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A ROMAN REPUBLICAN HOARD FROM CAPALBIO
(Plates I–IV)

In the course of building operations near Capalbio in the summer of 1949 a small hoard of Roman Republican silver was found by one of the workmen. The exact find-spot is not known, but it seems to have been close to the Via Aurelia, where this passes Lago San Floriano. The coins were contained in an earthenware jar, which was destroyed. Doris Taylor Bishop, who was excavating at Cosa at the time, was told of the discovery, prevented the hoard from being dispersed and made a list of its contents. At a later stage, she was able to buy the coins and export them to the United States.¹

The contents of the hoard are as follows² (pls. I–IV):—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Vict</th>
<th>₣B</th>
<th>113³</th>
<th>Plated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2–4</td>
<td>Den</td>
<td>Anonymous with Dioscuri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Atili Saran</td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Cup</td>
<td>404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Carbo</td>
<td>423</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous with biga of stags</td>
<td>438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cn. Dom</td>
<td>514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–11</td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Fouri L. f Phili</td>
<td>529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q. Fabi Labo</td>
<td>532</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q. Curt M. Sila</td>
<td>537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mn. Aemilio Lep</td>
<td>554</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Memmi</td>
<td>558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q. Lutati Cerco</td>
<td>559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ti. Q</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>S on rev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mn. Fontei</td>
<td>566a</td>
<td>H: on rev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Saturn</td>
<td>578a</td>
<td>—: on rev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–28</td>
<td>Quin</td>
<td>C. Egnatulei C.f</td>
<td>588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Quin</td>
<td>M. Cato</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>F on obv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>597</td>
<td>H on obv.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ They are now kept at Wheaton College, Norton, Mass. I should like to thank Doris Bishop very warmly for showing the hoard to me and allowing me to publish it. The coins when found were covered with a thick deposit, which Doris Bishop had skilfully removed by the time I came to work on the hoard.

² The coins are described according to E. A. Sydenham, The Coinage of the Roman Republic, London, 1952.

³ This coin, of the size, though not of the weight of a denarius, presumably passed as one. It also shows so little wear that it must have been struck not long before the deposition of the hoard and not at the same time as the regular victorieties with ₣B. It is curious that a forger thus copied an issue produced long before his own time.
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32  597a  Σ on obv.
33  597a  Φ on obv.
34  597b  ΤΙΙΙ on obv.
35  597b  ΤΙΙΙ on obv.
36  597c  Fly on obv.
37  597c  Snake on obv.
38  597c  Staff on obv.
39  597c  Bidens on obv.
40-44  597c  Symbols uncertain.
45  598  F on rev.
46  598  Q on rev.
47  615a  Grasshopper on rev.
48  665c  P and L on obv. M on rev.
49  669e  N and S on obv. Caduceus and F on rev.
50  672  Knife on obv.
51  672g  Arrow and Π on obv.
52  684  Brockage—Lyre on obv.
53  684c  S on obv.
54  684c  S : on obv.
55
56-58
59-63  Quin
60  691
61  692
62  693
63  698
64  698b
65  699
66-67
67
68
69-76  Cn. Lentul
70  700  Symbol uncertain.
71  702
72  705
73  707
74
75-80  Quin
76  708
77  713b  II on rev.
78  713b  III on rev.
79  714c  T above and VIII below on rev.
80  714d  N. above and I. below on rev.
81  84
82
83
84

85-86  Anonymous with Jupiter in quadriga
86  723
87  724
88  728c  Snake on staff on obv. B on rev.
89-91  L. Censor
90  737
91  738a  H and Grapes on obv. C on rev.
92  745
93  A. Post A.f S.n Albin
Thus constituted, the hoard of Capalbio adds significantly to the picture given by the other Republican hoards of the same period. Its latest coin is the same as that in the part which has been preserved of the hoard of Bellicello⁴ and it thus provides some further evidence for the possibility that Albinus began to strike earlier in 81 B.C. than his colleagues.⁵ It also belongs to the group of hoards, the burial of which must be associated with the fighting between Sulla and his enemies in Etruria in 81 B.C. and the following years. Together with the finds of Carrara,⁶ buried later in 81 B.C., of San Miniato,⁷ buried in 80 B.C., and of Montiani,⁸ buried in 79 B.C., it provides eloquent testimony of the violence of the struggle.

M. H. CRAWFORD

---

⁶ Rivista della Numismatica, 1864, 282.
⁷ Periodico di Numismatica e Sfraggiaco, 1873, 239.
⁸ Annali, 1960–61, 326.
UNDERWATER EXPLORATION OF THE ANCIENT PORT OF NORA, SARDINIA

On the peninsula of Capo di Pula, which lies some 32 km. west of Cagliari on the south coast of Sardinia, are the ruins of a Roman town overlying those of Punic date. The peninsula is shaped like a triangle; one corner now touches the mainland and forms a narrow isthmus of sand; the outer two corners are rocky promontories surrounded by scarps. Here stood the ancient town; excavation has revealed considerable urban remains, including the foundations of a temple of Tanit, with fine Punic masonry dating back to the fifth century B.C., a street plan with many houses, mainly Roman but some of Punic masonry and possibly dating to the sixth century B.C. In this area was the Roman theatre. At the base of the isthmus there are some Punic tombs along the shore and the Tophet; the earliest stelae may be of sixth century date but most appear to be late Punic in style. Nearby may be seen traces of a Roman aqueduct and the little Romanesque church of S. Efisio is still standing.¹

The site is generally accepted as that of the ancient Nora, one of the four principal Punic towns of Sardinia. Not only is this town known to have been near Cagliari, but a local inscription records a gift to the people of Nora made by Favonia Vera,² and the dedication of the church recalls the tradition that S. Efisio was martyred at Nora.

Little is known of the individual history of these cities; there are no Punic sources and it is only possible to follow the local course of events from the general history of the island. There are, however, two interesting references to Nora. Pausanias records that the city was founded by Iberians led by Norax, grandson of Geryon and that the city was by tradition the first to be founded in Sardinia³; Solinus adds that the Iberians came from Tartessus.⁴ The very name of this city may warn us that no consensus need be expected; some scholars believe the story to be substantially true and differ mainly on whether they believe the Iberians were Phoenician or indigenous, or both; others would place less reliance on a Greek source of late date.⁵ That the site lies on the coast most favourable for an early colonization and that the promontory would attract Phoenician settlers is not to be doubted⁶ and one may accept the tradition, reserving judgement on the homeland of the colonists until more

¹ The site was first excavated by Patroni at the beginning of this century and published in Monumenti Antichi 14 (1904), col. 110 ff. New excavations were begun in 1952 by Pesce, who has published a guide of the site: G. Pesce, Guida agli Scavi (1957). For general works, see D. B. Harden, The Phoenicians (1962), passim, and M. Guido, Sardinia (1963), 192 ff.
² CIL, x, 7541.
³ Pausanias, x, 17, 5.
⁴ Solinus, iv, 1.
⁵ See Pesce, op. cit., for a summary of the possibilities and T. Dunbabin, Western Greeks, 341, for a discussion of Pausanias' source. There was a Nuragic site on the promontory and it has been suggested that the origin of the name, Nora, arose from a mistake on the part of the colonists in interpreting the native word.
⁶ Early Phoenician settlements are consistently found on off-shore islands or promontories, as noted by Thucydides, vi, 2.
is known about the settlement of Spain. Opinions differ widely on the date of this Phoenician colonial expansion and in this debate Nora is especially important as an inscription on local stone was found built into a wall at Pula, and for this some epigraphists claim a ninth century date, while others would place it in the eighth century, and some still later. At whatever date the Phoenicians did appear in the west Mediterranean as colonists there is, apart from the Nora stone, still very little evidence of their presence in Sardinia before the seventh century, and it seems unlikely that the city was founded much before 700 B.C.

Throughout the seventh century one may imagine scattered Phoenician colonies on the coast, living by the exchange of local ores and providing safe halting places along the trade route to Spain. In the sixth century the Greeks still thought it possible to colonize in Sardinia and the island was not finally closed to them until the intervention of the rising power of Carthage. Early in the century the general Malchus had invaded the island and suffered defeat, but the battle of Alalia in circa 540 B.C. proved decisive; the Greeks were finally ousted, Corsica fell to the Etruscans and Sardinia passed to the Carthaginian sphere. Henceforth the Carthaginians must have taken an imperial interest in the old Phoenician colonies and attempted a deeper penetration of the island. We hear of Hasdrubal and Hamilcar (later to die at Himera) campaigning on the island and of the former being wounded and dying. In 508 B.C. is recorded the first treaty between Carthage and Rome by which the Romans might trade with the inhabitants of Sardinia only in the presence of a magistrate; we may think of coastal Sardinia strictly in the control of Carthage, so much so in fact that the island does not appear in the accounts of the fifth and early fourth century conflicts between the Greeks and Carthaginians. A second treaty with Rome is dated in 348 B.C., and this, characteristically of Carthaginian exclusive policies, prohibited any Roman trade whatsoever with Sardinia. Sardinia hardly appears in the First Punic War. Then came the Mercenaries War and during the subsequent weakness of Carthage the Sardinians asked Rome to intervene. After an initial refusal, the Romans accepted and in 238 B.C. the whole of Sardinia passed to the Romans.

An equal lack of history is characteristic of the Roman period. There was a brief revolt during the Second Punic War when Carthage tried unsuccessfully to re-establish her power. In the second century B.C. Sardinia and Sicily together became a province, which under Augustus—after a period of senatorial rule—passed under imperial control in order that the constant brigandage might be controlled. We know from an inscription of Imperial date that Nora became a municipium and

---

8 W. F. Albright, BASOR, 83 (1941), 14, upholds an early date and reads Tarshish. See for earlier references. G. R. Driver, Semitic Writing (1948), 107, believes both the Nora stone and Bosa inscription are of the second half of the eighth century B.C.
9 Herod, i, 170.
10 Justin, xviii, 7, 1.
11 Herod, i, 166.
12 Justin, xix, 1. See Dunbabin, op. cit., 333, for dating.
13 Polybius, iii, 22. He remarks that the Carthaginians thought Sardinia, like Libya, was their exclusive property.
15 At one moment the Carthaginians sent reinforcements to the island, and in 239 B.C. there was a naval engagement off the coast.
16 Polybius, iii, 27-8.
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had a council. The last known inscription records the repair of the aqueduct in the fifth century A.D., and it is probable that the population subsequently moved inland to avoid the piracy of the Vandals and Saracens, as did many other coastal populations. A reference to the town occurs in the Anonymous Cartographer of Ravenna who was writing about A.D. 700, and perhaps the existence of the Romanesque church may be taken as evidence that the city was not entirely abandoned. In A.D. 1089 the church was given to the Cistercians who restored it to its present form. After that date there is silence.

It is therefore extremely difficult to suggest at what date the coast sank to its present level (figs. 1–2). We know of no recorded earthquake and it is possible that a tilting of the land may account for the present 3-m. rise in the sea-level. A 3-m. change would not alter the form of a peninsula as favoured by Phoenician settlers, but would drain the present lagoon—a feature they also liked for the fishing.

Fig. 1

The Site of Nora, showing, Fig. 1, the coastline as it probably was in ancient times and, Fig. 2, as it is today.

17 Pesce, op. cit., 50, and fig. 11. Inscription of Q. Minucius Pius.

18 See Pesce, op. cit., for these references.
Most of the structures now under water are simply parts of the city that were once built upon land, and one of the most interesting aspects of the survey carried out by the Mensura Diving Team is the very extent of the ruins they have charted, which doubles the known size of the town. Among the many points for re-examination would be an investigation of how far the quay walls extend beyond the old land level. Quay walls of some 3 m. in height with a fill behind, as described below, would create quite imposing harbour installations, fit for ships of a considerable size. It seems strange that there is no indication of an outer harbour wall; perhaps ships simply had to seek shelter in the lee of the peninsula. As yet little can be ventured on the date of the underwater structures. Weeds and incrustation permitting, a careful examination of the cutting of natural rock and of the masonry would be indicative and the two parallel roadways which lead down into the sea on the southwest side, should be a useful guide. There is no reason to believe the underwater structures had a life shorter than that of the city itself. The ‘fish-pool’—if such it is—is a known characteristic of Phoenician sites and might be of considerable age, but it is easier to believe that the quays and the large structures upon them are either of Punic date (when Nora must have been a garrison town) or, like the majority of the ruins on land, that they date from the Roman period, during which Nora continued to be one of the chief towns of Sardinia.

Ellen Macnamara

The Mensura Diving Team was formed in 1963 with a view to turning amateur diving abilities into more useful channels than those of casual diving, underwater fishing and similar pursuits. The idea arose during a discussion with Dr. N. Flemming (then in the Department of Geography, Cambridge University), himself a keen diver.

We are indebted to Dr. Flemming, Miss J. du Plat Taylor and Miss E. Macnamara, who has kindly written a foreword to this paper, for much kind help and encouragement. Without their interest and enthusiasm these expeditions would never have started, and would certainly not have been developed to the extent they have. We wish also to express our thanks to Dr. Pesce and the Soprintendenza alle Antichità di Cagliari. We are also considerably indebted to various manufacturers who generously loaned us equipment.

The first expedition by the Mensura Diving Team to Nora took place in 1964 and was followed in 1965 by a second, which completed the project as far as our limited resources, equipment and time would allow. The ruins of Nora (fig. 3) proved to be far more extensive than originally thought and were found on both sides of the peninsula known as the Capo di Pula, a low sandy isthmus leading to a rocky promontory, upon which the present lighthouse is built, and believed to stand upon the site of the original Punic settlement.

On the eastern side was a large paved area of quay, measuring 130 m. by 350 m.

\(^{19}\) See Pesce’s comments on Punic masonry types used in Roman times. Pesce, op. cit., 29 ff.

long. At the present water’s edge the depth is only a few centimetres and a very
gentle slope leads to deeper water at the seaward edge. Here the general depth was
in the region of 2 m., occasionally dropping to 3 m. Beyond this, there was a steep
drop into some 9 m. of water. Along the outer edge the line was quite straight, if one
ignores the odd irregularity due possibly to breakage of the wall. At the northern-
most corner a small section jutted out into an angular wall partially enclosing an
area of water. This was uniform in height with the remainder and quite clearly
defined. Close by on the main mass of the quay were several rectangular depressions
(indicated on the chart at L), measuring approximately 3 m. square and 2 m. deep.
There is at present no explanation for them. The surface of the quay appeared to
have large areas of rubble and small stones mortared into a smooth upper surface.

On the quay were the remains of many buildings, reduced to foundation level,
except in two cases where they rose above the water level and clearly showed a brick-
like structure (A and B); these were large and perhaps had been store-houses. At the
southernmost end there were clear outlines of walls which from their size and thick-
ness indicated that they were most likely to have formed part of a villa.

Close, and almost parallel, to the present shore is a length of road, clearly seen
from land (C). Most of it lies just below water and extends for approximately 50 m.;
it is quite level and undisturbed. The main line of the road is preserved by the large
rectangular blocks measuring approximately 1-5 m. by 0-6 m., with the larger
dimension running across the road. The in-filling is of smaller rock, mortared to the
larger pieces. The level of this road is some 4 m. below that of the adjacent land
level, in which, opening towards the road, are several tunnel-like structures lined with
brick. At the eastern end it stops at a shallow cliff. The differing land levels here
give the impression of a geological fault having caused the whole seaward section to
drop on a more or less level plane. Alternatively, this section possibly dropped only
slightly, while the present landward section has risen. In either case, the ‘tunnels’
could well be cellars of houses constructed on the level of the original road. It has
been suggested that they were tombs, but although we did not examine them closely
there is no obvious evidence that this was so.

On the west side of the peninsula a gentle slope descends from about the midway
point on the present land area out into the bay beyond. The existing land ruins are
plentiful and in one place a road runs straight down into the sea. On land the road is
lined with remains of small buildings, possibly storehouses, and at the water’s edge
are some very large buildings with immensely thick walls rising several metres in
height. Their purpose is not yet known but they also are possibly storehouses.

The road, where it crumbles into the sea, provides an excellent cross-section of the
construction used, even the drains being intact. It continues straight out under the
water for approximately 200 m. Most of this area has been so damaged by winds
and storms that its original form is completely destroyed, but the large blocks of
stone, evenly cut into rectangular shapes measuring 1-5–2 m. long, by 0-5–1 m. wide
and 0-5–1 m. deep, still show the line that the road originally followed. The small
fill of stones and mortar seen in the road of the east quay has been completely washed
away, but the placing of these larger blocks gives a clear idea of its course and the
width of the road is estimated to have been about 3–4 m.

Another road, slightly to the south, runs parallel and is similar in construction.
It appears to lead from a cross road which can still be seen intact on the land. On either side of both roads are large masses of rubble with here and there the outline of walls. In most cases these buildings seem to have been only 3–4 m. square—the largest being only 5 m. or so across. There generally seems to have been only one room, although in some areas it appeared that several buildings were joined together along the sides, probably lining the road. The whole of the quay area was covered in rubble, masonry and tiles in so jumbled a state that, apart from the lines of the two roads, it was impossible to get any sense of planning. The difficulty was accentuated by the large areas of poseidon grass that limited examination of the site.

Both roads terminated at the edge of the quay where there was an abrupt change of depth from 2–3 m. to 8–9 m. The bottom here was level and sandy with some quantity of broken pottery and amphorae. The quay edge formed three sides of a square, the opening facing seaward. From the northernmost corner a narrow channel 4 m. wide by 3–4 m. deep, led back into the main quay area and terminated in a rectangular depression measuring 6 m. wide by 40 m. long (E). This depression was cut off from the channel by a narrow ridge, and another divided the larger area in two, giving the impression that these may have been gates or sluices protecting either fish tanks or possibly dry docks—or they may have formed a 'cothon.' Only a thorough examination with airlifts, or water jets, would establish which is the most likely.

West of this channel the bottom continued to slope gradually downwards for another 300–400 m. and then it started to rise gently towards the further side of the Porto di Pula. The bay here was some 1.5 km. across and the ruins extended for about 600 m. along the eastern shore, but did not go very far beyond the above-mentioned channel. While this area was relatively shallow, to the south the depth increased sharply to some 7–8 m.; there was no clear line of demarcation, but rather a series of irregular indentations and projections, the indentations or cuts being as much as 30 m. wide, with a level sandy bottom at depths of 7–8 m. (F). At the bottom of the cuts quite large amounts of broken pottery and amphorae were to be found, some embedded in the silt and weed that encrusted the sides. Probing with rods showed there was a considerable thickness of silt on the walls and the bottom, but at the base of the side, where scouring of currents had occurred, it was possible to see stonework and to trace the course of blocks, in which pieces of tile were embedded. However, the majority of the wall that we could see appeared to be of natural formation, as indeed did the adjoining higher surfaces; these bore traces of foundations and some clusters of broken pottery, but most were free of remains in marked contrast to the area nearer the channel and on the eastern side beyond.

Still further to the west was an area covered with remains of small buildings (G). A fresh-water spring was observed on one dive although it was not possible to relocate it later. It appeared that this was a separate development which may have been linked to Nora by a road, traces of which could be seen in the form of a shallow depression extending in an east-west direction for some 80 m. and at a distance of 200 m. from the deep waters' edge (H).

No outer walls or breakwaters were located to seawards and, as far as could be determined without echo sounding equipment, the depth seemed to increase steadily out to sea to 50 m. and beyond. Naval charts for the area confirm this.
The lack of outer walls was confusing and considerable time was spent endeavouring to locate such things by towing divers along behind the motor boat, for it was felt that there should have been some sort of seaward protection for the harbour; but the search revealed no walls.

Two very large anchors were located. The largest of these is thought to date back to the sixteenth century (J) and measured 4 m. along the shank and 2·5 m. across the flukes; there was no sign of a stock and it seemed likely that this had been of wood which had rotted away. This anchor was lying on its side on fairly flat ground. The other was not so large and was thought to be more modern, probably dating to the eighteenth century (K); it was wedged by its flukes in a bank of rocks which were at one time considered to have been a wall, but the depth and formation disproved this.

Both anchors were in some 12 m. of water, not too far from the quay edge, suggesting that quite large ships had sheltered in the bay. Off the end of the Isola Coltellazzo another, but smaller, grapnel-type anchor was found in some 30 m. of water, very similar to those still used by fishermen and probably quite recently lost.

Close by the latter, two clusters of amphorae were located in 30 m. of water, some still whole and very large, others badly smashed. There may have been wrecks in this area; but the bottom is very weedy and this, together with the presence of massive boulders from the nearby cliff, would have made search difficult.

Most of the amphorae found were of a familiar shape and size, but some did surprise us. When pieced together they measured over 2·6 m. in height and were approximately 60 cm. across their widest point. (The type is found at Carmona, Estapa, Alcola del Rio and Marchena in Spain and at Fosse, St. Colombe-les-Vienne in France and Diano Marina in Italy; and from the painted inscription it seems to have contained first-grade Muria.\textsuperscript{21})

The underwater remains at Nora are very extensive and a large-scale expedition equipped with airlifts, water jets, etc., would be required to investigate the area fully. Nevertheless, such an expedition would be well worthwhile, for the diving conditions are good and there is no reason why a great deal more that would be of great value in determining the full significance of this once-vital port could not be found.

W. G. St. J. Wilkes

\textsuperscript{21} See Archivo español de Arqueología, 26 (1953), fig. 8 (note kindly supplied by Miss J. du P. Taylor).
THE HEAD-CAPITALS OF SARDIS*

(Plates V–VIII, XXXVI)

SARDIS, most famous as the capital of Lydia in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C., was also a major Roman city under the Roman empire. The wealth of Croesus had dissipated, but the Roman inhabitants of Sardis again had the good fortune to live in a prosperous time. The fertility of the Hermus plain and its strategic inland position on the road to the Roman east stood the city in good stead. Nowhere among the ruins of Sardis is the opulence of the third century better to be seen than in the rich and elaborate Marble Court of the Roman gymnasium.

The Marble Court was first built, along with the gymnasium proper, under Lucius Verus in A.D. 165. At that time it served as an independent unit which was connected with—but did not lead directly into—the gymnasium. It was architecturally a part of the palaestra in front. Then in the early third century (212–213) elaborate additions were made: pavilions adorned three sides of the court, a monumental pedimented gate led into the gymnasium, and on the fourth side a screen colonnade was erected between the Marble Court and the palaestra. From this colonnade have come most of the head-capitals at Sardis (fig. 1).

* I should especially like to thank Prof. George M. A. Hanfmann, Field-Director of the Harvard-Cornell Archaeological Expedition to Sardis, and professor of archaeology at Harvard University, and Mr. John B. Ward-Perkins, Director of the British School at Rome, for the help and advice they have given me regarding this paper.
HEAD-CAPITOLS OF SARDIS

Fig. 2.—Marble Court. Screen Colonnade

The screen colonnade consists of ten oval columns, the bases of which are still in situ, and a rectangular pier at each end. As on some other screen colonnades in Asia Minor, the columns are double-engaged, with a flat projecting portion in the centre.\(^1\) The long axis faced east-west, i.e. towards the Marble Court and the palaestra. The nature of these oval-shaped columns is well-suited to a screen colonnade: with the shorter axis seen as one looked toward the inner court, from directly in front, the columns did not shut off the view, but rather provided a grand entrance way through which one could see inside, while approaching. On the

\(^1\) Compare, for example, the Vedius Gymnasium at Ephesus and the nymphaeum at Hierapolis.
other hand, when one approached from the sides, the longer axis of the columns would overlap, completely blocking off the view and acting as a solid wall; then as one moved toward the centre, the view through the columns would gradually open up, and the grand effect of the Court would be unfolded to the eye. From the structural point of view, the longer axis would provide greater stability for a colonnade which tended to be shaky because of a lack of lateral bracing. The long axis has almost the same diameter as the large spirally-fluted columns of the Marble Court, while the short axis corresponds to the smaller columns of the pavilions. Thus in dimensions as well as visually, the screen was carefully related to the Marble Court.

There were two storeys to the structure, with head-capitals on the first tier and Corinthian oval capitals on the second (fig. 2). Until the fifth century, the screen structure stood as described. Then a Byzantine rubble wall was built between the columns up to the first storey level. Three central entrances were made between the four central columns, and the column bases were partially hacked away to make the doors. This change radically altered the concept of the architectural unit; where there had been one long colonnade through which the Marble Court could be seen or entered at any point, now all movement was funneled through an axial centre.

The heads which adorn the capitals of this colonnade date from the 212–213 reconstruction. Figured capitals first appeared in Egypt, Paphlagonia and Persia. In Etruria and southern Italy capitals with heads on them are well-known in the late hellenistic period. The connection between such precedents and the figured capitals of the Roman world in the late second and third centuries A.D. is as yet not clear, but it is evident that Asia Minor was the centre of a distinct type which is frequently found also in North Africa. The variety in figured capitals, which is very large indeed, includes whole figures, busts, animals and birds, masks, and sometimes whole scenes. Our particular type presents a head, about 22 cm. high, on each of the two shorter sides at the top of the capital. It replaces a floral ornament which, however, remains on the two longer sides. The heads spring out of the acanthus leaves and tendrils of the Corinthian capitals. The leaves are typical of other Asia Minor capitals, with a deep groove at the sides of each lobe (pl. VII, c). The effect is one of strong shadows. Also characteristic are the lower lobes on each side, which are bent over at a sharp angle. The central rib of each leaf is unusual in having a shallow rounded channel down the centre.

The head-capitals found in Sardis are of three types:

(1) Five double-engaged column capitals used on the screen colonnade.

(2) One round head-capital belonging to the palaestra colonnade.

---

3 Pointed out by Mr. F. Yegul, an architect at Sardis, who is working on the reconstruction of the Marble Court.

4 First noted by Prof. John Coolidge, Director of the Fogg Museum of Art, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

5 Cf. especially the capitals from Vulci, now in the archaeological museum in Florence and in the Villa Giulia Museum, Rome, in Eugen von Mercklin, Antike Figuralkapitelle, Berlin, 1962, no. 198, figs. 377–83 and no. 200, fig. 372. A large collection of head-capitals has been compiled in the work by von Mercklin cited above; for the development of the type see also Arch. Anz., 1925, 162 ff. The use of heads projecting out of foliage has been treated by Hans Jucker, Das Bildnis im Blatterkelch, Lausanne, 1961.
(3) One capital with one round end and one square end. This capital belonged to a pier, which must have been related to the screen colonnade, but the exact location and scheme are not yet known.

Besides these, there are seven heads which have been broken away from their capitals, but which are associated with them by small pieces of the capital attached, by findspot, and by size. None of these can be made to fit on the remaining capitals. Finally, there are a number of very fragmentary pieces of the capitals, showing the leaves and mouldings.

The five double-engaged column capitals listed and described below come from the screen colonnade.⁵

Height 0·38; width 0·715 (at moulding); one side of moulding complete (front corner to centre of head) 0·46; depth at top centre (incomplete) 0·38. Head dimensions: height 0·24; width (ear to ear) 0·19.
The head is complete. The upper front left corner is entire, with the moulding and volutes still attached. The right front corner is broken away, also the lower part and back. Abacus mouldings: (upper) egg and dart 0·05; fascia 0·015; (lower) vertical fluting 0·05, fascia 0·025.
The satyr wears a crown of leaves. Two small horns grow on his forehead. He looks towards his left, with his head at an angle to the face of the stone. The twist is accentuated by his neck, which turns away from the left side. The eyes have no pupil or iris. The hair of the eyebrows is incised. The mouth is not deeply hollowed, and the nostril holes are only slightly indented by a chisel.
The top surface of the capital has a circular portion in the centre, raised 0·015 cm., to support the architrave block above. This surface is elevated more distinctly than on any other preserved piece. Setting lines can be seen on the top.
This is the finest capital preserved, and is carved in beautiful white marble. The satyr's expression shows great vigour and gaiety.

(2) Head with Phrygian cap or helmet. S 59.79, 2069. Findspot: E 34 N 45 Level 97.30.
Plate V, b. Also ILN, July 9, 1960, p. 62, fig. 10.
Height 0·55; width (at top) 0·96; depth 0·93. Head dimensions: height (including headgear) 0·19; without headgear but with hair 0·15; width excluding hair 0·155; with hair 0·20.
The head is entire except that the nose, mouth and chin are damaged. The capital is broken just at the right and left of the head, with almost nothing of the upper level of the moulding preserved. Below the head there are leaves and volutes on the front side; otherwise all are broken away.
Abacus mouldings: (upper) destroyed except for a tiny portion at the side, probably egg and dart; (lower) vertical fluting 0·04, fascia 0·027.
The identification of this head is uncertain. The headgear may be of the Phrygian type worn by Perseus or Attis. The head as a whole seems most likely to be of this type, also because of the typical long wavy hair, the Alexandrian gaze, the heavy brows, the total Pergamene treatment. The head, however, might possibly be an Athena (cf. ILN quoted above) or Dea Roma⁶ with a helmet. If so, the spiral decoration on the helmet at her right side is the same type as that on the Romano-Corinthian helmets.⁷ It must be admitted that this decoration is most unlikely on a soft cap. The heavy twisted neck and the hair style are

⁵ All dimensions are cited in centimetres. The inventory numbers are those of the excavation catalogue.
⁶ G. Jacopi, Mon. Ant., xxxviii, 1939, no. 87, cc. 63-4, fig. 13.
more appropriate to a hellenistic-type male, however, than to a helmeted female. Perhaps the figure wears a diadem.

The hair falls in long curls beside the face and projects at the top from under the headgear. The eyes are especially small; the iris is drilled, the pupil incised. The nostril holes are drilled but only as shallow holes. The mouth is turned down.

(3) Satyr. S 61.61, 4123. Findspot: E 57 N 66 Level 97.5.
Plate VI, b.
Height 0·425; width (complete; taken through centre of sides) 0·97; depth at top centre, with head 1·12; without head, 1·00. Head dimensions: height, with hair 0·23; width (ear to ear) 0·18.

Except for the nose, mouth and chin, which are somewhat battered, the head is complete. The front moulding is preserved. The four upper corners are missing; otherwise the upper sides are in good condition. The entire lower part of the stone is missing.
Abacus mouldings: (upper) egg and dart 0·055; fascia 0·017; (lower) vertical fluting 0·042, fascia 0·028.

A small piece of hair remains on the back of the capital, thus proving that two heads were carved on each capital (fig. 3). Because the small fragment of hair is apparently of the long wavy type, it belonged to a head different in nature from the satyr represented on the opposite end; thus the two heads on one capital need not have been the same.
The satyr faces to his right. There is good modelling of the forehead, cheeks and hair. The eyes have no pupil or iris but the rims of the eyes are raised. There are incisions on the eyebrows to indicate hair. The nostril holes are drilled. The mouth is sharply turned down at the corners.
The top surface of the capital has setting lines. On this surface the edges are cut away, ca. 0·02 cm. all the way around.
The carving is not so fine as on nos. 1 and 2 but the craftsman was not incompetent.

![Capital No. 3](image)

Plate VI, c.
Height (complete) 0·72; width at front moulding 0·435; depth at centre top (without head) 0·52. Head dimensions: height 0·23; width (without hair) 0·15; with hair 0·25. Bottom surface: 0·43 long; half of width 0·29.

* Similar types may be seen on the much earlier Etruscan head-capitals from the Campanari Tomb at Vulci (Von Mercklin, *op. cit.*, figs. 380 and 383) and at Chiusi (*ibid.*, fig. 396).
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The head is badly damaged: of the original surface there remain only the inner corners of her eyes and her left cheek. The mouth is preserved only as a running drill line. The bridge of the nose remains. The total height is preserved at the front side, but the back half is entirely missing.

Abacus mouldings: (upper) heavily worn egg and dart 0-05, fascia 0-02; (lower) in front, curving leaf pattern 0-045, fascia 0-025; at side, grape pattern 0-04, fascia 0-025.

The Medusa has streaming hair, which falls mainly on her right side. Between her hair and cheek there projects a solid band, which is intended to indicate snakes, tied in a knot beneath her chin. Her pupils are marked by two drill holes making a pendant arc. The head looks out directly from the stone.

Since the full height of the stone remains, the bottom surface can be studied; it is the best preserved to show the curvature of the lower surface.

From what little of the original surface remains it seems that the carving was somewhat careless: e.g. the straight drilled grooves to make the snakes. This head is very close to another head from Sardis, although this one is less fine (see below, no. 9).

(5) Battered head. 60. 9.
Height (complete): 0·74; width (left side projection to centre of stone) 0·52; depth at centre of head 0·38. Height of head 0·20.

The head is entirely destroyed except for one ringlet at its left side. The entire height at the front is preserved; also the beginning of the left side projection, with its moulding.

Abacus mouldings: (upper) egg and dart 0·042, fascia 0·02; (lower) vertical fluting 0·052, fascia 0·018.

The strand of hair at the left side suggests that the head may have been that of Medusa. The top surface of the capital has an irregular indentation at the edge, ca. 0·015 cm. deep.

The sixth head-capital is rounded, and comes from the East (Palaestra) Colonnade.

Plate VII, c. Also BASOR, April 1966, p. 37, fig. 29.
Height (complete) 0·725; width (at front moulding) 0·58; depth at top centre, with head 0·84; without head 0·77. Bottom surface: 0·62 long, 0·59 wide (essentially round).

Head dimensions: height 14·5; width, with hair 0·21; without hair 0·132.

The sides of the head (hair and cheeks), the mouth and chin are undamaged; the nose, eyes and upper centre are battered. The top of the head is sliced away. The front is almost entirely preserved except for part of the moulding and the tips of the leaves. The total height is preserved at both sides.

Abacus mouldings: (upper) oblique leaves, 0·04, fascia 0·02; (lower) running tendril 0·05, fascia 0·017.

This round capital, the bottom dimensions of which fit the tops of the palaestra columns, was found in the palaestra, and must come from that colonnade. It is uncertain whether there were heads on the sides or back.

The workmanship of the head, of a goddess (?), was very fine. The surfaces are smoothed, the features delicate. The mouth is half open and the nostrils distended.

The seventh capital has one round end and one square end, and was undoubtedly related to the screen colonnade, although at present we do not know how it was used.

Plates VI, a and VII, a. Also BASOR, April 1962, no. 16, p. 43, fig. 38.
Height (complete) 0·73; width across front 0·90. Bottom surface: length (complete) 0·90; width (complete) 0·62. Head dimensions: height 0·22; width (ear to ear) 0·21.

The nose is missing, as well as the whole upper left portion of the hair. The left brow, eyebrows, cheek and mouth are damaged. The front (square-ended) surface is complete except for the upper left and right moulding, and there is minor damage to the leaves.

* Compare a similar Medusa with snakes from Ephesus, second half of the second century, ibid., fig. 1112.
The left side is well preserved except for the upper back portion. The right side and back are largely missing.

Abacus mouldings: (upper) oblique leaves 0·065, fascia 0·015; (lower) vertical fluting 0·057, fascia 0·024.

The head projects straight out of the flat side. It is uncertain whether there was a head at the other end.

At the round end the diameter of the circle of the bottom surface is 0·30 cm.

The eyes have no pupil or iris but the rims of the eyes are raised. Incisions on the eyebrows indicate hair. The nostril holes are drilled. The mouth is turned sharply down at the corners. The workmanship is poor. Incisions are used on the face instead of modelling.

The following individual heads belonging to the screen colonnade have been broken away from their capitals.

(8) Head of Dionysus. S 66.10, 7069. Findspot: E 42.5 N 71–72 Level ca. 96.70.

Plate VIII, b.

Overall height 0·52, height of head 0·25; width at top 0·31, at bottom 0·04. Depth at top 0·14, at bottom 0·14.

The ivy leaf at the top of the head (on his right) is broken, also the lips, part of the chin, the bunch of grapes on his left side, and tips of the acanthus leaves below. The cheek surfaces are damaged.

A large, full face is depicted, with a diadem over the forehead. Above it, in the centre, is a knot (?) of hair, and on either side of it there are two small bunches of grapes, which are probably attached to the diadem. Two larger bunches of grapes, one at each side, are suspended from the temple to below the chin level. Ivy leaves lie at the top outside corners of the head. There are wavy vertical strands of hair next to both cheeks. The eyes have a single broad drilled hole for the pupil, facing upward. There is a particularly sharp-edged Asia Minor style (see below, p. 20), treatment of the eyelids, eyebrows and sides of the nose. The mouth is half opened.10


Plate VIII, a.

Overall height 0·31; height of head 0·22; width with hair 0·23; width of head alone 0·14; depth 0·19.

The upper forehead and hair are broken, but otherwise the head is almost complete. The lips are missing and the chin and her left eye are slightly damaged. There is the upper end of an acanthus leaf under the chin, and to right and left the ends of the inner volutes.

Abacus mouldings: (lower) vertical fluting 0·045, fascia 0·028.

The head faced slightly to her left, but at less of an angle than the other turned heads of the colonnade. The hair also is asymmetrical; the ringlets are 0·03 cm. longer at her left side than her right.

The eyes are well formed, with the pupil and iris delineated by drilled pendant arcs in each eye. Deep drilling is used at the corners of the eyes. The mouth went straight across. It was less deeply drilled in the centre than at the corners. The hair is in waves, with some drill holes.

The head is very similar to no. 4, also a Medusa head; this one has no snakes, however. It is slightly finer in carving, but the techniques are the same, e.g. the eyes and their irises. Probably the two were made by the same stone cutter.


Height (head with beard) 0·255; width (ear to ear) 0·21; depth 0·10.

The whole outline of the head remains, but the features are much battered. Satyr ears and a curly beard can be seen. Nostril holes and the curving mouth are preserved, but the lips are broken away. Small pieces of the volutes remain, one at each side.

10 Professor Hanfmann has suggested that there is a resemblance between our Dionysus and portraits of Caracalla; and that the Dionysus-Alexander type and Caracalla were combined in this head (cf. M. Bieber, Alexander the Great in Greek and Roman Art, 1964, p. 76 f. and fig. 114). I am inclined to think that the sculptor had made heads of Caracalla, and that the resemblance is due more to the style of the period than to an intentional similarity. There is actually a capital in Rome with two busts of Caracalla, one on each side (Von Mercklin, op. cit., figs. 399–400).
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Abacus mouldings: (upper) parallel curved lines 0·055; (lower) vertical fluting (small pieces at each side of head).

The head faced straight out from the moulding. The mouth, which was deeply cut, curved downwards. The top of the head is flat.

(11) Female head (Hera or a Maenad ?). S 60.21, 2708. Findspot: E 30 N 55 Level 97.60. Plate VII, b. Also BASOR, April 1961, no. 162, p. 44, fig. 27. Height 0·23; width at sides and widest point (hair line) 0·19; at chin 0·06; depth at top 0·075; at bottom 0·03.

Only the left half of her face is preserved, besides almost the entire forehead and the beginning of the right eye and nostril. The tip of her nose is broken off.

The head, which was turned toward her right, is seen at a strong angle. The hair is parted in the middle, and flows back in waves, marked by short drilled lines. The eyes are half closed, but the gaze is directed upwards (by high-placed pupils). The iris is made by a single drilled hole, much like that of the head of Dionysus (no. 8). The mouth is half open, and turned down at the corners. The eyebrows and the bridge of the nose have sharp contours.

The surfaces of the cheek and forehead are not finely polished, but the effect of the simple planes is a fine one. A languid classical expression covers the face.

(12) Head of Hermes or Perseus (?). S 60.25, 2975. Findspot: E 30 N 54.50 Level 99.75. Plate VIII, c. Also BASOR, April 1961, no. 162, p. 45, fig. 28.

Overall height 0·32; height of head 0·23; width 0·203.

The head is broken off flat at the back. The flat surface on top of the head is preserved.

The face is unharmed except that the nose and lips are broken away.

The hair is mostly in swirls, but also has three drilled holes. Two wings near the forehead suggest an identification as Hermes or perhaps as Perseus. The eyes have an incised pupil and drilled iris. The mouth is deeply gouged, and turns down at the corners. The tips of three acanthus leaves are preserved, one attached to the chin in the centre, two leading up to the neck at the sides.

The workmanship is not fine: e.g. the forehead wrinkles are incised, and at the meeting of the jaw and neck there is a hard drilled line.

(13) Head of a satyr. S 64.41, 6315. Findspot: E 18 N 31 Level 96.70.

Overall height 0·23; of preserved front surface 0·12; overall width 0·26; width (ear to ear) 0·24; depth at broken nose 0·09; at chin 0·05.

The top is sliced away above the lower part of the eyes and ears. The nose, cheeks and chin are battered. The ears are intact except for the upper tips. The nostrils holes and straight open mouth are visible, but heavily worn away. Small remains of a volute are seen on each side of the face.

The head projects straight out from the stone. There is a small piece of the lower moulding, which probably had vertical fluting. Deep hollows are sunken beneath the cheek bones. Especially in this area of the cheeks it is evident that the workmanship is careless.

(14) Head of a satyr. S 60.30, 3012. Findspot: Building B, E dump, Level ca. 98.00–97.00.

Overall height 0·22; width (ear to ear) 0·19.

Only part of the head remains; the upper left part is sliced away above the hole of the left ear. Both pointed ears remain except the tips. Part of the neck is preserved. The mouth is preserved only by a running drill line.

Small bits of curly hair lie in front of the ears. Behind the left ear there is a series of striations of running drill lines and chisel marks.

Among the fourteen heads preserved from the Sardis head-capitals, there is a very wide range in style and technique. We must presume that all were carved at the same time, in the Severan reconstruction, because there is no evidence of

11 Compare Jacopi, op. cit., no. 113, c. 77 and pl. XXX.
destruction or cause for replacements of the capitals in the periods which followed. The evidence of the capitals themselves also supports a single date, for all have the characteristic Severan leaves, with deeply drilled grooves at both sides of the stems. These grooves give a hard, sharp relief against the light-coloured stone and the curved lines of the foliage. The small triangular knobs from which the stems of the leaves spring are also characteristic of the Severan period. This sort of detail is one not likely to have been reproduced in later replacement pieces.12

The variety which these heads display must be attributed to the fact that sculptors were trained in the styles of different traditions. Copy books may also have circulated among the sculptors, with series of model examples and types taken from famous monuments of differing periods and schools. Variety in the style of contemporary architectural sculpture is found commonly, as for example in Leptis Magna, where the Gorgon medallions on the Severan quadriporticus are of different styles.13 Also at Aphrodisias the heads on the frieze of Tiberius and Livia (A.D. 14–29) are inspired by separate traditions. They are copies of specific classical, post-classical and hellenistic types, often reinterpreted, however, in Roman sculptural terms.

Among the Sardis heads there is a distinct difference between the hellenistic type and the strictly third-century Asia Minor style of sculpture. The sculptors trained in the hellenistic style continued to portray the full, fleshy, and realistic features which they could imitate from the many hellenistic monuments which were still to be seen in the city. Sculptors of the Asia Minor style no longer copied the techniques or effects of those pieces, though they still continued to use the same iconographical attributes. Instead, they minimised fleshy or muscular aspects, making hard and flat surfaces of skin. The bone structure, on the other hand, was emphasised, especially by sharp ridges at the nose and brows. Details of the hair and attributes become flattened.

The most obvious hellenistic influences are seen in the laughing faun (no. 1) with his fully rounded, bulbous features, well-moulded cheeks and lips, a fleshy fold above the eyes, full locks of hair; and in the head with the Phrygian cap or helmet (no. 2) with its strong undulating nose, heavy Alexander-type fold over the eyes, upward Pergamene glance, the muscles in the neck, the full wavy hair. On the other hand, the Dionysus (no. 8) is an Asia Minor style head with sharp ridges for the eyebrows and nose, a hard outline above the eyelid, flat stylised strands of hair. That it probably comes from a fourth-century prototype can be seen by comparing it with an intermediary step: i.e. a head of a young unbearded Dionysus on the portico of Livia and Tiberius at Aphrodisias.14 The features of this head are Praxitelean. The headgear, with grape bunches, leaves, a fillet at the forehead, is fuller and more naturalistic than on the Sardis example, but the two are certainly related in type. Closer to our head is another Dionysus at Aphrodisias and also a baccante.15 These have the same decorative attributes, but they are more flattened and stylised than the other Aphrodisias head.

12 Kindly brought to my attention by Mr. J. B. Ward-Perkins.
14 Jacopi, op. cit., pl. XIV, no. 40.
15 Ibid., pl. XX, no. 67 and pl. XXXIII, no. 117.
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The other head with the most distinctly Asia Minor style of carving is that of Hera or a Maenad (?), no. 11. The eyes are handled almost like those of Dionysus, and the sharp ridges of the nose and eyebrows are characteristic. Also the drilling of her hair. But the prototype here is a fourth-century female head.

The tradition for satyrs and silens seems to have been distinctly hellenistic. At Aphrodisias all but one of the eight examples is in a hellenistic style. We have already seen at Sardis that the laughing faun is an excellent hellenistic type. Another satyr head (no. 3) has puffy cheeks and generally a fleshy texture, but the poorer-quality stone and a lesser artist have given it a more subdued and lifeless character. At the other extreme lies satyr head no. 7, which was surely based on a hellenistic model (cf. the locks of hair sweeping away from his temples, similar to Aphrodisias head no. 79, and the cleft chin); yet he has been treated in a purely Asia Minor way, by an inferior sculptor. The eyebrows have become sharp ridges, the cheeks are flat, the hair and forehead ridges have become incised lines. This is an interesting example of two forces working on one head. The two Medusas similarly have hellenistic prototypes, but are of distinctly Asia Minor workmanship. Our Silenus is too badly destroyed to admit much comment, but his full beard with wavy locks testifies to a hellenistic type.

Where did the sculptors at Sardis learn the different styles of carving? It is clear from the characteristic manner of carving leaves and mouldings on capitals, and from the architectural ornament in general, that the same sculptors were working in Asia Minor and in North Africa. It has been suggested that sculptors from Aphrodisias in Caria were actively working in the Severan building programme at Leptis Magna.\(^{16}\) It is evident, in any case, that the similarities between contemporary capitals from Leptis Magna, Cyrene, Sabratha, Ephesus\(^{17}\) and Sardis indicate close connections between the schools of sculptors.

Attempts to work out the original position and order of the heads have been met by difficulties. One would like to place the Dionysus in or near the centre since the theme, also with maenads and satyrs, is Dionysiac. However it must be noted that the Dionysus head was not found near the central columns, but towards the north end of the colonnade. Since some of the heads are turned at an angle to the stone, to the right or left, and some are directed straight forward, those with the turned heads logically belong towards the ends, so that they would be looking in to the centre; the Dionysus head could then be placed in a central position, since he faces straight out from the capital. However, the theory is not supported by the findspots, which give no indication of any logical order. For example, the turned head of a female (no. 11) and the straight forward-facing head of Hermes (?) (no. 12) were found right next to each other. Presumably the Dionysiac figures had become so common in the sculptural repertory that there was no longer any


attempt to be logical or orderly in the placement of individual heads. The subject matter was ‘decorative, but not symbolic’.  

The use of Corinthian capitals decorated further by carved heads is a baroque feature not uncommon in the Severan age. Heads were used also in Rome, as for example on the Ionic capitals of the Baths of Caracalla, now in Santa Maria in Trastevere. Those in the West, however, were of a different type, and as we have seen, the structure and decoration of the capitals at Sardis were much closer to those of other sites in Asia Minor and North Africa. The Dionysiac theme, with satyrs, Silenus, and maenads, was often used, but the examples from Sardis provide an unusually rich series for study, particularly since so many are preserved from a single colonnade. They are instructive further in the unevenness in quality. The best of these capitals are fine pieces of architectural sculpture, suitable to the monumental entrance to the Marble Court.

NANCY L. HIRSCHLAND

Postscript.

During the excavations at Sardis in the summer of 1967, two more head-capitals were discovered. One, with a head of Zeus, is a pilaster capital which was found in the ‘North Hall.’ This hall lies adjacent to the Marble Court on the north side. The capital fell from a pilaster which stood at the entrance way to the court, on the side towards the screen colonnade. The other newly found capital is unique at Sardis in having a whole bust projecting out of the leaves. It is a round capital from the palaestra colonnade.

Plate XXXVI, a.
Height (complete) 0.71; width (across front at base) 0.60; (across sides at base 0.40).  Head dimensions: Height 0.215, width 0.19.
The head is entire except that the tip of the nose is damaged, and some of the curls on the beard are chipped.  All the upper corners of the pilaster were struck off.  On the left side, the flower at the moulding is well preserved, and on one of the two lower leaves the tip of the leaf remains intact.  An old repair was found on this side, on the central leaf. A lewis hole is cut on the top surface.
Abacus mouldings: (upper) oblique leaves 0.05; fascia 0.02; (lower) vertical fluting 0.06, fascia 0.03.
This dignified bearded head could be Zeus or Poseidon, or another of the venerable gods represented in this manner.  (Cf. Jacopi, op. cit., no. 112, col. 77, pl. XXX.)  The head is of very good quality.

Plate XXXVI, b.
Height 0.77; maximum width 0.72; maximum depth 1.00.  Head dimensions: width at top 0.155; height 0.14.  Entire bust: height 0.25; width 0.33.
The head of the bust has been completely broken away.  The right shoulder and well formed upper arm disappear into the foliage.  The left shoulder is covered by a chlamys, held together by a brooch.  A lewis hole was cut in the top centre.
Abacus mouldings: (upper) egg and dart; (lower) vertical fluting.
The capital is of the same round type as no. 6, which also came from the palaestra colonnade.  There was no bust on the back of the capital.

N.L.H.

19 Von Mercklin, op. cit., no. 338, figs. 626–34.
AN EARLY AUGUSTAN CAPITAL IN THE
FORUM ROMANUM

(Plates IX–XI)

The fragmentary upper part of a Corinthian capital which is the principal subject
of this note can be seen near the north-east corner of the Temple of Saturn, between
it and the Basilica Julia. Until a few years ago the two surviving fragments were
separated, one piece lying approximately where it now is, the other among the debris
stacked against the base of the temple. It was through the kindness of the Superin-
tendent of Antiquities for the Forum and Palatine that the two pieces were placed
together, confirming the writer's suspicion that they were parts of the same badly
damaged capital. To Professor Carettoni, to Miss Vanessa Wills (Mrs. P.
Winchester) who helped in the initial study of the fragments, and to Dr. F. Rakob
and Dr. D. E. Strong, the writer wishes to express his warm thanks. The drawings
and many of the photographs here reproduced are the work of Miss Sheila Gibson,
A.R.I.B.A.

The two fragments are of a white Carrara marble of which some of the surfaces
have been badly damaged by fire. Together they constitute the greater part of
one carved face and of half of an adjoining carved face of a large angle-pilaster or
anta capital which, when complete, occupied the full height of two courses of the
masonry into which it was built. In addition to the two carved faces there are
substantial remains of the upper surface and of the two inner vertical faces, and a
short stretch of the under surface. On the upper surface can be seen the seatings
of an architrave block laid at right-angles across the carved corner. The overall
dimensions of the block, when complete, were 1-71 m. long, 70 cm. wide and 68 cm.
high (fig. 1).

As carved, the capital was divided into two almost equal parts along a line
corresponding to the tops of the cauli and of the upper ring of acanthus leaves,
and enough has survived of the carving to reconstruct most of the essential elements
of the upper half of the capital. The inner volutes reach up to touch the lower edge
of the abacus, and both the inner and the outer volutes display a continuous
acanthus-leaf motif along the whole visible length of the channel. A tendril rose
between each pair of volutes, curling over to fill the curved triangular space between
them with a four-petalled rosette; and the curled extremities of the volutes them-
selves, inner and outer alike, were supported by acanthus leaves which rose from the
fluted caulus, framing each pair of volutes. (The lower 'petals' of one of the
central leaves can be seen near the base of the right-hand volute in Plate X, b.)
The surviving carved detail is rather flat and lifeless, but the upper ends of the
volutes and their supporting acanthus leaves must have stood out in strong relief
against a background of shadow, now represented only by the marks of the coarse
punch with which the background of stone behind the carved surface was hollowed
out (pls. IX, b; X, b).
Fig. 1.—Fragments of a Capital beside the Temple of Saturn: End, Longer Side and Upper Surface
AN EARLY AUGUSTAN CAPITAL

What appears to be half of the lower part of the same capital (or more probably of a pilaster capital of the same series) is preserved nearby, placed on the stump of one of the piers of the Basilica Julia (pl. XI, b; fig. 2).\textsuperscript{1} It is the right half of the lower part of a capital of the same general construction and proportions as our own, with the top of the upper ring of acanthus leaves and the top of the cauliculus forming a horizontal line across the upper edge of the block. This was a disposition which, while conforming to the traditional proportions of the late Hellenistic Corinthian capital, also satisfied the practical requirements of one that was to be carved on the blocks of two successive courses of masonry. It appears regularly in the freestanding monumental capitals of late Republican and Augustan Rome.\textsuperscript{2}
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\caption{Face and One Side of Block from a Pilaster Capital, now in the Basilica Julia}
\end{figure}

The closest surviving parallel to our capital seems to be a fragmentary pilaster capital found in the ruins of the Temple of Divus Julius (pl. XI, a).\textsuperscript{3} Here is the same rosette (a motif that vanished soon after from the Corinthian repertory, surviving only in the Composite capital) and, even more distinctively, here is the same acanthus-leaf motif within the channels of the volutes. It is among the monuments of the first half of the reign of Augustus that we have to look for the building from which our capital came. At least two such buildings spring to mind. One is the Basilica Julia, which was left unfinished by Caesar, was finished by Augustus, was burnt down soon after completion and was rebuilt and rededicated in A.D. 12; and since two, possibly three, separate fragments of a badly damaged capital are unlikely to have travelled far from their original location, it could very well have come from the earlier of these buildings. On the other hand it is not easy to envisage the circumstances in which two such very substantial pieces of damaged

\textsuperscript{1} H. Kähler, \textit{Die Römischen Kapitelle des Rhein-gebietes}, Berlin, 1939, Beilage 2.6.
\textsuperscript{3} Kähler, \textit{op. cit.}, Beilage 2.8.
Fig. 3.—Capital beside the Temple of Saturn: Suggested Reconstruction as an Anta Capital.
marble could have been preserved on the site: this was not the Middle Ages when any available lump of masonry might be pressed into service. A far more likely candidate would seem to be the Temple of Saturn, which was rebuilt by L. Munatius Plancus at some date after his second acclamation as imperator (an event variously ascribed to 40 and to 34 B.C.) and before his holding of the censorship in 22 B.C., most probably during the years following his reconciliation with Octavian in 31 B.C.\(^4\) The columns and capitals of the facade now surviving date from a reconstruction of the fourth century A.D.; but four of the marble column-bases are still those of Plancus’s building, and the survival of blocks of the original cornice in the same heap of debris as the second fragment of our capital indicate that parts of the early building were still standing to cornice height after the fourth-century reconstruction.\(^5\) All the evidence is consistent with the hypothesis that this is in fact part of the north-east anta capital of the early Augustan temple of Saturn, and that it remained in place throughout classical antiquity until burnt and finally abandoned where it lay, when the superstructure of the temple was demolished for its materials at some time during the Middle Ages (fig. 3). An alternative, but from the present position of the fragments less likely, possibility is that it was the capital of an angle-pilaster at the rear end of the building.

