with head of Salus issued by M'. Acilius c. 55 B.C., E. A. Sydenham, *The Coinage of the Roman Republic*, n. 922.

<sup>3</sup> Phot. *NS* 1910, 60.

<sup>4</sup> The title Caesar Augustus is applied to Claudius (CIL vi. 5539) and to Nero (*ILS* 1838).

<sup>5</sup> The association at a lower level of the family of Plaria Vera with the Acilii is reflected in a funerary inscription from Rome (CIL vi. 24260) which records the marriage of Q. Plarius Trypho to Acilia Nebris; a Plaria Vera, presumably their daughter, is included in the inscription.

<sup>6</sup> 287 records an *Augustalis* and is therefore earlier than the institution of the *seviri Augustales* under Domitian or a little later (p. 219). S 4761, to judge from the lettering, is also not later than the early second century.

Two of these Manii Acilii are registered in the tribe Voturia, M'. Acilius M'. f. Vot. Marianus, and M'. Acilius M'. f. Vot. Restitutus.<sup>1</sup> A natural inference would seem to be that Voturia was the tribe of the Manii Acilii Glabrones and that Ostia was their town of origin. Other evidence, however, raises serious doubts. In an inscription from Tibur (*CIL* xiv. 4237) Glabrio, consul of 152, has the tribe Galeria; in a republican inscription a much earlier Glabrio has the tribe Voltinia.<sup>2</sup> In face of this embarrassing conflict the origin of the family must remain uncertain until more decisive documents are found. It is, however, reasonable to infer from the Ostian evidence that the Acilii Glabrones had a residence in Ostian territory.

#### The Nasennii

I have inferred (p. 202) that C. Nasennius Marcellus, duovir III in 111, a censorial year, was from a family long established at Ostia on the strength of the Ostian tribe Voturia recorded for C. Nasennius Proculus (1395 + S 5035). I have found no traces of the family, however, before the Flavian period. The name does not appear earlier in surviving fragments of the Fasti, and none of the inscriptions of freedmen C. Nasennii or their descendants that I have seen is pre-Flavian.

The argument from silence cannot, however, be pressed, since the record of the Fasti is very incomplete and pre-Flavian inscriptions are considerably less common than those of the succeeding period. It is reasonable to believe that a man who is duovir for the third time in 111 is not a newcomer. The inscription recording C. Nasennius Vot(uria) Proculus may also be significant. Its lettering suggests a Flavian or slightly later date, and the association of names in the family group is interesting. Proculus makes the tomb for himself, C. Nasennius Agathyrsus his father, Lucilia — his mother, Terentia Acris his wife (a freedwoman), and C. Nasennius Proculus his son. His father's cognomen Agathyrsus suggests that he is a freedman; his wife is a freedwoman of the Terentii. Both Lucilii and Terentii are old-established families.<sup>3</sup> Freedmen are likely to follow the associations of their patrons.

The full career of the duovir of 111 is recorded in one complete inscription (171) and another that is fragmentary (S 4457). Though the lettering is radically different in the two inscriptions<sup>4</sup> the identity cannot be questioned. The same posts are set in the same chronological order. This Marcellus was

<sup>1</sup> S 4761, 1073.

<sup>2</sup> S.C. de *Thisbensibus*, Riccobono, *Fontes iuris Romani* (1941) i. 243. Münzer (op. cit. 92) infers from their Hellenic interests a family origin in the south of Italy.

<sup>3</sup> Lucilii, p. 493; Terentii, p. 194.

<sup>4</sup> S 4457 is typical of public inscriptions of the period. 171 comes from the tomb and was set up by a freedwoman; its style derives from painting and the letters resemble rustic capitals (p. 557).

*duovir III, curator operum publicorum et aquarum perpetuus, patronus coloniae* (171). He is described as *senior*, an alternative to *pater*, to distinguish him from his son.

The next record is of a Marcellus who was *duovir* with M. Lollius Paulinus in 166, a census year (4148). In 184 a Marcellus is recorded on the base of a statue as assigning the site in virtue of his office as *curator p(er)p(etuus) oper(um) pub(licorum)* (172 + p. 481). Since the elder Marcellus held this office after the *duovirate* and it was a life appointment we may identify the *duovir* of 166 with the *curator operum publicorum* of 184. It is presumably the same man who is recorded as *patr(onus) col(oniae)* on 4 January 189 (460). He is more probably the grandson than the son of the *duovir* of 111, and the similarity in the two careers recalls the strong resemblance in the careers of the two Gamalae.

A C. Nasennius Marcellus is also recorded as *pontifex Volcani* on an inscription from Portus (47). Dedications were made to Serapis 'permissu C. Nasenni Marcelli pontificis Volcani et aedium sacrarum et Q. Lolli Rufi Chrysidiani et M. Aemili Vitalis Crepereiani Ilvir(orum)'. This inscription cannot be precisely dated. If the patron of 189 was *pontifex Volcani* he can have lived very little longer, for by 194 at the latest M. Antius Crescens Calpurnianus held the office (325). This inclines me to believe, without strong conviction, that the Portus inscription should be dated to the early third century, after 203 when M. Antius was still *pontifex Volcani* (324).

## Appendix VI

### FASTI

#### *Duoviri and Praefecti*

THE list of dated duovirates is taken from the Fasti, with the exception of the last two entries. Censorial years are marked with an asterisk.

B.C.	<i>Duoviri</i>	*36 T. Sextius African[us]
48	M. Acil[ius]	A. Egrilius Rufus [?]
47	Q. Vitell[ius]	<i>Praefecti</i>
46	A. Vitelli[us]	Q. Fabius Longus [?]
45	Q. Vitelli[us II]	A. Egrilius Rufus [?]
A.D.		37 C. Caecilius Montan[us]
*6	A. Egrilius Rufus	Q. Fabius Longus I[?]
	L. Cre[pereius—]	84 --- Celsus *
14	--- anius Gemellus II	--- uos II
	--- ranius Pollio	85 --- Ore]stes *
15	--- menius Veiento	--- Secu]ndinus
	--- ius Rufus	*91 C. Cuperiu[s ---]
*16	--- ius Rufus	C. Arriu[s ---]
	[P. Paetini]us Dexter	92 L. Terentius Tertius
17	[A. Egrilius Rufus] maior	94 A. Caesilius Honorin[us]
	--- us Severus	95 P. Lucretius Cin[na]
18	C. Volusius Flaccus II	L. Naevius Proc[ulus]
	P. Sabidius II	102 Cn. Se[ntius] Clodianus
19	P. Lucilius G[amal]a II	P. V ---
	M. Suellius M --- s II	104 --- us Verus
20	M. Valerius [---]	105 A. Livius Priscus
	C. Avian[ius ---]	L. Licinius Valerianus
30	P. Paetinius Dexter II	*106 [M. Acilius Priscus Egriliu]s
	L. Iulius Carbo	Plarianus p.c.
	A. Host[ili]us Gratu[s]	--- us p.c.
*31	Q. Fabius Lo[ngus]	107 --- us Honoratus
	M. Naevius Opt[atus]	108 A. Manlius Augustalis
32	L. Bucius Proculu[s]	C. Iulius Proculus
	P. Manlius Bassus	109 M. Valerius Euphemianus
33	P. Lucilius [Gamala?]	C. Valerius Iustus
	C. Naevius ---	110 P. Naevius Severus
34	D. Otacilius Rufu[s]	D. Nonius Pompilianus
	A. Egrilius Rufus	*111 C. Nasennius Marcellus III p.c.

- |  |                                  |
|--|----------------------------------|
| *111 C. Valerius Iustus II                               | *146 A. Egrilius Agricola p.p.c. |
| 112 - - - L]ongus Grattianus Cani-<br>nianus             | D. Nonius Pompilian(us) p.p.c.   |
| - - - F]adius Probianus                                  | 147 [L. ?] Plinius Nigrinus      |
| *126 [Imp. Caesar Traianus Hadr]i-<br>anus Aug(ustus) II | P. Annius Annianus               |
| - - - r p.c.   | C. Mamilius Martia[lis]          |
| <i>Praefecti</i>   | 152 M. Iulius Sever[us]          |
| - - - pater  | 153 - - - Fortis                 |
| - - - du - - -   | L. [- - -]                       |
| 127 M. Antistius Flavianus                               | *166 C. Nasennius Marcellus      |
| L. Valeriu[s - - -]                                      | (4148) M. Lollius Paulinus       |
| 145 P. Turranius Aemilianus fil(ius)                     | *251 Q. Veturius Firmius Felix   |
| L. Pomponius Pri - - -]                                  | Socrates                         |
|  | (352) L. Florus Euprepes         |

The following, recorded in other inscriptions, can only be approximately dated:

- C. Cartilius Poplicola, duovir VIII, cens. III, died early Augustus (p. 40).  
 Postumus Plotius M. f. V, A. Genucius A. f. II, contemporary with or earlier than Poplicola (S 4710).  
 C. Fabius, contemporary with Poplicola (4134).  
 C. Tuccius L. f., Voturia, ? Augustan (426).  
 P. Lucilius Gamala, ? Augustan (I, p. 30).  
 ? M. Turranius, colleague of Gamala (130).  
 — Co]rnelius [— ii]vir iter. cens., Augustan (S 4638).  
 C. Aq[ui]lius, ? Augustan (Bloch, 66).  
 — [ii]vir cens., decorated by Augustus and Tiberius (Bloch, 61).  
 M. Maecilius Furr[—], early Julio-Claudian, recorded on temple of Bona Dea (p. 352).  
 P. Lucilius Gamala IV, ? early Julio-Claudian, perhaps to be identified with duovir of A.D. 19 (p. 501 f.).  
 — Proculus (? Julio-Claudian, p. 323 n. 1).  
 C. Fabius, Voturia, Agrippa, Julio-Claudian (8).  
 A. Egrilius, Voturia, Rufus, ? Flavian (Bloch, 22; p. 196).  
 M. Acilius Priscus iivir, aedil(is) II, quinquennal(is), pr(aef)ect(us) II, Flavian (Bloch, 23; ? cutter's error in record of career, p. 197 n. 7).  
 Cn. Sentius, Teretina, Felix, Flavian (5, p. 200).  
 C. Silius, Voturia, Nerva, Flavian-Hadrian (415, p. 204).  
 C. Silius, Voturia, Nerva, son of above (415).  
 A. Livius Proculus, P. Lucilius Gamala, iivir praef. Caesaris, ? 137 (4, p. 201).  
 M. Aemilius Hilarianus, ? early Antonine (332, p. 204).



- C. Granius, Quirina, Maturus, Antonine (364, p. 203).  
 P. Aufidius, Quirina, Fortis, Antonine (S 4620, p. 203).  
 P. Aufidius Fortis, son of above, Antonine (S 4622).  
 M. Junius, Palatina, Faustus, Antonine (4142, p. 209).  
 M. Antonius, Menenia, Severus, Antonine (298, p. 320).  
 M. Lollius Rufus Chrysidianus, M. Aemilius Vitalis Crepereianus, Severan (47, p. 209).  
 \*L. Licinius, Palatina, Herodes, ? late Severan (373).  
 \*P. Flavius, Palatina, Priscus, mid-third century (4452).

If, as is probable, the phrase *omnibus honoribus functus* implies the holding of the duovirate, the following should be added:

- L. Fabricius, Palatina, Caesennius Gallus, ? early second century (354).  
 L. Julius Crescens (S 4653).  
 T. Antistius Favor, Severan (294).  
 L. Combarisius, Palatina, Vitalis, ? Severan (335).  
 All four are Roman knights.

The title of duovir was accepted by emperors and members of their family:

- Trajan or Titus (S 4674-5).  
 Hadrian, for the second time in 126 (Fasti).  
 Lucius Caesar (? = L. Aelius, adopted son of Hadrian) in ? 137 (p. 201).  
 ? Pertinax (Bloch, 54).

#### *Decuriones*

This list excludes decurions who are known to have risen to the duovirate. It is arranged alphabetically since few of the inscriptions can be securely dated.

- M. Annius, Palatina, Proculus, son of president of builders (292).  
 T. Antistius Favor Proculeianus, knight, grandson of patron of *lenuncularii tabularii* (294).  
 Sex. Av[ienius L]ivianus, ? president of corn measurers (S 4623).  
 Sex. Carminius Parthenopeus, knight, president of builders (314).  
 P. Celerius, Palatina, Amandus, ? shipbuilder, died at eighteen (321, p. 205).  
 Cladius Venidius Eupalus, knight (S 4632).  
 M. Cornelius, Palatina, Valerianus, patron of *lenuncularii tabularii* in 192 (341).  
 M. Cornelius, Palatina, Valerianus Epagathianus, knight, patron of the *lenuncularii tabularii*, son of the above (341).  
 P. Cornelius Architectianus, son of president of builders (5).  
 C. Domitius, Palatina, Fabius Hermogenes, knight, formerly a *scriba* (14).  
 D. Junius, Palatina, Bubalus, knight (S 4625 = Bloch, 56).  
 L. Licinius M—, knight (Bloch, 57).

M. Licinii —, sons of M. Licinius Privatus, freedman (15).

D. Lutatius, Palatina, Charitonianus, knight (378).

P. Nonius, Palatina, Anterotianus, knight (390).

M. Orbius — (Bloch, 58).

Sex. Publicius, Collina, maior (4143).

Cn. Sergius —, son of an *Augustalis* (411).

L. Sextius Agrippinus, knight, died under twenty (414).

Q. Veturius Felix Socrates (431).

Q. Vibius Rufinus (435).

Knights, whose names are not preserved, are recorded in S 4680, Bloch, 60.

*Ornamenta decurionatus* are recorded for M. Licinius Privatus (15) and P. Aelius Liberalis, imperial freedman, *procurator annonae*, and formerly *praepositus mensae nummul(ariae) f(isci) f(rumentarii) Ost(iensis)* (2045).

#### *Pontifices Volcani*

? Augustan	P. Lucilius Gamala (1, p. 493).
Died in A.D. 30	P. Paetinius Dexter (Fasti).
30-36	A. Egrilius Rufus (Fasti).
From 36	M. Naevius Optatus (Fasti).
Flavian	M. Acilius Priscus (Bloch, 23).
? c. 100	? Q. Domitius — (p. 503 n. 2).
Died in 105	P. Ostiensis Macedo (Fasti).
From 105	M. Acilius Priscus Egrilius Plarianus (appointment, Fasti; still alive in 118 (Bloch, 26)).
Before 127	? C. Suetonius Tranquillus (below).
Before 128	A. Egrilius Plarianus (S 4445, as <i>praefectus aerari militaris</i> , not yet consul; consul in 128, Fasti).
Antonine	P. Lucilius Gamala (2, p. 493).
194-203	M. Antius Crescens Calpurnianus, recorded in these two years (325, 324); full length of office unknown.
? Early third century	C. Nasennius Marcellus (47, but possibly before Calpurnianus (p. 510)).
In 251	Iulius Faustinus (352).

That the office continued into the fourth century is shown by 132 (dated 303): [*ob redi*]tum Constantin[— *pontifex Volcani et] aedium sacrar—* \*

Wickert (S 4542) restores fragment XXXV of the Fasti (Degrassi, 210): '[in locu]m Q. Asini Marcelli ille pontifex Volkani creatus est.' This fragment must be dated before 115, but not much earlier (Degrassi, 239). Q. Asinius Marcellus is probably the *patronus coloniae* known from two Ostian inscriptions (p. 207), but it is very doubtful whether this entry records his death as *pontifex*: (a) the holders of the office from 105 to 118 are already known;

(b) the last letter of the sentence containing his name seems to be 'x', which is incompatible with the restoration proposed or any likely variant giving the same meaning. \*

The inclusion in the list of C. Suetonius Tranquillus, biographer of the early emperors and imperial secretary, derives from what seems to me to be logical argument, stimulated by shrewd questions from Dr. Weinstock.

Suetonius' career was recorded on a handsome inscription set up in his honour at Hippo Regius in Africa. Sufficient fragments were found in 1950 to restore the main outline and the first editors have done their work well (E. Marec and H. G. Pflaum, *Comptes rendus . . . des inscriptions et belles lettres*, 1952, 76-85):

C. Suetoni[o | · fil(tribus)] Tra[nquillo | f]lami[ni—c. 10—| adlecto  
i]nt[er selectos a di]vo Tr[a]iano Parthico p[on]t[ifici] Volca[nal]i | [—c.  
16— a] studiis a byblio[thecis | ab e]pistulis | [imp. Caes. Trai]ani  
Hadrian[i Aug. | Hipponienses Re]giū d.d.p.p.

In line 5, I prefer 'pont. Volca[n]i'. The number of letters missing depends on the precise placement of the small fragment from the end of l. 4; it can, I think, be moved a little to the left.

From literary sources we have only one control for the official career of Suetonius. His biographer records that on his return from Britain Hadrian dismissed Suetonius, his secretary, together with C. Septicius Clarus, praetorian prefect, because they had been too familiar with Sabina, the emperor's wife (SHA, *Had.* 11. 3). This was presumably in 121 or 122.

The offices recorded in the inscription seem to be arranged, as one would expect, in chronological order. Suetonius was first a *flamen* (perhaps *flamen Cerialis*, cf. *ILS* 1447). He was then appointed by Trajan, perhaps to a judicial commission. The remaining offices, according to the natural interpretation of the text, fell under Hadrian. We might also infer from Pliny's letter to Trajan in 112 (*Ep.* x. 94), asking the emperor to confer the *ius trium liberorum*, that Suetonius had not yet been appointed to the emperor's service. The post of *pontifex Volcani* should have been held before or at the same time as Suetonius became a *studiis*, but it is possible that the religious post came later and was given its position in the text in order not to interrupt the impressive sequence of palace posts. These three posts are compressed within a very short period, between Trajan's death and the dismissal of Suetonius in 121 or 122. The rapid promotion is an indication of the emperor's special favour.

The post of *pontifex Volcani* is not recorded or known outside Ostia. Realizing that the priest of Vulcan at Rome was a *flamen* (Varro, *De ling. Lat.* v. 84), the editors first thought of Ostia but dismissed the possibility on the ground that all inscriptions recording the *pontifex Volcani* came from Ostia itself. They inferred that Suetonius must have been *pontifex Volcani* at Rome, and they found a parallel in the *pontifex Palatualis*, recorded in two

inscriptions, though Varro (*De ling. Lat.* vii. 45) makes this priest a *flamen*. The parallel is not completely satisfying, because in the only inscription recording Vulcan's priest at Rome the title is *flamen* (ILS 1456), while no *flamen Palatualis* is recorded. Nor is the reason for dismissing Ostia decisive. Some sixteen letters have to be supplied at the beginning of l. 6: we could, for example, restore 'p]on[t.] Volca[n]i | [in colonia Ostiens.]'. \*

The appointment of Suetonius as *pontifex Volcani* at Ostia in one of the early years of Hadrian's reign would be intelligible. Hadrian inherited from Trajan a personal concern for the development of Ostia. Though the monumental inscription honouring him dates from 133 (95), he had accepted the title of duovir for the second time in 126 (Fasti), and one of the most important projects of the reign, involving the rebuilding of the area north of the Forum and the great new Capitolium, was carried through in his first few years of rule (p. 136). It is reasonable that he should have wished Suetonius, whom he seems to have valued highly, to acquire an Ostian association. If the *pontifex* was appointed at Rome, the formal choice lay with the emperor; if, as we think more probable the election rested with Ostia, the election of Suetonius will still reflect the wishes of Hadrian.

The Ostian evidence makes the appointment of Suetonius doubtful perhaps, but not impossible. By analogy with other such priesthoods, and by reasonable inference from the evidence (p. 179), we may assume that the *pontifex Volcani* was appointed for life. We know from the Fasti that M. Acilius Priscus Egrilius Plarianus succeeded P. Ostiensis Macedo in 105. This Plarianus was still alive in 118 (Bloch, 26); when he died we do not know. The next *pontifex* known to us is his nephew, who had been appointed to the office before he became consul in 128 (S 4445). Between these two dates there is room for Suetonius, though it is often assumed from the extent of his writings that he lived longer than this short interval would allow (*RE*, 'C. Suetonius Tranquillus' (Funaioli), 597).

If Suetonius had been *pontifex Volcani* at Ostia he would have been commemorated or would have commemorated himself in one or more public inscriptions. No trace of his name has yet been found. We should also expect to find some trace of his freedmen, but the family name is not recorded on surviving inscriptions. No secure inference, however, can be made from this negative evidence. Until the title of *pontifex Volcani* is found outside Ostia, Suetonius should tentatively be claimed for the Ostian priesthood.

#### *Flamines Romae et Augusti*

? Flavian	A. Egrilius, Voturia, Rufus (Bloch, 22).
Flavian	M. Acilius Priscus (Bloch, 23).
Before 141	Q. Plotius, Quirina, Romanus (400).
Antoninus Pius	P. Aufidius, Quirina, Fortis (S 4622).

Before 173 M. Junius, Palatina, Faustus (4142).  
 End of second century — Hermias eq. Rom. (Bloch, 54).  
 ? C. Aemilius P(alatina) A—us (Bloch, 49).  
 Early third century L. Licinius L. fil., Palatina, Herodes (373).  
 S 4674-5: — [praef.] quinq. divi T[— f]l(amini) perpetuo Ro[mae et Augusti].

*Sacerdotes geni coloniae*

? C. Aemilius C. f. P(alatina) A—us (Bloch, 49).  
 L. Licinius L. fil. Pal. Herodes (373).  
 P. Flavius P. fil. Pal. Priscus (S 4452).  
 M. Aurelius Hermogenes (S 5340).

This priesthood has also been restored (by L. R. Taylor, *The Cults of Ostia*, 35) in S 4671, 'eq. R. [sac(erdoti) gen(i)] col. Ost. flam. divi Ma[rci . . .]'. I agree with Bloch (ad 49) that 'eq. Rom. dec. col. Ost.' is a more probable restoration. The only other offices recorded are junior priesthoods. The *sacerdos geni coloniae* seems to have been a man who has held or is shortly to hold high office.

All four inscriptions recording the priesthood are from the third century.

*Addenda*

Fausto Zevi has very kindly sent me the following additions to the list of duoviri, from his paper read at the Sixth Epigraphic Congress (1972).

A.D. 53 - - - - - [? Cn.] Sergius Florus  
 \*66 [A. Egrilius Ru]fus II  
 [ - - - - ]us  
 69 or 72 [ - - - - ]  
 P. Luci[lius Ga]mala F(ilius)  
 ? 93 [ - - - - ]er  
 140 A. Egril[ius - -

## Appendix VII

### THE CHRISTIAN MARTYRS OF OSTIA AND PORTUS

THE evidence of Christianity from the buildings and inscriptions of Ostia and Portus is supplemented by a substantial volume of Christian tradition and legend. In this field the basic evidence is the list of anniversaries of Christian martyrs. The first and most reliable list comes from the church calendar included in his compilation by the chronographer of 354;<sup>1</sup> a much fuller list is given in the so-called Martyrology of Jerome, which may date from the fifth century.<sup>2</sup> In the earlier list Ostia has no place, Portus martyrdoms are recorded for two dates. In the later and fuller list a substantial number of martyrs are recorded from both centres. These lists are confined to names and dates; details of some of the martyrdoms are recorded in martyrs' Acts of varying date and value.<sup>3</sup>

This is a notoriously treacherous field, but no historian of Ostia can afford to neglect it, for amid fantasy and exaggeration there are grains of genuine local tradition. De Rossi, the founder of modern Christian archaeology, knew Ostia and Portus well, and was able to apply his knowledge of both centres to the Christian documents. His study of Christianity at Portus<sup>4</sup> and his passing reflections on Ostia are still the essential foundations, but he has had no successor. Delehaye, for long the leading authority on the cult of the martyrs, has briefly and critically reviewed the list of martyrs from both centres,<sup>5</sup> and Lanzoni in his study of the dioceses of Italy has also examined the evidence.<sup>6</sup> But neither Delehaye nor Lanzoni was familiar with the topography and history of Ostia, and new evidence has accumulated since they wrote.

