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ETRUSCAN AND SOUTH ITALIAN FINGER RINGS
IN OXFORD
(Plates I–VI)

Of the many benefactions to the University of Oxford made by Charles Drury Edmond Fortnum (1820–99) one of the most important but least publicised was his great collection of finger rings. Signet rings of all periods were but one of his many interests, and he wrote several short studies about them. The present article presents a publication of the Etruscan and South Italian metal rings in the collection, since they can readily be considered on their own, while the Greek and Roman rings with intaglio devices and swivel rings with scarabs are best reserved for the proposed catalogue of Greek and Roman engraved gems. This study of the Oxford rings is also complementary to a more general one by the present writer devoted to Archaic Finger Rings, to be published in Antike Kunst. The Oxford rings listed here are illustrated in Plates I–III, the bezels enlarged twice (except nos. 16, 23–34), side views life size. Measurements are given in millimetres and the devices are described as they appear on the ring, not the impression. I have to thank Dr. H. W. Catling for giving me access to the rings and supplying photographs, and Mr. R. W. Hamilton, Keeper of the Ashmolean, for permission to publish them.

1. Rings in the Ashmolean Museum

1. F.50. Bought in Rome. Gold. Bezel 11 × 6. Width of hoop 21. The bezel is diamond-shaped, with a raised central area on which the device is cut. On each of the four borders are four gold pellets, of which the outer and inner pairs are linked by twisted gold wire. At each end of the bezel is a three-leaved palmette of twisted gold wire. The back of the bezel is rough. The hoop is hollow, a flat oval in section, with its ends soldered to the underside of the bezel, which it only slightly overlaps. The edges of the hoop are decorated with twisted gold wire running the full length on one side, on the other for only a little way on either side of the bezel.

A sphinx faces left with one wing stretched before her, the other a sickle over her back. Her hair is dressed high and she wears a fillet, or pointed cap. Two locks of hair fall on the shoulder. One foreleg is raised. There is a hatched border.

The style of this, and of the rings that follow (nos. 2–8) has been variously described as Ionian, Etrusco-Ionian, or Etruscan. It appears in Etruria on jewellery, bronzes, wall paintings and painted vases little before the middle of the sixth century and there can be no doubt that it was introduced by Greek artists, most probably East Greek artists. The materials and forms of the works they made in Etruria were largely determined by the market there: gold was more plentiful than at home, and there had developed a native taste for colour and vigorous figured scenes. How far and how soon the products of these workshops became ‘Etruscan’, by native artists and exhibiting features which in the Greek homeland might never have emerged, it is hard to say. The style of the figures on the gold rings is very
close to that on the so-called Pontic vases, which are from a workshop which was surely staffed originally by Greeks. For the sphinx on our ring and the position of her wings we may compare a Pontic vase in Paris (Ducati, *Pontische Vasen*, pl. 7a).

The wire and knob decoration on the edges of the ring is unusual in this position, but it recalls the treatment of the sides of the cartouche rings, like our nos. 4 and 5. The wire palmettes springing from the bezel ends are worked in the solid metal on simple Greek versions of these rings (*B.M.C. Rings* 1023, pl. 20, from Smyrna; Geneva, from Rhodes; *Olynthus* x, 157, fig. 16, no. 504; and cf. Berlin 150, Furtwängler, *Beschreibung*, pl. 4 and fig. on p. 16) and recall the more elaborate treatment of a ring from Axos in Crete, also with a sphinx (*Pierres gravées*, A. J. Evans Coll., Drouot, 8 May 1905, pl. 2.22).

Late sixth century.

2. F.56. Bought in Rome. Gold. Width of hoop 21. The hoop is circular in section and tapers towards the bezel. This is in the form of a diamond, cross-hatched and flanked by small curls from which emerge summary lion-heads biting the ends of the hoop.

A more elaborate version is a gold ring in London (*B.M.C. Rings* 34, pl. 1) on which the bezel is larger, with an archer as device, and the lion-heads are more carefully formed. It is Late Archaic, but the Oxford ring need not be so late, since two impressions from another ring with the lion heads appear on an Etruscan bucchero vase from a tomb in Orvieto. This contained pottery and other objects of the third quarter of the sixth century. It is published in *Stud. Etr.* xxx, 1962, 129, fig. 42, but the ring type is not there recognised and the impressions are thought to be from a ring stone. This is a very rare example of one of these Etruscan rings, probably a bronze one, being used to make an impression. The bezels of many of the gold rings are too slight to withstand much pressure and it is doubtful whether they were ever used as real signet rings. This is obviously true of those with relief devices, while the intaglio devices are usually too shallowly cut to give clear impressions in relief.

Second half of the sixth century.

3. F.52. Gold and gilt silver (lower part of bezel). Bezel 16 × 8, height 5. Width of hoop 22. The hoop is solid, round in section, tapering towards the bezel. The lower part of the bezel is shaped like a bath; the upper part is a flat lid, soldered on to it, with the device cut in its top.

A hatched border and lines divide the device into three registers: (1) A winged human figure is collapsing on to the ground. Behind and before him (? held by him) are branches. (2) A siren with spread wings and long crest, to the left with her head turned back. (3) A goat to the left, kneeling or just rising.

These 'cartouche' rings derive from a well-known type, introduced to East Greece from Phoenicia, probably via Cyprus, in the late seventh century. The examples in gold from Etruria span the second half of the sixth century, or a little longer, and are the commonest of the ring types with figure decoration. The scheme of dividing the long bezel into registers is an eastern one, seen on scarabs, and appears on our nos. 3–6. The bath-shaped bezel rarely has a flat bezel plate
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(as our nos. 3 and 7) since this is usually provided with flanges which clip on to the bezel sides (as our nos. 4, 5, 8) and occasionally the bezel is solid (as no. 6). The Oxford rings represent all the main types of construction and decoration, except for the class with relief devices.

The figure in the top register might well be Ikaros, fallen. Compare the Cretan bronze from Afrati (Cretan Collection in Oxford 48, pl. 16, and ibid., 114 and pl. 42.511 for collapsing figures), which Platon thinks might be Talos (Gnomon xxxiv, 1962, 502). The siren is very like that on a vase by the Triton Painter (Dohrn, Die schweflfigurigen etr. Vasen, pl. 4.140).

Third quarter of the sixth century.

4. F.53. Gilt silver, at least for the hoop and lower part of the bezel. The bezel plate is gold. Bezel 22 × 10, height 6. Width of hoop 21. The hoop is hollow and is badly corroded. The body of the bezel is as the last, but the bezel face is attached by side flanges with a zigzag edge clipping on to it, and around the lower edge of the bezel run S spirals of knobs and twisted wire.

The devices are framed and divided into three registers by hatched borders, as on the last. (1) A siren with spread wings, facing left and wearing a pointed cap. (2) A hippocamp facing left. (3) As (1) but inverted and facing right.

For the unusual zigzag edge to the flange of the bezel compare the more elaborate treatment of our no. 5. The spirals decorating the lower edge are uncommon in this position and are more often seen on the bezel edges, as on no. 5. It is not uncommon on rings of this type to see the outer registers carry the same or even different devices, one inverted (e.g. B.M.C. Rings 20, 28, pl. 1). This is again a feature of some eastern scarabs. The hatched detail of the creatures on the ring recalls B.M.C. Rings 20, pl. 1, a better piece. Sirens and hippocamps are very common on these rings, and in much this style they are seen often on Etruscan black figure vases of the Micahli Group.

Last quarter of the sixth century.

5. F.763. Bought in Rome, 1881. Said to have been found with a gold spiral ring (F.764) of the type discussed by Karo in Stud. e Mat. ii, 1902, 70f. Gold. Bezel 23 × 11, height 6.5. Width of hoop 22. Construction with hollow hoop and bezel as the last, but the ends of the hoop cut only a short way into the lower edge of the bezel. The flange at the side of the bezel is provided with a zigzag border. The straight part is decorated with gold studs linked in pairs as S spirals with thin twisted wire; all within borders of twisted wire. On the pendent triangles below is neat granulation.

The device is within a hatched border, and divided into three registers by two hatched bands. (1) A bird with raised wing and a branch over its back and a φ-shaped device before it. (2) A seated figure, long-haired and beardless, facing left on a cross-legged stool and with a foot stool; a branch or tree behind him. His raised hand holds a staff above which appears a creature with a long tail, perhaps a mouse. His other hand is stretched towards the head of a snake, coiled and rearing before his legs. They are faced by a bird, behind which is an S scroll in the field. (3) A bird, as in (1), and a long-tailed creature with four short legs,
perhaps a crocodile or lizard. In front, the twisted body of a two-legged creature, possibly meant for another bird.

The decoration of spirals around the bezel is met on several rings of this type. The granulated triangles below recall the zigzag border on our no. 4, and are suggested by the ‘teeth’ which hold scarabs in their setting on finger- or swivel-rings (e.g. B.M.C. Rings, pl. 8 passim). The rather lumpy cut figures and the smaller creatures which appear in registers 2 and 3 are odd and resemble those on a ring in Dresden from Vulci (Arch. Anz. 1889, 171, no. 161, fig.). The second scene is more complicated than any other on these rings with separate registers and it defies ready explanation. The seated figure with the snake recalls Greek stelai showing the heroised dead. If a divinity, the branch, snake, mouse (perhaps impaled) and bird could all suit an Apollo.

Last quarter of the sixth century.

   The device is badly rubbed. Two birds, with heads turned back and raised wings. An upright line between them, and all in a single line border.
   This is an extremely simple version of the gold cartouche rings. For the raised wings of the birds compare the silver ring in Karlsruhe from Capodimonte (Schumacher, 208, no. 1098), B.M.C. Rings 28, pl. 1 (two birds) and the Dresden ring cited above. The two birds appear as a device on similar rings in the east, in gold from Amathus (Myres and Richter, Cyprus Museum Cat., pl. 8.4147) and in silver from Sunium (Arch. Eph. 1917, 207, fig. 17 top right). Yet farther afield they appear in one of three registers on a Syrian scaraboid (von der Osten, Sammlung von Aulock 100 with plate).

Second half of the sixth century.

   Within a hatched border two sphinxes with heads turned back flank a centrepiece. This is in the form of a column with splaying foot, volute capital and a band on the shaft, topped by sickle wings and an onion-shaped knob.
   The centrepiece is not readily identified. In such a position a version of the sacred tree is expected. It is often in Greek art like a column, and the wings might be suggested by the winged disc which appears above it in the east. But this is a feature not generally met in Greece or the west, and in fact the object on the ring is quite close to various eastern representations of the Achaemenid period (e.g. Perrot-Chipiez, iii, 136, fig., and 641, fig. 435). In Etruria one thinks also of the phallus and anthropoid stelai, or the stand on the Zannoni stele (Ducati, L’Arte etrusca, fig. 393). Finally, the superficial resemblance of the object to a potnia theron may not be fortuitous. There is a real potnia on B.M.C. Rings 29 (Radet, Cybèle 117, fig. 77). The slim animals are very like those on a ring from Vulci (Furtwängler, Antike Gemmen, pl. 6.28) and compare Villa Giulia 40877, from Caere (Becatti, Oreficerie, pl. 72.276; Banti, Die Welt der Etrusker, pl. 22 top left). They resemble the neater animals on early Pontic vases.
Mid sixth century.

8. F. 54. Brown, *The Etruscan Lion*, pl. 33d. Gilt silver. Bezel 21 × 10, height 6. Width of hoop 23. The hoop is hollow, round in section, and the construction of the bezel is as for no. 4 but the side flanges are plain and straight.

A crouching horse with its tail tossed in the air and a cross over its back, faces a chimaera. A tree between them and hatched border around. The chimaera lacks the snake head to its tail and the goat's head grows from a wing. Light outline incision is employed for all details and the stippling of the chimaera's mane, but there is also some shallow scoring of the animals' bodies to lend depth.

Ordinary horses are not otherwise seen on these rings, and the chimaeras generally face sphinxes. The common Etruscan chimaera with the goat's head growing from a wing is discussed by Zanco in *Stud. Etr.*, xxxii, 1964, 47ff. (our ring is his D5). The style is close to that of *B.M.C. Rings* 22, 23, pl. 1 (these two by one hand), and the animals are very close to those on the earlier Pontic vases; *cf.* Brown, loc. cit.

Third quarter of the sixth century.


Side by side in a hatched border are shown a squatting human figure with one arm raised; the forepart of a lion with stippled neck; and a small bird, inverted. The deep-cut, lumpy style is common on bronze rings of this class.

This recalls the gold rings with the devices in registers (as our nos. 3–5) and this clustering of disparate motifs with no divisions is a feature of the later bronze cartouche rings, and the rings with leaf-shaped bezels (*e.g.* the impressions from Orvieto cited under no. 2). The squatting figure appears on several of the rings, sometimes facing an animal or monster, and is not to be identified as any particular mythological figure. Indeed it may be asked whether it is not rather a monkey, such as often intrudes in Etruscan figure scenes. Animal foreparts are rare. Ours recalls the lion-head fountains on the gold rings (*Antike Gemmen*, pl. 7.8 and Louvre Bj1075) and Pontic vases (Ginouvès, *Balaneutike*, pl. 16.48; Louvre E703). For the lion forepart showing a leg in Greece and Etruria see also Brown, *The Etruscan Lion*, 76f. and pl. 27.

Last quarter of the sixth century.


In a line border the forepart of a bull; a seated figure with one arm raised; and a flying bird, inverted.

The composition of this device—protome, seated figure, inverted bird—is very like that of the last ring, but the cutting is even deeper and fuller, the figures more swelling. Nor is this a real cartouche ring since there is no separate bezel raised from the hoop. It is not impossible that the bezel has been cut down from a broader leaf shape and recut with its device in more recent times.
11. F.148. Bought in Rome. Silver. Bezel 15 × 18. Width of hoop 24. The hoop is round in section and tapers slightly towards the bezel, which is long, with rounded ends and hollowed beneath to fit the curve of the hoop.

A naked woman is shown on her hands and knees, looking round. Beyond her is a stylised plant or tree. All in a single line border. The cutting is bold and sure. Eye, nose, chin and long back hair are detailed, the breast prominent, three ribs and some fingers marked. The tree, which makes clear which way up the scene is to be viewed, is like an emaciated palm.

The pose may well be obscene: the λέινα ἐπὶ τυρωκτῆτοιος posture (Ar., Lys. 231; cf. Jacobsthal, AM lvii, 1932, 1–7) being demonstrated, and compare the satyr ἀποσκεφαλίσας in the satyr-play scene on an Attic red-figure vase (Greifenhagen, Ein Satyrspiel des Aischylos? 23, 25, fig. 21). The bezel shape derives from the cartouche rings, but is shallow and incorporated in the line of the hoop. Generally such rings have more rectangular bezels, as B.M.C. Rings 1011–2, pl. 26.

Early fifth century.


The bezel is badly worn. It shows a dog (?) running to the left within a carefully hatched border.

Rings of this type are made from a cylindrical bar, drawn and hammered to make the diamond- or leaf-shaped bezel, then bent in a hoop and the ends soldered together (as here) or left open. The type was current in Greece and particularly popular in Etruria. The most elaborate examples are a group in Paris and London (Louvre Bij340–2, 1344; Coche de la Ferté, Les bijoux antiques, pl. 30.1; B.M.C. Rings 1016, pl. 26) which have collars added to the hoop. Simpler versions, as ours, often have running animals on them, usually a lion, but there is a dog on B.M.C. Rings 1017. The insertion of a gold stud is not uncommon in silver rings and is thought to have bestowed some magical properties (cf. B.M.C. Rings xxiii, xxxiii; Antike Gemmen iii, 90; Walters, JHS xxiv, 1924, 332ff.). The practice began by about 600 B.C.; compare the ring from the Menelaion at Sparta, found with Laconian II pottery (BSA xv, 1908–9, 142, fig. 12).

Late sixth century.

13. F.149. Bought in Rome. Silver. Bezel 17 × 11. Width of hoop 23. The hoop is facetted. The bezel, which is lightly curved, but not enough to fit the curve of the hoop, is bevelled behind.

A wingless griffin (?) crouching to the right with its rump in the air. A roughly dotted ground line, and a star over its back. The creature’s head is most like that of a bird, with large eye, pointed beak, five knobs along the top of the head, and a mane continuing down the back of the neck. If a griffin it is not of the usual type, for it has also a striated lion’s mane over its neck. The belly hair is shown. The paws are simple knobs and the tail is broken.

The flat or nearly flat leaf-shaped bezel becomes the commonest Greek and Etruscan ring type in the fifth century. The style of this ring is odd and provincial, but the griffin mane and sleek body suggest a date no earlier than 500 B.C.
14. F.49. From Praeneste, 'found in one of those cistae, so abundantly discovered at Palestrina, in which the sponge, bone pins, the wooden lining, and the other objects were perfectly preserved. Among these were two wooden boxes for holding cosmetics, one formed as a sandalled foot, the other as a bird, which are figured in vol. xliii of the Archaeologia, pl. xxvi, p. 486, and described by Mr. W. M. Wylie, F.S.A.' (Fortnum, Archaeologia xlv, 1873, 360f., pl. 13.8). Silver, with gold studs piercing the bezel at each end. Bezel 20 x 9. Width of hoop 26. The bezel is flat and leaf-shaped. The hoop is round in section and tapers up towards the bezel which it joins at little more than a right angle.

Within a dotted-line border is a chariot, being drawn by two lions, one with its head turned back. The charioteer wears a fillet and, it seems, a long chiton. He holds a short goad. The lions’ manes bristle and are shown by straight lines over the neck. Belly hair is marked. The cutting is bold and sure but without much detail.

Lions regularly draw Cybele’s chariot. Various wild animals, including lions, may draw Dionysos’ chariot, as on the Chalcidian Phineus cup. His lion-chariot is borrowed by a satyr on the scarab, Antike Gemmen, pl. 8.42, or, as Beazley suggests (Boston Vases ii, 72) he may be supporting his master’s fight with a Giant. Admetos who had to yoke a lion and a boar together is shown on two of the cartouche rings from Etruria (Antike Gemmen, pl. 7.3 and Louvre Bj1074) where there are other monstrous teams (sphinx and stag, as Antike Gemmen, fig. 60 and pl. 7.2). There is nothing about our charioteer to suggest that he is divine or heroic. The bronze cista in which the ring was found is not likely to be earlier than the second half of the fifth century, but the ring may have been made earlier in the century.


Skylia. The hair is short, the breasts barely formed. One dog forepart springs from the belly. The gesture is threatening but it is not clear whether weapons or missiles are held.

The type for Skylia appears first on Melian reliefs of about 460 (cf. Shepard, The Fish-tailed Monster, 44f., fig. 66) on which the human part is dressed. The same type is seen on Classical gems—Berlin 301, pl. 6 (Shepard, fig. 67) and Paris, Bibl. Nat. (de Luynes 264; Perrot-Chipiez, iii, 442, fig. 315). On a third gem, published in Mon. Ined. iii, pl. 52.9 (Lenormant) it is not clear whether dress is shown or not. The naked upper part is seen on coins of several West Greek cities after the mid-fifth century (cf. Rumpf, Ant. Sark. v. 1, ‘Die Meerwesen’, 107), but our Skylia has still only the fins of earlier sea creatures, not the spiky ‘mane’ or spine.

Second half of the fifth century. Possibly South Italian.


This is a common type of funerary ring, without device and of extremely flimsy construction. Others are B.M.C. Rings 921–2, pl. 23; Oman, Cat. of Rings (Victoria and Albert Museum), no. 19, from Novi, south of Catania; Fasti xv, pl. 9.32, from Chiusi, a third-century tomb; Paris, Bibl. Nat. 490.
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The ring was said to have been found together with our nos. 17–21 in a sarcophagus excavated at Praeneste in 1868. The contents were dispersed but Fortnum (loc. cit.) says that they included the three bronze mirrors illustrated in Mon. Ind. ix, pl. 7. He goes on ‘This same tomb also yielded, as I am informed, a large cista of wood, with bronze feet formed as sphyxes, and handle on the lid modelled as a group of three armed warriors; another, a small bronze cista of fine workmanship, ornamented with centaurs &c.; a mirror of remarkable beauty and size, having a figure of Bacchus on a leopard, in rilievo, of admirable art; also one of cast metal with a figure of Leda in relief, and some other less important objects’; and he speculates on the problems of such excavation.

17. F.81. From Praeneste (see no. 16). Fortnum, op. cit., pl. 13.2. Gilt silver, the gold having largely amalgamated with the silver. Bezel 23 × 13. Width of hoop 27. The hoop is circular in section.

In a border of tongues, a plain fillet and heavy beading, a scene of Herakles throwing the Nemean lion, worked in relief. For the subject and other rings of this type (nos. 18–22) see the discussion below on the Fortnum Group, under (xxv).

18. F.82. From Praeneste (see no. 16). Fortnum, op. cit., pl. 13.3. Gilt silver, construction as the last, the gold largely disappeared. Bezel 20 × 13. Width of hoop 22.5.

Within a border similar to that of no. 17 is shown a man, his arms raised to behind his head holding an axe or mallet and looking down towards the upper part of a woman, who appears to be rising from the ground and offering a wreath to him. Her dress is marked with very fine incised lines.

Fortnum thought the scene showed the maddened King Lykourgos of Thrace attacking the nurses of Dionysos, who appears on other monuments with an axe. Picard discusses these in Mon. Piat xlv, 1951, 15ff., but when the axe-swinging alone appears, as in the famous Warren bronze now in Dumbarton Oaks, other explanations are possible. Langlotz had argued for Epimetheus freeing Pandora (in Die Antike vi, 1930, 1ff.) while Richter (Greek and Roman Antiquities in Dumbarton Oaks, 25ff., pl. 9) opts for Hephaistos, preparing to cleave Zeus’ head to release Athena; but this pre-natal swing is not likely to be shown. On the ring the woman is not pleading for mercy but extending a crown to the man. This should be Pandora with Epimetheus and for her gesture we may recall the Eros flying over her to give Epimetheus a fillet on the Oxford vase (Beazley, CVA i, 19, pl. 21.1; and cf. in Scritti Libertini 91ff.), while she extends her arms wide with relief and pleasure. See further below, Fortnum Group (xxxi).

19. F.83. From Praeneste (see no. 16). Fortnum, op. cit., pl. 13.4. Gilt silver, construction as the last, the gold visible only in patches. The hoop is hollow, semi-circular in section. Bezel 25 × 17. Width of hoop 25.

Within a border as on the last two rings a naked bearded man and a woman embrace, their arms round each other’s necks, and his right hand brought across to her breast. He is stooping slightly. She wears a chiton, covered with fine incised lines, and a himation drawn over her head. This has lines of dots in the folds over the arm and waist and at the lower border. For the subject see below, Fortnum Group (xii).

In a border similar to the last a warrior restrains a rearing horse. He wears a rounded cap or helmet, a corselet, a sword (the scabbard visible behind his back), and a cloak with lines of dots in its folds slips over his legs to the ground. The background is finely stippled. For the subject see below, Fortnum Group (xxi).


The border is as the last, but heavier in its elements and the rounded outline of the outer tongues is shown. The young Herakles is seated on his lionskin. His club, held in his right hand, rests on the ground while he seems to rest his chin against its upper end. His left hand may be taken to be grasping his right knee or shin. Finely stippled background. For the subject see below, Fortnum Group (xxiv).


In a border, as on nos. 17–20, a satyr is assaulting a complaisant maenad. He insinuates a knee between her legs, raising her dress to above her waist, and has his other hand at her hair—not, it seems, pulling it but possibly crowning her, though this is an unexpected gesture in the circumstances. The girl’s dress is covered with fine incised hatching. She holds it back with her right hand and has her left arm around the satyr’s neck, where her hand is seen below his hair. The background is finely stippled. For the subject see below, Fortnum Group (iii).


Two heart motifs in relief within a beaded border. Very similar to B.M.C. Rings 1539–41.

This, and the following (nos. 24–34) lead rings with relief devices resemble the Fortnum Group rings (nos. 17–22) in general form and seem to be cheap versions of finer rings, made for purposes of dedication or as grave goods. But while the Fortnum Group is Etruscan, the lead rings seem to belong to South Italy and Sicily. The Oxford examples are from Calabria (F.38 is so described in the catalogue and the entry probably refers to the whole series), while Beneventum and Aedona in Sicily are recorded as proveniences in the large collection of such rings in London (B.M.C. Rings 1483–1558, two illustrated on pl. 34). The rings were mass-produced from moulds, but although the devices on the Oxford rings closely match those in London, none seem to be from the same moulds. The ring types are the same—some with ribbed hoops and a spur at the junction of hoop and bezel. The moulds were three-piece, waste metal from a careless join often being visible around the hoop and at the bezel back and sides.

B.M.C. Rings 1032, pl. 26, is an isolated example of a ring with summary relief decoration of this type in more precious material—silver. There is no clear indication of date but all probably belong within the fifth century. Lead rings copying types in more precious metal or stone are seen in the Peloponnese in the
second half of the seventh century; see Island Gems 157, adding Perachora ii, pl. 193. D750.

   Two palmettes in relief.

25. F.44. From the same moulds as the last.

   Lion to the right in relief within a beaded border. Cf. no. 29.

   Bird with raised wing in relief within a beaded border. Similar to B.M.C. Rings 1546–53, but facing the other way.

   Dog to the left in relief within a beaded border. This has the same stick-legs and tail as B.M.C. Rings 1533–7, where the head is turned back.

   Lion to the right in relief within a raised border. Cf. no. 26. Very similar to B.M.C. Rings 1524–32.

   Frontal head in relief within a hatched raised border. Very similar to B.M.C. Rings 1517–9.

   Sphinx to the right in relief within a hatched border. Quite detailed work.

   Rosette of pellets in a hatched raised border.

   Rosette in relief within a beaded border.

34. F.766. From the same moulds as the last.

2. The Fortnum Group

The rings, nos. 17–22, belong to a well-defined group discussed by Fortnum in his publication of them in Archaeologia xliv, 1873, 353ff. They deserve a name, and Fortnum Group would do justice to their first publication and to that scholar's expertise. He knew ten more rings of this type. The only other detailed discussion
of them has been by Magi in Racc¸olta Guglielmi ii, 243ff., who was able to add eleven further examples. The list can be lengthened, and I enumerate below those known to me. (i) and perhaps (ii) are not of the main group but very closely related.

(The items marked by an asterisk are illustrated in Plates IV–VI. The length of the bezel is given where known.)

(i) * London, B.M.C. Rings 216, fig. 43 (once Hamilton). From Atri in Abruzzi (for co-finds, see below). L.17. Small ring, outer diameter 18, with solid thick bezel and solid hoop, round in section. A standing youth, frontal, holding a jug and a phiale.

(ii) Once Nelidow Collection. From Ismid. L.17. A standing satyr, frontal, pouring from a wine amphora. Pollak, Nelidow Coll. no. 414, fig.


(iv) * London, B.M.C. Rings 214. L.23. Solid flat hoop. The bezel is badly worn. Subject as the last, but reversed. The satyr’s right hand is at the girl’s breast rather than holding her dress, both have their legs more bent and her hand is raised above her head. The background is plain.

(v) * Florence 81113. Hollow bezel, badly crushed. Subject as the last and the treatment apparently very similar although more summary.

(vi) * Louvre Bj1114 (once Campana). L.26. Hollow bezel and hoop, round in section. Standing dressed man and woman, their arms round each other, his hand at her breast. In the field behind them a sword (?). de Ridder, Cat. somm. des bijoux antiques no. 1114.


(viii) Vatican, Mus. Greg. III E. 163. As the last, according to Magi’s description (op. cit., 243f.).

(ix) * Louvre Bj1113 (once Campana). L.22. Hollow bezel and strip hoop with an open □-shaped section. A youth, seated on a stool to the left, and naked above the waist, is kissing a dressed girl seated on his knees. One hand is at her breast and her hand is on his arm. Stippled background. de Ridder, no. 1113.

(x) * Florence 15733. Hollow bezel. As the last but more summary and with a plain background.

(xi) * Louvre Bj1115 (once Campana). L.28. Hollow bezel and hoop, semicircular in section. As the last but more detailed work, with a broader bezel and plain background. de Ridder, no. 1115, pl. 18.

(xii) Oxford, F.83 = no. 19 above. A man embracing a woman, standing.

(xiii) * Tarquinia. As the last, the man naked and beardless, holding the woman round the waist. Magi, op. cit., 243.

(xv) * Berlin 365 (once Campanari). Probably from Vulci. A very summary and small version of the last.


(xix) * Florence 80882. From Populonia. Solid hoop and bezel. A warrior stands with his arm round a woman. At his side he holds a shield. NS 1905, 56, fig. 3 (side), 59; von Vacano, Die Etrusker, pl. 122a.

(xx) Once Guilhou Coll. Hollow bezel (?). Youth standing frontal with spear and shield. A cloak is swathed round his hips. de Ricci, Cat. Guilhou, pl. 5.284; Sotheby, 9–12 Nov. 1937, no. 79, pl. 4.

(xxi) Oxford, F.84 = no. 20 above. Warrior restraining a horse.


(xxiii) * Ferrara, Mus. Naz. From Spina, Valle Trebbia Tomb 559 (for co-finds see discussion below). L.24. A youth with a chlamys and whip on a rearing horse. Alfieri, Ori e argenti dell’Emilia antica (1958) no. 45, figs. 32–3; Aurigemma, Scavi di Spina i, 184, no. 12 (as bronze, but Professor Alfieri tells me that the gold ring is the one in question).


(xxv) Oxford, F.81 = no. 17 above. Herakles throws the lion.

(xxvi) Naples 115745. From Populonia. L.29. Flat bezel and hoop. Herakles wrestles with the lion, on its hind legs. Stippled background. Breglia, Cat., no. 30, pl. 8.4; Siviero, Gli ori e le ambre, Napoli no. 38, pl. 44.


(xxviii) * Tarquinia. A naked youth standing holding a crown (thus Magi, op. cit., 243–5) or a strigil. Behind him a garment draped on a pillar. Magi thought he might be wearing some kind of head-dress but compare the way the hair is treated on (xiii).


(XXXI) Oxford, F.82 = no. 18 above. Epimetheus and Pandora.
ETRUSCAN AND SOUTH ITALIAN FINGER RINGS


(xxxxiii) Once Guilhou. Solid bezel. Dressed woman carrying a patera and jug. de Ricci, Cat. Guilhou, pl. 7.442; Sotheby, 9–12 Nov. 1937, no. 54, pl. 4.


It is surprising that such a closely-knit group of objects has been assigned to such widely differing dates by scholars. The 'slightly archaic' appearance of the motifs suggested the first half of the fifth century to Marshall, as well as the association of a related ring, our (i), with an early necklace. But the find at Praeneste with late mirrors and, perhaps, the resemblance in technique to other Etruscan jewellery that is generally dated late, have led others to put the rings in the third if not even the second century B.C.; thus Furtwängler and Ducati. Siviero put the Naples ring (xxvi) in the fifth century, Breglia in the fourth. Von Vacano has the Florence ring (xix) fourth–third century, which is where Zahn placed the Berlin ring (xxii). Magi, who studied the problem with care, preferred the second half of the fourth century, but his arguments—the dotted backgrounds on some, the embrace motif and the fourth-century Populonia tomb—are not conclusive.

Champions of the early date seem now to be vindicated by the find of (xxxiii) in a tomb at Spina with Attic pottery of little after the mid-fifth century. It is difficult to believe that the type continued to be made for as long as 300 years, even in Etruria. Even a century seems too long. The iconography and technique of the rings might help to determine their probable life span.

Erotic motifs are dominant. The satyr assaulting a girl and lifting her dress at the front (on iii, iv, v) comes straight from the repertory of Late Archaic Greek art, even though this composition is not exactly paralleled. Such archaic subjects survive a while in Etruscan art, a good example being the Victoria and Albert Museum mirror where a satyr lifts the hem of a girl's dress; the subject is archaic, the treatment early classical. On later Etruscan mirrors a satyr attacks a winged woman in this way (Gerhard, pl. 105), and Zeus Semele (Gerhard, pl. 81.1) while Aphrodite has her dress raised to her shoulder by Adonis (Gerhard, Suppl., pl. 25). The standing symplegma is seen also on Etruscan red figure. The satyrs on the rings have the archaic horse tails, not the later goat tails.

---

1 He had good reason for this. The necklace is B.M.C. Jewellery 1460, p. 21, with early fifth-century gorgoneia and lion masks. Of the same find are the earrings, ibid., 2196–7, pl. 43, dated fifth-century by Higgins (Greek and Roman Jewellery 139) and the famous relief mirror, B.M.C. Bronzes 542, pl. 18, dated by Beazley about 480 (JHS lxxix, 1949, 3 with pl. 2a).

2 NS 1905, 58, fig. 6. If the tomb group is a real one it should be noted that it includes at least two fifth-century Attic vases: a glaux cup and a St. Valentin kantharos.

3 A cup by the Aberdeen Painter, ARF 9199, no. 1.

4 Compare for the general motif, Pfuhl, MtZ, fig. 443 (Louvre G144, Makron); fig. 427 (Cab. Med. 576, Brygos Painter); Beazley, Greek Vases in Poland, pl. 10.1 (Warsaw, Brygos Painter). Closest to our (iv) are the groups on the Caeretan hydria in Vienna (Robertson, Greek Painting 74). Compare too the cooperative maenad on the Würzburg black figure vase, Langlotz, pl. 38.178, or the inscription on a red figure pelike in Tarquinia (ARF 224, no. 7; CV A i, pl. 12.2). On a Majolica plate of c. A.D. 1500 in Toronto (Heinrich, Art Treasures in the R.O.M., 127.4) a very similar figure of a woman offers herself to Pan.

5 JHS lxxvi, 1937, pl. 7.

6 The two vases mentioned by Beazley, EVP 68: Élite iv, pl. 81 (London F100) and Brussels CV A ii, pl. IV Be, 1.11.
Rather more polite, but also amorous, are the groups of a man and woman. Both may be clothed, standing (vi, vii, viii) or with the woman seated on the man’s knee (ix, x, xi). Sometimes the man is naked (xii, xiii). The clothed standing couple may recall those seen embracing on Etruscan funerary monuments, as Magi observed, but this is certainly not true of the rest, which seem decidedly extramarital. Indeed, on (xii) it looks as though the artist has deliberately made the man look old and bent, and one is reminded of nothing more than the ‘Ungleiches Paar’ or Mercenary Love theme as depicted by Dürer, Cranach, Baldung and their contemporaries. The general theme both of the marital embrace and of a man importuning a girl is common in Late Archaic vase-painting, and a survival of it may be seen in groups showing a seated clothed man with a naked girl standing beside him, or even the seated Herakles with a standing girl. For a standing group of a satyr with a girl there is an archaic Etruscan relief plaque in Paris and an Etruscan red figure vase of the fourth century. The standing groups are common enough on Etruscan mirrors, the figures with or without clothes.

The kneeling satyrs on (xiv, xv) with their hands raised to the back of their heads in a gesture which might convey weariness as well as ecstasy (rather than pain, as Marshall), may look uncomfortable, but they fill the leaf-shaped field very well. The position of the legs recalls the kneeling satyr with a goat on an Etruscan gem, and the Herakles on our (xxvii). There is a good study of the satyr head alone on (xvi). The Nélidow ring (ii) with a satyr pouring from a wine jar was excluded from the group by Magi, but the published drawing does not make it clear that the border is seriously unlike the rest, and the general style seems to be suitable. The motif is commonplace and recurs on Etruscan gems.

Warriors are seen on their own (xviii), restraining a horse (xxi), riding one (xxii), and embracing a woman (xix). The last motif can perhaps be related to the scenes with standing couples and reappears on Etruscan mirrors, where the woman can be naked. Where the warrior wears a corselet (xviii, xix, xxii) it is of a most distinctive type with several rows of square flaps or lappets. The same armour appears on a number of Etruscan works which are generally attributed to the second half of the fifth century, notably the ‘Mars of Todi’ and the figures on a Villa Giulia cista lid. The youth fighting to keep his seat on the rearing horse (xxiii) offers one of the best studies in this group. A gold ring from Tarquinia in London shows the same predicament, but it lacks the vigour and the horse is seen from behind.

7 As on the black figure pelike, London W40 (Beazley, Attic Black-Figure, A Study, pl. 15) where it is contrasted with the satyr seizing a woman on the other side of the vase.
8 Cf. the Etruscan gem, B.M.C. Engraved Gems 694, pl. 12 (Antike Gemmen, pl. 18.34; the second figure is probably not a youth).
9 The Etruscan gem, Oxford 1965, 360 (Exhibition of Antiquities, Spencer-Churchill, 1965, pl. 17.105), forerunner of the Roman gem, Antike Gemmen, pl. 49.25, if not a modern (reversed) copy after it.
10 Coche de la Ferté, Les bijoux antiques, pl. 32.4 (Louvre Bj.4).
11 Giglioli, pl. 280.5; Beazley, EVP 121, Clusium Group. Standing man with dressed girl on the scarab, Boston 08.289.
12 Beazley, Lewis House Gems 92, pl. 3 (Antike Gemmen, pl. 20.70) now Boston 27.726.
13 As Antike Gemmen, pl. 63.20; B.M.C. Engraved Gems 710 (no. ill.).
14 Gerhard, pl. 201, Suppl. pl. 121,132; and cf. the candelabrum top, Giglioli, pl. 215.1.
15 Riis, Tyrrhenika, pl. 11.2; and compare the bronzes in London and Florence, van Vacano, Die Etrusker, pl. 84. For the cista, Ducati, L’Arte etrusca, fig. 514, and Riis, op. cit., 54, 62, for its date.
16 B.M.C. Rings 43, pl. 2 (Antike Gemmen, pl. 9.36).
Of the mythological figures shown Herakles is the most popular. He sits resting, a beardless youth, on (xxiv), in a pose which differs from that of many resting heroes on Etruscan fifth-century gems in that he is supporting himself on his club while his left hand is brought across to grasp his right knee. The theme of the weary young Herakles appears first in the Olympia metope and the seated type is later developed by Lysippus in his colossus for Tarentum.

On (xxv) and (xxvi) he wrestles with the lion in accomplished renderings of standard classical compositions. For the type of the group on (xxvi) a date before the mid-fifth century is impossible. The actual throw, as shown on (xxv), is rare, but appears in much this form on a gem of similar shape, where also a short ground line is given. The group on (xxvii) is more problematic. de Ridder saw a Herakles with caduceus, but the ‘caduceus’ is a club with its end damaged. The beardless figure wears a cloak fastened at his neck and seems to lean on the lion rather than fight it. Nevertheless it is probable that the artist was attempting to show the lion being thrown over Herakles’ back. This is the motif of (xxv), but it is nowhere shown more ineptly.

The case for recognising Epimetheus on (xxxii) has been argued above, and parallels drawn in fifth-century Greek art. On (xxxii) the flying Nike offers a subject beloved by the engravers of fifth-century rings (generally of the first half of the century). The beardless charioteer with the winged horses on (xxxix) may be Helios. The reclining figure below, whether part-fish or not, could be a merman, even Okeanos. The general type of the chariot is common enough, carrying either Helios or Zeus (bearded).

The eagle and omphalos (xxxiv) recall the Delphic group, rarely seen in Greek art. If the object in the eagle’s beak is animal—say, a snake—it could be taken for an omen. There is a reminder too of the Egyptianising Phoenician motif of the Horus-falcon seated on a cross-hatched omphalos-like stand, often with the uraeus snake before it. This appears on Phoenician and Punic scarabs of about the date of our ring.

From this brief survey it is clear that most of the subjects on the rings can be suitably dated in the second half of the fifth century. This agrees with the date of the grave group at Spina (xxxiii) and is not seriously affected by the possibly later contexts at Praeneste (the Oxford rings; the cista need hardly be later than c. 400) and Populonia (xix). The period of production cannot have been a long one and

---

17 On the type, Brown, *The Etruscan Lion* 141 and pl. 51c. An early example on a scarab, Bibl. Nat. 1762B.
18 Beauley, *Leaves House Gems* 22, pl. 2 (Antike Gemmen, pl. 10.2; now Boston 27.674). The stone should be set vertically since the straight end to the bezel border is surely an indication of a ground line. This and our ring can be added to the Andokides Painter’s representation of the throw (ARV² 4, no. 8). It is not as rare as Brown (op. cit., 140f., 143n.) suggests; others are the Etruscan gem, Richter, *Engraved Gems in New York* 173, pl. 29; the Etruscan mirror, Gerhard, pl. 133; the Greek gem, *Antike Gemmen*, pl. 9.7 (Paris, Cab. Med., de Luynes 262).
19 Schefold, *Meisterwerke* no. 561 (Guilhou 81); Reinach, *Ant. Bosph. Cimm.*, pl. 18.14; Boston 98.784 (Arch. Anz. 1899, 140, no. 18); Bull. Rhode Island xxv, 1938, 23 (in relief); *Met. Res. 69, 70*, fig. 38.3 (Nymphæum); Carapanos 258, Svoronos, pl. 4; B.M.C. *Rings* 39, fig. 10.
20 London B641 (Haimon Painter; Haspel, *ABL* 242; Roscher, *Omphalos*, pl. 4.3). And *ibid.*, pl. 8.3 (Aegina relief) for two eagles on the omphalos and pl. 2.1 for the vertical fillets.
21 E.g., Vercoutter, *Oh. ég. . . . carthaginois* 214f., nos. 554–5, 558; Babelon, *Coll. Pauvert de la Chapelle*, pl. 4.29 (Sardinia); B.M.C. *Engraved Gems* 286, pl. 6 (Amathus); 287; London (Western Asiatic) 104472 (Byblos); Berlin 105, Furtwängler, pl. 3 (with snake in mouth; Sardinia).
the rings with solid bezels continued in use for some time, to judge from the excessive wear shown by several of them. This feature alone is enough to demonstrate that they were not all made as funerary rings.

If many can then be placed securely in the second half of the fifth century it remains only to assess their position in the history of finger rings with metal bezels in Etruria and Greece, and to consider any possible predecessors they may have had. Their iconography and its relationship to Etruscan art, especially gem-engraving, has been discussed sufficiently. It is their shapes and technique that require attention.

The idea of having a relief design on the bezel of a ring instead of the usual intaglio was already current in Etruria in the sixth century on cartouche rings. Only in the fifth century is it applied to the leaf-shaped bezel, which is the standard shape for finger rings in Etruria in this period. An early example in Etruria is the extremely elaborate ring from Bologna with a winged head of a youth as device. It is surrounded by beading, but the bezel itself is very thick, and its sides are decorated with upright tongues in relief: all the elements of the border decoration of the Fortnum Group rings. The idea of a box-like bezel, recalling the bulk of a stone scarab set in a swivel, persists into the later fifth and fourth centuries both for relief figure devices and wire scrolls or florals, with similarly moulded borders. The Fortnum Group, in which the bulk of the bezel is reduced and the border moldings rendered as a more summary frame, is a simple Etruscan variant of this type. The immediate forerunner, and close contemporary of the Bologna ring to judge from its style and context, is our (i), which still has some bulk and keeps its much reduced tongue border to the bezel side, separated by a plain strip from the beading round the device. The device itself is in a clearer, high relief than others of the Group and the figure fills less of the field. It is possible that the Nelidow ring (ii) goes with it. The Fortnum Group rings are skimpy by comparison, generally with (now) hollow hoops and with thin gold plate, sometimes only gilt silver, for the relief. When the bezel is solid it is very shallow and we may contrast the smaller but more massive (i). On most of them the edge is not even scalloped, to follow the tongue pattern. This was done most easily on the solid bezels. If the Bologna ring and our (i) belong to the middle of the fifth century and earlier the Fortnum Group rings can be seen to be their immediate successors, conforming more to the common Etruscan ring type with flat leaf-shaped bezel and stirrup-shaped hoop. The distinctive border of tongues, plain strip and beading, appears in roughly the same form on a number of more elaborate Etruscan rings which have other motifs in relief bordering an inset stone.

22 There are a few other types with relief decoration: e.g., Louvre Bj1107, which has a circular bezel with a twisted wire border and a Late Archaic gorgoneion in relief.

23 Becatti, *Oreficerie* 305, pl. 76; Alferi, *Or e argenti dell’Emilia antica*, figs. 4–6.

24 Hague (Becatti, 330, pl. 81); St. Louis 334.23; Berlin 293; Reinaich, *op. cit.*, pl. 18.9; *Ars Antiqua* (Luzern) i, pl. 63.140a,b (a=Schefold, *Meisterwerke no. 586*); *B.M.C. Rings* 218, pl. 6, 219, 908, pl. 23 (the figure gone); *BMQ* ix, 1934–5, pl. 5c; Naples 26408, Siviero, pls. 84–5; Guilhou, Sotheby, 9–121 Nov. 1937, pl. 3.67.

25 E.g., Berlin 30219 (Becatti, 319, pl. 80). I take no account here of other ring types with relief devices—the plain oval bezels or gold scarabs.

26 Cf. also the border to the relief shield-bezel ring, Coche de la Ferté, *Les bijoux antiques*, pl. 17.2–3.

27 As *B.M.C. Rings* 704, pl. 18 (Becatti, 307, pl. 76).
Of the other technical details the stippled background on some devices was likened by Magi to late mirrors, but it is an obvious device to diversify the background and throw up the relief, and can be paralleled in the use of both granulation and stippling on earlier work.\textsuperscript{28} It is of course most like the technique of fourth-century and later bullae,\textsuperscript{29} where we also see the triple dots on rocks or waves, as in the background of our (xxxiii). The figures on the bullae were impressed on matrices, unlike the ring bezels which are individual.

\textsc{John Boardman}

\textsuperscript{28} As the plaque, Coche de la Ferté, \textit{op. cit.}, pl. 32.4, or the Villa Giulia brooch with a satyr, Becatti, 282, pl. 73. Compare the roughened backgrounds to many stone reliefs, or the stippling used to bring out the background on even earlier bronzes (\textit{cf. Grecian Coll. in Oxford 84-5}).

\textsuperscript{29} As the fine Vatican examples, Becatti, 360-1, pl. 92 (von Vacano, pl. 76) or \textit{B.M.C. Jewellery} 2284-5, 2307, pls. 45-6, figs. 74-5.

The photographs of the Oxford rings were taken by the Museum photographer, except for nos. 9, 10, 15, 31, 33, 34, by the writer. Of the Fortnum Group rings in other collections I am indebted to Museum authorities for photographs and permission to publish them. The photographs of the rings in London and the Cabinet des Médailles, Paris are my own. For help in these and other matters I have to thank: N. Alfieri (Ferrara), G. Caputo (Florence), P. Devambez (Louvre, Paris), R. A. Higgins and D. Strong (London), M. Moretti (Tarquinia, Rome), G. le Rider and F. Rosswag (Cabinet des Médailles, Paris), E. Rohde (Berlin), J. B. Ward-Perkins.
CONTROL-MARKS AND THE ORGANIZATION OF THE ROMAN REPUBLICAN MINT

Rome under the Republic, from its beginnings as a small barbarian community, gradually took over the Greek world. It then transformed itself and its subjects into an Empire of remarkable stability and continuity of institutions. Similarly, the Roman Republican coinage, modelled originally on that of the Greek city-states of S. Italy, became under Augustus the coinage of the Empire. It would be interesting to know to what extent, if at all, the Republican mint anticipated or foreshadowed the ultimately very sophisticated organisation of the Imperial mint and its systematic use of control-marks forming part of the coin-type.

Certainly for the Republic the problems caused by the need to produce an enormous bulk of coinage already existed and a number of issues display series of marks which can be regarded as controls. For instance, the issue of L. Iulius Bursio\textsuperscript{1} displays such marks and alone used nearly as many obverse dies as the entire Athenian New Style silver coinage. It would be surprising if the process of striking was not in some way systematised and controlled by the marks, as it was in the case of the Athenian coinage. However, the Roman mint did not use a system of marks based on the chronological subdivision of an issue, as was the practice at Athens, nor do the control-marks indicate sources of metal, as at Athens and apparently Corinth.\textsuperscript{2} The only Roman issue of which the control-marks have been thought to be indications of date is the Roma/Victory ROMANO series of didrachms. But the pattern of die-combinations makes it clear that this is not possible.\textsuperscript{3}

It is necessary, therefore, to examine the various Roman Republican series of control-marks in detail in order to discover whether they point to an organisation of the mint related to the Imperial officina system or whether the Republican moneyers had a scheme or schemes of their own, which were then superseded under the Empire.

The earliest appearance of control-marks on the denarius coinage occurs in the issue of N. Fabius Pictor\textsuperscript{4} of about 130 B.C. The issue falls into two parts. The first, for which four obverse and five reverse dies were used, bears no control-marks. The second bears a letter of the Latin alphabet on both obverse and reverse. Although our record is incomplete, it seems that the reverse dies ran through the entire alphabet, while the obverse dies stopped short of the last few letters. A to K, M to O and R are known from the obverse, A to F, H to S and V and X from the reverse. Bahrfeldt considered that every letter on the obverse was combined with every letter on the reverse. But this is not so and a system of the type sought by Bahrfeldt on the analogy of later issues does not exist here. The letters were simply used to identify the dies—no letter has more than one obverse or reverse die—and not to determine the way they were combined. The combinations of

\textsuperscript{1} E. A. Sydenham, *Coinage of the Roman Republic* (hereafter referred to as CRR), no. 728.
\textsuperscript{3} R. Thomsen, *Early Roman coinage*, III, 133–134.
\textsuperscript{4} CRR, no. 517.
obverse and reverse letters in fact do no more than reflect the way the dies were
used. But if these combinations are plotted diagrammatically, two important
features of the issue become apparent. Since every die is directly or indirectly
linked to every other die, it may reasonably be held that the whole issue was
produced in one workshop. It is also clear that this workshop used more than
one anvil at a time and that any current obverse die could be paired with any
current reverse die taken from a die-box.5 As far as one can tell, the
Roma/Victory ROMANO series of didrachms was produced in the same way.

The control-marks which appear on denarii and quinarii of the later second
century B.C. and the first few years of the first century B.C. fall into two distinct
groups. The issues with marks of the first group may behave in the same way as
that of N. Fabius Pictor, but do not obviously do so. The issues with marks of the
second group have a totally different structure.

The control-marks of the first group are Latin or Greek letters, with or without
dots, or symbols—it is of no great significance which—placed indifferently on
obverse or reverse.6 Normally, each mark has only one die, but this is not always
so. The succession of dies in these issues seems similar to that in the issue of N.
Fabius Pictor and points to a single workshop using a number of anvils, the dies for
which were arbitrarily taken from a die-box. It may be that the moneyers felt
that control-marks were only necessary for one die, not for both. But the fact that
within this period many issues do not display control-marks, although larger than
issues with such marks, raises the interesting possibility, to which I shall return,
that the control system for an issue was only sometimes, and then often incompletely,
expressed in marks forming part of the coin-type.

The control-marks of the second group are very curious. They appear on both
obverse and reverse, but invariably in the same combination. For instance, if
A on the obverse and X on the reverse occur together, they always occur together.7
Here also it is normal, though not quite universal, for each mark to have only one
die. Since obverse dies had a longer life than reverse dies, the effect of using
this system of control marks will have been to waste, on my calculation, about a
quarter of the working life of the obverse dies, assuming that the reverse dies were
used as long as possible. I know of no case where an obverse die was recut with a
later control-mark. Since issues of this type can display no die-links, they can tell
us little about their structure or about the organisation of the mint. Their main
interest is the confirmation they provide for the view that plated denarii are con-
temporary forgeries, for these always get the combination of control-marks wrong.

The two types of control-marks which I have been considering remained the
only ones in use until about 95 B.C. Shortly before the Social War the mint began
to experiment with different types, which developed over the next ten years into
some very sophisticated systems. But it should be remembered that the simple
types of control-marks not only remained in use all through this period, but persisted
after the abandonment of the experiments of the 80s B.C. Of the moneyers after
82 B.C., only C. Piso Frugi8 seems to have been aware of these experiments. It is

6 Examples are the issues of L. Saturninus
(CRR, no. 578) and Piso, Caepio (CRR, no. 603).
7 As in the issue of L. Cassius Caeicianus (CRR,
no. 594).
8 CRR, no. 840.
particularly surprising that the wasteful system of control-marks with dies paired for the whole period of their use persisted. Part of the coinage of M. Volteius of about 77 B.C. was produced thus, as was one of the last issues of the Republic to bear control-marks, that of L. Roscius Fabatus.\textsuperscript{10}

The issue which marks a break with the type of control-marks in use from about 115 to 95 B.C. is that of C. Allius Balai.\textsuperscript{11} It bears a Latin letter on the obverse and a symbol on the reverse, and each letter, used on several dies, is combined with each symbol, likewise cut into several dies. It is thus the first issue in the Republican coinage where what may be called normal use of dies is combined with correlation of obverse and reverse control-marks. The main coinage of D. Silanus\textsuperscript{12} takes up the system, but uses a letter on the obverse and a numeral on the reverse.

The next issue, that of L. Piso Frugi,\textsuperscript{13} although it has control-marks on both obverse and reverse and although these marks are more varied in form than on any other issue of the Republic, does not represent an advance on the system of D. Silanus, but a reversion to that of N. Fabius Pictor, with the marks on obverse and reverse doing no more than reflecting the order of use of the two sets of dies. Owing to the size of the issue, we are presented with bewildering sequences of letters, numerals and symbols. But there is no attempt at correlation. The pressure of war presumably prevented this.

The first issue to return to an attempt to correlate obverse and reverse control-marks is that of L. Iulius Bursio. The obverse dies always display a control-mark, a symbol or a numeral, the reverse dies usually do so, a numeral below the quadriga, a numeral above, a letter below, a letter above, two letters below or two letters above. The single letters are sometimes accompanied by one or two dots, the double letters consist of each consonant and each vowel in turn, BA, BE, BI, BO, BV, CA, CE, etc. In the series above the quadriga, IA, IE, II, IO, IV are somewhat oddly included.

To consider the obverse dies briefly first, numerals occur haphazardly within sequences of symbols and are clearly no more than occasional substitutes for them. One obverse die with no mark at all, since it occurs in the middle of the issue, may be regarded as an aberration.

But it is the reverse control-marks which seem at first sight to hold the key to the arrangement of the issue and to remove the need for consideration of links of obverse marks. The numerals above the quadriga run to over CL, those below to only XII; the single letters above run through the entire alphabet, whereas below only A and E appear; the double letters above and below follow the same pattern. Here, if anywhere during the Republic, we seem to have a picture of three officinae being used to produce an issue. One officina will have used a numeral as its reverse control-mark, the second a letter, the third two letters. Each officina, after first striking coins with no control-mark on the reverse, will have produced a complete series with a mark on the reverse above the quadriga and an incomplete series with a mark on the reverse below the quadriga.
But the picture is false. The numerals up to XII occur only below the quadriga and the natural conclusion is that they are not an incomplete series, but are followed by the numerals above the quadriga, the two together forming a single series of control-marks. Once the pattern of reverse control-marks that suggested itself has thus broken down, it becomes necessary to plot all known die-links through the issue. When this is done, the whole issue appears as a single sequence, produced in one workshop. It remains to try and establish the way in which the symbols were used as obverse control-marks. The sequence which I have worked out for the issue suggests that a limited, but still large, number of symbols was chosen and cut into the starting dies and that when a die wore out it was replaced by one with the same symbol. It is a pleasant surprise to find that the third obverse die to use an ear as its control-mark bears in addition a small III.  