The third fragment (if it belongs) offers another hint as to the form of the Augustan building. A block half the width of the one above it makes little sense at an outer angle, where one or other of the vertical joints would in that case have been almost bound to coincide with the jointing of the course above. On the other hand it makes excellent sense as part of the capital of one of a series of pilasters placed against a continuous wall. We may probably envisage the temple as pseudoperipteral, in the manner of the rectangular temple in the Forum Boarium.

Yet another clue is afforded by the shallow but clearly-defined horizontal groove near the lower right-hand corner of the upper block, where the capital merged with the adjoining wall-surface (pl. X, c; fig. 1). In the context this can only mean that the wall between the pilasters carried a decorative, channeled drafting of the type that was fashionable in late Republican and Augustan Rome—as we see it, for example, on the Round Temple in the Forum Boarium and on the Temple of Mars Ultor.\(^6\) This might be carried out in actual masonry (as on the two buildings just named) or it might be carried out in stucco upon a basis of plain opus quadratum (as on the Rectangular Temple in the Forum Boarium). In either case the appropriate horizontal coursing would have been carried through, as here, on to such parts of the capital or pilaster blocks as were bonded into the adjoining wall-surfaces.

If one accepts that the fragments in question do in all probability come from the early Augustan Temple of Saturn, one can in fact present a reconstruction of the cella that is perfectly consistent with what we know of contemporary temple architecture in Rome. It is only when we pass on to the facade that we run into difficulties. The existing facade, with its Ionic capitals, is of fourth-century date. But the well-known representation of the buildings along the south side of the
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Forum in the Anaglypha Traiani gives good reason for believing that in this respect the fourth-century builders were following a precedent that goes back at least to the beginning of the second century. Either we have to believe that the Augustan Temple was damaged and its facade restored as Ionic at some time during the first century A.D. (a restoration of which there is no hint in our sources), or else we are driven to conclude that it was built from the outset with an Ionic facade and a Corinthian cela. Is this a credible answer to the problem? Can one believe that any architect of the early Augustan Age would have been prepared to commit an architectural solecism of such dimensions?

Before rejecting the possibility out of hand it is well to remember that the early years of Augustus’s reign were a moment when such experimentation was very much in the air. A generation later it had largely given place, at any rate in the monumental public architecture of the capital, to the rather orthodox classicism which is the hallmark of the later Augustan building programme. One has only to think, however, of the exuberant mixture of Doric and Corinthian elements in the facade of the Basilica Aemilia, as recorded by Sangallo, or in the decoration of the Arch of Augustus,7 to be aware that the combination of Ionic and Corinthian is by no means unthinkable.

There is, moreover, at least a possibility that one other major building in the Forum Romanum did present the same combination of orders. We have already referred to the fragment of an early Augustan Corinthian pilaster capital which is now preserved in the Temple of Divus Julius, within the footings of the cella, and which was presumably found nearby (pl. XI, a). The several surviving cornice blocks8 of the same temple attest an equally close relationship between the architectural detail of the two buildings. Fragments of two column-bases were found among the debris and the illustration of one of these,9 though regrettably small in scale, supports Richter’s statement that they too closely resembled the bases of the Temple of Saturn. Otherwise our main evidence for the facade lies in the statement of Vitruvius (iii.2.2) that it was pycnostyle and upon representations of it on coins. Those of Augustus, in particular, recording its dedication, do indeed seem to indicate Ionic capitals.10 Richter’s restoration of the facade as Ionic was followed by Huelsen, and it has been generally accepted by later scholars. The evidence is short of conclusive; but in the light of the new evidence from the Temple of Saturn there do seem to be grounds for the belief that both this building and the Temple of Divus Julius may have combined an Ionic facade with Corinthian ornament upon the cela. If so, we have another welcome example of the remarkably eclectic, experimental character of much of the early Augustan architecture of the capital.

J. B. WARD-PERKINS

8 O. Richter, J.d.L., iv, 1889, p. 142, figs. 2 and 3.
9 Richter, op. cit., fig. 1 (p. 138).
10 Cohen, Aug. 89. Photographic reproduction in G. Lugli, Il Centro monumentale, p. 201, fig. 45. The coins of Hadrian that show the building (Richter, op. cit., fig. 6a) are too schematic to be of much help.
ADAMKLISSI
(Plates XII-XIX)

The lecture of which the following article is the text was delivered to the Society of Antiquaries of London on 17th November, 1960, and to an invited audience at the British School at Rome on the 25th of January, 1962. Its publication in these pages is a modest token of the debt owed to its author by all students of Rome and of Roman antiquities, and in particular by the British School. It has been prepared for publication by Dr. D. E. Strong. No changes have been made in the text; a few footnotes have been added and some plates selected to illustrate it. The illustrations are owed to the kindness of Professors Em. Condurachi and Florea Bobu Florescu.

The numbering of the metopes, given in lower case Roman numerals in the text, follows the definitive publication of the Tropæum Traiani by Professor Florescu, Monumentul de la Adamklissi, Tropæum Traiani, Ed. A II–A, 1960 (German edition, Das Siegesdenkmal von Adamklissi, Tropæum Traiani, Bonn, 1965). Florescu’s arrangement of the metopes, which differs in some cases from that suggested by Richmond, is shown in fig. 2.

The geographical position of the monument of Adamklissi is at first sight unimpressive. There is nothing dramatic about the low and rolling hills of the southern Dobrudja, but in a wider setting its northern end looms large. Physically, it blocks the direct eastward flow of the Danube, causing the formation of the well-known double bend by which the great river reaches the Black Sea. In fact, in relation to human movement, the Dobrudja and it alone provides a natural land bridge, from 25 to 30 miles wide, between Bessarabia and the Balkans, by which it is possible to avoid the numerous flat and marshy valleys which furrow the Wallachian plain and made it in ancient times an unwelcome spot. It is as the principal gateway to the Eastern Balkans from the teeming Scythian plains and from Eastern Germany that these hills became of importance, for this is a door which any power desiring mastery of Southern Europe must bolt and bar. In the narrow confines of the gate itself no deployment is at first possible: but at Adamklissi come the cross-roads. Here the invader makes his choice: shall he fare southwards to Turkey and Greece or westwards to Bulgaria or Serbia? If this, then, is the stage, what of its furnishings?

On the broad flat-topped ridge, by which the roads and tracks from the north converge upon Adamklissi, there stand three monuments (fig. 1). Two of them face one another at a distance of over 200 yds. apart, and are similarly oriented, somewhat south of east: the first, on the crown of the ridge, is a great mausoleum 125 ft. in diameter, founded, as excavation has shown, upon a sacrificial pit containing ox-bones. The second, lower down the gentle eastward incline, is an altar about 40 ft. square, upon which were engraved in column after column the names of troops, the fortissimi viri qui pro republica morte occubuerunt. The date of these monuments and the occasion of their erection are unknown, but one of the inscribed sides of the altar, listing legionaries, including headquarters staff, and auxiliaries, among whom is at
least one Briton, is headed by a prefect, probably a *praefectus castrorum*, or deputy commander of a legion. This important officer’s town of origin was originally Pompeii: but it had been changed to Naples, indicating that he died after Pompeii was overwhelmed at the eruption of A.D. 79. A date in Domitian’s reign is therefore reasonable, and the casualty list must accordingly be associated with one of the important episodes of Domitian’s Dacian wars. There is much to be said for the view that it marks the scene of the defeat of Oppius Sabinus, governor of Moesia: but that
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1 Dessau, *ILS*, 9107.
of Cornelius Fuscus is not excluded, if the *praefectus* is not *praefectus praetorio*: if the *praefectus praetorio* is in question then, as Professor Syme has shown, Pompeii was certainly not the colony of Fuscus.  

We have here, then, two monuments. Both are connected with the dead and both are of a type described in Roman literature. The first is a great round tomb, a stately mausoleum of vast proportions, comparable in intention with the tumulus described by Suetonius as built by the army in honour of the imperial prince Drusus, the brother of Tiberius. At the memorial to Drusus a ceremonial parade was held annually, and representatives of the provincial cantons offered sacrifices. The second is a monumental altar, of the kind which Cassius Dio tells us that Trajan set up at Tapae after heavy casualties and where yearly sacrifices were also held. Here, in short, are the real counterparts of literary description, mighty monuments to the fallen, placed at either end of a spacious parade-ground for anniversaries. These monuments, however, are overshadowed by a third, no less significant and impressive.

Due south of the mausoleum, on the ritually acceptable side of anyone facing the altar, lies another great circular monument, 100 ft. in diameter, standing upon a round platform with seven steps (pl. XIIa). The entire circumference has been encased in masonry, but the interior is concrete except for a central core also encased and laced in dressed stone. This central drum is an integral part of the monument. Its function was to carry a ponderous stone image of a lopped tree-trunk girl about with a panoply and accoutrements of war. The existing fragments account for a height of almost 30 ft., but the head-piece and spears or javelins are missing and the total height can hardly have been less than 40 ft. At the base of the tree trunk were four stone statues of alternate standing or sitting barbarians in chains, twice life size, now reduced to weathered and almost featureless fragments. There is no mistaking the type or intention of this monument. It is a *tropaeum* or trophy, erected in a durable material which perpetuates the ancient impermanent form—a lopped tree-trunk carrying the captured armour and weapons of a foe turned to flight. This was the original form of a Greek type going back to Marathon, and then probably not new. Earlier Greek opinion, always mindful of the chances and changes of mortal life, avoided the use of permanent materials for such trophies and acquiesced in their decay. But this custom faded and durable material was used for the first time by the Thebans in triumphing over Sparta. Thereafter permanence became the vogue; and although many links in the chain are missing, it will have been Hellenistic examples, such as that from Ephesus, which set victorious Roman generals about erecting trophies upon towers and arches, to give them vain-glorying height. But these are monumental forms. In the field, the grandeur of the temporary work erected after battle could be enhanced by placing the trophy itself upon an elevated mound: and this type of monument was erected by Drusus, the brother of Tiberius with spoils of the Marcomanni in 9 B.C.—‘a lofty tumulus in the manner of a trophy.’ It is this kind of battle-field monument which is the prototype for the Adamklissi
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2 *AJP*, lvi, 1, 1937, 7–18; on this vexed question see most recently *Dacia*, n.s. v, 1961, 345 ff. and *Latomus*, xv, 1956, 57–82.  
4 Dio, lxvii, 8.  
7 Florus, ii, 30, 23 (iv, 12).
tropaeeum. Only one point remains dark. It is uncertain at what moment in the history of such monuments it became customary to chain male and female captives alive to the tree-trunk. It is certainly contrary to early Greek practice, and alien to all mature Greek feeling. The Roman attitude was different: less humane, but it was adopted towards folk of different race, hostes without legal rights; less merciful, but barbarians subjected captured Romans to savage atrocities; less regardful of life, but a trophy was a dedication to war-gods athirst for victims. In such an atmosphere men lost all touch with ethical standards and responded to much more primitive instincts. One of those instincts was revenge. This at least was expressed in words, for the dedication-tablet of the monument is inscribed to Mars Ultor. Its date is given as Trajan’s thirteenth period of tribunician power, that is, between 10 December 107 and 9 December 108: and the executants of the work were also recorded, though this part of the stone is in part seriously abraded and in part missing. But there is much to be said for the view that an exercitus was involved.

The stones which carry the dedication form an integral part of the great hexagonal pedestal for the trophy. They are so cut as to interlock with the architectural framing, on which some letters stray in such a fashion as to show that the inscription was there from the first. It has sometimes been argued that the dedication was additional or that its text commemorated a restoration. The former point is emphatically rebutted by the arrangement of the stones and the latter by the arrangement of the lettering.

As for the dedication, Otto Hirschfeld was almost certainly right in thinking that the consecration to Mars Ultor could also be matched in literature. After the victory of the campus ldistavisus, in A.D. 16, Germanicus built a vast pile of enemy arms, dedicated, according to the text of Tacitus, Martii et Iovi et Augusto. But the inversion of Mars and Iuppiter runs so counter to Roman practice, that Hirschfeld’s skilful emendation, Marti Ultor et Augusto, carries complete conviction. At Adamklissi, however, the trophy is not erected on the site of a victory. Mars the Avenger is honoured as wiping out the disgrace of a defeat, and to those who annually paraded beneath its shadow, in honour of the fallen, the great monument proclaimed Rome’s power to avenge her dead.

If this were all that was to be said of the Adamklissi monuments, the group would be notable as a series of impressive war memorials, unique in their double commemoration of defeat and victory. But there is much more. The drum of the tropaeum is no less elaborate than the trophy which crowns it. The lower half consists of six 2-ft. courses of chisel-drafted ashlar blocks, standing upon a conventional base mould. The upper half is, in contrast, richly carved (pl. XII, b). The first element is a frieze of bold acanthus scrolls, which harbour little birds but terminate in wild wolf-heads with snipping jaws. This supports a series of sculptural metopes framed between pilasters 5 ft. high. The pilasters are decorated alternately with fluting and spiral wreaths, and are crowned with simple capitals of palm-fronds enriched with ovolo. There follows a frieze enriched with bold palmettes springing alternately from top and bottom and linked by an elongated cable scroll. Finally, there is a cornice crowned by couchant lion gargoyles and a decorative crenellation.

8 Wiener Studien, v, 124.  9 Ann, ii, 22.
As Studniczka\textsuperscript{10} has pointed out, the design is here peculiarly Roman, and closely related to Roman Etruria. The arrangement of the metopes between pilasters is like nothing so much as the entablatures of Etruscan sarcophagi or the famous Porta Marzia of Perugia, with its fenestration enlivened by the Dioscuri and their steeds. As in the closely related Sullan phase of the second style in wall-painting, the architectural framework enshrines a kaleidoscopic series of vistas, each complete in itself but each related to its neighbour, sundered and yet knit together by the frame in which they are set. Etrurian Falerii also supplies the best parallel for the crenellations, on a round tomb, where each crenellation is decorated with a \textit{candelabrum}, lights for ever burning in honour of the dead.\textsuperscript{11}

Here the victors are not honoured with sempiternal \textit{candelabra}; the crenellations carry standing prisoners chained to trees. These captives differ much, and much care has been taken to define and distinguish their diverse features and clothing. Some figures resemble Dacians (pl. XIII, \textit{a}), with belted tunic-like shirts and trousers, and hair flowing or cropped with a pudding-basin cut. Others are tall trousered Germans (pl. XIII, \textit{b}), with their distinctive Suebic hair knot, a short light tunic and a cloak. Others, again, are dressed like \textit{Sarmatae} (pl. XIII, \textit{c}), in trousers and a knee-length coat fastened down the front, while their heads display the long matted hair typical of the Scythian tribes. The Germans are most readily identifiable: they must be the East-German \textit{Bastarnae}, as has long been recognised. The Sarmatian folk should be their neighbours the Roxolani, and the semi-Dacian types probably represent local people of Getic stock. In brief, they are exactly the tribes that literature or epigraphy frequently associate with the Dobrudja gateway. It is interesting and significant that the types hardly at all correspond to the Transylvanian Dacians figured upon Trajan's Column, nor even to the other peoples whose ambassadors or representatives we sometimes see there. They are specifically the enemies of Lower Moesia, and of the eastern portion of the province at that, a point to be reconsidered bye and bye.

The operations of which the prisoners were the result are the subject of the metopes. There is room on the drum of the \textit{tropaeum} for fifty-four of these (Fig. 2); fifty are known and out of the forty-nine now extant, forty-four are reasonably complete, if varying much in degree of preservation. As the position of the fallen metopes indicates, the series started from the north front; and as now surviving they plunge abruptly into a cavalry action proceeding westward, anti-clockwise. The first group (i–iii), comprising three metopes, is two cavalrymen at the gallop, headed by a pair of mounted standard-bearers with \textit{vexilla}. All are clad in jerkins of chain-mail, represented by drill-holes, and the troopers have no helmets but are armed with sword, lance and hexagonal shield. Their hair is brushed back in stiff straight locks, cut close at neck and ears, and they are clean-shaven. The saddle-cloths and richly caparisoned horses are worth note, and the men ride without stirrups like all Roman cavalry. These scenes represent moving up. They are simple and have much in common with the cavalry tombstone, with which they may fitly be compared in design and execution. The next four metopes (iv–vii)

\textsuperscript{10} F. Studniczka, 'Tropaeum Traiani,' \textit{Sächs. Abh.} xxii, 1904, 17 ff.
\textsuperscript{11} C. Weickert, \textit{Antike Architektur}, 1949, 16 ff.
represent a cavalry engagement, in which three scenes depict heavy fighting on the part of troopers in chain-mail jerkins of the kind previously described. The action is varied. In two cases it is virtually repeated. The cavalryman spears an opponent either standing (iv) or on the run (v) and rides over a dead or dying Bastarnian, while another corpse in long Scythian coat occupies the background. The design for these panels has severely taxed the sculptor's abilities. The second pair shows a horseman riding down an opponent. In one case (vii) a cavalryman in scale-armoured jacket has chopped off his adversary's head and brandishes it in triumph, while the corpse sinks into the background. In the other (vi) it is an officer, with cloak, scale-armour and double skirt of mailed lappets who rides down a barbarian chief in conical cap, tunic and trousers (pl. XIV, a). It seems probable that this figure should lead the series, which plainly consists of three themes in duplicate; moving into battle, contest and pursuit. But it is doubtful if the figure is the Emperor as suggested, for his appearances in the reliefs are carefully timed, and one of quite a different kind is about to take place. This appearance occurs upon a metope from the west side. The Emperor is distinguished by his moulded metal cuirass of Greek type, with a skirt of elaborate quadruple lappets and the paludamentum of an imperator (x). In the original state scarlet colouring for the cloak will no doubt have made the identification even clearer. He stands between a pair of attendant guards and is clearly engaged in conversation. The folk addressed, as Tocilescu long ago suggested, are a family in an ox-wagon, all in suppliant though not cringing attitude (ix) (pl. XIV, b): and the group should be augmented by two otherwise meaningless pairs of standing barbarians, a man and wife (xlix) and two women, one lifting aloft a child in arms (l). The group as a whole expresses the first result of the heavy cavalry raiding, an offer of surrender and perhaps the plea for new lands that was so early and so frequently heard upon this frontier. If the figure of the Emperor were less weathered, we should see more clearly how he had received the suppliants; but the gesture is certainly not one of welcome: and when these ox-wagons are seen again it is amid scenes of wild butchery.

The main invasion of heavy infantry is now set in motion. This action represents, as it were, the Emperor's remorseless response to offers of surrender. Full retribution was to be exacted for previous aggression. The trumpets sound, filling with their sweeping curves two magnificent panels of three cornices apiece (x and xlii) (pl. XV, a), each man blowing with all his might. Two panels form one half of the host (xii and xiii). The other half is formed by very tall infantry with massive helmets, oval shields and chain-mail tunics, also represented by two panels (xiv and xv). These are presumably praetorian guards: for it is they who regularly attend the Emperor. The legionaries carry their pila and shields at the ready, and are helmeted. The standard-bearers on each panel carry a legionary eagle and two maniple-standards, the combination used on Trajan's Column but here repeated, like so many of the subjects. Then follows the fighting, in an impressive crescendo (xviii (pl. XV, b) xix, xxi, xxix, xxxiii).

The scenes of combat open with five hand-to-hand engagements between two opponents, on the Roman part, of legionaries. The Romans wear both chain-mail and scale-armour, and at least two types of helmet and of shield device are to be distinguished. More than one unit is plainly involved. But all alike wear
elaborate vambraces of plate armour on their sword-arms, and greaves on the leg. This special provision, which is never depicted upon Trajan’s Column, is to protect the men from the murderous scythe-like swords of the barbarians, which are two-handed yataghans capable of lopping off an unprotected arm or leg without difficulty. The weapon in question is easily recognisable as the *falx*, regularly associated by the Romans with folk of Getic stock. It is not to be confused with the shorter Dacian scimitar figured upon Trajan’s Column.

As the battle develops, the scenes become more complicated. Triple figures appear, one always a dying barbarian, and there are four panels of this kind (xvi, xvii, xx (pl. XVI, a) xxii). These more complicated scenes are in general composition almost beyond the powers of the artist, and there are some strange effects of design and perspective. But the individual figures have the wild vigour and power typical of Roman military art at its best. Then the battle begins to develop into
carnage, as four-figure compositions supervene. Sometimes a Roman is hemmed in by barbarians (xxiv) (pl. XVI, b), a grim reminder that the severe struggle was not without losses on the Roman side: but the dominant theme is a wholesale slaughter, in which the Romans glut their thirst for vengeance (xxiii), leaving a field of dying foes amid the mangled or headless remains of their comrades (xxiv) (pl. XVII, a).

The battle terminates in a pursuit of fugitives. A mounted barbarian chieftain (xxx) is caught by a legionary, as he attempts to leave the corpse-strewn field, and enemy archers (xxxi) (pl. XVII, b) who have taken to trees are mercilessly hunted down by legionaries with lances. This stage, rather more than half-way round the monument, is marked by the Imperial presence once again. Trajan himself watches the woodland fight, and is again recognisable by his elaborate moulded cuirass and skirt with as before quadruple lappets (xxxii) (pl. XVIII, a). He wears no helmet, the better to be recognised: and is attended by two guards, one holding a spear which obtrudes clumsily across the scene. This panel, however, while clearly related to that of the archers in trees by the continuation of woodland, is the sole composition hitherto considered whose main actors face left, or clockwise. It thus acts as a stop, and is the preparation for a change of theme. The new sphere of action is the hunting down and capture of nomad folk with their wagons. The Romans are first shown fighting among the four-wheeled wagons (xxxvi), then as boarding them and slaying the adult males, while women beg for mercy and children fly quaking with terror (xxxv) (pl. XVIII, b). But no mercy is shown; and in the end the wagons and their equipment lie deserted amid dead and dying of both sexes and all ages (xxxvii). Here most naturally belongs the scene of ‘sheep that have not a shepherd’ (viii), the flocks of the nomads adrift and unconscious of their masters’ fate.

Once more the scene changes, and the last act opens. This is a review of prisoners in which captives and their guards are balanced against a Roman audience. The Romans are now in field service kit, as opposed to full battle dress, and the scene is presumably staged on return to base. On the left, facing right, are detachments of the army and their standard-bearers. Two standard-bearers (xliii) carry vexilla, one still crowned by a bird, the other, before transport to Bucarest, by a Victory of which only the outstretched arm survives. These banners presumably indicate vexillations of legionaries and praetorian guards, since the eagle and victory are their crowning symbols. The troops, in field service uniform, are grouped in double ranks, with shields at rest and pilum at the slope, standing at ease. Then follow two magnificent officers (xl), also in undress uniform. Facing them are two groups of less senior officers. The more prominent group is identifiable, by their roll, as tribunes (xl) (pl. XIX, a); the second group is identifiable by their vinestick as centurions (xxvii). No clearer representation of these senior officers in undress uniform exists. Finally, come the captives whose inspection is the occasion of the parade. Three panels of these exist. A Bastarnian is hustled unwillingly forward by a guard (xlvi), two less distinctive tribesmen are held stationary by a legionary between them in the background (xlvii), and two more are to await their turn (xlvi). Soldiers in undress uniform standing at ease and facing left (xxviii) fitly close the group, proud and alert spectators of the scene of their triumph.
Two important metopes remain for consideration (xxvi and xli) (pl. XIX, b). These are groups of standard-bearers, each comprising one aquilifer and two vexilliferi. On metope xxvi the men, in full battle array, stand towards their left, but their heads are turned sharp right, intent upon an object. They do not belong to the army moving into battle, for in that scene a full equipment of standard-bearers is on the move; nor does their full battle-dress fit the undress uniform of the prisoners’ parade. But there is another great scene of action, required to complete the cycle. A Roman campaign opened and ended with the solemn sacrifice of the suovetaurilia, a triple offering of ox, sheep and pig. No campaign was ritually complete without it, and it appears even in so summary a pictorial record as the Bridgeness slab. At this solemnity, a ceremonial parade of standards was de rigueur. The second indispensable requirement was the correct ritual music: flute-playing for the sacrifice, trumpet-blowing, not upon the cornua but upon the long straight tubae, for the processional march which preceded it. These scenes are missing. But their original existence is not left wholly to conjecture. The fiftieth metope, lost in the Danube during the removal of the reliefs to Bucarest, is recorded to have exhibited three figures, one blowing the tuba. The complementary sacrifice is not known, even from record, though there survives a suggestive top left-hand corner of a crowded stationary scene, which strayed to Rassova (xxv). Four whole metopes, in addition, are missing, but some of them may belong to themes already considered, and there is no need to think that all were concerned with the sacrifice. It will be noted, however, that the sacrifice occurs at the beginning of the series. This is singularly appropriate. For with this act campaigning both opened and terminated, and in the circular series of sculptures which we have been considering it is in effect both the beginning and the end.

From the detailed consideration of the reliefs, we may now turn to some general points. The first and perhaps most striking is the direct connexion between the dedication of the monument, to Mars the Avenger, and the subject of the reliefs: for the sculptured theme is plainly the vengeance of Rome upon her enemies. In that respect the monument differs completely from Trajan’s Column, which is a glorification of the army and its work. Here the matter in hand is inseparable from the earlier monuments on the site, the vast mausoleum and the altar to the fallen, ‘blood and judgment are so well commingled.’ Secondly, the enemy depicted as vanquished are plainly local. Their weapons are the two-handed Getic or Thracian falx, not the shorter single-handed scimitar of the Dacians proper. Their physical features, their costumes and their wagons identify them as Bastarnians from Bessarabia, Roxolani and other Scythian nomads from the steppes. They differ markedly from both the Transylvanian Dacians and their allies. These differences so impressed Cichorius that he was inclined to date the reliefs to a far later age, and to suppose that they marked a fourth-century restoration of the monument. But this will not do. In the first place, Trajan is clearly recognisable on the reliefs. Secondly, the army officers shown, legionary tribunes and centurions, have no place in the fourth century: and, finally, the fourth-century adversaries were not the Roxolani and Bastarnians here shown, but Goths.

12 J. M. C. Toynbee, Art in Roman Britain, 1962, no. 27, pl. 102.
13 C. Cichorius, Die römischen Denkmäler in der Dobrudscha, 1904.
Stylistically, there is much that is archaic about the general design of the work. But the problem was a special one. The requirement was to translate into permanent materials the impermanent type of monument erected by Roman armies in the field, 'the lofty tumulus in the style of a trophy' described by Florus. For this kind of edifice, the best models available were themselves archaic, the great Roman mausolea based upon Etruscan tumuli. Indeed, one stood immediately to hand, bigger in diameter than the tropaeum itself. Whether through this intermediary or not, the tropaeum was manifestly based upon the circular tomb as prototype. This was a simple pattern to copy, and one feature about it in particular suited the designer well. It is very evident that the sculptors of the metopes were often barely equal to the task which they were set. What looked well enough as sketches or cartoons proved difficult to translate into stone and almost beyond the competence of the workmen. It is easy to see the subjects with which these workmen were familiar. Their most successful pieces are the simple standing figures or the troopers riding down barbarians: and it is exactly these designs that are the favourite fashions of military tombstones. In fact, just as the major design is tomb architecture, so the sculpture is closely related to the minor military monuments of the half century before Trajan's time. The whole work, in short, is of local reference, designed to commemorate and avenge troops of the Moesian army and executed by military architects, military labour and military carvers. This will explain on the one hand the crudities, and on the other the care and accuracy devoted to military equipment and to local colour.

There are evident indications that the designer of the work was well aware of the limitations of his craftsmen. The subject chosen for the metopes is a continuous narrative. The feeling for continuity goes far beyond the metopes of a Greek temple, where each panel stands alone and can be isolated as self-sufficient; and it is obvious that a continuous frieze would have been the most appropriate vehicle of expression. But it is equally clear, from the treatment of the complicated figure-scenes, that its execution would quickly have got quite out of hand if entrusted to artists whose normal work was the simple panel. So the designer chose to restrict himself to metopes, which kept the round monument static and firmly anchored its massive base, and got his sense of movement by the ingenious method of repeating many of the scenes. This is a unique feature of the Adamklissi tropaeum. The device recurs so many times that it cannot be accidental; it must be recognised as a deliberate repetition, to secure an effect of continuity, like a cinematograph or kaleidoscope. But one craftsman there was to whom a complicated continuous repetitive theme could be assigned. Whoever carved the frieze of acanthus scrolls which runs below the metopes was a still-life sculptor of ability and power. This is a design which, as Studniczka noted, will bear comparison with metropolitan art, the corresponding frieze in Rome being that of the Arch of Titus—a significant point, since it usefully links the style of decoration with the Trajanic inscription.

Elsewhere on the monument, all the conventional detail, covering the pilasters, their capitals and the upper frieze which they carry, is simplified to suit the capacity of military sculptors. The result is an effect as individual and as vigorous as the figure sculpture. It was not the first time that this sort of simplification had taken place in the art of ancient Italy. Etruscan sarcophagi and ash-chests demonstrate
what native artists could make of Hellenistic models, copying their form but simplifying and transmuting their style to serve as a vehicle of non-Hellenic ideas. So now the legionaries were transforming current metropolitan styles into a simpler idiom, crude in its failures, but full of glorious vigour in success: it is the sermo castrensis of Roman art, flashy and crisp, unrefined and unrepentant.

These considerations must inevitably bring us back to the original purpose of the monument. It gave its name, Tropaeum Traiani, to the small municipality founded a few years later in the valley to the south. Here there is room for misunderstanding. As the inscription from the monument tells us, the work was indeed Trajan’s. But this need not necessarily imply that it was a personal dedication by the Emperor. It is Trajan’s monument only in the sense that scores of works by his soldiery all over the Empire were his monument, dedicated in his name because erected under his auspices. It is therefore unnecessary to regard it as the counterpart in the field of Trajan’s Column in Rome: indeed, the inscriptions on the two monuments alone are sufficient to reveal their totally different genesis. For Trajan’s Column is not the Emperor’s work at all, but a memorial to him from the Senate and People. Here the Emperor, through his army of Moesia, is paying a vow, the ascription to Mars Ultor of a grim and remorseless vengeance for that army’s earlier defeat. This act of A.D. 108 sets the seal upon the Dacian War; it is its last consequence, just as the defeat which it transcends was among its first causes.

But this does not mean that the monument is to be regarded as the principal memorial of the Dacian Wars in the field. In the past, the reliefs have sometimes been viewed as an attempt to represent the first and second Dacian Wars; the first followed by the surrender of the Dacians, the second by their total defeat. But this is too facile an interpretation of the campaigning scenes of Adamklissi, which are not in fact repetitive but complementary. The first is cavalry raiding, the second the full weight of heavy invasion. The refusal to receive the nomads at the end of the one is followed by their annihilation at the end of the other. In other words, the story is not of two wars but of one: and the victims are not Transylvanian Dacians, but the local aggressors of the Dobrudja. What we are seeing is no clumsy epitome of the major Dacian campaigns, but a brilliant chapter telling the story of their sequel. The operations are those which followed the main war and preceded the establishment of the legions at Durostorum and Troesmis. This explains their close connexion with the army of Lower Moesia, for it was their triumphant conclusion that effectively and specifically wiped out old scores on that part of the frontier and avenged previous defeat. Herein is felt the full weight of the dedication to Mars Ultor: it was vengeance achieved which prompted, first, the choice of site for the monument, hard by the earlier mausoleum and altar to the fallen, the fortissimi viri whose honour was appeased by an annual ceremonial parade. It was vengeance which inspired the subject of the reliefs, and the local style and feeling accounts both for the crudity and the power of the work. But the sum total is one of the most remarkable achievements of Roman military art, a grim and telling statement of the army’s grandeur, of pride and of ruthlessness.
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MEDIEVAL archaeology in the sense of a field study involving controlled excavation is in its infancy in Italy. Scarcely a dozen excavations have been carried out with the recovery of information about the middle ages as their primary objective and little attention has been paid to the material remains of everyday life. It is not surprising, therefore, that in the past the only medieval pottery to receive lasting attention has been the tin-glazed ware which was valued as the forerunner of renaissance maiolica. Nevertheless, in recent years programmes of surface collecting and selective excavation have been initiated in two areas with the specific purpose of studying the middle ages. The two areas are Lazio and Apulia. In Apulia the Society of Antiquaries sponsored a survey of the Tavoliere, or Foggia Plain, reports on which are in active preparation. In Lazio the British School at Rome extended the scope of its topographical survey of South Etruria to include the medieval period. As a result we
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* This paper is based on four chapters of my Ph.D. thesis, The Medieval Pottery of South Italy, in the University Library, Cambridge (accession no. Ph.D. 5855–6). The thesis was written between 1963 and 1966 under the supervision of the Director of the British School at Rome, Mr. John Ward-Perkins, and Dr. Brian Hope-Taylor. I offer both my warmest thanks. My research was financed by the Department of Education and Science and the British School at Rome, and I acknowledge their support with gratitude.

already have the results of one major excavation, Santa Cornelia, and of two smaller
digs, Porciano and Santa Rufina (see map, fig. 1). We also possess surface collections
from more than a hundred sites, many of which had gone out of use by the fifteenth
century. In addition we have the material from excavations carried out by the
Danish Institute at Belmonte, Pietrapertusa and Torre Busson, and by the Swedish
Institute at S. Giovenale and Luni. Finally we have the pottery and other objects
found at Rome during the excavation of classical monuments, by chance and used as
decoration in the façades of medieval buildings. Much of the field work and excavation
has gone ahead in close conjunction with historical research and consequently
we know more about the medieval culture of Lazio than of any other region of Italy.
This paper is an introduction to the medieval glazed pottery found in Lazio. It
appears in an exciting period in the development of medieval archaeology in Italy,

---

2 The excavations at Santa Cornelia were directed by Mr. Charles Daniels, those at Porciano by Dr.
Michael Mallett and those at Santa Rufina by Lady Wheeler. I am grateful to the excavators and to
Mr. Ward-Perkins for placing at my disposal all the medieval pottery found during the Survey of South
Etruria.

3 I am grateful to Dr. Hans Stiesdal for allowing me to study the finds from Belmonte, Pietrapertusa
and Torre Busson; and to Drs. Eric Berggren and Carl Eric Ostenberg for permission to describe the
pottery from San Giovenale and Luni.

4 I have not been able to examine all the medieval pottery from Rome. This paper takes into account
the material in the Vatican Museums, the Antiquario of the Roman Forum, the Museo del Palazzo
di Venezia and the bacini in the museum at SS. Giovanni e Paolo. I am indebted to the late
Guy Ferrari O.S.B. (Vatican Museums), Prof. G.
Carretoni (Roman Forum) and the abbot of SS.
Giovanni e Paolo for permission to study the pottery
in their custody.
for information of fundamental importance is accumulating all the time. Indeed, I must emphasise that my 'conclusions' are essentially working hypotheses liable to large-scale revision.

The region of Lazio occupies an important position in central Italy. It extends from Viterbo to Gaeta and from the Tyrhenian Sea to the Apennine foothills. Its capital is Rome and throughout the medieval period Rome was the focal point of the region. In the north Lazio consists of a tufaceous plateau with volcanic lakes and steep-sided valleys. South of Monte Soratte this plateau is known as the Roman Campagna and its principal feature is the Tiber Valley. South of Rome the topography becomes more varied. Much of the coastal zone is occupied by the Pontine Marshes, while the rugged hinterland contains the Alban Hills, a volcanic massif 2,000 ft. high, and the limestone peak of Monte Sempervisa, which rises more than 5,000 ft. above sea level. Most of the medieval pottery found in Lazio to date comes from the Roman Campagna north and west of the River Tiber, and from the tufo country farther north. We know little of the pottery used in the marshes and the mountainous areas south of Rome. Because of the uneven distribution of the evidence, I have made only limited use of maps showing the occurrence of particular types of pottery.

This paper exceeds the scope indicated by the title in two respects. Firstly, I have prefaced my accounts of the earliest lead-glazed and tin-glazed wares of Lazio with notes on the introduction of the two glazing techniques to Italy. I have done this because up-to-date accounts of the origins of Italian lead-glazed pottery and maiolica are lacking. Secondly, I have included descriptions of the glazed pottery made at Orvieto in south Umbria. Not only has Orvieto Ware occupied a prominent place in earlier discussions of Italian maiolica, thus making inclusion here advisable, but it was also marketed in Lazio and exerted a considerable influence on the potters of the Roman Campagna.

**PART I. LEAD-GLAZED POTTERY**

1. *The Problem of Continuity*

The problems of the origin and date of the earliest medieval lead-glazed pottery made in Lazio are of considerable interest, not only because this pottery provided the basis for later developments in the region but also because it represents an important stage in the diffusion of the glazing technique to north-west Europe. During the Roman period, glazed pottery was manufactured in both the Mediterranean and the European provinces of the Empire. It is widely accepted that production ceased in the transalpine provinces in the Migration Period and was not resumed until the technique of glazing had been re-introduced from the Mediterranean. Within the Mediterranean region the problem of continuity is more complex and, while it is usually claimed that the technique survived the end of the Roman period in the east, the evidence from the west has provoked controversy.

Outside China, the technique of lead-glazing was first practised on a large scale in Western Asia in the first century B.C. The commonest type of glazed pottery used

---

in the Mediterranean at this date consisted of dishes, bowls and cups, the forms of which imitated contemporary silverware. They are completely covered with glaze. The outside is coloured green by the addition of iron or copper oxide, and the interior is yellow-brown. The decoration is moulded and includes wreaths, festoons and lightly-ribbed scales. Much of this pottery was made in Turkey, where moulds or kiln debris have been found at three sites: Tarsus, Tschandarli near Pergamum and Notium near Ephesus.6

The glazing technique was diffused rapidly to Italy, and by A.D. 100 glazed wares were being manufactured as far afield as Britain.7 However, glazed pottery failed to compete commercially with glass, samian ware and the later terra sigillata chiara and production was more often geared to local markets than to long-range trade. By the fourth century the character of the glazed pottery made in the central and western provinces had become markedly different from that of the relief wares of the Early Empire. In north Italy, Switzerland and Germany, for example, the late Roman glazed wares consisted principally of jugs and jars glazed on the outside only. The glaze may be fairly thick and it varies in colour from brown to yellowish green. Although a few decorated vessels occur, the typical product was plain. In Italy pottery of this type has been found in fourth or fifth century contexts at Stabio,8 Albenga9 and Aosta.10

Discussion of the possibility of continuity between late Roman and early medieval glazed pottery in the west Mediterranean has produced two hypotheses, of which the views of the late Gaetano Ballardini and Mr. R. B. K. Stevenson are the fullest expression. Ballardini, in a monograph written in 1943 but published only in 1964, argued that there was continuity and that glazed pottery was manufactured in Italy without a break.11 This opinion, which is supported by most Italian scholars, rests partly on accepting at face value two finds of glazed pottery for which early medieval dates have been proposed: (i) Tharros in Sardinia and (ii) the Lacus Iuturnae in the Forum at Rome. The pottery from Tharros (discussed below, p. 46) includes vessels with a green glaze on the outside and a yellow-brown interior. One of these, a cup, is decorated with lightly-ribbed scales. The material was allegedly found associated with coins of Justinian (527–65) and Heraclius (610–41). The pottery from Rome (see below, p. 48) consists of numerous jugs with a green or brown glaze on the outside, many of which are decorated with applied scales. They were found in association with fragments of eighth or ninth century sculpture. Thus both finds include pottery with scale decoration. Furthermore, the combination of green and yellow glazes found at Tharros resembles that of the early Roman wares made in Turkey. Accepting the dating evidence from both sites, Ballardini concluded that glazed pottery of Roman type was still in use in the seventh century and that similar wares were manufactured at Rome in the eighth or ninth century. Continuity, therefore, was assured.

8 Christoph Simonett, Tassiner Gräberfelder (Basel, Monographien zur Ur- und Frühgeschichte der Schweiz, no. 3, 1941), p. 30 and pl. 17.
10 Gaetano Ballardini, L'Eredità ceramistica del Antico Mondo romano (Roma, Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato), 1964, p. 113 and fig. 152.
11 Ibid., This conclusion, implicit in the title, is argued throughout.
Stevenson, on the other hand, rejected the possibility of continuity in the west. He discussed the problem when drawing attention to the similarity between the earliest datable medieval glazed pottery then known in western Europe, Stamford Ware, and Byzantine plain glazed pottery from Istanbul. Both have a fine white fabric and a yellow glaze. The Byzantine pottery was found in early ninth century deposits at the Great Palace and the earliest Stamford Ware was found at Thetford (Norfolk) in East Anglia associated with a coin of Edmund (875–905). Stevenson rejected the possibility that Italy provided an intermediate stage in the diffusion of the glazing technique from Byzantium to north-west Europe on the grounds that the material from the Lacus Iuturnae was more likely to date from the fourteenth century than the ninth and that, contrary to local opinion, no glazed pottery of undoubted early medieval date had ever been found in Italy. I shall suggest here that recent discoveries in Lazio render both hypotheses untenable and that, although no continuity between Roman and medieval glazed pottery may be demonstrated in Italy, Italian potters nevertheless played a significant part in the diffusion of the glazing technique to western Europe.

It is the consensus of opinion that glazed pottery was made continuously at Istanbul from the Roman period onwards. However, I suggest that the evidence for its continuous production before the seventh or eighth century is at present equivocal. The only published finds of post-Roman glazed pottery thought to be earlier than the seventh century come from the peristyle of the Great Palace and the atrium of Sancta Sophia. The first is an isolated fragment which may be a residual sherd of Roman origin. The second find, on the other hand, is of great importance. It consists of a group of sherds with a coarse white fabric and impressed decoration under a clear yellow glaze. They were found by Schneider below the foundations of the atrium of Sancta Sophia and appear to date from before 532, when building began. The importance of this pottery lies in its apparently early date and its close resemblance to Byzantine Impressed Ware, which is otherwise unknown before the ninth century. If the sherds are indeed earlier than the construction of Sancta Sophia, they might be used as evidence that a characteristic form of Byzantine glazed pottery was already in use in the sixth century. Discussing the find, Deichmann showed that the type cannot be derived from any of the Roman wares with relief decoration made in Turkey, for these were finished in a mould. On the other hand, both the technique of impressing the ornament and the combination of a white fabric and yellowish glaze have parallels in Mesopotamia. Byzantine Impressed Ware, Deichmann concluded, was derived from Sassanian, not Roman, prototypes. Unfortunately, however, the position is not necessarily as clear-cut as Deichmann

supposed. Impressed Ware is completely absent from the earliest deposits both at the Great Palace and at Corinth (see below, p. 47), a situation which argues against the view that the type was already in use in the sixth century. Indeed, it is possible that the sherds from Sancta Sophia were imported from Western Asia and that production of similar wares at Istanbul did not begin until considerably later than the sixth century. Whatever the true status of the sherds, one conclusion is clear; they certainly do not establish that the glazing technique was practised continuously at Istanbul from the Roman period, and the case for continuity remains to be proved.

If we exclude the find at Sancta Sophia, the earliest published groups of Byzantine glazed pottery come from the Great Palace. They have been described by Stevenson. The first group, Stevenson’s Stage I, was associated with coins of Phocas (602–10) and Constantine IV (668–85). Despite the coins, Stevenson dated the group to the Early Isaurian period (i.e. the first half of the eighth century) rather than to the seventh century, because the pottery closely resembles that of Stage II, which was associated with coins of (?) Justinian II (685–95 and 705–11), Constantine V with Leo IV (771–5), and Leo V (813–20). The glazed wares of Stage I consist of two different types. The first has a coarse fabric which varies in colour from grey to red or brown. The fabric of the second type is fine and may be either buff or red, with a reddish slip. Both varieties are covered with a green, red-brown or brownish glaze. In Stage II the most common glazed ware has a smooth pink fabric, a cream slip and a glaze which varies from orange through yellow to greyish green. It appears that all these colours were produced by adding iron oxide to the glaze, which was then fired in a reducing atmosphere to make it green and in oxidising conditions for orange and yellow. In some cases a mottled effect was achieved by firing the vessel in a reducing atmosphere and then, after allowing it to cool slightly, introducing a draught which oxidised the hottest parts of the glazed surface. The majority of the sherds belong to bowls glazed either completely or, less often, on the inside only. A second type of pottery which occurs in small quantities in Stage II is Petal Ware. This is decorated with small wedges of clay applied to the sides of cups and similar vessels in horizontal rows. The effect was often enlivened by the use of a different clay for alternate ‘petals,’ thus producing a contrast of colour. Stage III in the sequence at the Great Palace belongs to the ninth century. It was dated by fifteen coins which range from Nicephorus I (802–11) to Basil I (867–86), who is represented by five. The pottery shows a marked development from Stage II. Although most of the vessels are again dishes and bowls, the majority are now glazed on the inside only. Ninety per cent of these have a plain yellow or bright green glaze, and it was the former which Stevenson compared with Stamford Ware. Two other pottery types occur in Stage III: Petal Ware and Impressed Ware similar to the sherds from Sancta Sophia.

On the basis of this material, the early development of Byzantine glazed pottery at Istanbul may be summarised as follows. Although it is often claimed that glazed pottery was produced continuously from the Roman period, the evidence for glazed

---

18 Stevenson, op. cit. in note 15, pp. 31–63.
wares before the seventh or eighth century is not conclusive. The earliest securely-dated material, the pottery which belongs to Stage I at the Great Palace, has a green or brownish glaze and belongs to the seventh or eighth century. By the beginning of the ninth century Petal Ware was in use; and shortly afterwards, in Stage III, the glazing technique was improved to produce clear yellow and bright green finishes.

Just as the earliest evidence of medieval glazed pottery at Istanbul is equivocal, so is the earliest evidence elsewhere in the Mediterranean basin. The following is a list of glazed pottery which is, or may be, early medieval, together with notes on two discoveries which have been described as medieval but are, in fact, either Roman or post-medieval in date. The list omits the ‘Coptic’ glazed pottery of Egypt because, whatever its date, this material stands apart from the problem of the origin of the glazing technique in Italy. 20

(i) Yassi Ada. Yassi Ada, near Halicarnassus in south-west Turkey, is the site of a group of off-shore wrecks investigated by Bass and Throckmorton. Wreck III, which is dated to the seventh century by four coins of Heraclius (610–41), contained a small bowl with a scalloped rim, decorated with ‘nail impressions’ and covered with a green and brown glaze. 21

(ii) Gela. The find at Gela (prov. Caltanissetta) in Sicily consists of a single small jug, 6.5 in. high, with an ovoid body, flaring cylinder neck and an oval-section handle. 22 The body has an ophaloid base and the handle has a spur just below the highest point. The outside is covered with a thin yellow-brown glaze. The jug is regarded as early medieval by Italian scholars and similar, but unglazed, vessels certainly occur in ‘Byzantine’ contexts elsewhere in Sicily, the closest parallels coming from Palazzolo Acreide 23 and Sofiana. 24 Unfortunately, no parallel is sufficiently close or itself sufficiently well dated to establish whether the vessel from Gela is late Roman, like the fourth and fifth century pottery from north Italy (see above, p. 43), or early medieval, like the seventh century bowl from Yassi Ada.

(iii) Rossano. The find at Rossano (prov. Cosenza) in Calabria presents a similar problem. It is again a single vessel, a jar about 9 in. high, with an ovoid body, slender neck and an everted rim. 25 The neck is decorated with three incised wavy lines and the body has a series of vertical stripes painted in red. The upper part of the vessel carries a splash of yellow-brown glaze. The pot belongs to the earliest group of painted pottery with simple decoration, which I defined in 1966. 26 Other examples occur in Sicily, where they have ‘Byzantine’ parallels, none of which is later than the seventh century. The exact date of the Rossano find is, however, unknown.

(iv) Tharros. I have said already (see above, p. 43) that the pottery from Tharros, near Oristano on the west coast of Sardinia, occupies an important place in the controversy over the continuity of the glazing technique in the west Mediterranean. The principal finds from this site are a cup and a jar. 27 The cup is 3.7 in. high and has a globular body, ring base, a single everted rim and a single handle (now missing). The upper part of the body is decorated with four horizontal rows of lightly-ribbed scales. The jar is 6.9 in. high and has an ovoid body with a ring base, a tall flaring neck and two handles. Both vessels are completely covered with glaze. This is coloured green on the outside and left plain yellow-brown on the interior. The vessels were allegedly found, together with other glazed pottery, 28 in 1856 in tomb 33 at Tharros. The tomb was also

---

20 For an example of ‘Coptic’ glazed pottery, see a jar in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, decorated with brown, green and yellow stripes under a thin lead glaze (inv. no. CI412–1921), for which a date between the fifth and eighth centuries has been suggested.
22 Unpublished: Gela, Museo Archeologico.
23 Unpublished: Syracuse, Museo Archeologico.
25 Unpublished: Rossano, Museo Diocesano.
27 H. B. Walters, Catalogue of the Roman Pottery in the Department of Antiquities, British Museum (London, 1908), p. 3, nos. K 16 and K 17. In my article on Forum Ware (see note 42) I mistakenly accepted these vessels as early medieval.
28 Ballardini, op. cit. in note 9, p. 136.
said to contain coins of Justinian (527–65) and Heraclius (610–41). Several scholars have accepted the alleged association of pottery and coins and regarded the former as the earliest medieval glazed ware in the west Mediterranean. However, a medieval date is highly unlikely. Mr. D. M. Bailey suggests that many of the so-called tomb groups from Tharros were put together from various sources by dealers, and the vessels display several features which indicate that they are almost certainly Roman. The technique of glazing pottery on both sides but only colouring the exterior was a standard procedure in the first century but it had already been abandoned in the fourth. The shape of the cup has numerous parallels in the Roman period, but none in the seventh century; and the applied ornament resembles the ribbed scales of early Roman glazed pottery rather than the plain scales found in the Lacus Iuturnae at Rome (see below, p. 49). All the reliable evidence, therefore, points to a Roman date for the vessels from Tharros. It thus removes a crucial stage in the argument for continuity in the west advanced by Ballardini.

(2) Mesagne. One, or possibly two, green-glazed jar(s), each with an ovoid body completely covered with scales, were found at Mesagne (prov. Brindisi) in Apulia, some time before 1952. Although these have been compared with the vessels from the Lacus Iuturnae and dated to the ninth century, a later date is probable. Indeed, the pots may be local imitations of the cone-shaped vessels manufactured in central Italy in the sixteenth century.

Despite the lack of evidence from Istanbul, the find at Yassi Ada shows that glazed pottery was used, if not made, in the east Mediterranean in the seventh century, and the vessels from Gela and Rossano afford the possibility that it was also known in the west. It was, however, rare. Glazed pots are completely lacking from the late Roman deposits found at Athens and the ‘Byzantine’ cemeteries of Sicily. The latest deposit at Athens was an osteotheke on the Areopagus which contained a coin of Heraclius, and the latest Sicilian cemeteries belong to the seventh century.

Two agencies were responsible for re-introducing the custom of glazing large quantities of pottery in the west Mediterranean: Byzantium and Islam. The Arabs invaded Egypt in 641, and by the end of the seventh century they controlled the entire north African coast from Alexandria to the Straits of Gibraltar. They acquired the glazing technique in Mesopotamia and glazed wares were in use from an early date in their western possessions. An Islamic origin is probable for most of the medieval glazed pottery made in north Africa, Spain and perhaps also Sicily. It was from Byzantium, however, that the technique was diffused to the Italian mainland. It spread first to Greece, where the earliest medieval glazed pottery comes from Corinth and is said to date from the ninth century. Glazed wares were abundant

39 As above.
31 For example, Charleston, op. cit. in note 6, pl. 28B.
32 A. Franco, 'Una Postilla sulla Ceramica Salentina,' Faenza, xxxviii (1952), pp. 79–91, particularly pl. XX, no. 3 (printed upside-down), and Nicola Vacca, La Ceramica Salentina (Lecce, tip. Modernissima, 1954), p. 22 and fig. 21. I am grateful to Dr. Vacca for information about the possible second vessel of this type.
33 Franco, op. cit. above, p. 83, and Vacca, op. cit. above, p. 22.
34 For example, Bernard Rackham, Catalogue of Italian Maiolica, Victoria and Albert Museum (London, 1940), nos. 436 (Deruta c. 1520) and 517 and 518 (both Gubbio, c. 1515–20).
36 Most of the material is unpublished. The largest collection of 'Byzantine' pottery in Sicily is at Syracuse, Museo Archeologico.
38 Arthur Lane, Early Islamic Pottery (London, Faber and Faber, fifth impression, 1963), p. 9.
at Corinth and among the earliest types found there are ‘brown glazed’ pottery, which has a coarse red fabric and a brown or greenish glaze, and wares with a yellow or bright green finish. Clearly both types were derived from the pottery of Stages I to III at the Great Palace. Indeed, the occurrence of pottery with a coarse fabric and a brownish glaze suggests that the glazing technique was introduced to Greece during Stage I; that is, in the eighth rather than the ninth century.