#### Ostia

The fullest of the Acts concerns a large group of martyrs, among whom Aurea has become the central figure. These Acts survive in several Latin

<sup>1</sup> Mommsen, *Chronica minora*, i. 71 f.

<sup>2</sup> Text and commentary, *Acta Sanctorum* Nov. ii. 2 (Delehaye and Quentin, 1931), cited as 'Comm.'.

<sup>3</sup> The Latin manuscripts are catalogued in *Bibliotheca hagiographica Latina* (BHL). They are liberally quoted and discussed in the *Acta Sanctorum*.

<sup>4</sup> *Bull. arch. crist.* (1866) 37-51.

<sup>5</sup> H. Delehaye, *Les Origines du culte des martyrs*<sup>2</sup> (1933) 293-5.

<sup>6</sup> F. Lanzoni, *Le Origini delle diocesi antiche d'Italia* (*Studi e Testi* 35; Roma, 1923).

manuscripts which preserve two variant versions: there is also a much briefer Greek version.<sup>1</sup> The central body of the story is common to all versions.

Aurea, described as 'virgo sacratissima, nobili genere orta, imperatorum filia et a cunabulis Christiana', refused to renounce her faith and was sent with a retinue, whose religious views were sound, to Ostia, where she lived on her estate, 'foras muros Hostiae civitatis in loco, qui vocatur Euparisti in praedio suo'. She there got in touch with the bishop, Cyriacus, three presbyters, Maximus, Eusebius, and Concordius, and a deacon, Archelaus, who was working miracles.

Meanwhile at Rome a certain Censorinus, 'vir praepositus magisteriae potestatis', who had secretly followed the Christian faith, was exposed, refused to recant, and was sent under guard to Ostia, where he was imprisoned. He was visited by Aurea and her companions, who comforted him. On the visit of Maximus his chains were miraculously loosed and the soldiers of the guard were converted. Soon afterwards Maximus brought to life the dead son of a cobbler (or tailor), Faustinus by name. When the news came to Rome the emperor sent a *vicarius urbis Romae* to investigate. His instructions were to persuade the converts to renounce their faith and put recalcitrants to death. The soldiers remained faithful under torture. They were led to execution 'ad arcum ante theatrum'.<sup>\*</sup> Cyriacus was killed in prison. Eusebius collected the bodies of the bishop and of Archelaus and Maximus by night and buried them. The bodies of the soldiers were thrown into the sea, recovered on the shore by the presbyter Concordius, hidden 'in campo Hostiae', and buried 'extra urbem in crypta Ostiensi' on 13 August. Two of them, Taurinus and Herculanus, were hidden at Portus. The tribune, Theodorus, was buried by Concordius in his own tomb. All the other bodies he eventually laid to rest by the bodies of Cyriacus and Maximus on 23 August.

On the same day Aurea was summoned and was examined. When she remained stubborn, a stone was tied to her neck and she was thrown into the sea. Her body drifted to the shore, was recovered by Nonosus, 'qui etiam Ypolytus nuncupatur', and buried by him 'in praedio eius ubi habitaverat' on 29 August. The *vicarius* then summoned Sabinianus, a servant on Aurea's estate, and demanded her possessions. He refused to obey and after a series of tortures was burnt to death and thrown into a well. His body was recovered by Concordius, who laid it beside Aurea on 28 August. Hippolytus pleaded with the *vicarius* to end the persecution and was tortured and drowned 'in foveam ante muros urbis, iuxta alveum Tyberis'. The voice of heavenly infants praising God was heard for the space of an hour. Christians secretly by night raised the body from the well and buried it in the same place 'non longe ab ipso puteo sed quasi pedes plus minus sexaginta', on 23 August.

<sup>1</sup> *Comm.* 264, 461; *BHL*, 808-13; *Acta SS.* Aug. iv. 755-61; *S. de Magistris, Acta martyrum ad Ostia Tiberina* (Roma, 1795); Lanzoni, 69.

In the two Latin versions there are minor variations in detail, as in the names of some of the soldiers and of the *vicarius urbis*, but the main difference is in the date. In one version Claudius Gothicus was emperor, in the other Alexander Severus. Closely related to the story of Aurea are the acts of Censorinus.<sup>1</sup> In this account, which closely follows the others, Trebonius Gallus and Claudius Gothicus are recorded in different manuscripts as emperor; Censorinus is described as 'vir quidam praefecturae potestatis'. The emperor, on hearing of the raising of the dead boy, angrily exclaims 'magicam artem exercent'.

The story of Aurea has been generally rejected as historically valueless, and there are indeed many features that do not ring true. The dates of burial are not consistent. Hippolytus is martyred before he buries Aurea! The office of *vicarius urbis* had not been instituted at any of the three dates given by the traditions. The dialogue has the dramatized overtones of a late composition. The miracles are typical of the genre and therefore suspect. Until 1910 critics would not have gone beyond the evidence of the martyrology which includes Hippolytus, Cyriacus, and Archelaus and Aurea. The church of S. Aurea was clearly of early origin, and was the main centre of Christian worship in Ostia during the Middle Ages. She would have become the centre of legend and attracted other traditions to her own.

The discovery by Vaglieri of a medieval oratory at the place where tradition placed the execution of most of the martyrs, in front of the theatre, is a remarkable illustration of the value of topographical detail even in the least convincing martyr traditions.<sup>2</sup> In the twelfth century priests from the church of S. Aurea still celebrated mass in this 'church of S. Cyriacus'<sup>3</sup> and in the church was a sarcophagus, simply inscribed: 'hic Quiriacus dormit in pace.' When the church was built to commemorate the saint and his followers it would have been natural to transfer his body from its original tomb. Since the date of the relief and of the lettering are not inconsistent with the traditional date of the martyrdom it is not irresponsibly romantic to believe that this may be the bishop's sarcophagus rather than that of a roughly contemporary Christian with the same name. Delehaye dismisses even the possibility: 'ex ipsis autem verbis constat Quiriacum illum neque episcopum neque martyrum fuisse.'<sup>4</sup> Have we enough third-century parallels to be confident?

We conclude that there was a group of martyrs executed near the theatre, and that the leaders of the Ostian church, including the bishop, were involved

<sup>1</sup> BHL, 1722-3; *Acta SS.* Sept. ii. 518-24.

<sup>2</sup> NS 1910, 136.

<sup>3</sup> In the record of the visit of Waltherus, canon of Arrouaise, to Ostia, *Acta SS.* Maii i. 485 (9): 'mane autem facto cum idem Andreas pergeret ex more cum alio ad ecclesiam S. Cyriaci extra villam ut missam dicerent.' Reference to a more detailed unpublished manuscript, *Topografia*, 163 n. 12.

<sup>4</sup> *Comm.* 461. Vaglieri hesitatingly suggested identification, *Nuovo bull. arch. crist.* 16 (1910) 61.



in this persecution. Of the three emperors recorded in the varying traditions all that we can say is that on general grounds Alexander Severus is the least likely and that Claudius Gothicus is the best attested. But, though there is a kernel of truth in the narrative, there has almost certainly been a conflation of different stories, apart from embellishment. In the Martyrology Aurea is recorded under 20 May, though she also appears under 22 August. It is probable that the first is the correct date and that, when she attracted to herself the story of the wider persecution, her date was correspondingly moved. The burial of Herculanus and Taurinus at Portus, when the remaining soldiers were buried at Ostia, is odd, and we shall see that they probably belong to a different martyrdom. Hippolytus also should probably be detached from the group. He is described without elaboration at a late stage in the story as *episcopus*, bishop presumably of Portus, and at Portus there was a church of S. Hippolytus. His martyrdom will be discussed later.

The story of Gallicanus is set in high places and historically he is the most important figure among the martyrs associated with Ostia. He is not recorded in the lists of martyrs, but he is connected with the stories of two other Roman martyrs, John and Paul, and also with Constantia, the daughter of Constantine.<sup>1</sup> According to the tradition, which is not early, he was a pagan until his mature years and, after leading a successful campaign against the Persians, asked the emperor for his daughter in marriage. Constantia declared her resolution to remain a Christian virgin but, before the situation could become embarrassing, Gallicanus was required to save the empire on the Danube front against an invasion of Scythians. It was arranged that he should take with him two of Constantia's servants, John and Paul, who, unknown to him, were devout Christians, and leave with Constantia his two daughters by a wife who had died, Artemias and Attica. The persuasion of John and Paul, powerfully reinforced by miracles in battle, converted Gallicanus. He had sacrificed to the demons on the Capitol when he left; he returned to the blessed feet of Peter. Constantine with his mother Helena, and his daughter, warmly welcomed him. He no longer pressed for Constantia's hand. He was made consul and freed 5,000 slaves.

Later he was living at Ostia, on close terms with Hilarinus, a devout man. Gallicanus provided the resources to enlarge the home of Hilarinus so that he could give shelter to foreigners, '*ad peregrinorum susceptionem*'. His fame spread abroad. Men came from east and west to see a former consul and patrician washing the feet of the poor. He was the first to build a church in Ostia, '*et dedicavit officia clericorum*'. This he did in response to a revelation from St. Lawrence, who exhorted him to build a church in his name '*in porta, quae nunc usque Laurentia nuncupatur*'.

<sup>1</sup> BHL, 3236-44; *Acta SS.* Jun. v. 35-39.

But Julianus, when he had been made Caesar by Constantius, 'dedit legem ut Christiani nihil in hoc saeculo possiderent'. Men were sent to claim the revenue from Gallicanus' property which he had diverted to Hilarinus' house of charity, 'in Ostiensi pago quattuor casas'. The collectors were stricken with leprosy. Julian sends instructions that Gallicanus is to sacrifice to the gods or leave Italy. He goes to Alexandria, retires to the desert and becomes a hermit, is persecuted and killed. His Ostian friend Hilarinus, 'when he refused to sacrifice under pressure from the persecutors of the Christian faith', was beaten with sticks and died a martyr's death. Christians buried his body solemnly in Ostia. There is an echo of the same story in the *Acts of Constantia*,<sup>1</sup> and part of it was turned into elegant verse by Aldelmus, bishop of Sherborne, in the early eighth century.<sup>2</sup>

As in the passion of Aurea, there are serious errors in this attractive story. There are two prominent Gallicani known in the reign of Constantine, Ovinus Gallicanus, consul in 317, Flavius Gallicanus, consul in 330. The latter fits the context better, but we know nothing of his career from other sources. No war against Persia is known under Constantine until 337; the Danube war would seem to be the war of 334. Both probably fall after Gallicanus' consulship, which was, in the story, the reward for his victories. Nor was Constantine in Rome after 327, though he is made to welcome Gallicanus in his palace at Rome after the war of 334. The description of Constantine's successors is inaccurate. There is no evidence for an enactment issued by Julian confiscating the property of Christians.

And yet the story cannot be dismissed out of hand. In Anastasius' Life of Pope Silvester a Gallicanus is reported to have added very generous endowments to the basilica presented to Ostia by Constantine, and it may be significant that they included revenue from *massa Gargiliana*,<sup>3</sup> from which Constantine also drew part of his endowment of the Lateran Basilica in Rome.<sup>4</sup> The story implies a connexion between the church of S. Lawrence and the Porta Laurentina, but the Porta Laurentina derives its name from Laurentine territory. Is it possible that the gate has given the name to the church and that Gallicanus' church should be identified with Constantine's basilica, to which Gallicanus added endowments almost as substantial as those of the emperor? Nothing is heard of Constantine's basilica in medieval records; it would have been a rich prize for raiders and may have been sacked early and abandoned. Its ruins may still be found in the neighbourhood of the gate.

The nucleus of the story is probably the association of Gallicanus' two daughters, Artemias and Attica, with Constantia. They were buried with her

<sup>1</sup> *Acta SS.* Feb. iii. 67 f.

<sup>2</sup> In his poem, *De virginitate*, Mon. Germ. hist. auct. ant. xv. 302 f.

<sup>3</sup> *Lib. pont.* i. 184. The revenue from the properties bequeathed by Gallicanus yielded 869 *solidi*, compared with 1118 *solidi* from those bequeathed by Constantine.

<sup>4</sup> *Lib. pont.* i. 173.

later and had shared the latter part of her life. The main reason for the introduction of Gallicanus is that he was their father. His eagerness to marry Constantia could be invention; the embroidery around his consulship is false. But he probably did become a Christian, he may have fought in the east and north and been on familiar terms with Constantine. There is no good reason for not believing that in later life he lived at Ostia, and that he owned *casae*, probably farms, in the territory. Nor is the allusion to the attempted seizure of his rents necessarily without foundation. It may have arisen from an enactment cancelling the exemption of Christians from curial *munera*.<sup>1</sup>

The story of Hilarinus may also preserve sound tradition, for he is independently recorded in Jerome's Martyrology under 16 July: 'in civitate Ostia Hilarini'. There is no good evidence of an official persecution under Julian, but the pagan reaction of the emperor is likely to have met with sympathy at Ostia at least among the aristocracy;<sup>2</sup> and the persecutors of the faith who killed Hilarinus may have been Ostians acting on their own initiative, rather than Roman officials under direction from Rome. It would not be uncritical to watch excavation reports for the possible identification of a house enlarged to give shelter to pilgrims. The building may even have already been found. The so-called House of the Fishes is the only late house in Ostia which has what may be Christian symbolism in its decoration. The original building probably dates from the third century; at some later date, almost certainly in the fourth century, it was substantially restored and enlarged.<sup>3</sup> Unfortunately the house had been stripped almost bare before it was excavated, but the absence of graffiti on such of the plaster as remains might be held to weaken an attractive hypothesis.

The Martyrology of Jerome includes under 19 October 'in Hostia Asteri'.<sup>4</sup> That this Asterius is an historical figure is confirmed by an inscription of the late fourth or fifth century from the cemetery of Commodilla at Rome, which records that a certain Pascasus died on 11 October, eight days before the anniversary of Asterius, 'ante natale domni Asteri depositus in pace'.<sup>5</sup> But, though the Martyrology records only one Asterius, two martyrs of the name are associated with Ostia in tradition.<sup>6</sup>

Of the first we are told very little. He was a Roman priest who suffered for his persistent loyalty to Pope Callistus. When Callistus himself had been

<sup>1</sup> *Cod. Theod.* xii. 1. 50.

<sup>2</sup> Julian was commemorated at Ostia as *princeps indulgentissimus* (S 4408), but, since the initiative came from the *praefectus annonae*, this is not necessarily an index of local feeling.

<sup>3</sup> Becatti, *Casa tarde*, 18. The plan (Fig. 17) shows clearly the distinction between original and later walls. The Christian reference is not certain, p. 400 n. 5.

<sup>4</sup> *Comm.* 562; Lanzoni, 68.

<sup>5</sup> Diehl, *Inscr. Lat. Christ. vet.* 2124.

<sup>6</sup> *Acta SS.* Oct. ix. 6-11.

martyred, Asterius was thrown from a bridge into the Tiber. His body floated down river, was discovered at Ostia by certain Christians, and buried there. It is probably this Asterius who was commemorated in the inscription referred to above.

The story of the other Asterius is more detailed and colourful. It is included in the account of the martyrdom of Marius and Martha, with their sons, Audifax and Abachuc, who had come from Persia under Clodius Gothicus to visit the holy places in Rome.<sup>1</sup> The part of the story which concerns Ostia opens with sympathetic remonstrances by the emperor against the Christian stubbornness of Valentinus, a priest. The emperor's better feelings are submerged by his prefect Calpurnius, who is authorized to cross-examine Valentinus: 'si sanum consilium non est quod declarat, fac in eum quod in sacrilegum leges praedixerunt; sin vero, audiat iusta postulatio eius.' Calpurnius entrusts Valentinus to Asterius, a member of his staff. The household of Asterius was converted; his adopted daughter, who had serious eye trouble, recovered her full sight. The house attracted the curious and the faithful, including Martha and her companions. The emperor summoned Asterius, and all those in his house were arrested. Asterius was bound and, with his household, sent to Ostia 'sub poenarum examinatione iudicium sumere'.

At Ostia Asterius came before the judge Gelasius. He remained true to his faith under cross-examination and torture, and was condemned to the amphitheatre. They led him and his followers 'ad locum qui appellatur Ursariae iuxta fanum aureum, quia ibi ferae nutriebantur'.<sup>2</sup> The wild beasts were sent into the arena; Asterius prayed and they grovelled at his feet. Gelasius appealed to the people as witnesses of this display of magic. The wild beasts having failed, Gelasius ordered the Christians to be burnt, but fire was unavailing. They were then led outside the walls of Ostia and executed. Their bodies were buried by Christians on 18 January, and by the site a church was built, 'et ita florent beneficia Martyrum usque in praesentem diem'.

Apart from the melodramatic ending this story has the comparatively simple form of an early tradition. There is, however, no Calpurnius in the list of urban prefects of the period. Gelasius is stationed at Ostia and might be the *praefectus annonae*: that he is not otherwise known is not damaging, for there are many gaps in the list of known holders of the office. There is, however, good evidence that by the late fourth century a basilica had been built in honour of an Asterius outside the walls of Ostia. The invective against Pope Damasius, known as the *Libellus precum*, records that a certain priest Macarius, who rebelled against the Pope, was arrested with violence and sent to Ostia, where he died of his wounds.<sup>3</sup> The bishop of Ostia, Florentius, though supporting Damasius against the rival church faction, respected

<sup>1</sup> *Acta SS.* Jan. ii. 214-19.

<sup>2</sup> *Acta SS.* Jan. ii. 218 (13).

<sup>3</sup> *Libellus precum*, 22 (Migne, *PL* xiii. 98 f.).

Macarius and 'transferred his body to the basilica of Asterius'. In the twelfth century we hear of the bringing in of the bones of S. Asterius and twelve other martyrs to the church of S. Aurea.<sup>1</sup> They probably came from this basilica, then presumably in ruins.

Since the mention of a church is well founded it is not unreasonable to look for further topographical evidence in the story. If the ordeal of the arena—a set-piece in many of these stories—were described only in general terms we could ignore it; but the circumstantial detail is impressive: 'ad locum qui appellatur Ursariae . . . iuxta fanum aureum'. This seems like genuine local tradition. I accept it tentatively as evidence for an amphitheatre or at least for gladiatorial shows outside the walls.

Ostia is also the recorded burial-place of the martyrs Flora and Lucilla.<sup>2</sup> These virgins are said to have been captured by a barbarian king Eugegius in the second half of the second century, though no details of the nature and place of the capture are recorded. Eugegius was converted by their steadfast devotion to the faith, but after twenty years at his court they determined to go to Rome to face martyrdom. Eugegius accompanied them, and they were all put to death. In the earliest traditions of these martyrs, which defy rationalization, Ostia is not mentioned. A much later account records that their bodies were honourably buried by faithful Christians 'in suburbano civitatis Ostiae', where they remained for 700 years, until they were translated from Ostia to Arezzo by the Pope's authority in the ninth century.<sup>3</sup>

It would clearly be dangerous to draw historical inferences for the Roman period from such evidence as this. We can, however, infer that by the ninth century Ostia was too enfeebled and impoverished to preserve all her sacred relics. The same impression is given in what was said by the priests of S. Aurea to Waltherus, canon of Arrouaise, when he came to Ostia in the twelfth century and was allowed to take away the relics of S. Monica: 'There are so many relics of saints in that wilderness (the area outside medieval Ostia) that we could not easily decide where we should lay them to rest as was fitting. A few days ago we brought in the relics of blessed Asterius and twelve other martyrs and, not knowing where we should lay them, we dug a trench in the church (of S. Aurea) and buried them there.'<sup>4</sup>

Finally the Martyrology of Jerome includes under both 22 November and 22 December 'et in Ostia Demetri et Honori (or Honorati)'. Of them nothing is known or even invented.

On the basis of the story of Aurea we may believe that the Ostian community of Christians had their own bishop and priests in the third century. Constantine's basilica was probably the first church within the town; but

<sup>1</sup> Below.

<sup>3</sup> *Acta SS.* Jul. vii. 30 (106-8).

<sup>2</sup> *BHL*, 5017-21; *Acta SS.* Jul. vii. 13-34.

<sup>4</sup> *Acta SS.* Maii i. 485 (9).

basilicas may have been built earlier by the tombs of Asterius and Aurea. There is no evidence that Ostian magistrates or prominent laymen were concerned in the martyrdoms and the impression derived from the late houses that the aristocracy was predominantly pagan is not inconsistent with such Christian traditions as survive. Gallicanus, residing in Ostia, but probably not an Ostian, should be regarded as exceptional, though there may have been a small minority of his social peers who shared his views. The list of martyrs when analysed is also consistent with our general picture. The purge of the leaders of the community in the third century is isolated; the first scene of most of the other Ostian martyrdoms is Rome. The view that Christianity was stronger at Portus than at Ostia receives some confirmation from a study of the Martyrologies.

#### Portus

In the Middle Ages the church of S. Hippolytus seems to have been the main centre of Christian worship at Portus, but the problem of Hippolytus is highly controversial. Various traditions have assigned him to Rome, Portus, Antioch, Arabia. The last two identifications arise from confusions that can be easily understood; the Roman and Portus traditions require more careful disentanglement.<sup>1</sup>

In the time of Pope Callistus a certain Hippolytus produced a long series of learned works in Greek, many of them highly controversial in doctrine, fiercely attacking the personality and policies of the Pope. In the sixteenth century a seated statue was discovered near the Via Tiburtina; on the chair was a list of writings which clearly are those of the polemical writer. This identification is reasonably certain. The statue when found had no head. This has been restored, though the benign features are barely consistent with the fierce character of the writer. The statue is now displayed in the Lateran Museum, and the modern inscription reads 'Hippolytus, episcopus Portuensis'. Our purpose is limited to showing that this identification is wrong, that the Roman Hippolytus had no connexion with Portus, that the confused tradition which is the basis of the identification is therefore no evidence that Portus had a bishop in the early third century.

One stage in the confusion can already be seen in a colourful poem of the late fourth century by Prudentius.<sup>2</sup> In this poem Prudentius tells us that Hippolytus, a Roman presbyter, followed the schism of Novatus, and left Rome for Portus where he continued in heresy. He was there tortured and finally dragged by yoked horses until his body was torn in pieces. The

<sup>1</sup> For an understanding of the elements that concern this book I have relied primarily on De Rossi, *Bull. arch. crist.* (1882) 9-76; Delehay, 'Recherches sur le légendier romain', *Analecta Bollendiana*, 51 (1933) 58-66; *Dict. d'arch. chrétienne et de liturgie*, vi. 2409-83 (H. Leclercq, 1925).