This solitary die suggests strongly that L. Iulius Bursio was moving towards the careful correlation of obverse and reverse control-marks of P. Crepusius. It also provides further evidence for the idea that the control system for an issue was sometimes only incompletely expressed in marks forming part of the coin-type.

The most carefully designed system of control-marks is that of P. Crepusius, elucidated by Hersh in an article that may be properly described as revolutionary. The reverse control-mark is simply a numeral, but on the obverse the letters of the Latin alphabet were used in turn first with no symbol and then with each of twenty-three different symbols. This type of obverse control-mark is slightly different from that of L. Iulius Bursio, but follows naturally from it. Instead of the same symbol being used and replaced when necessary throughout the issue, all the dies with the same symbol were used in a group over only a small part of the total sequence. But several groups were always current at any one time. With a number of obverse dies being thus succeeded in parallel not just by any new obverse die, but by an individually designed replacement, a fairly careful check must have been kept on the correlation of obverse and reverse die use. And in fact the issue comes to a very neat and tidy conclusion.

Herein lies a very striking contrast with part at least of the rest of the coinage of the triumvirate of which P. Crepusius was a member. This coinage consists of the individual issues of the other two members, L. Censorinus and C. Mamilius Limetanus and of a joint issue signed by all three. The earliest form of the joint issue bears the name of P. Crepusius in the most prominent position on the reverse and he should therefore be regarded as the head of the triumvirate. The system of control-marks of the joint issue is very simple and consists of the numerals up to about CL placed on the reverse, one to each die. The issue is a large one, though not as large as that of P. Crepusius, and its dies seem to have been used up quite normally.

None of these characteristics fits the issues of C. Mamilius Limetanus and L. Censorinus. The former used as control-marks only those letters which made up his name, C sometimes being followed by a full-stop, TA sometimes appearing in

---

14 The coin is in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.
15 CRR, no. 738.
16 C. A. Hersh, NC, 1952, 52.
17 CRR, no. 737, no. 741, no. 736.
monogram form. Apart from this piece of vanity, the issue is peculiar in that each die is represented now by comparatively few specimens.

L. Censorinus seems to use a fairly normal system of control-marks, symbols on the obverse, letters or numerals on the reverse, with no mark having more than one die. But this issue also seems to suffer from a low survival-rate. Indeed, the available material is so scanty that it does not seem possible to establish the complete sequence of dies.

Before attempting to assess the significance of these facts, it is appropriate to return briefly to the second century B.C. After taking into account all the evidence available from hoards and from style and fabric of both silver and bronze, I have come to the conclusion that the only possible way to arrange the coinage of about 135 to 125 B.C. is in two parallel sequences. There will have been two workshops which, at that period, struck in alternate years and used the years when they were not striking to prepare the next lot of issues.\footnote{M. Thompson, R. Thomsen and M. H. Crawford, The Agrinion Hoard.}

The coinage of P. Crepusius, L. Censorinus and C. Mamilius Limetanus seems to me to be also the product of two workshops, though not in the same way as the issues of 135 to 125 B.C. It belongs to 82 B.C. and the college responsible was the last Marian college to strike before the capture of Rome by Sulla.\footnote{M. H. Crawford, NC, 1964, 143-144.} It is only too likely that that capture took place after the two workshops had finished striking the joint issue and the issue of P. Crepusius, the head of the triumvirate, but before the coinage of C. Mamilius Limetanus and L. Censorinus had got fairly under way.

The last control marks which I wish to discuss in detail are those which appear on part of the issue of L. Sulla and L. Manlius Torquatus.\footnote{CRR, nos. 757 and 759.} The control-marks, when they occur, take the form of numerals placed on the reverse before the horses' legs and this might seem straightforward enough. But VI and XX are the only numerals which occur,\footnote{VI is on coins in the San Giuliano hoard and in Glasgow, XX on a coin in the Vatican Collection.} and on dies where there is plenty of room there is normally no trace of a numeral at all. Nor is this all. When one does occur, it is very small and very faint and clearly not cut into the dies in the same way as the rest of the type. It seems almost to have been scratched on as a sort of last-minute extra and of this I think there only two possible explanations which make sense. Either the mark was normally placed elsewhere than on the face of the dies or it was usually scratched on the die so lightly that it became obliterated as soon as striking began. Either way, I think we must conclude that at any rate this issue was provided with a control system, the traces of which were not intended to survive on the coins.

As I have indicated, the issues after Sulla tell a story of gradual abandonment of control-marks. Those marks that are used are either a simple series, mostly numerical, on obverse or reverse only, or else indicate the use of paired dies. The only exception to this picture is provided by the issue of C. Piso Frugi, which sports a parody of a system, rather than a system. It is as if he set out to show that he could produce an even greater variety of control-marks than his father.

The conclusions of this paper are two, the first relating to the use of control-marks, the second to the organisation of the Republican mint. The apparently arbitrary occurrence of control-marks has always been puzzling. But in view of
the addition of a number on one die of one symbol in the issue of L. Iulius Bursio, and in view of the fugitive nature of the control-marks of L. Sulla and L. Manlius Torquatus, the question we ask should be rephrased slightly. We should ask why the control system of an issue was sometimes expressed in marks cut into the faces of the dies and thus forming part of the coin-type and sometimes was not. I think we can assume that from the time of N. Fabius Pictor a check was kept on the general order in which the two series of dies, obverse and reverse, were used and that from the 80s B.C. some check was also kept on their correlation.

As for the organisation of the mint, it is possible to point to two periods when two workshops functioned. The way in which they functioned at these two times was very different. At the first they were used in alternate years for the entire coinage of a college of moneyers, at the second the coinage of a college was divided between them. At neither time can any resemblance to Imperial practice be detected; and a great deal of exhaustive study is clearly necessary to establish whether and for how long the use of two workshops survived and when the groundwork of the Imperial organisation of the mint was laid.

M. H. Crawford
SOME ROMAN STUCCO RELIEFS FROM POZZUOLI
NOW IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM

(Plates VII—XI)

In 1956 the British Museum acquired on loan from the Victoria and Albert Museum a series of eighteen stucco reliefs of the kind used by the Romans in the interior decoration of walls and vaults: these were bought in 1078, together with a terracotta relief, and were all ascribed to a 'Greek tomb of the second century B.C. lately discovered in South Italy.'¹ They appear as follows in the British Museum Register of Antiquities:²

1. In relief foreparts of Griffin facing right, ending in short twisted tail. Background painted red. 35 × 39-5 cm.

2. In relief foreparts of panther facing left, ending in short twisted tail. Background painted red. 35 × 38-8 cm.

3. In relief 'putto' moving left holding a patena (?) in his right hand and tambourine in left hand. Overhead hanging swags. 47-7 × 35 cm.

4. 'Putto' flying to right holding a lyre in right hand. Overhead hanging swags. 49-6 × 35-6 cm.

5. In relief a winged Victory moving lightly to right. 48-3 × 34-4 cm.

6. In relief 'putto' running to right, over his left arm a small piece of drapery. Overhead hanging swags. 48-3 × 39-5 cm.

7. Concave and framed with leaf-tongue moulding. In relief 'putto' riding a sea-horse. 30-5 × 39-5 cm.

8. Concave and framed by leaf-tongue moulding. In relief 'putto' riding sea-monster. 31-2 × 43-9 cm.

9. In relief half-reclining semi-nude female figure, probably Venus. 30-5 × 37-6 cm.

10. Concave, framed by leaf-moulding. In relief 'putto' on back of panther prancing to left. 31-8 × 34-4 cm.

11. In relief, griffin prancing to left. 28 × 33-1 cm.

For their co-operation in enabling me to study and photograph the material discussed in this article, and for much invaluable help and information, I have to thank Dr. D. E. Strong and Mr. D. M. Bailey of the British Museum. I should also like to thank Professor J. M. C. Toynbee, who looked at my photographs and made a number of suggestions; and Mr. M. H. Bräude for reading through a rough draft of this paper and advising how to improve it. Thanks are due finally to Dr. D. E. Rhodes of the British Museum and to the authorities of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, for their help in providing me with illustrations.

¹ D. E. Strong, BMQ xxi (1957–9), pp. 98–100, pl. XXXIV; see also G. P. Bankart, The Art of the Plasterer (London, 1909), figs. 9–13, 18, 26. Bankart's text (pp. 15–6) is unhelpful. The loan to the British Museum is in effect permanent.
² This list is reproduced by kind permission of Dr. Strong. The full registration numbers are 1956 12–4 1–18. I have omitted the Victoria and Albert numbers, which are also given in the Register, and have converted all measurements from inches into centimetres. The first figure in each case is the height, the second the width. Points of interpretation on which I disagree will appear in the text.
12. Concave, framed by fillet and ovolo moulding. In relief a goat leaping to right. 33·1 × 29·9 cm.

13. Concave, framed by fillet and ovolo moulding. In relief ‘putto’ flying to right. 26·7 × 29·3 cm.

14. In relief ‘putto’ flying to right, holding a patera (?) in left hand. 23·5 × 26·7 cm.

15. In relief a stork with head down looking right. 26·7 × 26 cm.

16. In relief protome of a griffin looking right, his long tail ends in scrolls. 19 × 31·8 cm.

17. In relief a goat leaping to left. 14·6 × 19·7 cm.

18. Concave, framed by decorated ovolo. In relief Perseus and Andromeda (or perhaps Heracles and Hesione). Background painted red. 40·7 × 48·3 cm.

The height of relief is usually at the most 1 cm. or a little over. In no. 14 it reaches 15 mm., while in nos. 15, 16, 17 it is about 5 or 6 mm., and in nos. 1 and 2 only 2 or 3 mm.

At least ten of the stucco reliefs (nos. 1–4, 6–10, 18) can now be shown to come from a group of three Roman tombs in Fondo Fraia at Pozzuoli. These tombs and their stucco decoration were described and discussed by G. Minervini in *Bullettino Archeologico Italiano*, vol. i (1861–2).³ They had been excavated some years before his publication and the stuccoes seem already to have been cut out when he described them.⁴ It is not even certain that he himself ever saw the stuccoes in situ, though he is able to assign to each relief its particular place in the decoration. The tombs cannot now be identified: Johannowsky failed to find them in 1952.⁵

Minervini gives line-drawings of the better-preserved stucco reliefs⁶ and it is these drawings which confirm the provenance of the British Museum group. By no means all of Minervini’s stuccoes survive, but it will be useful to consider his description in full in order to understand the original context of those now in London.

Several tombs at Pozzuoli are notable for their stucco vault-decoration,⁷ and Minervini’s tombs, like these, were chamber-tombs. The stucco reliefs which he described were confined to the niches within the aediculae at the centre of each wall. No mention is made of the vaults, but by analogy these too would have been decorated with stuccoes, and we are forced to assume that either the vault-decoration or the whole vault had in each case been destroyed.

The first tomb was entered from the west. Facing the entrance, in the middle of the east wall, was an aedicula which contained, presumably on the back-wall of its niche,⁸ a badly damaged figure-scene in stucco relief representing a winged

---


⁴ Minervini, op. cit., p. 178, ‘qualche anno fa.’

⁵ M. Ruggiero, *Scavi di Antichità nelle Province di Terraferma* (Naples, 1888), p. 233, refers to excavations by D. Salvatore di Fraia which had revealed two ancient tombs in 1855.


⁸ See note 12.
cupid flying down towards a man who stood upright. The side-walls of this niche each had a nude woman sitting in a chair with a high back (pl. VII, a, top left).

The main representations within the central aediculae of the north and south walls of the tomb were of a subject apparently unique in Roman art. There were two women, fully clothed, each carrying a scroll in her left hand; between them lay a pair of skulls, towards which the right-hand woman was pointing. In one case the left-hand woman was seated on a table, on which the skulls also rested; in the other case both women were standing and the skulls were on the ground (pl. VII, a, middle). The significance of these scenes is a mystery, for Minervini's suggestion that there is an allusion either to necromancy or to some form of sorcery is not convincing.\(^9\)

More relevant to the purpose of the present paper however are the figures on the side-walls of the two niches. These are all putti with cloaks flying from their shoulders or hanging from their left arms. One of these figures was almost entirely lost when Minervini saw the tomb: a second carried a plate in his right hand and a tambourine in his left; a third was advancing with his right hand outstretched: a fourth was playing the lyre. The three better-preserved figures were drawn by Minervini and his drawings correspond to three of the pieces now in the British Museum (nos. 3, 4, 6), although he omits the garlands which hang above the putti (pl. VII, a, b, c).\(^10\)

Each of the three niches mentioned had an arched vault. The two dancing figures with birds at their sides which decorated the vault of the east niche were almost destroyed in Minervini's time, but some of the figures in corresponding positions in the other niches are among the British Museum group. They are the cupid riding a sea-horse from the centre of the vault of the south niche, along with the cupid who rode a panther to one side of him\(^11\) (the cupid who rode a tiger on the other side is unaccounted for), and the cupid riding a sea-griffin from the north niche (nos. 7, 8, 10; pls. VIII, b; X, b; cf. pl. VIII, a). The reliefs preserve the concave surface of the vaults which they originally decorated. But in his drawings Minervini omits the unusual lotus-bud moulding which frames each group. Finally outside the northern aedicula, presumably decorating the walls to either side of it,\(^12\) were two female figures reclining on the ground, one of which is now in the London group (no. 9; pls. IX, a, top right; X, a).\(^13\)

None of the reliefs described by Minervini in the second tomb of Fondo Fraia has found its way to the British Museum. The sole aedicula of this tomb contained a relief of a nude woman reclining by a tree on rugged ground (pl. IX, a, top left), while on the side-walls were women with floating drapery who carried plates full of fruit. These latter figures were represented in a pavilion with a triangular pediment, above which swam a pair of dolphins (pl. VIII, a, bottom left and right).\(^14\)

---

\(^9\) See Appendix, p. 32.

\(^10\) Bankart, op. cit., figs. 22, 23.

\(^11\) Ibid., fig. 12.

\(^12\) Minervini's language in describing the positions occupied by the various reliefs is not always clear (see Appendix, p. 32).

\(^13\) The fact that this figure is one of a pair rules out the suggestion that it represents Venus (see catalogue above).

\(^14\) The entrance of this tomb was from the east. To the left of the aedicula, which faced the entrance, was a stairway. For a discussion of the decoration see Appendix, p. 32.
Another cupid riding a sea-monster decorated the vault of the aedicula of the third tomb, but here again the relief was almost destroyed when Minervini saw it. On either side were scenes from Greek legend: the first showed a beardless Heracles leaning on his club and watching the hind suckling Telephus; the second showed a nude woman bound to a rock being threatened by a monster while a man drew back in horror to the left. On the side-walls within the niche were ‘two sea-monsters, a griffin and a panther.’ Minervini’s drawings (pls. VIII, a, bottom centre; IX, a, bottom) confirm that the two sea-monsters, whose foreparts dissolve in one summary whorl of a tail, and the relief with the woman, the monster and the reluctant rescuer are in the British Museum group (nos. 1, 2, 18; pls. IX, b; X, c, d).

The last scene is particularly interesting. If it represents the legend of Perseus and Andromeda, this is a very strange version. The pose and stature of the male figure are worthy of no hero, he is not armed in any way, and indeed he seems to be retreating from the monster: compared with the hero in the Heracles and Telephus relief drawn by Minervini, he is quite ridiculous. One is tempted to interpret the scene as a parody, either derived from a well-known stage-farce, or based on a famous painting or relief. Some representations of the rescues of Andromeda and Hesione show the female figure similarly threatened by the monster from below, and it is possible therefore to assume derivation from a famous original in the classical repertoire.

Parody however is hardly likely to occur in a funerary context, and the companion-piece of our relief is the scene with Heracles and Telephus, which contains no hint of parody. Minervini’s theory that the male figure is not Perseus but Phineus, the uncle and suitor of Andromeda later slain by Perseus, is attractive, but ancient literature mentions no encounter between Phineus and the monster, and there are no parallels in ancient art for this subject. Perhaps Aeschylus’ lost play, ‘Phineus,’ provided the inspiration; or perhaps it came from the plays written by Sophocles and Euripides on Andromeda. Even so, it is difficult to see why the spectacle of Phineus shirking the responsibility of rescuing Andromeda should be chosen to decorate a tomb; whereas the liberation of Andromeda by Perseus, signifying the liberation of the soul from the bonds of the body, is an obvious sepulchral subject. Perhaps after all we must ascribe the comic effect of the relief

---

15 This tomb is also entered from the east.
16 A comparatively rare motif in Roman art and one that, as far as I know, is not found elsewhere in a funerary context. Heracles however is a favourite figure in tomb-decoration because of his triumphs over death and his subsequent apotheosis (see e.g., J. Bayet in Mélanges d’Arêth., xxxix (1921), pp. 219 ff; xl (1923), pp. 19 ff). Minervini calls attention to a Capuan coin which has a beardless Heracles on the obverse and Telephus and the hind on the reverse (Avellino in Bull. Arch. Nap., vol. i (1843), p. 11).
17 Bankart, op. cit., figs. 11, 25, 26.
18 It is less likely to represent Heracles and Hesione, as the male figure has no club. On the other hand, if Perseus it is, he has no distinguishing attributes—neither sickle, nor sword, nor head of Medusa.
19 Strong, op. cit., p. 100.
20 The posture of our female figure closely recalls that of a figure on a stucco relief which forms a small panel in the Great Frieze of the House of Melaeager at Pompeii (now in Naples Museum) and which may well represent Perseus and Andromeda, or Heracles and Hesione (Naples inv. 9595; Real Museo Borbonico, x, pl. XL111, p. 3). There is no trace of a monster now, but it may have broken away since ancient times. See also Espérandieu, Recueil Général des Bas-Reliefs, Statues et Bustes de la Gaule Romaine, iv, no. 2997; Reinauch, RR ii, p. 116, 1.
22 Suggestion of Minervini, op. cit., p. 186.
23 Woodward, op. cit., pp. 84, 86.
to the incompetence of the artist, who, in seeking to portray Perseus and Andromeda, has accidentally produced something ludicrous. Details of the figure of Andromeda, such as the further arm and the further leg, and the torsion of the body at the waist, show that he was not a master of his craft: is his Perseus supposed to be drawing back, as Dr. Strong suggests, ‘pour mieux sauter’?  

Ten of the reliefs drawn by Minervini are in the British Museum. What has become of the others, including those with the women and the skulls, is unknown. At the end of his article Minervini declared that the stuccoes were in the possession of the Abbate Giuseppe di Criscio, who had kindly allowed drawings to be made: this can only mean that they had already been cut from the tombs. Certain it is that ten of them found their way on to the market in 1870, when they were bought for the Victoria and Albert Museum. Are the others possibly preserved in one of the European museums, or in a private collection? More likely they have been destroyed. A stucco relief representing a cock in profile was described by Dubois in 1907 as being ‘chez l’abbé de Criscio,’ but again nothing has been heard of it since. The di Criscio collection is now dispersed.

It would be hazardous to attempt to date these stuccoes from Fondo Fraia too closely. Even when such decoration is found in its architectural context, dating is difficult because any wall could have been decorated or re-decorated many years after its construction: however closely we can date the wall, it only offers a terminus post quem. As the tombs of Fondo Fraia are now lost, we have no external evidence to help to date the stuccoes. Minervini did not even say whether the tombs had accommodated only cremation burials or whether inhumation had also taken place there; but aediculae, large niches with pediments supported by columns or semi-columns, are designed for cinerary urns and are associated generally with small cremation tombs of the first 150 years A.D. Figure-scenes in stucco relief are unknown in Roman tombs before the time of Augustus, and other examples of this kind of decoration in Pozzuoli probably belong to the first century A.D. Moreover, the great series of tombs along the Via Campana, second only to those round Rome itself, belong to the period of Pozzuoli’s greatest prosperity; that is, before the time of the Antonines. Later there was much re-use of the old burial-chambers. Although the city remained an important port and health resort throughout the imperial period, its acme belongs to the first centuries B.C. and A.D., and it suffered a decline after the building of new harbours at Ostia by Claudius and Trajan: much of the traffic which had made Pozzuoli the hub of trade between Rome and the East now went through Ostia and many of the rich merchants of Pozzuoli must have migrated there. It seems that from this time

---

26 Information from W. Johannowsky. 
27 See above, note 5. 
28 The earliest example I know is the stuccoed tomb in the Via Laurentina necropolis at Ostia (Not. Scav. 1938), pp. 56 ff.; Squarciapino in Scavi di Ostia iii, pp. 85-91. An earlier stuccoed tomb near Osimo (G. V. Gentili, Auximum (1955), pp. 129-31, fig. 9) seems to have only shields, plant-motifs, etc., in its vault-decoration.

29 See Maiuri, op. cit., p. 329, for the hypogeeum of Via Vigna. The unpublished stuccoed tombs of Fondo Caiazzo and San Vito can be dated on the basis of their architecture to the first century A.D. 
the people of Pozzuoli spent less on their burials: the practice of decorating a tomb with stucco reliefs, which must have been costly and seems to have been associated mainly with fairly prosperous families, died out, just as it did at Isola Sacra\textsuperscript{32} and Rome with increased economic stress in the third century.

That is as far as we can go in pin-pointing the date of the reliefs. Style is too dangerous a criterion. In the first place, plaster being a particularly vulnerable medium, only a very small proportion of Roman stucco decoration has survived, and very little is securely dateable: from some periods there are hardly any examples, though there is no reason to believe that stucco decoration was out of fashion in those periods. Generally speaking therefore we face a shortage of reliable comparative material for dating purposes.

Secondly technique and style do not seem to change appreciably in different periods. A sketchy style with much use of incisions in the rendering of detail is typical of almost all periods. One can perhaps detect general trends. Exceptionally fine, delicate work is found in the Augustan and Hadrianic periods;\textsuperscript{33} while the composition of the plaster becomes less fine and contains less marble-dust as time goes on. But to all such general trends there are exceptions, and in the light of the limited nature of our evidence it is impossible to say with confidence what is exceptional and what is the rule.

The stuccoes from Fondo Fraia are especially difficult to date in the absence of external evidence because they show a number of unusual features. Of the three pieces preserved from the third tomb described by Minervini (nos. 1, 2, 18), the Perseus and Andromeda scene is of course unusual for the reasons discussed above, while the two sea-monsters with their long necks, abrupt tails\textsuperscript{34} and expressions of benign stupidity, are of a very strange species. They too look almost like parodies. The sea-‘panther’ surprisingly recalls a creature depicted on a fragment of a stucco frieze from the Roman baths at Virunum in the ancient province of Noricum.\textsuperscript{35} One point which Minervini failed to record is that these three reliefs are set against a background painted red. The projection of white stucco reliefs on a coloured background was a common practice which may owe something to cameo-engraving, but there are no other examples known from Pozzuoli.

The other seven reliefs which can be assigned to Fondo Fraia (nos. 3, 4, 6–10) belong to the first tomb described by Minervini. Although associated with the mysterious women and skulls, they are not themselves unusual in subject-matter. Cupids are regular motives in funerary art;\textsuperscript{36} and there are other Pozzuolan stuccoes which depict them riding sea-monsters.\textsuperscript{37} But the moulding which frames three
dolphins and hunting wild animals (Fondo Caiazzo and Via Vigna), trying to trap a dragon-fly (Fondo Caiazzo), and firing arrows (two-storeyed tomb near San Vito; Dubois, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 352; P. A. Paoli, \textit{Avanzi delle Antichità esistenti a Pozzuoli, Miseno, Baia}, pl. XXXVI). For cupids on sarcophagi, see Cumont, \textit{Symbolism}, pp. 341–9.

\textsuperscript{32} G. Calza, \textit{La Necropoli del Porto di Roma nell’Isola Sacra} (1940), p. 108.

\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Cf. MAAR} iv (1924), pls. I–IX, XVII; Calza, \textit{op. cit.}, fig. 56. Further examples at Baia.

\textsuperscript{34} Perhaps the rest of their tails was originally painted or rendered in a thin plaster wash.

\textsuperscript{35} Kenner-Praschniker, \textit{Der Bäderbezirk von Virunum} (Vienna, 1947), p. 208, fig. 208. The scale of this figure however is much smaller than that of our figure: the fragment measures only 10 cm. × 10.5 cm.

\textsuperscript{36} At Pozzuoli for instance they are found riding

\textsuperscript{37} Real Museo Borbonico xv, pls. XXV and XXVI, p. 5, note 1; \textit{cf.} Naples inv. 9626 (Dubois, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 442, no. 162). For the sea-thiasos and the participation in it of amorini, see Petersen in \textit{Ann. Inst.}, 32 (1860), pp. 396–409; \textit{cf.} A. Rumpf,
of the reliefs (7, 8, 10) is very unusual: it is a relative of the waterleaf but so debased as to be hardly recognisable as such. The heart-shaped leaves have become U-shaped and between them, in place of tongues, hang lotus-buds.\textsuperscript{38} The plaster of all seven pieces is putty-coloured but hard and cement-like in texture: it is quite unlike the usual Pozzuolan stucco, which is coarse and purplish or brownish with dark grains of volcanic dust, and usually has a much-worn surface. Our reliefs combine comparatively high relief in some details, such as the heads of the putti, with other details such as wings merely incised in the background: the outlines of the figures are also incised in the background, as are the outlines of certain figures in stuccoes at Naples\textsuperscript{39} and Castellammare di Stabia.\textsuperscript{40} The modelling of the bodies is summary and not too lifelike, while inner detail is sparsely rendered with no more than an occasional pair of incisions; but the combination of this technique with the hard, well-preserved surface produces a pleasing dry effect, somewhat like a quick pen-and-paper sketch.

The style of these reliefs is not only different from that of the other three described above, it has no close parallel in the corpus of Roman stucco decoration. But three other stuccoes in the British Museum group are almost certainly by the same hand and therefore probably from Pozzuoli, perhaps from the same tomb, though if so it is strange that Minervini does not mention them. One represents a putto flying to the right with arms outstretched, the left hand holding a plate, the right holding a cloth above it (no. 14). The second relief represents a griffin prancing in profile to the left (no. 11; pl. XI, b); the third a goose or swan with neck lowered (no. 15; pl. XI, c).\textsuperscript{41} All the hallmarks of the Fondo Fraia artist are there: the hard, cement-like plaster; the indication of body-detail by the occasional pair of little nicks; the incised outlines.

Three more of the British Museum stuccoes (nos. 12, 13, 17) make up a third group. There are two concave rectangular panels of roughly the same size framed by an egg-moulding and containing in one case a goat leaping to the right and in the other a clumsily executed flying putto (pl. XI, a).\textsuperscript{42} The small figures are rather lost each in the middle of its comparatively large empty field. Another fragment has leaping to the left a goat who is obviously a brother to the first goat.\textsuperscript{43} The stucco of all three reliefs is coarse in texture: one of the panels has a number of blemishes and air-bubbles, caused perhaps by inadequate slaking of the lime used in the plaster. This plaster could from its appearance be Pozzuolan, but it is impossible to be confident about such an attribution.

More likely to be from Pozzuoli is another relief, which shows the foreparts of a griffin whose lower body is resolved in formal volutes (no. 16; pl. XI, d) The

\textsuperscript{38} I know of only one other example at all similar—a stucco fragment in Naples Museum (inv. 9575).
\textsuperscript{39} E.g., Naples inv. 9567, 9572, 9574, 9575, all of unknown provenance.
\textsuperscript{40} From a villa rustica at Petrarò: see L. d’Orsi, Come Ritrovai l’Antica Stabia, 2nd ed. (Milan, 1962), pl. 37, 38. Compare the relief (from another Stabian villa) depicting a cupid and a dog, op. cit., pl. 39.
\textsuperscript{41} E.g., Naples inv. 9567, 9572, 9574, 9575, all of unknown provenance.
\textsuperscript{42} From a villa rustica at Petrarò: see L. d’Orsi, Come Ritrovai l’Antica Stabia, 2nd ed. (Milan, 1962), pl. 37, 38. Compare the relief (from another Stabian villa) depicting a cupid and a dog, op. cit., pl. 39.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., figs. 9, 10.
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., fig. 13.
coarse, worn surface, with a pinkish-brown tinge and dark grains, recalls Pozzuolan
stuccoes in Naples Museum, and the motif in particular recalls Naples inv. 9585.\footnote{Dubois, \emph{op. cit.}, p. 442, no. 154.}

The last relief (no. 5) represents a winged female figure in three-quarters view. Her arms are raised and a cord seems to run over her hands and hang behind her body almost as if she is holding a skipping-rope. The drapery which swirls round her leaves the front of her body bare, or else it is of that transparent stuff much
favoured by the artists of the Hellenistic Age. The posture is ungainly and the
anatomy ill-proportioned,\footnote{The lower legs and feet have been restored, probably incorrectly.} the surface of the plaster is powdery. It is difficult
to fit this relief into any of the other groups, though the coiffure with its garland-like fringe scored by short oblique strokes recalls that of the male figure in the Perseus
and Andromeda scene.

But to assist the division of the eighteen reliefs into groups, there is one form of
evidence which has yet to be studied. On several of the reliefs, and particularly
on those from the first tomb of Fondo Fraia with their firm surface, are preserved
a number of finger-prints, made by the artist as he worked the damp plaster. The
prints are a little confused, and the surface is not fine enough to preserve a really
sharp impression, but there is a possibility that some one working with a knowledge
of finger-prints and with the right technical equipment could establish which of
the reliefs were executed by the same hand.\footnote{Finger-prints are also preserved on the winged Victories modelled in stucco on three panels cut
from a Roman columbarium and acquired by the British Museum in 1922 (E. Strong, \emph{Art in Ancient Rome} (London, 1929), ii, fig. 260).}

Although the stuccoes seem to belong to four or five different buildings, it is
very likely, since they were purchased as a group, that they all come from the
Pozzuoli region: they probably all belonged to the di Criscio collection. In
quality they fall behind other examples of stucco decoration in Pozzuoli, but they
form an interesting addition to our knowledge of the work produced by stuccoists
in this important centre. The most interesting aspect of the group is, of course, the
link with the three tombs described by Minervini, each of which presents problems
of interpretation, the first with its women and skulls, the second with its so-called
Rhea Silvia, the third with its two mythological scenes. It is not the purpose of
this paper to examine these problems closely, especially as only one, the Perseus
and Andromeda group, is preserved among the British Museum stuccoes. Leaving
aside the problem-pieces, one finds a series of subjects that is familiar to the
repertoire of funerary art: it is interesting especially to note that all three tombs
have marine motifs—dolphins and sea-creatures. Nearly all the decorated tombs
of Pozzuoli, whether their decoration was executed in mosaic or in stucco, seem to
have included subjects from this range: the choice may owe something to the fact
that Pozzuoli was a port and that its inhabitants not only lived in contact with the
sea but had probably in many cases sailed widely in the interests of trade.

Two of the three tombs of Fondo Fraia also had examples of cupids riding sea-
monsters. These are the two tombs which are represented in the British Museum

\footnote{See Dubois, \emph{op. cit.}, pp. 349–54, fig. 50. The sea thiasos is represented in the tombs of Via Vigna and Fondo Caiazzo (references in note 7
above). The domed vault of a half-destroyed tomb on the Via Campana about 3 miles from Pozzuoli shows the tail of a sea-monster, while a stucco
relief in Naples with a Nereid riding a sea-monster is also from Pozzuoli (inv. 9627; Dubois, p. 443, no. 163). Other references are given in note 37.}
group. In spite of this connexion of subject-matter, the style of the material surviving from each tomb suggests that two different artists were responsible. The work in the Perseus and Andromeda relief is rather clumsy and laboured, whereas the figures from the other tomb are executed in a sketchy style, with free-flowing lines which give an effect of great zest and vigour. The technique too is different. Both the red-painted background of the three pieces from the Perseus tomb and the texture of the plaster, which glints with grains of marble-dust, distinguish them from the others, with their close-grained, putty-coloured surfaces. Stucco fragments from Pozzuoli now in Naples\(^48\) and decoration surviving in the tombs of Fondo Caiazzo and Via Vigna show the work of still other hands, much of it on a par with metropolitan work, and the influence of still other artistic ideas: all this material gives us some idea of the extent to which stucco decoration was used in the city during the early Empire, of the number of artists and craftsmen involved, and of the richness and diversity of their achievement.

ROGER LING

APPENDIX

The problems of interpretation raised by those stuccoes which were drawn by Minervini but which do not appear in the British Museum group deserve closer attention. After discussing the decoration of his first tomb, Minervini comes to the conclusion that the four women represented with scrolls and skulls are either four necromancers buried in the tomb or four sorcerers to whose dire work is owed the death of four women buried here; in the latter case the occupants of the tomb would be represented by the two seated and two reclining women, who are enjoying perpetual bliss in the Afterlife in spite of the maledications of their rivals. It would be attractive to argue that the women are Muses and that Minervini has mistaken masks for skulls, but I do not think that we can do so, even though some theatrical masks look very like skulls (e.g., M. Bieber, *The History of the Greek and Roman Theater*, fig. 260). The accuracy of Minervini’s drawings is attested by the British Museum stuccoes, and the good state of preservation of these stuccoes would suggest that he is not likely to have been misled by damage to the surface of the originals. True, his rendering of the skulls is rather sketchy: but, if the two women represent the Muses of Tragedy and Comedy, they ought to be distinguished somehow—either by the appearance of their masks or by additional attributes, such as the club (Melpomene) and the pedum (Thalia). Moreover Calliope, and not Thalia or Melpomene, is usually associated with a scroll. Interesting in connexion with these reliefs are a number of gems showing men with skulls (A. Furtwängler, *Die Antiken Gemmen*, pls. XXII, 12, 15; XXX, 43, 48). One gem shows a seated man who appears to be reading a scroll, while a skull lies at his feet (*ibid.*, pl. XXX, 45), but in no case are women associated with the skulls.

The reliefs of the second tomb also raise problems of interpretation. There is much to recommend Minervini’s theory that the reclining woman is Rhea Silvia beneath the *ficus ruminalis*. The desire of the artist to give the figure a particular setting by introducing the trees and rocks suggests that he has a particular legend in mind and is not merely seeking to represent the ‘soul of the dead enjoying eternal sleep in Elysium’ (a view quoted by Minervini). If we can rely on Minervini’s drawing some attempt has also been made to depict fruit on the tree, and this fruit for all the artist’s clumsiness may be figs. In fact the tree need not be the *ficus ruminalis*, which is associated in legend with the exposure of the twins rather than with the dream of Silvia. The absence of Mars, who is usually shown approaching the sleeping figure to carry out the act of union, is more strange. But perhaps the type of the reclining Silvia was well enough known for the figure of Mars to be assumed: the god is on his way, but the artist has chosen to represent the moment before his arrival. A. Alfoldi, in *Museum Helveticum* 7, 1950, pp. 2 ff., interprets the reclining woman engraved on a pair of gems (Furtwängler, *op. cit.*, pl. XXX, 1, 55) as Rhea Silvia, but his arguments are not entirely convincing: in any case there are several elements in the gem-engravings, such as the basket on which the woman reclines, and the eagle carrying the sceptre of Zeus, which are lacking in our stucco relief. Perhaps the figure of Mars had been destroyed before Minervini saw the stucco panel, and he may have drawn only the lower part of the composition. This is especially likely if the

\(^{48}\) Dubois, pp. 442–3.
stuccoes were cut from the tomb before he saw them. The episode of Mars and Rhea Silvia is a common motif in funerary art, occurring on sarcophagi (Robert, *Die Antiken Sarkophagreliefs* iii, 2, pp. 227 ff.) and on the monument of the Secundinii at Igel, where Drexel observes (*RM* xxxv, 1920, p. 129) 'der Schlaf der Rhea Silvia, in dem sie des Gottes teilhaftig wurde, konnte den Tod als einen ähnlichen Vorgang erscheinen lassen.'

I cannot accept Minervini's interpretation of the female figures carrying plates of fruit as Horae: the Horae, being identified by the Romans with the Seasons, are four in number and would carry distinguishing attributes. Perhaps here we have members of the Bacchic cortège familiar in Roman funerary art (for Maenads carrying plates of fruit, cf. for instance Reinach, *RR* iii, 361, 1; 424, 2; and for the significance of Bacchic revellers in tomb-decoration, Cumont, *Lux Perpetua*, pp. 255 ff.). For the dolphins on the pediments above these figures it is hardly necessary to presume more than a decorative function.

In regard to the position of the reliefs (see note 12, p. 26 above), the reliefs of the Cupid and the man and of the women and the skulls are described as 'sotto la edicola': they are clearly the most important scenes in their respective aediculae and would therefore have decorated the most important field, the back-wall, while the figures described as 'sotto le volte' would have decorated the soffits of the niches. The cupids were situated 'ne' due laterali,' which can only mean the side-walls of the niche. More doubt surrounds the position of the women seated in chairs 'a ciascuno de' due lati della edicola': are they on the inner side-walls or outside the aedicula? The former seems more in accord with the usual practice in tomb-decoration, but the women reclining on the ground are specifically said to be outside the aedicula.

R. L.
THE LATINs OF ARGOS AND NAUPLiA: 1311-1394

During the fourteenth century the Latinis' hold on those fragments of the great empire of Romania which they had acquired after the overthrow of the Byzantine emperor in 1204 became increasingly precarious. In the Morea, as the Peloponnese was then known, the foremost Frankish houses, the Villehardouin, the Courtenay, the de la Roche and others, were extinguished. The French magnates faced hostility not only from the Greeks and Turks, but also from the Catalans and the Italianate elements to whom their lands passed through conquest, marriage or princely favour. A turning point in this process was the slaughter of many male members of the old Frankish aristocracy by the Catalan companies and their Turkish allies in a great battle near Thebes in 1311, at which Gautier de Brienne, who had succeeded his kinsman Guy de la Roche as Duke of Athens and Neopatras in 1309, was killed. Gautier's duchies were occupied by the Catalans, who were acting independently of the Aragonese King of Sicily, though they subsequently rendered a vague formal allegiance to a line of Siculo-Aragonese dukes. The Catalans did not take Corinth, which lay on the isthmus separating the Duchy of Athens from the Morea, and the Brienne family retained effective possession of its lands beyond Corinth, around Argos and Nauplia, which continued to form part of the Principality of Achaea. Gautier de Brienne's young son, also named Gautier, and his descendants failed however in their repeated attempts to recover Athens and Thebes, and in the years after the younger Gautier's death in 1356, when his Enghien nephews inherited his Greek claims and possessions, the great baronies of the Principality of Achaea were held by Italians: the Zaccaria of Genoa, Lords of Chalandritza; the Tocco of Naples who in 1357 became Counts of Cephalonia; and the Florentine Acciaiuoli who were granted Corinth in 1358.1

The struggle for possession of Athens and Thebes took place within the context of the great Mediterranean conflict between the royal houses of Aragon and Anjou. For a brief period in 1311 Gautier de Brienne's widow, Jeanne de Châtillon, defended Athens against the Catalans. When no help came, many of her subjects fled to seek protection from the Venetians on the island of Negroponte, while she travelled westwards with the young Gautier to secure the assistance of her father Gautier de Châtillon, Constable of France; at Naples on 22 November 1312 she formally

1 For general background and extensive bibliographies, K. Setton, Catalan Domination of Athens: 1311-1388 (Cambridge, Mass., 1948); J. Longnon, L'empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée (Paris, 1949); Cambridge Medieval History, iv, part 1 (revised: Cambridge, 1966). Too much of what has been accepted in many standard works derives from K. Hopf, Geschichte Griechenlands vom Begin des Mittelalters bis auf die neuere Zeit, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1867-1868) [=Hopf, i-ii], which is unreliable and hard to control, especially since it is partly based on the Angevin documents in the Archivio di Stato, Naples [=Naples], which were destroyed in 1943. The undocumented and inaccurate genealogies in K. Hopf, Chroniques gréco-romanes inédites ou peu connues (Berlin, 1873) [=Hopf, CGR], are largely derived from his earlier work. The present study is based as far as possible on the original texts; it ignores many secondary works and attempts no systematic indication of the numerous past errors, but since so little material relating to fourteenth-century Greece survives considerable detail has been included. Inevitably, more material on the present topic remains to be exploited, especially among the sources of French and Italian history, and above all among material which does survive at Naples. The archives of the Counts of Conversano apparently contain nothing relevant to the present study: G. Monti, Nuovi studi angiosini (Trani, 1937), 375.
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constituted him baillii of the Brienne possessions. Gautier de Brienne had come of age by January 1321, when he was compelled to accept liability for part of the debts incurred by his parents in the defence of the family lands in Greece. His marriage to Beatrice, daughter of his overlord Philippe of Anjou, who was Prince of Taranto, Prince of Achaea and titular Emperor of Constantinople, increased Gautier’s prestige, though as titular Duke of Athens and Neopatras, Count of Brienne in Champagne and Count of Lecce in the Kingdom of Naples, he was a grand and influential magnate in his own right, with extensive possessions and interests. Gautier was always eager for power and ready to oppress his own vassals. The Florentine chronicler Giovanni Villani, naturally critical of Gautier after his tyrannical rule in Florence, described him as cruel, cunning, avaricious, proud and dictatorial, and noted that he was ‘nourished in Greece and Apulia rather than France.

By March 1312 Jeanne de Châtillon was sending men and horses from Italy to Greece under Guillaume de Usez. Support came from Robert of Anjou, King of Naples, and from the pro-Angevin French popes at Avignon, who excommunicated the Catalan usurpers and promoted attacks on them. In 1312 Pope Clement V ordered the Master of the Hospitallers at Rhodes to assist Philippe of Anjou, Prince of Achaea, in driving out the Catalans. In 1313 he permitted Gautier de Brienne’s kinsman Gautier, Bishop of Negroponte, to reside away from Negroponte, for the Catalans were harassing the island. In 1314 Clement V instructed that the Templars’ properties in the Duchy of Athens should be handed over to Gautier de Châtillon; he also invoked the intervention of Jaime II of Catalunya-Aragon against his fellow Catalans, and he commanded the Master of Rhodes to provide three or four galleys and a military force to defend those places, presumably in the Argolid, which were still holding out. Jeanne and Gautier de Châtillon sent provisions to their followers at Argos and Nauplia. They also tried to secure from the Venetians the shipping and the large sums of money necessary for an attack on Athens, but in 1318 the Venetians evaded these requests, reporting that the scheme could not succeed since the Brienne vassals at Argos and Nauplia had come to terms with the Catalans. In fact Gautier and François de Foucherolles were defending Argos for the Brienne, and in August 1319 Pope John XXII wrote to encourage their resistance. It was the Venetians who in 1319 made a pact with the Catalans, and in the coming decades a major reason for Gautier de Brienne’s failure to reconquer Athens was the persistent refusal of Venice to provide military and naval assistance against its Catalan allies.

After 1321 Gautier continued to supply his Argolid castles from Italy, but his Apulian lands were continually being invaded, pawned and subjected to litigation, and he had long had great difficulty in paying his endless debts and providing the

---

4 Hopf, i, 424, and many others date the marriage to 1325, but R. Gaggese, Roberto I d’Angio e i suoi tempi, 2 vols. (Florence, 1922–1930), ii, 304, 335, n. 2, citing Naples, Reg. Ang. 221, f. 133–133 v; 239, f. 60–61 v, shows Gautier married by May 1321.
5 Giovanni Villani, Cronica, ed. F. Dragomanni, iv (Florence, 1845), 6, 9 et passim.
6 Hopf, i, 411, citing Naples, Reg. Ang. 195 (1310 C), f. 89.
70 knights whose service he owed to the crown. He repeatedly announced his coming invasion of Greece; this secured him exemptions and financial favours from the crown, but for years there was no effective action. In 1326 he was serving as a captain in Tuscany, and by 1328 he had even concluded a truce with the Catalans of Athens. Finally, strong Angevin backing enabled him to launch an expedition. In March 1331 he sent Corrado Guindazzo to Argos and Nauplia to inspect the terrain, but when he left Brindisi in August he sailed not to the Argolid but to Epirus, which he invaded with a force which included 800 French cavalry and 500 Tuscan foot. Villani remarked that Gautier had too few troops for a quick victory but too many for the long, expensive siege campaign in which the Catalans tied him down. A year later Gautier was back in Italy. Possibly he had not even visited Argos and Nauplia, and his only permanent conquests were the Adriatic island of Leucadia and the nearby port of Vonitza in Epirus, to which he had claims through his wife Beatrice, whose mother Thamar was the daughter of Nicephorus I, Despot of Epirus.

Despite this failure, Gautier intermittently renewed his attempts to organise an attack on Athens. He negotiated with Venice, but he also fought against the English in France; and in 1342 he became signore of Florence, though the Acciaiuoli and other leading families soon expelled him. King Robert of Naples died in 1343 and the subsequent ascendancy at the Neapolitan court of Niccolò Acciaiuoli, who had his own Greek interests, further diminished Gautier's influence. In the same year Pope Clement VI, faced with mounting Turkish aggression in the Aegean, moderated the papal campaign against the Catalans. None the less, in December 1351 Gautier was preparing to set out for Greece from Brienne in Champagne. The Venetians had continued to refuse effective military aid, and on 2 January 1352 they once again declined to allow Gautier to arm ships at Venice although they were prepared to supply him with provisions. By 17 February 1352 Gautier was in Lecce, but in the following years he was distracted by campaigns at Taranto, Brindisi and elsewhere in Apulia, at a time when the whole Neapolitan kingdom was in confusion. On 8 September 1354 he was at Naples, but later he returned to France. At Paris on 18 October 1355 Gautier granted the island of Leucadia and its castles as a fief to Graziano Giorgio of Venice.

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Hopf, i, 426, citing Naples, Reg.Ang. 282 (1930), l. 173.}
\footnote{A document of Gautier (21 December 1351) referred to his kinsman Guillaume de Mello qui nous doit suivre es parties de Romanie: quoted in M. Huillard-Bréholles, \textit{Titres de la maison ducale de Bourbon}, i (Paris, 1867), 451.}
\footnote{Archivio di Stato, Venice; Misti del Senato \textit{[=Misti]}, xxvi, f. 77 v. Note that the pencil foliations of Venice documents are generally those cited; Hopf worked from and cited the unreliable modern copies.}
\footnote{Text cited in H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, \textit{'Catalogue d'actes des comtes de Brienne: 950-1356,' Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, xxxiii (1872), 185-186.}}
\footnote{Text quoted in J. Buchon, \textit{Nouvelles recherches historiques sur la principauté française de Morée}, i (Paris, 1843), 83, n. 1.}
\footnote{A. Luttrell, \textit{'Vonitza in Epirus and its Lords: 1306-1377,' Rivista di studi bizantini e neoolenici, xi (=ns. i) (1964), 135.}}
\end{footnotes}
9 September 1356, Gautier de Brienne, Constable of France, was killed in battle at Poitiers.

Gautier de Brienne had drawn up his will at Hesdin in Flanders on 18 July 1347, and it reflected his Greek interests. Having no surviving children, either by Beatrice of Anjou or by his second wife Jeanne de Brienne, he left his possessions in France, around Lecce and Conversano in Apulia, and in Greece and Cyprus to his sister Isabelle. In Greece he held Leucadia and Vonitza, in addition to Argos, Nauplia and two other castles in the Argolid, one at Thermission, the other at Kiveri on the coast near Nauplia; he bequeathed a month’s wages to his constables and sergeants at these six castles. He endowed a chantry at Kiveri, and made bequests to the church at Argos, to the chapels of his castles at Argos and Nauplia, to the Franciscans at Clarenza and Patras, and to the Dominicans at Clarenza. Those he named as executors, including a number of them Frenchmen with Greek connections, included his tres chers et amez compagnons: Renaud de Lor, Archbishop of Taranto, later Archbishop of Patras; his brother Gautier de Lor, who had been with Gautier de Brienne in Florence as his marshal in 1343 and who later became Angevin bailli or vicegerent in the Principality of Achaea; Robert de Châteauneuf, Archbishop of Salerno, also to become Bailli of Achaea; Nicolas de Foucherolles and Boniface de Prothimo, both Gautier’s vassals in the Argolid; Anthonace de Plancy; and the Bishop of Argos. In Cyprus, Gautier’s proctor did homage to the king for his estates there. These consisted of the casali of Dischoria, Conodra and Omorphita near Nicosia, which were producing some 16,700 besants annually in 1356; the lands were worked by slaves and the profits were sent westwards through Italian bankers. Gautier’s bailli in Cyprus, Cosimo de’ Medici of Athens, was replaced in about February 1354 by Raouche de Monteron. In 1356 Raouche journeyed to Lecce where he saw Gautier’s nephew Jean d’Enghien, at whose command he then travelled to Nauplia and thence back to Cyprus.

Gautier’s lands in the Argolid, which he held as a vassal of the Angevin Princes of Achaea, were of some value for their products and incomes. The Argolid had been ravaged by the Catalans during the decade following 1311 and apparently by Umur, the Turkish Emir of Aydin in Anatolia, in 1332; in 1333 and 1334 large quantities of grain had to be sent to Gautier’s castles in Romania following several years of famine. Yet despite the plague, Turkish razzias and the consequent

19 Libro de los fechos, 150.
21 Gille de la Plainche, Bailli of Achaea, sealed the will of Gautier’s father at Zeitoun on 10 March 1311: text quoted in Hopf, CGR, 537.
22 Unknown to C. Eubel, Hierarchia catholica medii aevi, i (Münster, 1913), 105–106.
23 Text in Recueil des historiens des croisades: lbs, ii (Paris, 1843), 386.
25 Diplomatar. doc. 171 (ca. 1338).
26 Diplomatar. doc. 110.
27 E. Lemerle, 122.
28 Caggese, ii, 359, nn. 6–7, citing Naples, Reg. Ang. 289, f. 62; 293, f. 182 v, 188 v, 205.
depopulation, the Morea continued to enjoy a certain agrarian prosperity and to support a not inconsiderable population; in fact, the inhabitants of Argos claimed in 1451 that the Turks had enslaved as many as 14,000 persons there in 1397. There were vineyards around Argos with grazing in the hills and plains, and fishing at Nauplia; other products included cereals, cotton and linen. Carobs, raisins, resin and acorn dye for tanning were being exported in 1378; there was a trade in cloth; and there were valuable saltings at Thermision near the tip of the Argolid peninsula. This economy supported the town of Argos, protected by its great fortress dominating the Argolid plain, while the port of Nauplia was well placed at the head of the Bay of Nauplia on a rocky promontory with an excellent fortified harbour and only a short landward wall to defend.

On Gautier de Brienne's death in 1356 his lands and claims did not pass to his sister Isabelle, though she was apparently still alive in 1361. They went to Gautier's nephews, the sons of Isabelle de Brienne and Gautier d'Enghien. The eldest son, Gautier, had died in 1340, and it was Solier d'Enghien who became titular Duke of Athens and Count of Brienne, while Jean became Count of Lecce and Lord of Vonitza and Leucadia, and Louis received the County of Conversano. The Brienne lands in Cyprus passed to Engelbert, who probably sold or abandoned them. Apparently Engelbert d'Enghien also received Argos and Nauplia but, being unwilling to defend them, he exchanged them for his brother Guy's part of the inheritance, Ramerupt in Champagne, where Engelbert took up residence. It was Guy d'Enghien who became Lord of Argos and Nauplia. Apparently he married into the local aristocracy and defended his lands stoutly against the Turks: Guido fuit vir bellicosus et acer in hostes, qui fortissime guidem, quaduix vivit, sed laboriosissime, propter Turcos qui sibi maximam inquietudinem ingerebant, terram suam rexit.

Guy's chief Frankish vassals were descended from a Jean de Foucherelles who married a daughter of Renaud de Veligour, Lord of Damala. In 1309 Gautier de Brienne confirmed Jean's son François and François' son Nicolas in their succession to certain lands inherited from Renaud. In 1319 François and his brother
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29 F. Thiriet, Régestes des délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Roumanie, 3 vols. (Paris, 1958–1961) [=Régestes], iii, no. 2865; the chroniclers reported over 30,000 enslaved (Zakythinos, i, 157).
31 Régestes, iii, nos. 2598, 2694, 2866, 2888, 3093 (mid fifteenth-century documents).
32 Misti, xxxvi, f. 56.
33 The comerale de fusaines at Argos in 1347 (Hofp, CGR, xxix, 537).
34 A document of 1451 reported: in el castello de Termis, se trova le piu notable saline che sia in tutt Levante, de lequel se poria casar un pozo d'oro...
35 (Régestes, iii, no. 2866); on salt exports in 1384, infra, 43.
37 Du Chesne, 354.
38 Epitaph in E. Matthieu, Histoire de la ville d'Enghien (Mons, 1876/8), 68; Hofp, CGR, 474, wrongly gives 1358.
39 According to a document cited in O. Vredius, Genealogia comitum Flandriae, ii (Bruges, 1643), 258.
40 All this appears in Chronographia regum francorum, ed. H. Moranville, ii (Paris, 1893), 321–322 (inaccurately annotated); apparently composed in France soon after 1415, this contains some accurate or partly accurate information about the Enghien in Greece and gives Guy's wife as a daughter of the 'Lord of Arkadia' (possibly Érard le Maure). Vredius, ii, 263, gives her as a Greek named Bonne or Maria (cf. infra, 55, n. 159).
Gautier, who was then Captain of Argos, were defending the Brienne possessions in the Argolid. On François’ death his lands passed to his son Nicolas, and thence to Nicolas’ daughter who married Jacomo, Lord of Tzoya in the Western Morea. The Assizes of Romania, the old feudal customs of Achaea, stated that the husband of a wife who held a fief should do homage for it to the lord, and in December 1364 Guy issued letters from his castle at Nauplia reducing to four armed men the service due from Jacomo de Tzoya, his ‘dear and well-loved knight and companion,’ and from Jacomo’s heirs in perpetuity, for the fief which Jacomo held ‘by reason of his wife.’ Following his wife’s death, there was trouble over her fief, for according to the Assizes of Romania fiefs passed by primogeniture to the children, and on the death of his mother her son Niccolò had to ask to be invested with the fief. Jacomo de Tzoya, having held the fief while his wife was alive, contested his son’s rights. On 15 February 1376 a court consisting mostly of Italians found in Jacomo’s favour, and Guy d’Enghien subsequently decided that he should hold the fief and owe the service of three armed men for it.\textsuperscript{40}

Though the Enghien were among the last of the great French families established in the Morea, their position in Greece, like that of the Angevin themselves, partly depended on their strength as Italian magnates. Jean and Louis inherited lands in Apulia and married into the Neapolitan nobility, but they did not acquire sufficient power to exert any great influence in the Morea, which was suffering from Turkish invasions and the unruliness of the great barons and the local populace. In 1360 the Greek and other inhabitants of Argos and Nauplia shut up Guy d’Enghien’s men in their strongholds in protest against restrictions on the sale of figs and raisins imposed by Guy’s bailli, Averardo de’ Medici.\textsuperscript{41} The Enghien position at Vonitzia and Leucadia was even more precarious. On 24 August 1359 Jean d’Enghien wrote from Lecce complaining to the Venetian government that Graziano Giorgio, who held Leucadia as his vassal, was attacking Vonitzia, damaging lands and fisheries there and imprisoning the inhabitants. The Venetians refused to enforce the cessation of the attacks or to secure the payment of reparations, but they did write admonishing Graziano. At some point in the next few years Leucadia was, apparently, seized by Leonardo Tocco, who by 1373 at the latest had also secured Vonitzia, with or without the consent of the Enghien who seem to have abandoned their claims both to Leucadia and Vonitzia.\textsuperscript{42}

During this period the brothers were distracted by events outside Greece. In 1356 Jean d’Enghien was serving in Apulia as a captain under Robert of Anjou, Prince of Taranto and Achaea, titular Emperor of Constantinople,\textsuperscript{43} and in August 1359 he was at Lecce.\textsuperscript{44} On 27 March 1363 Pope Urban V called upon Jean and Louis, among many other Neapolitan nobles, to give assistance to Jaime of Mallorca, husband of Jeanne of Anjou, Queen of Naples. Guy was in Greece, and on 19 September 1363 the pope exhorted him, with the other magnates in the Morea, to

\textsuperscript{40} Texts and discussion infra, 52–55; cf. texts in P. Topping, Feudal Institutions as revealed in the Assizes of Romania (Philadelphia, 1949), 34, 41, 48, 52, 65, 143.

