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I Introduction

1. Study Material

Conditions prevailing in the Roman brick industry (in the city of Rome itself) during the early Empire are the theme of this study. A study of this kind is made possible by the preservation of a coherent set of evidence: the stamps which were impressed on bricks before firing. These stamps provide the only opportunity of examining the Roman brick industry, and any study of this subject becomes—in practice if not in principle—an interpretation of Roman brick stamps.

These stamps have long been available in printed form to students. The main collections are Heinrich Dressel’s *CIL XV, 1* of 1891 and Herbert Bloch’s *Supplement to Vol XV, 1 of the CIL, 1947.* Stamps not published in these collections, but forming part of my material, are further to be found in *CIL XIV Supplementum* I (No. 5308). The indexes made by Bloch for these three collections are an indispensable aid in dealing with the subject-matter.

The original brick stamps were the starting point for my studies, however. At Institutum Romanum Finlandiae I was part of a group directed by Professor Jaakko Suolahti which made an inventory for publication of brick stamps found in excavations at Ostia. We examined the stamped bricks found in early excavations and stored in the Castello of Ostia, the bricks stored in the Horrea Epagathiana within the ancient city, and some stores of smaller size; also brought for our inspection were bricks from excavations still in progress. Almost 9,000 stamped bricks were studied by us; there were some 1200 different stamps, which account for over 1/3 of the brick stamps discovered in the region of Rome and on the coast of Latium. They included some hitherto unpublished stamps, but these did not add greatly to the material. From the control of material standpoint, however, the work done at Ostia was important, for it is difficult to obtain a clear understanding of such material from publications alone.

Chronologically I have confined myself to the first two centuries. The composition of the material is the reason for this. Brick stamps are divided into two clearly distinguishable time groups. The last stamps of the earlier group are from the reign of Caracalla, and the first of the later group from the time of Diocletian; between these lies a blank period of several decades without any datable stamps. The earlier group, which will be examined in this study, is by far the greater, comprising
almost 10 times as many stamps as the later group. In themselves both groups are very coherent entities, but great differences are found between them: in the later, for instance, names of persons are almost entirely absent, as are the words 'figilinae' and 'praedia'. It is clearly apparent that during the third century a great change occurred in the organization of brick production, part of the same process which affected economic life as a whole in the Empire of that time. It would be interesting to study how the transition of the third century is reflected in Roman brick stamps, but this would require a precise analysis of stamps preceding and following the transition, and a comparison of results. In my view this is too far-reaching a task, and I have therefore confined myself to the earlier period.

Remaining outside the study, accordingly, is CIL XV, 1, caput iv 'lateres urbani aetatis Diocletianae et posterioris' (CIL 1540–1731; S. 597–615). Because the object of study is the brick industry, pars ii 'dolia, pelves, arcae' (CIL 2416–2557; S. 467–567) was also excluded from the material. And because the subject, to be precise, is the brick industry whose products were used for construction of the urban district of Rome, in particular Rome itself and the ports of Ostia and Portus, I have omitted stamps which are not encountered in the urban district but only in the bordering areas of the Campagna Romana. Omitted on these grounds are the sections of CIL XV, 1 'lateres Tusculani, Albani, Lanuvini', 'lateres Praenestini' and 'lateres Tiburtini' (CIL 2224–2395; S. 445–459), and also 'lateres externae originis' (CIL 2396–2415; S. 460–466).

Remaining are the CIL XV, 1 sections 'lateres urbani aetatis melioris' (CIL 9–1539; S. 3–408, 568–596), 'lateres Ostienses et reliqui litoris suburbani' (CIL 2156–2223; S. 409–444), and the stamps which actually exist from section 'lateres urbani fracti vel male excepti' (CIL 1732–2155). Also included are the CIL XIV S I stamps which are missing from CIL XV and its Supplement, and the new stamps found at Ostia.

Some difficulty has been caused by the tendency of many stamps to appear in several variants. Dressel in CIL marks the variants known to him with the letters a, b, c etc. I have included only one variant of each stamp in my set, where one unit may therefore represent several variants. Because Dressel and Bloch are not always consistent in their division of stamps into 'independent' and variants I have here and there departed from their practice, usually by treating certain stamps as variants of the same stamp which Dressel and Bloch have treated as independent. I define a variant as follows: Stamps whose texts express the same matters in the same words are variants of the same stamp. Thus two stamps which differ only in shape, in form of writing (abbreviations and ligatures), or in signum are variants of the same stamp.

The set of stamps defined in this way contains 1815 stamps. These stamps form the basis of my calculations. In Chapter IV, where the subject-matter of stamp-texts is examined, and to some extent elsewhere, the figures showing the division of the whole body of stamps were thus obtained by calculating from this set of stamps.
2. Description of Brick Stamps

Brick stamp texts are sparingly worded and contain more abbreviations than are usual in inscriptions. This complicates understanding and interpretation of the text, but this is counterbalanced by the stereotyped character of the subject-matter and the tendency of the same word to appear shortened in one stamp and more complete in another. Many difficulties are removed by comparison.

Texts vary a good deal in length, which is due partly to the development of stamps in the course of time. Stamps with little text are earlier on the average than those with much. The form of stamps and the composition of texts also changed with time, and a certain regularity is noticeable in the changes.

In Chapter IV I examine the form and content of stamp texts historically. By means of the following stamp I shall present the components of texts: this stamp is chosen as a specimen because its text is as complete as possible: it is not, in fact, a typical brick stamp text.

EX·PR·M·A·V·OFFIC ANNI ZOS FIG
CERM·PONT·ET ACIL  a. 135
COS
CIL 245
ex praeda M. Anni Verus, (ex) officina Anni Zosimi, (ex) figlinis Cermanianis (?);
Pontiano et A(t)iliano consulibus

The text contains two names of persons and their head words 'praedia' and 'officina', the word 'figlinae' with a qualifying proper adjective, and a consular date. The preposition ex at the opening shows that the text describes the situation prevailing in brick production, and does not refer, for instance, to the use of bricks at a construction place. The stamp declares in whose praedia, whose officina, in which figlinae and at what date the brick was made. Many stamps carry a word signifying the brick itself, e.g. 'opus doliare'; it is missing from this stamp, as from many others.

When the organization of brick production is examined, the names of persons appearing in texts are important. The specimen stamp above contains two names (if names of consuls are disregarded). I call such a stamp binominal and its persons dominus (= dominus praediorum) and officinator. The specimen stamp dominus is M. Annius Verus and the officinator Annius Zosimus. There are 650 binominal stamps (from a total of 1815), the others having one name of person or none at all.

The earliest stamp with a consular date is from the year 110 (CIL 18) and the latest from 164 (CIL 1369). A consular date appears on 398 stamps. Its manner of
appearance is highly inconsistent: more than half the dated stamps (207) carry the names of consuls for the year 123, next in order of frequency is the year 134 (39 stamps), and the remainder are divided unevenly over the other years. Building historians in particular have given much reflexion to the purpose of dating bricks, but a satisfying explanation has not been found. Brick stamps with consular dates have been met with elsewhere in Italy, indicating that this dating is not a special Roman feature like the words ‘praedia’ and ‘figlinae’ and the mention of two persons.

Some stamps bear the greeting ‘valeat qui fecit’.

Stamps are usually round in shape, with a raised pattern (signum) in the centre, which seems, in some cases at least, to have an informative function. The present study will make no attempt to elucidate this possible information.

3. Dating of Brick Stamps

One reason for the source value of brick stamps is that they can be dated more precisely than inscriptions in general; they interest building historians for this feature only. Dating methods can be divided in two groups: some are based on the characteristics and subject-matter of stamps, others on the fact that the stamps are on bricks that have been used as building material.

Internal dating criteria, the consular dates and persons known from other sources (of whom there are many among the domini of brick stamps) are certainly the most reliable and leave least room for interpretation. The chronology of stamps has improved with the increasing knowledge of prosopography and the fasti consulares of the early Empire. The period 120–150 is on the whole the best documented for brick stamp chronology. The earlier or later from that time one proceeds, the more uncertain and inexact the chronology becomes.

Dressel evolved a more general system of dating for his publication. He started from the observation that clearly differing stamp types existed, and assumed that stamps of different type had been used at different times. In order to find out how matters had proceeded he collected as many stamps as possible that could be dated by means of the above-mentioned internal criteria; the main body of stamps which could be certainly dated on the basis of names of persons appearing in them was composed of the stamps of gens Domitia. From this material Dressel drew up a chronology of stamp types which was suited to general application, and by this means dated the stamps of CIL XV, 1. The criteria generally used by Dressel, apart from consular dates and names of well-known persons, are ‘‘sigillorum forma atque litteratura’’.

The place of discovery of a brick gives a possibility of external dating also. Bricks found in a building can be dated if the time of construction is known. For brick stamps this time is in principle merely a terminus ante quem, because old
Bricks might have been used in construction; on the other hand the construction time need not be even terminus ante quem, because the bricks may have originated from later repairs. Secondly: if certain stamps often occur together in the same buildings they must be regarded as contemporaneous or nearly so.

Dating criteria for buildings contain many factors of uncertainty. The history of early Imperial buildings went through many phases. After the repairs, demolitions and re-use of material which occurred in antiquity buildings became mines of material and, from the 18th century onward, archaeologists have moved this material from place to place. A place in which brick is found by excavation today is by no means always the place where it was originally left. However, the greater the number of observations referring to stamped bricks found in situ in buildings, the more reliable the datings on building-historical grounds may be considered to be. Bloch in particular has emphasized the importance of dating from the history of buildings.  

Literary and archaeological sources place the terminus post quem for all brick stamp material in Rome somewhere in the Augustan period. Dressel – who is followed by other literature on the subject – believed that brick stamping ceased in the Roman region at the beginning of the third century, to be resumed under Diocletian. The basis for this assumption is that internal criteria pointing to the third century are missing from the stamps. There are no consular dates after 164, and the last well-known person to be mentioned in early stamps is the Emperor Caracalla. Absence of criteria, however, does not necessarily mean absence of stamps. 'Timeless' stamps with the name of a person only may belong to any period after terminus post quem; to the 'empty period' of the third century may also belong the stamps in which the only person mentioned is the Emperor without an individual name.  

4. The Study of Brick Stamps

Brick stamps have been a source of interest to students for two main reasons: they enable gaps to be filled in the prosopography of the early Empire and the chronology of buildings in the area of Rome to be explained.

From the mid-16th century onward collections of stamps have been published. The most important before the appearance of CIL XV was the collection of Gaetano Marini, which was completed in manuscript during the 1790s but printed only in 1884. It contained some 1500 stamps. In these old publications research was contained in commentaries for each stamp. Names of well-known persons occurring in stamps were the object of special interest. Among the domini appearing in stamps are all Emperors from Trajan to Caracalla, also several members of Imperial families, senators and knights. Efforts were made to identify these persons by comparing brick stamps with other sources. Also explained was the time at
which the pairs of consuls mentioned in stamps were in office.\textsuperscript{12}

Dressel's work \textit{Untersuchungen über die Chronologie der Ziegelstempel der gens Domitia}, in which he developed his method of dating brick stamps, appeared in 1886. Systematic excavations were then in progress in the Roman area, and it was hoped that brick stamps would provide help in the dating of buildings. Archaeologists and historians of buildings wished to know how precisely the buildings excavated could be dated by means of brick stamps. There was disagreement in particular on the significance of the consular dates: is the year marked on the stamp the year the brick was made, or does a dating mean something else? Bloch's work \textit{I bolli laterizi e la storia edilizia romana} (henceforth abbreviated to \textit{BL}) deals with these questions. Bloch's conclusion was that the year declared on the stamp is the year when the stamp was impressed on the brick, and that buildings can be dated very reliably with the aid of brick stamps.\textsuperscript{13}

Giuseppe Cozzo's work \textit{Una industria nella Roma imperiale} contains a fresh viewpoint: he uses brick stamps to study the brick industry itself and the persons employed by it. Cozzo interpreted the \textit{signa} of stamps as religious symbols, and on this basis drew conclusions on the spread of mystery cults to the capital city; on the same basis he explained the regularity which was observed in the evolution of the form of the stamp. He also proposed far-reaching corrections in the chronology of brick stamps, but after Bloch's critique the chronology of Dressel is again generally accepted.\textsuperscript{14}

A major contribution to the study of Roman brick stamps will be made by the members of the above-mentioned group. Studies on the following topics are in preparation: location of the \textit{figlinae} mentioned in Roman brick stamps by Tauno Huotari; Imperial persons as \textit{domini} in brick stamps by Jussi Kuusamäki; terminology by Mirja Lahtinen; private \textit{domini} by Päivi Setälä; palaeography by Hannele Soini; \textit{signa} of the stamps by Margareta Steinby; brick stamps of the Late Empire by Professor Suolahti; results of mineralogical analysis of ancient Roman bricks by Hannu Appelqvist. – Two studies of brick stamps by Margareta Steinby will appear shortly: \textit{Ziegelstempel von Rom und Umgebung} in \textit{RE Suppl.} XV, and \textit{Cronologia dei bolli laterizi romani} in \textit{Bullettino comunale}.

5. The Problem

My starting point is the conviction that brick stamps contain information on the Roman brick industry and persons working in it. No special study of brick stamps has been written from the standpoint of economic history. The reason may be that the indexes of \textit{CIL XV}, I appeared only in 1948, and before then it was difficult to obtain an adequate knowledge of brick stamps without long scrutiny of the \textit{Corpus}.

General works on the economic history of Rome, however, contain conclusions drawn from brick stamps.\textsuperscript{15} The picture given of the organization of brick produc-
tion and its development is as follows: At first the industry was in the hands of small enterprisers, but from the early second century onward great capitalist interests appeared, members of the senatorial and equestrian orders. Among the new enterprisers was the Emperor himself. During the second century his share of total production grew steadily, until during the time of the Severi the brick industry had become in practice an Imperial monopoly. The considerable part played by members of the senatorial order—senators were not normally concerned in business life as enterprisers—is explained by the fact that the brick industry was regarded as part of agriculture, which was an appropriate senator's livelihood.

The main part of my study, Chapter IV, is an analysis of brick stamp texts, criticism of the sources from the historian's standpoint; my aim is to find out what is said in the stamp texts and, consequently, what conclusions can be drawn from the stamps. I then examine the relation between the persons of the stamps, dominus and officinator, and the relation of these persons to the brick industry.

The source value of brick stamps—and stamps of other commodities—is affected by their mechanical reproduction. Several copies of the same stamp exist. The representativeness of brick stamps must be estimated in a different way from that of "normal" inscriptions. Now that Roman brick stamps have been collected and published for 400 years there are good grounds for assuming that almost all stamps which were used in their time are known, whereas, for instance, the student of epitaphs must start with the knowledge that only a fraction of the epitaphs originally composed are at his disposal. The student of brick stamps, unlike the student of epitaphs, need not consider what proportion of the original material has survived and what has vanished. Thus in research of philological type, when applied to brick stamps, the material is largely complete; time has not reduced the material in such a manner as to distort the internal relations it originally possessed. Matters are different, however, when the reality is examined of which brick stamps form part. Did all producers stamp their bricks? How large a proportion of bricks were stamped? If not all producers stamped their bricks, what was the character of producers who did so? If we knew the correct answers to these questions we should be able to estimate how the Roman brick industry is reflected in Roman brick stamps. But we do not know the answers: the stamps are not so stereotyped as to enable us to say why the bricks were stamped and for whom the message of the stamp was intended. For this reason conclusions reached on the evidence of brick stamps must be treated with reserve.
Notes to Chapter I

1 Bloch’s *Supplement* does not attempt the same completeness as *CIL* XV: it omits the provenance of stamps and the numbers of exemplars discovered, for instance. Bloch states his purpose as follows in the Preface to the *Supplement*: ‘‘It must be strongly emphasized that this Supplement to *CIL* XV, 1 does not settle the question of a new edition; that its purpose is only to gather, for the time being, all brick-stamps not published in *CIL* XV, 1 into a usable system.’’ (*Suppl.* p. 4)

2 The results of the work of Professor Suolahti’s group are forthcoming as Vol. VII: *Lateres signati Ostienses* of *Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae*.

3 In referring to *CIL* XV numbers I use the abbreviation CIL before the number without the number of volume; the letter S. before the number of the stamp signifies Bloch’s *Supplement to Vol. XV, 1 of the CIL*... The *CIL* XV table of contents is *Suppl.* p. 125–127.

4 In *CIL* XV Dressel counts as non-urban the stamps encountered only in a limited border area of the Campagna Romana, e.g. in Palestrina (‘‘*lateres Praenestini*’’) or Tivoli (‘‘*lateres Tiburtini*’’). The section ‘‘*lateres urbani*’’ includes stamps found either in Rome only or in Rome and elsewhere.

5 This section contains: 1) Stamps seen and copied by Dressel himself, but ‘‘*Itracti*’’ to such an extent that he was unable to place them in other sections. These are present in the set of stamps used by me. 2) Stamps which are ‘‘*male excepti*’’, mainly stamps previously known and published elsewhere in the *CIL* XV, 1 but so vaguely recorded in the sources that Dressel could not identify them: these are omitted by me.


7 E.g. *CIL* XI 6673.

8 See below, p. 100. In his work *Untersuchungen über die Chronologie der Ziegelstempel der Gens Domitii*, Dressel elucidated the chronology of this group of stamps.

9 See Bloch, *BL* p. 1–2 and 7–9.

10 Absence of stamps also does not necessarily signify absence of bricks. The Aurelian wall, surely the city’s largest separate structure of brick, was built in a period to which no brick stamps have been dated; it is difficult to believe that the wall was built only with materials obtained from the demolition of old buildings.

11 Bloch gives a brief history of brick stamp publications, *BL* p. 3–7; a slightly longer exposition appears at the beginning of Descemet’s work, *CIL* XV, 1. however, omits the survey of manuscripts and publications included in most volumes of *CIL*.

12 The years of two pairs, *Severo et Arriano* and *Italiano et Casto*, are still unknown.

13 See particularly *BL* p. 341 –.

14 Bloch’s critique of Cozzo’s theories are given in *BL*, p. 14–26.
The conclusions to be presented here appear already in Dressel’s paper, *Bull. dell’ Ist.* 1885 p. 103–107; then more fully in Frank’s *Economic History* p. 227–9 and *Economic Survey* p. 207–210 and in Loane’s work p. 101–105. The course of development is most fully presented by Bloch, *BL* p. 334–340. Extensive comments on brick stamps have also been written by Gummerus, *RE* IX, 1460, and Shtaerman, p. 80–82. They have a somewhat different notion of the organization than the first-mentioned writers.

Out of almost 9,000 stamped bricks examined by us at Ostia, for instance, very few were previously unpublished if variants of different degrees are disregarded. Bloch, who examined the Roman excavations more widely than we, made similar observations. See *Suppl.* p. 94.
II Pre-conditions for the Brick Industry

1. Use of Brick as Building Material

From the work of Vitruvius and the results of archaeological research we know with fair accuracy when brick was first used as building material in Rome. Vitruvius, who wrote his work in the time of Augustus and worked as an engineer in Rome during the periods of Caesar and Augustus, is certainly aware of the employment of fired brick, but his exposition makes clear that Roman builders were not yet using it at the time he wrote. The material for great public buildings was concrete and the stone species of the Roman region, particularly tufa. The framework was made of these, and for facing purposes tufa, travertine and marble were utilized. Vitruvius speaks of building materials in the second book of his work. He devotes a chapter to each of the following: sun-dried brick (lateres), sand (harena), limestone (calx), pozzolana, stone (lapis), wood (materies). In Vitruvius the words 'later' and 'latericius' mean sun-dried brick, and he discusses this material extensively (2, 3 and 2, 8, 9-17). For fired ceramic Vitruvius uses the words 'testa' and 'testaceus'. In the chapter on wall structures (2, 8) he mentions only opus incertum and opus reticulatum, but not opus testaceum; the use of testa is mentioned briefly in connection with opus latericium (sun-dried brick) as a building method which cannot be used in the city of Rome (2, 8, 18-19). Only for outer roofs is brick, i.e. tile used regularly.

In the time of Vitruvius most of the Roman building output consisted of insulae, rented houses of many storeys in which the majority of the city's population, possibly a million people already, lived. Sources of the late Republic and early Empire indicate that housing production was subject to the most ruthless speculation. The aim was to build cheaply, and costs were held down by sacrifice of quality. Because land for building was expensive, insulae were built as high as possible. These many-storeyed insulae, cheaply built of poor material, were a positive danger to residents. Collapsing houses seem to have been a common event, and frequent floods of the Tiber may have played a part in it; several great fires are also mentioned.

Nothing has remained of the rented houses of Rome from the end of the Republic. Excavation has produced nothing on which an investigation of building methods and materials might be based. The account of Vitruvius reveals, however, that a great deal of wood was used. Some, at least, of the weight-bearing structures were of concrete. Of wall structures Vitruvius uses the word 'craticii', which may mean that a wooden framework functioned as a support and that it was plastered on the outside. Intermediate floors were of wood.
Vitruvius severely criticises such building practices. He says directly that poor construction is the result of speculators’ lust for profit:

Vitr. 2, 8, 20: craticii vero velim quidem ne inventi essent. quantum enim celeritate et loci laxamento prosunt, tanto maiori et communi sunt calamitati, quod ad incendia uti faces sunt parati. itaque satius esse videtur impensa testaceorum in sumptu quam compendio craticiorum esse in periculo.

Vitruvius condemns the use of craticii. They have their advantages, such as saving of time and space, but their use should be abandoned because of the danger of fire. Vitruvius proposes the replacement of wooden structures by brick (testacea). He notes that this would increase building costs, but demands that builders give up part of their profit for the public good.

Vitruvius, in fact, demands that the public good be considered in building. He was certainly not alone in this. The stabilization of conditions in Rome and throughout the Empire at the end of the civil wars must have been a decisive turning point here. One of the chief aims of the peaceful activities undertaken by Augustus was the transformation of Rome into a capital worthy of an empire. We know that on the initiative of Augustus a water supply system was organized for Rome (curator aquarum and his subordinates), also a fire service (cohortes vigilum) and a staff whose duties included protection of the city from Tiber floods (curatores riparum et alvei Tiberis). The innovations brought about by Augustus and his followers were not confined to great public constructions: norms were also set for private building work.

Building statutes of the first Emperors have been preserved. Augustus directed, for instance, that no building in the city should be more than 21 metres high; Trajan reduced this to 18 metres. In no statute known to us is building material spoken of, but here too the Emperors must have imposed certain minimum standards. Presumably the adoption of fired brick is connected with the regulative influence of the Emperors on private building.

Vitruvius does not consider the stone near Rome particularly suitable as building material. In the seventh chapter of his second book he enumerates the bad qualities of these stone types. Speaking of the lapidicinae Anicianae stone from south of Lake Bolsena, which was too far from Rome to be worth bringing there, he says: "Quae si prope urbem essent, dignum esset, ut ex his officinis omnia opera perficerentur." The poor quality of the building stone most easily available may explain the fact that brick soon became prevalent when once its use had been adopted. Clay suitable as a raw material for bricks is of such common occurrence in surface soil that it was possible to site brickworks in places favourable for transport purposes, which in the Roman region meant along the Tiber and its tributaries. The replacement of stone with brick thus reduced the cost of transport.

Vitruvius appears to have considered the use of fired brick expensive. This is seen from the extract above, and the same is apparent from the following
words discussing the material to be used for a city wall:

Vitr. 1. 5. 8: non enim, uti Babylone abundantes liquido bitumine pro calce et harena
ex cocto latere factum habent murum, sic item possunt omnes regiones seu locorum
proprietas habere tantas eiusdem generis utilitatis, uti ex his comparationibus ad
aeternitatem perfectus habeatur sine vitio murus.

Vitruvius holds the theory here that in every locality the "natural" building materials found on the spot should be used; fired brick was not a "natural" building material in Rome. Three hundred years later, however, the city wall was built of fired bricks joined with mortar made of limestone and sand; evidently the organized production of bricks and mortar had developed in the Roman area by then to such an extent that these materials had become cheaper to use than "natural" materials of the locality.

Ostia is a splendid monument of Roman architecture in brick.13 The buildings of this city indicate how the use of brick spread during the first century. Development in Rome was undoubtedly the same as in Ostia, but in Rome less material for observation has survived. In the words of Rostovtzeff, Ostia was "a Rome in miniature".14

The use of brick increased throughout the first century and reached its maximum extent in the second, when brick, with concrete, was the building material most in use. One reference by Vitruvius shows that in his time already pieces of ceramic objects such as roof tiles (tile had long been used for outer roofs) and amphorae were used in place of tufa for the facing of concrete walls.15 Brick first came into general use for this facing purpose, but later it displaced other materials in more vital constructions. It is visible at Ostia that weight-bearing structures such as columns and pillars supporting roofs were made of brick; it was also used for floors and for the pavements of streets and courtyards. "The most impressive features of Roman building, the arch and the vault, are associated with this material", as Frank Granger says in his Introduction to the Loeb edition of Vitruvius.

2. Demand for Bricks and Market Structure

We do not know the precise location of the brickworks which marked their products with Roman brick stamps. The distribution of the stamps leads us to conclude that the works were within suitable transport range of the city of Rome. Rome with its surroundings formed a natural market area. It is truly surprising that the builders of coastal cities in north Africa, present-day Tunisia and western Libya, also used bricks made in the area of Rome.18 I do not know whether brick was used as much in Carthage, for instance, as in Ostia – probably not – but in any case this export is a fact to be noted when the total output of the Roman brick industry is estimated.
The market area thus included the urban centres of Rome, Ostia and Portus, also Carthage at a greater distance. There have been many attempts to estimate the population of Rome, but results have varied widely.\textsuperscript{17} The figure was greatest toward the end of the second century – so much is unanimously agreed. Picard's calculations put the population at over a million at the beginning of the Empire, while Kirsten reaches a figure less than a million. Literary sources indicate that in the third century Carthage was the second largest city of the Empire,\textsuperscript{18} with a population of some 300,000 at its height, according to Picard.\textsuperscript{19} Frank puts the second century population of Ostia at 100,000, Ostia then being considered an extensive area which evidently included Portus; estimates of the population in the area bounded by the walls of Ostia vary between 21,000 and 58,000.\textsuperscript{20}

City populations increased vigorously in the first and second centuries. Kirsten estimates the combined population of Rome and Ostia at the death of Augustus as some 500,000, and 150 years later as double that figure.\textsuperscript{21} Carthage did not begin to flourish again until the time of Augustus, when a colony was founded there and the right to practise trade was given back to the citizens.\textsuperscript{22} The development of Ostia into a great city began after the harbour of Claudius was completed.

The population of the market area and its development does not yet tell us much regarding brick production; it would be necessary also to know the density of living conditions and the extent to which brick was used compared with other building materials. Density was certainly great, but brick was a highly favoured building material.

The above information leads us to conclude that brick production in the Roman region was very large even by modern standards. Demand and output grew until the second century. Growth was due partly to advancing urbanization and population increase, and partly to the increasing use of brick instead of other materials.

Something may also be said of the distribution of total demand between builders, though information is scanty in the extreme. The Emperor was the biggest builder, but the share of public building should not be overestimated. The monumental public constructions are best known to us because of literature and excavations, but private building as a whole was undoubtedly greater in extent. Surviving lists from the 4th century tell us that in Rome there were 46,602 insulae and 1790 domus.\textsuperscript{23} These houses were privately owned, and it must be presumed that private builders erected them.\textsuperscript{24} Public construction work was also frequently assigned to private contractors during the Empire as in Republican times.\textsuperscript{25}

What was said above on the structure of the Roman brick market on the demand side is mainly speculation, since the sources are silent. On the supply side, however, and on connections between producers and builders there is more reliable information available thanks to brick stamps. If we assume, with Bloch, that the frequent occurrence of the consular date of the year 123 signifies a stamping of bricks in that year by almost all producers appearing in the market of Rome,\textsuperscript{26} then the stamps of 123 serve as a cross-section of brick production. In stamps for that year there appear 54 domini, which means that production units were functioning on the estates of at least 54 landowners; because many of the domini owned land on...
a large scale, several independent units may have been located on lands belonging
to the same dominus. In the year 123, therefore, more than 54 producers appeared
in the brick market of Rome.

To judge by places of discovery of stamped bricks, brick producers and users
were not in direct contact: between them there existed a complex system of
transport and marketing. Facts suggesting this are: 1) the same building always
yields several different stamps from several producers; 2) the same stamp may
appear in several buildings far from each other (e.g. Rome, Ostia and Carthage).27

We may assume that transport was mainly by water, and that transport and brick
storage in Rome and other centres of building activity was not in the same hands as
brick production or utilization.28

There were, then, several producers of bricks and several users located far from
each other and with an independent distribution system existing between them.
This seems like a modern market structure. But in conditions prevailing in the
urban area of Rome it is impossible to imagine builders themselves manufacturing
the bricks they needed, bricks produced and utilized within the same economic unit;
the oft-quoted words at the table of Trimalchio, "omnia domi nascentur" (Petr.
Sat. 38), are not applicable to the units which operated in the Roman brick market.

Notes to Chapter II

1 The version of Vitruvius' work which has come down to us appeared in 16–15 B.C.
Parts of it, or possibly a condensed version had appeared before 27 B.C., to judge mainly
by the fact that the name Augustus is not used for Octavianus. Homo, p. 5.

2 Lugli on p. 48–49 has a short exposition of building methods.

3 Augustus used the word 'latericius' in the same sense in his well-known statement,
of which Suetonius relates: "Urbem neque pro maiestate imperii ornatam et
inundationibus incendiisque obnoxiam excoluit adeo, ut iure sit gloriatm marmorem sa

4 Brunt calculates that the population of Rome at the end of the Republic was about
750,000; this estimate is based on data which have been preserved regarding the number

5 Salvioli, p. 54–.

6 Serious Tiber floods are mentioned for the years 54, 44, 27, 23, 22, 13 B.C., A.D.
5, 12, 15, see le Gall p. 29. Dio mentions great fires for the year 16, 14, 12, 7 B.C.,

7 Lugli p. 44. – Vitruvius discusses the use of wood, Book 2, Chapter 9. Strabon, who
also wrote in the time of Augustus, stresses the importance of obtaining building wood
and stone for the development of Rome, Strabon 5, 3, 7.
8 Lugli p. 531– and Homo p. 571.

9 Homo p. 571.

10 Such a connection is suggested by Boethius, Eranos 1941, p. 154.

11 Vitru. 2, 7, 1–3.

12 Vitru. 2, 7, 4. The poor opinion held by Vitruvius of the stone quarried near Rome is apparent from his advice to builders (2, 7, 5), which begins with the following sentence: "cum ergo propter propinquitatem necessitas cogat ex Rubris lapidicinis et Pallensibus et quae sunt urbi proximae copiis uti, si qui voluerit sine vitii perficere, ita erit praeparandum."

13 For the use of brick in Ostia see Italo Gismondi in the work Scavi di Ostia I, p. 192–208 and Boethius, Stadtbehyggelse, especially p. 8, 25 and 38.

