

**Puteoli in the Second Century of the Roman Empire: A Social and Economic Study**



J. H. D'Arms

*The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 64 (1974), 104-124.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0075-4358%281974%2964%3C104%3APITSCO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-N>

*The Journal of Roman Studies* is currently published by Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/sprs.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# PUTEOLI IN THE SECOND CENTURY OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE: A SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC STUDY

By J. H. D'ARMS\*

τὰ γὰρ τὸ πάλαι (sc. ἄστεα) μεγάλα ἦν, τὰ πολλὰ μικρὰ αὐτῶν γέγονε. The period of high prosperity in Roman Puteoli extended from the late Republic until the early years of the second century A.D., after which economic primacy in Italy passed from the great port city on the Bay of Naples to Ostia at the Tiber's mouth. Or so, at any rate, it is now commonly believed: Charles Dubois was the first scholar to develop the thesis that Puteoli declined in the second century, and his arguments have been accepted, with modifications, both by economic and social historians and in most recent investigations of the two Roman cities.<sup>1</sup> But inevitably, given the nature of our sources, there are elements of subjectivity in the criteria used to measure historical change; 'decline', 'prosperity' and 'growth' are relative, and therefore often ambiguous, terms, particularly when applied to pre-industrial cities and towns. In this article I hope to modify the prevailing opinion by a closer scrutiny of the evidence for social and economic conditions in second-century Puteoli. In part one the various arguments for a decline are critically reviewed; parts two and three are attempts to exploit a substantial body of local evidence, which is largely inscriptional, to shed light on the nature of Puteolan society and on the economic conditions prevalent in the city; the results of the study are set forth in a brief conclusion.

## I

What are the signs of local change which have led historians to the belief that Puteoli was in decline in the second century? Invariably cited in such discussions are, first, Puteoli's replacement by Ostia as the Italian port which received the grain carried by fleet from Alexandria, an event closely associated with the construction of Trajan's new hexagonal inner harbour at Portus; second, the letter communicated to the senate of Tyre on 23rd July, 174, in which the Tyrian traders at Puteoli complain that their decreasing numbers have made it impossible for them to continue to pay the annual rent for their trading station; and, finally, the presence, in local inscriptions from 161, of *curatores rei publicae Puteolanorum*, which has been interpreted not only as a serious imperial encroachment upon Puteolan autonomy, but also as a sign that local finances were in a perilous condition. A reconsideration of each of these factors may prove useful.

By attracting eastern shipping to Ostia the building of Trajan's harbour marked a decisive stage in the decline of Puteoli's importance and prosperity.<sup>2</sup> But there are no grounds for believing that Ostia was receiving Alexandrian grain already in Trajan's time: the first unequivocal record of the change dates to the reign of Commodus.<sup>3</sup> In fact, clear testimony to Puteoli's continuing involvement with various departments of the *annona* extends into and beyond the Antonine Age. A recent unpublished find, an inscribed funerary altar carrying a *modius* in high relief and very possibly of Hadrianic date, is but one sign that Puteoli still played an important complementary role to Ostia in the reception and

\* It is a pleasure to thank R. P. Duncan-Jones, P. Garnsey, J. F. Gilliam, W. Johannowsky, E. Lepore and P. White for their helpful suggestions and criticism. Prof. A. De Franciscis kindly facilitated access to inscriptions and monuments in Pozzuoli and in Naples, and I am grateful to the American Council of Learned Societies, and to the American Academy in Rome, for providing me with the opportunity to carry out this research.

<sup>1</sup> Ch. Dubois, *Pouzzoles Antique* (= Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 98, Paris 1907), 81 (hereafter Dubois, *PA*); Tenney Frank, *Economic History of Ancient Rome* v (Baltimore, 1940), 127-132; M. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 1957), 162 ff. (with 610, n. 25) (hereafter Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*<sup>2</sup>); R. Anacchino, *Storia di Pozzuoli* (Pozzuoli, 1960), 133-134; R. Meiggs, *Roman Ostia* (Oxford, 1960), 60-61 (hereafter Meiggs, *RO*). M. W. Frederiksen,

'Puteoli', *RE* 23 (1959), 2044-45 (hereafter P-W, 'Puteoli'), alone produces much of the evidence for continuing prosperity in Puteoli through the late second century, observing that with Ostia's attraction of eastern shipping away from Puteoli 'im 2. und 3. Jhd. n. Chr. . . . begann für P(uteoli) der allmähliche Abstieg' (2050). See also R. Ling, *PBSR N.S.* xxi (1966), 28; J. Rougé, *L'Organisation du commerce maritime en Méditerranée sous l'empire romain* (= École pratique des hautes études — VI<sup>e</sup> section, centre de recherches historiques, 21), 138; E. Lepore, in *Storia di Napoli* i (Naples 1967), 316 (where decline is dated to the period of Commodus); J. H. D'Arms, *Romans on the Bay of Naples* (Cambridge, Mass. 1970), 138, 163 (hereafter *RBN*). In the following pages all dates, unless otherwise indicated, are A.D.

<sup>2</sup> Meiggs, *RO* 60.

<sup>3</sup> *IG* xiv, 917-918.

storage of grain; a local *proximus commentariorum annonae*, deputy head in charge of records in the administration of the corn-supply, can be dated to the late Trajanic or early Hadrianic period; a grain clerk with responsibilities at both Ostia and Puteoli is known in the reign of Antoninus Pius, under whom important repairs, promised by his predecessor, were carried out at Puteoli's harbour.<sup>4</sup> This material, much of which is familiar, has recently been discussed elsewhere, in connection with new and later evidence: an inscription which reveals an equestrian *procurator portus Puteolanorum*—the procuratorship had been known previously only at Ostia—stationed in Puteoli in the mid-fourth century; in view of the earlier parallelism of the two harbours, it is scarcely conceivable that he was the first imperial official of his kind to have been dispatched to Puteoli from Rome.<sup>5</sup> In the relatively meagre archaeological record of Puteoli, the quantity of local evidence for the city's continued links with the *annona* is impressive. That Ostian prosperity in the second century was to some degree achieved at Puteoli's expense ought not to be denied, but the Alexandrian grain fleet was only one source of wealth, and in a period of general prosperity for harbour cities economic expansion at Ostia is perfectly compatible with continued vitality in Puteoli.

Thus it must next be asked: how much eastern shipping was diverted from Puteoli after the building of the new basin at Portus? There is little direct evidence; <sup>6</sup> the answer, therefore, has depended upon the weight given to the Tyrian inscription.<sup>7</sup> Traders resident in Puteoli complained that while their station once surpassed all others in both adornment and size (καὶ κόσμῳ καὶ μεγέθει), and was maintained by resident compatriots who were numerous and rich (πολλοὶ ὄντες καὶ πλούσιοι), they were by now (174) reduced to a small number (εἰς ὀλίγους ἡμᾶς περιέστη τὸν ἀριθμὸν); they requested the Tyrian βουλή to assume the payment of the annual rent of HS 400,000 for the *statio*.<sup>8</sup> Quite clearly, the resident Tyrians found themselves in reduced economic circumstances—naturally enough, since their main Italian base was by this time in Rome.<sup>9</sup> Does it therefore follow that the economic health of Puteoli was generally threatened? That involves a separate and perhaps unjustified inference, against which it should be emphasized, first, that the sum of HS 400,000 represented an enormous contribution to the city's revenues—the sum is the single largest cost on record in Imperial Puteoli, and the largest rent recorded for any Italian city; <sup>10</sup> second, that, despite the reduced numbers the βουλή of Tyre must have considered it nationally important to maintain the station, for the payments were continued: the son of Diodorus, Philocles, pointed out to his fellow Tyrian senators in a meeting of 8th December, 174, that until then the rent for Puteoli's *statio* had always been paid by the Roman agency from its receipts, and the βουλή voted that the practice be continued: δίκαια ἄξιουσιν οἱ ἐν Ποσιόλοις.<sup>11</sup> We should like to know how long the treasury of Puteoli went on receiving this substantial annual contribution; we do know that it was still being paid in 174. Any evidence for economic trouble contained in this document more strictly concerns the resident Tyrians than Puteoli itself.

Finally, the *curatores rei publicae*. The first, Flavius Longinus, is mentioned in an inscription of the year 161, and a second held the post between 176 and 179; both were senatorial officials.<sup>12</sup> Of the four other known *curatores*, none is attested before the last years of Caracalla's reign (the Marcellus of *CIL* x, 1791, who had long been thought to add another second-century *curator rei publicae* to the Puteolan list, has recently found his proper home, and proper title, at Ostia).<sup>13</sup> By the time of Septimius Severus and Caracalla, when twenty-

<sup>4</sup> *CIL* x, 1729 on which see now P. R. C. Weaver, *Antichthon* v (1971), 77 f.; cf. proc a]d an[nonam, *Eph. Epigr.* viii, 396. Antoninus Pius: *CIL* x, 1562 (= *ILS* 344): Aug. disp(ensator) a fruminto (*sic*) Puteolis et Ostis. Pius and the harbour: *CIL* x, 1640-1641 (139).

<sup>5</sup> Procurator: J. H. D'Arms, *Parola del Passato* xxvii (fasc. 145, 1972), 255-270. Parallel treatment by the emperors of Puteoli and Ostia: Suet., *Claud.* 25, 2, cohorts of *vigiles* sent to both cities to protect the granaries.

<sup>6</sup> But see below, p. 120, for signs of continued vitality of Eastern trade and cult.

<sup>7</sup> *IG* xiv, 830 (= *OGIS* 595; *IGRR* i, 421); Dubois, *PA* 83 f.

<sup>8</sup> *ibid.*, lines 6-14.

<sup>9</sup> *IG* xiv, 830, line 17; P-W, 'Puteoli', 2045; G. La Piana, 'Foreign Groups in Rome during the first centuries of the Empire', *HTR* xx (1927), 256-260.

<sup>10</sup> See R. P. Duncan-Jones, *The Economy of the Roman Empire* (Cambridge, 1974), 210, 236 (no. 1187), who argues that the numeral should read HS 100,000.

<sup>11</sup> *IG* xiv, 830, lines 31-38.

<sup>12</sup> *CIL* x, 1814; *AE* 1920, 45.

<sup>13</sup> M. Raoss, 'Note di Epigrafia latina e greca', *Epigraphica* xxx (1968), 96-102, where the text is plausibly restored 'loc(us) adsig(natus) per [Na-] sennium Marcellum cur(atorem) [ope]r(um) pub(licorum)'.

three Italian cities had had *curatores rei publicae*,<sup>14</sup> the presence of these officials had become the rule, rather than the exception, in the Roman West, and may fairly be viewed as symptomatic of the period of 'crisis' which the entire Empire was about to enter.

On the other hand, the first dateable *curatores*, appointed to answer particular needs of individual cities, appear nearly half a century before Flavius Longinus went to Puteoli.<sup>15</sup> By the time of Hadrian these imperial agents are found in five Italian cities; under Antoninus Pius in at least six; and by the reigns of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus the number of cities had risen to twenty-two. We continue to lack an up to date and thorough study of *curatores* in Italy, along the lines laid down more than thirty years ago for Africa by C. Lucas,<sup>16</sup> but even a provisional survey enables us to view the Puteolan agents in a wider historical context: the fact that no *curatores rei publicae* are attested at Puteoli from the outset is probably more instructive about financial conditions than their appearance fifty years later, by which time the institution had gathered its own momentum and its precise significance in individual localities is therefore much more difficult to gauge. Moreover, the activities and powers of *curatores* will probably have varied widely from city to city. Certainly the Puteolan inscription which identifies the city's first known *curator rei publicae* suggests no contemporary economic malaise: the *curator* merely gives permission for the erection of a new honorary statue, whereas the *duovir* chooses the location, and supervises the work which was executed—the implication is clear—at the city's own expense.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, in a city like Puteoli, long a major economic centre, and in consequence quite naturally a focal point for imperial supervision and concern, the duties of the *curator*, like those of Pliny in Bithynia, may well have involved discriminations between permissible and illicit building projects, for the emperors might find themselves having to discourage such private building as impeded satisfactory maintenance or expansion of Imperial services—in other words, the presence of *curatores rei publicae* is entirely compatible with local affluence, and indeed may even have resulted from it, or from its side effects.<sup>18</sup> In any case, until we have a clearer conception about the duties and activities of these imperial *curatores* at Puteoli, it would be precipitate to interpret their presence as 'a sure indication that the town's economy had lost its buoyancy'.<sup>19</sup> There is other, and better, evidence to the contrary, and to exploit that evidence most usefully, which is the main aim of the present study, it will be necessary to turn away from the historical currents affecting Italy as a whole, and to look instead at the composition of the local aristocracy of Puteoli during the first centuries of the Empire. It is the local conditions and institutions, in so far as they can be reconstructed, that form the foundation upon which impressions of overall prosperity or decline must ultimately rest. What were the social characteristics of Puteoli up to the end of the second century? Who were the magistrates and *decuriones*? What were their origins, what their sources of wealth?

## II

Aside from a few major and familiar monuments—the harbour works, the Flavian amphitheatre, the *macellum*, tombs on the Via Celle and Via delle Vigne, and now the temple precinct on the arx itself—very little of ancient Puteoli has been systematically studied. Furthermore, the available epigraphical evidence, which must form the basis for a social

<sup>14</sup> See G. Mancini, 'curator rei publicae', *Diz. Epigr.* (Spoleto, 1910), 1368 f; *curatores* are attested at Aeclanum, Aesernia, Amerina, Ancona, Aquinum, Ariminum, Caere, Cornum, Cremona, Faventia, Formiae, Lanuvium, Lavinium, Matilica, Minturnae, Nola, Otesia, Pisaurum, Plestia, Tarracina, Tibur, Verona and Vettona.