\textsuperscript{41} Text infra, 51.

\textsuperscript{42} Luttrell, 138–139; exactly how and when Tocco acquired Leucadia and Vonitzia is still unclear.


\textsuperscript{44} Diplomatari, doc. 238.
support the newly-elected Archbishop of Patras. Then in March 1364 Solier d’Enghien, who had remained in Flanders, was beheaded by Albert of Bavaria. His title as Duke of Athens and Count of Brienne passed to his young son Gautier, and by 12 July 1364 Pierre d’Ameil, Archbishop of Naples, had written to Jean d’Enghien at Lecce urging him to go to look after the young Gautier’s affairs in Flanders. The archbishop was scheming to marry Gautier to a Sicilian noblewoman, Costanza, the daughter of Giovanni di Randazzo, the Siculo-Aragonese Duke of Athens and Neopatras, from whom she took her courtesy title of Duchess of Athens; but nothing came of these plans for an alliance which could have united the two rival claims to the duchies. On Solier’s death, Engelbert d’Enghien summoned his brothers Jean and Louis from Italy. Jean had reached Flanders by about June 1364, and he launched a war of revenge which was only concluded by a peace on 11 April 1367; Louis was also in Flanders in December 1366. Jean was still at Enghien on 6 June 1367 when he wrote to the Venetian consul at Bruges about a galley left at Venice by Gautier de Brienne, which Jean had subsequently sold.

On 22 July 1362 Guy d'Enghien, ‘Lord of Argos and Nauplia in Romania’ became a citizen of Venice, where a proctor swore fealty on his behalf. In December 1364 he was in his castle at Nauplia, and soon after he became involved in the civil war which followed the death of Robert of Anjou, Prince of Achaea, in September 1364. Robert left no direct heir and the rival claimants were his younger brother Philippe of Taranto and his widow Marie de Bourbon, who claimed the Principality of Achaea as part of her dowry on behalf of her son by an earlier marriage, Hugues de Lusignan, titular Prince of Galilee. Philippe of Taranto appointed Simone del Poggio of Perugia to rule in the Morea as his bailli, but Guillaume de Talay, who was defending the castle of Navarino for Marie de Bourbon, captured the new bailli and held him prisoner. During the ensuing siege of Navarino Guillaume de Talay sought help from Guy d’Enghien and from Manuel Cantacuzenus, the Greek Despot of the Morea, who raised their followers and overran the plain behind Clarenza, doing damage estimated at over 20,000 florins. There was a temporary peace in 1366 but Hugues de Lusignan was able to continue the struggle, still with the assistance of Guy and Manuel, until by an agreement concluded at Naples on 4 March 1370 Hugues was bribed to abandon his claims to the Principality of Achaea.

Since their inheritance of the Brienne lands in 1356, the position of the Enghien in Greece had been weak. Leucadia and Vonitza were lost; the Bourbon attachment involved them on the weaker side in prolonged civil strife; they lacked powerful
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46 Matthieu, 77; K. Setton, in Speculum, xxvii (1953), 682–683, n. 116; Loenertz (1955), 118–120, 156. Diplomata, docs. 312, 314–315, belong to 1364; Setton shows that Hopf, i, 453, and others, including recently L. Nicolau d’Olwer, La duquesa d’Athenes i els ‘documents misteriosos’ (Barcelona, 1958), 59–62 et passim, contain serious chronological and other confusions on these points.
48 Archivio di Stato, Venice; Libri Commemorali [= Commemorali], vii, f. 92; reply in Gregorovius-Lampros, iii, 366–367.
49 Commemorali, vi, f. 143.
50 Infra, 53.
51 Libro de las fechas, 152–155, but many details await elaboration; the date of 4 March 1370 is given in Hopf, ii, 9, citing Naples, Arche Angiov. K.m. 31, n. 18; D.m. 31, n. 83; Fasc. Ang. BBB, f. 71; DDD f. 76, 78.
allies. Then in 1370 Philippe of Taranto sent Louis d’Enghien, Count of Conversano, to govern the Morea as Baili of Achaea, and during the brief period in which Louis held that office²² the Enghien made a serious attempt to recover the Duchies of Athens and Neopatras from the enfeebled Catalans. This new project, which meant that the Enghien exchanged their opposition to the Angevin in the Morea for an attack on the Catalans made with Angevin encouragement, apparently formed part of the general settlement of March 1370. At Naples on 28 March Queen Jeanne of Naples granted a request from Jean d’Enghien, Count of Lecce, to be allowed to use vessels from her ports to transport 1000 men and 500 horses, and Jean subsequently tried to collect shipping in Apulia, at Bari and along the coast as far as Brindisi.⁵³ At the same time Jean, Louis and Guy sent envoys to Venice claiming the duchies as heirs of Gautier de Brienne, no mention being made of their nephew Gautier d’Enghien. They stated that they were about to attack the Catalans with a large army and, as citizens of Venice, they requested: firstly, that their shipping should be free from attacks by the Venetians; secondly, that they should be allowed to set up stores of provisions on the island of Negroponte; thirdly, that the Venetian baili at Negroponte should be ordered always to give prompt justice to their men; and finally, that these favours should be guaranteed for the future by letters from the Doge. The Venetian senate replied on 22 April, accepting the first demand, rejecting the second on account of their truce with the Catalans, declaring that the third required no special order, and evading the fourth. Early in 1371 Jean d’Enghien sent envoys who again pointed out his family claims to the duchies, reminding the Venetians that the Catalans were usurpers and excommunicates. He demanded that the Catalans should not be allowed to send their cattle to safety on Negroponte, that the subjects of the Prince of Achaea who inhabited the island should be able freely to join the Enghien, that the Enghien soldiers should be permitted to forage and secure provisions and supplies there, and that Venice should provide them with a large galley. On 2 February 1371 these requests were politely rejected, the Venetians again emphasizing their truce with the Catalans.⁵⁴

In the following months Louis d’Enghien, having made a pact with Manuel Cantacuzenus, ruler of the Greek despotate in the south-east of the Morea, set about raising troops. Assembling the men of the Morea, he invaded the Catalan duchies and ravaged the land. He occupied Athens but the castle on the Acropolis was too strong for him; after a while he fell ill and returned with his men to the Morea.⁵⁵ By August 1371 his brother Guy had concluded a truce with the Catalans; announcing this to the Venetian government on 9 August, Giovanni Delfin the Venetian baili on Negroponte sought permission, granted him by the senate on 23 September, to occupy the Catalan castle at Megara, perhaps in the capacity of arbitrator between the Enghien and the Catalans. Soon after, the treaty was modified, and it was agreed that the projected marriage between Joan de Lluria.

²² According to Libro de los fechos, 155, Louis became baili some time after the conclusion of peace (i.e. after 4 March 1370 ?), and was replaced after his campaign against Athens, apparently late in 1371.

⁵³ Text in S. Santeramo, Codice Diplomatico Barletiano, iii (Barletta, 1957), 21-22.

⁵⁴ Diplomatari, docs. 317 (correct date 1371), 320.

⁵⁵ Libro de los fechos, 155, without precise date, but the invasion presumably took place after the appeal answered from Venice in February 1371.
Lord of Stiris near Thebes and probably the son of the late Catalan marshal Roger de Lluria, and Guy’s daughter Marie, heiress apparent to Argos and Nauplia, should after all take place, despite the clause in the treaty revoking it.66

In the end there was no Catalan marriage. The Enghien position in Greece worsened and they lost the initiative in pressing their claims, while as the Catalans grew weaker and the Ottomans more aggressive, the papacy could no longer sanction attacks on Athens and Thebes. In 1372 Pope Gregory XI summoned a congress of almost all the Latin rulers of Greece and the Aegean who were to meet at Thebes to discuss measures against the Turks; the congress never took place, but the Enghien were conspicuous absentees from the list of those invited.67 Even after the truce of 1371 Guy d’Enghien would scarcely have visited the capital of his greatest enemies. The Enghien lacked strength and allies, and they were again distracted by events outside Greece. Jean and Louis were both in Apulia for at least part of 1372;68 then in 1373 Jean, who had married Sancia de Baux, died and was succeeded as Count of Lecce by their son Pierre; he also left two daughters, Marie and Francesca.69 In May 1374 Louis, Count of Conversano, was fighting in Apulia against Sancia’s brother François de Baux, who had risen in revolt against Jeanne of Anjou, Queen of Naples.60 After the death of Philippe of Taranto in November 1373, the barons of the Morea had recognised Jeanne as Princess of Achaea, but François claimed the principality through his wife Margherita of Taranto, who was Philippe’s sister. This quarrel was settled later in 1374, and towards the end of the year Pierre d’Enghien was planning a pilgrimage; on 1 October 1374 he received a papal licence to send a ship to Egypt or Syria, and to visit Jerusalem.61 Not until 6 May 1376 did Pierre make his formal entry into Lecce, accompanied by his uncles Louis d’Enghien and François de Baux.62

The Enghien claims suffered a further blow when Megara, which lay between Corinth and Athens, was seized from the Catalans, in 1374 or very early in 1375, by Nerio Acciaiuoli. Nerio’s father Niccolò Acciaiuoli had been granted Corinth by Robert of Anjou in 1358 and had been expected to help the Enghien during the revolt at Argos and Nauplia in 1360, but Nerio, unlike his father, did not depend on the favour of the Angevin, and at Megara he was occupying territory claimed by the Enghien.63 Guy d’Enghien was alive at Nauplia in October 1376,64 but he died soon after and for a short time his brother Louis, Count of Conversano, administered Argos and Nauplia on behalf of Guy’s young daughter Marie. While acting as Marie’s guardian Louis settled a debt of a 1000 ducats, which Guy had owed to his vassal Jacomo de Tzoya, by granting Jacomo another fief. More important, he arranged Marie’s marriage, which was apparently concluded by Louis’ proctor at Venice on 17 May 1377, to Pietro Cornaro of Venice;65 possibly Louis was still

65 Diplomataria, docs. 336–337; there is no evidence that the congress took place.
66 D. Morea—F. Muciciaccia, Le pergamene di Conversano (Trani, 1942), doc. 140.
67 A. Cutolo, Maria d’Enghien (Naples, 1922), 19.
70 Cutolo, 20.
71 Setton, 65–68, 78; text of 1360, infra, 51.
72 Text infra, 53.
hoping to involve Venice against the Catalans. On 16 July at Venice the senate gave Pietro's father Federigo Cornaro permission to arm a galley to bring his daughter-in-law Marie to Venice, and on 8 March 1378 it conceded him a ship to carry supplies for the defence of 'his places' of Argos and Nauplia.66

Louis d'Enghien's control in the Argolid presumably came to an end at about this time. Enghien influence in Greece had almost evaporated, but Louis may have undertaken a final sortie against the Catalans. During 1378 Latin Greece was in turmoil. Federigo III of Aragon, King of Sicily and Duke of Athens and Neopatras, died in July 1377. For a while his daughter Maria acted as Duchess of Athens, but in 1379 the inhabitants of the duchies recognised King Pedro IV of Catalunya-Aragon as Duke of Athens and Neopatras. Venice and Genoa were at war, and Queen Jeanne of Naples, having leased the Principality of Achaea to the Hospitallers of Rhodes in mid-1377, became involved in the conflicts provoked by the schism in the papacy in 1378. An invasion of Epirus by an expedition of Hospitallers, launched by Pope Gregory XI and led by Juan Fernández de Heredia, Master of Rhodes, sailed to Voinitz in Epirus early in 1378, and was defeated by the Albanian Lord of Arta during the summer. Probably in 1379, possibly in the spring, the Navarrese mercenaries, who were at one point employed by the Hospitallers, attacked the Catalans and captured Thebes with the assistance of Nerio Acciaiuoli, Lord of Corinth and Megara, and of certain Hospitallers.67 In 1378 Marie d'Enghien's Catalan ex-fiancé Joan de Lluria, Lord of Stiris, had become the prisoner of Louis d'Enghien, who still held him captive in 1381.68 Possibly therefore Louis, while acting as Marie's guardian in the Argolid, had launched a raid against the Catalans during the year before the Navarrese campaign.

The Venetian family which gained control of Argos and Nauplia was extremely powerful. The Cornaro had long held lands and offices in Crete, which Andrea Cornaro governed as Duca di Candia from 1341 to 1343; they were lords of Skarpathos and other islands between Crete and Rhodes;69 and when Andrea Cornaro married the widow of the last Pallavicini Marquis of Boudonitza in 1312, they gained a temporary foothold on Negroponte and at Boudonitza in mainland Greece.70
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66 Misti, xxxvi, f. 23 v, 56.
68 On 8 May 1381 Pedro IV of Aragon, from distant Zaragoza, wrote: quod dictus Johannes, tres anni afluxerunt, fuit et adhuc detinetur captus in posse comitis de Convera . . . (Diplomatarii, doc. 714).
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This gives 1378; Loenertz (1955), 136, dates Joan's capture to 1377, and mistakenly describes Louis as Angevin bailli. No more is known of Joan de Lluria. Louis' movements are obscure. On 20 November 1378 the pope, at Fondi, granted him a supposition: K. Hanquet, Documents relatifs au Grand Schisme, i = Analecta Vaticano-Belgica, viii (Rome, 1924), 188. An inscription formerly at Conversano read, Hoc opus fieri fecit Lodovico de Enchino Comes Capersani. Anno Domini 1380: G. Bolognini, Storia di Conversano (Bari, 1935), 91, n. 5.
69 Hopf, i-ii, passim; S. Borsari, Il dominio veneziano a Creta nel XIII secolo (Naples, 1963), 21, n. 37, 23, n. 52, 77, n. 56, 81-82, 90, 102-103, 153-154; F. Thiriet, La Romanie méridionale au moyen âge (Paris, 1959), 162-163, 274-276, 296, 350-333; Régister, i, nos. 32, 34, 64, 118, 147, 172, 197, 286, 322, 446, 555.
70 References in Setton, 30-34.
They were one of the few Venetian families which successfully maintained a certain independence of their government. The greatest and wealthiest member of the house, Federigo Cornaro di Santa Lucia, developed something approaching a foreign policy of his own. By about 1360 he was advantageously established in Cyprus in partnership with his brothers Marco and Fantin. A financier and business magnate, Federigo raised money in Italy and invested it in his extremely lucrative sugar plantations in Cyprus; in 1379 he was the richest man in Venice. King Pierre I of Cyprus, to whom Federigo loaned 60,000 ducats, three times stayed at Palazzo Cornaro in Venice. Federigo stood proxy for King Pierre II of Cyprus at the king’s marriage to Valentina Visconti at Milan in April 1376, and he was employed on diplomatic missions by the King of France as well as by the Venetian republic.71

It was Federigo’s son Pietro Cornaro who married Marie d’Enghien in 1377; she was less than fourteen years old,72 and he was probably young as well. It is unlikely that Marie brought the Cornaro any considerable dowry in cash, and presumably their interest was in Argos and Nauplia. Federigo Cornaro may have felt that difficulties lay ahead in Cyprus and that he should diversify his operations by establishing a branch of his family in the Argolid, with its commercial opportunities and its salt. Support was forthcoming from the Venetian government, which must have sensed the long-term possibility of securing a naval base at Nauplia. On 16 July 1377 the senate, acting pro honori nostri domini, lent Federigo a galley which he was to arm at his own expense to transport Marie to Venice; on 8 March 1378 he was conceded a ship to take supplies to defend ‘his places’ of Argos and Nauplia, and to bring raisins, resin, carobs and acorn dye back to Venice.73 Meanwhile the Venetians had launched upon a great war with Genoa, and Federigo Cornaro was hard hit by heavy war taxation and by his failure to recover monies lent to the King of Cyprus. Yet when peace came in 1381 Federigo secured favourable privileges for his family in Cyprus, and though his executors faced bankruptcy proceedings after his death in 1382, the Cornaro were able to sustain their interest in the Argolid.74

Pietro Cornaro ruled with Marie d’Enghien at Argos and Nauplia. For example, they confirmed Jacomo de Tzoya in possession of the fief he had received from Louis d’Enghien, while Pietro granted a vineyard at Argos to a certain Leo Pigassi.75 On 14 November 1381 the Venetians conceded Federigo Cornaro, acting for Marie d’Enghien, permission to buy a galley to defend Argos and Nauplia against the Turks ‘and other pirates’, and when on 16 March 1383 Pietro Cornaro was permitted to travel with his company on a Venetian galley to defend Argos and Nauplia, the senate considered those places more or less as Venetian possessions:

Cum loca nobilis viri ser Petri Cornario, quondam ser Phedericci, scilicet Argos et Neapolis, fuerint et sint ad honorem nostri dominij, et pro omni bono respectu, pro statu nostro, faciat quod dicta loca consenventur in manibus dicti ser Petri, ad honorem nostri dominij ...76

71 L. de Mas-Latrie, Histoire de l’ile de Chypre sous le regne des princes de la maison de Lusignan, ii–iii (Paris, 1852–1855), ii, 365, 372–373; iii, 817; G. Hill, A History of Cyprus, ii (Cambridge, 1948), 328, n. 1; 423, n. 3; 427, n. 2; G. Luzzatto, Studi di storia economica veneziana (Padua, 1954), 118–123, 135–136, 281 (but Luzzatto, 119, 121, confuses Marie d’Enghien with Marie de Bourbon);

72 F. Lane, in Nuova rivista storica, xlix (1965), 71–75. The Cornaro deserve further study.

73 Infra, 47.

74 Misti, xxxvii, f. 23 v, 56.

75 Mas-Latrie, ii, 378–381; Hill, ii, 428–429; Luzzatto, 122, 281.

76 Infra, 49.

77 Misti, xxxvii, f. 25 v; xxxviii, f. 14 v.
On 25 April 1384 Pietro was licensed to import into Venice 150 modia of salt from Argos and Nauplia. 

Early in 1385 Pietro was in Venice and due to return to Argos in March. The Dominican Jacopo, Bishop of Argos since 1367 and an agent of the Acciaiuoli, who was to return with Pietro Cornaro, referred to him as dominus patrie Argolicensis; he had, in effect, become Lord of Argos and Nauplia, and was addressed as such by the King of Aragon on 17 August 1386. The towns may have suffered from the Turkish raids on the Morea during 1387, and the Venetian envoy commissioned on 3 October to treat with the Ottoman ruler Murad about these attacks was Daniele Cornaro. But by 1388 Pietro Cornaro was dead, and in that year Marie sold Argos and Nauplia to Venice.

After 1388 the Enghien were completely without influence in Greece, but they did retain certain claims the precise nature of which was of considerable importance, since they could be used as a legal basis for new interventions there. Louis and Pierre d’Enghien became involved in the struggles of the Neapolitan kingdom. In January 1380 when Louis, Duke of Anjou and younger brother of Charles V of France, was negotiating to be adopted as the heir of Jeanne of Naples, the French envoys were empowered to secure the allegiance of the Counts of Lecce and Conversano, who as Frenchmen were expected to support Louis of Anjou. Jeanne was captured by her rival Charles of Anjou in July 1381 and assassinated in July 1382; Charles became King of Naples and was supported by Jacques de Baux, whose claims to the Principality of Achaea were recognised by the barons in the Morea late in 1381. In 1382 Louis d’Enghien and his nephew Pierre d’Enghien, Count of Lecce, rallied to Louis of Anjou, while Charles of Anjou confiscated and attacked their Apulian lands and on 11 February 1383 formally declared them rebels. Pierre d’Enghien was at Venice in 1382, where on 27 November, after a delay there of many days, he secured permission from the senate to hire or purchase a ship to take him ad domum suam. Louis was in Flanders, for on 7 July 1381 Gautier d’Enghien was killed at Ghent, and Louis, who inherited from him the County of Brienne, had travelled northwards from Italy to secure his new lands against the pretensions of his brother Engelbert; by 2 July 1382 he was at Hesdin, and he stayed in Flanders until 1384. Louis d’Enghien was at Troyes on 3 May 1384, on his way to support Louis of Anjou in Apulia, and he was present when Louis of Anjou made his will at Bari on 15 September 1384, shortly before his death; Louis d’Enghien was named an executor and swore to defend the rights of the young Louis II of Anjou.

A final abortive scheme for the revival of the Enghien claim to Athens seems to have been considered early in 1386 when Juan Fernández de Heredia, Master of
the Hospitallers of Rhodes, who was already negotiating to secure from Louis II of Anjou his claims to the Principality of Achaea, instituted an inquiry in Flanders as to who was the true heir to the Enghien claim. The position was somewhat doubtful, for at that point Louis d’Enghien was still alive but he had no surviving son. His nephew Pierre d’Enghien, Count of Lecce, who had married a sister of Waleran de Luxembourg, Count of Saint Pol, had died without issue in 1384; the County of Lecce then passed to Pierre’s sister, another Marie d’Enghien, who married first Raimondo de Baux-Orsini, and later, in 1407, Ladislas of Anjou, King of Naples. Louis d’Enghien, who remained in opposition to Charles of Anjou, apparently died between April 1387 and, at the latest, September 1390. Louis had married Giovanna di San Severino, and the County of Conversano passed to their daughter Margherita, whose husband Jean de Luxembourg became Count of Enghien, Brienne and Conversano. Jean was dead by 5 May 1395 and was succeeded by his son Pierre de Luxembourg, who was ultimately chased out of his Italian county by King Ladislas of Naples in 1407. In their documents neither Louis, Margherita, Jean nor Pierre took the title of Duke of Athens which technically passed to them. The Enghien claims to Athens and Neopatra had in effect lapsed, and their two Luxembourg marriages reflected a shift of interest away from the Mediterranean lands of which they gradually lost control. The Aragonese claim to the duchies also became merely theoretical when, in 1388, Athens itself was captured from the Catalans by Nerio Acciaiuoli; and on 11 January 1394 Nerio was created Duke of Athens by King Ladislas of Naples. When Nerio made his will at Corinth on 17 September 1394, just before his death, he directed that the property he had by then acquired in Argos should be used to endow both a weekly mass for his soul at Argos and a hospital for the poor to be established at Nauplia. His agent Jacopo Bishop of Argos was made an executor with powers to administer the nunnery Nerio had already founded at Nauplia.

The Enghien connection with Greece was all but ended, though after Marie d’Enghien’s death, in or before 1393, her uncle Engelbert d’Enghien sent letters to Venice, dated at Bruges on 24 June 1393, claiming Nauplia, Argos and Kiveri as Marie’s heir. The Venetians pointed out on 25 August 1393 that they had purchased full rights to these places in 1388, though Argos was not yet in their possession. However they agreed, cynically enough, that Engelbert should have both Argos

88 Hopf, ii, 47-49; J. Delaville le Roux, _Les Hospitalliers à Rhodes jusqu’à la mort de Philibert de Naillac_ : 1310-1421 (Paris, 1913), 220-224 (both with errors).
89 In May 1386 the Hospitallers’ treasurer at Avignon paid eight francs ‘pour envoi en brabant par devers frère hery de saincteron et autres commandeurs du paiz pour faire faire information si comme par monser le maistre me fut expressem ent mande de ceuls qui sont vraix heretiers du duchesme dathenes’ (Royal Malta Library, Valletta; Archives of the Order of St. John, codex 48, f. 124 v). Henri de Saint Trudon was Preceptor of Avalterre in Brabant (Delaville le Roux, 193, 206, n. 7).
90 Chronographia regum francesorum, iii, 38; her name was Marguerite (Vredius, ii, 260).
91 Cutolo, 32 et passim.
92 Naples, Reg. Ang. 361, f. 1; 365, f. 35, cited by N. Barone, in _Archivio storico per le province napoletane_, xii (1887), 499, 501; Matthieu, 101, without evidence, gives 1390; Hopf, i, 453, gives 17 March 1394.
93 Morea—Muciacci, xviii—xxiii; docs. 151-152, 156. In these documents Margherita, Jean and Pierre are not styled as Dukes of Athens; nor were Pierre’s descendants (Vignier, 621-622 et passim; Matthieu, 102-125 et passim). Vignier and subsequent authors contain numerous errors and confusions regarding the Enghien genealogy, but an undocumented seventeenth-century heraldic work (Biblioteca Nazionale, Naples; Ms. Brancacciana II A 7, f. 176) concords exactly with the details established in this paper.
94 Diplomatari, docs. 622, 643.
95 Text in Gregorovius—Lampros, iii, 146-152.
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and Nauplia if he would pay all the expenses incurred by Venice in acquiring and defending them. Engelbert was not satisfied and on 5 November 1394 the Venetians agreed to show his envoy the act by which Marie had sold the towns, and to tell him they were ready to give him both places, provided he paid the cost of the occupation of Nauplia and of the siege and conquest of Argos, which by then they held. The matter apparently ended there, and when Engelbert died on 12 February 1403 the Enghien interest in the Argolid was extinct. Few male members of the family had survived, and they lacked the allies or resources necessary to combat the new powers which controlled the Morea.

From about 1377 onwards the Morea was increasingly unsettled, while the Ottomans were making rapid advances in Northern Greece and the Balkans. In 1387 the situation worsened following the fall of Thessalonika and the subsequent Turkish razzia in the Morea. Theodore Palaeologus, the Despot of the Morea, paid tribute to the Ottomans and in August 1388 the Venetians, fearful of the consequences, sent a mission to try to wean him from the Turks. In that year Pietro Cornaro died; thereafter both Argos and Nauplia were left with no adequate defender, and Pietro’s widow Marie d’Enghien, to whom the towns belonged, became an important prize. Late in 1388, with the backing of his Turkish allies and his father-in-law Nerio Acciaiuoli, and with the support of the Greek and probably also some of the Latin inhabitants, Theodore attacked Argos and Nauplia. The Venetians were forced to act to secure a strategic base, in which a number of Venetians were already settled. By December Marie d’Enghien was at Venice and had agreed to sell Argos and Nauplia. On 12 December the government at Venice declared that this acquisition was not only useful but that it was necessary in order to prevent the towns falling to Nerio Acciaiuoli, tirannus cradelissimus and an enemy of Venice, in whose hands they would be dangerous:

nam sunt situata et potentia ad adquirendum totum residuum Amoree; et in dictis partibus, et in toto duchamine [Athenarum], non est aliqua terra nec aliquod castrum quod habeat portum pro defensione navigorum nisi terra Neapolis, que est etiam potens ad armandum duas galeas,...

Giovanni Gradonio of Venice had been sent from the Argolid with letters in which certain citizens and nobles begged the Venetians to take over Argos and Nauplia and thus exclude Nerio Acciaiuoli, and it was decided, by 51 votes against 7 with 4 abstentions, to purchase the places on certain conditions. On the same day, 12 December, Marie d’Enghien, then in Venice and said to be between 14 and 25 years of age, agreed to sell Argos and Nauplia to Venice; she and her heirs were to have an annual income in perpetuity of 500 gold ducats; she herself was to have an additional 200 ducats annually during her lifetime; and if she died without heirs, she might leave 2000 gold ducats to whom she pleased. On 17 December, in the house

94Misti, xlii, f. 129 v; xliii, f. 34. According to Chronographia regum francorum, ii, 322, Engelbert went to Venice and sold Argos, Nauplia and ‘Thebes’ pro magna pecunierum summa!
95Epitaph in Matthieu, 69 (Hopf, i, 453, wrongly gives 1392); Vredius, ii, 265, names Engelbert’s descendants.
97Archivio di Stato, Venice; Secreta Consili Rogatorum [=Rogatorum], E. f. 46 v.
of the heirs of Federigo Cornaro, she also promised, on pain of losing her incomes from Venice, that she would not remarry except to a Venetian noble.\textsuperscript{100} The Venetians thus acquired another naval base, but their enemies accused them of exerting pressure on Marie d’Enghien. Nerio’s brother Donato Acciaiuoli wrote that her relations treated her badly and that the Venetians ‘have kept the woman in Venice against her will and married her as they wish, so that they retain that barony.’\textsuperscript{101}

It required several years of energetic diplomatic campaigning before the Venetians were able to secure actual possession of both Argos and Nauplia. On 22 December 1388 the government at Venice decided to write to Albano Contarini of Venice, who was thought to be still holding the castle at Argos in the name of Marie d’Enghien against Theodore’s attacks, urging him to resist until 15 April when help would arrive; it was also decided to write to Marco Morosini at Nauplia, to the Bishop of Argos and to Jacomo de Tzoya. On 26 January 1389 Perazzo Malipiero was appointed provisor of Argos and Nauplia, but it was doubted whether he could secure either place; indeed by February it was believed in Venice that the walls of Argos had been knocked down. The Venetians had succeeded in occupying Nauplia by May, and in June they still hoped that at least the castle at Argos was resisting. Perazzo Malipiero had been ordered on 18 February to raise the local nobility in the Venetian cause, and on 22 June he was instructed to make payments to the faithful subjects of Venice who were in the castles at Argos, Nauplia and Kiveri.\textsuperscript{102} The Venetians were determined to win control of Argos from Theodore but they were divided as to how to do so, being reluctant to embark on large-scale military operations against Theodore and the Turks on a mainland reduced almost to anarchy. They attempted to impose an economic blockade; they tried to bribe Theodore; and they engaged in the most treacherous and complex negotiations with Pedro de San Superan, the Navarrese Prince of Achaea, who in 1389 captured Nerio Acciaiuoli and held him prisoner. In the end, however, Theodore had trouble with his own Greek nobles, and early in 1394 he broke with the Turks, who had demanded that he should cede Argos to them. A rapprochement with Venice naturally followed, and the Venetians occupied Argos on 11 June 1394. The treaty with Theodore previously concluded at Modon on 27 May provided that Argos, Kiveri and Thermision should be handed over to Venice with all rights enjoyed there by Pietro Cornaro and Marie d’Enghien. There was to be an amnesty for all those at Argos who were politically culpable towards Venice, and up to twenty families were to be allowed to leave Argos, provided they were free from debt.\textsuperscript{103}

There was already a considerable Venetian presence in the Argolid by 1388, and the new rulers sought to win the favour of the local notables. One of these, Jacopo Bishop of Argos, was in Venice in December 1389 and again early in 1391, acting

\textsuperscript{101} Text in J. Buchon, Recherches historiques sur la principauté française de Morée, ii (Paris, 1845), 499. Apparently Marie married Pasquale Zane of Venice and died before 28 January 1393 (Hopf, ii, 50).
\textsuperscript{102} Rogatorum E, f. 46 (22 December 1388); Misti, xl, f. 151 (26 January), 162–163 (18 February) [the text printed by E. Gerland from Hopf’s notes is seriously unreliable]; xli, f. 9 v (31 May), 19 v–20 v (22 June 1389). Cf. Régestes, nos. 743, 748, 753, 757.
\textsuperscript{103} G. Cessi, ‘Venezia e l’acquisto di Nauplia ed Argo,’ Nuovo archivio veneto, n.s. xxx (1915); Zakythinos, i, 130–143; Loenertz (1943), 168–165; Setton, 190–193; Régestes, i, nos. 753–865. This affair requires further study.
once more as an envoy for the Acciaiuoli. Another was the nobilis miles Gerardo de Laburda, a Venetian subject, who was confirmed on 23 April 1390 in the possession of the fief which had previously been conceded to Jacobus de Castronovo by the 'former lords' of Argos and Nauplia. On a later occasion in 1400, however, the Venetians refused to accept a privilege granting to a Leo Pigassi a vineyard at Argos which had once belonged to a priest called Nicholas Cocho, on the grounds that Pietro Cornaro had been wrongly informed when granting the privilege. Probably the most important of Venice's new vassals was Jacomo de Tzoya. In 1389 he was in Venice, and on 22 June he was ordered to remain there until news arrived from the Argolid; he was granted a small pension to cover his expenses in Venice since all his goods were in the city and territory of Argos. On 17 August he was at last permitted to leave for home, since his stay in Venice was affecting his health and his affairs. On 31 August 1389 the senate gave him permission to leave to one of his younger sons the fief in the Argolid which had once belonged to Boniface de Prothimo, and which Louis d'Enghien had granted to Jacomo after Guy d'Enghien's death in lieu of 1000 ducats owed him by Guy. He produced privileges to show that Pietro Cornaro and Marie d'Enghien had confirmed his possession of the fief. By the customs of the country it was due to pass on his death with all his other possessions to his eldest son, but since he had two other small sons who could expect no inheritance at all, and on account of the services he might be able to render the Venetians, they agreed to allow this fief to be left to whichever of the other sons he might choose, on condition that the eldest son was agreeable and that thereafter it should always pass to the eldest son, according to custom.

Argos and Nauplia were governed in much the same way as the other Venetian colonies in Romania, though with certain concessions to local conditions. Venetian officials were instructed to observe the customs of Argos and Nauplia, and to send a text of them to Venice for correction. Old privileges, such as exemptions from payments of wax granted in the times of Guy d'Enghien and his predecessors the Dukes of Athens, were recognised. The castles were repaired and kept in Venetian hands; the Venetians maintained garrisons in the towns and a galley at Nauplia; the population had to work on the fortifications, to guard the walls, to serve on the galley, and to assist in the manufacture of wax. Nauplia came under attack by the Turks in 1391, and even after 1394 Venetian lordship did not bring peace. Apart from the wars against the Greeks of the Morea, the plain of Argos suffered devastation by the Count of Cephalonia in 1395, and in 1397 Argos was overrun by the Turks, who enslaved large numbers of persons there. The Venetians imposed an effective taxation system and attempted to repopulate the Argolid by settling Albanians. For several decades there was a measure of prosperity, and it was only later in the fifteenth century, with the general crisis of the Latin Levant, that this turned into decline at Argos and Nauplia.

104 Misti, xli, f. 52 v; Régester, i, nos. 792, 800. 105 Misti, xli, f. 76. 106 Texts in Sathas, ii, 2–3, 18–20. 107 Misti, xli, f. 20 v, 32 v. A letter of 15 December 1379 had listed Jacomo among those in Greece to whom Lorenzo Acciaiuoli was advised to write (text in Gregorovius—Lampros, iii, 129–132). 108 Misti, xli, f. 35. 109 Régester, i, nos. 748, 761, 784, 792, 831, 861, 865, 886, 904–905, 936, 950, 967; ii–iii, passim. The numerous documents at Venice (cf. texts in Sathas, passim) would permit a much more detailed study of conditions in the Argolid during the period after 1394.
having passed to the Brienne and the Enghien, Italianate Frankish possessions, and from them to the great Venetian house of Cornaro with its wide Levantine interests, had become a link in the long chain of Venetian naval bases.

Anthony Luttrell

Appendix I

The Medici in Greece

The Medici were not among those Florentine houses which extended their business activities to Greek lands in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. In fact, by the 1340’s a number of the Medici were far from prosperous; some gave up banking and business and devoted themselves primarily to their estates, while others turned to crime. When Gautier de Brienne became signore of Florence in 1342 he had Giovanni di Bernardino de’ Medici decapitated, and other members of the family played a leading part in securing Gautier’s expulsion from Florence in 1343. Yet several Medici served Gautier in Greece. By the 1350’s certain Medici were well enough established there to have hellenized their name to Iatros; they described themselves as ‘of Athens’ although the Brienne whom they served had not held Athens itself since 1311. A certain Cosma d’Athinaise dit Yatro was Gautier de Brienne’s bailli in Cyprus. He was replaced in about February 1354 by Raouche de Monteron, whose accounts show that in 1356, on Gautier’s instructions, he paid 1000 besants owed by Gautier to Pierre Yatro d’Ataines. Cosimo apparently went to the Argolid, for a Cosmas ntatenes was a witness to the act, given in Greek at Nauplia in April 1357, by which Pierre tantenes called Iatros, who was acting as bailli and captain-general at Argos and Nauplia, confirmed the purchase of a house at Nauplia by Gregorio di Michele Catello of Messina.


112 Giovanni Villani, iv, 7, 28, 31, 45. Presumably it was only a coincidence that between 1314 and 1316 Gautier and his mother borrowed considerable sums from, and pawned lands in Apulia to Pierre Miège (also known as Petrus Medico or Petrus Meci seu Medici) of Toulon, galley-owner and money-lender at Marseille and Naples: details in Caggese, i, 217, n. 7, 240, n. 3; ii, 178, n. 5, 328, n. 1, 331; Histoire du Commerce de Marseille, ed. G. Rambert, ii (Paris, 1951), 29-31, n. 1, 151, n. 2.

113 Poncelet, 14, 26 et passim. Niccolò Acciaiuoli may have been referring to Piero dei’ Medici in writing, on 14 March 1356: . . . e Piero riuvera la sua terra piu tosto che non pensa (text in Léonard, iii, 589-590).

114 This document survives in a sixteenth-century copy (executed by Janus Lascaris and attested by Alexius Celadonius, Bishop of Molletta (not Amalfi) 1508-1517) from the Medici archives. It is now in Archivio di Stato, Florence; Carte orientali e greche, busta 2: text in Gregorovius—Lampros, ii, 738-740. Two drawings on the parchment, clumsily reproduced in W. Miller, Historia tes Phrangokratias en Helladi: 1204-1566, trans. S. Lampros, ii (Athens, 1909/10), 10, purport to show the baili’s ‘seal and counter-seal (antibouilla)’ mentioned in the text. One drawing depicts the Brienne seal with the inscription: GAVIERT DVC DE ATHISNES CONTE DE BRENE ET DE LICE SEIGNOR DE FIOIRA(N)CE 1342. The second drawing shows a seal with the Medici arms inscribed: PIERRE DE MEDICIS DE ATHISNES BAVILVS ET GNAL. CAP. DE ARGOS ET DE NEAPOLI DE ROMA; the date 1342 also appears, though not as part of the inscription on the seal but beneath the drawing. The document does not mention Gautier, who was dead by 1357; the drawings look suspect; and the date 1342 suggests that the inscriptions are at least partly unreliable. It seems unwise to conclude (as in Gregorovius—Lampros, ii, 232, n. 2, 670-671, and elsewhere) that Piero was already baili in 1342. Professor Peter Topping of Cincinnati University most generously supplied information and advice on this question, as on many others.
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Piero was presumably acting for Guy d'Enghien, and he was apparently succeeded by another Medici. On 3 July 1360 a Bartolo Talenti wrote from Venice to Giovanni Acciaiuoli of Florence, Archbishop-elect of Patras:

Sapiate monsigniore chome avemo per novele che lo cholettore del santo padre che mando in Patraso vende tutta biava e fa danari quanto elo pode, e per zo monsigniore farete bene a dare i spaco o di venire o di mandare per vedere i fatti vostrì. Anchora ordinate di dire o di far dire a monsigniore lo graade sinischalcho la dove fosse chome avemo per novele che i greci e altra gente citadini d’Argo e di Napoli di Romania si anno asediatì queli d’Anghi dentro nel donzo dele dette Argo e Napoli per che messer Arardo avea fatto dare bando per le dette tere che niuno dovese vendere ne fiche ne uva pasa senon ala chorte, e per zo ordinate che monsigniore lo sapia tosto per che sapra quello chara a fare.

Bartolo Talenti vi si rachomanda,

fatta in Vinega a di 3 di luio 1360.

(reverse)

Reverendissimo in Christo patri, et domino suo, domino Johanni, ecclesiae Patracensis Archiepiscopo dignissimo.118

The writer, probably Bartolomeo di Talento de’ Medici, was invoking the assistance of Niccolò Acciaiuoli, Grand Seneschal of the Kingdom of Naples, who had become Lord of Corinth in 1358. The Enghien bailli of 1360 was apparently an Averardo de’ Medici.

These Medici may well have been descendants of the Averardo de’ Medici who died in 1318/9, and whose sons included Talento, Salvestro, Jacopo and Giovenco detto Venturo. Talento’s son Bartolomeo was presumably the Bartolo Talenti who wrote from Venice in 1360. Salvestro’s son Averardo detto Bicci, the grandfather of the famous Cosimo, was in Florence in 1360, and the Arardo then at Argos was possibly Jacopo de’ Averardo’s son Averardo, who was certainly still alive in 1353.119 Averardo di Jacopo’s wife Giovanna di Bencivieni Baroncelli117 was perhaps related to Aldobrandino Baroncelli of Florence, who acted in Greece as an agent for the Acciaiuoli.118 Giovenco detto Venturo’s grandson Piero di Francesco119 may have been Piero de’ Medici of Athens. This Piero de’ Medici was still alive at Nauplia in October 1376.120 He held lands around Corinth from the Acciaiuoli Lords of Corinth, and his son Niccolò de’ Medici married the daughter of the Greek notary Damianos Phiomachos, who became Nerio Acciaiuoli’s secretary. After Piero’s death, Nerio confirmed Niccolò de’ Medici in the possession of his father’s

115 Brucker, 9, 25 et passim; R. de Roover, The Rise and Decline of the Medici Bank: 1397—1494 (Cambridge, Mass., 1963), 385. Professor Brucker most kindly searched his notes for more information on these Medici, as did Professor F. Gaupp of Southwestern University (Texas).
117 P. Litta, Famiglie celebri italiane, fasc. xvii (Milan, 1827—1830), tavola III.
119 Litta, fasc. xvii, tavole XVII, XIX.
lands and granted him other properties which lay within the Duchy of Athens by an act of January 1387 recorded in Greek at Athens.\textsuperscript{121} The Medici of Athens subsequently remained in Greece for many decades.\textsuperscript{122} 

**APPENDIX II**

**The Foucherolles and Their Argolid Fiefs\textsuperscript{123}**

The Foucherolles acquired at least some of their Argolid lands by marrying into a cadet branch of the de la Roche family. Guy de la Roche, Lord of Athens, was granted Argos and Nauplia by the Prince of Achaea, and his younger brother Guillaume de la Roche married a daughter of Mathieu de Walincourt de Mons, Lord of Veligourt (or Veligosti) in the Morea. In 1276 their son Jacques de Veligourt did homage for the fief of la Valê, ou tout le casal de la Regranice et cellui de Coscolomy, possibly places in the Argolid, while in about 1304 Jacques' son Regnau de Veligourt held Dama la as liege vassal of Nicolás de Saint-Omer, Co-seigneur of Thebes.\textsuperscript{124} Renaud, whose father Jacomo de Veligort or de la Rocia married Marie, daughter of Guillaume Alaman Lord of Patras,\textsuperscript{125} was still alive in April 1309;\textsuperscript{126} Renaud probably died fighting the Catalans in March 1311.\textsuperscript{127} By 1325 Dama had passed to Martino Zaccaria,\textsuperscript{128} apparently through his marriage to Renaud's daughter Jacqueline. Another daughter of Rinaldo di Valgonato or delle Porte married Jean de Foucherolles, through whom some of Renaud's lands passed to Jean's son François. In 1309, in an act witnessed by François, the elder Gautier de Brienne confirmed François' son Nicolas in the inheritance of these lands.\textsuperscript{129} By this time the Foucherolles were firmly established in the Argolid, where their holdings included three knight's fees: en la partida de Corento et de Argo tres cavallerias de tierras et de villanos.\textsuperscript{130} So their lands seem to have lain north of Argos towards Corinth and perhaps towards Dama. A Nicolas de Foucherolles was a canon at Argos 1311;\textsuperscript{131} François and Gautier de Foucherolles were defending Argos, Gautier as Captain of Argos, in 1319;\textsuperscript{132} and François' son Nicolas was named in Gautier de

\textsuperscript{121} Diplomatari, doc. 600.

\textsuperscript{122} References in W. Miller, The Latins in the Levant (London, 1908), 338, 510, 553-554.

\textsuperscript{123} The Foucherolles' history derives, only with considerable uncertainty, from the two documents printed here. These survive only in modern copies which, whether the originals were in Latin, French or Italian, are clearly corrupted, confused and unreliable; so are Hopf's interpretations of them (i, 390, 424; ii, 19-20; CGR, 472-473).

\textsuperscript{124} Livre de la conquête de la principauté de l'Amorée, ed. J. Longnon (Paris, 1911), 44, 71, 208, 379.

\textsuperscript{125} Libro de los fechos, 30, 87, anachronistically stating that Jacques was granted Veligourt in 1209.

\textsuperscript{126} J. de Saint Génois, Droits primitifs des anciennes terres et seigneuries du pays et comté de Haynaut, i (Paris, 1782), 215 (as cited in Hopf, i, 369).

\textsuperscript{127} Hopf, i, 391, without evidence, regards this as certain.

\textsuperscript{128} Text in C. Minieri Riccio, Saggio di codice diplomatico, supplemento, part ii (Naples, 1883), 75-77 (date corrected in Hopf, i, 408, n. 13).

\textsuperscript{129} Hopf, CGR, 502, gives Martino as Lord of Veligosti and Dama in 1234, but as marrying Jacqueline in 1327! Hopf, i, 413, supposes that Martino helped defend the Argolid after 1311, but the 1318 text (Diplomatari, doc. 102) only shows, without specifying where, that the Catalans had captured his brother Niccolò.

\textsuperscript{130} This genealogy derives from the 1376 text; Hopf's version (CGR, 472) is hopelessly confused.

\textsuperscript{131} Libro de los fechos, 31, anachronistically stating that the Foucherolles acquired them in 1209; the other versions of the Chronicle of the Morea make no mention of this (Livre de la conquête, 44, n. 2, 45, n. 5).

\textsuperscript{132} Text in Regestum Clementis Papae V, vi (Rome, 1887), no. 6776.

\textsuperscript{133} Diplomatari, doc. 110. Bull of 14 January 1314 mention an unnamed captain of Argos (ibid., docs. 63-66); Hopf, CGR, 472, without evidence, gives Gautier as captain from 1311 until 1324.
Brienne's will in 1347. Nicolas was dead by 1364, the seif passing, apparently under some kind of entail, to his daughter. Her husband Jacomo, who was Lord of Joya in the Griseria, that is of Tzoya just south of Clarezza in the west of the Morea, was holding the seif from Guy d'Enghien by 1364; after his wife's death his right to it was confirmed by Guy d'Enghien in 1376, though only after a dispute with Jacomo's son Niccolò. Jacomo continued to participate in Argolid affairs and was still alive in 1391.

**GUY D'ENGHIE: NAUPLIA, DECEMBER 1364**


**GUY D’ENGHIE: NAUPLIA, OCTOBER 1376**

Noi Gui d’Anguiano Signor d’Argues, et de Napoli facciamo saper alli nostri Nobili il Signor Miser Nicola de Zoia figliuolo del Signor Jacomo de Zoia, et Zise, et Laurento, that è verità, che noi habbiamo fatto fare una rivestizione per il Signor Jacomo di Zoia di Argues, per che la rivestizione non poteva fare rinvestire il Signor Jacomo di fossieres that sariano datte a sua moglie, et figlio di sua

---

133 Supra, 37. A Ferry de Foucherolles was Marshal of the Hospital at Rhodes from 1330 to 1335, and later Prior of Champagne; Gérard de Foucherolles held preceptories at Châlon, Metz and Beaune, became Hospitaler of the Hospital, and in 1400 was empowered to treat with the Despot Theodore in the Morea (Delaville le Roux, 278).

134 Infra, 55, n. 159.

135 Luttrell, 'Principality of Achaear,' 344.

136 1316 porolam in Satas, i, endpiece. Hopf (i, 424; CGR, 472) places Tzoya in the Argolid and gives Nicolas de Foucherolles as Baron of Tzoya in 1324!

137 Supra, 48–49. Hopf, ii, 20, wrongly states that Jacomo died in 1376, and that Niccolò died in 1382 leaving a son Jacomo, Lord of Tzoya!

138 Modern copy from a codex entitled Famiglia Cornera in Archivo di Stato, Venice; Miscellanea codici I, Storia veneta no. 149 (olim Brera, Milan, Ms. I, 58), f. 66 (punctuation as in Ms.); printed, inaccurately, in Hopf, CGR, 240.

139 Ibid., f. 66–66 v (punctuation as in Ms.); printed, inaccurately, in Hopf, CGR, 240–242 (only significant errors noted here).

140 Reading et Liste de Laurento, Hopf, ii, 19–20, deduces a first husband for Liste named Lorenzo or Lorenz! Laurento remains a puzzle.

141 Or fossieres (?): Hopf forestieresis.
This obscure passage might mean that Guy had re-invested Jacomo with certain lands but that others (fossieres = Foucherolles?) could only pass through his wife to their son Niccolò.

This is a sentence.

Possibly Gerardo de Laburda (supra, 49); Hopf, ii, 20 gives Peter!

Possibly messer Janni Mistilo and Nicola alamangno who held castles in the Morea in 1377 (Luttrell, ‘Principality of Achaia,’ 344).

Possibly Galeazzo Nani, Venetian consul at Clarenza in 1356 (Regestes, i, no. 282).

Or Cavazz (?); Hopf Castello, but Hopf, ii, 20, gives Marco and Niccolò Cavazza. Johannes Cavaza was castellan of Nauplia castle in 1400 (Sathas, ii, 13–14).

Sic. Hopf Petru Castelli, but Hopf, ii, 20, gives Aporito Castello. Niccolò and Aporico Castello were inhabitants of Nauplia in 1400 (Sathas, ii, 14).

I. e. Jacomo de Tzoya is son-in-law (figliolo) of Nicolas de Foucherolles.

Sic. Hopf altrei, unde.

I.e. on 15 February 1376 Guy’s court judged, against Niccolò, that Jacomo should be invested as his wife’s heir.

Sic.

Read 1309: Gautier only reached Greece and became duke in 1309 (Setton, 6–7).

I.e. the lands passed from Renaud de Veligourt alias de la Roche (Rinaldo di Valgonato or delle Porte) to his son-in-law (figliolo) Jean de Foucherolles, to Jean’s son François (given as Renaud’s figliolo), to François’ son Nicolas, and to Nicolas’ daughter; in 1309 Gautier de Brienne confirmed them, in François’ presence, to Nicolas. Niccolò de Tzoya obviously argued that the rule of primogeniture should continue so that he inherit from his mother, who was the daughter of Nicolas.

Niccolò di Caves and Nurdo di Carghi remain unidentified.

Possibly the casal de la Regranais held by Jacques de Veligourt in 1276 (supra, 52).

Possibly Kastri (Hermione) on the Argolid coast near Thermision (Sathas, i, endpiece; Andrews, 249 and pl. xxvii).
rivestita sua detta Madre, faciamo saper, che è fatto, et scritto privilegio l’anno 1328 del mese d’Aprile dato al Castello d’Argues et facciamo saper, et recchime diamo a tutti nostri suggetti, che sia investito il Signor Jacomo come herede di sua mogliere nominato nella sopra detta nominatione, come si la detta investizione di sua detta mogliere fosse stata fatta in nome del detto Miser Jacomo, deve ancora simile investizione tenere, galdet et posseder il detto signor Jacomo nella forma, et modo che la teneva sua detta mogliere inanzhi ch’ella moresse, con gli fonti, mollini, Ville con tutte le sue ordinanze, et tutto il detto possesso, et uno corpo, come e apparito per il paese, et non soleva per il possesso esser obligato nome di tre huomini a Cavallo bene Armati, et Cavali sufficienti, et buoni, et ha promesso il Signor Jacomo, et iurato nella mano dell’homo delegato esser contra tutti li nostri nemisi, et noi promettiamo, et faremo restare questo previlegio stabile, durabile et valabile, sino che il sole lusara a gli huomini, et per certezza, et corroboratione di Verita del detto Privilegio habbiamo fatto bollare quel detto Privilegio del nostro bollo grande pendente. scritto, et datto il detto Privilegio l’anno 1376 al mese d’Ottobre nel nostro Palazzo di Napoli.

A. L.

159 This most obscure passage conceivably means that—in accordance with a privilege granted at Argos in April 1328 (though this date is suspect) to a Guillaume (Guitelmo) de Foucherolles, son of Nicolas and Captain (Conte) and Seigneur (Signor) of Argos and Nauplia, and to his descendants—Nicolas de Foucherolles’ lands were to pass to Nicolò de Tzoya as they had passed to Niccolò’s mother (who was Nicolas’s daughter), her brother Guillaume presumably having died before his sister without an heir; alternatively, though the text says qui naque del Signor Nicole, the Guitelmo was possibly Nicolas’ brother Gautier who was Captain of Argos in 1319. Hopf reads una nostra Sorella Antonia (!) signor Guitelmo Conte consolo (!) d’Argues, . . . Hopf then invents (ii, 19–20; CGR, 472) two other daughters for Nicolas, an Antonia (ell) de Foucherolles, wife of a Guillaume, Count of Plancy, and a Bona de Foucherolles-Zoia, the wife of Guy d’Enghien, making Antonia Guy’s sister-in-law (nata Sorella) and Jacomo de Tzoya his brother-in-law! But the Anthonace de Plancy of 1347 (supra, 37) was presumably a man; the Sorella and much else await explanation.
INSCRIPTIONS FROM SOUTH ETRURIA

(Plates XII–XVIII)

The following group of inscriptions includes some unpublished texts found recently during the South Etruria survey and a few published ones in which additional or improved readings can be offered as a result of re-examination.* Most of them are tombstones of essentially local significance, but nos. 1 and 4 from Tomba di Nerone, 5 from Casale Spizzichino and 20 from Filissano are of greater importance and interest.

* I have to thank the Director of the School at Rome and a number of those who have been taking part in the South Etruria Survey, especially Mrs. Anne Kahane and Mr. G. D. B. Jones, for information about the stones and for photographs; Mr. J. A. Crook of St. John’s College, Cambridge for discussing no. 4 with me and Mr. John Morris of University College, London for discussing no. 5.

I. Sites on or near the Via Cassia

1. Travertine tombstone, damaged at the upper right corner (0·52 × 0·98 × 0·12), with schematic gable and acroteria above and a lightly and crudely incised wreath in the gable; inscribed on the exposed face, whose surface is damaged. Built into the wall of the drive leading to Via Cassia 901, which lies on the west side of the road a short distance beyond Tomba di Nerone. Recent building development revealed drainage cuniculi and other elements of a Roman building, and along the ancient road frontage there were several graves and remains of at least one mausoleum. It is very likely that some or all of the texts (nos. 1–4) were found locally.

Letters, I cent. A.D.: l. 1, 0·06; l. 2, 0·05; ll. 3 f., 0·04.
Photo: BSR 6 × 9. 6820. (Pl. XII, a).