14 Rostovtzeff II, p. 568 n. 56.

15 Vitru. 2, 8, 18. See also Lugli, p. 593 and 661.

16 Roman brick stamps discovered in north Africa were last published in the Corpus in 1900, CIL VIII S 3, 22632; see also Picard p. 87- (esp. Note 100). Brick stamps encountered in north African excavations are almost all Roman. I have been unable to examine how common the use of brick was in north Africa. The following instance shows that at least in some cases Roman bricks were used systematically: AE 1967 No. 538: in excavations at a Roman villa in Tagiura, 29 km east of Tripoli, 65 stamped bricks were found, incl. 6 different stamps; all were Roman, and 5 can be dated midway in the decade of 150.


18 Herodian 7, 6, 1; see also Picard p. 170.

19 Picard p. 176.

20 Frank, Survey p. 237; Duncan–Jones p. 276, Note 7.


22 Picard, p. 176.

23 Lehmann–Hartleben RE III A p. 2071; Calza p. 60–63. The meaning of the word 'insula' in 4th century sources has been under dispute; Calza shows in his article that 'insula' = 'rented house'.

24 This is Loane’s opinion, p. 79–83 (esp. Note 77).

25 Loane p. 83.

26 Bloch, BL p. 321 and 324; Bloch 1959.

27 The best means of studying the diffusion of brick stamps are still the provenance lists of CIL XV, 1. The diversity of brick stamp material in buildings is made clearly evident in Bloch’s lists in BL and in Scavi di Ostia I.

28 Stamping of bricks was possibly connected with this transport and marketing system.
III Nomenclature and Social Status of Persons in Brick Stamps

In this chapter I shall examine the persons mentioned in brick stamps as a group and elucidate the social composition of this group as far as possible. The categories I shall use are: slaves, freedmen and freeborn. From the last-mentioned I further isolate the "higher orders" of senators and knights. In this division, therefore, a person belongs to the social category indicated by his position under law; students of Roman social history have generally operated with these categories.

Data regarding the nomenclature of brick stamps are taken from Bloch's indexes I (nomina virorum et mulierum), II (cognomina virorum et mulierum) and III (imperatores et domus eorum). Included are all persons appearing in the stamps of CIL XV, I and the Supplement (except consuls mentioned in the consular dates). Because Bloch has not separated domini and officinatores in his indexes I have been unable to take adequate account of this important division.

1. Domini

Even a cursory examination shows that the domini appearing in brick stamps are, on the average, from very high levels of society. The persons we know both from brick stamps and from other sources belong to the group domini. They include all Emperors from Trajan to Caracalla, the Empresses Domitia Domitiani, Plotina, Sabina and both Faustinae, also other members of Imperial families: Matidia (mother-in-law of Hadrian), Arria Fadilla (mother of Antoninus Pius), Iulia Lupula (sister of Antoninus Pius), Domitia P.f. Lucilla (mother of Marcus Aurelius) and Annia Faustina (sister of Marcus Aurelius). 54 further identified senators and 7 knights are included. Domini total 150 if Emperors are omitted.

Second century senators are known chiefly from inscriptions on monuments erected in honour of officials. For this reason women of the senatorial order are less known than men. To judge by their names, the women mentioned in brick stamps may include otherwise unknown members of the senatorial order. Examples are Plotia Isaurica, Flavia Seia Isaurica, Aelia Severa, Iulia Albana, Antonia
Manliola, Memmia L.f. Macrina, Valeria Polla. These all appear in stamps as domini.

Another special feature of domini as a group is, in fact, the large number of women. 100 women are mentioned in brick stamps, including 43 domini and 20 officinatores; the remainder are found in stamps where one person only appears and this person cannot be classified as dominus nor as officinator. Among the group of officinatores, 355 persons in all, there is only one certain member of the higher orders: the officinator of stamp CIL 526 announces himself as eq(ues)Romanus. This indicates a clear social difference between domini and officinatores.

2. Total Number of Persons. Free and Slaves

For the most part the names of persons in brick stamps are those of free Roman citizens; that is to say, most contain a nomen gentilicum. The tria nomina type with praenomen + nomen + cognomen, and the duo nomina type with nomen + cognomen are about equally common; on the other hand the praenomen + nomen type is rare, which is consistent with the fact that the stamps are generally later than Augustus. The tribus is missing almost entirely. Filiation is hardly encountered among the names of freeborn men. In the first century stamps it appears quite commonly in the names of freedmen ('libertination') and women, but in the second only in the names of a few women domini and freedmen of the Emperor. If the forms of names occurring in brick stamps are compared with the official forms, the lack of filiation in brick stamps is the clearest difference. In second century epitaphs it is still fairly common. This omission, we may be sure, is due mainly to shortage of space, but the unofficial nature of brick stamps may also have been responsible.

1325 persons are mentioned by name in brick stamps. This number is made up of all cases which Bloch considers to be personal names; owing to the widespread use of abbreviations not all cases are certain. There are 1076 names which include the nomen gentilicum, and 249 unaccompanied cognomina. The absence of gentilicum is not incontrovertible evidence that the person is a slave. In the following cases this can be proved by comparison of stamps: Proculus (stamp S. 32) = Pettius Proculus (CIL 90, 95); Ingenua (CIL 205) = Sabinia Ingenua (CIL 203); Fortunatus (CIL 297) = T. Travius Fortunatus (CIL 297); Fyrmus (S. 175) = P. Servullus Firmus of Fyrmus (CIL 232-3, S. 178 etc); Magnio (CIL 943-4) = Caetennius Magnio (CIL 942, 1203, S. 568); Rufinus (CIL 2174) = Domitius Rufinus (CIL 2173, 2204). These persons are officinatores in brick stamps. Of well-known senators and knights appearing as domini the cognomen is more commonly used alone.

Since the use of gentilicum was so common, however, its omission from the name of a free person was obviously exceptional. In late stamps it is more likely than in early stamps that the cognomen used alone stands for a free peson.
19 % of all names are unaccompanied cognomina, so that somewhat less than 19 % of the persons concerned are slaves.

The total number of persons mentioned gives reason for reflection on the representativeness of brick stamps. The number of persons who worked in Roman brick production over nearly 200 years must have been many times greater than 1325, the number of persons mentioned in stamps. In what manner do the persons appearing in stamps represent those who worked in Roman brick production? I have expressed the opinion earlier that almost all stamps which have been in use are known to us. If this is correct, the small number of persons cannot be explained by the assertion that only a part of the stamps are known.

Far from all bricks are stamped. Lugli estimates that in the late first century some 10 % of bricks were stamped, and in the time of Hadrian, when stamping was at its most common, 20–50 %. Lugli does not say on what calculations his figures are based; they are evidently a general impression formed by him during decades of archaeological work. The rarity of stamped bricks is generally explained by assuming that each producer stamped only a proportion of his bricks. If this is correct, we can first infer that most producers stamped their bricks; from this and from the small number of persons appearing in stamps it may further be concluded that each person mentioned in stamps represents a large number of persons engaged in production and therefore a large production unit. – A second possibility is that only a part of producers practised stamping, but stamped all their bricks. If this is true, then stamps represent only a proportion of the production units, and we do not know how large; in that case we can conclude nothing as to the size of production units from the total number of persons.

I regard it as highly probable that brick stamping was connected with the following fact: the transport and storage of bricks in Rome and other centres of building activity was not in the charge of producers or users but of organizations quite separate from them. It can be assumed that stamps were used to indicate the brick consignments of each producer during transport and storage. (This was not necessarily the only purpose of stamping.) If this hypothesis is correct, brick stamping was a general practice among producers, especially those who manufactured bricks for urban centres.

3. Freeborn and Freedmen

Because the filiation is missing, free persons cannot be divided into freeborn and freedmen in the same way as all persons were divided into free and slaves. The division can only be based on cognomina.

When a slave was freed he received the praenomen and nomen of his former master as a token of his new status; his old slave name he retained as a cognomen. If we assume – and many scholars start with this assumption – that names of slaves
in general differed from the *cognomina* of the freeborn, then it may be concluded that the free persons whose *cognomen* is a slave name are former slaves. Regarding Latin *cognomina* it has not been possible to make a division into free and slave names. But a Greek *cognomen* in Italy and the western provinces is generally viewed as an indication of unfree origin in its bearer. Because the significance of Greek names too is still a great problem, I shall briefly explain the main points at issue.

Examination of various groups of inscriptions has revealed the two following facts: 1) the proportion of Greek *cognomina* in Latin areas is very large, in central and southern Italy more than half the persons appearing in the material have Greek *cognomina*; 2) parents gave their children a Latin name distinctly more often than a Greek one, regardless of whether they themselves had a Latin or a Greek name. How are these observations to be reconciled? How was the proportion of Greek names able to remain large? The answer given to this question is that persons with Greek *cognomina* were not the descendants of free citizens in Latin-speaking districts.

Frank, from whose studies this discussion started, believed that a Greek name expresses first and foremost an Eastern origin. Because persons arriving in Italy from the east were generally slaves in his view, he considered that a Greek name also signified an unfree origin. Among later scholars Thylander has regarded a Greek name as especially revealing an Eastern origin. He takes the view that the preference for Latin names simply reflects a normal linguistic development, while Greek-speaking arrivals were assimilated into the Latin-speaking native population. Other scholars, such as Lily Ross Taylor and Heikki Solin, have considered a Greek name a sign of unfree origin in particular. In their belief a slave in Rome and throughout Italy was more willingly given a Greek name regardless of his place of origin. Because a Greek name was a sign of unfree origin, free parents did not like to give their children Greek names.

The problem of Greek names cannot yet be considered solved, so that there is not cause to draw far-reaching conclusions from the relation between Greek and Latin *cognomina* occurring in the material. The following tabulation gives figures derived from the names appearing in brick stamps. If the root of a word is Greek but its ending is Latin, I have counted the word as Greek. Geographical and ethnic names I have counted as Latin if they refer to the western part of the Empire, and Greek if they refer to the eastern part. Only those names are included whose Latin, Greek or other linguistic character I have been able to determine. Because words often appear sharply abbreviated in stamps this has not always been possible.
Division of *cognomina* occurring in brick stamps into Latin, Greek and other languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Cases total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Names</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– free</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– slaves</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– all persons</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As slaves I have counted all persons whose name is formed by an unaccompanied *cognomen*.

Attention is aroused in these figures by the large proportion of Latin *cognomina*: 63.4 % of all persons appearing in brick stamps bear a Latin *cognomen*. Kajanto has calculated the same proportion for a part of the epitaphs of the city of Rome, with a result of 41.5 %.13 Thylander’s calculations from inscriptions in the ports of Latium give a result of 47 %.14 The proportion of Latin *cognomina* is distinctly larger in brick stamps than in other inscriptions which were compared.

According to Taylor, Solin etc. it might be concluded from these figures that persons mentioned in brick stamps included a larger proportion of freeborn than those persons whom the materials of Kajanto and Thylander represent. The presence of *domini* partly explains the large proportion of Latin *cognomina* in brick stamps, but not entirely, because when *domini* are removed from the calculations, Latin *cognomina* still account for 60.0 %.

Slaves appearing in brick stamps have Latin names as often as Greek. This is not compatible with the opinion that slaves were generally given Greek names. The explanation may be that among the persons mentioned by *cognomina* alone, whom I have counted here as slaves, there may in fact be many free persons. The material is so small, however, that it is not worth trying to draw further conclusions.

I shall now show the proportions of Latin *cognomina* to be found among the *cognomina* of the three person-categories in brick stamps. These categories are *'domini', 'officinatores'*, and *'others'*, the last being *'those who are neither domini nor officinatores'*. I shall elucidate later on pages 89–91 how these categories are composed.
The proportion of Latin cognomina varies distinctly in the different groups. For officinatores it is much the same as in the material of Kajanto and Thylander, while for domini it is about twice that figure.

We know that the domini of brick stamps usually belonged to the highest level of Roman society. The large proportion of Latin cognomina among domini is evidence in favour of the belief that Latin cognomina were generally used in the highest levels of society. The social difference between domini and officinatores also seems to be clearly reflected in the figures.

Persons belonging to the categories domini and officinatores appear almost exclusively in second century stamps, and these groups can therefore be compared. But members of the "others" group appear on the average in earlier stamps; this group accounts for almost all persons in first century stamps. This time difference may be reflected in the figures.

4. CIL VI, 1, 1815 and the gens Calpetana of Brick Stamps

In his comment on stamp CIL 517 Dressel refers to inscription CIL VI 1815 = ILS 1926; he thinks it possible that the persons mentioned in these inscriptions have a connection with each other. Bloch suggests the same possibility in the index nominum of CIL XV, 1 for C. Calpetanus Livianus. Because the gens Calpetana, on whom the inscription mentioned gives some data, is an officinator family of the greatest importance in Roman brick stamps, and because there is very little information of officinatores apart from that contained in brick stamps, I shall examine the said inscription from this point of view. The inscriptions to be examined will be found on page 28.

The following questions must be studied: 1) In inscriptions 1, 2 and 3 a person named Calpetanus Livianus is mentioned; how likely is it, that the person is the same in all cases? 2) What is the connection of this Calpetanus with other Calpetani mentioned in stamps? 3) What was the social status of Calpetanus Livianus?

Dressel linked inscriptions 1 and 6 together on the ground that in 1 a person appears whose name is C. Calpetanus Glyptus, and in 6 a person whose name is Glypt(us) Calpetanus or-etani). In inscription 1, however, GLYPTVS is merely a conjecture of Gruter which has not been accepted for the CIL VI text, as Dressel mentions. This connection is therefore a very weak one, and is not worth further consideration.
1) *CIL* VI, 1, 1815 = *ILS* 1926

Q FABIVS AFRICANI L CYTISVS
VIATOR QVAESTORIVS AB AERARIO
SCR LIBR TRIBVNICIVS SCR LIBR
QVAESTORIVS TRIVM DECVRIARVM
5 C CALPETANVS C L CRYPHIVS VIATOR
PVLLARIVS PRIOR VIR CVLICINAE
L NVMPIDIVS L L PHILOMELVS SCR LIBR
Q III DECVRIARVM CYTISI
FRATER PIVS ET FIDELIS
10 C PROCVLEIVS C L HERACLEO
CVLICINAE PATER
PROCULEIA STIBAS CVLICINAE MATER

Textual criticism (see *CIL* VI, 4, 32266): Line 5: Mazochius: CLIPTIVS pro CRYPHIVS, Gruter’s conjecture: GLYPTVS. The original inscription was lost in the 16th century.

2) *CIL* X, 2, 8048, 3 = S. 475

_CALPETani pelvis, Pompeii_

CRESCENs
C-CALPETAni
LIVIANI

3) *CIL* X, 2, 8048, 4 = S. 476

_CALPETani pelvis, Pompeii_

CRESCENTIS
C-CALPFAVORIS

4) *CIL* 2422 _pelvis, amphora_

_CALPETani, Rome_

5) *CIL* 901 = S. 243 = S. 473

_CALPETAN dolium, pelvis, brick, Rome_

6) *CIL* 517 _EX-FIG Q-CASS CAECIL-SALAR_

_AGIT-GLYPT-CALP_

_Ex fig.(linis) Q. Cass(ii) Caecilian(i), Salar(ense sc. opus). Agit Glypt(us) Calp(etanus vel -etani)_

The _gentilicum Calpetanus_ is an anus-ending type of late and rare occurrence.15 The first known holder of a name of this type is C. Norbanus, consul in 83 B.C. Other anus-ending _gentilicia_ do not occur in senatorial lists until the Imperial Age.16 Listed in the *Onomasticon of The saurus* are 32 Calpetani, 17 of them in Roman brick stamps. No other _praenomina_ than C. occur for Calpetani in brick stamps.
Known from the first century A.D. is a senatorial *gens Calpetana*, whose members use the *praenomen* C.; other *C. Calpetani* evidently descend from freedmen of this *gens Calpetana*. The known members of the senatorial family are the following:

- *C. Calpetanus C.f. Rantius Quirinalis Valerius P.f. Pomp(tina tribu) Festus*, evidently adopted son of the above, the only representative of this family known from literature. Related to Vitellius and his *legatus* in Africa in 69/70, went over to Vespasian and was *cos. suff.* in 71, *curator riparum et alvei Tiberis* in 73, *legatus* of Titus in Hispania in 79/80, died before 85/86. The senatorial family seems to have died out with the decease of its last known member.

Inscription 1 is obviously that of a family grave, although most of the characteristics of epitaphs are missing. The right-hand column is the original epitaph, the left-hand was added later. Relationships of the persons concerned are as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{C. Proculeius C.l. Heracleo} & \infty & \text{Proculeia Stibas} \\
\text{C. Calpetanus C.l. (1) } & \infty & \text{Livia Divae Aug. l.}\infty & \text{(2) Q Fabius Africani l.} \\
\text{Cryphius} & \text{Culicina} & \text{Cytius} \\
\text{Calpetanus Livianus} & \text{brother of Cytius:} & \text{Plasidiena L.f. Agrestina} \\
\infty & \text{L. Numpidius L.l.} & \text{Philomelus} \\
\end{array}
\]

The most accurate basis for dating is provided by the name of the central personage, *Livia Divae Aug(ustae) liberta* Culicina. *Diva Augusta* is Livia, wife of Augustus. She was pronounced *diva* at the suggestion of Claudius in the year 42. That year is therefore *terminus post quem* for the inscription; in *CIL VI* it is dated to the reign of Tiberius. The name reveals, moreover, that *Culicina* was freed before A.D. 14, because in that year Livia transferred to the Iulii, and those freed by her thereafter received the name Iulius.

The parents of *Culicina* were obviously freed by C. Proculeius, friend and close associate of Augustus. Proculeius was about the age of Augustus; he committed suicide and willed his property to Augustus. From the names of persons we see that Proculeius himself had time to free the parents of *Culicina*, perhaps by the terms of his will; *Culicina* with the other property of Proculeius was transferred to Augustus and from him to Livia. *Culicina* was therefore born before Proculeius died, but we
do not know exactly when he died. From these data it may be deduced that Culicina was born a little before the birth of Christ. By the time the epitaph was composed Calpetanus Livianus, the son of Culicina, must have been a middle-aged man, 40 years at the least, to judge by the office he was holding or had held (see below). Thus the epitaph must be re-dated to the reign of Nero, perhaps its latter part.

The second husband of Culicina, Q. Fabius Afrani l. Cytius, was freed by Africanus Fabius Maximus. Africanus Fabius Maximus was born in 44 B.C. and was consul ordinarius in 12 B.C.

The first husband of Culicina, C. Calpetanus C.l. Cryphius, was evidently freed, therefore, by the first known Calpetanus senator. This dating fits best with the previous datings.

The lifetime of Livia Culicina and thereby the birth time of her son Calpetanus Livianus can be deduced fairly accurately from the inscription. Calpetanus Livianus was born early in the reign of Tiberius, or perhaps in the last years of Augustus.

Stamps 2 and 3 were found at Pompeii, and were thus in use before the year 79. This being so, the Calpetanus Livianus who appears in inscriptions 1, 2 and 3 can from the chronological viewpoint be the same person in all cases. The rarity of the name Calpetanus and the still greater rarity of the combination Calpetanus-Livius which is postulated by the name Calpetanus Livianus render it highly probable that these persons are identical.

Stamps 2, 4 and 5 may contain information on the nature of the connection between C. Calpetanus Livianus and the C. Calpetani of the officinator family which appears in brick stamps. If the Crescens appearing in these three stamps is the same person in all cases, then the following is known of him: he was the slave of C. Calpetanus Livianus before the year 79, then the slave of C. Calpetanus Favor and finally a free man. Crescens therefore transferred from Livianus to Favor; this suggests that Favor was the successor of Livianus in this field of work. Evidently Favor was the freedman or the son of Livianus; the latter possibility is suggested by the fact that C. Calpetanus Favor invariably appears in stamps as a free man, not once as a slave.

Stamps 4 and 5 are from the end of the first century, and the last stamps of C. Calpetanus Favor are from the end of the reign of Trajan. The work of Favor as officinator finished before the year 117 (when Trajan died). The proposed connection between Livianus and Favor is therefore possible chronologically. But the name Crescens is fairly common, and it is therefore by no means so likely that its three bearers are identical as in the previous case of Calpetanus Livianus.

The relation of C. Calpetanus Livianus to ceramic production was not necessarily close, although two of his slaves worked in this line. C. Calpetanus Favor, on the other hand, appears as officinator in several stamps of the second century; he was the central figure of the Calpetanus officinator family; after him figlinae Marcianae began to be named figlinae Favorianae in the second century. Inscription 1 is interesting from the standpoint of the present study because it may illuminate the background of C. Calpetanus Favor.
From inscription l the social status of the persons therein mentioned becomes clear. The offices held by both husbands of Livia Culicina, her brother-in-law and her son are mentioned. The family belongs to the influential ‘freedmen aristocracy’ of the reigns of Claudius and Nero. Scr(iba) libr(arius) quaestorius trium decuriarum was head of a department in the Senate treasury (aerarium Saturni). This was the highest apparitor office in State administration under the Senate. 40 holders of this office are known, 5 of them freedmen, the others freeborn; many were knights or received the rank of knight later. 28 The second husband of Livia Culicina, Q. Fabius Cytisus and his brother L. Numpidius Philomelus rose in their careers to the office of scriba librarius quaestorius trium decuriarum. – Viator pullarius, the office of C. Calpetanus Cryphius, who was Culicina’s first husband and the father of Calpetanus Livianus, was lower in rank than the scriba offices.

Calpetanus Livianus, of the second generation, adopted a military career in which he, as a freeborn Roman citizen and with an influential family behind him, enjoyed good possibilities for promotion. When the monument was erected he was primus pilus or primi pili centuria, the senior of 60 centurions in the legion and a member of the legion commander’s council of war (or, more probably, had held this office and was now primipilaris). 29 This was an esteemed office, and especially well paid. 30 In the light of De Laet’s researches it looks as though it was already an equestrian office. 31 The office of primus pilus was reached after more than 20 years’ service as a centurion; consequently, the holders of this office were elderly men. 32

5. A Note On the Reading of Stamps

The reading of brick stamps presents certain difficulties which the epigraphist does not normally encounter. These are due 1) to the form of the stamps and the placing of the text, and 2) to the ellipticity of the texts (syntactical stops and word endings are missing, as is also in most cases the word signifying the brick itself). The cases I present here will be referred to later.

As a rule stamps are not rectangular in form, but are plane figures bounded by circular peripheries, parts of such peripheries and straight lines. The text placed within these frameworks does not follow straight lines: at least part of it is in lines which are in circular or other curved form. Two difficulties arise from this: it is not always certain in what order words are intended to be read within a line, nor is it always certain in what order lines themselves should be read.

1) When a text is in a line forming a complete circle and syntactical stops are missing, it is uncertain at what point the stamp-maker intended reading to begin.
The following stamp, for instance, is circular in form, the text is in one line following the circle and the words are linked without gaps.

(i)  

EX F CASTRICIA C-SATRINI CELERIS  

CIL 141

The text is understandable in the above order given in CIL, but an understandable text is also obtained in the order: C-SATRINI CELERIS EX F CASTRICIA; both orders are possible, and we do not know which the stamp-maker had in mind.

Appearing in the text is a figlinae mentioned by name, figlinae Castricianae, and a person mentioned by name, C. Satrinius Celer. For purposes of interpretation it would be important to know whether something is said in the stamp of the relation between figlinae Castricianae and C. Satrinius Celer; to be more precise, whether it is said that C. Satrinius Celer owns figlinae Castricianae? The answer may depend on which of the two possible orders of words is chosen. By adding to the text the word 'opus' signifying the brick itself and a punctuation mark we obtain the following interpretations:

CIL order of words:

(a) (opus) ex figlinis Castricianis C. Satrini Celeris
(b) ex figlinis Castricianis, (opus) C. Satrini Celeris

Second order of words:

(c) (opus) C. Satrini Celeris ex figlins Castricianis

According to interpretation (a) it is said in the text that C. Satrinius Celer owns figlinae Castricianae, but according to (b) and (c) it is not said that C. Satrinius Celer owns figlinae Castricianae.

Is it said in the stamp that C. Satrinius Celer owns figlinae Castricianae, or not? From the standpoint of conclusions the question is important. On the evidence of this stamp alone the problem may be deliberated as follows. If we examine only the order of words given by CIL, interpretation (a) gives an affirmative answer to the question, and (b) a negative one: the mathematical probability is, in fact, 1/2 for each alternative, and so the problem is not resolved. But if both possible orders of words are taken into account the alternative 'it is not said in the stamp that C. Satrinius Celer owns figlinae Castricianae' has two interpretations, (b) and (c), and a mathematical probability of 2/3 in its favour, while the alternative 'it is said in the stamp that C. Satrinius Celer owns figlinae Castricianae' has only one interpretation, (a), in its favour and a mathematical probability of 1/3. So the problem is resolved in favour of the negative alternative. It is a problem which proves to be highly significant for the interpretation of stamp texts. The negative alternative is supported not only by mathematical probability but by the fact that the positive alternative applies only if the CIL order of words is chosen, while the negative alternative applies regardless of which order is chosen. This is a strong argument when we interpret the whole class of stamp texts of this form, and not one stamp only.
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Problems of this type need not usually be solved on the evidence of one stamp alone, since further illumination is obtained from other stamps. Thus the previous stamp can be compared with the following stamp of rectangular form:

(ii)  

C: SATRINI: CERELIS  
EX: FIGLINIS: MARCIA  

(opus) C. Satrini Celeris ex figlinis Marcianis

CIL 303 a

The order of words is now unambiguous, being the same as the second order for the previous stamp. To the question "is it said in the stamp that C. Satrinius Celer owns figlinae Marcianae?" there is only one answer: No. Comparison of the stamps therefore produces the same result as was arrived at on grounds of mathematical probability.

2) The stamp is in the form of a segment of a circle and part of the text is placed in lines following the arc of the circle, another part in straight lines in the direction of the chord. In this case it remains uncertain whether the lines following the arc of the circle should be read first and those in the chord direction next, or vice versa. The following stamp, for instance, is of this character:

(iii)  

STATI M ANTIOCHI  
DE FIGLIN  
VICCIAN  

CIL 672 = S. 203

In this the top line follows the arc of the circle and the other two are straight. Of this stamp three variants are known which vary in the placing of lines and letters in relation to each other. The problem is similar to that in (i) above: are the lines to be read in the above order 1–2–3 or in the order 2–3–1? Both are possible and both produce an intelligible text. The problem of interpretation is the same as in (i), and a solution is obtained in the same manner.

3) The most common type of brick stamp is the so-called orbiculus-stamp. Its outline is formed by two circles, a big and a small. The smaller circle (orbiculus) is drawn inside the bigger in such a way that the circumferences either touch or intersect each other. The text is placed in lines following the circumference of the bigger circle.

In these stamps the lines are usually to be read in order from the outermost to the innermost, but this rule does not always apply. In reproductions of stamp texts for CIL Dressel, however, observes a consistent rule: the outermost line of a stamp is the topmost in a CIL text, and the innermost is the lowest. For this reason lines in CIL are not always in the order in which the text composer intended them to be read. In the following stamp, for instance:
reading is clearly intended to begin from the second line or the innermost of the stamp: *ex praedis Faustinae, L. Vallius Proclus fecit*. By having the lines printed in this order Dressel shows readers in what order the lines occur in the stamp, not in what order they are to be read. – Thus for stamps with *orbiculus* it is not always certain from which point the composer intended his text to begin. The consequence is that in some cases the text can be read in more than one order. In this stamp, for instance,

SOTERICI ET FAVORIS
D FVLVIORVM

there are two different interpretations – both intelligible – depending on which line is read first:

(a) *Soterici et Favoris duorum Fulviorum*
(b) *duorum Fulviorum Soterici et Favoris*

With interpretation (a) the slaves *Sotericus* and *Favor* of two *Fulvii* are mentioned; with (b) two *Fulvii, Sotericus* and *Favor*, are mentioned. Because it is uncertain in which order the lines should be read, it also remains uncertain in which of the two ways the text should be interpreted.

Cases such as the following will prove to be significant later:

T·RAV·PAMP·EX·FP·IS
CAEPION

The word *CAEPION*, alone in the second line, is the adjective *Caepionianus, a, um*. It is now to be asked whether this adjective is grammatically the adjectival attribute of a word occurring in the stamp. If the text is read in the above order, then the adjective *CAEPION* can be linked to the word *figlinae* and the text is as follows: *(opus) T. Rausi Pamphili, ex figlinis Plotiae Isauricae Caepionians*. But if the lines are read in reverse order the text cannot, without doing violence to it, be interpreted as showing that a *figlinae* named *Caepionianae* is mentioned in the stamp. The interpretation in that case is: *Caepioniana (sc. tegula) T. Rausi Pamphili, ex figlinis Plotiae Isauricae*. Therefore the adjective *CAEPION* is either the name of *figlinae* or the *name* of the brick, depending on the order of lines.

The changing of the order of lines in *orbiculus* stamps is a fairly consistent feature of development. Those *orbiculus* stamps may be taken as a starting point in which the lines do not follow the circumference of the circle but are curved only a little. In these stamps the lines are placed in the same manner as in stamps of rectangular form. Dressel marks these stamps in CIL with the words *‘versibus falcatis’* and in the printed text keeps the order of lines the same as in the stamp:
the highest and innermost line in the stamp is the highest in CIL, and the lowest and outermost in the stamp is the lowest in CIL. – The next stage of development is represented by stamps in which the lines follow the circumference of the circle but reading must begin from the innermost line. Finally the order of lines is reversed and we arrive at the "normal" orbiculus stamp in which the text starts from the outermost line. The following stamps exemplify the transition from the first stage to the second:

(vii) IMP·CAE·TRO·AVG
     EX·FIGLI·MARC·DOLI
     C·CAL·FAVORIS
     CIL 313

(viii) C·CALPETANI·FAVORIS
      EX·FIGL·MARC·DOLIA
      IMP·CAE·TRA·AVG
      CIL 314

Both stamps contain the same lines (the only differences are in abbreviations of words), but the lines are in reverse order. Stamp (vii) is "versibus falcatis", while in stamp (viii) the lines follow the circumference of the circle. In accordance with his principle Dressel has printed the text of stamp (vii) in CIL with the innermost line highest and the outermost line lowest, and the text of stamp (viii) with the outermost line highest and the innermost line lowest. The order in which the composer intended his text to be read is clearly that of stamp (vii): imperator Caesar Tr(a)ianus Augustus, exfiglinis Marcianis, doliare (sc. opus) C. Calpetani Favoris.

Notes to Chapter III

1 Data regarding domini are available in the dominus lists of Setälä, Setälä, Appendixes 1.1 and 1.2.

2 Tribus is mentioned in 3 or 4 cases; see Indices p. 95.

3 In early stamps an indication of master is encountered in the nomenclature of slaves, e.g. CIL 1269: Eumenes Marci C. s ervus).