<sup>2</sup> Prudentius, *Peristeph.* xi.

remains were gathered together and laid to rest on the Ides of August in a tomb on the Via Tiburtina, which the poet describes in some detail. Prudentius' description of the tomb is genuine, as excavation has revealed.<sup>1</sup> His allusion to Hippolytus' heresy is taken from an inscription set up in the tomb on the Via Tiburtina in the fourth century by Pope Damasius. The vivid description of the martyrdom is taken, as Prudentius tells us, from a painting preserved in or near the tomb. Its value is worthless save as an example of a poet's imagination, working on a painter's imagination, working, directly or indirectly, on a tragedian's imagination. The scene is drawn ultimately from Euripides' *Hippolytus*.

There is authentic material in Prudentius. Hippolytus was a heretic, his tomb was on the Via Tiburtina. The story of the martyrdom, however, is nonsense. Can any value be attached to the introduction of Portus into the story? Almost certainly not. Eusebius, a careful and learned scholar, knew in the middle of the fourth century the writings of Hippolytus, which had not had a long currency in the west as they were written in Greek; he believed that Hippolytus was a bishop, but could not identify his seat. Later in the fourth century Jerome had the same difficulty. If the writer was bishop of Portus these two scholars would surely have known. The truth can be inferred from the chronographer of 354, who records that in 235 Pope Pontianus and Hippolytus, presbyter, were deported to Sardinia.<sup>2</sup> Their bodies were later translated to Rome and the chronographer's entry in his church calendar for the Ides of August reads: 'Ypoliti in Tiburtina et Pontiani in Callisti'. The natural inference is that Hippolytus remained in Rome after the death of his rival Callistus and continued his polemics and that, probably when Maximinus succeeded Alexander Severus, the leaders of the two factions were deported. Hippolytus was considered a bishop later since he had so described himself in the titles of his writings; he was in fact an anti-Pope.

This embarrassing phase in church history was best forgotten, and, as his works were in Greek, they were soon neglected. But the tomb remained on the Via Tiburtina: the existence of a cult of a Hippolytus at Portus suggested the identification. What, then, of the church of St. Hippolytus at Portus? Delehayé, whose view is accepted by Lanzoni, has suggested the most economic solution, that there is no Hippolytus of Portus, and that the date recorded in the Martyrology of Jerome, 20 or 21 August, is the date not of a martyrdom, but of the foundation at Portus of a church to commemorate the Roman Hippolytus.<sup>3</sup>

This extreme view carries scepticism much too far. The church of St. Hippolytus was built in what we now know to be the cemetery of Isola

<sup>1</sup> De Rossi, *Bull. arch. crist.* (1882) 9-76.

<sup>2</sup> Mommsen, *Chronica minora*, i. 75.

<sup>3</sup> Delehayé, *Les Origines du culte des martyrs*,<sup>2</sup> 295; Lanzoni, 79.

Sacra and this suggests association with a tomb. The site of the tomb is circumstantially described in the story of Aurea. Hippolytus was drowned 'in foveam ante muros iuxta alveum Tyberis' and his body was buried in the same place, 'non longe ab ipso puteo sed quasi pedes plus minus sexaginta'. One of the manuscripts points more specifically to the site of the church close to Trajan's canal: 'in insula, quae uno latere mare habet, a duobus divisione alvei Tyberis cingitur'.<sup>1</sup> Baronius, visiting the site in the sixteenth century, recorded that the famous well ('puteus ille, seu profunda fovea aquis plena, in qua sanctus Hippolytus martyri coronam accepit') could still be seen, though the church had suffered from a long series of pirate raids and was in ruins.<sup>2</sup>

The body of the saint was thought to rest in the church, for Pope Leo II (795–816) presented two vestments to the church, one for an altar, the other to cover the body.<sup>3</sup> We also hear of the translation of the body to Rome in the eleventh century.<sup>4</sup> It seems quite clear that the people of Portus did not believe that they were venerating a Roman saint whose tomb was on the Via Tiburtina. Nor does it seem likely on general grounds that this controversial Roman figure, whose memory was so soon obscured, would have had a church built in his honour so near Rome. We may conclude that the church of St. Hippolytus commemorates a martyr of Portus. The date of his death is unknown; the possibility that he was bishop of Portus cannot be ruled out, but we need stronger evidence than the story of Aurea to confirm the title.

In the story of Aurea and in the Martyrology of Jerome Hippolytus of Portus is also called Nonnus or Nonosus—'Yppoliti qui dicitur Nonnus', or 'Nonosus qui etiam Ypolytus nuncupatur'. The martyrs recorded by the chronographer of 354 include, for 5 September, 'Aconti, in Porto, et Nonni et Herculani et Taurini'. The date is different from that given in the Martyrology of Jerome, which is more closely associated with the Ostian persecutions. It seems likely that the martyrdoms were separate and independent and later conflated, to the greater glory of Aurea. The Martyrology of Jerome adds to the confusion by two further entries. For 25 July, 'Romae in Portu natale Aconti et Nonni': for 5 September (the date given for Nonnus by the chronographer of 354), 'in portu Romano Taurini, Herculani, et Aconti' (Nonnus is not mentioned).

This desperate tangle cannot be satisfactorily unravelled, but a few probabilities emerge. Herculani and Taurinus in the story of Aurea were for no apparent reason buried at Portus apart from their companions. Their bodies, or what were taken to be their bodies, were translated to Rome in the eleventh century with that of Hippolytus,<sup>4</sup> which suggests that they were buried near him. Their martyrdom has an historical basis, because they are

<sup>1</sup> *Acta SS.* Aug. iv. 506 (12).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 505 (8).

<sup>3</sup> *Lib. pont.* ii. 12 (xlii).

<sup>4</sup> De Rossi, *Bull. arch. crist.* (1866) 49.



invoked in a fourth- or fifth-century Christian inscription, found either at Ostia or at Portus.<sup>1</sup> Acontius is also a genuine figure; a church of S. Acontius existed at Portus in the eleventh century.<sup>2</sup> Hippolytus was associated with these three martyrs, but probably not with Aurea. Their story belongs to Portus and not to Ostia.

Jerome's Martyrology includes among the martyrs celebrated on 15 July Eutropius, Zosima, and Bonosa at Portus, 'in porto Romano, hoc est in hiscla'.<sup>3</sup> We have seen that inscriptions confirm this martyrdom. The first celebrates in hexameters the reception of Zosima in heaven,<sup>4</sup> the second records the building by Bishop Donatus of a basilica in honour of the martyrs beside their tomb.<sup>5</sup> The surviving story of Bonosa may help to determine the date.

In this story the opening scenes are laid in Rome. Bonosa is a noble virgin, 'nobili quidem prosapia orta'. She was required by the emperor to recognize Jupiter, Hercules, Aesculapius, Saturnus. When she refused to abandon her faith she was imprisoned, later stripped and beaten: the angels protected her. The emperor then handed the case to a *praeses* and the scene shifts to Portus. The *praeses* at first tries persuasion, but she remains stubborn and her faith converts fifty soldiers of the guard, who are put to death. A final appeal to Bonosa to take a young husband or become a Vestal Virgin merely increases her defiance. She is condemned to a brothel, but men have no power over her. Finally she is executed outside the city walls and buried on 15 July (the day given in the Martyrology) 'non longe a portu Romano stadio uno'.

This story is unconvincing. There is no apparent motive for the shift of scene from Rome to Portus. The dialogues are set-pieces. The account has possibly been embroidered in the church of S. Bonosa in Trastevere in Rome, introducing Rome into what may have been a martyrdom which began and ended in Portus. No mention of Eutropius and Zosima is made in the story, though they are linked with Bonosa both in the Martyrology and in the inscription recording their basilica. But the distance of the burial-place

<sup>1</sup> 1942, p. 395.

<sup>2</sup> Delehaye, *Origines*, 295.

<sup>3</sup> *Comm.* 375 f.; *BHL* 1425-6; *Acta SS.* Jul. iv. 18-23; De Rossi, *Bull. arch. crist.* (1866), 45-49; Lanzoni, 80.

<sup>4</sup> 1938 = Thylander, B 235. De Rossi (art. cit. 48) dated this inscription immediately after the martyrdom, which he placed under Aurelian. The lettering is much more elegant than any Ostian inscription of the mid-third century that I have seen. Its style and the tone of the epitaph more probably reflect the activity of Pope Damasius (366-84) and his followers. The martyrdom itself seems to be placed by the best manuscripts under Septimius Severus.

<sup>5</sup> 1937 = Thylander, B 234: 'sanctis martyribus et beati[ssimis] | Eutropio Bonosae et Zosim[ae] | Donatus episc(opus) tumulum ad[ornavit] | sed et basilicam coni[un]ctam [tumulo] | a fundamentis sanctae [ple]bi d[ei] construxit.'

from the walls is roughly correct. The inscriptions were found near Capo Due Rami, where Trajan's canal and the Tiber meet.<sup>1</sup>

One version transfers the setting to the reign of Aurelian, but the original tradition seems to have placed it under Septimius Severus, and the selection of gods whom Bonosa was required to recognize may be significant. Hercules, whose cult was strong at African Lepcis from which the family of Septimius Severus came, was regarded by the emperor as his special protector;<sup>2</sup> the cult of Saturn was particularly widespread in Africa.<sup>3</sup>

The other Portus entries in Jerome's Martyrology are mere names to us, but their number is significant: on 24 February Primitivus (or Primitiva) and Paulus; on 24 May Vincentius; on 18 October Agnes;<sup>4</sup> on 13 December Ariston.<sup>5</sup> There are two further entries, on 16 April and 15 May, but their attribution to Portus is disputed. The martyrs of 15 May assigned to Portus seem to be from Milan, and the text can be emended to give that meaning.<sup>6</sup> Martialis, however, in the record of 16 April is probably a Portus martyr, though many of those associated with him in inferior manuscripts should be assigned to Spain.<sup>7</sup>

Delehaye, followed by Lanzoni, would withdraw from this list the names of Vincentius and Agnes, whom he identifies with the Spanish Vincentius and the Roman Agnes to whom, he suggests, churches were built at Portus.<sup>8</sup> These churches are not recorded in a list of Portus churches given in an eleventh-century survey of the diocese;<sup>9</sup> but this is not a decisive argument, since they might by then have been destroyed and deserted; the list also omits the basilica of S. Bonosa known to have once existed. But Vincentius and Agnes are common names, and their identification should at least remain an open question. Both are represented with Hippolytus on a Roman glass vase

<sup>1</sup> There is no more precise indication of the site, but De Rossi's account (*Bull. arch. crist.* 1866, 45) suggests that the inscriptions were found on the north side of Trajan's canal and not on Isola Sacra. If this is so, the emendation of the obscure 'in hiscla' to 'in insula' in the manuscripts of Jerome's Martyrology should be rejected.

<sup>2</sup> *RE*, 'Hercules' (Haug), 581.

<sup>3</sup> See index *CIL* viii.

<sup>4</sup> Possibly Ostian, *Comm.* 560.

<sup>5</sup> Possibly to be identified with a victim of Diocletian's persecution, Lanzoni, 81.

<sup>6</sup> *Comm.* 255 f. (18). Some of the names occur also on the previous day and are there assigned to Milan. They include Victor, to whom a church was dedicated at Milan by the Porta Romana. 'In portu Romae' might be a corruption of 'in porta Romana'. An alternative possibility is a conflation of two martyrdoms, in Portus and Milan.

<sup>7</sup> *Comm.* 193 f. (16). The most convincing manuscript has the simple entry 'Romae in portu, Martialis'. In the lesser manuscripts Marcialis is followed by several other names, many of them from a Spanish martyrdom. The confusion probably represents the conflation of two separate martyrdoms.

<sup>8</sup> Delehaye, *Origines*, 295; Lanzoni, 80.

<sup>9</sup> Nibby, *Analisi della carta de' dintorni di Roma*<sup>2</sup> (1848) ii. 631.

decorated in gold.<sup>1</sup> If Hippolytus is a Portus saint, it is perhaps more probable that Vincentius and Agnes also were martyred at Portus.

Even if the benefit of the doubt is given to the critics, the Portus list of martyrs remains a much longer list than that of Ostia, and De Rossi was right in seeing in this a reflection of the greater strength of Christianity at Portus. De Rossi also thought that Portus had her own bishops in the third century, for he identified the Hippolytus who was described as 'bishop' with the Roman Hippolytus. If this identification is rejected, the question should remain open, for we have already argued that the absence of a bishop of Portus from the council of 313 in Rome is no valid evidence against a Portus bishopric at that date.<sup>2</sup> If Thylander's dating to *c.* 300 of the inscription recording the building of a basilica to Bonosa and her fellow martyrs by Bishop Donatus were correct, we should have an earlier *terminus ante quem*;<sup>3</sup> but the letters, as De Rossi argued in detail, suggest a date nearer 400.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> H. Vopel, *Die altchrist. Goldgläser* (Freiburg, 1899), n. 401. I assume, following De Rossi and Delehaye, that 'Poltus', inscribed on the glass, represents Hippolytus.

<sup>2</sup> p. 88.

<sup>3</sup> Thylander, B 234.

<sup>4</sup> De Rossi, *Bull. arch. crist.* (1866) 48.

## Appendix VIII

### THE POPULATION OF OSTIA

WE should like to know the size of Ostia's population, particularly at the height of her prosperity in the second century. It is very doubtful whether the city magistrates, or even their clerks, could have given an accurate answer. Records of properties were kept, and the total number of adult male citizens registered in the Roman census was known, but the number of women, children, and slaves was not required to be registered for any official purpose. To think in terms of precise figures is a comparatively recent development. The size of Ostia's population is one of the first questions that a modern visitor asks; it would not have occurred to a Renaissance traveller.

The study of population in the classical world has attracted continuous attention during the past century; but, though it has sharpened our approach to historical problems, the results have been meagre. The evidence available to the ancient historian cannot match the modern historian's detailed material, and in most cases one can hope for no more than guesses of the population of ancient cities. Rome is exceptional. Figures for the public distribution of corn and for the import of corn, the sums spent on *congiaria*, the number of *insulae* and *domus* recorded in the regionary catalogues, provide the basis at least for serious discussion.<sup>1</sup> Ostia and Pompeii lack such controls from literary sources, but the area enclosed by their walls is known and we know also the types of houses in which their people lived. But for Ostia, even more than for Pompeii, the margin of error should not be underestimated.

Nearly all writers on Ostia have ventured a figure for the population, and their estimates range, not surprisingly, from 10,000 to 100,000. Calza alone has assembled the evidence for a rational estimate.<sup>2</sup> His argument may be briefly summarized.

The area enclosed by the Sullan walls is 690,000 square metres. In the area excavated the proportion of living accommodation to the rest of the city—temples, baths, *fora*, *horrea*, barracks, streets—is roughly 5 : 3 (181,405 sq. m.: 139,095 sq. m.). If it is assumed that the average area occupied per person is 26 sq. m. (including open courts, walls, gardens; 18·20 sq. m. without), and that the average height of Ostian houses above the ground floor is two stories

<sup>1</sup> A critical review of the value of the evidence, F. G. Maier, *Historia*, 2 (1953) 318–51. I accept a total of roughly a million in the early second century. The evidence for the fourth century is very much weaker.

<sup>2</sup> Calza, *BC* 69 (1941) 150–2, 156–9 (in 'La Popolazione di Roma antica', Calza, Gismondi, Lugli, 142–65).

and a half, then the total population within the walls will have been roughly 36,000.

My calculation for the area within the walls on the basis of Calza's figures gives a rather higher total, of 37,500. To this must be added some 2,000 for the built-up area outside the Sullan walls on the seaward side and for the narrow fringe of building on the right bank, giving a grand total of nearly 40,000. But the foundations on which such a total rest are weak.

Calza, in formulating his estimate, seems to discount the ground floor,<sup>1</sup> presumably because it was mainly occupied by shops. But, though shops lined most of the streets, the larger blocks such as the House of Diana had living quarters behind them. Nor can the shops be entirely ignored. Many had mezzanine apartments above them and even some of the shopkeepers who had no upper rooms probably lived on their premises.<sup>2</sup> Calza also discounts baths and *horrea*, but the smaller baths, such as the Baths of Buticosus, had apartments above them and the upper stories of *horrea* may have been partly used to house their workers. The proportion of living accommodation to the rest of the area is based on the most important quarters of the town. In the unexcavated areas, mainly near the periphery, the proportion of space occupied by public buildings is likely to have been less.

But the main margin of error lies in the two basic estimates of the average height of the houses and of the density of the population. Within the excavated area the average height of the insulae is probably nearer four than three stories, including the ground floor; but allowance has to be made for the much lower domus, which may have numbered more than thirty (twenty-two have been excavated), and for the south-eastern quarter where the level of the grass-covered ruins suggests that the buildings were much lower than in the rest of the town. Perhaps a general average of three stories should be allowed. For the density of the population, the figure most needed to recreate a realistic social background to Ostia's life, we lack evidence. Calza allows an average per person of 18·20 sq. m. of living space, excluding walls, courts, &c. On this basis a ten-roomed apartment in the House of the Painted Vaults would hold nine persons. This may allow too much space for freedmen and slaves. It is almost certainly too generous an allowance for the mezzanine rooms above shops.

These various considerations suggest that Calza's estimate is too low. My own guess, and it should be admitted that any such calculation is little more than a guess, would be a population between 50,000 and 60,000 during the

<sup>1</sup> Calza is not explicit, but his discounting of the ground floor follows from a comparison of p. 153 with p. 157. The point is emphasized by G. Girri, *La Taberna nel quadro urbanistico e sociale di Ostia* (Ist. di arch., Milano, *Tesi di laurea*, 1 (1956) 41).

<sup>2</sup> G. Girri, however, exaggerates (op. cit. 42) in assuming that all shops were lived in at night.

Antonine period; but the figure was not static.\* It was considerably less before the imperial harbours were built, when houses rarely, if ever, exceeded, two stories; it shrank perceptibly in the third century, when the domus revived and many of the insulae were abandoned.

The area available for living accommodation at Portus was very considerably smaller than at Ostia, but population guesses made before the main living quarters are at least partially excavated could carry little weight. From the number of second-century tombs in the Isola Sacra cemetery and the large membership of the *fabri navales Portuenses*<sup>1</sup> it is clear at least that several thousand people were already living near the harbours by the Severan period.

<sup>1</sup> 354 members in their guild roll (256) in or near the Severan period.

## Appendix IX

### THE DATING OF OSTIAN BUILDINGS

THE chronology of republican buildings at Rome can be based in part on a series of monuments whose date is either precisely or approximately fixed by the evidence of literary sources or inscriptions. For the history of Ostian building in the Republic we have to rely exclusively on a comparative study of construction. Changes in technique can be approximately dated by reference to practice at Rome, and general historical considerations provide a measure of control, but the margin of error in dating individual buildings remains considerable.

In the imperial period we move on much firmer ground. The custom of adding consular dates to brickstamps, adopted first under Trajan, provides firm evidence for the close dating of much of the great rebuilding of the town in the first half of the second century. The material available for the comparative study of construction is considerably more plentiful than for the Republic, both in Ostia and Rome; and it now includes decorative elements as well as walls. The influence of Apollodorus' work in Trajan's Forum at Rome is apparent in the cornice of the Ostian Capitolium; the architectural decoration of the Temple of the Round Altar shows that the reconstruction of this temple cannot be far from the Flavian period.

Inscriptions also provide valuable controls. The original inscriptions from temples of Bona Dea and Bellona survive and their lettering confirms conclusions based on the study of their construction. In two cases the evidence is more explicit. A large fragment including the name of Agrippa almost certainly comes from the original inscription on the theatre (p. 42); the dating of this building to the first half of Augustus' principate provides a useful point of reference. The construction of a temple to Serapis in 127 A.D. is recorded in the Fasti; it can be identified with a temple on the Via della Trinacria (p. 139). Of more general importance are the terms in which Hadrian is honoured. Ostia is 'conservata et aucta omni indulgentia eius' (95): we are justified in looking for considerable traces of Hadrianic building.

#### *Styles of Construction*

The main succession of construction styles that can still be seen at Ostia follows the Roman pattern: *opus quadratum*; *opus incertum*; *opus quasi-reticulatum*; *opus reticulatum*; brick, accompanied at first by reticulate, later alone; block and brick; block.<sup>1</sup> The succession of styles provides a useful foundation

<sup>1</sup> English terms are retained to avoid confusion. Lugli (*La Tecnica edilizia Romana*, 40-49) has proposed a standard terminology, but *opus mixtum*, which he adopts for the

for chronology, but it is not a decisive criterion. When concrete construction has once been evolved it is normally adopted by the builder and the main change thereafter comes in the style of facing walls. But *opus quadratum* does not suddenly end with the introduction of concrete. It is still freely used for the platforms of temples, for piers supporting porticoes or strengthening walls, and even for the main walls of important buildings. It is not until after the middle of the first century A.D. that it is abandoned at Ostia. The Grandi Horrea were probably built under Claudius: though the inner walls were in brick the outer walls of the original construction were in large blocks of hard tufa, carefully cut and joined together without mortar.<sup>1</sup>

Similarly reticulate construction continues after the first adoption of brick, and brick with reticulate is not completely discontinued at the end of Hadrian's principate, although in the Antonine period all-brick facing dominates construction. Nor is there a neat dividing line between brick and brick-and-block; for a long time they are both in use, sometimes in the same buildings. Even *opus incertum*, which gives way naturally to *quasi-reticulatum* towards the end of the Republic, reappears in the second century A.D. A practised eye might not be deceived and it might be better to call this style *opus informe*, but some of these later walls have at first sight an archaic appearance. It is therefore necessary to control the general indication of construction style by every other criterion available. Of these the most important is the level of building. In a purely typological sequence one might place the *horrea* on the Via degli Aurighi (iii. 2<sup>6</sup>), which are predominantly in reticulate with a very small admixture of brick, before Julio-Claudian buildings in which brick and reticulate are evenly divided; its level, however, makes such a dating impossible and a brickstamp confirms that it is not earlier than Trajan.

When the level offers no secure clue, the relation of a building to its neighbours will often help to establish its date. A study of foundations (as well as other logical inferences) shows that the 'Curia' is earlier than the House of the Lararium, which adjoins it on the west side; and that building can be dated by brickstamps to the beginning of Hadrian's principate.<sup>2</sup> With the 'Curia' goes the Basilica opposite because the bricks that it uses are of the same quality and size. It is important to know that these public buildings, which considerably enhanced the dignity of the Forum, were constructed before the great building programmes of Hadrian's principate.

combination of brick with reticulate, could apply equally well to any type of facing in which different materials are combined, and has often been used for the combination of brick with tufa blocks. For this latter style Lugli suggests *opus vittatum*, but the term is not clearly descriptive.

<sup>1</sup> NS 1921, 360.

<sup>2</sup> Bloch, *Topografia*, 217 (i. 9. 3).



*Opus quadratum*

The wall is built with large squared blocks of tufa, carefully cut and carefully laid. At first there is no trace of clamps to hold the blocks together; they are found regularly from the time of Augustus.<sup>1</sup> This style was adopted for the Castrum walls in the middle of the fourth century B.C. and was still used 400 years later for the outside walls of the Grandi Horrea.