M(arcus) Vibius
M(arcus) f(ilius) Fab(ia tribu)
Tertius Luca¹
aedil(is) Luc(a)² milit(auit) in coh(orte)
5 VII pr(aetoria) (centuria)³ Mamili⁴
[an]n(os) VII uix(it) a[n(nos)] XXVIII⁵

¹ Tertius is registered in the correct tribe for Luca and his nomen, Vibius, is attested there. A number of praetorian soldiers are known to have come from Luca under the early empire; see A. Passerini, Le Coorti Pretorie (Rome, 1939), p. 152 and M. Dury, PW XLIV, col. 1626.
² An indication of the good social status of praetorian recruits at this date; see Passerini, loc. cit., p. 164 f., for others who had been municipal officials or were related to such officials.
³ I cannot find that there is any other record of municipal aediles at Luca, though their existence might have been guessed.
⁴ Written >.
⁵ Probably C. Mamilius Naus, centurion of cohors VII praetoria, CIL X, 6674 = ILS 2020, in which he figures as heir to a veteran soldier who became decurion and quaestor at Antium; it seems likely that this veteran was one of the soldiers settled in Nero’s colony at Antium in A.D. 60 (Tac. Ann. XIV. 27).
⁶ He was aged 21 at recruitment, a little older than the norm of 18–20 years as tentatively calculated by Passerini, loc. cit., p. 145 f.
2. Panel of Greek marble, cut down at either side and broken at the upper left corner \((0.43 \times 0.315 \times \text{depth not measurable})\), inscribed on the exposed face within a simply moulded border \((\text{die}, 0.43 \times 0.25)\), the surface damaged. Cemented into a garden-seat at Via Cassia 901 (see 1).

Letters, II cent., with rustic forms: 1. 1, 0.04; 1. 2, 0.03; ll. 3, 4, 0.025; ll. 5, 6, 0.02.

Photos: G. D. B. Jones. (Pl. XII, b).


\(\upsilon\) coniugi sanctissima[\(\epsilon\)]

A(ulus) Pontius Eutychus[2]

\(\omega\)mnium hominum infelicissim[us]

5 qui tam incomparabilem feminam

\(\upsilon\) cito carui \(\upsilon\).

---

1 Compare the Memmii buried in a large family tomb near the Via Cassia 'a little beyond the Pons Mulvia,' CIL VI, 3763 f.; it is possible that this text is a stray from the same tomb or comes from a related one.

2 The cognomina of husband and wife suggest freed origin.

---

3. Upper left corner of a small marble altar \((c. 0.24 \times 0.24 \times 0.20)\), with reliefs of a patera and a bucranium with swag on the front; inscribed on the front, above the swag. Lying loose in the garden of Via Cassia 901 (see 1).

Eum[...]

\(\upsilon\) et[...]

\(\upsilon\) [...]

---

Map to Show Location of Inscriptions
4. Fragment of a marble panel (0.305 x 0.51 x 0.03) inscribed on one face. First seen lying in the garden of Via Cassia 901 (see 1); now in the house.

Letters, II cent.: 0.011-0.012.
Photos: BS 6 x 9. 6821, 6822. (Pl. XIII).

[...]
... ]ea con[...
... ]est T Flau[i-...
... ]m eius loci siu[e...
... ]I ire aut mittere po[...

5
... ]isse possidere dixit v. [...
... ]is ager est quo de agitur moni[ment-...
... ]I tabernas cum pergulis diaetam ue[l...
... ]Ia aliudue quid aedificare cippum cip[pos...
... m]aceria cludere clusumque habere inqu[e...

10
... ]m mortuos ossaue mortuorum cinerus[e...
... moni]mento aut maceria titulum titulos po[nere...
... moni]mento aram aras ponere posita[s...
... ]ue is ager est itum actum aditu[m...
... e]o loco siue monimento sacr[-...

15
... C]oceio Atimeto heredique ei[us...
... uol]untate Coccei Atimeti he[redis...
... ]m locumque arae ue[...]
... qu]od ita licitum[...]

[...]

L. 4. A serif at the foot of the first surviving stroke shows that it was not part of N.
L. 7. The first surviving stroke is probably a simple upright with a strongly marked base serif, but might be L, T, or even E.
L. 16. No crossbar is visible in the letter read as H, but the cutter is liable to omit the crossbar of A too.

This inscription, obviously from a tomb (l. 10), incorporated a copy of the act (or part of it) by which the property on which the tomb was built came into the possession of Cocceius Atimetus (ll. 15, 16). A number of funerary inscriptions from the area of Rome refer to or incorporate parts of such acts, these being normally mancipationes donationis causa, cf. CIL VI. 10231 (= FIRA III. 93 = ILS 7313), 10239 (= FIRA III. 94), 10240, 10241 (= FIRA III. 80 d = ILS 7912), 10244, 10247 (= FIRA III. 95). None of the published instances is as elaborate as this seems; nevertheless by comparison with them, with acts involving other types of mancipatio (FIRA III. 87-92) and with emptiones (FIRA III. 132-140) it is possible to offer a tentative reconstruction of the general lines of the text as follows:

..... Cocceius Atimetus ..... mancipio accept de ..... (sestertiis)
nummis ? libripende ..... ] ea con[dicione quae supra scripta est]
[... c. 8 . antestatus] est T(itum) Flau[ium ... c. 16 . inque]
uacuam possessionem]m eius loci siu[e is ager est ... c. 13 ...]
[Cocceium Atimetu]m ire aut mittere po[ssidendi causa iussit se]
5 [inde abisse des]isse possidere dixit v. [si quis autem]
[eum locum siue] ies ager est quo de agit tur moni[mentumue euicerit]
quominus ibi tabernas cum pergulis diaetam uc[1 omnia ad ea]
[pertine]ntia aliudue quid aedificare cippum cip[os ponere]
locumue m]aceria cludere clusumque habere in[u]e eum locum uel

10 [agrum mortu[m] mortuus ossaue mortuorum cineresu[e inferre uel]
in eo moni]mento aut maceria titulum titulos po[nere uel in eo]
loco siue moni]mento aram aras poner posita[sque colere]
[uel in eum locum si]ue is ager est itum actum aditu[m ambitum]
habere uel esse in e]o loco siue monimentum sacr[ificii faciundi]

15 [causa recte liceat C]occeio Atimeto heredique ei[us uel si qui]
[alii fuerint qui ex vo]luntate Coccei Atimetii hef[redisquie eius]
in eum locum siue monimentum locumque arae uel[nerint . . . .]
[sepeliundi uel sacrificandi causa qu]od ita licitum [non erit]
tunc quanti ea res erit tantam pecuniam dari stipulatus est

20 [Cocceius Atimetus spopondit . . .

At the head of the text there may have been one of the normal funerary formulae in memory of Cocceius Atimetus and his family, but cf. CIL VI. 10247 where no such formula occurs; and before the legal formula there may have been a heading, cf. Chirographum in CIL VI. 10241, l. 7. The act itself must have begun with a description and definition of the property and presumably the condition referred to in l. 1, unless that is contained in the hypothesis that begins in l. 4.

If the act of alienation was mancipatio donationis causa only a nominal sum changed hands; but there may have been a sale. A piece of land in which a body was buried, being res religiosa, was, strictly, incapable of ownership and therefore of alienation by any method, although it would appear that practice diverged from strict theory in this matter (cf. Arangio-Ruiz, FIRA III, p. 253). At the same time a piece of land not yet used for burial might quite properly be acquired with a view to such use by any of the normal methods of alienation, and it would seem possible that this is what happened here. The purchaser in such a case might well wish for an assurance that the plot he acquired was not in an area where burial was forbidden, or subject to any other impediment to the celebration of funerary rites, and this would account for the elaboration of ll. 6 ff. here.

The name of the purchaser, Cocceius Atimetus, is restored from ll. 15, 16; that of the vendor is lost; that of the witness to the transaction survives in part in l. 2. The nomina of the purchaser and the witness, and the cognomen of the purchaser suggest that the persons involved were of freed origin, and the nomina then indicate, ultimately if not immediately, a connection with the Imperial household.

L. 1 probably contained the name of the libripens at the beginning; for the subsequent formula I have not found any completely satisfactory solution.

L. 2 ended with the name of the vendor, who is the subject of dixit.

L. 3 contains rather a long space after the break if it was filled solely by the witness' cognomen; his status may have been given as well, e.g. Aug(usti) lib(ertum).

L. 4. Possidendi causa is a conjecture that I owe to Mr. Crook; in its common
form the phrase is simply *ire aut mittere* and none of the elaborations that I have found fits the trace of the next word here.

L. 5. The *vacat* after *dixit* marks the end of the clause describing the formal transfer of ownership. The clause that follows and occupies the whole of the remainder of the surviving text provides in considerable detail against loss to Atimetus resulting from impediments to his free and full use of the plot for funerary purposes.

Ll. 8–9. *Tabernae cum pergulis* recall the terms of a Pompeian advertisement of property to let (*ILS* 6035), but *tabernae* are not uncommon in funerary contexts too (*cf.* *ILS* 7536, 8092); they are presumably structures for the shelter of those attending the tomb and the *pergulae* would be a not inappropriate amenity to add to them. *Diaetae* also occur in funerary contexts, *cf.* *ILS* 8351 for a possible use—*diaeta aeinjecta Ianuae custodiae causa*. The other pertinent structures (if my supplement is on the right lines) would be items such as a well or an oven needed to facilitate the life of a caretaker and/or the organisation of funerary feasts.

Ll. 16–19. There seems to be a reference to other persons authorised by Atimetus or his heir to use the tomb for burial or funerary rites, but the precise form in which their activities were described is highly conjectural.

The name of the vendor followed and was the subject of *spopondit*; and the document may have concluded with a date, *cf.* *CIL* VI. 10241, ll. 31 ff.

5. Three fragments from a marble panel inscribed on the exposed face within a moulded border (*a*, 0·24 × 0·26 × depth not measurable; *b*, 0·174 × 0·167 × 0·075; *c*, too high to measure). Reported to have been found on the Spizzichino estate; now re-used in the paving and wall of the courtyard and in the wall of the entrance hall of the Casale Spizzichino (Via Cassia 1416).¹

Letters, II–III cent.: 0·035–0·04; one ivy leaf stop.

H. Comfort, *AJA* 64 (1960) 273 ff., no. 5, pl. 76.6 (fragments *a* and *c* only);

*AE* 1960, 31.

Photos: *BSR* 1927. 66, 68. (Pl. XII, *c*).

\[a + b\]
\[C(ai-) Vi\tilde[t]^{2} \ldots\]
\[Flaui^{3} \ldots ? \ldots (decem)u\tilde{r}-\]
\[st\tilde{u}tib[u] dc\tilde{a}n[dis] \ldots\]
\[quaes[tor-] urb(an-) leaf \tilde{a}[\. \ldots ? \ldots aedil-]\]

5 ceri\tilde{a}[\tilde{n-} \ldots ] pro[\ldots]
\[\ldots \]
\[\ldots ]ae m[\ldots\]
\[\ldots \]

¹ Most of the inscriptions collected in the house and garden were published by Mr. Comfort in 1960; I have supplements and new readings to suggest in this case and in no. 6 and one unimportant piece (no. 7) to add.
2 VIT, VIF, VIP and VTT seem possible; the condition of the stone to the right appears to exclude other possibilities for the third letter. It has not been possible to identify the subject.

3 Comfort proposed Sodali [Flavius[all], but Flavi[, . . . may equally well be part of the man’s name.

4 It is impossible to calculate the line-length with any certainty. At first sight one might restore as follows:

\[ \text{stilitsib[us iu]dicen[dis]}
\text{quaes[tori] urb(ano) a[ed(illi)]}
\text{ceria[li pr(aetori)] pro[co(n)s(uli)] or ceria[li leg(ato)] pro[pr(aetore)]}
\]

5 [provinciae . . .]

but the combination of full forms for some titles and heavy abbreviation for others is unsatisfactory, as Mr. John Morris has suggested, and something more on the following lines may be preferable:

\[ \text{. . . Xuiro}
\text{stilitsib[us iu]dicen[d(is) tribuno milit(um) leg(ionis)]}
\text{quaes[tori] urb(ano) a[b actis Senatus aed(ili)]}
\text{ceria[li leg(ato)] pro [pr(aetore) provinciae] or pro[uinciae . . . a. 12 . . .]}
\]

5 There is no clue to the position of this fragment; but there is a tempting possibility that it might be from the legate’s title, if one stood in l. 4, . . . provinciae at M[acedonii . . .]

6 Small funerary altar of Luna marble (0·285 × 0·62 × 0·25), moulded above and below, pulvinaria and lunette decorated with volutes terminating in flowers on top, reliefs of a jug and a patena on the sides; inscribed on one face within a moulded panel (die, 0·165 × 0·295) whose surface is overgrown with moss;\(^1\) there is an ascia below the text.\(^2\) Reported to have been found on the Spizzichino estate; now in the courtyard of the Casale (see no. 5).

Letters, II–III cent. : 0·01–0·015.
Howard Comfort, AJA 64 (1960) 273 f., no. 6, pl. 76–7 (illegible). Pl. XIV, a.

\[ \text{Dis Manibus sac(rum)}
\text{T(ito) Minucio}
\text{Hermae}^3
\text{T(itus) Calpurnius}
\]

5 v. Agatho\(^5\) v.

\[ [a]m[i]co posuit
\]

1 Re-examination of the stone in a favourable light confirms most of the conjectures made by Dr. Hans Lieb opud Comfort, loc. cit., n. 8.

2 No other instance of this symbol is known at Veii and it is extremely rare in Rome itself, cf. PW Suppl. III, col. 168 for the recorded instances.

3 The cognomina suggest that both men are of freed origin.

7. Fragment probably from the top of a marble panel (0·16 × 0·14 × depth not measurable) inscribed on the exposed face. Reported to have been found on the Spizzichino estate; now built into the wall of the entrance hall of the Casale (see no. 5).

Letters, II–III cent. : 0·055.
Photo : BSR 1927.66. (Pl. XVII, c).

\[ . . . ] SPAP [ . . . ]\(^1\)
\[ . . . ] LIGV [ . . . ]\(^2\)
\[ . . . ]

1 The final letter might be B or R as well as P; the letter-group suggests Pap(eria tribu), but this would normally be preceded by filiation.

2 Possibly from publicus or a title, aedilicius; but not enough survives for profitable speculation.
II. Sites west of the Via Cassia

8. White marble funerary altar \((0.63 \times 1.19 \times 0.42)\) moulded above and below, with pulvinaria and lunette above and reliefs of a jug and a patera on the sides, inscribed on the face, which is badly worn and overcut with modern graffiti. Ploughed up in 1955 in a field on the road from La Storta to Malagrotta (map ref. 806474); now standing beside a barn in a field (map ref. c. 808470/1).

Letters, too worn to date: av. 0.05.
Photo: BSR 6 × 9. 8858. (Pl. XIV, b).

\[\begin{align*}
D(is) & \ M(anibus) \ leaf \\
G(ai-) & \ L\dot{a}b\dot{e}r[\ldots] \\
v. & \ Lg[\ldots] \ r[\ldots] \\
iuenu\nu[\ldots] \ c. \ 5 \ldots] \\
5 \ & \ \v C(ai-) \ R[\ddot{l}l]- \ c. \ 5 \ldots] \\
\v \ P(ubli-) & \ R\dot{l}l\dot{i}u[\ldots] \\
v. & \ \text{optim}[\ldots] \\
\text{optimorum} & \ [.\ldots] \\
\text{Veratia} & \ I[\ldots] \ c. \ 5\ldots]
\end{align*}\]

9. Marble funerary altar moulded above and below, acroteria and a lunette containing relief of a wreath on the top, and reliefs of a jug and a patera on the sides, inscribed within a moulded panel. Ploughed out in October 1956, 100 m. north of the Via Clodia.

Letters, II–III cent.
Photo: BSR 6 × 9. 1835. (Pl. XVI, a).

\[\begin{align*}
D(is) & \ M(anibus) \\
Sex(to) & \ \text{Pompeio} \\
\text{Martiali} \\
\text{Caesenia Felicula}^1 \\
5 & \text{coniugi karissimo} \\
cum quo uixit annis \\
\text{XXVII item Pompeius} \\
\text{Martialis filius patri}^1 \\
\text{indulgentissimo}.
\end{align*}\]

\[^1\text{The last letters of the line impinge on the moulding.}\]

III. Sites between the Via Cassia and the Via Flaminia

10. Moulded marble altar \((0.30 \times 0.40 \times 0.20)\) inscribed on one face, which is badly worn; there are reliefs of a jug and a patera on the sides. Seen in 1961, standing with CIL XI, 7742, 7751 in the porch of the Casale Spezzamazze (map ref. 876564–877564).
Letters, probably II cent.: c. 0·025.
Photo: *BSR* 6 × 9. 3578. (Pl. XVI, b).

D(is) M(anibus)
Herenniae
Ianuariæ
M(arcus) Herennius

5
[.] I [. . . ]
[co]niu[gi . . . ]
[. . . ]

1 The *cognomen* suggests a freedwoman, the *nomen* perhaps a connexion with the family of M. Herennius Picens, cos A.D. 1, patron of Veii, see CIL XI, 3797, 7746, 7747. For another Herennia connected with Veii, cf. CIL XI, 3213, the wife of a IIvir of the town who also held office at Nepi.

**11.** Marble panel, damaged at one side (0·32 × 0·52 × 0·03), inscribed on both faces. Reported to have been found on the Santa Cornelia estate; now in the Garden of the Casale Santa Cornelia (map ref. 875577).

(a) Inscribed below a panel of simple incised ornament.
Letters, II–III cent.: l. 1, 0·035; ll. 2 f., 0·03.
Photo: *BSR* 6 × 9. 4785. (Pl. XV, a).

D(is) M(anibus)
Arruntio
Ianuario
Ulpia Successa

5 coniumnx
quae uix(it) cu[m]
eo an(nos) [.]² m(enses)
X d(ies) [.]²

1 The husband’s *cognomen* and the wife’s *nomen* both suggest freed origin; the wife presumably descends from a freedman of Trajan.
² The figure is probably X.
³ The figure is either V or X.

(b) On the reverse.
Letters, perhaps III cent.: 0·05–0·06.
Photo: *BSR* 6 × 9. 4786.

D
Iulius V[a]
 lens gene
r socer
o suo b
enemerent(i)
fcit

¹ Possibly the *praenomen* D(ecimus), but the letter is inset and isolated as if part of the formula D(is) M(anibus) although there is no trace of an M; it may be that when the panel was in position another adjoined it to the right, carrying the M of *Manibus* and below it the name of the dead man, whose omission is otherwise singular.
12. I add two further notes on the inscription of Q. Cerellius Apollinaris, published in *PBSR XVII* (1962) 31 ff., which is also in the garden of the Casale Santa Cornelia (see no. 11).

1 Professor Pfleum points out to me that in an exclusively urban career such as this a posting in the second grade of eunuchdom posits is what is to be expected after the praetorian tribunate *(cf. the cases of T. Haterius Nepos, *ILS* 1338, T. Flavius Germanus, *ILS* 1420) and is not an oddity as I suggested.

A tombstone of a family of Caerellii found near Formello, *CIL* XI, 3830, and a dedication by a Caerellius at Fiano, *CIL* XI, 7763, suggest that Apollinaris, despite the different spelling of his nomen, may have been South Etruscan in origin, and that this panel is therefore quite likely to have come from a Veientine rather than a Roman monument.

13. Fragment of marble (0·10 × 0·14 × 0·15) probably from the bottom of a funerary stele, inscribed on one face. Reported to have been found on the Santa Cornelia estate; now in the garden of the Casale Santa Cornelia (see no. 11).

Letters, II–III cent.: l. 1, 0·03; l. 2, 0·025–0·03.

...]
...jssim[...
...] incom[parabil-...]

1 Clearly from a funerary text.

14. Left side of a marble panel (0·415 × 0·355 × 0·05) inscribed on the exposed face within an area defined by a lightly (and crudely) incised line. Formello, now fixed to a wall in the garden of Signora Flaminia Ambrosi Paolocci, but believed to come originally, with no. 15, from the Casale Pian Roseto estate, about a mile north of Veii, just south of the modern Via di S. Cornelia.

Letters, I–II cent. A.D.: 0·065.
Photo: *BSR* 6 × 9. 5927. (Pl. XVII, d).

MARTID[...2]
v. IVSTO[...]
BONO leaf P[...]

1 The quality of the cutting is at variance with that of the letters; the incised line is perhaps a later addition.

2 There are no spaces or punctuation marks between the surviving letters here, so that the interpretation is in doubt. *Marti D[eo]* is unlikely, both because of the absence of punctuation between I and D (which would be odd in contrast to the clear spacing and punctuation between O and P in l. 3) and because *Deus* rarely appears with the name of a Roman god in Rome. More probably, therefore, we have a man's name. *Martidius* seems not to be attested, but *Artidius* is known and probably occurs at Veii, *cf. CIL* XI, 3829. The text can then be restored on the following lines, but since the exact line-length cannot be calculated on the evidence available—in l. 1 there may have been filiation and tribe and even a first *cognomen* after the *nomen*—it is impossible to choose between *bono p[atru* and *bono pat[ono in l. 3.*

M(arco) Artid[i]o ...
v. Lusto [...]
bono [p]atr...-

15. Moulded marble panel (1·41 × 0·59 × 0·27) inscribed on one face (die, 1·225 × 0·385). Formello, now in the garden of Signora Flaminia Ambrosi Paolocci (but see no. 14).
Letters, Augustan—1 cent. A.D.: l. 1, 0-09; l. 2, 0-08 (the first letter 0-03); l. 3, 0-07; l. 4 (in a second hand), 0-045.¹
Photo: BSR 6 × 9. 5926. (Pl. XVII, a).

D(ecimus) Liuius D(ecimi) l(ibertus) Gora
V(iua) Liuiua D(ecimi) l(iberta) Truphera
D(ecimus) Liuius D(ecimi) l(libertus) Epaphroditus
D(ecimus) Liuius D(ecimi) et (Caiae) l(libertus) Priscus¹

¹ This line was added after the main inscription had been cut and is poor work.

16. Lower part of a tufa base or altar with coarse flat moulding below (0·76 × 0·89 × 0·61) inscribed on one face (die, 0·64 × 0·53) which is badly worn. Formello, in the Piazza.

Letters, II or III cent., showing Rustic influence: 0·08.
Photo: BSR 6 × 9. 7226. (Pl. XVII, b).

...]
M(arcus) P[...
leaf Vitalis

17. Block of limestone (1·355 × 0·375 × depth not measurable) inscribed on the exposed face within a moulded panel (die, 1·215 × 0·42) whose surface is badly worn. Built into the wall of a modern building in the main street of Campagnano Romano.

Letters, I cent. A.D.: l. 1, 0·078; l. 2, 0·068; l. 3, 0·065; l. 4, 0·06.
Photo: BSR 6 × 9. 7236. (Pl. XVIII, a).

Valerij A(ecimi)¹ l(ibertus) Psychario
мощумен inel uncit
sibij et u[iro] suo L(ucio) Quintio L(ucii) l(iberto)
[Philodamo de suo] se uiua

¹ Or (Caiae).

18. Upper left part of a travertine base, moulded above (0·325 × 0·525 × c. 0·25) inscribed on one face within a moulded panel (die, 0·20 × 0·30). Seen and drawn in 1956 on the left of the Mazzano road at Km. 4·5, some 200 m. east of the Roman road (map ref. 829745); subsequently destroyed.

Letters, II—III cent.: c. 0·035.

D(is) [M(anibus)]
C(aio) Ga[...]
Zos[imo]
[... atr[... ¹]
et [sibi]
[...]

¹ Fratri suo fits the space best, but patri suo or patrono suo are also possible.
19. Moulded limestone altar (0·45 × 0·94 × 0·40) inscribed on one face within a panel outlined by an incised line (die, 0·35 × 0·45), the surface badly worn. Casale Filissano (map ref. 837777) in the garden.

Letters, perhaps I–II cent.: 0·045.

Hercu[li . . .

[ . . .

20. Left side of a marble panel (1·01 × 0·52 × 0·07) inscribed on one face within a moulded tabella ansata (die, 0·82 × 0·41) with two columns of verse. Fixed to the wall of the Casale Filissano (see no. 19).

Letters, II–III cent.: 0·02–0·025.

Photo: BSR 6 × 9. 6157. (Pl. XVIII, b).

Cerne age principi uenerandum numen adorans¹ quem E[ . . .
quos similes fecit nos manus artificis Nymph[ . . .
sub laeua posui Marcum me nomine Carpum² feci et I[ . . .
qui procuraii auro sanctaquee Monetae³ mox I[ . . .
5 sed iam cesso mihi senio hortante libenter horto [. . . §
et merui laudis bonae sub principi famam T[ . . .
altera de parte situs est mihi karus Achilles [. . .
prudens et doctus nostro qui Caesare dignus⁴
hunc merito iuuenem cernimus a memor[ia⁵ . . .
10 signum etiam posui nostri maioris Achi[llis⁶ . . .
in medio eugens ut caelo stella Bo[tes⁷ . . .
qui solus longe tutatus nobiliter [. . .

Col. 1, l. 12: an upper serif survives before the break, suggesting that the next letter was I or V.
Col. 2, l. 1: the last surviving letter might also be F, P or R.
¹ An idea familiar in connexion with poets, cf. Ovid, Ars Am. iii, 548 numen inest illis and PW xxxiv s.v. Numen, is extended to the sculptor.
² The omission of a nomen is doubtless due to the exigencies of the metre. Carpus and his son were freedmen members of the imperial house, as appears from their offices combined with their cognomina and the reference in col. 1, l. 8 to the emperor.
³ On the attested officials of the Mint at Rome, see H. Mattingly, Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum i (London, 1923), pp. lvii f.; but as Carpus describes it his function does not quite correspond to any of theirs. The formal title Procurator Monetae is applied only to Knights; the most relevant of the known freedman titles seems to be optio et exactor auri argenti aerris (ILS 1634, 1635, both Trajnician), and was thought by Mattingly to describe the supervisor of the whole technical side of the Mint, who would also be responsible for the quality of all materials used. Carpus may have held this position, or a similar but more limited one concerned with gold issues only. Alternatively, since Statius, Silvae III, 3.105, shows that under the Flavians at least, the provision of metals for the Mint was the responsibility of the a rationibus, he may have been a subordinate in the office of that minister.
⁴ The implication that the emperor, like his servant, was prudens et doctus might perhaps suggest Marcus Aurelius.
⁵ The earliest known reference to this office is Hadrianic (ILS 1672); it remained a freedman’s post until Diocletian, see PW XV, col. 655 s.v. For a very young a memoria, as suggested here perhaps by the term iuvenis, see ILS 1673 (aged 17); he was doubtless a subordinate in the office of the a memoria rather than the minister himself.
⁶ Presumably the hero Achilles. For a similar claim to mythological ancestry by an imperial freedman, cf. Pallas, regius Arcadiae ortus, Tac. Ann. xii, 53. It is perhaps worth noting that what seemed in Pallas the pretentious arrogance of a peculiarly powerful minister has here become the almost casual assertion of an official too unimportant to have left any mark on the historical record.
⁷ Bootes, also called Arctophylax or Arcturus from the brightest of its component stars, and sometimes identified with Arcas son of Zeus and Callisto, is the constellation which follows the Flough = the Great
Bear = Callisto. While the name Bootes should imply that the preceding constellation is identified with a plough, the participle *tutatus* used here suggests that the writer had in mind the Bearward following the Bear. To be fully applicable the picture should be of Bootes between two constellations which he outshines, and we may guess that the last word in col. 1, l. 12 was *Ursam* and that *Xymph* [. . .] in col. 2, l. 2 refers to Virgo, the constellation which follows Bootes.

Possibly a funerary garden which was part of the monument.

21. Marble funerary altar (0.66 × 1.52 × 0.49) moulded above and below, with a relief of a patera to right and the scar of a relief of a jug to the left; inscribed on one face within a moulded panel (die, 0.39 × 0.60). In the garden of the Casale Filissano (see no. 19).

Letters, III cent.: l. 1–5, 0.042; l. 6, 0.04; l. 7, 0.045.
Photos: BSR 6 × 9. 6152, 6153. (Pl. XV, 6).

Dis Manib(us)
Sallustiae
Iannuariae
fecit Iulia
5 Cnone¹ fil(ia)
matri opti
mae

¹ The names suggest a family of freed origin. Cnone is presumably intended for Gnome.

22. Fragment from the upper part of a moulded funerary altar of Luna marble (0.69 × 0.52 × 0.44) inscribed on one face within a moulded panel (die, 0.45 × 0.32); on top are pulvinaria terminating in rosettes, which flank a lunette containing a relief of four rosettes linked by a scroll. Seen in 1959, in a field near Belmonte (map ref. 915656); when revisited in 1965 it had been hammered to pieces by the local shepherds.

Letters, too worn to date.
Photo: BSR 6 × 9. 8138.

Dis Manibus
[. . c. 5 .]NTI[. .]
[. . .]

J. M. Reynolds
NOTES ON THE LANDS OF THE ROMAN CHURCH
IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

The great landed wealth of the Roman Church both before and after the foundation of the papal state in the eighth century is well known. It is also well known that the Muslim invasions and the political breakdown which took place in Italy in the ninth and tenth centuries destroyed the ancient organisation of Roman Church lands, and that in the succeeding two centuries a new and partly feudal landowning organisation emerged in the Roman territory. But it is not at all clear what this decline of the Carolingian system meant in terms of the administration and extent of church property, and of the connected changes in the relations of the Roman Church with the local landowning nobility. The present short notes have been compiled in an attempt to shed a modest amount of light on this matter.

Our possession of the letters of Gregory the Great has given us some knowledge of the ancient organisation of the papal patrimonies.\(^1\) But even before the papal state came into being in the eighth century, there had already been two big changes since Gregory's time—the organisation of corn supply and charitable works in Rome through the Roman diaconates,\(^2\) and the re-organisation of many of the papal estates into larger aggregates known as *domus cultae*. Both these measures tended to centralise papal control over the economic life of Rome and the District, but it with the second that I am mainly concerned here. My business, however, is with the decline and not with the growth of the new economic system, and to its earlier nature and development I refer only briefly.

No modern scholar has to the writer's knowledge thoroughly sifted the literary evidence on the *domus cultae*, and even their number and identity remain in some doubt.\(^3\) They appear to have been particularly developed by the Greek Pope Zacharias (741–52), whose policies were so vital to the emergence of the papal state. The last *domus cultae* to be instituted were those of Hadrian I (772–95), one of whose foundations is among the few *domus cultae* to have been investigated by modern archaeologists.\(^4\) One of the most striking things about them appears to have been their size. The *domus culta* of Caprarcorum seems to have been about 8 or 9 km. wide by about 24 km. long, extending from the region of Prima Porta to that of Calcata near Nepi.\(^5\) That of Galeria (the ancient massa Careia) was again very extensive indeed, stretching from the Via Clodia to the Via Portuense.\(^6\)

---


3. G. Tomassetti, *La Campagna Romana* (C.R.), i (Rome, 1910), p. 110–2, has a list, but the locations of some of the sites he names are uncertain.


5. The sources are discussed below.

6. P. F. Kehr, *Italia Pontificia* (I.P.), ii (Berlin, 1907, reprint 1951), pp. 22, 28, thought that there were two *domus cultae* of Galeria, one on the Cornelia and the other on the Portuense, but Tomassetti's opinion that there was one huge estate (C.R., iii, pp. 36–47) seems preferable.
The *domus cultae* seem to have existed round the north of Rome in a continuous ring from the Via Portuense to the Via Flaminia, and it is possible that there were others across the Tiber towards Tivoli (Fig. 1).[7] South of Rome their distribution

---

[7] Tomassetti supposes the existence of a *domus culta* at Lunghezza near the ancient centre of Gabi, but his evidence is obscure.
seems to have been less intense, but they stretched as far south as Anzio, and even to Formia near Gaeta. On the extent to which the organisation of the domus cultae was distinct from that of other papal estates we are ill informed, but it seems to have been centralised and tight. Some at least of their produce was distributed direct to the Lateran. There was a special currency or at all events token system for these estates. The peasantry of the estates, the militia or familia sancti Petri, seems to have been politically important, and was much resented by the Roman nobles, who may also have seen the domus cultae as an unwelcome impediment to their obtaining grants of church lands in emphyteusis. The domus cultae were burned after the death of Leo III in 816; in 824 Pope Paschal used part of the familia sancti Petri in the execution of his coup d'état against the Primicerius Theodore.

The work done by the militia of Caprarorum on the Leonine wall round St. Peter’s, after the Arab attack of 846, is recorded in a well-known inscription. But the fate, not only of the domus cultae, but of the other great papal patrimonies during the Arab invasions of the late ninth and early tenth centuries is virtually unknown. It is not surprising that the domus cultae during this time of trouble disappeared for ever. As a highly centralised method of large scale farming, the domus culta was bound to decay, particularly as its distribution was widest just in the coastal districts which were most exposed to Arab attack. Arab bands were in occupation of areas near Sutri into the early years of the tenth century, and in the south places like Anzio and Formia were particularly vulnerable. Moreover, it was unlikely that a system to which the Roman nobility were in general hostile would persist at a time when all over Italy the nobility were greedily seizing church lands.

Practically the only glimpse of the kind of re-organisation forced upon the papal estates during these was years is the bull of Sergius II to the Bishop of Selva Candida in 905, ten years before the final expulsion of the Arab raiders at the battle of the Garigliano. Sergius refers to the almost complete depopulation of the bishopric through Arab raids, and in compensation grants it from the patrimony of the church in Tuscia the massa Cesana with its tied peasantry, in the evidently less troubled territory east of the Lake of Bracciano. How far we see in this document a change in the pattern of settlement is doubtful; the diocese of Selva Candida was re-settled during the tenth century, and did not finally decay until the wars of the Investiture Contest in the eleventh.

The first period during which we have some indication of what was happening to the lands of the Roman Church is that of the ‘principe’ of Alberic of Rome,

---

8 Fedele showed that Formia near Gaeta and not Formia near Velletri was probably intended in Liber pontificalis, ed. Duchesne, i, p. 435. Cf. Tabularium Cassinense, Codex Diplomaticus Caetanianus (Monte Cassino, 1887), i, pp. 31, 74–5.
11 Mansi, Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio, xxvii, p. 337, for the 877 Council of Ravenna at which this was notably denounced. Cf. L. M. Hartmann, Geschichte Italiens im Mittelalter (Gotha, 1903–15), iv, pp. 49–63, 119–21.
12 I. Kehr, I.P., ii, p. 25; J.-L., n. 3535. Cf. Tomassetti, C.R., iii, 126–8. The massa Cesana bordered on the west of the former domus culta of Caprarorum and on the north of that of Galeria. It has nothing to do with the massa Cesarona on the Via Tiberina, which is probably the proper site of the property Tomassetti attributes to S. Paolo fuori le Mura in this area (cf. I.P., i, p. 168, n. 16; J.-L. + n. 5200; and cf. also T. Ashby, ‘The Classical Topography of the Roman Campagna,’ above, iii [1906], pp. 129, 148).
from 932 until his death in 953. Alberic’s whole policy was the assimilation of the political aims of the Roman nobility with those of the Roman Church; the popes were his nominees and instruments, and his association with Odo of Cluny and John of Gorze is well known, although its reasons have been perhaps imperfectly understood. Essentially Alberic’s policies were concerned with the military defence of Rome, and in order to strengthen this he made use—as others were doing all over Europe at this time—of the disciplinary and organised power of the Benedictine order. This was what lay behind his having Odo made ‘archimandrite’ of the Roman monasteries, and of the attempted Cluniac reform of monasteries from Farfa to Monte Cassino.\[3\]

In so far as they concerned the patrimonies of the church, Alberic’s reforms seem to have concerned two main strategic areas: the region north of Rome between the Via Flaminia and the Via Cassia, and the valley of the river Aniene. In the whole area north of Rome, Alberic made the Benedictines supreme. His brother was bishop of Nepi, in the centre of this defensive zone, and next to Nepi Odo’s monks effected the reform of the ancient monastery of Castel Sant’Elia.\[4\] To the north was Paterno, the fortress where Otto III died, though there is no proof that it was already fortified in Alberic’s time, and even if it is assumed to have been so, its importance was probably as one of a chain of castles rather than as a single key point.\[5\] On Mount Soracte itself Alberic recovered the lands of the monastery of S. Silvester from his own vassals, and sent Leo the Chamberlain to restore and fortify it while his own priest from the Church of the Holy Apostles was sent to reform it.\[6\] This reform may also have affected the castle of S. Andrea in flumine, on a key position in the bend of the Tiber. South of Mount Soracte other important donations were made by Alberic himself and his family, to the monastery of S. Gregorio on the Coelian (SS. Andrea e Gregorio in Clivo Scauri), particularly in 945 of Mazzano, which was already referred to at that date as a castellum.\[7\]

Further east between the hills and the river the monastery of S. Paolo fuori le Mura was possibly already the most important landholder; here Odo of Cluny and John of Gorze had undertaken reform.\[8\] The holdings of S. Paolo were widespread and huge in the mid-eleventh century, though we have no certain knowledge of their extent in the tenth; certainly they later included some important...

---


\[5\] A. W. Lawrence, ‘Early medieval fortifications near Rome,’ above, xxxii (1964), pp. 91–5, 99–100, 113–6. Paterno was one of the castra granted by Alberic to S. Silvestro in Capite (see n. 29 below).


fortresses. Civitella di San Paolo in the area of Capena, and Castelnuovo di Porto, the most important fort on the Via Campana Vetus were held or part held by the monastery;\(^{19}\) there was also a fort at S. Paolo fuori le Mura itself, which fell to Otto the Great in 963.\(^{20}\) On the other side of the Tiber S. Paolo fuori le Mura later held important strong points, particularly the castle on the Via Gabina known as Longhezza,\(^{21}\) and south of Rome where the monastery seems to have inherited the territories of former domus cultae as far as the fortress of Ardea.\(^{22}\)

But the part played by the monastery of Subiaco in Alberic’s defence plans is the most striking of all. Huge grants of church lands, particularly the massa Jubenzana from the patrimonium Tiburtinum were made to the hitherto modestly endowed monastery of Subiaco, in order that it might control a chain of castles up the river Aniene, from Roviano to the monastery. The castle of Subiaco was granted to the monastery by the pope at Alberic’s behest in 937, and from that date for over a century the popes favoured the military and strategic role of the monastery.\(^{23}\)

Although some historians have thought him successful there, Alberic and his son John XII in fact gained only rather incomplete control of the great monastery of Farfa in Sabina. At the end of a long effort to ‘reform’ and control the monastery, the Sabine lands and forts of Farfa (so essential for the domination of the approach to Rome down the Via Salaria) were usually governed by a Roman nominee, but the middle and eastern Appenine possessions had fallen under the rule of the non-Roman counts.\(^{24}\)

Possibly typical of the property transactions concerned in this kind of operation is the case of Bocchignano, one of the three castles (the others being Tribuco and Arci) which control the pass of the Via Salaria near Farfa. The Frank Ingebold whom Alberic made one of the first Roman governors of Sabina gave Bocchignano to the monastery in 939.\(^{25}\) He had had the castle from his Roman wife the daughter of the dux Gratianus, and it was part of the massa Salla which was one of the Sabine patrimonial possessions of the Roman Church—out of whose patrimonial lands Farfa had in any case been endowed in the first place, at a much earlier period.

It is certainly not to be excluded that there was a military significance in the

---

\(^{19}\) Both in Gregory VII’s bull, _I.P._ , i, p. 168; _J.L._ + n. 5200. Following Kehr, I accept this document as genuine, though interpolated. That St. Paul’s was actually in possession of these lands a century earlier is no more than a possibility. The best edition is that of B. Trifone, ‘Le carte del monastero di S. Paolo,’ _ASR_ , xxx (1908), pp. 278–85.


\(^{21}\) Bull quoted in n. 18 above; Tomassetti, _C.R._ , iii, p. 485.

\(^{22}\) Bull quoted above.

\(^{23}\) R. Morgen, ‘Le relazioni del monastero sublacense col papato, la feudalità e il comune nel l’alto medio evo,’ _ASR_ , ii (1928), pp. 181–262.


\(^{25}\) Chron. Farf., i, 66, 312–3; _Reg. Farf._ , iii, n. 372; _Liber Largitorius_ , i, n. 221; _Cf. Vehse_ , p. 130. Sala means a centre for stock farming, and Tomassetti claims to have found early medieval farm buildings when he excavated at Bocchignano (C.R., i, p. 115).
foundations and donations of Benedictus Campaninus, probably one of the first counts of Campagna, and a close associate of Alberic, who founded the monastery of SS. Cosma and Damian in Rome, giving it important lands in the territory of Nepi, and also endowed S. Paolo fuori le Mura before himself becoming a monk. But it is not certain that all that was given to the Benedictines by Alberic and his family certainly had a necessary military intention; such an intention is not known in the case of Alberic's own foundation of S. Maria in Aventino, nor in that of his relatives Marozia, Stefania and Theodora, SS. Cirico and Nicola in Via Lata. It is on the other hand likely that some of the lands given by Alberic or confirmed by the pope to the monastery of S. Silvestro in Capite did have a place in the defensive system north of Rome, particularly the lands round Orte in the very north of the Roman frontier in Lombard Tuscia.

Whence did all these enormous donations to churches and monasteries come; what was the source of this immense generosity of the senator of all the Romans? It is reasonably certain that in practically every case the lands in question had at an earlier date been part of the patrimony of the Roman Church. Sometimes Alberic had in effect recovered them from other nobles (e.g. Bocchignano, or the lands of the monastery of S. Silvestro on Mount Soracte), or else he 'granted' church lands which had earlier been taken by his own family, or he caused the pope to confirm earlier transfers of papal patrimonies to the separate churches or monasteries. The old centralised administration of the patrimonies of the Roman Church had broken down — both the more recent phenomenon of the domus cultae and the older central system on which this was based. The system had not disappeared without traces; for example the actionarii of the Roman Church continued to collect revenues in the time of Alberic. But in effect the church lands had either fallen into the actual possession of nobles, or else been 'de-centralised' through their administration having been taken over by the separate Roman churches — actually these two alternatives were not exclusive, as the churches would grant their

26 G. Falco, 'L'amministrazione papale nella Campagna e nella Marittima,' _ASR_, xxxviii (1915), pp. 684–5, 705–7; P. Fedele, 'Carte del monastero dei SS. Cosma e Damiano in ‘Mica Aurea’,' _ASR_, xx (1898), pp. 474–80; see also Gregory VII's bull for S. Paolo fuori, in _ASR_, xxxi (1908), at pp. 282–5, totam massam Cesanam (see n. 12 above) . . . sicut Benedictus Campaninus monasterio tuo dedit, quando effectus est ibidem monachus. _Cf_. also _I.P._, i, p. 130; _J.-L._, n. 3944. 27 Ferrar, _Early Roman Monasteries_, p. 203. We have no detailed knowledge of what the endowment of this monastery was. 28 _Cf._ L. Cavazzi, _La diaconia di S. Maria in Via Lata e il Monastero di S. Cirico_ (Rome, 1908), pp. 243–922; L. M. Hartmann, _Tabularius Ecclesiae S. Mariæ in Via Lata_ (Vienna, 1895–1901). 29 V. Federici, 'Regesto del monasterio di San Silvestro de Capite,' _ASR_, xxii (1899), pp. 265–92. The massa Ortana or Maiana, pp. 281–3. There were also important lands in Sabina and also in the territory of Collinense west of the Via Flaminia (pp. 284–5). Some of these sites have been identified (e.g. Baccarecia = Vaccareccia near Riano, _C.R._, iii, p. 281) but many not. The Fosso di San Silvestro near Grotta Porciosa may be one of them: _Cf_. Frederiksen and Ward Perkins, above, xxv (1957), pp. 173–4 et passim. The lands possessed by the monastery south of Rome included one or two sites which were fortified later (e.g. Castel de’ Paoli between Marino and Castel Gandolfo) but it is not known if they were fortified at this time. It is doubtful if Civitella in the grant is identical with the important castle of Borghetto, as was once thought. _C.R._, iv, 332. For Paterno see p. 71 above. 30 I cannot agree with Hamilton, _Studia Monastica_, i (1962), p. 63, that Alberic's donations to Roman monasteries were 'from his private estates' — or not without qualifying the opinion by adding that these private estates were largely based on church property. 31 Federici, pp. 286–7. The church of Ravenna retained into the eleventh century a fairly elaborate system of rectors to oversee its patrimonies: G. Buzzi, 'La curia arcivescovile e la curia cittadina di Ravenna dall' 850 al 1118,' _Bulletino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo_, no. 35 (1915), pp. 10–21. The financial administration at Ravenna was in the hands of noble families — as probably also at Rome.
lands to nobles for a term of lives. To some extent also there had always been 'decentralisation', in that separate Roman churches and diaconates had retained special rights in lands which were centrally administered by papal officials—one example may be the lands of S. Maria in Cosmedin in the *domus culta* of Capracock, which are mentioned immediately below.

![Map of South Etruria](image)

**Fig. 2.**—South Etruria: showing places mentioned in the text

As an example of the manner in which the former papal estates were broken down in detail, I take the *domus culta* of Capracock, which is the best-known of the *domus cultae*, although many problems concerning it remain to be solved. The earliest knowledge of the lands attached to the later *domus culta* comes from a donation by an eighth century *dux* Eustathius and his brother George to the diaconate of S. Maria in Cosmedin.\[35\] This donation was of the *fundos* of Trea (on the river

\[35\] L. Lestocquoy, 'Administration de Rome et diaconies du VIè au IXè siècle,' *Rivista di Archeologia Cristiana*, vii (1930), pp. 261--295, at pp. 277--280. I owe a correction about this inscription to
Treia, north of Campagnano), Mercuriano, Scrofano, Agello and the *fundum antiquum*. All these lands are between Veio and Nepi. Then Hadrian I absorbed these lands in the *domus culta* of Caprarorum, which he formed from existing church lands and from the lands of his own family. The centre of the new *domus culta* was a site just north of Veio, where Hadrian built a church (later to become a monastery) to which he translated the bodies of the pontiff-martyrs S. Cornelius, S. Lucius, S. Felix and S. Innocent. To this church the Roman clergy and ‘senate’ went in procession for the consecration (Fig. 2).

What happened to Caprarorum in the ninth and tenth centuries is unknown, apart from the inscription recording the participation of the *militia* of Caprarorum in building the Leonine wall. In 1026 and 1037 it re-appears as having been granted to the diocese of Selva Candida, which now held not only the lands granted it in 905 round Cesano, but other lands in the same area and notably a *castellum* called Dalmachia in the area of Faleria which went south to adjoin the road leading to ‘pasture land of St. Peter’ (between Dalmachia and Cesano) from the *militia* of the ‘tower’ (in 1037 of the *curtis*) of Caprarorum. Then quite separately in the bulls, the diocese is said to possess the *plebem sancti Cornelii in Crapario*, by which is evidently intended the monastery of S. Cornelio near Veio, the original centre of the *domus culta*. Evidently the name of the *domus culta* had because of a shift in settlement been transferred from the original centre to a site much further north on the river Treia, as in 1053 Leo IX granted to the monastery of S. Stefano Maggiore (one of the Vatican monasteries) the *fundum Cornelianum positum in Macorano iuxta Caprarorum* (i.e. the monastery of S. Cornelio) and separately to the chapter of St. Peter’s the *castrum Caprarorum* in the territory of Veio, 27 miles from Rome.

Professor D. A. Bullough. Lestocquoy’s reading of ‘David’ as the brother of Eustathius does not seem to me satisfactory.

---

33 *Liber pontificalis*, i, pp. 501, 506.
I.P., i, p. 139; J.-L., n. 4294 (1 April 1053): castrum Caprarorum cum terris vini… et molaria sua cum ecclesia sancti Johannis qui dicitur de Latregia… posita territio Vegetano miliario ab urbe Rome plus minus vicesimo septimo, immo etiam fundum qui vocatur Agelium, positum in supradicto territorio Vegetano, Agelium was one of the *fundi* in the VIIIth century donation of dux Eustathius and his brother George (above). The link between Caprarorum and a site on the Treia is made more probable by a tenth-century source which associates a church of St. John with the river Treia, Chron. di Benedetto di S. Andrea, p. 26.

This is probably the same church of St. John as in Leo IX’s bull, and as in those of Hadrian IV, Urban III and Innocent III, which mention castrum Caprarorum… cum ecclesia sancti Johannis diruta (I.P., i, pp. 142, 143; J.-L., n. 10387, 15632; Potthast, n. 2592). Later relevant documents are Innocent III’s bull concerning the monastery at Castel S. Elia (Potthast, n. 4384) and the bulls of Gregory IX (Potthast, nn. 8213–4, 10217, 10683; L. Auvray, *Régistres de Gregory IX*, nn. 4480–1, 4647, 4650). Tomassetti cites Coppi’s edition of Gregory IX’s bull of 1238 (Diss. dell’Ac. Rom. Pont. di Arch., xxv, 1864, p. 243), but this is a very poor text indeed, and Auvray is here to be followed. The bull (14 June 1238) records the transfer to SS. Cosma and Damiano of the ecclesiæ S. Cornelii prope Insulam quod vocatur castrum Sancti Petri in loco qui dicitur Maceranum by the monastery of S. Maria de Farneta near Cortona. How this monastery came into possession of the property is unknown, but it was in possession of it by 1188 and perhaps by 1180. I.P., iii, p. 192, no. 7, dated 20 May 1188 and printed in *Gutt. Nachr.*, 1902 (not 1903, as quoted by Keus), pp. 543–5, no. 27. The bull refers to the monasterium sancti Cornelii cum ecclesiis suis, immediately before going on to list the churches held by S. Maria de Farneta in Rome. The fundum Maceranum positum iuxta ecclesiam sancti Cornelii is mentioned in Gregory VII’s bull for S. Paolo fuori, quoted in n. 26 above.
THE BRITISH SCHOOL AT ROME

From this we might well presume that the two main centres at least of the domus culta of Caprarorum had remained continuously in the hands of ecclesiastical owners after the decay of the domus culta, and that they had ended in the twelfth century in the possession of St. Peter's. Such a conclusion would be mistaken. In 1041 Stephen nobilis vir, son of Leo the nomenclator and husband of Marozza gave to the abbot of the monastery of S. Cornello the whole area of the land immediately surrounding the monastery—the description of this land is a very striking one, as it can still (until the modern Roman speculating builder arrives) be easily identified from the site of the monastery. It is notable also that one of the boundaries is the land belonging to the heirs of Crescenzo domini gratias olim prefectus. Thus the Roman nobility had obtained effective possession of these lands even while papal grants continued to label them as church property.

Like the main centres, the rest of the domus culta of Caprarorum went to various churches and monasteries, which often had to dispute possession with lay intruders. Mazzano has already been mentioned; by 998 the castle of Arnario which adjoined it had also been given by lay donors to S. Gregorio on the Coelian. Campagnano, which is notable for its growth and partial absorption of neighbouring population in this period, was with Sorbo and Formello the property of S. Paolo fuori le Mura, which in the early twelfth century was defending itself in the area with difficulty against the usurpations of the nobility. South of the former domus culta the ancient centre of Veio, which had been granted to S. Silvestro in Capite by Alberic, began to be again mentioned as a minor agricultural centre; by 1005 SS. Cosma and Damiano had the confirmation of possession of what was called the castellum insulae.

The domus cultae all suffered the same fate. Some lands fell into the definite ownership of laymen, particularly under the rule of thirty years occupation granting a prescriptive title. Of the lands whose title was attributed to one or other of the Roman churches or the suburbanian bishoprics, some were held in demesne while others were granted out to laymen. The huge domus culta of Galeria was much of it held by S. Maria Nova and SS. Cosma e Damiano, but its centre was from the early eleventh century held by the counts of Galeria. The domus culta of Lauroretum, which is rather tentatively identified with a site on the Via Aurelia, went largely to S. Gregorio on the Coelian. Beyond this there are no known sites of domus cultae on the Via Aurelia northwards, though there was certainly a great deal of important church property, which was badly hit by the Arab raids of the ninth century and subsequently was owned either by monasteries (particularly Farfa and SS. Cosma

---

36 Printed by Fedele in ASR, xxii (1899), n. xlv, p. 79, 2 April 1041. Other documents relating to S. Cornello on pp. 94, 424. For Leo the nomenclator, the brother of Peter 'caput longa,' see p. 32, ibid., where Leo is already dead by 1011, and p. 72.
42 Tomassetti, C.R., ii, pp. 492–5, where he revokes his earlier opinion that this site was located between Tor Vaianica and Pratica di Mare (ASR, xix, 1896, pp. 327–8). Cf. J.P., ii, p. 5.
and Damiano) or by Roman nobles. S. Leuco, a domus culta on the Via Flaminia instituted like Caprarorum by Hadrian I, broke up into a complicated network of clerical holdings round Tor di Quinto, with the Crescenzi family also taking a substantial share.

The domus culta of Sulpicianum at the foot of the Alban hills, which was itself the heir of the great ancient latifundium of Boville, remained substantially church property until the Savelli family encroached on it in the thirteenth century. The adjacent estates in the northern part of the ancient ager Lanuvinus went to the monastery of S. Lorenzo fuori le Mura which organised a new agricultural centre round what came to be called later in the middle ages Civita Lavinia. The domus culta of Calvisianum, which was again the direct descendant of a great and well-known ancient estate, was established on the Via Ardeatina by Hadrian I, and seems to have remained the property of various churches (principally the Lateran) until the fourteenth century.

The problem of determining the changes of land settlement and utilisation which accompanied these developments is a very complex one which can only be solved by the detailed archaeological and literary study of particular estates. The great estates in the Roman district at this period, although in some areas less populous than earlier, were in others appreciating in value and in population density. Vines and olives were being widely planted in central Italy at this period, both by the coloni on the demesne lands and—probably far more—by the libellarii who accepted church lands for small rents, with the obligation of improving, planting and populating them. Thus when the castle of Bocchignano was recovered by Farfa in 1014, the two-thirds of the lands attached to it which were not in demesne were immediately re-leased to smallholders with the duty of cultivating and improving them.

On the other hand the frequent mention of mills and ‘land fit for sowing’ in documents relating to the country round Nepi, including the area of the domus culta of Caprarorum, makes it plain that cereal cultivation was still being widely practised north of Rome. Sheep farming on a transhumance system was and remained one of the main agricultural occupations of the Roman District, but there is at present

---

43 For this area, stretching from Cervetri (Cere) to Corneto, see C.R., ii, pp. 515–20; G. Calisse, Storia di Civitavecchia (Florence, 1898); P. Lauer, in Mélanges d'Archéologie et d’histoire, xx (1900), pp. 147–53. I have not yet managed to see O. Totti, La città medievale di Centocelle (Allumeire, 1958). For Corneto, Dilcher's article in Quellen und Forschungen, xili–xili (1963), pp. 1–12 is not entirely satisfactory or complete; e.g. it makes no mention of the document printed by P. Egidii in Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano, no. 34 (1914), pp. 1–6. Reference to destruction by Arabs near Centocelle, I.P., i, p. 130, no. 3.