<sup>15</sup> *CIL* xi, 3614 (113-14); Pliny discharged his duties as *legatus Augusti* in Bithynia in 110, but the office of *curator rei publicae* may, as one scholar has suspected, in fact have originated under Domitian: cf. J. H. Oliver, *The Ruling Power* (= Transactions of the American Philosophical Society N.S. xliii, part 4), Philadelphia 1953, 974; P. Garnsey, *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1970), 81 n. dates the origin of *curatores* to the reign of Nero.

<sup>16</sup> *JRS* xxx (1940), 56-74.

<sup>17</sup> *CIL* x, 1814: *Locus datus ex auctoritate Flavi Longini Cl(arissimi) V(iri) cur(atoris) r(ei) p(ublicae), assignat(us) a M. Valerio Pudente Ilvir(o).*

<sup>18</sup> Compare *CIL* xiv, Suppl. 1, 4702, for a Roman praetor declaring that Ostian territory near the Tiber was the public property of the Roman people (Meiggs, *RO* 32); and, at a later date, *CIL* x, 1018 (= *ILS* 5942), T. Suedius Clemens interfering on behalf of the city of Pompeii, and on the authority of Vespasian, to restore to the city *loca publica a privatis possessa*. For the installation of *curatores* in wealthy cities with a view towards curing fiscal waste and mismanagement, cf. A. N. Sherwin White, *The Letters of Pliny* (Oxford, 1966), 526-27; F. Millar, *The Roman Empire and its Neighbours* (London, 1967), 203-4.

<sup>19</sup> Meiggs, *RO* 61.

study, will not bear comparison in quantity with that from cities like Ostia or Pompeii. To a considerable extent, therefore, any discussion of social patterns in Imperial Puteoli must remain tentative and hypothetical.<sup>20</sup> But neither, on the other hand, ought one to underestimate the usefulness for our purposes of such inscriptional evidence as does exist. More municipal decrees survive from Puteoli than from any other city in the Roman west; this material is complemented by numerous local dedications to the gods and to the emperors, and by more than one thousand *tituli sepulcrales*. There is now some new documentary evidence to add to what was available to earlier scholars: some unpublished inscriptions and, most conspicuously, the collection of wax tablets which were found near Pompeii in 1959 but which have only recently begun to appear in print. These record financial and legal transactions which occurred almost without exception among Puteolani (of libertine status but of a respectable level of wealth) between 35 and 61, and which illuminate onomastic, social, economic and topographical developments in late Julio-Claudian Puteoli.<sup>21</sup>

The surviving municipal decrees, *decreta decurionum*, are of particular interest to the social historian, since they preserve the names of *IIviri* and the members of decurional drafting committees, as well as persons of comparable wealth and status who were being singled out for special honors. By chance two of these edicts are dateable to the same year: although the consular date has not been preserved, in both the place of meeting is specified as the *curia basilicae Augusti Annianae*; <sup>22</sup> since the *decuriones* are stated to have met in precisely the same location in a third decree dateable to 196,<sup>23</sup> it is a safe presumption that the unknown year of the first two decrees falls also within the last quarter of the second century. These three documents alone yield the names of four *IIviri* and seventeen *decuriones*; an edict of 187<sup>24</sup> names another *IIvir* and six local senators; six other *primores* are mentioned in four other fragmentary edicts, ranging in date between 113 and the early years of the third century.<sup>25</sup> This group of thirty-four names, concentrated overwhelmingly in the closing years of the second century, may serve as a starting point for a survey of social patterns in Puteoli; while the total sample may seem too small to yield significant data, it can be combined, occasionally, with other inscriptional evidence, and the material falls into coherent and distinctive categories. (A list of all known Puteolan *IIviri*, priests and *decuriones* is presented below in an appendix.)

A first group of *domi nobiles* bear names which are attested in high places not only in late Antonine Puteoli, but also at least two centuries before. The *Annii* may serve as a first illustration. In 70 B.C. Cicero includes a M. Annii among the Puteolan *mercatores*

<sup>20</sup> cf. P.-W., 'Puteoli', 2050: 'Von dem Leben in P(uteoli) während der Kaiserzeit können wir uns nur ein unvollkommenes Bild machen.'

<sup>21</sup> The texts are being edited by C. Giordano, *RAAN* N.S. xli (1966), 107-121; N.S. xlv (1970), 211-231; N.S. xlvi (1971), 183-197; see also the critical reactions of A. Degrassi, *MAL* xiv (1969), 136 f. Already in the nineteenth century the actual provenance of many of the inscriptions in the Neapolitan collections was unknown, and Mommsen's practice (*CIL* x, pp. 183, 190) was to assign to Puteoli all stones the origins of which could not be established on the basis of internal or other evidence. While the passage of time has generally vindicated Mommsen's procedure (cf. also *PBSR* N.S. xiv [1959], 81) much new material has subsequently come to light, and some texts classed among those of Puteoli in the *Corpus* have had to be reassigned elsewhere. I have attempted in this study, which is based primarily upon inscriptional evidence, to reduce elements of uncertainty to a minimum by accepting as Puteolan only those texts for which a Puteolan origin is either securely established or clearly inferable. An element of subjectivity, inevitably, accompanies impressions as to the dates of sepulchral texts; furthermore, not all of those once visible in the Naples museum are still available for inspection. In what follows I accept A. Degrassi's conclusion (*Riv. Fil. Class.* N.S. xxxvii, 1959, 213) that the abbreviation of the formula *D(is) M(anibus)* is unlikely to be earlier than the Flavian epoch, and is attested with frequency only by the second century;

and I treat epitaphs of the type exemplified by *CIL* x, 2557, 2878 as Julio-Claudian in date. Other chronological indicators, such as the presence in epitaphs of freedmen of *praenomina* and *gentilia* of individual emperors (see P. R. C. Weaver, *Familia Caesaris* [Cambridge, 1972], 24-30), have been exploited wherever possible, always in preference to palaeographical criteria, which, since local fashions in lettering varied widely from city to city, remain notoriously imprecise: J. M. Reynolds and J. B. Ward Perkins, *The Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania* (London, 1952), 5-6; Reynolds, *JRS* I (1960), 204-05.

<sup>22</sup> *CIL* x, 1782 (= R. K. Sherk, *Municipal Decrees of the Roman West*, Arethusa Monographs 2, 1970, no. 33; hereafter Sherk, *MD*): '... in curia basilicae Augusti [An]nianae.' *CIL* x, 1783 (= *ILS* 5919; *FIRA* iii<sup>2</sup>, no. 111; Sherk, *MD*, no. 34): '... in curia templi basilicae Augusti Annianae.'

<sup>23</sup> *CIL* x, 1786: '... curia basilicae Aug(usti) Annian(ae).'

<sup>24</sup> *CIL* x, 1784 (= *ILS* 6334; K. Buresch, *Rh. Mus.* xlix [1894], 459-60; Sherk, *MD*, no. 35).

<sup>25</sup> *CIL* x, 1787 (= Sherk, *MD*, no. 36); J. H. D'Arms, *AJA* lxxvii (1973), 160-162 (no. 11, 113); *Eph. Epigr.* viii, 371 (although the fragmentary nature of the edict permits five possible dates between 140 and 220, M. Ihm, the editor, believed the lettering to be more appropriate to the third than to the second century, *Eph. Epigr.* viii, *ad loc.*); *Eph. Epigr.* viii, 372 (= Sherk, *MD*, no. 39).

('homines locupletes atque honesti') who testified to atrocities perpetrated by Verres in Sicily; in the decree of 187 Annii Proculus, *o(rnatus) v(ir)*, appears as one of the *decuriones*, and in the same period the local senate voted to erect a statue to L. Annii L.f. Modestus, the son of Annii Numisianus, a member of the *ordo*.<sup>26</sup> That the council was meeting on the day in question in a building donated by a member of the *gens Annia* is additional confirmation of the local prominence of the family in the time of Commodus. Or the Tettii: Cn. Tettius Q.f. was decurion in 105 B.C.; a fragmentary decree nearly three centuries later concerns burial honours awarded to a Cn. Tett[ius] and refers also to his father: at least one of them belonged to the *ordo*.<sup>27</sup>

For the Granii, probably the most prominent family in late Republican Puteoli, documentation is more abundant. C. Granii C.f. was *decurio* in 105 B.C.; the *praeco* immortalized by Lucilius was very likely an ancestor.<sup>28</sup> Another local member of the *gens* is described as archon (= *Ilvir?*) and *princeps coloniae* in 78 B.C.; while P. Granii was among the Puteolani who turned out in such numbers to testify at the trial of Verres.<sup>29</sup> Caesar's casualties at Dyrrhachium in 45 included A. Granii Puteolanus, *equus Romanus*, and if, as was recently suggested, Granii Petro, quaestor designate for 46 B.C., actually came from Puteoli, he is the only known Roman senator the town produced under the Republic.<sup>30</sup> Once again, at the end of the second century, the family name recurs in the decurial lists: Q. Granii Atticus and Granii Longinus were then members of the *ordo*.<sup>31</sup>

Documentation of local magistrates, councillors, and priests is most scanty during the Julio-Claudian, Flavian and Trajanic periods: it is therefore particularly welcome to have new evidence that one of the *Ilviri* in 35 was L. Granii Probus<sup>32</sup>—conclusive proof that the Granii had successfully weathered the uncertainties of civil war and were influential again in Puteoli late in the reign of Tiberius. So also the Hordeonii: in addition to the Ciceronian references to the family's presence—and respectability—at the end of the Republic, and to the presence of T. Hordeonius Secundus Valentinus among the *decuriones* in a municipal decree of 196,<sup>33</sup> we now know that an *ara Augusti Hordioniana* existed in the town in 44, and a *chalcidicum Hordionianum* is mentioned in 55: these benefactions must have been contributed to the city by prosperous and influential Hordeonii in the Julio-Claudian epoch.<sup>34</sup> While from these two isolated instances it would be rash to infer the steady recurrence of these other *gentilicia* in positions of power throughout the period under consideration, they nonetheless, when taken together with repeated notices of Annii, Granii, Hordeonii and Tettii in local epitaphs,<sup>35</sup> corroborate what is also *prima facie* likely: that the names prominent in both the late Republic and the late second century would be likely also to appear, were documentation more abundant, in the *fasti* and in the council during the intervening years.

The Granii were an old local trading family, which included *negotiatores* whose activities are attested on second-century Delos;<sup>36</sup> four Hordeonii appear between 111 and

<sup>26</sup> Cic., II *Verr.* 5, 154; *CIL* x, 1784; *CIL* x, 1782.

<sup>27</sup> *CIL* x 1781 (= Degrassi, *ILLRP*, 518); 1787.

<sup>28</sup> 105 B.C.: *CIL* x, 1781; Q. Granii the *praeco*: Cic., *Brut.* 172; Münzer, *RE* vii, 1818 (no. 8).

<sup>29</sup> 78 B.C.: Val. Max. 9, 3, 8; Plut., *Sulla* 37, 3. P. Granii: Cic., II *Verr.* 5, 154.

<sup>30</sup> A. Granii: Caes., *BC* 3, 71, 1; cf. Censor. 3, 2. Granii Petro: L. R. Taylor, *Voting Districts of the Roman Republic* (*PMAAR* xx, 1960), 218; T. P. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate* 139 B.C.–A.D. 14 (Oxford, 1971), 234 (no. 197).

<sup>31</sup> *CIL* x, 1783 (Atticus); 1782 (Longinus).

<sup>32</sup> C. Giordano, *RAAN* N.S. xlv (1970), 212 (no. 1).

<sup>33</sup> Cic., *ad Att.* 13, 46, 3; 16, 2, 1: T. Hordeonius, along with Cicero, was one of the heirs of M. Cluvius of Puteoli in 45 B.C.; he carries the same praenomen as the homonymous decurion of 196: *CIL* x, 1786.

<sup>34</sup> Giordano, *RAAN* N.S. xli (1966), 111 (= *AE* 1969–70, 94); cf. *RAAN* N.S. xlvi (1971), 185, 189, 190, 192, 193: 'ara Augusti Hordioniana'. For the *chalcidicum Hordionianum*, cf. F. Sbordone, *RAAN* N.S. xlvi (1971), 174.

<sup>35</sup> Annii: *CIL* x, 2055–2068; *Eph. Epigr.* viii, 370, 389; *RAAN* N.S. xlvi (1971), 177, 195 (no. 9). The frequency of the name in local contexts, together with repeated instances of buildings named for members of municipal families (e.g. Hordeonius, Suettius), makes it unlikely that the *basilica Augusti Anniana* received its name from the imperial Annii (cf. Mommsen's note on *CIL* x, 1783). Granii: *CIL* x, 2187, 2484–89, 2607, 2651, 8191–92. Hordeonii: *CIL* x, 3014, 3063, and cf. also 1806, a flamen of Divus Augustus who was thrice *Ilvir*; although the findspot of the stone is unknown, the man's tribe, Falerna, makes Puteoli the probable city of origin, cf. R. M. Peterson, *The Cults of Campania* (= *PMAAR* 1, 1919), 116 (hereafter Peterson, *Cults*): I suggest in an article forthcoming in *Historia* that the *gentilicium* be restored [Horde]onio. Tettii: L. Tetteius L.l. appears in an unpublished inscription dated to A.D. 13, discovered in the recent excavations of S. Proculo at Pozzuoli.

<sup>36</sup> J. Hatzfeld, *BCH* xxxvi (1912), 41; *ibid.*, *Les Trafiquants Italiens dans l'Orient Hellénique* (*BEFAR* 115) (Paris, 1919, hereafter *Trafiquants*), 94 (Mitylene), 70 (Chalcis).