The earliest walls are distinguished from those that follow by their low level and by the type of tufa they use. The walls of the Castrum were built with blocks of Fidenae tufa which must have been sent down from Rome when the fourth-century settlement was established. If we discount the re-used remains of these walls, this tufa is not found later at Ostia. When the original consignment was exhausted the colonists had to find new supplies. In the late Republic and through the Empire Ostia could draw on the Monte Verde quarries at Rome and the whole range of tufas used by Roman builders. The river boats which carried corn upstream could economically bring down return cargoes of building material. In the fourth century, however, it is doubtful whether river traffic had assumed a sufficient volume; it is more probable that Ostia then drew its tufa from the quarries in the hills to the south of the Via Ostiensis, by Mezzo Cammino and Risaro.<sup>2</sup>

In this district there are three main types of tufa. The hardest of these is of a dark-brown, sometimes reddish, colour; it has a close texture and wears well, but it is not found at the lowest levels in Ostia. The second type resembles Roman *peperino* in colour and texture and is fairly hard. It is found at the lowest levels but not in large blocks. The third type is probably the earliest to be generally used in *opus quadratum*. It resembles Roman *cappellaccio*, which is found on the Palatine and Capitol and is widely used in very early Roman buildings. Ostian *cappellaccio*, like its Roman equivalent, is normally mud-yellow in colour but occasionally reddish. It is a weak tufa, flakes easily, and wears badly; it lies near the surface, and the ease of extraction combined with its softness for cutting probably explain its early popularity. In the later Republic it was superseded in *opus quadratum* by harder tufas, though it is occasionally found, as in a pier in the House of Jupiter the Thunderer, which is not earlier than Augustus. Even for the square blocks used in quasi-reticulate and reticulate it is rarely used; an exception is the temple of Hercules.

Two good examples of this early *opus quadratum* survive:

Wall in the north-west corner of the block on the north side of the Decumanus, west of the Forum (i. 9<sup>2</sup>).

Walls abutting on the east wall of the Castrum on Via dei Molini (i. 1<sup>4</sup>). It might be possible to establish a chronological sequence in the use of

<sup>1</sup> Gismondi, *Topografia*, 191.

<sup>2</sup> These quarries are briefly noted by Tenney Frank, *Roman Buildings of the Republic*, 31.

harder tufas; but a specialist is first needed to identify securely the provenance of the various tufas used.

*Opus incertum*

The wall has a solid core of concrete. Lime, which has to come from Rome or beyond, is mixed with volcanic earth (*pozzolana*), which could be obtained either from Rome or from the quarries on the Via Ostiensis. The aggregate is composed of pieces of tufa of varying shape and size, normally small. Tufa blocks of irregular shape form the face, large and polygonal at first, but gradually decreasing to the size and shape of a man's fist. For wall angles and the frames of doorways tufa 'bricks' are used. Foundations are little wider than the walls they support, and they are laid without timber shuttering. The earliest mortar is dark and considerably less strong than later.

It is probable that concrete construction, and, with it, *opus incertum*, was introduced to Ostia early in the second century (p. 119). The style melts into *quasi-reticulatum* before the building of the new town walls, for which a Sullan date has been accepted (pp. 35 f.).

Early examples of the style, using large polygonal blocks, probably earlier than 150 B.C., can be seen:

Wall on the east side of the western Decumanus under the Portico della Fontana a Lucerna (iv. 7<sup>1</sup>).

Shop walls on the south side of the eastern Decumanus in front of the Horrea of Hortensius (v. 12<sup>1</sup>).

Wall of early house under Vicolo di Dionisio (iv. 5<sup>9</sup>).

Late examples of the style, with smaller facing blocks, may be dated towards the end of the second century B.C.:

Early building incorporated in the Mithraeum of the Painted Walls (iii. 1<sup>6</sup>).

House of Jupiter the Thunderer (iv. 4<sup>3</sup>).

Three small republican houses (i. 9<sup>1</sup>).

House of the Peristyle (v. 7<sup>4</sup>).

*Opus quasi-reticulatum*

The size and shape of the tufa blocks of the wall's face become more regular. Foundations are normally wider and deeper than in *opus incertum*, and timber shuttering is used. Some walls are strengthened by tufa piers inserted at regular intervals.

If the quasi-reticulate town walls are rightly dated to the Sullan period, this style will roughly cover the period from the beginning of the first century to the end of the Republic and a little beyond. The following buildings, listed in roughly chronological order, are included, though there can be no clear demarcation between *opus incertum* and *opus quasi-reticulatum*:

Temple of Hercules (i. 15<sup>5</sup>).

Tetrastyle temple (i. 15<sup>2</sup>).

Town walls.

Four temples, west of the theatre (ii. 8<sup>2</sup>).

Temple outside east gate of Castrum (ii. 9<sup>4</sup>).

Shops and industrial premises near Porta Romana (ii. 2<sup>1-3</sup>).

#### *Opus reticulatum*

A reasonably secure *terminus ante quem* for a mature reticulate style is provided by two buildings that can be dated to the Augustan period. The theatre is earlier than the death of Agrippa in 12 B.C. (p. 42); the tomb of a praetorian soldier of the sixth cohort is almost certainly earlier than the concentration of the guard in Rome on the accession of Tiberius.<sup>1</sup> In both buildings the reticulate pattern is regular. At Rome mature reticulate is found for the first time in Pompey's theatre;<sup>2</sup> it probably developed at Ostia between 50 and 25 B.C. It continues into the Julio-Claudian period, but meets increasing competition from brick. The strengthening of the reticulate face by tufa piers at regular intervals in the wall is more widespread than in the previous period. The following reticulate buildings can be dated to the early Principate:

Shops on south side of Decumanus by western gate of Castrum (i. 10<sup>1</sup>).

Shops on west side of Semita dei Cippi, north of eastern entrance to Forum Baths (i. 12<sup>5</sup>. Pl. XI a).

Temple of Bona Dea at south end of Via degli Augustales (v. 10<sup>2</sup>).

House of the Mosaic Niche on Cardo Maximus (iv. 4<sup>2</sup>).

Market, south side of Via della Foce (iii. 1<sup>7</sup>).

Shrine of Jupiter in area of four republican temples (ii. 8<sup>4</sup>).

Temple of Rome and Augustus.

Temple of Bona Dea outside Porta Marina (iv. 8<sup>3</sup>).

Partly excavated public baths (v. 10<sup>3</sup>).

#### *Brickwork*

The introduction of brick facing was the decisive innovation of the Empire. At first the number of all-brick walls is small; more commonly brick and reticulate are used together. This style of construction is particularly widespread in the early building of Hadrian's principate, but from about A.D. 130 it becomes increasingly rare. The great replanning of the area which includes the Baths of Neptune and is dated to Hadrian's last years is exclusively in brick, and most of the dated buildings of Antoninus Pius follow this fashion. I know of no example of the combination of brick with reticulate

<sup>1</sup> NS 1912, 23; *Topografia*, tav. xlviii. 4.

<sup>2</sup> M. E. Blake, *Ancient Roman Construction in Italy*, 254.

after the middle of the second century. By the fourth century at the latest block-and-brick construction rivals brick in quantity at Ostia, but it cannot be chronologically separated from brick and its beginnings are to be found as early as the second century.

*Brick with reticulate*

In most early examples of this style brick is introduced sparingly to surfaces that are still predominantly reticulate. The function of the brick is to strengthen the wall as an alternative to the combination of tufa piers with reticulate; it is normally used at the main points of stress. In the so-called 'navale' by the river west of the excavated area, which may be Augustan (p. 126), the brickwork is confined to six courses at the top of the walls, from which the barrel vaults spring. In the Julio-Claudian Horrea of Hortensius vertical panels of brick are inserted in the side walls of all the rooms (Pl. XL c). Elsewhere brick frames are provided at the sides and at the top and bottom of walls, sometimes with intermediate horizontal bands of brick. But by the time of Trajan and Hadrian reticulate and brick are almost evenly mixed, and reticulate panels are neatly bonded into frames of brick in a manner that seems more decorative than functional. There is a tendency for the tufa squares of the reticulate to become larger, from an average of 6.5 cm. under Augustus to 7.5 cm. under Trajan and Hadrian, but the bricks normally provide a more reliable indication of date.

Before resuming the sequence of styles it is necessary to examine the criteria for dating brickwork.

*The dating of brickwork*

The history of Ostia during the Empire depends largely on the dating of brickwork, and for the most important phase in the town's development brickstamps provide a firm chronological framework.

Confidence in the validity of brickstamp evidence has run an uneven course. The nineteenth-century pioneers had no qualms. Scepticism, however, grew strong in this century, especially as a result of the increasing preponderance of stamps of the year A.D. 123. Cozzo persuaded many when he urged that the consular date on a brickstamp indicated the date not of production but of the opening of a new brickworks.<sup>1</sup> Cozzo's arguments, however, have been fully answered by Bloch, who, by a detailed study of the various sources of manufacture and of a wide range of buildings in Rome and Ostia, has shown that the stamp gives the production date and that normally bricks were used soon after they had been produced.<sup>2</sup> When they are found in the

<sup>1</sup> G. Cozzo, 'Una industria nella Roma imperiale: la corporazione dei figuli ed i bolli doliari', *Mem. acc. Lincei*, 1936.

<sup>2</sup> Bloch, *I bolli laterizi e la storia edilizia* (Roma, 1938). See Addenda.

construction and not simply among the ruins, they provide valid evidence for the date of the building; when stamps of widely different dates are found in significant numbers, we must look for more than one building period. No one who has studied the material at Ostia intimately can doubt the validity of Bloch's main conclusions.

Caution, however, is needed. Dated stamps are not decisive if their number is very small. Presumably the Ostian builders ordered considerable quantities of bricks at a time. When a particular building was finished, the stock of bricks in hand may not have been used at once, and brick producers who did not sell all their current output may have sold old stock considerably after its production.

The stamping of consular dates on brickstamps begins towards the end of Trajan's principate and the proportion of stamped to unstamped is highest under Hadrian; from Antoninus Pius onwards the practice becomes less common and other criteria become more important. Similarly for the period before the last years of Trajan stamps are comparatively rare and undated: for their approximate date we depend on a study of their distribution in dated buildings.

Where brickstamps are not found, a study of the bricks themselves and the way in which they are used, together with the technique of the concrete construction, can provide important clues for dating. The pioneer in this field was Miss Van Deman, who elaborated a series of canons in 1912.<sup>1</sup> Her work is still important for the imperial period to the death of Hadrian; but her treatment of the later period provided only a summary outline and was based on a very limited range of material.

Miss Van Deman examined the type of brick used, the quality and measurements of the brick, the nature of the mortar and of the concrete, and other distinctive features of the construction. She showed that canons could be framed which, used with discretion, afforded valuable indications of date. Such discretion has not always been shown and Miss Van Deman has sometimes been criticized for the misuse of her methods by lesser scholars. The measurement of the width of the brick is the easiest test to apply, but used alone it can be very misleading. A false average can easily result if the number of bricks measured is inadequate, or if an untypical piece of walling is measured. Miss Van Deman herself emphasized the importance of applying every test available.

(i) *Type of brick.* Three types of brick are found in Ostian walls, derived from roof tiles, *bessales* (small square bricks), and from large bricks such as are used to line pavements, *bipedales* and *sesquipedales*.

Fired roof tiles were already being produced in large quantities during the Republic, and it is for that reason presumably that they were first used for the

<sup>1</sup> E. B. Van Deman, *AJA* 16 (1912) 230-57, 387-432.

facing of walls. The face of the brick, broken by the hammer from roof tiles, was carefully dressed, but the shape of the brick penetrating the concrete was very irregular at first, though there was a growing tendency towards a roughly triangular form. Bricks from *bipedales* and *sesquipedales* followed the same principles, and it is not easy to distinguish the two types.

Bricks from *bessales* approach much closer to the modern brick. The square (20–22 cm.) was broken with the hammer across the diagonal and regular triangular bricks were thus formed, the largest side being used for the face. Walls built with triangular bricks can be distinguished by the uniformity of their brick lengths, as in the Basilica and the 'Curia'.

So far as our present evidence goes, only roof tiles were used under Augustus and Tiberius. Triangular bricks are found first under Gaius or Claudius;<sup>1</sup> they predominate in later Julio-Claudian buildings and through the Flavian period. They are still used under Trajan and Hadrian, but on a decreasing scale. In the great rebuilding of the first half of the second century there is a marked preference for using roof tiles, and *bipedales* and *sesquipedales*. There is a revival in the popularity of the triangular brick towards the end of the second century, but they are rarely found in the Severan period or later. When triangular bricks are used they are normally used throughout the construction or at least throughout certain parts of it; but occasionally all three types are found in the same wall.

The production of Roman bricks was not mechanical. The side of the brick which provided the facing of the wall was always hammer-dressed or cut with the saw.<sup>2</sup> Even *bessales* were not divided before firing, nor is there any trace at Ostia of surface cuts having been made in the clay. The brick was normally broken across the diagonal by the hammer after firing. This procedure, which seems strangely uneconomic to us, helps to account for the liveliness of brick surfaces in Ostian buildings.

(ii) *Brick measurements.* There is a clearly marked tendency for the width of bricks gradually to decrease, from an average of 4.0 cm. in the early Empire, to 3.8 cm. in the Flavian and early Trajanic period. By the end of Hadrian's reign the average has fallen to 3.4 cm. and in the Severan period the average falls below 3 cm. But in all periods there is a wide range in the width of contemporary bricks, and averages are misleading unless based on a wide sample. Triangular bricks also tend to be a little thicker than the two other types.

In triangular bricks formed from *bessales* the length is consistent at 26–

<sup>1</sup> In the baths under the Via dei Vigiles. Triangular bricks are very uncommon in Rome before Gaius.

<sup>2</sup> Illustration of the use of saw and hammer on bricks, Lugli, *La Tecnica edilizia*, 546, fig. 113. Gismondi, *Topografia*, 195, would exclude the use of the saw at Ostia. Some traces can, I think, be seen, but they are rare.

28 cm. In the other two types the length varies much more, though in the best work of the second-century rebuilding there seems to have been a deliberate attempt to secure regularity in length (20–22 cm.). Short lengths are normally a sign of later work.

(iii) *Colour* is a weak criterion. Though the tiles used under Augustus and Tiberius seem to be of a constant deep red, in later brickwork red and yellow can almost always be found together. The colour depends partly on the quality of the firing, partly on the nature of the clay and its ferric oxide content. The decisive factor may therefore be the brickfield and not the date. Only by detailed work in correlating brickstamps with the quality and colour of the bricks can useful progress be made here. In the two main Hadrianic areas at Ostia the colour is uniformly red and the bricks were probably deliberately selected; but in the Hadrianic House of the Triclinia, in the House of the Lararium, in the podium of the Capitolium, and in other Hadrianic buildings, there is an ample admixture of yellow.

It is true that by the middle of Antoninus Pius' reign the 'Hadrianic' red seems to become much rarer and mixed walls with yellow predominating become typical by the middle of the century. Therein lies evidence probably of the exhaustion of certain clay fields and of the opening of new.

(iv) *Width of joints*. There is a general tendency for the layer of mortar between bricks to become wider. The horizontal joints under Augustus and Tiberius are rarely more than 1.2 cm. wide; by the second half of the third century they are very rarely under 2.5 cm. and in the fourth they are more often over 3.0 cm. But this is only a general tendency and there are important exceptions. Thus the joints in the early Hadrianic House of the Triclinia are extremely narrow, often less than 1 cm., while the joints in the Basilica, a more important building, which is certainly not later than Trajan, average about 2 cm. Similarly in the temple of Bellona some of the joints are as wide as 3.5 cm., but the construction is certainly earlier than the Severan period.

(v) *Mortar*. Ostian mortar is formed by a mixture of lime and volcanic earth (*pozzolana*). There are considerable differences in colour, but these afford no clue to chronology during the Empire. They depend on the particular deposit used and red, light-grey, and dark-grey earths are found quite close together.<sup>1</sup> Sometimes the earth is not well fired and large lumps remain in the mortar, but this carelessness can be found at all periods. Nor does there seem to be any chronological clue in the proportion of lime used.

(vi) *Concrete*. Broken brick, tufa, even marble, are all found in Ostian concrete; the nature of the aggregate depends primarily on the material available from the destruction of earlier buildings. Since pre-Domitianic building at Ostia is mainly in tufa, the aggregate in the period of active

<sup>1</sup> Red *pozzolana*, the strongest, is not found before Augustus. The earliest to be used, in *opus incertum*, is the dark-grey, which normally lies near the surface and is the weakest.

rebuilding from Domitian to Antoninus Pius is composed almost entirely of tufa. A large admixture of brick is normally found not earlier than the late second century.

(vii) *Bonding courses.* Courses of *bipedales* running through the wall are a marked feature of Hadrianic work at Ostia, and often yellow bricks are deliberately chosen for these bonding courses to contrast with a dominantly red brick surface. Under Antoninus Pius bonding courses are not always used and, when they are used, they are less conspicuous. They receive revived emphasis under Commodus, when it becomes fashionable either to select red *bipedales* for the purpose, or to paint red courses on the wall, even when no true bonding courses are present. The fashion lasts for barely a generation and bonding courses are not found after the early years of the third century.

(viii) *Relieving arches* are first found under Trajan. They are widely used under Hadrian, but only found occasionally later. Their function should be to relieve pressure; they have a natural place over doorways or at the base of walls where the foundations are not continuous. It is difficult to understand their short-lived popularity under Hadrian; in many cases their purpose seems to be purely decorative.

#### *Block and brick*

Block and brick are combined in a wide variety of ways. Some walls are mainly of brick, with a few courses of tufa blocks interspersed; in others this relation is reversed. The most common and attractive combination is to alternate courses of block and of brick; sometimes there is a regular alternation of two courses of each. The tufa blocks are normally oblong; sometimes they are cut carefully to a rectangular shape, sometimes they are most irregular in shape and size. Less commonly the blocks are small and square and are similar to the blocks of reticulate walls, from which many of them may have come; but they are laid square rather than diagonally.

In Rome this style of construction is first used for an important building by Maxentius in his circus on the Via Appia, but it is found earlier in private building. It is common under Constantine and afterwards. Examples of its use in a subordinate role in the second century can be seen at Ostia. The first dated example is in a wall closing the entrance to the House of Jupiter and Ganymede on the Via di Diana, which is earlier than the death of Commodus.<sup>1</sup> From the middle of the century probably come the nymphaeum in the area of the four republican temples (ii. 83) and a wall in the west wing of the House of Apuleius (ii. 85); in both of these it is tentatively used in combination with reticulate.

A somewhat similar style is seen in the northern nucleus of the 'Imperial

<sup>1</sup> MA 26 (1920) 369.



Palace', where it is used in the peristyle court and in the baths at the east end. The bricks used in these walls are regular and well coursed, suggesting a date before the middle of the second century; they are contemporary with neighbouring brick walls, and the bulk of the brickstamps found in this part of the building are from the early years of Antoninus Pius.<sup>1</sup> The pattern seems experimental, varying between a mixture of reticulate with block-and-brick, and block-and-brick in alternating bands of two courses. Many of the blocks are carefully cut and regular in size. Block-and-brick is also used for some beautifully finished applied columns.

Rather later a row of shops on the eastern Decumanus (v. 11<sup>5</sup>) uses brick alone for its front on the street, but block-and-brick for the dividing walls of the shops. In the easternmost of two dividing walls the lowest courses, however, are in brick. Brick-and-block is also commonly used in modifications of second-century buildings, and it is the dominant style employed in building or adapting private houses to the taste of the late Empire. No public buildings yet excavated are originally constructed in this style; it will be interesting to see whether it was used for public building on the line of the coast, where building seems to have remained active in the late period.

It is clearly very difficult to date this style of wall-facing. A possible clue to an early date may be the even quality of the bricks, suggesting that they are not reused material. More important perhaps is the shape of the blocks. In all the second-century examples that I have noted a large proportion of the blocks are carefully cut to rectangular shape; in fourth-century walls the shapes seem to become increasingly irregular. That this does not merely indicate a difference between good and bad, but also between early and late, is seen by comparing the regular blocks used in the second century for such comparatively unimportant buildings as the guild house of the *hastiferi* (iv. 1<sup>5</sup>) and buildings on the west side of the Via del Pozzo (v. 2<sup>12-14</sup>) with the extreme irregularity of the blocks in the walls framing the vestibule of a new entry to the Forum Baths in the late fourth century.

The predominance of brick over blocks also seems in general to be early, but the use of small square blocks instead of the more general larger oblong shapes recurs throughout the period, especially in small niches and apses where its convenience is manifest. Signs of lateness apart from the irregular shape of tufa blocks may be the high proportion of mortar to tufa in the face and the lack of regularity in the pattern. When, in a wall that is not unimportant to the construction, a course of tufa blocks is continued in brick, we may suspect a late date. Such signs, however, are only valid evidence when seen in important walls. In walls of only secondary importance, such as in the closing of a shop or house door, the workmanship is always likely to be rough.

<sup>1</sup> Bloch, *Topografia*, 225.

*Block facing*

In the Middle Ages walls were often faced with courses of tufa blocks alone without admixture of brick. Such facing is already found in the podium of the Round Temple (i. 11<sup>1</sup>), in walls later than the original construction in the 'Imperial Palace', and in substantial repairs to an Augustan *crypta* (south of i. 4<sup>9</sup>). We cannot date its use within narrow limits, but it seems to be rare before the fifth century.

*Early and Middle Empire**Augustus and the Julio-Claudian period*

Reticulate, brick with reticulate, and brick are all found.

The earliest brick walls use broken tiles, and are probably earlier than the death of Tiberius:

Wall immediately surrounding the podium of the four republican temples (ii. 8<sup>2</sup>).

Cistern below the *palaestra* of the Baths of Neptune (ii. 1).

Triangular bricks are found towards the middle of the century:

Central rooms of the Grandi Horrea (ii. 9<sup>7</sup>).

Baths under the Via dei Vigiles.

Shops added to the east side of the Grandi Horrea (ii. 9<sup>7</sup>).

Brick is also used in association with reticulate:

The Horrea of Hortensius, the walls of which are mainly in reticulate, but have reinforcing brick panels in the side walls (v. 12<sup>1</sup>).

External brick pilasters on reticulate walls of the Bona Dea area (iv. 8<sup>3</sup>).

*The Flavian period*

There is an increasing tendency towards all-brick facing, and triangular bricks are much more freely used than under Trajan and Hadrian.

The only building securely dated by brickstamps to the Flavian period is the House of the Thunderbolt, outside Porta Marina (iii. 7<sup>4</sup>).

The following may, by comparison, be attributed to the late Flavian period, or the early years of Trajan:

Curia (i. 9<sup>4</sup>) and Basilica (i. 11<sup>5</sup>).

Temple in Piazzale delle Corporazioni (ii. 7<sup>5</sup>), and rooms on the east side of the Piazzale.

First phase of fountains on eastern Decumanus (ii. 7<sup>6,7</sup>, 9<sup>1</sup>).

Shops on eastern Decumanus (i. 1<sup>3</sup> and ii. 9<sup>2</sup>).

Baths by Christian Basilica on western Decumanus (iii. 1<sup>3</sup>).

Temple east of Hall of Measurers (i. 19<sup>2</sup>).

*Trajan*

The following buildings are dated by brickstamps:

- Shops backing on Castrum wall (i. 8<sup>5</sup>).
- Baths of Buticosus (i. 14<sup>8</sup>).
- Public building between temple of Hercules and tetrastyle temple (i. 15<sup>1</sup>).
- Horrea of Measurers (i. 19<sup>4</sup>).
- Market on north side of Via degli Aurighi (iii. 2<sup>6</sup>).
- Casette-tipo (iii. 12 and 13).
- House of Bacchus and Ariadne (iii. 17<sup>5</sup>).
- Baths of Six Columns (iv. 5<sup>11</sup>).