4 Huttunen p. 137–142.

5 Lugli, p. 557.

6 For the system of names see e.g. Cagnat, p. 37–87 and Duff p. 52–53.


8 For discussion on the significance of Greek cognomina see Thylander p. 143–167 and Solin p. 121–158.
9 This observation has been made from inscriptions in which parents and children are both mentioned. Such calculations are presented by Frank in 'Race Mixture', p. 693; Thylander p. 123-5 and L.R. Taylor p. 126-7.


11 Thylander p. 143.

12 Taylor p. 127; Solin presents his conclusions on pages 135-8 of his work.

13 Kajanto, Onom. Studies p. 57. Kajanto's material consists of grave inscriptions published in CIL VI:4, 2-3; 5680 persons are included.

14 Thylander p. 182. Thylander's material is composed of inscriptions in the ports of Latium (from Formiae to Centumcellae), 6100 persons.


17 For data on the senatorial family, Kleine Pauly I p. 1018.

18 Tacitus, Hist. 2, 98 and 4, 49-50. Tacitus uses only the name Valerius Festus.

19 Suet. Claud. 11. Modern scholars have not doubted the accuracy of this information provided by Suétone.

20 RE XIII, 919 (Lotte Ollendorf).

21 On C. Proculeius see RE XXIII, 72-74 (R. Hanslik).

22 PIR² III, p. 102 No. 46

23 All pelves discovered at Pompeii were made in Rome, to judge by the stamps. Bloch, Suppl. p. 94.

24 Information on C. Calpetanus Favor will be found later, p. 128 and p. 141 No. 14.

25 In his comment on CIL 725 Dressel dates stamp 5 in the time of Hadrian. In both form and content, however, it suggests the first century. Dressel's dating derives from stamp CIL 900 from the year 137 in which a person named C. Cal(petanus) Cre(scens) is mentioned.

26 Stamp CIL 317 from the year 123 is non-existent; Bloch BL p. 335, n. 286.

27 The history of officinatores named C. Calpetanus is expounded later, p. 128--.

28 RE II A, 850 (Kornemann).

29 On primus pilus see the article of F. Lammert in RE XXII, 2, 1074-1076 and Dobson's work mentioned in the bibliography.

30 The pay of a primus pilus was four times that of a common centurion. Dobson, p. 396.

31 In Ant. Class. 9 (1940), p. 13-14.

32 Dobson, p. 411.

IV Meaning of the Word 'figlinae'

1. Introduction

The text components of brick stamps can be divided into three groups according to
the information they contain: 1) names of persons; 2) words signifying place of
manufacture and the brick itself; 3) other matters such as consular dates, wishes etc.
In the present study the first two groups will be examined. Names of persons in
brick texts represent individuals who took part in brick production, and the
organizations formed by them; words signifying place of manufacture refer to the
setting within which production took place. The preposition ex occurring in the text
shows that the stamps reflect the situation prevailing in brick production and are not
connected, for instance, with the use of bricks as building material. This is a sound
presumption, though we cannot give a precise, uniform answer, applying to all
stamps, to the question "What was the purpose of stamping?"

Words signifying place of manufacture are 'praedia', 'figlinae', 'fundus',
'officina', 'fornax'. 'Praedia' and 'figlinae' are distinctly more common than
other words: 'praedia' occurs in stamps 545 times and 'figlinae' 448 times;
'officina' occurs with certainty 57 times; 'fundus' and 'fornax' are encountered in
a few stamps only, the former in 5 and the latter in 4.

All others among these words are common in Latin and have a clear meaning,
except for figlinae. Figlinae is strictly a word of Roman brick stamps: it occurs
very rarely in literature or in other inscriptions, nor is it encountered in other
ceramic stamps or in brick stamps in other areas than Rome. In Roman brick
stamps, however, the word is common and seems to be linked more specifically to
brick production than officina and praedia. Figlinae is the keyword of Roman brick
stamps, and our notion of the organization of brick production depends on the idea
we have formed of the meaning of this word.

The meaning of the word 'figlinae' in brick stamps will be studied mainly by
comparing its use with that of 'praedia' and 'officina'. The derivation and meaning
of the words is as follows:

officina (opus + facio): 'a place in which something is manufactured, workshop,
manufactory'. 'Officina' is the only Latin word which means 'workshop,
manufactory' generally (German 'die Fabrik', Swedish 'fabrik'). The word
'fabrica', from which many words linked with industrial production in present-day
languages are derived, is more limited in its Classical Latin meaning than 'officina': it means merely one type of officina, namely 'the workshop of an artisan who works in hard materials'. In the great dictionary of Georges, for instance, the Latin equivalent for the German 'die Fabrik' is given as "officina" (Werkstätte überhaupt), - 'fabrica' (Werkstätte eines Fäbers, d.i. Schmiedes, Zimmermanns u.ergl. Handwerkers), - 'testrina', 'testrinum' (Weberei)." Because the processing of raw materials has quite a different rating in modern industrial society than in antiquity (and, for that matter, before the 19th century), the use of any word connected with industrial production as an equivalent for the Latin 'officina' easily gives rise to wrong associations.

praedium is derived from 'praes, dis' = 'surety, bondsman'; 'praedium' was security accepted by the State in agreements between State and private citizens affecting exploitation of public wealth. Already in Plautus 'praediolum' occurs in the sense of 'small farm'. As a rule 'praedium' signifies landed property, but it can also mean built property. In legal texts the terms 'praedia rustica' and 'praedia urbana' are used for these forms of real wealth.4 In speaking of a specific farm the main word is often omitted, e.g. Tusculanum (sc. praedium) Cicero, suburbanum, etc. In Roman brick stamps the word is generally shortened to P, PR, PRA, PRAE, PRAED; when written in full it is in the ablative plural except in one case, stamp CIL 417, where the form is ablative singular.

fig(u)linae (the formfigilinae also occurs) is an adjective in plural form used as a substantive. The meaning of fig, the root, is found in the verb 'fingo', 'to mould or form (originally from clay, later in the widest significance)'. Also derived from the root fig is 'figulus', 'a potter or clayworker'. Examples of adjectival use: ars figulina, opus fig(u)linum. In Roman brick stamps the word generally appears in abbreviated form; in cases where the ending is indicated, the form is the ablative plural ex figlinis except in stamp CIL 2200, where the nominative figline is used. Stamp CIL 2200 and some occurrences of the word outside brick stamps which will be examined later indicate that the head word from which 'figlinae' separated to become a substantive was of feminine gender. It cannot be said with certainty what this word was: possibilities are 'fornax', 'officina' and 'fodina'.5

2. Meaning of the Word 'figlinae'

According to Dressel and Cozzo

Dressel and Cozzo have elucidated the meaning of 'figlinae' in Roman brick stamps.

Dressel’s method is to compare the occurrence of 'figlinae' and 'officina' in stamp texts. He notes that both words signify officina, a place where opus doliare was made; 'figlinae' is more often encountered in stamps than 'officina'. Then he continues.6
sed voces figlinae et officina ita usurpantur, ut inter utrumque verbum aliquid interesse certum sit. Nam ubi ex figlinis ponitur, sequitur aut figlinarum nomen peculiare aut nomen eius cuius figlinae sunt; post verba ex officina vero sequi solet nomen officinatoris. Vocabulo figlinae igitur designari videtur totum (die Fabrik), officina contra pars (die Werkstatt), quorum plures in singulis figlinis fuisset existimandum est.

According to Dressel figlinae is a production establishment, a brickworks; brick stamps also indicate a two-level establishment: figlinae is a production unit composed of several "departments" or officinae.

Dressel’s reasoning is not made fully clear by the passage quoted, but when account is taken of what he has said elsewhere of the persons of brick stamps, i.e. dominus ("is cuius figlinae sunt") and officinator (see below p. 93), the chain of reasoning can be given as follows: "Because the word 'figlinae' is connected with the name of dominus, and the word 'officina' with the name of officinator, and because the stamps of each dominus generally contain several officinae, each figlinae contains several officinae; for this reason officina is part of figlinae; because officina is die Werkstatt and officina is part of figlinae, figlinae is die Fabrik."

Cozzo examines the meaning of 'figlinae' as follows:

Dopo il fondo, nelle iscrizioni doliari, venivano citate le Figlinae, ossia le cave di argilla dove si producevano i mattoni. ( . . . ) avendo essa ['figlinae'] la stessa radice di figulus, operaio dell'argilla, operaio vasaio, deve riferirsi più alla materia lavorata che all'impianto industriale necessario alla preparazione dei mattoni. È naturale che in un primo tempo, quando l'importanza del banco d'argilla prevaleva sulla modestia degli impianti, il luogo di fabbricazione delle tegole e dei mattoni fosse indicato prevalentemente dal sedimento argilloso che veniva sfruttato; dalla cava, cioè, da cui si estraeva la materia prima. ( . . . ) Le Figlinae rimasero così, fino all'epoca Severiana ad indicare in modo prevalente, sia, insieme, la cava di argilla e la fabbrica, sia la sola cava di argilla, oppure, infine, la cava di argilla ed il praeedium, quando il proprietario dell'una si identificava con l'altro.

According to Cozzo the original and principal meaning of 'figlinae' was 'clay-pit', though in course of time the word came to have further connotations. Cozzo’s etymological reasoning for 'figlinae' = 'clay-pit' is not convincing, for it can as easily be maintained that the word 'figlinae' contains the same root as 'fingo', whose meaning is connected more with the manufacturing process than with the raw material used. But what he says of the technique of brick production and the part played in it by raw material and manufactured equipment is noteworthy.

For the present study the meanings proposed for 'figlinae' by Dressel and Cozzo provide a good starting point. The problem is: was figlinae a manufactory or a clay district? These meanings involve the following implications affecting
persons mentioned in the stamps and the organization of brick production. If *figlinae* is a manufactory, then persons mentioned in stamps of the same *figlinae* belong to the same production organization; it is then most natural to suppose that the *figlinae* owner (*dominus*) is the manager of the production establishment, the 'manufacturer', and that the *officinatores* mentioned in stamps of the same *figlinae* are foremen, persons of lower rank in the same organization. But if the meaning of *figlinae* is merely territorial, 'a clay district', there is no specific reason to suppose that a manufacturing organization is implied in the word *figlinae*: it may be that there is no organizational connection between *officinatores* appearing in stamps of the same *figlinae*, and no connection either between the *figlinae* owner (*dominus*) and the *officinatores*. Thus our understanding of the organization of brick production depends on our notion of the meaning of *figlinae*. The problem is as follows: does the word *figlinae* refer simply to a locality (meaning: 'clay district'), or does it also imply a manufactory and production organization (meaning: 'brickworks')?

It must first be noted that Dressel's reasoning is not beyond reproach. The data he gives on stamp texts and on the use of the words *figlinae* and *officina* are correct, as is also the premise formed from these data, that "one *figlinae* may contain several *officinae*". But it does not follow from this that "*officina is part of *figlinae*' *officina may be contained in *figlinae* without being part of it. Therefore, although Dressel's second premise "*officina = 'die Werkstatt'" is also correct, the conclusion "*figlinae = 'die Fabrik'" is not necessarily so. *figlinae* = 'city' would also suit Dressel's premises, and so would Cozzo's *figlinae* = 'clay district'.

Although Dressel clearly propounds his notion of the meaning of the word *figlinae*, he builds up no precise picture of the organization of brick production from it. Dressel's method was that of a philologist, collector of material and publisher; he explained his material, but drew no far-reaching conclusions on its basis. With Bloch the situation is different. He no longer investigates the word *figlinae* but accepts Dressel's meaning and draws the conclusions suggested by it. To him *figlinae* are factories whose owners (*domini*) are manufacturers, while the *officinatores* are foremen in their service. The same view of the organization of brick production appears in Frank's general works on Roman economic history. In the *History* which came out before Bloch's studies, Frank uses in connection with the *figlinae* and their owners such words and phrases as 'factory', 'firm', 'enterprise', 'tended toward factory and monopolistic methods', 'certain brick firms at Rome grew to immense proportions'. In the *Survey* the same picture is given, with Bloch's results as an addition.

The "modern" picture by Bloch and Frank of the organization of Roman brick production is based on the meaning *figlinae* = 'manufactory'. In the following pages the applicability of this meaning to passages where *figlinae* occurs is examined. Brick stamps form the chief material, but a beginning is made by considering some occurrences of the word apart from brick stamps.
3. Examples of Use of the Word 'figlinae' Apart from Roman Brick Stamps

In the following passages the word 'figlinae' occurs in a sufficiently full context for examination of the meaning to be possible. Apart from the inscription of Veleia the passages are mentioned in the *Thesaurus*, where other occurrences of the word are also listed. The problem formulated above – to what extent the word 'figlinae' means a manufactory and to what extent a locality, a place for digging clay – is not solved by these passages: the purpose is merely to throw light on the problem.

The texts differ widely in period: *Lex Ursonensis* is from 44 B.C., Varro's *De re rustica* from about 35 B.C., the inscription of Veleia about A.D. 110 and the writings of Paulus and Ulpian from the early 3rd century A.D.

*Lex Ursonensis* 76: 'figlinae teglariae maiores tegularum CCC tegulariumq(ue) in oppido colon(ia) lul(ia) ne quis habeto. qui habuerit it aedificium isque locus publicus colon(iae) lul(iae) esto. (...)"

In this passage ''figlinae teglariae'' signifies a building in the urban area (''in oppido colonia lulia''). This is clear, at least, if it is assumed that ''id aedificium'' in the second sentence refers both to ''figlinae teglariae'' and ''tegularium''. If, on the other hand, it is considered that ''id aedificium'' means ''tegularium'' alone, then the use of the words ''maiores tegularum CCC'' to express the size of ''figlinae teglariae'' shows that a building is spoken of.

Mingazzini has amply explained this passage in an article¹² and reported on the discussion aroused by it. For the words ''maiores tegularum CCC'' two interpretations have been offered: 1) three hundred roof tiles are the capacity of a ''figlinae teglariae'' oven, or the usual production capacity of a manufactory in some unspecified period of time; 2) ''tegula'' is the unit of measurement for the size of building, three hundred tegulae expressed the floor area (or some other standard) of a ''figlinae teglariae''. The former is the traditional interpretation proposed by Mommsen. Mingazzini supports the latter interpretation on the grounds that in the *Lex Tarentina*¹³ the size of a normal urban house is expressed in the same way. Further support for Mingazzini's view is found in passages where the property tax levied on Roman citizens in 43 B.C. is discussed.¹⁴ The basis for calculation of this tax in urban houses was the number of tegulae (in Cassius Dio the word is keramis). These passages show that tegula – precisely specified in a manner unknown to us – was the unit of measurement for the size of a building.¹⁵ This is also the best explanation, in my view, for the *Lex Ursonensis* passage.

For the purposes of this study it is immaterial in which way ''maiores tegularum CCC'' is explained, for in both interpretations ''figlinae teglariae'' means building, brick oven and other manufactured production installations.
The word 'figlinae' occurs twice in the inscription of Veleia:16

obligatio 14: P. Albius Secundus ( . . ) professus praed(ia) rustica ( . . ) et obligare [dehet] fundum Iulianum cum figlinais et coloniis VIII pagis Iunonio et Domitio ( . . )

obligatio 47: C. Coelius Verus professus est saltus Avegam Veccium Debelos cum figlinais, saltus Velvias Leucomelium qui sunt in Veleiate pag(is) Albense et Velleio ( . . )

The properties listed in the inscription are areas of land in rural districts. At the beginning of most bonds (e.g. the 14th) the legal term praedia rustica, meaning landed property, is used of the wealth to be mortgaged; the term praedia urbana, meaning built property (See Ulpian’s definition, note 4, p. 84), does not occur in the inscription, and urban properties are not mentioned. In the same way as 'figlinae', the following words occur as appendages to fundi or saltus mentioned by name (in the text they are connected to 'fundus' and 'saltus' by the preposition cum): 'cum silvis' (passim), 'cum casis' (passim), 'cum meride' (passim),17 'cum meridibus' (passim), 'cum silvis sagatis et loco agri Nasulliani' (obl. 22), 'cum casis et silvis et meridibus et debelis' (ibid.)18, 'cum iure Appennini' (obl. 28), 'cum vadis' (obl. 44), 'cum alluvionibus iunctis praedis' (obl. 44). These 'appendages' to fundi and saltus are mentioned separately for the undoubted reason that their yield was not a direct or normal income derived from agriculture and stock raising. Figlinae are mentioned as parts of great landed properties extending over the area of two pagi and situated far from population centres on the central slopes of the Apennines.19

All these facts indicate that 'figlinae' in the inscription of Veleia does not signify buildings and other manufactured production establishments. We may suppose that these figlinae were clay deposits favourably located for transport along the Trebia and Nure, and used for the manufacture of ceramic objects. One can imagine a landowner deriving income from charges paid to him for the right of using clay. Perhaps used in these figlinae were some of the brick stamps which in CIL are entitled "Tegulae agrorum Placentini, Veletiatis, Parmensis".20

In the following extracts the word 'figlinae' appears in contexts where the economic employment of irreplaceable natural resources is in question.

At the beginning of Varro’s De re rustica there is a long passage (1, 2) in which Varro and his interlocutors ponder the question: What belongs to agri cultura and what does not? The following is an extract.

Varro, Rust. 1, 2, 22–23: Anne ego, inquam, sequar Sasernarum patris et fili libros ac magis putem pertinere [ad agri culturam] figilinas quem ad modum exerceri oporteat, quam argentui fodinas aut alia metalla, quae sine dubio in aliquo agro fiunt? sed ut neque lapidicinae neque harenariae ad agri culturam pertinent, sic figilinae. neque ideo non in quo agro idoneae possunt esse non exercendae, atque ex iis capiendi fructus: ut etiam, si ager secundum viam et opportunus viatoribus locus, aedificandae tabernae devorsoriae, quae tamen, quamvis sint fructuosae, nihil magis sunt agri culturae partes.
"Figulinas exercere" here means exploitation of the riches of the soil. *Figlinae* is a mine belonging to the same category as other mines (*alia metalla*). Very closely related to *figlinae* are quarries (*lapidicinae*) and sand pits (*harenariae*). In the first sentence the word *'fodinas' may be actually added: "'figilinas (sc. fodinas) (. . .) quam argenti fodinas et alta metalla'." It also appears from the second sentence that the question of whether "'figilinas exercere'" is possible in a certain locality depends on the nature of the soil, because the words "'in quo agro idoneae (sc. figilinae) possunt esse'" can be interpreted in no other way. It is emphasized throughout the extract that the activity called by Varro "'figilinas exercere'" depends on natural condition which man cannot change. Best suited to this passage is the meaning proposed by Cozzo: 'figlinae' does not mean buildings and other manufactured productive establishments, but a clay deposit which can be employed for the making of ceramic objects.

Varro's text indicates the division of the riches of the soil between metallic and non-metallic; the word 'figlinae' is linked with the latter together with the words 'lapidicinae' and 'harenariae'. Stone (*lapis*), clay (*creta*), gravel/sand (*harena*) and limestone (*calx*) were non-metallic extracted substances with considerable economic importance. They often occur together in texts when there is discussion of economic exploitation of the soil, for instance in legal texts dealing with *locatio-conductio*, *usus fructus* and servitudes when the right to use land is defined for holders of the above rights.

In the following passages there is discussion of the rights of the holder of *usus fructus* (*fructuarius*) and of the three extracted substances stone, clay and gravel/sand:

*Ulpian* Dig. 7, 1, 9, 2 sed si lapidicinas habeat et lapidem caedere velit, vel cretifodinas habeat vel harenas.

*Ulpian* Dig. 7, 1, 13, 5 inde est quaesitum, an lapidicinas vel cretifodinas vel harenifodinas ipse instituere possit.

If we compare these with the extract from Varro, we note similarities and divergences. In all extracts there is examination of the three substances stone, clay and gravel/sand, and in all there is the question of defining different methods in economic exploitation of the land. Varro draws a distinction between "'agricultura'" and other methods of land exploitation, while Ulpian defines the rights of *fructuarius* in relation to the rights of the owner (*dominus*) of the same land. But the word used in connection with the utilization of clay is not the same in Varro and Ulpian, Varro using 'figilinae' and Ulpian 'cretifodinae'. What difference of meaning is there between the two words?

In the following extract the situation is the same as in the former, except that the right of land utilization now examined is that of a servitude holder on burdened land; the question at issue is the types of servitude which can be created. Appearing in the passage are the extracted substances stone, clay, gravel/sand and limestone.
Dig. 8, 3, 5–6:

5 Ulpian (…) sed ipse [Neratius] dicit, ut maxime calcis coquendae et cretae eximendae servitus constitui possit, non ultra posse, quam quatenus ad eum ipsum fundum opus sit:

6 Paulus veluti si figlinae haberet, in quibus ea vasa fieren, quibus fructus eius fundi exportarentur (sicut in quibusdam fit, ut amphoris vinum evehatur aut ut dolia fiant), vel tegulae vel alia* ad villam aedificandam. sed si, ut vasa venirent, figlinae exsercerentur, usus fructus erit. item longe recedit ab usu fructu ius calcis coquendae et lapidis eximendi et harenae fodiendae aedificandi eius gratia quod in fundo est (…) (*) alia is an addition by Mommsen.

In defining the right of utilization possessed by a servitude holder Paulus quotes the purpose for which extracted substances may be used. On a servitude basis material may be taken only if it is used for needs arising from the normal operation of fundus dominans; if, on the other hand, material or goods made from it are intended for sale, servitude is insufficient: the beneficiary must possess usus fructus.

In the Paulus extract and the earlier quoted Varro extract there are, in addition to the occurrence of 'figlinae', two common features: stone, clay and gravel/sand are spoken of (also limestone in Paulus), and clay is set apart from the rest for separate examination. Why is clay given this special status? Because clay was far more important and variously used in agricultural economy than the other substances, being the chief raw material of ceramic objects which were used for a great variety of purposes. Paulus mentions the purpose specifically and gives a list of ceramic objects; and from Varro it is easily discerned that the Sasernae included figlinae within agri cultura because clay artefacts had such variety of use in farm economy, but excluded lapidicinae and harenariae because the use of stone and sand was more limited.

We arrive at the following distinction of meanings: 'cretifodinae' is associated merely with the extraction of clay, referring to its economic utilization from the 'industrial extraction' side; 'figlinae' covers not only this but also the fabrication of ceramic objects from clay, and refers to the 'processing side' too of the economic utilization of clay. An etymological connection with the verbs 'fodio' and 'fingo' thus seems to be reflected in the meanings of 'cretifodinae' and 'figlinae'.

The use of the words 'cretifodinae', 'figlinae' and 'officina' can also be explained in terms of the general conditions prevailing in the ceramic and, specifically, the brick industry. In brick production the following factors are influential: 1) clay is by far the most important raw material; 2) the processing grade is low; 3) transport is a very expensive item compared with other production costs. These factors are responsible for the siting of brickworks in relation to population centres (market areas) on the one hand, and raw material sources on the other.

It is a characteristic feature of the brick industry that primary production (clay digging) and processing (brick-making from clay) are performed as an integrated procedure without disruption by transport. Only finished bricks are conveyed to the
market area, because clay is more expensive to transport than bricks.\textsuperscript{24} Owing to the dominance of clay among production commodities and also owing to transport costs, therefore, brickworks are located in clay districts.\textsuperscript{25}

Working conditions for the manufacture of finer ceramic are different. Clay is of less central importance, mainly because the processing grade is higher: the finer the ceramic, the less clay is required for production of a certain value. On the other hand, more production requisites are needed. It is more natural in this case that primary production and processing should differ in locality. The clay-digging site, \textit{cretifodinae}, and the processing establishment, \textit{officina}, are in different places. Clay is more suitable for transport than easily breakable finished ceramics. Greater quality demands are made on clay, and it can be brought from afar and from many places. The best location for a processing establishment is a population centre where customers live and production requisites and equipment are most easily obtainable.

The following explanation may now be proposed for the words occurring in the texts: \textit{cretifodinae} is the clay-digging site, \textit{officina} the manufactory; \textit{figlinae} is the clay-digging site and manufactory together in cases where primary production and processing form an integrated procedure. This would explain the fact, for instance, that the word \textit{'figlinae'} occurs only in brick stamps, while \textit{'officina'} occurs also in the stamps of finer ceramic objects.\textsuperscript{26}

4. The Word \textit{'figlinae'} in the Text of Roman Brick Stamps

\textit{Introduction}

In this chapter I examine the meaning of \textit{'figlinae'} in Roman brick stamps. More precisely, the problem is: does the word \textit{'figlinae'} refer to the organization of production and to an administrative unit (meaning 'brickworks'), or merely to a territorial unit (meaning 'clay district')?

The study method is historical and comparative: that is, the occurrence of the word \textit{'figlinae'} in stamp texts is compared with that of other words, and account is also taken of time as a variable. For purposes of comparison texts are analyzed in their components, in relation to content on the one hand and form on the other.

It transpires that the content of texts is made up of three components, i.e. three matters are announced (omitting consular dates and wishes).
They are:
- The first person, to whom I later give the name officinator,
- the place of brick manufacture (name of figlinae),
- the second person, to whom I later give the name dominus.

The words with which these three matters are announced are divided into four groups:
- Nouns signifying place of brick manufacture (in one or another manner): 'praedia', 'figlinae', 'officina' etc. Dressel's remark on the relation between the words 'figlinae' and 'officina' (see p. 39 above) holds good, i.e. in one figlinae there may be several officinae, but in one officina there cannot be several figlinae. If note is taken of this result as it stands, the chief matter remaining for comparison is the use of the words 'figlinae' and 'praedia'.
- Words signifying the brick itself: 'opus', 'opus doliare', 'opus figlinum', 'tegula' etc. The text of the stamp is often so composed that the word signifying the brick itself is missing, but account has been taken of it in the grammatical structure. In that case the absent word must be understood.
- Proper names in adjectival form which can be linked grammatically to the words of either previous group. Such adjectives are Marcianus, a, um, Caepionianus, a, um, Domitianus, a, um, Oceanus, a, um etc. They number about 80 all told. An adjective occurs in 580 stamps, or nearly one third of the total.
- Names of persons, important since they enable the conditions of figlinae ownership and possession to be examined.

The occurrence of the components of content of the text is not consistent in stamps. Any component may be absent, and any component may alone form the whole of a text. Component occurrence is only partly correlated with time. As noted earlier, the inconsistent occurrence of components makes it impossible to suggest a consistent purpose for the stamping of bricks; in other words, the question "What was the purpose of stamping?" can receive no answer which takes account of all components and is applicable to all stamps. For this reason conclusions drawn from stamps must be treated with reserve.

In addition to components of content and form, time appears as a variable. To take account of time is possible, because stamps can be dated with great reliability. I used Dressel's datings (with Bloch's additions) because they are based for the most part on other stamp features than the occurrence of the mentioned components, and thus form a variable which is independent of the other variables examined. The aim is to avoid errors of reasoning arising from multicollinearity.

The main point is that Dressel in his dating of stamps took no account of the occurrence of the words 'figlinae' and 'praedia', which in my examination turns out to be significant.
Division into periods has been roughly performed: only clear time differences are taken into account, so that certain features of the development of the text become visible. The main division is between stamps of the first and stamps of the second century; in the latter group two sub-groups can be further distinguished: early second century and late second century stamps.

Early second century stamps make up the main type, the category of "typical" brick stamps. Their texts contain most commonly all the components of content, and consular dates are found only in them. These informative stamps have always interested students most, and conclusions drawn from brick stamps are based to a great extent on them.

Stamps of the First Century

I first examine the most simple type, which is common to all ceramic stamps.

(1a) STATI·MARCI [STATATORIS] S. 337 (lb) ST·MARCIVS RABBAEV·FEC CIL 311

In these texts there is one component only, the name of a person. The grammatical structure of both texts is such, however, that completion is needed: in (1a) the person’s name in the genitive needs a head word; in (lb) the predicative transitive verb needs an object. This missing part, which the compiler of the text intended the reader to supply, is obviously the very article on which the text is written. If the brick itself is marked with the word ‘opus’, the completed texts in general form are: (1a) opus illius and (1b) ille opus fecit.

Who is the person mentioned in the stamp? or: what is his position in the production process? When we are dealing with some other ceramic object than a brick, the answer seems clear: the stamp bears the name of the person who has given the object its form, who has made it. This answer does not apply if the object is a brick. One cannot then speak of giving form in the same sense as when speaking of finer ceramic: the form is important, but in a different manner. Bricks must be as similar as possible, they take their form mechanically in accordance with certain standards fixed in advance. In other ceramic form is individual: it does not arise mechanically, but is imparted to an object by its maker. Bricks represent mass production among ceramic objects, composing a category of their own. With other ceramics, the finer the object, the greater its individuality of design.
A similar distinction must be made between stamps. An "ordinary" ceramic stamp is in greater or less degree a signature, while a brick stamp is in greater or less degree a trade-mark. Bricks are made collectively: at no working stage does an individual of such supremacy appear as the designer of a finer ceramic, who would deserve his name on the stamp more than others. The person mentioned in a brick stamp is the director of the production process, his name represents all those who took part in that process, from the clay diggers to the firers. This distinction explains, partly at least, why Roman brick stamps, having at first been similar to other ceramic stamps, evolved with time into a group of their own.

Differentiation becomes graphically visible in certain stamp groups of the first century. In early Roman brick stamps the same names of persons commonly appear as in the stamps of other rough ceramic objects (sarcophagi, dolia, amphorae, pelves etc); the same stamps are even found in objects of both categories. For instance, members of the three families St. Marcii, C. Satrinii and C. Calpetani who worked on figilinae Marcianae in the first century are known to us both from the stamps of bricks and those of other ceramics. The following stamp is from a dolium:

(2) C·SATRIN·COMMVNI
AVCTVS·FEC

C. Satrini Communis, Auctus fecit

Two names are mentioned in the stamp, C. Satrinius Communis and Auctus, who is obviously the slave of Communis. With some constraint the text can also be interpreted as meaning that only Auctus, the slave of C. Satrinius Communis, is mentioned. This interpretation is arrived at by removing the comma from the text written in full. Thus in the dolium stamp the name of C. Satrinius Communis is accompanied (or replaced) by that of his slave. In brick stamps, on the other hand, C. Satrinius Communis appears alone.

The same situation is encountered with C. Satrinius Celer: four (or six, depending on interpretation of texts) slaves of C. Satrinius Celer are known from pelvis stamps found at Pompeii (S. 543–548), but he appears alone without slaves in all his brick stamps (CIL 141, 303–305, 388). Further cases of the kind are found in early stamps.29

The difference between brick stamps and other ceramic stamps in these cases may be explained by the fact that C. Satrinius Communis and C. Satrinius Celer made bricks themselves and left other objects to be made by slaves. But a better explanation is obtained from the difference between "trade mark" and "signature": A dolium and a pelvis were marked with the name of the maker, i.e. designer, while a brick was marked with the name of the director of the production process:
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his name in the stamp represents all those taking part collectively in the work of production.