94 B.C. in the lists of the *magistri* at Capua, whence the family originally came; <sup>37</sup> likewise the Blossii, early members of the local Campanian aristocracy who had earned a reputation for *adrogantia* long before branches of the family appear at Cumae and Puteoli, where a C. Blossius Q.f. was decurion in 105 B.C., and another C. Blossius IIvir in 113.<sup>38</sup> Cossutius Rufinus was a decurion in 187, Cossutius Priscus IIvir in 52, and the family appears in the Capuan *magistri* lists in 105 B.C. and still earlier on Delos.<sup>39</sup> In each of these cases, as the Oscan nomenclature and restricted geographical distribution combine to show, the local magistrates of the empire will have emanated from the indigenous population of Campania, rather than from immigrants. With more common *gentilicia* such as Annia, Tettia, Clodia, inference as to origins is on less sure a basis. Nevertheless, Annii also had connections with Delos and are established in high economic and political positions at Capua in the late second century B.C.; <sup>40</sup> while the name of Tettius, which Schulze has, predictably, derived from Etruria, may reflect very early immigration into Campania from the north.<sup>41</sup> Perhaps the same is true of the Clodii, known in a variety of Campanian cities and known too from their activities on Delos: at Puteoli L. Clodius Rufus was IIvir in 55, A. Clodius Maximus decurion in the late second century.<sup>42</sup> In short, Campanian connections for nearly all of these *gentes* are securely established well before the names appear in the local aristocracy at Puteoli.

That the onomastic antecedents of these late Republican, early imperial, and late-second-century Puteolani can be traced back to the indigenous pre-Roman population of Campania, or at least to early immigration, has an important bearing upon a second group of names of late-second-century *primores*, whose prominence is not explicitly attested until the Severan or late Antonine period. Within this group fall T. Aufidius Thræsea, M. Laelius Atimetus, P. Manlius Egnatius Laurinus, T. Oppius Severus, Cn. Papirius Sagitta, and M. Stlaccius Albinus. While it is of course theoretically possible that no previous member of any of these *gentes* had held local office, this is most unlikely: for, like the first group of Puteolani considered above, all these *gentilicia* are known in a variety of Campanian contexts, and from an equally early period. Early ties with Delos, which imply trading contacts in Eastern markets, are attested for the Aufidii, the Laelii, the Oppii, and the Stlaccii around the end of the second century B.C.; <sup>43</sup> Aufustius (cf. Aufidius), Egnatius and Op[p]ius were Campanian *magistri*; <sup>44</sup> C. Egnatius Postumus had held the office of IIvir at Pompeii by the end of the first century B.C., T. Oppius Proculus the same office at Nola under Tiberius; <sup>45</sup> and once again in almost every case these imperial Puteolan dignitaries bear names whose distinctive linguistic pattern reveals their ultimate descent from the Oscan-speaking inhabitants of Central Italy. Further, these *gentilicia* are frequent in the epitaphs of Puteoli, where the Egnatii, Oppii, and Stlaccii make an early appearance,<sup>46</sup> and there are

<sup>37</sup> M. W. Frederiksen, 'Republican Capua: A Social and Economic Study', *PBSR* N.S. xiv (1959), 126-130, nos. 2 (= *CIL* i<sup>2</sup>, 673; *CIL* x, 3774, restoring [Ho]rdioni M.L., 112 or 111 B.C.), 8 (= *CIL* i<sup>2</sup>, 677; x, 3779; *ILS* 3340, 106 B.C.), 11 (= *CIL* i<sup>2</sup>, 679; x, 3780; *ILS* 3341, 104 B.C.), 17 (= *CIL* i<sup>2</sup>, 682; x, 3772; *ILS* 6302, 94 B.C.); See further 119, with references to trading commitments in the East.

<sup>38</sup> *CIL* x, 1781 (C. Blossius Q.f.); *AJA* lxxvii (1973), 161-62, no. 11 (IIvir, 113); on the earlier history of the *gens* see art. cit. (above, n. 37), 117. Observe C. Blossius Celadus, named as an *iudex* in a transaction of 52: Giordano, *RAAN* N.S. xlvi (1971), 187.

<sup>39</sup> *CIL* x, 1784; Giordano, *RAAN* N.S. xlvi (1971), 187 (no. 6); the plate shows that there is space for Coss[ut]ius, or possibly Coss[in]ius, and that Giordano's 'Cassius' is unacceptable. Cf. art. cit. (above, n. 37), 127 (no. 10); Hatzfeld, *BCH* xxxvi (1912), 30 (Delos); id., *Trafikants*, 228 (Athens, 174 B.C.).

<sup>40</sup> Hatzfeld, *BCH* xxxvi (1912), 14; art. cit. (above, n. 37), 127 (no. 10, 105 B.C.), 128 (no. 15, before 94 B.C.).

<sup>41</sup> W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte Lateinischer Eigen-*

*namen* (Berlin, 1904), 242. On 'Etruscan' nomenclature in Campania before the Roman occupation cf. art. cit. (above, n. 37), 116.

<sup>42</sup> E. Lepore, *PdP* x (1955), 430: the *gens* is prominent in Herculaneum and known also in Pompeii (*CIL* x, 1074 d, an Augustan IIvir); Hatzfeld, *BCH* xxxvi (1912), 27; F. Sbordone, *RAAN* N.S. xlvi (1971), 176-77 (L. Clodius Rufus); *CIL* x, 1783 (A. Clodius Maximus). For the name at Puteoli, see *CIL* x, 2297-98, 3142.

<sup>43</sup> Hatzfeld, *BCH* xxxvi (1912), 19 (Aufidii); 45 (Laelii); 60 (Oppii); 82 (Stlaccii).

<sup>44</sup> Art. cit. (above, n. 37), 128, no. 17 (Aufustius); 129, no. 24 (Egnatius, Op[us]).

<sup>45</sup> *CIL* x, 787 (Egnatius); 1233 (Oppius), and cf. also *AE* 1967, 88.

<sup>46</sup> Egnatii: Giordano, *RAAN* N.S. xiv (1970), 221 (51); it is uncertain if the city of origin of the M'. Egnatius M'. l. Lucullus of Augustan date (*CIL* x, 2381) was Puteoli; cf. *AJA* ii (1898), 387 (no. 35), which must be early. Oppii: *CIL* x, 2810. Stlaccii: P. Stlaccius P.l. is mentioned in the unpublished Puteolan inscription of A.D. 13 (above, n. 35); *CIL* x, 1930. The Laelii are attested in Puteoli by 163 B.C.: *RBN* 7.

instances of *ingenui* among the *sepulcrales* of the Aufidii, Laelii, and Oppii.<sup>47</sup> The conclusion seems clear: earlier members of all these *gentes*, given their long-standing connections with the Campanian region in general and with Puteoli in particular, are likely to have held office, or at least to have entered the *ordo*, in Puteoli; it is merely chance that the first record of their local importance appears only at the end of the second century.<sup>48</sup>

To be sure, not all of the *gentilicia* preserved in the decrees of the imperial period point backward so directly to the late Republic, and so explicitly to Campania, as do those of the late-second-century *domi nobiles* discussed above. Imperial freedmen, for example, whose local connections may have begun with lucrative appointments as procurators at the nearby palaces and estates of the Caesars: they would tend to marry and settle in the region and in later generations their descendants might be found within the *ordo*. Julius Capretanus could have been such a descendant of an imperial ex-slave based at one of the early imperial villas on Capreae;<sup>49</sup> the ancestors of Ti. Claudius Quartinus and P. Aelius Eudaimon, both late-second-century IIviri, may have found similar employment elsewhere on the *crater delicatus*.<sup>50</sup>

Along with the descendants of imperial *liberti*, descendants of local ex-slaves rose to the local senate, and comprise another distinctive feature of Puteoli's social composition. Their forbears, upon manumission, prospered in branches of local industry and commerce; some could reasonably expect to invest in land and to see their sons enrolled among the decurions before their death.<sup>51</sup> Social improvement such as that attested for the Cn. Haii must have been a familiar phenomenon. Cn. Haius Doryphorus amassed wealth as a *purpurarius*, one of the most thriving of Puteoli's industries, and became an *Augustalis dupliciarius*, the highest local honor to which a freedman might aspire.<sup>52</sup> Since one of his slaves is designated *actor* we may presume that the profits from the dye works were invested in land. Clearly it is this social and economic milieu which produced Cn. Haius Pudens, decurion in 196.<sup>53</sup> Since continued upward mobility of Puteolani is only rarely attested in our evidence, it is interesting to find the Cn. Haii in the service of the Caesars in a slightly later period. A Cn. Haius Diadumenus erected a funeral monument to one of his *liberti* on the roadway between Baiae and Puteoli. He must surely be a close relative of (and perhaps identical with) the man who served as equestrian procurator of Mauretania Caesariensis and Tingitana in 202.<sup>54</sup>

Cn. Haius Doryphorus as *Augustalis* belonged to the *libertina nobilitas*, Cn. Haius Pudens sat in the local senate. From other texts of an earlier period it is possible to witness more closely the process by which a family built a fortune and rose to decurional status. A handsome funeral altar, now in the Vatican museum, is inscribed on two sides; the first text is a dedication by N. Naevius Moschus, *Augustalis Puteol(is)*, to his son Vitulus and to his wife Naevia Saturnina; the opposite side commends to the Dii Manes N. Naevius N.f. Pal(atina tribu) Vitulus, decurio Puteol(is), and his mother Naevia Saturnina.<sup>55</sup> Here, incidentally, is excellent indication of the tendency of *cognomina* to become more respectable by translation into Latin along with an increase in social status. But the chief importance of the monument lies in its early date: on stylistic grounds—and epigraphical data provide corroboration—the face of the altar which conveys the information that Vitulus was a member of the *ordo* cannot be later than the reign of Domitian, and may well be of early Vespasianic date, whereas the lettering of the other text falls comfortably within the Julio-Claudian period.<sup>56</sup> The freedman Moschus, an *Augustalis*, set up the monument to his wife

<sup>47</sup> Aufidii: *CIL* x, 2125, 2130 (T. Aufidius T.f. Fal[erna tribu] Templitanus). Laelii: *CIL* x, 2639, 2640, 2642. Oppii: an Oppia T.fil. Bassilla was married to an early *Aug. L.*: *CIL* x, 2810.

<sup>48</sup> To this group Viguetius Liberalis, the late-second-century decurion, ought probably to be added, for the name seems indigenous, despite absence of parallels in local epigraphy (*CIL* x, 1782).

<sup>49</sup> *CIL* x, 1782.

<sup>50</sup> *CIL* x, 1782, 1783 (Ti. Claudius Quartinus); 1786 (P. Aelius Eudaimon).

<sup>51</sup> M. L. Gordon 'The Freedman's Son in Municipal Life', *JRS* xxi (1931), 65-77; see now P. Garnsey, 'Descendants of Freedmen in Local Politics' in *The Ancient Historian and his Materials* (essays in honour of C. E. Stevens, forthcoming).

<sup>52</sup> *CIL* x, 540. Although found in Salerno, Mommsen was surely right to assign the inscription to Puteoli; see his comments *ad loc.*; and cf. Dubois, *PA* 294 f.; P-W, 'Puteoli', 2045, lines 36-40. *Purpurarii* of Puteoli: Dubois, *PA* 129.

<sup>53</sup> *CIL* x, 1910 (two slaves of a Cn. Haius Proculus); 1786 (Cn. Haius Pudens); see further Dubois, *PA* 129.

<sup>54</sup> Cn. Haius Diadumenus: *NSc.* 1891, 204; Diadumenianus: *CIL* viii, 9366; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> H 8.

<sup>55</sup> *CIL* x, 1807.

<sup>56</sup> For the date, see W. Altmann, *Die römischen Grabaltäre der Kaiserzeit* (Berlin, 1905), 88; and especially G. Lippold, *Die Skulpturen des Vaticanischen Museums* iii, 2 (Berlin, 1956), no. 619a (pp. 93-94).

and son before the latter's elevation to the *ordo*, at a date which, while it can not be fixed precisely, is likely to have been early in the second half of the first century.

This date is not only perfectly appropriate from the point of view of local social patterns—at Puteoli, whose days of greatest affluence preceded those of Ostia, there is every reason to believe that the social and political prospects of ex-slaves became attractive at a correspondingly earlier period<sup>57</sup>—but also coheres neatly with other evidence bearing upon the Naevii at Puteoli. The local production of *terra sigillata* was a bustling industry early in the Augustan Age; a series of potter's stamps reveals that N. Naevius Hilarus, a *libertus*, was one of the most important, and presumably affluent, producers.<sup>58</sup> From this milieu emerged, in all probability, the N. Naevius Moschus of the Vatican altar.

This unambiguous inscriptional evidence that sons of freedmen could occasionally attain high political position by the beginning of the Flavian period<sup>59</sup> may help us to place some contemporary literary testimony, which is highly tendentious, in proper perspective. Pollius Felix, as is well known from poems in the *Silvae*, was the wealthy patron and friend of P. Papinius Statius; before his retirement to his Surrentine villa by the nineties, he had shown himself to be a most generous benefactor—*largitor opum*—in his native Puteoli.<sup>60</sup> Beloch concluded long ago that Pollius had held office in the city; and suggested that he was descended from the M. Pullius who was *Ivir* in 105 B.C.<sup>61</sup> While the former thesis seems entirely plausible, Beloch's hypothesis as to Pollius' origins is less persuasive. It is true that Statius lays great stress upon the extent of Pollius' riches and his cultural attainments, as well as upon the refinement of his tastes.<sup>62</sup> But these are the verses of artificial compliment, no very reliable guide to the patron's social origins. Those may have been considerably more humble: Felix as *cognomen* has a suspiciously servile ring, and the wife's name, Polla, conveys no very strong impression of *ingenuitas*. None of Statius' lines is in any way inconsistent with the view that Pollius Felix was born at Puteoli the son of an ex-slave. Indeed, that Statius augurs *dignitas senatoria* for Pollius' grandchildren, the name of whose father, Iulius Menecrates, itself is suggestive of servile descent, is another sign that Pollius' own social origins were very probably undistinguished.<sup>63</sup> If his father was a *libertus*, he would have been beyond middle age in the reign of Nero, for Pollius, Statius implies, held office early in his career, possessed property near Naples by 65, and had been many times a grandfather by 94.<sup>64</sup> Interestingly, the name of one of the Augustales in Puteoli in 56 was Cn. Pollius Cn. l. Victor.<sup>65</sup> Was he the father of Pollius Felix?