The following may, by comparison, be dated to roughly the same period:

- Horrea* on west side of *Semita dei Cippi* (i. 13<sup>1</sup>).
- Shops, &c., on *Via della Foce* in front of *Casette-tipo* (iii. 15).
- House at north end of *Via della Casa del Pozzo* (v. 3<sup>1</sup>).
- Horrea* of *Artemis* (v. 11<sup>8</sup>).

*Hadrian*

Buildings dated by brickstamps fall into three periods.

*Early*

- Capitolium and area to the north, *horrea*, shops, &c. (i. 5, 6, 7, 8<sup>1</sup>, 8<sup>2</sup>, 8<sup>10</sup>).
- Block west of Forum, north side of *Decumanus*, except 'Curia' (i. 9<sup>1-3</sup>).
- House of the *Triclinia*, builders' headquarters (i. 12<sup>1</sup>).
- Portico on western *Decumanus* by *Lamp Fountain*, with adjacent building (iv. 7<sup>1</sup>).

*Middle*

- Bakery on *Via dei Molini* (i. 3<sup>1</sup>).
- House of *Lucretius Menander* (i. 3<sup>2</sup>).
- House of the *Paintings* and two neighbours (i. 4<sup>2-4</sup>).
- Baths of *Mithras* (i. 17<sup>2</sup>).
- Market west of *Horrea* of Measurers (i. 20<sup>1</sup>).
- Shops on south side of *Via della Foce* (iii. 1<sup>8</sup>).
- House of *Mars* (iii. 2<sup>3</sup>).
- House of *Painted Vaults* and block to the north (iii. 4, 5).
- Insula* of *Serapis* (iii. 10<sup>3</sup>).
- Insula* of *Annius* and store with sunken *dolia* (iii. 14<sup>3-4</sup>).
- Baths of *Trinacria* (iii. 16<sup>7</sup>).
- Temple of *Serapis* (iii. 17<sup>4</sup>).
- Loggia* by monument of *Cartilius Poplicola* (iv. 9<sup>1</sup>).

*Late*

Area north of eastern Decumanus, including Baths of Neptune (ii. 3<sup>1</sup>, 3<sup>3-4</sup>, 4, 5, 6<sup>1</sup>, 6<sup>3-7</sup>).

Among Hadrianic buildings, not dated by brickstamps, I would include:

Bakery on Semita dei Cippi (i. 13<sup>4</sup>). See p. 134, n. 3.

Area of the Garden Houses (Hadrianic stamps, not yet recorded, can be seen in the construction) (iii. 9).

Temple of Cybele and portico (iv. 1<sup>1-2</sup>), p. 364.

Temple of Bellona (iv. 1<sup>4</sup>), p. 365.

Forum of Porta Marina (iv. 8<sup>1</sup>).

*Antoninus Pius*

The following buildings are dated by brickstamps:

First phase of the 'Imperial Palace' (*Topografia*, 225).

House of Diana (i. 3<sup>3</sup>).

Horrea Epagathiana (i. 8<sup>3</sup>).

Chapel east of Insula of Serapis (iii. 2<sup>12</sup>).

Schola del Traiano (iv. 5<sup>15</sup>).

Building east of tomb of Poplicola (iv. 9<sup>4</sup>).

Portico, south side of eastern Decumanus, west of Piazzale della Vittoria (v. 14, 15).

Forum Baths (i. 12<sup>6</sup>).

By comparison I would include among the buildings of this reign:

Shrine on Decumanus near Porta Romana (ii. 2<sup>4</sup>).

Building, east side of Via di Iside (iv. 4<sup>7</sup>).

'Fullonica' on Via di Iside (iv. 5<sup>3</sup>).

Insula with chapel of Isis (iv. 5<sup>4</sup>).

House of Fortuna Annonaria (v. 2<sup>8</sup>).

Buildings east of House of Fortuna Annonaria (v. 2<sup>9-10</sup>).

Building at corner of Via della Fortuna Annonaria and Semita dei Cippi (v. 4<sup>1</sup>).

House of the Sun (v. 6<sup>1</sup>).

*Marcus Aurelius to Alexander Severus*

After the death of Antoninus Pius the proportion of stamped bricks, already considerably smaller than under Hadrian, continued to decrease and building chronology becomes more hazardous.

A large block on the west side of the western Decumanus, the Caseggiato dell' Ercole (iv. 2<sup>3</sup>), has sufficient stamps to be assigned confidently to the

reign of Marcus Aurelius. Two other buildings can be assigned with some probability to his reign. In the social headquarters of the Augustales (v. 7<sup>2</sup>) the brickwork seems less good than under Antoninus Pius, and the bricks less wide, often falling below 3 cm.<sup>1</sup> Bricks of short length, which are not often found in the first half of the second century, are common, but they do not, as later, indicate the reuse of old material. Bonding courses, which are rare after the second century, are used. The same characteristics are found in a temple on the eastern Decumanus (v. 11<sup>1</sup>), and a fragment of entablature, probably from this temple, is consistent with this dating.<sup>2</sup>

For the period of Commodus the evidence is rather better. The reconstructed theatre was dedicated in the first year of Septimius Severus. Several Commodan brickstamps were found in the walls, and it is probable that the building was begun and perhaps nearly completed under Commodus (p. 80). The main rebuilding of the Grandi Horrea is also dated to this reign by brickstamps of M. Aurelius and Commodus.<sup>3</sup>

These two buildings have the distinctive red bonding courses which come into fashion under Commodus. The same feature is seen in the large *horrea* for the storage of corn near the Porta Romana (ii. 2<sup>7</sup>), and the same type of yellow triangular bricks from *bessales* are used here as in the Grandi Horrea. Other buildings may be dated to Commodus or a little later by their red bonding courses:

Building south of bakery on Cardo (i. 13<sup>5</sup>).

Reconstruction of north wing of Macellum (iv. 5<sup>2</sup>).

Block west of nymphaeum at south end of Forum (iv. 4<sup>6</sup>).

Block on Decumanus, east of 'guild temple' (v. 11<sup>3</sup>).

Walls enclosing republican monument on Decumanus (v. 11<sup>6</sup>).

Building by the triumphal arches opposite theatre (v. 11<sup>7</sup>).

For the reign of Septimius Severus there are no firm controls. The closing of the portico in the Grandi Horrea, however, has a brickstamp of the period, and there are good grounds for believing that the northern part of this building was rebuilt in the Severan period.<sup>4</sup>

In the walls of this section of the building ample use is made of a thin red brick (from 2.5 to 3 cm. wide) which is not found in the Commodan walls. The same brickwork is found also in a large-scale restoration of the eastern wall of the Piccolo Mercato, which therefore probably also dates from Septimius Severus. In these walls bonding courses are not used.

<sup>1</sup> The only three brickstamps recorded are from the reign of Antoninus Pius, but they come from a large apse which is a later addition; they probably were taken from an earlier building.

<sup>2</sup> D. E. Strong, 'Late Hadrianic architectural ornament in Rome', *BSR* 21 (1953) 140.

<sup>3</sup> *NS* 1921, 381.

<sup>4</sup> The brickwork is very similar to Severan work at Rome.

The baths on the line of the Sullan wall west of the Porta Marina (iii. 8<sup>2</sup>) are Severan. Hypocausts in this building have stamps of 210, and the brickwork has its natural context at approximately this date. It can be paralleled in the temple of 'Portumnus' at Porto, which on architectural grounds may be dated roughly to the first half of the third century (p. 167).

A date in the early third century should probably be assigned to the line of tombs on the south side of the Via dei Sepolcri outside the Porta Romana. They are designed for inhumation alone, showing that they are later than the first half of the second century, and they are homogeneous. The façades are in brick but a subordinate use of block-and-brick is made in the interior. The bricks are thin (averaging about 2.8 cm.) and the coursing is less good than in the work that has been assigned to the reign of Septimius Severus. The lettering of the inscriptions found in the tombs strengthens the dating in the first half of the third century.

#### *The late Empire*

The last Roman period at Ostia is the most difficult to unravel. Block-and-brick becomes common as an alternative to brick. The growing tendency to reuse bricks from older buildings complicates the dating of brickwork, but the width of horizontal joints helps to distinguish late walls from early. Before the fourth century the joints are rarely more than 2.5 cm. wide; in the fourth century they are rarely less.

Within this difficult period there are some possible points of departure. The approximate dating of the Round Temple (i. 11<sup>1</sup>) is of importance because it is the last large public building known to us. Its date would also provide a standard of reference for other brick buildings. It is earlier than the House of the Round Temple (i. 11<sup>2</sup>), because the brick cornice above the podium projects into the west wall of the house.<sup>1</sup> The brickwork of this house is of fairly good quality. Though short lengths suggesting the possible reuse of old material are found, most of the bricks seem to be homogeneous. They are fairly well coursed, and the width of the horizontal joints is not more than 2.5 cm.

The temple itself, however, is without parallel in Ostia. The podium face is mainly in brick but has also substantial stretches in tufa blocks which are contemporary. In the cella two very different types of brick are used. The façade towards its western end has very thin long red bricks averaging under 2.5 cm., such as are found in Severan work at Rome and Ostia. The remainder of the facing bricks form a mixture of red and yellow averaging 3.4 cm. in width, but they do not seem to be old material.

The general indications of the brickwork suggest that the temple was built towards the middle of the third century.<sup>2</sup> Similar brickwork is seen in a small

<sup>1</sup> Wilson, *BSR* 14 (1938) 159 n. 30.

<sup>2</sup> See also pp. 81 f.

area west of the temple (i. 10<sup>4</sup>) including a guild temple, which was probably planned at the same time. The House of the Round Temple will have been built later in the century and may reflect the brick revival under Diocletian. Roughly contemporary is the House of the Columns (iv. 3<sup>1</sup>), which is shown to be late by its level; its brickwork would fit the context.

An analysis of late work in the Forum Baths (i. 12<sup>6</sup>) should also provide useful clues. There were probably two main phases of restoration in the fourth century. The earlier, perhaps Constantinian, is reflected in two brick-stamps found in the apse that replaced the rectangular end of the Frigidarium. Contemporary brickwork can be seen in several of the walls of the heated rooms in the south wing, including the apse of the Caldarium. It may have been at this time that large windows framed by columns were introduced into the southern walls. Similar brickwork reflecting large-scale reconstruction in the heated rooms of the Baths of Neptune has been dated by stamps to the reign of Constantine.<sup>1</sup>

The other conspicuous late change in the Forum Baths is the provision of a monumental entrance on the north side towards the east end. Four tall brick piers served to emphasize the entrance and to buttress the north wall of the baths, weakened by the new opening. Inside the door two new framing walls formed a vestibule. The arches are in brick of a different character from the Constantinian work; the new walls of the vestibule are in block-and-brick. The shapes of the tufa blocks are very irregular and the proportion of mortar to tufa very high. This new entrance should probably be associated with the inscriptions recording the restoration of the baths by Vincentius Ragonius Celsus in the late fourth century;<sup>2</sup> the brickwork of the arches and the brick-and-block of the vestibule walls can be used as standards of reference.

On the east side of these Forum Baths outside the entrance that leads in from the *Semita dei Cippi* are two two-storied arches in brick, whose function is most obscure. Though the brickwork is not noticeably different from that of the entrance arches on the north-west side, large blocks of marble and travertine are used in the face near the ground level; in fact one arch rests on a nicely decorated marble panel. Such 'plugging' of brick walls with large blocks is common at Ostia in the Middle Ages, but I have not seen examples from the fourth century in important constructions. I suggest that these two-storied arches are from the fifth century.<sup>3</sup> It is possible that the original intention was to balance them by a second pair on the other side of the street.

<sup>1</sup> Bloch, *Bolli laterizi*, 243.

<sup>2</sup> 139, *S* 4717, 4718; Bloch, 'The Name of the Baths near the Forum of Ostia', *Studies presented to D. M. Robinson*, ii (1951) 412.

<sup>3</sup> A fifth-century restoration may be reflected in *S* 5387, found in these baths: '— [ ] abebatur ut lava[? — splen]dore excultum ad usum pop[uli — | —] annonae praefec—. On the back is an earlier funerary inscription.

Considerably better than the brick-and-block of the new vestibule of the Forum Baths is the adaptation of the west wing of the Baths of Mithras to Christian use. Such adaptation must be later than Constantine's conversion to Christianity; a date towards the middle of the fourth century is suggested. To approximately the same date I would assign the construction of the new walls that formed the House of the Dioscuri from a Hadrianic insula.<sup>1</sup> Some of these walls are in brick; most are in block-and-brick. In some walls small squares are used, in others the more normal oblong blocks; in both styles the blocks are very irregular, but less so than in the vestibule of the Forum Baths. Perhaps a more detailed study of the mosaics and of the lettering of the proverb in the Venus mosaic would confirm a date near the middle of the fourth century.

Brick-and-block was not invariably used after Constantine's death. A small set of baths on the north side of the Via della Foce (i. 19<sup>5</sup>) is built in brick alone. The bricks are from earlier buildings and the coursing is very irregular. Since these baths interrupt a line of shops in brick-and-block which have a Diocletianic stamp, it is inferred that the baths are considerably later, and probably post-Constantinian. Another set of baths (iv. 4<sup>8</sup>) south of the Round Temple uses a small number of much earlier walls; the main construction is in brick, with a very subordinate use of brick-and-block. The brickwork is very rough and reused material; it is probably not far in date from the Baths on Via della Foce. Such a dating receives a little confirmation from the predominance of circular and apsidal rooms in both buildings.

I would also provisionally assign a late-fourth-century date to the House of Cupid and Psyche (i. 14<sup>5</sup>), one of the most attractive of the late houses.<sup>2</sup> The tufa blocks are very irregular, but more important for dating purposes is the *opus sectile* pavement of the main room of the house. The intricate elaboration of the design, the liberal use of such hard stones as serpentine and porphyry which are seldom found in early pavements, and the reproduction of minor motifs whose natural place is in cornices suggest a later date. For similar reasons the House of the Nymphaeum (iii. 61)<sup>3</sup> may be dated in the second half of the fourth century. Almost all the wall-facings in this house have been recently restored, but what little remains of the original work is irregular. It may also be significant that this house is very similar in plan to the House of Cupid and Psyche.

The most important general conclusion provisionally drawn from a comparative study of late work in Ostia is that almost all the late houses in their present form belong to the fourth century, and that some at least of them were formed nearer the end than the beginning of the century.

It may also be possible to distinguish some work of the fifth century. The core of large blocks of marble or travertine in a brick face has been suggested

<sup>1</sup> Becatti, *Casa tarde*, 14.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 10.



as a reason for dating the two-storied arches on the east side of the Forum Baths to the fifth century.<sup>1</sup> Similar work on a grosser scale is seen in the walls built to complete the south wall of the Christian Basilica on the western Decumanus (iii. 14). Huge blocks of selce, travertine, and marble are used on a scale that I have not seen in any wall of the fourth century or earlier. It is noticeable also that in the apse courses of tufa blocks are continued in brick. There is, I think, no difficulty in dating to the fifth century the inscription over the entrance to the 'baptistery'.

A fifth-century phase can perhaps also be seen in the House of the Porch (v. 25). Brick is used for the main weight-carrying walls, block-and-brick for the less important walls. Since the brickwork is homogeneous and the block-and-brick fair, the original building should not be dated later than the early fourth century. The name on the pediment over the entrance doorway, however, is inscribed in lettering considerably worse than that found in Ostian fourth-century inscriptions. It is inscribed on an erasure and may represent a change of ownership, probably in the early fifth century. To this late phase should perhaps be attributed the building of the nymphaeum in the court, the closing of the underground chapel, and the paving of the vestibule with extremely large tesserae of different colours in a pattern of interlocking semicircles.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* 21.

## Appendix X

### THE DATING OF OSTIAN INSCRIPTIONS

IN the course of my study of Ostia I have tried to see as many as possible of the Ostian inscriptions surviving in Italy. The task has been made considerably easier by the building up of a Lapidarium at Ostia, and the transfer to Ostia of the large collection of Ostian inscriptions from the National Museum at Rome. A considerable proportion of Ostian inscriptions, recovered in excavations carried out under Papal authority, remain in the great Papal Collections. Those in the Vatican are mainly concentrated in the Galleria Lapidaria and are comparatively easy to find from the indications in the Corpus; inscriptions on statue bases and reliefs are scattered through the other galleries. The Lateran Museum includes in its Christian wing the majority of the Christian inscriptions from Ostia and Portus. Pagan inscriptions are fixed to the walls round the central courtyard, and these now include fragments which were still in store-rooms when the Corpus was published. Another important collection is to be found in the Capitoline Museum.

Several Ostian inscriptions came to St. Paul's basilica, which owned property on the Via Ostiensis. The monumental inscription honouring Hadrian (95) was used for centuries in the pavement of the nave, with its face upwards. As a result the inscription now looks as if it was never completed; the weaker strokes have been completely worn away. A few of these inscriptions can now be seen in the cloisters; the remainder are in the Lapidarium of the adjoining monastery. Most of the inscriptions found at Portus since the middle of the nineteenth century remain in the possession of the Torlonia family, on the site, in the Torlonia Museum, or in the Villa Albani. They are considerably less accessible.

The history of the site after the Roman period explains the wide dispersal of other Ostian inscriptions. The most important pockets are in the museums of Naples and Florence, but individual stones, some of them important, are scattered over more than a dozen centres in Italy, in museums, churches, and private houses. The study of Ostia would gain considerably if these scattered stones could be sent back to Ostia.

My general picture of Ostia's history is in part based on the approximate dating of more than half these inscriptions. It is not practicable to give detailed reasons for each individual case, but a brief summary is needed of the criteria used. A few inscriptions are explicitly dated by consular years or imperial titles. Normally less precise indications have to be used.

1. The imperial cult was first administered by *Augustales*, later by *seviri*

*Augustales*. The date of the change falls between the middle of the first century and Trajan, probably under Domitian (pp. 219 f.). The names of *Augustales* help to identify families established in Ostia before the great expansion of the second century.

2. A large number of inscriptions were set up by the *fabri tignuarii*, and many of them refer to the numbered *lustrum* of the presidents. These can be approximately dated, since we know that the guild was formally incorporated near the middle of the first century A.D. (p. 331).

3. The offices of *pontifex Volcani* and *flamen Romae et Augusti* were held for life. Sufficient names, in the two series, survive to provide valuable controls.

4. Some inscriptions are associated with buildings which can be approximately dated by their style of construction, as the temples of Bona Dea (p. 353) and of Bellona (p. 365). In assembling the list of families known at Ostia by the early Principate the large group of tombs from the Via Laurentina provides particularly valuable evidence.<sup>1</sup> These tombs can be arranged by the style of their walls and the form of the tomb in a chronological series, and the latest tombs in the first phase of the cemetery include one that can be confidently dated to the early Julio-Claudian period. By the same means Thylander has been able to date approximately a large proportion of the inscriptions from the Isola Sacra cemetery.<sup>2</sup>

5. For inscriptions on decorated urns, funerary altars, sarcophagi, and reliefs the style of decoration provides important clues. The long inscription recording the career of Cn. Sentius Felix would never have been dated to the late second century if the decoration of his funerary altar had been studied (p. 200). The style belongs unmistakably to the late first or early second century.

6. There remains the examination of letter forms and style. Confidence in this criterion has fluctuated violently and it may be fair to say that more harm has been done by faith than by scepticism. A glance at the photographs of Isola Sacra inscriptions published by Thylander<sup>3</sup> shows how uneven in style contemporary inscriptions can be; bad workmanship may indicate a cheap job rather than a late date. Thylander has also shown that it can be dangerously misleading to follow any individual criterion such as the form of the stop, accents, or individual letter forms.<sup>4</sup> Caution is certainly needed, but not capitulation.

Two examples may illustrate the danger of neglecting script in dating inscriptions. Groag's authority has virtually imposed the identification of Glabrio *patronus*, who dedicated a statue to *salus Caesaris Augusti*, with the proconsular governor of Africa in 25 B.C.<sup>5</sup> The letters seem too mature for

<sup>1</sup> NS 1938, 26-74.

<sup>2</sup> Thylander, *Étude sur l'épigraphie latine*, 15-40.

<sup>3</sup> Thylander, *Inscriptions du port d'Ostie*, Planches (Lund, 1951).

<sup>4</sup> Thylander, *Étude*, 40-52.

<sup>5</sup> PIR<sup>2</sup>, A 71.

such an early date. Q. Asinius Marcellus, consul and patron of Ostia, recorded in two inscriptions, is dated by Groag to the Julio-Claudian period, on the ground that the office of *iiivir monetalis* was the only post in the vigintivirate held by patricians from the Flavian period onward; Marcellus, a patrician, was *xvir stlitibus iudicandis*.<sup>1</sup> The inscriptions, however, are typical of late first- and early second-century work at Ostia, and suggest identification with a Q. Asinius Marcellus known to be consul shortly after 96 (p. 207). The number of Flavian careers recorded in full is insufficient to establish a firm law concerning the junior offices.

For purposes of dating it is important that like should be compared with like. We should not expect to find the same style in a public tribute to an emperor as in the funerary inscription of a building labourer. Inscriptions of the latter class present wide variations in all periods; the higher-class work of public inscriptions and rich men's dedications and tombstones is much more homogeneous. There are sufficient dated inscriptions in this class to provide a foundation for study. Exceptions to all rules can be found, but the following criteria, reviewed together, normally help to give an approximate date:

(a) *Form*. Down to the end of the principate of Augustus Ostian craftsmen show little sense of design in setting out long inscriptions. Lines are of uneven length and the general form of the text does not seem to be seriously considered. The arrangement improves in the Julio-Claudian period and reaches its best in the early second century. In the best inscriptions of the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian the general composition is particularly striking. Size of letters and length of line vary in a deliberate pattern; there is no sense of crowding. This mastery declines towards the end of the second century and is not recovered.

(b) *Stops*. In the Republic squared stops and circles are often used to separate words; it is doubtful whether either form persists beyond Augustus. From Augustus onwards the triangular stop is the normal form, and it is found as late as the fourth century. But within that long period a stop which resembles a comma is not uncommon. Its highest frequency is in the late Julio-Claudian and Flavian periods, though isolated cases appear earlier and later. Stops are rarely elaborate before the end of the third century. In the fourth century elaborate forms become increasingly common.

(c) *Accents*. In the Fasti accents are used first in the entries from A.D. 2 to 20. They drop out between 29 and 38, reappear from 82 to 112, and are not found after 112. In other inscriptions they are found spasmodically in the Julio-Claudian period, but their maximum frequency is in the Flavian period and early second century. They are very rare after the middle of the second century.

(d) *Letter forms*. Though there are significant changes in letter forms

<sup>1</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup>, A 1234.

during the Empire no tables adequately cover all cases. There is, for instance, a tendency for the tail of G to be a vertical stroke in the first century and a half; G with a curling tail is normally late: but there are too many exceptions both ways for this difference to have value. Similarly P in the early Republic resembles the Greek Π. It remains very open until the end of the Republic and only gradually assumes its modern closed form. The closed form is normal by the third century, but it appears as early as the Julio-Claudian period, and the open form still survives in the fourth century. The most useful single letter is perhaps Q. The tail of Q gradually lengthens through the first century until in the early second century it often extends in a graceful curve below two letters. This exaggerated emphasis, which has a clearly decorative purpose, is a distinctive feature of Trajanic and Hadrianic inscriptions. After the middle of the century the length of the tail again contracts.