The following stamps show how the place of brick manufacture is expressed in the first century stamps:

(3) C·SATRINI·COMMVN
DE·FIGLINIS
MARCIANIS
CIL 306 c = S. 77

(4) MARCIANA
C SATRINI COMMVNIS
S. 573

Place of manufacture is expressed by the adjective *Marcianus, a, um*, which is linked either to the word 'figlinae' or directly to the brick itself (stamp (4) is completed to read: *(tegula) Marciana*). If the adjective is indicated by the letter M, the texts in general form are:

(3) opus illius, de figlinis M
(4) opus M illius

Both texts are evidently the same in content.

In examples (3) and (4) expression of the place of brick manufacture is linked to type (1a) (page 47). Both expressions of the place can also be linked to type (1b). Name of person and expression of place thus can appear in four combinations which are all the same in content.

The place of manufacture is thus expressed only in brick stamps; no similar expression appears in other ceramic stamps. Why is this? What was intended to be expressed? To these questions too an answer may be sought among the difference between production conditions in the brick industry and other ceramic industry – besides the fact, of course, that the surface of a brick or tile provides room for a more abundant text than that of a finer ceramic object.

In brick-making, because the processing grade is low, the quality of the finished product depends largely on that of the raw material used, namely clay; production is confined, on the other hand, to clay occurring in one place. With other ceramics the situation is different: quality depends more on factors other than the clay used as raw material, and production is not confined to clay occurring in one place. Perhaps *C. Satrinius Communis* wished to make known in his stamps that his bricks were made of *figlinae Marcianae* clay: the name of the *figlinae* was a kind of quality mark.
To the expression ex (or de) *figlinis* *M* in Roman brick stamps an analogy can be found in building stone production. Vitruvius in Book 2 Chapter 7 deals with rock species in the Roman region and their suitability for building. He uses the word *'lapidicinae'* for an occurrence of rock, and indicates quality by stating from what *lapidicinae* stone originates. In the following extract, for instance, *'lapidicinae'* directly signifies 'quality of stone': *'lapidicinae ( . . . ) Rubrae, Pallenses, Fidenates, Albanae sunt molles'. *30* The next extract is an exact parallel to the expression of brick stamps:

*Vitr. 2, 7, 3* *lapidicinae ( . . . ) quae dicuntur Anicianae ( . . . ) quarum officinae maxime sunt circum lacum Volsiniensem*

*Lapidicinae Anicianae* is a region where stone of a certain quality occurs.*31* *Officina* is a place where stone is quarried and cut to sizes suitable for transport; in *lapidicinae Anicianae* there are several *officinae*, as in one *figlinae* there are several *officinae*. The specification of locality *'circum lacum Volsiniensem'* shows that *lapidicinae Anicianae* is an extensive area.

Brick-making is part of the ceramic industry where raw material and production methods are concerned, but it is part of the building material industry, like building stone production, where the use of its products is concerned. It may be assumed that when brick was first used as construction material in the Roman area and a brick industry came to life the terminology previously employed in this field was adapted to the new material. The word *'figlinae'* came to correspond to *'lapidicinae'*.

As stated, this was possible because the processing grade of brick was only little higher than that of building stone. Just as building stone quality could be expressed by reference to the place of occurrence, e.g. *''de lapidicinis Anicianis''* or *''lapis Anicianus''*, so brick quality could be expressed by the locality of occurrence of a certain kind of clay, e.g. *''de figlinis Marcianis''* or *''tegula Marciana''*.

It may be supposed that brick producers thought on these lines when they included the name of the *figlinae* in the stamp text. The notion that clay qualities in the various *figlinae* differed so much as to be distinguished in the finished bricks may be partly imaginary, but not entirely so. Clay used for roof tiles has to meet higher quality demands than that used for wall bricks.*32* Clay must be easily moulded if it is to make good roof tiles, thus fatter clay is required. Fat clay can be made leaner by admixture of sand or other material, but lean clay cannot be made fatter. Thus the quality of the clay employed was of greater importance for finished products in early times, when wall bricks were not yet in use and roof tiles were the only building components made in *figlinae*. It may be assumed that in these early times the reputation of certain good clay regions had become established, they were the *figlinae* mentioned by name; and in the later wall brick period the mention of a *figlinae* by name had already become traditional. Such mention by name was not used as a guarantee of
quality or a trade-mark in the modern sense, as is seen from the rather inconsistent use of figlinae names in stamps. C. Satrinius Communis and C. Satrinius Celer did not mark the name of figlinae Marcianae on all their brick stamps, for instance, nor did other persons with several stamps act in that way.33

With regard to the meaning of the word 'figlinae' my reasoning leads to the conclusion that Cozzo is correct: figlinae is a clay district. It is obviously difficult to make the distinction between 'brickworks' and 'clay district' merely by comparing brick stamps. The form of speculation introduced above is more likely to produce new hypotheses than dependable results. Brick stamps, however, enable us to examine the problem of the meaning of 'figlinae' from a further standpoint. If figlinae is a manufactory it is also an administrative whole; if figlinae is merely a clay district it does not necessarily compose an administrative unit. I will therefore seek to discover how the possession relations of the figlinae are reflected in brick stamps of the first century.

At figlinae Marcianae early in the first century members of three families were at work.34 Statius Marcius Rabbaeus (CIL 310, 311; S. 81, 616), C. Satrinius Communis (CIL 306–309; S. 77–79, 573, 574) and C. Calpetanus Auctus (CIL 302; S. 72, 73) make known in their stamps that their bricks are from figlinae Marcianae. Bricks of all three have been found on the ships of Nemi, which makes it reasonably certain that they were producing bricks contemporaneously, about A.D. 40.35

To Bloch, who accepts the meaning proposed by Dressel ('figlinae' = 'brickworks'), there are difficulties in explaining these stamps. How can three persons have owned the same manufactory at the same time? Bloch’s answer is that figlinae Marcianae was owned at that time by a community resembling a co-operative association.36 This explanation is complicated, and legal exposition would be needed to substantiate it. It might be asked, for instance, whether the names of all society members should not appear in all stamps, or whether stamps should not announce in some way that the bricks are produced by a society. Examples of the societas are found in Roman brick stamps. But these problems need not be elucidated, for Bloch’s question proves to be wrongly posed.

From the specimen stamps (3) and (4) (p. 49) it is easily established that there is no question of the ownership of figlinae Marcianae in them. In stamp (3) the order of words shows that the name of C. Satrinius Communis is not the genitive attribute of the word 'figlinae', and in stamp (4) the word 'figlinae' does not appear. In the stamps it is therefore not stated that C. Satrinius Communis owns figlinae Marcianae, but that he 'owns' the brick.

The order of words does not indicate the meaning of the text so
unambiguously in all stamps as in (3). In the following stamp the text components are in the opposite order:

(5) DE FIGLINIS MARCIANIS  
ST·MARCI·RABBAEI  
CIL 310

The text can be interpreted in two ways, either:

(a) de figlinis Marcianis St. Marci Rabbæi, or
(b) de figlinis Marcianis, (opus) St. Marci Rabbæi

According to (a) St. Marcius Rabbæus would be the owner of figlinae Marcianae; according to (b) he would be merely the 'owner' of the brick. The reason for this uncertainty is that the maker of the stamp has used no syntactical stops. Dressel in CIL chooses interpretation (b), and his choice must be regarded as correct, because (b) fits not only the unambiguous texts (3) but also the ambiguous (5), whereas (a) fits only the ambiguous. Also in favour of (b) is the fact that the order of words in (3) is more common in stamps than that occurring in (5). In this special case there is yet another support for Dressel's choice: for specimen stamp (5) there exists a variant, S. 616 (very fragmentary, it is true), with the same order of words as in the specimen stamp (3). If we want an interpretation that suits both variants we must choose (b).

Thus in the stamps there is no question of the ownership of figlinae Marcianae. Bloch's problem has arisen because in his view the word 'figlinae' means 'brickworks'. The thought process is that if the stamps mention the name of a manufactory and the name of a person, then the person is the owner of the manufactory. Because this conclusion is eminently reasonable, the observation that the owner of figlinae is not mentioned must be considered proof that the word 'figlinae' does not mean 'brickworks'. In second century stamps the owner of figlinae is mentioned, and it is obvious that Dressel arrived at the meaning 'figlinae' = 'brickworks' precisely on this evidence: the stamps of the second century make up the great majority of stamps, and these stamps have always received the most attention. The historical method has the advantage, however, that it enables conclusions to be drawn also from the order in which text components have been included in the stamps.

If the meaning of 'figlinae' is 'clay district', then first century figlinae Marcianae stamps present no problem. In the figlinae Marcianae district there were several administratively independent officinae, the names of whose ''directors'' are mentioned in the stamps. The name of figlinae Marcianae is present only as a quality mark in the manner previously explained. To mention the name of the owner of figlinae Marcianae, i.e. of the land, is therefore unnecessary.
I have used as examples in this chapter only the stamps of *figlinae Marcianae* and persons connected with it. The reason – it must be admitted – is that it is difficult to find another connected group of first century stamps which exemplifies all the features examined. Possession relations, the best evidence in favour of 'figlinae' = 'clay district' are reflected especially well in early stamps of *figlinae Marcianae*, for the reason – among others – that the ships of Nemi make precise dating possible. But the features of first century stamps which have been explained are visible too in early stamps of other *figlinae*; such are *figlinae Caepionianae* (stamps CIL 52–), *figlinae Castricianae* (CIL 141), *figlinae Curtianae* (CIL 144–147), *figlinae Domitaniae* (CIL 148–), *figlinae Oceanae* (Octianae) (CIL 357, 384–), *figlinae Rhodinianae* (CIL 474), *figlinae Tempesinae* (CIL 609–), *figlinae Tonneianae* (CIL 631–), and others.

The features which distinguish first century stamps from second century stamps are:

- the word 'figlinae' appears modified by a proper adjective indicating the name of the *figlinae*,
- the name of the person occurring in the text is not a genitive attribute of the word 'figlinae', i.e. the owner of the *figlinae* is not mentioned,
- the word 'praedia' does not occur.

**Second Century Stamps**

The following stamp continues the series started by (1a) and (3) (in CIL the order of lines in this text is reversed; cf. p. 34–35 above):

(6)  

\[\text{C·CAL·FAVORIS} \]
\[\text{EX·FIGLI MARCIANIS} \]
\[\text{IMP·CAES NER·TRA·AVG} \]  

*C. Calpetani Favoris, ex figlinis Marcianis imperatoris*  
*Caesaris Neruae Traiani Augusti*

From the general form of the text, *opus illius, ex figlinis M huius*, a new feature is apparent – compared with first century stamp (3): a second person’s name. (6) is a binominal stamp; I distinguish the persons from each other by calling one *officinatores* (*C. Calpetanus Favor*) and the other *dominus* (the Emperor Trajan).
The stamps so far examined, (1) – (6), are all from figlinae Marcianae, and therefore belong to a historically homogeneous group. On their basis, accordingly, conclusions can be drawn regarding the development in figlinae Marcianae: stamp (6) is some 70 years later than (3) and (4). Which person of the binominal stamp continues the traditions of the persons of the one-name stamps? Obviously officinator, because C. Calpetanus Favor belongs to a family whose members already worked in figlinae Marcianae in the early first century.\textsuperscript{37} The Emperor Trajan, for his part, has no connection with figlinae Marcianae stamps of the first century. This shows that mention of the name of dominus is a new feature. The position of the name of dominus in the stamp (6) shows that the Emperor Trajan is mentioned as the owner of figlinae Marcianae. The difference is, therefore, that in stamps of the first century the owner of figlinae is not mentioned, but in second century stamps he is. From the appearance of the name of dominus in stamps it cannot be concluded that the ownership of figlinae Marcianae changed at that time. It may have done; but there is also nothing to disprove that Trajan himself or earlier Emperors owned figlinae Marcianae as early as the first century; for unknown reasons it was not until the early second century that it became customary to mention the name of the owner of figlinae in stamps. It is certain that someone already owned figlinae Marcianae in the first century.

I shall now examine stamp texts of the early second century with regard to the meaning of 'figlinae'. The following stamp indicates how the name of dominus was linked to the type represented by the stamp (4). In this case no examples of figlinae Marcianae stamps are found.

(7) CAEPL·GELLI·PRVDENTIS EX·F·PLO·ISAV CIL 55

Caepioniana (sc. tegula) L. Gelli Prudentis, ex figlinis Plotiae Isauricae

The general form of the text is: opus M illius, ex figlinis huius. Before the comma the text is the very same as the text of the first century stamp (4), as an addition, after the comma, the owner of figlinae (dominus) is declared. The content is composed of the same three matters as in the stamp (6): the names of officinator, figlinae and dominus. But the form of expression is different: the adjective expressing the name of figlinae is linked in stamp (6) to the word 'figlinae', but in stamp (7) to the brick itself.

In all earlier stamps the word 'figlinae' is defined by the adjective expressing the name of figlinae, but in stamp (7) it appears without an adjective. This shows that the word 'figlinae' has acquired a new function.
The word 'figlinae' is not needed in stamp (7), as it was not needed in (4), to announce the name of figlinae, but it is needed for another function: to announce the name of the owner of figlinae (dominus).

In the following stamp the word 'figlinae' occurs "plainly" in this new function.

(8)  
C·CALPETANl HERMETIS  
OPVS DOLIAE·EX·FIG  
CAESARIS·N  
CIL 320 = S. 84  
C. Calpetani Hermetis opus doliare, ex figlinis Caesaris nostri

In general form: opus illius, ex figinis huius

The words before the comma are the same as in the first century stamp (1a), and after the comma comes what is new in second century stamps: the name of the owner of figlinae (dominus). The name of figlinae is missing from stamps (1a) and (8). If we compare (8) with (6) and with some other stamps, we may conclude that (8) too has been in use in figlinae Marcianae, but this is not said in the text.

Dressel, Bloch and other commentators on Roman brick stamps draw no distinction between the two uses of the word 'figlinae'. They treat the expressions ex figinis M and ex figinis huius as equivalent methods of stating the place of manufacture of the brick or its origin; in other words they consider that a figlinae can be equally well specified by mentioning the name of its owner and by mentioning the name of figlinae itself. The development of brick stamp texts becomes more comprehensible, however, as I have shown earlier, if different meanings are given to the expressions: ex figinis M (e.g. ex figinis Marcianis) expresses the place of brick manufacture (and is, initially at least, a form of quality mark), ex figinis huius (e.g. ex figinis Caesaris nostri) expresses the owner of figlinae (dominus); the only purpose of the latter is to express ownership.

The difference between the two ways of using the word 'figlinae' becomes still clearer if we compare the use of 'figlinae' with that of 'praedia'. The word 'praedia' appears in brick stamp texts at the beginning of the second century. This was noted by Mirja Lahtinen in her study of brick stamp terminology. Frequency of occurrence of the words 'figlinae' and 'praedia' at various periods is shown in the following table.
Frequency of occurrence of words 'figlinae' and 'praedia'. Figures as percentages of all stamps of the period. (Source: Lahtinen, Table 4.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>99</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>123</th>
<th>138</th>
<th>180</th>
<th>220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stamps in which word 'figlinae' occurs</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamps in which word 'praedia' occurs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table shows that the word 'praedia' does not appear in stamps until the early second century, while the word 'figlinae' appears in the first already. Lahtinen has used the datings of Dressel, whose dating criteria were to a very large extent independent of the occurrence of 'figlinae' and 'praedia'. Results are therefore reliable in this regard.

The following stamps illustrate how the word 'praedia' is used in the early second century.

(9) CAEPIONIANA·MAR·LVCIFER PRAED PLOTIAE ISAVRICAE

Caepioniana (sc. tegula) Marci Luciferi, (ex) praedis Plotiae Isauricae

The text in its general form reads opus M illius, ex praedis huius, i.e. the same as (7) except that 'figlinae' is replaced by 'praedia'. (In addition the stamps are from the same figlinae, figlinae Caepionianae, and the same dominus appears in them.)

The preceding text contains all components of content: officinator (Marcius Lucifer), name of figlinae (Caepionianae) and dominus (Plotiae Isauricae). From the following the name of figlinae is missing.

(10) EX PRAEDIS CAES N-OPVS DOL·TETELI·DON

ex praedia Caesaris nostri, opus doliare Tetelli Donacis

If the components are placed in the same order as in earlier stamps, the general form reads opus illius, ex praedis huius, which is the same as stamp (8), except that the word 'figlinae' is replaced by 'praedia'.

A comparison of stamps shows that the expressions ex figlinis huius and ex praedis huius can be used interchangeably to convey the same matter: I shall demonstrate later that this holds good for brick stamps in general. As reported earlier, the name of dominus appears in bricks at the same period.
of the early second century as the word 'praedia'. This confirms the notion introduced previously, that dominus is mentioned in stamps as the owner of the land, because *ex praedis huius* cannot mean other than "(the brick originates) from the land of such and such a person".

With regard to the meaning of 'figlinae', comparison leads to the conclusion that 'clay district' is more likely than 'brickworks', because if one person makes bricks in the clay district of another, he can express the fact equally well with the words "'on the land of so and so'" and with "'in the clay district of so and so'"; on the other hand the expressions "'on the land of so and so'" and "'at the works of so and so'" are further from each other.

The difference of meaning between *ex figlinis* (e.g. *ex figlinis Marcianis*) and *ex praedis huius* (e.g. *ex praedis Caesaris nostri*) is especially evident in cases represented by stamp (10). *Figlinae Marcianae* – regardless of the meaning of 'figlinae' – is a *figlinae* with precisely defined location, whereas "*praedia Caesaris nostri*" signifies the Emperor's landed property, an area covering tens of thousands of square kilometres around the Mediterranean. Therefore the expressions *ex figlinis* and *ex praedis huius* cannot have the same function in the stamps.

It may be pointed out, of course, that stamp (10) is a special case. Is it not possible that the landowner's name contains also an indication of the locality if he is not an owner on the same scale as the Emperor? The answer is affirmative. But a very large proportion of the *domini* of brick stamps are members of senatorial and equestrian families, persons whose *praedia* were extensive, even if less so than those of the Emperor; parts of these *praedia*, moreover, might be located anywhere in the territory of the Empire, and in several places in the surroundings of Rome. In the second place, there are many cases where we know by name several *figlinae* of a certain *dominus*, e.g. the *figlinae* of Seia Isaurica: Aristianae (CIL 11–12), Fabianae (CIL 207–210), Publilianae (CIL 421), Tonneianae (CIL 651) and Tur( ) (CIL 674). If, now, the stamp tells us merely that a brick is "*de praedis Seiae Isauricae*", as, for instance, in stamp CIL 1423 (see stamps (22) on p. 60 below), we do not know from which *figlinae* of Seia Isaurica the brick originates, nor, apparently, did the person know for whom the text was stamped. The same is true of the expression "*de figlinis Seiae Isauricae*", which occurs in stamp CIL 1425. The expression *ex figlinis* (e.g. *ex figlinis Aristianis*) does not therefore contain the same information as *ex praedis huius* and *ex figlinis huius*.

Comparison of brick stamps for the early second century indicates that the words *figlinae* and 'praedia' are used as follows:
1) 'figlinae' and 'praedia' are used as equivalents, without difference of meaning, when the owner of the *figlinae* (*dominus*) is conveyed;
2) 'praedia' is not used in place of 'figlinae' when the place of brick
manufacture (name of figlinae) is announced. — For indication of the figlinae owner (dominus) and the place of manufacture (name of figlinae) the following three combinations are therefore available:

(a) opus M ex praedis huius
(b) opus M ex figlinis huius
(c) opus ex figlinis M huius

Reasons for the differences between these expressions are, on the one hand, that the words 'figlinae' and 'praedia' can be used interchangeably and, on the other, that the adjective M expressing place of manufacture (name of figlinae) is connected either with the brick itself or with the word 'figlinae'. The grammatical difference between 'figlinae' and 'praedia' is that the adjective M expressing place of manufacture (name of figlinae) is linked as an adjectival attribute to 'figlinae' but not to 'praedia'.

I shall now demonstrate the truth of the foregoing in the light of fuller evidence. It cannot be statistically proved that the similar use of 'figlinae' and 'praedia' was a general practice, because it is impossible to define what is meant by "similarity" of two stamps. But it is possible to list an adequate number of examples. In the following pairs of stamps the words 'figlinae' and 'praedia' are used as equivalents; in the first stamp of each pair is the word 'figlinae' and in the second the word 'praedia'. The stamps of each pair are similar at least in the sense that each contains the same figlinae owner (dominus). 39

(11) (a) EX FIGLINIS·DOM DOM
     CIL 556
(b) EX·PR·D·D·
    ex praedis Domitiae Domitiani
    CIL 557

(12) (a) EX F L BELLICI SOLLERTI
     CIL 887a
    ex figlins L. Bellici Sollertis
(b) DE·PRAEDIS·L·B·S
    de praedis L. Bellici Sollertis
    CIL 888
(13) (a) SEVERO ET ARRIAN COS EX FIGL DOM DOMIT a. ? CIL 552
Severo et Arriano consulibus, ex figlinis Domitiae Domitiani

(b) PAET ET APR COS EX PR DOMITIAE DOMIT a. 123 CIL 553

(14) (a) EX F CVSINI MESSALINI
AP ET PAE COS a. 123 CIL 957
ex figlinis Cusini Messalini; Aproniano et Paetino consulibus

(b) EX PR CVSINI MESSALLIN CIL 958

(15) (a) GLABRION ET TORQVATO COS EX FIG CL CELSI a. 124 CIL 395
Glabrione et Torquato consulibus;
ex figlinis Claudii Celsi

(b) EX P CLAVDI CELSI
AP ET PAE COS a. 123 CIL 393
ex praedis Claudii Celsi; Aproniano et Paetino consulibus

(16) (a) EX F CL MARCELLIN
AS II ET AQ COS a. 125 CIL 935
ex figlinis Claudiae Marcullinae; 
Asiatico II et Aquilino consulibus

(b) APR ET PAET COS a. 123 CIL 934
EX PR CL MARC
Aproniano et Paetino consulibus;
ex praedis Claudiae Marcullinae

(17) (a) TROP EX F PL AVG DOL CIL 701
Trophimi, ex figlinis Plotinae Augustae, doliare

(b) L CALPVRNI PHOEBI
EX PR PLO AVG DOL CIL 703
(The text is completed from an exemplar found by us at Ostia)
(18)  
(a) EX·FIG·DOM·LVC·OP·DOL  
AEI·ALEXAD  
sic  
CIL 173

(b)  
O DOL·EX·PR·D·P·F·LVC·P·A·ALEX  
NIGNRO ET·CAMER  
a. 138

COS  
opus doliare ex prædïs Domitiae P. f. Lucillae, P. Aelii Alexandri; etc

(19)  
(a) EX·FIGLINIS·DOMIT·DOMITIAN  
C·GALVISI·MNESTER  
sic

KAABECCEI  
CIL 555

(b)  
EX PR DOMIT DOM  
T AVENI ATTICI

ex prædïs Domitiae Domitiani, T. Aveni Attici

(new stamp)

(20)  
(a) EX FIGIL PLOTINAE AVG DOL  
M OCI ANTIOCIHI

ex figlinis Plotinae Augustae, doliare M. Oci Antiochi

CIL 698

(b) EX·PR·PLOTINAE·AVGVSTAE  
DOL·P·OCI·ANTIO

CHI

ex prædïs Plotinae Augustae, doliare P. Oci Antiochi

CIL 700

(21)  
(a) EX FIG ASINIAE QVADRATILLAE O D C NVN  
NIDI FORTVNAT·LVCIO  
QVADRATO COS  
a. 142  
CIL 861

ex figlinis Asiniae Quadratillae, opus doliare C. Nunnidi Fortunati;  
Lucio Quadrato consule

(b)  
EX PR·ASINIAE QVADRATILL·OP DOL·A·FLAV  
MAXIM GALILICA·ET VETER COS  
a. 150

ex prædïs Asiniae Quadratillae, opus doliare A. Flavi Maximi;  
Gallicano et Vetere consultibus

CIL 150

(22)  
(a) P·SERVILI·FIRMII OP·DE FGL  
SEIAES·ISAVRICAEE  
sic

CIL 1425

P. Servili Firmi, opus de figlinis Seiae Iasuricae

(b) IVLI FORTVNATI DE PRAEDIS  
SEIAE ISAVRICAEE

CIL 1423
(23) (a) EX FIG DOM LVC O D DION DOM LV SE SERVIANO III ET VARO COS a. 134 CIL 1030a

ex figlinis Domitiae Lucillae, opus doliare Dionysi Domitiae Lucillae servi; etc

(b) OP DOL EX PR DOM LVC DIONYS LVC PAETIN ET APRO COS a. 123 CIL 1020

opus doliare ex praedis Domitiae Lucillae, Dionysi Lucillae (sc. servi); etc

(24) (a) T·RAV·PAM·EX·F·PIS CAEPION CIL 65

Caepioniana (sc. tegula) T. Rausi Pamphili, ex figlinis Plotiae Isauricae

(b) EX PRAED·PLOTIAE·ISAVRICA·CEPIONAL T·RAVS·PAMPHILI CIL 67a

ex praedis Plotiae Isauricae, Cepionalis (sc. tegula) T. Rausi Pamphili

(25) (a) EX F·C·C·C·CAEPIONANA·SEX·ALF·AM PAETINO ET APRONIANO a. 123 CIL 99

ex figlinis C. Curiati Cosani C( ), Caepioniana (sc. tegula) Sex. Alfi Amandi; etc

(b) EX PRAED·C·C·COSAN·CAEPIONIAN SEX·ALFI AMAND PAETIN ET APRONIANO a. 123 CIL 98

(26) (a) EX·FEGLINIS·ARRIAE·FAD·CAE C·IVLI·LVPIonis sic S. 25

ex figlinis Arriae Fadillae, Caepioniana (sc. tegula) C. Iuli Lupionis

(b) EX PR·ARRIAE·Fadillae·CAEP C·IVLI·LVpionis S. 26

ex praedis Arriae Fadillae, Caepioniana (sc. tegula) C. Iuli Lupionis
These examples show that in the early second century the expressions ex figlinis huius and ex praedis huius in stamps were equivalent means of denoting the figlinae owner (dominus). From the table on page 56 it is seen that in early stamps the word 'figlinae' is more common than 'praedia', and that in course of time this position is reversed. The conclusion might be drawn that 'figlinae' and 'praedia' were not equivalents at the same time, but that 'figlinae', the word in earlier use, was later replaced by 'praedia'. This was not the case, however, as can be seen from specimen stamps with consular dates. In stamp pairs (15), (16) and (23) the word 'praedia' occurs in the earlier stamp and 'figlinae' in the later; in pair (21) 'figlinae' is in the earlier stamp and 'praedia' in the later; in pairs (25) and (27) the stamps are from the same year, 'figlinae' occurring in one and 'praedia' in the other. To take account of time differences, therefore, is not to alter the conclusion that it was immaterial whether the word 'figlinae' or 'praedia' was used to indicate the figlinae owner (dominus).

But in another matter, namely expression of the place of manufacture (name of figlinae), the words 'figlinae' and 'praedia' are not used in the same way, and are therefore not equivalents. The difference is seen in the list of expressions on page 58: (a) and (b) correspond to each other, in them the words 'figlinae' and 'praedia'
are equivalents. But for (c) there is no counterpart which might contain the word 'praedia'; in the expression *ex figlinis M huius*, that is to say, the word 'figlinae' cannot be replaced by the word 'praedia'.

I shall expound the matter first by means of examples, and then support my assertion by more general arguments.

(29) **EX FIGL MACEDO HADRIANI SEVERI**  
**EX OFIC SYNTRO**  
sic S. 572 = CIL 294

*ex figlinis Macedonianis Hadriani Severi ex officina Syntrophi*

In its more complete form, the name of the *dominus* mentioned in the stamp, as known in brick stamps and other inscriptions, is *T. Statilius Maximus Severus Hadrianus*. The stamp declares all three matters: name of officinator, place of brick manufacture (name of figlinae) and name of figlinae owner (dominus). I analyse the text in order to bring to light the words used to express specific matters:

- officinator: *ex officina Syntrophi*
- place of manufacture: *ex figlinis Macedonianis*
- dominus: *ex figlinis Hadriani Severi*

It will be noted that the word 'figlinae' is used in two functions: 1) to express the place of brick manufacture; 2) to express the figlinae owner (dominus). The word 'figlinae' is not repeated in the text, but the grammatical structure of the expression is such that to the word 'figlinae' the name of figlinae is linked as an adjectival attribute and the name of the figlinae owner (dominus) as a genitive attribute.

In the following stamp the same matters emerge as in the previous, and the expressions are precisely the same in content in both stamps: the same officinator, the same place of manufacture and the same dominus. But the form of expression is different.

(30) **EX-PR·HADRIANI MACE**  
**OFIC·SYNTRO**  
sic  
CIL 295

This text differs from the previous at two points (if inessential differences are disregarded): the word 'praedia' occurs in place of 'figlinae', and the names of dominus and figlinae have changed places. The words of this text can be linked to each other in more than one way, whereas the word order of the previous text allowed of only one interpretation. Dressel generally chooses the following interpretation.
1) *ex praedis Hadriani Macedonianis, (ex) officina Syntrophi*

If the stamp maker thought of the words as interconnectable in this way, he used the word 'praedia' in exactly the same way as the word 'figlinae' in stamp (29): place of manufacture is expressed by the words *ex praedis Macedonianis* and dominus by *ex praedis Hadriani.*

A second possible interpretation is the following:

2) *ex praedis Hadriani, (opus) Macedonianum (ex) officina Syntrophi*

This is the interpretation I have previously supported, because if the stamp maker thought of the words as interconnected thus, he has used the word 'praedia' in a different manner from the word 'figlinae' in stamp (29). In stamp (30) matters are expressed in the following words:

- officinator: (ex) officina Syntrophi
- place of manufacture: (opus) Macedonianum
- dominus: *ex praedis Hadriani*

If the use of the word 'praedia' here is compared with the use of 'figlinae' in stamp (29), it will be observed that 'praedia' is used only to express dominus, while 'figlinae' is used for both dominus and place of manufacture (name of figlinae). As stated earlier, the use of the word 'praedia' differs from that of 'figlinae' in precisely this manner.

What evidence is there that the stamp maker imagined a combination of words for stamp (30) in the manner of 2) and not 1) – since both are syntactically possible? In this special case, when we are concerned with stamps of *figlinae Macedonianae,* light is cast on the problem by comparison of stamps. On page 62 both stamps of pair (28) are of *figlinae Macedonianae,* and in both the place of manufacture (name of figlinae) is expressed by the words *opus Macedonianum,* in one shortened to O MACE, in the other as OPVS MACE; a similar example is stamp CIL 293, which reads OP FIG MACED (= *opus figlimum Macedonianum*). In most stamps of *figlinae Macedonianae* the place of brick manufacture (name of figlinae) is expressed in the same manner as for stamp (29). That is to say, the adjective *Macedonianus,* a, um is linked directly to the word 'figlinae,' but in not a single *figlinae Macedonianae* stamp is the adjective linked directly to the word 'praedia.' These facts suggest that the stamp (30) is intended to be read in the manner of 2) and not 1); in this case, therefore, as in many others, the word signifying brick itself must be understood.