44 C.R., iii, pp. 239–42. It is possible that the inhabitants of the domus culta were displaced in part to Malborghetto, ibid., pp. 262–3.


48 Liber largitorius Mem. Phark., i, no. 3, 545, 564, 611, 624, 686, 709, 734, 760–1, 766, 769, 783–4, tenebamus partem tertiam et alias duas nostris libellariis, Chron Forf., i, 65. For this obligation to improve and cultivate the holdings of the monastery, see Zuchetti, ‘Il “Liber largitorius”’, etc., BISH, no. 44 (1927), pp. 74–7.
little means of telling from the documents whether the pattern which is known from the later middle ages had already taken shape. How far back in history the practice went of very large numbers of sheep not owned by the church, pasturing on church lands under a standard fiscal arrangement, is not clear. The mention of the ‘demesne pasture’ or ‘pasture of St. Peter’ in the bulls granting the massa Cesana to Selva Candida makes it clear that sheep farming went on, but we do not know how far if at all later important centres like Musignano with its abbey ad pontem had yet developed. Nor do we know how the forests in the Roman district were exploited, or the extent to which they were being cleared. Finally, a factor of the first importance which affected settlement at this time as at others was the change experienced by water courses, in which alluvial deposits changed levels and courses, and could block ancient drainage systems. Only when the documents have been read and the ground examined with considerations of this sort in mind can some of the problems of the decay and growth of settlements at this time be solved—the decline of Orchia and the rise of Viterbo; the growth of Civita Castellana; the de-population of the dioceses of Selva Candida and Porto in the early twelfth century—all these are questions of this kind which with many others await an answer.

Peter Partner

---

49 Quoted above, nn. 12 and 33.
53 Frederiksen and Ward Perkins, above, xxv (1957), pp. 193–5, where there is also a comment on the forest.
54 C.R., ii, pp. 487–90; Tomassetti in ASR, xxiii (1900), pp. 129–70.
THE ORIGIN OF AFRICANO

(Plate XIX)

The explorations which resulted in the discovery recorded below were undertaken by Mr. Ballance on behalf of the Committee for the Study of Ancient Marbles and Similar Stones in Antiquity. This Committee, which is sponsored by the International Association for Classical Archaeology, was established in 1965 in order to serve as a centre for reference and for the exchange of information between all those persons and institutions who are concerned with the identification and study of the fine building stones and other decorative stones used in classical antiquity. The present members of the Committee are MM. M. H. Ballance, F. Braemer, G. Carettoni, L. Cozza, R. Gnoli and T. Kraus, Dottoressa M. F. Squarciapino (representing the International Association) and the undersigned (Secretary).

A primary objective of the Committee’s work is the establishment of authentic reference-collections of samples from ancient quarries. The nucleus of such a collection is already available in Rome, thanks to a generous grant made by the Italian Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, through Professor Gnoli. It is housed temporarily in the British School, and it is hoped that supplies of quarry-samples will in due course be available also for distribution to other appropriate centres.

The Committee hopes to issue periodical bulletins, listing such identifications and giving recent bibliographical information. Meanwhile it is conscious that the value of its own work will depend very largely on the extent to which it can profit by, and can itself assist, the work of all scholars interested in this field of research. Any of those who are not already in touch with the Committee are most cordially invited to communicate with the Secretary of the Committee, c/o the British School at Rome, Via A. Gramsci 61.

J. B. Ward-Perkins

Africano is one of the most distinctive, although one of the most variable, of the ornamental stones commonly used by the Romans. It is a breccia containing lumps of white, grey or, most typically, pink marble, in which the crystals vary from minute to very large, the largest usually occurring in well-defined veins or patches. These lumps of marble, which may be of any size up to several feet long, are embedded in a black, dark green or greyish matrix that is usually harder than the marble itself. It probably derives its modern Italian name simply from its generally dark colour, rather than from any early speculation as to its origin, and since Corsi’s attribution of it to Chios was disproved by the discovery that Chian marble was the Portasanta of Italian stonemasons, it has usually been listed as of unknown origin.\(^1\)

The period of its principal use stretches from Augustus to the Antonines, and both columns and slabs are fairly widespread in Italy and North Africa. In Asia Minor it is in general rare, though odd columns and slabs appear at Ephesus and Pergamum.

\(^1\) F. Corsi, *Delle Pietre Antiche*, 3rd ed., Rome, 1845, pp. 99ff.; for the Chian quarries, W. Brindley in *R.I.B.A. Trans.*, New Ser., iii, 1887, pp. 47, and M. W. Porter, *What Rome was Built With*, London and Oxford, 1907; Portasanta was attributed by Corsi to Iasus in Caria, which in fact produced a most distinctive dark red marble with straight or contorted white bands, which is characteristic of Justinianic churches at Constantinople, Ravenna and Ephesus.
In August 1966, the writer, on a rapid tour of ancient quarries in Turkey under the auspices of the International Committee for the Study of Marble and Decorative Stones in Antiquity, and with the aid of a generous grant obtained through Professor R. Gnoli from the Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, visited the quarries at Teos.

Four quarry-areas can be distinguished. The most obvious is that at the northwest end of a rocky hill just to the north of the Seferihisar-Sığacık road, about 3 km. from Seferihisar. Several small ancient quarries are recognisable in spite of modern blasting and lime-burning. The stone is a dark grey marble, sometimes streaked with white, with large or very large crystals; it was used for ordinary building work of all periods at Teos, and apparently exported in quantity; bigio antico and bigio morato, which occur frequently in Italy, usually as columns, are superficially identical with darker and lighter forms of this Teian marble, though this does not of course preclude the possibility of other sources of supply.

About 1000 m. north-north-west of this outcrop, at the foot of the gently rolling hills that bound the Teos plain on the north, lies a small lake of clear greenish water, named Kara Göl (pl. XIXa). It is about 150 m. in diameter, and has steeply shelving banks covered with a narrow fringe of dense reedbed that suggests that there is a little seasonal variation in the level. Such natural rock as is visible on the banks is micaceous schist and dark grey marble of poor quality. The most remarkable feature, however, is the almost unbroken ring of spoil-heaps, up to 20 m. high, that surrounds the lake. These heaps are composed of chips of africano,2 and there can be no reasonable doubt that they were extracted from what is now the lake. The otherwise continuous ring of heaps is interrupted only on the south-west side, where a road leading to the safe anchorage at Sığacık, 3 km. away, must have left the quarry; near the lake shore at this point lie two large blocks of white-veined grey marble, which appear to be the sole survivors, apart from one lying in the sea at Sığacık, out of a score of vast and curiously-shaped masses, bearing quarry-inscriptions, which were seen by earlier travellers.3

A short distance north-west of Kara Göl and higher up the hill there is a third quarry, of small size and little interest, which seems to have produced an inferior form of africano.

Further on in the same direction, on the east face of a valley running south-west towards Sığacık, lies a fourth quarry, some 100 by 40 m., that must have produced very large quantities of the ordinary grey marble. The working face on the south side is well preserved; the technique was that common to most ancient quarries;

---

2 I am indebted to Mr. F. G. Dimes of the Geological Survey and Museum, South Kensington, for the following description of a thin section of a specimen from the spoil-heaps at Kara Göl.

3 The specimen is seen to be composed of granular calcite; the areas coloured pink and white are of finer and more even grain than the rest. There are also organic fragments in the form of sea-urchin spines included in one or two of the pink and white patches; these patches have a rather angular outline. The rock appears to be a recrystallized limestone breccia. He adds, however, that some of the Kara Göl specimens also contain non-calcareous material in the form of a silty mudstone, and that one consists mainly of quartz.

individual blocks were isolated from the surrounding rock by V-shaped trenches cut with the pick, and were then split off from below with wedges (pl. XIX, b).

Previous descriptions of the Teian quarries mention the isolated hill, also Kara Göl and the curiously shaped blocks beside the latter. Hamilton, a distinguished geologist as well as an observant traveller, describes the chips in the spoil-heaps at Kara Göl as ‘a hard brecciated limestone of a fine quality,’ as distinct from the ‘blue marble’ of the isolated hill. Other visitors to Teos, from Pococke and Chandler in the eighteenth century to Béquignon in the twentieth, seem to have been content to describe the material of the marked blocks at Kara Göl as ‘grey marble’ or ‘pierre grisâtre,’ without noting that the quarry had produced anything of more unusual colour. Indeed the existence of these grey blocks, which diverted the eye of the traveller from the adjacent quarry, seems to be responsible for the mystery that has so long shrouded the origin of africano.4

It is obviously fruitless to speculate on the manner in which the Kara Göl quarry was abandoned and became a lake, nor is there any absolute certainty as to when this took place. The latest of the quarry-marks on africano recorded by Bruzza5 belongs to A.D. 135, while the latest of the grey blocks at Kara Göl, which may or may not have been cut in the Kara Göl quarry, were dated 166. In Rome, africano appears in quantity in the Forum of Trajan and is a conspicuous, though not, in terms of sheer volume, very important element in the presumably Hadrianic wall-decoration of the Pantheon. The threshold of the Antonine Capitolium at Ostia, the latest large block known to me, may have come direct from the quarry or may equally well have been cut down from a damaged column; where africano appears in the late houses at Ostia, such as the Casa della Fortuna Annonaria, it is presumably reused. On this evidence, for what it is worth, the abandonment of the quarry can be provisionally assigned to the second half of the second century.

M. H. BALLANCE

---

4 The only literary reference to Teian marble appears to be that of Dio Chrysostom (Orat., lxxix, 2), where Teos appears as one of a list of cities that have benefited by the possession of a supply of finely-coloured or variegated stones (Λίθων ἄρετον καὶ ποικιλῶν). An incense-burner of Teian stone is recorded in an inscription from Smyrna (Syll., III, 996). On other supposed references see Ruge in RE., s.v. Tess., col. 569 f.

5 L. Bruzza, Annali dell’ Instituto, 1870, p. 183, no. 182, cf. p. 146. With the benefit of hindsight, the similarity between Bruzza’s no. 181 (on africano) and his no. 239 (on grey marble) might have suggested that the two came from the same group of quarries.
URBAN CHANGE IN EARLY MEDIEVAL ITALY:
THE EXAMPLE OF PAVIA

(Plate XX)

Prefatory Note.—My interest in Pavia goes back at least to 1951 when I was elected Rome Scholar in Medieval Studies. I began seriously to collect material for the history of the city in the early Middle Ages in the winter and spring of 1953 when I enjoyed the warm hospitality of the Collegio Ghislieri, thanks to the efforts made on my behalf by the late Hugh Last, to whose memory this article is dedicated. The published proceedings of the Reichenau and Spoleto congresses on ‘The early medieval town’ in the 1950s clearly underlined the need for detailed studies of particular towns; but the lack of adequate archaeological evidence discouraged me from attempting such a study of early medieval Pavia. In 1964, however, Dr. A. Peroni, Director of the Museo Civico invited me to read a supplementary paper on this topic to the Convegno di Studio sul Centro Storico di Pavia held in the Università degli Studi at Pavia on July 4th and 5th of that year. The present article is an amplified and corrected version of that paper: I have made no substantial alterations to my account of the ‘urbanistica’ of early medieval Pavia—written for an audience of architects and art-historians as well as of historians—but have dealt more fully with the social history of the city in this period. Professor Richard Krautheimer read a draft of the revised version and made some pointed and helpful comments. I am greatly indebted to Dr. Peroni, not merely for the invitation to present the original paper but also for supplying illustrations and answering queries at a time when he and his staff were engaged in helping to repair the ravages of the Florence floods.

In addition to the familiar standard abbreviations (PW., CIL., CSEL., HL., etc.), I have used the following abbreviations in the notes:


D.Arn. = Die Urkunden Arnulf’s, ed. P. Kehr, 1940 (Mon. Germ. Hist., Dipl.)

D.B.I = I Diplomi di Berengario I, ed. L. Schiaparelli, 1903 (Fonti per la storia d’Italia).


D.Lo.III = I Diplomi di Lodovico III . . ., ed. L. Schiaparelli, 1910 (Fonti).


D.O.II = Die Urkunden Otto II in ibid., ii.

D.O.III = Die Urkunden Otto III in ibid., ii.


D.U.Lo. = I Diplomi di Ugo e di Letario, ed. L. Schiaparelli, 1924 (Fonti).


Solmi, Amministrazione finanziaria = A. Solmi, L’amministrazione finanziaria del Regno tical nel l’alto medioevo (B.S.Pav., xxxi, pp. 5–288 and separately), 1932.
In the opening years of the sixth century Ennodius, a cleric trained in a good secular rhetorical tradition, wrote a wordy panegyric of bishop Epiphanius of Pavia, by whom he had been ordained. In it he refers to the city of which he himself became bishop in 514 or 515 as Ticinensis civitatum; and in another passage he speaks of the oppidi Ticinensis angustia. Such expressions need not be taken too literally. The context of the first of them was an account of the threat to Pavia from a supposedly vast barbarian host, the context of the second a description of the consequences of trying to quarter in it the immense number of Ostrogoths who had come to Italy from ‘the Orient.’ None the less the Ticinum known to Epiphanius and Ennodius was small in comparison with contemporary Milan or with Ravenna, then enjoying its period of greatest glory: but like these same two cities, it had become a far more important place in the late Empire than it had ever been in the days of the Imperial peace. A mint was established there in the time of the Emperor Aurelian, although it seems to have come to an end before the death of Constantine. In the fourth and early fifth centuries the city was both a regular garrison-centre and a staging-point on expeditions which in earlier centuries would have taken other routes; and in the same period an Imperial bow-factory was established there.

These and doubtless other developments of temporary or permanent importance are unfortunately neither illustrated nor paralleled by archaeological evidence: excavation in and around Pavia has been for the most part too casual and its recording too summary; and the preparation of a comprehensive inventory of what has come to light at various times is only now getting under way. It is, however, presumably to the period of the later Empire that we should attribute the large multi-apsed building (reconstructed by its discoverers as an elaborated triconch, Fig. 3) of which part of the foundations were discovered in 1895 on the site of the later church of S. Tommaso—correctly described by Opicino de Canistris in his vivid description of fourteenth-century Pavia as ‘almost in the centre of the city.’ It was almost certainly a bath-building: in Opicino’s time the main city fountain was adjacent to the church; a Roman lead pipe carrying spring-water into a cistern that probably once supplied the fountain was found in 1894; the foundations exposed in the next year were also served by lead conduits and were surrounded by

---


2 The article *Tricium* in PW., ser. 2, vi/l, cols. 846–8 is very unsatisfactory. Additional material for the history of the Roman town, although no comprehensive account, can be found in G. Nocca, ‘Topografia di Ticinum all’epoca romana,’ *Atti del Terzo Congr. Naz. di Studi Romani*, i, 1934, pp. 415–22; P. Fracarco, ‘Centuriazione romane dell’agro Ticinese’ [1940] and ‘Strade romane dell’agro pavese’ [1946], republished with revisions in Fracarco’s *Opuscula*, iii, 1957, pp. 51–62, 171–94; and in the recent studies of the Roman town-plan by G. Tibiletti (details below, n. 9). See also the *Carta Archeologica* (1939) of Pavia: but cf. n. 4.


4 The *Carta Archeologica* (1939) of Pavia and its territory includes a number of items not previously recorded (nor subsequently published); but it is by no means a complete record of pre-1939 discoveries. A complete inventory and photographic file of archaeological finds in and around the city is being compiled at the Museo Civico, on the initiative of its energetic Director, dott. A. Peroni.
FIG. 1.—PAVIA, THE HISTORICAL CENTRE

A, B, C, D—Points on the 'First Wall', corresponding to the equivalent points on Opicino’s map (Fig. 2)

1.—Duomo
2.—Broletto
3.—(ex-) S. Tommaso
4.—S. Michele Maggiore
5.—S. Teodoro
6.—S. Giovanni Domnarum
7.—SS. Gervasio e Protasio
8.—S. Pietro in Ciel d'Oro
9.—S. Felice
10.—S. Eusebio (crypt)
11.—S. Maria Canepanova
12.—S. Maria delle Cacce
13.—Remains of ?late-Roman Wall
   (no. 9, Via Porta Nuovo)
14.—Remains of ?Roman Wall
   (no. 27, Corso Garibaldi)
15.—Porta S. Felice

(Street widths not to scale; minor streets not shown; small curves and irregularities along principal streets omitted.)
Fig. 2.—Medieval Pavia as mapped by Opicino de Canistris (1320–30):

based on reconstruction by R. G. Salomon (in Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, xxv, after p. 142), with corrections introduced by A. Peroni (Pavia, gennaio-giugno, 1964, p. 10) and the line of the south wall modified to correspond with the evidence of Vat. Pal. 1993, fol. 27 v.

For the wall-angles ABCD cf. Fig. 1

wide and high drains, linked with the main Roman drainage system; and a closely related plan is a feature of the late-Roman baths excavated in the Via Brisia, Milan, in the mid-1950s. But it is not absolutely excluded that the building was the audience-hall of some Imperial official.5 In view of the remarkably complete preservation of the Roman gridded street-plan in the later town it is worth observing that the reconstructed plan of the ‘bath-building’ would make it extend across one

5 The discoveries of 1895 were first published, from careful drawings made at the time by members of the Genio Militare, by G. Nocca, 'Topografia,' p. 421 f. and pl. LXII. The reconstruction of the original building as a large trefoil, open on its west side to a rectangular hall which had shallow apses north and south, is acute and plausible: but it is not unequivocally demanded by what was found. Opicino's observations are in the De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 18; ed. Gianani, p. 92. The discoveries of 1894 are reported (so far as I know) only in a footnote to Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 18, n. 1. For the Via Brisia baths see M. Mirabella Roberti in Cisalpina, i, 1959, (Istituto Lombardo, Milan), pp. 77–9. For the use of triconch rooms as banqueting halls and later as audience-rooms in many parts of the Empire from the second century onwards, see the abundantly documented and illuminating study by I. Lavin in Art Bulletin, xlv, 1962, pp. 1–12, 25–7. The claim by E. Arslan in Storia di Milano, ii, 1954, pp. 515–7 that the Pavanian building should be dated to the early seventh century and identified as the earliest Lombard church [sic!] in the city is perverse.
Fig. 3.—Excavations in the Vicinity of the Church of S. Tommaso (1895), Showing Roman Drains, Late-Antique Bath-building (?) and (?) Medieval Walls

From a drawing made by the members of the Genio Militare: photograph supplied by Dott. A. Peroni, Museo Civico di Pavia
URBAN CHANGE IN EARLY MEDIEVAL ITALY

of the original (and modern) streets running east–west. It is beyond dispute that two other pre-medieval buildings protruded into the Roman streets corresponding respectively to the Corso Strada Nuova (ex-Vittorio Emanuele), the cardo of the Roman city—at its junction with the Via Mentana and the Via Calatafimi—and to the western continuation of the latter, the Via Mascheroni.6

The most fully documented feature of the late Imperial city (comparatively, that is, rather than absolutely!) is the primus murus urbis described by Opicino in his De laudibus, the ‘strong walls’ referred to by both Ennodius and Procopius.7 For it is highly improbable that the origins of this wall are attributable in any real sense to the first century B.C., as is assumed in a recent re-examination of the evidence for its site and course.8 The line of the west wall was some fifteen metres in advance of what Professor Tibiletti has plausibly suggested was the western edge of the Augustan city.9 The Porta Marica or Marenga, demolished in 1825, had towers with a rectangular lower storey and incorporated marble and other re-used material of first-to-third century date.10 The Porta S. Giovanni, in the southern half of the east wall, also incorporated material of the third century and seems to have been made in part of tufa blocks.11 Finally, Opicino’s two plans are probably reliable evidence that the south-west and north-east angles of the wall were curved.12 All this suggests that we have to do with a wall substantially of late-third or fourth century construction.13 (It has indeed been supposed that the

6 G. Patrini in Notizie degli Scavi, 1924, pp. 265–8 (= no. VII on the Carta Archeologica (1939), although the location is inaccurately indicated); G. Panazza in B.S.Pav., iv (n.s., vii), 1955, pp. 93–5. In both instances the later building has preserved some of the paving of the original Roman street.


8 F. Fagnani, ‘Il tracciato delle mura romane di Ticinum’, B.S.Pav., n.s., xi, 1959, pp. 3–42. Although marred by wrong references and contradictory statements, Signor Fagnani’s article makes substantial additions to our knowledge of the ‘first wall,’ based on personal examination of surviving fragments.

9 G. Tibiletti, ‘La struttura topografica antica di Pavia’: unpublished lecture given to the Convegno di Studio sul Centro storico di Pavia, July 1964, expanding and correcting an earlier study of the same theme in Regiose, iv, no. 33, maggio-giugno 1962, pp. 6 ff.

10 CIL., v/2, 6422, 6433, 6437, 6447, 6456, 6462; P. V. Aldini, Sulle antiche lapidi ticinesi, 1831; C. Terenzo, La Statua del muso dell’Acesso al colto [Pavia], 1855. For the towers see the ‘thumb-nail’ but probably reliable sketch in the part reconstruction/part plan of Pavia made by G. B. Claricioio in 1585: reproduced best in C. Magenta, I Visconti e gli Sforza nel Castello di Pavia, 1883, p. 1; most recently (much reduced) in Pavia, luglio/dicembre 1963, p. 12.

11 CIL., v/2, 6241; Fagnani, pp. 34 f. and n. 101. Signor Fagnani’s account of the siting of this gate (destroyed in 1818) and of the wall from here northwards to the supposed junction with the Porta Palacense is confusing and contradictory. His attempt to link the Porta S. Giovanni with remains of an Antique wall at Corso Garibaldi no. 27 locates it much too far west (inside the city!); Prof. Tibiletti, ‘Struttura topografica,’ more plausibly associates this wall-fragment with the original (Augustan) south wall of Ticinum, although this would be excluded if—as has been suggested by two qualified scholars quoted by Fagnani, p. 35—it is in fact ‘late Antique.’ Earlier, Signor Fagnani accepts that the famous inscriptions relating to the donus of Augustus, CIL., v/2, 6416 were on the Porta Palacense and were transcribed from it by the compiler of the Silloge Einsiedelensis which is now our only source. But he also accepts the evidence of H.L., V, 36 that a new Porta Palacense had been built on a different site before the date at which he supposes the compiler to have been active! He, like the Carta Archeologica, makes no reference to the foundations of a tower discovered in 1924 on the south side of the Via Giov. A. Scopoli and identified by G. Patroni in Not.d.Scavi, 1924, p. 286 as one of the towers of the (?medieval) Porta Palacense: cf. however, n. 25.

12 Vatican, ms. Pal. Lat. 1993 fol. 27 v, reproduced in R. Salomon, Opicinus de Canistris (Studies of the Warburg Institute, 1966, fig. 52; Vatican, ms. Pal. Lat. 6435, fol. 84v, reproduced in Journ. Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, xxv, 1962, fig. 27a, opp. p. 140; both reproduced (after Salomon) in Pavia, gennaio/giugno 1964, pp. 4, 6 (Fig. 2, p. 85).

13 Compare the walls of Rome: J. A. Richmond, The City Walls of Imperial Rome, 1930, passim; of
building of the wall was connected with Aurelian’s establishment of a mint in the
city—an ingenious but so far unproved hypothesis). On the north side of the city,
where the cemeterial evidence shows that there had been no expansion of the
inhabited area in the post-Augustan period, such a wall might conceivably have
followed closely the line of an Augustan predecessor, either being built a few feet
in advance of it, as at Verona, or actually on the earlier foundations, as on at least
two sides of the early fifth century wall at Albenga (Liguria); and it is possible to
claim support for this theory from the polygonal brick towers of the north gate
(which survived until the sixteenth century), closely similar to those of the early
first century A.D. that are still extant at Turin and at Asti. Signor Fagnani has
recently put forward the view that the walls on the south-east and south of the city,
where there had evidently been an expansion of the inhabited area in the post-
Augustan period, were added under the Ostrogoths. This view, which relies
essentially on the well-known passage in a near-contemporary chronicle that
Theodorici fecit . . . alias muros civitatis, seems to me highly implausible. If the text
in question is not merely a reference to repairs to the existing walls, as comparable
evidence from both Rome and Verona suggests, it may none the less refer to some
less substantial change in the course of the wall, conceivably in connection with
the building of the palatium: could this be the explanation of the curve outwards
of the east wall (beginning apparently just north of the Porta Palacense) which is
shown on Opicino’s larger plan? Only archaeology can provide a satisfactory
answer to these unresolved problems; and a few transverse sections by a qualified
archaeologist would be worth any number of ingenious hypotheses.

The approximate course of all four sides of the ‘first wall’ in its final form is,
however, not seriously in doubt. It had a total perimeter of about 3,100 m.,
forming a rough trapezoid of which the east side was longer than the west. The
many city walls built in Gaul in the later third, fourth and fifth centuries usually
surrounded only part of the area regularly inhabited in the first and second
centuries; and there is a certain amount of evidence—although too little that is

mura di Susa,’ Atti 5° Congresso Naz. di Studi Romani, ii, 1940, pp. 72–6 and pls. xvi, xviii; id. in
Not. d. Scavi, 1941, pp. 20–8 (rightly rejecting Taramelli’s suggestion of an Ostrogothic date).
For contemporary city-walls in Gaul and Britain see nn. 18, 23.

18 Richmond-Holford, p. 74; N. Lamboglia, Albenga Romana e Medievale, 1957, pp. 37–9 (the
north wall on the hand being probably some 50 m. in advance of the Republican wall: ibid., pp. 6,
39, 98).

19 Pavia: for early descriptions and drawings see F. Gianani, ‘La “Torre di Boezio”,’ Arch. Stor.
Lombardo, iii, 1925, pp. 130–48, with a reproduction of Sangallo’s drawing (of c. 1490/95) in VAT. Barb.
lit. 4424 fol. 13v at p. 137; Fagnani, art. cit., pp. 19 ff. and pl. III; and the ‘thumb-nail’ representa-
tions—based ultimately on Claricchio or Clarici-
cio’s source—in the earliest printed maps of the city
(below, n. 59). Asti: ‘Touring Club Italiano,
Attracesso l’Italia (n.s.): Piemonte Orientale, 1959,
Both building-technique and design of the Porta
Savoia at Susa are essentially different—and cruder.
But at Milan the polygonal ‘Torre de Ansperto’
(not, however, a gate-tower) formed part of the wall
associated with Maximian (third/fourth century):
Calderini in Storia di Milano of the Fondazione
Treccani, i, 1953, pp. 493 ff.

Auct. Ant., ix, p. 324.

19 I.e. VAT. Pal. Lat. 6435, fol. 84v. A change in the course of the wall might explain why Perotti
later built a new Porta Palacense contiguum palatii:
HL., V, 36. Another possible reason for the curve
in the wall is that it was taken round the outside of
the amphitheatre (compare Verona and other
cities on both sides of the Alps). The location of
the latter in this general area is made probable by
the fact that in the later Middle Ages an inscription
from it (below, n. 54) was in the church of S. Maria
in Verzario: see Opicino, De Laudibus, ed. Maiocchi
and Quintavalle, p. 8; ed. Gianani, p. 82.
beyond dispute—that many cities in north and central Italy similarly contracted sharply in the fifth and sixth centuries.18 At Ticinum, on the other hand, the wall embraced the whole of the Augustan city, as defined by Professor Tibiletti, plus the subsequent extension southwards to the river Ticino.19 This entire area together with the suburban cemeterial districts that were most extensive along the north wall20 constituted early medieval Pavia (figs. 1 and 2).

The construction of the 'first wall' must be regarded as an important stage in the transformation of the Roman city. Opicino, an acute observer and an accurate recorder, tells us that of the three walls whose course he was able to trace: interior mirabiliter grossus est.21 He was hardly exaggerating: the Porta S. Felice, although radically rebuilt in comparatively recent times, has traces of what appear to be medieval repairs on its north face some 7 m. above the present street level; and a section of the late-third century wall at Verona still stands to almost its full original height of 12 m.22 A wall of late-third or fourth century date would undoubtedly have had substantial towers at various points along its course, and in all probability a wide shallow ditch some distance in advance of it.23 One such tower can reasonably be identified with the turris ubi est oratorium in honore sancti Archangeli Michaelis in the west wall south of the Porta Marica, which before 839 had been annexed to the monastery of S. Maria Teodota; Signor Fagnani has supposed that parts of its base and foundations were uncovered—and subsequently destroyed—in the ex-cloister of the monastery in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, but the account of the discoveries do not support this interpretation.24bis

The antemuralis mentioned in an Imperial diploma of 839 granting to S. Maria land outside the walls between the Porta and the turris could perhaps be a reference to the city's defensive ditch.24 The remains found under the Via Giov. Antonio

---

18 Gaul: R. M. Butler, 'Late Roman town walls in Gaul,' Arch. Journ., cxvi, 1959, pp. 29–50, especially, pp. 40 ff., to which add the town-plans in, e.g., A. Grenier, Manuel d'Archeologie Gallo-Romaine, iii, 1938, pp. 115 ff. (Aix-en-Provence); Grenier, Carte Archéologique de la Gaule romaine, xii, 1959, pp. 85 ff. (Narbonne). Italy: a sharp contraction of the walled area of Florence in the 5th century has been convincingly demonstrated by G. Maetake in Acad. dei Lineti, Rendiconti, ser. 8, iii, 1948, pp. 97–112, further details in C. Hardie, 'The origin and plan of Roman Florence,' JRS., lv, 1965, pp. 135–40; for supposed evidence of similar developments at Bologna, Modena, Brescia and elsewhere see the references collected (but not examined critically) by L. Ruggini, Economia e Società nell' Italia Antoniana, 1961, pp. 79, 533–4; and cf. the discussion of this author's views in Appendix I.

19 Tibiletti, art. cit. in n. 9.

20 Below, p. 90.


22 Richmond-Holford, p. 75.

23 For changes in late-Roman defensive tactics and the consequent construction of fortifications of a new type see the late I. A. Richmond's penetrating observations in Durham University Journal, xxv, 1926/8, pp. 399–405, and the archaeological evidence assembled and analysed by P. Corder in Arch. Journ., cxiii, 1955, pp. 21–42 (city-walls in Britain) and by R. M. Butler, art. cit. in n. 18, pp. 38–43 (Gaul). For the ditch see particularly Corder's reconstruction drawing on p. 35 and the references in Butler, p. 43. The representation of Pavia from the northwest in Schedel's Liber Chronicarum, Nuremberg, 1493, fol. 74, although highly schematised and partly imaginative, does seem to show some of the late-Roman bastions of the city: see pl. XXb.

24bis References in n. 24.

24 BM, 1062; D. Loth. I., no. 38: the abbess's petition was for quaedam terra ibidem necessaria inter murum civitatis et antemuralem; the land granted is defined as de superiori capitie a porta que dicatur Marcena usque ad turram ipsius monasterii etc. It is a slight complication that in HPM.CDL, no. 192, BM, 1248 of 14 April 871, which is generally regarded as a confirmation of the 839 diploma, the subject of the grant now confirmed is referred to in very different terms, and indeed in words that have been taken to mean that it was within the walls (so Fagnani, p. 29), e.g.: terra necque ibis monasterium ipsum, quia urbis ipsius terminus includat, ut ipse tam monasterii septum muniret, quam urbis fines usque ad publicum viam includeret—words that are exactly repeated in DG., no. 10 of 891. I find this description far from clear and like Signor Fagnani am inclined to distinguish the precepta of Lothar's
Scopoli in 1924, near the assumed location of the Porta Palacense, sound from the brief description which is all that has been published (although the discoveries are said to have been properly recorded at the time) as if they may have been those of one of the bastions of the east wall. Another of the late-Roman bastions was probably the *turris que vocatur Alba*, apparently in the west wall, which is referred to in a document of 967; it was presumably so called because it had an exterior of stone and not of red bricks. Such fortifications brought security to the city and its inhabitants; but they profoundly altered its character and appearance and therewith, no doubt, the ‘psychology’ of its inhabitants. Existing structures, as we have seen, were robbed to provide for the construction of the wall; and as the larger public and private buildings fell into ruin or were demolished—as Ennodius tells us happened in 489/90, to provide space for the Ostrogoths—it was increasingly the dominant visual feature of the city.

For nearly two centuries after the conversion of Constantine to Christianity no buildings designed to provide for the public needs of the new religion were built within the walls of the city. The location of the church to which the young Martin ‘took himself off’ about the year 340 to become a catechumen is unknown: it might have been an oratory on a great estate and not in the Pavia area at all; but it could well have been in one of the city’s cemeteries and the forerunner of the episcopal church. When Pavia obtained its own bishop in the third quarter of the fourth century, the site of his church, the *ecclesia maior*, was the cemetery area beyond the north-west angle of the city wall: its earliest recorded dedication was to the Milanese martyrs, Protasius and Gervasius, and there is a little evidence to suggest that the fifth century church was a smaller version of the *Basilica Apostolorum* (S. Nazaro) at Milan. Before the end of the fourth century a second church was built by bishop Iventius, in honour of SS. Nazarus and Celsus, a short distance to the east. It was here that the Christians of Pavia—and from the early fifth century this would have meant almost all the inhabitants except for the Jews—had their only places of worship for a hundred years and here that they continued to gather

referred to in 871 and 891 from the extant diploma of 839. The latter is in any case quite specific. The few examples of *contumile* (almost) in early medieval texts unfortunately do not throw any light on the kind of ‘outwork’ that the writers had in mind. The discoveries made in the ex-cloister described by E. Vidari, *Frammenti cronistorici dell’agro Tizinese*, ed. 2, 1891, p. 171 (apparently using Sacic or some other writer contemporary with the discoveries) as: ‘tre metri sotto il piano... una galleria a grossi mattoni colla impugnatura all’orlo, rivolta al Tierno; entro di esso poteva camminare tanto un uomo che un cavallo.’ This is surely a description of part of the Roman drainage-system and not of the lower part of a tower.

---

A. Bernard and A. Bruel, *Charses de l’abbage de Cluny*, ii, 1880, p. 313, no. 1229. *Cf* Manaresi, *Placita*, ii/1, 1957, p. 67. For another *turris* which in my view was of medieval origin and not part of the wall see below. 

Videres urbem familiarium coetibus scententem, domorum inanimum culmina in angustissimis resecata tuguriiis; cerneres a fundamentis aedificia immensa migrare nec ad recipiendum habitantium densitatem solum ipsum posses sufficiere: *Vita Epifanii*, ed. Hartel, p. 360, ed. Vogel, p. 98. This passage *has* been interpreted as one of Ennodius’s elaborate metaphors: but the literal translation is grammatically possible and makes perfectly good sense.

For Martin’s church see *Vita S. Martini*, II, 3, ed. Halm, pp. 111–2. The principal early references to the church of SS. Gervasius and Protasius are in Appendix III, s.n.; the evidence for the plan of the fourth/fifth century church is discussed in Appendix II. Its extra-mural site is, in my view, fairly typical of early episcopal churches in north and central Italy.

References in Appendix III, s.n.
for the main liturgical ceremonies of the Christian year for nearly two centuries
more. The first intra-mural churches at Pavia almost certainly belong to the period
of Ostrogothic rule. Theodoric's Arian followers must have had their own church;
but it has left no trace, unless it was the church eventually dedicated to S. Eusebio
which was for a time the church of the Lombard Arians.\footnote{S. Eusebio: \textit{HL.}, IV, 42; there is no archaeo-
logical evidence for a pre-Lombard church on this site: but see below, p. 104 and n. 86. It is not
impossible that the \textit{basilica b. Petri} (unidentified) referred to in \textit{HL.}, IV, 31 was founded in the early-
sixth rather than the late-sixth century as I prefer to think.
Merkel argued forcibly that the evidence both for the
extra-mural church of S. Victor (not to be confused
with an intra-mural chapel also dedicated to
S. Victor, destroyed in 924 and not rebuilt) and for
Ennodius's burial there was too late to be comp-
pelling. The first reference to the church is,
however, rather earlier than he supposed although
still late, \textit{viz.} 909 (Appendix III, s.n.); there is at
the moment no evidence that a church existed on
the site of S. Michele before the later seventh
century, although archaeology may one day
provide such evidence; and the burial of a bishop 'intra-murally' as early as 521, if not absolutely
excluded, is very improbable. (The burial of the
Jewish convert Peter under the floor of a 'parochial'
church at Grado, in the Venetian littoral, apparently
before the middle of the fifth century is widely
recognised as an exceptional mark of favour; and
Grado was not at that time a \textit{civitas}. A bishop
Marcian, a refugee from elsewhere, was buried in
7578 in the newly-established episcopal church of
Grado, but again the circumstances were abnormal.
For details see G. Brusin and P. L. Zovatto,
\textit{Monumenti Paleocristiani di Aquileia e di Grado}, 1957,
pp. 458 ff., 486 ff. and the observations of R. Egger
in \textit{Studi Aquileiesi}, 1963, pp. 343–7. Verona had a
major intra-mural church in the late-fourth to
sixth centuries, but the burial place of its bishops
was first S. Procolo and then S. Stefano, both
extra-mural: see Zovatto in \textit{Verona e il suo territorio},
i, 1960, pp. 562 ff., ii, 1964, pp. 488 ff.).\footnote{For SS. Cosmas and Damian see Appendix III,
s.n. For the tiles see Panazza, \textit{Lapid.,} nos. 7, 8.
Noccia's suggestion that (like other tiles from the
'Broletto' destroyed at the time of their discovery)
these belonged to the original S. Stefano, has been
cautiously accepted by Panazza, loc. cit. and in
'Le basiliche,' p. 5; the fragmentary evidence for
its plan and elevation is considered \textit{ibid.}, pp. 7–9;
for the exterior wall, \textit{cf.} below, p. 103. Professor
Richard Krautheimer's categoric reference to a
\footnote{Ennodius's epitaph is \textit{CIL.}, v/2, 6464;
Panazza, \textit{Lapid.,} no. 6. Every conceivable feature of
the inscription was studied by C. Merkel,
'L'epitaffio di Ennodio,' \textit{R. Accad. d. Lincei: Memorie,}
ser. 5, scienze morale, iii, 1896, pp.
83–219, with minor additions and corrections in
argued forcibly that the evidence both for the
extra-mural church of S. Victor (not to be confused
with an intra-mural chapel also dedicated to
S. Victor, destroyed in 924 and not rebuilt) and for
Ennodius's burial there was too late to be comp-
pelling. The first reference to the church is,
however, rather earlier than he supposed although
still late, \textit{viz.} 909 (Appendix III, s.n.); there is at
the moment no evidence that a church existed on
the site of S. Michele before the later seventh
century, although archaeology may one day
provide such evidence; and the burial of a bishop 'intra-murally' as early as 521, if not absolutely
excluded, is very improbable. (The burial of the
Jewish convert Peter under the floor of a 'parochial'
church at Grado, in the Venetian littoral, apparently
before the middle of the fifth century is widely
recognised as an exceptional mark of favour; and
Grado was not at that time a \textit{civitas}. A bishop
Marcian, a refugee from elsewhere, was buried in
7578 in the newly-established episcopal church of
Grado, but again the circumstances were abnormal.
For details see G. Brusin and P. L. Zovatto,
\textit{Monumenti Paleocristiani di Aquileia e di Grado}, 1957,
pp. 458 ff., 486 ff. and the observations of R. Egger
in \textit{Studi Aquileiesi}, 1963, pp. 343–7. Verona had a
major intra-mural church in the late-fourth to
sixth centuries, but the burial place of its bishops
was first S. Procolo and then S. Stefano, both
extra-mural: see Zovatto in \textit{Verona e il suo territorio},
i, 1960, pp. 562 ff., ii, 1964, pp. 488 ff.).\footnote{For SS. Cosmas and Damian see Appendix III,
s.n. For the tiles see Panazza, \textit{Lapid.,} nos. 7, 8.
Noccia's suggestion that (like other tiles from the
'Broletto' destroyed at the time of their discovery)
these belonged to the original S. Stefano, has been
cautiously accepted by Panazza, loc. cit. and in
'Le basiliche,' p. 5; the fragmentary evidence for
its plan and elevation is considered \textit{ibid.}, pp. 7–9;
for the exterior wall, \textit{cf.} below, p. 103. Professor
Richard Krautheimer's categoric reference to a
Other changes in the ‘townscape’ of Ticinum, most of them only of temporary significance but one or two of lasting importance, are associated with the relative peace and prosperity that Theodoric brought to north Italy. His arrival in the city was marked, as we have seen, by large-scale demolitions. Subsequently, according to the near-contemporary chronicler previously quoted in connection with the problem of the city walls, the king *fecit palatium, thermas, amphitheatrum* at Pavia; and Theodoric’s construction of a palace there (as well as at Ravenna and Verona) was also recorded by a seventh-century Burgundian writer who was well-informed about Italy.\(^{33}\) Analogy with other cities where the evidence of the monuments themselves provides a check on the chronicler’s assertion of similar building activity suggests that in the case of the baths and amphitheatre the Ostrogothic king was simply responsible for repairs to structures that had been for many years unused and unusable; and these repairs would usually have been at the expense of other buildings; it is entirely characteristic that the inscription relating to repairs in the amphitheatre undertaken by Theodoric’s successor Athalaric in 528/9 is a re-used piece of a second/third century sarcophagus.\(^{34}\) The palace, on the other hand, doubtless was an entirely new building and it must have involved some radical changes in the appearance of the south-east part of the city, which are reflected to this day in the absence of the characteristic grid-plan of the streets in this area of Pavia. Alas! medieval and modern destruction have been disastrously efficient, and we know little more about it than can be gathered from a passing mention by deacon Agnellus of Ravenna who visited it in the late 830s on the occasion of a royal baptism and the bare references to various parts of the palace in the records of judicial proceedings that were held there in the tenth century.\(^{35}\) It was none the less one of the few witnesses to Theodoric’s attempt to revive in Italy the glories of the past that was to survive the prolonged agony of the Gothic wars and the briefer violence of the Lombard conquest.

Some sort of picture, then, does emerge of the changing appearance of *Ticinum* in the fourth, fifth and early sixth centuries, even though the evidence is fragmentary and rarely lends itself to only one interpretation. The social and economic history of the city and its *territorium* in the same period is not perhaps a complete blank: but it is only fitfully illuminated by material remains, by the passing remarks of literary writers and by the rare administrative document; and I do not believe that these scanty sources will bear the weight of interpretation put upon them in some recent works.\(^{36}\) One of the royal orders written by Cassiodorus for Theodoric c. 507/11 is addressed to the *comites, defensores et curiales* of *Ticinum* and shows, therefore, the combination of old and new forms of city-government and of military authority which is characteristic of late Imperial and Ostrogothic Italy;\(^{37}\) and two others

---

\(^{34}\) CIL*, v/2, 6418; Panazza, no. 10.  
\(^{36}\) See Appendix I.  

---
written by Cassiodorus in 535/6 refer to the release of grain from the state granarics at Pavia.38 These and other documents in the same collection, together with the writings of Ennodius, provide evidence for the economic difficulties of the region in the last years of the fifth century and the early decades of the sixth and for some of the measures taken to resolve them:39 it is, however, impossible to tell whether the conditions they describe are symptomatic of long-term and ultimately permanent changes or whether they are merely local and temporary. Even if archaeology adds substantially to our knowledge of the economic life of the region (which seems improbable), we shall still have no evidence worth the name for changes in the sources and amount of wealth of particular persons or families, for forms of tenure and the relationships of persons or groups, for shifts of power and influence within the city and the country districts round about. Except for a few clergy, the parents of Epiphanius, the deplorable Burco—who fought with the clergy of Pavia over the boundaries of a piece of land by the river Po and assaulted the subdeacon Epiphanius—and his unfortunate mother, and the Gothic count Wisibad who was given leave of absence to ‘take the waters,’40 individual inhabitants of late-Roman Ticinum are documented only in their deaths, in the funerary inscriptions from the city’s cemeteries: and few of these tell us anything about the lives of their subjects. Among those that do is an inscription in Greek, dated 471, which commemorates three members of a family that had come (apparently) from northern Syria;41 and the lost epitaph of Asbad, a Gepid chief who fought in Justinian’s armies against the Goths and died at Pavia in 566/7.42 Equally interesting for different reasons is the epitaph (unfortunately undated but presumably fifth/sixth century) of Ennia Valeria, wife of Valerius Campanianus, whose names suggest links with some of the great Roman aristocratic families and whose grandson, who was only three years when he died, was simply Senator—a personal name which recurs in Pavia, uniquely, some two centuries later.43 Conversely the name Burco is a reminder that long before the coming of the Ostrogoths or the allocation of ‘thirds’ to warriors there were men of Germanic ancestry who owned property and even lived in towns in north Italy.44 Casual finds of jewellery and metalwork in the region of Pavia, notably at Trivolzio, have been interpreted by more than one scholar as showing that in the fifth century local metalworkers were adapting their styles to the tastes

38 Variae, X, 27, XII, 28, discussed by Ruggini, Economia e Società (n. 18), pp. 326 ff.
41 IG, xiv, 2290; Panazza, no. 4. For the place of origin of the family, given as Κώμης Μακραυτάτων δρόμοι Ἀπαμών, cf. the entries Μαρκάτως κόμης and Μαρκοτον Ζαββάτης χωρίον in PW., xiv/2, cc. 1435, 1436 (Honigmann): the first is described as ‘Dorf Nordnyriens, unweit von Antiochia,’ the second as ‘Ortschaft bei Apameia in Syria II’; there is no reference to the Pavia inscription in either entry.
42 Copied in the ?early-seventh century portion of the Auctarium Harniense, ed. Mommsen (Mon. Germ. Hist., Auct. Ant., ix), p. 337; Panazza, no. 9. For his career see also Procopius, Bell. Goth., III, 38, 4–6, 9; IV, 26, 13; IV, 32, 22–5. The Auct. Harn. gives the year of his death as ‘the second year of Justinian,’ which is clearly impossible, since he took part in the battle of Tadino in 552; and I suggest that the copyist misunderstood a dating-clause (not copied) indicating the second year of the Emperor Justin (II).
43 CIL, v/2, no. 6465, Panazza, no. 31. For the fifth century as a crucial period in Roman name-giving see I. Kajanto in Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae, ii, 1963, especially pp. 11 ff., 121 ff. Senator first occurs as a personal name at Rome in the early fifth century. For the later Pavian Senator see below, p. 100.
of barbarian newcomers.\(^{46}\) Equally casual excavation within the city, finally, has produced some evidence of the changes and innovations that combined to make the medieval city very different even from its late Roman predecessor. The moulded, kiln-fired tiles bearing the name of bishop Crispin (II) seem to imply the acquisition by the bishopric of Pavia, whether by formal grant or tacit consent, of a formerly Imperial (royal) manufactory.\(^{46}\) At various points within the ‘first wall’ discoveries have been made of burials \textit{a capanna} attributable with varying degrees of certainty to the fifth, sixth or seventh centuries. Some at least of them were doubtless emergency burials, made during one or other of the sieges of the city; with one doubtful exception they were not the forerunners of permanent cemeteries within the city walls.\(^{47}\) They none the less reflect a profound change in attitudes and urban environment.

The detailed history of Pavia and its citizens might easily have been as obscure for another four or five centuries after the mid-sixth century as is that of most other Italian cities in this period. That it is not is due to an exceptional combination of circumstances. Within less than a year of their crossing of the Julian Alps in 568, the Germanic Lombards had advanced almost unopposed across north Italy. Pavia, however, held out for three years (569–72). The obvious strength of the city, together with its strategic situation at a road-crossing of a navigable tributary of the Po and the existence of the \textit{palatium} (possibly but not certainly with some resident officials who could be taken into the service of the newcomers), explain why Pavia eventually became, in Opicino’s words, the \textit{caput et camera seu sedes totius regni Langobardorum}.\(^{48}\) This did not happen immediately: for although some of the early \textit{reges Langobardorum} favoured Pavia as a royal residence, others seem to have preferred Milan or the hitherto insignificant Monza. But from the time of Rothari (636–52) Pavia—now usually so called—was the undoubted ‘capital’ of the Lombard kingdom; and this fact largely determined the evolution of the town for four centuries.\(^{49}\)

Pavia’s distinctive status as a capital city did not end with the overthrow of the


\(^{47}\) Panazza, nos. 7, 8. Further examples were found during the reconstruction of the ‘Broletto’ in 1926–28: cf. n. 32. For the transformation of the private enterprise brick-and-tile industry into a State monopoly by the end of the third century, see H. Dressel in \textit{Bull. dell’Istituto di corrisp. archeol.}, 1885, pp. 98–110; H. Bloch, \textit{I Bolli laterizi e la storia editoria romana}, 1947, pp. 389 f.; and add for the reign of Theodoric the examples cited in Richmond, \textit{City Wall}, pp. 37 f. The direct evidence for State control comes exclusively from Rome and vicinity; a similar development in the Po valley and Milan can, however, be inferred from the standardised bricks used in fourth/fifth century major churches and the tiles at Milan stamped with the names of Lombard kings, for which see \textit{Storia di Milano}, i, 1954, p. 509 (Arslan), \textit{ibid.}, pp. 225 f. (Bognotti).\(^{47}\)

\(^{48}\) \textit{De laudibus}, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 1; ed. Gianani, p. 73.\(^{48}\)

\(^{49}\) There are innumerable partial discussions of the theme ‘Pavia as capital’: in the absence of a comprehensive one see, \textit{e.g.} P. Vaccari, \textit{Pavia nell’alto Medioevo e nell’età Comunale}, 1956, chs. 2, 3; my own remarks in \textit{Engl. Hist. Rev.}, lxxvii, 1962, pp. 627 ff.; and E. Ewig’s remarks in \textit{Revue Historique}, ccxxx, 1963, pp. 36 ff.—all with references to other literature.
independent kingdom by Charles the Great in 774. It was, in my view, not in the Lombard period but in the second half of the ninth century and the first half of the tenth that it achieved its greatest authority and importance. It is precisely for this reason that the early medieval town and its inhabitants are comparatively well-documented. By the late ninth century, Pavia's unique contribution to the institutional and legal history of medieval Europe, the creation of a professional class of 'notaries and judges of the Palace,' was responsible for bringing many disputes to the city for final decision; moreover, churches and individuals from many parts of the kingdom found it advantageous to have a house of some sort in the city: hence, nearly all the main collections of early medieval documents contain one or more that throw light on the forma urbis of Pavia before 1024 and make up for the almost total loss of its own archives for this period. Furthermore, for the period before 774, which for most cities except Ravenna and Lucca is an almost complete blank, we have the valuable information included by Paul the Deacon in his Historia Langobardorum and the rich series of inscriptions recently admirably re-edited by Prof. Panazza. The total number of relevant documents of the period 774–1024 is none the less pathetically small in absolute terms—approximately forty royal and Imperial diplomas, fifteen notitiae iudicii and twenty-five donations, sales, exchanges and testaments: less than the evidence for one year at Florence in the later twelfth century or for one month in the early fourteenth century. As the late Professor Bognetti remarked in another connection, we are dealing with 'rammenti di frammenti'; but short of archaeological discoveries comparable with those recently made and still being made in, for example, Belgian Antwerp and English Winchester (the Pavia of Wessex) they are probably all the evidence we shall ever have.

There is a little evidence to suggest that for a considerable period after the conquest the Romani on the one hand and the barbarian newcomers and their successors on the other lived in two more-or-less separate communities. The Theodorician palace cannot have been left unoccupied for any length of time, and indeed if we accept (as I do) the substantial authenticity of the early Bobbio diplomas it was certainly a Lombard royal residence in the 620s. In spite of their late date, two tenth-century texts and one of the early eleventh century—the first much discussed, the others almost unknown—are good evidence that at an early stage in the Lombard conquest one or more of their færae (warrior-bands linked by kinship) occupied the north-east sector of the city, where they were not far distant from the palace. In 915 the bishop of Bergamo was authorised to build what he wanted in loco qui dicitur Faramania to replace the houses belonging to his see that had been destroyed when the adjacent section of the city-wall had been rebuilt to give protection against the Magyars; and in 1026 a later bishop of Bergamo made an exchange of property with St. Martin's at Tours which included, on his part, two pieces of land—one built on and one not—posita infra civitate Ticinense locus ubi dicitur Formannia. In 944 or 945 the bishop of Pavia gave to his acolyte Rozo

---

80 Cod. dipl. di Bobbio, ed. C. Cipolla, i, 1918, no. 7 of 2622, no. 9 of 2625. See also Jonas, Vita Columbani, II, 24 (ed. Krusch, ScR rer. Germ., 1905, p. 286) on the Bobbio cleric Bidual who a beato Atala ad Ticinum urbem directus suisset ibique pervenisset, viaque medio civitatis ambulans, obivium habuit Ari-
uldo et atum Langobardorum, i.e. the duke of Turin who was brother-in-law of Adalaoald and succeeded him as king; the episode belongs to the early 620s.
(subsequently bishop of Asti) abbatias duas quae sunt sitas intra hanc Ticinensem civitatem in loco que dicitur Foramania, unam in honore sancti Archangeli Michaelis, alteram vero in honore sancti Iacobi apostoli dicatas.\textsuperscript{61} The second of these is evidently the church that figures in Opicino's list of churches within the first wall, and in other texts of the twelfth to fourteenth century, as ecclesia sancti Iacobi in Foro Magna; the first named is equally evidently the ecclesia sancti Michaelis de Canevanova which is the immediately preceding name in Opicino's list. The church of Sant'Agata in Foromagn, first recorded as such in 1100, is also subsequently referred to alternatively as de Canevanova, after the prominent local family which was steadily accumulating property in this part of the city from the late twelfth century; and a S. Agathe duly figures on one of Opicino's maps of the city immediately inside the north wall in the second insula westwards. The modern Via di Foro Magna marks the approximate southern limit of the ancient faraman(n)ia of Pavia and preserves the pseudo-learned rendering of a word that already in the tenth century had become quite unintelligible.\textsuperscript{62} A short distance to the west, in the time of king Rothari if not

\textsuperscript{61} DB. I, no. 100; Manaresi, Placiti, iii/1, no. 324; Arch. Cap. Asti, no. 62. The second document is referred to in a recent article by Signor Fagnani (next note); the third seems never to have been noticed, although it provides the most specific topographical indications. The significance of the correct reading faramania in the first document and its connection with the faroae referred to in the earliest written sources for Lombard social organisation were first recognised by G. P. Boggetti in his 'Arimannia nella citta di Milano,' Rendiconti del Istituto Lombardo, lxxi, 1939, pp. 173 ff. and especially p. 177 (now reprinted in Boggetti, L'et\'a Longobarda, i, 1966, pp. 32 ff.). Boggetti assumed that the word was a parallel formation with the long-familiar arimannah; and in his fundamental contribution to the collective Sta. Maria di Castelseprio, 1948, p. 70 (= L'et\'a Longobarda, ii, 1966, p. 123) he declared that 'viene emergendo sempre più sicura la identità fra farmanino ed arimanno, fra farimanna ed arimannia.' In his last writings he was perhaps not quite so sure; but there is certainly no justification for the distinction made by C. G. Mor (5\textsuperscript{a} Settimana di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1958, p. 281) and subsequently uncorrectly accepted by others, between 'il faramanno legato al suo dux' and 'l'arimanno legato direttamente al re.' A word faramannus is nowhere recorded. Conversely arimannia (as distinct from arimannus) is apparently not found before the tenth century; and after the penetrating and critical studies by G. Tabacco (I Liber de Re nell'Italia carolingia e postcarolingia, 1931), it can no longer be assumed that arimannah are areas in which groups of Lombard warriors had once been settled. If Professor Tabacco's main thesis is accepted, however, the faramania of Pavia will become of even greater importance in future discussions of the character of the Lombard conquest and settlement of north Italy.