Apart from differences in individual letter forms there is a tendency for the general shape of letters to change from a roughly squared form to a more vertical form, common in the third century and more pronounced in the fourth. The elaboration of letter forms by the extensive use of finials is normally a sign of lateness, but from this generalization an important category has to be excepted. Many inscriptions of the first and second centuries have such elaboration, but their letters might be described as rustic capitals.<sup>1</sup> They are good of their kind, but it is a different kind, more suited to and probably derived from painted notices.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Thylander, Planches xxvi. 3; xliii. 3; lxxxi. 1.

<sup>2</sup> For the difficulties of dating inscriptions by palaeographic criteria see *Contributions to the Palaeography of Latin Inscriptions*, by J. S. and A. E. Gordon (Univ. of California Publications in Class. Arch., vol. 3, n. 3, 1957). Their inquiry, however, is concentrated on Rome and not all inferences from Roman inscriptions are valid for Ostia.

## Appendix XI

### SELECTED INSCRIPTIONS

1. P. Lucilio | P.f. P.n. P. pro|nep. Gamalae | aed(ium) sacr(arum) Volk(ani) |  
 5 aedili d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) allecto || gratis decurioni | pontifici ii-  
 vir(o) censo|riae pot(estatis) quinquennal(i) | in comitis facto cura|tori  
 10 pecuniae publicae exigen||dae et adtribuendae | in ludos cum accepisset  
 public(um) | lucar remisit et de suo erogati|onem fecit | idem sua  
 15 pecunia viam silice stravit || quae est iuncta foro ab arcu ad arcum | idem  
 epulum trichilinis CCXVII | colonis dedit | idem prandium sua pecunia  
 20 colonis | Ostiesibus bis dedit || idem aedem Volcani sua pecu|nia restituit |  
 idem aedem Veneris sua pecu|nia constituit | idem aed(em) Fortunae sua  
 25 pecu|nia constituit | idem aed(em) Cereris sua pecunia | constituit |  
 30 idem pondera ad macellum | cum M. Turrano sua pecu|nia fecit | idem  
 aedem Spei sua pecunia | constituit | idem tribunal in foro mar|moreum  
 35 fecit || huic statua inaurata d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) | p(ecunia) (publica)  
 posita est | item ahenea d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) p(ecunia) p(ublica)  
 posita | proxume tribunal quaes(toris) | propterea quod cum res pu-  
 40 blica || praedia sua venderet ob pol|licitationem belli navalis | HS XX CC  
 rei publicae donavit | hunc decuriones funere pu|blico efferendum  
 censuerunt

*CIL* xiv. 375.

2. P. Lucilio P.f. | P.n. P.pron. Gamalae | aed(ili) sacr(is) Volcáni | eiusdem  
 5 pr(aetori) tert(io) dec(urioni) | adlectó d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) infanti ||  
 iivir(o) praefectó L(uci) Caesar(is) | Aug(usti) f(ili) cens(orio?) q(uae-  
 stori) a(erarii) pontif(ici) | tabulár(um) et librorum | curátori primo  
 10 constitut(o) | hic ludós omnes quós fécit || amplificávit impensá sua | idem  
 munus gladiatorium ded(it) | idem áedem Castoris et Pollucis rest(ituit) |  
 15 idem curator pecuniae publicae exi|gendae et attribuendae in comi- ||  
 tiis factus cellam patri Tiberino | restituit | idem thermas quas Divus Pius  
 20 aedifi|caverat vi ignis consumptas refecit | porticum reparavit || idem  
 aedem Veneris impensa sua | restituit | idem pondera ad macellum et  
 men|suras ad forum vinar(ium) s(ua) p(ecunia) fecit | idem navale a  
 25 L. Coilio aedificatum || extru[e]ntibus fere collapsum | restituit | huic  
 statua aenea peq(unia) pub(lica) d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) posit(a) | est—?

*CIL* xiv. 376. Pl. xxxviii d.

3. P. Lucilio P.f. P.nep. P.pro|n. P.abnep. Gamalae | aedilii trib(un)o  
 milit(um) dec(urioni) adlec(to) | ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) grateis

iiviro IIII | dec(urionum) decr(eto) publice | quod is causam coloniae | publicam egit in senatu | —

See p. 501 n. 1.

4. A. Livius Proculus P. Lucilius | Gamala f(ilius) iivir(i) praef(ect(i)) Caesa-  
r(is) | locum quo aedes Bellonae fieret | impensa lictorum et servorum  
publicorum | qui in corpore sunt adsignaverunt d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) |  
cur(antibus) | M. Naevio Fructo et — (erasure)

*Mem. Pont.* 6 (1943) 198 n. 1a. Pl. XXXVIII a.

5. Cn. Sentio Cn. fil. | Cn.n. Ter(etina) Felici | dec(urionum) decr(eto)  
aedilició adl(ecto) d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) d(ecurioni) adl(ecto) | q(uae-  
stori) a(erarii) Ostiens(ium) iivir(o) q(uaestori) iuvenum | hic primus  
5 omnium quo annó dec(urio) adl(ectus) est et || q(uaestor) a(erarii) fact(us)  
est et in proxim(um) annum iivir designat(us) est | quinq(uennalis) cura-  
tór(um) navium marinar(um) grátis adléct(us) | inter navicular(ios) maris  
Hadriatici et ad quadrígam | fori vinari patrónó decuriae scribár(um) cé-  
rariór(um) | et librariór(um) et lictór(um) et viatór(um) item praeconum  
10 et || et argentariór(um) et negotiatór(um) vinárior(um) ab urbe | item  
mensor(um) frumentariór(um) Cereris Aug(ustae) item corpor(is) |  
scaphariór(um) et lenunculariór(um) traiect(us) Luculli et | dendró-  
phor(um) et tógatór(um) á foro et dé sacomár(io) | et libertór(um) et  
15 servór(um) publicór(um) et oleáriór(um) et iuven(um) || cisianor(um)  
et veteranor(um) Aug(usti) item beneficiariór(um) | próc(uratoris) |  
Aug(usti) et piscator(um) própolar(um) cúratóri lusús iuvenalis | Cn.  
Sentius Lucilius | Gamala Clodianus f(ilius) | patri indulgentissimo

*CIL* xiv. 409

6. [A. Egri]lio A.f. A.n. A. [pr]o[n.] | Vot(uria) Rufo | [dec(urionum)  
d]ecr(eto) decurioni adl(ecto) | [aedi]li quaesto[r]i iivir[o] | [flam]ini  
Rom[ae et] Augu[s(ti)] | —que? —ibu— | —u—

*NS* 1953, 255.

7. M. Acilius [M.f. P]riscus | d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) d(ecurio) adle[ctus]  
quaest(or) | aer(ari) suffra[gi]o de]curion(um) | iivir aedil(is) II [quinq]uen-  
nal(is) | pr[ae]f[ect]us II [prae]f[ectus] colleg(i) fabr(um) || Ostiens(ium)  
cont[inuo t]riennio | praef(ectus) cohort[is] — Baracara | Augustano-  
r[um t]rib(unus) coh(ortis) III | voluntariorum t[ribun]us militum |  
leg(ionis) XI Claudia[e pia]e fidelis || flamen Roma[e et Aug]usti | ponti-  
fex [Vol]cani | testamento f[ieri ius] sit per | A. Egrilium [Primi]genium

*NS* 1953, 256.

8. C. Fabi<sup>o</sup> Longi p(rimi) p(ilaris) f. | Longi p(rimi) p(ilaris) n. Fabi Rufi |  
prón(epoti) C. Gratti abn(epoti) | Vot(uria) Agrippae | prāetori sacrīs  
Volka[ni fac(iundis)] | dec(urionum) decr(eto) decurió[ni adlecto] |  
aedili iī[viro —

CIL xiv. 349.

9. C. Nasennio C.f. Marcello seniori | praef(ecto) coh(ortis) I Apamenae  
trib(un)o coh(ortis) I Italicae civium Rōmanorum volun|tariorum prae-  
f(ecto) alae Phrygum praef(ecto) fabrum aedili quaestori duumvi|ro  
quinquennali III curatori operum publicorum et aquarum | perpetuo  
praetori et pontifici Laurentium Lavinatium p(atrono) c(oloniae) Osten-  
sium || Nasennia Helpis fecit patrono indulgentissimo et C. Nasennio  
Sa|turnino coniugi carissimo sibi liberis libertis libertabus posteris|que  
eorum

CIL xiv. 171.

10. P. Aufidio P.f. Quirina | Forti | [d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) decu]rioni  
adlecto iiviro | [quaesto]ri aerari Ostiensium IIII | [praefe]cto fabrum ||  
[tignuariorum] Ostis patron[o] | corporum mensorum | frumentariorum |  
et urinatorum decurioni adlecto | Africae Hippone Regio | corpus merca-  
torum | frumentariorum | q(uin)q(uennali) perpetuo

CIL xiv, S.4620.

11. L. Licinio L. fil. Pal(atina) | Herodi | equit(i) Rom(ano) decuriali |  
5 decuriae viatoriae | equestris co(n)s(ularis) decurioni || quinquennali  
duumviro | sacerdoti geni col(oniae) flam(ini) | Rom(ae) et Aug(usti)  
curat(ori) oper(um) publ(icorum) | quaestori aer(ari) aedili flam(ini) |  
10 divi Severi sodali Arulensi || praet(ori) prim(o) sac(ris) Volk(ani) faci-  
u(ndis) | ordo Augustal(ium) | optimo civi ob merita

CIL xiv. 373.

12. P. Flavio P. fil. Pal(atina) | Prisco e(gregio) v(iro) | equestris ordinis |  
5 religiosa disciplina | ad centena provecto || pontifici et dictatori | Albano  
primo annos | viginti octo agenti | q(uin)q(uennali) c(ensoria) p(ote-  
10 state) patr(ono) colon(iae) Ost(iensium) | sacerd(oti) geni colon(iae) ||  
patr(ono) corp(or)is pistorum | corp(or)is mesorum | frum(entariorum)  
Ost(iensium) patron(o)  
in latere dextro: dedicata kale|ndis Martis | Aemiliano ite|rum et Aquil-  
lin|o cos. (249)

CIL xiv, S 4452.



13. fide exercitationem | bonitati pollenti Lucio | Crepereio Madaliano  
 v(iro) c(larissimo) | praef(ecto) ann(onae) cum iure gladii | comiti Flavi-  
 5 ali corr(ectori) Flam(iniae) || et Piceni leg(ato) pro praetore prov(inciae) |  
 Asiae leg(ato) prov(inciae) Africae consula(ri) | aed(ium) sacrar(um)  
 consul(ari) molium fari | at purgaturae quaest(ori) candid(ato) | prae-  
 10 t(ori) consuli ob multa in se eius || testimonia ordo et populus | Fl(aviae)  
 Constantinianae Portuenses | statuam publicae ponendam | censuerunt  
 CIL xiv, S 4449.

14. C. Domitio L. fil. Pal(atina) F(abio) | Hermogeni | e(quitum) Romano  
 scribae aedil(ium) curul(ium) dec(urioni) adle(cto) | fl(amini) divi  
 H(adria)ni in cuius sacerdotio solus ac primus lud(os | scaenic)os sua  
 5 p(e)cunia fecit aedili hunc splendidissimus ordo decur(ionum) || fun(ere)  
 publ(ico) hon(oravit) eique statuam equestrem subscriptione ob amor(em |  
 et industr(iam) o(mnium) in foro ponendam pecunia publica decre(vi)t |  
 inque loc(um) eius (aedil(em) substituendum non putavit in solacium  
 Fab(i) pat(ris) | (qui) ob honores (ei) hab(iti)tos HS L M N rei publicae  
 dedit ex quorum usuris quincun(cibus) | (quod) annis XIII k(alendas)  
 Aug(ustas) die natali eius decurionib(us) \* DL praesentib(us) | in foro ant(e  
 10 stat(uam) s(upra)) s(cryptam) || (divi) dantur et decurialibus scribis ceraris  
 \* XXXVIIS libris \* XIIS item lictoribus [\* XXV] | L. Fabius Sp.f.  
 Eutychus lictor curiatus scrib(a) cer(arius) | et librarius q(uin)q(uen-  
 nalis) collegi fabr(um) (tignuariorum) Ostiens(ium) et Artoria eius  
 par(entes)

CIL xiv, S 4642.

15. Marco Licinio | Privato | *decurionatus ornamentis honorato et* | bisellario in  
 5 primis constituto | inlatis rei publicae sestertis || quinquaginta milibus N |  
*quaestori et q(uin)q(uennali) corporis pistorum Ostiens(ium) et Port(ensium)* |  
 magistro quinquennal(i) collegi | fabrum tignuariorum lustr(i) | XXVIII  
 10 et decurioni eiusdem || numeri decur(iae) XVI decurial(i) scrib(ae) | patri  
*et avo decurionum* | librario tribuli tribus Claudiae | patri equitum Romano-  
 15 rum | patrum et liberorum clientium || universus numerus | caligato-  
 rum | collegi fabrum tignuarior(um) Ostiens(ium) | magistro optimo ob  
 amorem et merita eius | locus d(atu)s d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) p(ublice)

CIL xiv. 374. The lines italicized were added in smaller letters between lines after the statue had been set up.

16. dis manibus | L. Calpurnius Chius sevir Aug(ustalis) | et quinquennalis |  
 idem quinq(uennalis) corporis mensor(um) | frumentarior(um) Ostien-  
 5 s(ium) et curat(or) || bis | idem codicar(iorum) curat(or) Ostis et III  
 honor(atu)s | idem quinquennal(is) collegi Silvani | Aug(usti) maioris

- 10 quod est Hilarionis | iunctus<sup>1</sup> sacomari idem magistro ad Marte(m) ||  
 Ficanum Aug(ustum) | idem in collegio dendrofor(um) | fecit sibi et |  
 Corneliae Ampliatae coniugi suae | carissimae cum qua vixit annis XXXI |  
 15 Calpurniae L. lib(ertae) Pthengidi libertae || carissimae L. Calpurnio  
 Forti vern(ae) lib(erto) | L. Calpurnio Felici lib(erto) L. Calpurnio  
 Adaucto vern(ae) lib(erto) | Calpurniae L.f. Chiaie vern(ae) Calpurniae  
 L.f. | Ampliatae vern(ae) L. Calpurnio L.f. Felici vern(ae) | L. Calpurnio  
 20 L.f. Pal(atina) Chio Felicissimo || libertis libertab(us) posterisq(ue) eorum  
 b(ene) m(erentibus)

*CIL* xiv. 309.

<sup>1</sup> 'functus' (*CIL*) is a less probable reading.

## ADDENDA

*P. 56 n. 1.* D. W. MacDowall, 'The Numismatic Evidence for the Neronia', *CQ* 8 (1958) 192-4, emphasizes that Nero's bronze coinage, which was not begun until 64, includes commemorations of his first *congiarium*, from the beginning of his reign, and of the Macellum, dedicated in 59 (Dio lxi. 18. 3). The harbour might also have been completed before 60; but the beginning of Nero's canal in 64 still makes 63 or 64 an attractive date for the end of the work (p. 57).

*Pp. 169, 388.* P.-A. Février, 'Ostie et Porto à la fin de l'antiquité', *Mélanges*, 70 (1958) 295-330, has made an important contribution to the study of Christianity at Ostia and Portus in the fourth and fifth centuries. He accepts the tradition of Constantine's basilica at Ostia, siting it outside the Porta Laurentina, and suggests approximate sites for other Christian buildings on evidence that is considerably less strong.

In discussing the Christian oratory by the theatre (302 f.) he infers that the Quiriacus whose name is inscribed on a sarcophagus lid found in the ruins is a fourth- or fifth-century Christian who had himself buried near the oratory, and that the legend of the martyrdom by the theatre may be a false deduction from the name. It is not naïve to reject such scepticism. The sarcophagus cannot be later than the late third century; the dating of the inscription on the lid is more precarious, but it must surely be earlier than the fifth century, and it is very doubtful whether burials would be tolerated within the walls during the fourth century. Février reconsiders the 'Christian basilica' on the western Decumanus (304-11). He associates the inscription over the entry to the 'baptistery' with a martyr-cult and compares the plan of the building to early double churches. His study may provoke a detailed re-examination of the history of the construction, which is badly needed.

The general assumption that the Xenodochium of Pammachius has been identified is challenged, with good reason (316 f.). De Rossi's identification rested on a hexameter incorporated in an inscription round the fountain in the centre of the atrium or court: '[qu]isq[ue] sitit veniat cupiens aurire flue[nta]'. This line occurs in verses attributed alternatively to Pope Damasius and to Jerome. Since Jerome was a friend of Pammachius, and since the inscription (Thylander, B 361, pl. cxxv. 2) shows the influence of Filocalus and is therefore probably of the late fourth century, De Rossi's identification was unquestioned. Ferrua, however (*Epigrammata Damasiana* (Rome, 1942), 219-28), gives good reasons for dating the verses attributed to Jerome to the sixth century and suggests that the hexameter in question is common stock. Février believes that the building complex is more probably the church of St. Peter and St. Paul. The question should be left open until the area can be more carefully examined.

*Pp. 234, 468.* P. Hommel, 'Euripides in Ostia', *Epigraphica*, 19 (1957) 109-64, reconsiders tomb 106 on Isola Sacra and its inscriptions. If his conclusions are sound he has recovered an interesting paragraph in Ostia's social history.

This tomb was built within a large enclosed area at some distance from the tombs that can now be seen and in no planned relation to them. It was one of several discovered in 1938 after the main excavation of the area and had to be covered up again; but Calza was able to give a brief account in his basic publication (*Necropoli*, 373-6). The inscription over the entry recorded that C. Marcus De[metrius],

*archiatros*, and Munatia Helpis built the tomb. Within were found the record of five deaths and a portrait statue of a young woman, with the attributes of Hygia, and the name 'Julia Procula' inscribed below. According to Bloch's persuasive establishment of the relationships (*AJA* 1944, 217), Demetrius married Munatia Helpis, who had a family by a first husband, Julius Proculus. The tomb was thought to be Trajanic from Calza's judgement of the construction and the distinctive hair-style of the statue.

Hommel suggests that C. Marcus Demetrius is the Demetrius mentioned by Galen, M. Aurelius' court physician, who died c. 170. He derived his *nomen* Marcus from the emperor's *praenomen* Marcus, when he was freed or adopted. The quick succession of deaths, combined with the court physician's date, indicates that the tomb was built in one of two violent attacks of the plague, in 165/6 or 168/9. Hommel further suggests that Marcia Aurelia Ceionia Demetrias, known from an inscription found at Anagnia (*CIL* x. 5918), and identified by Mommsen with Commodus' mistress Marcia (Victor, *Epit.* 17. 5; Dio lxxii (lxxiii). 4. 6), may be the daughter of the court physician who married an Ostian wife.

Much of the argument is vulnerable: (1) Unless roughly contemporary parallels are cited, the derivation of Marcus from Marcus should not be accepted. (2) To reconcile his date for the tomb (160–70) with a Trajanic portrait statue Hommel has to believe that the portrait is not of Julia Procula. This is formally possible, but improbable. (3) Calza's account of the excavation lacks precision at crucial points, but his description favours, though not decisively, a date before the middle of the century. (4) There is no evidence for a quick succession of deaths. T. Munatius Proculus died when he was 6 years 14 days old; his mother was still alive then but she must have died soon afterwards, since she died just before she was 29. There is no evidence that the other deaths occurred at or very near the same time. The number of inscriptions in this family tomb is not extraordinary; the plague is an unnecessary hypothesis. (5) It is difficult to place the lettering of the earliest of the inscriptions (Thylander, pls. xlv. 4; liii. 1, 2; lvi. 1, 2) as late as Marcus Aurelius' reign.

I therefore remain sceptical. The name C. Marcus is more probably to be associated with other C. Marcii from Portus, some of whose inscriptions are earlier than M. Aurelius (e.g. Thylander, A 176, pl. l. 4; 174, pl. l. 1; B 107, C. L. Visconti, *I monumenti del Museo Torlonia* (Rome, 1885), n. 413, tav. civ). A doctor brought up at Ostia could have become a court physician, but it is very difficult to fit the date of the tomb to Hommel's identification. The possibility that Marcia Demetrias is descended from the Ostian doctor cannot yet be ruled out; I should like to believe that Commodus, who left such a prominent mark on Ostia (p. 79), had an Ostian mistress.

P. 286. A possible exception to the rule must be admitted. While I was working at Ostia I was very intrigued by the tantalizing sight of a few letters on a statue base which had been incorporated in a late, possibly medieval, wall closing the space between the piers of the portico in front of the theatre. In 1957 this base was extracted and I have to thank Professor Barbieri for confirming the text on the side of the base (the text on the face has been erased): 'quarto idus Maías | imperatore Commodo iterum | P. Martio Vero iterum | locus acceptus ex auctoritate | Flavi Pisonis pr(aefecti) ann(onae) adsignante | Valerio Fusco proc(uratore) Augg.'

Before this base was recovered I had assumed that, like the bases recovered from the theatre itself, it came from the gardens behind the theatre. The text, however,

implies that the site where the statue was erected was controlled by the *praefectus annonae*. It can, however, be maintained that the formula on this base should have been used on all bases set up in the same place. Since all the other bases from the gardens which preserve a formula of allocation record the authority of the local council, the logical conclusion must be that this recently recovered base was set up elsewhere in the neighbourhood.

- P. 428 n. 5. There may have survived part of a more interesting Ostian tribute to Plautianus. G. Barbieri, 'Un nuovo cursus equestre', *Epigraphica*, 19 (1957) 93-108, shows that three new Ostian fragments of a base go with a fragment already published (S 4468/70), and that the same career is recorded in an inscription found in Rome (*AE* 1946, 95). Neither Roman nor Ostian fragments preserve the name of the man honoured, but Barbieri makes a good case for identifying him with C. Fulvius Plautianus, whose career before he became praetorian prefect was not previously known. If he is right, Plautianus was *praefectus annonae* before being put in charge of the guard not later than 197. He was already specially trusted by Septimius Severus in 193 when he was sent to seize the children of Cassius Niger (*SHA, Severus*, 6. 10). His appointment to the key position of controller of the corn supply would be interesting and intelligible. But the positive grounds for the identification are less compelling than they seem at first.