An alternative route to local honours was available to the descendants of freedmen. The

<sup>57</sup> Meiggs has shown conclusively that beginning with the Flavian period new families of freedmen origin were rising to prominence alongside members of the earlier aristocracy at Ostia, but their ascendancy is not securely established before the early second century: C. Julius Proculus, *Ivir* in 108, was probably a local man descended from an imperial freedman of the early empire, and a Ti. Claudius (his *cognomen* has not been preserved) was very probably of similar background (*RO* 204). C. Silius C.f. Vot(uria tribu) Nerva held the duovirate before 105; his father, C. Silius Felix, was an Augustalis (*CIL* xiv, 415; Meiggs, *RO* 204). At Pompeii, the arrival of sons of freedmen in the *ordo* came considerably earlier, and was very likely linked with the economic upheavals attendant upon the earthquake of 62: see now J. Andreau, 'Le tremblement de terre de Pompéi (62 ap. J.-C.)', *Annales (Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations)* xxviii (1973), 391 f. N. Popidius Ampliatius, apparently a freedman, secured entry into the *ordo* for his son Celsinus, only six years old, as a result of the elder's reconstruction of the temple of Isis (*CIL* x, 846 = *ILS* 6367 = G. O. Onorato, *Iscrizioni Pompeiane* (Florence, 1957), no. 51, with commentary on pp. 135-136); and C. Julius C.f. Polybius, from whose name servile ancestry has justifiably been inferred, stood for election as aedile in the latest period: *CIL* iv, 886; 449; cf. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate* 90, n. 3.

<sup>58</sup> For the *officina* at Puteoli see P. L. Bruzza, *Bull.*

*Corr. Arch.* 1875, 242 ff; for the date, between 40 and 20 B.C., A. Oxé, *Rhein. Mus.* lix (1904), 130. See further Dubois, *PA* 121; Frank, *ESAR* v, 189 f; S. Treggiari, *Roman Freedmen in the Late Republic* (Oxford, 1969), 91-92.

<sup>59</sup> cf. C. Iulius C.f. Puteolanus, adlected into the *ordo* of Puteoli before his death in his seventeenth year (*CIL* x, 1804 = *ILS* 8236). Gordon believed that the honour stemmed from benefactions undertaken by the man's freedman father (*JRS* xxi (1931), 66-67); it is more likely, given the concentration in the area of former slaves of the Caesars, that it was from association with the emperors that the family acquired local respectability; cf. Julius Capretanus *et al.*, above nn. 49-50.

<sup>60</sup> Stat., *Silv.* 3, 1, 91 f.; 2, 2, 133 f.; for his villa at Surrentum cf. *Silv.* 2, 2, and *RBN*, 220-221.

<sup>61</sup> Local office has been inferred from the mention of *suffragia* in *Silv.* 2, 2, 133: see e.g. P-W, 'Puteoli', 2051; on Pollius' descent cf. K. J. Beloch, *Campanien*<sup>2</sup> (Breslau, 1890), 269; *CIL* x, 1781.

<sup>62</sup> *Silv.* 3 *praef.*, 3, 1, 91-93 (wealth); 2, 2, 112-117; 95-97 (culture).

<sup>63</sup> *Dignitas senatoria*: *Silv.* 4, 8, 59-62; *Silv.* 4, 8 celebrates the birth of a third child to Julius Menecrates, on whom see further *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 430.

<sup>64</sup> Neapolitan property: *Eph. Epigr.* viii, 337 (= *ILS* 5798); *RBN* 221-222. *Turba nepotum*: *Silv.* 4 *praef.*

<sup>65</sup> *CIL* x, 1574.

awarding of equestrian status by a special imperial grant might stimulate the local council to follow suit and raise a man to decurional status. The Nemonii are known in Campania only from inscriptions of second-century Puteoli, which disclose that they exercised important priestly functions in the Syrian cult of Juppiter Damascenus; in 168 they dedicated an ornate altar *sanctissimo deo Genio coloniae Puteolanorum*.<sup>66</sup> Probably they were Easterners who prospered in Puteoli as representatives of Syrian trading interests (possibly the production of glass<sup>67</sup>); the cognomen of the freedman M. Nemonius Eutyches lends some support to this interpretation. In any case M. Nemonius M.f. Pal. Eutyichianus, son of Eutyches, received equestrian rank from a direct grant by Antoninus Pius; subsequently—such at least is the impression conveyed by the order in which the phases of his career are registered on his monument—he was made a member of the *ordo* and held a magistracy.<sup>68</sup>

Some men, *libertino patre nati*, reached the *ordo*—but easily, without a struggle? Surely that is implausible: the ruling class, at Puteoli as elsewhere, will have exhibited oligarchical tendencies, working to reserve the power and privileges of local *dignitas* to themselves and remaining reluctant to share magistracies and offices with persons whose fortunes were greater than their status. Such a tendency towards exclusiveness can be seen in operation within the local aristocracies in imperial Africa and earlier, in several periods, at Pompeii, where one scholar has protested against the 'idilliaco quadro' which has until recently dominated the scholarly literature on social structure:<sup>69</sup> there are concrete grounds—adoption procedures, the rigidly hierarchical character of social stratification—for doubt whether the more established families were so openly encouraging to newer *gentes* as has often been assumed. An intriguing glimpse of social friction at Puteoli is provided by Tacitus, who reports that in 58 the plebs protested against the *avaritia* of the magistrates, the *ordo* feared the violence of the plebs, and the Roman senate was forced to intervene—in the interest, it is scarcely necessary to add, of the upper classes.<sup>70</sup> This evidence, which falls precisely in the period when the sons of freedmen are first beginning to appear in the local senate, ought to warn against adopting excessively sanguine views of the social and political prospects of ex-slaves, and against assumptions of a constantly prevailing social harmony. In Puteoli, where the inscriptions of known or presumed *liberti* outnumber those of *ingenui* by a ratio of at least 10:1,<sup>71</sup> social tensions must always have been marked. Descendants of freedmen and *novi homines* will have had to struggle to become members of

<sup>66</sup> *CIL* x, 1563 (= *ILS* 6320).

<sup>67</sup> Puteolan glass; Dubois, *PA* 124-125; Syrian production and Puteoli: Frank, *ESAR* v, 196.

<sup>68</sup> *CIL* x, 1576 (= *ILS* 4326): 'iussu Iovis optimi maximi Damasceni sacerdotis M. Nemonio M.f. Pal. Eutyichiano sacerdoti, honorato equo publico ab imp. Antonino Aug. Pio p.p., adlecto in ordinem decurionum Puteolanorum, aedili, M. Nemonius Callistus p(ater?) sacerdos remissa collatione.'

<sup>69</sup> E. Lepore, 'Orientamenti per la storia sociale di Pompeii', *Pompeiana* (Raccolta di studi per il secondo centenario degli scavi di Pompeii) (Naples, 1950), 166. At Gighis and Volubilis in Imperial times the self-perpetuating character of the municipal oligarchies is now clear; M. G. Jarrett, 'Decurions and Priests', *AYP* xcii (1971), 532-536.

<sup>70</sup> Tac., *Ann.* xiii, 48: 'Isdem consulibus auditae Puteolanorum legationes, quas diversas ordo plebs ad senatum miserant, illi vim multitudinis, hi magistratum et primi cuiusque avaritiam increpantes. Easque seditio ad saxa et minas ignium progressa ne caedem et arma proliceret, C. Cassius adhibendo remedio delectus. Quia severitatem eius non tolerabant, precante ipso ad Scribonios fratres ea cura transfertur, data cohorte praetoria, cuius terrore et paucorum supplicio rediit oppidanis concordia.' I have discussed this passage in *The Ancient Historian and his Materials* (essays in honour of C. E. Stevens, forthcoming).

<sup>71</sup> *CIL* x, 1813-3154 are almost exclusively *sepulcrales*; 82 persons named in these 1341 texts are certainly *ingenui*, for filiation is explicit; i.e. a ratio of freedmen to freeborn of 16:1. The likelihood that

a number of other persons among these texts were freeborn but did not make their *ingenuitas* explicit is counterbalanced by the fact that most of the texts mention more than one person. Even allowing for accidents of survival, for the uncertain provenience of some of the texts, for the likelihood that *liberti* were more anxious to erect funeral monuments as a mark of newly acquired status (L. R. Taylor, 'Freedmen and Freeborn in the Epitaphs of Rome', *AYP* lxxxii, 1961, 129-30), and for the fact that the proportion of freeborn is much higher in the approximately 300 dedications, decrees, and career inscriptions which precede the sepulcrales in *CIL* x (more than one half of the persons named in these texts are *ingenui*), the large number of *liberti* in Puteolan inscriptions remains impressive. Further, a ratio of 10:1 is maintained in the major additions to Puteoli's inscriptions published since 1883, the date of the appearance of *CIL* x. See *Eph. Epigr.* viii, 387-424; *AYA* ii (1898), 374 f.: 3 certain *ingenui* in a total of 36 texts; *AYA* lxxvii (1973), 151 f.: 9 of 37 Puteolani are freeborn; in the wax tablets from Pompeii (above n. 21) only 5 of the more than 60 persons known thus far are freeborn, the remainder *liberti* or *servi*. I. Kajanto has employed criteria in addition to filiation in determining freeborn, as opposed to freedmen and uncertain status, at Puteoli (although he does not stipulate whether he has exploited epigraphical material in addition to that of *CIL* x); his figures show that approximately one person in seven was *ingenuus* ('The Significance of non-Latin Cognomina', *Latomus* xxvii, 1968, 523).

the *ordo*; there must always have been larger numbers of such persons eligible for election (on financial grounds) than places available in the council.

'... litora mundi hospita.'<sup>72</sup> Statius is writing primarily of the foreign element in Puteoli's population, of traders and other *peregrini* who found it profitable to settle near the harbour. But migration *within* the borders of Campania is a factor to be reckoned with at all periods and especially, at Puteoli, during the Flavian epoch. When Vespasian ceded a large portion of Capua's territory to Puteoli, after Pompeii, Herculaneum and Stabiae were obliterated, and after the Via Domitiana (completed in 95) opened more direct communication to the north, with the consequence that Capua was by-passed by traffic bound for Rome, Puteoli doubtless gained appreciable numbers of new inhabitants, some of whom will surely have risen to councillor status in course of time.<sup>73</sup> One late-second-century IIvir falls within this category. The Gavii were a Pompeian family of great distinction and antiquity. The name occurs among the electoral programmata in the latest period, in association with other aspirants for Pompeian office whose lineage was equally respectable.<sup>74</sup> They may have migrated to Puteoli after the eruption of Vesuvius: certainly there is no earlier trace of the *gens* in the maritime city, the name appearing but twice in the funerary inscriptions.<sup>75</sup> But by the middle of the second century M. Gavius Puteolanus had attained high office at Puteoli.<sup>76</sup> He might have been the son of a Gavius who was still a boy when he reached Puteoli in 79; is it fanciful to see in his *cognomen* an indication that he was the first member of the *gens* to be born in Puteoli and to enjoy the prestige and functions of a local magistrate?

Unfortunately, not all the *gentilicia* contained in the municipal decrees lend themselves so readily to social classification as do the names in the several categories distinguished above. The Caecilii and Calpurnii highlight the hazards of arguments based upon nomenclature: the *gentilicia* are bland and indistinctive, far too common in both Campania and elsewhere to be susceptible of sure inferences. It will therefore be wiser to suspend judgement about direct links between the Caecilii who are known from Delian inscriptions, the early imperial duovir, the decurion M. Caecilius Crispinus of 113, and the member of the *ordo* in 196.<sup>77</sup> The Calpurnii were among the most prominent families in Augustan Puteoli; what were the origins of Calpurnius Pistus, *decurio* in 187?<sup>78</sup>

These illustrations are a salutary reminder of the incompleteness and ambiguities of our evidence. We must make allowance for both fluidity and tension in social life in a great port city, recognizing that, just as influential and prosperous families of the early period will have died out<sup>79</sup> or moved elsewhere,<sup>80</sup> so the others who arrived, not without a struggle, to take their place, came both from other Campanian towns and from other Italian and foreign

<sup>72</sup> Stat., *Silv.* 3, 5, 75-76.

<sup>73</sup> For the sources, see P-W, 'Puteoli', 2044, 2053-54.

<sup>74</sup> See M. L. Gordon, 'The Ordo of Pompeii', *JRS* xvii (1927), 178.

<sup>75</sup> *CIL* x, 2472, 2473.

<sup>76</sup> *CIL* x, 1784 (= *ILS* 6334); 1785 (= *ILS* 6333). Further advancement of this family is a distinct possibility. Curtius Crispinus, the equestrian husband of Gavia M. Marciana (x, 1784), was perhaps the father, as Stein suggested, of a similarly named man of senatorial rank, known to us from a fragment of priestly *fasti* datable to the reign of Commodus: *CIL* vi, 32321; A. Stein, *Der römische Ritterstand* (Munich, 1927), 133.

<sup>77</sup> Hatzfeld, *BCH* xxxvi (1912), 22; *CIL* x, 1796; *AYA* lxxvii (1973), 161-62 (no. 11); *CIL* x, 1786.

<sup>78</sup> *CIL* x, 1631 (a *vicus* bore their name); 1797 (trade with the east), 1613 (L. Calpurnius built the temple to Augustus); 1784 (the decurion).