The pottery from the Lacus Iuturnae at Rome (described below) represents another stage in the westward diffusion of the glazing technique from Byzantium. Several features show that it was derived from a Byzantine prototype and has nothing in common with the late Roman wares of north Italy or the glazed vessels from Gela and Rossano. Fragmentary as it is, the present evidence points to the conclusion that the technique of glazing pottery had been either abandoned or nearly abandoned in the west Mediterranean after the fifth century. In Italy the technique was revived under Byzantine influence.

2. Forum Ware

The glazed pottery from the Lacus Iuturnae was originally thought to belong to the eighth or ninth century, and von Bode claimed that similar finds from Rome were datable to the eighth century. Like the vessels from Tharros, this material was crucial to Ballardini’s case for continuity in the west. Its early date was, however, questioned by Stevenson and most scholars outside Italy have adopted the same sceptical approach. However, recent excavations at Santa Cornelia and other sites in Lazio have confirmed the original opinion, and in 1965 I re-published the pottery from the Lacus Iuturnae under the name ‘Forum Ware.’

Forum Ware is now known from a dozen sites, but the material from the Lacus remains the largest single group; it forms the basis of the present account. The group was discovered in 1900 by Giacomo Boni, who found that some time in the middle ages the basin of the Lacus had been filled to the brim with earth and rubbish. This deposit contained a vast amount of archaeological material, including sculpture, small-finds and pottery. Among the last were more than fifteen hundred pieces of glazed pottery, including eighty-three complete or nearly complete vessels. With three exceptions (see below, p. 53), the entire group is Forum Ware.

The fabric of the Forum Ware found in the Lacus is coarse and fairly hard, with small white inclusions which are usually visible through the glaze. The clay may also contain purple grits and a little mica. It varies in colour from dark grey to pale greyish pink, with a few examples of red; grey, however, predominates. The unglazed surfaces are pink.

All but one of the glazed pots from the Lacus are jugs, and the exceptional piece is a jar. These hollow vessels are glazed thickly on the outside and on the inside of the neck. Splashes of glaze occur also on the interior of the body: the underside, too,

---

42 D. B. Whitehouse, ‘Forum Ware: A Distinctive Type of Early Medieval Glazed Pottery in the Roman Campagna,’ *Medieval Archaeology*, ix (1965), pp. 55–63. The present paper leans heavily on this earlier article, but corrects a number of errors and adds new evidence for the chronology of Forum Ware.
may be wholly or partly covered. The glaze is often rough or blistered and, although the acidic soil conditions of the Lacus have undoubtedly contributed to this effect, it is clear that the glazing process was not always successful. Nevertheless, several pots preserve a rich and glossy finish. This varies in colour from dull green through yellow-brown to chestnut. The colours are patchy and may vary considerably on a single piece. In two cases, in which one side of the vessel is bright green and the other brown, this variation may be deliberate; if so, it recalls the mottled brown and green effect found in *Stage II* of the pottery sequence at the Great Palace (see above, p. 45).

Most Forum Ware is decorated with applied scales made from the same clay as the rest of the pot (pl. XX). On the jugs from the Lacus these are sometimes accompanied by simple combed or incised decoration made before the handle, spout or scales were added. With two exceptions, in which the scales are applied either all over the body or in a relatively complex design, they are placed in single vertical rows. Three or four rows occur on either side of the body and each consists of between four and eight scales. Shorter rows are applied on the handle and under the spout. Occasionally incised ornament occurs alone and about one-eighth of the vessels from the Lacus are completely plain. Although the ornament is arranged differently on a few pots from other sites (cf. pl. XXI, a, from Santa Cornelia), the decoration found in the Lacus Iuturnae appears to be typical of Forum Ware as a whole.

The Forum Ware from the Lacus may be divided into five principal types. These are as follows:

1. **Globular pitcher with straight tubular spout starting just below the neck.** This has two sub-types:
   
   (a) Vessels with narrow cylinder necks (pl. XX, a and fig. 2, 1), made in two sizes, about 7 and 10.5 in. high respectively.

   (b) Vessels with broad cylinder necks (pl. XX, b, and fig. 2, 2), made in one size only, about 7 in. high.

2. **Biconical jug with a spout which may be tubular or, more often, pinched and pressed back to touch the neck immediately under the rim.** This has four sub-types:
   
   (a) Vessels with roughly biconical bodies and pinched or, rarely, plain or bridged tubular spouts.

   (b) Vessels with bodies carinated shortly below narrow cylinder necks and tubular spouts.

   (c) As (b), but with broad cylinder necks.

   (d) Vessels with broad biconical bodies, their diameter equalling or exceeding the height.

---

44 Whitehouse, *op. cit.* in note 32, fig. 16, types 2a and 2c.
3. Ovoid jug, nearly always with the spout pinched and pressed back against the neck. This has two sub-types:
   (a) Vessels with a single handle (pl. XX, c, d, and fig. 2, 3).
   (b) Vessels with three handles.

4. Small ovoid jug with a tall flaring neck and a long tubular spout (fig. 2, 4).

5. Jar with a globular body, everted rim and two handles.

The most common of these types is the ovoid jug (form 3(a)).

Fig. 2.—Forum Ware from the Lacus Iuturnae in the Roman Forum. Scale \( \frac{1}{4} \)
Each type of body is associated with a different combination of spout constructions and decorative techniques. As these combinations recur fairly consistently, I suggest that they represent stages in a typological sequence rather than the range of products available at one particular time. If the latter explanation were correct, the desire to produce a variety of wares would have to be invoked as the reason for the absence of applied ornament from all the globular jugs and the occurrence of only one example of incised decoration in forty-three ovoid vessels. If, on the other hand, different combinations do represent different stages of development, two observations offer the basis for establishing the sequence. Firstly, the incised motifs usually consist of straight or wavy horizontal lines which both underlie and ignore the scheme of applied ornament when the two occur together. Pots with incised decoration only are thought, therefore, to have been in use before the scales were introduced. Secondly, vessels with pinched rather than tubular spouts more closely resemble the forms associated with sparse-glazed pottery (see below, p. 53) and the earliest maiolica. Pots with pinched spouts are thought, therefore, to be relatively late. The different combinations of forms, spout constructions and types of ornament may be expressed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number of Vessels</th>
<th>Spout</th>
<th>Decoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Tubular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken with the observations described above, these combinations suggest that the principal types of Forum Ware found in the Lacus Iuturnae came into use in the following order:

1. Globular pitcher with a tubular spout and a broad or narrow cylinder neck (type 1). The body is either plain or decorated with combing or incision only.

2. Biconical jug with a tubular or, more often, a pinched spout and a broad or narrow cylinder neck (type 2). The decoration is either incised and applied or simply applied.

3. Ovoid jug, usually with a pinched spout and a narrow neck (type 3). The decoration is usually applied.

The small jug with a tall flaring neck (type 4) and the jar (type 5) perhaps belong to Stage 1, while the most elaborate ornament and the variegated glazing effect occur in Stage 2. The similarity between all the Forum Ware found in the Lacus may imply that the suggested development, if correct, took place rapidly. However, the long currency of the single common type of sparse-glazed pottery (see below, p. 53) warns us against assuming that similar wares are necessarily of a similar date.
It has always been assumed that the pottery from the Lacus was made at Rome, and this assumption is undoubtedly correct. Two of the vessels are wasters, so distorted that they would have been unusable, and several others are 'seconds'.\textsuperscript{45} Forum Ware was not, however, restricted to Rome and fragments have now been found at ten other sites in Lazio and one in north Apulia. Indeed, several of the sherds from north Lazio have a soft pinkish fabric which suggests that Forum Ware was made in at least one kiln outside Rome, where the paste was usually grey. The complete list of find-spots is as follows:

\textit{Lazio.}  
1. Rome  
2. S. Giovenale  
3. Santa Cornelia  
4. Santa Rufina  
5. Ostia\textsuperscript{46}  
6. Deserted medieval site at Grid Ref. 862735\textsuperscript{47}  
8. Do., 876563, 300 m. east of the Via Flaminia at Km. 16.4.  
9. Do., 919609, beside the Via Flaminia at Km. 21.5.  
10. Do., 922559, Grotte Vecchiarelli, east of Veii.  

\textit{Apulia.}  
12. Lucera.

The original argument in favour of an early date for Forum Ware was based partly on its association with eighth and ninth century sculpture in the basin of the Lacus, and partly on the apparent occurrence of glazed pottery with scale decoration at Tharros in the seventh century. However, the first point is inconclusive, because the sculpture might have been old at the time of burial, and the second is incorrect. It is fortunate, therefore, that sherds of Forum Ware have now been found in datable deposits at Santa Cornelia. Here the excavators identified three periods of occupation. Period 1 immediately preceded 2, which consisted of a domuscula, or large mixed farm, founded by Pope Hadrian I c. 780 and probably abandoned by the middle of the ninth century. Thereafter the site was deserted until Period 3, which began shortly after 1100.\textsuperscript{48} Forum Ware was used in both Periods 1 and 2 and it belongs, therefore, to the eighth and ninth centuries, as originally thought. Indeed by the end of Period 2 Forum Ware had already been replaced by sparse-glazed pottery, and it seems likely that production had ceased by the middle of the ninth century (see below, pp. 53–4).

It is clear that Forum Ware had a Byzantine origin. The coarse fabric and the green or brownish glaze resemble the rougher glazed wares found in \textit{Stage I} at the Great Palace and in the earliest deposits at Corinth. The use of applied scales

\textsuperscript{45} Rome, Antiquario del Foro Romano and Faenza, Museo Internazionale delle Ceramiche.  
\textsuperscript{46} Ballardini, \textit{op. cit.} in note 9, p. 143.  
\textsuperscript{47} This site and those which follow were discovered by members of the British School at Rome. Many such sites lack modern names and are identified by six-figure map references taken from sheets published by the Istituto Geografico Militare.  
\textsuperscript{48} I am grateful to Mr. Daniels for information on the site. For notes on Santa Cornelia and other domusculae, see John Ward-Perkins, \textit{PBSR}, xxix (1961), p. 75 ff.; Peter Partner, \textit{ibid.}, xxxiv (1966), pp. 68–78; and Anna Maria Respighi, \textit{Faleria} (Roma, Istituto di Studi Romani), 1961, pp. 10–17.
recalls not only Byzantine Petal Ware but also some of the more elaborate brown-glazed pottery from Corinth. Finally, it is just possible that the variegated finish occasionally found at Rome is an imitation of the mottled effect produced at Istanbul. Thus there is little reason to doubt that Forum Ware represents an extension of the glazing technique from the Aegean area to central Italy. The earliest Forum Ware was manufactured some time before c. 780 and was probably plain. The applied ornament is thought to have been added later, after its introduction in the Byzantine east.

3. Pottery with a Sparse Glaze

Before the middle of the ninth century Forum Ware was replaced in Lazio by pottery with a thin greenish glaze applied to the outside of the vessel in irregular streaks and patches. I have called this ‘Pottery with a Sparse Glaze’ on analogy with similar wares found in Holland. There is, however, no evidence to show that the two groups are related, although both were in use at the same time and a connection is not impossible.

Sparse-glazed ware has a smooth fabric which varies in colour from pink through orange to dull red. Like most of the contemporary jugs and amphorae, sparse-glazed vessels were made from alluvial clay with rare calcareous inclusions and a little mica. The glaze hardly ever covers the entire surface of the pot and it clearly had little practical value. Its colour varies from yellow through light green to brown and it may contain dark green specks. The edges of the glazed areas are brown and the overall effect is usually brownish-green. The surface is often pitted with small ‘pin-holes’ made by bubbles of gas released from the glaze when the vessel was fired.

Pottery with a Sparse Glaze was usually plain. Apart from scattered examples of simple stabbed and incised ornament, the only decorated vessels known to me are a jug with arcs of glaze painted on either side of the body, found during the excavation of the Domus Publica in the Roman Forum, and a jug with relief decoration from Santa Cornelia (see below, p. 54).

Nearly all the Sparse-glazed vessels found to date are jugs. Few complete or restorable examples exist, but the fragments suggest that the only common form had a squat biconical body, with a broad tapering neck and a pinched spout (fig. 3, 1). The neck is usually rilled and the spout may be attached to the rim by a bridge. Other forms, represented by scattered finds from the Roman Campagna, include ‘saucers,’ jars and conical lids.

Pottery with a Sparse Glaze was used in Lazio for a considerable time. The earliest datable vessels come from the Lacus Iuturnae and Santa Cornelia. In the Lacus the only decorated pots which are not Forum Ware are three sparse-glazed jugs. At Santa Cornelia sparse-glazed sherds were found associated with Forum Ware in

---

49 Morgan, op. cit. in note 40, pp. 40 and 181, cat. no. 32 (fig. 28).
50 Dunning and others, op. cit. in note 13, pp. 37–42.
51 Wherever possible, medieval potters in Italy used alluvial clay for the finer vessels and iron-rich quarried clay for kitchenware, a practise described in the sixteenth century by Piccolpasso; see Bernard Rackham and Albert van de Put, Li Tre Libri del Arte del Vassoio (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, 1934), pp. 7–10.
52 Unpublished: Rome, Antiquario del Foro Romano.
Period 2, which lasted from c. 780–850. The numbers of fragments of each type found in the early deposits are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Forum Ware</th>
<th>Pottery with a Sparse Glaze</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the Sparse-glazed pottery from Santa Cornelia is a jug with the scale decoration characteristic of Forum Ware (pl. XXI, a).
It is clear, therefore, that Pottery with a Sparse Glaze was in common use before the middle of the ninth century, and that the earliest examples were contemporary with the latest Forum Ware. The reasons for the change from an efficient glaze like that of Forum Ware to a sparse finish which failed to make the vessel water-tight are obscure. The change occurred, however, at a time when the breakdown of political relations between Byzantium and the Papacy was leading to the progressive isolation of Rome from many of the commercial centres of the east.\textsuperscript{53} Innovations like the yellow and green glazes found at Corinth and Istanbul were never diffused to Rome, and as a result the glazing technique declined. Thus, despite the differences between them, I suggest that sparse-glazed pottery was a local product using a glazing technique derived from Forum Ware.

Sparse-glazed wares were still in use in the twelfth or even the thirteenth century. Sherds are common in Period 3 at Santa Cornelia, which did not begin until shortly after 1100, and they also occur in the twelfth and thirteenth century deposits at Porciano.\textsuperscript{54} However, they were markedly less common in the latest level at Porciano than in the earlier deposits, and in a thirteenth or fourteenth century rubbish pit at Casale Santa Bruna they did not occur at all.\textsuperscript{55} The combined evidence suggests that Pottery with a Sparse Glaze survived until the twelfth century, if not the thirteenth, after which it disappeared rapidly. Its decline was evidently caused by the introduction of more efficient and attractive glazes, the first of which arrived in the late eleventh century. The Sparse-glazed wares of Lazio were, therefore, in continuous use from the ninth century until c. 1200, or slightly later.

4. Green-Glazed Pottery

The simplest type of improved glaze introduced to Lazio to supplement the sparse-glazed wares was a bright green finish which varied in colour from apple-green to emerald. It was applied to vessels with the smooth pink or reddish fabric commonly found among the table-wares of the Roman Campagna, often over an off-white slip. The principal forms (fig. 3, 2–5) are bowls and jugs, but dishes and jars also occur. The open forms are glazed on the inside and the hollow vessels are covered either completely or on the outside only. Decoration is rare and the only examples known to me are a jug from the Forum at Rome\textsuperscript{56} and a fragmentary bowl from Santa Cornelia, both of which have simple ornament in brown.

Green-glazed pottery has been found at thirteen sites in Lazio, distributed from Gaeta in the south to Tuscania in the north. It also occurs in Umbria,\textsuperscript{57} and it was in common use throughout Campania, Apulia and Sicily. Many of the vessels from Lazio are bacini built into the walls of churches, often in considerable numbers. In contrast, very few sherds have been found during the excavations and surface collecting carried out in the Roman Campagna, and the ware is absent from many sites which were certainly occupied when it was in use. Thus, although green-glazed wares were available all over Lazio and in the adjoining provinces, they were

\textsuperscript{54} PBSR, xxxvi (1967), p. 143.
\textsuperscript{55} The medieval Aliano, 5 km. west of Gallese Grid Ref.: 818965.
\textsuperscript{56} Unpublished: Rome, Antiquario del Foro Romano.
\textsuperscript{57} Unpublished: Orvieto, Museo dell'Opera del Duomo.
apparently never abundant outside the towns. If this is an accurate reflection of the
distribution of green-glazed pottery, it is possible that the type was a luxury ware
when first introduced, but was outsold by decorated pottery almost as soon as the
latter came into use in the later twelfth century.

Pottery with a bright green glaze was made in most parts of the Mediterranean
region in the later middle ages. It appeared at the Great Palace during the ninth
century (see above, p. 45) and by the eleventh century it was in use in the Islamic
areas of north Africa and Spain. By the late eleventh or early twelfth century
green-glazed wares were manufactured in Sicily, and about this date they appeared
in peninsular Italy.

The earliest reliably dated green-glazed pottery found in Lazio comes from the
campanili of three churches at Rome: Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, Santa Maria
Maggiore and SS. Giovanni e Paolo. The first of these campanili was built during
the pontificate of Lucius II (1144–5) or Eugenius III (1145–53), the second under
Eugenius III and the last under Alexander III (1159–81). However, although
proof is lacking, it is possible that a bowl from Grottaferrata, 10 mile south of Rome,
is even earlier. This has the same form as some of the ‘Spiral Ware’ bowls found at
Grottaferrata, which belong to the late eleventh century (see below, p. 59, and cf.
fig. 4, 3). Green-glazed ware was thus undoubtedly used in Lazio by the middle of
the twelfth century and was possibly in use before c. 1100. The ware was still being
made in the fourteenth century; more than a hundred green-glazed bowls were built
into the walls of Santa Annunziata at Gaeta c. 1321 and others were set in the
campanile of Santa Maria in Trivio at Velletri in 1353.

5. Spiral Ware

A second type of improved finish introduced to Lazio consisted of spiral decora
cation carried out in brown and green under a thin colourless glaze. Ornament
of this type was applied exclusively to bowls, most of which have a curving side, a ring
base and a plain or thickened rim (fig. 4). The fabric is pink and often bears an
off-white slip. ‘Spiral Ware’ occurs at five sites on the Tyrrhenian coast, including
two in Lazio, and at a sixth site in Sicily (see distribution map, fig. 5). The
sites are as follows:

1. Rome. At least one example is built into the campanile of Santa Prassede.

2. Grottaferrata. Eight fragmentary bowls, including those illustrated here,
decorated with double spirals in brown and green or simply brown. (Grotta-
ferrata, Abbazia di S Nilo).

---

58 G. Marçais, Les Poteries et Faïences de la Qal’a des Beni Hammâd (Constantine, 1913), pp. 9-12, and
59 Green-glazed pottery was made in the same kilns as late eleventh and twelfth century ‘Siculo-
Norman Ware’ at Agrigento and Syracuse; the material from these kilns is at Caltagirone, Museo
Statale per la Ceramica.
60 Alberto Serafini, Torri Campanarie di Roma e del Lazio, vol. 1 (Roma, 1927), p. 209, and J. Tavenor-
Perry, ‘The Marble and Ceramic Decoration of the
Roman Campanili’, Burlington Magazine, xi (April-
September 1907), pp. 209–212.
61 Luigi Cesari, ‘Campanili romanici in Roma,’ Faenza, xiv (1926), pp. 17–24, particularly 22, and
Tavenor-Perry, op. cit. above, p. 212.
62 Adrianio Prandi, Il Compresso Monumentale della
Basilica Celimontana dei SS. Giovanni e Paolo (Vaticano,
63 Nicola Aletta, Gaeta (Gaeta, 1931), p. 111.
64 Serafini, op. cit. in note 60, p. 236.
65 Ibid., pp. 201–204 and fig. 522 A.
Fig. 4.—Spiral Ware Bowls at Grottaferrata. Scale $\frac{1}{4}$
3. Cratere dell’Arso, Ischia (prov. Naples) in Campania. Two sherds of Spiral Ware are among a group of fragments found beneath a lava-flow from the Cratere dell’Arso, the last eruption of which took place in 1301.⁶⁶ (Ischia, Museo dell’Isola).


5. Paestum (prov. Salerno) in Campania. Fragments of at least three Spiral Ware bowls are among the medieval pottery found during the excavation of the so-called Temple of Ceres, together with coins of Constantine IX and Zoe (1042–54), Charles I of Anjou (1266–78) and Guillaume de la Roche (1276–85).⁶⁷ (Paestum, site museum).


---

⁶⁶ A. Rittmann, *Volcanoes and their Activity* (New York, Interscience, 1962) p. 139. I am grateful to Mr. David Ridgeway for drawing my attention to this work.

⁶⁷ A. E. Gunther, 'Re-drawing the Coast Line of Southern Italy,' *Illustrated London News*, 18 January 1964, pp. 86–9, maintains that the site of Paestum was submerged to a depth of 12 feet when the sea invaded the coastal plain in the middle ages. The latest documentary evidence for the occupation of Paestum is 1076, when Robert Guiscard sacked the town. Gunther suggests that Paestum was then abandoned and became gradually 'surrounded by marsh, and so disappeared under vegetation'. However, the occurrence of thirteenth century coins and fragments of Proto-Maiolica (also in the site museum) suggests that the town remained habitable until at least c. 1280.

⁶⁸ Guido Russo Perez, 'Ancora delle Ceramiche Siculo-Normanne,' *L’Arte*, xliii (1940), pp. 119–27, particularly fig. 1.
The date of Spiral Ware is given by the *bacini* from Santa Prassede at Rome. The *campanile* was built during the pontificate of Gregory VII (1073–86), and there is no reason to doubt that the pots were inserted at the time of construction; several have parallels in the tower of S. Sisto at Pisa, and this was begun in 1089. The ware belongs, therefore, either wholly or partly to the late eleventh century. Its origin is unknown. The distribution suggests that it was made on the Tyrrhenian coast and the absence of examples north of Rome, combined with their rarity in Sicily, further suggests a source in Campania or southern Lazio. The decoration has little in common with the small crowded spirals used in a late variety of 'Siculo-Norman Ware,’ the typical glazed pottery of Sicily in the late eleventh or twelfth centuries, and no obvious prototype exists elsewhere in the west. Indeed, the closest analogies come from the Aegean, where spirals formed a distinctive element in the decoration of Byzantine 'Green and Brown Pottery.' At Corinth, for example, large spirals appear on the earliest wares of Group II of the Brown and Green Pottery, which Morgan dated between 1100 and 1125, although most of the coins with which it was

---

**Fig. 6.—Sites that have produced the three types of pottery with plant and abstract decoration**

---

69 Cesari, *op. cit.* in note 61, p. 17.
71 Guido Russo Perez, 'Il Periodo delle Origini nella Ceramica Siciliana,' *Faenza*, xx (1932), pp. 84–103, particularly 90–96, and *op. cit.* in note 68.
associated were minted by Alexius I (1081–1118). If Italian Spiral Ware is, in fact, related to Byzantine Green and Brown Pottery, a plausible context for its development in Campania or south Lazio is provided by the trade relations of the principal ports of the region: Amalfi, Naples and Gaeta. However, the spiral is a widespread motif, and we should be careful not to attach too much importance to similarities which may be fortuitous.

6. Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration

The variety of glazed pottery available in Lazio increased again in the twelfth century with the introduction of a group of wares decorated with buds, leaves and geometric motifs carried out in brown, green and, sometimes, yellow. Examples of this ‘Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration’ from Rome have been known since the last century, but in the past these have been included, mistakenly, with Orvieto Ware in the ‘Umbria and Lazio’ group of Archaic Maiolica (see below, p. 67). In fact they belong to a group of wares with both lead and tin glazes which are distributed throughout north Lazio and are found also in the Umbrian province of Terni. Within this group it is already possible to distinguish three regional variants, typified by the finds from Rome, north-west Lazio and Orvieto (see map, fig. 6).

In this section I am concerned only with the lead-glazed Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration; accounts of the tin-glazed material appear below (pp. 71, 79 and 80). All three lead-glazed variants are closely related. All have a pink or creamy fabric and a transparent yellowish glaze; the decoration of all three uses brown outlines filled with colour and includes coiled leaves and broad green stripes with brown borders; the Rome and Orvieto styles share the use of ‘arcaded’ ornament; and the vessels from Orvieto and north-west Lazio have at least two shapes in common. The characteristics of each variant are as follows:

(i) Rome. I have named both the lead-glazed and the tin-glazed material ‘Early Rome Ware’. Lead-glazed Early Rome Ware has a fine, thinly potted fabric which may be either pale pink or cream. When over-fired, it has a greenish tint and a few grey inclusions. The colours are thin and consist of brown, which varies from charcoal to brownish mauve, drab, often yellowish green and yellow ochre. Brown and green always occur; yellow sometimes appears in addition. The glaze is thin and, on vessels from Rome, often corroded. The commonest form is a jug with an ovoid or piriform body, a tapering neck, pinched spout and a strap handle (pl. XXII and fig. 7, 1–3). Other shapes include a bowl with a curving side, ring base and a narrow flange rim (pl. XXI, b and fig. 8, 2) and a jar (fig. 8, 1).

Three types of ornament are found on the pottery from Rome: plants, geometric motifs and stripes. When the first two appear on jugs, they are placed

---

23 Morgan, op. cit. in note 40, pp. 75–7.
25 The jug illustrated in pl. XXII came into the South Kensington collection in 1889. See also Henry Wallis, Italian Ceramic Art (London, privately printed, 1907), pp. 8–13, figs. 4–6.
26 For example, Mario Bellini and Giovanni Conti, Maioliche del Rinascimento (Milano, Vallardi, 1964), pp. 43–4 and plates 45–54.
27 The bowl is one of the bacini from the tower of SS. Giovanni e Paolo, see below, p. 65; the jar, now in the Vatican Museums, was originally kept in the Sancta Sanctorum of S. Giovanni in Laterano; see Henry Wallis, Byzantine Ceramic Art (London, Quaritch, 1907), p. 10 and pl. xxv, fig. 75.
Fig. 7.—Lead-glazed Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration. Scale $\frac{1}{4}$
in panels, one on either side of the vessel. The panels are bordered by four or five thin brown lines and may have a band of ‘arcaded’ decoration at the top. The plant motifs consist of bulbous flowers or leaves on a coiled stem (pl. XXII). Buds sometimes sprout at intervals from the outer side of the stem. The background is either plain or filled with green. In a more elaborate version of the plant motif, two stems are joined to form a scroll (fig. 7, 2). The geometric decoration consists of broad green or yellow horizontal stripes separated by brown lines; oval motifs; panels of lattice filled with green and yellow dots; and zones of ornament composed of intersecting arcs (fig. 7, 3). Striped decoration occurs only in brown and green and consists of broad green bands with narrow brown borders. At Rome, the stripes are always vertical (fig. 8, 1).

![Figure 8](image)

**Fig. 8.—Lead-glazed Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration. Scale ⅓**

(ii) **North-west Lazio.** The only published find of pottery with plant and abstract decoration from north-west Lazio is a jug from Viterbo. However, small sherds from S. Giovenale may be of the same type and other, more complete, examples are reported from other sites in the region. The jug from Viterbo has geometric decoration carried out in brown and green. Other sherds from north-west Lazio have a rich brownish yellow glaze. The decoration includes green ‘horseshoes’ with narrow brown borders, zigzags, stripes and leaves.

(iii) **Orvieto.** The Museo dell’Opera del Duomo at Orvieto possesses not only a remarkable collection of medieval maiolica (see below, p. 71) but also a group of lead-glazed pottery with plant and abstract decoration. The latter has the same light pink fabric as Orvieto Ware and there is no reason to suppose that it was manufactured outside the town. The vessels are completely covered with a clear yellowish glaze and, as in north-west Lazio, the decoration is restricted to brown and green. The commonest forms are as follows:

1. Cup with a broad carinated body and two circular-section handles (cf. fig. 11, 4b and p. 75).

77 Bellini and Conti, *op. cit.* in note 75, pl. A (right) on p. 47.
2. Jar with a piriform body, flaring neck and a short squared-off rim (cf. fig. 11, 7 and p. 76).

3. Jug with an ovoid or globular body, a tapered or slightly flaring neck and a strap handle. The spout is either pinched and pressed back against the neck or, more often, made in the same form from a folded strip of clay (pl. XXIII, a, b and fig. 9, 1, and 2).

4. Similar to type 3, but with a cylinder neck and a bridged tubular spout.

5. Jug with a small globular body, tall flaring neck, a trefoil mouth and a strap handle.

6. Jug with a globular body, narrow neck, a trefoil mouth and a strap handle (fig. 9, 3).

The carinated cup and the jug with a tall flaring neck (type 5) have analogies in north-west Lazio. The jug with a pinched or folded spout (type 3), on the other hand, recalls the jugs from Rome. In the same way, the decoration of the pottery from Orvieto has parallels both in north-west Lazio and Rome. The cups, the jug with a flaring neck (type 5) and a few of the jugs of type 6 have straight or horseshoe stripes carried out in green with narrow brown borders, resembling the striped motifs from north-west Lazio. On the other hand, the jar and most of the jugs (types 3 and 6) are decorated with leaves on a coiled stem, often on a green background, similar to the plant motifs at Rome. However, they differ from the Roman plant motifs in their use of curving multipartite leaves instead of bulbous leaves and ‘flowers’ (contrast pl. XXIII, a and b from Orvieto with pl. XXII from Rome).

The ornament which appeared on Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration was without precedent in Lazio and, in the absence of eleventh and twelfth century glazed wares elsewhere on the Italian mainland, it is impossible to pin-point the origin of several of the motifs. For example, although leaves on coiled stems were common throughout the peninsula in the thirteenth century, the area in which they were used first is at present unknown. On the other hand, the broad green stripes with brown borders have parallels on Siculo-Norman Ware of the twelfth century; it is possible, therefore, that this motif was introduced from the south. The possibility is strengthened by the occurrence in Sicily of jars recalling the vessel from Rome (fig. 8, 1) and of yellow glazes associated with brown and green.

None of the three groups of lead-glazed Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration can yet be dated with precision. It is likely, however, that one of them, the

---

78 For North Italy, see Giuseppe Liverani, ‘Un recente trovamento di ceramiche trecentesche a Faenza,’ Faenza, xlvi (1960), pp. 31–51; and for Apulia, Whitehouse, op. cit. in note 1.

79 For example, among pottery from the kilns at Agrigento see Antonino Ragona, ‘La ceramica della Sicilia arabo-normanna,’ Rassegna dell Istruzione Artistica, 1966, no. 2, pp. 11–26.

80 Unpublished vessel from Piazza Armerina, temporarily kept at Syracuse, Soprintendenza alle Antichità.

81 Most writers omit to note that much Siculo-Norman Ware is decorated in brown, green and yellow. For example, all the sherds I have seen of the type found at Caccuari (Catanzaro) in Calabria (N. Catanuto, Faenza, xxiii (1965), pp. 35–46) have polychrome decoration.
Fig. 9.—LEAD-GLAZED POTTERY FROM ORVIETO. Scale 1
group from Rome, was already in use by the end of the twelfth century and the similarities between all three groups suggest that the wares from north-west Lazio and Orvieto were roughly contemporary. One of the distinctive features of the Rome group is the occasional use of yellow. The introduction to Lazio of yellow glazes thus provides a terminus post quem for at least some vessels found at Rome. Yellow glazes had been introduced to north Africa by the eleventh century, and by the early twelfth century they were made in Sicily. They were quickly diffused to the mainland of Italy. In Lazio the earliest examples occur not on pottery, but on bricks and tiles. It was customary to decorate the walls of Romanesque campanili with pieces of purple and green porphyry and giallo antico salvaged from the ruins of classical buildings. Beginning in the eleventh century, these were supplemented not only by bacini but also bricks and tiles glazed purple, green and yellow in imitation of the three types of stone. Among the earliest examples of yellow glaze in Lazio are bricks and tiles from the campanili of Santa Maria Maggiore at Rome, which was built between 1145 and 1153 (see above, p. 56), and of the abbey church at Grottaferrata, which was probably re-built c. 1191. The earliest actual pottery decorated in brown, green and yellow which can be dated are a bacino from SS. Giovanni e Paolo at Rome, which is earlier than 1181 (see above, p. 56), and a group of three jugs from the medieval cloister formerly attached to S. Paolo fuori le Mura. The latter were among more than two hundred jugs and amphorae used to lighten the vaulted roof of the cloister; they were discovered when it was demolished in 1905. Although the cloister was not finished until 1241, much of the work was already complete in 1208 and the vessels probably belong to the first rather than the fourth decade of the thirteenth century. The available evidence thus suggests that yellow glazes were available in Lazio by the middle of the twelfth century and that they were already being applied to Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration in 1181. What is not known, however, is whether the ware was manufactured first using brown and green only and, if so, when its production began.

Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration gradually went out of use after the introduction of maiolica in the thirteenth century (see below, p. 67). Thus, at Rome, while the ware sometimes occurs with a milky glaze produced by adding a small proportion of tin oxide to the lead and sometimes with a true tin glaze, it has never been found bearing ornament typical of fourteenth-century maiolica. At Orvieto, jugs of type 6 were never made in maiolica and ‘arcaded’ motifs and stripes were rare. It was only in north-west Lazio that the lead-glazed ware and the maiolica were closely similar. It is probable, therefore, that Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration came into use in Lazio and south Umbria in the twelfth century, when the use of yellow and some of the motifs may have been diffused from Sicily. The wares continued to be made for some time after the introduction of maiolica, but

---

83 A fragmentary dish, similar to the vessel mentioned in note 82, was found under the footings of S. Giovanni degli Eremiti, Palermo, which was begun in 1132; see Perez, op. cit. in note 68, pp. 21-6.
84 Tavenor-Perry, op. cit. in note 60.
85 A. Rocchi, La Badia di S. Maria di Grottaferrata (Roma, 1884), p. 60 and Serafini, op. cit. in note 60, p. 190. In 1964 some of the circular tiles were kept in the abbey museum.
at Rome and Orvieto large-scale production had ceased before the fourteenth century. In outlying areas, such as the north-west Lazio region, it may have persisted longer. Generally speaking, however, it seems likely at present that Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration belongs to the period c. 1150–1300.

**PART II. MAIOLICA**

1. *The Earliest Italian Maiolica*

At the end of the twelfth century a new method of glazing was introduced to peninsular Italy. This consisted of the addition of some 5 per cent. of tin oxide to a modified lead glaze, thus producing an opaque white finish which provided an effective background for decoration. Tin-glazed pottery, or maiolica, was developed first in the Middle East as a rival to the white porcelainous wares imported from China. The technique of making maiolica was diffused rapidly throughout the Moslem world and tin-glazed wares were in use in the Maghreb by the late ninth century and in southern Spain by the tenth. By the fourteenth century maiolica was being produced widely in Spain, Italy and southern France.

In Italy the earliest tin-glazed pottery aroused interest first as the forerunner of renaissance maiolica. Although it has been a subject of discussion since the last century, until recently little material was known from the south and the bulk of the pottery available for study came from north of Rome. The earliest maiolica produced in the north forms a large but homogeneous group, of which Orvieto Ware (see below, p. 71) is often taken as typical. It is decorated with geometric motifs, heraldic emblems, plants and animals, all of which are carried out in brown and green. The majority of this brown and green pottery, which is usually known as 'Archaic Maiolica,' belongs to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Italian scholars, conscious of the leading role played by Italy in the development of renaissance maiolica, frequently attribute a similar role to the medieval potter. In doing this they minimize the scale of foreign influence, although it is clear that the technique of tin-glazing was introduced from abroad and not independently invented in Italy. When, therefore, in 1934 it was suggested that a group of tin-glazed pottery with polychrome decoration recently identified in the east Mediterranean might be the prototype of Italian maiolica, a controversy ensued which was resolved only recently. Here I shall describe the characteristics of Archaic Maiolica and of the polychrome pottery, which was named 'Proto-Maiolica,' and suggest a solution to the problem of their relationship. The key to this solution is the earliest maiolica made in Sicily and southern Italy.

---

87 Through the kindness of the Director, Dr. N. F. Astbury, the British Ceramic Research Association analysed the glaze of three maiolica sherds from Orvieto. The quantity of tin oxide varied between 3 and 5 per cent. I am grateful to Dr. Mario Bizzari, Director of the Museo Faina at Orvieto, for providing the sherds.
89 For example, at Kairouan in Tunisia; see Marçais, *op. cit.* in note 83 passim; and for Spain, Seco de Lucena, *op. cit.* in note 58.
91 Note the high proportion of 'Orvieto Ware' illustrated in Bellini and Conti, *op. cit.* in note 75, pp. 45–54.
(i) Archaic Maiolica. In 1937 Liverani divided Archaic Maiolica into three regional groups: Umbria and Lazio, Emilia-Romagna and Tuscany. Useful as this division was, we now know so much more about the earliest maiolica of north and central Italy that a new approach is possible. We know, for example, that maiolica was manufactured throughout most of the region and that, with the exception of the pottery from Lazio, some of which is not Archaic Maiolica at all, it belongs to a single 'family.' In almost every area the Archaic Maiolica has a soft or medium-hard fabric, which is smooth and varies in colour from pink to pale orange. The commonest vessels to survive are jugs, and these have a tin glaze on the outside and a green or yellowish lead glaze on the interior. The decoration is always brown and green. It includes plants, many of which consist of leaves on a coiled stem, geometric motifs, heraldic emblems, animals and human beings. The scarcity of distinctly non-Italian motifs has contributed towards the opinion that foreign influence in the development of Archaic Maiolica was negligible.

It is not yet known when Archaic Maiolica was first produced, and recent guesses range from the beginning of the thirteenth century to c. 1300. Among the earliest datable pieces of Archaic Maiolica are the tiles in the steps of the high altar of the Upper Church of S. Francesco at Assisi, which belong to the mid-thirteenth century. The earliest actual vessel which can be dated accurately is a bowl of Orvieto Ware decorated with the arms of Charles I of Anjou as King of Naples (1268–72/3). Other early pieces are a jug from S. Francesco at Bologna, which according to Ballardini was built into the church in 1274, and a group of bowls from the campanile of Gaeta cathedral, which was finished in 1279 (see below, p. 81). It is clear, therefore, that Archaic Maiolica was already in use about the middle of the thirteenth century and that it was widely distributed by c. 1280.

(ii) Proto-Maiolica. The first large group of polychrome pottery was found at the Pilgrims' Castle, Atlit, a crusader stronghold on the coast of Israel. It consisted of dishes and bowls with a buff fabric, decorated with plants, sailing ships, animals, birds, fish and human figures carried out in brown and pale blue or 'russet' with, in one case, the addition of red. The pottery was associated with twelfth and thirteenth century coins, most of which were minted by Henry I of Cyprus (1218–53). A second group of polychrome ware was found at Corinth and published in 1934 by Frederick Waagé, who gave it the name 'Proto-Maiolica' and suggested that it was the prototype of the Italian tin-glazed pottery. Although the fabric and the motifs found at Corinth resembled those from Atlit, the colour-scheme was different; it consisted of brown, blue and yellow,
sometimes enriched with orange and green. Coin evidence showed that most of the Proto-Maiolica from Corinth belonged to the thirteenth century, although the earliest pieces were thought to date from the end of the twelfth century.

Proto-Maiolica has since been found on at least ten sites in the east Mediterranean, notably at Gastouni (Elis) and Merbaka (Argolis) in the Peloponnese. The pottery from these two sites consists of *bacini* built into the walls of Byzantine churches which Mr A. H. S. Megaw has shown recently to belong to the last quarter of the twelfth century.¹⁰⁰

The opening contributions to the debate about Proto-Maiolica and its connections with the Archaic Maiolica of Italy were made by Waagé and Liverani. Discussing the sherds from Corinth, Waagé claimed that they were not only identical to the pottery from Atlit, but also strikingly similar to the earliest maiolica from Italy. Proto-Maiolica shared a number of motifs with Archaic Maiolica, together with the practice of using brown outlines filled with colour. The greatest differences were the absence of the buff fabric and the blue decoration from Archaic Maiolica and the absence of Italian jug forms from the polychrome wares of Atlit. Despite these differences, Waagé ended his article confidently: ‘there can be no doubt about the conclusion; the Near Eastern ware was brought to Italy and served as the parent and prototype of the Italian. It was not a matter of mere “influence”, for the resemblance is too close; the actual pots were imported to Italy, perhaps potters too, and closely imitated in all details’.

Waagé’s conclusion provoked a sharp rejoinder from Liverani, who attempted to prove that Proto-Maiolica was not ancestral to Italian tin-glazed pottery by establishing three points: (i) that the two groups belonged to separate traditions, (ii) that the eastern wares were not necessarily any earlier than the Italian, and (iii) that the similarities noted by Waagé might have been diffused from west to east and not *vice versa*.¹⁰¹ Liverani argued the first point by showing that Archaic Maiolica belonged to a group of lead-glazed and tin-glazed wares with decoration in brown and green found over a wide area of the west Mediterranean, which had little in common with the polychrome pottery from the east. He argued the second point by producing evidence for the manufacture of Italian maiolica in the mid-thirteenth century, an argument which falls down in the face of the chronology at Corinth. Finally, he pointed out that Proto-Maiolica was found in areas occupied by the crusaders and that it belonged, moreover, to the period of crusader activity; it might well have been imported from the west. In short, Liverani concluded that Waagé’s case for a direct parental relationship between Proto-Maiolica and the earliest maiolica of Italy had not been substantiated and, although he failed to prove his second point, his general conclusion is undoubtedly correct.

Liverani had mentioned a number of isolated finds of polychrome pottery in south Italy, but he did not pursue their possible connection with Proto-Maiolica. However, as the quantity of polychrome ware known from Sicily and south Italy has increased, its relationship with Proto-Maiolica has emerged more and more clearly. In 1937, for example, Arthur Lane recorded additional pieces, including a dish from

¹⁰¹ Liverani, op. cit. in note 93.
Lucera Castle (prov. Foggia) in Apulia, and claimed that all the characteristics of Proto-Maiolica except the method of glazing were European and not Islamic. He concluded that Proto-Maiolica was probably made in the Levant for sale in the crusader settlements, that it may have been made by European settlers and, if so, that these were probably Italian. More recently large quantities of maiolica with polychrome decoration have been found in south Italy and Sicily. Not only the quantity of the material but also the discovery of wasters shows that much of this pottery was made locally, and in 1950 J. S. P. Bradford asserted that in one region, the Foggia Plain in north Apulia: ‘polychrome wares had taken hold during the first half of the thirteenth century’. A series of excavations carried out in 1964 and 1965 at Lucera Castle provided ample confirmation of Bradford’s claim; maiolica with a buff fabric and decoration in brown, green and yellow or light blue was found in deposits sealed beneath an earth mound piled against the castle built by Frederick II between 1223 and 1240, and abundant quantities of similar wares were found in other thirteenth century levels.

In the present context the occurrence of maiolica with polychrome decoration in south Italy raises two problems: what was its relationship with Proto-Maiolica and how were both related to the Archaic Maiolica with brown and green ornament, found in north and central Italy? The first problem is easily solved: the tin-glazed wares of south Italy are Proto-Maiolica. Scholars have stated repeatedly that Proto-Maiolica forms only a small and exotic element in the glazed pottery of Greece and the Levant. In south Italy, on the other hand, it is common; most of the medieval table-ware were maiolica and most of these had polychrome ornament. Furthermore, many of the types found in small quantities in the east Mediterranean have numerous parallels in Italy. Among the earliest Proto-Maiolica, for example is a group of bowls decorated on the inside with a ‘gridiron’ in a central medallion. Bowls with gridiron ornament occur among the bacini at Gastouni and Merbaka, and other eastern find-spots are Corinth, Atlit, Al Mina and Hama, 80 miles south of Aleppo. Maiolica of this type was made in Apulia; sherds with grid-iron decoration have been found at Dragonara, S. Lorenzo and Salpi on the Foggia Plain, and derivative motifs occur at Lucera Castle. Another type of Proto-Maiolica found in the east is a bowl with a ring base, curving side and a wide flange rim. The decoration is carried out in brown, yellow and blue or green, and consists of geometric motifs, plants, birds and fish. The most distinctive feature, however, is the ornament on the rim, which comprises arcs, intersecting arcs and cables carried out in brown and filled with coloured dots. Find-spots in the east Mediterranean include Corinth, Al Mina, Famagusta in Cyprus and Fostat.

Maiolica of this type was made in Sicily, and I have named it ‘Gela Ware’ after one of the most prolific find-spots on the island.  

It is now certain, therefore, that most, if not all, of the Proto-Maiolica found in the east Mediterranean was made in south Italy, and we are left with the second problem: what was the connection between Proto-Maiolica and the tin-glazed pottery of north and central Italy? As Liverani showed, the first was not ancestral to the second. Indeed, it is likely that they developed independently. Archaic Maiolica belongs to a group of pottery with brown and green decoration found in many parts of the Mediterranean Basin. It occurs in north and central Italy, and it was already in use by the middle of the thirteenth century. Proto-Maiolica is a polychrome ware made in Sicily and south Italy and exported to the east Mediterranean, where the earliest examples occur sometime before c. 1200. The traditional hypothesis about the origin of Archaic Maiolica is that the new glazing technique sprang up in Italy at a number of centres, such as Orvieto and Faenza. Today, however, it seems more probable that the technique was introduced from abroad and was diffused rapidly from the point of introduction. If this is correct, I suggest that the point of introduction was the Ligurian coast. From the eleventh century Pisa and Genoa were two of the most powerful maritime states in Italy, and their widespread trade relations are reflected in the numerous Islamic vessels built into the walls of Pisan churches. Signora Tongiorgi has shown recently that in the thirteenth century Pisa supported a flourishing pottery industry which not only produced an early type of Archaic Maiolica (see below, p. 77) but also exported its products to inland towns such as Florence. It is reasonable, therefore, to suggest that the technique of making maiolica was introduced to north Italy through the coastal cities of Liguria and diffused thence to the more famous factory towns of Faenza, Siena and Orvieto.

A similar mechanism was probably responsible for the origin of Proto-Maiolica in the south. Among the Islamic wares of the Maghreb are bowls with a flange rim and polychrome decoration which includes plants, animals and zones of arcs and cables. These closely resemble Sicilian ‘Gela Ware,’ and I suggest that the glazing technique and some of the motifs found on Proto-Maiolica were introduced to south Italy from the Maghreb. Regional styles developed in Italy, thus explaining the different colour-schemes found on Proto-Maiolica in Greece and the Levant. By the middle of the thirteenth century polychrome pottery was used throughout Sicily and south Italy. The present evidence thus points to the conclusion that the earliest tin-glazed pottery made in Italy belongs to two families, not one: Archaic Maiolica in the north and Proto-Maiolica in the south. Their development followed mainly independent lines and only in marginal areas, such as Lazio (see below, p. 80), did fusion occur.

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Nino Ragona, ‘La ceramica del Periodo della Monarchia Aragonesa in Sicilia,’ \textit{Fenzo}, xlii (1956), pp. 52–6, including pls. XX (b) and XXI.}
\footnote{Luzzato, \textit{op. cit.} in note 73, p. 53.}
\footnote{C. Tongiorgi, ‘Pisa nella storia della Ceramica’ \textit{Fenzo}, i (1964), pp. 3–24.}
\footnote{Marçais, \textit{op. cit.} in note 83, plates XIV, XVII and XVIII.}
\footnote{Another region in which fusion may have occurred is the Abruzzo, but insufficient material is available for us to define the characteristics of its medieval maiolica; see Giancarlo Polidori, \textit{La Maiolica Abruzzese} (Milano, Alfieri, 1949), p. 6, etc., with references.}
\end{footnotes}
2. Orvieto Ware

One of the best-known varieties of Archaic Maiolica is Orvieto Ware from southern Umbria. Although numerous examples of Orvieto Ware exist in museums and private collections both in Italy and abroad, no detailed account of their characteristics has appeared since 1909, when Alessandro Imbert published a short, but valuable monograph.\(^{120}\) As a result of this omission, Archaic Maiolica from all over north and central Italy is liable to be described as ‘Orvieto Ware.’ The following paragraphs offer a summary of what is known about the history of the pottery industry and the typology of the maiolica made at Orvieto between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries.

The town of Orvieto (prov. Terni) is 65 miles north of Rome along the medieval course of the Via Cassia. In the later middle ages Orvieto was a large and prosperous commune,\(^{121}\) and potting was one of the many industries practised there. Between c. 1905 and 1911 a large number of complete or nearly-complete examples of Orvieto Ware were found in the town, mostly by builders clearing areas containing back-filled wells and rubbish pits.\(^{122}\) Because of the scarcity of comparable material elsewhere, these vessels came to be regarded as crucially important to the history of early Italian maiolica. However, Orvieto stood near the southern edge of the area in which Archaic Maiolica was produced and I suggest that it played only a minor role in the development of the family as a whole.

By 1295 the potters of Orvieto had united to form an arte or guild. Individual potters, however, are recorded as early as 1211, and Imbert collected an important series of references to them in documents now preserved in the Archivio dello Stato at Orvieto. In view of the rarity of Imbert’s book, I re-publish the references below:\(^{123}\)

1211 Petrus vascellarius (i.e. potter) of the quarter of Sta Maria paid 27 denarii for land leased from the bishop and 4 denarii for rent.\(^{124}\)
1220 Guiccone vascellarius is cited as a witness.\(^{125}\)
1222 Gualtericetus Johannis Petri vascellarii admits that the tenancy of his house belongs to the canons of S. Costanzo.\(^{126}\)
1223 Tadino vascellarius is cited as a witness.\(^{127}\)
1258 Johannes Johannis Petri vascellarii admits that the tenancy of his house in the quarter of S. Cristoforo belongs to the canons of S. Costanzo.\(^{128}\)
1272–9 Nicolai vascellarii, a resident in the quarter of S. Lorenzo de’Arari, pays census to the canons of S. Costanzo.\(^{129}\)
1292 The same Nicola is registered in the castatum, or inventory of taxable goods, as possessing 100–500 lire of land. Other potters registered are: Iacobus vascellarius et Petrus vascellarius of the quarter of S. Lorenzo, who also possess 100–500 lire, and Guido Simonis vascellarii of the quarter of S. Egidio, who possesses 500–1000 lire.\(^{130}\)
1295 A street, unfortunately not located, is named after a potter who may had a kiln there. It appears thus: via in contrada texani iuxta viam Guidei vascellarii.\(^{131}\)

\(^{120}\) Alessandro Imbert, Ceramiche Orvietane dei Secoli XIII e XIV (Roma, Forzani; an edition limited to 200 copies, 1909).
\(^{121}\) Daniel Waley, Medieval Orvieto (Cambridge, 1952).
\(^{122}\) Imbert, op. cit. in note 120, p. 9 and Domenico Arcangeli and Pericle Perali, Arte de’ Vascellari di Orvieto (Orvieto, 1920), p. 31.
\(^{123}\) I am grateful to Mr. Peter Llewellyn for checking all but the first three of the references.
\(^{124}\) Archivio vescovile, cod. B, cap. 76 and Archivio capitolare, lista di tasse d’allodio.
\(^{125}\) Archivio capitolare, cod. S Costanzo, cap. 3.
\(^{126}\) Ibid., cap. 16.
\(^{127}\) Ibid., cap. 21.
\(^{128}\) Ibid., cap. 155.
\(^{129}\) Ibid., cap. 179.
\(^{130}\) Ibid., s.a. 1292.
\(^{131}\) Archivio comunale, Riformanz i, cap. 30.
From the early fourteenth century the potters were always placed between twentieth and twenty-second in lists of the twenty-five guilds in the town, arranged in order of seniority. It is likely, therefore, that in 1295 they had only recently received their charter. When the guilds were re-organised in the fifteenth century the potters, who had previously been a large and prosperous body, were placed in the fifth and least important division, a clear indication that the industry was in decline. However, it was still in existence in 1602, when the emblem of the vasari appears on a banner of the city guilds, preserved in the Museo dell’Opera del Duomo at Orvieto.

The largest single collection of Archaic Maiolica from Orvieto is also preserved in the Museo dell’Opera del Duomo. While a considerable part of the original collection, including nearly all the more elaborate pieces, has been dispersed, the group still includes more than two hundred pieces. These form the basis of the following account, and I have made no attempt to collect comprehensive information on Orvieto Ware in other collections.192

The Archaic Maiolica in the museum belongs almost without exception to a single type. Some of the vessels are ‘seconds’ and it is obvious that the type was made at Orvieto. Its characteristics are sufficiently distinctive for us to define ‘Orvieto Ware’ in the strict sense of the term, and to recognise examples preserved in collections elsewhere. The fabric of Orvieto Ware is smooth and soft or medium-hard. The colour varies from cream to salmon pink and the only visible inclusions are occasional red and purple specks. The decorated surfaces of the vessels are covered with white enamel and the remainder is lead-glazed. The jugs illustrated in fig. 10, 4 and 5, for example, have an ivory tin-glaze on the outside of the body down to just below the bottom of the decoration, on the outside of the spout and on the handle. The inside of the body and spout and the lower part of the exterior have a lead-glaze. The enamel is of a high quality and it was evenly applied. Unless corroded, it has a glossy finish which sometimes has a metallic sheen. It is either white or ivory, and it may contain a suggestion of pink. Corroded vessels found at Orvieto usually have a matt, off-white surface with yellow-brown patches. The lead glaze varies in colour from sepia to a rich golden-brown.