\textsuperscript{62} For S. Giacomo and S. Michele see De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 7, ed. Gianani, p. 79; and the texts cited in F. Fagnani, 'La faramania longobarda di Pavia e il problema storico della basilica di S. Michele Maggiore,' B.S.Pav., n.s., xiii/2, 1961, pp. 3-36, especially pp. 13 ff. For S. Agata see Fagnani, p. 12; De laudibus, loc. cit.; and the map in the Opicino manuscript VAT. lat. 6435 (R. Salomon in Journal Warburg and Courtauld Inst., xvi, pp. 45 ff.), fol. 85 (Fig. 2). In his reconstruction of 'the plan of Pavia according to Opicino' in Journ. Warb. Court. Inst., xxv, pp. 140 ff., Salomon unfortunately transposes the respective locations of the Canevanova churches (S. Agata, S. Michele) and of S. Agata al Monte, presumably misled by a denomination which in many cities would certainly refer to the highest ground away from the river but in Pavia refers to the sharply-rising ground between the Carona and the Ticino which is still recognisable in the modern town: see especially p. 143 and fig. 1 (after p. 142); the Italian version of Salomon's article (due to A. Peroni) in Pavia, gennaio-giugno 1964, pp. 3–13 silently corrects these mistakes: see p. 9 and the plan on p. 10. By coincidence, a long-lost church of S. Michaelis de Monte is listed by Opicino immediately before S. Agatha de Monte (ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 10; ed. Gianani, p. 83); but Salomon was probably correct in identifying the S. Michaelis vulgariter Micheliin recorded in the margin of VAT. lat. 6435, fol. 85, with S. Michele di Canevanova. Signor Fagnani's suggestion in 'La faramanna,' esp. pp. 6 ff., that most of the curtes granted to non-Pavian churches in the ninth and tenth centuries were within the one-time faramania is original and suggestive. But the exceptions seem to be more numerous than he supposed (cf. below, p. 109 and n. 111); and the ingenious attempt to establish the original boundaries of the Faramania by combining the evidence of these grants with later references to churches in Foromagn, has only a limited value. Furthermore, Signor Fagnani's unawareness that S. Michele was in existence before 944/5 considerably weakens the force of his arguments against the late Professor Boggetti's account of the early history of the churches in this area of the city. For a characteristic misrendering of faramania in documents of the later tenth century see DO. I, no. 268 (an original) : in ciuitate Paphia terram in Foris magna.
earlier, was the episcopal church of the Arians, subsequently dedicated to S. Eusebio: frequently rebuilt and finally abandoned, the church was demolished in the 1930s without any light being thrown on its earlier history; but its crypt, constructed or reconstructed probably in the late tenth century, still exists below the Piazza Leonardo da Vinci.53 In the early Lombard period the main centre of worship for the orthodox was still at SS. Protasius and Gervasius, although I have already suggested that before the Lombard conquest at least one church had been built for them in the western half of the walled city. For more than half a century, it seems, Pavia was a city of two distinct communities, separated by language and culture as well as by location. (This is not to suggest that there was no contact between them. There clearly was: but the ability of immigrant and other minority groups to live largely separate lives for many years when their neighbours belong to a different cultural tradition is now familiar to everyone.)54 This dichotomy ended, however, when the Lombards accepted the faith of the Romani: the one-time division of the city influenced its future topography only to the extent that the area of the farammia was subsequently regarded as royal property and was only gradually granted away to churches or to specially-favoured individuals.55

The city of the eighth, ninth and tenth centuries was none the less already a very different place, both in appearance and function, from that of earlier centuries. If the forum Papiae visited by a northern pilgrim in the early eighth century really was the Roman one, he is unlikely to have seen many substantial relics of Antiquity there apart from the dedication stone that he copied.56 Such Roman buildings as still survived in the early medieval town would normally have been adapted to new uses and new modes of life. There is, it is true, an unexpected reference to an apparently public balneum in the late seventh century; and in the same period bishop Damian, according to his epitaph, built or rebuilt thermarum vapores associated with the cathedral—which are surely to be interpreted as a bath-house for the clergy and not, as many scholars have supposed, as an extremely oblique reference to intra-mural baptisteries! But neither is mentioned again.57 One reason for

53 For details see below.
54 Examples of this contact are the careers of the apparently Pavian Paul and his son Peter at the Lombard court in the period 590 to 626 (Gregory of Tours, Hist. Francorum, X, 8; Mon. Germ. Hist., Epist., iii, p. 694: convincingly explained by Bognetti, Sta. Maria di Castelseprio, p. 104 f. = L'età Longobarda, ii, p. 180 f.) and possibly in the employment of the unknown writers of the Bobbio diplomas cited in n. 50; and—at a later period—the name of the wife of Senator (below, p. 100), Theodelinda. The survival of a distinction between Lombards and 'Romans' until almost the end of the seventh century is implied by Paul the Deacon's description of king Percarit's concubine Theodota as paella ex nobilissimo Romanorum genere orta, HL, V, 37. Only archaeology and art could help us to decide the extent to which a distinctively 'Roman' culture persisted in Pavia in the early Lombard period: unfortunately, as we shall see, at the moment evidence of this type gives a very ambiguous answer.
55 Fagnani, 'La farammia,' pp. 6 ff. and the references given below.
56 CIL., v/2, 6431; de Rossi, Inscriptiones Christianae, ii/1, p. 32 (no. 81): from the manuscript Einsiedeln Stiftsbibliothek cod. 326 (the Silloge Einsiedelsis), col. 79. In 'La farammia,' pp. 6, 14, Signor Fagnani maintains that the Roman forum was in the area of the present-day Piazza del Municipio and that a memory of this, persisting over the centuries, is reflected in what Opicino calls the ‘popular designation’ of in Roma veteri given to the church of S. Giacomo in Foromagno (De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 7, ed. Gianani, p. 75, and similarly in VAT. lat. 6435, fol. 20v). See also his summary account of excavations under the Piazza Grande which he believes rule out the possibility that the forum once occupied this more central site: B.S.Pas., xiii/1, 1961, pp. 71 ff. It seems to me more likely that the phrase in Roma veteri is the result of false antiquarianism; and although the suggested location of the forum is by no means impossible it has still to be proved.
57 Balneum where Cunincipert's wife first saw the beautiful Theodota: HL., V, 37. Damian's epitaph (preserved in the 'Sylloge of Lorsch'): de Rossi, Inscriptiones Christianae, ii/1, p. 170 (no.
their disappearance was the difficulty of maintaining an adequate water-supply. With the breakdown of the more elaborate methods used in the Roman period, those who lived away from the river had perforce to rely very largely on wells: and the construction of good wells was both a skilled job and expensive; moreover, there was an obvious limit to the number of wells that could be sunk in any particular region of the city. Hence, a well on one's own property was always a valuable asset, even though (as laws of Rothari and Liutprand interestingly make clear) it was assumed that others would customarily have access to it.\textsuperscript{58} We must not attach over-much importance to the preservation of the lines of the Roman streets in the ‘centro storico’ of the modern town. It has already been noted that two or three late-Antique buildings stood partly on or even cut across existing streets; and in the later Middle Ages and early modern period the precinct of the Senatorate monastery extended northwards across the present-day Corso Cavour.\textsuperscript{59} The grid-iron street plan of contemporary Pavia is to some extent the result of periodic restoration: in the later Middle Ages this seems to have been encouraged by the rediscovery of the Roman drainage system. But if enough of the Roman layout survived to make the re-establishment of the Roman plan a practical possibility, this was certainly in part because in the early Middle Ages a resident monarch was able to enforce his claim that the main streets within the city walls were \textit{viae publicae}.\textsuperscript{60} The appearance of the approximately one-and-a-third-acre blocks of land within the grid of roads had changed radically since the early

\textsuperscript{26}; Panazza, no. 61. The implausible theory inferred from the following lines of the epitaph that the \textit{thermarum vapores} were the two baptistries of S. Giovanni de fontibus (adjacent to the cathedral) and S. Giovanni Domnarius, recorded by Opicino and elsewhere, has superficially been strengthened by the discovery that the second of these was built over the remains of \textit{thermae} (see the references in n. 84). But the early documents relating to S. Giovanni Domnarius offer no hint that it functioned as a baptistery (see Appendix III, s.n.), which is indeed unlikely; and it is not proved that the \textit{thermae} were visible when the first church was built on the site (the remains are in the foundation of the crypt). Prof. Arslan has correctly noted that bath-houses are found in association with Syrian churches (\textit{Storia di Milano}, ii, p. 533, n. 1, citing J. Lassus, \textit{Sanctuaires chrétiens de Syrie}, 1947, pp. 116, 238) which fits well with Damian's supposed East Mediterranean connections. But it is unnecessary to look so far for a parallel: Agnellus tells us, on the evidence of an inscription which he copied, that bishop Victor of Ravenna (\textit{eb. c. 546}) rebuilt a bath-house—which was still functioning when Agnellus wrote—to provide his clergy with regular baths; and his words [\textit{refert} \textit{balneum iuxta domui ecclesiae, haerens partebatur muri episcopi} are noticeably similar to the epitaph's [\textit{funeris} \textit{domus episcopi\textsuperscript{(*)}} (\textit{al. et}) \textit{thermarumque vapores}: see the Lib. Pont. ecci. Ravennatis, in \textit{Mon. Germ. Hist.}, Ser. rerum Lang., pp. 324 f.\textsuperscript{58}\textsuperscript{59}\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{58} Memoratorium de mercedibus magistri Commacinorum, c. 8 (\textit{Mon. Germ. Hist.}, \textit{Leces}, iv, p. 180); Ed. Roth. 306; Ed. Luitpr. 136. Wells were surprisingly close together, however, in the vicinity of S. Tommaso (see the plan of the excavations of 1895, fig. 3, above) but there is no proof that they were all in use contemporaneously. Documentary evidence for the ownership of wells at Pavia is not found before the fifth decade of the ninth century (\textit{D.Loth.I.}, no. 97 of 846: a grant of land with \textit{usum futes}) but simply because there are no documents; compare for the eighth century the Lucca documents Schiaparelli, \textit{Cod. Dips.}, (i) nn. 65 of 738 (ownership of a whole well), 91 of 747; (ii) n. 148 of 761 (ownership of \textit{pars de futes}). Wells 100 ft. deep, as provided for in the \textit{Memoratorium}, c. 8, cannot have been very frequent, particularly as the windlass was still unknown and buckets were raised and lowered only with the aid of a swing-beam—the \textit{tolutum} of Luitpr. 136. A supposedly early medieval well uncovered in 1955 close to the Corso Cavour was 1-18 m. in diameter but its depth is not recorded: \textit{B.S.Pav.}, n.s., viii/2, 1956, p. 195.

\textsuperscript{59} See the Corte-Maggi map of 1599/1600, reproduced in \textit{Pavia}, luglio-dicembre 1963, fac. p. 12, and the so-called Ballada map of 1654 (actually the work of Corrit in 1617) which is best accessible in P. Pessani, \textit{Dei palazzi reali ... di Pavia} (Pavia, 1771); and see pl. XX.

\textsuperscript{60} For knowledge of the Roman drains in the fourteenth century see Opicino's vivid description in \textit{De laudibus}, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 20; ed. Gianani, p. 93. Opicino's statement that \textit{tam altas testudines habent seu fornicis, ut positur per eas equus cum sessore transit} is echoed (apparently unconsciously) by Vidari's description of the remains found in the area of S. Maria Teodota in the early nineteenth century, quoted in n. 24 above.
URBAN CHANGE IN EARLY MEDIEVAL ITALY

centuries A.D. Where only two churches existed to suffer damage in the siege of 476, forty-four were said by a contemporary French chronicler to have been burnt by the Magyars in 924—a claim that, true or not, is certainly compatible with the number of churches known to have existed at that time in the city and suburb of Pavia; and the private residences among which they stood had little in common with the domus and insulae of the Roman period.

The claim that the remarkable remains discovered in the vicinity of the later church of S. Tommaso are those of an early Lombard church must certainly be rejected; but the church dedicated to S. Peter, which is mentioned by Paul the Deacon in an early-seventh century context, may well have been built in the time of the Catholic queen Theodelinda, whether or not we identify it with the later church of S. Pietro a mura which was in or close to the faramania. The first great age of church-building at Pavia began in the middle years of the seventh century: within little more than fifty years oratories, basilicae (the standard word of the period for a non-parochial, non-conventual church) and monasteries had been founded and built by kings and their families and by private individuals in many parts of the city, within and without the walls. Rothari himself may have been the founder of S. Giovanni in Cimiterio, although the evidence is late. King Aripert (652–61) founded the oraculum sancti Salvatoris outside the west wall. In the third quarter of the seventh century members of the ruling family were responsible for the founding of two separate churches in the apparently specifically Lombard cemetery outside the eastern half of the north wall: Santa Maria in Pertica and S. Adriano. Even when such churches were served by only a few clergy and were in an essentially rural setting—for several centuries the location of a church only a short distance outside the walls is more often described as the campae than as the suburbium—they provided new points of habitation and nuclei of further growth. Within the walls, Rothari's wife or widow founded the church of S. Giovanni Domnarum (later, but probably not originally, a baptistery) on the site of a large Roman house or public thermae in the western half of the city; King Grimoald (662–71) founded the church of Sant'Ambrogio and was buried there—the first example of a royal burial intra-muraly. His successor Perantarit (671/2–688) established the female convent of S. Agata, in quo multas virgines adgregavit, on the rising ground in the south-west angle of the city. An acceptable tradition attributes to an otherwise unknown Gregorius, who lived in all probability in the later years of the seventh century, the foundation of the monasterium sanctae Mariæ not far from one of the posterns in the west wall: this community was soon to be distinguished from others similarly dedicated by taking the name of the unfortunate

61 See Appendix III, pt. 1, pt. 2.
62 Hl. IV, 31, between chapters referring to events in 604 and 605 respectively. For S. Pietro al Muro (a Mura) see Appendix III: (3) S. Petrus. The fact that none of the city's many eighth- and ninth-century inscriptions and carved stones come from the site of S. Pietro is an argument against an early origin of the church, although in view of its disappearance already in the fifteenth or sixteenth century not a compelling one. Fagnani, 'La faramannia,' p. 11 cites a publication of 1882 (unfortunately inaccessible to me) for the discovery in 1868, during the building of 'la nuova ala di levante dell'Ospedale S. Matteo' of 'traccie della chiesa di S. Pietro, assieme a numerose tombe dell'epoca longobarda' (of which some relics are said to be in the Museo Civico, although I have failed to identify them there): it is unfortunately not made clear whether the tombs were inside or outside the line of the wall.
63 A Schiaffini in Archivio storico italiano, lxxxi, 1923, pp. 25 ff.
64 For all these churches see Appendix III, s.nn.
Theodota—'a girl from a most distinguished Roman family,' according to Paul the Deacon—who was sent there, and later buried there, when King Cunincpert tired of her charms. In or shortly before 714 an obviously rich landowner Senator founded another female convent dedicated to the Virgin, *in domo propria* in the western half of the city.\(^65\)

It is probably mere chance that the only laymen who are linked with the endowment of churches at this period are both, to judge from their names and the location of their properties, of 'Roman' origin. Lombard laymen were doubtless among the anonymous founders of other churches in the city that are first referred to in the second half of the seventh century or the early years of the eighth—one or more of the churches dedicated to S. Michael (which is usually regarded as a characteristically Lombard dedication) or the church of S. Pietro *ad vincula.*\(^66\)

Several foundations by king Liutprand or by others during his reign are recorded.\(^67\)

From this time onwards for more than two centuries, however, the evidence is much less full and precise than for the previous sixty years. Most Pavian churches are first mentioned incidentally in some document that does not concern them, usually because property being disposed of was in the vicinity of a church or bounded by land owned by one. But there can have been few decades in which a church was not founded or a monastery established within the city or its suburb.

Many of these churches and monasteries were to play an important part in the religious and topographical history of the city; but probably no new foundation was of comparable importance with the transfer of Pavia's episcopal church from its extra-mural site to one within the walls. It is unfortunate that there is no conclusive evidence for the date and circumstances of the change. The problem is complicated by the fact that Pavia was one of several north Italian cities in which, for much of the Middle Ages, two adjacent churches functioned respectively as a summer and a winter cathedral—in this case, Santo Stefano to the north and Santa Maria del Popolo to the south; and further complicated by the archaeological evidence recently brought forward to support the old idea that S. Stefano was founded in the early sixth century (although not as the cathedral). There will probably always be room for debate and in strict rigour we can say only that the co-cathedrals certainly existed in the early ninth century and that they are not likely to have been established on their present sites before the conversion of the

---

\(^{65}\) For Gregorius' foundation see Appendix III: (8) S. Maria; for Theodota see *HL,* V, 37. The authenticity of the foundation-charter of S. Maria Senatore, Schiaparelli, *Cod. Dip.* (i) no. 18, has several times been questioned although it was convincingly defended by Schiaparelli (who, however, admitted possible interpolations). Subsequently new doubts were raised by the late G. P. Bognetti, who extended them to the beautiful monogrammed tomb-slab of Senator (Panasza, *Lapidi,* no. 64): see *Sta. Maria di Castelseprio,* pp. 397 ff. The inclusion in the endowment of the monastery of an *oraculum sancti Petri in Stafula* (on which see my remarks in *Zeitschr. f. romanische Philologie,* bxxx, 1964, pp. 466 ff.) and other features of the charter of which no account seems to have been taken by its critics are in my view all in favour of its substantial authenticity; and if my suggestion is sound that the Lombard conquerors left the western half of *Ticinum* to the native 'Romans' (above, p. 97), the name of the founder does not present any problem. The quality of the decoration on the tomb undeniably sets it apart from other carved stones of the early eighth century; but on stylistic grounds it seems equally difficult to attribute it either to a later period or to, say, the beginning of the seventh century.

\(^{66}\) Appendix III: S. Michaelis (7 entries); (1) (3) (4) S. Petrus.

\(^{67}\) Appendix III: (5) S. Maria, (2) S. Petrus. I see no good reason for supposing that an extra-mural basilica S. Petri pre-existed Liutprand's foundation of a monastery on the site, although it is certainly possible.
Lombards from Arianism. Like Professor Panazza, however, although for rather different reasons, I believe that it was bishop Damian (c. 680–c. 710) who moved the Pavian cathedra from the extra-mural church of SS. Protasius and Gervasius to Santo Stefano, and that the adjacent church of Santa Maria was transformed into the ‘winter cathedral’ not long after its foundation as a private church in the reign of king Liutprand.\(^{68}\) Whether the eighth- and ninth-century cathedral churches were larger or smaller than the city’s early Christian basilicas and the later buildings on the same sites, they were surely larger than most of the other churches in Pavia at this time. Moreover, the co-cathedrals were only part of a larger complex of buildings. Associated with them were: the ecclesia sancti Iohannis de fontibus baptismalis (destroyed in 1488) of which the polygonal foundations were probably discovered in 1934/5 on the edge of the Piazza Cavagneria, only to be covered over or destroyed, as so often without a proper record being made;\(^{69}\) for a time, the bath-house previously referred to; presumably a residence for the clergy (or for some of them); certainly a residence for the bishop (his domus or palatium, eventually including its own chapel) which until the end of the twelfth century was on the north side of Santo Stefano, although its exact location is not clear.\(^{70}\)

We would dearly like to have some record of the property transactions that preceded this substantial piece of urban development. Even if religious fervour or religious fear played the part of a modern ‘Law of compulsory purchase’ the local upheaval must have been considerable; and it doubtless brought loss to some and substantial profit to others. In the long run, of course, the town gained from the re-siting of the cathedral in a variety of ways. One of them was evident to the anonymous ninth-century writer who gave as one of the reasons for the translation of the body of S. Sirius from the church of SS. Protasius and Gervasius to Santo

\(^{68}\) For the history and architectural history of the two cathedral churches see especially Porter, Lombard Architecture, iii, pp. 185–96, 231–6; R. Krautheimer in R. Salomon, Opicinus de Canistris, pp. 328 ff.; Panazza, ‘Le basiliche,’ passim; and my comments on the latter, above, p. 91 and n. 32. Archaeological evidence apart, the key texts in any discussion of the origins of Pavia’s intra-mural and ‘double’ cathedral are: the funerary epitaph of bishop Damian, preserved in the ‘Sylloge of Lorsch’ (Panazza, Lapidii, no. 61), where domus episcopis\(^{6}\) is just as likely to refer to the cathedral church itself as to the residence of the bishop or of the clergy generally; and the inscription from the time of Liutprand recording the foundation of Sta. Maria by a certain Anso (Panazza, Lapidii, no. 63), which unlike many scholars I take to mean what it says. I hope to return to this complex problem on another occasion.

\(^{69}\) Opicino, De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 4, ed. Gianani, p. 77; Panazza, ‘Le basiliche,’ p. 6. The poor but unique photograph which is our only evidence for the character of the destroyed baptistery does not seem to have been published.

\(^{70}\) For the bath-house see above, p. 97 and n. 57. Apart from the ambiguous domus episcopis\(^{6}\) of Damian’s epitaph (ibid. and n. 68), the earliest references to residences of the cathedral clergy or of the bishop are: 899 (Manaresi, Placiti, i, no. 108, p. 401), in domum sancte Ticinensis ecclesie, intus caminata qui extat post tribunal capelle sancti Martini; 967 (Manaresi, Placiti, ii, no. 158, p. 65), in caminata maioris salee, scilicet domus episcopis sanitex Ticinensis ecclesie, que extat post capitum basilice sancti Siri confessoris; 976 (Manaresi, Placiti, ii, no. 180, p. 165), in caminata dormitoria que est nostrer edificata in palatio domni Petri episcopus [sic]. Capitum in the second of these is presumably (as later) ‘sanctuary, choir’ and the domus was therefore on the north-east of the cathedral complex (S. Sirius being the usual post-ninth century name of the summer cathedral). The capella sancti Martini does not seem to be referred to elsewhere but clearly formed part of the domus in 899. At a later date the chapel in the episcopal palace was dedicated to S. Silvester but it is unfortunately not clear whether Opicino, De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 4, ed. Gianani, p. 77, which remained on the old site of the episcopal palace when the ‘Brolotto’ (Palace of the Commune) was built there or to the new episcopium built in the early thirteenth century opposite the west front of the cathedral. The discussion of the earlier location of the episcopal residence in Solmi, Amministrazione Finanziaria, pp. 219 ff. (apparently following closely some remarks of G. Bariola in Nella rinascita del Brolotto, 1928, pp. 61 ff.) is superficial and confusing.
Stefano that: *cum essent [reliquiae] eminus ab ecclesia ubi episcopi clericorumque conventus officiorum gratia convenit, minus studiose circa reverentiam sacri corporis eius occurrebat urbana frequenta*; whereas when the precious relics were brought to the cathedral and laid in the specially-prepared crypt, it was possible to maintain decency and order even though there was a constant press of visitors, men, women and children, who had often come considerable distances to benefit from the *virtutes* of the Saint. The *atrium sancti Syri* corresponding roughly to the present-day Piazza del Duomo was for a century or two the place where, except in moments of revolution, the Pavians expressed their corporate feelings; and where, before as well as after the establishment of an oligarchic ‘commune’ in the city, its ordinary inhabitants tended to gather: Opicino’s vivid description of the goods and commodities that were bought and sold daily in the *platea atrii* in his time would probably apply equally well to a much earlier period. Visually, aesthetically, none of Pavia’s other open spaces could compare with the cathedral *platea*: until the laying out of the Piazza Grande (now Piazza della Vittoria) it was much the largest within the walls; one or more of its sides was flanked with unusually imposing buildings; and in its midst was the magnificent *Regisole*, a larger-than-natural equestrian statue brought from Ravenna, possibly in 751, and subsequently the symbol of Pavia’s civic pride.

The settings of other churches were as various as their origins and consistent only in being unplanned. The church shut in by houses to north, south and east (like the present-day S. Giovanni Donnarum) belongs to a later phase of urban development, as does the church opening on to an informal but well-defined *piazzetta* (like S. Teodoro). Already in the early Middle Ages one or two churches may have had their façade or an outer wall aligned along a *via publica*. The earliest Pavian documents, however, show clearly that before the eleventh century intra-mural churches could be sited in any part of an *insula*, usually on an open piece of ground of modest size; and although several of the churches had early burials associated with them, it does not appear that there were cemeteries within the first wall either before or after the creation of separate urban parishes. Monasteries on the other hand were normally surrounded by a claustral wall, the *monasterii septum* referred to in a diploma of 871 for S. Maria Theodota—particularly after the measures taken by the Carolingian Emperors, and later by the abbots of Cluny and those who shared their ideals, to secure stricter observance of the Benedictine Rule.

The evidence for the appearance of individual buildings before the eleventh century is pitifully small: until excavation produces more of it and provides us with a more secure basis for dating what we have, much discussion of the extent to which late Antique skills survived in early medieval Pavia and of the distinctive

---


23 As S. Felice at the end of the tenth century or beginning of the eleventh and probably S. Maria alle Cacce already in the eighth century: see below, p. 103.

contribution made by the newcomers will remain subjective and fruitless.\textsuperscript{75} The well-known \textit{Memoratorium de mercedibus magistri Commacinorum}\textsuperscript{76} of the end of the seventh century or shortly afterwards and the less well-known grant by Liutprand of the \textit{carpentarii} of the Valle d'Intelvi and of Besozolo to the Pavian monastery of S. Pietro in Ciel d'oro\textsuperscript{77} have been diversely interpreted: but they certainly show that in north Italy at that period there were groups of specialist craftsmen who were familiar with several different techniques of construction, in brick, masonry and wood, and that some of their buildings were of considerable size and elaboration. The \textit{Memoratorium} contrasts \textit{opera gallica} with \textit{opera romanense} and identifies them with the use respectively of \textit{scindolae} and \textit{tegulae}—which if correctly interpreted as 'roof-shingles' and 'roof-tiles' leaves the types of wall-construction associated with the two traditions unexplained.\textsuperscript{78} It is, none the less, a fairly safe assumption that \textit{opera romanense} involved the use of moulded kiln-fired bricks in the late Antique manner.\textsuperscript{79} The latter are indeed a feature of the surviving fragment of the exterior wall of Sta. Maria delle Cacce, which has been plausibly attributed to the later seventh century or the first half of the eighth; its continuous blind arcing with a large recessed unplayed window in alternate bays seems to show the continuing vitality of a local architectural tradition that began in late fourth century Milan.\textsuperscript{80} The surviving nave wall of the church of S. Felice, with which some scholars have compared it, is of much cruder brickwork, the windows here are narrower and the blind arcing rests on a well-defined podium: these features in conjunction point to a building date not earlier than the very end of the tenth century when the blind arcing and arched corbel frieze of an earlier period were both revived and modified, with major consequences for the history of Romanesque architecture.\textsuperscript{81} The much mutilated fragment of blind-arcaded walling on the north side of the modern cathedral, which has been rightly recognised as a unique relic of the pre-Romanesque S. Stefano, seems to me to resemble Sta. Maria delle Cacce rather than S. Felice; but in its present state it is impossible to be sure and it would be referring to kings Agilulf and Adalold—early seventh century therefore—from S. Simpliciano, Milan (Arslan, cit., p. 509). For supposed ninth-century examples see P. Verzone, \textit{L'Architettura religiosa dell'alto medievale}, 1942, pp. 171, 177, n. 2. In \textit{Studi in onore di A. Calderini e R. Peribeni}, iii, 1956, pp. 825 f., G. P. Boggetti (who had previously argued for a break in tradition possibly as early as the seventh century) assumes a continuous history of moulded tiles from the Roman to the Romanesque period. Evidence for kiln-fired bricks, on the other hand, comes only from extant and mostly uncertainly-dated buildings: as we shall see, I agree with Porter, \textit{Lombard Architecture}, i, p. 36, and Verzone, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 177, that in north Italy they cease to be made in the early ninth century.

\textsuperscript{75} E. Arslan's chapter 'L'architettura dal 568 al mille' (which is as much concerned with Pavia as with Milan) in \textit{Storia di Milano}, ii, pp. 501 ff. is the outstanding recent contribution to a debate that began in the earlier nineteenth century and was put on a new footing by R. Cattaneo, \textit{L'Architettura in Italia dal secolo VI al Mille circa}, 1888. Arslan seems to me to go wrong only when he adopts uncritically some of the many ingenious but in this field often ill-judged ideas of G. P. Boggetti in \textit{Sta. Maria di Castelseprio, Storia di Milano} and elsewhere.


\textsuperscript{77} Lost but quoted in \textit{extenso} in kingHugh's confirmation of 929, \textit{DU.Lo.}, no. 20.

\textsuperscript{78} \textit{Memoratorium}, cc. 3, 5a. \textit{Cf.} Porter, \textit{Lombard Architecture}, i, pp. 35 f.

\textsuperscript{79} The manufacture of moulded, kiln-fired \textit{roofing-tiles} in sixth- and seventh-century Lombardy is proved by the Crispin tiles at Pavia (above, p. 91 and n. 32) and a tile with a stamped inscription referring to kings Agilulf and Adalold—early seventh century therefore—from S. Simpliciano, Milan (Arslan, cit., p. 509). For supposed ninth-century examples see P. Verzone, \textit{L'Architettura religiosa dell'alto medievale}, 1942, pp. 171, 177, n. 2. In \textit{Studi in onore di A. Calderini e R. Peribeni}, iii, 1956, pp. 825 f., G. P. Boggetti (who had previously argued for a break in tradition possibly as early as the seventh century) assumes a continuous history of moulded tiles from the Roman to the Romanesque period. Evidence for kiln-fired bricks, on the other hand, comes only from extant and mostly uncertainly-dated buildings: as we shall see, I agree with Porter, \textit{Lombard Architecture}, i, p. 36, and Verzone, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 177, that in north Italy they cease to be made in the early ninth century.


\textsuperscript{81} Compare Verzone, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 155 with Panazza, 'Le basiliche,' p. 9, and \textit{ibid.}, \textit{Lapidii}, no. 112.
foolish to base any theories on its supposed similarity to any other building in the city, especially one of which the dating is equally uncertain.  

On present knowledge the surviving wall-bays of Sta. Maria delle Cacce, which evidently once belonged to an outer wall of considerable length, provide the least unsatisfactory evidence that substantial churches were being built in late Lombard Pavia—probably not very different in general appearance from San Salvatore at Brescia.  

Independent evidence that Pavian churches of this period might rise to a considerable height would exist if Professor Panazza is right in detecting ancient masonry, which he tentatively attributes to the late seventh century, in the upper walls of the several-times-rebuilt S. Giovanni Domnarum. An even more remarkable example of the survival of late Antique building styles may well have been the circular church of S. Maria in Pertica which (with its later accretions) was demolished in 1815: a building in which a central arcade of marble columns and ‘Classical’ capitals, possibly supporting a tambour, opened on to a broad ambulatory where a succession of rectangular or semi-circular niches in its wall counterbalanced the inner arches, is as plausibly attributed to the period of the church’s foundation in the 7670s as to any later period. The cross-vaulted hall crypt of S. Eusebio has been supposed by many scholars to be substantially of the later seventh century. If this were so it would follow that crypt-design at Pavia was at least a century ahead of anywhere else in Europe. It is possible that the crudely-carved capitals are of this early date, although in that case they belonged originally to some quite different structure: the crypt in which they are now incorporated is most probably of the late tenth or early eleventh century. The crypt of S. Giovanni Domnarum is in all likelihood of the same period, similarly re-using older capitals. The account of the translation of the relics of S. Sirus to the cathedral church of S. Stefano in the second quarter of the ninth century, however, makes it clear that these were laid in a crypt that was apparently built for the purpose, although it throws no light on the latter’s plan.

In architecture, then, a final break with late Antique traditions and the introduction of novel structural features into churches seem to have taken place as late as the Carolingian period. In architectural decoration the break with the

---

82 See especially Panazza, ‘Le basiliche,’ pp. 9 f.; Porter, Lombard Architecture, iii, p. 234, however, dismisses these remains from further consideration as having been ‘denatured in the time of the Renaissance.’
83 See Atti del 6° Congresso di studi sull’arte dell’Alto medioevo, ii: S. Salvatore di Brescia, Milan, 1962, passim. In this volume Professor Panazza and his collaborators argue that the discoveries made during excavation and restoration show S. Salvatore to be a building of the second decade of the ninth century rather than of the 760s (the generally accepted date); and I adopted their point of view when writing The Age of Charlemagne, 1965. Subsequently, conversation with Dr. Hjalmar Torp (Assistant Director of the Norwegian Academy in Rome) convinced me that the weight of the evidence is in favour of the traditional dating, which is that of the foundation of the church or shortly afterwards.
85 H. Balducci, ‘La chiesa di S. Maria in Pertica,’ Ticinum, v, 1935, fasc. 1; Verzone, L’architettura religiosa, pp. 105 ff.; Arslan, cit., pp. 537 ff. Discussing the problems of this lost building with me, Professor Richard Krautheimer agreed that without the historical evidence art-historians would probably have dated it earlier than the second half of the seventh century but certainly not claimed it as later.
86 Porter, Lombard Architecture, iii, pp. 167 ff.; G. Chierici, La chiesa di S. Satiro a Milano, 1942, pp. 62 ff. (the fullest and best description); Arslan, cit., p. 528. For the capitals see Panazza, Lapidi, nos. 113, 114 and pls.
87 Arslan, cit., p. 600; cf. ibid., p. 510, no. 2, and Panazza, Lapidi, p. 219 (with an erroneous date), nos. 109, 116 and pls.
past and the evolving of new styles of ornament took place considerably earlier. The evidence of sculptured capitals is equivocal; the evidence of the many fragments of what were once altars, presbytery screens and their supporting pillars or columns, and of tomb-slabs (which can often be closely dated) fortunately is not. The simple patterns and large decorated spaces of what seems to be fifth/sixth century stonework contrast sharply with the proliferation of ornament on, for example, the early eighth-century sarcophagus of Theodota or the ‘all-over’ decoration of the screen-pillars from S. Pietro Ciel d’Oro.99 Later examples from Pavia and elsewhere show a further elaboration of these decorative patterns and combinations of the separate motifs in new ways. How far north Italy was the innovator, how far merely an imitator in the evolution and spread of this characteristically Dark Age sculptural style has been vigorously—even violently—debated for a century and more. Arguments about the ethnic affiliations of predominantly anonymous stonemasons are, however, always bound to be fruitless; and there are, I am convinced, solid reasons for thinking that in the earliest phase (say, the thirty or forty years after c. 690) the sculptors of western Lombardy, whatever their racial or local origins, were among the leaders in the new artistic fashions.90 At a slightly later date, but still in the Lombard period, the repetition of the border-design of one of the long sides of the Theodota sarcophagus on a tomb-slab at Bobbio (apparently commissioned by king Liutprand) and on another, less skilfully cut, at distant Osimo implies either that local craftsmen had access to patterns created by more skilful stonemasons elsewhere or that there were itinerant workers with a common training: in either case Pavia may have been a major centre of dissemination.91 On this point as on problems of chronology there is probably still something to be learnt from the types of stone and marble used for ‘Dark age’ sculpture in Pavia and elsewhere—which would also tell us a little about the economic activity of the period.92

Trying to reconstruct the original appearance of Pavia’s earliest churches is a difficult enough undertaking; trying to envisage the appearance of the city as a whole in the early Middle Ages is more difficult still. The typical setting of private houses and their associated structures in the ninth and tenth centuries is

99 Panazza, _Lapidi_, nos. 110, 111 and pls.; _ibid._, no. 66 and pls.; _ibid._, nos. 120–3 and pls. I believe that Schaffran was for once right in dating the fragment of decorated stonework, Panazza, _Lapidi_ no. 43 (and consequently the related pieces, _ibid._, nos. 44–6), to the Ostrogothic period rather than to the seventh century; compare the S. Apollinare screen-panel, S. Fuchs, _Kunst der Ostgotenzeit_, 1944, p. 23, and the well-known tesseræ ornament of the cornice of Theodoric’s Mausoleum (although in general Pavia and Ravenna follow different lines of artistic development in the sixth, seventh and eighth centuries).

90 On this point (if on no other) the views of R. Kautsch, ‘Die langobardische Schnuckkunst in Oberitalien,’ _Römisches Jahrb._ für _Kunstgesch._, v., 1941, pp. 3 ff. are certainly to be preferred to those of his post-war critics.

91 Theodota sarcophagus: Panazza, _Lapidi_, pls. xcvii, xcix (for the date see _ibid._, no. 66); Bobbio tomb-slab: A. Silvagni, _Monumenta Epigraphica Christiana_, ii/3, 1943, pl. iv, no. 8; Osimo tomb-slab: L. Serra, _L’Arte nelle Marche_, 1929, p. 34. In favour of the idea of itinerant masons based on Pavia is the very close similarity of the letterforms used in the Bobbio and Osimo inscriptions and in four other inscriptions from Pavia, Panazza, _Lapidi_, nos. 67, 69–71. The lettering of the Theodota inscription is different and superior: see N. Gray, ‘The palaeography of Latin inscriptions,’ _PBSR_, xvi, 1948, p. 60.

92 Panazza identifies the stone used for Senator’s tomb-slab and for the mid-eighth-century epitaph of Cunincperga as ‘cipollino della Val di Susa’ (_Lapidi_, nos. 64, 75), and that used for many other carved stones and inscriptions of the seventh and eighth centuries simply as ‘marmor.’ I have been unable to discover where in the Val di Susa the cipollino was supposedly quarried; F. Rodolico, _Le pietre delle città d’Italia_, s.d. [c. 1953], pp. 147 ff. is helpful only for later periods.
comparatively well-documented. The records of sales and gifts show that like the churches they were more often distributed haphazardly throughout the rectangles formed by the network of viae publicae than aligned along the edges of the streets—the normal siting of their later medieval successors and probably of their Roman predecessors. Most had their own enclosure (hedge or wall) and were surrounded by a patch of land on which vegetables could be grown. In the ninth and early tenth centuries there were in addition many plots free of buildings. Access to ‘courts’ and empty plots was provided by paths that were communia vicinorum. The picture in the eighth century would probably not have been very different.

The evidence for the houses themselves is less clear; and the shacks and hovels in which we must suppose the poorest inhabitants lived are not (so far as I know) mentioned in any early text. The previously-cited Memoratorium de mercedibus magistri Commacinorum is indeed concerned with secular rather than ecclesiastical buildings. The reference to caminata, cancellae (apparently in the sense of ‘wooden lattice dividing a room’) and furno in pensile, as well as to axes marmoreae and to carolae [factae] cum gipso, suggests very strongly, however, that those who drafted this text had in mind the buildings that formed part of a royal residence or were constructed for bishops and their clergy. If anything so grand was commissioned by anyone else in the Lombard period it is certainly at Pavia that we would expect to find it: but the residences of the majority even of those citizens who were prosperous enough to own a house of their own were surely less elaborate. The traditional word domus is only rarely used of a private residence in the seventh to tenth centuries, although it continues to occur in more specialised senses. Its replacement by casa as the normal word for ‘the dwelling-place of a family’ is already evident in the edict of Rothari, compiled and promulgated at Pavia in 643; and it is implied here that the casa will normally be of wood. It is a legitimate inference that the typical residence of the dominant class of Lombards in the first half of the seventh century was more modest and less substantial than that of their Roman predecessors. The Germanic word sala also occurs in the Edict but apparently always refers to rural residences and more particularly to the economic centre of a rural estate. Urban salae, however, figure in eighth-century documents from Tuscanv, in documents of the mid-ninth century from Milan and in late-ninth century (but almost the earliest extant) documents from Pavia itself. One sold at Pistoia in 726 is described as pedeplana, mura circumdata, scandula cooperta;

---

53 See, for example, D. Loth. I, no. 97 of 846 (area of land not built on and casa of two laymen completely surrounded by the property of others; ingressus); Arch. Cap. Novara, no. 16 of 887 (casa, area in qua existat, currit; bounds including ingresso comuno vicinorum); HPM. C.D.L., no. 716 of 970 (pieces of land cum muris et petras super abente).
54 Mem., cc. 6, 7, 7a. Caminata ‘room with a hearth’ (hardly at this period ‘with a chimney,’ as Niermeyer, p. 120, s.v.) appears here for the first time; Niermeyer’s oldest example is nearly a century later. Cancellae ‘wooden room-divider’ has no exact parallel elsewhere but is a natural extension of the secular Classical (rather than of the medieval ecclesiastical) usage of cancelli; abietarit (of those who make the lattices or screens) is found only here but presumably comes from abies ‘made of fir or other wood.’ For pensile ‘work room, used by women dependants for spinning, weaving, etc.’ see Ed. Roth., c. 221; V. Fainelli, Cod. Diph. Venetius, i. 1940, no. 101 of 813; and the non-Italian examples collected by Niermeyer, p. 784, s.v. pensili. Carola (architectural) is found only here: Beyerle translated ‘Fensternisch’ which does not seem very likely; the sense must be rather ‘decoration applied to a wall or arch, festoon.’
55 Ed. Roth., cc. 144 (domus), 145 (domus aut casa), 167 (in casa commune), 159, 227, 254, 282 (Si quis de casa erecta lignum quodlibet aut scandolaum furaverit), 233, 379.
56 Ibid., c. 136, 133.
a donation to a church at Lucca in 764 comprises a *curtis cum sala comodo ipse istaffilli positi sunt*, *seo et orto comodo sepis circumdata fuit*. The type of building described is, like the word itself, apparently one brought by the Lombards from their earlier homelands—a one-storey building with a post framework (*iūstifili*) and a wooden roof, and evidently of substantial proportions. When it was used as the town-residence of a property-owner and his family it must have closely resembled the early medieval houses recently uncovered at Antwerp of which one eleventh-century example is sixteen metres long by seven metres wide and had evidently required carpentry of a high standard. Liutprand’s grant of the services of ‘corporationes’ of *carpentarii* to S. Pietro Ciel d’Oro shows that the services of skilled woodworkers were both greatly prized and not universally available in late Lombard Pavia; and *sala* as magnificent as the Antwerp example were probably always exceptional. Indeed, it has yet to be established that residential *sala* of this type were ever built within the walls of Pavia, however probable this may be. The contexts in which *sala* are mentioned in Pavian documents of the late ninth and tenth centuries suggest that at this period they were usually store-houses or houses for a group of servants or dependents rather than family dwelling-houses.

The earliest extant sale of a house at Pavia describes a rather different kind of building. On 31 July 887 the acolyte Dagibert (subsequently bishop of Novara) bought from the wife of an Imperial *vassus*—who had acquired the property partly by inheritance and partly by purchase or exchange—*casa una solariata et sala una cum area in qua extat cum curte et puteo infra ipsa curte*. *Casae solariatae* are recorded at Viterbo in 789 and at Milan at the beginning of the tenth century. The first chapter of the *Memoratorium* fixed the payment for laying tegulae both *Si sola fecerit* and *si in solario* (the latter being twice as expensive as the former); the bishopric of Bergamo had *mansiones et solarium* in Pavia before 915. A Pavian document of 970 speaks of a *solarium edifice[turnum] super via publica*; and *solarium* occurs several times apparently as an alternative for *casae solariata* in the 887 document. At Pavia, therefore, *solarium* was used not only of part of a house but also, as other texts confirm, of a particular type of house. In the second sense, it and its more usual alternative *casae solariata* have usually have referred to a two-storeyed building in which the principal room was on the upper floor, a direct if more modest precursor of north Italian town-houses of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. *Solarium* was, however, also used for ‘platform, gallery’: and it is possible (although I think unlikely) that some of the north Italian *casae solariatae* were single-storey houses with an internal balcony providing an additional room. The *solaria* of tenth-century Pavia were certainly often substantial buildings: one of them already had its own chapel before it became a monastery under the abbot of Cluny in 967.

---

97 Schiaparelli, *Cod. Dip.*, (i) no. 38; *ibid.*, (ii) no. 178.  
100 *Arch. Cap. Novara*, no. 16.  
101 *Regesto di Farfa*, ed. L. Giorgi and U. Balzani, ii, 1879, no. 146; *HPM.CDL.*, no. 402 of 903; and in the falsified testament of archbishop Ansbert, *ibid.*, no. 287 of ‘879’ (the genuine testament, *ibid.*, no. 290, refers simply to *casae* at both Milan and Pavia).  

103 The entry *solarium* in Niermeyer, p. 976, does not record the sense ‘house of two storeys’ nor does it cite the *Memoratorium*. *Solarium* with a chapel:
Even before the end of the ninth century the more prosperous inhabitants of Pavia were building or buying houses of some size and complexity; and there are reasons for thinking that the part of the city in which Dagibert bought his casa solariata et sala in 887, a short distance to the north-west of the cathedral, was regarded as a particularly desirable area in which to live. In 918 the Pavian deacon Rotgerius was licensed by king Berengar to build a hedificium ... supra viam publicam next to (iuxta) the houses of a certain Iohannes qui et Bono and of bishop Dagibert; and the diploma goes on to give Rotgerius the right of pilas fregendum et murum atque arcum volutum subit hidem hedificium in eadem viam faciendum ... ita tamen uti aditus publicus nullatemus intercludatur.104 This passage is difficult to interpret with confidence. The word arcus volutus occurs in another diploma of Berengar's, in favour of his chancellor John, where (like the related word [arcus] covalis) it refers to the vaulted cellae in the Roman theatre at Verona—the sense also of arcovala in an earlier diploma. In the testament of 922 by which John, at this date bishop of Pavia, disposed of his property in the Verona region, there are no less than four separate references to arcovoluti et arcovala: three of them concern cellae of the old theatre, and the fourth may do.105 In spite of these texts and in spite of Signor Fagnani’s ingenious attempt to link the grant of 918 with remains found at different times below the via Cavour in approximately the right area of the city,106 I do not think that Rotger’s arcum volutum was an underground or semi-basement vault. In a Pavian document of 970 one of the parties to an exchange obtains land ubi pilas ei necessarias facere debet ad solarium edificandum super via publica.107 I suggest that the writers of both texts have in mind a construction that projected over part of the street and was supported by a row of pillars or primitive arcade; it seems to me less likely at this date that Rotger’s construction was to span the entire street, like a covered bridge or gatehouse—the most usual meaning of the later Italian arcivolto.

The house that changed hands in 887 can hardly have been typical even of the smartest areas of the city. It is unlikely that many other private houses in the late ninth century boasted their own necessarium. It also had its own well, whereas most of the known sales and gifts of urban property, as we have seen, only involved a part-share or the use of a well. Dagibert’s purchase was the first in a series of transactions extending over more than thirty years in which he steadily bought up the casae and areae of his neighbours, including presumably the hedificium and arcum volutum of Rotger; and although many of the relevant documents are inevitably lost, those that survive give a uniquely detailed record of landownership in one particular part of a north Italian city at the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth century.108

Manaresi, Placiti, ii/1, no. 158, p. 66 (inserted document). Other Pavian solaria: ibid., no. 196 of 981 (in caminata magiore solario proprio obblacionis Vualtori), no. 221 of 995 (in laudia solario proprio obblacionis Alberici). Compare the reference to a caminata magiore solariata (of the count of Verona) in a Verona document of 911 inserted in ibid., i, no. 128, p. 462: solariata here can surely mean only ‘being on an upper floor,’ not ‘having an upper floor.’ 104 DB.I, no. 119. 105 DB.I, no. 89 of 913; ibid., no. 57 of 905; Fainelli, Cod. Dipl. Veronese, ii, 1963, no. 86. 106 B.S.Pav., n.s., viii/2, 1956, p. 195. 107 HPM.CDL., no. 716. 108 The basic documents are Arch. Cap. Novara, no. 16 of 887; ibid., no. 20 of 899; DB.I, no. 119 of 918; Le più antiche carte ... di S. Gaudenzio di Novara, ed. C. Salsotto (BSSS., vol. lxvii/1), 1937, no. 5 (a sale by Iohannes qui et Bono to Dagibert). To these should almost certainly be added Dloth.I, no. 97 of 846 which was part of the Novara cathedral archives in the tenth century.
The ultimate beneficie of these transactions was the church of Novara. Initially, however, Dagibert was presumably buying for himself. Nothing is known about his origins beyond the name of his father, and the sources of his wealth when he was still only a minor cleric are a mystery: but it is not impossible that the manipulation of property was one of them. Long before Dagibert’s time the function of Pavia as a capital was encouraging churches in many other parts of the regnum to acquire a permanent footing in the city. The abbey of Nonantola had its cellulae vel casae there before 830, the abbey of Bobbio its cella before 834/6, the bishopric of Luni its domus and the monastery of Sesto (?Udinese) its casa before 846.\(^9\) By the data of Otto I’s final annexation of north Italy more than twenty other churches are known to have owned single houses or groups of buildings (cellae, etc.; but also mansiones, salae and even xenodochia) which served the double function of providing accommodation for visitors and providing storage facilities for agricultural and other produce intended for consumption or sale.\(^10\) Where the property was a gift from the Crown it may often have been, as Signor Fagnani has recently argued, in the area of the one-time faramania; but the evidence from Novara and elsewhere shows that the properties of extra-urban churches were in widely-separated parts of the city.\(^11\) In at least two cases at the end of the ninth century a grant by the Crown included the right of demolishing for private building purposes part of the north-eastern section of the city-wall—in one case subsequently rebuilt to meet the Magyar threat and then again demolished in the interests of the original grantee: evidence (like the privilege of building supra viam publicam) of the growing pressure on land in the city. Some of the extra-urban churches acquired sizable holdings in Pavia; and when these are added to the sites occupied by local churches and their property the total area within the walls that was lost to the property market by the early tenth century was obviously considerable. An undiminished demand for urban land put those with something to sell or lease in a very favourable position.

There was, of course, more than one way of making money in ninth- and tenth-century Pavia and more than one way of spending it. Service at court, the writing

---

\(^9\) DLoth.I, no. 7; Cod. Dipl. Bobbio, i, p. 140; DLoth.I, no. 97.

\(^10\) The listing of these properties was first attempted by G. Volpe, whose comments are still valuable: see most conveniently his Per la storia economica e giuridica del Medioevo italiano, 1923, pp. 257 ff. The fullest account is C. Milani, ‘Intorno all’organizzazione di una città capitale,’ Ann. di Sci. Polit. dell’università di Pavia, x, 1937, pp. 131 ff. (to which Prof. C. M. Cipolla kindly drew my attention). But Milani’s list is by no means complete: in particular, it omits three of the four pre-850 examples quoted above, the earliest reference to a cella S. Ambrosii (BM. 1259) and the curtes qui dicitur genuensis recorded in 887 (Arch. Cap. Novara, no. 16).

\(^11\) Fagnani, ‘La faramania,’ pp. 6 ff., with my comments in n. 52 (above). The location of the casae named in DLoth.I, no. 97 is unfortunately not known, but since the property that was the subject of the grant was apparently later acquired by the church of Novara, they were probably to the north-west of the cathedral rather than in the faramania.

\(^12\) DAnn., no. 123 of 894, in favour of S. Ambrogio, Milan: cellulae monasterii intra Papiensem urbem locatæ consecutus murum eiusdem civitatis, quantum eiusdem cellulae vel terra ipsius cohaere videtur, ut abbæ et successores sui potestatem habentem super edificandi quicquid voluerint (but it is unlikely that this concession was ever effective); DBJ, no. 100, quoted above, p. 96 and n. 51. In locating the cella of S. Ambrogio in the north-east corner of the city, I am assuming (as others have done) that it was on or near the site of the later church of sanctus Ambrosius de curte Archi- episcopi which Opicino names between S. Pietro a Mura and S. Agata di Canevanova (De laudibus, ed. Miosco and Quintavalle, p. 7, ed. Gianani, p. 79) and this seems to be confirmed by the document which is the earliest evidence for S. Pietro a Mura (App. III, s.n.) and the reference to sancti Ambrosii terræ in this area in DII.II, no. 215—whether this was land of the monastery or land of the archbishopric.
of documents as a notary, the striking of coins as an official moneyer all brought their rewards, small or large. The city had become a regular stopping-place on journeys from across the Alps to Rome and back. Both permanent residents and transients provided an excellent market for the Venetian and other traders who came up the Po with silks and other luxury products. In the 830s the royal palace itself seems to have produced fine cloth and richly-decorated garments for those who could afford them. Local negotiatores figure regularly in the documents from 887 onwards; and although the commodities in which they traded are never named, the contexts in which they occur—as witnesses or as parties to a property transaction—show that they are not mere peddlars. A lease granted to a merchant by the abbot of Nonantola in 901 is the earliest evidence for the Foro Cluso of the city and the private stationes in or adjacent to it. The latter were presumably booths or huts erected by the owner or lessee of the separate plots of land; the mensolae that were in front of them were doubtless fixed stone benches. The site of a former statio now built on (‘developed,’ to use the modern jargon), close by the Foro Cluso, is the subject of two extremely interesting transactions in July 967.

113 The earliest and so far as I know only ninth-century reference to notarial fees is Mon. Germ. Hist., Capit., ii, no. 201 of 832, c. 13 which prescribes half-a-pound of silver for the preparation of maioria scripta; for comparison I note merely that Dagibert paid 20 pounds for his house, sala and land in 887 and 6 pounds and five solidi in 899: Arch. Cap. Novara, nos. 16, 20. For Pavian moneyers in this period see especially R. S. Lopez, ‘An aristocracy of money in the early Middle Ages,’ Speculum, xviii, 1953, pp. 1 ff.: the author rightly insists that the property-transactions of moneyers and their presence in witness-lists shows that they are not mere artisans; and compare the evidence for the moneyer Leopertus, cited below in n. 121. But Lopez almost certainly exaggerates their wealth and degree of privilege and the profits to be made from moneying (see the observations of P. Grierson, ‘Mint output in the tenth century,’ Economic History Review, 2nd ser., ix, 1956–7, 462 ff.) and the fact that a Pavian moneyer sold rural property in the Lakes area for twelve pounds of silver in 849, HPM.CDL., no. 148, could mean that business was bad (but of course, we don't know why he sold it).

114 The emergence of a standard pilgrim route from northern Europe to Rome via Pavia, which is first documented over its entire length by the itinerary of archbishop Sigeric of Canterbury in 990 (Memoriales of St. Dunstan, ed. W. Stubbbs, pp. 392 ff.), may go back to the Lombard period; but its existence cannot safely be inferred from any text earlier than the Vita Geraldii Aureliacensis, Acta Sanctor. October, vi, pp. 300 ff., written in the late 930s (see F.-L. Ganshof in Mélanges offerts à M. Nicolas Jorga, 1933, pp. 295 ff., esp. pp. 298 f.) of a man who died c. 909. Gerald's arrival at Pavia when already *per omne illud iter satis nobilissimus erat et religionis atque largitatis causa apud omnes famosus is described in Vita, i, iii, 34 (I, 27 in Migne) and repeated journeys *per igsaw montis Iovina, that is to say, down the Val d'Acosa, are referred to in Vita, ii, v, 67 (II, 17 in Migne); on the other hand a journey *per illam viam ab Italia qua Lugdunum a citivitate Turinensi venit, Vita II, v, 71 (II, 21) would be through the Val di Susa and then over the Montenesci or the Montgendarre, and a journey to Rome that took Gerald to Asti, Vita, II, v, 68 (II, 18) would have used the same route in reverse and then have by-passed Pavia.