Barbieri gives four main converging clues: (1) The letters of the Ostian and Roman inscriptions seem to fit the late second and early third century. (2) To be honoured so handsomely in both Rome and Ostia the man must be an important figure. (3) The base is a particularly large base. (4) It seems clear that the base was deliberately broken. It would be dangerous to claim more than speculation from these premises. The lettering will suit any *praefectus annonae* of the late Antonine or early Severan periods; and any *praefectus annonae* might be honoured at Ostia and Rome, the two main centres of his responsibility. His status would entitle him to a specially large base at Ostia. If we could be certain that the base was violently broken the case for Plautianus would become very much stronger, but so many fragments of bases and tablets have been found in the ruins (e.g. S 4620, 4664, Bloch, 21) that the discovery of dispersed fragments cannot be regarded as evidence for deliberate destruction in the Roman period. Before scholars less careful than Barbieri build further on the hypothesis, two points should be considered. The promotion to the post of *praefectus annonae* is not abnormal, but by the most favoured route through posts in the palace secretariat (Pflaum, *Les Procurateurs équestres*, 257). Finally Herodian (iii. 10. 6) says that Septimius Severus raised Plautianus to power from humble status: 'πλὴν ἄλλ' ὁ Σεουήρος ἐκ μικρῶς καὶ εὐτελοῦς τύχης ἐς μεγάλην προήγαγεν ἐξουσίαν.' This *praefectus annonae* was nearing the climax of a distinguished equestrian career. Herodian, though a contemporary, is not a reliable source (cf. E. Hohl, 'Kaiser Commodus und Herodian', *Sitz. der deutsch. Ak. Wiss. Berlin*, 1954, 1). His language in such a context cannot be pressed too closely, but it slightly weakens the case.

- P. 437 n. 1. Ostian painting is liberally illustrated by M. Borda in *La Pittura romana* (Milan, 1958). The photographs are excellent, but the chronology is established almost exclusively on grounds of style, without reference to the walls concerned.

- P. 464 n. 4. A. W. Byvanck, 'Le Problème des sarcophages romains', *BVAB* 31 (1956)

31–38, examines early second-century sarcophagi, the decoration of which derives directly or indirectly from Greek sources, and attributes the change from cremation to burial to the influence of oriental freedmen. A wider explanation is needed of such a general change in custom.

P. 473. E. J. H. Oliver, 'Gerusiae and Augustales', *Historia*, 7 (1958) 472–96, interprets differently the registers and other inscriptions of *seviri Augustales* (316, 360, 461, S 4559). Though he has clarified some points of detail, some of his main inferences are unconvincing. In particular he makes no allowance for what seems to be a major change in organization in or soon after the Flavian period (p. 217).

P. 481. An important passage had escaped me (and others). In his terse account of 428 B.C. Livy (iv. 30. 5–6) mentions Ostia: 'Men of Veii raided Roman territory. It was widely held that men of military age from Fidenae had joined in the raid. L. Sergius, Q. Servilius, and Mam. Aemilius were appointed to conduct an inquiry. Some men were banished to Ostia, since there was no satisfactory explanation why they had been absent from Fidenae at the time. A number of colonists was added [? at Fidenae]. The land of those who had been killed in the war was assigned to them.'

This uncoloured passage seems to derive from an annalistic record. A motive can be found for the invention of a regal Ostia; the introduction of Ostia into any story focused on the corn supply could be a reflection of later conditions; but the mention of Ostia in a context where it has no natural place is more likely to derive from historical fact.

P. 487 n. 5. Miss Tilly, 'The Topography of *Aeneid* IX with reference to the way taken by Nisus and Euryalus', *Arch. Class.* 8 (1956) 164–72, has argued that in this passage Virgil had the detailed topography of Ostian territory in mind. Nisus, leading the attempt to break through the enemy's lines round the Trojan camp at Ostia, reaches a place called 'Loca Albani' (*Aen.* ix. 386–8): 'iamque imprudens evaserat hostes | atque locos, qui post Albae de nomine dicti | Albani (tum rex stabula alta Latinus habebat)'. Miss Tilly suggests that this was the contemporary name for the Ostian salt marshes. Though there is no other evidence for the name, there is no good reason for rejecting it; but it is more likely to have been attached to grazing land to the east of the marshes.

Her second identification is more important. Nisus and Euryalus propose to break out of camp on the seaward side (*Aen.* ix. 237 f.): 'locum insidiis conspeximus ipsi | qui patet in bivio portae quae proxima ponto.' Miss Tilly suggests that the *bivium* is the historic cross-roads outside the western gate of the Castrum, which, according to Becatti (above, p. 14), preserves the meeting-place of two early tracks from Laurentine territory and from Rome. I am doubtful whether *bivium portae* could be Virgilian Latin for 'the cross-roads outside the gate'; it should rather refer to the gate itself. (*Thes. L. L.* ii, col. 2024, compares Statius, *Thebaid*, i. 609: 'illa novos ibat populata penates | portarum in bivio.' Virgil does not elaborate the phrase; from the moment that the two heroes leave the Trojan camp the description of their route remains extremely vague.

P. 500. L. Vidman, 'De familia Gamaliana Ostiensi', *Eunomia (Ephemeridis Listz filologické suppl.)*, 2 (Prague, 1958) 1, reconsiders the career of the Lucilius Gamala whose inscription is lost. He uses some of the arguments that I also have used in

favour of an early date, but assumes from the discovery of the stone at Portus that this Gamala must have died after the harbour was begun. From the *Fasti* Vidman infers that he became *pontifex Volcani* after 42 and died before 80. I still see too many pointers to the Augustan period to change my mind.

P. 540. H. Bloch, 'The Serapeum of Ostia and the Brick-Stamps of 123 A.D.', *AJA* 63 (1959) 225-40, has considerably strengthened his conclusions by a detailed analysis of the stamps found in the Serapeum and adjoining buildings. The temple was dedicated on 24 January 127 (*Fasti*); the great majority of stamps found in the construction are dated between 123 and 126.

Pp. 522 f. Had I been more familiar with the literature I should have been even more conscious of the difficulties of unravelling the true stories of Gallicanus and Hilarinus. To my references should be added the articles listed in the Bibliography (Religion) under the names of H. Grégoire and P. Orgels, and of B. Le Gaiffier.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL studies of Ostia and Portus are separately listed first in chronological order. The short section on Inscriptions which follows is confined to the main collections of Ostian inscriptions and excludes individual inscriptions separately published recently. These, together with a very large number of unpublished inscriptions, are to be edited by G. Barbieri. Housing, trade, religion, and the arts are also separately classified; further subdivision would not, I think, serve a useful purpose and in many cases would be arbitrary. The unattractive heading Miscellaneous should not be interpreted as a mark of disrespect.

The books and articles listed are, with few exceptions, specifically concerned with Ostia. No attempt has been made to list the general histories, works of reference, and more specialized studies that have been useful in this inquiry.

### GENERAL STUDIES OF OSTIA

- C. FEA, *Relazione di un viaggio ad Ostia e alla villa di Plinio detta Laurentino*, Rome, 1802.  
A. NIBBY, *Viaggio antiquario ad Ostia*, Rome, 1829.  
L. CANINA, *Sulla stazione delle navi ad Ostia*, Rome, 1837.  
G. TOMASSETTI, 'Vie Ostiense e Laurentina', *Archivio della Reale Società Romana di Storia Patria*, xvii-xx, 1897.  
R. FISCH, *Eine Wanderung nach den Trümmern von Ostia*, Berlin, 1898.  
L. PASCHETTO, *Ostia colonia romana, storia e monumenti*, Rome, 1912. (Review: J. Carcopino, *Rev. arch.* 21 (1913) 389.)  
D. VAGLIERI, *Ostia, cenni storici e guida*, Rome, 1914.  
J. CARCOPINO, *Virgile et les origines d'Ostie*, Paris, 1919.  
— *Ostie* (coll. 'Les visites d'art'), Paris, 1929.  
F. H. WILSON, 'Studies in the Social and Economic History of Ostia', *BSR* 13 (1935) 41; 14 (1938) 152.  
G. CALZA, 'Ostia', *RE* xviii. 1654 (1942).  
A. BOETHIUS, *Stadsbebyggelsen i Roms hamnstad Ostia*, Göteborg, 1951.  
G. CALZA, G. BECATTI, *Ostia*<sup>3</sup> (Itinerari dei musei e monumenti d'Italia), Rome, 1954.  
G. CALZA, G. BECATTI, I. GISMONDI, G. DE ANGELIS D'OSSAT, H. BLOCH, *Scavi di Ostia, I, Topografia Generale*, Rome, 1954. (Reviews: H. Schaal, *Gnomon*, 26 (1954) 551; R. Meiggs, *JRS* 46 (1956) 190; J. Le Gall, *Rev. arch.* 49 (1957) 60.)  
H. SCHAAL, *Ostia, der Welthafen Roms*, Bremen, 1957.

### GENERAL STUDIES OF PORTUS

- C. FEA, *Alcune osservazioni sopra gli antichi porti d'Ostia, ora di Fiumicino*, Rome, 1824.  
A. NIBBY, *Della Via Portuense e dell' antica città di Porto*, Rome, 1829.  
G. RASI, *Sui due rami Tiberini di Fiumicino e di Ostia e sui porti di Claudio e di Trajano*, Rome, 1830.



- C. TEXIER, *Mémoire sur les ports antiques situés à l'embouchure du Tibre*, Paris, 1858 (= vol. xv, *Revue générale de l'architecture et des travaux publics*).
- R. LANCIANI, 'Ricerche topografiche sulla città di Porto', *Ann. Inst.* 40 (1868) 144, with *Mon. Inst.* 8, tav. 49 (plan).
- G. TOMASSETTI, 'Via Portuense', *Archivio della Reale Società Romana di Storia Patria*, xxii-xxiii, 1900.
- J. CARCOPINO, 'Il Porto Claudio Ostiense secondo recenti tatti', *NS* 1907, 734.
- K. LEHMANN-HARTLEBEN, *Die antiken Hafenanlagen des Mittelmeeres* (*Klio*, Beiheft xiv), 1923.
- G. CALZA, 'Ricognizioni topografiche nel Porto di Traiano', *NS* 1925, 45.
- G. LUGLI and G. FILIBECK, *Il Porto di Roma imperiale e l'Agro Portuense*, Rome, 1935.
- G. CALZA, *La Necropoli del Porto di Roma nell' Isola Sacra*, Rome, 1940. (Review: H. Bloch, *AJA* 48 (1944) 213.)
- M. FASCIATO, 'Ad quadrigam Fori Vinarii', *Mélanges*, 59 (1947) 65.
- G. LUGLI, 'L'iconografia della città di Porto nel secolo xvi', *Rend. Pont.* 23-24 (1947-9) 187.

## INSCRIPTIONS

- H. DESSAU, *CIL* xiv (1887).
- L. WICKERT, *CIL* xiv Supplement (1930).
- G. CALZA, *NS* 1938, 47-74 (inscriptions from tombs outside Porta Laurentina).
- A. DEGRASSI, *Inscriptiones Italiae*, xiii. 173-241 (*Fasti*).
- H. THYLANDER, *Inscriptions du port d'Ostie*, 2 vols. (Lund, 1952). (Reviews: A. Degrassi, *Gnomon*, 26 (1954) 102; R. Meiggs, *CR* 4 (1954) 157; *JRS* 44 (1954) 151.)
- H. BLOCH, *NS* 1953, 239-306 (selected inscriptions, found 1930-9).
- G. BARBIERI, *Scavi di Ostia*, iii. 1 (1958) 131-65 (Republican and Augustan sepulchral inscriptions revised).

## HOUSING

- A. A. VAN AKEN, 'Late Roman Domus Architecture', *Mnemosyne*, 2 (1949) 242.
- 'The Cortile in the Roman Imperial Insula-architecture', *Opuscula Archeologica*, 6 (1950) 112.
- 'Some aspects of Nymphaea in Pompeii, Herculaneum and Ostia', *Mnemosyne*, 4 (1951) 272.
- G. BECATTI, *Case Ostiensi del tardo impero*, Rome, 1949.
- A. BOETHIUS, 'Remarks on the Development of Domestic Architecture in Rome', *AJA* 38 (1934) 158.
- 'Appunti sul carattere razionale e sull' importanza dell' architettura domestica in Roma imperiale', in *Scritti in onore di B. Nogara*, Rome, 1937.
- 'Notes from Ostia (strip-insulae)', in *Studies presented to D. M. Robinson*, ii (1953) 195.
- G. CALZA, 'La Preminenza dell' "insula" nella edilizia romana', *MA* 23 (1915) 541.
- 'Gli scavi recenti nell' abitato di Ostia', *MA* 26 (1920) 321.

- G. CALZA, 'Le origini latine dell' abitazione moderna', *Architettura e arti decorative*, 3 (1923-4) 3, 49.  
 — 'Esplorazione dell' isolato a ovest del Campidoglio di Ostia', *NS* 1923, 177.  
 — 'Contributi alla storia dell' edilizia imperiale romana', *Palladio*, 5 (1941) 1.  
 P. HARSH, 'Origins of the Insulae at Ostia', *MAAR* 12 (1935) 9.  
 G. HEJZLAR, *Obytný a Obchodní Dům v Ostii* (with résumé in French), Prague, 1933.  
 L. HOMO, *Rome impériale et l'urbanisme dans l'antiquité*, Paris, 1951.  
 A. MÜFID, *Stockwerkbauten der Griechen und Römer*, Leipzig, 1932.

## TRADE

- D. VAN BERCHEM, *Les Distributions du blé et d'argent à la plèbe romaine sous l'Empire*, Geneva, 1936.  
 G. CALZA, 'Il Piazzale delle Corporazioni e la funzione commerciale di Ostia', *BC* 43 (1915) 178.  
 — 'Gli horrea tra il Tevere e il decumano, nel centro di Ostia antica', *NS* 1921, 360.  
 L. CASSON, 'The Grain Trade of the Hellenistic World', *TAPA* 85 (1954) 168.  
 A. CIALDI, *La Navigazione del Tevere*, Rome, 1845.  
 P.-M. DUVAL, 'La forme des navires romains d'après la Mosaïque d'Althiburus', *Mélanges*, 61 (1949) 119.  
 R. ÉTIENNE, 'Les amphores du Testaccio au III<sup>e</sup> siècle', *Mélanges* 61 (1949) 151.  
 M. FASCIATO, 'Ad quadrigam Fori Vinarii', *Mélanges*, 59 (1947) 65.  
 C. FEA, *Storia delle saline d'Ostia*, Rome, 1831.  
 T. FRANK, 'The People of Ostia', *Class. Journ.* 29 (1934) 481.  
 G. GIRRI, *La taberna nel quadro urbanistico e sociale di Ostia* (Ist. arch. Milan; tesi di laurea, I) Rome, 1956.  
 A. HÉRON DE VILLEFOSSE, 'Deux armateurs narbonnais', *Mém. soc. Ant. de France*, 74 (1914) 153.  
 — 'La Mosaïque des Narbonnais à Ostie', *Bull. arch.* 1918, 245.  
 L. A. and L. B. HOLLAND, 'Down the Tiber on a raft', *Archaeology*, 1950, 87.  
 — 'The Tiber in Primitive Commerce', *AJA* 54 (1950) 261.  
 J. LE GALL, 'Les Bas-reliefs de la statue du Tibre au Musée du Louvre', *Rev. arch.* 21 (1944) 115; 22 (1944) 39.  
 — *Le Tibre fleuve de Rome, dans l'antiquité*, Paris, 1953.  
 A. MEYER, *L'Arte di restituire a Roma la tralasciata navigazione del Tevere*, Rome, 1685.  
 L. PASCOLI, *Il Tevere è navigabile da Perugia a Roma*, Rome, 1740.  
 H. PIGEONNEAU, *De convectione urbanae annonae et de publicis corporibus apud Romanos*, Paris, 1876.  
 L. PRELLER, *Rom und Tiber*, Leipzig, 1849.  
 G. B. RASI, *Sul Tevere e sua navigazione da Fiumicino a Roma*, Rome, 1827.  
 S. A. SMITH, *The Tiber and its Tributaries*, London, 1877.  
 M. F. SQUARCIAPINO, 'Tesoretto di monete d'argento', *NS* 1948, 326.  
 — 'Frammenti Ostiensi della così-detta ceramica tarda', *Rend. class. scienze mor. stor. fil.*, ser. viii, 6 (1951) 136.  
 D. VAGLIERI, 'Le corporazioni professionali in un grande porto commerciale dell' antichità', *Misc. in onore di Attilio Hortis*, Trieste, 1910.

## RELIGION

- G. BARBIERI, 'Settimio Nestore', *Athenaeum*, 31 (1953) 158.
- A. BARIGAZZI, 'Sopra alcune epigrafi metriche di Ostia', *Κρητικά Χρονικά*, 7 (1953) 97.
- G. BECATTI, 'Il culto di Ercole ad Ostia', *BC* 67 (1939) 37.
- 'Nuovo documento del culto di Ercole ad Ostia', *ibid.* 70 (1942) 115.
- 'Rilievo con la nascita di Dioniso e aspetti mistici di Ostia pagana', *Boll. d'arte*, 36 (1951) 1.
- *Scavi di Ostia, II, i Mitrei*, Rome, 1954. (Reviews: M. Bieber, *AJA* 60 (1956) 310; J. Bayet, *Gnomon*, 27 (1955) 349.)
- 'Una copia Giustiniani del Mitra di Kriton', *Boll. d'arte*, 42 (1957) 1.
- H. BLOCH, 'A New Document of the Last Pagan Revival in the West', *Harv. Theol. Rev.* 38 (1945) 199.
- C. R. BRIGGS, 'The Pantheon of Ostia', *MAAR* 8 (1930) 161.
- G. CALZA, 'Una basilica di età costantiniana scoperta a Ostia', *Rend. Pont.* 16 (1940) 63.
- 'Ancora sulla basilica cristiana di Ostia', *ibid.* 18 (1941-2) 135.
- 'Il tempio della Bona Dea', *NS* 1942, 152.
- 'Il santuario della Magna Mater a Ostia', *Mem. Pont.* 6 (1946) 183.
- 'Nuove testimonianze del cristianesimo a Ostia', *Rend. Pont.* 25-26 (1949-51) 123.
- R. CALZA, 'Le sculture rinvenute nel santuario della Magna Mater', *Mem. Pont.* 6 (1946) 207.
- 'Sui ritratti ostiensi del supposto Plotino', *Boll. d'arte*, 38 (1953) 203.
- L. CANTARELLI, 'Un frammento epigrafico cristiano dall' isola Portuense', *BC* 24 (1896) 67.
- A. CASAMASSA, 'Ritrovamento di parte dell' elogio di S. Monica', *Rend. Pont.* 27 (1952-4) 271.
- A. C. DELIPERI, 'L'Albergo di S. Agostino a Ostia', *Pantheon*, 5 (1951) 372.
- P.-A. FÉVRIER, 'Ostie et Porto à la fin de l'antiquité', *Mélanges*, 70 (1958) 295.
- H. FUHRMANN, 'C. Caeionius Rufus Volusianus Lampadius', *Epigraphica*, 3 (1941) 103.
- A. VON GERKAN, 'Die christliche Anlage in Ostia', *Römische Quartalschrift*, 47 (1939) 15.
- H. GRÉGOIRE and P. ORGELS, 'S. Gallicanus, consul et martyr dans la passion des SS. Jean et Paul, et sa vision constantinienne du Crucifié', *Byzantion*, 24 (1954) 579.
- M. GUARDUCCI, 'Nuovi documenti del culto di Caelestis a Roma', *BC* 72 (1946-8) 11.
- 'Tracce di Pitagoreismo nelle iscrizioni Ostiensi', *Rend. Pont.* 23-24 (1947-9) 209.
- T. KLAUSER, 'Die Inschrift der neugefundenen altchristlichen Bauanlage in Ostia', *Römische Quartalschrift*, 47 (1939) 25.
- B. LE GAFFIER, 'Les Avatars de S. Hilarinus', *Analecta Boll.* 66 (1948) 276. "Sub Iuliano Apostata" dans le martyrologe romain', *ibid.* 74 (1956) 5.
- J. LE GALL, *Recherches sur le culte du Tibre*, Paris, 1953.
- H. J. LEON, 'The Jewish Community of Ancient Porto', *Harv. Theol. Rev.* 45 (1952) 165.
- H. P. L'ORANGE, 'The Portrait of Plotinus', *Les Cahiers archéologiques*, 5 (1951) 15.

- J. H. OLIVER, 'Gerusiae and Augustales', *Historia*, 7 (1958) 481.  
 R. PARIBENI, 'I quattro tempietti di Ostia', *MA* 23 (1914) 441.  
 G. B. DE ROSSI, 'I monumenti cristiani di Porto', *Bull. arch. crist.* 4 (1866) 37.  
 M. F. SQUARCIAPINO, 'Una statua fittile Ostiense', *Arti figurative*, 3 (1947) 3.  
 — 'Coppa cristiana da Ostia', *Boll. d'arte*, 37 (1952) 204.  
 — 'Vetri incisi portuensi del museo sacro del Vaticano', *Rend. Pont.* 27 (1952-4) 255.  
 — 'L'ara dei Lari di Ostia', *Arch. class.* 4 (1952) 204.  
 — 'Placchete con simboli della Zodiaca', *ibid.* 5 (1953) 263.  
 L. R. TAYLOR, *The Cults of Ostia* (Bryn Mawr Monographs, XI) 1912.  
 D. VAGLIERI, 'Scoperte di antichità cristiane in Ostia', *Nuovo bull. di arch. crist.* 16 (1910) 57.  
 C. L. VISCONTI, 'I monumenti del Metroon Ostiense', *Ann. Inst.* 40 (1868) 362; 41 (1869) 208.

## THE ARTS

- M. E. BLAKE, 'The Pavements of the Roman Buildings of the Republic and Early Empire', *MAAR* 8 (1930) 1.  
 — 'Roman Mosaics of the Second Century in Italy', *MAAR* 13 (1936) 67.  
 M. BORDA, *La Pittura romana*, Milan, 1958.  
 G. CALZA, 'Il mosaico di Nettuno delle terme Ostiensi', *Boll. d'arte*, 6 (1912) 199.  
 — 'Rappresentanze di provincie e di venti in un mosaico di Ostia', *BC* 40 (1912) 103.  
 — 'Expressions of Art in a Roman Commercial City: Ostia', *JRS* (1915) 165.  
 R. CALZA, *Museo Ostiense* (Itinerari dei musei e monumenti d'Italia), Rome, 1947.  
 J. CARCOPINO, 'La mosaïque de la caserne des vigiles à Ostie', *Mélanges*, 27 (1907) 227.  
 C. C. VAN ESSEN, 'Chronologie der romeinse schilder-kunst', *Meed. Ned. hist. ist. te Roms*, 8 (1954) 33.  
 — 'Chronologie der romeinse mozaïeken', *ibid.* 64.  
 F. FORNARI, 'La pittura decorativa in Ostia', *Studi Romani*, 1 (1913) 305.  
 B. NOGARA, *Le Nozze Aldobrandini . . . e le altre pitture murali antiche conservate nella biblioteca vaticana e nei musei pontifici*, Milan, 1907.  
 M. F. SQUARCIAPINO, 'Forme Ostiensi', *Arch. class.* 6 (1954) 83.  
 C. L. VISCONTI, 'Sulle pitture murali di tre sepolcri Ostiensi scoperte nel 1865', *Ann. Inst.* 38 (1866) 292.  
 F. WIRTH, *Römische Wandmalerei vom Untergang Pompejis bis am Ende des 3. Jhdts.*, Berlin, 1934.

## MISCELLANEOUS

- T. ASHBY, 'Recent Discoveries at Ostia', *JRS* 2 (1912) 153.  
 R. BIANCHI BANDINELLI, 'Sarcophago da Acilia con la designazione di Gordiano III', *Boll. d'arte*, 39 (1954) 200.  
 G. BARBIERI, 'Fistole inedite', *NS* 1953, 151.  
 — 'Un nuovo cursus equestre', *Epigraphica*, 19 (1957) 93.  
 G. BECATTI, 'Il ritratto di Ippocrate', *Rend. Pont.* 21 (1945-6) 123.