As on all Archaic Maiolica, the decoration is invariably brown and green. The former colour varies from mauve through brown to charcoal and the latter is usually pale and slightly bluish or grey. The motifs produced at Orvieto fall into the following categories:

1. Abstract
2. Plant
3. Zoomorphic
4. Heraldic
5. Religious
6. Decoration in relief.

192 I am grateful to the Director of the Museo dell’Opera del Duomo for permission to study the material in his custody. For vessels found at Orvieto but since dispersed, see Imbert, op. cit. in note 120. I have in my possession an album of photographs of pottery in the Museo dell’Opera del Duomo c. 1910, most of which is no longer in the collection. It includes vessels shown in plates XXIV and XXV, now in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.
The abstract ornament consists of simple linear elements and complex 'interlocking' motifs (fig. 10, 1 and 4). The linear decoration includes leaf-shaped designs and panels of parallel stripes, all of which have a plain white ground. The interlocking elements, on the other hand, often have backgrounds cross-hatched in brown. The plant ornament consists of feathery or trefoil leaves on a coiled stem, a few "Oak Leaf" motifs (pl. XXIV, b) and plants with a slender stalk, pairs of pointed oval leaves and a round or bulbous flower. The best-known type of decoration is, however, zoomorphic. This consists of elegantly painted birds, fish, animals, human beings and human-headed beasts (pl. XXIV, a, XXV, a). The most common zoomorphic motifs are the birds, which include peacocks and doves. All have folded wings and many carry stalks in their beaks. Some of the human figures and human-headed beasts recall the decoration of Paterna Ware, a type of brown and green maiolica made in the Spanish Levant.133 The heraldic motifs include triangular shields, institutional badges and initials. The religious decoration consists of two motifs which occur exclusively on the carinated cups (type 4), the paschal lamb and the emblems of the crucifixion (fig. 10, 2). The former was identified by Bellini and Conti as the badge of the guild of wool producers, but the banner of 1602 shows that the emblem of the arte lana was, in fact, a bale.134 The decoration in relief was produced by applying small moulded elements to vessels which were then painted in the usual way. The commonest type of ornament consists of a human head flanked by oval motifs variously identified as pine cones or ivy flowers (pl. XXV, b).135 Shields, lions and birds also occur, and the most elaborate examples depict bishops, monk-like figures and the virgin and child.136

The most elaborate examples of Orvieto Ware are now to be seen in collections outside Italy and the pottery in the Museo dell'Opera del Duomo represents only the more utilitarian forms. The most common of these are as follows (fig. 11):

Bowls.

1. Small, with a hemispherical body and a plain, sometimes inturned rim.
   
   (a) Without handles.
   
   (b) With two circular-section handles.

2. Small, with a horizontal flange rim.

Dish.

3. Broad shallow vessel with a straight flaring side and a flange rim.
   
   (a) Without handles.
   
   (b) With two strap handles.

---

133 Joachim Folch i Torres, Noticia sobre la Céramica de Paterna (Barcelona, Publicaciones de la Junta de Museus, 1921).
134 Bellini and Conti, op. cit. in note 75, caption of pl. A on p. 46.
135 For a similar motive, see Guide to the Collections, Bayerisches Nationalmuseum (Munich, second (English) edition, 1967); cover photograph showing wood carving, dated c. 1350, from Berchtesgaden.

I am grateful to Mr. J. Palmer for this reference.
136 For bishops, see Liverani, op. cit. in note 96, pl. 4; for monk-like figures, Imbert, pl. XII, 45 and comment on p. 32; the photograph album mentioned in note 132 contains pictures of a pedestal jug decorated with a Virgin and Child standing in a gothic niche. The whereabouts of this important piece is unknown.
Cups.

4. Shallow vessel with a carinated side.
   (a) Without handles.
   (b) With two circular- or oval-section handles.

5. Vessel with a straight flaring side and two circular-section handles.
   (a) The height is less than half the diameter of the rim.
   (b) The height is more than half the diameter of the rim.

6. As type 4, but with a lobed mouth.
   (a) the mouth is quatrefoil.
   (b) The mouth has eight lobes and the vessel may also have a zoomorphic spout.
Jar.

7. Vessel with an ovoid or piriform body and a triangular-section rim.

Jugs.

8. Ovoid or piriform body, with a broad cylinder neck and a pinched spout pressed back against the rim.

9. Similar to type 8. The spout, however, is made from a strip of clay, the ends of which are attached to the neck.

10. Globular or squat biconical body with a cylinder neck and a large ‘pelican’ spout constructed as on type 9.
   (a) With a globular or biconical body.
   (b) The body has a constriction at the maximum diameter.

11. Globular body with a cylinder neck and a trefoil mouth.
   (a) With a globular body.
   (b) The body has a constriction, as on type 10 (b).

12. Globular or biconical body with a broad trefoil mouth.

13. Slender ovoid body tapering towards a trefoil mouth, with a hollow pedestal base.

The development of Orvieto Ware spans a considerable period, and I suggest that it may be divided into three chronological stages. These are as follows:

1. Early, with plant and abstract decoration.

2. Developed, in which the early ornament is supplemented by zoomorphic decoration, relief elements and interlocking motifs with cross-hatched backgrounds.

3. Late, in which the developed ornament is supplemented by motifs derived from Tuscan and Emilian maiolica decorated in brown and dark blue (see below, p. 82).

This triple division is supported by both the typology and the occurrence of the different types of decoration. I have suggested above (p. 65) that, broadly speaking, the lead-glazed pottery of Rome, north-west Lazio and Orvieto is earlier than the maiolica. If this is correct, it follows that maiolica bearing shapes or decoration found on the lead-glazed pottery is among the earliest tin-glazed material produced. At Orvieto, this early group includes both cups (type 4) and spouted jugs (type 8). They provide a convenient starting-point for a discussion of subsequent developments. These developments are illustrated most clearly by the jugs. Most of the maiolica jugs from Orvieto fall into two categories: (i) vessels with a spout (types 8–10) and vessels with a trefoil mouth (types 11–13). The spouts of group (i) were made in two different ways: from a tube which was pinched and then pressed back against the neck (type 8), and from a folded strip (types 9 and 10). The latter
variety either copied the form of the pinched spouts or was similar, but greatly enlarged. I have named this last type the ‘pelican’ spout. It would be reasonable to suppose that the three types of spout represent a continuous development, pinched spouts occurring before small folded spouts and the pelican variety appearing latest of all. Indeed, it is highly probable that such a development did, in fact, take place. The first two types of spout are found on the only jug which occurs with both lead- and tin-glazes (type 8); the second type occurs on a tin-glazed derivative of this (type 9) and the pelican spout appears only on globular vessels which seem to be a development from the preceding form (type 10). The last vessel certainly displays a number of features which do not occur on the jugs with pinched and small folded spouts, among them the presence of a well-defined groove at the maximum diameter and the use of cross-hatched and interlocking ornament.

The jugs with a trefoil mouth may be arranged in a similar typological order, which again probably represents a chronological sequence. Pots with a globular body and a tall cylinder neck (type 11) are similar to the lead-glazed jugs of type 5 (see above, p. 63) and so were probably made from an early date. Some, however, have a groove at the maximum diameter (type 11 (b)), and these were evidently produced about the same time as the jugs with a grooved body and a pelican spout (type 10 (b)). The pedestal jugs (type 13) were roughly contemporary; none occurs with a lead glaze and some, like the jugs with a pelican spout, have cross-hatched and interlocking ornament. The jugs with a globular body and a broad trefoil mouth (type 12) are probably later, for many of them have decoration derived from the fifteenth century ‘Oak Leaf’ style and the Stile Severo of Tuscany and Emilia.

On the basis of typology, the jugs from Orvieto may be classified as follows:

1. Early: 8 and 9.
2. Developed: 10, 11 and 13.
3. Late: 12.

If each stage in the classification may be correlated with particular styles of ornament, it is probable that the sequence really is chronological. With the exception of types 10 (a) and 11 (a), which carry decoration typical of both the early and the developed stages, a close correlation does in fact occur. The early forms usually bear simple decoration consisting of plant and abstract motifs, many of which were derived from the ornament of the lead-glazed pottery made at Orvieto. Other simple motifs recall the decoration of Archaic Maiolica made at Pisa137 and Faenza,138 and it seems likely that these were introduced at the same time as the technique of making maiolica. The motifs which never occur on the early jugs are cross-hatching, interlocking ornament, animals and decoration in relief. These motifs appear first in the developed stage. I have already said that one of the trefoil-mouth jugs (type 12) carries ornament derived from fifteenth century maiolica in Tuscany and Emilia. Such ornament seldom, if ever, appears on the vessels attributed to the developed stage. Thus all three typological stages correspond to particular decorative styles, and a division of Orvieto Ware into early, developed and late seems to be justified.

137 Tongiorgi, op. cit. in note 117, fig. 3.  
138 Liverani, op. cit. in note 79, pl. XIII.
Having established the stylistic content of each of the three stages by examining the jugs, we may extend the system to include the other forms. The following is a list of all the common types of Orvieto Ware, dated on the basis of typology and ornament:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (a)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (b)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (a)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (b)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (a)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (b)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (a)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (a)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The absolute chronology of the three stages is not yet clear, but scattered pieces of information make it possible to suggest approximate dates. The earliest datable Archaic Maiolica belongs to the middle of the thirteenth century (see above, p. 67). This does not come from the region in which I suggest Archaic Maiolica was manufactured first, and there is no reason to suppose that it is among the earliest maiolica made in the vicinity of the find-spot; tin-glazed pottery may, therefore, have been made in northern Italy appreciably earlier than c. 1250. However, Orvieto is situated near the southern edge of the area in which Archaic Maiolica was produced, and the technique of tin-glazing probably arrived there relatively late. I suggest, therefore, that the beginning of the early stage took place during the generation which ended c. 1250. The developed stage probably began c. 1300, for one of the characteristic forms, the pedestal jug (type 13), was in use at Siena in Tuscany at the beginning of the fourteenth century, three examples being depicted on the ‘Marriage at Cana’ panel of Duccio’s ‘Maestà’, which was painted in the town between 1308 and 1311.\[139\] The late stage was contemporary with the earliest maiolica decorated in brown and dark blue, a colour-scheme which came into use in Tuscany and Emilia c. 1425. It represents the transition from Archaic Maiolica to pottery with brown and blue decoration in Umbria, and it was probably short-lived. In the cases of the first two stages, the suggested dates are late rather than early, and the developed style

\[139\] Siena, Museo dell’Opera del Duomo.
thus appears as the longest; it is certain that future research will enable us to sub-divide it into a series of successive styles. As a preliminary measure, I suggest that the development of Orvieto Ware took the following course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>c. 1250–1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>c. 1300–1425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>c. 1425–1450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Early Rome Ware**

I have said already (see above, p. 65) that the Rome variant of Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration sometimes has a milky finish and sometime a true tin glaze. The tin-glazed Early Rome Ware is almost identical in its typology and ornament with the earlier lead-glazed material. Indeed, it is often difficult to decide whether corroded examples have tin in the glaze or not. An important group of tin-glazed Early Rome Ware was found by Dr Hans Stiesdal during excavations at Pietrapertusa, the site of an abandoned medieval settlement some 10 miles north of Rome along the Via Flaminia. One of the structures excavated by Stiesdal was a ruined sump.\(^{140}\) Mixed with the earth fill of the sump were numerous fragments of jugs and amphorae, many with lumps of mortar adhering to them. The structure had evidently been covered with a mortared vault and this was lightened by the inclusion of pottery vessels. Among the fragmentary jugs were sherds of early Rome Ware, several of which are wasters.\(^{141}\) Most of the sherds are decorated with vertical green stripes with narrow brown borders, reminiscent of the lead-glazed jar illustrated in fig. 8, 2.

The clear derivation of tin-glazed Early Rome Ware from the lead-glazed version shows that in Lazio some of the earliest maiolica was neither Archaic- nor Proto-Maiolica. The new glazing technique was introduced from outside the region, but for some time the Roman potters decorated their ware in the traditional manner.

Early Rome Ware with decoration in brown, green and yellow and an undoubted tin glaze has been found at seven sites in Central Lazio (see distribution map, fig. 6).\(^{142}\) Many of the sherds from surface collections in Lazio which are decorated with brown and green only may also belong to this group, but I have omitted them from the map because they cannot be distinguished from Archaic Maiolica.

4. **North-west Lazio**

A second type of maiolica decorated in brown and green, sometimes with the addition of yellow, was manufactured in north-west Lazio. It has a fairly hard, slightly sandy fabric which varies in colour from cream to pale pink. Overfired examples have a greenish tint. The decorated surfaces of the vessel are covered with a thin off-white enamel. In the case of the jugs, this extends over the whole surface,

---


\(^{141}\) The wasters include Stiesdal, *op. cit.*, above, fig. 22.

\(^{142}\) The sites are: Rome, Pietrapertusa, Porciano, Santa Cornelia, Santa Rufina, Monte Casoli (Grid Ref. TH731090), Torre di Fosso Fontanalonga (Grid Ref. 948602) and an unnamed site at Grid Ref. 902531.
a feature which distinguishes the type from the maiolica made at Orvieto, in which the enamel ceases just below the decoration. The inside of the jugs has a thin lead glaze which may be light yellow or golden brown, and which sometimes contains dark brown specks.

The fragments found to date belong to carinated cups and jugs with a trefoil mouth. The cups closely resemble type 4 of the Archaic Maiolica made at Orvieto, while the jugs, which have an ovoid or barrel-shaped body, were probably derived from those made in the local variant of the lead-glazed Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration.

The few examples of this maiolica are decorated with geometric, zoomorphic and plant motifs. The geometric elements include stripes and interlocking motifs on a cross-hatched background. Among the plant motifs are scrolls consisting of leaves on contiguous coiled stems. The leaves are either feathery or triangular, and they differ from those found on both Early Rome Ware and the lead- and the tin-glazed pottery of Orvieto.

Maiolica of this type has been found at Viterbo and S. Giovenale and other examples are said to come from Tuscania, Santa Severa and Tarquinia. The occurrence of carinated cups with interlocking motifs and cross-hatched backgrounds suggests that the type was contemporary with the Developed Stage of Orvieto Ware, which I have tentatively dated to the period c. 1300–1425. Among the plant motifs are scrolls consisting of leaves on contiguous coiled stems. The leaves are either feathery or triangular, and they differ from those found on both Early Rome Ware and the lead-glazed and tin-glazed pottery of Orvieto. The carinated bowl is decorated with a zone of split palmettes above a second zone filled with fish. The fish, which are separated by schematic leaves, have dotted scales which recall some of the zoomorphic motifs found on the Proto-Maiolica of south Italy.

5. Other Medieval Maiolica

A number of medieval pots from central and south Lazio do not belong to any of the groups of maiolica described above. Some of them are Archaic Maiolica, while others appear to be hybrids between the polychrome pottery of Lazio and either Archaic Maiolica from the north or Proto-Maiolica from the south. Our inability to place such pieces in the general classification of maiolica from Lazio underlines the fact that we know practically nothing of the medieval pottery of the provinces of Latina and Frosinone. Some of the anomalous finds are as follows:

(i) Grottaferrata. The abbey museum at Grottaferrata possesses three pieces of Archaic Maiolica. The first (fig. 12, 1) is a small bowl with a ring base, a curving side and a plain rim. The fabric is pink and has a thin cream slip. The interior is covered with a corroded tin glaze and decorated with a pair of birds facing each other across a schematic leaf. Both the second and the third vessels are bowls with a ring base and a hooked rim. They have a coarse red-brown fabric and a greenish enamel on the interior. The decoration consists of a series of arcs

143 For Viterbo, see Bellini and Conti, op. cit. in note 75, pl. A on p. 47. I am grateful to Sig. Giorgio Ricci of Tarquinia for information on the pottery from Santa Severa.
painted in brown and green. The bowls are without parallel in Lazio and it is possible that they were imported from elsewhere in north or central Italy. A fourth vessel from Grottaferrata appears to be a hybrid. It is a fragmentary dish of a form commonly found in Apulia, decorated in brown, green and yellow (fig. 12, 2). The ornament consists of two dove-like birds with a plant in the background. It resembles the zoomorphic decoration found on Orvieto Ware in the fourteenth century. The vessel thus combines the colour-scheme of Early Rome Ware with a shape usually restricted to Proto-Maiolica and ornament reminiscent of the Archaic Maiolica made at Orvieto.

(ii) Gaeta. The campanile of Gaeta cathedral contains a large group of bacini decorated in brown and green. They are built into the circular turret which surmounts the tower and which was completed in 1279. All the vessels are bowls with a flange rim. They are decorated with abstract and heraldic motifs and several

---

144 Cf. dishes from Lucera Castle illustrated in Whitehouse, op. cit. in note 1. For an early reference to this and other fragments from Grottaferrata, see Wallis, op. cit. in note 76, p. 10 and pl. XXXVI, figs. 76 and 77.

145 Atella, op. cit. in note 63, pp. 124–9; for the dedicatory inscription, see Diego Monetti, Cenni Storici dell'Antica Città di Gaeta (Gaeta, 1872), p. 49.
have 'arcaded' borders. The colour-scheme and the 'arcaded' borders suggest that the vessels may be local hybrids between Archaic Maiolica and maiolica of the type produced at Rome.

(iii) Rome and Pietrapertusa. A similar hybrid tradition is apparently represented by fragmentary jugs from the Basilica Aemilia in the Roman Forum and from Pietrapertusa (pl. XXVI, a). Both vessels are examples of Early Rome Ware with geometric decoration in three colours. Their ornament, however, includes panels of cross-hatching carried out in brown. Cross-hatching is otherwise unknown on Early Rome Ware, and it is probable that the motif was introduced from the north, where it was first applied to Orvieto Ware in the fourteenth century.

The evidence of these scattered finds suggests that during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries potters in Lazio were subject to influences from both the north and the south. The influence from the north was probably the more persistent in the province of Viterbo, the Roman Campagna and at Rome, but it is equally probable that future research in the provinces of Latina and Frosinone will reveal additional evidence of traits derived from the south. Nevertheless, the occurrence of Archaic Maiolica south of Rome and the almost complete absence of Proto-Maiolica north of the city suggests that the influence of Umbria and Tuscany was stronger than that of Campania.

6. Later Rome Ware

This northern influence became even more pronounced in the fifteenth century, when Archaic Maiolica was replaced in Tuscany and Emilia by a group of wares decorated in brown and dark blue, the best-known of which are the Florentine 'Oak Leaf' style and the Stile Severo of Faenza. Both were introduced between c. 1400 and 1450, and Ballardini proposed a starting-date of c. 1425 for the earliest maiolica decorated with blue. The earliest datable examples of dark blue are the polychrome maiolica reliefs made by Luca della Robbia c. 1440 for the Pazzi Chapel in Santa Croce at Florence. The use of dark blue spread rapidly towards the south. Blue occurs in the maiolica floor tiles of the Caracciolo Chapel in S. Giovanni a Carbonara at Naples, and of the chapel built by Pope Leo X in Castel Sant’Angelo at Rome. The first of these was built to contain the tomb of Giovanni Caracciolo, who was assassinated in 1432. It was probably completed by c. 1440 and the tile floor is thought to be original. The chapel in Castel Sant’Angelo formerly contained a floor of tiles bearing the arms of Pope Nicholas V (1447–55). It is clear, therefore, that maiolica

146 Unpublished: Rome, Antiquario del Foro Romano.
147 The only undoubted example of Proto-Maiolica in north Lazio or south Umbria known to me is a fragmentary bowl in Orvieto, Museo dell’Opera del Duomo.
148 Gaetano Ballardini, La Maiolica Italiana dalle Origini alla Fine del Cinquecento (Firenze, Novissima Enciclopedia Monografica Italiana, 1938), pp. 20–5.
149 Charles Seymour Jr., Sculpture in Italy 1400–1450 (Harmondsworth, Penguin Books), 1966, p. 120.
151 Ibid., p. XXII. For other fifteenth-century floor tiles from Rome, see Antonietta Valente, 'La Collezione di Maioliche del Museo del Palazzo di Venezia,' Le Arti xvii (1938–39), pp. 510–13 and pl. CLVIII, fig. 2.
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tiles with dark blue decoration were available in central Italy by the middle of the fifteenth century, and it is reasonable to suppose that pottery decorated in brown and blue became available about the same period.

The new Tuscan and Emilian wares were imitated at various towns in central Italy, first in the traditional colour-scheme of brown and green (e.g. the Late Stage at Orvieto; see above, p. 78), but later in brown and dark blue. Shortly after the introduction of blue, a distinctive type of ornament, based partly on the Stile Severo, came into use in Lazio. Numerous examples of the type occur at Rome, and it is almost certain that this was the principal source of supply. I suggest, therefore, that the name 'Later Rome Ware' is appropriate.

Later Rome Ware has a smooth, fairly hard fabric which varies in colour from salmon to greyish cream. The enamel is thick and evenly applied and the glaze, which occurs on the interior and the lower part of the jugs, is either yellow or yellowish brown. The commonest forms are hemispherical bowls, small carinated cups (cf. fig. 10, 4) and jugs with a pelican spout (cf. fig. 10, 10). The decoration is carried out exclusively in brown and dark blue. It is firmly drawn. The ornament found on the open vessels consists of plants, geometric motifs (pl. XXVI, 6) heraldic emblems and birds. Some of the plants have lobed triangular leaves resembling those found on Orvieto Ware of the Developed and Late Stages, and the geometric elements include interlocking motifs, some of which have cross-hatched backgrounds. The birds have plump bodies filled with blue, and folded cross-hatched wings. Among the decoration found on the jugs are a few applied motifs, including human heads and cones or ivy leaves.

The date at which Later Rome Ware appeared in Lazio is relatively clear for, although the type exhibits numerous features found on the latest Archaic Maiolica made at Orvieto, it was always decorated in brown and dark blue. It may be assumed, therefore, that the ware was developed while the latest Orvieto Ware was still in use, but after the introduction of blue c. 1440. Among the few dateable vessels from Rome is a dish bearing the arms of Pope Calixtus III (1455-58). The ware remained in use until the arrival of renaissance polychrome pottery at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Thus the majority of Later Rome Ware was probably manufactured within the period c. 1450-1500.

PART III. CONCLUSIONS

The glazed pottery manufactured in Italy in the middle ages falls into two distinct categories: lead-glassed wares and maiolica. Both glazing techniques were introduced from abroad. The first came into use in Lazio c. 750, and the second in south Italy and possibly also Liguria shortly before c. 1200. Their chronology is summarized in fig. 13.

The technique of covering pottery with a lead glaze was practised in Italy in the Roman period, but by the fifth century it had been completely or almost completely abandoned. Indeed, the evidence available at present suggests that the technique disappeared from the whole of the west Mediterranean; and while it is

162 London, Victoria and Albert Museum, inv. no. 399-1889.
usually said that glazed wares were produced continuously in the Byzantine east, even where positive information is lacking. However, if a break in continuity did occur, it was short-lived, and glazed vessels were undoubtedly available in several parts of the east Mediterranean by the seventh century.

In the eighth century the glazing technique was re-established in the west. It was diffused from two sources: Byzantine and Islamic. The expansion of Islam along the coast of north Africa and into Spain and southern France ensured that by c. 750 glazed pottery was marketed as far west as Narbonne. Meanwhile the technique of glazing was re-introduced to Italy from Byzantium. The earliest medieval glazed pottery recognised in Italy so far, Forum Ware, was in use at Rome before c. 780. It has a thick green or brownish glaze and is decorated with applied scales, usually arranged in stripes. Both the glaze and the decoration have parallels among the earliest Byzantine pottery from Corinth. Forum Ware went out of use in Lazio in the ninth century. It was replaced by Pottery with a Sparse Glaze, and this apparently continued in production until the thirteenth century. Sparse-glaazed wares are covered with irregular patches of thin yellow-green glaze; they are rarely decorated.

By the end of the eleventh century the sparse-glaazed pottery of Lazio was supplemented by wares with a more attractive and efficient finish. Between c. 1080 and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lead-Glazed Pottery</th>
<th>Maiolica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forum</td>
<td>Orvieto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sparse glaze</td>
<td>Early Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>North-West Lazio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spiral</td>
<td>Later Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 13.—The Medieval Glazed Pottery of Lazio, Chronology, p. 83
1180 three new varieties of glazed pottery were introduced to the Roman Campagna: Green-Glazed Pottery, Spiral Ware, and Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration. The first has a brilliant and even finish. It was probably produced first in the late eleventh century, although the earliest securely-dated examples belong to a campanile built between 1144 and 1153. The ware was still in use in 1353. Spiral Ware belongs either wholly or partly to the late eleventh century. It was probably made in south Lazio or Campania and is decorated with large brown and green spirals. Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration has elaborate ornament carried out in brown and green, sometimes with the addition of yellow. The principal motifs are leaves of a coiled stem, geometric elements and stripes. Three regional variants have been identified to date: Rome, Orvieto and north-west Lazio. The variety made at Rome was probably in use by 1181, and it seems likely that the other two were broadly contemporary. All three variants went out of use after the introduction of maiolica.

While the technique of lead glazing was re-introduced to Italy from Byzantium, maiolica was diffused from Islam. Tin-glazed pottery was used throughout the Islamic areas of the west Mediterranean and in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries it was introduced to Italy.

The earliest Italian maiolica can now be shown to belong to two major groups: Archaic Maiolica in the north and Proto-Maiolica in the south. The first group is decorated in brown and green and the second in two, three or even four colours. Archaic Maiolica was introduced to north Italy from Spain or the Maghreb, probably by way of the Ligurian ports. At its greatest extent the distribution of Archaic Maiolica reached at least as far north as Milan and as far south as Lazio. Proto-Maiolica, on the other hand, was probably introduced to Sicily and the mainland of south Italy from Tunisia. Evidence from sites in the Peloponnese shows that it was already in use in the last quarter of the twelfth century. Its distribution in Italy included Sicily, Calabria, Apulia, Basilicata and Campania.

By the middle of the thirteenth century, two types of tin-glazed pottery were manufactured in Lazio and south Umbria: Archaic Maiolica and maiolica with decoration in brown, green and yellow. Archaic Maiolica was made in a number of towns, of which Orvieto is the most famous. Orvieto Ware was in use for at least two hundred years and it is provisionally divided into three chronological stages. In the Early Stage (c. 1250–1300) much of the ornament resembled that of the local Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration, with an admixture of geometric motifs introduced from the north. The most elaborate vessels belong to the Developed Stage (c. 1300–1425), and these include pedestal jugs decorated with birds and vessels with decoration in relief. In the Late Stage (c. 1425–50) the ornament came under the influence of the earliest brown and blue maiolica made in Tuscany and Emilia. The maiolica with decoration in brown, green and yellow derived its colour-scheme from the Rome variant of Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration. Two regional variants have been recognised: Rome and north-west Lazio. The first, known as Early Rome Ware, is very similar indeed to the local lead-glazed pottery. The second variant, from north-west Lazio, combined the colour-scheme in use at Rome with some of the motifs found in the Developed Stage at Orvieto. In the vicinity of Rome itself, several hybrid wares came into use in the thirteenth and fourteenth
centuries, and it is probable that additional hybrid types remain to be identified in southern Lazio. The hybrid wares included vessels with forms otherwise restricted to Proto-Maiolica and ornament with abundant cross-hatching derived from late Archaic Maiolica.

About the middle of the fifteenth century the various types of medieval maiolica were replaced at Rome by a distinctive ware decorated in brown and dark blue. This Later Rome Ware remained in use until the arrival of the first renaissance polychrome pottery in the early sixteenth century.

David Whitehouse
A LATE FIFTEENTH CENTURY DIVISION REGISTER
OF THE COLLEGE OF CARDINALS

How much revenue did the College of Cardinals receive as a corporate financial
organisation in the late fifteenth century? What was the share of individual
cardinals from the corporate sources of the College?

These are questions to which as yet no answer has been given, though materials
long known to historians of papal finance exist towards answering them. The most
important of these records are the division registers of the College of Cardinals
contained in the series of Vatican Cameral documents entitled 'Obligationes et
Solutiones.' Only one such register (vol. 80 in the series) survives for the late
fifteenth century, while a fuller number are extant for the earlier period, notably
three under Eugenius IV forming a continuous series for the pontificate. These
earlier volumes, some rather different in character, deserve closer study in themselves
and will be used here merely for general comparisons.

While numerous sections of vol. 80 have been studied and printed the register has
rarely been considered as a whole or for what its main original purpose was, namely
to record the cardinals' shares in the service taxes. These are set out in the general
divisions following the record of individual quittances (solutiones) with details of the

---

1 The series (abbreviated below as o.s.) runs from 1295 to 1555 and consists of 91 volumes
(based on K. A. Fink, Das Vatikanische Archiv, Rome, 1951, p. 51). A complete inventory is to
be found in P. M. Baumgarten, Untersuchungen und Urkunden über die Camera Collegii Cardinalium,
Leipzig, 1898, pp. xvi-xxi. Also in Inventario dell'Archivio Camerale in the Sala degli Indici of the
Vatican Archives.

2 The inventory of M. Lonigo printed by F. Gasparolo in Studi e documenti di storia e diritto, viii,
1887, lists another division register under the form 'Eiusdem et Pauli 2 divisionum liber 1.' 'Eiusdem'
refers to Pius II in the entry before (p. 46) and not to Nicholas V, as given by E. Goller, 'Untersuchungen
über das Inventar des Finanzarchiv der Renaissancepapste', in Miscellanea F. Ehrle, v (Studi e testi, 41),
Rome, 1924, p. 241. This would appear then to have been a duplicate of the division register,
listed in the inventory in the same form.

3 The early surviving division registers in the series, vols. 1A, 3, 4, 11, differ from those following in
recording at length the cardinals' shares in the revenues of the papal states and the visitation tax.
How far the cardinals in the fifteenth century still participated in these revenues is a question I hope to
discuss on a later occasion; see P. Partner, The Papal State under Martin V, British School at Rome, 1958,
pp. 138-40, where the question is raised and briefly discussed. A reference in OS. 65 to cardinals
sharing in the revenues of a Dogana del Patrimonio (f. 134 v.) does not seem to have been noted before.

The remaining division registers, dealing almost exclusively with the service taxes, are: vols. 51
(1389-99), 54 (1399-1407), 61 (1413-20), 63A (1442-7), 65 (1428-37), 69 (1437-43), 80 (1460-70).
A few general divisions from these volumes have been printed by Baumgarten, eg. docs. nos. 297b, 323.

4 A good selected list of works on the Obligationes et Solutiones series is given in H. Hoberg, Taxae pro
Communibus Servititis (Studi e testi, 144), Rome, 1949, p. ix, for general works on the service taxes and pp.
xxxviii for documents published. The Bibliografia dell'Archivio Vaticano (3 vols. so far appeared,
1962, 1963 and 1965) lists further items, but is far from being exhaustive. The most important
publications making use of OS. 80 since Hoberg are: L. M. Baath, Diplomatarius Svecanum, appendix,
Acta pontificum sweca, acta cameralia, vol. ii, Stockholm, 1957, prints the Swedish entries; J. Lisowski,
Polonica ex Libris 'Obligationes et Solutiones,' Elementa ad Fontium Editiones, i, Rome, 1960, prints the
Polish entries; W. E. Lunt, Financial Relations of the Papacy with England, vol. ii, Mediaeval Academy of

5 These go back at least as far as the bull Coelestis Altitudo of 1289 (A. Theiner, Codex diplomaticus
domini temporalis S. Sedis, i, Rome, 1851, doc. CCCCCLXXI). For the rules about divisions in
general, see below and Baumgarten, pp. xxxii ff: and A. Clergeac, La Curie et les beneficaires consistoriaux,
Paris, 1911, passim.
date of consistorial provisions and the number of cardinals participating. The study of the individual entries, looked at in general rather than from national viewpoints, as has hitherto been done, could yield interesting results: for example, on the workings of papal government during Pius II’s itineraries. But I propose here to concentrate on the general divisions and their totals.

Before examining the figures in our division register, a brief account of the service taxes and the procedures of consistorial provisions may help to set them in context. Service taxes were paid by patriarchs, archbishops, bishops and abbots on the occasion of their provision, confirmation, or translation by the pope and cardinals in consistory. They consisted of servitia communia, the common services which formed the main sum and were divided between the camera of the pope and the camera of the cardinals, and the servitia minuta, petty services, which were shared between the officials and servants of the pope and those of the College of Cardinals.

Papal provision to major benefices in consistory arose along with the general development of papal reservations and provisions, especially from the mid-thirteenth century. The main stages of this development, from Clement IV’s bull ‘Licet ecclesiarum,’ Boniface VIII’s decrees and further extensions under John XXII, Urban V and Gregory XI have often been described. Alongside this growth of papal control over appointments to major benefices the system of service taxes took definite form in the course of the thirteenth century. The common services were generally assessed at one-third of the annual revenue of benefices over 100 florins gold of the camera. Provision by the papacy essentially replaced election by the cathedral chapter, though the forms of capitular election were still often maintained. Nor did papal provision necessarily preclude the continuing influence of monarchs over appointments: it might even reinforce it, and royal recommendations often preceded actual papal provision in consistory. None the less the growth of the service taxes represents ‘a chapter in the history of papal centralisation.

After the various preliminary stages following the actual vacancy, the first essential step of any promotion in consistory was for a cardinal to prepare a dossier on

---

6 The provisions recorded in the register sometimes go back as far as the pontificate of Calixtus III, e.g. f. 35.
7 A detailed study of the individual entries would require comparison with the other contemporary volumes in the Obligationes et Solutiones series. These are: vol. 76, containing obligations to the College from 1447 to 1461; vol. 78, a volume of quittances to the College almost contemporary with the division register (1460–70) and therefore a good check on the figures there given; also vols. 82 and 83, provision registers starting from 1466 (more or less duplicate volumes), and again a useful check on the dates for promotions given in the division register from that date. Common service payments are also recorded in the Intronitus et Exitus volumes and occasionally in the Mandati Camerali in the Archivio di Stato, Rome.
8 I do not propose to discuss in detail the division of the servitia minuta. Only the share of the clerks of the College is regularly recorded in the register; see below.
9 On the consistorial records for the fifteenth century and later, see Fink, op. cit., p. 61, and above all Sussidi per la consultazione dell’Archivio Vaticano, 1, Rome, 1926, Inventario del Fondo Concistoriale, pp. 203–19. On the volume of consistorial sedulæ in the Vatican Library (Vat. Lat. 3478 for the years 1480–7), see A. Lang, Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte der Steuermark, Graz, 1903, pp. 95–108, and the extracts there printed.
10 A. Gottlob, Die Servitientaxe im 13 Jahrhundert, Stuttgart, 1903. The author tried to establish that the service taxes were an innovation of the pontificate of Alexander IV. Cf. E. Goller, Die Einnahmen der Apostolischen Kammer unter Johann XXII, Paderborn, 1910, with an introductory section on the service taxes.
the candidate and read this to the pope and cardinals.\textsuperscript{12} The cardinal proposer or reporter was expected to examine the fitness of his candidate and extol his merits.\textsuperscript{13} For this service he generally received a fee, the \textit{propina}, one of the many incidental expenses involved in any provision.\textsuperscript{14} The other cardinals present presumably had to give their consent to the candidate. On occasions there was more than one cardinal promoter and some provisions were made by the pope \textit{motu proprio}.\textsuperscript{15}

Following the consistorial provision a memorandum of the proceedings, called a schedule or \textit{cedula}, was given to the proctor or \textit{solicitator} who was to receive the bulls.\textsuperscript{16} This was taken to an \textit{abbreviator} of the major parc in the Chancery who made a copy of the \textit{cedula} and a minute or draft of the bulls. The \textit{cedula} was then taken to the Vice-Chancellor to notify him of the collation made and he signed a copy of it, the counter-schedule, which authorized the various officials of the Chancery to perform the further acts necessary to expedite the bulls. The excellent account by W. E. Lunt makes it unnecessary to pursue here in detail the ensuing procedures through the bureau of scrivors, the custodian of the Chancery (who registered the cardinal's \textit{cedula}), the abbreviators of the minor parc and major parc, the bureau of seals and the registry or discuss the gratuities and fees paid on the way.

Before the bulls were delivered to the candidate or to his proctor, he had to subscribe by oath to a written obligation to pay the common service and the petty services within a given period, under pain of ecclesiastical censure. Procedure was usually by means of a proctor invested with special powers for the occasion, and by the late fifteenth century this was often a member of a banking company. The delivery of the bulls to the prelate was therefore in the nature of a receipt for the payment of his dues, in fact often paid in anticipation by the bankers, who could be refunded if within the allotted term they brought back the bulls undelivered through

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{12}] I hope to discuss the cardinal-promoters of the fifteenth century in greater detail on another occasion. By the end of the fifteenth century it seems that these promotions had become a near monopoly of mainly national 'cardinal protectors': on these see J. Wodka, \textit{Zur Geschichte der nationalen Protektorate der Kardinale}, Leipzig, 1938.
\item[\textsuperscript{13}] On the development of the formal examination of candidates for major benefices, especially from the early sixteenth century, see R. Ricter, 'Die bischöflichen Informativprozess in den "Processus Consistoriales":[Römische Historische Mitteilungen, ii, 1957-8, pp. 204-20. There is also an excellent summary account in L. Jadin, 'Procès d'information des évêques et abbés des Pays-Bas, de Liège et de Franche-Comté d'après les archives de la Congregation Consistoriale,' \textit{Bulletin de l'institut historique belge de Rome}, viii, 1928, introduction. These regular procedures for examining the merits of candidates date in particular from the bull 'Supernae dispositionis' of 5 May 1514, though the origins can be traced much further back. It is not clear in fact if these regular procedures were not already observed in the late fifteenth century; see Clergeac, pp. 188-9.
\item[\textsuperscript{14}] On the \textit{propina} see Lunt, pp. 297-8, and above all Clergeac, pp. 190-2, citing a decree on the rate of the \textit{propina} in the Vatican Library, Barb. Lat. 2892. For the whole question of additional expenses involved in consistorial provisions, see Lunt, pp. 247-79, based largely on documents printed by Mayr-Aldwang in \textit{MIoG}, xvii, 1896, pp. 90 ff., and W. von Hofmann, \textit{Forschungen zur Geschichte der Kurialen Behorden}, Rome, 1914, ii, pp. 209-26. These documents are now in the Vatican Archives, Cam. Apost., Taxae 34. For composition with the Datary on these payments, see Clergeac, doc. XXIII, and Mayr-Aldwang, pp. 91-5.
\item[\textsuperscript{15}] For examples of provision \textit{motu proprio}, see OS, 83, ff. 47 v., 48, 50, 50 v., 51 v., 59, 64 v., 66 v., 67 v., 70 v., 71 v. On f. 39 there is the formula 's.d.n. proprio et in suo consistorio secreto,' and on the same folio 's.d.n per suam signaturam.' On f. 4 is found the common form 'motu proprio de consensu omnium r. cardinalium.' It seems that many of the provisions \textit{motu proprio} were for benefices 'vacantes in Curia.' The relation of the candidate was often performed too by the Vice-Chancellor.
\item[\textsuperscript{16}] Lunt, p. 258 ff., on which most of the following is based. In 1482 Sixtus IV established the college of \textit{solicitatores litterarum apostolicarum}, one of the functions of which was to supervise, at fixed rates, the preparation of bulls of consistorial provision (see Hofmann, i, p. 134 ff.). The bull is printed in full in J. Schlecht, \textit{Andrea Zasmodius und der Basler Konsiliversuch von 1482}, Paderborn, 1903, pp. 125-37 of the documents section.
\end{itemize}
failure of the prelate to carry out his obligation. Generally three copies of the bulls of provision were expedited: to the prelate, to the king and to the archbishop. The quittance of the prelates was entered in the 'Libri Solutiones' of the College and of the Camera Apostolica, as well as in the 'Introitus et Exitus' volumes.

The dates and totals of the general divisions are given in Table 1. The statutes of the College of 1437\textsuperscript{17} decreed that divisions should normally take place every two months. In 1466\textsuperscript{18} the interval was allowed to be shortened if so required by the College. The table shows that although there is some degree of system in the times of the divisions (notably around 1466–7) they are on the whole fairly haphazard, and this is perhaps even truer of the earlier division registers. This is particularly noticeable in a year of political disturbance such as 1434, when Eugenius IV was forced to leave Rome for Florence along with many of the cardinals; eight divisions are recorded during the year. Or in 1439, the time of the Council of Florence, when eight divisions were again recorded. The volume covering the Council of Constance also shows frequent general divisions and divisions 'ad partem' made 'pro necessitatibus eisdem iminentibus.'\textsuperscript{19}

Owing to the absence of cardinals on legations, the creation of new cardinals and the deaths of others, the number who were present at any one provision and particularly in any one general division, also varied considerably, as the Table shows. The number of cardinals participating in the general divisions in the mid 1430s was sometimes as low as five, whereas after the creations of 18 December 1439 as many as twenty-one living and thirteen dead cardinals participated.\textsuperscript{20}

Present at the divisions were normally the camerarius sacri collegii,\textsuperscript{21} the two clerks of the College,\textsuperscript{22} and the depositarius sacri collegii,\textsuperscript{23} or whoever else was made to attend by the camerarius.\textsuperscript{24} It does not seem that the Camera of the College had a fixed

\textsuperscript{17} Printed in Baumgarten, pp. lxxviii–xci.
\textsuperscript{19} The 'reformationes et additiones officii camerariatus' (in Eubel, ii, pp. 67–8, from the present Fondo Concistoriale, Acta Viccancellarii 1) refer to four divisions a year, but the statutes of 1514 (Eubel, iii, pp. 93–6) repeat the provisions of 1466. After further fluctuations, a decree of 1546 (cited in Clergeac) fixed four annual divisions at Christmas, Easter, The Nativity of St. John the Baptist and All Saints Day.
\textsuperscript{20} OS. 65, ff. 201–15 and 69, ff. 55 v.–71 v.; see also Baumgarten, doc. 300.
\textsuperscript{21} Eubel, ii, pp. 7–9. For new cardinals created during the period of the division register, see Eubel, ii, pp. 13–16.
\textsuperscript{22} For this official, in charge of the business of the Chamber of the College, see Baumgarten, p. xliii ff.; and for a list of camerarii for the period of the division register, Eubel, ii, p. 69 and the extracts there printed from Vat. Arch. Arm. XXXI, 52, for the exact dates of appointments. The office was an annual one and as the statutes of 1466 say was to be exercised 'per omnes et singulos reverendissimos dominos cardinales vicissim.'
\textsuperscript{23} Baumgarten, p. liii ff. No list of the clerks of the College for the late fifteenth century exists, but some can be picked out from Eubel's notes. For the sixteenth century Eubel, iii, gives fuller details (pp. 96–100). The clerks for the period 1460–70 were Nicolo di Bonaparte, until 1468 when he became a clerk of the Apostolic Camera, Gabriel Rovira, and from 1468 Jeronimus Junius.
\textsuperscript{24} To the right of the table of general divisions are given the receipts of the clerks of the College as recorded in the register. According to the statutes of 1437 and 1466 they were entitled to 1 florin in every 100 received by the Cardinals and our figures show that this rule was generally adhered to. Attendance in consistory was a necessary qualification for a share in the service taxes for the clerks as for the cardinals.
# A REGISTER OF THE COLLEGE OF CARDINALS

## TABLE 1: OBLIG. ET SOL. 80. GENERAL DIVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>V.</th>
<th>M.</th>
<th>Summa Divisa.</th>
<th>Clerici Collegii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29–29 v.</td>
<td><strong>12 April 1460</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,582</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36–36 v.</td>
<td><strong>14 Aug. 1460</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,943</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39–39 v.</td>
<td>8 Sept. 1460</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,117</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42–42 v.</td>
<td>6 Dec. 1460</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,948</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–45 v.</td>
<td>15 Jan. 1461</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–50 v.</td>
<td>29 April 1461</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,465</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54–55</td>
<td>6 July 1461</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,061</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58–59 v.</td>
<td>28 Oct. 1461</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64–65</td>
<td>22 Feb. 1462</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,296</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 v.–72 v.</td>
<td>3 May 1462</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,539</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80–81</td>
<td>3 Jan. 1463</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,140</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 v.–87</td>
<td>21 March 1463</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,398</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94–95</td>
<td>30 June 1463</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,455</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 v.–102</td>
<td>1 Nov. 1463</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,521</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105–106</td>
<td>8 Jan. 1464</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,316</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112–113</td>
<td>15 June 1464</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,956</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 v.–122</td>
<td>1 Nov. 1464</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,932</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124–124 v.</td>
<td>31 Dec. 1464</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,253</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 v.–129</td>
<td>31 March 1465</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,153</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130–131 v.</td>
<td>10 April 1465</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,153</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133 v.–134</td>
<td>8 June 1465</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,554</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140–141</td>
<td>1 Nov. 1465</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,847</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144–144 v.</td>
<td>24 Dec. 1465</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,192</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148–148 v.</td>
<td>5 March 1466</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,394</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 v.–152</td>
<td>5 May 1466</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,713</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155–155 v.</td>
<td>30 June 1466</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6,216</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159–159 v.</td>
<td>31 Aug. 1466</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,822</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162–162 v.</td>
<td>31 Oct. 1466</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,326</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165–165 v.</td>
<td>31 Dec. 1466</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,229</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169–170</td>
<td>31 March 1467</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170–174 v.</td>
<td>30 June 1467</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178 v.–179</td>
<td>31 Oct. 1467</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183–184</td>
<td>31 Dec. 1467</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,856</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188 v.–189</td>
<td>17 March 1468</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,168</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194–194 v.</td>
<td>28 June 1468</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,551</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197 v.–198</td>
<td>14 Aug. 1468</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,259</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202 v.–203 v.</td>
<td>6 Dec. 1468</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,386</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206–207</td>
<td>6 Jan. 1469</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,047</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215–216 v.</td>
<td>8 June 1469</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3,740</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 v.–221 v.</td>
<td>8 Sept. 1469</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,199</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225–225 v.</td>
<td>1 Jan. 1470</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,140</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = Division at Siena. For the rest of the register, at Rome.
* = Summa dividenda, not divisa which is not given for these entries.

Columns of cardinals sharing in divisions:—

V. = cardinales viventes
M. = cardinales mortui. They are not always very clearly distinguished, hence the brackets for some figures.
TABLE 1: OBLIG. ET SOL. 80. GENERAL DIVISIONS—ANNUAL TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Divisions</th>
<th>Fl.</th>
<th>Sol.</th>
<th>Den.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1460</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24,591</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1461</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19,362</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1462</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,836</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1463</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29,829</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1464</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24,181</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1465</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31,569</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29,702</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1467</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13,326</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1468</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17,365</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1469</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,986</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1470</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,410</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>217,161</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Average*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21,716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculated throughout on the basis of 1 florin = 50 solidi
1 solidus = 12 denarii

No account has been taken of fluctuations in the value of currency.

* On the basis of ten years, i.e. adding 1460 to 1470. There may be an unrecorded division for 1460 before the entries of the register begin.

Throughout, the distinction between summa divisa and summa dividenda has been ignored, but the entry summa divisa has been used when available (v. Table 1). The differences are not generally large, 500 florins at the very most for a single division. The totals are therefore a slight overestimate.

location at the period of the register and as late as 1514 the divisions were to take place ‘in domo camerarii vel ubi ipse deputaverit.’

In view of the activity of the bankers in all the procedures of papal finance in the late fifteenth century, it would be of fundamental interest to define the precise functions of the depositarius of the College, especially in the general divisions, but the subject remains tantalizingly obscure. The importance of the links between individual cardinals and the banking companies, while it has often been acknowledged, awaits detailed study.

35 For the location of the Camera of the College and its archives see Baumgarten, p. xiii, and now the important article of R. Ritzler, ‘Per la storia dell’ Archivio del Sacro Collegio,’ in Mélanges Tisserant, (Studi e Testi, 235) Rome, 1964, v, pp. 299–338. The archives of the college were not properly established as an institution until Urban VIII.

36 Eubel, iii, p. 95.

37 See, for example, the accounts of individual cardinals with the Medici as revealed by R. De Roover, The Rise and Decline of the Medici Bank, Harvard, 1963, pp. 204 ff., 215. On Cardinal Bainbridge and his relations with bankers in the early sixteenth century, see D. S. Chambers Cardinal Bainbridge in the Court of Rome, Oxford, 1965, p. 129: ‘Like many other cardinals, it seems that Bainbridge ran his economy largely on credit.’ Clergeac, p. 30, gives a few instances of cardinals assigning their share from the service taxes to bankers to pay off their debts, e.g. Pietro Barbo to Antonio della Casa v. doc. no. viii printed in the Appendix. Eubel, ii, note 458, gives an example from 1483: ‘Et die Dominica proxime praecedentis mandavit mihi Jeronimo (clericus s. collegii) idem dominus Andegavensis, quod omnes cedulas divisionem suarum debere dire societatis de Martellis, quae suae dominationi servivit de certis quantitate pecuniarum.’ Also ibid. note 455, where the cardinal of Aragon, leaving on a legation, instructs the clerk of the College ‘ut cedulas suarum divisionem dare societati olim de Rabatis et nunc de Martellis in deductionem suorum debitorum.’
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The intervention of bankers is recorded on several occasions in the general divisions of the register, though the exact nature of all these entries remains unclear. There is, for example, often mention of sums of money used for a variety of purposes being subtracted in equal shares from the proceeds of individual cardinals in the divisions before the remainder is shared out. On ff. 87 and 84 v., a part of the cardinals’ revenues seem to be assigned ‘pro oratoribus Rodi pro emendo frumentum’, the Medici acting as intermediaries. The same banking house appears on ff. 42, 42v., 64, 64 v., 71 v., 72, 72 v., 80, and along with Ambrogio de Spanocchis on f. 64 and on f. 101 v. with Alexander de Bardis. In the same division there is mention of Ludovicus de Ludovisis, an auditor s. palatii, being given a sum of money. Perhaps most interesting of all are the payments made to Thomas, the Despot of Morea, already known to us from other sources. The sums involved throughout are not large.

The shares of individual cardinals in the general divisions are set out in Table 2. It was a long established rule that only cardinals present in consistory when a provision was made participated in the revenue of that particular provision. Cardinals absent on legations ceased to have a share, unless by special concession. The consistorial diary printed by Eubel records in detail such absences and any concessions made to individual cardinals. Clergeac, analysing these entries, notes some concessions before 1450; a strict period of enforcement of the rules 1450–70; followed by a general relaxation, except for cardinals absent within the papal states. There were in fact very few concessions during the period of the division register; there were two partial concessions to legates in France, and some exceptions were made for cardinals escaping the plague or absent at nearby baths for reasons of health. A newly created cardinal normally participated only after the ceremony of ‘aperitio oris’. The procedure for the shares of dead cardinals also underwent considerable fluctuations. The cardinales mortui are nearly always

28 Cf. von Hofmann, ii, p. 23, 28. The intervention of the bankers is often clearer in the earlier division registers, which are generally fuller in marginal entries and comments. See, for example, the extracts from OS. 61 printed in Baumgarten.
30 The division record registers on f. 101 v. ‘Item flor. XVIII pro rata de flor. CCLLDati d. despot. Amoroe et C clericens collegii divisio inter XXV (18 × 25 = 450). On f. 72 ‘flor. XXXIII sol. III d. VII pro rata contingente uniusquisque istorum dominorum cardinalium de flor. VIIºL quos habuit dominus despotus de banco de Medicis inter XXII cardinales divisio’ (32 × 22 = 720 i.e., + the rest = 750).
31 See Baumgarten, p. xxxiii ff.
32 See the statutes of 1466: ‘quod legati de latere in eorum absintia de communibus et minutis servitis nullo modo participant.’
34 Clergeac, p. 126.
35 Eubel, ii, notes 253 and 255.
36 Eubel, ii, notes 203 and 251. Many of the consistorial provisions recorded in the register were made at places where Pius II was staying for similar reasons, e.g. Tivoli and Petriolo. Pius II’s Commentaries, pp. 392–405, 671.
37 Eubel, ii, note 246, an exception for three cardinals created 15 Nov. 1467 ‘non obstante stilo et consuetudine s. collegii de non participando nisi a die aperitio oris.’ For this ceremony in general, see G. Molland, ‘Contribution à l’histoire du Sacré Collège de Clément V à Eugène IV,’ Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique, xlvi–vii, 1951–2, pp. 44–5.
38 See Cameron, pp. 1–11, for some interesting remarks on the subject. For the special case of Nicholas de Cusa (see eg. f. 95), the entry in the division register is now printed and discussed in E. Meuthen, Die letzten Jahre des Nikolaus von Cues, Köln, 1958, doc. LXXXV, pp. 289–90.
grouped together in the general divisions towards the end; but while there are occasional special notes on the assignment of the money, there is no trace in the register of the pope having a share. 88

What general significance have the figures here established? An attempt may first be made to estimate the proportion of total papal revenues which went to the College of Cardinals.