<sup>79</sup> For example, the Cluvii: N. Cluvius M'. f. held magistracies in a number of Campanian towns, including Puteoli, in the early first century n.c. (*CIL* x, 1573 = *ILLRP* 561; x, 1572 = *ILLRP* 182); M. Cluvius of Puteoli left property to Cicero in 45 B.C. (Cic., *ad Att.* 13, 48, 1, etc; cf. *RBN* 52-53). But of the four Puteolan epitaphs recording members or freedmen of the *gens* (x, 2305-07, 2511) only one is likely to be later than the first century; and aside from an early imperial magistrate at Nola (x, 1233,

dated to 32), Cluvii are rare elsewhere in Campania. With the death of M. Cluvius the family's days in Puteoli may have ended—as is suggested, indeed, by the large number of extra-familial legatees who shared bequests with Cicero. N. Fufidius N.f., and Q. Fuficius Q.f., were in positions of influence in 105 B.C. (*CIL* x, 1781); later Fuficii are extremely rare in Puteoli (see *NSe*, 1926, 233 f.), Fufidii unattested. But the names occur in inscriptions of Naples, Herculaneum, Pompeii and Capua: perhaps only collateral branches of these families settled in Puteoli, in insufficient numbers to establish durable local prominence.

<sup>80</sup> E.g. the Vestorii. The economic importance of C. Vestorius Puteolanus in eastern and local markets through the Augustan period was considerable (*CIL* x, 1631: *regio vici Vestoriani* . . .; P-W, 'Puteoli', 2048), but the name is subsequently extremely rare in the local inscriptions. C. Vestorius Priscus was aedile in the latest period of Pompeii: if, as was suggested long ago, he was a direct linear descendant of Cicero's banking friend, the family will have left the town (Gordon, *JRS* xvii (1927), 173; for the Pompeian aedile, whose tomb stands outside the Vesuvian gate, cf. *NSe*. 1910, 402). It will be recalled, furthermore, that the owner of the Murecine villa near Pompeii appears to have lived and worked in Puteoli between 35 and 61: for the villa, see O. Elia, *RAAN* N.S. xxxv (1960), 29 ff.

centres. We have noted that local and foreign freedmen found the economic climate of Puteoli to their liking: in time, with fortunes securely established and status improved, the more fortunate and resourceful of their sons will have entered the *ordo*. Further, men of humble origins may well elude detection, owing to their tendency to discard or effectively disguise their servile nomenclature as they rose in social status. And yet, after all uncertainties have been allowed for, one remains impressed by one feature of the evidence from *decreta decurionum*, a feature noted at the outset of this section: a strikingly high proportion—17 of 34, or exactly one half, of the late-second-century Puteolan notables mentioned in the municipal decrees included in our sample, are the bearers of *gentilia* which belonged also to the ruling municipal gentry of the late Republic and early Empire.<sup>81</sup> How is one to explain this steady reappearance in the municipal senate of the same few *gentes*? Were the late-second-century *decuriones* direct descendants of the late Republican dignitaries of the same names, or had the original bearers of the *gentilia* died out, and is the continuity of nomenclature due rather to its preservation by ex-slaves of the early *domi nobiles*, or by adoption? If an assessment were based solely upon the available inscriptional material the first alternative will appear implausible: four generations of linear descent are the most for which there is explicit evidence, and they are a unique example.<sup>82</sup> We have noted above that Cn. Haius Pudens ought to be regarded as having emerged from a servile background; whereas the multiple *nomina* of such decurions as M. Caecilius Publilius Fabianus, who was very likely born a P. Fabius, may well be a sign that a M. Caecilius was attempting to preserve his male line through an adoptive link with another *vir municipalis* whose family was of decurional status.<sup>83</sup> Old *gentilia*, then, will surely have attached to *novi homines* on some occasions, and to adopted persons upon others—although there are signs that decurional families were inclined to forge adoptive links, as well as marriage ties, from among members of their own class.<sup>84</sup> It is possible too, since we have noticed the same distinctive *gentilia* in a number of Campanian cities,<sup>85</sup> that some of these late-second-century *decuriones* could have been members of collateral branches of families of early *domi nobiles*, rather than direct linear descendants. But other types of evidence and argument can be employed, which cumulatively convey a substantially different impression: direct linear descent from late Republic to the closing years of the second century is by no means so implausible in some cases as at first sight appears.

First, comparative evidence from other cities. A detailed onomastic study of the ruling families of Pompeii, long a desideratum and currently nearing completion, will help to place comparison of social patterns in the Campanian cities upon a surer basis. Provisional conclusions from the Pompeian material are nonetheless instructive: at least 10 per cent of the candidates who are known to have stood for election in the latest period at Pompeii are believed to be directly descended from persons whose prominence is demonstrable also in the days of the Sullan colony.<sup>86</sup> The social fabric of Ostia, a city more like Puteoli also in

<sup>81</sup> Annius Modestus, Annius Numisianus, Annius Proculus, T. Aufidius Thræsea, M. Caecilius Publilius Fabianus, Calpurnius Pistus, A. Clodius Maximus, Cossutius Rufinus, Q. Granius Atticus, Granius Longinus, T. Hordeonius Secundus Valentinus, M. Laelius Atimetus, P. Manlius Egnatius Laurinus, T. Oppius Severus, Cn. Papirius Sagitta, M. Stalaccius Albinus, Viguetius Liberalis. This statistic requires special emphasis in the light of Gordon's misleading observation (*JRS* xxi (1931), 70) that 'among the decurions and municipal officials of Italy whose names are known to us from the inscriptions, about 33 per cent may be suspected of servile descent at Ostia, Puteoli, and Capua...'

<sup>82</sup> *ILS* 9014: 'T. Caesio T. fil. T. n. L. abn. Pal. Anthiano ... Puteolani pub[lice] civi indigenae' (early third century). Three generations are attested only rarely: *CIL* x, 1792 (C. Avianius C. f. C. n. Flaccus, Augustan); J. H. D'Arms, *HSCP* lxxvi, 1972, 207 f.); *CIL* x, 1685, (= *ILS* 1397); 1686, L. Bovius l. f. L. n. Celer, Domitianic; H. G. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres* i (Paris, 1960), 126-128 (no. 55).

<sup>83</sup> M. Fabius Firmus was among the decurions in the late second century: *CIL* x, 1783.

<sup>84</sup> The children of Gavius Puteolanus (above, n. 76) were M. Gavius Fabius Justus and Gavia Fabia Rufina, respectively: it is likely that their mother belonged to the distinguished local branch of the Fabii (see preceding note). If so, it might be conjectured that Gavius Puteolanus, as a new man, was anxious to contract marriage ties with a family better established in local politics. So also, perhaps, L. Bovius Celer, an *eques* and local dignitary of the Domitianic period (see n. 82): his wife, Sextia L.f. Nerula was in all probability of a highly respectable local family: a *porticus Sextiana*, which must have been the benefaction of a prominent member of the *gens*, stood in Puteoli in 51 (Giordano, *RAAN* N.S. xlv (1970), 221-223).

<sup>85</sup> See above, p. 109 and below, p. 116.

<sup>86</sup> P. Castrén's study, *Ordo Populusque Pompeianus: a Study of Social Structure*, is to appear in Helsinki, probably during 1974; cf. *Annales E.S.C.* xxviii (1973), 391, n. 109. Castrén reports that 16 of the 160 families known to have held office (which he estimates to be more than 70 per cent of the total number of families which produced magistrates) are prominent in both periods, namely the Caecilii, Casellii, Cuspii, Gavii, Herennii, Holconii, Loreii,

other ways, is equally suggestive. There the family of P. Lucilius Gamala held local office for more than two hundred years; the Egrilii produced a *IIvir* in A.D. 6 and were still closely associated with the town in the middle of the second century; the C. Fabii, prominent in the Julio-Claudian period, were prominent too in the time of Antonius Pius.<sup>87</sup> The family of C. Nasennius Marcellus spanned the second century, providing at least four generations of municipal magistrates.<sup>88</sup>

The Puteolan pattern, undoubtedly, was the same. Economic conditions, both locally and throughout Italy, provide a first argument. If a family could survive from the Augustan age to the time of Vespasian—and as a result of Augustan policies, including colonization,<sup>89</sup> local levels of wealth were certainly rising throughout that period—the new impetus from Flavian land concessions to the town assured continued, even increased, prosperity. Capital accumulated from trade, banking and local industry could be invested in land, and wealth could thus be stabilized and made secure: it is well to recall that Trimalchio, late in the Julio-Claudian period, amassed his fortune in precisely this way.<sup>90</sup> Second, it is remarkable, even making due allowances for the incompleteness of our records, how few Puteolani, in any period, can be found moving beyond the boundaries of Campania. Rare indeed are the city's contributions to the Roman consulship, or even to the senate,<sup>91</sup> and a good number of the *equites* were stay-at-homes (in comparison with those from other towns), content to continue to amass wealth and enjoy the modest but tangible distinction which holding local office could guarantee.<sup>92</sup>

Why this should have been so can never, perhaps, be fully understood. Originally, the commercial character of Puteoli's aristocracy may have been the root cause; there was always a connection between the senatorial *dignitas* and ownership of land, and a corresponding stigma against traders;<sup>93</sup> and the exiguous strip of territory which still comprised

Marii, Popidii, Sallustii, Septumii (Septimii), Sextilii, Trebii, Veidii (Vedii), Veranii, and Vibii.

<sup>87</sup> Meiggs, *RO* 193 (Lucilii Gamalae); 196 (Egrilii, on whom see also F. Zevi, *MEFR* lxxxii (1970), 279 f.); 199 (C. Fabii).

<sup>88</sup> *ibid.* 209.

<sup>89</sup> For Augustan policies see P-W, 'Puteoli', 2043; *RBN* 81–82. The Augustan colony, long a matter of dispute, is now unequivocally attested: Giordano, *RAAN* N.S. xlv (1970), 219 (no. 6, ll. 24–25): 'actum in colonia Iulia Augusta Put(e)olis' (A.D. 36).

<sup>90</sup> Petr., *Sat.* 76; on which see P. Veyne, 'Vie de Trimalcion', *Annales E.S.C.* xvi (1961), 213–247, substantially modifying the view of Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*<sup>2</sup> 57–58.

<sup>91</sup> Consul: T. Aquillius Proculus (*CIL* x, 1699; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 1000; the year of office is unknown but his funeral monument suggests a mid-second-century date). Cf. A. Aquilius Proculus, *decurio* in 196, *CIL* x, 1786. Senators: For Granus Petro, *q. des.* for 46 B.C., see n. 30 above; I argue in an article forthcoming in *Historia* that Hordeonius Flaccus, *legatus Germaniae superioris* in 68 (Tac., *Hist.* i, 9 etc.) came from Puteoli. For the Puteolan connections of C. Egnatius Certus (*suff. ann. inc.*), see *Eph. Epigr.* viii, 376; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> E 20; *RBN* 212. Note also the Caesonii, two of whom held proconsulships in Africa in first half of the third century: *CIL* xiv, 3902 = *ILS* 1186; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 209, a L. Caesonius C. fil. Quir., *curator rei publicae [P]uteolanorum*; *CIL* x, 1687 = *ILS* 1206; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 212, son of the foregoing, L. Caesonius L.f. Quir. Quintus Rufinus Manlius Bassus; cf. also *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 210. For earlier presence of the gens at Puteoli, cf. *CIL* x, 1923 (a *faber tignarius*); x, 1874 = *ILS* 6330 (an Augustalis); x, 2198, 2200, 3580 (gravestones); and especially Giordano, *RAAN* N.S. xlv (1970), 221: a *chalcidicum Caesonianum* stood in Puteoli's forum in 51.

<sup>92</sup> For the *equites* see above, n. 54 (Cn. Haius Diadumenianus); C. Aelius Gaurus (*Eph. Epigr.* viii, 368 = *ILS* 2748); M. Artorius Priscillus Vicasius Sabidianus (*CIL* vi, 32939 = *ILS* 2700; Pflaum, *Carr. proc. eq.* 185–86, no. 88); M. Bassacus

Axius (*CIL* x, 1795 = *ILS* 1401; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> B 68; Pflaum, *Carr. proc. eq.*, 552, no. 207); L. Bovius Celer (*CIL* x, 1685 = *ILS* 1397; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> B 149, and see above, no. 82); T. Caesius Anthianus (*ILS* 9014; Pflaum, *Carr. proc. eq.*, 827, no. 321); L. Valerius Valerianus, equestrian *praefectus Mesopotamiae et Osroenae* under Caracalla or slightly later, and perhaps descended from M. Valerius Pudens, *IIvir* in 161 (*CIL* x, 1814; R. P. Duncan-Jones, *CP* lxiv (1969), 229 f., *ibid.* *CP* lxv (1970), 107 f.; see further J. M. Reynolds, *JRS* lxi (1971), 147.) For all of the above, working posts are attested, usually in combination with municipal responsibilities. In contrast, the following *equites* held no administrative posts in the equestrian *cursum*: L. Annius Modestus (*CIL* x, 1782), Curtius Crispinus (*CIL* x, 1784 = *ILS* 6334), M. Gavius Fabius Justus (*CIL* x, 1785 = *ILS* 6333), and Veratius A.f. Severianus (*CIL* x, 3704 = *ILS* 5054; Mommsen assigned the stone to Cumae—with hesitation, since mention of the *duovirate* is inappropriate to Cumae, where the chief magistrates were *praetores*. Puteoli is the more likely city of origin, particularly since the *deus patrius* mentioned in line 6 is now certainly attested in Puteoli: see *PdP* xxvii (1972), 255 ff.)

<sup>93</sup> T. P. Wiseman has persuasively shown that for the late Republic 'the prejudice against senatorial participation in commerce was neither universal nor applied in practice' (*New Men in the Roman Senate*, 78), and argues also that *viri municipales* in important towns near the locations of senatorial villas (31, 47–50), as well as those placed in strategic positions near the main trunk roads (28), could cement ties with Roman dignitaries and so prepare for their eventual entry into the senate. Puteoli was especially favoured in these respects; yet only one of Wiseman's 563 entries (Granus Petro, above, n. 30) was a Puteolanus. That we happen to know of no others may be no more than an accident of our evidence; but perhaps one ought to distinguish the activities of men already within the senate from those of *municipales* anxious to rise. Among the latter the practice of *artes inhonestae* might well continue to impede political advancement—as Wiseman himself recognizes (82).