A second, similar example is here given:
Stamp (31) can be read only in the manner shown, because the adjective Caepionianus, a, um is linked directly to the word 'figlinae', i.e. a word is marked in the text which is clearly the word qualified by the adjective. But in stamp (32) the words can be linked to each other in a further manner, and this is chosen by both Dressel and Bloch 43 namely:

ex praedis Plotiae Isauricae Caepionianis, ex fornace Peculiaris

The fact that the stamp maker intended stamp (32) to be read in the first manner presented by me and not in that chosen by Dressel and Bloch may also be noted in the figlinae Caepionianae case by comparison with other stamps of the same figlinae 44. In specimen stamp (9) on page 56 the adjective appears as first word of the text in the form CAEPIONIANA, and the only possible interpretation therefore is (tegula) Caepioniana. In other figlinae Caepionianae stamps too the adjective appears as first word of the text, so that the interpretation tegula Caepioniana (or generally opus M) must be chosen. Such stamps are, in addition to those mentioned, CIL 53 and 55, the specimen stamp (7) on page 54 above. See also my comment on the reading of stamp (vi), p. 34 above. In other respects too the place of manufacture (name of figlinae) is expressed in the same way as in figlinae Macedonianae stamps: the adjective is linked directly to the word 'figlinae', but not to the word 'praedia'.

The third example, which I shall now present, is one in which the place of brick manufacture (name of figlinae) is expressed in a manner so unambiguous that there is no room for different interpretations. The names of persons appearing in the stamps are in their complete form as follows officinator: P. Servilius Firmus (Fyrmus); dominus: Q. Aburnius Caedicianus.
In stamp (33) only two matters are expressed, the names of officinator and dominus; the place of brick manufacture (name of figlinae) is not mentioned. The word signifying the brick itself must be understood, because the name of officinator needs a head word. – In stamps (34) and (33) all three matters are declared: name of officinator, place of manufacture (name of figlinae) and name of dominus, and these are the same in both stamps: the texts are therefore the same in content. In form of expression, however, the texts differ, and in exactly the same manner as the stamps in the two previous examples. But stamp (35) can now be interpreted in one way only. The expression is unambiguous because the word 'tegula', meaning the brick itself, is marked on the stamps and need not be supplied. (Even without 'tegula' stamp (35) would be unambiguous: its word order is such that the adjective Tempesinus, a, um cannot be linked to the word 'praedia'.) If the order of components is made the same as in earlier examples, the following general forms are obtained for the texts:

(33) **opus illius, ex praedis huius**

(34) **opus illius, ex figlinis M huius**

(35) **opus M illius, ex praedis huius**

By means of the specimen stamps two facts are noted regarding stamps of the early second century:

1) For the place of manufacture (name of figlinae) two alternative means of expression are used: the adjective (M) expressing name of figlinae is linked either to the word 'figlinae' (ex figlinis M) or to the word signifying the brick itself (opus M); these means of expression are the
same as in first century stamps (see p. 49 above), in this respect those of the second century contain nothing new. The substantive meaning the brick itself is usually missing from the text, so that the detached adjective must be interpreted as substantivally employed, e.g. CAEP = Caepioniana = "brick made in figlinae Caepionianae"; MACE = Macedonianum = "brick made in figlinae Macedonianae" etc.

2) The word 'figlinae' is used for both place of manufacture (name of figlinae) and name of dominus, but 'praedia' is used only for name of dominus. 'figlinae' is therefore used in three combinations: ex figlinis M, ex figlinis huius and ex figlinis M huius, while 'praedia' is used in one combination only: ex praedis huius. Of these combinations only ex figlinis M occurs in first century stamps; thus in the stamps of the second century the name of dominus (huius) and the word 'praedia' appear as new features.

The formal difference between the words 'figlinae' and 'praedia' proves to be that they are placed differently in stamp texts in relation to the adjective (M) expressing place of manufacture (name of figlinae). Because stamp texts are extremely elliptical, with words shortened, syntactical stops missing and the word signifying the brick itself generally omitted, the reader of stamps has less chance of verifying in what manner the composer intended words to be linked together than if he were concerned with a normal text. The only recourse is to examine the placing of words in relation to each other. Let us suppose that a substantive and a proper name linked to it as an adjectival attribute form such a close unit of words that only in exceptional cases is another word placed between them. The matter may then be examined statistically: adjectives (M) are attributes of the word 'figlinae' if they are placed immediately next to (after) the word 'figlinae'; they are attributes of the word 'praedia' if placed immediately next to (after) the word 'praedia'.

I shall now show the placing of 'figlinae' and 'praedia' in relation to the adjective (M) expressing place of manufacture (name of figlinae) in cross-tabulated form. In the Table appear all stamps containing the adjective, grouped on the one hand according to the occurrence of 'figlinae' and 'praedia', and on the other according to their position in relation to the adjective. A dot signifies that the case is logically impossible.
Position of the adjective expressing place of manufacture in relation to the words 'praedia' and 'figlinae'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position of the adjective</th>
<th>Text type</th>
<th>Occurring in stamp</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'praed' but not 'figl'</td>
<td>'figl' but not 'praed'</td>
<td>both 'praed' and 'figl'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adj. linked directly to word</td>
<td>'praedia'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'figlinae'</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adj. not linked directly to either word</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of stamps containing the adjective 580

The Table shows very clearly that the adjective "behaves" in different ways to the words 'figlinae' and 'praedia'. From the right-hand column it will be seen that in 273 stamps the adjective is linked directly to the word 'figlinae' and in 11 stamps directly to the word 'praedia'; this difference is significant, especially when it is noted that 'praedia' occurs more commonly in the stamps than 'figlinae'. From the same column it is seen that the most common case is one in which the adjective is not linked directly to 'figlinae' or 'praedia'. Examples of this are stamps (4), (7), (9), (32), (35) above. Especially communicative are the figures of the central column: if a stamp contains both 'figlinae' and 'praedia' the adjective "chooses" 'figlinae' in all but one case. This is typical of late second century stamps, which I shall examine later.

Examination of specimen cases and statistics has now led to the result that the adjective (M) expressing place of manufacture is linked to the word 'figlinae' but not to the word 'praedia' (except for 11 special cases to be examined later). My interpretation of this result is that the adjectives are merely names of figlinae, i.e. the praedia have no names, but the figlinae have names. Even when an adjective occurs detached in the text, substantivally employed, as 'the name of the brick' (e.g. (opus)Macedonianum, (tegula) Tempesina etc), its origin is the name of figlinae in the sense that the name of figlinae is transferred to the product made in that figlinae.
As noted earlier, Dressel and Bloch take no account of this difference, but consider 'figlinae' and 'praedia' as words of equal value even in relation to the adjective expressing place of manufacture. Dressel presents the matter thus in the list of text types which appears at the beginning of CIL XV and in his comments.46

I shall now give an example of Dressel’s interpretations; the case is one in which his error can be noted by comparison of stamps. The stamps are as follows:

CIL 221b

EX PRE FAV OPVS DOLIARE             sic
A CALPETAN BERN 

ex praedis Faustinae, opus doliare a Calpetano Verna

CIL 220

OP·DOL·EX·PR AVGG NN FIG FAO             sic
RIAN CALP·VERNA·

opus doliare ex praedis Augustorum duorum nostrorum,
figlinis Favorianis, (a) Calpetano Verna

CIL 725

EX 'PRAE'D FAVST·OP·DOLIAR A CALPETA
CRESCENTE QV·R·TL·A

ex praedis Faustinae, opus doliare a Calpetano Crescente
qu.r.tl.a.(?)

CIL 218

OP DOL EX PR AVGG NN FIGL FAVO
R·A CALPET CRESCENTE·

opus doliare ex praedis Augustorum duorum nostrorum,
figlinis Favorianis, a Calpetano Crescente

In stamp CIL 221 Dressel completes the words EX PRE FAV as ex praedis Favorianis, because the same officinator, Calpetan Verna (Berna) appears in CIL 220 with the words FIG FAORIAN (= figlinis Favorianis). A comparison of the stamps of Calpetan Verna CIL 221 and 220 with the stamps of Calpetan Crescens CIL 725 and 218, parallel to the former pair, shows that the correct completion of CIL 221 is: ex praedis Faustinae. We are not concerned, therefore, with a praedia named Favoriana, but with the landed property of the Empress Faustina (the younger). Marini supports the latter interpretation, but Dressel does not accept it because he prefers to date CIL 221b to a period later than Faustina.47 – So the adjective Favorianus, a, um is linked directly to the word 'figlinae’ but not to the word 'praedia'.
I shall now examine separately the 11 stamps in which the adjective is linked directly to the word 'praedia'. The conclusion reached earlier, that the adjectives are merely the names of figlinae, does not hold good here. The stamps are:

CIL 542  D·PSVB·ORTA  
         IMP·CAE·NE·T·AVG  
         GER·DAC·Q·C  
         L·LAB·BARS  

CIL 530  APR·ET·PAE COS·EX·PR·SABIN  
         EX·OF·CL·FRON  
         SAL  

CIL  9  OP DOL EX PR AIACIA ARVL EPAGATH  
         MAXIM ET AVIT COS  

CIL 10  EX·PR·AIACIANIS·OP·DOL  
         EX·OF·CAL·PRIMIT  

CIL 462b  EX PREDIS QVINTANESIB  
          AGATHYRSVS AVG LIB  
          F  

CIL 279  OP FIG DOL EX PRAED LIC DOMINI N  
         L SEPTIMI SEVERI AVG  

CIL 142  FVNDVM SILIANI SERVILI PROCE  
         SSI PRAEDIA CENTVRION  

CIL 541a  OPVS DOL EX PRED STATON COMM AVG  
          DOMIN N EX FIG MADISP  

CIL 14  EX PRAEDIS ASTIVIANIS  

CIL 137  OP·F·EX·PR·CANINIANI·SERG  
         SVLPICI·SERVANDI  

S. 148  L·V·VAL EX PRAE SALARE. . .  
         PAETIN APRONIA  

I briefly comment upon these stamps:

CIL 542: the beginning is completed as de praeidis sub Orta imperatoris etc. To the word 'praedia' a prepositional expression is actually linked. The words SVB·ORTA, which in this stamp are best interpreted as a prepositional expression, occur in other stamps more clearly in adjectival form, e.g. in stamps (27) (p. 62)
CIL 530: Dressel completes the end of the first line as *ex praedis Sabinis*, but adds that SABIN may also signify a person's name (name of *dominus*), Sabinus or Sabina. Domini mentioned in brick stamps who would fit this particular stamp are *Larcia Sabina* (CIL 1235–1236), whom Dressel also mentions, *Sabina Sabinilla* (CIL 354) and the Empress Sabina (S. 144–145). Since the latest discoveries appear to show that the Empress Sabina actually appears as *dominus* of brick stamps, it is probable that in CIL 530 SABIN is in fact an abbreviation of her name. The correct choice would be *ex praedis Sabinae*, and we should encounter a similar case to the ''praedia Favoriana'' explained earlier.

CIL 9 and 10: Dressel considers it possible that the *praedia Aiaciana* mentioned in these stamps has received its name from *Vibius Aiacianus*, who appears as *dominus* in stamps CIL 1500, 1503 and 1504. It may be assumed that the adjective *Aiacianus* in these stamps replaces the name of a person in the genitive; 'praedia Aiaciana' would be an expression of the same kind as 'bona Plautiana'. Such use of an adjective may indicate that *Vibius Aiacianus* has died and that his landed property, 'praedia Aiaciana', has been undivided at the time that stamps CIL 9 and 10 were made.51

CIL 462 and its variant CIL 463: The *praedia Quintanensia* mentioned in the stamp is known also from other sources.52 The adjective *Quintanensis* occurs in several stamps. In none of them is it linked directly to the word 'figlinae', and it is therefore merely the name of a *praedia*.

CIL 279: *Praedia Liciniana* or *Licinianum* (sc. *praedium*) is a similar case to *praedia Quintanensia*. The adjective occurs in 17 stamps, generally without a head word, in the following abbreviations: DE LICINI, DE LICIN, DE LIC, DL; only in CIL 279 does the adjective have a head word, which is 'praedia'. Mentioned in CIL 139, 226, 408 and 630 is portus Licini, which is best explained as the name of a river harbour. Possibly the name of *praedia Liciniana* is derived from that of portus Licini.

CIL 142 and 541: *Praedia Centurion(iea?)* and *praedia Statoniensia* are similar cases to the two preceding. These adjectives occur only in these stamps.

CIL 14: The adjective *Astivianus, a, um* is linked in this stamp directly to the word 'praedia'; in CIL 13 the same adjective is linked directly to the word 'figlinae'. In the CIL XV list of text types Dressel presents this case as an example of the fact that the adjectives are linked both to the word 'figlinae' and the word 'praedia'.55

CIL 137: In this stamp the adjective *Caninianus, a, um* is linked directly to the word 'praedia', in 16 stamps it is linked directly to 'figlinae' and in one it is linked to neither. In the other stamp (CIL 136) of officinator Serg. Sulpicius Servandus, who appears in CIL 137, *praedia Caniniana* is replaced by *figlinae Caninianae*. In this case the anomalous stamp CIL 137 may be explained as a mistake of the stamp maker.

S. 148: The adjective *Salarensis, e*, which in this stamp is linked directly to the word 'praedia', is in other stamps detached without a head word; in not a single stamp is it linked directly to the word 'figlinae'.57
Late Second Century Stamps

In the late second century a new analytic text type becomes general which does not cause such problems of interpretation as the synthetic texts of the early second century. The analytic character may be seen from the following points, which can be compared with points 1) and 2) on pages 66–67 above.

1) The place of brick manufacture (name of figlinae) is expressed in one manner only, by linking the adjective expressing the place to the word 'figlinae': ex figlinis M.

2) The word 'figlinae' is used with only one function, namely to express the place of brick manufacture: ex figlinis M; to indicate dominus only the word 'praedia' is used: ex praedis huius.

In each stamp, therefore, occurs both 'figlinae' and 'praedia'; the frequency of this text type is shown by the figures in the central column of the Table on page 68.

The following stamp is an example of an analytic text:

(36) EX PR FAVSTINA AVG EX FIC CANINIA
     OP DOL BRITTIDI PRISCINI
     ex praedis Faustinae Augustae, ex figlinis Caninianis, opus doliare Brittidi Priscini

The text is unambiguous although syntactical stops and word endings are absent. The reason for the lack of ambiguity is that the words 'praedia' and 'figlinae' both occur, each in its own function, and in addition the words 'opus doliare' signifying the brick itself are marked in the text. The three matters are expressed as follows:

- officinatar: opus illius
- place of manufacture: ex figlinis M
- dominus: ex praedis huius

The matters expressed are the same as in early second century texts (those, that is to say, in which all three matters are expressed), but the form of expression is different. The difference in use of the words 'praedia' and 'figlinae', whose detection in earlier synthetic texts made analysis of the texts necessary, is now clearly apparent. Similarly with the difference between stamps of the first and second centuries: from the first century stamp (3) (p. 49) the dominus portion (ex praedis huius) is missing, but other matters are expressed in both stamps in the same way.

The analytic expression opus ex praedis huius, ex figlinis M is evidently quite the same in content as the synthetic expressions opus M ex praedis huius, opus M ex figlinis huius, opus ex figlinis M huius; all contain two matters, place of manufacture (name of figlinae) and name of dominus, expressed in different ways.
It may be deduced from this that in stamp (36), for instance, *dominus* is the owner of both *praedia* and *figlinae* although his name is a genitive attribute of the word *'praedia' only. It appears from the stamp, that is, that *figlinae Caniniaene* belongs to the *praedia* of the Empress Faustina, or is located in them. This accords with what was previously noted with regard to the similar use of *'praedia' and 'figlinae' in early second century stamps. The two words are equivalents in the expression of *dominus* for the undoubted reason that *figlinae* was located in *praedia*, the owner of *figlinae* and *praedia* being the same.

If the words *'praedia' and 'figlinae'* are used with the same meanings in analytic as in earlier synthetic stamp texts, then *praedia* and *figlinae* mentioned in the same stamp must have the same owner. That this is so is not as clearly visible in all stamps as in (36). In the following stamp, for instance (whose textual omissions and scriptural errors will be corrected).

(37) O DO EX FAVST AVG FIG RANINIANAS sic
RVTILI SVCESSI sic CIL 134

*opus doliare ex (praedis) Faustinae Augustae, figlinis Caniniaene, Rutili Successi*

the text differs from the preceding one only in the transfer of the words *'opus doliare'*, signifying the brick itself, from before the name of officinator to the beginning of the text, but this is enough to make the stamp ambiguous. The problem is the same as with the first century stamp (5) (p. 52): should there be a comma before the name of officinator or not? If the comma is omitted, *Rutilius Successus* is the owner of *figlinae Caniniaene*; if the comma is added, *Rutilius Successus* is merely the "owner" of the brick. Comparison with the preceding and following stamps readily indicates that the composer of the text intended it to be arranged with a comma before the name of officinator, meaning that *Rutilius Successus* is not the owner of *figlinae Caniniaene* but the "owner" of the brick. The owner of *figlinae Caniniaene* remains the Empress Faustina.

The following stamp is again unambiguous, although the words *'opus doliare'* signifying the brick itself are in a different position from the positions they occupy in the two previous texts:

(38) EX PR LVCIL VERI OP DO-EX-FIG
CAN-VIBI PVDES S. 41

*ex praedia Lucillae Veri, opus doliare ex figlinis Caniniaene, Vibius Pudens (fecit)"

This is unambiguous because the *cognomen* of officinator is written in full, so that the syntactical position of the name of officinator is seen from the case ending; the name of officinator is the subject of the sentence in the same way as in the first century stamp (1b) (p. 47). This text too cannot be interpreted as showing that
Vibius Pudens is the owner of figlinae Caninianae.

In some stamps the word 'figlinae' seems to occur without an adjective expressing place of manufacture (name of figlinae). These stamps are more difficult to explain than the preceding ones. Here, for instance

(39) EX·PRAE·MAGIAE·MARCELLAE
    FIGVL·ORTENSI·PROCL

Dressel completes the second line as figulinis Ortensi Procli. If this is correct, then praedia and figlinae have different owners. In this case, too, the text can be completed in another way which preserves the consistency of the expressions.

The abbreviations F, FIG, FIGL, FIGVL etc in stamps do not indicate the word 'figlinae' alone, but may also signify (when not preceded by the preposition ex or de) the words 'figlinum' (= opus figlinum), 'figlinator' or 'figulus'.

58 In the following stamp, for instance

(40) OPVS DOL EX PRAED AVGG NN FIGL
    MARCION FIGL AEL FELIX

the only possible completion on the second line is figlinator Aelius Felix. The word 'figlinae' cannot be considered because of FIGL MARCIAN (= figlinis Marcinis) earlier in the text; 'figlinum (sc. opus)' does not fit because the name of officinator is in the nominative.

In the following stamp again

(41) OPVS DOL EX PRAED AVGG NN FIGL
    MARCION FIGL A CAL MAXM

the only possible completion on the second line is figlinum (sc. opus) a Calventia Maximina. The word 'figlinae' cannot be accepted for the same reason as in the previous case, nor can 'figlinator' 'figlinatrix' because the name of officinator appears in a prepositional construction used with a genitive function. The letter A, moreover, signifies the preposition and not the praenomen Aulus because the officinator is a woman (her name occurs unabbreviated in stamps CIL 214–216).

Correspondingly, stamp (39) can now be completed in such a form as not to contain the information that praedia and figlinae have different owners, e.g.: ex praedis Magiae Marcellae, figulinum (sc. opus) Ortensi Procli. There are four more similar cases in the stamps, CIL 416, 769, 1092 (= S. 282) and 1466.

Remaining in the material are four stamps which can only be interpreted in the sense that praedia and figlinae have different owners. The following is one of them:
The word 'figlinae' cannot now be replaced with the words 'figlinator' and 'figlinum'. In the following stamps the same persons appear as in the preceding: Domitia Lucilla and Quartio (who is evidently the slave of Domitia Lucilla); but another picture is given of the proprietary relationships of figlinae.

In these stamps Quartio does not own a figlinae, but Domitia Lucilla owns both figlinae and praedia.

These stamps cannot be explained by ascribing the same meaning to 'figlinae' in all cases. Stamps (43) and (44) form a similar pair to those listed on pages 58–62; in these the words 'figlinae' and 'praedia' are used as equivalents in a connection where it is immaterial which of the two is used. In stamp (42), on the other hand, the words 'figlinae' and 'praedia' are used to express different matters. Stamp (42), which does not fit the picture, could be explained as a maker's error, particularly as only one specimen of it is known, but this explanation would not fit the three other stamps of the same type. The only explanation left is that in these four stamps the word 'figlinae' is used in the sense of 'officina'. Although all these stamps are late it cannot be argued from them that 'figlinae' gradually assumed the meaning of 'officina', because in the latest stamps, after the 'empty period' of the third century, only the word 'officina' appears, and 'figlinae' has disappeared.

The subject-matter of brick stamp texts is so simple that the persons for whom the message was intended understood it from a very scanty text. Name of officinator, place of manufacture (name of figlinae) and name of dominus were clearly conveyed if proper nouns and the words 'figlinae' and/or 'praedia' were present; word order mattered little and inflectional endings not at all. The maker of stamps had no need to be careful with regard to his ancient readers, but the way he acted caused difficulties for later students.
5. A Case Study: the *figlinae Caepionianae*

The stamps of *figlinae Caepionianae* illuminate the meaning of the word 'figlinae' in the same way as the stamps of *figlinae Marcianae*. For this reason I have chosen them as an illustration. They contain abundant data and provide more opportunities for deduction than is normal; they are not, in fact, a typical group of Roman brick stamps. – Dressel and Bloch place 78 stamps under the *figlinae Caepionianae* heading. The earliest are from the late first century and the latest is from after the year 138.

Because the stamps are from the second century the name of the owner of *figlinae (dominus)* is also mentioned in them. Relations of possession are thus reflected in *figlinae Caepionianae* stamps more fully than in the first century stamps of *figlinae Marcianae* which were examined earlier.

The history of *figlinae Caepionianae* ownership is as follows: About the year 100 the *figlinae* had two owners, Plotia Isaurica and C. Curiatius Cosanus. Subsequently, but at the same time as the former, Arria Fadilla, mother of the later Emperor Antoninus Pius, appears as owner of *figlinae Caepionianae*. About the year 115 the share of Plotia Isaurica is transferred to Arria Fadilla; Cosanus retains his share until the year 123, after which his name disappears from the stamps and is replaced by Ti. Tutilius Sentius Satrinus. After the year 130 the only owners encountered in stamps are the son of Arria Fadilla, who used the names Arrius Antoninus and Fulvus Antoninus before he became Emperor, and her daughter Arria Lupula.

*Figlinae Caepionianae* therefore had at least two owners at once, sometimes three. In the year 123 at any rate there were three, because the names of the consuls of that year are mentioned in stamps of *Arria Fadilla, Curiatius Cosanus* and *Sentius Satrinus*.

How are complicated proprietary relationships to be explained? What did these persons own? If we start from the meaning 'figlinae' = 'brickworks' we encounter great difficulties of explanation: either there were several manufactories of the same name or the same manufactory was owned by several persons at the same time. I shall examine only the latter alternative, because it alone gives opportunities for further deductions. We are faced with a question of collective ownership (*societas*), of which many examples are known from brick stamps (see p. 113 below). *Societas*, however, is a poor explanation in the *figlinae Caepionianae* case, because in each stamp only one owner is mentioned and not all contemporaneous owners, as might be expected. If, on the other hand, 'figlinae' is 'manufactory', then *societas* is not only collective ownership but also collective enterprise. It is difficult to understand why persons of the senatorial order should have practised commercial activities in such forms (among the owners of *figlinae Caepionianae Arria Fadilla, Arrius Antoninus* and *Arria Lupula* at least were of this order, and probably others also).
Dressel observed the difficulties and therefore arrived at the explanation that the adjective *Caepionianus, a, um* refers not to *figlinae* but to *praedia*: the *figlinae* of the *domini* mentioned in stamps were located in *praedia Caepioniana*. This explanation is poor because *figlinae Caepionianae* but not *praedia Caepioniana* is mentioned in the stamps. Dressel’s explanation shows that he had in mind the meaning ‘*figlinae*’ = ‘brickworks’, in other words he supposed that the word ‘*figlinae*’ refers to the production organization, an administrative whole and not merely a territorial whole.

All difficulties vanish if we accept ‘clay district’ as the meaning of ‘*figlinae*’. There was only one *figlinae Caepionianae*, and each *dominus* had his own *praedia*. The boundaries of these *praedia* intersected at *figlinae Caepionianae*. Each *dominus* had a part of *figlinae Caepionianae* on his *praedia*. *Figlinae Caepionianae* contained several *officinae* in which bricks were made from the clay of *figlinae Caepionianae*. The *officinatores* of the stamps were ‘‘directors’’ of these *officinae*. In their stamps they mentioned not only their own names but also those of *figlinae Caepionianae* and the person on whose land they produced bricks. By this explanation *figlinae Caepionianae* is neither an administrative nor a production unit but merely a territorial entity.

Our mental picture of *figlinae Caepionianae* is clarified by additional epithets which occur in some stamps. In CIL 106 (= S. 36) the words ‘‘*ab Euripo’’’ are joined to the name of *figlinae Caepionianae*; in CIL 107-110 and S. 37 ‘‘*ab Euripo’’’ occurs without that name. A similar addition linked to *figlinae Caepionianae*, in Dressel’s view, is ‘‘*a Pila Alta’’’, which occurs in CIL 111. Other expressions which clearly indicate a place and are closely linked to *figlinae Caepionianae* are ‘‘*Caricet( )’’ (stamps CIL 101 and 102 (= S. 34)) and ‘‘*de Mulionis’’’ (stamps CIL 338–340). *Figlinae Caepionianae* was evidently an extensive area. It stretched in one direction to a canal (*euripus*) and in another to the area of a high column or embankment (*pila alta*). Sub-areas later became independent and were no longer regarded as parts of *figlinae Caepionianae*, but as *figlinae* in their own right. In the latest stamp (CIL 110) in use after the year 138 (Antoninus is already Emperor) the place of brick manufacture is merely ‘‘*figlinae ab Euripo’’’; in CIL 338, a stamp of about the same time, the place of manufacture is ‘‘*figlinae Mulionis’’’. It may be imagined that clay digging and brick making gradually ceased in the central area of *figlinae Caepionianae*, but that activities continued in bordering areas.

Dressel and Bloch do not interpret the letter combinations CARICET and CARÇ[], which occur in the stamps, in the manner introduced earlier, but assume that the combinations contain the name of a person.

The stamps are as follows:
The interpretations of Dressel and Bloch are:

CIL 101 ex praedis Curiati Cosani, Caric(i?) et T. Rausi Pamphili
CIL 102 T. Rausi Pamphili, ex figlinis Car(i)c(i . . ) C. Curiati Cosani

According to this interpretation a person named Caricus appears in the stamps, in CIL 101 as officinator with T. Rausius Pamphilus, and in CIL 102 as dominus evidently with C. Curiatius Cosanus. Such a situation is highly improbable, however, because the officinares and domini of brick stamps form two non-overlapping categories, the same person not appearing in stamps as both officinator and dominus (see p. 92 below). Matters are made still more improbable by the fact that Caricus would in both cases be a partner of a societas.

It is therefore better to explain CARICET and CARÇ[ as place names of the same nature as "ab Euripo", "a Pila Alta" and "de Mulionis". This interpretation is also supported by comparison of the stamps; the preceding specimens may be compared with the following:

The stamps correspond to each other in pairs, on the one hand CIL 101 and CIL 67a, and on the other CIL 102 and CIL 86. Among text components the name of officinator, T. Rausius Pamphilus, remains constant in all stamps; the other components are variables: dominus: C. Curiatius Cosanus – Plotia Isaurica – Arria Fadilla; name of place of manufacture: Caricet/Carc[ – Cepional/Caepionianis. The correspondence of place names is quite clear: the word CARICET corresponds to the word CEPIONAL and the word CARÇ[ corresponds to the word CAEPIONIANIS. It is so clear, indeed, that the words CARICET and CARÇ[ might be suspected as errors by the stamp maker.
I shall still examine stamps CIL 338-340, in which the place of manufacture is expressed by the words EX FIG MVLIONIS, DE MVL and D MVLIONIS. Dressel did not place these stamps among the stamps of figlinae Caepionianae, but the connection between them and the latter is extremely clear. In all three stamps at least one person is mentioned who appears also in figlinae Caepionianae stamps. The dominus of CIL 339 is Plotia Isaurica, the first known owner of figlinae Caepionianae. Avienus Halitius ( ), mentioned in the same stamp as officinator, may also appear in the following figlinae Caepionianae stamp which has only recently been published complete:67

EX PR SENTIC SATRIANI CAE
A·A·H

The second line of CIL 339 containing the name of officinator reads as follows: AB AVIENO HALITY. If A·A·H is an abbreviation of the words ab Avieno Halitius, which is not improbable, then both persons of CIL 339 appear also in figlinae Caepionianae stamps. — "De Mulionis" stamp CIL 340 contains one name: the person mentioned is M. Bassus (= Statius Marcius Bassus), who was officinator in figlinae Caepionianae in the time of both Plotia Isaurica and Arria Fadilla (see below p. 144 no. 33).

The most interesting and problematical person appearing in these stamps is dominus of CIL 338, Iulia Lupula (the name appears in the form IVLIAE LXPVLAE), whose connection with figlinae Caepionianae went unnoticed by Dressel and Bloch.

Iulius Capitolinus mentions at the beginning of his biography of Antoninus Pius68 the following relations of the Emperor: mother, Arria Fadilla, step-father Iulius Lupus and step-sister Iulia Fadilla. Arria Fadilla had therefore, evidently after the death of the Emperor's father T. Aurelius Fulvus,69 contracted a new marriage with Iulius Lupus.70 Born of this marriage was a daughter for whom Capitolinus uses the name Iulia Fadilla. In a brick stamp published by Bloch in 195871 this person appears with the name Arria Lupula as dominus of figlinae Caepionianae. If account is taken of the many connections between stamps of figlinae Caepionianae and "de Mulionis" noted earlier, Iulia Lupula, dominus of stamp CIL 338, may also be identified as this daughter of Arria Fadilla and step-sister of the Emperor.