The problems of establishing a complete annual balance-sheet of papal receipts and expenditure for the late fifteenth century are well known. 89 Confining oneself to estimates of revenue from the service taxes or more broadly from the 'spiritualia' in general, the average total annual sum from the service taxes, according to the figures in the register, doubling the cardinals' receipts, was about 43,000 florins in the period 1460–70, with considerable fluctuations from year to year, as shown in Table 3. 40 The fact of wide variations is perhaps reflected in the form of the estimate made in the balance-sheet printed by Gottlob: 'Spiritualia tanto dannate quanto di communi si puo ragione luno anno per laltro duc. 60,000'. Bauer thought this total 'senz'altro calcolata troppo alta,' for in the balance-sheet of 1480–1 which he printed the 'spiritualia' (anates + common services) came to 42,000 ducats. In 1525 the estimate was 50,000. It would be hazardous to make a firm choice between these estimates on the basis of our evidence for a ten-year period, but adding the receipts from anates, presumably less than from the service

88 f. 122, note at the foot: 'pecunie de post mortem d. de Columpna et Ruteni usque ad hanc divisionem inclusiva fuerunt date per me Gabrielem Rovira et cedulae eorum Rmo. dno. Niceno exequoratorium testamentorurum eorundem.' Cf. f. 131, a long note on the division of the proceeds of card. Aquiligianis shared out between 16 cardinals (named) each receiving 32 fl. 8 sol. 10d. and on a sum of money given 'executoribus ipsius domini Aquilegensis.' And on f. 179 a note: 'Dominus N. (Nicholas de Bonaparte?) habuit omnes cedulas mortuorum usque in hanc divisions inclusur.'

The register also includes three sections headed 'De Emolumento sigilli' giving the receipts from the seal of the College and their distribution. The totals are ff. 184 v.–185 v.: Summe sigilli 150 fl.; ff. 207–208 v., Summe sigilli 159 fl.; ff. 226, 21 cardinals each receiving 6 fl. 9 sol. 6d.

89 A. Gottlob, Aus der Camera Apostolica des XV Jahrhunderts, Innsbruck, 1889, remains the fundamental general guide, but a modern work is badly needed. There has been nothing comparable in papal historiography to the fresh work on the history of the later medieval English Exchequer, although the materials are not less plentiful. A late fifteenth century 'budget' of papal revenues is published in Gottlob, pp. 253–5, from the Carte Strozzi, Florence. This and the budget of 1480–1 printed by C. Bauer in Archivio della Società romana di storia patria, 1, 1927, pp. 319–400 are discussed by P. Partner in Italian Renaissance Studies, ed. E. F. Jacob, London, 1960, pp. 256–78, where a budget for 1525 from Vat. Arch. Arm. XXXVII, 27, is printed in extract.


I have found an unpublished summary papal 'budget' of 1500 in Vat. Arch. Arm. XXXIV, 11, ff. 233–7, entitled 'Information super Thesaurium generale S. D. N.'

For valuable information and documents for the papal budget under Sixtus IV, see E. Müntz, Les arts à la cour des Papes pendant le XV° et XVI° siècle, Paris, 1878–82, vol. iii, pp. 60–5.

40 The papal part of the service taxes came, from the late fifteenth century, to be assigned to various officials of the Curia, notably the colleges of offices from Sixtus IV onwards. Clergeac, pp. 119 ff., largely with reference to a MS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris lat. 12576.

It is not entirely clear if the spiritual revenues assigned to creditors of the papal Camera under Innocent VIII included the service taxes or not. See document in Clergeac, no. XV. And also E. Müntz, Les arts à la cour des Papes Innocent VIII, Alexandre VI, Pie III, Paris, 1896, pp. 41–2, from Vat. Arch. Diversa Cameralia 1491–2, vol. 48, ff. 138 v.–140 v. Further documents on these assignments exist in other sources, e.g. OS. 79A (an out of series volume of miscellaneous camerai material).
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taxes but not negligible, to the total of 43,000 florins calculated as above, Gottlob’s figure does not appear so unduly off the mark. In Gottlob’s balance-sheet total papal receipts from all revenues given were estimated at 260,000 ducats. Following on Bauer’s printed budget, Partner estimates income under Sixtus IV at 290,000 ducats, about 90,000 in ‘spiritual revenues.’ Cardinals’ corporate revenues, at least from the service taxes, may thus be tentatively said to represent about a tenth of total papal receipts.

What was the relation of receipts of individual cardinals from the service taxes to their revenues as a whole?

Again, in the present state of our knowledge and in view of the very partial nature of the sources, it would be rash to give a firm answer, but some indications of scale may be attempted.

Looking first at individual income from collective sources, the cedula of the revenue of the College for 1498 has the entry: Rmi. Dni. Cardinales viventes pro maiore parte capiunt pro quodlibet flor. DCCCIIIIII s. XX, i.e. about 900 florins a year. D. S. Chambers, basing himself on the annual takings of Cardinal Fieschi from the distribution of common service from 1504 to 1520, also estimates an average of 900 ducats a year.

The figures show that the annual takings under Pius II and Paul II could be slightly higher for many cardinals who were frequently present in consistory. One of the most frequent participants was Guillaume d’Estoutville, whose average annual receipts in the division register come to about 1,000 florins. In 1460, seventeen cardinals received over 1,000 florins: the corresponding figures for the following years were 1461 (seventeen); 1462 (none, only two divisions); 1463 (twenty-two); 1464 (nineteen); 1465 (sixteen); 1466 (seventeen) 1467 (none); 1468 (none); 1469

---

41 Compare the figures in Lunt, pp. 305–433, admittedly not perhaps typical, for receipts from the two taxes. Work is being done by Emile Brouette on the Belgian entries from the ‘Libri Annatarum’ from Eugenius IV to Alexander VI, following that by F. Baix, La Chambre Apostolique et les ‘Libri annatarum’ de Martin V, Brussels-Rome, 1947. One volume for the later period has so far been published (Analecta Vaticano-Belgica, vol. xxiv 1963) and when the series is complete it will be a useful means of comparison with the findings of U. Berlière on the common services.

42 A few comparisons may here be made with the totals in the earlier division registers. In the earliest of all, OS. 1A, as examined by F. Baethgen, ‘Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der papalische Hof- und Finanzverwaltung unter Bonifatius VII, QRS, xx, 1928/9, pp. 114–95, following on the work of Kirsch and Baumgarten, the estimated revenue from the service taxes was 25,616 florins in 1299 and 14,492 in 1302.

For the pontificate of Eugenius IV, I estimate average annual receipts in the three division registers at about 18,000 florins (a total of roughly 280,000 florins for the pontificate in eighty-nine recorded divisions over sixteen years). Calculated from OS. 65, 69, 68A.

43 J. Korzeniowski, Excerpta ex libris Archivi Consistorialis, Cracow, 1890, p. 43, from what is now Fondo Concistoriale, Acta Vicecancellarii I.

44 VAT. Arch., Fondo Sacro Collegio dei Cardinali, Libri Cedularum et Rotolorum, I, the first in a series that seems to constitute a continuation of the fifteenth century division registers, but this volume concerns the receipts of only one cardinal. For this series s. Fink, p. 64, and Ritzler in Mélanges Tisserant.

Fieschi’s accounts show wide variations, e.g. 1,489 ducats in 1517 and only 407 in the following year. Information from a forthcoming article by D. S. Chambers, ‘The Economic Predication of Renaissance Cardinals,’ where the receipts of Fieschi are tabulated in an Appendix. In some accounts of Cardinal Giulio de Medici for 1521–2, his average receipts from the service taxes were quoted as about 700 ducats a year. Archivio di Stato, Florence, Carte Strozziene, Prima Serie X, f. 299, cited by Chambers. (See Postscript below, p. 96).

45 Under Eugenius IV, Cardinal Domenico Capranica’s receipts from 1437 to 1447 averaged about 1,241 florins per year (counting florins only), with receipts above 2,000 in 1438 and 1439, years of frequent divisions and few participations. For some sixteenth-century figures of variations in cardinals’ revenues from the service taxes, see Clergeac, p. 130, dealing with the divisions of 1541 and 1542.
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Chamber's article on the promotions of 1517 as an explanation of the fall in Fieschi's receipts. The large increases in the numbers of the College in the later fifteenth century date from Sisitx IV.

U. Mannucci, 'Le capitolazioni del Conclave di Sisto IV, 1471,' Römische Quartalschrift, xxix, 1915, pp. 73-90.


Vat. Arch. Arno. XI, 88, f. 6; M. Sanuto, Diari, Venice, 1879-1903, xxxiii, 440. Both references from the article by Chambers, where further estimates are given.

For a useful collection of references to these, see the works of E. Rodocanachi, La première Renaissance: Rome au temps de Jules II et Léon X, Paris, 1912. The Chapter on 'Luxes et richesses des cardinaux' gives a documented statement of what may be termed the traditional view of the scale of cardinals' revenues. Also idem, Histoire de Rome: Le pontificat de Léon X, 1513-21 [Paris], 1928, especially p. 170 ff. The material evidence of palaces, artistic patronage, tombs, etc. is not of course to be overlooked in any balanced estimate, but admittedly this evidence is not easy to assess.

See Chambers' article and his book on Cardinal Bainbridge, where he estimates his income at about 8,000 to 9,000 ducats.

For wide variations in income, see the contributions of the cardinals to a crusading tax of Alexander VI, supposedly based on a tenth of their income, as related by Burchard. The totals are tabulated by Delumeau, op. cit., vol. i, pp. 451-2, but must obviously be treated with the utmost caution.

Postscript.

The article of D. S. Chambers cited above (note 44) has now appeared in Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History, vol. iii, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1966. The figure there given as the total for 1466 (p. 297, note 41) is an error and should be 29,702 florins. A better year for receipts was 1465 with a total of 31,560 florins from 5 divisions.
## TABLE 2: GENERAL DIVISIONS—RECEIPTS OF INDIVIDUAL CARDINALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruthenus</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>*116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estouteville</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Sixti</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquilegiensis</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursinis</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avionensis</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduensis</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bononiensis</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Marci</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamoensia</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS. Quattuor C.</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Anastasiae</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columna</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>*41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Nicolai or Vicecancellius</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicenus</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Petri</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reatinus or S. Crucis</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senensis or S. Eustachii</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoletanus or S. Sabinæ</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theanensis or S. Ceciliae</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Susannae</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisco</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papiensis</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Angelii or Portuensis</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constanciensis</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantuanus</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alebrato</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albienis or Atrebatensis</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Is used throughout to indicate receipts for a dead cardinal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cardinals</th>
<th>1.11. 1463</th>
<th>8.1. 1464</th>
<th>15.6. 1464</th>
<th>31.12. 1464</th>
<th>31.3. 1465</th>
<th>10.4. 1465</th>
<th>8.6. 1465</th>
<th>1.11. 1465</th>
<th>24.12. 1465</th>
<th>5.3. 1466</th>
<th>5.5. 1466</th>
<th>30.6. 1466</th>
<th>31.8. 1466</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruthenus</td>
<td>*50</td>
<td>*2</td>
<td>*2</td>
<td>*19</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>*31</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>*4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estouteville</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Sixti</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquilegiensis</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>*13</td>
<td>*17</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursinian</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avinionensis</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduensis</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bononensis</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Marci</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamorensis</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS. Quattuor C.</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Anastasias</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columna</td>
<td>*14</td>
<td>*2</td>
<td>*4</td>
<td>*18</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>*31</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>*3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Nicolai or Vicecancellarius</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicenus</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Petri</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>400×2</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*37×2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>*31</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>*5</td>
<td>*17</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reatinus or S. Crucis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senensis or S. Eustachii</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoletanus or S. Sabinae</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theanensis or S. Ceciliae</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Susannae</td>
<td>*45</td>
<td>*89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>*20</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>*31</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>*4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flisco</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papiensis</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Angeli or Portuensis</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constanciensis</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantuanus</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alebreto</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>*13</td>
<td>*19</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albienensis or Atrebatensis</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>*4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Is used throughout to indicate receipts for a dead cardinal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruthenus</td>
<td>*3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*15</td>
<td>*11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estouteville</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Sixti</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*41</td>
<td>*60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquilegienis</td>
<td>*3</td>
<td>*19</td>
<td>*15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursinis</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avironensis</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>(147)</td>
<td>(172)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduinensis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bononiensis</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Marci</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamorensis</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>*157</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>*8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*13</td>
<td>*43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS. Quattuor C.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Anastasiae</td>
<td>*81</td>
<td>*80</td>
<td>*21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>*13</td>
<td>*49</td>
<td>*6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columba</td>
<td>*3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Nicolai or Vicecancellarius</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicenu</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Petri**</td>
<td>*3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reatinus or R. Crucis</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senensis or S. Eustachii</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoletanus or S. Sabinae</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>(141)</td>
<td>(176)</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaenensis or S. Ceciliae</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Susanna</td>
<td>*3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flisco</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*8</td>
<td>*11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papiensis</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Angeli or Portuensis</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constaniensis</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantuanus</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alebreto</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albiensis or Atrebatensis</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolitanus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicentinus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquilanus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monteferrato</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Mariae in portico</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Luciae</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Is used throughout to indicate receipts for a dead cardinal.
KEY TO THE TITLES IN TABLE 2

Ruthenus = Isidore of Kiev, d. 27.4.1463.
Estouteville = Guillaume d’Estouteville.
S. Sixti = Juan Torquemada, d. 26.9.1468.
Aquilegiensis = Lodovico, the patriarch of Aquilea, d. 22.3.1465.
Ursinis = Latino Orsini.
Avinionensis = Alain Coctivy.
Eduensis = Jean Rolin.
Bononiensis = Filippo Calandrini.
S. Marci = Pietro Barbo (Paul II)
Zamorensis = Juan de Mella, d.12.10.1467.
SS. Quattuor C. = Luis Juan Mila.
S. Anastasiae = Jacopo Tebaldi, d.4.9.1465.
Columna = Prospero Colonna, d.24.3.1463.
S. Nicolai or Vicecancellarius = Rodrigo Borgia.
Nicenus = Bessarion.
S. Petri = Nicholas of Cusa, d. 12.8.1464. From 18.9.1467 the title is held by Francesco della Rovere. Indicated in the Table by ** after S. Petri.
Reatinus or S. Crucis = Angelo Capranica.
Senensis or S. Eustachii = Francesco Todeschini-Piccolomini.
 Spoletanus or S. Sabinae = Berardus Erol.
Theanensis or S. Ceciliae = Nicolo Fortiguerra.
S. Susannae = Alessandro Oliva, d. 20.8.1463. From 18.9.1467 the title is held by Jean Balue.

Flisco = Giorgio Fieschi, d. 8.10.1461.
Papiensis = Jacopo Ammanati.
S. Angeli or Portunesis = Juan Carvajal
Constanziensis = Richard Olivier de Longueil
Mantuanus = Francesco Gonzaga.
Alebreto = Louis d’Albret, d. 4.9.1465.
Albiensis or Atrebatis = Jean Jouffroy.
Ravenna = Bartolomeo Rouverella.
Neapolitanus = Oliviero Carafa.
Vicentinus = Marco Barbo.
Aquilanus = Amico Agnilli.
Monteferrato = Teodoro de Monteferrato.
S. Maria in porticu = Giovanni Baptista Zeno.
S. Luciae = Giovanni Michiel.

Some cardinals who appear very infrequently have been omitted from the table. They are:

Firmanus (Domenico Capranica, d. 14.8.1458); Ulixbonensis (Jacobi, Infans de Portugal); Messanensis (Antonio de la Cerda, d. 12.9.1459); Metensis (Guillaume d’Estaing). Payments outstanding to Pius II and Calixtus III, for money due to them while cardinals have also been omitted.

Throughout the table only the florins have been recorded and smaller units of currency omitted. The figures are therefore a slight underestimate of actual receipts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cardinals</th>
<th>1460</th>
<th>1461</th>
<th>1462</th>
<th>1463</th>
<th>1464</th>
<th>1465</th>
<th>1466</th>
<th>1467</th>
<th>1468</th>
<th>1469</th>
<th>1470</th>
<th>Average*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruthenus</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>*23</td>
<td>*31</td>
<td>*7</td>
<td>*27</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>927 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estoutiveville</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Sixti</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>*116</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquilegensiensis</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>*56</td>
<td>*19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,050 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursinis</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avisnonensis</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduensis</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>125 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bononiensis</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Marci</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>918 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanmorensis</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>*56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS. Quattuor C.</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Anastasiae</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>*1,555</td>
<td>*93</td>
<td>*12</td>
<td>*2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,240 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columna</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>*24</td>
<td>*31</td>
<td>*6</td>
<td>*27</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>914 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Nicolai or Vicecancellarius</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicenus</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>1,822</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Petri</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>*31</td>
<td>*29</td>
<td>*19</td>
<td>**78</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reatinus or S. Crucis</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senensis or S. Eustachii</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>1,822</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoletanius or S. Sabinae</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>(565)</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theanensis or S. Ceciliae</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Susannae</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>*110</td>
<td>*31</td>
<td>*11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,047 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flisco</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>*17</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papiensis</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,822</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1,100 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Angeli or Portuensis</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>1,822</td>
<td>1,568</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constanciensis</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>807 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantuanus</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>1,822</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1,035 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleperto</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>*113</td>
<td>*6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,237 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albiensis or Atrebantis</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>404 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>989 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolitanus</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>661 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicentius</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>596 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquilanus</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>583 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monteferrato</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>537 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Mariae in porticu</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>596 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Luciae</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>596 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When an individual cardinal has participated in divisions for every year of the table his yearly average has been estimated on the basis of ten years. Otherwise the number of years used to calculate an average are indicated in brackets.
THE 'GREAT ANTRUM' AT BAIAE: A PRELIMINARY REPORT
(Plates XXVII–XXVIII)

Note.—In view of the unusual nature of the system of underground corridors and caverns which is the principal subject of the following article by Mr. R. F. Paget, it has seemed desirable to put on record an objective account of it independently of any detailed conjecture as to its significance and use. Its interpretation is a matter which Mr. Paget himself discusses in another context, and it may well prove to be controversial. The rock-cut features themselves are a matter of observation and of factual record. The survey of them, made under conditions of considerable difficulty, reflects great credit on its authors, and this account will have served its purpose if it draws the attention of serious scholars to this very unusual complex.

The complex of tunnels and buildings described in this article was discovered by Keith W. Jones of the United States Navy and myself in the course of our general exploration of the underground antiquities of the Phlegrean Fields, made with the kind permission of Professor Alfonso de Franciscis, the Superintendent of Antiquities for Campania. They are the subject of a book recently published by myself (In the Footsteps of Orpheus, Hale, London 1967), but in view of their very unusual nature I have gladly accepted an invitation by the Director of the British School to contribute to the Papers a short factual account, together with the plans we made in the course of our survey (fig. 1).

When the terraced structures overlooking the bay and port of Baia were excavated in 1956–58, many tunnel entrances were uncovered. With the exception of the one short tunnel leading to the hot spring at the rear of the so-called Temple of Mercury, and a few obvious drainage ducts, the tunnels are all concentrated in the areas marked III and IV on the plans in the guide book, The Phlegrean Fields by A. Maiuri (3rd ed., 1958).

In these areas, with one exception, the tunnels are all short communication passages leading to underground rooms. There is a network of interconnecting tunnels between the rooms. These tunnels have no lightshafts or lamp niches, and illumination must have been by hand lamp. In fact the whole complex appears to have been a series of cave-dwellings. The main concentration of tunnels is in Section III, under the Little Theatre and other structures further up the terraces, all of which were connected by a main access stair ramp, cut in the living rock and extending from the level of the ‘Piscina’ to the terrace level 21.5 m. above sea-level. From this level subsidiary tunnels extend further up to the circular flat space upon which the statue of the Dioscurus lies. The final tunnel actually comes to daylight through the plinth of the statue.

Whilst these tunnels are of exceptional interest, they are only ancillary to the Great Antrum, which we located in the remains of the Greek Temple, situated in the upper part of Section IV at the 23 m. level.
When the excavations were made and the mouth of the tunnel was exposed it was still exuding hot sulphurous gas which made entry difficult. Later another attempt was made by the excavators, but owing to the foul air, it was abandoned after an advance of less than thirty metres, and orders were given by the authorities prohibiting
further entry. We did not know of this prohibition. Nevertheless when we made our entry we took all possible precautions against foul air as we had met this so often in our explorations.

On the first attempt we went in to a distance of 122 m., far beyond the point reached by the excavators, as we could see their footprints in the dust on the floor and where they ended. The atmosphere is hot and dusty and the tunnel is only 55 centimetres wide. There is headroom to walk, but progress must be crab-fashion. At 122 m. we felt we had gone enough for the first day, and I must admit we were very scared by the aura of mystery and the possibility (afterwards disproved) of unsafe walls or roof.

In all there are some 350 m. of narrow tunnels of beautiful workmanship, perfectly preserved and descending to a depth of 50 m. below the surface of the ridge. The whole complex was lit by more than 500 lamps, the niches for which can still be seen and counted in the tunnel walls, some of them still bearing the imprints of the bases of little lamps. Now follows a detailed description which can be followed by reference to the plans (figs. 1–5), while the photographs (pls. XXVII–XXVIII) give a visual impression of the confined space and dusty atmosphere of the complex.

At approximately the level of the present entrance to the excavations, that is to say at a height of about 23 m. above sea-level, at the southern limit of the present excavations, the ridge of the steep crater wall takes a slight bend towards the south-east. In the angle so formed, at the level stated, there is a small flat area, measuring some 25 m. north and south by 15 m. east and west. Upon this flat space five buildings stand with their west walls against the cliff-face, which is here orientated 330 degrees on the True Compass. They are in fact the only buildings with this orientation in the whole of the ruins. One of the buildings, namely that at the southern end of the line, exhibits three or four courses of ashlar construction fastened with metal clamps of similar design to those used in known Greek buildings at Paestum of the late sixth century B.C. M. W. Frederiksen was the first to suggest to me that these may be the remains of the cela of a Greek temple. This appears to be confirmed by the evidence of the clamps, which are similar to those described by W. B. Dinsmoor in The Architecture of Ancient Greece (London 1950) p. 178. Our investigations revealed a maze of tunnels and chambers in the cliff behind this line of buildings, which clearly indicate that they form a composite unit, which has existed for a very long period of time, and has been subject to many changes due to earthquake damage and reconstructions. After four years of almost daily study on the site, I have been able, with the valued help of Colin G. Hardie, to recover in great part, the original plan and quite a considerable amount of the shape of the buildings. Whilst the Antrum tunnels as a complex were evidently planned as a unit on a single occasion, the associated surface buildings on the other hand exhibit marked evidence of diverse epochs. The interpretation of these indications will be given after the technical description of the remains on the site has been given. For the purposes of identification we gave conventional names to the various units and tunnels and these are those which appear on the plans. All compass bearings relate to True North. The margin of error both in angular and linear measurements probably does not exceed 2 per cent, as we were careful to take reverse bearings in every case. In
addition, over the years, these measurements have been repeated many times and the drawings brought up to date and corrected where necessary.

The northern limit to the Sacred Area is defined by the drop in level down to Section III (fig. 2). The southern limit is the service ramp and stair leading to higher terraces situated adjacent to the south wall of the Temple. We established our Datum at 23 metres above sea-level (our own measurements) at the bottom step of the service ramp at the south-east angle of the Temple wall. All our measurements are based on this point.

I will describe first the Great Antrum, then the surface buildings. I hold the
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**Fig. 2.—General Plan of the ‘Great Antrum’ at Baiae**
opinion that the whole complex of buildings on the Sacred Area together with the Great Antrum form an integrated unit and cannot be treated separately.

The ashlar walls of the temple form an almost square rectangle 6·10 × 6·70 m. with the short side facing the Heliacal sunrise (060°) on Midsummer Day. Traversing the Temple roughly diagonally is a trench which enters the Temple from the east on a bearing of 275° and a width of 1 m., with the floor level 2·25 m. below Datum. At a point 2·00 m. from the north-west corner of the ashlar walls, the trench is suddenly constricted to a width of 0·55 m., and the bearing changes to 270°. At this point the Antrum begins. The tunnel extends for 124·50 m. perfectly straight on the bearing of 270°, and maintains the dimensions of 0·55 m. wide and walking height throughout its length. The excavators cleared the trench down to the original floor, so that it is possible to see that the original height of the 270 entrance tunnel was 2·50 m., which has, in the course of the centuries, been reduced to about 1·80 m. by a deposit of fine calcareous crystals. The crystals appear to be the result of the drying out of droplets of concentrated solution from a telluric source further inside the tunnel complex, which have solidified in the course of time, into a hard deposit, now about one metre thick. On either side of the Antrum in this 270 Section, there are lamp niches every 2·65 m. on alternate sides at a height of about 1·00 m. above the floor level. They would, of course have been just above head level when the passage was in use in former times. There is headroom of just under 1·80 m. and the vault of the roof is semicircular. The tunnel is cut in the live tufa rock, commencing from a point 8·60 m. west of the 'narrors' in the Temple. This point is identifiable because the junction with the masonry extension connecting with the Temple is arissed (the edges of the tufa are rounded off). The workmanship and alignment are perfect. There are no signs of earthquake damage or cracks due to pressure from the overlying strata. The preservation is perfect and there is no doubt that we are looking at the original (fig. 3).

About 7·00 m. before reaching the end of this straight tunnel, whilst the axis remains constant on 270°, the walls make a slight S-bend in such a manner that a visitor cannot see what is beyond the bend until he is past it. This is a technique that appears at several places in the complex, and appears to have been used to create the sense of the dramatic by the sudden appearance of the picture beyond the bend.

At 124·50 m. there is a small wedge-shaped enlargement of the passage formed by a 10 cm., enlargement on the south side and a 15 cm. widening on the north side. At the west end of this enlargement, when we first entered, there was a door cardinal in situ. Unfortunately this has now disappeared, but it gave the clue to the purpose of the enlargement. Further extension of the 270 tunnel is blocked by a concrete wall 10 cm. thick, diagonally across from the eastern entry into the wedge. We later found that 270 extends some 6·10 m. beyond the wall to connect with two parallel passages known to us as the 120’s, which will be described in due course. In former times the door could close either this extension or, alternatively, the descending passage on the right. Thus at first sight there was nothing to show that at this point the passage divides, with its left fork continuing on the 270° axis, whilst the right fork branches on to a bearing of 290°, and becomes a descending stair. We named the enlargement The Dividing of the Ways, and it is 5·55 m. below Datum. (Fig. 4.)
Fig. 3.—Enlarged Plan of the Sacred Area Shown in Fig. 1

Corridor 290 is a ramp and step stairway, 45-70 m. long, which descends a total of 12-20 m. in its length. The rate of descent is not uniform. The first 8 m. have a fall of one in two, the next 33 m. about one in three, and the last 8 m. at the bottom are level. At the commencement of 290, a line of heavy red tiles can be seen in the left half of the roof extending for 5-20 m. At first we thought there was a room behind these, but later, when we had penetrated the 120 passages, we found that formerly this had been the open end of the North 120 Passage and had formed an integral part of the ventilation system. At the bottom of the 290 stairway there is another S-bend, which effectively prevents premature sight of the water tunnel.

The 290 Tunnel ends at a step, beyond which the tunnel is filled with water. At this point there is a change of bearing to 300.
Here we were stopped as the tunnel opening on the north side of 290 about 1.50 m. from the step was filled with earth, and there seemed no means of further progress. At this point also there is a sudden rise of temperature to over 120° F. and a marked lack of oxygen in the air. Until we had cleared some of the passages of their fill of earth we could only remain at the water's edge for a few minutes. Under these conditions we found that coloured flashlight photographs which could be studied at home was an efficient method of procedure. In this manner we saw on one of the photographs a tile in the roof over the water. We pushed this to one side and Jones climbed through, to find himself at the bottom of a steeply sloping passage leading up to a level platform 6.10 m. above the water level. We cleared the dog-leg and scraped enough of the earth-fill in the Rise down through the tile hole to
enable us to confirm that the Rise was a stair leading up to a chamber excavated in the living rock. At first appearance all that could be seen was a rough wall with what appeared to be a blocked-up door on the left. On the right the wall and a passage continue round to the north and west. Later we were able to penetrate one of the ‘doors’ and found that the chamber is very similar to the Etruscan underground tombs as seen at Tarquinia. We named it the Inner Sanctuary. The plan (fig. 5) gives a better idea than any written description. There were no doors, the rough wall and blocked ‘doors’ being merely a device on the part of the masons to have less space to fill to destroy the usage of the Sanctuary. Opposite the north ‘door’ is a passage which makes a semicircular turn to the west, but in very few
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**Fig. 5.—The Inner Sanctuary**
metres the roof descends to meet the floor, which is level. I shall show later that this and many other parts of the complex were filled with earth brought in from outside. If continued this passage would lead down to connect with the extension of the water tunnel. I shall return to this later.

Opposite the east 'door' there is a shelf running along the south wall of the Rise for about 6.00 m., when it becomes the entrance to the 120 tunnels. There is an earth blockage at the entrance about 6 m. long. We scraped our way over this and in so doing discovered a traverse on the north side, leading in 2 m. to a parallel tunnel, which however, is at 2 m. higher level. There is also a wedge-shaped chamber and door stops at this point, similar to that at the Dividing of the Ways.

At this point it is appropriate to describe the ventilation system. It is a well-known fact that generally speaking it is impossible to ventilate a long tunnel with no outlet at the far end. Coal mines for example have two shafts, one to introduce fresh air and the other to remove the foul. In the Antrum, the designers have made use of the physical law of convection to achieve their purpose. I have already referred to the hot spot at the bottom of 290. This is also the lowest point in the whole complex. From here the gradients of the tunnels are so arranged that the hot air rises to the level of the Inner Sanctuary floor. The North 120 Passage is at a higher level than the south 120 to ensure that the smoke and foul air will go out to the Dividing of the Ways by that route. At the Dividing of the Ways, before the tiles blocked the opening, the foul air spilled into the roof of 290 and 270 to continue out to daylight. The circuit was completed by an inflow of cold fresh air along the floors of 270 and 290 down to the water. The system works even today, when the exit into 290 is closed by the tiles. It must have been very efficient when in proper working trim.

It remains to tell of the exploration of the Water Tunnel. I was fortunate enough, in May 1965, to persuade Colonel David Lewis, who has done a lot of underwater archaeological research in the Naples area, to dive into the Water Tunnel (fig. 6). He found that the roof and sides of the tunnel as seen from the bottom of 290, constrict until the point where the roof touches the water at 5 m. from the step in 290. At this point there is a sharp descent almost vertically for 5 m., at the bottom of which the tunnel levels out again and also widens to 2 m. But the whole tunnel is filled with mud to within 0.20 m. of the roof and the water is nearly at boiling point. In spite of this Col. Lewis explored the tunnel for a further 6 m., where he could see and confirm the existence of the stair leading up to the north 'doors' of the Inner Sanctuary. He also found that there are two springs of boiling water coming out of two arched entrances on the south side of the tunnel just at the bottom of the steep drop.

The level of the water had remained constant all the years we had known it, until suddenly in May 1966 it fell by about 0.47 m. and has remained at this level since. At the same time the spring at the rear of the so-called Piscina of Mercury ceased to flow; obviously the two phenomena are connected and are probably traceable to a general lessening of volcanic pressure in the area, also exhibited by Solfatara. But this is only a minor problem. The water in the tunnel is quite fresh and drinkable, thus indicating a flow to avoid stagnation. We have been unable to find any outlet to account for this, although we know that the average flow from the other
springs in the ruins is considerable, and Col. Lewis could see considerable quantities issuing from the two hot springs. We assumed an outlet under the mud and tried fluorescin. But although the fluorescin eventually disappeared we could find no trace of it even in the sea itself. The whole of this tunnel remains a big question.

We found nothing inside the tunnels except two lumps of congealed mortar still bearing the imprint of the weave of the baskets in which they were carried. These were just outside the east 'door' of the Inner Sanctuary. We also found a mason's lead plumb-bob in a light niche in the Traverse. Alongside were some painted letters about 0-20 m. high, which up to date have not been deciphered.
Summing up the description of the Antrum, we can enumerate the following points.

1. The elaborate design and good workmanship denote design as a unit and not a gradual expansion.
2. The 500 lamp niches indicate use for ceremonial. One lamp every 20 m. would have been sufficient for walking.
3. The orientation of the surface buildings and the Inner Sanctuary towards Midsummer Heliacal sunrise and sunset denote interconnection.
4. Tunnels outside the Sacred Area have no lamp niches.
5. The incidence of the Antrum under the Greek Temple.
6. The presence of a Tholos among the surface buildings.
7. The elaborate efforts made to fill the Inner Sanctuary, North 120, the blocks in South 120, the fill in the Rise and in the stair from the north ‘doors’ to the water. A calculation shows that some 200 cubic metres of fill were required, all brought in from the surface in baskets along 270, where there is not room for two persons to pass. The operation represents 15,000 man-journeys.
8. The Great Antrum, the surface buildings and the chambers behind the cliff-face are clearly one unit.
9. The mention by Strabo quoting Ephorus, of an Oracle of the Dead ‘near Avernus’ (V.4.5.).

There are many difficulties associated with the study of the surface buildings on the site. The buildings themselves are in a very ruinous condition, nothing but wall footings remain. Nevertheless within the cliff much has been preserved. There is evidence of reconstructions following landslides and other earthquake damage, upon previous foundations. Traces of camouflage and adaptation to other usage also increase the difficulties of arriving at their original functions. More than one epoch is involved (e.g. Greek and Roman). At this time it is premature to attempt any interpretation of archaeological value. Sundry very speculative suggestions were included in my book In the Footsteps of Orpheus, but it was made quite clear that these were intended only to create interest in the discovery on the part of the general public.

When the author and Keith Jones first made the discovery in 1962 the first person to be informed was J. B. Ward-Perkins, and it is entirely due to his encouragement and help that the researches at the site were continued. Permission was kindly given by Professor Alfonso di Franciscis, the Superintendent of Antiquities for the Campania, for the author to continue work at Baiae. The original attempts at dating were greatly helped by observations of M. W. Frederiksen and later since 1965 the study of the surface buildings has been much facilitated by the cooperation of Colin G. Hardie.

The author hopes at a later date to give an account of the surface buildings in full detail and to attempt an overall interpretation of the site.

R. F. Paget
CASTEL PORCIANO: AN ABANDONED MEDIEVAL VILLAGE OF THE ROMAN CAMPAGNA
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1. Introduction

One of the problems which has arisen during the course of the work on the topographical survey of South Etruria has been that of the date and cause of the abandonment of many of the smaller medieval settlements of which there is evidence in the area. The study of deserted medieval villages has advanced considerably in northern Europe since 1945, but in Italy it is still in its infancy.1 There is therefore an almost complete lack of comparative material with which to work in the study of the deserted settlements in the area between Rome and Viterbo, and we have found traces, either documentary or physical, and often both, of over seventy-five such settlements in this area.

As I hope to take up the whole question of the deserted villages of South Etruria in the near future, I shall not here attempt to enlarge on the wider aspects of the problem of shifting rural settlements in the later Middle Ages. However, it is important to emphasise that the picture is on the whole very different from that in northern Europe. There the factors which dictated the siting of a settlement tended to be economic, and consequently the factors which produced abandonment were closely associated with the economic depression and agrarian changes of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In Provence and most of Italy the sites of medieval settlement were largely dictated by the need for security, and hence the widely prevalent use of hill-top sites, sites which in normal economic terms tended to be unviable.2 Similarly the abandonment of such sites was in large part the result of an increase in security which allowed normal economic factors to play a greater part in the siting of human settlement. It is true that in certain coastal areas the prevalence of ‘malaria’ was also a problem which necessitated settlement on higher ground, and it was not
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1 The only attempt to consider the subject in general terms is C. Klapisch-Zuber and J. Day, ‘Villages déserts en Italie; esquisse,’ in Villages déserts et histoire économique, XIe-XVIIIe siècle, Paris, 1965.

2 The term ‘hill village’ applied to South Etruria is a rather misleading one as, owing to the geological structure of the area, the villages are usually sited on promontories hidden in ravines. However, the historical and social factors governing the choice of such sites are similar to those applicable to the better known hill-top sites. For further details and explanation, see p. 117.
until the nineteenth century that improved irrigation and drainage systems enabled the rural population in such areas to establish themselves in the lowlands. But it was on the whole growing security and improved administration which enabled drainage projects to go forward rather than any dramatic technological advances.\(^3\)

The turning point in the history of the Roman Campagna came with the pontificate of Martin V, the end of the Schism, and the revival of papal temporal power and organisation, and it is probably true to say that the first half of the fifteenth century was a crucial stage in the history of settlement in the area. This is, of course, a simplified picture and is not intended to discount the effects of population decline and the final outburst of medieval disorder which marked the second half of the fourteenth century and the first two decades of the fifteenth. In fact many of the abandoned sites were described as ‘inhabitatum et distructum’ by 1416.\(^4\) But there is reason to believe that these terms were not necessarily intended to be taken literally. They probably implied a destruction of the fortifications and a drastic reduction in population, necessitating relief from taxes; but in many cases we know that this did not mean complete desertion, nor did it preclude recovery\(^5\). In fact it is the key to the study of deserted settlement problems to see past the immediate, and sometimes dramatic, causes of depopulation and abandonment to the underlying social and economic factors which led to the final desertion of certain groups of sites and to the continuance of others. In the Roman Campagna and indeed Italy in general it was the growing security of the fifteenth century which led to the gradual abandonment of the more inaccessible and economically unrealistic sites, or the failure to revive of those which had been destroyed in war. At this stage there was little sign of a tendency for the rural population to descend from the hills, but rather for the better sited hill villages to expand at the expense of their smaller neighbours. It was this process which produced the majority of the abandonments in the Campagna, rather than subsequent phases of population decline at the beginning of the seventeenth century, or a shift to lowland settlements in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The site of Castel Porciano, which is the subject of this report, was just one such small site, apparently abandoned during the fifteenth century. On it we conducted trial excavations spread over two short seasons of one week each in May 1965 and April 1966. Our aims were very limited; to collect comparative archaeological data for use when examining other similar sites, and to try and arrive at some approximate idea of the historical and architectural development of the site, and particularly of the dates of its establishment and abandonment. The investigation represented a
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\(^3\) For general analysis of deserted village problems, see particularly the contributions by various authors in Part I, ‘Problèmes de méthode,’ in Villages désertés et histoire économique, op. cit. On the origins of Italian hill settlements, see G. Gribaudi, ‘Sulle origini dei centri rurali di sommità,’ Rivista geografica italiana, 1951, and F. Cusin, ‘Per la storia del castello medioevale,’ Rivista storica italiana, 1939.

\(^4\) On Provence, see G. Démians d’Archimbaud, ‘Archéologie et villages déserts en Provence,’ Villages désertés et histoire économique.


Among the villages described as uninhabited and destroyed in 1416 in the provinces of Tuscia and Colline, the following all survived as centres of habitation: Castel Giuliano, Santa Severa, Castel di Guido, Monte Romano, Santa Pupa (Manziana), Riano and Monterosi. On Monterosi see a special report prepared by J. B. Ward-Perkins and M. E. Mallett for a forthcoming publication by the Department of Biology, Yale University.
further stage in the programme initiated by Stiesdal with the examination of the three abandoned sites of Belmonte, Pietra Pertusa and Morolo.

2. The Documentary Evidence

_Castrum Porcianum_ has left little surviving record in the documentary sources. Tomassetti gave it passing notice as one of the original _fundī_ of the _domuscula_ of Capracorum, which, after the decline of the _domuscula_, became independent settlements and homes for the former inhabitants of the papal estate. This stage of Porciano’s history therefore resembles that of Formello, Campagnano, Mazzano, Calcata, and Stabia (Faleria), all of which are thought to have grown up in the late ninth and tenth centuries within the boundaries of the defunct _domuscula_. One must assume that Tomassetti never found the actual site of Porciano, as he could hardly have failed to describe so considerable a ruin had he done so. Consequently none of his successors amongst topographers of the Campagna have made even passing reference to this settlement. The existence of the abandoned village was known, however, to the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century cartographers although they did not always agree as to its exact location.

For most of the history of the settlement the documents are no less vague and uninformative about this tiny isolated castle. The first reference to Porciano so far discovered is its inclusion, with its church of Sant’ Andrea, among the estates of the great Roman hospital of Santo Spirito in Sassia in 1295. As the previous confirmation of Santo Spirito holdings by Pope Nicholas IV in 1291 had not included Porciano, and as we know that this was a period in which the hospital was rapidly building up a considerable patrimony in the Ager Faliscus, it seems a reasonable assumption that Santo Spirito got possession of Porciano in the early 1290s. At this time and during the fourteenth century Santo Spirito also acquired Castel Sant’ Elia, Isola Conversina, Santa Maria di Falleri, Castiglione di Nepi and Borgo San Leonardo (Borghetto). In 1378 the anti-pope Clement VII conceded Santa Pupa (later Manziana), Castel Sant’ Elia and Porciano, all Santo Spirito estates, to the Orsini as a reward for their support. But the concession does not seem to have taken effect. Both Santa Pupa and Castel Sant’ Elia remained in the possession of the hospital, and we must assume that the same held good for Porciano.

The village does not appear in the salt tax lists ascribed by Tomassetti to the middle of the fourteenth century and this perhaps accounts for his lack of interest in it. This absence is rather surprising as it indicates a very small population by this time, whereas the extent of the site and particularly of the later structures would suggest a rather larger settlement.

The only other secure mention of the settlement comes in 1467 when the _tenimentum Portiano_ was the subject of a dispute between the castellan of Castel Sant’ Elia.

---

6 Tomassetti, iii, p. 111.
8 Archivio di Stato, Rome, Archivio del Archiostedale di S. Spirito in Sassia, i, _Bullarium_, f. 86.
10 See the above-mentioned bulls and Silvestrelli, ii, pp. 494, 498, 511-2, 705.
11 Tomassetti, iii, p. 562.
12 G. Tomassetti, ‘Sale e focatico,’ in _Archivio della Società romana di storia patria_, xx (1897).
and the councillors of Nepi. As the dispute was referred to the Commendatore of Santo Spirito it would seem that the influence of the hospital was still predominant in the area. The use of the word *tenimentum* rather than *castrum* by this time suggests depopulation, and the pottery evidence does indicate a cessation of continuous occupation in the early years of the fifteenth century. There was certainly, however, continued spasmodic occupation into the sixteenth century and later.

3. The Site

*General Description of Site and Buildings*

The site of Porciano is typical of that of nearly all the villages of South Etruria. As a result of the interaction of fast-flowing streams on a relatively level bed of soft volcanic tufa, the countryside is intersected by a series of deep and spectacular ravines. Where two streams converge their ravines have left narrow steep-sided promontories, and it is on these promontories that the ‘hill villages’ of South Etruria are sited.

In the case of Porciano the promontory is one formed by the junction of an unnamed subsidiary stream with the Fosso Cerreto at a point about two miles south-east of Nepi (grid reference: Nepi 820779). The gorge of the Cerreto begins at a point a little to the west of where the Via Amerina crosses it at Ponte Napesino, and then runs eastwards to its junction with the Nepi gorge (Fosso del Castello) and the Treia gorge at a point three miles south-west of Civita Castellana. This junction was dominated by three more fortified medieval sites all now abandoned, Ischia, Fogliano and Paterno. Furthermore the two gorges leading south from this junction area, the Treia itself and the Fosso del Rio, were controlled by the castles of Agnese and San Valentino. Finally the gorge continues as the Treia down to its junction with the Tiber at a point east of Civita Castellana (see Fig. 1).

In a sense this complex of gorges with its row of fortified settlements suggests a natural frontier, and it is perhaps not without significance that throughout the later Middle Ages the limit of the influence and authority of the city of Rome lay around this area. To the north lay the independent patrimony of the Prefects of Vico and the area controlled by the Viterbesi and the Rector of the Patrimony; to the south were the great estates of the Roman monasteries and the growing territories of the Anguillara, Orsini and Colonna families.

Porciano itself was approached from the south, most conveniently by a track leading off the Via Amerina and running parallel to the gorge, but also by tracks from Filissano (now abandoned) to the east, and from Mazzano and Monte Gelato to the south-east. Close by the modern direct road to the site, which may or may not have followed the old track, lie the remains of a large Roman villa.

---

16 For Paterno, see Lawrence, pp. 91–5 and 113–6.
18 Frederiksen and Ward-Perkins, p. 80 (site grid-reference 812768).
tempting to think that this might have been the centre of the *fundus porcianus* of the Capracorum documents, the early medieval settlement within the *domusculata* from which the frightened inhabitants fled in the ninth or tenth century to the nearest defensible site, *i.e.* the promontory of Porciano.

In all events, whatever tracks there were converged at the base of the promontory and led downwards to the tip. This approach is now a narrow mule track and it passes between obvious signs of habitation even before it reaches the outer defences of the site itself. On either side of the track there are niches and shallow caves cut into outcrops of tufa. At what period this area was occupied cannot be said without a far more extensive investigation than we were able to undertake.

The first evidence of the defences of the settlement itself is a deep rock-cut ditch straight across the promontory (see fig. 3). This was a defensive feature common to all these promontory villages and was an obvious way of protecting the vulnerable side of the site. In this case the cutting varies from 2.5 to 4 m. wide and is over 4 m. deep. The track originally crossed it by means of a wooden bridge, the grooves for which can still be seen cut into the tufa on either side. Such a bridge would have been quickly removed in case of assault. The defensive strength of this cutting would probably have been increased by a wooden palisade along the inside edge.

---

19 Stiesdal found a similar feature at Belmonte (Stiesdal, p. 85).
Once across the cutting the track continued for a short distance straight on towards the nucleus of the settlement. The first 15 m. of this track are clearly visible in the form of a shallow cutting across the surface of the tufa; the width of the track at this point varies between 2.5 and 3.5 m.

Immediately after crossing the cutting the track passes on its left a considerable tufa outcrop into which have been cut a series of three basins (see fig. 4). The main basin which is approximately rectangular is provided with a drain into the lowest basin, which itself has a rectangular 'sump' cut into its floor. The top basin is a long narrow trough, apparently unconnected with the lower basins. Although we have so far found no other installations of this type on sites in the area, the Swedish Institute working at San Giovenale have located four, and there seems to be no doubt
that they are a primitive type of wine press, known locally as a *pestarola.*\(^{20}\) The examples investigated by the Swedes all have the two main basins draining one into the other, but not the upper long basin noted at Porciano. The function of this may have been to take the base of some form of pressing mechanism, which would have been an advance on the simpler form of two-basin wine press.

The rest of this *borgo* which lay between the outer cutting and the main defences is now covered with a dense mass of small trees and bushes which the time at our disposal did not enable us to clear. We were able to see, however, that there are some caves in this area, and that the track heading directly towards the walls bore away to the right to avoid a sharp drop in the ground and then approached the entrance to the main defences obliquely.

The track into the main fortified part of the settlement wound up under the west tower, which was a late addition to the defences, and then along the north side of the promontory. It ran along a terrace lined with caves just below the side of the chapel.

\(^{20}\) I am indebted to Professor Bergren for showing me plans and drawings of four *pestarole* investigated by the Swedish Institute which will be published in the two forthcoming volumes of the *Acta Instituti Romani Regni Sueciae.*
and turned up a ramp into the middle of the settlement. At this point, overlooking this entrance ramp which was probably originally another defensive ditch, stood a tower with a later building attached to it. The whole of the south side of the main site was defended by a perimeter wall, much of which is still standing almost to its full height. The tip of the promontory seems to have been left as an open area or bailey and at the extremity stood a further fortification, which may have been a three-sided tower. This tower commands a spectacular view down the eastward course of
the Fosso Cerreto. Into the almost sheer sides of the cliff all round the promontory have been cut caves, sometimes at three or four levels, which would have served as dwellings for the inhabitants at least in the early years of the settlement.
The whole site from outer ditch to east tower is some 150 m. in length with a maximum width of about 45 m. (fig. 5). As the promontory on which the settlement was sited runs slightly downhill, the fortifications were below the level of the surrounding cliffs. This was in itself an additional form of defence in that it is only by approaching to the very edge of the ravine that one becomes aware of the castle’s existence.

In view of the limited time and funds available and the very dense cover of undergrowth which had to be cleared before any work could be done, the investigation was inevitably incomplete and to a large extent superficial. It took the form of clearing the chapel and part of the complex of buildings to the south of it, digging trenches at the foot of the west tower and across the central ramp in two places, emptying two storage pits and examining the surviving structures and caves.

The West Tower (plates XXXI, XXXVa, fig. 6)

The most commanding feature on the site of Porciano is the west tower which, like the rock cutting, was designed to protect the settlement at its one vulnerable point, the direct approach down the ridge. The present standing structure consists of two short stretches of walling meeting at a slightly obtuse angle, but it was almost certainly originally a three-sided fortification which masked the direct approach to the castle. Of the two sides which survive the south side is 3·4 m. long and the west side 3·75 m.; both measurements being internal. The south side of the tower is intact in that the eastern end of the wall is neatly finished and squared off. This leads us to the first surprising conclusion about this tower, that it was a separate entity, not attached to the remainder of the outer walls of the castle, but apparently erected in front of them. The west face of the tower is broken at its northern end but the contours of the ground, which fall away sharply beyond the break, indicate that the angle with the presumed north side was almost at the break. One must assume that the north face has fallen over the cliff, as the whole tower follows very closely the line of a natural spur commanding the borgo and the approach down the ridge.

The walls of this tower are 1·08 m. thick and survive to a height of over 7 m. or 23 courses; the courses average 32 cm. and the whole is carefully faced with well cut tufa blocks. These walls are by far the thickest and most imposing on the site, and indeed we have seen nothing like them in any of the smaller local castles. The quality of the masonry and the thickness of the walls, in addition to the siting of the tower, indicate that this is certainly the final addition to the defences and should be dated to the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century. It also seems reasonable to suppose that the addition of so formidable a fortification in front of the old defences at such a period was associated with the appearance of the first siege cannon.

The very earliest development of gunpowder fortifications has been little studied, presumably because in most cases the first tentative and primitive attempts to combat the new threat were later replaced by more sophisticated fortifications and have therefore left little trace. However, we know that by 1359 artillery was not unknown in the Papal states, and in the 1370s Niccolò della Tuscia makes frequent
references to bombards in Viterbo and Viturchiano. In the circumstances some of
the wealthier and more farsighted of the local castellans might well have prepared
some form of defence against these weapons which were already in use close by.

High up in both surviving walls, about 5 m. above the present ground level, are
two rectangular embrasures measuring $60 \times 64$ cm. These can certainly not be
described as arrow slits and were probably for look-outs, although it is quite possible
that a small cannon was mounted to command the approaches. Certainly the
presence of these embrasures and of beam holes set regularly along the west wall three
courses below them indicates that there was a wooden floor. In the south wall at the
east end there is one beam hole set one course lower than the row in the west wall,
and this would have been duplicated in the missing north wall. Thus a single heavy
beam ran across the back of the tower supporting the beams and boards running out
from the west wall. This floor would presumably have been reached by a wooden
ladder (see fig. 6). Also to be seen in both surviving walls are two rows of put-log
holes for the scaffolding of the builders. These are carefully placed and always cut
into the corners of the blocks, discounting any possibility of their being the work of
later squatters erecting lean-to huts against the walls.

In addition to studying the surviving structure of this tower, we dug a trench at
the foot of the east end of the south wall in order to examine the foundations of the wall
and its relationship to the older circuit wall which appeared to run up close to it.
This trench at 1 m. below the present surface revealed a mortar platform or spill which
was cut across obliquely by a channel. The footings of the old perimeter wall were
also visible running along a line slightly outside that of the south wall of the tower and
stopping a little short of it.

Datable pottery found under the mortar platform and in the channel was all of
the Sparse Glaze type, whereas immediately above the platform were found sherds
of archaic maiolica datable to the second half of the thirteenth century. This
would suggest that the platform or spill can be reasonably dated round the middle of
the thirteenth century and that prior to this some form of retaining wall must have
been in place on the south side to hold the material in. Since the west tower as it
stands today can hardly be as early, this mortar platform cannot have been directly
associated with the building of the present tower. It is possible that it was associated
with the building of the perimeter wall, and that prior to this there had only been a
retaining wall which had already been built.

The Chapel and Buildings to the South

Standing immediately behind the west tower and overlooking the entrance road
are the remains of a chapel, presumably the Sant’ Andrea referred to in the docu-
ments (pls. XXXI, XXXII). The walls of this stand only to a height of two or
three courses and in the north-west corner they have collapsed altogether into a cave
which had been cut in under the west end. This chapel was extremely small

21 Niccolò della Tuscia, Cronache di Viterbo e di
altre città, ed. I. Ciampi (Florence, 1872), pp. 38 and
401.
22 See part II of this report.
(7.6 × 9 m., internal dimensions into the apse) and was oriented east and west with the apse at the west end. The walls are built of irregular tufa blocks and faced with rectangular blocks set in 32 cm. courses with an entrance over a marble lintel at the east end, and possibly an additional entrance in the south side. The walls are c. 60 cm. thick, and a certain amount of tile has been used in the mortar. The roof was certainly tiled as a considerable quantity of broken tile was found. The floor of the chapel was natural rock and the items of interest which were revealed in the course of the clearing were a group of tufa blocks which appeared to be in situ at the west end, presumably the base of an altar (pl. XXXII, a); an irregular line of blocks in the centre, probably the basis of a step or low screen dividing the church into two parts; and a natural rock-cut bench against the wall in the north-east corner.

No significant dating material was recovered from this building, the only indication of its date being that it was sited over what appears to have been an older storage pit, intercommunicating with storage pit A (see below). This suggests that the chapel belongs to a period of expansion of the settlement when an older storage pit area was encroached upon by new buildings. When such an expansion might have taken place will be discussed later.

A final point of interest about this building, and indeed about several buildings on the site, was the almost complete lack of fallen building material surrounding it. It is possible that the tufa walls were never more than three courses high and that above
this some form of wood or wattle palisade served as a wall. On the other hand all the storage pits and the entrance ditch are choked with tufa blocks, which indicates that superficial tumble has been cleared at some stage, perhaps for grazing purposes.