Puteoli in the days of the Elder Pliny<sup>94</sup> must have prevented any local dignitary from amassing a fortune based upon the land. Later, that original tendency prevailed, unaffected by the more fluid developments in society and politics which were typical of the Flavian and endured through the Antonine Age. The advance of Puteolani may have been impeded by the simultaneous promotion to Roman government in this period of large numbers of provincials from the Roman West, Africa, and the Greek East: senatorial percentages between A.D. 70 and 180 show how small was the Italian, particularly the southern Italian, contribution to the senate in proportion to that made by men of non-Italian extraction.<sup>95</sup> Puteoli, whose leading men in the earlier period had been excluded from the senate because engaged in commerce and trade, probably remained content with the still lucrative possibilities of local office and money-making; established patterns are not easily disrupted, and although a few influential members of the local gentry opted for a more ambitious life, it was the non-Italian leading men from western and Greek cities who had the easier and more accessible path to Roman politics and administration.

The local aristocracy, then, became increasingly a regional aristocracy with multiple estates and other economic interests distributed throughout Campania. Although the evidence is not sufficient to trace the movements of collateral branches of families throughout the Campanian region, it is enough to re-emphasize what has been noticed above: the concentration, in all periods and in most cities of Campania, of members of the same *gentes*. The *gens Aviania* was important in early imperial Puteoli, but a collateral member of the family moved to Pompeii, was adopted, and held high office.<sup>96</sup> Clodii, Hordeonii, and Laelii are known in Capua, Pompeii and Herculaneum, as well as in Puteoli.<sup>97</sup> The Egnatii were still prominent in Puteoli late in the second century; earlier, a T. Egnatius T.f. Pal. Rufus was among the *decuriones* at Abella.<sup>98</sup> We may reasonably assume that from the Flavian period for reasons noted above, it was to Puteoli that other Campanians increasingly gravitated owing to the presence there of the chief signs of civic importance and wealth, and that within the region the dynamics of migration were to an increasing extent centripetal. Nevertheless, the old family names continue to be found in other cities: in 273 a Clodius, Oppius, Pollius and four Granii were among the *dendrophori* at Cumae.<sup>99</sup>

In other words, the local tendency to remain in Puteoli or Campania rather than to seek honours further afield—Pollius Felix in the Flavian period may serve as a case in point—reinforced the stability and continuity of the local aristocracy. These general considerations, furthermore, are corroborated by arguments from the nomenclature of the late-second-century councillors themselves. First, we may consider the *cognomina* of the decurions whose *nomina* point back to the late Republic: Longinus, Modestus, Secundus, Albinus, Thrasea, Rubinus, Severus, Proculus, even Atticus. Being either latinate, or at least long-established in Roman society, rather than peregrine in character, these surnames are in marked contrast both with the much larger proportion of the foreign *cognomina* found among lower-class dependants of these families in the Puteolan *sepulcrales*, and, far more revealing, with the *cognomina* of those late-second-century councillors whose servile descent can be confidently inferred from other evidence. The names of the *duoviri* of 196, Cn. Papirius Sagitta and P. Aelius Eudaimon, may be juxtaposed and serve as illustration; their *gentilicia* alone, as has already been seen, are indicators of their differences in origins, social differences which are corroborated also by their *cognomina*.

Nomenclature, then, strengthens the case for ties of direct linear descent between late Republican leading men and the political élite of the late second century. The evidence of tribal affiliation tends to point in the same direction. As at Ostia, the heavy enrolment in

<sup>94</sup> P-W 'Puteoli', 2053-54.

<sup>95</sup> See e.g. M. Hammond, *JRS* xlvii (1957), 74 f., with a summary of the period A.D. 64-235; A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny: a Historical and Social Commentary* (Oxford, 1966), 377-78, with refs. *ad loc.* For oriental senators, see now G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford, 1965), 141-145. The period 69-138 has been most recently studied by W. Eck, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian* (Munich, 1970).

<sup>96</sup> *CIL* x, 1792, on which see J. H. D'Arms, lxxvi *HSCP* (1972), 207 f.; for L. Avianius Flaccus

Pontianus, *duovir* at Pompeii in an unknown year, cf. *CIL* x, 1064 = *ILS* 5382, on which see Onorato, *Iscrizioni Pompeiane* 139, no. 58.

<sup>97</sup> See above, n. 42; *CIL* x, 1403 (Herculaneum), with E. Lepore, *PdP* x (1955), 430. For the economic effects at Puteoli of the destruction of the Vesuvian towns in 79, see below, p. 121.

<sup>98</sup> *CIL* x, 1208.

<sup>99</sup> *CIL* x, 3699. This onomastic diffusion throughout Campania has been discussed briefly, for Neapolis, by E. Lepore, in *Storia di Napoli* 1, 302-3 with n. 16, 364.

Palatina at Puteoli seems a direct reflection of the numbers of men of servile descent who were present in the town; the old tribe of Puteoli was Falerna.<sup>100</sup> Unfortunately, for none of the notables of the waning years of the second century whose nomenclature points back to the late Republic is the tribe known. But in three cases the late Republican *gentes* whose names they bear belonged to Falerna; and in every instance in which two centuries of family continuity seems possible the tribe, where it is known, was in fact Falerna. It follows, then, that T. Aufidius Thræsea, M. Laelius Atticus, and T. Hordeonius Secundus Valentinus can have been members of Falerna,<sup>101</sup> and it is likely, further, that the contemporary Granii, Oppii, and Stlaccii were members of the same tribe. Again, it is instructive to contrast the tribal affiliation, when it is on record, of imperial notables whose advance into membership in the governing élite came, in all probability, only late in the second century: T. Caesius Anthianus, M. Vettius Pius and M. Bassaeus Axius all belonged to Palatina.<sup>102</sup>

These various considerations, then, require us seriously to entertain the possibility that at least some members of the municipal aristocracy at the outset of the Severan age—certain *duoviri* and certain members of the drafting committees of municipal edicts and decrees—continued to consist of direct descendants of the late Republican and early imperial *domi nobiles*: that is the best explanation of the tenacity of the same nomenclature among the members of the *ordo*. And it is now possible, at last, to emphasize a second and more general impression which emerges from the evidence for social patterns presented and analysed in this section, and which has direct bearing on the hypothesis of second-century decline: most of the signs of municipal energy are present at Puteoli late in the second century, well after the time at which most scholars have fixed the beginnings of municipal decay. The *ordo* of Puteoli stands revealed as a flourishing institution: the considerable financial outlays, ranging from *summa honoraria* to the games and other benefactions which public opinion expected, were being met in part by an influential nucleus of early *gentes*, whose ties with Puteoli or other Campanian cities had long existed. But we know also of other decurions whose wealth and status had been won more recently: the presence of such men in positions of power illustrates a certain diversity in the composition of the *ordo*, and suggests economic conditions which were still favourable for the acquisition of wealth by persons who, as migrants to Puteoli at a later period, were without long-standing local or regional connections. Neither, to judge from our texts, was municipal spending narrowly restricted to the members of the *ordo*: the dedications and private monuments of the *libertina nobilitas*, the Augustales,<sup>103</sup> and the numerous provisions for freedmen in epitaphs of Augustales, the *plebs ingenua*, and persons of equally respectable status,<sup>104</sup> argue for a reasonably wide distribution of wealth within the city, rather than for a concentration in the hands of a few 'conspicuous consumers'. It remains, in the final part of this study, to substantiate this impression: to attempt a closer analysis of the various signs of this civic wealth and vigour, and then to suggest, in a brief conclusion, some of the reasons for their continued survival.

### III

A first proof of the stability and size of local fortunes is provided by the number of dated monuments of private individuals which reflect a high degree of private wealth. A public funeral to honour the memory of Gavia Marciana was decreed by the *ordo* in 187,

<sup>100</sup> On Puteoli's tribe cf. P-W, 'Puteoli', 2042, where it is emphasized that the presence of some persons in Falerna may have been due to the expansion of Puteolan territory under Vespasian to include that which was previously part of Capua (where the tribe is also Falerna). But see Taylor, *Voting Districts* 323, who correctly observes that no occurrences of Falerna in Puteoli's inscriptions can be dated later than the first century A.D. For Ostia, cf. Meiggs, *RO* 190. The great ports of Italy—including Aquileia—show, as is to be expected, a heavy concentration of enrolments in Palatina.

<sup>101</sup> *CIL* x, 2131 (Aufidius); 2640 (Laelius); 1806 (Hordeonius—if the restoration of the *gentilicium* is correct; cf. above, n. 35).

<sup>102</sup> *ILS* 9014; *CIL* x, 1777 (not certainly Puteolan); *CIL* x, 1795 = *ILS* 1401.

<sup>103</sup> *CIL* x, 1877, a dedication to Q. Insteius Diadumenus by his heirs, is dated to the year 176; x 1872, the funeral altar of M. Antonius Trophimus and his wife, carries their portraits which on stylistic grounds—the drilling of the eyes, plasticity of drapery, length of the busts, coiffure, depth and rounded setting of the portraits—can scarcely be earlier than the time of M. Aurelius; and in quality it bears comparison with contemporary metropolitan monuments.

<sup>104</sup> Note, for example, the following dedications, none of them erected by persons known to have been members of ruling families: *CIL* x, 2191, 2220, 2338, 2343, 2462, 2492, 2500, 2782, 2858, 2878, 2908, 3142; *Eph. Epigr.* viii, 394; *AJA* ii (1898), 377, 384.

along with three statues and *decem libras folei*: the father of the deceased, who is described in another text as holder of all the local offices and a lavish municipal benefactor, met these expenses from his private resources.<sup>105</sup> Approximately a decade later the regret of the local senate was recorded at the loss of the son of another of its members, while a dependant of the dead man contributed the cost of the commemorative statue.<sup>106</sup> M. Laelius Atimetus, *singulis et universis karus*, had paid for a public building (*in (foro) transitorio*) at approximately the same date,<sup>107</sup> and the *ordo* agreed out of gratitude to grant him a certain proportion of the income<sup>108</sup> for enjoyment during his lifetime, at the end of which the monies were to revert to the public chest (*rei publicae nostrae esset*). There is record, too, in the case of the *biga* granted to Silius Sitrianus,<sup>109</sup> of the local council's use of *pecunia publica* to reward local benefactors. An honorary statue was erected in the memory of M. Octavius Agatha in 196: the local *corpus dendrophorum* met the expense.<sup>110</sup> Records of this kind help to corroborate what we might otherwise have guessed from the very high attendance figure—another helpful economic indicator—preserved for a contemporary meeting of the local senate: ninety-two of the hundred decurions were present during the deliberations concerning M. Laelius Atimetus' request.<sup>111</sup> Earlier and later benefactions of comparable nature, both private and corporate,<sup>112</sup> suggest that in the closing years of the second century the *ordo* of Puteoli was experiencing no mere Indian summer of prosperity, but rather that wealth was on a solid footing.

If we consider a different category of information, the impressive succession of local dedications to the Roman emperors, signs of wealth appear in Puteoli throughout the principate of Septimius Severus and continue well into the third century. The monuments which were issued in the name of the *colonia Puteolanorum* were no doubt paid for by the *ordo*, but sponsorship often came from different strata of local society: regional wards, the city's guilds, or private citizens. Such varied initiatives, all of which cost money, reinforce the impression of overall municipal vigour. The *ordo* erected commemorative bases to Trajan in 112 and 116, respectively;<sup>113</sup> the *vicus Lartidianus* commemorated Hadrian in similar fashion twice early in his reign.<sup>114</sup> Puteoli's *collegium scabillariorum*, which figured prominently in dramatic productions, erected large bases dedicated to Antoninus Pius in 139 and again in 140<sup>115</sup>—appropriately, since that emperor instituted the celebrated Hellenic games, the Eusebeia, in the city (the last inscriptions recording performances are from the second half of the third century)<sup>116</sup>—and honoured Marcus Aurelius in 161.<sup>117</sup> Meiggs has argued that Commodus took a special interest in Ostia, but the evidence is far less circumstantial for that emperor's associations with Puteoli, where a private dedication by a *marmorarius* shows that Commodus assumed the title of *duovir quinquennalis* probably in 183, and a marble bust of the emperor, carved probably in the same year, was discovered during excavations of 1951.<sup>118</sup> Two large bases reveal that the *Colonia Flavia Augusta Puteol(anorum)* paid homage to Septimius Severus at the outset of his principate.<sup>119</sup> If we may trust our literary sources, Roman senators were still enjoying their luxurious retreats on Campanian shores as late as 276;<sup>120</sup> six years later a text in honour of Carus and Carinus, inscribed by a *corrector Campaniae*, constitutes the last tribute to an emperor in

<sup>105</sup> *CIL* x, 1784 (= *ILS* 6334); x, 1785 (= *ILS* 6333).

<sup>106</sup> *CIL* x, 1782.

<sup>107</sup> *CIL* x, 1783 (= *ILS* 5919).

<sup>108</sup> The exact meaning of *solarium aedifici* is uncertain: see V. Arangio Ruiz, *FIRA* iii<sup>2</sup>, no. 111; for 'ground rent', cf. *Digest* 43, 8, 2, 17; 7, 1, 7, 2 etc.

<sup>109</sup> *Eph. Epigr.* viii, 371.

<sup>110</sup> *CIL* x, 1786.

<sup>111</sup> *CIL* x, 1783 (above, n. 107): *in curia f(uerunt) n(umero) LXXXII*; the economic implications of this figure are stressed also in P-W, 'Puteoli', 2042.