115 The evidence for the early trading-activity of Venetians and others in the Po valley, with Pavia apparently as its focus, is so scanty that it has been discussed many times. The most reliable accounts are in L. M. Hartmann, Zur Wirtschaftsgesch. Italiens im frühen Mittelalter, 1904, pp. 74 ff., and Solmi, Amministrazione finanziaria, ch. 5 (but pp. 93 ff., on tributum and ripasticum are hopelessly confused), although it should be stressed that the only evidence for Venetians trading in silks at Pavia in Charlemagne's time comes from the De gestis Karoli magni of Notker of St. Gall, written in Latin in the late 880s. Some scholars have thought to find an earlier reference to the silk trade in a little-discussed passage in Agnellus's Liber pont. eccl. Ravenntatis alluding to events of the late 890s. This, however, refers to something quite different, for it reads: (Mon. Germ. Hist., Scr. rer. Lang., p. 388) [Georgius archiepiscopus] emit ex palatio imperatoris [Popis] vestimenta baptismalia quingentos aureos, ex auro ornata, bisiinta alba. The sale by the Palace—at very high prices—of fine linen garments decorated with gold (+thread) deserves to be considered, I suggest, in conjunction with the known activity of royal pennisilium or gnypaece (cf. n. 94, above) and the monopoly rights of the Pavan Palace in gold taken from north Italian rivers, on which see Honorantiae civitatis Popis, c. 10, and Solmi, Amministrazione Finanziaria, ch. 7.

116 Pavian merchants: Arch. Cap. Novara, no. 16 of 887 (witness; if mercator is for mercator—which I doubt also former property-owner); ibid., no. 20 of 899 (seller); HPM.CDL., no. 393 of 901 (lessee; five witnesses), etc. Stationes, mensolae, etc.: HPM.CDL., no. 393; similarly, the mercatum of Milan cum stationibus imit banculas ante se habentibus, DOI, no. 143 of 952.
The documents in question describe the stationes and Foro as being prope locus ubi Becaricia dicitur. Becaricia is unidentified and unexplained; the wording used and the fact that the documents of 967 are both preserved in the originals make it unlikely that there is any connection with the later Italian beccaria ‘meat-market, cattle-market’ (recorded only from the thirteenth century). It is none the less a remarkable coincidence that in the later Middle Ages the beccaria maior of Pavia was in the very area where it is tempting to locate the Foro cluso, namely, to the north-east of the cathedral on part of the site of the Piazza della Vittoria (ex-Piazza Grande):\textsuperscript{117} the modern street-name Via Beccaria on the west side of the Piazza recalls this lost feature of the city. Its continuation on the east side of the Piazza is the Via Zecca; the moneta duly figures on one of Opicino’s maps in this part of the city-centre, although it is not clear whether the mint still functioned on this site in his time or whether he knew of it only from the church of sanctus Nicolas in moneta.\textsuperscript{118} Wherever the early-tenth century Foro cluso was, it is unlikely that it was the direct successor of the Roman forum; and the name was perhaps meant to point a contrast with the fields outside the wall to the south-east where, as we know from the biography of Gerald of Aurillac, Venetian merchants and other foreigners pitched their tents and did their trading.\textsuperscript{119}

The currently fashionable urge for ‘quantification’ in history is one that the early medievalist has no difficulty in resisting: the evidence simply does not exist. We are, however, probably safe in assuming that the gap between the wealth of the ordinary inhabitant of Pavia and that of a privileged few widened in the ninth and tenth centuries, as it did on many other cities a century or two later, and that this was felt acutely by some and perhaps by many of the citizens. But the evidence we do have hardly justifies our speaking of ‘the rise of a new class,’ still less of defining it narrowly in terms of function or of composition, and then using its supposed emergence and claim to recognition as an explanation of undoubted social tensions and internal change. A trustworthy contemporary annalist records that on Palm Sunday 886 sedicio urbe Papia inter satelles regis et civibus infeliciter orta, in which many were killed and others fled the city and died from their wounds.\textsuperscript{120} Officious bureaucrats and licentious soldiery, however, are quite capable of provoking antagonisms which have nothing to do—initially at least—with class conflict and national feeling; and there is not the slightest reason for concluding that the sale of property to Dagibert in 887 by the wife of an Imperial vassus et mansionarius (presumably a Court official) was a consequence of the previous year’s disorders. The seller, Maria, was clearly of local origin, as perhaps was her husband; and the relatives who consent to the sale include a moneyer and an iudex.

\textsuperscript{117} Foro Cluso, etc., in 967: Bernard and Bruel, Charles de Cluny, i, nos. 1228, 1229; cf. Manaresi, Placiti, ii/1, no. 158; the pecia de terra of the sellers and the neighbouring terra de Vulaperti iudicis in the second document are pecia una de terra que vocatur Statzona turis nostris and Statzona Vulaperti iudici in the first document—an interesting example of an appellative evolving into a toponym. Becaricia maior: De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 49; ed. Gianani, p. 118.

\textsuperscript{118} Opicino names the church (De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 6; ed. Gianani, p. 78) but not the mint itself. On Salomon’s reconstructed map (above, fig. 2) moneta is shown one square to the west of S. Nicolai, i.e. immediately to the north of the cathedral.

\textsuperscript{119} Vita Geraldi, i, iii, 34 (I, 27). For the problem of the siting of the Roman forum see above, n. 56.

The other witnesses to the transaction include a negotiator and another moneyer who describe themselves as ex generi franco-rum.  

The struggle for royal authority in the regnum Italiae which brought Pavia nine different sovereigns in fifty years, and other external events of the period affected individual citizens in very different ways and their long-term impact on the life of the city was less than one might have expected. There were doubtless years or parts of years when the prudent pilgrim or trader steered clear of the Italian capital. Yet in the decades either side of 900 the saintly Gerald of Aurillac made a number of journeys via Pavia to Rome and back; and on one of them an encounter with Venetian traders who told him that he had paid a remarkably low price for a piece of silk bought in Rome, provided his biographer with an edifying tale. In 901, only a few months after Louis III of Provence had temporarily ousted king Berengar from Pavia, as we have seen, a merchant took the lease of a market statio in the city. In 919 the first known nauclerius of medieval Pavia, a certain Severo, son of Siro, was given land in the Po delta (in settlement of a debt?) by a citizen of Verona. The histories of individual iudices and notarii sacri palatii show that many of them were either impressionable forerunners of the non-political civil servant or successful 'Vicars of Bray.' In 915 the bishop of Bergamo was empowered to demolish a recently-rebuilt section of the city wall. Less than nine years later, in March 924, the Magyars fell on and sacked a city that was described by the contemporary French chronicler Flodoard as populissima atque opulentissima.  

Medieval chroniclers invariably dramatise and usually exaggerate the disastrous effects of pagan attacks: but it is difficult to discount Flodoard's precise figure of forty-four churches set on fire on this occasion, bishop John and the bishop of Vercelli dying in the flames and smoke; and it is possible to believe the report that scarcely two hundred people remained there who scraped together eight modii of silver to buy off the raiders. The refugees soon returned to the city, however, and with the accession to the throne of Hugh of Arles its recovery proceeded apace, helped unquestionably by its unique status as a royal capital. Odo of Cluny's vivid account of the Venetian traders visiting the tents of other travellers encamped near the city to offer them cloaks and spices has reasonably been claimed as the

---

112 The property had come to Maria per ereditatem Richeri qui fuit genitor meus seu et per certolam ab Sigelberga germana mea adque et a Benedictum presbyter de inter decimanos. Petrus monetarius was her consiprimus, Domnellius iudex et Anteramus her insoprin. The witnesses ex generi franco-rum are Leodemarius negotiator and Leopertus monetarius. The latter unexpectedly figures again, together with two other moneyers Odilicus f.b.m. Sebastiani and Ermoaldus, among those resedentes in a court of justice at Pavia on 4 March 899, Manaresi, Placiti, i, no. 108. There were at least four Pavian moneyers simultaneously at this period (cf. Honorantia, c. 8, whose higher figure can be neither proved nor disproved) since Evrardus monetarius, also legem vivente salicha, witnesses. Ex Arch. Cap. Novara, no. 20 of 3 January 899.  

113 Above, n. 119.  

114 HPM.CDL., no. 483. The editor's denial that the property was located in the neighbourhood of Gavello in the Basso Polesine is quite unnecessary: compare the in comitato Gavello of the present document with in fribus civitatem Gavellum in Manaresi, Placiti, i, no. 43 of 858.  

115 I have for many years been compiling a 'biographical dictionary' of iudices and notaries in the ninth and tenth centuries, which it would be inappropriate to summarise here: but it shows beyond doubt that many iudices palatii continued to act through the successive and often bewildering changes of monarch in the last decades of the ninth century and the opening years of the tenth.  


118 King Rudolf II issued a diploma at the request of the marquises Berengar and Anscar in favour of S. Giovanni Domnarum in the city on 18 August 924: DRO.II, no. 4.
description of an eye-witness—therefore probably in 936 or 938. The well-known H槟onis citatis Pamie shows the resources and privileges at the disposal of the court and its leading officials; and even if we suppose (with Professor Violante and others) that the centralised financial organisation and commercial monopolies described in this text were already in being in the ninth century, the anonymous author is particularly concerned with the situation in the middle decades of the tenth century. With the aid of royal and private donations most of Pavia’s damaged churches were rebuilt, although we know of one where the site was turned over to houses and there may have been others which had the same fate, and new churches were founded. Those whose property had not been destroyed doubtless had innumerable opportunities of speculation and personal enrichment.

Intimacy with the monarch could still prove a more valuable asset than available cash or land and entrepreneurial skill. One of the few technological advances of the early Middle Ages was the widespread adoption of the water-mill; but in southern Europe, where suitable all-the-year-round water-courses were fewer than in the north, its construction and the profits from its use long remained the prerogative of religious communities and a few fortunate individuals. In 945 the mills of the western Carona make their first appearance in history when king Hugh gave three of them to his former mistress Rotruda (one-time wife of the Count of the Palace Gilbert), their illegitimate daughter and her husband; and two others that were the property of religious houses are mentioned in the next twenty years. Significantly, the wife of the iudex Gaidulf who, with her dying husband, disposed of a one-eighth share of a mill in 967, was the daughter of a iudex Walpert—either the judge of that name who was active during the reigns of Hugh and his son Lothar or (less probably) one who was a iudex palatii in the 920s and the father of Rotruda.

128 Vita Geraldi, loc. cit. in n. 119. For the date see Ganshof in Mélanges lorga, pp. 298 f.
129 For details see Solmi, Amministrazione Finanziaria, poteri, and especially ch. 2 and 9.
130 The capella s. Victorius: see DRo.II., no. 4 and DU Lo., no. 83 of 947 (ubi modo mansiones videntur et compositae).
131 DU Lo., no. 79; DB.II. Ad., no. 10 of 958 = DO.I. no. 240 of 962 (abbey of Leno); DO.I. no. 273 of 964 (S. Pietro Ciel d’Oro). For the mills of the Carona in the early fourteenth century, at which time there were eleven on the two branches of the river, see Opicino, De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, pp. 18, 49; ed. Gianani, pp. 92, 119; the present-day Via dei Molini is approximately on the line of the western Carona. For Rotruda-Rosa as the Christine Keeler of her time see Lietprand, Antapodosis, III, 39, IV, 14, ed. Becker, pp. 92, 112; for her family connections see the first of these passages and HPM.CDL., no. 634 of 959.
132 Bernard and Bruel, Chartes de Cluny, ii, nos. 1228, 1229: Ima qui et Imiza filia quondam Vualperti iudex [sic]. The precise identity of Ima’s father—which is a point of some importance for the social history of Pavia in the tenth century—is difficult if not impossible to establish because Walpert seems to have been a popular name for iudices in this period. The first iudex Walpert, recorded in documents from at latest 915 was executed c. 930 (next note). A second Walpert is recorded several times between 935 and 945 and his autograph signature exists in the manuscript sources of Manaresi, Placiti, i, nos. 140, 141, 142 of 941–44; that he was alive as late as 17 April 967 is suggested by the presence of a Gualpertus iudex domnorum regum—an anomalous usage (the correct one at this date being of course iudex domini imperatoris) which would be accounted for by his having continued to use a title that had been his in previous reigns—in a court of that date held at Ravanua, Manaresi, Placiti, ii/1, no. 155, p. 51. By March 976 at least two iudices (sacri palatii) Walpert were simultaneously active in the Pavia region: see the document inserted in Manaresi, Placiti, ii/1, no. 100. This notitia, of September 976, is preserved in the original and includes an autograph signature of one Vualpertus iudex sacri palatii: if this proves on examination to be identical with the signature to the 941–4 documents (which I think unlikely) it would make it almost certain that Ima was the daughter of the Walpert who died c. 930; but if it is not identical we are still unable to say whether Ima’s father was the second or the first Walpert. The one positive argument against the latter is that Ima apparently had a brother Bertari (Chartes, ii, no. 1228) who is unlikely to be his son: see n. 134.
In his time the earlier Walpert attained exceptional power and influence in the capital and perhaps in the kingdom at large; but he lost his head when, with another iudex, he plotted rebellion against the king. Thanks to the sexual attractions of his daughter, his misjudgment did not permanently damage the fortunes of the family. Nor did it affect the fortunes of the class from which the chief plotters came—a class of literate professional men, unique in western Europe at the time, whose authority and status had been rising for many decades. The importance of the Pavian iudices in the history of law is familiar, if ill-defined. As a numerically substantial group of citizens, whose growing influence evidently went hand in hand with an increase in wealth, they could hardly have failed to make a substantial contribution to the internal development of the city. One of the best-documented Pavian iudices active during the reigns of Otto I and Otto II is a certain Waltari or Valterus who may have been a close relative of Rotruda’s. His foundation of the church of S. Maria Gualtieri, in which he was buried on his death in 989, is the earliest that we know to have been undertaken by a judge or notary. Eight years previously he had held a public court of justice in his own house, which was still a novel practice if it was not actually an innovation. Before 976 all but a few of the surviving placit held in Pavia took place in the Palace whether the monarch was present or not: the exceptions were in the residence of the Count of the Palace (the leading figure of the royal court, who at least from the early tenth century had his own substantial house in the city) or within the precincts of the cathedral. In 976, however, Waltari presided over a court of justice held in curte propria abitacionis Adami qui et Amica iudex (who was in fact one of the parties to the proceedings!), and in the next forty-five years the private houses of iudices were used for a similar purpose on a number of occasions.

The houses used for these courts evidently had a number of rooms, at least one of them large enough to accommodate twenty or thirty people. The apparent trend towards more substantial and more luxurious residences was not peculiar to

133 Lütprand, Anttopodosis, III, 39, ed. Becker, p. 92—the only evidence for this episode but hardly to be questioned, although it is not now possible to date it more precisely than a year or two after 927.

134 Waltari’s activity as a iudex and missus was briefly studied by J. Hicker, Forschungen zur Reichs- u. Reichsgesch. Italiens, ii, 187, pp. 43 ff. In HPM. CDL., no. 634, Rotruda’s mundoald is named as Walterius iudex domorum regum; since this document is an original there should be no difficulty in establishing that this iudex is (or is not) the Waltari of later documents. In Lombard law a woman’s mundoald was her husband, on his decease a son or in default of sons, normally a brother. As we learn from this document, Rotruda’s son by Gilbert had predeceased her; and it is a reasonable assumption that the Waltari of 959 was Walpert’s son: the absence of other named relatives makes it unlikely that the Bertari recorded in 967 (n. 132) was also Rotruda’s brother. For Waltari’s church-foundation and burial, see: the lost inscription, Panazza, Lapidi, no. 102; the unpublished documents of 1153 and 1157, quoted in De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 6, n. 7; De laudibus, loc. cit. and ed. Gianani, p. 78. For his house and the judicial proceedings held there see Manaresi, Placiti, ii/1, no. 196 of 981.

135 Courts in the precincts of the cathedral: Manaresi, Placiti, i, no. 106 of 899; ibid., ii/1, no. 158 of 967; courts in the residence of the Count of the Palace: ibid., i, no. 133 of 927; ibid., ii/1, no. 148 of 962. Court of 976: ibid., no. 180; the other party to the proceedings, and the successful one, was the daughter of the iudex Gaidulf and presumably of Ima. Later courts in the house of a iudex: Manaresi, Placiti, ii/1, no. 221 of 995; ii/2, no. 301 of 1018 (both in the residence of the iudex Alberic).

136 In caminato maiore solario proprio abitacionis of Waltari in 981, in laudia solarii proprio abitacionis of Alberic in 995 and 1018. Those present in 1018 were eleven named judges et reliquis plures plus five persons who were parties to the proceedings; those present in 981 included twelve named judges. On the other hand in 976, when there were sixteen named judges and notaries et reliquis plures and four persons who were parties to the proceedings, the court took place in curte propria abitacionis Adami.
the iudices. In an exchange of property made in 970 a priest gave up salas duas cum areas in qua extant, one of which had a furnum. In the context, this probably refers to a stove in a weaving-shed or a bake-oven (in which case it may be compared with the pristimum (sc. pistrimum) which was included in a lease of property in Milan in 972), although it is not absolutely excluded that it was a kiln for baking bricks, tiles or pottery.\textsuperscript{137} Two documents of the 980s refer respectively to a casa riciolata and a terra cum riciolo which seem to mean a house and a piece of ground with a stone floor.\textsuperscript{138} The reappearance of the term edificium \textit{de} lignam\textit{en} suggests that once again there was a need to contrast buildings of timber with others of brick or masonry.\textsuperscript{139} Bigger houses added to the land-hunger within the walls. In attributing the secundus murus of Pavia to bishop John, i.e. either John III who died in the burning city in 924 or his predecessor who died c. 911, Opicino for once seems to have made a substantial mistake, although a venial one. Like the modern scholars who have followed him without question, he may have been misled by the diploma of 915 in favour of the Bishop of Bergamo which refers to the murus civitatis edificatus super terram ecclesiae (and possibly by other similar grants now lost): the rest of the document makes it quite clear that a rebuilt section of the first wall is being referred to.\textsuperscript{140} No tenth-century document makes any mention of the supposed new wall and several make no sense if the ‘first wall’ had already been superseded—notably an Imperial diploma of 980 and a testament of 983: the second of these contrasts property \textit{intra ac civitate Ticinense} . . . non longe da basilica sancti Petri qui dicitur ad muro with other property foris et prope anc urbern . . . non longe da porta qui dicitur eodem sancti Petri ad muro et iacet iusta fluvio qui dicitur Catedrona, i.e. the eastern Catrona.\textsuperscript{141} This does not mean that churches and private houses were not steadily being built in the area that was walled-in at a later date (although precisely when has still to be determined): the contrary is clearly true. For the layman who was not in a position to build a strong enclosing wall around his residence there were, however, obvious advantages in living within the urbs; although in times of crisis and conflict, such as the revolt and coronation of Ardoin in 1002 and the subsequent descent on Italy and coronation of Henry II of Germany, there might be equally obvious disadvantages. A way of meeting both needs was one with which we have again become familiar: build high. Before the eleventh century the only \textit{turre} I have found recorded in Pavian documents form part of the city wall. In the tumults that followed his royal coronation in May 1004 king Henry sought safety outside the city wall \textit{ad munitiunculam quamdam, quae sancti Petri Cella Aurea vocatur}. Little over a decade later the first transactions occur that involve a private \textit{turr}is within the city.\textsuperscript{142}

\textsuperscript{137} Exchange of 970: \textit{HPM.CDL.}, no. 716. Milanese pistrimum: \textit{ibid.}, no. 732. For furnum, cf. above, p. 106 and (for kiln-baked tiles or bricks) n. 79.

\textsuperscript{138} \textit{HPM.CDL.}, nos. 816 of 983, 820 of 984 with the editor’s note to the first of these. But cf. G. Tiraboschi, \textit{Memorie storiche modenese}, i, 1793, no. 152 = E. P. Vicini, \textit{Regesto della chiesa cattedrale di Modena}, i, 1931, no. 81 of 1007: land adjacent to riciolo cum area sua, which does not fit very well with the translation adopted in the text.

\textsuperscript{139} \textit{HPM.CDL.}, no. 716 of 970, with which compare Ed. Roth. 283, Manaresi, \textit{Placiti}, i, no. 67, p. 244 of 865.


\textsuperscript{141} \textit{HPM.CDL.}, no. 816. A glance at Opicino’s maps will confirm that at the date of this document the \textit{secundus murus} did not exist.

\textsuperscript{142} \textit{Munitiunculam}: Adalbold, \textit{Vita Heinrict II}, c. 40 (ed. Waitz, \textit{Mon. Germ. Hist.}, \textit{Scriptores}, iv, p. 693. \textit{Turr}is: Muratori, \textit{Ant. It.}, i, c. 38 f., Manaresi,
A few years later again, in 1024, the inhabitants of Pavia rose and burnt the Palace so completely that Opicino was apparently unaware of its former existence—an act that symbolised the finish of Pavia as the capital of the Italian kingdom, the *sedes regni*. I say ‘symbolised’ rather than ‘caused,’ because the growing independence and enhanced local importance of the *iudices* in the last decades of the tenth century was only one aspect of the diminishing importance of the Palace as a basis of royal authority in north Italy. As we learn from the unknown author of the *Honorantie*, writing in the last years of Henry II, and as other evidence confirms, the reigns of the three Ottos saw the progressive dismantling of the centralised financial administration of the *regnum*. The anonymous writer, perhaps himself a former financial official, still believed that *si fuisset prudens imperator et honorabilis* the process could be reversed: his hopes must have died in the ashes of the Palace.\(^{143}\)

Round about the year 990 the *iudex* Cunibert, a brother of the well-placed Gaidulf who had died in 967, was made a count—apparently the first and last example of promotion of this kind.\(^{144}\) The next generation of ‘judges of the Palace’ gained fame and influence as codifiers and expositors of Lombard and post-Lombard Italian law rather than as instruments of royal or Imperial power in capital and kingdom. The burning of the Palace on the death of Henry II put an end to a unique centre of bureaucratic administration and to a unique system of schooling in the law: it also forced the ‘notaries and judges of the Palace’ either to throw in their lot with the emergent forces in their urban community or to continue to act in the name of an authority that was increasingly rejected in north Italy. Pavia in 1050 was a very different place from Pavia in 950, not to speak of *Ticinum* in 450. Change may have been slow, architectural ideas limited and wealth modest in the early medieval town. But ‘slow change’ is not ‘no change’; and while Pavia’s distinctive position in the *regnum Italicae* forbids us to think of its history as typical of that of the north Italian town in this period, it provides some measure of the contemporary evolution of other urban societies whose great age was to come when Pavia’s was already over. *Civitatulae*, too, *habent sua fata*: and the calamities and destinies of Pavia and of many other towns in the dark early medieval centuries help to explain why the *civitates* of the Communal period were not simply distorted copies of their Roman predecessors. They were towns or communities of a new kind: but ones, too, in which the heritage of the past gave shape and direction to the energies of the present.

**D. A. BULLOUGH**

---

** NOTES ON PLATE XX **

a. Detail of map of Pavia in 1599–1600 by Corte and Maggi (orig. Museo Civico, Pavia). To the left can be seen a section of the western Carona not yet covered in, with the mill-houses on the east bank; to the right is the atrium or *platea ecclesiae cathedralis* with the ‘Regisole’. Immediately to the north of this is the *insula* containing the Senatora monastery: the property

*Placiti*, ii/2, pp. 600–2 (inserted document); Muratori, *Ant. It.*, i, c. 95 f. = *Vicini, Regesto*, i, no. 92; Manaresi, *Placiti*, ii/2, no. 801 of August–October 1018: a donation by a husband and wife to the bishopric of Modena of *casas duas solaritias et turre una cum capella una infra ipsa turre edificata in onore sancti Nicologi adque sala una mura cum areis ubi estat cum curte, omnia insimul tenente, etc.*

\(^{143}\) *Honorantie*, c. 21 ex: ed. Solmi, p. 25.

\(^{144}\) Compare Manaresi, *Placiti*, ii/1, no. 206 of 985 (pp. 241, 251: *Cunibertus iudex sacri palatii*) with ibid., no. 291 of 997 (pp. 352, 355: *Cunibertus comes et iudex domni imperatoris*): both documents have autograph signatures. For Cunibert’s family see Appendix IV.
acquired by Dagibert was perhaps on the southern edge of this or across the street further west. (Photo.: dott. A. Peroni, Museo Civico.)

b. Pavia from the north-west in Schedel's Liber Chronicarum (1483), fol. 74. This view from close to the junction of the second and third walls (see text, fig. 2) is highly stylised and given a marked 'northern' look: it none the less gives an acceptable impression of the west side of the primus murus with its towers and the immediately adjacent western Carona.

APPENDIX I

THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC HISTORY OF NORTH ITALY IN THE LATE IMPERIAL PERIOD: A NOTE ON RECENT WORK IN RELATION TO PAVIA AND ITS TERRITORY

Signorina L. Ruggini's monumental Economia e società nell' "Italia annonaria." Rapporti tra agricoltura e commercio dal IV al VI sec. d.C. (1961) is widely recognised as something new and significant in Italian historiography of the late Empire. The author is rightly dissatisfied with generalised accounts of the increase in 'great landlordship' and of overall economic decline in this period, and with the assumption that the chronology of change was more or less the same in all the western provinces (with the partial exception of Britain); and she has attempted to substitute a more dynamic picture of the changing relationship of agricultural and urban life in a more limited area. To this end, she directs questions hitherto unasked at an unusually wide range of source-material. Her method and her conclusions have been acclaimed by many—not always judiciously—and criticised by a few—not always fairly. Her central thesis may be summarised as follows. Although small proprietors still existed in the Po valley in the fourth century, there was already an overwhelming preponderance of great estates, as a result both of the establishment in that region of Imperial courts and armies (which favoured the rise of a new class of possessores) and of taxation which bore hardest on peasant proprietors. The newcomers did not, like their counterparts in Africa and to some extent in Gaul, live on their estates but remained in the towns, where many of them combined their non-resident landownership with corporate activity as negotiatores, manipulating the market in grain and also in wine—particularly of course in times of scarcity, of which there were many in this period. It is, in Signorina Ruggini's view, only in the sixth century, as a consequence, firstly, of the growing difficulty of taking advantage of the food-shortages of distant regions and, secondly, of the destruction brought by the 'war of reconquest' that north Italian landowners too abandoned the towns for their rural estates.

The persistence of small peasant proprietors in the region centering on Milan (including, that is, both the Lakes area and the territory of Pavia) has also been postulated by Calderini in the Storia di Milano, vol. i; but his arguments are too general and a priori to add anything to Signorina Ruggini's evidence on this point. She has relied particularly on the incidental remarks of the north Italian Fathers, notably Ambrose; and as far as it goes, their evidence is decisive. But it must be remembered that sources of this kind do not even allow a controlled guess at the relative importance of 'great' and 'small' landownership: even at a much later date, when the documentation is very much fuller, this is usually impossible to determine; and it is clear only that the proportions might vary widely in different parts of a region as large as the Lombard and Emilian plain. The demonstration, on the basis of these same sources, of the existence of a hitherto- unnoticed class of possessores-negotiatores which played a key part in the economy of the region in the late fourth century has, on the other hand, rightly been recognised as a major contribution to our knowledge and understanding of the period.

Signorina Ruggini's account of the post-fourth-century changes, however, seem to me to be much less convincing. It is regrettably true that there are no sources comparable to the writings of Ambrose in the late fourth century or the Variae of Cassiodorus in the early sixth century to throw light on conditions in north Italy in the fifth century. Signorina Ruggini may be right in assuming that the legal texts which imply a flight from the cities in Italy as well as in other parts of the Empire in that period (see A. H. M. Jones, The Later Roman Empire, 1964, ii, pp. 762 ff.) have no bearing on north Italian conditions; and indeed K. Hannestad's concise, careful but not always convincing L'évolution des ressources agricoles de l'Italie du 4ème au 6ème siècle (1962), ch. 9, even suggests that the later fifth and the sixth centuries were (in Italy) a period of migration from the country to the towns: he does not appear to me, however, to have proved this point. But the scanty evidence for Italian agriculture in the fifth century cannot simply be ignored, even if none of it applies specifically to the north (cf. Hannestad, ch. 6); and some consideration must surely be given to the probable consequences of the establishment of barbarian landowners in the region, whether through the allocation of 'thirds' or in some other way: on this see now Jones, op. cit., i, pp. 249 ff.
Signorina Ruggini has demonstrated that there were some significant changes in the ‘class’ of negotiatores in western Romania during the two centuries after Ambrose; but she produces no convincing evidence that possessori-negotiatores were also still active in the Po valley in the early sixth century, although her suggested interpretation of some difficult and important passages in the Variae requires her to assume that they were. In several places in the second half of her book she lists a vast range of writings relevant (more or less) to a problem briefly stated in the text, without any attempt at a critical assessment—e.g. the supposed evidence of town walls for the expansion or contraction of north Italian cities in this period; and on this topic the same secondary works appear in no less than three separate footnotes as evidence for both the fourth and the sixth centuries! The fault here is, indeed, not entirely Signorina Ruggini’s: as my discussion of the evidence for Pavia’s wall should have shown, in this field (as in so many others) the groundwork has still to be done.

On other points the evidence from Pavia does not seem to agree with Signorina Ruggini’s general picture: thus, while Burco may be one of the ‘new’ landowners who chose to live in the town rather than on a rural estate (in the fifth century and not in the fourth, however), Gregorius and Senator seem to be examples of rural possessores who continued to have their principal residence in the city in the seventh and early eighth centuries. But on the evidence available we cannot argue either that they were typical or that they were not typical of the area and the period. Signorina Ruggini’s account of north Italy between the late fourth and late sixth centuries may be more categoric than the evidence warrants. But only detailed studies of particular districts or particular problems, which draw on at least as wide a range of sources as she does and which show an equal disrespect for traditional views, will show whether or not this is so.

APPENDIX II

SS. Gervasio e Protasio: the Interpretation of the Remains of the Early Christian Church

The existing church of SS. Gervasio e Protasio is an unattractive and rather shabby building, basically as it was left by an early eighteenth century reconstruction; until comparatively recently it was thought to contain no substantial relics of its earlier history except for the eleventh-century campanile. The indefatigable researches of Professor G. Panazza in 1947 and 1949, however, established conclusively that the north and west walls of the campanile incorporate brick-work of an earlier type, that the north wall formed (in part) the springing of an apse of which the foundations could be traced to the east of the present church, and that substantial remains of similar brick-work are embodied in the eastern-most bay of the south wall of the nave; the type of brick-work as well as the external pilasters of the former apse are closely comparable with those of the Early Christian churches of Milan and, in the view of Professor Panazza, point to a fifth or sixth century date for the Pavian building: for the details see B.S.Pao., n.s., vii, 1955, pp. 109–23.

One of the most important and at the same time most puzzling of the features discovered by Professor Panazza was ‘un’immenso arco,’ m.7.40 di luce’ and with its crown more than 11 metres above the original ground level, in the south wall: art. cit., p. 117 and figs. 1, 2 and 12; and he posed the questions whether this arch and the remains associated with it (p. 119) ‘appartenevano ad un tempio che aveva un orientamento nord-sud’ oppure, sono avanzi di un grande transetto di cui era dotata la Chiesa? questa ipotesi sembrerebbe un po’ difficile, pensando alle grandi dimensioni che l’ipotetico transetto avrebbe rispetto all’apertura dell’abside (m.10.50 circa).’ A transept of the type that is a normal feature of the larger Romanesque and Gothic churches is clearly excluded; it was not, in any case, a usual feature of Early Christian basilicas. But comparison with a later fourth century church at Milan, which was still almost unknown when Panazza made his discoveries at SS. Gervasio e Protasio, suggests an alternative explanation that is both simple and satisfying.

The church in question is the Ambrosian Basilica Apostolorum of which large parts of the walls were incorporated into the Romanesque S. Nazaro. An account of the Ambrosian church in the light of the most recent discoveries is to be found in G. Traversi, Architettura paleocristiana Milanes, 1964, pp. 91 ff., but its most important features were already known to Arslan for his contribution to Storia di Milano, ii, pp. 608–10, 615, and there is an excellent summary in Krautheimer, Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture, p. 57 f. The surviving remains point to, in Krautheimer’s words, ‘a huge cross 200 feet long . . . formed by four aileless arms, each roughly 50 roman feet wide. The stem of the cross, somewhat longer than the transverse wings, continues unbroken into the head.’ Arslan’s description (op. cit., p. 610; and similarly Traversi, pp. 98 f.) of the Milanese church’s ‘due arconi fatti di mattoni sesquipedali e legati con malta rosa signina’ which mark the openings into the cross-pieces is strikingly similar to Panazza’s description of the arch in the Pavian
church as made of ‘mattoni bellissimi,’ ‘sesquipedali,’ ‘con alti strati di calce fine e rosata per la presenza di coccio pesto’ (art. cit., pp. 117, 119 and fig. 12). In both churches the apse opened the full width of the nave; substantial pilasters extended north and south from the springing of the apse of the Milanese church, less substantial but still well-defined pilasters extended from the exterior of the SS. Gervasio e Protasio apse (cf. Panazza, fig. 10). The seemingly problematic arch discovered by Prof. Panazza is, I suggest, evidence that the Early Christian SS. Gervasio e Protasio was a ‘cross-church’ and one that was, in spite of the obvious differences, a smaller version of Ambrosius’s Basilica Apostolorum.

There is, indeed, literary evidence which not only seems to support this interpretation of the archaeological evidence but may even reflect a conscious dependence on the Ambrosian building, although the language is too commonplace for it to be pressed very hard. According to the Vita Syri, c. 7 (ed. Prelini, i, 196, 198), the bishop concepit animo templum Domini: idque in modum crucis, ut agressus est, consummavit; atque hoc primum coelesitis Regis ossi perorat in hac urbe erectum est. There is an obvious echo here of the inscription that Ambrose himself, or someone else shortly after his death, composed and placed in the Basilica: (de Rossi, Inscriptio Christ., ii/1, p. 161—from the Lorsch Sylloi) Condedit Ambrosius templum Dominico sacratit/Nomine apostolici numero reliquis./ Forma crucis templum est templum victoriae Christi/Sacra triumphalis signat imago locum.

The suggested parallels between the Milanese Basilica Apostolorum and the Early Christian elements in SS. Gervasio e Protasio are obviously relevant to any discussion of the dating of these. Professor Panazza cautiously attributed them to the fifth or sixth century (art. cit., pp. 116, 119 f.). The earlier rather than the later part of these two centuries seems on several grounds to be the more probable date. It must not be forgotten, however, that Professor Panazza showed that the ‘triumphal arch’ in front of the apse was later (although obviously not much later) than the apse itself and that there is literary evidence (Vita Epiphanii, c. 98: cf. Appendix III) of a partial reconstruction of the church after 476. Moreover, the recent discovery at S. Nazaro, Milan of a substantial foundation-wall linking the two pilasters that mark the springing of the apse has posed the question whether the wide apse was an original feature of the church or whether it replaced an earlier straight east wall. Clearly there are problems in the structural history of both churches and the dates of the various elements to which at the moment no solution is possible.

APPENDIX III

Evidence for Churches in Pavia before the Sack of the City in 924

1. General.


Vita Epiphani, 98 (ed. Vogel, p. 96): (in the course of Odovacer’s revolt in 476) utraque ecclesiae flammis hostilibus concerentur; cf. ibid. 102 (ed. Vogel, p. 97): iamiamque tamen fastigia perfectionis maioris ecclesiae . . . extemplo alienius ecclesiae etc. (full quotation below).


2. Individual churches in alphabetical order.

The purpose of this list is simply to collect the evidence which shows or suggests that a particular church existed before March 924. A standardised Latin form of the dedication-name has been used for each church, followed by a descriptive or topographical qualification only where this is recorded not later than the tenth century; in other cases the form of the name given by Opicino (usually in the genitive) or some other later medieval writer is given. The usual modern designation is given in brackets: no distinction is made between churches still in existence and those which have been deconsecrated or destroyed in the last 150 years, although I have sometimes noted the incorporation of one church in another. A ? before the name means the evidence for existence before 924 is too late to be accepted without qualification but is not necessarily to be rejected. <Pointed brackets> indicate that a pre-924 origin is plausible but is not supported by any direct evidence. [Square brackets] indicate that the supposed pre-924 origin of the church is in my view to be rejected. The evidence for each church is as follows: (a) evidence for date of foundation and/or name of founder; (b) earliest reference if not identical with (a); (c) earliest documentary evidence if not given under (b); (d) function or ecclesiastical status; other early references that throw light on its history.
S. Adrianus, sancti Adrianii martiris (Sant’Adriano: later incorporated in Sta. Maria in Pertica).

(a) Founded by an unidentified Lombard king before 712 (when king Anspraud was buried there) : see the thirteenth-century Sermo in De Laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 59, reges [Langobardorum] multas ecclesias construerunt, sicut . . . sanctum Adrianum; and H.L., VI, 58, quoted below.

(b) H.L., VI, 58: Corpus [Liutprandi regis] in basilica beati Adrianii martyr is ubi et eius genitor requiescit sepultum est, 744. (Anspraud’s epitaph, Panaza, Lapidi, no. 62, has no topographical indications.)

(c) Unknown.

(d) A cementery church: see (b), and Opicino, De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 12.

S. Agatha, sanctae Agathae de Monte (S. Agata al Monte).

(a) H.L., V, 34: [Percarit] ut regni iura suscepit, in loco illo qui a parte fluminis Ticini est, unde ipse olim fugerat, monasterium quod Nuncum appellatur domino et liberatori suo in honore sanctae virginis et martyris Agathae constructum, shortly after 672.

(b) D.I. no. 38 of 839: monasterium numq que est situm in honore sancte Agathe (a party to an exchange now confirmed).

(c) A conventual church serving a community of nuns: and so still in the time of Opicino.

S. Agnes, sanctae Agnetis virginis et martiris, qui dicitur sancti Teodori (S. Teodoro).

(a) Cronica brevis (of s.xiii) in De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 62: Beatus Theodorus (bishop before 752) [erat] sacros ecclesias sancte Agnetis—a statement that can neither be proved nor disproved: the reconstruction of bp. Theodore’s career based on this statement and on the lost funerary inscription (which perhaps was in the cemetery of S. Giovanni in Borgo), Mon. Germ. Hist., Poetae, i, p. 101, Panaza, Lapidi, no. 81, is quite false since the epitaph is almost certainly that of bp. Peter II and not Theodore’s.

(b) Unknown. The core of the existing church, including the crypt, is of the second half of the twelfth century and probably c. 1170–80: see Porter, Lombard Architecture, iii, pp. 256 ff.

(c) Unknown; but see C. Bollea, Documenti degli archivi di Pavia, 1910, no. 4 of 11.vi.1185: a sale to a canon ecclesiae sancte Agnetis et sancti Theodori.

(d) A church of canons.

(1) S. Ambrosius, sancti Ambrosii minoris (Sant’Ambrogio Minore).


(b) Unknown.

(c) Within the first wall and therefore not a cementery church; perhaps always simply an oratory.

(2) S. Ambrosius, sancti Ambrosii de curte archeibishopi (Sant’Ambrogio della corte dell’arcivescovo). D.Arm., no. 123 of 894 may refer to the future site of this church (see above, n. 112) but provides no evidence that the church already existed. D.O.II, no. 212 of 980 still refers simply to sancti Ambrosii terra in this area; and HPM.CD.L., no. 816 of 983 similarly. And cf. the document of 885 cited under (3) S. Petrus.

S. Augustinus (probably not identical with Opicino’s ecc. sancti Augustini de domo comuni).

(a) The dedication suggests that the foundation of the church is later than king Liutprand’s translation of the relics of the Saint from Sardinia to Pavia in 726 (Bede, Chron. min. in Mon. Germ. Hist., Auct. Ant., xiii, p. 321—the source of H.L., VI, 48).


(c) Unknown. Possibly no later record; but I see no reason to doubt that Notker is referring to a church that existed in his day, i.e. in the 870s and 880s, and probably earlier in the century.
S. Brancacius, ?, for S. Pancracius.

(6) Arch. Cap. Novara, no. 20 of 3.1.899: sale of land intra hanc Ticinensem civitate non longe a basilica sancti Brancacii. I have found no other reference to a church dedicated to this otherwise-unknown saint, and I suggest that the notation of the 899 document (which is an original) misheard a reference to sancti Pancracii—possibly identical therefore with the ecclesia sancti Pancracii martiris, which figures last in Opicino’s list of ‘churches within the first wall’: De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 10, ed. Gianani, p. 83.

S. Christina (?).

(a) The grant of Sta. Cristina by the Emperor Berengar to the church of S. Antonio, Piacenza in 920 (see (b)) describes it as abbatiola turis regni nostri, which suggests that it was a royal (Imperial) foundation—possibly Carolingian or later: evidence for the efflorescence of the cult of S. Christina from the ninth-century onwards has been noted by Mons. Lanzoni (F. Lanzoni, Le diocesi d’Italia, 1927, p. 536): and although the uncertainty whether an originally single saint has been ‘doubled’ or two saints confused makes the early history of her cult in Italy extremely difficult to follow, it is noteworthy that there are few if any dedications to S. Christina in pre-774 documents although they are common enough in the ninth century (for two examples from the territory of Piacenza see E. Falconi (ed.), Le carte più antiche di S. Antonio di Piacenza, 1959, nos. 19, 30).

(b) DB.I, no. 132 of 20.xii.920: abbatiola turis regni nostri ad honorem beatissimae Christinae virginis consecratam, infra Ticinensem urbem sitam.

(d) The grant of 920 is confirmed in DU.Lo., no. 5 of 28.xi.926 but not (so far as I can discover) in any later diploma. The monasterium or abbatia sanctae Christinae at Pavia confirmed to the bishopric of Pavia in DU.Lo., no. 74 of ?943 and DO.II, no. 144 of 976 is probably a different monastery—certainly so if DRo., no. 2 of ‘925,’ where it is referred to as abbatiam etiam Sancte Christine infra urbe positam prope Foro Apero (this last phrase is, however, highly suspect), has an authentic basis, as Schiaparelli believed.

It is very unlikely that the abbatiola granted to Piacenza is identical with the ecclesia sanctae Christinae virginis et martiris recorded by Opicino, De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 6 and subsequently incorporated in S. Rocco.

SS. Cosmas et Damianus, sanctorum martirum Cosme et Damiani (subsequently San Giuseppe).

(a) Cronica brevis (3.xiii) ed. cit. p. 61: Beatus Crispinus secundus sedit annis xx [sc. c. 521–c. 541]. Huius non inveniens gesta, nisi quia constructis oratorio in urbe Cosme et Damiani; and similarly Opicino, De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 6, ed. Gianani, p. 78, although with a cautious ut mihi videtur repertusse. The lateness and uniqueness of the tradition would normally make it somewhat suspect. In favour of its authenticity are:

(i) nothing else was known about Crispin II in medieval Pavia;
(ii) the moulded tiles bearing the name of bp. Crispin (above, n. 32) were found in the vicinity of the church;
(iii) the period of Crispin’s pontificate is precisely that in which the cult of the two saints was being introduced to many parts of Italy: for a convenient summary, with reference to other literature, see V. L. Kennedy, The Saints of the Canon of the Mass (Studi d. Antichità cristiana, xiv), 1938, pp. 138–40.

It is true that the discovery of the Crispin tiles in the twelfth or thirteenth century—proved by their incorporation in the Broletto (above, n. 32)—might have given rise to the tradition recorded by the writers previously quoted (cf. the false tradition of the origin of Santa Maria in Verzario, (9) S. Maria); but the coincidence between the choice of dedication and the supposed date of origin of the church is very striking.

(b), (c) Unknown.

S. Eusebius, sancti Eusebii maioris (Sant’Eusebio Maggiore).

(b) HL., IV, 42: in civitate quoque Ticinensi usque nunc ostenditur, ubi arrianus episcopus aput basilica sancti Eusebii residens baptisterium habuit in the time of king Rothari. The dedication almost certainly belongs to the period of the conversion of the Arian Lombards to the Catholic faith and throws no light on the church’s origins.

(c) Unknown. For the tenth/eleventh century crypt and its use of possibly seventh-century material see above, p. 104.
SS. Gervasius et Protasius, sanctorum martirum Gervasii et Protasii (Santi Gervasio e Protasio).

(a) Vita Syri (§viii). c. 7, ed. Prelini, i, 196, 198: Vir autem venerabilis [sc. Syrus episcopus] suscipiens pignora beatorum martyrum [sc. Protasii et Gervasii] in eis virtutibus usus est; subsequentem exultans de mirabilibus quae per merita suorum martyrum Christus Dominus sedulo faciebat, concepit animo non procul ab huic urbis moerbus extra civitatem templum domini: idque in modum cruci ... consummavit. Atque hoc primum coelestis Regis vixillum in hac urbe erectum est; Vita, c. 13 ex, ed. Prelini, i, 226: in basilica sanctorum martyrum Protasii et Gervasii, quam ipse [sc. Syrus] construxerat. ... Cf. Opicino, De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 11, ed. Gianani, p. 84: ecclesia etc. que fuit prima ecclesia Ticinensis; in qua alim beatissimus pater Syrus episcopus noster primus et conditor ... requiescit. But see also the first entry under 'General' (above, p. 119) which may be evidence of an earlier church on this site.

(b) Ennodius, Vita Epiphani, c. 102 (ed. Vogel, p. 96, ed. Hartel, p. 356): after the partial destruction of the church in 476 (Vita, c. 98, second entry under 'General') the bishop fastigia perfectionis majoris ecclesiae opus atigerat aedificio.

(c) Older writers claim to have documentary evidence for the church from 913: their sources cannot now be traced.

(d) Originally a cemetery church functioning as the ecclesia maior or cathedral; later a monastic church.

S. Gregorius (possibly the ecclesia sancti Gregorii in the area between the first and the second wall; S. Gregorio).

(a) Possibly founded by the (anonymous) mother of Senator, fl. 714 (see (b)).

(b) Schiaparelli, Cod. Dip., (i) no. 18 of 27.xi.714: basilica beati Gregorii, quam recordandus memoria domina genetricis meae meo reservarum viro included in Senator's endowment of his new monastic foundation.

(c), (d) For the history of the later S. Gregorio see G. Roboloni, Notizie appartenenti alla storia della sua patria [sc. Pavia], 1823, ii, pp. 159–60.

(1) S. Johannes, sancti Iohannis in Cimiterio al. in Burgo (S. Giovanni in Borgo).

(a) Cronica de corporibus (of ?1236), ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, in De laudibus, p. 57: In ecclesia sancti Iohannis in burgo quam construxit Rotharius rex Longobardorum iacet corpus dicti regis in fundo dictae ecclesie; De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 10, ed. Gianani, p. 83; Ecclesia sancti Iohannis in burgo, quae antiquam cimiterium dicebatur, quam condidit Rotarich rex Longobardorum. Opicino's statement is probably a version of a tradition misrepresented by the Cronica: see (b).

(b) HL., IV, 47 in: rex Rothari ... iuxta basilicam beati Iohannis baptizatae fuisse humatus. An identification with the church of S. Giovanni Domnarum is excluded by the later part of HL., IV, 47 (see (2) S. Iohannes). It is possible, but not I think very likely, that Paul had a non-Pavian church in mind, e.g. S. Giovanni at Monza as early editors suggested.

(c) Apparently not before the twelfth century. Kehr, Italia Pontificia, vi/1, p. 189 records a lost papal privilege of 1183 known to G. Bossi in the seventeenth century.

(d) Originally a cemetery church; later a college of canons.

(2) S. Iohannes 'Quo Dictur Domnarum' (S. Giovanni Domnarum).

(a) HL., IV, 47: Gundiperga regina ad instar suae genetricis, sicut illa in Modicia, sic et ista in Ticinensem civitatem basilicam in honore beati Iohannis baptizatae construxit ... in qua et eius corpus tumulatum quiescit—recorded between events of 632 and 653 respectively, but the whole chapter is very muddled; and HL., V, 40 similarly. (For HL., IV, 47 in see (1) S. Iohannes.) HL., IV, 47—or perhaps more precisely its oral or written source: cf. the documentary evidence quoted in (c)—seems to be the origin of all later statements about the origins of the church. For the supposed seventh-century features in the existing fabric see the studies by Panaza quoted above, pp. 100–00.

(c) DB.I, no. 69 of 23.vi.909: confirmation to ecclesie in honore sancti Iohannis intra hanc Ticinensem civitatem fundatus of possessions that came from various sources including per domum sanctae memoriae Gundipergae reginae, que ipsam edificarit ecclesiam, which is solumodi usui et utilitati canonicoorum præstaxit ecclesie quae nuncupatur Domnarum.

(d) In 827 (not 830, as often stated), as Einhard records, those travelling from Rome to East Francia with the relics of SS. Marcellinus and Petrus rested for a while Ticenii apud basilicam beati Iohannis baptizatae quæ vulgo Domnanæ [sic] vocatur ac tunc ex beneficio regum ad meas pertinent potestatem: Transl. et mirac. SS. Marc. et Petr., Mon. Germ. Hist., Ser., xv/1, p. 242. Documents of the tenth and
early eleventh centuries are unanimous that S. Giovanni Domnarum was a church of canons under an archipresbyter et propositus who celebrated the normal liturgical ceremonies (see esp. DB.I, no. 69 and HPM.CDL., no. 534, new ed. in Bib. Soc. stor. Subalp., xlvi (ed. Bollea), no. 1 of 929, recording a sale to a priest qui missa canera videris in ecclesia sancti Ioannis qui dicitur Domnarum). It is therefore extremely improbable that there is any connection between the thanum vaperes of the Damian epitaph, the siting of the church over a Roman hypocaust and the statement in De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 5, ed. Gianani, p. 77, that adjacent to the church were two chapels ubi est baptisterium secundum.

S. I(n)ventius: see S. Nazarius.

S. Laurencius (?).

(b) Arch. Cap. Novara, no. 20 of 3.i.899: property in Pavia with bounds uno capite sancti Laurencus [sic].

Opicino records two churches with this dedication within the 'first wall,' the ecclesias sancti Laurentii de Ardenegi (De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 7) and the ecclesia sancti Laurentii de Cantibus (ibid., p. 8). There is nothing to show whether either of these is identical with the church recorded in 899.

(1) S. Maria 'Brit(t)onum'

(b) HPM.CDL., no. 245, BM.2 of 28.iv.868: grant to Empress Angelberga of the nunnery of San Salvatore, Brescia, with its dependencies, including xenodochium sanctae Marie in Papia situm, quod dicitur sancta Maria Brionum.

(d) Xenodochium for pilgrims. No subsequent record.

(2) S. Maria, sancte Marie foris porte; also S. Maria Venationum (Santa Maria delle Cacce).

(a) Cronica de corporibus (of ?1236), ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 55: In monasterio beate et gloriosae Dei Genitricis que dicitur sancta Maria foris porta iacet Pyphania filia regis Rangiberti [sic] qui eandem ecclesiam construxit ob devotionem Genitricis Dei set non est conseratam corpus eius. As Raginpert was king for only a few months in 700, I believe that this tradition can be confidently accepted. For the arguments for attributing the surviving fragments of S. Maria to the early eighth century, see in the text, above, pp. 103–104.

(b) According to Kehr, Italia Pontificia, vi/1, p. 220 the seventeenth-century local historian Bossi maintained that S. Maria was united with the neighbouring church of S. Martino in 1100. It is presumably for this reason that Kehr attributes a papal privilege of 1186 in favour of S. Maria foris porta to the supposed amalgamated convent: ibid., p. 221. In the fourteenth century and probably in the thirteenth the two communities were, however, distinct; and I prefer to regard the privilege of 1186 as documentary evidence for Santa Maria delle Cacce.

(d) Perhaps always a conventual (nuns') church. In Opicino's time it was a monasterium Nigrarum: De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 10, ed. Gianani, p. 83.

(3) S. Maria 'Quae Dicitur de Leotardo,' sancte Marie capelle (Santa Maria Capella).

(a) De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 9, ed. Gianani, p. 76, ecclesia sancte Marie capelle que olim dicebatur Leucardi a nomine conditoris. Cf. HPM.CDL., no. 820 of 984: capella sancte Dei genitricis Marie que dicitur de Leotardo. The suggestion—which is at least as old as Robolini—that the conditor was bishop Liutha(r)d of Pavia who was certainly active in 861 and 863 and whose pontificate should possibly be dated 841–64 may reasonably be accepted as correct.

(b) HPM.CDL., no., 816 of 970: basilica sancte Dei genitricis Marie, que dicitur a capella.

(4) S. Maria 'Ad Perticas' (Santa Maria in Pertica).

(a) HL., V, 34: Regina vero [Percarit] Rodelinda basilicam sanctae Dei genitricis extra muros civitatis Ticinensis quae ad perticas appellatur, opere mirabili condidit, later than 672, therefore, and possibly before 680.

(c) A lost diploma of Rudolf II, utilised for DRs., no. †2 of '925' and by DU.Lo., no. 74 of ?943: abbatia...sanctae Marie ad Perticam in the last of these.
(d) Originally a cemeterial church; in Opicino’s time a canonica: De laudibus ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 12. In the tenth century it was apparently the ‘property’ of the bishopric of Pavia: see references under (c).

(5) S. MARIA, sancte Marie maioris (Santa Maria del Popolo; duomo).

(a) Panazza, Lapid., no. 63: Nomine quod vocitans ornavit marmore pulcro/Intima cum variis templi fulgere metaliti/Templum Domino devotus condedit Anso/Tempe preceles Liutprandi denique regis/Aedibus in propriis Mariae virginis almae/Orantes penitent caelos vota god: in the period 712–1,744, therefore, Opicino’s statement (De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 4, ed. Gianani, p. 76, that ecclesia sancte Marie cum fuisset destructa incendio simul cum alia per Odovacrem tyrannum, etc. is obviously his own interpretation of the reference to the ecclesia maior (i.e. SS. Gervasius et Protasius) in Vita Epiphanii, c. 98.

(b) Transl. S. Syri, ed. Prelini, i, p. 256: when bishop Donusdei al. Deodatus translated the body of S. Sirus from its previous resting-place outside the walls round about the year 830, for a brief space preotiose reliquiae in basilica hiemali servatae sunt. For S. Maria as the ‘winter cathedral’ see especially Opicino, loc. cit.

(c) Unknown. Unfortunately none of the tenth century royal, Imperial or papal grants in favour of the episcopal church of Pavia refer to the cathedral by name.

(6) S. MARIA ‘Regina.’

(a) The name and the recorded history of the church in the second half of the ninth century as a dependency of S. Salvatore, Brescia make it almost certain that it was a foundation of a late Lombard or early Carolingian queen. If, as I believe, it is identical with the church of San Martino fuori Porta (see (d)), it was apparently a foundation of Lothar I and his wife Irmengard (Hermingarda) who died 20.II.851: cf. DO. III, no. 304.