Immediately to the south of the chapel was a complex of buildings of which only the footings of the walls are to be seen. This group may have consisted of one rectangular building divided from the chapel by a small courtyard, or of two small rectangular buildings. The floor of this area was in part the natural rock and in part a built-up platform of trodden earth. The area was bounded on the north side by the chapel, on the south by the perimeter wall, on the east by a very rough un-mortared wall built of large tufa blocks laid between two roughly dressed faces and surprisingly substantial (average width 80 cm.), and on the west by a well laid wall of mortared tufa blocks abutting onto the south wall of the chapel. This west wall effectively cut off the west tower from the remainder of the settlement. A trench was dug down to the foundations of the east wall of the complex and the only datable sherds found were of pre-maiolica Sparse Glaze ware. This probably indicates that this very substantial wall pre-dates 1250, and at the time when it was built it may have been an outer wall of the primitive settlement.

A further interesting point about this area is that at two or three points there is evidence of the remains of a second and possibly older wall inside the perimeter wall. This older wall is a rough rubble structure associated with the east wall described above.

*The Storage Pits*

Of the twelve storage pits found, nine were concentrated in the area between the chapel and the central ditch, and two lay further to the south between the central mound and the perimeter wall. Apart from the pit which appeared to have been covered by the south-east corner of the chapel, all these pits were probably cut in the open. One pit appeared to have been cut into by the extension of the central ditch, and the appearance of the bend in the ditch suggested that a further pit had been utilised in this extension (see below, p. 129).

All the pits were filled with tufa blocks and other building debris. Two were cleared and examined in detail and as these conformed very closely to similar pits found on other sites (notably the *rocca* at Trevignano, and Monte Fiore), it is probably safe to assume that all the pits were of similar type. The two pits examined were basically ovoid reaching a depth of 2.5 m. and a maximum diameter of 1.75 m. (fig. 8). They were entirely cut into the natural tufa and the carefully cut rectangular openings were provided with an inset lower edge to receive a capstone or possibly a wooden cover (pl. XXXIII, b). Inside the pits there were niches cut at various levels to receive a layer of boards to divide up the stores. Virtually no pottery was found at the bottom of the pits, and this, together with the curved shape of the bottom of the pits, suggests that storage jars were not used and that the grain was emptied in loose.23

*The Central Ditch*

One of the most puzzling features of the whole site is the central ditch or ramp which ran up the west side of the central mound. It was immediately clear from the

23 Jones, ii, pp. 164–5, describes the similar pits found at Grotta Colonna (Monte Fiore).
location of storage pit C that this ditch had never run straight across the site, and the position had been further complicated by the southern part of the ditch having been entirely filled with fallen tufa blocks and building rubble as a result of the tower above collapsing into it. It was therefore extremely difficult to get any clear idea of the ditch’s extent or purpose.

A metre-wide section dug straight across at a point opposite the south-west corner of the central tower revealed a carefully cut ditch which in its upper levels was 4·10 m. wide, but then narrowed by means of a cut step to 2·70 m. This step was on the west side of the cutting about one metre below ground level. The ditch in its narrower section was a further 2 m. deep. Although the entire section was filled with tufa blocks and tumble, there was some indication of a significant distinction in the fill above and below a level corresponding with the step. The material found in the upper part of the trench was all of the late fourteenth or fifteenth century and the maiolica mostly of Roman type, whereas below the level of the step the maiolica found was all of a rather earlier type, including some thirteenth-century wares, with a prevalence of Orvieto wares. This evidence was not absolutely conclusive, but there are other factors which suggest that the division was not without significance, and these will be discussed later.

A second trench was subsequently cut in order to investigate the relationship
between the ditch and storage pit C. This trench was eventually extended until an area of some 3 m. square had been cleared down to the natural rock. This clearance revealed that the ditch curved eastwards round the south side of the central mound. However, a number of curious features became apparent; in the first place the natural rock wall at the bend was strongly concave, unlike the other rock cuts on the site, which were all sheer. This may have been a natural way of cutting a corner without taking too much trouble over it, or it may indicate that to the north of storage pit C had lain another pit which had been cut into to continue the ditch. The second point of interest was that along a continuation of the line of the east side of the ditch and straight across the path of the new course of it a further and very considerable step had been left. This step was 1.7 m. above the floor of the main part of the ditch and brought the floor of the remaining course of the ditch up to little more than a metre below ground level. Time did not permit us to pursue the course of the ditch very much further eastwards, but immediately above the deep step across the ditch three small rough steps were found to lead up out of the new shallow ditch on the south side to ground level. To the left of these steps were indications of the broken opening of another storage pit; and finally, opposite these steps and against the sheer face of the central mound, there was charred evidence of fire associated with some very late sherds. This last was presumed to be a relic of squatting occupation. All along the inward, i.e. east and north sides of this ditch there were niches cut into the rock face at various levels.

The evidence, though incomplete, suggests the following reconstruction of events. Assuming that the central mound overlooking the ditch held the original nucleus of the settlement with its tower (and this seems a reasonably safe assumption), the ditch itself was probably originally a defensive feature. Although the ditch did not completely cut off the promontory, this was not an unusual feature, and the pattern of a tower and a rock-cut ditch defending these early settlements is too clearly established for us to ignore it here. In this first stage the ditch would have been a simple straight rock-cutting running north and south, and probably 2.7 m. wide, the width of the lower part of our section. It would have served the purpose of channeling the attackers into a narrow corridor which would have been defended by other means.

When the original nucleus of the settlement was gradually expanded with the addition of storage pits on the other side of the ditch and eventually of the extensive perimeter wall beyond, the ditch became redundant as a defence, and was probably converted into an entrance ramp for the new access road, which thus turned up into the middle of the site from the north terrace. This was achieved by filling in the lower section of the ditch with rubble and building material from the demolitions associated with the building of the perimeter wall, and by widening the upper part of the ditch, so creating the impression of a step. Such a fill in the lower section of the ditch, though in itself scarcely distinguishable from the similar and later tumble above, would account for the consistent line of division which appeared to run right through the fill at this point.

If this reconstruction is accepted, then the pottery indications already referred to become of considerable interest and value for dating this conversion of the ditch into

\footnote{Stiesdal, p. 86.}
an entrance way. They suggest that not only did the development take place sometime in the first half of the fourteenth century, but also that the development was accompanied by or even the result of a shift in the political and economic orientation of the settlement. Such a shift could well have taken place at the time of the appearance on the scene of Santo Spirito in Sassia.

The Original Nucleus—Tower and Residence

Almost in the centre of the site stands a partly artificial, partly natural mound. The sides of this have in places been cut away, particularly on the west side which is bounded by the ditch, and on the east side where caves have been cut into the rock face. The mound stands some 2 or 3 m. above the level of the rest of the site, and its dimensions are approximately 25 m. square.

On the south-west corner of this mound stand the remains of a square tower built of rectangular tufa blocks set in courses of 30–31 cm. The external dimensions of this tower, which now stands to a maximum of eight courses high, are 3.75 m. square. This is a good deal smaller than most of the towers seen in the Roman Campagna and suggests that at no time could it have been lived in. It is now impossible to determine its original height or any details of its plan above ground level. It was usual for such towers to have two or three floors, and they were by no means all built specifically for defence. Many were never more than watch towers or signalling towers, and in this case it seems more than likely that the tower, which rising even to a moderate height would have cleared the surrounding cliffs and given all round observation, was primarily intended as a watch tower for the settlement.

It certainly seems to be the oldest surviving structure on the site and can be tentatively dated to the twelfth or early thirteenth centuries. This would suggest that the mound was the original nucleus of the settlement (many of the caves are also concentrated in this area) with this small tower and the ditch in front of it as the primitive defences. This is the defensive pattern for these early settlements which is apparent on many other sites.

At a later date a fairly considerable building has been added to the tower, a building the masonry of which is close in technique to that of the perimeter wall and other structures on the site. Only a small part of what was probably the south wall of this building remains, but there is a very extensive pile of blocks and rubble suggesting a building which must have covered a large part of the mound. Such an expansion of the original tower would be entirely in keeping with examples found on other sites, and indeed in the surviving villages of the area. Once the settlement had spread over the whole promontory, this mound with its tower and associated buildings would have remained the strongpoint of the site and presumably the residence of the signore or castellan.

The Perimeter Wall and Associated Buildings

Along the whole length of the south side of the settlement from the west to the east tower there was a perimeter wall. Considerable stretches of this survive along its

---

25 I am indebted for confirmation of this conclusion, as for advice on many other points of architectural dating to Professor A. W. Lawrence, who spent a very fruitful day with us on the site.
western half, rising to twelve courses high of rectangular tufa blocks. For the remainder of its length the footings are visible in most places. At approximately the middle point of this wall what looks like a sort of internal tower has been added, and houses abutted against the inside of the wall right along its western half.

The first interesting point about this defensive feature is that it was built on the south side of the village only. The reason for this was clearly the fact that the opposite cliffs on the south side were rather nearer than those on the north side across the Fosso Cerreto. It is hard today to estimate the exact distance of the bowshot from the cliff on the south side as modern tufa quarries have destroyed the original conformation of the land; but it was probably a range of under 100 m. On the north side on the other hand the range is considerably greater and we can safely assume that the villagers would have been out of range of bowshot from the Massa ridge. Many of the abandoned sites and surviving villages of South Etruria have no outer walls at all, relying on the sheer cliffs as their defence, and it seems to have been widespread local practice only to build walls when, for one reason or another, it was felt that they were absolutely necessary.

The surviving stretches of wall average 90 cm. in thickness. This is a good deal thicker than the walls of neighbouring Paterno, which were almost certainly of an earlier date. The wall is pierced at regular intervals by arrow slits, which themselves vary considerably in size (pl. XXXV, a). Some are two courses high, others three, and one is two courses inside and three outside, with a sharp downward inclination of the arc of fire of the arrow slit. Similarly the width of the slits varies considerably, from 20 cm. down to 14 cm. on the outer face of the wall and from 40 down to 26 cm. internally. It is evident therefore that exact uniformity in the same fortification was not necessarily to be expected. There is no evidence in this wall of the erection of the type of wooden fighting platform postulated by Lawrence at Paterno; this is hardly surprising since this wall was essentially designed to protect the defenders from fire from the opposite cliff, and not to repel a physical attack. The possibility of such an attack was obviously not seriously considered as only one of the surviving arrow slits is inclined downwards to command attackers trying to climb up from the ravine below.

At a point opposite the south-east corner of the central mound the wall has been strengthened, or possibly rebuilt, at a later date. The feature has the appearance of an internal tower or fighting platform built against the inside of the existing wall, but it could be a repair to the wall after a stretch of the original structure, together with the edge of the cliff on which it was standing, had fallen into the ravine. An internal tower, although slightly unusual, would be a perfectly logical feature bearing in mind the fact that the wall was built on the extreme edge of the cliff and that therefore no towers could be built outwards. Only the footings of this feature remain but it is tempting to think that its construction was part of the final strengthening of the fortifications which also produced the west and east towers; in which case it could have served as a platform for a small cannon.

All along the inside of the perimeter wall, from the buildings south of the chapel, which have already been described, to the central addition, there was a row of

---

26 Lawrence, p. 93.
houses built up against the wall. The fact that these houses were at least as early as the wall is indicated by a series of well made niches which are contemporary with the wall itself, and not cut at a later date.

A final significant feature which may have a bearing on the dating of the wall is that a considerable quantity of broken tile was used in the bonding of the tufa blocks (pl. XXXV, c). This is an unusual feature and suggests that some tile-roofed buildings were at least in part demolished to make room for the wall. This would fit in with the evidence of relatively early structures found in the area south of the chapel. Here, as will be remembered, there was not only a primitive but strangely substantial cross wall running north and south, but also a suggestion of another wall of the same type running inside the line of the perimeter wall. Whether this could conceivably have been an earlier perimeter wall, or just the outer wall of a building which was not completely destroyed, is obscure. But it does seem that there were solid structures in this part of the site before the surviving perimeter wall was built.

**The Bailey and the East Tower**

The tip of the promontory beyond the central mound is taken up by a gently sloping triangular area which appears to have been quite free of structures, except for the perimeter wall continuing along the south side, and a fortification on the extreme eastern end which was probably another three-sided tower. This area was cut off from the rest of the site partly by the east side of the mound, which is sheer, and partly by a wall which continued the same line southwards until it met the perimeter wall. This bailey area was entered by a gate or opening close to the south-east corner of the mound.

There are the remains of two caves cut into the slope of this area, but otherwise no obvious traces of habitation were found. It seems likely that it served as a corral for livestock. The east tower is a far less substantial fortification than that at the west end; indeed its distance from the opposite cliffs is such that it is surprising that it was needed at all. It is true, however, that the slopes down into the ravine are less steep at this point and the tower may have been built as a protection against actual attack at this point. Evidence from other sites indicates that the tip of the promontory was often regarded as a possible weak point, since in many cases the church, often in the early stages the only stone building other than the tower, was placed on the tip to create an additional strongpoint. The remains of the east tower indicate that this also was probably a three-sided structure. The north wall stands to three courses high, measuring 2.15 m. in length and only 58 cm. in width. On the other hand the east wall is the same thickness as the walls of the west tower 1.10 m., and its present length 2.10 m. The contours of the ground once more indicate that this is almost the maximum possible dimension of this wall and that the south wall would have turned back immediately. Two small tufa outcrops with cut surfaces survive as the possible foundations of this south wall.

This tower is provided with an arrow slit set obliquely into the east wall to command the cliffs to the south-east. It is cut through two courses of the wall, and has a very wide inside opening of 47 cm. indicating perhaps that it was designed for use with a crossbow. The east wall remains standing to 17 courses or about 5½ m., but there
is no indication of another arrow slit at the first-floor level, although three beam holes in the tenth course of this wall indicate that such a floor existed.

Caves

Like all the village sites of South Etruria Porciano is amply provided with large caves cut all round the upper slopes of the promontory. In some cases these caves are reached by fairly substantial terraces, and in others only a barely discernible track runs down to them. On the south side of the site many of the caves have been almost completely destroyed either to provide building material, or to accentuate artificially the steepness of the slope. On the north, however, where the drop into the ravine is already almost sheer, the caves are largely intact. On this side they are divided into three main groups. There is a row which borders the access road; one of these was directly under the chapel and is partly collapsed, and the others also seem to have been cut back either as a result of collapse or in order to widen the road. The second group are those cut into the central mound. These consist of two on the east side and three rows of two or three caves sited one above the next on the north side. The third group leads off a narrow terrace on the north side of the bailey area.

Nearly all these caves are roughly rectangular in plan with well cut square or rectangular entrances. Many have been provided at some date with mangers or troughs cut into the walls, and in some cases there are holes in the roof which presumably served either as chimneys, or for quick access from above, or both. It seems extremely probable that these caves and their counterparts on other sites served as human habitations at least during the early stages of the settlement. Apart from the fact that cutting caves in this soft tufa is an extremely easy and rational way of providing housing, evidence of human habitation is provided by the considerable care taken with the cutting and sometimes even the decoration of the caves, and by the obvious signs of fire within them.

Two of the Porciano caves were examined in some detail. Cave 1 is set apart from the main groups and is immediately under the bend in the access road where it winds up under the west tower. The main entrance to this cave faces west and is rectangular. The entrance has been cut to take a door and this degree of sophistication was perhaps dictated by the fact that the approach to the cave was outside the village walls and the occupants of the cave might have needed to defend themselves from attack. The cave has a window cut on the north side which overlooks the Fosso Cerreto, and also a hole in its roof which is cleverly screened from view across the ravine behind a rock outcrop which has been specially cut back to make room for what was perhaps an emergency entrance and exit. The siting of the cave, its extensive command over the ravine and the approaches to the main settlement, and its carefully protected emergency exit, create the impression that it might have served as a sort of guardroom. In the east wall of the cave a series of rectangular niches have been cut in a row about 3 ft. above the level of the cave floor. Much larger groups of rather deeper niches have been noted in caves on other sites and are usually thought to have been dovecotes, but in this case the niches do not seem to have been sufficiently large or numerous to fit this conclusion.

The other cave examined, cave 2, is in the top row on the north side of the central mound (see fig. 9). This is a large, basically rectangular cave, with two holes in its
Fig. 9.—Cave no. 2
roof which open on to the ground level of the mound. Mangers have been cut almost all round this cave, and in the centre a natural column was left when the cave was made. Such columns have been found in other large caves in the area, but in this case it is of particular interest as the column has been shaped with a simple capital and a base; an indication that the cave was not designed solely for animals (pl. XXXIV).

The particular interest of cave 2 lies in the two rock-cut passages which lead out of it, on the south side and in the north-west corner. These slope sharply downwards and their full extent and purpose was not discovered. That in the south wall has a carefully cut arched roof and at a point some 2 m. below the floor of the cave it appears to end in solid rock up to a point about 30 cm. below this arch. However, by shining a torch through the gap between the top of this natural partition and the arched roof, one can see the passage running on down along the same axis. The angle of the passage is such that it seems possible that if it continued it would eventually emerge on the south side of the promontory at the bottom of the ravine. A corresponding entrance at this point was not found owing to the very dense nature of the vegetation, and the whole feature remains an enigma. The other passage was covered by a cut capstone and was filled with earth. In the time available it proved impossible to investigate this for more than its first 2 m. and the attempt to clear it or understand it was then abandoned.

Michael Mallett

PART II

4. The Pottery

The material from Porciano Castle is typical of the later medieval pottery of the Roman Campagna and falls into three distinct categories: coarse ware, which is almost invariably unglazed, lead-glazed pottery and maiolica. Although an account of the glazed wares of Lazio appears between pp. 40 and 86 of this volume, discussion of the coarse pottery must await the publication of the finds from Santa Cornelia, the site of Capracorium. As an interim measure, I include here not only descriptions of the sherds from Porciano itself, but also notes on the principal types of medieval pottery used in northern Lazio.27

The Coarse Pottery

Throughout Lazio, as indeed most of Italy, medieval pottery was made of clays acquired from two sources: alluvial deposits in the valley bottoms and outcrops of clayey bedrock. Clay obtained from outcrops may be either ‘ball clay’, which has much the same properties as alluvium, or ‘red clay’, which is rich in iron oxide and often too plastic to be worked without the addition of a temper. Most quarried clay has to be weathered before potting. Alluvial clay, on the other hand, is usually

27 Santa Cornelia was excavated between 1961 and 1964 by Mr. Charles Daniels and members of the British School at Rome. I am grateful to Mr. Daniels for information on the results of his excavation. For Santa Cornelia and domuscultae, cf. J. B. Ward-Perkins, PBSR, xxix (1961) p. 75 ff.; P. D. Partner, PBSR, xxxiv (1966), pp. 68–78.
ready for use without either weathering or the addition of a temper. Rivers draining the Apennines, the Tuscan Hills and the tufo country of Lazio deposit relatively iron-free alluvia which, when fired under oxidising conditions, turn either cream or pale pink. They have, therefore, the additional advantage over iron-rich red clay of being ready for decoration without first receiving a light-coloured slip. In areas where both types of clay were readily available, most of the kitchen wares were made of quarried clay and most of the table wares of alluvium. Amphorae, too, were made of alluvium, perhaps because it is more easily worked than the plastic clay obtainable from quarries.

Clearly both types of clay were used at the potteries which supplied Porciano, for nearly all the table wares and amphorae have a light fabric, while all the kitchen wares are dark. The fabrics with a light surface vary in colour from cream through pink to orange. They are fine and their texture ranges from smooth to slightly harsh, while abraded sherds have a powdery surface. The kitchen wares are entirely different. They are made of quarried clay and fired in a reducing atmosphere. As a result, they vary in colour from brown to dark grey. The fabric is coarse and it sometimes contains abundant quartz or mica inclusions. It may be either soft and crumbly or, when fired at higher temperature, hard and brittle. The only pottery which does not belong to either category is a small group of sherds with a smooth, dark grey fabric, evidently made of alluvial clay but fired in a reducing atmosphere. At Porciano the frequency of the various coarse ware fabrics is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Number of sherds</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cream</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine grey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse grey-brown</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,439</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the excavation yielded a large collection of pottery, the number of recognisable forms is small and most of these are represented by rim sherds only. Fortunately, however, the discovery of more complete examples elsewhere in Lazio leaves little doubt about the general appearance of the vessels before they were broken. The fragmentary pots from Porciano consist of the following types (fig. 10):

Dishes and bowls.

These have straight or curving sides and a flat bottom. Most examples from Lazio are relatively shallow. They are usually made of the same grey-brown fabric as the cooking pots and other kitchen utensils. Type 5, which has a fine orange fabric, is therefore, atypical.

1. Plain, slightly thickened rim.
2. Similar, but the rim has a pronounced thickening.
3. Inturned rim.
4. Flattened, slightly everted rim.
5. The rim has a triangular section.
Fig. 10.—Coarse Pottery from Porciano. Scale 1:4.
Cooking pots.

Throughout the middle ages the cooking pots made in Lazio had a globular or biconical body, a flat or slightly rounded base and either one or two broad strap handles. They were always made of a soft grey-brown fabric which often has conspicuous mica inclusions.

7. Everted rim.
8. The rim has a triangular section.

Jar.

Jars were not common in Lazio. Most, but not all, of the few examples known to me have a light pinkish fabric.

9. Large vessel, with an everted rim thickened at the lip.

Jugs.

In the later Middle Ages most of the jugs used in Lazio were glazed, either with lead (see below, p. 139) or tin (p. 141). Unglazed vessels do, however, occur and all of these have an oxidized fabric.

10. Slightly bulging cylindrical neck with a plain rim and a circular-section handle.
11. Small vessel with a slightly flaring neck.

Amphorae.

Like the cooking pots, the amphorae changed little in the medieval period and the basic form was always globular, with a rounded or omphaloid base, a short neck and two broad strap handles. The form, which may have been introduced from the Aegean, was already in use in the eighth and ninth centuries and it continued to be made until the post-medieval period.

12. Slightly flaring cylindrical neck with a bevelled rim.
12a. Typical omphaloid base.
13. Tapering neck with an everted rim.
14. Markedly tapering neck with a plain rim.
15. Amphora-like vessel with a bung-hole near the bottom, on either side of which is a horizontal handle.

Lids.

Lids were usually made of quarried clay and their size suggests that many were covers for cooking pots. They are divisible into two types: (i) those with convex (types 16 and 17) and (ii) those with concave (type 18) profiles.

---

28 For a restored cooking pot from Santa Cornelia, cf. Stiesdal, fig. 20.
29 For globular amphorae from a seventh-century wreck at Yassi Ada, off the Turkish coast, cf. George F. Bass, Archäologische Anzeiger, lxvii (1962), 735–64, fig. 6a, b.
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16. Convex side and simple rim.
17. As above, but with a downturned rim.
18. Concave side and thickened rim.

Lamps.

Most of the later medieval lamps in Lazio consisted of a saucer with a central knob. They were made of both oxidised and reduced fabrics.

20. Saucer supported on a pedestal with a splayed base and a broad flange half way down, presumably intended either to contain another wick or to catch the drips from the saucer above.

The Lead-glazed Pottery

Five types of medieval lead-glazed pottery are known in Lazio at present: Forum Ware, Pottery with a Sparse Glaze, Pottery with a Bright Green Glaze, Spiral Ware and Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration. The first and earliest of these, Forum Ware, was the subject of an article published in 1966.\textsuperscript{30} Since this article went to press, new evidence has accumulated and it is now possible to define the position of Forum Ware with greater clarity. The largest group of Forum Ware was found c. 1900 in the \textit{Lacus Iuturnae} in the Roman Forum.\textsuperscript{31} During the middle ages the basin of the \textit{Lacus} became filled with earth and rubbish. Contained in this filling were more than 1500 pieces of glazed pottery, including eighty-three vessels which were almost or wholly complete. All but three were of Forum Ware and all but one of these were jugs. They have a coarse fabric which varies in colour from dark grey to red. The glaze was applied to the outside and the inside of the neck. It is thick, and green or greenish brown. Most of the vessels are decorated with applied scales made from the same clay as the rest of the vessel and arranged in vertical rows. Incised decoration also occurs, and there is reason to suppose that the earliest Forum Ware was either plain or decorated with incisions, and that only the later vessels were decorated in relief.

Forum Ware has now been found at eleven sites in Lazio. At Santa Cornelia, where the excavators recognised three phases of occupation, it occurs in both periods 1 and 2. Period 1 immediately preceded 2, which consisted of a \textit{domuscula}, or centre of an agricultural estate, founded by Pope Hadrian I in 780 and abandoned before the end of the ninth century. The earliest Forum Ware was already in use, therefore, by 780.

Forum ware has an important place in the development of medieval glazed pottery, not only in Lazio but also in the whole of south-west Europe. The origin and date of the earliest medieval glazes made in Europe are controversial. Most Italian scholars maintain that glazed pottery was produced continuously in Italy

from the Roman period, while others assert that there was a break in continuity and that the technique of glazing pottery was reintroduced from Byzantium. The latter view now appears to be correct. Forum Ware is the earliest securely-dated medieval glazed pottery yet found in the west Mediterranean. It shares a number of features with Byzantine glazed pottery, notably the use of applied ornament recalling 'Petal ware' and some of the more elaborate brown-glazed pottery used at Corinth in the ninth century. Thus, while it would be premature to dismiss the possibility of continuity between Roman and medieval glazed pottery anywhere in the west Mediterranean, the present evidence does suggest that Forum Ware represents an early stage in the re-introduction of the glazing technique to Italy.

In Lazio Forum Ware was replaced by pottery with a thin greenish glaze applied to the outside of the vessel in irregular patches. I have named this 'Pottery with a Sparse Glaze' on analogy with similar wares from Holland. Sparse Glaze occurs on vessels with a light-surfaced fabric. It varies in colour from yellow to greenish brown and the surface is often pitted with small 'pin-holes,' made of bubbles of gas released from the glaze when the vessel was fired. Pottery with a Sparse Glaze was used in Lazio for a considerable time. Among the earliest examples are the three exceptional vessels from the Locus Iuturnae. At Santa Cornelia, the numbers of sherds of Forum Ware and Pottery with a Sparse Glaze found in Periods 1 and 2 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Forum Ware</th>
<th>Pottery with a Sparse Glaze</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and it is clear, therefore, that sparse-glazed pottery was in common use by the late eighth or ninth century and that the earliest pieces were contemporary with the latest forum Ware. Pottery with a Sparse Glaze was still in use at Santa Cornelia in period 3, which did not begin until the twelfth century.

During the late eleventh and twelfth centuries three improved finishes were introduced in Lazio. The simplest of these had a brilliant dark green finish made by adding copper oxide to a normal lead glaze. The 'Bright Green Glaze' was applied to bowls and jugs with a smooth oxidised fabric, sometimes covered with an off-white slip. The presence of a slip suggests that the glaze was introduced from an area where pale fabrics were unobtainable. The earliest datable Pottery with a Bright Green Glaze comes from the campanili of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme and Santa Maria Maggiore at Rome. The first of these was constructed during the pontificate of Lucius II (1144-5) or Eugenius III (1145-53) and the second under Eugenius III. Another type of improved finish consisted of spiral decoration in brown and green under a colourless glaze. It occurs on bowls with a ring base and a plain or thickened rim, and I have named the type 'Spiral Ware.' It is found on sites in Sicily,
Campania and Southern Lazio. The only closely dated example is a vessel built into the *campanile* of Santa Prassede at Rome, presumably when it was constructed by Gregory VII between 1073 and 1086.  

The third and most elaborate improved finish consisted of a group of wares decorated with buds, leaves and geometric motifs carried out in brown, green and yellow. Examples of this 'Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration' have been known since the last century, but in the past they have been included, mistakenly, in the 'Umbria and Lazio' group of Archaic Maiolica (see below, p. 142). The type cannot yet be dated with precision. Brown, green and yellow glazes were all in use in Lazio for bricks and tiles by the middle of the twelfth century. However, the earliest actual pottery decorated in these colours is a bowl from the *campanile* of SS. Giovanni e Paolo and a group of jugs from the medieval cloister formerly attached to San Paolo fuori le Mura, both at Rome. The former was built shortly before 1181 and the cloister was at an advanced stage of construction in 1208. Lead-glazed Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration went out of use with the introduction of maiolica.

With two exceptions, the lead-glazed sherds from Porciano consist of Pottery with a Sparse Glaze. Seventy-three sparse-glazed fragments were found. Most of them are tiny and it is rarely possible to reconstruct the vessels they represent. A few, however, come from jugs with a squat biconical body, a tapering neck and a spout, similar to one of the sparse-glazed vessels from the *Lacus Iuturnae* at Rome. Another fragment belongs to a small jar (fig. 11, 1) and others to jugs with a rilled cylindrical neck. A handful of sherds have simple stabbed and incised ornament.

The two exceptional lead-glazed fragments are Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration. Both were found in late deposits, associated with Archaic Maiolica.

*The Maiolica*

At the end of the twelfth century the technique of adding tin oxide to lead glazes, thereby providing an opaque white finish, was introduced to peninsular Italy. Tin-glazed pottery, or maiolica, was developed in the Middle East in the ninth century, probably as rival to the white porcelain then imported from China. The technique of tin-glazing was rapidly diffused throughout the Moslem countries bordering the Mediterranean and by the fourteenth century maiolica was in regular production outside the borders of Islam, in Italy and southern France. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion, often denied by Italian scholars, that tin-glazed pottery was introduced to these areas from an Islamic source.

The most famous medieval tin-glazed pottery made in Italy, the so-called 'Archaic Maiolica,' was decorated exclusively in brown and green. It is found throughout north and central Italy and is usually divided into three regional groups:

---

38 Serafini, pp. 201–4 and fig. 522 A.
39 For example, Bernard Rackham, *Catalogue of Italian Maiolica* (Victoria and Albert Museum, London, 1940), no. 2, which was in the South Kensington Collection in 1889.
42 Ballardini, p. 142, fig. 183.
Lazio and Umbria, Tuscany and Emilia. The earliest dated examples belong to the later thirteenth century. Of all Archaic Maiolica perhaps the best known type is Orvieto ware from southern Umbria. It has a smooth cream or light pink fabric and is decorated with a wide variety of abstract, heraldic, plant and zoomorphic motifs. The earliest Orvieto ware, which belongs to the period c. 1250–1300, has geometric and simple plant ornament only. In the fourteenth century zoomorphic decoration was added and the famous pedestal jugs decorated with birds came into production. At a slightly later date applied ornament, usually consisting of a human mask flanked by oval ‘bunches of grapes,’ became common, as did the use of abundant brown cross-hatching. Some time after 1400 potters at Orvieto began to imitate the latest styles of decoration farther north, notably the Florentine ‘Oak Leaf’ style and the stile severo of Faenza. Both were carried out in brown and dark blue and, after producing imitations in the traditional brown and green, manufacturers at Orvieto adopted the new colour-scheme, probably c. 1450.

Archaic Maiolica was not the only type of tin-glazed pottery available to the occupants of Porciano. During the thirteenth century the technique of tin-glazing was introduced at Rome and there potters began to produce maiolica with ornament identical to that of the lead-glazed pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration. It apparently continued in use until the fourteenth century, when Archaic Maiolica with relief decoration and frequent cross-hatching captured the market.

Both types of maiolica were found at Porciano. The Archaic Maiolica (fig. 11, 6) consisted of fragmentary jugs and carinated cups, and the polychrome ware from Rome of jugs only (fig. 11, 2-5). All the Archaic Maiolica appears to be early; there is no relief decoration, no abundant cross-hatching and no imitation of the Oak Leaf style or the stile severo. Most of the unglazed pottery from Porciano was found in a cutting through the ditch which surrounded the central tower (see above, p. 127). The filling of the ditch consisted of five separate deposits and the maiolica from there is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Archaic Maiolica</th>
<th>Rome Maiolica</th>
<th>Indeterminate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is probable, therefore, that the occupants of Porciano of the later thirteenth or fourteenth century were supplied first with Archaic Maiolica and later almost exclusively with the type of pottery made at Rome. If this conclusion is correct, it suggests that the occupants who purchased Archaic Maiolica had business farther north and that those who later bought Rome-style maiolica had business farther south.

---

\(^{45}\) This summary of the suggested development of Orvieto ware is based on a study of the pottery in the Museo dell’Opera del Duomo at Orvieto, which I was able to carry out through the kindness of the Canonical authorities and the Director of the Museo Faina, Dr. Mario Bizzari.  
\(^{46}\) Fragmenta which belong to a single vessel are here recorded as a single piece.
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Fig. 11.—Glazed Pottery from Porciano. Scale 1:4.
(N.B. 4 is restored from fragments)

Chronology

The evidence which the pottery provides for the chronology of Porciano is disappointing, for three factors combine to make close dating impossible. Firstly, the study of medieval pottery in Italy is in its infancy, and at present only a few of the most distinctive types may be dated with precision; secondly, the glazed wares, about which we know considerably more than the coarse pottery, were represented by small and often indeterminate fragments; and, lastly, although a number of securely-stratified deposits were excavated, most of these belong to the later stage of the occupation and the early history of the site is consequently obscure.

Nevertheless, it is possible to divide the medieval deposits into two periods and to suggest an approximate date for each. This division, which, it must be emphasised, holds good for the pottery and not for the history of the site as a whole, is supported both by the stratigraphy and the contents of each deposit. Period 1 is represented by the earthen levels in an exploratory trench cut at the side of the salient in 1965 (see above, p. 123). It contains abundant Pottery with a Sparse Glaze, but no maiolica. It may be divided into phases (a) and (b). The deposits belonging to phase (a) were sealed by a layer of dark grey mortar which accumulated during the construction or re-constructed of the stone defences (p. 121). The deposits of phase (b) overlay fine mortar spread. Period 2 is represented by most of the remaining deposits, including the filling of the ditch, although the latest levels of all are clearly post-medieval. The characteristic pottery of period 2 is early maiolica.

Neither period is closely datable. The characteristic ware of Period 1, Sparse-
glazed Pottery, was already made in the ninth century and it continued in use at least until the twelfth. It is highly unlikely, however, that the occupation of Porciano began in the ninth century. As a promontory site with natural defences, it belongs to a large class of medieval settlements in Lazio, most of which came into use in the ninth and tenth centuries (p. 145). Unless Porciano was exceptional, it is reasonable to suppose that period 1 began, roughly speaking, c. 1000. The boundary between Periods 1 and 2 is defined by the introduction of maiolica, although the rarity of Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration suggests that there may, in fact, have been a gap between them. Although it is not yet possible to suggest firm dates for the earliest stages in the development of medieval maiolica, the present evidence indicates that it was available in Lazio from the middle of the thirteenth century. The medieval tin-glazed wares from Porciano do not include any sherds with decoration imitating the Oak Leaf style or the Stile Severo and this suggests that Period 2 had already ended by the middle of the fifteenth century. Indeed, the absence of relief decoration and abundant cross hatching, types which certainly reached the Porciano region as they occur at the neighbouring site of Monterosi, further suggests that the period was over by 1400. The two periods probably fall, therefore, within the following limits:

**Period 1**  
c. 1000–1250/75 (i.e. Dr. Mallett’s Periods I and II)\(^{48}\)

**Period 2**  
c. 1250/75–1400 (Dr Mallett’s Period III)

Despite the latitude of this chronology, it is useful at this early stage in the study of medieval pottery to record the stratigraphical positions of the various types of coarse pottery described above (p. 136). They are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Period 1 (c. 1000–1250/75)</th>
<th>Period 2 (c. 1250/75–1400)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the status of Porciano declined after the end of the fourteenth century, occupation continued, possibly intermittently, well into the post-medieval period.

\(^{47}\) Grid ref. 774749. Material collected by members of the British School at Rome.  
\(^{48}\) See below, conclusions. Phase (a) belongs to Dr. Mallett’s Period I and (b) to Period II.
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The most sophisticated pottery found on the site, for example, consists of a fragmentary dish decorated with the head of a woman, seen in profile, carried out in yellow, orange and blue on a deep blue ground. It belongs to the sixteenth century. More recently still, 'squatter' occupation in some of the caves overlooking the Cerreto gorge and in the vicinity of the chapel left a scatter of hard reddish pottery with an orange lead glaze, a common post-medieval ware in most of central Italy.

DAVID WHITEHOUSE

PART III

5. Conclusions

The foregoing report brings out very clearly how much more there is to find out about this very complex site, and how tentative must be any hypothesis about its history and development. To attempt to excavate it completely would, considering its inaccessibility and extent, be an exaggerated dissipation of funds and time. It is not historically a key site, and the lessons to be learnt from it have little more than local application.

It would, however, be unduly cautious to leave it at this stage without hazarding some general hypothesis as to the various stages of its development, to add to the individual pointers which its investigation has contributed to our knowledge of medieval settlements in South Etruria.

During the entire course of the excavations no pre-medieval material of any sort was found. The fact that such a site was not occupied in Roman times fits in well with our present ideas about the pattern of settlement in the area. Nor is the lack of indications of Faliscan settlement surprising, as although medieval and pre-Roman sites tended to be similar in character, there are frequent examples in the area of tenth- and eleventh-century occupation of hitherto unoccupied sites.

The evidence, even if admittedly incomplete, suggests four stages in the development and history of Porciano.

Period I, c. 1000–c. 1200: the occupation of the central mound by a group of the inhabitants of the disintegrating domuscula of Capracorum. At some stage during this period the small tower would have been built, and the community would have been further defended by a partial ditch across the promontory. The inhabitants would have been living in the caves round the mound and perhaps in timber and wattle huts on the top.

Period II, c. 1200–c. 1275: a first period of expansion. During this period most of the area within the present walls would have been occupied, storage pits dug, and some rough stone buildings put up. The site, particularly at the west end, would have been levelled and built up with a platform, and possibly some rough perimeter wall was erected.

Period III, c. 1275–c. 1350: a period of more organised expansion, which probably coincided with the appearance of the hospital of Santo Spirito as lord, and the
establishment of a definite link with Rome. In this period the approach to the settlement was reorganised and the central ditch converted into an entrance. The primitive buildings were largely demolished and a perimeter wall with houses and chapel built. Occupation of the borgo and the cutting of the outer ditch would probably date from the same period. Such a physical expansion need not necessarily have been accompanied by a growth in population. It is quite possible that with the passage into the hands of the hospital, the settlement might have been converted from a loose village community into a seigneurial castle of the type more common in northern Europe. Such a process could well involve a certain dispersal and diminution of the population, which would explain its non-appearance in the salt tax registers.

*Period IV, c. 1350 to abandonment (probably complete by 1520)*: this period was marked by further fortification of a fairly advanced type which would indicate continued local strategic and administrative importance even if not a flourishing population. The hypothesis of the site becoming increasingly a seigneurial strong-point rather than a natural population centre, would explain its abandonment once such a strongpoint became superfluous in the later years of the fifteenth century.
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Introduction

This article is a study of the relationship between equestrian rank and local affairs in the cities of Africa Proconsularis, Numidia and the Mauretanias, during the period of the Principate. The discussion centres on the conferment of equestrian rank; the question of how far local office was an avenue to equestrian promotion; and the extent to which local men, having once achieved equestrian or juror rank, continued to take part in municipal affairs.

The enquiry is based on a classified list of knights and indices in African cities, drawn from epigraphic evidence (pp. 166–183, below). Because the purpose is the limited one of investigating knighthood in the municipal context, some knights have been excluded from the list. Knights who held public office, and who would thus probably have spent substantial parts of their adult life away from their native town, have been omitted, except in cases where they are actually recorded as taking some part in municipal affairs. In fact, a substantial number of those who followed equestrian careers (as distinct from merely receiving equestrian rank) did also participate in municipal affairs, often at the beginning of their careers; and fifty-five entries in the list are made up of procurators (nos. 1–23), and holders of military posts (nos. 41–72). A further small category of semi-public officials, the viri not explicitly described as procurators have also been included in the list where they are known to have taken part in local affairs (nos. 24–40; see Appendix II). For other holders of the equestrian militiae, see M. G. Jarrett 'The African Contribution to the Imperial Equestrian Service', Historia, xii, 1963, pp. 209–26; and A study of the municipal aristocracies of the Roman Empire in the west, with special reference to North Africa (Ph.D. thesis, Durham 1958).
equestrian curatores rei publicae, have been included, since they were in some sense holders of local office² (nos. 73–87).

The next part of the list, which is the longest, is made up of knights not known to have begun public careers of any kind, who took part in municipal affairs³ (nos. 88–180). The last section consists of knights who are not recorded either as the holders of equestrian office, or as taking any part in municipal affairs (nos. 181–254; some of these inscriptions are fragmentary).

THE EVIDENCE

The greater part of the evidence for knights in the African provinces comes from inscriptions honouring the individuals concerned, set up in public places during their lifetime and giving details of the offices which they held. Some knights appear peripherally as the relations of other persons honoured with public statues; in these cases the inscription is not always punctilious in listing the details of the knight’s career. For example, a knight at Cuicul in Numidia, commemorated under Marcus Aurelius, was referred to on the base of his son’s statue without being credited with any of the local offices which he is known to have held by this date.⁴ The father could easily afford this omission, because other statue-bases (which have also survived) described his career in detail; but the majority of African knights are unfortunately known only from single surviving inscriptions, even if they were originally commemorated several times over in varying degrees of detail. Some knights are known only from funerary inscriptions, where great brevity usually prevailed, probably resulting in the omission of details about local office in some cases. Fragmentary inscriptions are another cause of incomplete information.

Three African knights mentioned in literary sources have been included in this list, which is otherwise entirely derived from inscriptions (nos. 205, 237, 238).

I. THE NATURE OF EQUESTRIAN RANK

(i) When equestrian rank is stated in an inscription, this is normally an indication that a specific grant of rank had been made to the individual concerned by the Emperor or in his name.⁵ The characteristic description of equestrian status in second-century African inscriptions is equo publico exornatus, or a similar phrase.

It is sometimes argued that there were also many knights who, although lacking the equus publicus, nevertheless had a legitimate claim to equestrian title on the simple grounds that they possessed the equestrian census and were of citizen status and

² The office involved supervision of public spending by the town. In some cases it seems to have amounted to little more than an exalted local magistracy, held by men drawn from the same class as local magistrates (cf. 'cur.r.p. bis' in a Mauretanian inscription of A.D. 311, AE 1922, 23). In general, C. Lucas ‘Notes on the Curatores Rei Publicae of Roman Africa’, JRS xxx, 1940, pp. 56–74.

³ The few knights who held only the decurionate have been included under the heading of officeholders, since a summa honoraria was payable for membership of the ordo (CSRA, nos. 345–8). Some knights did not even belong to the ordo (C. 8938, cf. p. 1953 = ILS 5078).

⁴ C. Iulius Crescens Didius Crescentianus, AE 1916, 13, cf. C. 8318–9, etc. (no. 57 in the list).

⁵ The authors of the two main modern works on the knights do not admit the existence of any additional category of knights who claimed equestrian rank on the basis of wealth and birth under the Principate (Stein, pp. 57 ff.; Nicolet, pp. 177 ff. Also Mommsen, St 111, p. 484 = Dr. P. VI, 2, p. 79).
descent. It is true that literary sources could in some contexts describe all citizens with the necessary census qualification as knights. For example, Strabo states that both Gades and Patavium had 500 equestrians in his day, though it is inconceivable that either town can have had so many equestes equo publico at this time. But in both statements Strabo was plainly speaking in terms of census-qualifications. It does not appear that individuals ever described themselves as knights in inscriptions on this basis alone. Under the Principate, citizens who did not claim equestrian rank made public gifts whose size exceeded the equestrian census, both in Italy and in Africa. Stein and Nicolet give more extensive arguments against believing that there existed under the Principate a class of knights based on wealth and birth alone, which need not be repeated here.

It has been further suggested that the supposed individual claim to equestrian rank on the basis of wealth and birth alone might be denoted in inscriptions by the title equestes Romanus. This view is undermined by evidence from Ostia in which a local benefactor (who died in the late second century) appears variously, in two posthumous inscriptions, as ‘e[ques Ro]manus’ and as ‘equo publ(ico)’. The same fluidity of title in referring to one man is found in a single inscription from a town near Aquincum. Again, several procurators (whose claim to equestrian rank in the fullest sense is beyond doubt) are referred to in inscriptions as equites Romani. Citizens who were not knights sometimes produced several sons who were ‘equites Romani’, whose rank was presumably conferred on them (instances in the present list: nos. 116–7; 176–7; 208–9; 243–5). And one of the present inscriptions also shows an ‘eq(ues) R(omanus) ex inquisitione allectus’, whose rank was clearly a conferred one (no. 91).

A letter of Pliny’s appears to confuse the issue by suggesting that money alone would be enough to make Romatius Firmus, a decurion of Comum, an equestes Romanus. But a later letter shows that Pliny in fact also obtained a specific grant of rank for Firmus (whose adlection to the decuriae indicum could not have resulted automatically from an increase in wealth). Consequently, the silence of the first letter cannot be taken to indicate that Pliny did not also obtain a specific grant of equestrian rank for Firmus.

Literary sources, such as Pliny’s first letter to Romatius Firmus, commonly referred to knights as equites Romani, and they very rarely mentioned the equus publicus by name. Inscriptions, on the other hand, normally used the term equus publicus under the earlier Principate. The regular appearance of the term equestes

---

6 Strabo III, 169; V, 213.
7 ήκουσα γενόντων ἐν μὲν τῶν καθ’ ἡμᾶς τιμήσεων πεντάκοσιον ἄριστα τιμηθέντας ἑπτάκοσιος Ταδσένοσ (Πάθεος, ναός ἀρίστης τῶν ταυτής πόλεως, ἡ γε ναοῦστι λέγεται τιμήσασθαι πεντάκοσιον ἑπτάκοσιος ἄριστος) (V, 213).
8 A possible exception was Laelius Timminus of Madauros, ‘qui rem paravit haud mediocrem familiae,/domumque teneam ad equestrem promovit gradum’; these words may refer to equestrian wealth without necessarily indicating equestrian rank. But this is uncertain (no. 218).
9 CSHA, nos. 1; 77 (HS600,000 and HS1 million);
11 CIL XIV, 353 & 4642; cf. SCRI, no. 672.
12 CIL III, 3626 = 10570 = ILS 7127.
13 Nicolet, p. 181.
14 Id., p. 183.
17 Id., V, 2, 734–5.
Romanus in later inscriptions amounts to no more than an extension of common literary usage.\textsuperscript{18} It does not indicate a different kind of knight.

(ii) The duties attached to equestrian rank as such amounted to very little under the Principate. All knights between 17 and 35\textsuperscript{19} were in theory expected to attend a parade in military array in Rome on 15 July (the transsectio equitum).\textsuperscript{20} It cannot be known whether provincial knights were assiduous in attending this occasion. The presence in Rome of African knights who did not follow active equestrian careers is mentioned in six of the present inscriptions: five of the men held equestrian priesthoods\textsuperscript{21} and the sixth simply resided in Rome (nos. 131, 139, 142, 143, 227\textsuperscript{a}; and 154).\textsuperscript{21a} The children on whom the Emperors sometimes conferred equestrian rank (p. 157, below) could hardly have attended the parade before their maturity.

In theory, equestrian rank opened the way to a variety of opportunities, including service in the jury-courts, service as an officer in the auxiliaries and legions, and exalted administrative employment as one of the Emperor's procurators. But in practice, only a minority of those who received knighthood went on to any of these public activities, whether from their own lack of initiative, or through absence of opportunity. A large number of those who became knights were probably content to remain as possessors of a rank which gave considerable social prestige, though little more. The appurtenances of equestrian rank in the form of special dress, and privileged seating at public entertainments\textsuperscript{22} were enough to mark out its holders as men apart from the ordinary municipal aristocracy, though most of the knights were in fact only the most successful members of this aristocracy. The majority of equestrian promotions seem to have been honorific,\textsuperscript{23} and were only connected with the active administration of the Empire insofar as they showed concern for the maintenance and increase of the privileged classes from whom future administrators might be drawn.

II. Chronology (see also Appendix I)

Though the majority of the inscriptions in the present list contain no specific date, there are enough dated examples to give a strong indication of where the main concentrations lie. The earliest dated African knight known from epigraphic sources is a holder of the military tribunate who held magistracies and dedicated an arch at Thugga early in the reign of Claudius (A.D. 42, no. 56). The last in the present series (from which all evidence later than the accession of Diocletian is omitted), is an equestrian curator rei publicae at Nigrenses Maiores in Numidia attested in the year A.D. 267. The present collection of evidence thus spans a period of more than 200 years; but the main concentrations certainly lie in the second and third centuries.

\textsuperscript{18} In African inscriptions 'eq(ues) R(omanus)' was mainly a later usage than 'equo publico' (below p. 152 and Appendix I).
\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Sta} III, pp. 496-8 = Dr. P. VI, 2, pp. 93-5.
\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Id.}, p. 522 = p. 125; Stein, p. 55, nn. 3-4.
\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Cf. Sta} III, pp. 567-9 = Dr. P VI, 2, pp. 179-181.
\textsuperscript{21a} The grandfather of the Emperor Septimius Severus 'in decursis et inter selectos Romae iudicavit' (no. 155).
\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Loc. cit.}, pp. 513-21 = 113-24.
\textsuperscript{23} Compare the promotions of children to equestrian rank discussed below, p. 157 and n. 52.
THE BRITISH SCHOOL AT ROME

For dating purposes, the contents of the list can be divided into three main categories: the iudices or members of the decuriae; 24 those described as ‘equo publico’ or who were adlected ‘in turmas equitum’; and those who used the title ‘eques Romanus’. The chronological concentrations of these three categories can be shown in a brief tabulation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Earliest dated occurrence</th>
<th>Median date 24a</th>
<th>Latest known occurrence</th>
<th>Total dated sample</th>
<th>Overall total, including undated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decuriae</td>
<td>93/117</td>
<td>138/161</td>
<td>c. 190/200</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Eq. pub.’ &amp;</td>
<td>98/117</td>
<td>193/211</td>
<td>222/235</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘turm. eq.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Eques Romanus’</td>
<td>198/217</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dated inscriptions of these three categories are set out more fully in Appendix I, p. 185, below.

None of the three categories show any examples firmly dated to the first century (the only individuals in the present list who certainly belong to the first century are two holders of military posts from Thugga, nos. 56 and 71). The dated iudices lie almost entirely in the second century, 25 as do the majority of the holders of the equus publicus. However, the ‘equites Romani’ appear to be concentrated almost entirely in the third century, though only fifteen of the 102 men in this category are securely dated.

The dated series suggests some acceleration in the number of Africans who received promotion in rank: there are significantly more mentions of ‘equites Romani’, who were mainly concentrated in the third century, than there are mentions of the mainly second century ‘equus publicus’ and ‘turmas equitum’ (the totals are 102 and 73). Even taking into account the substantial number of procurators and holders of military posts who do not appear in this list, it still appears that as many of the attested promotions of Africans to the equestrian order took place in the third century as in the second century.

III. ACCESS TO EQUESTRIAN AND JUROR RANK

(i) The surviving evidence gives the impression that the first move in equestrian promotions usually lay with the candidate himself or his sponsor, and not with the government (though imperial initiatives are not unheard of). 26 If a rich local man

24 The mentions of the decuriae in the present list are as follows: nos. 72, 21, 155, 68, 96, 147, 167, 178, 50, 93, 101, 102, 103, 129, 146, 152, 166, 9, 158, 137, 10, 43, 147, 90, 138, 144, 168, 180. Other African iudices (who followed public careers and are not known to have taken part in local affairs): C. 15872; 27572; AE 1925, 44; 1953, 73; 1954, 140; 1957, 249; 1962, 183.

25 The median date is the date of the middle inscription in the series when all the inscriptions are arranged in chronological order.

26 The African inscriptions (many of them discovered since the Staatrecht was written) do not contradict Mommsen’s observation that evidence for the decuriae virtually ceases with the accession of Septimius Severus. 5 a III, p. 539, n. 1 = Dr. P. VI, 2, p. 144, n. 2.

26 Imperial initiative in extending the membership of the equestrian order in Dio LIX, 9, 5. Initiative by a local figure, who sought the equus publicus for himself, and was questioned by the Emperor Hadrian, in Ps. Dositheus (G. Goetz, Corp. Hist. Lat. III, 1892, pp. 33, 1–25 and 388, 11–21). Initiative by a senator in obtaining the equus publicus and membership of the decuriae for a friend, in Pliny, Ep. I, 19 and IV, 29 (n. 15 above).
wanted equestrian rank, civil life offered no automatic institutional routes of access. But he could sometimes hope, if he distinguished himself in local affairs, to be able to attract favour from above and thus to achieve promotion. Some inscriptions suggest that in the earlier period it was very much more difficult for a man from a minor town in the African provinces to obtain equestrian rank than for a man from a major town.

Although most of the inscriptions are uninformative or inconclusive about access to equestrian rank, some clearly show a sequence in which municipal activities, usually including the tenure of magistracies or priesthoods, were followed by promotion to equestrian or juror rank. It is reasonable to see a causal relationship between the two parts of this sequence, since the promotion of obscure provincials was probably closely related to paper qualifications, and can have depended little upon direct assessment of personal ability. The Emperor is unlikely to have had any effective personal acquaintance with the candidate for advancement in the great majority of provincial promotions, even when promotion took place as the result of an interview. The two African inscriptions which refer to equestrian promotion as the result of personal scrutiny both show knights who had held major municipal offices.

Since equestrian rank was often largely honorific, it seems possible that knighthood was also given as a recognition of local eminence which had not so far received any institutional expression. Equestrian rank may have gone to rich local men merely on the strength of their being considered the most important men of their town, those reputed to be the 'principes civitatis'. If such adlections were made, we cannot expect any specific confirmation or denial from the present collection of epigraphic evidence. A series of African knights are recorded without mention of equestrian careers or municipal activities, but it is almost impossible to say whether the bulk of these inscriptions provide any positive proof of the inactivity of the individuals and families concerned, or whether they are merely incomplete records (nos. 181–254). Some of the inscriptions are funerary and therefore exceptionally brief, while others are fragmentary; some record knights whose adlection (usually at an early age) took place after an impressive display of municipal activity by their parents, a sequence which may have been more widespread than is indicated by the specific examples which survive. The number of local knights for whom municipal activities are specifically recorded in the present sample is still greater than the number who, for whatever reason, are not so recorded (nos. 88–180, compared with nos. 181–254). It appears that the promotion of families who were active at the municipal level must have been more frequent than the promotion of the merely wealthy, if this took place at all.