- G. BENDZ, 'Sur la question de la ville de Laurentum', *Opuscula Archaeologica*, 1 (1934) 47.
- M. E. BLAKE, *Ancient Roman Construction in Italy from the Prehistoric Period to Augustus*, Washington, 1947.
- *Roman Construction in Italy from Tiberius through the Flavians*, Washington, 1959.
- H. BLOCH, *I bolli laterizi e la storia edilizia*, Rome, 1938.
- 'The Name of the Baths near the Forum of Ostia', in *Studies presented to D. M. Robinson*, ii (1953) 412.
- 'The Serapeum of Ostia and the Brick-Stamps of A.D. 123', *AJA* 63 (1959) 225.
- J. BRADFORD, *Ancient Landscapes*, London, 1957.
- G. CALZA, 'Die Taverne der sieben Weisen in Ostia', *Die Antike*, 15 (1939) 99.
- P. CAMPANA, 'Scavi di Ostia', *Bull. Inst.* 6 (1834) 129.
- J. CARCOPINO, 'Glanures épigraphiques', *Mélanges*, 29 (1909) 341.
- 'Le Quartier des docks', *ibid.* 30 (1910) 397.
- 'Les Inscriptions Gamaliennes', *ibid.* 31 (1911) 143.
- 'Notes complémentaires', *ibid.* 365.
- 'Les Récentes Fouilles d'Ostie (1909-11)', *Journal des Savants*, 1911, 448.
- L. CASSON, *The Ancient Mariners*, London, 1959.
- L. CONSTANS, 'Les fouilles d'Ostie (1914-17)', *Journal des Savants* 1917, 465.
- 'Ostie primitive', *ibid.* 1926, 436.
- N. EATON, 'A Roman Construction (Forum Baths)', *The South African Architectural Review*, Jan. 1933.
- C. C. VAN ESSEN, 'A propos du plan de la ville d'Ostie', *Hommages à Waldemar Deonna* (Coll. Latomus, Brussels, 1957), 509.
- T. FRANK, 'Aeneas' City at the mouth of the Tiber', *AJP* 45 (1924) 64.
- 'The People of Ostia', *Class. Journal*, 29 (1934) 481.
- I. GISMONDI, 'La Colimbetra del teatro di Ostia', *Anthemon* (Scritti in onore di Carlo Anti, Venice, 1954), 1.
- F. GROSSO, 'Nuovo epigrafe Ostiense dei Gamala', *Atti del III<sup>o</sup> Congresso internazionale di Epigrafia greca e latina*, 1959, 133.
- H. HOMMEL, 'Euripides in Ostia', *Epigraphica*, 19 (1957) 109.
- TH. HOMOLLE, 'Sur quelques inscriptions d'Ostie', *Rev. arch.* 34 (1877) 234, 301.
- L. LAFFRANCHI, 'La Translation de la monnaie d'Ostie à Arles', *Rev. belge de Numismatique*, 1922.
- R. LANCIANI, 'Le antichità del territorio Laurentino', *MA* 13 (1903) 133.
- G. LUGLI, *La tecnica edilizia Romana*, Rome, 1957.
- H. MATTINGLY, 'The First Age of Roman Coinage', *JRS* 25 (1945) 65.
- P. MINGAZZINI, 'Esisteva un abitato ostiense anteriore alla colonia romana?', *Rend. Pont.* 23-24 (1947-9) 75.
- 'Ippocrate o Pindaro?', *ibid.* 25-26 (1949-51) 33.
- A. PELLEGRINI, *Le Scienze e le arti sotto il Pontificato di Pio IX*, Rome, 1860.
- A. VON PREMERSTEIN, 'Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Marcus', *Klio*, 12 (1912) 139.
- L. ROSSI, *La bonifica degli stagni e delle paludi di Ostia*, Rome, 1894.
- G. STUHLFAUTH, 'Der Leuchtturm von Ostia', *RM* 53 (1938) 139.
- L. R. TAYLOR, 'The Publii Lucilii Gamalae of Ostia', *AJP* 57 (1936) 183.

- E. A. THATCHER, 'The Open Rooms of the Terme del Foro at Ostia', *MAAR* 24 (1956) 169.
- H. THYLANDER, *Étude sur l'épigraphie latine*, Lund, 1952.
- B. TILLY, *Vergil's Latium*, Oxford, 1947.
- 'The Topography of *Aeneid* IX with reference to the way taken by Nisus and Euryalus', *Arch. class.* 8 (1958) 164.
- D. VAGLIERI, 'Monumenti repubblicani di Ostia', *BC* 39 (1911) 225.
- L. VIDMAN, 'De familia Gamaliana Ostiensi', *Eunomia (Ephemeridis Listz filologické suppl.)*, 2 (Prague, 1958) 1.
- P. E. VISCONTI, *Catalogo del Museo Torlonia di sculture antiche*, Rome, 1880.
- L. WICKERT, 'Vorbemerkungen zu einem Supplementum Ostiense des *CIL*', *Sitz. der Preuss. Ak. Wiss.* 1928, 36.
- F. H. WILSON, 'The so-called Magazzini Repubblicane near the Porta Romana at Ostia', *BSR* 13 (1937) 77.

The following articles were seen too late even to be recorded in the Addenda:

- C. C. VAN ESSEN, 'Studio cronologico sulle pitture parietali di Ostia', *BC* 76 (1956-8) 155.
- F. GROSSO, 'L'epigrafe di Ippona e la vita di Suetonio con i fasti dei pontefici di Vulcano a Ostia', *Rend. Acc. naz. dei Lincei*, 14 (1959) 263.
- M. F. SQUARCIAPINO, 'Piccolo corpus dei mattoni scolpiti Ostiensi', *BC* 76 (1956-8) 183.

# OSTIA, 1960–1972

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A. ALFÖLDI, 'Die alexandrischen Götter und die vota publica am Jahres Beginn', *Jahrbuch für Antike Christentum*, 8–9 (1956–7) 53 (Ostia, 59–68).
- A. AUDIN, 'Inhumation et incinération', *Latomus*, 19 (1960) 312.
- S. BALBI DE CARO, 'Un nuovo pontefice di Vulcano ad Ostia', *Epigraphica* 30 (1968) 75.
- G. BARBIERI (1), 'Revisioni di epigrafi', *Rend. Pont.* 42 (1969–70) 73 (Ostia, 76).
- (2), 'Pompeio Macrino, Asinio Marcello, Bebio Macro e i Fasti Ostiensi del 115', *Mélanges* 82 (1970) 263.
- G. BECATTI (1), Review of *Roman Ostia*, *JRS* 51 (1961) 199.
- (2), *Mosaici e pavimenti marmorei* (*Scavi di Ostia*, iv), 1961.
- (3), 'L'edificio Ostiense con opus sectile', *Rend. Pont.* 41 (1968–9) 205.
- (4), *Edificio con opus sectile fuori Porta Marina* (*Scavi di Ostia*, vi), 1969.
- (5), *AC* 19 (1967) 170, 20 (1968) 157.
- (6), 'Scavi di un edificio termale in Ostia Antica' (Terme del nuotatore), *AC* 19 (1967) 170.
- J. P. BECKER, 'The actual value of the Horrea of Hortensius at Ostia', *Rend. Ist. Lombardo di sci. e lett.* 47 (1963) 605.
- L. BERTACCHI, 'Elementi per una revisione della topografia Ostiense', *Rend. Linc.* 15 (1960) 8.
- H. BLOCH (1), Review of *Roman Ostia*, *Gnomon* 37 (1965) 192.
- (2), 'A Monument of the Lares Augusti in the Forum of Ostia', *Harv. Theol. Stud.* 4 (1961) 211.
- A. A. BOYCE, 'Nero's Harbour Sestertii', *AJA* 70 (1966) 65.
- M. BURZACHECHI, 'Nuove osservazioni sull'epigrafe cristiana della basilica di Ostia', *Röm. Quartalschrift* 1964, 103.
- C. BUTTAFAVA, *Elementi architettonici Ostiensi*, Milan, 1963.
- R. CALZA (1), and E. NASH, *Ostia*, 1959.
- (2), *I Ritratti I* (*Scavi di Ostia*, v), 1964.
- (3), 'Le sculture e la probabile zona cristiana di Ostia e di Porto', *Rend. Pont.* 37 (1964–5) 155.
- (4), *Ostia* (Archaeological Guide), Rome, 1965.
- (5), and M. F. SQUARCIAPINO, *Museo Ostiense*, Rome, 1972.
- A. CARANDINI and others, *Le Terme del Nuotatore*, Ostia I and II, *Stud. Misc.* 13 (1968), 16 (1970).
- L. CASSON (1), 'Harbour and River Boats of Ancient Rome', *JRS* 55 (1965) 31.
- (2), *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World*, Princeton, 1971.
- M. CÉBEILLAC, 'Quelques inscriptions inédites d'Ostie', *Mélanges* 83 (1971) 39.
- M. A. CHASTAGNOL, 'La restauration du temple d'Isis au Portus Romae sous le règne de Gratien', *Hommages à Marcel Renard*, vol. ii, *Coill. Latomus*, 102 (1969) 135.

- EUGENIA EQUINI, 'Un frammento dei fasti Ostiensi', *Epigraphica*, 29 (1967) 11.
- B. M. FELLETTI Maj. (1), 'La casa delle Volte Dipinte', *Boll. d'arte*, 29 (1963) 69.
- (2), *Le pitture della casa delle Volte Dipinte e delle Pareti Gialle*, Monumenti della pittura antica scoperti in Italia III, fasc. 1-2.
- (3), *Le pitture della casa delle Muse*, Mon. Pitt. Ant. III, fasc. 3.
- D. FISHWICK, 'Hastiferi', *JRS* 57 (1967) 142.
- C. GASPARI, *Le Pitture della caupona del pavone*, Mon. Pitt. Ant. III, fasc. 4.
- S. GIANNINI, *Ostia* (mainly architectural), Genoa, 1970.
- R. GNOLLE, *Marmora Romana*, Rome, 1971.
- M. GUARDUCCI, 'Il misterioso quadrato magico', *AC* 17 (1965) 219 (Ostia, 254 f.).
- T. HACKENS and NICOLE DACOS, 'Ostie: découvertes et recherches récentes (1957-1962)', *Ant. Class.* 31 (1962) 303.
- M. HAMMOND, 'Three Latin Inscriptions', *Harv. Stud. Class. Phil.* 68 (1966) 78.
- A. LICORDARI, 'Il rilievo funerario di Caltilia Moschis', *Stud. Misc.* 20 (1971-2) 61.
- H. B. MATTINGLY, 'Suetonius, *Claud.* 24.2 and the "Italian Quaestors".' *Hommages à Marcel Renard*, vol. ii (1969) 505.
- L. MORETTI, 'Sulle iscrizioni greche di Porto', *Rend. Linc.* 19 (1964) 193.
- J. E. PACKER (1), 'The Domus of Cupid and Psyche in Ancient Ostia', *AJA* 71 (1967) 123.
- (2), 'Housing and Population in Imperial Ostia and Rome', *JRS* 57 (1967) 80.
- (3), 'Structure and Design in Ancient Ostia', *Technology and Culture* 9 (1968) 357.
- (4), *The Insulae of Imperial Ostia*, American Academy in Rome, 1971.
- F. PALLARES, 'Terra sigillata iberica ad Ostia', *Riv. di Stud. Liguri* 29 (1963) 69.
- C. PANCIERA, 'Il sepolcro Ostiense di C. Cartilio Poplicola ed una scheda epigrafica di Gaetano Marini', *AC* 18 (1966) 54.
- G. RICKMAN, *Roman Granaries and Store Buildings*, Cambridge, 1971.
- V. SCRINARI (1), 'Il Porto di Claudio ed osservazioni sulla tecnica del conglomerato cementizio presso i Romani', *L'industria italiana del cemento* 33 (1963) 527.
- (2), 'Il "Portus Claudii" e i più recenti ritrovamenti nella zona di Fiumicino', *Atti del III Congresso Internazionale di Arch. Sottomarina*, Barcelona, 1961.
- H. SOLÍN (1), 'Eine neue Fluchtafel aus Ostia', *Comm. Humanarum Litterarum* (Soc. Scient. Fennicarum) 42 (1968) 3.
- (2), 'Republikanisches aus Ostie (Analecta Epigraphica)', *Arctos, Acta phil. Fennica*, NS 6 (1970) 106.
- (3), 'Griechische Graffiti aus Ostia', *Arctos* 7 (1972) 190.
- M. F. SQUARCIAPINO (1), Review of *Roman Ostia*, *AC* 12 (1960) 251.
- (2), 'Un nuovo santuario della Bona Dea ad Ostia', *Rend. Pont.* 32 (1959-60) 93.
- (3), 'Piccolo corpus dei mattoni scolpiti Ostiensi', *BC* 78 (1961-2) 112.
- (4), 'La sinagoga di Ostia', *Boll. d'arte* (1961) 326.
- (5), 'La sinagoga recentemente scoperta ad Ostia', *Rend. Pont.* 34 (1961-2) 119.
- (6), 'La sinagoga di Ostia: seconda campagna di scavo', *Atti del VI Congresso intern. di arch. crist.* (1962) 299.
- (7), 'The Synagogue at Ostia', *Archaeology* 16 (1963) 195.
- (8), 'Scoperte in occasione di lavori stradali tra la via Guido Calza e la via dei Romagnoli', *NS* 15 (1961) 145.
- (9), *I culti orientali ad Ostia*, Leiden, 1962.



- M. F. SQUARCIAPINO (10), 'Ebrei a Roma e ad Ostia', *Studi Romani*, 11 (1963) 129.  
 — (11), 'Ostia, porto di Roma', *Economia e storia* (1964), 299.  
 — (12), 'La rocca di Giulio II di Ostia', *Boll. dell'ist. storico e di cultura dell'arma del genio*, 89 (1965) 5.  
 — (13), 'Plotius Fortunatus archisynagogus', *Israel* 36 (1970) 183.  
 R. A. STACCIOLI, 'Le taverne a Roma attraverso la Forma Urbis', *Rend. Linc.* 14 (1959) 56.  
 O. TESTAGUZZA (1), 'The Port of Rome', *Archaeology*, 17 (1964) 172.  
 — (2), *Portus*, Rome, 1970.  
 P. TESTINI, 'Sondaggio dell'area di S. Ippolito all'Isola Sacra', *Rend. Pont.* 43 (1970) 223.  
 M. L. VELOCCIA RINALDI, 'Nuove pitture Ostiensi: la casa della Ierodule', *Rend. Pont.* 43 (1970-71) 165.  
 L. VIDMAN, *Fasti Ostienses*, Prague, 1957.  
 T. P. WISEMAN, 'Pulcher Claudius', *Harv. Stud. Class. Phil.* 74 (1968) 207 (Ostia, 217).  
 F. ZEVI (1), 'La sistemazione della collezione epigrafica Ostiense e la carriera di Q. Baieno Blassiano', *Acta, Fifth Epigraph. Congress*, London, 1967, 193.  
 — (2), 'Quinto Baieno Blassiano, cavaliere Triestino', *Atti e Mem. della Soc. Istriana di Arch. e Storia Patria* 16 (1968) 5.  
 — (3), 'Anfore Istriane ad Ostia', *Atti e Mem. della Soc. Istriana*, 15 (1967) 208.  
 — (4), 'Brevi note Ostiensi', *Epigraphica* 30 (1968) 83.  
 — (5), and A. TCHERNIA, 'Amphores de Byzacène au bas-empire', *Antiquités africaines* 3 (1969) 173.  
 — (6), 'Nuovi documenti epigrafici sugli Egrilii Ostiensi', *Mélanges* 82 (1970) 279.  
 — (7), 'Caserna dei Vigili. Scavo sotto il mosaico del vano antistante il "Cesareo"', *NS* 24 (1970) 7.  
 — (8), 'Tre iscrizioni con firme di artisti greci', *Rend. Pont.* 42 (1969-70) 95.  
 — (9), *Atti, III Congresso Internaz. sul Dramma Antico a Siracusa*, 'Iscrizione . . . apposta alla statua di Platone commediografo'.  
 — (10), and I. POHL, 'Casa delle Pareti Gialle, salone centrale. Scavo sotto il pavimento a mosaico', *NS* 24 (1970) 43.  
 — (11), 'Una statua dall'Isola sacra e l'Isco di Porto', *Rend. Pont.* 43 (1970-71) xxiv, *Nuove Immissioni* (1971) 7.  
 — (12), 'Miscellanea Ostiense', *Rend. Linc.* 26 (1971) 449.  
 — (13) and P. PENSABENE, 'Un arco in onore di Caracalla ad Ostia', *Rend. Linc.* 26 (1971) 481.  
 — (14), and A. TCHERNIA, 'Amphores vinaires de Campanie et de Tarraconaise à Ostie', *Recherches sur les amphores romaines*, École française de Rome, 1972, p. 35.

References in the following sections to articles and books are given by author's name only. Numbers are added where needed from the Bibliography. The following abbreviations are used:

- |                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| FA              | Fasti Archeologi.   |
| Immissioni 1971 | Museo Ostiense, Nuove Immissioni, Ostia, 1971.  |
| Mostra 1967     | Mostra di Rinvenimenti e Restauri del 1967, Ostia, 1968.                                |
| Mostra 1972     | Mostra di Rinvenimenti da Scavi in corso, Ostia, 1972.                                  |
| Stud. Misc.     | Studi miscellanei del Seminario di Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte greca e romana, Rome. |

## THE NEW EVIDENCE

To the casual visitor returning to the site Ostia 1972 may not seem significantly changed from Ostia 1960. There are more visitors, the trees are taller, and the landscaping of the ruins is even more attractive. But those who have followed Ostian studies more closely will soon realize that there has been a quiet revolution. In 1960 Barbieri had already laid the foundation for the more systematic study of Ostian inscriptions by bringing together all the inscriptions on the site, including even the most unpromising fragments. Since it was common practice in the late Empire to break up inscribed stones even from cemeteries and public buildings for reuse in pavements or building repairs it is not unusual to find fragments of the same inscription in widely separated parts of the town: the dispersal of the town's official record, the *Fasti*, is a conspicuous example. When the fragments are systematically arranged they have a much better chance of finding their partners. The continuation of Barbieri's work under his general supervision has led to increasingly important results (see below, p. 583). Following the same principle specimens of all brick stamps found at Ostia have been put on display in chronological order, providing an admirable illustration of Bloch's basic work, and a most useful point of reference in further excavations. Even more important has been the detailed work on the classification and dating of pottery. The tools for the study of Ostia's history have been considerably sharpened.

By 1960 the dramatic excavations of 1938-42 had been largely absorbed and it must have been very tempting to resume digging, especially along the line of the sea-shore where the height of the grass mounds suggests rich rewards, or along the line of the Tiber towards the mouth of the river, which must always have been one of the most important areas for traders. Future generations will be grateful to Anton Pietrogrande and Maria Squarciapino, his successor as director, for resisting the temptation. Working to a lean budget with a small staff they have made the conservation of what had already been excavated their first priority. The preservation of wall paintings, threatened by damp and frost, has been significantly improved by the elaboration of new techniques, and the disintegration of mosaics has been averted by raising and resetting them on concrete foundations. Apart from

emergency operations to take advantage of opportunities provided by work on roads new digging has been restricted to completing the excavation of buildings only partly uncovered and investigating the lower levels at selected points within the excavated area to fill out the very fragmentary history of republican Ostia. New ground won in these ways and by the general progress of Ostian studies as the importance of the site becomes more widely appreciated requires the modification of several assumptions, and opens up new questions.

The Ostia of Ancus Marcius still remains no more than a hypothesis but scepticism is becoming less emphatic, and the rediscovery of a large cemetery half-way between Rome and Lavinium with tomb furnishings that, on present evidence, begin in the late eighth and do not yet extend beyond the end of the seventh century adds a little strength to the tradition (Zevi, *Mostra*, 1972). For Nibby had already suggested that this was the site of Politorium said by Livy (i. 33. 3) to have been destroyed by Ancus Marcius. That there were settlers in the area before the foundation of the Castrum in the fourth century is also suggested by pottery, attributed to the fifth century and possibly earlier, that was found near but not associated with some tombs exposed by road-work south-east of the 'Sullan' walls (Squarciapino 8, p. 174).

The few examples of polychrome architectural terracottas from the early years of the Castrum (*Scavi di Ostia*, i. Tav. xxii) have been supplemented by a lively fourth-century head of a Silenus found in a fill under the earliest pavement of the temple of the Round Altar. Three further fragments have been recovered from the Castle of Julius II, but there is no record of when or where they were found. The most interesting of the three comes from a group in the round, designed for a pediment or akroterion of a temple or other public building, and has been dated c. 350 B.C. The other two reproduce familiar decorative patterns (Zevi, *Immissioni*, 1971, 29-31).

The development of the Castrum in the middle Republic remains very obscure, but the main questions that have to be answered have been more clearly defined. The most important and embarrassing result of the widespread examination of the lower levels is that there is still no evidence of any pre-Sullan building east of the Castrum except perhaps some light structures under the four Republican temples west of the theatre (MA 23 (1914) 443, with p. 127 above) and a series of tufa walls running out from the east wall of the Castrum at a very low

level, presumably to form shops (p. 120). Under the Baths of Neptune nothing has been found earlier than the emperor Claudius (Zevi, *FA* 18–19 (1963–4) 7429); in a limited excavation on the west side of the Piazzale delle Corporazioni nothing was found earlier than the Augustan reticulate wall enclosing the square; under the Baths of the Swimmer (*Terme del Nuotatore*) there seems to have been no building before the Flavian baths. Under the Baths of the Drivers, north of the Decumanus and just inside the Porta Romana, nothing was found earlier than the reticulate construction of the Augustan period or slightly earlier. The natural inference from this evidence is that there were no living quarters east of the Castrum, for even if all building was in perishable materials—timber, wattle and daub, or unbaked brick—floor levels should have survived and far more kitchen pottery than has been found. It has been suggested that the large area between the Decumanus and the river east of the Castrum was kept free of buildings because this was the main dock area of Rome's river harbour, where merchantmen tied up and unloaded their cargoes. This would be why a Roman praetor had a series of *cippi* set up along the line of the Decumanus declaring that on the authority of the Roman senate this land was public land belonging to the state (p. 32). If, however, this is the right explanation one would have expected, by the end of the second century B.C. at the latest, some buildings for storage and general harbour services. These may perhaps be found when it is eventually possible to extend excavation to the ancient river bank. But, even so, one would expect more evidence of trade in the form of broken amphorae if the area was reserved for shipping interests. Another possibility perhaps is that this area was reserved for the fleet. Even if the Ostian station had normally no more than thirty ships, these would have required up to 6,000 men, and they would presumably have lived in timber barracks when not required for active service. This might explain why building in the area on a substantial scale seems to have begun under Augustus (p. 539, the theatre with the Piazzale delle Corporazioni; and the large area on the north side of the Decumanus near the Porta Romana, REG. II. II. 1–3, though the dating of this area is more uncertain). The reason could be the transference of the headquarters of the Roman fleet by Augustus from Ostia to Misenum. But unless and until some secure evidence is found this will be no more than a frail hypothesis. Neither of the two explanations, however, would explain the absence of pre-Flavian