A capricious use of name by the Emperor's sister strikes our attention: in each document she has a different name formed from various combinations of the names of her parents. Such vacillation is common, however, among senatorial families of the second century. The name occurring in stamp CIL 338 is composed merely from the names of the father of Iulia Lupula and gives no indication of the close relationship between Iulia Lupula and the Emperor Antoninus Pius.72

The later history of the ownership of figlinae Caepionianae may now be particularized as follows: About the year 130 the whole of figlinae Caepionianae
belonged to the lands of Arria Fadilla. That part, among others, to which the words "de Mulionis" refer had been transferred to her from Plotia Isaurica, and that part to which the words "ab Euripo" refer was transferred from Ti. Tutinius Sentius Satrinus. The landed property of Arria Fadilla was divided on her death between her son and daughter. That part of figlinae Caepionianae to which "de Mulionis" belonged became the property of the daughter, Iulia Lupula (Arria Lupula, Iulia Fadilla), while the part containing "ab Euripo" became the property of the son, Arrius Antoninus (Fulvus Antoninus). Another possibility is that the "ab Euripo" part was transferred directly from Ti. Tutinius Sentius Satrinus to Arrius Antoninus after the death of Arria Fadilla. This is suggested by the words of CIL 1427 EX FIG QVAE FVE SEN SATR (= ex figlinae quae fuerunt Sentii Satrini), the year being 134, and on the other hand by the fact that the dated stamps of Arrius Antoninus are from 134. It may be assumed that in early 134 Sentius Satrinus had been dead only a short time and that the land left by him was not yet divided; this situation would be reflected by stamp CIL 1427. Later the same year the property of Sentius Satrinus would have been divided and part of it transferred to Arrius Antoninus.  

Location of figlinae Caepionianae

Roman brick stamps contain little information on the whereabouts of figlinae mentioned by name; it has been possible to locate only two or three with reasonable certainty. With reference to figlinae Caepionianae, Huotari, who to my knowledge has studied the location of figlinae most extensively, alludes only to an inscription of Curiatius Cosanus found in Ameria and makes no further suggestion. I shall now present data which connect figlinae Caepionianae with the region of the present-day town of Orte, situated near the confluence of Tiber and Nera.

Among the domini of figlinae Caepionianae C. Curiatius Cosanus is known, apart from brick stamp references, only from three inscriptions all connected with the town of Ameria. His letter sent in the capacity of curator municipii Caeretanorum to the decurions of Caere is dated in Ameria on 12th September 113. An altar has been found at Ameria whose inscription states that it was set up to Fortuna by decision of the decurions "ob munificentiam Curiati Cosani". A third inscription is fragmentary, with only the cognomen preserved, but in this too the same person is possibly mentioned. In inscriptions of Ameria there appear two other C. Curiatii, who may be freedmen of Curiatius Cosanus. These data indicate that C. Curiatius Cosanus was a man of note in Ameria, which means that he owned a great deal of land in its territory. The date of the letter is compatible with what we know of the history of owners of figlinae Caepionianae (see p. 76 above). Marini already connected these three inscriptions with the C. Curiatius Cosanus mentioned in brick stamps.
The left bank of the Tiber near the present-day town of Orte belonged to the territory of Ameria at the period of the *figlinae Caepionianae* stamps, the Tiber formed the boundary between the territories of Horta and Ameria.

In the territory of Ameria near the left bank of the Tiber has been found a monument to Cassia Venetia, said in the inscription to have been raised by Doris, a *liberta* of the deceased. This Doris might be the same person as officinator Cassia Doris, who appears in brick stamps CIL 73–75. In CIL 73 and 74 the name of *figlinae Caepionianae* is mentioned, also Arria Fadilla as *dominus*; CIL 73 has the consular date of 124.

Among the *nomina* of *figlinae Caepionianae officinatores* appearing in the Ameria inscriptions of *CIL XI* are Aljos, Avienus, Pettius and Travius. Appearing as *officinatores* in brick stamps are Sex. Alfius Amandus (CIL 98, 99, 104, 111), Avienus Halty ( ) (see p. 79 above), Pett(ius) Proculus (CIL 90, 95; S. 31, 32) and T. Travius Felix (CIL 235, 338, 383). Avienus Halty ( ) and T. Travius Felix declare DE MVL and FIG MVLLIONIS as the place of manufacture for their bricks, while the other stamps bear the name of *figlinae Caepionianae*.

A third connection between *figlinae Caepionianae* and the Orte area is provided by the Statii Marcii and C. Satrinii, *officinatores* of the "*figlinae Marcianae* group". As I shall recount later in the history of the Statii Marcii (p. 126–127 below), the last *officinatores* bearing that name are encountered in *figlinae Caepionianae* and *figlinae Subortanae*. St. Marcius Lucifer and St. Marcius Bassus in the former and St. Marcius Fortunatus in the latter. If it is assumed that the Statii Marcii did not move geographically far from each other, then *figlinae Caepionianae* was located near *figlinae Subortanae*. Some degree of proof that at least St. Marcius Lucifer and St. Marcius Fortunatus worked near each other in the early stage of their careers is offered by stamp CIL 62 for the former and stamp CIL 1275b for the latter; these are of an extremely rare type and closely resemble each other.

*Figlinae Subortanae* is a *figlinae* whose name expresses its geographical location. Occurring in the stamps is the word SVB·ORTA (CIL 542), SVB·HOR (CIL 543), SVB·VRTAN (CIL 546), SVBORTANI (CIL 545) etc., meaning "below Orta (Horta)", and *figlinae Subortanae* therefore signifies "*figlinae below Horta". The ancient Horta (Orta) is present-day Orte.

A second connection between the *officinatores* of *figlinae Marcianae* and *figlinae Caepionianae* is supplied by the Satrinii. In stamp CIL 110 Satrinius Fortunatus is *officinatores*; mentioned as place of manufacture is merely "*figlinae ab Euripo*" and *dominus* is the Emperor Antoninus Pius, which shows that the stamp is from the year 138 at the earliest. Can this Satrinius be linked in some manner to C. Satrinius Communis and C. Satrinius Celer, who were active in *figlinae Marcianae* during the first century (cf. p.127 below)?

Marini has already drawn attention to the epitaph CIL XI 4519 found in the territory of Ameria and composed by Satrinius Clemens for his sons. Marini thought it possible that this Satrinius Clemens was the same person as C. Satrinius Clemens of brick stamp CIL 384 = S. 96. In the stamp of C. Satrinius Clemens the
words EX FI OCE M (= *ex figlinis Oceanis minoribus* (or *maioribus*)) are used for the place of manufacture. Because in one stamp of *C. Satrinius Celer* (CIL 388), whose stamps CIL 303 and 304 mention the name of *figlinae Marcianae*, the place of manufacture is expressed with the words EX F OCIANI (=*ex figlinis Oceanis*), it may be assumed that *C. Satrinius Clemens* is associated with the *C. Satrinii* of *figlinae Marcianae*. In fact, *C. Satrinius Clemens* may be the same person as *Clemens*, the slave of *C. Satrinius Celer*, mentioned in stamp S. 547, subsequently manumitted. Thus the *Satrinii* form a connection between *figlinae Marcianae*, *figlinae Oceanae* and *figlinae Caepionianae*, and the territory of *Ameria*.

The same combination of *figlinae* arises through stamps of the *Statii Marcii*, members of the second family belonging to the *figlinae Marcianae* group. In *figlinae Marcianae* appear *Statius Marcius Rabbæus* (CIL 310, 311; S. 81), in *figlinae Oceanae* *Statius Marcius Secundio* (CIL 357) and in *figlinae Caepionianae* the earlier mentioned *Statius Marcius Lucifer* and *Statius Marcius Bassus*. As evidence of connection between *figlinae Caepionianae* and *figlinae Oceanae* at a later period stand the stamps of *T. Travius Felix*: EX FIG MVLIONIS (=*ex figlinis Mulionis*) as place of manufacture in CIL 338 and FIG OCEAN MIN (=*(ex) figlinis Oceanis minoribus*) in CIL 383; *Travius Felix* is officinator in these stamps; the domini mentioned, *Iulia Lupula* and *Augg. nn.*, indicate the middle and later part of the second century.

With the aid of officinator families some sort of relative position is thus found for *figlinae Caepionianae* in relation to *figlinae Marcianae*, *figlinae Subortanae* and *figlinae Oceanae*. The name of *figlinae Subortanae* and the inscription of *Satrinius Clemens* point to the district of present-day Orte as an absolute location.

*Figlinae Caepionianae* stamps also contain many features which do not indicate the district of present-day Orte; no source discloses, for instance, that any *figlinae Caepionianae* owner other than *C. Curiatius Cosanus* had owned land in the *Ameria* or *Horta* territory. But no facts speak against the Orte area as a location. The above argument is intended as a hypothesis which might possibly be tested by investigations on the ground or other methods. If the location of *figlinae Caepionianae* (or another *figlinae* of importance) could be established with certainty, the information would have great significance for the study of Roman urbanistics and economic geography.

6. Conclusions

Analysis of brick stamp texts and examination of specimen cases show that of the two possible meanings of the word 'figlinae', namely 'brickworks' and 'clay district', the latter is correct. 'Clay district' is a meaning far better suited to the contexts in which the word 'figlinae' is used in brick stamps. The reasons are briefly as follows:
1) The name of the figlinae owner (dominus) is found in stamps not earlier than the beginning of the second century. In stamps of an early period (the first century) the owner is not mentioned, but other persons active in the figlinae are referred to. — If figlinae were a manufactory, then the owner of figlinae would be, nominally at least, director of the production organization operating at the said manufactory, and it would then seem natural for his name — and no other person’s — to appear in stamps as representative of all members of the production organization.

2) The word 'figlinae' appears in stamps qualified by a proper adjective, in other words figlinae are mentioned by name; in early stamps the word 'figlinae' appears only thus. — Mention of the name of figlinae in brick stamps can easily be explained as a mark of quality in some degree. Figlinae mentioned by name were areas whose clay was considered especially suitable for manufacture of high-quality bricks.

3) The word 'praedia' appears in stamps at the same time as the name of the owner of figlinae (dominus). The words 'figlinae' and 'praedia' are used without difference of meaning when the owner of figlinae (dominus) is declared. Therefore, as an instance of the right of ownership figlinae = praedia, but as a specified locality figlinae ≠ praedia. — If the word 'figlinae' meant 'manufactory', its possible replacement by the word 'praedia' would be strange. But if the word 'figlinae' has a territorial meaning only, then ex figlinis huius = ex praedis huius is fully understandable because these expressions are equivalent means of designating the owner of the land on which and from which the bricks were manufactured.

4) Proprietary relations of figlinae: On the evidence of brick stamps cases can be found in which a figlinae mentioned by name is owned simultaneously by more than one person, not collectively (as a societas) but with each individual owning his own part. Such cases are difficult to explain if figlinae is an administrative unit (manufactory), but easy to explain if figlinae is merely a territorial unit (clay district).

Notes to Chapter IV

1 Words occur in stamps in forms so abbreviated that it is not always certain what word is intended. Thus the letters F, FIG, FIGL, FIGVL etc. may be short forms not only of fig(u)linae but also of fig(u)linum (sc. opus), figlinator (occurs in full in stamp S. 311), figulus or even fecit; OF, OFIC may signify not only officina but also opus figlinum. The word intended must be deduced from the context.

2 In late stamps which belong to the years following the "blank period" of the 3rd century and which Dressel has placed in a separate section of CIL XV, 'officina' is the only word mentioned here which appears, and it is in general use. These late stamps do not lie within the scope of the present study and do not figure in the calculations presented.
3 See Ernout-Meillet and Walde etymological dictionaries, Georges and Lewis & Short and Thesaurus, v.v. 'officina', 'fabrica', 'praedium', 'figlinus', 'figlinae' and their equivalents in modern languages.

4 Definition of Ulpian: Dig. 50, 16, 198 'Urbana praedia' omnia aedificia accipimus, non solum ea quae sunt in oppidis, sed si forte stabula sunt vel alia meritoria in villis et in vicis, vel si praetoria voluptati tantum deservientia: quia urbanum praedium non locus factit, sed materia.

5 'Fornaces figlinae' occurs in Arnob. nat. 6, 14: "simulacra fornicibus incocata figlinis". 'Fodinae figlinae' may perhaps be completed in accordance with a passage of Varro which will be examined later, p. 43. 'Officinae figlinae' is supported by stamp S. 574, where the normal "ex figlinis Marcianis" is replaced by [ex] officinis Marcianis].

6 CIL XV, p. 4. Dressel adds to the above quoted: "est tamen ubi figlinae et officina idem valeant." – This explanation of Dressel has been taken into Thesaurus, v. figlina, 708, 12–14.

7 Cozzo p. 252–253.

8 Cozzo's thesis in his book is that the period when building and the use of brick were at their most intensive began in Rome at the time of the Severi. Accordingly, he would move the dating of stamps as a whole about 100 years forward from the chronology of Dressel. Bloch has shown (BL, p. 15–23), to my mind convincingly, that the datings of Cozzo rest on a faulty foundation, and that the chronology of Dressel is largely reliable. The passage mentioned above occurs in a section where Cozzo uses the meaning of words appearing on stamps to support his theory: 'figlinae' refers to a primitive production method and belongs therefore to an early period, the 2nd century, when brick production was slight; 'fornax' refers to a more developed method and belongs to the Severian epoch and the 3rd century, when production was abundant; 'officina' 'ci dà il concetto di una vera organizzazione industriale' and belongs to a later period when production establishments had been transferred to the State and productive activity was 'the most rational'.

The fact that Cozzo's theory is not based on the analysis of brick stamps is revealed in this passage particularly by what he says of the occurrence of 'fornax' in stamps: 'Da quel momento, il vecchio termine industriale Figlinae, non deve avere più risposto all'importanza dei nuovi impianti; vediamo, perciò, prevalere l'altra denominazione Furnace o Fornace, che ci indica la prevalenza del forno su tutte le altre parti della fabbrica, conseguenza certa di una specializzazione degli impianti e del personale.'

Cozzo thus asserts that 'fornax' is a word of similar general occurrence in Roman brick stamps to 'figlinae' and 'officina'. This is not the case, however. The word 'fornax' occurs in only 4 stamps (CIL 58, 63, 64, 157; S. 24 = CIL 64 b), which with one exception are early stamps of figlinae Caepionianae, from about the year 100 by Dressel's chronology.

9 Bloch, BL p. 334–. In this Chapter Bloch presents his conclusions more widely; his notions are also revealed elsewhere, in BL and the Supplement.


11 Bruns p. 122–139 = CIL II S 5493 = ILS 6087 = FIRA p. 177–199.

12 Bull. com. LXXVI (1956) p. 77–95, especially 79–.
Lex Tarentina 28 (Bruns p. 120–122, FIRA p. 166–169): It was a qualification for municipal office that the candidate should own in the city "aedificium quod non minus MD tegularum tectum sit".

Cic. ad Caes. iun. fr. 5 and Cass. Dio 46, 31, 3.

These tegulae were not necessarily, of course, the same or of the same size as actual roof tiles, as Mingazzini assumes.

CIL XI 1147.

Thesaurus: 'meris, dis' = 'pars fundi alii iuncta'.

Thesaurus does not explain the meaning of ''cum debelis''. It is treated merely as a proper noun in the Onomasticon; it occurs three times (obl. 17, 22 and 47); elsewhere it is a proper noun, but here clearly a common noun.

See Pachtère's map, between p. 30 and 31 in his book.

CIL XI 6673, 1–25; 6674, 1–56.

Both extracts belong to passages in which further diggings are mentioned, and the word 'metalla' occurs in both passages. In similar surroundings 'cretifodina' occurs in Ulp. Dig. 24, 3, 7, 13–14 and the following extracts from which gravel/sand is missing: Ulp. Dig. 27, 9, 3, 6; Gai. Dig. 39, 4, 13 pr; Paulus Dig. 50, 16, 77. Also Ulp. Dig. 4, 3, 34 ''cum mihi permisisses saxum exfundo tuo eicere vel cretam vel harenam foderere'.'

The word 'cretifodinae' means not only clay-pit but also chalk-pit, just as the root word 'creta' means both clay and chalk (Thesaurus, creta p. 1186, 7–27–). The fact that clay is the subject of discussion in the extracts quoted in this chapter is deduced from the presentation of creta as a substance of general occurrence in the soil, like lapis and harena.

See, for instance, Bruno, p. 40–43.

Finished bricks are lighter than the clay used as their raw material. Bruno mentions the following figures: In the 1920s in Germany an average of 1250 kg clay was used for 1000 kg bricks, and in central Sweden 1400 kg clay for 1000 kg wall bricks. Bruno, p. 37–38.

Supply of fuel may have been a factor affecting the location of brick-works. According to Bruno the share of fuel in the total production costs was some 20–30 % in Sweden before introduction of the ring-oven (Bruno p. 47). In Roman region the effect may have been that the brick-works were located to a greater distance from Rome, farther up the Tiber valley. – But on the location of the brick-works in relation to the clay digging site this factor has no effect.

E.g., of Gallic ceramic stamps, CIL XIII, 10 001–, Thesaurus states (v. fig(i)linus p. 708, 16): "In vasculis Gallicitis nusquam legitur figilinae, semper officina." – The same applies to Hispanic ceramic stamps, CIL II, 4970, and others too.

They are listed in CIL XV table of contents. Suppl. p. 125–127.
28 Datings by Dressel and Bloch have later been adjusted for several stamps, notably by Steinby, but Dressel's chronology has not been altered in essentials. Steinby in her datings has taken note of the variables whose occurrence I am examining, and therefore her datings are not independent of my variables.

29 Bloch draws attention to this difference in his comments on S. 548 b and S. 550 a.

30 *Vitr.* 2, 7, 1.

31 Pliny too mentions *lapidicinae Anicianae, HN* 36, 168: "'Anicianis lapicidinis circa lacum Volsiniensem'."

32 Bruno p. 34–35. Good clay for wall bricks must be 25% finegrained (dimension of grain not more than 0.001 mm); for roof tiles the corresponding proportion is at least 30%.

33 This would further suggest that the *figlinae* name is mentioned more often in roof tile than in wall brick stamps. To my knowledge no study has been made from this point of view.

34 *Q. Valerius Cato* (S. 82) and *L. Mescinius Flaccus* (CIL 2469 = 1787, 2470) also mention in their stamps the name of *figlinae Marcianae*, and their stamps may be as old as those mentioned in the following. It is impossible, however, to fix their period of activity exactly.

35 Bloch *BL* p. 219–222. Regarding the ships, their chronology and the bricks found in them, see the article by G. Gatti in the book by Ucelli.

36 Bloch *BL* p. 220 and 334–335.

37 The history of the C. Calpetani is explained later, p. 128–.

38 C. Calpetanus Hermes was a former slave of C. Calpewnus Favor, as shown by stamps CIL 904 and S. 244; in his stamp CIL 318 C. Calpetanus Hermes mentions the name of *figlinae Marcianae*.

39 Corresponding pairs are CIL 124 & 125; 498 & 592; 525 & 524; 1043 & 1042; 1302 & 1301; 1378 & 1377; CIL 511 & S. 145; S. 147 & CIL 516; S. 120 & CIL 478; S. 155 & CIL 545; S. 28 & CIL 74; CIL 286 & S. 70 = CIL 291; S. 215 & S. 216.

40 See Bloch, *Indices* p. 47.

41 CIL XV p. 87. In this special case Dressel's interpretation is less clear, because he had two variants of stamp CIL 295, neither of which he had seen himself. This interpretation is a combination of the variant texts.

42 The *figlinae Macedonianae* stamps are CIL 281–300 and S. 62–71.

43 Dressel's completions CIL p. 24–25 and Bloch's comment on stamp S. 36.

44 *Figlinae Caepionianae* stamps are CIL 52–111 and S. 23–39.

45 CIL XV p. 6, sub. X.

46 E.g. Dressel's comments on CIL 644 and 1773.
47 See Dressel's comment on CIL 221.

48 For the meaning of 'sub Orta' and 'Subortanus' see p. 81.

49 See Bloch's comments on S. 144 and 145, and Coste p. 94 and 95 (with photograph). Bloch has a fragmentary exemplar of stamp S. 145 whose second line he completes as: a. gabiN AVGVST sal (= A. Gabini Augustalis, Salarese). Coste has a better fragment, in which the beginning and end of the second line are preserved: S-BIN AV-VST (= Sabinae Augustae). Thus the Empress Sabina really occurs as dominus in brick stamps, as Coste asserts. As stamps of Sabina we must now reckon also CIL 510, 511 and S. 144.

50 CIL XV p. 15.

51 Cf. CIL 1427, in which appears EX FIG QVAEFVESEN SATR (= ex figlinis quaer fuerunt Sent Satrini).

52 It was located on Via Labicana 'ad Quintanas': CIL XIV p. 275.

53 See CIL 437-470.

54 See CIL 258-279.

55 CIL XV p. 6 sub X.

56 See CIL 116-140; S. 41-43.

57 See CIL 478-530; S. 120-152.

58 The word 'figlinator' appears written in full only in stamp S. 311; it is 'an addition to the Thesaurus', as Bloch observes in his comment. For the occurrence of these words see Bloch, Indices p. 96.

59 CIL 299, 731ab, 757 and 1063.

60 The figlinae Caepionianae stamps are CIL 52-111; S. 23-39, 569.


62 The names of both socii of the societas of Domitius brothers, the societas best known in stamps, appear in all their stamps. Only the name of Tullus, who outlived his brother, appears alone.

63 CIL XV p. 25.

64 Such additional epithets occur also in the stamps of some other figlinae: in figlinae Domitianae 'natores' and 'minores', 'natae' and 'veteres', see CIL XV p. 48; in figlinae Oceanae 'natores' and 'minores', see CIL XV p. 105.

65 CIL XV p. 25 no. 101 and Bloch's comment on S. 34.

66 Stamps CIL 102 and 86 are also linked together by a rare composition which is common to both. Dressel states in his comment ad CIL 102: 'Forma ac species huius sigilli eodem est quae sigilli n. 86.'
67 Steinby 1974, p. 97, no. 1; previously this stamp was known as a fragment, CIL 2001: a third specimen was found by us at Ostia.

68 SHA Pius 1, 1–6.

69 T. Aurelius Fulvus was consul in the year 89, which is therefore the terminus post quem for the birth of Iulia Fadilla (Syme, Tacitus p. 793).

70 P. Iulius Lupus, cos. suff. 98? (Syme, Tacitus p. 794).

71 Bloch 1958, p. 409. Bloch assembled the stamp from fragments found in three separate places.

72 Leiva Petersen (PIR² IV 2, p. 319 no. 676) thinks it more likely that Iulia Lupula is the granddaughter of Arria Fadilla and Iulius Lupus. This is to complicate the prosopography unnecessarily, however. Stamp CIL 338 belongs to the time of Antoninus, and it must be presumed that the Emperor’s younger sister was living.

73 Pliny mentions (Ep. 4, 27, 5), to be sure not quite without ambiguity, that Sentius Augurinus, an otherwise unknown poet, was related to Arrius Antoninus (father of Arria Fadilla). The transfer, as reflected in the stamps, of the property of Sentius Satrinus to Arrius Antoninus (son of Arria Fadilla) also suggests a relationship between gens Sentia and gens Arria.

74 Huotari p. 79–80.

75 CIL XI 3614 = ILS 5918a.

76 CIL XI 4347 (cf. CIL XI 2:2 p. 1322).

77 CIL XI 4397.

78 CIL XI 4391, 7843.

79 Marini, p. 138 ad no. 334.

80 CIL XI p. 639: in the time of Cicero part of the Tiber bank belonged to the Ameria territory (Rosc. Amer. 7, 20); according to Pliny (Ep. 8, 20, 3) Lacus Vadimonis west of the Tiber was part of the Ameria territory.

81 CIL XI 3061 (cf. CIL XI 2:2, p. 1322).

82 CIL XI 4361, 4416, 4431, 4432 (Alfius); 4383, 4384, 4495 (Avienus); 4348 (Pettius); 4530, 4531, 4402 (T. Travius).

83 Suborta as a place name is comparable with names of stations appearing in Itineraria: Succosa (= sub Cosa, "below Cosa" on the Via Aurelia) and Sub Lanuvio ("below Lanuvium" on the Via Appia).

84 Marini gave this interpretation as a possibility, but thought it more likely that SVBHOR, SVB ORTA etc. refer to 'horus' and that this figlinae was situated below a garden or park famous at the time. See Marini, no. 24. Dressel borrows this interpretation of Marini, CIL p. 156.

85 Marini, no. 1265; Dressel borrows Marini’s comment for CIL 384.
V Organization of Brick Production.
Persons Mentioned in Brick Stamps in Their Relation to the Brick Industry

1. Dominus and officinator

Earlier I have used the titles 'dominus' and 'officinator' for persons mentioned in brick stamps. These titles are established in the literature dealing with brick stamps, and are used by Dressel and Bloch among others. I use these titles in a more exact sense than the two above-named. My definition is as follows:

- Dominus is the person whose name is used in a brick stamp text as a genitive attribute of the word 'praedia' or 'figlinae'; i.e. the person declared in the stamp to be the owner of praedia or figlinae;
- officinator is the other person mentioned in the stamp.

With the aid of this definition it can be said of each individual in each stamp whether he is dominus, officinator or neither; the groups of 'domini' and 'officinatores' can be formed merely from data appearing in the texts of stamps – nothing else is required.

In binominal stamps the groups of 'domini' and 'officinatores' emerge naturally. In their respect it is quite evident that dominus and officinator had a different position in the production process and production organization. For this reason I have been able in the analysis of texts to use the titles 'dominus' and 'officinator' in conjunction with binominal stamps without danger of confusion. In the following text, for instance:

\[(45)\quad \text{EX·FIG M·HERENNI POLLIONIS DOL}
\quad L·SESSI·SVCCESSI\]

CIL 1180

ex jìglinis M. Herenni Pollionis, doliare L. Sessius Successus

M. Herennius Pollio is dominus and L. Sessius Successus is officinator. The origin of the title 'dominus' is clearly visible: in the stamp text it is said that M. Herennius Pollio is the owner of figlinae (dominus figlinarum). As shown earlier, the word 'figlinae' in such a connection can be replaced with 'praedia' without a change in the content of the text. Dominus is therefore 'dominus figlinarum' or 'dominus praediorum'. – The title of officinator owes its origin to the occurrence of the word 'officinatar' in some stamps, and to the use of the name of the officinator as genitive attribute of the word 'officina' in others.
One-name stamps are more problematical. By means of my definition _domini_ can be distinguished in them, but not _officinatores_, because _officinatores_ is defined in relation to _dominus_. L. Bellicius Sollers and Claudia Marcellina, for instance, whose names occur in one-name stamps (12) p. 58 and (16) p. 59, are _domini_ in those stamps because they are announced as owners of _figlinae_ or _praedia_. The texts can only be interpreted so that the names of persons are genitive attributes of the words 'figlinae' and 'praedia'.

The 'domini' and 'officinatores' groups are composed of persons whose names occur in stamps at least once in the position of _dominus_ or _officinatores_. _Dominus_ and _officinatores_ are defined as 'role names', components of the text of each stamp. A person belonging to the 'domini' group may also appear in stamps in a position where he is not _dominus_ according to my definition. L. Bellicius Sollers, for instance, who appears as _dominus_ in stamps presented earlier, is found in the following stamp:

(46) L VELICI SOLLER

_L. (B)el(l)ici Sollertis (or: L. Bellicius Sollers)_

but not as _dominus_ (or _officinatores_).

Similarly, a person belonging to the 'officinatores' group may appear in a position where he is not _officinatores_ by my definition. In the following stamps, for instance:

(47) L SESSI-SVCESSI DOLIARE
    DE FIGLINIS PVBL
    LIANIS

    sic

    CIL 420 = S. 107

(48) SEIAES ISAURICAES
    EX FIGLINIS PVBLILIAN
    DOLIAR

    CIL 421

the texts are formed from the same components, but the name of the person is different. In each stamp appears the word 'figlinae' and the word 'doliare' meaning the brick itself, and in each stamp the name of _figlinae_ is the same (_figlinae Publilianae_). Neither of the persons mentioned in the stamps (_L. Sessius Successus_ and _Seia Isaurica_) is _dominus_, for neither is stated to be the owner of _figlinae Publilianae_. The second stamp, by reversing the order of its lines, could be put in such a form that _Seia Isaurica_ might be interpreted as the owner of _figlinae_, but even in that case such an interpretation would not be the only one possible (cf. following specimen stamp). On the evidence of these stamps neither person can be placed in the 'domini' and 'officinatores' groups.

But the classification can be made if other stamps are considered. Comparison shows that _L. Sessius Successus_ belongs to the 'officinatores' and _Seia Isaurica_ to...
the "domini" group. In the stamp (45) serving as an example above p. 89. L. Sessius Successus appears in the position of officinator, while Seia Isaurica appears as dominus in many stamps, such as those taken as examples above, (22) p. 60. So the name of a person belonging to the group "domini" can occur in a stamp in which it is not in the position of dominus, and the name of a person belonging to the group "officinatores" can occur in a stamp in which it is not in the position of officinator.

The division must be carried out thus, because also appearing in the stamps are persons who do not occur in a single stamp as dominus or officinator. In the following, for instance,

(49) ·EX·FIG·DOM·
     L·VALERI·SEVERI
     CIL 151

ex figlinis Domitianis, (opus) L. Valeri Severi

the word FIG is adequately defined by the adjectival attribute DOM; it needs no person's name as an attribute. Thus the name of a person can be interpreted as a genitive attribute of either the word FIG or the omitted word signifying the brick itself. – L. Valerius Severus, therefore, may be interpreted as the owner of figlinae Domitianae, but equally well as "owner" of the brick alone; the latter interpretation is obtained by adding a comma before the name of L. Valerius Severus. It is the more likely interpretation in this case because the text composer may well have intended the lines to be read in reverse order, in which case the latter interpretation is the only possible (cf. p. 32 above).

L. Valerius Severus does not appear in a single stamp as dominus or officinator, and cannot therefore be placed in the "domini" or the "officinatores" group. From individuals like L. Valerius Severus a third person-group is composed, namely "those who belong to neither the "domini" nor the "officinatores" group".

My definition is of a character which enables dominus to be found directly from the text, but officinator only in relation to dominus. From the standpoint of my investigation this is favourable, because the organization of brick production is reflected first and foremost by the relation between the two persons dominus and officinator. Because the "production" status of dominus (owner of praedia or figlinae) is quite clear when the meaning of the words 'praedia' and 'figlinae' is once elucidated, the chief remaining problem is to determine the status of officinator in relation to dominus.

The "domini" and "officinatores" groups formed in the manner expounded are mutually exclusive. In the stamps no persons appear who belong to both groups.2 This shows that the definition and the groups formed by its aid are not artificial, but that the "domini" and "officinatores" groups had corresponding groups clearly distinguished from each other in the reality which the brick stamps reflect. The mutual exclusiveness of the groups leads also to a conclusion bearing on reality: the
same person did not appear as both *dominus* and *officinatores* in brick production; the positions of *dominus* and *officinatores* did not belong to the same career with, for instance, promotion in course of time from *officinatores* to *dominus*.

There are 650 stamps in which both *dominus* and *officinatores* appear, and 160 in which only *dominus* appears. (Stamps number 1815 in all). The "'domini'" group, exclusive of imperial persons, contains 149 persons, and the "'officinares'" group 355. (The total number of persons referred to in stamps, when consuls mentioned in dates are omitted, is 1325.)