It cannot be argued that local office and local munificence by themselves

---

27 For the Emperor's personal responsibility for maintaining the membership of the decuriae, Suetonius, Tib. 41 (adlections are said to have lapsed altogether while Tiberius was on Capreae).
28 'Eq(ues) R(omanus) ex inquisitione allectus', and 'probatus ab Imp(eratoribus) L. Septimio Severo Fl. Pertinace Aug. et M. Aurelio Antonino Aug.' (nos. 91, 158).
29 *Cf. TLL* III, 1236, 39–40; *CIL* II, 6278, 1. 24; IX 1083; Pliny, *Ep.* III, 2, 2, etc.
30 See below, p. 158.
31 Procurators, *egregii*, and holders of military posts are omitted from this count, since they have only been included in the present list in cases where their local involvement is attested.
constituted a sure route to promotion in rank. Specific patronage by members of the Senate or holders of equestrian posts was almost certainly often also necessary. An example is provided by Pliny’s advocacy of Romatus Firmus of Comum for equestrian rank and membership of the decuriae. Letters of recommendation abound wherever the correspondence of Roman public men has survived. The wider background against which the success of men from African cities in achieving equestrian rank must be seen is the increasingly large entry of Africans into the Senate and procuratorial service from the end of the first century onwards. But if the success of Africans in public life was to become almost a self-generating process from the late second century onwards, it cannot have been so from the outset. The entry of Africans into the Senate may have owed its origin to definite central initiatives, akin to Claudius’s admission of the Aedui. We know that the first African to hold the consulship (‘cos. ex Afric[a] primus’) was adlected inter praetorios by Vespasian. But Dio already records a senator resident at Carthage in the time of Claudius.

It is very rarely possible to make any suggestion about the identity of the officials to whose help particular knights may have owed their promotion. In one case, however, a very small Numidian town (Tiddis) is seen to produce first a major military commander, and then some years later, a successful candidate for the decuriae. Here it seems very likely that the candidate for the decuriae may have received help from the senator, since they are the only local public men who are recorded in the extensive epigraphy of the town. And magistrates of Cirta, numbers of whom attained equestrian rank in the second century, may have owed some of their success to fellow-townsmen in the Senate. Cirta was already represented in the Senate under Vespasian, and produced the first consul from Africa; there were a sizeable number of Cirtan senators in Fronto’s day.

(ii) To illustrate equestrian promotion which followed local office, we may take two examples from towns in Numidia. The sequence is beyond doubt in both

---

22 Even the highest local office did not provide automatic access to equestrian promotion. The majority of the known priests of the province of Africa did not reach equestrian rank, although the holders of this office were ‘die Spitzen der municipalen Nobilität’ (H. Dessau, Hermes xlv, 1910, p. 12). Of 14 priests, 4 are known to have become equites or iudices (nos. 10, 90, 128, 144), 9 appear not to have had either rank (C. 12039; 14611; 14731; 22727, cf. ILTun 36; ILAlg I, 1295; ILAlg 458a–
AE 1964, 177; JRT 397; BCB, p. 318, cf. C. 2343 etc.; AE 1949, 40); and one man appears in a fragmentary text which leaves the issue in doubt (BAC 1951–2, p. 197).

23 N. 15 above.
26 Q. Aurelius Pactumceius Fronto of Cirta, cos. suff. A.D. 80, CIL VI, 2059, cf. 32363; C. 7057–8, cf. 19426–7 = ILAlg II, 1, 642, 644; Stein, pp. 219–20, 266.
27 Surdinius Gallus, Dio LX, 29, 2; PIR S 747.
28 Q. Lollius Urbicus, legate of Britain and prefect of the city under Antoninus Pius (ILAlg II, i, p. 322, nos. 3605, 3464, 3563, PIR2 L 240); Q. Sittius Faustus, no. 158 in the present list. The inscriptions of Tiddis are ILAlg II, i, 3570–4177; cf. A. Berthier, Tiddis, antique Castellum Tiditanorum, 1951.
29 Cirtan knights: nos. 46, 97, 98, 99, 108, 109, 110, 112, 113, 138, 145, 169, 174, 197, 198, 199, 222, 223, 235, 246, 251. It is curious that the abundant epigraphy of Cirta (ILAlg II, i, 468–2083) mentions no local men as procurators. Possibly Cirtan connections with the Senate were strong enough to allow most of those destined for major public careers to serve as senators (cf. nn. 36 and 41).
30 N. 36 above.
cases, because each man is commemorated before his promotion as well as after it had taken place. T. Flavius Monimus, of the Trajanic colony of Thamugadi, is first seen as flamen perpetuus, in a dedication by his half-sister, who at that time held no office herself. He subsequently appears as equo publico exornatus in a reciprocal dedication to his half-sister, who had by now become flaminica perpetua. The promotion is dated to the period of Pius and Marcus Aurelius by imperial dedications by Monimus’s brother-in-law, M. Cælius Saturninus, who served as duovir quinquennalis, and later as flamen perpetuus (no. 132). All three members of this family grouping held the perpetual flaminate, the highest and most expensive office in the municipal career. In the second case, Q. Sittius Faustus, from the small town of Tiddis (above, n. 38) is first seen as the holder of three magistracies in the Cirtan confederation. A later inscription, which reproduces the earlier three magistracies, shows that Faustus went on to hold the highest magistracy and the highest priesthood (the quinquennalitas and the perpetual flaminate), and was then adlected into the decuriae by Marcus Aurelius. Subsequently Faustus was admitted to the equestrian order by the Emperors Septimius Severus and Caracalla, by which time his age cannot have been less than 50 (no. 158).

The comparative evidence shows twelve other cases where a combination of magistracies and priesthoods preceded equestrian promotion (nos. 3, 6, 45, 50, 57, 93, 96, 101, 129, 134, 155, 168). A further eight men held priesthoods without any magistracy before their promotion (nos. 5, 21, 49, 102, 121, 122, 146, 147). Only five men are attested as holding magistracies without priesthoods before promotion (nos. 59, 64, 130, 149, 152; the first and last inscriptions have serious lacunae).

There is very little clear evidence in the present list for tenure of local office after equestrian promotion. The examples are as follows: at Thubursicu Numidarum and Sabratha, men who were already knights are seen on the verge of holding magistracies (‘(duo)vir desig(natus)’ and ‘(duo)vir q(uin)q(uennalisis) [d]esig(natus)’, nos. 52, 118). In the first case, the magistracy named was evidently the first local office of the man’s career; in the second, the man concerned had already held three local offices, some of which may have preceded his promotion to equestrian rank. At Cirta and at Thugga, knights held flaminate after their promotion (nos. 145, 134). Finally, at Rusicade and Thugga, inscriptions show knights whose first advancement clearly fell in the middle of a career of local office, which was continued after they had received promotion in rank (nos. 90 and 134). Thus the present sample provides only one case where a local career was clearly begun ab initio after the attainment of equestrian rank; and here equestrian rank is not stated, but is only implied by the tenure of one of the three militiae equestres (‘praef. coh.’, no. 52).

There are also a number of ambiguous cases where mention of equestrian rank is placed at the head of an inscription, which goes on to list local offices in ascending

---

43 For local office as a preliminary to active equestrian careers, see RO, pp. 123, 151; Stein, pp. 129–55; Jarrett, p. 221. 44 C. 9669, commented by Hirschfeld (Annali dell’Inst. di Corrispondenza Archeologica xxxviii. 1866, p. 53). CSRA, nos. 353 & 370. The largest public gifts were often made in honour of the flaminate. 45 This is evidently the meaning of ‘probati ab Imper(eratoribus)’, a reference to the probatio equitum (Pflaum, ILAlg II, i, 9610).
order. It is impossible to say here whether equestrian rank has been placed at the head of the inscription simply because of its importance, or whether it was actually conferred before the local career took place. In the absence of supporting indications, it remains uncertain whether those to whom equestrian rank was given often went on to follow new local careers.

Taking as a whole the evidence for tenure of local office by those who received equestrian rank, and including the mass of careers whose sequence is ambiguous or uncertain, the largest group of knights who held local office were those who held local priesthoods without magistracies. There were 55 in all, one of whom also held the priesthood of the province (no. 10). The next largest group held both local priesthoods and magistracies (35 in all); they include two priests of the province (nos. 90 and 144). Then follow those who held magistracies without priesthoods, who total 30. Finally, there are two knights who held the priesthood of the province, without apparently holding any office in their native towns (nos. 128 and 162, the latter being Mauretanian). Of the 123 knights for whom local office of some kind is recorded, almost half held only honorific (though expensive) priesthoods, without undertaking working magistracies which would involve the administration of local affairs. The priesthood most often named is the perpetual flaminiate, which represented the summit of the normal municipal career in African cities (there are 62 instances, 31 of which show the perpetual flaminiate held in isolation). That future knights were frequently able to attain this office without having to hold any previous local offices suggests that they came from families which already enjoyed considerable local prestige.

A first variant of the pattern of promotion which has been considered so far is provided by knights who made public gifts as well as holding local office before their promotion. For example, L. Caecilius Athenaeus of Suffetula gave a gladiatorial munus as well as holding three local offices, before his promotion to equestrian rank at the beginning of the third century (no. 3). As a rule there is more uncertainty about the sequence of events than there is here, and specific indications about the point in the career at which the gift falls are few. But it was usual for holders of local office in African cities to link any public gifts that they made to one of their local offices, promising the gift at the time when they took office. Though outlays by equestrians often followed their promotion, the promise which committed the donor to his expenditure would normally have taken place much earlier.49

44 For instance, nos. 92, 98, 108.
45 In senatorial career-inscriptions, the consulship was sometimes placed out of sequence at the head of the list of offices (ILS 1024, 1025, 1059, etc.).
47 N. 43 above.
48 Other equestrian munera in nos. 27, 34, 172; donors of munera not called munerarii, nos. 65, 68 (the difference is one of terminology, not of substance). The term munerarius meant specifically the donor of a gladiatorial munus (TLL VIII, 1640, 47-1641, 28), and not merely 'un personnage qui offre des libéraîtés à sa cite' (Leschi, p. 122, n. 3).
49 CSR, p. 51, cf. Digesta L, 12, 'De Pollicitationibus'; P. Veyne, Carthago ix, 1958, pp. 95-7. Promises made to the city in honour of local office were legally binding (Digesta L, 12, 1, 1).
50 For substantial delays in fulfilling promises in honour of local office, see WM, p. 161, n. 8.
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In one instance this chronology is almost explicit: L. Cosinius Primus of Cuicul in Numidia promised a market-place to his town in honour of the flaminate, the highest local office. Primus's career-inscription shows that only after he had held three more local offices (at Carthage) was he adlected to the decuriae by Antoninus Pius. The market inscription itself is too fragmentary to show whether the market was built before or after Primus's adlection, but it had certainly been promised beforehand (no. 93).

Sometimes the donations made by those who achieved promotion were larger than this: M. Manlius Modestus Quietianus of Curubis gave his city a theatre, probably promised in honour of his flaminate (cf. no. 102), tenure of which preceded his being given the equus publicus and membership of the decuriae by Antoninus Pius (no. 101). At Thugga, two of the three Marcius brothers whom Pius adlected into the decuriae gave their town fine buildings, a Capitol and a theatre, in the following decade (nos. 103, 102). The donor of the theatre attached his gift to the perpetual flaminate, tenure of which probably preceded his promotion in rank. Several other major gifts appear to have been connected with local careers that were crowned by promotion to equestrian rank. At Thignica, the Memmius brothers, who both received the public horse, gave a building complex which included a triumphal arch, under Commodus or Septimius Severus (nos. 104–5). A knight at Thugga gave a portico, together with HS50,000 in cash, under Gallienus (no. 94). (See also nos. 46, 54, 62, 65, 68, 97, 107, 111; smaller gifts which may have been promised during the period of local office, nos. 88–114 passim.)

So far we have seen the promotion of men who had distinguished themselves in municipal affairs. A second main type of promotion was the conferment of equestrian rank upon the sons of distinguished municipal figures. The essence of this practice is seen most easily in the promotions of those so young that they could not possibly have been given equestrian rank on the grounds of their own merits or achievements. For example, C. Artorius Tertullus of Thubursicu Numidorum died a Roman knight at the age of 14 (though the legal minimum age for knighthood was 17); his father, and this is the significant feature, was a flamen perpetuus, and a veteran (no. 183). The reason for promoting the son was not the previous decease of the father, who in fact outlived his son. Also at Thubursicu Numidorum, L. Vetidius Maternus Vetidianus, signo Heraclius, died a Roman knight at the age of 18 (no. 244). Though Vetidianus was too young to have held any offices himself, his father had held all the honores at Thubursicu. Both of these promotions appear to belong to the third century.

Four seventeen-year old knights are attested in African cities, two at Volubilis, one at Sicca Veneria, and one at Cirta (nos. 184, 185, 210, 235). Though their parents' careers are not known, it is likely that these too were the children of men who had held local office. Six other knights who were too young to have held the

---

52 Cf. id., pp. 423–4. Twelve instances from non-African evidence of the grant of equestrian rank to those aged 16 or less in St. III, p. 496, n. 2 = Dr. P. VI, 2, p. 93, n. 3 and Stein, p. 56, n. 4. The youngest knight was aged 3 years and 9 months (JLS 1317).
53 N. 19 above.
municipal honorès\textsuperscript{54} are also attested: one aged 20, one aged 21, two aged 23, and two aged 25 (nos. 241\textsuperscript{a}, 243, 212, 214, 211, 225).

Another feature of the promotions of municipal figures was the conferment of rank on several brothers by what appear to have been block grants.\textsuperscript{55} The three Marcus brothers of Thugga, two of whom gave public buildings to the town, were all promoted to the decuriae by Antoninus Pius (nos. 102, 103, 146). The Attius brothers of Thuburbo Maius both received the equus publicus from Marcus Aurelius and Commodus as joint-emperors, and held municipal careers which were identical in every office (nos. 121–2). In the background of their promotion lay very substantial generosity by their mother, who had held the office of flaminica perpetua at Thuburbo, and whose munificence was considerable enough to warrant the erection at public expense of statues of members of her family.\textsuperscript{56} Nine other promotions of brothers figure in the present list (nos. 93, 129; 104–5; 176–7; 116–7; 197–8–9; 208–9; 215–6; 243–5; 253–4).\textsuperscript{57}

The local activities of the fathers of those who received equestrian rank, seen in the case of the two juvenile knights of Thubursicu discussed above, are also attested in a number of other inscriptions. C. Egnatius Cosminus Vinicianus, on whom Hadrian conferred the public horse, was honoured with a statue by the curiae of Uthina, because of the munificence of his father, a flamen perpetuus whose gifts included a legacy of HS60,000 to the curiae (no. 196, CSRA, no. 254). No offices are attested for the son. This pattern of local offices or gifts on the part of the father without any known municipal activity by the equestrian children is seen in nine other cases (nos. 116–7; 188; 197–9; 204; 208–9; 213; 221; 222–223; 253–4).

A further five knights whose fathers were active municipal figures are themselves seen as the holders of local office (nos. 28, 50, 96, 133, 161). Here equestrian rank may have been earned as much by the individuals concerned as by their forbears.

There were a few knights whose fathers had held local office after retiring from the legions (nos. 55; 150; 183; 208–9). In every case the local offices included the flaminate, and promotion for the sons may have been based on a combination of their fathers’ municipal and military claims. Military rank may also have counted towards equestrian promotion in the case of the son of a centurion at Lambaesis in the later second century; the son held the flaminate and received the equus publicus, though the father did not hold local office (no. 88; cf. no. 227). The sons of primipili found in two inscriptions presumably owed equestrian rank to their fathers’ military standing (nos. 175; 215–6).\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{54} The legal age for entry into the ordo was 25, cf. Ulpian, Digesta I, 2, 11.
\textsuperscript{55} Cf. Stein, pp. 423–4 and n. 1.
\textsuperscript{56} For the voting of public statues of the relations of a donor, compare no. 146, where the building gift in question was a Capitol. At Calama, the promise of an outlay of HS400,000 on a theatre was recognised by the vote of 5 statues of the donor, a flaminica Augg. perpetua, together with a single statue of her father, a flamen Aug. perpetuus (probably under Marcus and Verus, C. 5365–6 = ILAlg 1, 286–7).
\textsuperscript{57} Also C. 20651 (Tubusuctu), omitted from the present list because the sons followed military careers without local activities; the father held the flaminate and duovirate.
\textsuperscript{58} Cf. RO, p. 172.
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IV. VARIATIONS IN THE DEGREE OF PROMOTION AND IN THE AVAILABILITY OF EQUESTRIAN RANK

Differentiations of type are obvious in the promotions of the second century. A man could be given the public horse; he could be adlected to the decuriae; or he could receive both of these distinctions. Presumably the most honourable condition was to belong both to the equites and to the decuriae. The decuriae nominally demanded a lower property qualification than the public horse: HS200,000, as compared with HS400,000 for full equestrian rank. But in practice there is little indication that those who were only adlected into the decuriae necessarily fell below the equestrian census. This cannot have been true for instance of the three Marcii brothers of Thugga, two of whom gave their town large public buildings. In five cases adlection to the decuriae seems to have been accompanied by the simultaneous grant of the public horse (nos. 50, 96, 101, 137, 152). In two more cases the grant of the public horse clearly preceded adlection to the decuriae, which took place in the following reign (nos. 68 and 166). Commenting on this sequence in an Italian inscription, Mommsen related the arrangement to the minimum age for entry into the decuriae, which was 30, compared with a minimum age of 17 for the equus publicus. These may then have been men who had been too young to get into the decuriae at the time of their first promotion; alternatively, their being adlected at a later date may have been decided by vacancies which subsequently arose in the decuriae. The opposite sequence, in which membership of the decuriae preceded tenure of the public horse, is less easily explained (two instances from Africa, n. 59 above). Possibly in these cases the public horse was a reward for faithful service on the decuriae which might be given to those whose influence or whose qualifications had been insufficient to obtain this preference in the first instance.

The number of specified addictions of Africans to the decuriae is very much smaller than the number recorded as having the equus publicus. There are 28 members of the decuriae in the present list (n. 24 above), compared with 73 mentions of the equus publicus and the cognate usage turmae equitum (both totals include the ten cases where membership of the decuriae was combined with the equus publicus). But it should be noticed that the African evidence for the decuriae is confined to the second century, from Trajan to Commodus, whereas specific mentions of the equus publicus and the turmae continue until the end of the Severan dynasty (Appendix I, p. 185, below). Greater discrimination may have been exercised in the grant of membership of the decuriae, since this rank theoretically involved the person who was

---

48 Membership of the equus publicus followed at a later date by membership of the decuriae: nos. 68, 166. CIL X, 53. The reverse sequence: nos. 50, 158; ILS 5016, 6713.
46 St III, p. 535 = Dr. P. VI, 2, pp. 140–1.
honoured in active service in the jury-courts, though membership of the decuriae may sometimes have been titular where provincials were concerned. Unlike the equus publicus, membership of the decuriae was not abused by being given to children. It is difficult to see a likely technical explanation for the discrimination between the conferment of membership of the decuriae alone, and membership of the decuriae combined with membership of the knights. The difference was essentially one of status. Membership of the decuriae alone was the more common, and evidently the less eligible of the two possibilities. Presumably also, membership of the decuriae alone rated lower than membership of the equus publicus alone, since the census-qualification was technically lower, and the title of iudex was less illustrious than that of eques. In a few cases the discrimination between ranks seems to have been related to the standing of the town from which the candidates came. Thus under Antoninus Pius, a man who had held the flaminate at Curubis, a Julian colony on the coast, and who built a theatre there (now or at a later date), received both the equus publicus and membership of the decuriae from the Emperor (no. 101). A contemporary from the obscure inland town of Thugga (which was no more than a pagus), who had likewise held the local flaminate and had promised (and later built) a theatre, received membership of the decuriae alone (no. 102). Discrimination related to differences in urban status is suggested in two more cases. A man from Zitha in Tripolitania, one of the few African towns which Augustus had allowed to mint its own coins, which was probably a municipium by now, received the equus publicus from Hadrian. Under the same Emperor, two men from the neighbouring town of Gighis (which did not become a municipium until the reign of Antoninus Pius) were given only membership of the decuriae (nos. 226, 147, 178). Under Marcus Aurelius, a man from Tiddis, a small castellum, received no more than membership of the decuriae, after holding five offices in the Cirtan confederation, including the flaminate; whereas a man from the colonia of Thamugadi who had held only the flaminate, received the public horse from Marcus Aurelius or Antoninus Pius (nos. 158, 132).

A further refinement can sometimes be seen, in the form of discrimination between different candidates for promotion from the same town, on the basis of the period for which their families had been distinguished in local affairs. At Thugga, the promotion of the three Marcii to the decuriae by Antoninus Pius had been preceded by Hadrian’s promotion of A. Gabinius Datus, who was given the equus publicus as well as membership of the decuriae (nos. 96; 102, 103, 146). Datus may have owed his greater success to the fact that as well as holding local office himself, he was the son and nephew of important municipal figures, both office-holders, who were jointly building a series of temples at Thugga. The Marcii by contrast were first-generation notables, whose father evidently had no offices or gifts to his name. Two promotions made by Antoninus Pius at Cuicul provide

---

63 Cf. Pliny, Ep. IV, 29, where Romanius Firmus is chided for not taking up his membership of the decuriae. The inscription of L. Septimius Severus, grandfather of the Emperor, says explicitly "in decuriae et inter selectos Romae iudicavit" (no. 155).
64 L. Teutsch, Das Städtewesen in Nordafrika, 1962, pp. 136–7; the Forum was begun under Claudius, C. 11002, cf. BAC 1886 (1887), pp. 54–65.
66 In addition to texts cited under no. 96, see C. 26467–8; ILAf 568; ILTun 1511–2.
67 To judge from a posthumous statue-base set up in his honour, whose text survives complete (C. 26605).
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an analogy: L. Claudius Honoratus received membership of the decuriae, together with the equus publicus, after a short municipal career at Cuicul and Cirta (no. 50). His contemporary, L. Cosinius Primus, after a much longer municipal career, including the promised donation of a market at Cuicul, and subsequent office at Carthage, received only membership of the decuriae for himself and his brother, who had held local offices at Cuicul (nos. 93 and 129). Again there seems to have been a corresponding difference in the relative periods for which their families had been distinguished: Modestus's father had held the pontificate, the second highest priesthood, and possibly other offices, whereas the Cosiii seem to have had no distinguished antecedents, to judge from their abundant surviving epigraphy.

For men from very minor inland towns in the mid-second century, office at Carthage or Cirta was sometimes the stepping-stone to promotion in rank. The advantage of holding office at the most important towns perhaps lay partly in the fact that they were assize towns and as such they would automatically receive visits from the proconsul or his legates, which small secondary towns could not expect. The large number of attested knights from Cirta suggests that equestrian rank was more freely available at this town than at smaller places, in the second century (the surviving epigraphy of Carthage is too small to allow any corresponding inference). Some of the careers which show office at Carthage by men from other towns have just been cited: Gabinius Datus and the three Marci, from Thugga, all held priesthoods at Carthage before their promotion in rank (nos. 96, 102–3, 146). Also from Thugga was an anonymous knight who held office at Carthage at an unspecified date (no. 69). The son of a patron and benefactor at Agbia, a pagus near Thugga, held two magistracies at Carthage in the second half of the second century, and obtained the rank of egregius (no. 28). The two Attii of Thuburbo Maius, who received the public horse from Marcus and Commodus, each held a priesthood at Carthage (nos. 121–2). M. Vettius Latro, also of Thuburbo Maius, held two priesthoods at Carthage, and was subsequently adlected to the decuriae and given the public horse by Domitian or Trajan (no. 21). The equestrian curator rei publicae of Furnos Minus in the late Severan period, a native of the town, had held office at Carthage (no. 83; also nos. 77, 81, 85).

There is a little evidence to suggest that Cirta served the same purpose for ambitious men from the small towns of Numidia as did Carthage for the small towns of northern Proconsularis. Two men from Cuicul reached equestrian rank after they had held office at Cirta (nos. 50, 57). A third man from Cuicul went on to hold office at Carthage before his adlection to the decuriae by Antoninus Pius; but possibly he chose this route because he was of Carthaginian origin, as his tribe (Arnesis) might suggest. The knight from Tiddis who has already been cited

67 Hirschfeld, cited in n. 43 above.
68 The context (the fulfilment by his son of a promise made in honour of the pontificate) does not necessarily give the father's offices in full.
69 Cf. A. J. Marshall, 'Governors on the move', Phoenix xx, 1966, pp. 231–46. The fasti of Africa occasionally show proconsuls at secondary towns, but not frequently enough to suggest that their visits were habitual. The occasion was usually the dedication of a major public building, for which a specific detour could well have been made. (C. 11002, 11006 Zitha; ILAlg I, 1230 Thubursicu Numidarum; ILAf 13 Chemmakh; C. 11798 Mactaris; ILTim 672 Avitta Bibba; ILAlg I, 1030 Thagura; IRT 21 Sabratha; ILTim 699 Thuburbo Maius).
70 N. 39 above.
(Q. Sittius Faustus) only received his first promotion (to the decuriae) after assiduous activity as a magistrate at Cirta and the other towns of the Cirtan confederacy (no. 158). The career of a knight from Thamugadi included tenure of the flaminate at Lambaesis, probably after the date when Lambaesis became the seat of the independent legate of Numidia (no. 160). Another instance from Numidia of a knight who held office at a town larger than his own is provided by Q. Flavius Lappianus, a third-century figure who was apparently a native of the populus Thabarbusitanus, on which he conferred substantial benefits; his only recorded office was the flaminate at Calama, a nearby town of considerable size (no. 95).

Apuleius's Apology may provide a reflection of the earlier and greater accessibility of equestrian rank at the more prominent towns. Three millionaire families of the reign of Antoninus Pius are mentioned by Apuleius: the Sicinii of Oea, whose fortune vested in Aemilia Pudentilla (Apuleius's wife) amounted to HS4 million; the Herennii of Oea, amongst whom Herennius Rufinus had HS3 million; and the Apuleii of Madauros, who, in the person of Apuleius's father, had nearly HS2 million. The two families of Oea had both received equestrian rank at the date of the Apology (nos. 205, 237). But the Apuleii, from the much smaller inland town of Madauros, had evidently not received equestrian rank, although the fortune of the elder Apuleius (who had held all the magistracies up to the duovirate) was still five times the size of the equestrian census.

By some stage in the third century, perhaps from the Severi onwards, differentiations between the availability of equestrian rank at major and minor towns seem to have become less marked. Madauros eventually came in for its share of knights. It was evidently now possible for men from quite small towns such as this to gain equestrian rank without holding office elsewhere, though a preference was still sometimes shown for promoting the second generation of prominent families. Though few of the texts are dated, the third century is evidently the period to which a number of knights from the most obscure Numidian towns belong (nos. 176, 177 Diana Veteranorum; 201 Henchir Bel Kitan; 182 Medjuez Ahmar; 186–7 Verecunda; 228 Umm el-Bawaghi. For Mauretania, cf. nos. 54 Rapidum; 181 Kherbet el-Kebira; 195, 193, 29 Novar).

V. Participation in Municipal Affairs by Knights and Judices

(i) The most obvious way of assessing the participation in local affairs of equestrian families is to study the frequency with which those who had achieved equestrian rank subsequently held local office and made gifts to their cities. Unfortunately, analysis of offices is impossible in the many cases where the sequence of a career is not clear from the inscription. It has only been possible to extract from the mass of local careers whose sequence is uncertain six clear cases where local office followed the conferment of equestrian or juror rank. These have already been discussed (p. 155, above). The question of how often public gifts were made after achieving equestrian rank by those who held local office is even

---

less securely documented. Though various gifts were almost certainly made by holders of local office after their promotion, it is not possible to establish that the gifts were not promised before equestrian rank had been conferred (various instances have already been discussed above, pp. 156–7). One exception was the support given to local corn-supplies at a time of famine by a knight at Madauros, who had also held magistries (no. 91). But this was a special case dictated by circumstance,78 which falls outside the usual ritual pattern of the donation of monuments in honour of magistries.77

However, gifts made by knights who did not hold local office are quite well documented. Sixteen knights or groups of knights are attested as making lifetime gifts to their cities without holding public office, and another six made public bequests.

The lifetime gifts were as follows (in roughly chronological order): a iudex of the quinque decuriae at Gigthis gave a small temple and a bronze statue of the wolf with Romulus and Remus (no. 178). The latter gift was made under Antoninus Pius and may have celebrated Gigthis's accession to municipal status under this Emperor.78 At Sicca Veneria procurators built a temple and a shrine (nos. 209 and 3a). Though neither gift is dated, both may belong to the late Antonine period, on the analogy of the bequest of alimenta made by another procurator at Sicca late in the reign of Marcus Aurelius (no. 15, below). At Mactar, two procurators gave statues or groups of statues in the period of Marcus and Commodus; they were father-in-law and son-in-law (nos. 9 and 17). Again at Sicca, a 'centurio legionarius ex equite Romano' was honoured with a public statue 'ob munificentiam', probably under Septimius Severus (no. 67). Under this Emperor, a procurator put up four statues of the Imperial family at Lepcis Magna (no. 14). Four gifts which are probably no earlier than the reign of Septimius Severus can be mentioned at this point. An 'eq(ues) R(omanus)'7 at Thagaste gave his city a building with a portico at a cost of HS300,000, at the same time making gifts to the curiae worth about HS20,000 (no. 170). At Auzia in Mauretania a knight who had served the militiae built a small temple of Saturn in opus signinum (no. 60). At Diana Veteranorum, two knights participated in the gift of a temple by their father, a magistrate (nos. 176–7). At Neapolis on the northern coast of Proconsularis, an 'eq(ues) R(omanus)' was responsible for a gift whose nature is uncertain (no. 179).

Returning to firmly dated material, at Mustis, a fisci advocatus gave a building in conjunction with his mother, a flaminica, and his brother, under Elagabalus (no. 7). At Thuburbo Maius in a.d. 225 an 'eq(ues) R(omanus)' gave, in conjunction with his father, a primipilarii, a portico, and distributions worth nearly HS3,000 (nos. 175 and 61). At Sufetula, a knight who had held a tribunate was honoured with a statue on account of his public generosity, probably under Gordian

---

75a The epigraphy of Madauros has survived exceptionally well. Nos. 11, 12, 27, 49, 87, 91, 125, 153, 165, 189, 217 (cf. also Appendix II (ii)).
76 Comparative evidence in SEHRE3, pp. 599–600.
77 Cf. n. 49 above.
78 N. 65 above.

78 The inscription apparently comes from above the doorway of the cella of a temple, inside the portico. The corresponding inscription from the Thugga Capitol has the same format and the same brevity (C. 15514). The portico inscription of the Thugga temple, giving fuller details, has also survived (C. 15513).
III (no. 66). At Novar in Mauretania, an egregius vir contributed prominently to the restoration of a temple in A.D. 244 (no. 29). At some time in the mid-third century T. Iulius Sabinus, a procurator, built a temple at Madauros, carrying out a promise by another party (no. 11). Lastly, at Thugga under Gallienus, a procurator carried out a journey 'pro libertate publica', to represent his city's cause at his own expense, in return for which he was commemorated with a statue (no. 23).

The six bequests by knights who did not hold local office are as follows. Under Marcus Aurelius a procurator a rationibus bequeathed to the town of Sicca a vast alimentary scheme worth HS1,300,000, for the support of 600 children (no. 15). Slightly later, probably under Commodus, a centenarian procurator bequeathed a much smaller foundation at Mactar for feasts for the curiae (worth HS50,000, no. 19). Under Septimius Severus, a procurator and an egregius vir bequeathed one or more statues each, at Portus Magnus in Mauretania, and at Lepcis Magna (nos. 4 and 30). Under Caracalla, a praefectus legionis bequeathed gifts at Theveste amounting to over HS700,000 in value, consisting of a quadrifrontal arch (which still stands), two statues and tetrastyles, a foundation for oil-distributions on 64 days of the year; and various pieces of plate for the Capitol (no. 51). Probably also under Caracalla, a knight bequeathed money at Seressi for the structure of an arch, which his surviving relatives embellished at a cost of HS25,000 (no. 173).

Two characteristics stand out in the gifts by knights who did not hold local office. Firstly the donors are predominantly men who followed public careers: procurators make up nearly half the total of 23; there are also two egregii and four military knights. There are only five municipal knights or pairs of knights, and there is one iudex (no. 178). This distribution is extremely top-heavy when compared with the gifts which accompanied local office; here purely municipal figures predominate by 26 to 10. Secondly, the gifts by those who did not hold local office are mainly confined to the third century: only six out of 23 clearly belong to the previous century. It is evident that purely local figures who hoped for equestrian or juror rank generally held local office as well as making gifts, if they made them at all. The gifts made by career knights who were not bound to their towns by any obligation incurred while holding local office show that munificence was not restricted to those who might hope for some immediate advantage from it, though the period in which these gifts are mainly concentrated is fairly short.

(ii) It goes without saying that some of the local men who received equestrian rank left descendants (nos. 57, 213; 128, 193*, etc.). These descendants would tend to cite the equestrian rank of their parents in municipal inscriptions. Yet few cases are known where the sons of knights held municipal careers of any kind or made gifts to their cities. A procurator held the flaminate at Bulla Regia and

---

80 Nos. 20, 3a, 9, 17, 14, 7, 11, 23, 15, 19, 4, 29, 30; 67, 66, 51, 60.
81 Nos. 170, 176–7, 179, 175, 173.
82 Gifts by municipal figures: nos. 88–114; gifts by knights with public careers who also held local office: nos. 3, 27, 34, 46, 50, 53, 57, 62, 65, 68.
83 A knight at Manliana described his wife as the 'soror fratrum et av[uncularum] c'[gregiorum]
his two sons became decurions of the town (no. 18). Two more procurators were the fathers of flamines (no. 3; Pflaum no. 331 bis), as was an egregius at Furnos Minus (no. 33). A simple knight left a son who also held equestrian rank and became priest of the province (nos. 193; 127).

These five examples of the involvement of the second generation in local affairs (all of which belong to the third century) amount to little when related to the large number of knights and magistrates attested in African inscriptions.

There is thus some suggestion that active involvement in municipal affairs was not often continued by the subsequent generation once the father had achieved equestrian rank. In some cases, if circumstances were favourable, the equestrian family might continue its ascent with eventual promotion to senatorial rank for one of its members. Six of the knights in the present list are known to have been the fathers or grandfathers of senators (nos. 25, 30, 36, 37, 106, 234). But the majority of equestrian families can never have achieved this, since the membership of the equestrian order was immensely larger than that of the Senate.

There is little suggestion in African inscriptions that knights often continued local careers after they had received equestrian rank, despite some equivocal evidence. And instances of the tenure of local office by the sons of equestrians are very few. Though a surprising number of public gifts by knights who followed active equestrian careers are attested, municipal figures are rarely known to have initiated public donations after their promotion in rank. At Saldae, one of the large coastal towns of Mauretania, knights were plentiful enough in the late second or early third century to figure in a distribution of sportulae as a distinct group. Significantly, the inscription describes them as a category separate from the decurions, showing that a number of knights at this town did not sit on the town-council.

Local office seems to have provided an effective means of access to equestrian and juror rank for a fortunate minority of the local aristocracy. But equestrian rank transferred its holders from the purely municipal class to an order whose public activities properly lay outside the sphere of town life. Though many knights in Africa did not pursue active careers of the kind which their new rank allowed, neither as a rule did they compromise their superior status by continued participation in local affairs.

---

84 The second-generation knight who contributed to the gift of a portico at Thuburbo Maius in A.D. 225 was the son of a primus pilus, not of a municipal figure (no. 175).
85 L. Titinius Maximus Clodianus, son of L. Titinius Clodianus who was ducenarian procurator ludi magni in A.D. 247. C. 8329, etc.
87 Under Augustus the Senate had 600 members (Dio LIV, 14, 1); de Laet estimates the number of knights at this date at 10,000 (Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire xx, 1941, p. 511, n. 1).
88 C. 8938, cf. p. 1953 = ILS 5078. Other survivals at Saldae include the inscriptions of 2 procurators, 2 military tribunes, and 2 local knights (Pflaum nos. 132, 137; C. 20685, present list nos. 64; 123, 127).
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LIST OF KNIGHTS AND IUDICES

NOTE Knights who followed public careers (procursors, fisci advocati, and holders of military posts), together with egregii whose careers are uncertain, are included in this list only in cases where they are known to have held local office or made public gifts. For procursors not listed here, see n. 1 above.

In the interests of brevity, the main epigraphic abbreviations have generally been retained as they appear in the inscriptions (ILLS III, pp. 752–97). Abbreviations of modern works are listed on pp. 147–8 above. The following abbreviations are also used: M Mauretania; N Numidia; NP Numidia Proconsularis; PB Proconsularis (Byzacena); PT Proconsularis (Tripolitania); PZ Proconsularis (Zeugitana).

Items in the list whose number is given in italics (24, etc.) are discussed in notes with corresponding numbers at the end of the list (pp. 183–4).

### I. Procurators and fisci advocati who held local office or made public gifts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and public titles</th>
<th>Local activities</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aelius Rufus Ianuarius, v.e., ad fisci advocatones ter numero promotus, etc.</td>
<td>flam. perp., IVirialicus, curator (r.p.?)</td>
<td>Lambaesius N</td>
<td>(post-200)</td>
<td>C. 2757, cf. p. 1739. RO, p. 231. PIR² A 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. L. Alfenus Sencio, praesae Mauretaniae, etc.</td>
<td>sacerdos Neptunalis</td>
<td>Cuicul N</td>
<td>169/176</td>
<td>ILS 9489; C. 9046; CIL XIV 4509; X 3334 = ILS 8391. Pflaum no. 176. PIR² A 520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. C. Cassius Macer, procurator Augusti</td>
<td>gave shrine of Jupiter</td>
<td>Sicca Veneria PZ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 1627, 15830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sex. Cornelius Honoratus, proc. sexagenarius Mesopotamiae, c.m.v.</td>
<td>bequeathed statue</td>
<td>Portus Magnus M</td>
<td>198/211</td>
<td>C. 9760, cf. p. 2046 = ILS 1386; C. 9757. Pflaum no. 281. PIR² C 1372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and public titles</td>
<td>Local activities</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. T. Iulius Sabinus, proc. patrimonii reg. Leptiminensis, etc.</td>
<td>part-donor of temple</td>
<td>Madauros</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>(post-200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. M. Iunius Punicus, proc. centenarius Alexandrianae ad Mercurium, etc.</td>
<td>gave 4 statues</td>
<td>Lepcis Magna PT</td>
<td>200/201</td>
<td>IRT 392; 403; 422; 434. Pflaum no. 244. PIR² I 802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. P. Licinius Papirianus, a rationibus</td>
<td>gave alimenta</td>
<td>Sicca</td>
<td>Veneria</td>
<td>169/180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Ti. Plautius Felix Ferruntianus, procurator ad solaminia et horrea, etc. (Son-in-law of no. 9)</td>
<td>gave temple statues</td>
<td>Mactaris</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>180/192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. C. Sextius Martialis, proc. Macedonie, etc.</td>
<td>gave foundation for feasts</td>
<td>Mactaris</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>(180/192)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name and public titles

21. M. Vettius Latro, procur. Mauretaniae Caesariensis, etc., equo publico et in quinque dec. ad
Local activities flam. divi. Aug., sacerd. Cer. (both at Carthage)
Town Thuburbo Maius
Date 128
Reference C. 8369; ILTun 720; 721; AE 1951, 52; Pflaum no. 104. PIR² V 332

22. C. Vibius Maximus, eq. R., fisci advocatus
Local activities fl. pp.
Town Lambaesis
Date (c. 245)
Reference AE 1917–8, 85. Cf. Pflaum no. 331 bis

Local activities legatio gratuita
Town Thugga
Date 253/268
Reference C. 26582 = ILS 9018; cf. ILTun 1424, AE 1957, 255. Pflaum no. 353

II. Egregii viri who held local office or made public gifts

24. L. Aemilius Salvianus, eq.m.v. (Brother of primipilars)
Local activities bequeathed temple
Town Lambaesis
Date 210/225
Reference C. 2758, cf. p. 1739; AE 1939, 37. PIR² A 401

25. Q. Appaeus Saturninus Juventianus e.v.
Local activities sac, urbis Romae aeternae, fl. pp., IIvir
Town Gori
Date 190/230
Reference C. 24054; ILTun 768. PIR² A 941

Local activities fl. pp.
Town Bisaica
Date (post-161)
Reference C. 12300 = ILS 6829. Cf. ILAf 217. PIR² C 45

27. L. Caesonius Honoratus Caesonianus e.v.
Local activities fl. pp., mu[nerarius] (?)
Town Madauros
Date (post-161)
Reference ILAlg I 2144

28. M. Cincius Felix Iulianus v.e., patronus
Local activities aedil., IIviral. (both Carthage)
Town Agbia
Date c. 180/200
Reference C. 27420; 1548, cf. 15550 = ILS 6827. PIR² C 734

29. T. Coelius Martialis e.v., patronus
Local activities contributed to the rebuilding of a temple
Town Novar M
Date 244
Reference C. 20429; cf. 20449. Cf. PIR² C 1245

30. M. Cornelius Bassus Servianus e.m.v. (Father-in-law of senator)
Local activities bequeathed 2 statues
Town Lepcis Magna
Date 198/205
Reference IRT 443; 524

31. L. Flavius Felix Gabinius v.e.
Local activities fl. pp., IIvirallic.
Town Carthage
Date (post-161)
Reference C. 1165, cf. p. 929. PIR² F 266

32. M. Gargiliius Syrus, v.e.
Local activities fl. pp.; gave temple
Town Thagaste
Date (post-161)
Reference ILAlg I 867 = C. 5142

33. L. Gentius Zebucianus e.m.
Local activities fl. pp.
Town Furnos
Date (post-161)
Reference AE 1961, 53

34. . . . rus Iulianus, eq. R., e.v.
Local activities pontif., munerarius
Town Theveste
Date (post-161)
Reference ILAlg I 3067 = C. 16558

35. . . . Memmius Florus, e.v.
Local activities flaminalis
Town Thamallula
Date (post-161)
Reference AE 1937, 57; cf. C. 20576
### EQUESTRIAN RANK IN AFRICAN CITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and public titles</th>
<th>Local activities</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>C. Terentius Julianus Sabiniatus v.e.</td>
<td>fl. pp.</td>
<td>Thugga PZ</td>
<td>(post-161)</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>. . ius Caelianus v.e.</td>
<td>fl. Aug. pp.</td>
<td>Zama Regia PB</td>
<td>(post-161)</td>
<td>ILTun 572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. Equestrian holders of military posts who held local office or made public gifts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and public titles</th>
<th>Local activity</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>. . . Aelius Horatius Paritor, a militiis. (Brother of no. 1)</td>
<td>IIvir</td>
<td>Lambaesis N</td>
<td>(post-200)</td>
<td>C. 2757, cf. p. 1739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>P. Aelius Primianus, eq. R., a militiis, etc.</td>
<td>decurio (Auzia, Rusguriae, Equizeto)</td>
<td>Auzia M</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>C. 9045 = ILS 2766. Pflaum, pp. 909-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>P. Aelius Silvanus, a tribus militiis</td>
<td>fl. pp.</td>
<td>Thamugadi N</td>
<td>(post-120)</td>
<td>AE 1946, 70-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>M. Aemilius Respectus, prae. fabr., trib. mil.</td>
<td>flamen perp. divi Aug.</td>
<td>Leptis Minor PZ</td>
<td>(pre-200)</td>
<td>C. 58 = 11114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>L. Annius Fabianus, adlectus in quinque decuriis, prae. coh.</td>
<td>aed., IIvir, flamen</td>
<td>Caesarea M</td>
<td>(pre-200)</td>
<td>C. 9374, cf. p. 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>C. Aufidius Maximus, prae. coh., trib. mil.</td>
<td>pontifex; donor of portico</td>
<td>Cirta N</td>
<td>88/139</td>
<td>ILAlg II, i, 671 = C. 7079, cf. p. 1848 = ILS 5549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>. . . Avitius Rufus, trib. mil., prae. coh., proximus tertiae militiae</td>
<td>IIvir</td>
<td>Sabratha PT</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>IRT 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>L. Caninius Iunarius Flavianus, eq. R., a mi(1)</td>
<td>decurio (Carthage), magister pagi</td>
<td>Gillium PZ</td>
<td>(post-192)</td>
<td>ILTun 1367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Ti. Claudius Hispanus, trib. mil., scr. q., prae. fabr.</td>
<td>flam. perp.</td>
<td>Madauros NP</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILAlg I 2194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>C. Cornelius Egrilianus, prae. legionsis</td>
<td>bequeathed arch, 2 tetrastyles, foundation for oil-distributions, &amp; temple bullion</td>
<td>Theveste NP</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>ILAlg I 3040 = C. 1858 &amp; p. 939; ILAlg I 3041 = C. 16504. CSRA nos. 32, 250, 382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and public titles</td>
<td>Local activities</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Cornelius Flaccus, praef. coh. (died at 35)</td>
<td>IIvir desig.</td>
<td>Thubursicu Numidarum NP</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILAlg I 1335 = C. 4879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Fabius Mettianus, praef. coh., trib. leg., praef. eq.</td>
<td>fl. pp.; donor of small shrine</td>
<td>Segermes PB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILTun 261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Iulius Crescens, Didius Crescentianus, equo publico, trib. coh. (Father of no. 213)</td>
<td>fl. pp. (Cirta), pontifex (Cuicul), omnibus honoribus funct. (both towns)</td>
<td>Cuicul N</td>
<td>c. 175</td>
<td>AE 1920, 114–5; 1913, 21; 1949, 40 = 1925, 23–4; 1916, 13. C. 8318, cf. p. 968; 8319 = ILS 5533. PIR² I 284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iulius Theofilus, eques Roman., dec. alae</td>
<td>decurio (Caesarea)</td>
<td>Caesarea M</td>
<td>c. 220/</td>
<td>C. 21039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juli . . ., praef. eq., trib. leg., praef. alae</td>
<td>aedil., IIvir</td>
<td>Caesarea M</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 21037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Petronius Felix, primipilares ex tribuno praetor. (Father of 175)</td>
<td>part-donor of portico &amp; distributions</td>
<td>Thuburbo Matus PZ</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>ILAf 271. CSRA nos. 301, 308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Plotius Faustus, signo Sertius, eq. R., a militis</td>
<td>fl. pp., sacerdos Urbis; joint-donor of market</td>
<td>Thamugadi N</td>
<td>(post-</td>
<td>C. 2395; 2399, cf. p. 1693 = ILS 192</td>
<td>192)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Pompeius Senior, trib. mil., praef. coh., equo publico exornat. a divo Pio</td>
<td>decurio</td>
<td>Volubilis M</td>
<td>161/180</td>
<td>AE 1957, 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Pomponius Crispinus, tr. militum</td>
<td>IIvir, praef. i.d., IIvir quinqu.</td>
<td>Saldae M</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 8940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
65. L. Postumius Felix Celerinus, a mil.  fl. Aug. pp, pontifex, IIvir; gave 3-day munus  Hippo (post-120)  ILAlg I 95 = C. 5276, 17454; ILAlg I 96  

66. M. Valgius Aemilianus, eq. R., trib.  author of unspecified generosity  Sufetula 238/244 (7)  C. 11343 + ILTun 353  

Cf. C. 27573.  
Cf. Pflaum no. 243  

68. Q. Voltedius Optatus Aurelianus, equo publ. adlect. (Trajan), et in quinqu. dec. (Hadrian), trib. mil.  fl. divi. Ner., aed., praef. i.d., mag. Cer. sacr., [IIvir], IIvir quinqu.; gave 4-day munus  Carthage 130/ c. 138 PZ  ILafl 390 = ILS 9406.  
CSRA nos. 281, 360  

69. . . ervius, praef. [ala-chan?]  (an office at Carthage)  Thugga 205 pre- PZ  C. 15529, ef. p. 2616;  
cf. ILTun 1391 & C. 26592  

70. . . eq. publ. adlect., praef. coh. . . .  donor of building  Thibari 131 PZ  C. 15437  

71. . . praef. coh.  flam. Aug.  Thugga 54 PZ  ILafl 559, cf. ILTun 1499  

72. . . ex quinque decurrius, donis militariibus donatus . . .  donor of building  Sabratha (69/ 79 ?)  PZ  IRT 98  

IV. Equestrian curatores rei publicae  

73. . . Aelius Rufus v.e.  cur. r.p., fl. pp.  Lambaesia 268/ 270 N  C. 2661, ef. p. 1739 = ILS 5788  

74. P. Aelius Rusticus e.v.  cur. reip.  Sufetula 196 PB  ILafl 130; 131  

75. M. Annius Sacerdos, eques R., patronus  curator et dispunctor  Satafi M (post-192)  C. 20268; 8396, ef. p. 970 & 20240 = ILS 5728  

76. Aurelius Flavius, eq. R.  aedil. q., duoviralicius, curator (Vina), d(ecurio) (Carthage)  Vina PZ (post-192)  AE 1961, 200  

Cf. CIL VI 1366  

78. Cocceius Donatus, eq. R.  c. reip.  Nigrenses 267 Maiores N  C. 2480–1, ef. 17970  
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### Name and public titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Title</th>
<th>Local activities</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>C. Iulius Maximus, equo publico exornatus</td>
<td>aedilicius quaestorius (Carthage), curator rei publicae (Abthugni)</td>
<td>Abthugni</td>
<td>post-211</td>
<td>C. 23085 = ILS 6815 &amp; add.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>T. Iulius Pansa Crispinianus, c.v.</td>
<td>cur. r.p.</td>
<td>Zama Regia</td>
<td>(post-192)</td>
<td>ITun 574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Q. Paccius Victor Candidianus, equo publ. exornatus, patronus</td>
<td>mag. sac. Cerer. anni CCLXIII, flam divi Severi (both at Carthage), cur. r.p. mun. sui</td>
<td>Furnos Minus</td>
<td>c. 220/230</td>
<td>C. 25808 e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>C. Vasidius Pacatus v.p.</td>
<td>curator rei publicae, fl. pp.</td>
<td>Thubursicu Numidarum NP</td>
<td>(post-192)</td>
<td>ILAlg I 1299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>. . . v.p.</td>
<td>cur. r.p.</td>
<td>Calama NP</td>
<td>(post-192)</td>
<td>ILAlg I 288 = C. 5367, 17496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>. . . v.e.</td>
<td>cur. r.p.?</td>
<td>Madauros NP</td>
<td>(post-192)</td>
<td>ILAlg I 2153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V. Knights and indices who held local office and made public gifts without following equestrian careers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Title</th>
<th>Local activities</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Cn. Ca. . . Soricio, eq. pub. ornatus</td>
<td>IIIvir; restored walls &amp; gates</td>
<td>Rusicade N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILAlg II, i, 35 = C. 7985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>C. Caecilius Gallus, hab. equum pub., praef. fabr. (quater), ex V decuriis dec. III</td>
<td>aed. hab. iur. dic. q. pro praet., praef. pro IIIvir III, hab. orn. quinquennalis, praef. i.d., Rusicadi, flam. divi Iuli, flam. provinciae; gave tribunal et rostra</td>
<td>Rusicade N</td>
<td>pre-115</td>
<td>ILAlg II, i, 36 = C. 7986 = ILS 6862; ILAlg II, i, 71 = C. 7987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>M. Cornelius Fronto Gabinianus, eq. R. ex inquisitione allectus, honestae memoriae vir</td>
<td>fl. pp., IIViralis; gave 'frumenti copiam tempore inopiae'</td>
<td>Madauros NP</td>
<td>(post-180)</td>
<td>ILAlg I 2145; 2125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>L. Cornelius Fronto Probianus, eq. p. orn.</td>
<td>dec. IIII col., fl. pp. divi Magni Antonini; gave statue with tetraestyle, etc.</td>
<td>Rusicade N</td>
<td>218/235</td>
<td>ILAlg II, i, 10 = C. 7963, ef. p. 967, &amp; 19849. CSRA nos. 94, 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and public titles</td>
<td>Local activities</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. ... Felix Iulianus, eq. R.</td>
<td>fl. p., duumviralicis; gave portico and cash sum to city</td>
<td>Thugga PZ</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>ILTun 1416= C. 26559. CSRA no. 323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Q. Flavius Lappianus, eq. R.</td>
<td>fl. pp. (Calama); author of unspecified generosity</td>
<td>Thabarbusi NP</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>AE 1960, 214; Libya vi, 1958, pp. 149–50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. A. Gabinius Datus filius, patronus, equo publico in quinque decuris ... adlect. (Hadrian)</td>
<td>fl. divi Titi, aedil. augur (all at Carthage); joint donor of temple complex</td>
<td>Thugga PZ</td>
<td>117/138</td>
<td>ILTun 1513; C. 26470+ILTun 1391; unpub. text; ILaF 569. CSRA no. 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. P. Iulius Noricus, equo pub. exornatus</td>
<td>aedilis; gave building &amp; statue</td>
<td>Cirta N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILaG II, i, 685; 686 =C. 7146, 19448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Julius Urbanus, eq. p. ornat.</td>
<td>quaest., aed. IIII col., praef. pro IIIvir.; gave tetrastyle, games and largesses</td>
<td>Cirta N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILaG II, i, 529= C. 19489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. ... Iunior, eq. R.</td>
<td>aedilis; gave monument</td>
<td>Cirta N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILaG II, i, 689= C. 7121 &amp; p. 1848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Q. Lollius Saturninus, equo publico exornat.</td>
<td>IIvir qq.; gave sedes for statue</td>
<td>Bulla Regia PZ</td>
<td>198/9</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. M. Manlius Modestus Quietianus, equo publico et in quinq. decur. adlectus a divo Pio</td>
<td>fl. perp., IIviralic, curator alimentorium; gave theatre</td>
<td>Curubis PZ</td>
<td>c. 161/ 170</td>
<td>ILaF 320 = ILS 9407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. P. Marcius Quadratus, in quinque decurias adlectus (Pius) (Brother of 103 and 146)</td>
<td>fl. divi Aug., pontifex (Carthage), fl. pp. (Thugga); gave theatre</td>
<td>Thugga PZ</td>
<td>166/169</td>
<td>C. 26606, cf. ILTun 1434, = ILS 9364; C. 26607; 26528; 26528a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. L. Marcii Simplex, in quinque decurias ... adlectus (Pius). (Brother of 102 and 146)</td>
<td>fl. pp. (Thugga), fl. divi Aug (Carthage), aedilis; gave Capitol</td>
<td>Thugga PZ</td>
<td>c. 166/7</td>
<td>C. 26609; 15513; 15514, cf. p. 2616 &amp; ILTun 1379. Cf. Poinssot, NAM xxi, n.s., fasc. 8, 1913, p. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. ... Memmius Felix Sabinianus, equo publico adlectus. (Brother of 105)</td>
<td>decurio (Carthage), sacerdos Aesclapii; joint donor of arch and building complex</td>
<td>Thignica PZ</td>
<td>c. 180/ 200</td>
<td>C. 15205; cf. 15212 = ILS 6822</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. Q. Memmius Rufus Fortu ... , equo publico adlectus. (Brother of 104)</td>
<td>decurio (Carthage), sacerdos Aesclapii; joint donor of arch and building complex</td>
<td>Thignica PZ</td>
<td>c. 180/ 200</td>
<td>C. 15205; cf. 15212 = ILS 6822</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THE BRITISH SCHOOL AT ROME