(b) D. Loth., no. 115 of 8.IX.851: grant to Gila, daughter of Lothar and Irmengard, of S. Salvatore, Brescia and its dependencies including monasterium in Papia qui vocatur Regina.

(d) The last reference to S. Maria Regina is apparently in DC., 7 of 891 when it was given by Guido to his Empress, although not as part of the S. Salvatore complex (which was already in the process of disintegration). The fact that the later church of S. Martino fuori Porta, reputedly founded by Lothar I and Irmengard, is first recorded in 972 under the double dedication of S. Maria and S. Martinus, suggests to me that the two churches are identical: for the details see S. MARTINUS.

(7) S. MARIA ‘Quid Dictur Senatoris’ (S. Maria Senator; monastero del Senatore).

(a) Schiaparelli, Cod. Dip., (i), no. 18 of 714: charter of foundation by Senator of a monastery intra hanc Ticinensem civitatem (discussed above, p. 100 and n. 65).

(c) D. Loth. I, no. 38 of 839: usque territorium monasterii Senatoris. For the dedication, Arch. Cap. Novara, no. 16 of 887: sala monasterii sancte Dei genetricis Marie qui dictur Senatoris.

(d) Always a convent of nuns.

(8) S. MARIA ‘Theodotae’ (Santa Maria Teodota, al. della Pusterla).

(a) DB.I, no. 27 of 28.III.899: confirmation to the monastery sanctae Dei genetricis semperque virginis Marieae . . . quod est situm infra urbe Ticinensem et nominatur Teodote of possessions including those given a Gregorio ipsius monasterii fundatore. The foundation must be earlier than 700: see (b).

(b) HL., V, 37: Cunicerpert [concubinam Teodotam] postea in monasterium quod de illius nomine intra Ticinum appellationes est misit.

(c) D. Loth. I, no. 38 of 839: cenobio qui dictur Teodote qui est dicatus in honore Dei genetricis semperque virginis Marie, degens sub regula eximii sanctissimique patris Benedicti.

(d) Always a convent of nuns. For the name ‘della Pusterla,’ cf. the document of 1172 cited in De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 5, n. 2.

(?9) S. MARIA ‘De Verzario’ (Santa Maria de Canibus al. in Verzario).

(a) De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 8, ed. Gianani, p. 82; ecclesia sancte Marie in verzario quam condidit Athalaricus Longobardorum [sic] rex. But this claim is clearly because the inscription recording Athalaric’s repairs to the amphitheatre, Panazza, Lapid., no. 10, was later built
into the church, as the sixteenth and seventeenth century evidence assembled by Panazza, loc. cit., clearly shows.

(b) Arch. Cap. Novara, no. 16 of 31.vii.887: bounds of property in Pavia de tercia parte solario Iohanni et solario de verzario et sola basilice sancte Tegle; although the document is an original, I suggest that some words have been omitted and that the text should have read solario <basilice sancte Marie> de verzario.

S. MARINUS, sancti Marini confessoris (San Marino).

(a) Sermo in depositione (?s.XIII), ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 59: the Lombard kings mulas ecclesias construxerunt, among them sanctum Marimum; Opicina, De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 8, ed. Gianani, p. 82: ecclesia sancti Marini confessoris, quam condidit Astulfus rex Longobardorum; and cf. the papal privilege of 1150, Kehr, Italia Pontificia, vi/1, p. 209, no. 1, confirming a grant reputedly made by Astulf.

(b) DG., no. 5 of 21.ii.891: grant by Guido to his wife of quandam abbatiam in honore sancti Marini constructam, sitam Ticinensi civitate.

(d) Always a conventual church. DU.Lo., no. 52 of 939, which is the earliest evidence for the double dedication SS. Martinus et Leo (for Leo see Opicina, loc. cit.), refers to the members of the community as monachus, which should be from monacha: but the later evidence always speaks of monks.

S. MARTINUS ‘QUOD DICITUR FORIS PORTAM’ (S. Martino fuori Porta).

(b) HPM.CDL., no. 733, Italia Pontificia, vi/1, p. 221, no. 1 of 20.iv.972: papal confirmation of a (projected rather than completed) re-building and re-foundation by the Empress Theophano of monasterium Dei et beatae Marie et sancti Martini situm non longe a Ticinense civitate prope portam quae dicitur Aureliana atque Pallatina. The fact that this privilege was issued only six days after Theophano’s marriage to the young Emperor makes it likely that the church and community had been granted to her as part of her ‘marriage-gift’; and it is therefore all the more striking that a church said to have been founded by Lothar I and Irmingard (which there is no good reason to doubt) does not figure among those granted in the second half of the ninth century successively to Gisla, Angilberga and other female members of the Italian ruling family. I suggest that the conventual church which thereafter is usually referred to as S. Martinius is identical with the conventual church of S. Maria Regina recorded 851–91 (see above, (6) S. MARIA), and that this explains the double dedication in the privilege of 972. The change of dedication was perhaps intended to avoid confusion with the neighbouring church of Santa Maria delle Cacce. Kehr, Italia Pontificia, vi/1, p. 221 assumes that the dedication to S. Maria was revived in the twelfth century but I am not convinced: see (2) S. MARIA (above).

S. MAURITIUS (?).

(b) Arch. Cap. Novara, no. 20 of 899: boundaries of land in the city including de alio latere sala monasterii Senatores et Sancti Mauriti.

(d) Not recorded elsewhere, unless we suppose that it is identical with the capella Sancti Mauriti in the Palace at Pavia recorded in Manaresi, Placiti, ii/1, no. 266 of 1001: the identification seems to me unlikely.

(1), (2) S. MICHAELIS (?).

(b) (i) HL., V, 3: a fugitive from royal vengeance in Pavia mutiatum est ... quod in beati archangeli Michaelis basilicam confessit fecit, 662 ex.

(ii) HL., V, 51: a man who drew his sword at the Pavian court in basilica beati Michaeleis confessed a deinde regis indulgentia solus inpunitatem promeruit.

It is probable but not certain that both texts refer to the same church. It is possible that the basilica referred to in one or both passages is to be identified with the monasterium of S. Michele said by a ninth-century writer to be infra palatum but not referred to in any later text (see (5) S. MICHAELIS). Most of the many writers who have discussed the problem of the churches dedicated to S. Michele
in early medieval Pavia, however—either because they have overlooked or because they distrust the evidence for the Palace church—have preferred to identify the church(es) referred to by Paul the Deacon with one or other of the (? two or three) churches discussed under (3), (4) and (7) S. Michaelis. We are unlikely ever to know the truth.

(3) S. Michaelis.

(b) 'Sylloge of Lorsch,' Vat. Pal. 833, fol. 45 v = de Rossi, Inscriptiones christianae, ii/1, p. 165, no. 13: In introitu ecclesiae sancti Michaelis: Regna poli ianuas; etc.; ibid., fol. 46 = de Rossi, p. 166, no. 16: the epitaph of Barionas who festa summi Michaelis in edibus istis praefidixit.


The two inscriptions noted in (b), together with de Rossi nos. 14 and 15, which were probably in the same church, are almost certainly of the last years of the seventh century or the early years of the eighth: they cannot in any case be much later because of the date of the Sylloge. The church in which they then were is identified by some scholars with my (4) S. Michaelis, by others with my (7) S. Michaelis: the arguments for either identification seem to me about equally valid—or invalid. The documentary evidence of 774 has almost always been connected with (4) S. Michaelis: this is plausible but not proved. The most that one can say with confidence is that the church(es) of S. Michele recorded down to 774 are not likely to be totally distinct from the churches of S. Michele recorded in the ninth and later centuries.

(4) S. Michaelis 'Quae Dicitur Maior' (S. Michele Maggiore).

(a) [Cronica de corpuribus (?s.xiii): in ecclesia sancti Michaelis maioris fundata et hodierna per Constantium regem Italiam et deinde dotata per Damianum, iacet hic corpus sancti Ennodii episcopi papiensis. Cf. Opicino, De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, pp. 8 f., ed. Gianani, p. 82 f., which has nothing to say about the origins of the church but notes that Ennodius's body had been brought there from S. Vittore.]

(b) Possibly one or more of the texts cited under (1), (2), (3) S. Michaelis. Otherwise (the lost diploma of Berengar I which is the source of) DU.LO., no. 74 of ?943 and DRO., no. †2: sancti Michaelis quaie dictur Maior.

(d) Beginning with the coronation there of the rebellious Ardoin as rex Italiae on 15.i.1002, the church of San Michele Maggiore figures prominently in the history of Lombardy in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, which is one reason for the assumption that it must have existed before 774.

(5) S. Michaelis.


(d) Not recorded elsewhere unless identical with (1), (2) S. Michaelis.

(6) S. Michaelis.

(b) D.Loth., no. 38 of 6.v.839: oratorium in honore sancti archangeli Michaelis in a torris in the west wall.

(d) A private oratory within the precincts of S. Maria Theodota. No later record.

(7) S. Michaelis 'In Fora Mania' (S. Michele di Canevanova).


?Identical with (1), (2) or (3) S. Michaelis.

SS. Nazarius et Celsus, sanctorum maritrum Nazarii et Celsi qui dicitur sancti Yovtii (Sant'Invenzio).

(a) Vita Inuentii (= cont. Vitae Syri) (?s.viii), ed. Prelini, i, p. 230: Inventius tantus operarius Christi crebris in basilica beati Nazarii quam ipsa construxerat regularly prayed there at night and (p. 232) was buried there; Opicino, De laudibus, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 11, ed. Gianani, p. 84: ecclesia etc., in qua iacet corpus santi Yovtii qui fuit tertius episcopus Papiensis, conditor huius ecclesie, et
reliquie martirum predictorum, videlicet de ipsorum sanguine, quem ipse beatus Yventius iussu beati Syri de Mediolano attulit. The relics of the two martyrs were revealed by St. Ambrose in 395; a bishop of Ticinum who was presumably Inventius’s successor was consecrated by Ambrose in April 397.


(d) Originally a cemeterial church. A church of canons already in 1088/99.

(1) S. PETRUS.

(b) *HL.*, IV, 31: *Apud Ticinum quoque in basilica beati Petri apostoli Petrus cantor fulmine ictus est*, recorded between events datable to 604 and 605.

Unidentifiable. Has been identified both (2) and (3) S. PETRUS: but an identification with the latter is unlikely by the text cited under (b).

(2) S. PETRUS ‘CAELUM AUREUM’ (S. Pietro Ciel d’Oro).

(a) *HL.*, VI, 58: [Luitprandus rex] monasterium beati Petri quod foras muros Ticinensis civitatis situm est et Caelum Aureum appellavit institut. *DU.Lo.*, no. 20 of 929 (possibly using a lost diploma of Berengar I): confirmation to S. Pietro of possessiones quascumque idem monasterium longo tempore dinoscerit posseddense a Liutprando rege ipsius monasterii funditore conceesse, isted inter caeteras res cortem illum quae dicitur Alpeplanana, in predicto sancto loco emissa a quodam Langobardorum rege Aripero. *Chronica de corpibus* (?xiii), ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 56: *In basilica sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli, que hodie dicitur sancti Petri in celo aureo, quo monasterium hedificavit Constantinus rex dota vitique Liutprandus rex Langobardorum*. Modern scholars seem to be agreed that the establishment of a monastic community at S. Pietro was the work of king Liutprand but most assume that he added it to a pre-existing church which he presumably embellished. This does not, however, clearly follow from Paul the Deacon’s reference to a monasterium since in the early eighth century and by Paul himself the word was used of a wide variety of religious establishments including apparently (in some areas of Italy) private churches; and it is not necessary, in my view, to assume that there was a church on the site before Liutprand. On the other hand the reference to a donation of king Ariper (I or II?), if authentic, presupposes an earlier church, whether or not we identify it with (1) S. PETRUS, or suppose that one of the Ariperts was the founder. The thirteenth-century reference to Constantine belongs to the realm of legend: cf. (4) S. MICHAELIS.


(c) *DU.Lo.*, no. 20 or its lost source (see (a)).

(3) S. PETRUS ‘QUI DICITUR A MURO’ (S. Pietro al Muro).

(a) The text quoted in (b) may imply that the church had come into existence since the grant to S. Ambrogio, Milan, of the land on which it stood (although this cannot safely be inferred from the word *fundata*: if so, it was almost certainly a comparatively recent foundation in 885. For supposed archaeological evidence of the church—unfortunately undated—see in the text, n. 62.

(b) *HPM.CDL.*, no. 331 of 18.vii.885: *in potestatem basilicae sancti Petri, fundata civitate Pavia, qui dicitur a muro et fundata in propriis rebus monasterii sancti Ambrosii.*

(c) Has been identified by several scholars with (1) S. PETRUS, although usually in ignorance of the text cited in (b).

(4) S. PETRUS ‘QUAE AD VINCULA DICITUR’ (S. Pietro in Vincoli).

(b) *HL.*, VI, 5: *in basilica beati Petri quae ad vincula dicitur sancti Sebastiani martyratis alterium poneretur, 679.*

(c) Unknown.

(d) Has as strong a claim to be identified with (1) S. PETRUS as any other church in Pavia.
(b) HL., VI, 6: events in the city of Pavia involving the basilica sancti Romani martyris quae prope palatium situm est, in 680 or shortly after.

(c) Unknown.


S. ROMULUS.

(b) DU. Lo. III, no. 17 of 902: hortum outside the walls of Pavia terminantem de una parte terra Sancti Romuli.

(d) DU. Lo., no. 74 of ?943 confirms the abbatia sancti Romuli to the church of Pavia. The later history of the church is unknown to me.

(1) S. SALVATOR, sancti Salvatoris maioris (S. Salvatore Maggiore).

(a) HL., IV, 48: [Aripi rex] condidit apud Ticinum oraculum domini Salvatoris, quod extra portam occidentalem, quae dictur Marencio, situm est, 653/61.

(c) HPM.CDL., no. 734, *Italia Pontificia*, vi/1, p. 204 of April 972: a papal privilege in favour of (non longe a Ticinnensi civitate) monasterium (in honorem Domini Salvatoris) recently founded by the Empress Adelheid in propriis.

(d) Originally merely an oratory (see (a)). A monastic church at least from the time of its foundation or refoundation by Adelheid. By the beginning of the eleventh century its full dedication and title was monasterium in honore domini Salvatoris et sancti Felicis et vocatur Regine: see e.g. Manaresi, *Placiti*, ii/1, no. 266 of 1001.

(2) S. SALVATOR.

(a) HL., VI, 58: [Liuiprandus] intra summa quoque palatium oraculum domini Salvatoris aedificavit et quod nulli alii reges habuerant, sacerdotes et clerici instituit, qui ei cotidie divinam officia decentaret. Apparently unrecorded elsewhere.

S. SAVINUS, sancti Savini Episcopi (S. Savino).

(a) HL., VI, 58: in the time of Liuiprand, Peter, having been brought back from exile to become bishop of Pavia, basilicam beato martyri Savino in solo proprio apud eandem civitatem construit. Bishop Peter (I) died shortly after rather than shortly before 740, as I intend to show elsewhere.


(d) The original site of the church was in the Piazza Cavagnaria where for many centuries was called the Piazza San Savino; cf. Opicino, *De laudibus*, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 13: ecclesia sancti Savini episcopi et martiris; hae ecclesia translata est olim de platea que nunc usque dicitur platea sancti Savini, and the editors' note.

S. SIRUS, see S. STEPHANUS.

S. STEPHANUS, sancti Stephani prothomartiris; ecclesia maior (Santo Stefano).

(b) *Translatio S. Syri*, ed. Frelini, i, p. 236: bishop Donusdei (Deodatus) [sancti Syri] corpus intra beati Stephani ecclesiam, quo caput est episcopii . . . collocavit, c. 830

For (debatable) archaeological evidence of a sixth-century church on this site see in the text, p. 91; for the possibility that the epitaph of bishop Damian, composed shortly after 710, refers to this church, see n. 68.

(c) Manaresi, *Placiti*, ii/1, no. 158 of 18.vii.967: basilica sancti Syri confessoris.

S. TECLA, sancte Tecla virginis et martiris (S. Tecla).


No early text throws light on the history of the church.
S. Thoma(s), sancti Thome apostoli (San Tommaso).

(b) *DArn.*, no. 49 of 12.vi.889: grant to the Empress Angelberga of *Papie... monasterium sancti Thome*.

(d) I have argued in the text that the supposed foundations of a seventh-century church on the site of the later S. Tommaso are something quite different: see pp. 83, 85. The discovery in the area at different times of inscribed and other fragments of the seventh and eighth centuries may, however, mean that a church already existed in this period.

(1) S. Victor, sancti Victoris martiris (S. Vittore).

(a) *Cronica brevis* (?s.xiii), ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 61: *Ennodius episcopus... sancti Victoris ecclesiam construxit et libris decoravit*. Opicino, *De laudibus*, ed. Maiocchi and Quintavalle, p. 13, ed. Gianani, p. 87: *ecclesia sancti Victoris martiris, quam condidit beatus Ennodius episcopus papiensis doctor Grecorum et ibi primo iacuit; sed in ecclesia sancti Michaelis maioris nunc tacet*. I have argued in the text (p. 91) that there are good reasons for accepting this account of Ennodius's first resting-place and for regarding the tradition reported by the author of the *Cronica* and by Opicino as reliable.

(b) *DB.I*, no. 69 of 909: *hortulos duos prope basilicam sancti Victoris*.

(d) According to Opicino, *cit: fuit olim ecclesia clericorum secularium*.

(2) S. Victor.

(b) *DB.I*, no. 69 of 909: grant to S. Giovanni Domnarum of *infra menia huius Ticinensis civitatis capellam unam sancti Victoris constructam*.

(d) In *DU.Lo.*, no. 83 of 947 the properties confirmed to S. Giovanni Domnarum include *cappellam unam in honorem sancti Victoris constructam cum solario ante se, ubi modo mansiones esse videntur et composite eo quod prefata capella cum solario dicto in consumatione huiusmodi urbis funditus dissipata est*.

*Appendix IV on p. 130.*
APPENDIX IV

FAMILY CONNECTIONS OF THE iuex or iudices WALPERT (Text, pp. 113–14)

The 'family-tree' of Walpert father of Rotruda is based on:

Liutprand, Antapodosis, III, 39, IV, 14; DU. Lo., no. 79 of 945; HPM.CDL., no. 634 of 959; a lost document of ?976 (formerly in the archives of SS. Trinità) used by Roboloni, ii, p. 243; G. Drei, Le carte degli archivi Parmensi, i, 1924, no. 85 of 996; Manaresi, Placiti, ii/1, no. 266 of 1001. For Gilbert I and his descendants see E. Hilwitschka, Franken, Allemannen. Bayern u. Burgunder in Oberitalien (774–962), 1960, pp. 186 ff., 216 ff. For the descendants of Giselbert II (not shown on the table) see especially E. Odazio, 'I conti del comitato Bergamasco,' Bergomum, vols. 28–9 (1934–5) (to be used, however, with caution).

The 'family-tree' of Walpert father of Ima is based on:

Bernard and Bruel, Chartes de Cluny, ii, nos. 1228, 1229 of 967; Manaresi, Placiti, ii/1, no. 158 of 967; ibid., no. 282 of 1014; and the evidence collected but not always correctly represented by B. Dragoni in B.S.Paw., vols. xlvii (1948), lv (1956) and lvi (1957).

(a)

\[\text{Walpert iuex} \quad \text{Fl. 915–27} \]
\[\dagger \text{e. 929}\]

Giselbert (I) \quad = \quad (1) Rotruda \quad \text{[2] = K. Hugh Peter} \quad \text{Uualtarius}
\[\text{comes, comes pat} \quad \text{bp. of Como} \quad \text{iuex Fl. 959}\]
\[\dagger \text{e. 928}\]

Lanfranc \quad = \quad Elisardi = \quad (1) Rotlinda (Rolend) \quad (2) = Bernard
\[\text{comes, comes palatii} \quad \text{Fl. 945} \quad \text{Fl. 945–1001} \quad \text{comes Fl. 965–976}\]

Giselbert (II) \quad = \quad Franca \quad = \quad Bernard
\[\text{comes Fl. 954} \quad \text{comer Fl. 990} \quad \text{diaconus Fl. 1001}\]

(b)

Petrus iuex \quad \text{Walpert iuex} \quad \dagger a. 967

Cunibert \quad = \quad Peter \quad = \quad Gaidulf = Ima q.e. Imiza
\[\text{iuex; comes et iuex} \quad \text{subdiaconus} \quad \text{iuex; } \dagger 967 \quad \text{Fl. 967}\]
\[\text{Fl. 976–997}\]

Aghinolf \quad = \quad Otto \quad = \quad Peter
\[\text{comes palatii} \quad \text{episcopus} \quad \text{Fl. 1014}\]
\[\text{Fl. 1014} \quad \text{Fl. 1001–1025} \quad \text{Fl. 1014}\]
\[\dagger \text{a. 1021}\]
TRIAL EXCAVATIONS ON THE SITE OF BOTROMAGNO, GRAVINA DI PUGLIA, 1966
(Plates XXI–XXXII)

The trial excavations of which the pages that follow give a short, provisional account, were undertaken during July and August of 1966 on the invitation, and under the auspices of the Superintendent of Antiquities for Apulia, Professor Attilio Stazio. Their purpose was to establish the archaeological possibilities of the Italic site of Botromagno, near Gravina, with a view to the possible mounting of a full-scale archaeological exploration at some future date. The work in the field was under the joint direction of Mr. R. T. Brooks, who very kindly undertook the task at very short notice, and of Mr. Alastair Small, who is currently engaged in a study of the native Peucetian and Daunian cultures within the context of their relations with that of the cities of Magna Graecia. They were assisted by a number of friends and students of the British School, among them Lady Wheeler (who supervised the excavation of one site), Mrs. C. Millard, Misses Ann Stoves (draughtsman), Pamela Pratt, Jacqueline Joyes and Katherine Dunbabin and Messrs. G. Sansbury and R. J. Ling. The sites for excavation were selected on the basis of a surface survey made by Mr. Small and Mr. Campbell MacKnight of the Australian National University, Canberra, and of a trial magnetometer survey conducted by a team from Philadelphia University Museum, under the direction of Miss Elizabeth Ralph.

The warm thanks of the expedition are due to Professor Stazio and to his assistant, Signor A. Campi; to the local Honorary Inspector for Antiquities, Ragioniere Vito Desianti; to the Mayor and civic authorities of Gravina; to the owners and tenants, respectively, of the three fields in which work was carried out, Avvocato Mascellaro, S. Gilifrese and S. Matera; to the firm of Binetti Rocco, which supplied the excellent workmen; to the foreman, S. Pietro Lo Capo; and to the many citizens of Gravina, who in various ways showed kindness to the members of the expedition.

The work was sponsored on the one hand by grants from the Craven Committee of Oxford University, by the Faculty Board of Classics of Cambridge University and by the British Academy; and on the other hand by a generous donation from an anonymous donor made through the University Museum of Pennsylvania.

In conclusion the writer would like to thank Mr. John Boardman, Professor Robert Cook and Dr. Froelich Rainey, without whose encouragement and practical support the enterprise would never have got under way.

J. B. WARD-PERKINS

BOTROMAGNO AND SILVIUM

The town of Gravina di Puglia lies 28 miles as the crow flies from the Adriatic Sea and 36 from the Gulf of Taranto, 50 miles north-west of Taranto itself and 7 miles west of Altamura (fig. 1). The position is a commanding one, on the line of the great geological depression ('the Bradano trough') which dominates the
physical geography of this whole region, constituting a natural corridor of relatively easy ground running north-west and south-east between the Murge, the limestone uplands of central Apulia, on the east and the high Appenines on the west. Gravina lies near the eastern edge of this depression. To the north and north-east the horizon is bounded by the steeply scarped south-western edge of the Murge; west and south, running in a generally south-eastern direction, lie the deep valleys and shelving, flat-topped ridges which constitute the basin of the river Bradano and its tributaries; and between the two, along the narrow strip of level, open ground at the foot of the scarp, runs the one easy inland route up the land-mass of south-eastern Italy, from the Gulf of Taranto to the valley of the Ofanto and northern Apulia.

Today the focus of local communications has shifted eastwards, towards the great arterial road (SS16) which follows the coast to Bari and Brindisi, with a branch to
Taranto. This is the modern successor of the Roman Via Traiana. Before Trajan’s day, the main road to Brindisi, the via Appia, ran down the western edge of the Murge from Venosa, past Gravina to Taranto, following a line which already had a millennium of history behind it, and which was to remain in busy use as one of the tratturi, the great drove roads which over many parts of Italy were still the principal lines of communication almost down to modern times (Plate XXIII, a).

Gravina commands the southern end of this natural defile, at the point where the country opens out, offering a wide choice of routes in all directions. Eastwards, skirting the southern edge of the High Murge, the road to Altamura gave easy access to the Adriatic, at Bari; south-eastwards the via Appia followed the open valley towards Taranto; southwards the river Gravina, an easterly tributary of the Bradano, offered a good alternative route to the Gulf of Taranto, at Metapontum; and westwards another road, more difficult but still the best natural route available, picked its way across-country towards Ir Tina and Potenza, forming the natural easterly outlet for the whole of this part of eastern Lucania (pl. XXIII, b).¹ Today Gravina lies off the main lines of communication, but in antiquity and during the Middle Ages it was an almost obligatory point of passage for the traffic of western Apulia and of north-eastern Lucania.

Gravina itself is not an ancient site. The nucleus of the modern town, clinging to the easily fortified rocky spurs on the east bank of the gorge from which it takes its name, is a medieval creation. It is possible, but quite unproven, that there was some refugee settlement here during the early Middle Ages. As an effective centre of urban life, however, Gravina makes its first appearance in the ninth century. A bishop of Gravina was present at the Council of Rome in 867, and the rich series of medieval coins found locally starts with the Byzantine emperor Theophillus (829–842). The suggestion that it was established as a Byzantine fortress in answer to the Saracen occupation of 841 is both historically and chronologically plausible; and since that date Gravina has had a continuous history upon the site which it occupies today.²

The ancient site lay directly across the valley to the west, on the plateau known variously as Botromagno, Petramanca, Petramanga and Petramagna. From across the valley it has all the appearance of an isolated hill rising sharply from, and dominating, the gently sloping fields that border the ravine (pl. XXII, a). From any other direction it is seen in fact to be the easternmost spur of the plateau of level higher ground between the two valleys that constitute the headwaters of the river Gravina. This has the flat-topped profile characteristic of almost all the hills within the Bradano trough, with the edges abruptly scarpd where the hard rocks of the upper levels overlie softer sands and gravels. Only towards the west does a narrow neck of open ground link the spur with the main plateau. This was a natural promontory fortress, needing only a minimum of artificial defence; and the abundant finds that have been made on the hill itself and in the cemeteries around

¹ Down to the fourteenth century Gravina was the market for the flax of Eastern Lucania. Pl. XXIII, b, illustrates the point at which this road climbs from the valley of the river Gravina towards the town, just below the present-day road to Ir Tina.

² For the early history of Gravina, see Pasquale Calderoni-Martini, Gravina e l'antica Silicium, Gravina, 1920.
it show that its value was early recognised by the Iron Age inhabitants of the area (fig. 2).

Fig. 2.—The Plateau of Botromagno (cf. Plate XXI)
BOTROMAGNO, GRAVINA DI PUGLIA

There seems little room for doubt that this is the site of the Peucetian city known to the Romans as Silvium. This is not the place to reopen a discussion to which only a detailed topographical survey of the whole area can bring fresh evidence. The arguments for the identification have been well set out by Calderoni-Martini, who offers the further suggestion that Silvium is a latinisation of the name Sidion, or Sides, which in the form of Sidion (presumably the Greek genitive plural of the name of its inhabitants) is recorded on a rare coin from Italy in the British Museum collections. The suggestion is plausible enough, the coin in question being of a type, based on the coinage of Alexander of Molossus (c. 334–331), which was used also by the third-century inhabitants of Matera; but here again one needs fresh finds. The only historical event of importance recorded in connection with Silvium is its siege and sack by the Consuls of 305 B.C. Otherwise it is known only from brief topographical references in Strabo (XI, 283) and Pliny (NH, III, 105, cf. 102), and in the later itineraries.

With a single important exception the conclusions which Calderoni-Martini drew from the literary record and from the finds made over the years on and around Botromagno have been confirmed by the observations of Small and MacKnight and by the results of the recent trial excavations. Botromagno was undoubtedly a major inhabited centre from at least the eighth century B.C. onwards; it lay on or near to the line of the prehistoric road which later became the Via Appia; and it was itself an important centre of local communications. Its identification with Sidion, or Sides, on the evidence at present available can be no more than a reasonable hypothesis; but that it was the Silvium of Diodorus and of the sources upon which Strabo and Pliny were drawing may surely be accepted.

What Calderoni-Martini did not realise is that by Strabo's time the inhabitants were abandoning, or had already abandoned, the old city. Among the many thousands of sherds collected on Botromagno there is not one of the highly distinctive Arretine pottery which from the time of Augustus onwards was the preferred table ware from the Rhine to the Indian Ocean; nor is there any other secure trace of Imperial date. As a substantial inhabited centre the town of Botromagno had ceased to exist by the first century A.D. Where then is the Silvium of the itineraries? We can only guess, but every analogy suggests that it lay beside the Via Appia, somewhere in the valley to the north or north-east. All over Italy the inhabitants of the old hill-top towns were moving down to the settlements that were everywhere growing up at the focal points along the new trunk roads, in response to the new-found conditions of security and freedom of movement created by the Pax Romana. Silvium was evidently no exception. Exactly where the new settlement was located has still to be determined, but it was certainly not on Botromagno.

J. B. WARD-PERKINS

SITES EXCAVATED

Site 1.—The sites selected for examination were three. One of these, the property of Avv. Mascellaro, lay at the foot of the north-eastern slopes of the hill, immediately north of the paved mule-track that climbs obliquely up to the plateau

---

* Diodorus, XX, 80, 1–2.
from the bridge across the Gravina. Here trenches were cut and a small area opened up at a point where the magnetometer had revealed a number of anomalies near the presumed western limits of the main cemetery area. In fact, if the results of an admittedly small excavation are representative, it lay outside the cemetery area proper. A number of infant burials were located, but these were associated with domestic structures. The actual cemetery must, however, lie only a very short distance to the east, where casual finds and the ploughing-out of large blocks of squared masonry attest the presence of a number of tombs and where the depth of soil accumulated since antiquity is sufficient to have discouraged the activities of tomb-robbers.

A detailed account of the structures and associated burials found would be out of place in a preliminary report such as this, particularly since in several cases further excavation would be needed to reveal the full story. The site is a sloping one, and there has been considerable local disturbance from soil-slip, ploughing and robbing for masonry. Within the limited area examined the most significant results so far obtained are the correlations between various individual features and groups of associated pottery.

The principal structural elements revealed were as follows:

(1) The earliest feature of the site was a floor of beaten stone chips, much disturbed by ploughing, which gave the impression of being a house floor. None of the pottery found beneath it need be later than the end of the eighth century B.C. (see below, p. 145).

(2) A short distance to the south of this surface there was a considerable stretch of a floor (pl. XXIV, a) composed of sherds of pottery datable to near the middle of the seventh century (see below, p. 145). This floor may originally have extended in a south-easterly direction, where many similar sherds were found in a neighbouring trench, but in this case scattered and mixed with others of a later date. The intact portion had been sealed by a thin, compressed layer of burnt material, suggesting sweepings from a nearby fire, and patches of charcoal and burnt clay in the neighbouring trench may indicate a kitchen area.

(3) North-west of the floor described in the previous paragraph was a wall of rather large masonry blocks, quite regular in shape and in places preserved to a height of two courses. The better-tooled surfaces faced east, and there was an associated paved surface to the west of it. Some charcoal was found on and between the stones of both wall and paving. The latest material found beneath the paving included a pithos burial (below, p. 143), two fragments of Ionic-type cups and five other pieces of black-glazed ware, suggesting a date in the fifth century for its construction.

The burials found within this area include four small 'sarcophagi' made of stone slabs (Sarcophagus Burials I–IV). Nos. I and II were intact, with infant skeletal remains and associated grave goods; no. III was lidless and had been robbed; no. IV was lidless but contained some pottery. The internal dimensions averaged about 60 x 30 cm., and the general direction was from east to west, the bodies in
I and II being in a hunched, *rannichiat* position, with the heads at the west end. Burials I and II had originally been covered by low mounds, truncated by ancient cultivation.

Three *pithoi* were found, all in disturbed soil and probably displaced. Two had been truncated, no doubt by cultivation, but the third contained inhumed infant remains with fragmentary pottery and it is probable that all three were used for burials.

There were also four burials associated with tiles (*tegulae*), all of very small infants (Tegula Burials I–IV). No. I was found under a single tegula, with the pottery at one end of the grave, but not covered by the tegula. No. II was similar, with the additional feature of a pit lined with blue clay, within which a small fire appeared to have been lit. No. III had only a small scatter of tegula fragments, but there were some infant bones with associated black-glazed ware. No. IV was virtually a complete coffin, with whole tegulae above and below and both ends blocked off with tegula fragments; but few bones remained and there was no certainly associated pottery.

The pottery from these burials is described below, pp. 141–5.

*Site 2.*—The second site selected for examination lay near the centre of the plateau. Here, in a field belonging to S. Gilirese, a large stone-built tomb, discovered earlier in the century, had recently been reopened on behalf of the Super-intendancy by the excavation foreman, S. Lo Capo. This tomb and part of an adjoining house were cleared under the direction of R. T. Brooks.

The tomb had been robbed in antiquity, and whatever remained of its contents has been removed without any published record by the previous excavators, apparently in 1919. On the latter occasion a number of roof-slabs were removed, but otherwise the structure is still largely intact, and the present excavation was able to disclose a number of undisturbed features. Clearance of the whole surface above and around the chamber revealed the outline of the pit within which it had been built and, extending over it, the remains of the low mound by which it was once entirely covered. This mound, of a distinctive white, concreted texture, was sharply distinguished from the undisturbed soil below, which is of a bright ferruginous ochre colour; and sunk into the upper surface of the mound were found a number of ‘post-holes’ (pl. XXIV, b), the shape of which suggests that they may once have held stone orthostates. So far as at present cleared, neither the mound (which is preserved to a maximum height of 40 cm.) nor the post-holes appear to be centred on the tomb, but only further excavation will show the exact relationship between the two. In passing it may be remarked that reconcretion of the soil after disturbance is a characteristic (and to the excavator very disconcerting) feature of the local archaeological scene. The contents of a tomb of fourth-century date found in 1966 in Gravina itself were imbedded in a white calcareous (?) rock so tough that it was quite impossible to extract them without damage.

The construction of the tomb is sufficiently revealed by the photograph (pl. XXV) and drawings (fig. 3). Signs of keying on the inner surfaces of the walls suggest that the interior may have been roughly rendered, and it is possible that a mass of clean grey clay found just outside may have been used for this purpose.
Apart from material that had fallen in through gaps in the roof and the upper part of the entrance, the interior was quite empty.

When in use the tomb was approached by a sloping ramp, which was subsequently filled in. The sealing slab was still in place, together with the stones set against it to hold it. In the fill that marks the final closing were found fragments of pottery (see below, p. 147) indicating that this took place c. 340 B.C. This makes the Gravina tomb contemporary with a tomb of similar construction at Paestum.  

---

The building, of which pl. XXVI, a, shows the part cleared, lies only a very short distance to the south of the tomb; and since it can be dated to shortly after the middle of the fourth century by fragments of Apulian red-figured and Gnathian wares found beneath the level of the floor, it is probably contemporary with it. The walls, which are nowhere more than 90 cm. wide, are dry-built of small pieces of local stone, implying a single-storeyed structure of which it may well be that only the footings and a low socle were of stone. It was a building of considerable size (only a part was cleared), and it was accurately laid out. The site extended over several deep, filled-in pits, and considerable care had been used in carrying a wall over one of these. It had sagged after erection and had then been partially dismantled and the level restored by the introduction of packing stones. Across part of the site a single course of another wall, roughly constructed of re-used stones, is probably part of a slighter structure erected after the fourth-century building had fallen into decay.

Site 3.—The third site lay some 200 m. to the west of Site 2 and about the same distance east of the West Gate, near the centre of the plateau. Here a well-defined crop mark, visible on the surface as a continuous shallow depression, suggested the line of an axial track or street. A trench across this did in fact fail to reveal any
sign of such a track, and the significance of the depression has still to be determined. The trench did on the other hand reveal domestic structures, and a small area was opened up under the supervision of Lady Wheeler. This revealed traces of buildings of several different periods.

The most coherent remains were those of two parallel walls, each about 50 cm. wide, running north-east and south-west and of a third, similar wall running at right-angles to them (pl. XXVI, b, fig. 4). All three were built of dry-stone masonry, and it is a reasonable presumption that they are part of one and the same building. To this building probably belonged also a small circular hearth, made up of a layer of sherds of Peucetian bichrome type, laid over a shallow trough and covered with a thick layer of burnt matter. The easternmost wall was interrupted by the mouth of a later, probably Roman, cistern. Just before it breaks off a larger, roughly square stone may mark one jamb of a doorway. An approximate date for this building is given by the sherds from the hearth, which can hardly be later than the sixth century B.C. A shallow pit just inside the southern wall is of later date, containing a second century B.C. coin (p. 150).

To the south of the early building, and about 3 m. from it, there was a layer of stones, probably a pavement, overlying a stratum with fourth-century sherds. Over this in turn was a yet later wall of irregular masonry.

For the pottery from the hearth, see below, p. 147.

R. T. Brooks
Alastair Small
J. B. Ward-Perkins

THE POTTERY

The following is only an interim report. No attempt has been made to prepare a detailed list of comparanda nor to discuss in detail questions of precise chronology. Nevertheless, in view of the shortage of published Apulian material from reliable archaeological contexts it has seemed worth while to present without delay a brief description and illustration of some of the more important pottery. The observations at the end are of a similarly provisional character, and may well require subsequent modification in the light of further study. They are offered here simply as a guide to the broad interpretation of the excavation described in the preceding pages.

A few preliminary remarks on the technique are called for. Some Apulian pottery of native type is wheel-made with regular markings on the inside. Some is equally clearly hand-made. In many cases, however, the technique is obscure: the pottery is sometimes of an eveness in thickness and shape to suggest the use of a wheel, whereas irregular markings on the inside show that they were at least finished by hand. They may have been made on a slow wheel. Here technique is not specified unless a pot of native manufacture is obviously either wheel-made or else hand-made in the sense of being made altogether without the use of a wheel.

The description of the pottery is not intended to cover details obvious from the drawings or photographs. All measurement are in centimetres.

I should like to thank Professor A. D. Trendall for advice on some of the Apulian red-figured fragments, and Dr. C. M. Kraay for identifying the coin.

I. The Tomb Groups. All are from infant burials found on Site 1 (above, p. 136).

1. Sarcophagus burial, no. 1
   (a) Biconical urn.
      Intact. The paint has been damaged by encrustation, but the details are clear. Ochre clay, slightly micaceous; probable slip. Reddish brown and black paint. The base is reserved.
      Height: 11-5; max. diam.: 13-9. Fig. 5, a. Pl. XXVII, 3.
   (b) Cup of Greek type, probably a local imitation.
      There is a small bulge on one side between the handles, caused by an impurity in the clay. The pale brown glaze is very fugitive and may have originally covered the handles. The underside of the foot is glazed. Pale ochre clay, with a little mica. Wheel-made, despite some irregular markings inside.
      Height: 4-9; diam. at rim: 11-3. Fig. 5, b. Pl. XXVII, 2.
   (c) Corinthian running-dog kotyle.
      Badly encrusted, and cleaned as far as possible. The extent of painting on the handles is obscure. Normal Corinthian clay and paint.
      Height: 4-45; diam. at rim: 6-2. Fig. 5, c. Pl. XXVII, 1.
   (d) Two convex bronze ‘buttons’ with hollow centres: (i) max. diam.: 2-4; (ii) max. diam.: 0-7. Fig. 5, d.
      Some fragments of bronze fibulae were found in this tomb, but they were too decayed to be restored.

2. Sarcophagus burial, no. 2
   (a) Native kantharos.
      Badly damaged by the fallen lid of the sarcophagus, and restored from many fragments. Much of the paint has been lost, but enough remained to allow the design to be reconstructed in the drawing. In addition there were probably two more pendant arrow-heads on each side (cf. Mayer, op. cit., Taf. 15-2), and there may have been other transverse lines on the outside of the handles. The background to the row of squiggles in the lowest panel is painted red on one side, reserved on the other. The base is reserved. Ochre clay with a little mica; rich ox-blood-red and black paint.
      Height to rim: 11-75; height to handle-top: 16-1; max. diam.: 16-65. Fig. 6, a.
   (b) Cup of Ionian type.
      Foot slightly damaged. Reserved tondo (diam. 1-8) with slight omphalos in the centre; inside of foot reserved. Strong black glaze, warm brown clay.
      Height: 6-2; diam. of rim: 11-15. Fig. 6, b. Pl. XXVIII, a, 2.
   (c) Small native jug.
      Ochre clay, slightly micaceous. The vase is not painted in the usual manner, but coated in a dull red slip. This begins inside the rim and extends outside to a varying level (mostly to about 8 cm. from the base, but on one side right to the bottom). Wheel-made.
      Height to rim: 4-45; height to handle top: 5-0; max. diam.: 4-8. Fig. 6, c. Pl. XXVIII, a, 1.

3. Sarcophagus burial, no. 3
   The lid was missing, presumably destroyed by ploughing, and the sarcophagus was empty except for:
   (a) Small feeding-vase.
      Spout missing. Ochre clay, slightly micaceous; thick ox-blood-red paint; foot and inside reserved. Hand-made.
      Height to rim: 6-1; height to handle-top: 8-3; max. diam.: 8-6. Fig. 7A, a. Pl. XXIX, a, 1.
(b) A feeding vase of askos type found outside the sarcophagus at its north-west corner should be associated with the burial. It has been reconstructed from fragments, but parts of the handle and one of the sides are missing. Grey clay and slip, unpainted; coarse hand-made technique.

Height to top of funnel: 8·1; max. width of body: 10·1. Fig. 7A, b. Pl. XXIX, a, 2.

Fig. 5.—Pottery from Sarcophagus Burial No. 1
Some fragments of a vase painted with black and deep-red bands found at the bottom of the sarcophagus. They were too small to allow any reconstruction of the shape. Not illustrated.

**Fig. 6.—Pottery from Sarcophagus Burial No. 2**

4. *Pithos burial*

The containing pithos was of a coarse sandy impasto, reddish brown in colour with a darker core. It was a good deal damaged. The base of a similar pithos covered the infant's skull and a number of other fragments of plain ware appear to have been used as filling. One fragment, the base of a wheel-made pot, had been trimmed to make a round object of 10·6 diam., and may have been intended as a toy. The native kantharos with ribbon handles was badly broken, and has been reconstructed in the drawing. One handle and much of one side are missing. Black paint tending towards brown when thin; dull clay, unslipped; wheel-made.

Height to rim: 9·45; height to handle top: 12·0; max. diam.: 12·5. Fig. 7B.
Fig. 7.—Pottery from Burials. A, Sarcophagus Burial No. 1. B, Pithos Burial. C, Tegula Burial, No. 1. D, Tegula Burial, No. 2.
5. *Tegula burial, no. 1*

(a) Small black-glazed dish.

The foot is misformed on one side. Dull reddish clay; dull even black glaze; the glaze has come off in places.

Height: 3-65; max. diam.: 8-25. Fig. 7C, a. Pl. XXVIII, b, 1.

(b) Small black-glazed jug.

Broken and mended; rim damaged. Clay and glaze similar to a; the ribbing on the sides is rather irregular. Reserved inside below rim.

Height to rim: 6-4; max. diam.: 5-2. Fig. 7C, b. Pl. XXVIII, b, 2.

6. *Tegula burial, no. 2*

(a) Small black-glazed dish.

Dull reddish clay, deep black glaze.

Height: 3-9; max. diam.: 5-6. Fig. 7D, a. Pl. XXIX, b, 2.

(b) Small black-glazed jug.

Deep black glaze, showing reddish in places. Glazed inside.

Height to rim: 6-4; max. diam.: 5-15. Fig. 7D, b. Pl. XXIX, b, 3.

(c) Small stemmed dish.

Dull grey clay; purple-brown matt paint extending over the whole bowl and irregularly down the stem; foot reserved. Wheel-made.

Height: 4-4; max. diam.: 10-0. Fig. 7D, c. Pl. XXIX, b, 4.

(d) Bronze fibula.

Well preserved. Total length: 3-85. Fig. 7D, d. Pl. XXIX, b, 1.

II. Site 1, Pottery from Below the Beaten Floor (above, p. 136)

This included some coarse impasto, some burnished impasto, and some fragments of terracotta wares. Nine of these were painted, in monochrome black and brown. One with pinkish-grey clay, pale ochre slip and faded brown paint shows a geometric duck. Fig. 11, e.

III. Site 1, Sherd Floor (above, p. 136)

This had been laid with considerable care and was in a good state of preservation. Many of the fragments were of coarse impasto or plain terracotta, but a large number was decorated. Some of these are hand-made, some apparently in the intermediate technique (see above, p. 140). The clay is of varying shades of grey or brown, and is normally treated with a pale slip. The usual paint is brown-black and mat. Among the pieces were:

(a) Part of belly of large urn; reconstructed from several fragments. Grey clay, paler slip, black paint. Estimated max. diam.: 38-0. Fig. 8, a.

(b) Neck of urn. Reconstructed. Grey-brown clay, pale slip, usual paint. Hand-made. Fig. 8, b.

(c) Rim with handle-spring. There may have been two handles. Light brown clay, pale slip, brown paint. Estimated diam. of rim: 12-0. Fig. 8, c.

(d) Light brown clay, pale slip, usual paint. Pl. XXX, 1.


(g) Light brown clay, pale slip, usual paint. Pl. XXX, 4.

(h) Grey clay, pale slip, usual paint. Pl. XXX, 5.

(i) Light brown clay, pale slip, usual paint. Pl. XXX, 6.
Fig. 3.—Pottery from Site I, Sherd Floor
Below the sherd floor and at a lower level, but not sealed by it were:

(a) From the neck of an urn. Pinkish grey clay, grey slip, black-brown paint. Hand-made. Estimated diam. of rim: 16-0. Fig. 9, a.

(b) From neck of urn. Bichrome. Pinkish clay, thick pale slip, black and red paint. Hand-made. Estimated diam. of rim: 16-0. Fig. 9, b.

IV. Site 1, Unstratified

Dish with running hares in three pieces. The shape of the fragments requires the arrangement in the drawing. Light grey clay, probable slip, brown paint. Underside reserved. Wheel-made. Approx. height: 4·7. Estimated max. diam. 20·0. Fig. 11, b.

V. Site 2, Pottery from the Chamber Tomb

A date for the final closing of the tomb is indicated by fragments of pottery in the fill behind the retaining slab. These include a number of pieces of Apulian red-figure datable to circa 340 B.C., and some early Gnathian fragments which suit this date (pl. XXXI). There is, however, no evidence to show when the tomb was originally built.

The oinochoe (fig. 11, a) was restored from fragments found in the fill. Parts of the neck and handle are missing, and there is therefore some doubt about the exact height of the vase and the position of the handle-spring, but the reconstruction in the drawing is probable. Pink-brown clay, smoothly finished; dull red bands. Max. diam.: 10·52; height: 23·2.

VI. Site 3, Sherd Floor (Hearth) (above, p. 140)

The sherds were laid more haphazardly here than in the similar floor in Site 1. They come from a wide variety of fabrics, but few pieces were large enough to allow useful shapes to be reconstructed. Most were of impasto or plain terracotta,
but there were about 40 fragments of painted wares, mainly of Peucetian bichrome type, with dark red and dull black paint of a thick mat quality. Sometimes the red is very dark and difficult to distinguish from the black, and some sherds (nos. iv, v) of bichrome type can only be described as monochrome. They may have suffered some discoloration through burning. The clay varies considerably, ranging from grey and ochre to bright brown. Red is unusual: a distinctive ware has brick-red clay with an ochre slip. Slip is used on about a third of the fragments, generally where the clay is brownish. The technique also varies. Both wheel-made and hand-made pieces are found, but most are in the intermediate technique, sometimes, as in the case of (i), (ii), (iii), combined with turned rims.

Among the fragments were:

(i) Rim, shoulder and handle-spring of a Peucetian urn. The original form of the handle is not clear from the fragment. Probably there were two of these, as normally on large Peucetian vases. Paint: dark red and black. Clay: grey-brown, possible slip. The rim shows marks of turning, the body is in the intermediate technique. Estimated diameter of rim: 17-8. Fig. 10, b.

(ii) Bichrome rim. Decoration, fabric and technique as (i) and possibly from the same vase. Pl. XXXII, 1.


(vii) Bichrome: brown band and red circle. Light brown clay, paler slip. Pl. XXXII, 6.
Fig. 11
VII. Site 3, Various

A small Peucetian urn was found resting on the sherd floor; broken and mended; both side handles and most of the rim missing; black and dark red paint crudely applied; light brown clay with paler slip; uneven walls; hand-made; present max. height: 8-2; max. diam.: 11-15. Fig. 10, a.

A bronze coin of Prusias II, king of Bithynia (180?–149 B.C.) was found beneath the pile of stones in Site 3. Obverse: Dionysus; reverse: centaur and inscription βασιλεὺς Προσσιού (see the British Museum Catalogue of Greek Coins, Pontus, Paphlagonia, Bithynia, Bosporus, p. 210, 8 ff.).

The painted pottery at Gravina goes back at least to the middle of the eighth century. This is indicated by the fragment with the geometric duck, a motif found also at Sala Consilina and in the pre-Greek deposit at Taranto, and by several unstratified fragments of vasi a tenda (not illustrated here). The sherd floors are an unusual feature, though they are paralleled in Apulia at Cannae, where they seem to have formed the bases of huts. They provide an interesting sample of wares in use at the same time. The sherds from the first floor illustrate a little known early phase of Peucetian, in part similar to some of the sherds found by Mayer at Putignano. There is little evidence to date them, but they are unlikely to be later than the middle of the seventh century, for they are considerably earlier than the pottery in the tomb groups illustrated by Gervasio, and are still under strong influence from Greek geometric. On the other hand, the fragment, Fig. 9 a, found at a slightly lower level has the hairy line motif which occurs in the Taranto deposit.

The second floor is distinctly later, being of sixth-century bichrome ware: a more precise chronology for this type has not yet been worked out.

The sarcophagus, pithos and tegula burials on this site are in chronologica succession, but it is not clear whether this is normally the case at Gravina.

The latest pottery illustrated here, the tomb groups 5 and 6, belongs to the fourth century, but the site abounds in fragments of later black-glaze. By contrast, there is little that is certainly later than 200 B.C.: a few rare specimens of red slipped ware, and some fragments of Megarian-type bowls. The evidence is still meagre, but it suggests that the hill site of Gravina may have shared in the misfortunes of other Apulian settlements, and declined suddenly after the Hannibalic war.

Alastair Small.

---

7 J. de la Genièvre, ‘La céramique géométrique de Sala Consilina’, Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire, LXXXIII (1961), pl. I, figs. 2, 3; pl. III, fig. 3.
8 Mayer, op. cit., Taf. 3.11; 4.2, 7.
9 For which see De la Genièvre, op. cit., passim; and Klaus Kilián, ‘Untersuchungen zu früheisen-zeitlichen Gräbern aus dem Vallo di Diano’ (Römische Mitteilungen, Ergänzungshefte X) passim.
10 Information given in conversation by Sig. A. Campi of the Soprintendenza alle Antichità, Taranto.
12 Bronzi arcaici e ceramica geometrica nel Museo di Bari (Bari, 1921). The earliest are on pls. XIII and XIV.
13 Mayer, op. cit., Taf. 3.8; 4.2, 7, 9.
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Plates II and III.—Etruscan and South Italian Finger Rings in Oxford (pp. 6-10)
FINGER RINGS OF THE FORTNUM GROUP (pp. 10-17)
FINGER RINGS OF THE FORNUM GROUP (pp. 10-17)
FINGER RINGS OF THE FORTNUM GROUP (pp. 10-17)
a. **Stucco Reliefs drawn by Minervini**

b, c. **Stucco Reliefs in the British Museum, Nos. 3 and 4 (pp. 24-26)**

*Photos: a, Ashmolean Museum; b, c, R.I.L.*
a. Stucco Reliefs drawn by Minervini

b. Stucco Relief in the British Museum, No. 8 (pp. 24-27)
a. Stucco Reliefs drawn by Minervini

(Photos: a, Ashmolean Museum; b, British Museum)

b. Stucco Relief in the British Museum, No. 18 (pp. 25-27)
PLATE XI

Sculpture Reliefs in the British Museum (pp. 24, 25, 30)

a. No. 13

b. No. 11

c. No. 15

d. No. 16
Inscriptions from South Etruria: No. 4 (pp. 58-60)
Inscriptions from South Etruria

a (left). No. 6 (p. 61)
b (above). No. 8 (p. 62)
PLATE XVI

b. No. 10
INSCRIPTIONS FROM SOUTH ETURIA (pp. 62-63)

a. No. 9
Inscriptions from South Etruria (pp. 61, 64, 65)
Inscriptions from South Etruria (pp. 65, 66)
a. Teos. **Kara Göl from the North-West. The Longer Arrow Indicates the Marked Blocks, the Shorter Arrow the Position of Şığacik**

b. Teos. **The North-West Quarry, Looking West**

(Photos: M. H. Ballance)
a. **Pavia.**—**Area North-West of the Duomo** (where Dagibert acquired property) in 1599: Detail of the Corte-Maggi Map

---

b. **Stylised Representation of Pavia from the North-West** in H. Schedel 'Liber Chronicarum' (1493), fol. 74. ‘First Wall’ with towers, the Carona and the junction of the ‘Second’ and ‘Third’ Walls

(pp. 82-120)
The Plateau of Botromagno (cf. Fig. 2, p. 134). Gravina lies just off the photograph, at the bottom.
a. Botromagno, from Gravina

b. Gravina and (right) Botromagno

(Photos: J.B.W.P.)
a. The Via Appia South of Altamura

b. The Old Road from Potenza, climbing the Hill to the South of Gravina
a. Botromagno, Site 1: Sherd Floor

b. Botromagno, Site 2: Remains of Mound (above the survey-pole) and Post-holes Beside the Tomb
Botromagno, Site 2: Fourth-century Tomb
a. Botromagno, Site 2: Fourth-century House

b. Botromagno, Site 3: Early House. In the foreground, Roman Cistern. Arrow marks site of Hearth
Botromagno: Pottery from Sarcophagus Burial No. 1 (p. 141)
a. Botromagno: Pottery from Sarcophagus Burial No. 2 (p. 141)
b. Botromagno: Pottery from Tegula Burial No. 1 (p. 145)
Botromagno, Site 1: Pottery from the Sherd Floor (p. 145)
Botromagno, Site 2: Pottery from the Fill of the Ramp in front of the Tomb (p. 147)
Botromagno, Site 3: Pottery from the Hearth (pp. 147-8)
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