In brick stamps, then, either one or two persons are mentioned, and there are two ranks at most. In his comments Dressel sometimes seems to have in mind a three-grade organization, namely "'domini', 'officinares' (or 'exercitores' or 'conduñores') and 'figuli'." This threefold division originates from stamps of a type of which an example is given later, stamp (57) p. 95, in which a slave is given his master's name as part of his own. In the following stamp, too,

(50)  

TROPHIMI·AGATHOBVLI
DOMITI·TVLLI  

Trophimi Agathobuli Domitii Tulli (sc. servi vicarii)

three persons can be distinguished who in a sense belong to three different ranks: *Domitius Tullus*, his slave *Agathobulus* and *Trophimus*, the slave (vicarius) of *Agathobulus*. In such cases it is best, however, to understand the brick-making situation represented by the stamp as involving only one of the persons mentioned, namely *Trophimus*. Other names occur only as parts of the name of *Trophimus*.

Only in one stamp is the three-rank system visible:

(51)  

DE F CAES N PAG STEL DE CON CETHES
EX OFIC TROPHIMATIS  

de figlinis Caesaris nostri pagi Stellatini, de conductione Cethes( ), ex officina Trophimatis

This stamp recalls what we know of the organization of mines. The owner of *figlinae* is the Emperor, the work of production is led by a contractor (conductor) acting on his own account, and every *officina* has a man in charge (officinatores). But this is the only case among Roman brick stamps, and it is possible that this stamp does not actually belong to them.

Besides the normal *dominus* and *officinatores* there appears in nine stamps a third person with whom the word 'negotiator' or 'negotians' is connected in stamps. The word clearly refers to some commercial task. These stamps form a uniform group and are of late date, about the year 200.
2. The Groups *domini* and *officinatores* of Dressel and Bloch

Dressel and Bloch use the words 'dominus' and 'officinatar' in a looser sense than I. Dressel composed these categories of persons in order to explain the stamps he had assembled for *CIL* XV. For him 'dominus' and 'officinatar' ('conductor', 'exercitor' and 'figulus' are titles he also uses of other persons than *domini* mentioned in stamps) indicate the positions held by persons in reality, in brick production and in society as a whole. Dressel composed his categories in this manner for the natural reason that his problems were philological: his task was to explain individual stamps by means of the actual situation reflected by the stamps.

Dressel does not state explicitly how he composed his categories of persons, but it is easy to observe that his starting point also was binominal stamps, from which two person-categories emerge naturally. In accord with his task to explanation he then attempts to place all persons mentioned in the stamps in these groups. The following extract illustrates Dressel’s grouping principles:

Nomen secundo casu positum, ex quo solum constant plurimi tituli antiquiores et bonae aetatis, utrum domini officinae vel praediorum sit, an eius qui officinae praerat (officinatoris, exercitoris) vel eam conduxerat, saepenumbero incertum est. Nominis enim indole quamquam dominus a figulo discerni plerumque potest, conductores tamen vel officinatores sive exercitores a dominis distingui vix possunt, quos omnes tam ingenuos quam libertinos esse potuisse constat.8

Dressel's first criterion for division is formal, based merely on data from stamp texts; it is identical with the definition I presented earlier. His second criterion is 'social', and he has recourse to it when the formal criterion gives no result. Numerous members of the 'domini' group composed by means of the formal criterion belong to the highest levels of society. On this ground Dressel places in the 'domini' group all persons mentioned in the stamps for whom he perceives some indication of high social rank. Similarly, the 'officinares' group contains persons for whom Dressel perceives no such indication. Bloch uses the titles 'dominus' and 'officinatar' in much the same way as Dressel. The 'domini' and 'officinares' groups of Bloch and Dressel are therefore larger than my corresponding groups. The differences are seen in two cases.

The first case consists of one-name stamps whose person cannot on formal grounds be placed in the 'domini' group or, consequently, in the 'officinares' group. In these cases too Dressel and Bloch endeavour to place the person in one group or the other. In the following stamps, for instance
Dressel and Bloch may designate *Ti. Iulius Optatus* as *dominus* and *C. Satrinius Celer* as *officinatores*. Classification of persons in *"domini"* and *"officinatores"* groups clearly does not take place on the evidence of stamp texts, for in both stamps the content is the same except for the names of persons. (Stamp (53) is circular and its text forms a closed ring. Thus the words can also be read in this order: *EX·F OCIANI C SATRINI CELERIS*. In CIL the text is in this form. Both orders of words are equally possible, and the text is interpretable in the manner shown regardless of which is chosen; see stamp (i) on p. 32 above.) In this case and others similar the classification of Dressel and Bloch is based on data obtained from other sources than the stamps. *Ti. Iulius Optatus* is known from elsewhere, he was *praefectus classis Misenensis* and belonged therefore to the highest levels of society. *C. Satrinius Celer*, on the other hand, is known only from brick stamps.

For Dressel the formal criterion always takes precedence over the social. He has recourse to the latter only when a person mentioned in a stamp cannot be placed in either the *"domini"* or the *"officinatores"* group by means of the formal criterion. Bloch is less concerned with the formal side. The question of whether the person mentioned is known or unknown interests him more than the position in which the name of that person appears in the stamp text. A rough example is the following stamp, in whose interpretation the *"social"* criterion is superior to the formal:

(54) **DOL EX FIG ANTEROTIS CAES :N SER PAETINO ET APRONIAN COS**

*doliare ex figlinis Anterotis Caesaris nostri servi, etc.*

The Emperor’s slave *Anteros* is *dominus* according to the formal criterion, because he is mentioned unambiguously in the text as the owner of *figlinae*. Bloch, however, classes him as *"figulo"* and *"officinatore"*, clearly because he knows *Anteros* to have been a slave. In this case the *"social"* criterion is particularly difficult to apply because it must be decided whether an Imperial slave belonged to the upper or lower levels of society.

A second case in which Dressel and Bloch use the titles *"dominus"* and *"officinatores"* differently from myself may be seen in the following stamps:
In stamp (55) dominus and officinator can be distinguished with the formal criterion: the Domitius brothers (duo Domiti) are dominus and T. Greius Ianuarius is officinator. In stamp (56), on the other hand, the division cannot be made with the formal criterion, because the Domitius brothers are stated to be owners not of figlinae but of a slave. In such a case also Dressel and Bloch may class persons as dominus and officinator: the Domitius brothers in this case too are dominus and their slave Amoenus is officinator. Thus "dominus servi" is placed in the same category as "dominus figlinarum", and dominus-servus pairs join the dominus-officinator pairs composed by means of the formal criterion.

The following stamp shows that dominus-servus pairs cannot be placed directly alongside dominus-officinator pairs:

(57) MERCVRRI TI CL QVINQVAT EX·PR·LVCALL·VERI

Mercuri Ti. Claudi Quinquatralis (sc. servi), ex praedis Lucillae Veri

Here "dominus servi" is Ti. Claudius Quinquatralis and "dominus praediorum" is Lucilla Veri (= Domitia Lucilla), i.e. different persons appear in these positions. By the formal criterion dominus is Lucilla Veri and officinator is Mercurius (or Mercurialis), a slave of Ti. Claudius Quinquatralis.

If dominus-servus pairs are counted as dominus-officinator pairs, then the set of dominus-officinator pairs turns skew. A set composed in this way cannot be used, for instance, as a means of drawing conclusions from the relationship in law of persons between dominus and officinator, because the set is so composed that all dominus-servus relationships are included, but only part of those between patronus and liber, and liber and liber.

Dressel used person-categories merely to explain stamps, bringing out all possible data to clarify the situation represented by each stamp. His categories are
well suited to such a task. In the situation indicated by stamp (56), for instance – so one may deduce from stamp (55) and some others – it is highly probable that the Domitius brothers were owners of *figlinae Caninianae*, although the stamp contains no mention of this. It is similarly possible in the situation shown by stamp (52), though less likely than in the previous case, that *Ti. Iulius Optatus* was owner of *figlinae Ocianae*. These circumstances must be displayed when individual stamps and the situations reflected by them are subjects of explanation.

Person-categories arising in this way are inapplicable, however, in studies where we are faced with the reverse of Dressel’s problem: when, that is, we draw conclusions from stamps regarding the reality that the stamps reflect. The weakness of the "*domini"" and "*officinatores"" categories of Dressel and Bloch then proves to be that in their composition two types of information totally different in value have been confused: these are data contained in the text of stamps, and data in our possession on the brick industry at the time concerned and on society in general. We know the brick stamps, but we do not know with anything like completeness the social status of persons mentioned in them. In the case of many a person so mentioned we know that he was high in the social scale, but in the case of the majority we do not know whether they were high or low. We have no means to decide whether, for instance, in the situation reflected by stamp (53) *C. Saurinius Celer* was owner of *figlinae Ocianae* or not. Confusion between stamps and the reality they reflect leads, on the other hand, to a vicious circle. We cannot examine the social composition of the "*domini"" and "*officinatores"" groups if we have used the social status of the persons concerned as a criterion for composing these groups.

3. Problems

Analysis of the text of brick stamps has now led to some degree of understanding of the relation between persons mentioned in the stamps and brick production. *Dominus* is mentioned as owner of land, which is the meaning of *ex figlinis huius* and also *ex praedis huius*. *Officinator* is closer to the actual making of bricks. What was the relation between *dominus* and *officinator*? Frank and Bloch, who start from the notion that *figlinae* is an administrative unit, arrive at the explanation that *dominus* and *officinator* belonged to the same organization, the latter being subordinate to the former. In other words, *dominus* was the manufactory owner and brick producer, while *officinatores* were foremen paid (or owned) by him.13 Bloch’s view appears in expressions such as: "*Arria Fadilla ha iniziato la sua attività industriale ancora sotto Traiano etc.*";14 "one of the (...) officinatores of Arria Fadilla had also previously belonged to Plotia’s staff";15 "Q. Aburnius Celer who was later in the service of Statilius Maximus";16 "L. Lunus Myrinus (...) now joins Zosimus as a workman for L. Iulius Rufus, proprietor of figlinae Tonneianae and Viccianae"17; "the appearance of three of Aburnius’ former officinatores in the service of his more successful competitors".18
Dressel is cautious in the conclusions he draws. Because he considers that *figlinae* is manufactory, *dominus* to him too is "manufactory leader" or "manufacturer", though he does not use such titles in his comments. But he is unsure of the relation between *dominus* and *officinatores*, and in some cases regards *officinatores* more as an independent tenant than as a foreman in the service of *dominus*. In accordance with this he uses various titles for *officinatores* — "conductor", "officinatores", "exercitor", "figulus" — depending on his conception of this status. The word 'conductio' or 'conductor', which points to a tenancy relation, occurs in some stamps.

Gummerus has a notion similar to Dressel’s of the nature of the organization reflected by brick stamps. In his view *officinatores* were often independent enterprisers, and among them were at least as many tenants (Pächter) as foremen (Werkführer). The reasoning of Gummerus is based not on the meanings of the words 'figlinae', 'praedia' and 'officina', but on observations concerning persons mentioned in the stamps. Facts indicating the independence of *officinatores* in his opinion are the abundance of Latin cognomina and uncommon gentilicia in brick stamps, and the circumstance that some *officinatores* are women.

Neither of the "organization models" presented conflicts with the fact that *dominus* is mentioned in stamps as a landowner, because the owner of the land may also possess the manufactory located on it. On the other hand the "model" of Gummerus accords poorly with the meaning 'figlinae' = 'brickworks'. In this regard the conclusion reached — that the word 'figlinae' in brick stamps has territorial meaning only — supports the opinion of Gummerus on the organization of brick production.

In the explanation of stamps the characteristics of brick production expounded earlier must be kept in mind. An industry producing brick as a building material is dependent on the large population centres which serve as its marketing area. The brick manufactories, however, are not located in cities but in rural districts within suitable transport distance. Because of the twofold nature of the industry — it is primary production and processing at the same time — a brick manufactory is bound firmly to the land. It needs an extensive area from which to obtain clay, and production apparatus also requires space. But was the producer compelled to own the land on which and from which he manufactured bricks? This brings us to the important problem of how land productivity was exploited. Did an owner make direct use of his land’s productivity through the aid of persons he paid (or owned), or did he lease the land for use by another?

It is a recognized fact that land near Rome (and throughout Italy) came into the possession of leading Roman families at an early stage. It is in no way surprising, therefore, that *domini* mentioned in brick stamps belonged to the highest level of Roman society. The clay deposits which enabled brick production to be established in the Roman area were part of the landed property of senatorial families. A problem of the greatest interest is the manner in which production was arranged in these circumstances in order to meet the demand which sprang up and quickly increased in the first century.
Textual analysis of brick stamps has shown that in first century stamps the landowner is usually unmentioned, only the manufacturer being referred to. The expression 'brick manufacturer' is not to be understood in a concrete sense. The person mentioned in the stamp has directed the production process: he has not taken physical part in brick manufacture— not, at least, in all cases. A person mentioned alone in stamps may or may not be the landowner: this is an open question, because land ownership is not referred to in these stamps. When the relation of brick production to land ownership is examined, suitable source material is provided by second century stamps in which the landowner (dominus) and the person more closely associated with brick manufacture (officinato r) are both mentioned. The purpose of the present chapter is to elucidate this problem, whose existence was realized by Gummerus: was dominus or officinato r the producer of bricks, that is the enterpriser in this field of industry?

The picture sketched by Frank of the development followed by the organization of brick production (see p. 13 above) is based merely on observations concerning the names of persons of the stamps. Like Bloch, he pays no attention to the development of stamps, nor does he attempt to solve the problems raised by it. To what extent is the development of stamps an independent phenomenon? To what extent does it reflect the development of the organization of brick production? Mention of the landowner's name in a stamp did not become customary until the early second century. Can it be directly concluded from this feature of the development of the text that a change occurred in the organization of brick production in the early second century? Hardly. The land certainly had an owner in the first century already. The appearance of the name of the landowner in stamps and the organization of brick production may be phenomena independent of each other.

According to Frank the Roman brick industry in the first century was in the hands of small enterprisers, but in the second century the small enterprisers were replaced by large ones. This is based on the correct observation that in second century stamps several well-known and financially powerful persons are mentioned, but in the first century only persons unknown from other sources are mentioned. When the evolution of the content of stamps is taken into account the matter may be explained in another way. First century stamps mention only the manufacturer, while those of the second century mention both the manufacturer and the landowner. The well-known persons of second century stamps are precisely these landowners. In this respect first and second century stamps are not comparable with each other.

The second century concentration of property which can be noted in stamps and which Frank regards as a concentration of the brick industry under Imperial leadership may also be seen as a development in the circumstances of land ownership. Just as it is known that during the Republic land had already passed into the keeping of leading Roman families (or landowning families had risen to the leadership of the Roman state), so it is also known that landed property during the early Empire had a strong tendency to concentrate. The birth rate was low in the
highest class of society, and for this reason property was not often divided. On the other hand families easily died out, and their property was transferred to other families related by marriage. The marriage policy of families advanced the concentration of property. 

The position of the Imperial 'family' was favourable in this system. It did not die out: an Emperor always inherited the property of his predecessor, and thus the property was not dispersed. In the first century the growth of Imperial landed property was favoured by a state of tension between Emperor and Senate which caused confiscations. In the second century the system governing the order of succession worked in the same direction. From Nerva to Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus each new Emperor brought a new family to the throne and combined its property with that of the Emperor. 

The evolution of the body of domini in brick stamps certainly reflects that of land ownership in the Roman area. For domini the stamps are a source of the greatest value for the study of details in this evolution, which is as much political as economic. But does this also describe how the organization of the brick industry evolved? Did the landowning nobility allow the transfer of parts of their lands outside the authority of themselves and their families? Was brick production tied to the ownership of land, or had enterprisers the opportunity to acquire some other entitlement to the use of land suitable for their purposes?

The problem which confronts us, therefore, is the relation of dominus and officinator to brick production. Which was the producer and the enterpriser in this field? As a start it may be assumed that dominus was the enterpriser unless facts emerge which indicate that officinator played that part. Thus the task is to search for features in brick stamps which provide grounds for concluding that officinatores were enterprisers and as such independent of domini. The question above may be answered on the strength of how many such features are found.

The investigation is divided into two parts. I first examine the relation in Roman Law of persons between dominus and officinator and compare the general picture which emerges with what is known of the significance of relations in law of persons in the society of the early Empire. In this part the set under examination consists of dominus-officinator pairs, and binominal stamps are the only acceptable material. I then examine the 'officinatores' group from the standpoint presented above.

First of all, however, I survey one group which contains both one-name and binominal stamps from both the first and second centuries, namely the stamps of gens Domitia. I survey this group in order to discover how the evolution of text content affected the type of persons to be mentioned in the stamps. Another reason is that in general expositions which include references to brick stamps, the stamps of gens Domitia have been taken as representing the whole material of Roman brick stamps. For a long period the studies of gens Domitia stamps by Descemet and Dressel were the only coherent works dealing with brick stamps. In particular the work of Dressel, published by the author in condensed form in CIL XV I, has been a source of information on this subject.
4. Persons in the Stamps of gens Domitia

Occupying a central position in Roman brick stamps is the gens Domitia, whose members and their years of death are as follows:\textsuperscript{28} Cn. Domitius Afer 59, Cn. Domitianus Lucanus\textsuperscript{29} 93/94, Cn. Domitius Tullus 108, Domitia Cn. f. Lucilla 123 and Domitia P. f. Lucilla 155. For these persons I use the general name Domitii in the following.\textsuperscript{30}

Dressel in CIL XV treats the stamps of the Domitii as one whole. Most of them are collected in the section "Lateres gentis Domitiae",\textsuperscript{31} while the rest are connected with figlinae owned by the Domitii and mentioned by name.\textsuperscript{32} Stamps of the Domitii appear in other ceramic objects than bricks, moreover.\textsuperscript{33} In CIL XV there are at least 250 stamps of the Domitii, by far the greatest number for a specific family.

Also appearing in the stamps of Domitii are other persons, either alone or in company with Domitii. These other persons are divisible in six groups according to their relationship in law of persons with the Domitii; 1) Slaves of Domitii; 2) vicarii of slaves of Domitii; 3) freedmen of Domitii (name Cn. Domitius + cognomen); 4) slaves of freedmen of Domitii; 5) free persons independent of the Domitii in law of persons; 6) slaves of persons in 5).

In the following tabulation I show the numbers of "other persons" in stamps containing the name of some Domitius. The numbers are calculated from Dressel's lists in CIL XV p. 268–273. The first column contains the numbers of "other persons" mentioned in stamps of Afer, Lucanus & Tullus and Tullus; these data therefore originate from stamps which have been in use until A. D. 108. In the second column are corresponding data on stamps of Domitiae Lucillae in use during the period 109–155. The third column has information on stamps of Domitia P. f. Lucilla, period 123–155. (Persons belonging to Group 4) do not appear in these stamps.)

\begin{table}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
   & -108 & 109–155 & 123–155 \\
\hline
1) Slaves of Domitii\textsuperscript{34} & 26 & 23 & 17 \\
2) Vicarii of slaves of Domitii & 2 & 0 & 0 \\
3) Cn. Domitii & 3 & 5 & 3 \\
5) Other free persons & 1 & 28 & 27 \\
6) Slaves of other free persons & 0 & 6 & 2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

The figures reveal one difference between first and second century stamps which has been reported earlier. It will be noted that slaves of Domitii (Group 1) are encountered steadily in all periods. Free persons, on the other hand, especially those independent in law (of persons) from the Domitii (Group 5), appear very little in first century stamps, but a great deal in second century stamps. How is this to be explained?
If conclusions are drawn without regard for the independent development of stamp content, the result is as follows: The Domitii worked their clay deposits at first with the help of their slaves alone. In the second century they left the working more and more frequently to free persons independent in law of themselves. – The fault in this explanation is that note has not been taken of the development of stamp content. On the lands of the Domitii during the first century many persons who were independent of the Domitii in law of persons may have worked, but because it was not yet customary for the landowner to be mentioned in stamps the names of Domitii do not appear in the stamps of these persons. The following stamp, for instance

(58) \[T \cdot \text{GREI-HANVARI} \]
\[\text{VALEAT-QVI F} \quad \text{CIL 120} \]

T. Greius Ianuarius, valeat qui fecit

does not inform us whether T. Greius Ianuarius worked the clay deposit on Domitian lands. But in two other stamps of T. Greius Ianuarius, CIL 117 and 118, of which the former is the specimen stamp (55) above on page 95, dominus is also mentioned, namely duo Domiti or the Domitius brothers Lucanus and Tullus. On the evidence of these stamps we can, in Dressel’s manner, place all stamps of T. Greius Ianuarius among those of the Domitii. It may well be that in the first century many free persons worked on the lands of the Domitii who used only stamps of (58) type. – The following stamp is an example of a different kind:35

(59) \[O \cdot \text{L-MVNA-TI-FAVSTI D} \]
\[\text{CRESCENTI} \quad \text{CIL 962a} \]

opus doliare Crescentis L. Munati Fausti (sc. servi)

From this text we do not know, as we did not know from the previous stamp, whether Crescens the slave of L. Munatius Faustus produced bricks on the lands of the Domitii or elsewhere. The previous stamp was placed by Dressel with the stamps of gens Domitia, but this one was not. Comparison strongly suggests, however, that this stamp also was used on Domitian lands. The same Crescens appears later, manumitted, with the name L. Munatius Crescens as officinator in stamps CIL 124, 127 and 128, the last of which is dated by the names of the consuls for the year 126; in all these stamps Domitia Lucilla appears as dominus. In addition two slaves of L. Munatius Crescens appear as officinatores in stamps CIL 121 (year 123) and CIL 123, and in these stamps too Domitia Lucilla is dominus. There are reasons for supposing, therefore, that specimen stamp (59) was used on Domitian lands; not a single known fact contradicts this supposition.36 The stamp
evidently would contain the name of some Domitius if a) Crescens had been a slave of some Domitius, or b) Crescens had signified the landowner's name (dominus) for this stamp of his, as he did so signify for his later stamps.

The appearance in stamps of gens Domitia of slaves of the Domitii and persons independent of the Domitii in law of persons can now be explained as follows: In first century stamps the landowner (dominus) is not mentioned, only the brick manufacturer is referred to. This being so, the names of Domitii appeared only on the stamps of their own slaves, as parts of the names of those slaves, in the manner exemplified by stamps (50) and (56) above on pages 92 and 95. In the second century it became a general custom to mention the name of the landowner (dominus) also on a stamp, and then the names of Domitii came to be included also in the stamps of free persons producing bricks on lands owned by the Domitii. The fault in the reasoning introduced earlier lies therefore in failure to take note of development in the textual content of the stamps on the one hand, and in counting dominus-servus pairs as dominus-officinator pairs on the other (cf. p. 95 above).

In addition to Domitii 21 persons appear in the stamps whose name is Cn. Domitius + cognomen. Some of these are known on the evidence of stamps to be freedmen of the Domitii, and some to have been liberated by such freedmen: there are good grounds for linking them all with the Domitii. Dressel in CIL XV has placed the stamps of these Cn. Domitii among those of gens Domitia.

From the preceding table it will be seen that 5 Cn. Domitii appear as officinatores in stamps where some Domitius is dominus: the other 16 appear thus in one-name stamps only. If it is true that the name of dominus came to the stamps late, at about the beginning of the second century, then a clear majority of these Cn. Domitii should be persons of early occurrence, primarily freedmen of the male Domitii, and the five Cn. Domitii appearing in binominal stamps should be the latest. Such is in fact the state of affairs. Dressel shows 37 that most of the Cn. Domitii appearing in one-name stamps are liberti of the Domitius brothers, two are still earlier, liberti of Domitius Afer, and only one is libertus of the elder Domitia Lucilla; the fact that all have the praenomen Cn. can be taken as an indication that not one of them is libertus of Domitia P.f. Lucilla; no slave of Domitia P.f. Lucilla appears as libertus in stamps. Those Cn. Domitii who appear in binominal stamps are the latest, although none of them extended his activity later than the decade of 120.
5. Relationship of *dominus* and *officinator* in the Roman Law of Persons

**Slaves**

It became apparent earlier that somewhat less than 19 per cent of persons appearing in brick stamps are slaves (see p. 24 above). The majority of slaves appear in one-name stamps, i.e. mainly in those of the first century. A considerable group is formed by stamps of the following type from the year 123:

(60) APRON ET PAE COS ALCIDIS

According to Bloch these stamps were used in the *praedia Quintanensia* owned by *M. Annius Verus*; 40 slaves are known from these. The abundance of stamps of this type in the year 123, among other things, has given reason to suspect that stamping in that year had some special purpose which did not exist in other years.

In cases where both *dominus* and *officinator* are mentioned in a stamp and *officinator* is a slave, the relationship in law of persons of *dominus* and *officinator* may be of two kinds: 1) *officinator* is the slave of *dominus*; 2) *officinator* is the slave of some other person than *dominus*. There are examples of both cases in second century stamps. The following

(61) EX PR FAVSTINAE AVG FIGL TERENT

*ex praedis Faustinae Augustae, figlinis Terentianis, opus doliare Mai Faustinae Augustae* (sc. servi)

is an example of the former case. It is stated specifically in the stamp that *officinator* (*Maius*) is the slave of *dominus* (Empress Faustina the Younger). An example of the latter case is stamp (57) on page 95 above, where *officinator* (*Mercurius*) is the slave of another person (*Ti. Claudius Quinquatralis*) than *dominus* (*Domitia Lucilla*).

If we take into account only those stamps in which it is specifically stated whose slave *officinator* is, then the cases where *officinator* is the slave of another person than *dominus* are more common (they are listed later, on page 104). In most cases, however, it is not stated whose slave *officinator* is; it is then most natural to assume that *officinator* is the slave of *dominus* mentioned in the same stamp. For the following calculations this assumption has been made.

103
a) Officinator is Slave of dominus Mentioned in Same Stamp

A total of 355 officinatores appear in stamps. 39 or 11.0% of these are slaves of dominus mentioned in the same stamp. This figure—as said before—includes all officinatores for whom a cognomen alone is used in a stamp, and of whom it is not stated that they are slaves of another person than dominus. Because the persons mentioned by cognomen alone obviously include free persons also, (see p. 23 above), the figure arrived at is a maximum. Thus of the officinatores of brick stamps not more than 11.0% are slaves of the dominus mentioned in the same stamp.

The largest groups of slave-officinatores are the following: 10 slaves of the Domitiae Lucillae, 39 5 slaves of Vismatius Successus (CIL 1518–1526; S. 397–402), 4 slaves of Iulia Albana (CIL 1214–1216; S. 322, all from the year 123), and 3 slaves of Q. Servilius Pudens (CIL 1434–1440; S. 379). In stamps of all these domini free persons, independent of the dominus in law of persons, also appear as officinatores.

The clearest example of a great landowner of the senatorial order possibly acting himself as producer and enterpriser in the brick industry is to be found in the stamps of Q. Servilius Pudens already mentioned. The stamps show that three of his slaves in succession were in charge of brick production for Pudens in the years 128–139. The stamps of Hedys are for the years 128–131 and 133,40 those of Arabus and Abascantus for 139.41 In the stamps of Hedys and Abascantus the fact that officinator is in the service of dominus is indicated by the words sub cura, cur(ante), ex opere or per. These stamps for the slaves of Q. Servilius Pudens are the only ones in which such expressions are encountered.42

b) Officinator is the Slave of Some Other Person Than dominus

In the following cases it is specifically mentioned in the stamp that officinator is the slave of some other person than dominus mentioned in the same stamp:43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>officinator</th>
<th>dominus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eutyc( ) A. ( ) A( )</td>
<td>Arrius Antoninus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chresimus L. Munati Crescentis</td>
<td>D(omitia) L(ucilla) CIL 121 (cf. CIL 122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August(alis) L. Munati Crescentis</td>
<td>D(omitia) L(ucilla) CIL 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primus Q. Sulp(ici) Aphy( )</td>
<td>Cass( ) (= L. et P. Cassi) CIL 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhod(us) C. C( ) Primig(eni)</td>
<td>Annius Lib(o) CIL 514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glypt(us) Calp(etani ?)</td>
<td>Q. Cass(ius) Caecil(ianus) CIL 517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August(alis) Publ(ici) Cresc(entis)</td>
<td>Aug(ustus) n(oster) CIL 686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aprilis Aquiliae Sozomen(ae)</td>
<td>Caes(ar) n(oster) CIL 709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epagathus Claudi Quinquatr(alis)</td>
<td>Dom(itia) Luc(illa) CIL 1073 (cf. CIL 1074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercuri(us) Ti. Claud(i) Quinquat(ralis)</td>
<td>Lucilla Veri CIL 1077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin(us) trium [ ] ioru(m)</td>
<td>I[saurica 44 S. 378]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In these 11 cases a connection in law of persons is absent between dominus and officinator, and present between officinator and a third person.

Two officinatores in the list deserve special attention. The officinator of stamp CIL 709 Aprilis Aquiliae Sozomenae appears later as a free man named C. Aquilius Aprilis in 5 stamps (CIL 358–362); in one of these the name of figlinae Oceanae is mentioned. In all stamps of Aprilis there appears Caes(ar) n(oster) (= Hadrian) as dominus, and his three dated stamps are from the years 123–125. – Mercurius Ti. Claudii Quinquatralis may be the same as officinator in stamps CIL 716 and 756, whose name appears only in the forms Mercuri(us) and Merc(urius) s(ervus) without an owner’s name. Dominus in stamp CIL 716 is Aurelius Caes(ar) and in CIL 756 Augustus. If Mercurius is the same person in all stamps, then it is quite possible that officinator in stamps CIL 716 and 756 is a slave not of dominus mentioned in the same stamp, and that this state of affairs is not declared in the stamp.

Officinator is libertus of dominus

A second possible link connecting dominus and officinator is that between former master (patronus) and freedman (libertus). If officinator has the same gentilicium (and praenomen) as dominus in the same stamp, it is highly probable that officinator is the libertus of dominus. This criterion is based on what we know of the Roman name system: a slave, when manumitted, took the praenomen and gentilicium of his former master.46 – Because the positions of dominus and officinator did not belong to the same career and a clear social distinction is noticeable between them we may exclude the possibility that a common name implies blood relationship (cf. p. 23 and 92 above).

Cases occur in brick stamps which show that this criterion is not certain. In stamps of Domitia Lucilla (see list p. 107) there appear three officinatores named Cn. Domitius of whom we definitely know that they were not liberti of Domitia Lucilla or her parents or ancestors. Cn. Domitius Carpus and Cn. Domitius Trophimus were liberti of Cn. Domitius Agathobulus, who was libertus of Domitia Lucilla the elder,46 and Cn. Domitius Adiectus was libertus of Cn. Domitius Trophimus.47 Cn. Domitius Arignotus too was manumitted not by either Domitia Lucilla or her parents or ancestors. This may be deduced from the fact that Arignotus appears already as free in pelvis stamp S. 501 found at Pompeii. Nor was Cn. Domitius Asiaticus freed by dominus of the same stamp, for if he had been freed by Domitia P.f. Lucilla his praenomen would obviously have been P.