#### Name and public titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Public Titles</th>
<th>Local Activities</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>M. Munius Primus</td>
<td>flam. perp.; author of unspecified generosity</td>
<td>Avedda PZ</td>
<td>(post-192)</td>
<td>C. 14373; ILaF 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>. . . Numisius . . .</td>
<td>aedilicius,</td>
<td>Uchi Maius PZ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 26277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eq[ues . . .]</td>
<td>IIviralicius;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gave building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>publ.</td>
<td>IIvir, sacerdos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urbis, fl. divi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Antonini; gave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>statue, sportulae,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>games &amp; largesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>L. Scantius Iulianus,</td>
<td>IIIvir; gave</td>
<td>Cirta N</td>
<td>c. 193/4</td>
<td>ILaG II, i, 560 = C. 6995 &amp; p. 965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eq. pub. exornatus</td>
<td>1-day munus &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>statue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>M. Seius Maximus,</td>
<td>IIIvir; gave</td>
<td>Cirta N</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>ILaG II, i, 569 = C. 7000, 19418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>equo publico</td>
<td>statue w. tetrastyle,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exornatus</td>
<td>games &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>largesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>. . . Victor Agrippianus,</td>
<td>fl. pp., sacerdos Dei Lib. Pat.; gave</td>
<td>Guelaa bou Atfane NP</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILaG I 562 = C. 16910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eq. R.</td>
<td>building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>. . . All . . . eq. pub.</td>
<td>aedilis; gave</td>
<td>Cirta N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILaG II, i, 696 = C. 7123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exornatus</td>
<td>monument, games &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>largesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>. . . anua . . . eques</td>
<td>aedilis; gave</td>
<td>Cirta N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILaG II, i, 697 = C. 7122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romanus</td>
<td>monument, games &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>largesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>. . . [equo publico</td>
<td>flamen pp.; gave</td>
<td>Rusicade N</td>
<td>218/222</td>
<td>ILaG II, i, 11 = C. 7964 &amp; p. 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e]xornatus</td>
<td>monument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### VI. Knights andJudges who held local office without following equestrian careers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Public Titles</th>
<th>Local Activities</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eq. R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>. . . Aemilius Marcianus,</td>
<td>decurio</td>
<td>Cuicul N</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>AE 1914, 45-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eques Romanus. (Brother of 117)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>. . . Aemilius Martialis</td>
<td>decurio</td>
<td>Cuicul N</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>AE 1914, 45-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iunior, eques Romanus. (Brother of 116)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>C. Anicius Fronto, equo</td>
<td>quaeest., aedil, IIvir,</td>
<td>Sabratha PT</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>IRT 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>publ. ornat.</td>
<td>IIvir eq. design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>L. Annius Maximus,</td>
<td>aedil. q., flaminicius,</td>
<td>Rusippisir M</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 20706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eques Romanus (of Rusuccuru)</td>
<td>duumviralis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>M. Antonius Proculleius,</td>
<td>aedilis</td>
<td>Portus Magnus M</td>
<td>196(?)</td>
<td>C. 9754, cf. p. 2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ex equestribus turmis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EQUESTRIAN RANK IN AFRICAN CITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and public titles</th>
<th>Local activities</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121. P. Attius Annianus Iulianus, equo publ. adlectus (Marcus &amp; Commodus). (Brother of 122)</td>
<td>fl. divi Titi (Carthage), sac. Aesculapii bis (Thuburbo)</td>
<td>Thuburbo M PZ</td>
<td>176/180</td>
<td>ILTun 723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122. P. Attius Exstrictianus, equo publico adlectus (Marcus &amp; Commodus). (Brother of 121)</td>
<td>fl. divi Titi (Carthage), sac. Aesculapii bis (Thuburbo)</td>
<td>Thuburbo M PZ</td>
<td>176/180</td>
<td>ILAf 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123. M. Aufidius Honoratus, eq. publ. ornatus</td>
<td>decurio</td>
<td>Saldae M</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>C. 8937, cf. 20681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126. P. Clodius Quadratus, qui et Scipio, equo publ. ornatus</td>
<td>dec. IV col.</td>
<td>Thibilis N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 18912= ILS 6856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128. M. Cornelius Proculeianus, eq. R. (son of 193*)</td>
<td>sacerdotalis p(rov.) A(fricae) v(eteris)</td>
<td>Ammaedara PB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 11546= ILS 6810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130. C. Domitius Alexander, equo publico exornatus</td>
<td>duumviralicius</td>
<td>Caesarea M</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>C. 9398=20984; 10980=20983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133. C. Fulcinius Optatus, equo publico</td>
<td>aedilicius</td>
<td>Cartenna M</td>
<td>c. 120/150</td>
<td>C. 9664; 9663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and public titles</td>
<td>Local activities</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134. . . . Gabinius Octavius, Festus Sufetianus, equo publico ornatus (Commodus), in quinque decur. adlectus, patronus</td>
<td>fl. divi Aug., sacerdos Aesculapi et Iovis, flam. perp., IIvir qq.</td>
<td>Thugga</td>
<td>180/192</td>
<td>C. 26598; 26624; ILAf 535; ILTun 1429; 1438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138. Q. Iulius Honon . . ., adlectus in . . . decurias</td>
<td>aed. q. pot., IIIIVir, augur</td>
<td>Cirta N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILAlg II, i, 481= C. 6950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139. C. Iulius Laetitus, adlectus in turmas equit. Romanor. (Marcus &amp; Verus), Laurens Lavinus, sacerdos Satium(?)</td>
<td>flam. (Thysdrus), IIIIVir (Cures Sabini)</td>
<td>Thysdrus</td>
<td>161/169</td>
<td>C. 10501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140. P. Iulius Pollio, eq. R.</td>
<td>fl. pp., IIIVir</td>
<td>Madauros</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILAlg I 2141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140a. C. Iulius Romuleanus, eq. R.</td>
<td>pontifex</td>
<td>Theveste</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILAlg I 3068= C. 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142. M. Iunius Asclepiades, equo publico exornatus sacrisque Lupercalibus functus</td>
<td>decurio</td>
<td>Caesarea</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 21063; AE 1933, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144. A. Luccius Felix Blaesianus, in quinque dec. adlectus</td>
<td>aedil., IIvir, fl. perpet., sacerdos provinciae Africai</td>
<td>Utica PZ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 25385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145. L. Maecilius Nepos, eq. p. exornatus</td>
<td>fl. pp., omnibus honoribus in IIII col. functus</td>
<td>Cirta N</td>
<td>(post-161)</td>
<td>ILAlg II, i, 690= C. 7112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146. C. Marc'H Lucius, in quinque decurias adlectus (Pius). (Brother of 102 &amp; 103)</td>
<td>flamen divi Vespasiani (Carthage)</td>
<td>Thugga</td>
<td>c. 160/7</td>
<td>C. 26604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EQUESTRIAN RANK IN AFRICAN CITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and public titles</th>
<th>Local activities</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>147. L. Memmius Messiah Pacatus, in quinque decurias adlectus (Hadrian)</td>
<td>flam. perpetuus divi Traiani</td>
<td>Gigthis</td>
<td>117/138</td>
<td>C. 22729 = ILS 9394. Cf. ILAf'22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148. M. Paccius Victor Fortunatus, eques Romanus</td>
<td>omnibus honoribus in patria sua functus</td>
<td>Thubursicu Numidarum</td>
<td>(post-161)</td>
<td>ILAlg I 1349 = C. 4689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149. Fabius Philippianus, equo publico adlectus (Marcus &amp; Verus)</td>
<td>IIvir</td>
<td>Segermes</td>
<td>161/169</td>
<td>C. 11173 + ILTu 258; ILTu 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152. . . Saturninus, adlectus . . . in turmas [equitum] et in decuriam iudicium (Pius)</td>
<td>IIvir</td>
<td>? (PZ)</td>
<td>138/161</td>
<td>C. 1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155. L. Septimius Severus, in decurias et inter selectos Romae iudicavit. (Grandfather of Emperor)</td>
<td>sues, praef. publ., du(u)mvr, fl. pp.</td>
<td>Lepcis Magna</td>
<td>c. 90/120</td>
<td>IRT 412; 413. Cf. SHA Sev. 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158. Q. Sittius Faustus, probatus ab Imp. L. Septimio Severo . . . et M. Aurelio Antonino, in quinq. decurias adlectus a divo M. Antonino Pio</td>
<td>flam. perp., IIIvir quinq., IIIvir, praef. i.d. Rusic../Mil./Chullu, aedil.</td>
<td>Tiddis N</td>
<td>c. 170/209</td>
<td>ILAlg II, i, 3610 = C. 6711 = ILS 6863; ILAlg II, i, 3611 = C. 6710 = ILS 6863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159. L. Sittius Rufinus, eq. publ. exornatus</td>
<td>dec. Cirtensium</td>
<td>Thibilis N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 5534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Name and public titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and titles</th>
<th>Local activities</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Tettius Gallicus</td>
<td>fl. perp., IIIvir,</td>
<td>Henchir</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 25834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clodianus, eq. Rom.</td>
<td>aedilic.</td>
<td>Debbik .PZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex. Valerius</td>
<td>flamen provinciae</td>
<td>Caesarea M</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 9409=21066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municeps (?), equo publico exornatus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Volusius Gallus, eq. R.</td>
<td>pontifex, duoviralis,</td>
<td>Lepcis</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>IRT 579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fl. pp.</td>
<td>Magna PT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... asius Sopater ...</td>
<td>aedilicus, IIIvir</td>
<td>Thugga PZ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 26617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoratus, eq. R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... nus Se ... eq. R.</td>
<td>fl. pp.</td>
<td>Madauros NP</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILAlg I 2147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... Sab ... Cr ...</td>
<td>[mag. Cer.] sacror.</td>
<td>Thysdrus PB</td>
<td>c. 130/150</td>
<td>C. 22862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caec ... [in quinqu. dec.] ab Imp.</td>
<td>(Carthage), flam.,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Caesare Antonino]</td>
<td>[IIvir] qv., II[vir]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. Pio [adlect ... ab Imp.] Caesar[e</td>
<td>(Thysdrus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traiano Hadri]ano Au[g. adlect. in turmas]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equit[u[m Romanor.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... adlectus in quinque decur. (Hadrian)</td>
<td>decurio</td>
<td>Hippo Regius</td>
<td>117/138</td>
<td>ILAlg I 132=5278, 17462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... in quinque [decur. adlectus]</td>
<td>IIIvir, pontif., praef.</td>
<td>Chullu N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILAlg II, i, 422=C. 19917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... equo publico</td>
<td>aed., quaest., IIIvir,</td>
<td>Cirta N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILAlg II, i, 705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>praef. i.d. Chullu,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>flamen ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VII. Knights and judges who made public gifts, but who are not known to have held local office or followed an equestrian career

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and titles</th>
<th>Local activities</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Amullius Optatus</td>
<td>gave large building &amp;</td>
<td>Thagaste N</td>
<td>(post-</td>
<td>ILAlg I 876–7=C. 5146 &amp; 5148,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crementianus, eq. R.</td>
<td>distributions</td>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>cf. p. 1634. CSRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nos. 39 &amp; 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... qui et Antiochianus,</td>
<td>gave building</td>
<td>Thamallula M</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>C. 20575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equo publ. ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Curius Servilius</td>
<td>muner(arius)</td>
<td>Gigthis PT</td>
<td></td>
<td>ILTun 15=C. 11033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draco, scrib. q., equo [publ.] turm (a quarta)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Memmius</td>
<td>bequeathed structure of</td>
<td>Seressi PZ</td>
<td>211/</td>
<td>C. 11216, cf. p. 2340;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix Armenianus, equo publico adlectus</td>
<td>arch</td>
<td></td>
<td>217(?)</td>
<td>11214. Cf. CSRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no. 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Paconius ... conus,</td>
<td>part donor of</td>
<td>Cirta N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILAlg II, i, 528=C. 6962. Cf. ILAlg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eques Romanus</td>
<td>2 statues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II, i, 472=C. 6943;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ILAlg II, i, 690=C. 7112 &amp; p. 1848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EQUESTRIAN RANK IN AFRICAN CITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and public titles</th>
<th>Local activities</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>175. P. Petronius Felix Fuscus, eq. R. (Son of no. 61)</td>
<td>part-donor of portico and distributions</td>
<td>Thuburbo</td>
<td>225</td>
<td><em>ILAf</em> 271, CSRA nos. 301, 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177. . . adlectus in quinque decurias?</td>
<td>gave building</td>
<td>Cuicul N</td>
<td></td>
<td>CSRA no. 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178. Q. Servaeus Macer, adlectus in quinqu. decur (Hadrian)</td>
<td>gave <em>aedes &amp; lupa aerea cum Romulo et Remo</em></td>
<td>Gigthis PT</td>
<td>117/150</td>
<td><em>ILAf</em> 16 = C. 22736; <em>ILTun</em> 801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179. L. Statius Aurelianus, eq. R.</td>
<td>gift whose nature is unknown</td>
<td>Neapolis</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. 24098, <em>cf.</em> <em>ILTun</em> 801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180. . . adlectus in quinque decurias?</td>
<td>gave building</td>
<td>Cuicul N</td>
<td></td>
<td>CSRA no. 410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VIII. Knights and judges who are not known to have held local office, made public gifts, or followed equestrian careers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and public titles</th>
<th>Local activities</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>182. . .. Annius Primus Iunior, eq(u)es Romanus. (Died at 26)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medjez</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ILAlg</em> I 520 = C. 5502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183. G. Artorius Tertullus, eq. Rom. (Died at 14)</td>
<td>(son of veteran, ff. pp.)</td>
<td>Thubursicu Numidarak NP</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ILAlg</em> I 1336 = C. 4882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184. M. Caecilius (I)bazatha, equo publico desig. (Commemorated at age of 17)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Volubilis M</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ILM</em> 94 = <em>ILAf</em> 622. <em>Cf.</em> <em>BAC</em> 1916, p. 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185. Q. Caecilius Priscus, equo pub. exornatus. (Commemorated at 17)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Volubilis M</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ILM</em> 98 = C. 21831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186. Q. Caecilius Rufus, eq. R. (Died at 51. Brother of 187)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Verecunda N</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. 4251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187. Q. Caecilius Barbarus, eq. R. (Brother of 186)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Verecunda N</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. 4251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188. L. Caesennius Auctus Aurelianus, equo publico . . . exornatus (Marcus)</td>
<td>(son of noted local benefactor)</td>
<td>Thuburbo Maius PZ</td>
<td>169/176</td>
<td><em>ILTun</em> 725; <em>cf.</em> 724, 726. <em>Cf.</em> also C. 26604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189. L. Caesonius Honoratus, eques Romanus. (Died at 65.) (Probably father of 27)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Madauros NP</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ILAlg</em> I 2196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190. Q. Calpurnius Rogatianus, equo publico exornatus (Marcus &amp; Verus), praef. fabrum, patronus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thugga PZ</td>
<td>166/169</td>
<td><em>Cf.</em> <em>ILTun</em> 1514-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and public titles</td>
<td>Local activities</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192. . . Clutorianus, eq. R.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Carthage PZ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 12582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193a. Cornelius Rogatianus, eq. R. (Father of 128)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ammaedara PB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 11546 = ILS 6810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194. Q. Cornelius Rusticus, equo publico exornatus</td>
<td>(magister of senator)</td>
<td>Thibilis N</td>
<td>211/212</td>
<td>C. 5528-9, cf. 18862-3. PIR² C 1430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195. . . us Crescens, eq. R.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Novar M</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 20450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196. C. Egnatius Cosminius Vinicianus, adlectus equo publ. (Hadrian)</td>
<td>(son of flamen &amp; local benefactor)</td>
<td>Uthina PZ</td>
<td>117/138</td>
<td>C. 24017; CSRA 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197. Fabii Rusticus, Fronio, Severus, eqq. RR.</td>
<td>(sons of omnibus honoribus functus)</td>
<td>Cirta N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILAlg II, i, 794 = C. 7101, cf. 19437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200. . . Felix, eq. .</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Mactaris PB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 23406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203. T. Flavius Silvanus, eq. R., advocatus</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Lambaesis N</td>
<td>244/9</td>
<td>(?) C. 2734, cf. 18125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204. . Gargilius Severus, eques Romanus. (Brother of 135)</td>
<td>(son of omnibus honoribus functus, fl. pp.)</td>
<td>Cuicul N</td>
<td>(post-161)</td>
<td>AE 1912, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205. . Herennius Rufinus, 'anulos aureos et omnia insignia dignitatis abicit'</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Oea PT</td>
<td>c. 150/157</td>
<td>Apuleius, Apol. 75. CSRA 384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206. Q. Herennius Rufus, eq. R. (Related by marriage to egregii viri &amp; equites Romani)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Manliana M</td>
<td>(post-161)</td>
<td>C. 9616, cf. p. 2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207. . Honoratus [e]q. R.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Membressa PZ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 1301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208. . Hostilius Saturninus et Felix, eq. Romani</td>
<td>(sons of veteran who was pontifex, and flaminica)</td>
<td>Lamsorti N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 4437 = 18596; 4436 = 18595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210. Iulius Castus Armoricanus, signo Cubernius, eques Romanus. (Died at 17)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Sicca Veneria PZ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C. 1643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and public titles</td>
<td>Local activities</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214. Iulius N... equo publ. exornatus. (Died at 23)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Tubusuctu M</td>
<td>—</td>
<td><em>C. 8839</em>, cf. p. 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215. Iullii Pompliumius et Bassinus, equites Romani</td>
<td>(sons of eq. R., p(rimus) p(illus))</td>
<td>Caesarea N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 1952, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216. ... Laelius Timminus 'qui rem paravit haud mediocrem familiae,/domumque tenuem ad equestrem promovit gradum'</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Madauros NP</td>
<td>—</td>
<td><em>ILAlg</em> I 2195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218. M. Lurius Faustus Caecilianus (eques)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Belalis</td>
<td>—</td>
<td><em>FA</em> xvii, 1962, 5086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219. C. Maecius Titianus Iunior, eq. R.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Hippo Regius</td>
<td>c. 260/ 262</td>
<td><em>ILAlg</em> I 7=*C. 5228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220. Q. Magnius Eutycles, eq. [R.]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Vazi Sarra PB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td><em>C. 12000</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221. Q. Magnius Maximus Flavianus, eq. R.</td>
<td>(son of fl. pp. inter quinquennalios adlect., who gave foundation)</td>
<td>Sufes PB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td><em>C. 11430=</em> <em>ILS</em> 6835. <em>CSRA</em> 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222. ... Marcellus &amp;... equites Romani</td>
<td>(sons of decurio)</td>
<td>Cirta N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td><em>ILAlg</em> II, i, 798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223. ... Marcellus &amp;... equites Romani</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Uchi Maius PZ</td>
<td>(post- 230)</td>
<td><em>C. 15455</em>, cf. p. 2595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224. L. Marcius Honoratus, Fabianus, eq. R., h.m.v., patronus</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Sitifis M</td>
<td>—</td>
<td><em>C. 8489</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226. C. Memmius Africanus, adlectus in turmas eq. (Hadrian)</td>
<td>(son of veteran)</td>
<td>Henchir Sidi Abd el-Basset PZ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td><em>C. 14344</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227. Memmius Victorinus, equo publico exornatus, h.m.v.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Cuicul N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 1913, 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227a. M. Papius Marcianus, equo publ. exornatus et sacror. publicorum causa Lupercus factus</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Umm el- Bawaghi N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td><em>C. 4781=18676</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and public titles</td>
<td>Local activities</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229. Petronii</td>
<td></td>
<td>Henchir el-Khima PB</td>
<td>(post-180)</td>
<td>C. 12151 + ILTun 593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229a. Petronianus et...</td>
<td>stor., [equo publ]ico exor[nat.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230. C. Pompeius Felix</td>
<td>Octavianus, equo publico ornatus (Septimius &amp; Caracalla)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sufetula PB</td>
<td>198/211</td>
<td>ILAf 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232. ... cius Proculus, equo publico exornatus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caesarea M</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. 9408, cf. 20949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233. Q. Pallaenius Donatus, eques Rom., honestae memoriae. (Died at 58)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Auzia M</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. 9050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233a. Q. Pallaenius Donantius, eques Rom. (Son of preceding)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Auzia M</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. 9050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235. M. Sattelius Rufinus Pancratius, eques Romanus. (Died at 17)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cirta N</td>
<td></td>
<td>ILAlg II, i, 799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236. . Sentius Rogatus, eq. Ro.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Auzia M</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. 20750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237. . Sicinius Pontianus, splendidissimus eques</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oea PT</td>
<td>157/8</td>
<td>Apuleius, Apol. 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238. . Statilius Capella, eques R.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sabratha PT</td>
<td>c. 30/40</td>
<td>Suet. Vesp. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239. C. Statius Celsus, eq. R., scrib. lib. (Died at 36)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vina PZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ILAf 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240. . Titiennius Datus Pompeianus, eques Rom.</td>
<td>(probably brother of aedilicius, fl. perp., donor of games)</td>
<td>Thugga PZ</td>
<td>205/261</td>
<td>C. 26581 + ILTun 1423; C. 26618, cf. ILAf 539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241. L. Turpiliius Victorinus Marianus, signo Audentius, eq. R., advocatus. (Died at 32)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuicul N</td>
<td>(post-180)</td>
<td>C. 20162 = ILS 7744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241a. L. Turpilius Victorinus, eq. R. (Died at 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuicul N</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. 20163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242. Q. Turranius Natalis Censorinus, eq. R.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sufetula PB</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. 239, 11342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242a. L. Valerius Optatianus, signo Panacrius, eq. R., advocatus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thamugadi N</td>
<td>(post-180)</td>
<td>C. 2393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EQUESTRIAN RANK IN AFRICAN CITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and public titles</th>
<th>Local activities</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q. Vetidius Felix</td>
<td>(son of omnibus honoribus functus)</td>
<td>Thubursicus</td>
<td>post-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoratianus, signo Iuvenitus, eques Romanus. (Died at 21, brother of 244–5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Numidarum</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Vetidius Maternus</td>
<td>(son of omnibus honoribus functus)</td>
<td>Thubursicus</td>
<td>post-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vetidianus, signo Heraclius, eques Rom.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Numidarum</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Died at 18, brother of 243, 245)</td>
<td></td>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. Vetidius . .</td>
<td>(son of omnibus honoribus functus)</td>
<td>Thubursicus</td>
<td>post-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(eques). (Brother of 243–4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Numidarum</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Volumnius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cirta N</td>
<td>197/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcellus Caecilianus, eq. publ. exornatus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Uruinus Crescens</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thubursicus</td>
<td>post-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livianus, equestris dignitatis exornatus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bure PZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zosimus . . . , equesque Rom. (Died at 65)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tubusuctu</td>
<td>post-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . eq(uites) R(omani)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guelaa bou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Brothers, related to 111)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Atfane NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . equo publico adlectus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cirta N</td>
<td>post-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . eq. Roman . .</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tichilla</td>
<td>post-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . in turmas adlecti (Septimius, Caracalla &amp; Geta)</td>
<td>(sons of omnib. honorib. functus, sacerdos)</td>
<td>Thubursicus</td>
<td>209/211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Numidarum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTES ON THE LIST

No. 24. Stein identifies L. Aemilius Salvianus, eg(regiae) m(emoriae) v(ir) of Lambaesis, with the homonym recorded as tribune of a cohort in Britain under Septimius (PIR² A 401; CIL VII, 986, 1003). The identification would presumably imply that Salvianus later held civil administrative posts, since the militiae alone would hardly have earned him the eground (cf. nos. 41–72). The identification, if correct, lends further substance to the view that those described merely as e(rga) v(iri) had sometimes followed active equestrian careers (Appendix II (i) below).

No. 25. The main text (CIL VIII 24054) reads 'Q, Appae P. fil. Ter. Satur/nino Iuventiano e.v., patri/Q. Appae Felici Flavi ani c.m.i./sac. U.R.A., fl. pp... III VI....'. Both the CIL editors and Toutain (BAC 1928/9, pp. 67–9), followed by Warmington, p. 54, read the offices in the fourth line as applying to the son. But it is unlikely that a young man who died in early manhood ('c(ollegiis) m(emoria) i(uvenis)') would have held the three major offices indicated here: the sacerdotium Urbis Romae Aeternae, the perpetual flaminate, and the duovirate. Moreover, it is almost unheard of in the copious African evidence for a senator to hold local office of any kind, either substantive or honorary (M. Coculinius Quintilius of Cirta was one of the handful of exceptions, PIR² C 1234). Local office by eground is well attested, by contrast (nos. 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40). Hence it seems clear that these offices must have been held by the father. For eground, see Appendix II.

In view of the local offices given, the uncertainty about the African origin of this family expressed by Pelletier (p. 520) is unjustified.
THE BRITISH SCHOOL AT ROME

No. 96. Pflaum dates the main inscription of C. Caecilius Gallus to the period before the setting up of the flaminate of the province by Vespasian in A.D. 70/72 (for which see CSRA, p. 52, n. 13), on the basis of his holding the office of *flamen divi Iuli* (*ILAlg* II, i, 36). The dating is evidently derived from Mommsen’s identification of this priesthood as an earlier version of the office of *flamen provinciae*, which Gallus is recorded as holding in his shorter inscription (Mommsen, *Ges. Schr. V*, pp. 484–5). But because the shorter inscription is palpably the later of the two (a daughter who contributed to the main dedication is now deceased), there are no real grounds for conflating the two priesthoods. The second inscription is not a career inscription, and mentions only the flaminate of the province. The office of *flamen divi Iuli* is not qualified in the main inscription in any way that suggests that it was a provincial rather than a local flaminate. It is much more likely that Gallus held the flaminate of the province at Carthage after being *flamen divi Iuli* (presumably at Rusicade). This sequence is not surprising, since six other men are attested as holders of local flaminae before they reached the priesthood of the province (C. 14731; 16472; 25385; *ILAlg* I 1295; *ILAf* 458+AE 1964, 177; *BCB*, p. 318). Gallus’s term of office must have fallen before the shift in the titulature of the priesthood of the province from *flamen* (*Aug.*) *provinciae* to *sacerdos provinciae*, which probably took place late in the reign of Trajan (*CSRA*, p. 52, n. 13). Though the final stages of Gallus’s career must have fallen after the Vespasianic foundation of the cult, Mommsen’s arguments for dating the career before the end of the first century are convincing (*loc. cit.*).

No. 96. The career of A. Gabinius Datus is given as ‘flamen divi Titii, aedil., augur C.C.I.K., equo publico in quinque [de]curiis ab Imp. Caesare [Traiano] Hadriano Aug [adlecto]’ (*ILTum* 1513, C. 26470, etc.). The *CIL* index assigns the flaminate of Titus to Thugga (p. 236; this is the only mention of the priesthood in *CIL VIII*). But nos. 121 and 122 (*ILTum* 723; *ILAf* 280) both show explicitly that there was a flaminate of Titus at Carthage, where some of Datus’s offices were certainly held. It is therefore more likely that Datus’s tenure of the flaminate of Titus also belonged to Carthage, since the cult is not securely attested in the very large epigraphy of Thugga.

No. 102. The inscriptions (from Thugga) give Quadratus’s offices thus: ‘flamen divi Aug., pont. C.I.K., in quinque decurias [adlectus ab Imp. Anton.]no Aug Pio, ob honorem flaminius sui perpetui patriae suae theatrum ... fec(uit)’. The *CIL* index is inconsistent, assigning the office of *flamen divi Aug.* to Thugga on p. 271, but to Carthage on p. 236. Since Quadratus’s brother (no. 103) clearly held this office at Carthage (‘flamen divi Aug. C.I.K.’) it is likely that Quadratus held the office there also; their careers were very similar.

No. 133. The father was probably the homonym who appears in another inscription from Cartenna (C. 9663; the filiation excludes the reverse genealogy). The father held a very full municipal career (only the aedileship is recorded for the son), but his greatest distinction lay in his successful organisation of the defence of Cartenna against the Baquates. Cf. E. Frézouls ‘Les Baquates et la province romaine de Tingitane’, *Bull. arch. marocaine*, ii, 1957, pp. 65–116.

No. 146. The assignment of the flaminate held by Clemens to Thugga and not to Carthage by the *CIL* index (p. 236) is based on a straightforward misreading of the text, whose words are ‘flamen divi Vespasiani C.I.K.’.

No. 166. The interpretation of the inscription followed here is based on the following restoration, which has been made in the light of the similar career in *ILAf* 390 (no. 68). The *CIL* editors give no restoration (C. 22862).

```
Sab[...........................]
Cr[...........................]
Caeciliano?, in quinque dec.
ab Imp [Caesare Antonino]
Aug Pio [adlect., mag. Cer.]
sacror. [ann ... , ab Imp.]
Caesar[e Traiano Hadri-]
ano Au[g. adlect. in turmas]
equitu[m Romanor .........]
III fl[a(m. perp. .... IIvir]
qq., II[vir ? ... ]
fl[...........................]
```

For promotion to the *decuriae* after bestowal of the public horse, see no. 68 and *CIL* X 53. For other mentions of the *turbanae equitum*, see nos. 120, 139, 151, 152, 226, 253–4.
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APPENDIX I: THE DATED EVIDENCE

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>indices</th>
<th>equus publicus &amp; turmae</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trajan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadrian</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pius</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septimius</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caracalla</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Mentions of indices, the equus publicus/turmae equitum and 'equites Romani' in other dated inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>indices</th>
<th>eq. pub./turn. eq. 'equites Romani'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>931/117</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98117</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98/138</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117/138</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138/161</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161/180</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180/192</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193/211</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198/217</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211/217</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222/235</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238/244</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244/249</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253/268</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References: Table 1.—Indices, nos. 68, 96, 147, 167, 178; 101, 102, 103, 146, 152, 166; 158. Equus publicus & turmae, nos. 68; 96, 166, 196, 226; 50, 63, 101, 152; 121, 122, 139, 149, 188, 190, 213; 134; 230, 253–4; 131; 151. Table 2.—Indices, nos. 21; 55; 50, 93, 129; 137. Equus publicus & turmae, nos. 21; 57; 108, 137, 109, 120, 123, 246, 130, 100, 171, 88, 124; 194, 110, 173; 116, 92. Equites Romani, nos. 150; 175, 116–7, 58; 66; 22, 203; 42, 54, 55, 219, 94, 78, 23.

APPENDIX II: EGREGII VIRI

(i) The 'egregii viri' are a class whose nature is only partly clear. The term egregius vir clearly had an official connotation relating to procurators, from at least the reign of Marcus Aurelius onwards (O. Hirschfeld, Kleine Schriften, pp. 652–3). This use is illustrated by a dedication to the young son of a procurator of Mauretania under Severus Alexander: 'T. Licinio Cl. Hie[roceti] L. Vinnius Fronto ex [t]a[b](ulari)]: Incipe, parve puer, studiis superare parent(um)/egregiumque genus propriis virtutibus orna'. (AE 1931, 39, cf. Pflaum, no. 316.)

But when egregii appear in inscriptions only as the holders of local offices (see nos. 24–40), there may be some doubt about whether the men concerned were procurators (cf. Hirschfeld, loc. cit.,
Though procurators did sometimes hold local office (nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 18, 21, 22), if all egregii served as procurators, why did some specify their local offices, but omit their much more important public offices? Though this may look like a conclusive objection to considering as procurators egregii who are only recorded as holding local office, it is not certainly so. The mere use of the letters E.V. or V.E. in an inscription may seem unimpressive when compared with the detailed citation of public offices characteristic of second century procuratorial inscriptions; but it should be noticed that career inscriptions declined very sharply in numbers in the first half of the third century, though the employment of procurators must have continued. And in the same period, the elaborate terminology in which equestrian rank was conveyed in the earlier period ('equo publico exornatus', etc.) was largely replaced in African inscriptions by the much briefer citation 'EQ(ues) R(omanus)'. Similarly, separate citations of local magistracies often gave way to the much shorter 'O(nnibus) H(onoribus) F(unctus)'. Even in the inscriptions which cite no procuratorships, 'E.V.' evidently meant something more than mere equestrian rank, since it sometimes appeared in addition to the words 'EQ(ues) R(omanus)' (nos. 34, 36). It should also be noticed that the sons of simple egregii were sometimes made senators (nos. 25; 36; 37; Stein, pp. 213 ff., and p. 32).

In the municipal context 'egregius vir' probably denoted at least a member of a procuratorial family; and there may be grounds for thinking that some simple egregii were themselves procurators. Egregii have been assigned a separate category in the list (nos. 24–40), and they have only been included in cases where their involvement in local affairs is attested.

(ii) It may be noticed here that one of the African viri egregii to be found in PIR³ did not in fact hold this title, and was not an equestrian. Tt. Clodius Loquella (not Lovella, as in PIR³), who was commemorated in two posthumous inscriptions, held three magistracies and two priesthoods at Madauros. His erratic metrical epitaph includes the words 'v(ir)/ egr(egius) fl(amen)'. But Gsell shows that 'egr(egius)' evidently qualified 'fl(amen)', and not 'v(ir)'; this conclusion is based on the fact that neither of the two prose accounts of Loquella's offices includes any equestrian title (JLaAlg 1 2207; 2131; PIR³ C 1168).

Richard Duncan-Jones
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INDEX OF NAMES INCLUDED IN THE LIST OF KNIGHTS AND IUDICES.

Numbers refer to entries in the list.

Aelius Horatius Paritor 41
P. Aelius Menecrates Florianus 88
P. Aelius Processus 115
Aelius Quintus 181
Aelius Rufus 73
Aelius Rufus Iunianus 1
P. Aelius Rusticus 74
P. Aelius Silvanus 43
Aemilius Marcianus 116
Aemilius Martialis junior 117
M. Aemilius Respectus 44
L. Aemilius Salvianus 24
L. Alfenus Senecio 2
... All ... 112
M. Amullius Optatus Cremetianus 170
C. Anicius Fronto 118
L. Annius Fabianus 45
L. Annius Maximus 119
Annius Primus junior 182
M. Annius Sacerdos 75
... qui et Antiochianus 171
M. Antonius Proculeius 120
... anua ... 113
Q. Appaeus Saturninus Iuventianus 25
G. Artorius Tertullus 183
P. Attius Annius Iulianus 121
P. Attius Extriaticianus 122
M. Aufidius Honoratus 123
C. Aufidius Maximus 46
Avitus Rufus 47
Aurelius Flavius 76
Q. Auriustinus Lappianus 124
Boncius Ma ... 77
Cn. Ca ... Scipic 89
L. Caecilius Athenaeus 3
Q. Caecilius Barbarus 187
C. Caecilius Felix 26
C. Caecilius Gallus 90
M. Caecilius Ibzathae 184
Q. Caecilius Priscus 185
Q. Caecilius Rufus 186
... ius Caecilianus 40
L. Caesennius Auctus Aurelianus 188
L. Caesonius Honoratus 189
L. Caesonius Honoratus Caesonianus 27
Q. Calpurnius Venustianus 125
Q. Calpurnius Rogatianus 190
L. Caninius Iunianus Flavianus 48
M. Cincius Felix Iulianus 28
T. Claudius Hispanus 49
L. Claudius Honoratus 50
P. Clodius Quadratus, qui et Scipio 126
C. Clodius Secundus Iucundianus 191
... Clotorianus 192
Coccetus Donatianus 78
T. Coelius Martialis 29
Cn. Coelius Seneca 193
M. Cornelius Bassus Servianus 30
Sex. Cornelius Dexter Maximus 127
C. Cornelius Egrilianus 51
C. Cornelius Flaccus 52
M. Cornelius Fronto Aemilianus 91
L. Cornelius Fronto Probianus 92
Sex. Cornelius Honoratus 4
M. Cornelius Proculeianus 128
Cornelius Rogatianus 193a
Q. Cornelius Rusticus 194
C. Cosinius Maximus 129
L. Cosinius Primus 93
... us Crescens 195
P. Curiius Servilius Draco 172
... [Dar]danianus 79
C. Domitius Alexander 130
M. Domitius Gentianus 131
L. Domitius Tustus Aemilianus 80
C. Egnatius Cosminus Vinicianus 196
L. Egnatieleius Sabinius 5
Fabius Fronto 198
M. Fabius Mettianus 53
Fabius Rusticus 197
Fabius Philippianus 149
Fabius Severus 199
... Felix 200
... Felix Iulianus 94
... Festus 177
... Flavius Antiochus 201
L. Flavius Felix Gabinianus 31
C. Flavius Hilarus Felix 202
Q. Flavius Lappianus 95
T. Flavius Macer 6
T. Flavius Monimus 132
T. Flavius Silvanus 203
C. Fulcius Optatus 133
L. Fulvius Kastus Fulvianus 7
M. Furnius Donatus 54
A. Gabinius Datus filius 96
... Gabinius Octavius Festus Sufetianus 134
Gargilius Honoratus 135
Q. Gargilius Martialis 55
Gargilius Severus 204
M. Gargilius Syrus 32
P. Gavius ... 136
L. Gentius Zebechanus 33
M. Helvius Melior Placentius Sabinianus Samuni-
anus 10
Herennius Rufinus 205
Q. Herennius Rufus 206
M. Herennius Victor 8
... Honoratus 207
Hostilius Felix 209
Hostilius Saturninus 208
... Iuli ... 59
... Iulianus 34
Iulius Bassinus 216
Iulius Castus Armorianus, signo Cubernius 210
L. Iulius Crassus 56
C. Iulius Crescens Didius Crescentianus 57
C. Iulius Crescentianus Instanarius 137
Q. Iulius Felix 211
Q. Iulius Hono... 138
C. Iulius Honoratus 212
C. Iulius Laetitius 139
C. Iulius Maximus of Abthugni 81
C. Iulius Maximus of Quicul 213
Iulius N... 214
P. Iulius Noricus 97
T. Iulius Pansa Crispinianus 82
P. Iulius Pollio 140
Iulius Pompilius 215
Sex. Iulius Possessor 9
C. Iulius Romuleanus 140a
Iulius Rusticianus 141
T. Iulius Sabinus 11
T. Iulius Sabinus Victorianus 12
Q. Iulius Silvanus 13
Iulius Theofilius 58
Iulius Urbanus 98
... Iunior 99
M. Iunius Asclepiades 142
M. Iunius Punicus 14
Laelius Timminus 217
P. Licinius Papirianus 15
L. Licinius Secundinus 143
Q. Lollius Saturninus 100
A. Luccius Felix Blesianus 144
M. Lucius Faustus Clodianus 218
L. Macelius Nepos 145
C. Maccius Titianus junior 219
Q. Magnius Euycthes 220
Q. Magnius Maximus Flavianus 221
M. Manlius Modestus Quietianus 101
... Marcellus of Auzia 60
... Marcellus of Circa 222
C. Marcus Clemens 146
L. Marcilius Honoratus Fabianus 224
P. Marcilius Quadratus 102
L. Marcilius Simplex 103
... Marinius 225
C. Memmius Africanus 226
C. Memmius Felix Armenianus 173
... Memmius Felix Sabinianus 104
... Memmius Florus 35
L. Memmius Messius Pacatus 147
Q. Memmius Rufus Fortunatianus 105
... Memmius Victorinus 227
M. Mu... 176
M. Munius Primus Optatianus 106
Nepotianus 16
... Numius... 107
Q. Octavius Rufus Erucianus 36
Q. Paccius Victor Candidianus 83
M. Paccius Victor Fortunatus 148
P. Paconius... conus 174
M. Papius Marcianus 227a
Q. Peticius Victor 228
P. Petronius Felix 61
P. Petronius Felix Pucus 175
... Petronius Petronianus 229
... Petronius... stor... 229a
Ti. Plautius Felix Ferruntianus 17
M. Plotius Faustus, signo Sertius 62
G. Pompeius Felix Octavianus 230
M. Pompeius Quintianus, signo Optatianus 150
L. Pompeius Senior 63
Q. Pomponius Crispinus 64
C. Pontius Victor Verianus 37
P. Porcius Rufus 231
L. Postumius Felix Celerinus 65
cius Proculus 232
Q. Pulleus Donatus 233a
Q. Pulleus Donatus 233
M. Rocclius Felix 108
C. Rovius Petronianus 234
M. Rossius Vitulus 18
Q. Rupilius Honoratus 151
... Sab... Cr... Caec... 166
M. Satellius Rufus Pancratius 235
... Saturninus 152
L. Scantius Iulianus 109
L. Scribonius Natalis Flavianus 153
... nus Se... 165
M. Seius Maximus 110
Sentius Rogatus 236
L. Septimius Malchius Fortunatus, signo Simplicius 154
L. Septimius Severus 155
C. Sergius Primianus 156
... Servaeus Avitus 38
Q. Servaeus Macer 178
C. Servaeus Messius Pacatus 157
C. Sextius Marsialis 19
Scicius Pontianus 237
Q. Sittius Faustus 158
L. Sittius Rufinus 159
... asius Sopater 164
Statilius Capella 238
L. Statinius Aurelianus 179
C. Statius Celsus 239
Q. Sulpicius Licinius Felix 160
C. Terentius Iulianus Sabinianus 39
M. Tettius Gallicus Clodianus 161
... Titienius Datus Pompeianus 240
L. Turpilius Victorinus 241a
L. Turpilius Victorinus Marianus, signo Audentius 241
Q. Turranius Natalis Censorinus 242
M. Tuclicius Proculus 20
Sex. Valerius Municeps 162
L. Valerius Optatianus, signo Panacrius 242a
M. Valgus Aemilianus 66
C. Vasidius Pacatus 84
... Vetidius... 245
Q. Vetidius Felix Honoratianus, signo Iuventius 243
L. Vetidius Maternus Vetidianus, signo Heraclius 244
M. Vettius Latro 21
C. Vibius Maximi 22
Victor 67
... Victor Agrippianus 111
M. Virrius Flavius Iugurtha 85
A. Vitellius Felix Honoratus 23
Q. Voltedius Optatius Aurelianus 68
G. Volumnius Marcellus Caecilianus 246
L. Volusius Gallus 163
Q. Uruinus Crescens Livianus 247
Zosimus 248
... ervius 69
[names missing,]
... 70, 71, 72, 86, 87, 114, 167, 168, 169, 180, 223, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254.
INDEXES

I. NAMES AND SUBJECTS

A
Adamklissi, 29-39; Tropaeum Traiani, work of military architects and sculptors, 38f.
Albinus, Republican moneyer, 3.
altar, monumental, at Tapae, 31.
Antonovics, A. V., A Late Fifteenth-Century Division Register of the College of Cardinals, 87-101,
Aphrodias, sculpture at, 20, 21.
Augustan Age, architectural experimentation in, 28; mixed orders in architecture of, 28.

B
Baiae, the ‘Great Antrum’ at, 102-112; ventilation system of tunnels, 110.
bankers, and College of Cardinals, 93; (Medici,
Ambrogio de Spancchio, Alexander de Bardis, Ludovicus de Ludovisiis, Thomas, Despot of Morea).

C
Campagna, rural settlement of, in middle ages, 114, 115.
Capraco rum, domuscula of, 116, 145.
Cardinals, a Late Fifteenth-Century Division Register of the College of, 87-101; statutes of the College of, in 1437, 90.
Carthage, campaigns of, in Sardinia, 5.
Castel Porciano, medieval village, 113-146; fundus of Capraco rum, 116; pottery of, 135-145.
Castel Sant’ Elia, dispute with Nepi, 116f.
coins: A Roman Republican hoard from Capalbio, 1-3; hoards of Sullan age; 3.
Cornelius Fuscus, 31.
Crawford, M. H., A Roman Republican Hoard from Capalbio, 1-3.

D
Divus Julius, temple of, 28.
Drusus, tumulus in honour of, 31.
Duncan-Jones, R., Equestrian Rank in the Cities of the African Provinces under the Principate: An Epigraphic Survey, 147-188.

E
equis publicus, significance of term, 149f.

F
Fosso: del Castello, 117; Cerreto, 117, 122, 131, 133; del Rio, 117; di Ronci, 119, fig. 2.

G
gunpowder, fortifications due to use of, 123, 125.

H
Hirschland, N. L., The Head-Capitals of Sardis, 12-22.

L
Lazio, Medieval Glazed Pottery of, 40-86; 135-145; potters’ clays in, 135f.; topography of, 42.

M
Macnamara, E. and W. G. St. J. Wilkes, Underwater Exploration of the Ancient Port of Nora, Sardinia, 4-11.
marble, Carrara, 23.
Mallet, Michael, and David Whitehouse, Castel Porciano, an abandoned Medieval Village of the Roman Campagna, 113-146.
Menzura-Diving Team, work at Nora, 7.
Moesia, Lower, army of, and Dacian wars, 39.

N
Nepi, dispute with Castel Sant’ Elia, 116f.
Nora, Sardinia, ancient port of, 4-11; submerged quays and buildings, 8-10; submerged roads, 9f.; amphorae, 10f.; anchors, 16th and 18th century, 11.

O
Oppius Sabinus, governor of Moesia, 30.

P
papal revenues, and College of Cardinals, 98.
Phlegrean Fields, tunnels of, 102.
pottery, medieval glazed:
Byzantine, 44-46, 59.
from Castel Porciano, 135-145.
‘Coptic’ ware, 46.
at Corinthis, (brown-glazed), 47.
Early Rome ware, 59, 79.
Forum ware, 47-53, 139f.
‘Gela’ ware, 70.
Green-glazed, 55f., 140.
Islamic, 47, 65f.
from Lacus Iuturnae, see Forum ware of Lazio, 40-86.
maiolica, 66-80, 128, 141f.
Orvieto ware, 71-79, 128, 142.
with Plant and Abstract Decoration, 59-66, 141, 144.
Petral ware, 45f., 140.
Siculo-Norman, 59.
Sparse Glaze, 53-55, 140f., 143.
Spiral ware, 56-60, 140.
Stamped ware, 44.
from Turkey, 43.
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CIL</em> iii, 3626 = 10570 = ILS 7127</td>
<td>150</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>DIGEST</em> i, 12, 1, 1</td>
<td>156</td>
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<tr>
<td>i, 2, 11</td>
<td>158</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIO CASSIUS</strong></td>
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<td>152</td>
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<td>lix, 9, 5</td>
<td>154</td>
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</tr>
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<td>lx, 29, 2</td>
<td>31</td>
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<td>lxxviii, 8</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PS. DOSITHEUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Corp. Gloss. Lat.</em> iii, 1892, pp. 33, 1–25 and 388, 11–21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FLORUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, 30, 23, (iv, 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRONTO</strong></td>
<td><em>ad amicas</em> ii, 11, 2</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAUSANIAS</strong></td>
<td>x, 17, 5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLINY THE YOUNGER</strong></td>
<td><em>Ep.</em> i, 19</td>
<td>150, 152, 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv, 29</td>
<td>150, 152, 154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOLINUS</strong></td>
<td>iv, 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRABO</strong></td>
<td>iii, 169</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v, 4, 5</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v, 213</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUETONIUS</strong></td>
<td><em>Tib.</em> 41</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Claud.</em> 1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TACITUS</strong></td>
<td>Ann. ii, 22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VITRUVIUS</strong></td>
<td>iii, 2, 2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Saturn, Temple of, at Rome, 27f.

Sculptors, schools of, in Asia Minor and N. Africa, 21.

Severan age, sculpture of, 19–22.

Strong, D. E., see under Richmond.

Via Amerina, 117.

Villa, Roman, near Porciano, *punyus porcianus*, 117f.


Wilkes, W. G. St. J., see under Macnamara.

Whitehouse, David, *Thh Medieval Glazed Pottery of Lazio*, 40–86; see under Mallett.

A Roman Republican Hoard from Capalbio (pp. 1–3)
A Roman Republican Hoard from Capalbio
A Roman Republican Hoard from Capalbio
A Roman Republican Hoard from Capalbio
b. CAPITAL no. 2. HEAD WITH PIRVSAN CAP OR HELMET

SARUS, HEAD-CAPITALS (pp. 15, 20)

a. CAPITAL no. 1. LAUGHING FAWN
a. Capital no. 7. Side View

b. Capital no. 3. Satyr

c. Capital no. 4. Medusa

Sardis, Head-Capitals (pp. 16, 17)
a. Capital no. 7. Satyr

b (above). Capital no. 11
Female Head

c (right). Capital no. 6
Female Head

Sardis, Head-Capitals (pp. 17, 19)
a. Capital no. 9. Medusa Head

b. Capital no. 8. Dionysus

c. Capital no. 12. Hermes or Perseus

Sardis, Head-Capitals (pp. 18, 19)
a. General View, from the Angle

(Photo: Sheila Gibson)

b. Central Part of the Longer Side
Capital in the Forum Romanum, beside the Temple of Saturn (pp. 23-28)

(Photo: Sheila Gibson)
a. Upper Surface

b. Detail of the Longer Face

c. Detail of the Longer Face, showing (bottom right) Decorative Drafting

Capital in the Forum Romanum, beside the Temple of Saturn
a. Part of a Pilaster Capital in the Temple of Divus Julius

b. Part of the Lower Half of a Pilaster Capital, now in the Basilica Julia
FORUM WARE (p. 48)

a. Type 1 (a), ht. 10.4 in.; b. Type 1 (b), ht. 8.5 in.;
c. Type 3 (a), ht. 9.7 in.; d. Type 3 (a), ht. 9.5 in.

Rome, Antiquarium of the Roman Forum.

(Photos: D.B.W.)
a. Pottery with a Sparse Glaze from Santa Cornelia, h. 6.3 in. (p. 54).

(Photos: B.S.R.)

b. Early Rome Ware diam. 10.8 in., (p. 60)

Roma, Antiquarium of SS. Giovanni e Paolo.

(Photos: D.B.W.)
EARLY ROME WARE

Found at Rome and now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Ht. 7.7 in., (p. 60).
Pottery with Plant and Abstract Decoration


b. From Orvieto, ht. 8.3 in., (p. 62).

(Photos: a. Fitzwilliam Museum. copyright reserved; b. D.B.W.)
Orvieto Ware

a. Carinated Bowl of an unusual form, diam. 12.4 in.

b. Jug Type 10 (b), (p. 76).
Orvieto Ware

Pedestal Jugs, type 13; a, certainly, and b, possibly, found at Orvieto;

a. 12.4 in., b. 11.5 in.

(Photos: a. Fitzwilliam Museum; b. City Museum, Stoke-on-Trent; both copyright reserved)
Maiolica from Pietrapertusa, ht. 5.5 in. (p. 82)
b. Later Rome Ware (p. 83 and cf. fig. 10, 4)

a. The Author at the top of 290, showing the Tiles in the Roof

b. The S-Bend at the Bottom of 290

The 'Great Antrum' at Baiae (pp. 102-112)

(Photos: R.F.P.)
a. **The Water Tunnel, seen from the Bottom of 290**

b. **The Rise and the Beginning of the 120's, outside the Inner Sanctuary**

**The 'Great Antrum' at Baiae**

*(Photos: R.F.P.)*
Castel Porciano and the Fosso Cerreto. The light-coloured areas to the south and south-west represent recent tufa-quarrying (p. 117)
a. The Chancel looking toward the Apse. The scale rests on the altar platform

b. Masonry of the south wall, at the south-west angle
Castel Porciano, the Chapel (p. 126)
a. Rock-cut Wine Press (pp. 119-120)

b. Mouth of Storage Pit (p. 127)
Castel Porciano
a. The West Tower (p. 123)

b. Arrow Slit (p. 131)

c. Masonry of the Perimeter Wall (p. 132)

Castel Porciano
a. Capital No. 15. Male Head

b. Capital No. 16. Bust of a Man

Sardis Head-Capitals (p. 22)