<sup>112</sup> e.g., *CIL* x, 1594: two private citizens, in the reign of Pius, donate columns, epistyle and entrance court of a temple; x, 1585 (211–212): dedication by the priestess Staccia to the Thiasos Placidianus; x, 521 (= *ILS* 6325, surely Puteolan: *AJP* lxxxviii [1967], 195 f.): a dedication by the *regio Hortensiana* to a patron. Cf. also x, 1787 (honours to Cn. Tettius).

<sup>113</sup> *CIL* x, 1633; 1634.

<sup>114</sup> *Eph. Epigr.* viii, 360; the second inscription, discovered in 1972, is unpublished.

<sup>115</sup> *CIL* x, 1642, 1643; see further Dubois, *PA* 61; cf. also A. Maiuri, 'L'anfiteatro flavio puteolano', *Memorie dell'Accad. di Arch., Lett. e Belle Arti di Napoli* iii (1955), 47, for late-second-century evidence from the amphitheatre.

<sup>116</sup> Eusebeia: SHA, *Hadri.* 27; Artemid., *Oneir.* 1, 26; *IG* xiv, 737, line 7; for the inscriptions see P-W, 'Puteoli', 2052, citing L. Moretti, *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche* (Rome 1953), nos. 73, 77, 78, 79, 81, 84, 87, 88, 90.

<sup>117</sup> *CIL* x, 1647.

<sup>118</sup> Meiggs, *RO* 79; *CIL* x, 1648 (dedication by Fl(avius) Pytheas); A. de Franciscis, *Bollettino d'Arte* xxxvii (1952), 290–92 (bust of Commodus).

<sup>119</sup> *CIL* x, 1650; 1651 (196).

<sup>120</sup> SHA, *Tac.* 19, 5; cf. 7, 5–6: *RBN* 158, 108.

local epigraphy before the remarkable revival of Puteoli at the outset of the reign of Constantine.<sup>121</sup>

Public buildings convey the same impression of continuing prosperity. The great Flavian amphitheatre,<sup>122</sup> far from being the last of the city's major public constructions, seems rather to have been the first in a monumental series, of which the most important was the impressive *macellum* (68 × 58 m) near the harbour; begun probably in the period of Domitian, it was lavishly renovated in the reigns of Septimius and Severus Alexander, as is shown by the character of the brickwork, by the quality of the marble revetment in the colonnades and the large latrines, and by the three monumental inscriptions found *in situ* near the principal entrance.<sup>123</sup> Important structural additions to the amphitheatre have been dated to the second half of the second century.<sup>124</sup> The immense size and scale of the thermal complex still visible to the west of the amphitheatre make them unique in Campania; built in the grand tradition ushered in by the *Thermae Traianae* on the Esquiline, they contain brickstamps of Hadrianic date, but it has been plausibly suggested that they were actually a later construction, to be identified with the *balneum Faustinae* (sic) which is known from the Bellori painting.<sup>125</sup> Indeed, the name of Antoninus Pius recurs so frequently and in such varied contexts in the local epigraphy that he must have done much—not unlike Augustus some 150 years before—to give new encouragement to the city, to its economy, and to its other institutions in the middle years of the second century;<sup>126</sup> that he (also like Augustus) should have been honoured with a temple in Puteoli is consequently less difficult to understand.<sup>127</sup> Nor is this the latest religious architecture originated by the city: a private citizen undertook the construction of a new temple to Venus between the years 212 and 217.<sup>128</sup> The brickwork and the elaborate, 'baroque' architectural style of some of the later tombs in the city's cemeteries (along the modern *via Celle* and the *via delle Vigne*) are appropriate to the Antonine Age, and detailed study of the masonry might well show them to have been still later.<sup>129</sup>

All this new activity, or the costly renovation and enlargement of earlier buildings, involving as they did the extensive use of imported marbles, and requiring a large and skilled labour-force of local architects, draughtsmen, masons and decorative artists, seems incompatible with stagnant conditions in the local economy. Nor can these craftsmen have been more than marginally indebted, for their profits, to the villa-society of the Roman rich, who built their luxurious estates on the *crater delicatus*: I have attempted to show elsewhere that the explanation for economic conditions in the local cities owed little to them.<sup>130</sup> Again, the kinds of buildings—public amenities and utilities on the one hand and, on the other, the development of elaborate multiple columbaria, as at Ostia, in the cemeteries—suggest the continuing presence of a widespread, rather than a narrowly restricted, prosperity.<sup>131</sup> The

<sup>121</sup> *CIL* x, 1655. Fourth-century revival: M. Napoli, *Bollettino d'Arte* xlv (1959), 113, n. 1; *RBN* 121-22, n. 27. Evidence continues to accumulate: see G. Camodeca, *Atti dell'Accad. Sci. Mor. Pol. Napoli* lxxxii, (1971), 1 ff.; J. H. D'Arms, *PdP* xxvii (1972) 258, with n. 3. Note also that Puteoli heads the list of the cities which benefited from Constantinian repairs to the Serino aqueduct: the implication is that the city was the most important of those served in the region (so also I. Sgobbo, *NSc.* 1938, 80).

<sup>122</sup> The third largest of its kind in Italy, with an estimated seating capacity of 40,000-60,000 persons: A. Maiuri (above, n. 115), 9 ff.; Dubois, *PA*, 315 f.; P-W, 'Puteoli', 2058.

<sup>123</sup> P-W, 'Puteoli', 2058; Dubois, *PA* 286 f.; J. B. Ward-Perkins, in *Etruscan and Roman Architecture* (London, 1970), 298: imported granite and Carystian marble columns in the Severan phase of the *macellum*.

<sup>124</sup> Maiuri (above, n. 115), 66-7; 69. Corinthian capitals, in the Asiatic style, which appear in the Severan period at Ostia, have been compared with the remains of a second-century temple discovered in *Via Terraciano* at Puteoli: P. Pensabene, *Scavi di Ostia* vii (Rome 1973), 237 f.; 233, n. 14; 244, n. 18.

<sup>125</sup> Maiuri, *NSc.* (1927), 320 for the total area of the complex; P-W, 'Puteoli', 2059.

<sup>126</sup> See n. 115, above, for dedications by the *collegium scabillariorum*; n. 4 (repairs of the harbour); n. 116 (Eusebeia); n. 112 (temple of Serapis).

<sup>127</sup> *CIL* x, 1784 (187): *in templo divi Pii*; the temple of Augustus, however, was constructed probably during his lifetime (*CIL* x, 1613-14; P-W, 'Puteoli', 2052).

<sup>128</sup> A. De Franciscis, *NSc.* 1954, 285 f., on which see now J. F. Gilliam, *CP* lviii (1963), 26-28.

<sup>129</sup> The stucco decoration in a number of the tombs confirms what the masonry suggests: the majority of the structures date from the Flavian epoch (R. Ling, *PBSR* N.S. xxi [1966], 28), but later specimens are known: Maiuri, *NSc.* (1927), 326 f. (a tomb of Antonine date on the *Via delle Vigne*); J. B. Ward-Perkins (above, n. 123), 300-01 (*Via Celle*); and W. Johannowsky informs me that the expansion of the cemetery towards Quarto and Murano in the Flavian period (cf. *CIL* x, 1894: an *ager religiosorum* at Quarto) can be plotted by the surviving funeral monuments in the district, many of which are of second-century date. Cf. in general A. De Franciscis and R. Pane, *Mausolei Romani in Campania* (Naples 1957), 28 f.

<sup>130</sup> *RBN* 131-164.

<sup>131</sup> G. Becatti, *JRS* li (1961), 205.

indications of increasingly unequal distribution of wealth, that is, of a growing gulf between rich and poor, so familiar from the final period in Ostia and characteristic too of late-fourth-century Puteoli, are absent in the city under the Antonines and Severans, even though local developments in domestic architecture, knowledge of which might help further to clarify social patterns, cannot at present be deduced from the meagre archaeological data. So too the re-use of earlier building materials for patching and repairs, which is often accompanied by a reduction of the total occupied urban area, is a category of evidence for economic decline which is not found at Puteoli. How far conditions in the city can be reconstructed from the dates at which earlier statue bases and honorary inscriptions began to be reinscribed is problematical; nevertheless, there is not a single known example of such re-use before the middle of the fourth century (when Puteoli, as is now known, was enjoying a final period of prosperity); the dates of the texts which these fourth-century inscriptions replaced, while concentrated in the latter half of the second century, include one late-third-century specimen.<sup>132</sup>

## IV

The main conclusion to emerge from the material which has been gathered and analysed in the foregoing paragraphs may be briefly stated: the prosperity which characterized Puteoli already in the days of the later Republic was more than has hitherto been supposed; the thesis that economic deterioration set in during or soon after the principate of Trajan cannot, upon analysis, be sustained. And countervailing evidence—the economic strength and social diversity of the local decurial class, the high level of private wealth of which the dated bequests by city dignitaries and other groups are the best reflection, the numerous dedications, both private and corporate, to the Caesars, and finally the energetic program of public building—offers serious testimony to the economic vigour of Puteoli and to the continuing vitality of her institutions well into the period of the Severan dynasty.

A complete account of the basis for Puteoli's affluence cannot easily be given, chiefly because we can gain only a very approximate idea of the various sources of local wealth in the late second century. Unquestionably, between the end of the Republic and the outset of the Severan period the economic structure of the city altered in a number of ways. Production of pottery did not survive the Augustan Age; on the other hand, other local industries continued to count for something: *pulvis Puteolanus*, that indispensable component of hydraulic cement, is still mentioned as late as the mid-fifth century of the Christian era,<sup>133</sup> whereas dyeing and glass works continued to flourish through the first three centuries.<sup>134</sup> Ownership of land in the port city was patently a source of profit: the high rent demanded and received from the Tyrians for their *statio* requires that interpretation.

And without question, the harbour remained a fundamental economic asset. Even if Egyptian grain was being transported to Ostia by the time of Commodus, the *annona* and Puteoli remained closely linked. Not surprisingly: grain for local and regional distribution would continue to be moved in bulk to Campania's chief harbour, the one port of major dimensions between Ostia and Tarentum. In Puteoli were granaries for the reception and storage of grain; there was technical and administrative competence gained from years of maritime experience; there was—not least important—an excellent road system to expedite transport and communications along the coasts and towards the hinterland.<sup>135</sup> Aside from grain, the products of the East passed through the harbour, an important source of gain for the resident aliens engaged in trade with their home countries. Because the expansion of Ostia ultimately challenged Puteoli's virtual monopoly in Eastern trading centres, it is all the

<sup>132</sup> *CIL* x, 1562 (after 139; reused under Valentinian); x, 1655 (282–83; reinscribed in 355: x, 1695); x, 1696, 97 (mid-fourth century; the dates of the earlier inscriptions are unknown); *PdP* xxvii (1972), 255 ff. (176; reinscribed in mid-fourth century); x, 1814 (161; x, 1815 dates from the second half of the fourth century); *Eph. Epigr.* viii, 365 (fourth century; the earlier text cannot be dated).

<sup>133</sup> Sidon. Apollin. 59–61.

<sup>134</sup> *Purpurarii*: P-W, 'Puteoli', 2048; Dubois, *PA* 127–29; glass: P-W, 'Puteoli', 2048; Dubois, *PA* 124–125; for the later imperial glass vases, manufactured in Puteoli and probably sold as souvenirs, see Ch. Picard, *Latomus* xviii (1959), 23–51. For other local manufacture, cf. Dubois, *PA* 117 ff.

<sup>135</sup> On the roadways, completed by the reign of Trajan, see P-W, 'Puteoli', 2054.

more exasperating not to have evidence sufficient to trace the stages of this process. There are, however, continued references in late inscriptions to *navicularii* and *negotiatores*, to *vascularii*, mosaicists and the workers of the marble which came largely from Eastern quarries;<sup>136</sup> these, taken in conjunction with late dedications to the divinities of Eastern cults,<sup>137</sup> which imply the presence both of resident Easterners in Puteoli and of their respectable levels of wealth, show that Eastern imports were still reaching Puteoli's harbour, and apparently in abundance, at the end of the second century. And finally, the parallel developments at Puteoli and Ostia discussed above help to illustrate the harbour's continued significance in the eyes of the Roman emperors: satisfactory maintenance of the harbour works, with the problems of engineering involved, were doubtless too great for a local town to sustain and required Imperial supervision and control—at Puteoli as at Ostia and elsewhere.

There is, in short, no suggestion in our sources for late Antonine and Severan Puteoli that the numbers, or the energy, of the municipal bourgeoisie had decreased—the indications of stagnation are first visible only in the late fourth century<sup>138</sup>—and very little evidence that the signs of wealth had begun to shift from *urbs* to *ager*, a process which can be detected during the empire in many other Italian urban centres of early importance, both in Campania and elsewhere.<sup>139</sup> To some degree, of course, such a movement of wealth was inevitable, the result of factors and forces which confronted Italy as a whole. Roman senatorial proprietors can occasionally be discovered in possession of Campanian estates,<sup>140</sup> some of which they will have acquired at the expense of the municipal gentry of Puteoli and other Campanian towns. But Puteolani, we may suspect, would have been the last to suffer: the addition to the city's territory of a portion of the highly fertile *ager Campanus* under Vespasian must have worked to the advantage of local notables—as is shown in fact, by the presence at the end of the second century of a decurional class, a proportion of which had for many generations maintained its position of local influence.

The chief difference in sources of wealth between the Augustan and Severan Ages may be defined as this, that ownership of land had come to replace overseas trade as the primary source of large local incomes. Land owners and traders, that is to say, had become the same persons: local *domi nobiles* were by now the owners of multiple estates in the fertile Campanian region, large-scale producers less of wine and oil, than of the grain, cereals, and pastoral produce for which Campania was still famous in the days of Cassiodorus;<sup>141</sup> the fortunes which were originally derived principally from trade had been stabilized and made secure by agricultural investments. For this, the destruction of the Vesuvian towns in 79 and the consequent losses to Puteoli of regional trading possibilities may have been in part responsible; and Imperial, rather than purely local management of the harbour works

<sup>136</sup> *Navicularii*: Maiuri, *N.Sc.* 1927, 322; id., *L'anfiteatro flavio Puteolano* (above, n. 115), 54. *Negotiatores*: *CIL* x, 1931 (*negotiator et ferrariarum et vinariarum*); x, 1872 (late Antonine *negotiator sagarius*); *vascularii*: M. Claudius Trypho, described in an unpublished inscription in Puteoli's amphitheatre as *Augustalis duplicarius, negotiator, vascularius, argentarius*; mosaicists: Dubois, *PA* 123, citing *CIL* xiii, 3225 (Lillebonne); Maiuri, (above, n. 115) 47 (late-second-century work in the amphitheatre); *marmorarii*: *CIL* x, 1648. A ship wrecked off Torre Sgarrata near Taranto in the late second century was carrying nearly 170 tons of rough cut marble from Aphrodisias, and the size of this marble shipment does not seem to have been extraordinary: see G. F. Bass (ed.) *A History of Seafaring* (London, 1972), 75–76. Cf. *Eph. Epigr.* viii, 405 (*mercator*); *IG* xiv, 841, 854 (*naucleros*).

<sup>137</sup> Oriental Liber, early third century: *CIL* x, 1585; cf. 1583, 84; cf. also Maiuri (above, n. 115), 52–53; in general, Peterson, *Cults* 143 ff. Dusares: *CIL* x, 1556 (and unpublished examples in the amphitheatre at Pozzuoli); Juppiter Optimus Maximus Damascenus: x, 1576.

<sup>138</sup> No *Ilviri* are named in the late inscriptions; individual initiative seems to have given way to the benefactions of *patroni*, whose sources of wealth lay increasingly outside the city (cf. the generalized phrase *ordo populisque* in late inscriptions, e.g. *CIL*

x, 1815). Of the seventeen known *patroni* of Puteoli, all but four fall within the period between 250 and 400, with the heaviest concentration in the latter portion of the fourth century: it is however clear that even in this period, when the gulf between rich and poor had widened, *patroni* were at work in general in the interests of preserving municipal amenities. Cf. Sherck, *MD* 85 ff.

<sup>139</sup> Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*<sup>3</sup> 192 ff, especially 205–206; more recently and more convincingly, for the cities of Magna Graecia, U. Kahrstedt, *Die Wirtschaftliche Lage Grossgriechenlands in der Kaiserzeit* (= *Historia Einzelschrift* 4, Wiesbaden 1960), 121 ff. For Neapolis in the second century, cf. E. Lepore, in *Storia di Napoli* 1, 314 ff. Cf. also J. Vogt, *The Decline of Rome* (tr. J. Sondheimer; London, 1967), 21 ff.

<sup>140</sup> For the Campanian estates of C. Bruttius Praesens, see Pliny, *Ep.* 7, 3, 1; *RBN* 204.

<sup>141</sup> Cassiod., *Varia* 8, 33, 3 ('industriosa . . . Campania'); 12, 22, 3 ('Campania, urbis regiae cella penaria'). On the farming-systems employed in Campania, see G. E. Russell, *The Classical Tradition in West European Farming* (Newton Abbot, 1972), 31, with n. 22. Campania was exceptionally well endowed for the production of cereals (Pliny, *NH* 18, 111), and the land could thus be cropped all the year round, in a three course rotation consisting of barley-millet-turnips-barley or wheat; K. D. White, *Roman Farming* (London, 1970), 121 f.

assuredly contributed to the shift from commercial to landed enterprises on the part of Puteoli's chief families. Not only did the land produce stable and steady incomes for its owners; it may not perhaps be pressing analogy too far to suggest that the wealth derived from landed properties gave much the same kind of economic protection, in the face of contracting overseas markets (which followed inevitably throughout Italy as a result of the exploitation of the provinces), as Venetian aristocrats experienced in the latter half of the sixteenth century. There the growth of Palladian villas, with their complementary agricultural holdings, helped to compensate for the opening of new trade routes round Cape Horn and the consequent losses for Mediterranean commerce, and also to stave off for at least two generations the period of Venetian economic deterioration.<sup>142</sup> *Mutatis mutandis*, there may be a more than superficial parallel with imperial Puteoli, where municipal decline has also been dated too early, owing largely to the bypassing of her harbour by one source of economic gain.

Further and finally, these local findings may raise questions about economic conditions in other contemporary urban centres. It is surely desirable to study the rhythms of evolution of the Italian cities of the early Empire on a case-by-case basis, distinguishing between large and small urban complexes, noting distinctions between agricultural and commercial societies, exploiting as much archaeological evidence as is available, making due and proper allowances, in short, for the peculiar local conditions which will have affected an individual city's growth, maturity, and decline. U. Kahrstedt's study of the cities of Magna Graecia under the Empire was a beginning;<sup>143</sup> it may be hoped that similarly detailed studies of municipalities in other regions will soon be undertaken, in which the investigation is carried through the Severan period. Such work would help to pave the way for a more sophisticated approach to the actual conditions of the Italian cities in the third century, an epoch which it has become fashionable to consider, portentously and perhaps prematurely, a period of crisis and decline.

### *The University of Michigan*

#### APPENDIX: II VIRI, DECURIONS, AND HOLDERS OF MAJOR PRIESTHOODS

The following list incorporates all new evidence which has accrued since the discussion of leading Puteolan families published in 1907 by Dubois (*PA* 44 ff.). The arrangement is alphabetical, but I have included dates, either firm or approximate, wherever possible.

- C. Aelius P.f. Quirinus Domitianus Gaurus (*Eph. Epigr.* viii, 368 = *ILS* 2748); *adlectus in ordinem* after 180.  
 P. Aelius Eudaimon (x, 1786); IIvir 196.  
 Q. Aemilius Helpidephorus (x, 1790 = *ILS* 6332); decurion, late second century.  
 M. Amullius Lupus (x, 1783); decurion, late second century.  
 L. Annius Numisianus (x, 1782); IIvir, late second century.  
 L. Annius L.f. Modestus (x, 1782, son of the above); decurion (?).  
 Annius Proculus (x, 1784); decurion, 187.  
 A. Aquili[u]s Proculus (x, 1786); decurion, 196.  
 M. Artorius Priscillus Vicasius Sabidianus (vi, 32929 = *ILS* 2700); *flamen divi Augusti*, early second century.  
 T. Aufidius Thrasea (x, 1782, 1783); IIvir, late second century.  
 C. Avianius C.f. C.n. Flaccus (x, 1792); IIvir, Augustan Age (*HSCP* lxxvi (1972), 207 f.).  
 M. Avia[n]ius M.f. Coniun[ctus] (x, 1793); IIvir, late first century (?).  
 M. Bassaeus M.f. Axius (x, 1795 = *ILS* 1401 = *PIR*<sup>2</sup> B 68); IIvir, late second century.  
 C. Blossius Q.f. (x, 1781); decurion, 105 B.C.  
 C. Blossius (*AJA* lxxvii (1973), 161); IIvir, 113.  
 L. Bovius L.f. L.n. Celer (x, 1685 = *ILS* 1397); IIvir, augur, Domitianic period (Pflaum, *CPE* 126-28, no. 55).

<sup>142</sup> For the economy of Venice in the sixteenth century see G. Luzzatto, 'La decadenza di Venezia dopo le scoperte geografiche', *Archivio Veneto* 5th series, liv-v (1954), 162 ff. (with earlier bibliography); id., *Storia economica di Venezia dal XI al XVI secolo* (Venice, 1961); A. Stella, *Archivio Veneto* 5th series,

lviii-ix (1956), 17-69; F. Braudel, 'La vita economica di Venezia nel sec. XVI', in *La civiltà veneziana del Rinascimento* (Florence, 1958). On Palladian villas and their economic implications see J. S. Ackerman, *Palladio* (London, 1966), 48 ff.

<sup>143</sup> Above n. 139.

- M. Caecilius Crispinus (*AJA* lxxvii (1973), 161); decurion, 113.  
 A. Caeci[lius Ru?]fus (x, 1796); IIvir, Flavian period (?).  
 M. Caecilius Publiolus Fabianus (x, 1786); decurion, 196.  
 Caep[lius?] Proculus (x, 1784 = *ILS* 6334); decurion, 187.  
 T. Caesius Bassianus (x, 1786); decurion, 196.  
 L. Calpurnius (x, 1613); IIvir (?), Augustan Age (cf. x, 1797).  
 Calp[urnius] Pistus (x, 1784); decurion, 187.  
 [C]assius L.f. Cerealis; IIvir quinquennalis, late Julio-Claudian period: J. H. D'Arms, 'Tac., *Ann.* 13.48 and a new inscription from Puteoli', *The Ancient Historian and his Materials*, cit. n. 70 above.  
 Ti. Castricius (x, 1781); decurion, 105 B.C.  
 Cl[audiu]s Priscus (x, 1784 = *ILS* 6334); decurion, 187.  
 Ti. Claudius Quartinus (x, 1782, 1783); IIvir, late second century.  
 A. Clodius Maximus (x, 1783); decurion, late second century.  
 L. Clodius Rufus (*RAAN* N.S. xlvi (1971), 176-77); IIvir, 55.  
 N. Cluvius M' f. (x, 1572, 73 = *ILLRP*, 561); magistrate, Sullan period.  
 N. Coss[ut]ius Priscus (*RAAN* N.S. xlvi (1971), 187, on which see n. 39 above); IIvir, 52.  
 Cossutius Rufinus (x, 1784 = *ILS* 6334); decurion, 187.  
 Curtius Crispinus (x, 1784 = *ILS* 6334); *omnibus honoribus functus*, late second century.  
 M. Fabius Firmus (x, 1783); decurion, late second century.  
 M. Falcidius M.f. Hypatianus (vi, 1944 = *ILS* 1934); *adlectus in ordinem* early empire (?).  
 C. Fictorius Firmus (x, 1799); IIvir, early empire (?).  
 Q. Fufcius Q.f. (x, 1781); decurion, 105 B.C.  
 N. Fufidius N.f. (x, 1781); IIvir, 105 B.C.  
 M. Gavius Puteolanus (x, 1784 = *ILS* 6334; x, 1785 = *ILS* 6333); *omnibus honoribus functus*; IIvir before 187.  
 C. Granius C.f. (x, 1781); decurion, 105 B.C.  
 L. Granius Probus (*RAAN* N.S. xlv (1970), 212); IIvir, 35.  
 Q. Granius Atticus (x, 1783); decurion, late second century.  
 Granius Longinus (x, 1782); decurion, late second century.  
 Cn. Haius Pudens (x, 1786); decurion, 196.  
 T. Hordeonius Secundus Valentinus (x, 1786); decurion, 196.  
 [Horde?]onius Musculus (x, 1806); IIvir bis, tert. quinquennalis, *flamen Divi Augusti*, reign of Tiberius (?).  
 Iulius Iulianus (*AJA* lxxvii (1973), 161-62); office is uncertain, but he was honoured by the local senate in 113.  
 Iulius Capretanus (x, 1782); decurion, late second century.  
 C. Julius C.f. Puteolanus (x, 1804 = *ILS* 8236); *adlectus in ordinem*, late Julio-Claudian period(?).  
 M. Laelius Atimetus (x, 1783); decurion, late second century.  
 P. Manlius Egnatius Laurinus (x, 1784 = *ILS* 6334); IIvir, 187.  
 Marius Sedatus (*Eph. Epigr.* viii, 372); augur, second century (?).  
 N. Naevius N.f. Vitulus (x, 1807); decurion, late Julio-Claudian period.  
 M. Nemonius M.f. Eutychnianus (x, 1576 = *ILS* 4326); *adlectus in ordinem*, aedile, reign of Antoninus Pius.  
 P. Octavius Rufus (x, 1808, not certainly Puteolan); decurion, early empire.  
 Octavius Agatha (x, 1786); magistracy uncertain; received a statue as *patronus coloniae* in 196.  
 T. Oppius Severus (x, 1782); decurion, late second century.  
 A. Paccius Rufus (x, 1810, surely Puteolan: cf. x, 1739 = *ILS* 1587; x, 6638; see further H. Chantraine, *Freigelassene und Sklaven im Dienst der Römischen Kaiser* (Wiesbaden 1967), 39); IIvir, Julio-Claudian period.  
 Cn. Papirius Sagitta (x, 1786); IIvir, 196.  
 Pollius Felix (Stat., *Silo.* 2, 2, 133); a magistracy during the reign of Nero.  
 M. Pullius (x, 1781); IIvir, 105 B.C.  
 C. Septimius C.f. Libo (x, 1725: his wife's name, Laberia Fusca, strengthens the case for a Puteolan origin, cf. *RBN* 60, 204); aedile, Julio-Claudian period (?).  
 Sittius Satrianus (*Eph. Epigr.* viii, 371); office is unknown; he was voted a *biga* by the local senate, late second century.  
 M. Stlaccius Albinus (x, 1783); decurion, late second century.  
 Cn. Tettius Q.f. (x, 1781); decurion, 105 B.C.  
 Cn. Tett[ius] (x, 1787); honours voted by local senate, late second century.  
 M. Valerius Pudens (x, 1814); IIvir, 161.  
 Veratius A.f. Severianus (x, 3704 = *ILS* 5054; see above, n. 92); *adlectus in ordinem*.  
 Viguettius Liberalis (x, 1782); decurion, late second century.

*fragmentary*

... ius Fronto (x, 1698); late Republican aedile.

... us M<sup>1</sup> f. Celer (unpublished); IIvir, A.D. 12

[Mem?]m<sup>1</sup>us Maximus (x, 1450; N. Degrassi, *Epigraphica* 8 (1946), 40 f.); unknown magistracy, Flavian period.

*ornamenta decurionatus*

Aurelius Symphorus Aug. lib. (x, 1727 = *ILS* 1678); late second century.

L. Aurelius Aug. lib. Pylades (*Eph. Epigr.* viii, 369 = *ILS* 5186); time of Commodus.