Because the status of patronus was hereditary48 but that of libertus was not,49 we can count Arignotus and Asiaticus as liberti of Domitia P.f. Lucilla, the dominus mentioned in their stamps; but in the three other cases the most that can be said is that there is a connection between dominus and officinator.

It is highly probable, on the other hand, that Servilius Gelos, officinator in stamp
CIL 50 (Ti. Servilius Gelos in CIL 51) was the freedman of Plotia Isaurica, dominus in the same stamp, although there is no nomen gentilicium in common. Isauricus had long been a cognomen of gens Servilia, and it is therefore possible that Servilius was among the gentilia of Plotia Isaurica also, though in brick stamps she appears only with the names Isaurica and Plotia Isaurica. Known from one inscription is a libertus of Plotia Isaurica named Servilius Sigerus. The multiplicity of names among senators and knights of the second century, in fact, makes it difficult to discover all patronus-libertus pairs by study of names alone.

I have looked up all dominus-officinatar pairs of which we can show in the manner described (and with the reservations mentioned) that officinatar is the libertus of dominus. It will suit our purpose to divide the cases in two groups: 1) dominus is the Emperor or Empress; 2) dominus is some other persons.

1) Because Emperors are generally referred to in stamps merely as Caes(ar) n(oster), Aug(ustus) n(oster) or d(ominus) n(oster), it is by no means always possible to say with certainty which Emperor is intended. Identification is still more difficult if an abbreviation such as Augg. nn. is used, because this may signify not only two Emperors, but also an Emperor and an Empress. For this reason I have included in the following list all officinatores who have the nomen gentilicium of an Imperial family and who appear in stamps whose dominus is Augustus, Augusta or Caesar. Because all stamps are from the second century I have not taken into account officinatores whose nomen gentilicium is Flavius or the name of a still earlier Imperial family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>officinatar</th>
<th>dominus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Aelius Alexander*)</td>
<td>Caes(ar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Aelius Secund(us) et April(is)</td>
<td>Aug(ustus) n(oster)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Aelius Asclep(iades)</td>
<td>Il Aug(usti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Aelius Demetrius</td>
<td>Faustina Aug.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelius Euphemus</td>
<td>Augg. nn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelius Felix</td>
<td>August. n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Aelius Phidelis*) (sic)</td>
<td>Augg. nn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Aelius Sabinianus</td>
<td>Aug. n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Aelius Victor</td>
<td>Augg. nn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocceia A. lib. Primigenia(a)</td>
<td>Aug.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex. Pompeius Heli(  )</td>
<td>Caes. n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Augg. nn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aug.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aug. n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caes. n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faus(tina) Aug.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIL 745 = S. 587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIL 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIL 757-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vibius Ver(na?)
M. Ulpius Anicetianus*)

Aug. n. CIL 222
Caes. n. CIL 472-3
Aurelius Caes. et CIL 719
Faustina Aug.

*) P. Aelius Alexander, L. Aelius Phidelis and M. Ulpius Anicetianus also appear as officinares in stamps of other than Imperial domini. See officinator list, nos. 1, 4 and 63.

Names can be removed from the list which clearly do not belong to Imperial freedmen: C. Aelius Asclepiades, because the praenomen C. does not appear among Emperors named Aelius; Cocceia A. lib. Primigenia, because the praenomen of Nerva was M.; Sex. Pompeius Helius, because the praenomen of Plotina’s freedmen was L.; P. Aelius Demetrius and Vibius Verna, because they appear in stamps so late that they are unlikely to be freedmen of Hadrian and Sabina. There thus remain 8 officinares who are possibly Imperial freedmen and who mention in their stamps some Imperial person as dominus.

2) The cases where dominus and officinator have the same nomen gentilicium and dominus is not an Imperial person are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>officinator</th>
<th>dominus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ab(urnius) G( )</td>
<td>Abur(nius) Cae(dicianus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annius December</td>
<td>Annius Libo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Ann(ius) Zos(imus)</td>
<td>M. Ann(ius) Ver(us)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Ann(ius) Hermes</td>
<td>Ann(ius) Ver(us)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Cornelius Thalam(us)</td>
<td>Cornelius At(jicus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn. Dom(itius) Ade(c(tus))</td>
<td>Dom(itia) Luc(illa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn. Domitius Arigno(tus)</td>
<td>D(omitia) P.(f) Luc(illa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn. Domitius Asiaticus</td>
<td>Dom(itia) P.f. Luc(illa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn. Domitius Carpus</td>
<td>Domitia Lucilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn. Domitius Trophimus</td>
<td>Dom(itia) Luc(illa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Flavius Phoebus</td>
<td>Flavius Posido(nius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulvius Primitivus*</td>
<td>C. Ful(vius) Plaut(ianus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. M(emmius) Astrag(alus)</td>
<td>M(emmia) Macrina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Statius Comolvis</td>
<td>C. Statius Capito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Tutt(ilius) Januari(us)</td>
<td>L. T(tutilius) L(upercus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vismatius Fel(x)*</td>
<td>Vismit(atus) Successus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Culvius Primitivus and Vismatius Felix appear as officinares also in stamps of other domini. See officinator list, nos. 24 and 61.
The list contains 16 dominus-officinatores pairs. Comparison of stamps for 7 of these enables us to note more precisely what connection existed between dominus and officinatores. As stated earlier, the relation between five Cn. Domitii and Domitia Lucilla was not a direct libertus-patronus relation, but was indirect in various ways. Again, we know on the evidence of other stamps that M. Annius Zosimus and Vismatius Felix were freedmen of the domini mentioned in their stamps. On the remaining 9 pairs the other stamps give no further information.

How many officinatores were the libertus of dominus mentioned in the same stamp? The lists contain 29 officinatores in all. 5 of the officinatores of Imperial stamps can be removed as not pertinent, also 3 with Cn. Domitius names; Ti. Servilius Gelos can be added from outside the lists. The result is 22 officinatores, which is 6.2% of all officinatores and 7.2% of free officinatores.

Conclusions

The results of my calculations can be summed up as follows:
- typically the officinatores were free persons and independent in law (of persons) of the domini of their stamps; 283 or 79.7% of all officinatores satisfy these requirements;
- 61 officinatores at the most, or 17.2% of all officinatores, were dependent in law of persons on the domini mentioned in their stamps.

Have these figures some relevance to the organization of brick production? Can we draw conclusions from them regarding the position in production organization of dominus and officinatores? – It is generally presumed that slaves were in their masters’ service, i.e. that a master and his slaves formed a unit in economic life. In many scholars’ opinion the same applies largely to a patronus and his liberti. Therefore, if the officinatores had been slaves or freedmen of the domini of their stamps, then we could infer that the domini and officinatores belonged to the same organization and the officinatores were subordinates of the domini. But my calculations show that the officinatores were generally independent in law of persons of the domini of their stamps. Can we from this inversely conclude that the officinatores and domini did not belong to the same organizations?

In my opinion reasoning on these lines is not admissible. We do not know sufficiently the role of patronage in the commercial and industrial life of the early Empire and the part played in it by relations in law of persons. From literary sources and inscriptions we are acquainted with some large households of first century aristocrats in which slaves and freedmen produced what was needed within the household. From Petronius we may deduce that the ideal among the wealthy was economic autarchy, the dominus/patronus exploiting his resources through his slaves and freedmen. From Classical law texts we know provisions which may have made it advantageous for the patronus to make use in his commercial and industrial activities of the services of his own freedmen rather than the services of
other persons. But this is knowledge of too vague and general a nature to be of use in interpreting the concrete situations reflected in brick stamps.

But the results are not without interest for the significance of relations in law of persons in industrial and commercial life. From brick stamps we know a concrete case. They reflect a clear-cut situation in industrial activity, and we are able to estimate fairly reliably their representativeness as source material. So we know from brick stamps that in the second century the mostly aristocratic landowners on whose lands bricks were produced for the builders of Rome obtained their revenue from this industry usually through persons independent of the said landowners in law of persons. This is a valuable piece of information, particularly so if the revenues were as considerable as Frank believes when asserting that "the profits made by a few large brick yards (...) provided the fortune upon which the Antonine family rose to prosperity and power".\textsuperscript{58}

On the other hand, we know from brick stamps that the "producers proper", i.e. officinatores or persons in whose officinae the bricks were produced, were usually independent, in law of persons, of the landowners on whose lands the officinae were situated.

Duff in his standard study of freedmen in the early Empire opts for the view that aristocrats mostly used their own slaves and freedmen in their undertakings. As a concrete case he presents Roman brick stamps. He writes:

In industries where the factory system prevailed, capitalists made their freedmen overseers, while the rank and file of the workmen were slaves. In this connexion we cannot have better evidence than the rough inscriptions on bricks. Many a brick bore not only the name of the maker, but also that of the foreman under whose direction it was made.\textsuperscript{59}

From the context we see that Duff refers by the words "capitalists" and "maker" to the domini of the stamps, and by the words "overseers" and "foreman" to the officinatores. But according to my calculations Duff's information is not correct: officinatores are very rarely freedmen of domini of the same stamps. Thus the example is not illustrative of the case he is propounding.

From the context we see where Duff's error originates. His source of information on brick stamps is the study of the stamps of gens Domitia which Dressel published in abridged form in \textit{CIL XV.} I.\textsuperscript{60} It is true that there are numerous slaves and freedmen in the stamps of gens Domitia, but this group is not typical of Roman brick stamps; besides, Duff underestimates the part played by those who were independent, in law of persons, of the Domitii in these stamps. But the main cause of Duff's error is his failure to take into consideration the development of the content of the stamp text. (See above p. 101.)

If Duff is right in his opinion that "in industries where the factory system prevailed, capitalists made their freedmen overseers", then the conclusion to be drawn from the result of my calculations is that the officinatores of brick stamps were independent enterprisers and not foremen paid by the domini.
6. Officinatores

What type of persons were the officinatores of brick stamps? In many cases the name of an officinator is a genitive attribute of the word 'officina' in the same way as the name of a dominus is a genitive attribute of the words 'praedia' and 'figlinae'. Were officinatores then ''owners of officinae'' and, if so, what does this mean in modern terms? Or does, for instance, the expression ''ex officina Valeriae Nices'' (CIL 693-4) merely mean that the brick was manufactured in an officina where Valeria Nice was foreman?

Thus far my study has disclosed nothing to indicate that domini and officinatores belonged to the same production organization with dominus as director and the officinatores his subordinates. The meaning of the word 'figlinae' does not suggest this, nor do the relations in law of persons which have been noted between domini and officinatores.

With regard to domini we need not believe only what is stated in stamps, because the names of domini accord well with names occurring in the prosopography of the senatorial and equestrian orders at the same period; we may take it as certain that the domini of brick stamps actually were landowners. Comparison of the groups domini and officinatores has shown that the latter, considered as a whole, did not belong to the same social levels as the former. This only means, however, that officinatores did not belong to the highest level of society; plenty of scope still remains. Did they belong to the ''middle'' or ''lower'' class? This is a difficult question when we bear in mind that scholars are in disagreement as to whether Roman society of this period included a ''middle class'' at all. All we can do is to search for characteristics among members of the officinatores group which reveal something of their status. We know at least that they were concerned in brick production for construction of the urban centre of the Empire.

In one-name stamps, which are on the average early, the official position of the person is sometimes mentioned. Mentioned in stamp CIL 1136 (cf. CIL 1137, S. 290) is L. Faenius Rufus pr(aefectus) pr(aetorio); we know through Tacitus that this person was praefectus praetorio in the year 62 (Ann. 14, 51). Mentioned in CIL 1380 (cf. CIL 1381) is C. Pontius Crescens trib(unus) coh(ortis) I pr(aetoriae). In CIL 1507 C. Vibius Eclectus scr(iba) lib(rarius) is mentioned. These are offices of good standing, and the persons concerned may be accepted as part of a high social level. What was their position in brick production?

As noted earlier among persons appearing in binominal stamps, dominus is a ''new'' person and officinator continues the traditions of the persons of one-name stamps. If this is so, then the officinatores of binominal stamps may also include
persons similar to the important individuals mentioned. Similar references are indeed to be found in binominal stamps, but still more rarely than in one-name stamps.

In stamp CIL 705, which is from the year 124 and contains as *dominus Caes(ar) n(oster)*, the *officinator* is Q. S( ) Scafa pr(ocurator) Aug(usti).*6 In CIL 527 the *officinator* is Iulius Theodotus eq(ues) R(omanus); the stamp is from the end of the second century. In CIL 1047, where *dominus* is Domitia Lucilla, *officinator* is Earinus, of whom it is said in stamp CIL 1049 that he is *Earinus Lucillae Veri act(or)*. The two first-mentioned *officinatores* belonged to very high ranks of society; *Earinus* was in a high position in the inner hierarchy of one of the most powerful houses in the Empire.

So we know that the *officinatores* included at least one knight. At an earlier stage I attempted to link one *officinator*, C. Calpetanus Favor, with persons known from other sources which give some indication of their social status; the link remained quite hypothetical. I shall now give a second example. – Was Ti. Claudius Secundinus, who appears in brick stamps as *officinator*, the same person as Ti. Claudius Secundinus L. Statius Macedo, whose successful equestrian career is known from inscriptions.*62

The stamps of *Ti. Claudius Secundinus*63 contain no consular dates, but they are easily dated in accordance with *domini* appearing in three stamps: the name form Lucilla Veri*64 indicates the period 145–155, Caesar noster indicates 156–161 (M. Aurelius after the death of his mother Domitia Lucilla, whose property he inherited, and before his accession), and Faustina Augusta perhaps indicates the period subsequent to 161. The term of *Ti. Claudius Secundinus* as *officinator* can thus be placed in the decade of 150 and the time following (possibly also the time slightly preceding). This is quite compatible with the career of the equestrian official bearing the same name. According to Pflaum *Ti. Claudius Secundinus L. Statius Macedo* became praefectus annonae at the earliest in 147; his term of office therefore fell into the decade of 150, and he must then have lived in Rome. How long he remained praefectus annonae is unknown, but this office was evidently the height of his career.

From the chronological standpoint, therefore, the persons could be the same, but there is nothing to show positively that they are identical. If *Ti. Claudius Secundinus* appeared in brick stamps as *dominus*, then his identification with a well-known knight would seem natural; the *domini* of brick stamps generally belong to the highest rank of society, and this is a fact which might be taken as a positive indication that *Ti. Claudius Secundinus*, appearing as *dominus*, was identical with the knight of the same name who is known from other sources. But we do not have the same clear picture of the social composition of the *officinatores* group: it may include persons from anywhere in the social scale from the lowest to the knights.
**Women as officinatores**

In connection with *domini* there has already been some discussion of women appearing in brick stamps. The following list gives all women *officinatores* mentioned in stamps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>officinatores</em></th>
<th><em>dominus</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aemilia Romana</td>
<td>Aug(ustus) n(oster)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aug(usti duo) n(ostri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appia Pyramis</td>
<td>Q. Asinius Marcellus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aufidia Restituta</td>
<td>T. S(tatilius) M(aximus)Sever(us)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustina</td>
<td>Aug(usti duo) n(ostri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caecilia Amanda</td>
<td>Aug(ustus) n(oster)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calventia Maximin(a)</td>
<td>Aug(usti duo) n(ostri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassia Doris</td>
<td>Arria Fadilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocceia A.lib. Primigeni(a)</td>
<td>Caes(ar) n(oster)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Menile</td>
<td>Q. Pomponius Mussa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iulia [S]a]urnina</td>
<td>Aug[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunnidia Sperat(a)</td>
<td>L. Aelius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procilla Gemella</td>
<td>Memmiav L.f. Macrina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procilia Phila</td>
<td>Mamm( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicia Quintin(a)</td>
<td>d(ominus) n(oster)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabinia Ingenua*</td>
<td>Aug(ustus) n(oster)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statia Primilla (Primula)</td>
<td>Dom(tia) Luc(illa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titia Rufina</td>
<td>dom. nn. Augg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerica Nice</td>
<td>Plotina Aug(usta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibia Procilla</td>
<td>Terentius Iulianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibia Procilla **</td>
<td>Flavius Aper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) In stamp CIL 205 the *societas* of Font(eius) Proculus et Ingenua appears as *officinatores*; probably this Ingenua is the same person as Sabinia Ingenua as Dressel supposes in his comment.

**) The *officinatores* of stamp CIL 1147 is a *societas*: Tontius Felix et Vibia Procla.
Gummerus took the presence of women officinatores as evidence that the officinatores included persons who were not foremen subordinate to dominus, but independent tenants. There is good reason to agree with this. It is difficult to understand why women should have been foremen, but easy to understand that they may have acted as independent enterprisers, a position in which they took no physical part in brick manufacture.

But if we regard the domini of the stamps as landowners and the officinatores as largely independent enterprisers, then the occurrence of women in the stamps, taken as a whole, fits well into the picture. There appear 43 women as domini in the stamps, or nearly 30% of all domini are women. This proportion is not surprisingly high, for in the society of that time, especially on its highest level, it was common for women to be owners of wealth (as heiresses, for instance). Nor is it surprising that only about 6% of the officinatores are women, for undoubtedly the opportunities of women to take part in economic activities as active enterprisers were much inferior to those of men.

Societas in Brick Stamps

Interesting in many respects are those brick stamps in which more than one person is mentioned either as dominus or officinato. There are a considerable number of such stamps: the present study is concerned mainly with those in which there are several officinatores.

Roman law knows a form of juridical person. Collective bodies existed with their own property and with an identity other than the sum of their members, bodies which remained the same although their members changed; but their field of action was limited, they were religious congregations, professional clubs, burial associations and so on. In the commercial field these collective forms were not recognized: economic life was ruled by individualism. Responsibility was always an individual matter.

Collaboration could certainly be practised, but only if each partner answered for his own share. Two or more individuals might agree on their collective ownership of, for instance, an inheritance, or on plans to work together for an economic
objective. Such an agreement and the association formed by it were known as societas, and those who made the agreement as socii. Societas had no economic significance comparable with that of the modern business company. This is further illustrated by the fact that societas was one of the contracts which could be made without formal procedure of any kind. The property of societas was merely the sum of the shares of socii, each socius controlling his own share as he wished. Also, societas itself was merely the sum of its members. Each socius was free to resign and remove his share at any time, and if one socius resigned the whole societas broke up. Societas could not be a party to agreements: it was necessary for one socius to put his name to an agreement and be responsible for it.

Cases of more than one dominus in brick stamps are easily explained in terms of societas. A societas of dominii evidently implied collective ownership without a particular joint enterprise. Almost all societates of dominii seem to have originated in socii together receiving an inheritance and forming a societas in order to preserve it whole. As proof of this, in all cases except one the socii were either brothers or otherwise related.

The societas of the Domitius brothers Lucanus and Tullus is well known also from literary sources. It was formed exactly as mentioned above, when Cn. Domitius Afer, father of the brothers, died. This was a case of societas omnium bonorum, which means that the agreement covered all property of the socii, both what was in their possession when the agreement was made, and what might come into their possession later. In this respect brick stamps fully confirm the data given by Pliny: the name of Lucanus, who died before his brother, occurs only in combination with the name of his brother Tullus.

Among the societates of dominii those have a special interest which illustrate the inheritance and control of the property of the Imperial family. The stamps indicate that the later Emperor, Marcus Aurelius, and his wife Faustina administered part of their property as a societas between the years 146 (when Faustina became Augusta) and 161 (when Marcus Aurelius became Augustus). This was not societas omnium bonorum, because both socii are also encountered alone in the stamps. Because Marcus Aurelius and Faustina were cousins it may be assumed that they had inherited the joint property from their grandparents M. Annius Verus and Rupilia Faustina, who both appear in brick stamps as dominii. What happened to this societas after Marcus Aurelius became Emperor in the year 161? If it continued, then part of the stamps with the abbreviation Augg nn are of Marcus Aurelius and Faustina (in Index III Bloch does not place one of them under the names of Marcus Aurelius and Faustina). It is also possible that the combined property was divided or united with the Emperor’s patrimony. Both Marcus Aurelius and Faustina appear alone as dominii also after the year 161.

In 161 it happened for the first time that power was divided between two Augusti of the same rank. Brick stamps show that both Emperors, Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, still controlled their private property separately, but held jointly the property they inherited from the previous Emperor Antoninus Pius.
More interesting than societates of domini from the standpoint of this study are societates of officinatores. The following list includes all cases where more than one officinator is mentioned in a stamp and dominus is also mentioned. The stamp-numbers refer to CIL XV (bare number) and to Suppl. (number preceded by S.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>officinator</th>
<th>dominus</th>
<th>stamp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C(audius) Q(uin)q(uatralis)</td>
<td>Dom(itia) Luc(illa)</td>
<td>1079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et L(ivius) Mart(ialis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermetianus et Urbicus</td>
<td>Augusti</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tontius Felix et Vibia Procla</td>
<td>Aug(ustus) n(oster)</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Font(eius) Proclus et Ingemia</td>
<td>Flavius Aper</td>
<td>1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunnidii(?) Rest(itatus) et Leon( )</td>
<td>Aug(usti duo) n(ostri)</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op(pius) Procul(us) et Op(pius) Just(us)</td>
<td>Statilius Severus</td>
<td>S. 69=286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justa et Rufinus</td>
<td>Caes(ar) n(oster)</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Aeli II Secund(us) et April(is)</td>
<td>Ti. Iulius Iulianus</td>
<td>2174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Am( ) Cip( ), d(uo) R(ufellii?)</td>
<td>Aug(ustus) n(oster)</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P( ) et Fel( )</td>
<td>Arr(ia) Fad(illa)</td>
<td>88,89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Sin( ) Am( ), Q. A[..]P( )</td>
<td>Ar(ria) F(adilla)</td>
<td>S. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.[ ]ucul( ) Euc( ) et Volu( )</td>
<td>L. Aurelius Commodus</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A good explanation of the appearance of two or more officinatores in the same stamp is that the officinatores had formed a societas to produce bricks together. On the other hand it would be difficult to explain why two foremen were appointed for one working crew. Stamps CIL 1147 and CIL 205, whose officinatores are evidently married couples, can hardly be explained by the assertion that the officinatores were subordinate to dominus in a production organization, for instance paid foremen.

Societates formed by officinatores seem to have been unions of a temporary nature. On the evidence of stamps only the societas of Hermetianus and Urbicus can be shown to have functioned for more than one year (CIL 367, 370); it operated through the change of rule in either the year 161 or 169. – In several cases one or more members of a societas are also encountered alone as officinator: Ti. Claudius Quinquatralis (CIL 1069–1079), Livius Martialis (CIL 1080), Sabinia Ingenia (CIL 203), C. Numidius Restitutus (CIL 289, 1158, 1278), Rufellius Felix (S. 29) and (Domitius) Rufinus (CIL 2174).
Officinatores Who Appear in Stamps
of More Than One dominus

There are a considerable number of officinatores in whose stamps more than one dominus appears. I have collected data on these officinatores in a list on pages 139-., the references below are to numbers in this list.

If the same officinator appears in several stamps with different domini, we know of the officinator that either 1) his officina was situated on land whose owner changed, or 2) he manufactured bricks first on the land of one dominus, and then moved to the land of another, or 3) he manufactured bricks simultaneously in different places on the lands of different domini. In order to clarify the relation between dominus and officinator it would be important to know which of the three alternatives applies in each case. If it is 1) nothing can be said of the relation, but if it is either 2) or 3) we may take it as a sign that officinator was independent of dominus.

Alternative 1) applies at least to cases in which it is known, or there is reason to suspect that land was transferred from one dominus to another by inheritance. This is so when domini are members of the Imperial house; other such cases are Domitia Lucilla – M. Aurelius (& Faustina) (nos. 1, 20, 32, 36, 63), Seia Isaurica – Flavius Aper (no. 8), Q. Asinius Marcellus – Asinia Quadratilla (no. 39), Arria Fadilla – Arrius Antoninus (no. 45) and perhaps others. – Analogously it may be suspected that a greater transfer of landed property, by will, for instance, took place in cases where more than one officinatores have the same domini. Such cases are: Plotia Isaurica – Arria Fadilla (nos. 25, 33, 35 and 52), Iulius Stephanus – Domitia Lucilla (nos. 1, 21 and 44), Seia Isaurica – Statilius Maximus (nos. 37 and 55). – On the evidence of the list a great variety of hypotheses can be formed regarding the transfer of property.

The appearance of the name of C. Fulvius Plautianus in the list was explained earlier (see note 26). I shall examine one further case separately, since it illuminates a phase of second century political history. The stamps of A. Aristius Thallus (no. 9) show that he procuded bricks in the years 123–134 on the land of Plaetorius Nepos, and in 138 on the land of the later Emperor L. Verus (L. Ceionius Commodus Caesaris filius). If it is assumed that Thallus throughout the period produced bricks in the same place, it is then clear that ownership of the land was transferred sometime between 134 and 138 from Plaetorius Nepos to the future Emperor.

Plaetorius Nepos is a person known from other sources. He was consul in the year 119 with Hadrian; for most of Hadrian’s reign he was one of the Emperor’s closest associates. In the last years of Hadrian he lost favour, however, being mentioned in Vita Hadriani as one of the notables whom Hadrian ‘quasi futuros imperatores detestatus est’. References in Vita Hadriani suggest, in fact, that
Plaetorius Nepos in the end fell victim to the Emperor’s suspicions. Carcopino, showing great powers of invention, has reconstructed the course of these events. According to him the aim of the ‘’futuri imperatores’’ was to prevent the appointment of L. Ceionius Commodus (L. Aelius Caesar) as successor. Hadrian could carry his adoption scheme into effect only after the death of the Empress Sabina (this is the essential point in Carcopino’s theory). We know that Sabina died “dans le second semestre 136” and that the adoption of L. Aelius Caesar took place in December 136; consequently the revolt of the ‘’futuri imperatores’’ must have occurred between these dates.

The stamps of A. Aristius Thallus are quite compatible with the above data. The course of events was as follows: Plaetorius was condemned and his property confiscated. At least part of the confiscated property was transferred by Hadrian to L. Aelius Caesar (father of L. Ceionius Commodus, dominus of stamp CIL 732), whom he adopted and thus appointed his successor. L. Aelius Caesar died on 1. 1. 138. This early death explains the fact that his name does not appear in stamps, though the name of his 7-year-old son appears. The property of Plaetorius Nepos was transferred to L. Aelius Caesar only in the year 137, because if the transfer had been made the previous year the name of L. Aelius Caesar would have been in time to appear in the stamps of 137. A second possibility is that the stamp series of A. Aristius Thallus contains gaps; the stamp for the year 138 in any case bears the name of the son and heir of L. Aelius Caesar.

The course of events illustrated in the brick stamps can be understood only on the assumption that the domini of the stamps were great landowners. The lands transferred to L. Aelius Caesar may have been very large, and for those concerned this was certainly the important fact, far more so than the location on this land of one brickworks. Land ownership had great political importance; it may be assumed that Hadrian wished to strengthen the status of the man he had chosen as his successor. This example is similar to the case of C. Fulvius Plautianus, which was expounded earlier. To explain the change of domini one need not look for changes in the brick industry, as there may be quite other features in the background.

But these changes of dominus took place without the influence of the officinator, he played a merely passive part in the events reflected in these stamps. Does the list contain cases in which officinator was active and responsible for the change of dominus? Among officinatores who produced bricks simultaneously on the lands of more than one dominus are almost certainly Sex. Alfius Amandus (no. 7), C. Nunnidius Restitutus (no. 40) and P. P( )B( ) (no. 43), for their stamps record several domini in the same year. Officinatores who very probably produced bricks in more than one place, either simultaneously or at different times, are: T. Rausius Pamphillus (no. 52), in whose stamps appear three domini of siglinae Caepionianae and one instance of an adjective suggesting a second place (Salarese); Caetennius Magnio (no. 12); P. Servilius Firmus (no. 55), in whose stamps appear three
Domini; and M. Ulpius Anicetianus (no. 63) with four domini. Further probable examples are nos. 14, 15, 34, 38, 42, 44, 48, 57, 60 and 61.

These cases may be regarded as proving that officinatores were not so tied to one dominus that they were unable to move to the lands of another or produce bricks simultaneously on the lands of several domini.

Continuity of the Functions of officinatores: For How Long Did They Operate?

Listed in this chapter are the officinatores of brick stamps who are known to have produced bricks for at least twelve years. Twelve years are the interval between the consular dates which appear most often in stamps, the years 123 and 134.

Persons who were officinatores in stamps for the year 134 and who also have a stamp for 123 but none for the years outside those limits are nine in number: M. Luigius Valens (CIL 336, 335), A. Gabinius Successus (CIL 490–4, 488–9), Pomp(onius?) Vitalis (CIL 453, 455), Dionysius Domitiae Lucillae (CIL 1020, 1030), Tertius Domitiae Lucillae (CIL 1041, 1043), Graphicus serv(us) (or Servius Graphicus) (CIL 851 = S. 237, CIL 852), C. Nunnidius Restitutus (see officinator list, no. 40), Pettius Proculus (no. 45) and A. Pontius Clodianus (no. 49).78

Zosimus, slave of M. Annius Verus, appears in stamp CIL 806, which has the consular date for the year 123; the same man appears as a free officinator named M. Annius Zosimus in stamps CIL 245–6, which are from the year 135; he therefore operated for at least 13 years. Other officinatores who are shown by the consular dates to have operated for over 12 years appear in stamps with more than one dominus. Data on them will be found in the officinator list below. P. Aelius Alexander (no. 1), A. Aristius Thallus (no. 9) and P. Servilius Firmus (no. 55) produced bricks for at least 16 years, 123–138; C. Nunnidius Fortunatus (no. 39) operated for at least 20 years, 123–142; M. Ulpius Anicetianus (no. 63) for at least 21 years, 134–154.

Officinatores who were at work even longer will be found among those whose names occur in stamps with more than one dominus.79 In these cases the minimum length of the period can be estimated from data in stamps referring to domini. M. Ulpius Anicetianus (no. 63), who was mentioned earlier, produced bricks for longer than the consular dates of his stamps show, because his stamp CIL 719 belongs to the period after the death of Domitia Lucilla (155 or later) (as dominus appears the societas of Aurelius Caesar and Faustina Augusta, heirs of Domitia Lucilla). – For Sex. Publicius Consors (no. 51) the time boundaries are the years 161 and 180, leaving a period of at least 20 years, because the domini of his stamps can be arranged in order as follows: Aurelius Caesar et Faustina Augusta (before 161, when M. Aurelius became Augustus), Faustina Augusta (until 176, when Faustina died), duo Augusti (177–180 M. Aurelius and Commodus), Augustus
noster (from 180 Commodus). – Calpetanus Crescens (no. 13) was at work at least 27 years from 151 till 177, if the domini of his stamps, Faustina Augusta and the two Augusti are placed in the same order as in the stamps of Sex, Publicius Consors.\textsuperscript{80} – L. Lanius Festus (no. 31) produced bricks for at least 27 years: stamp CIL 399 was in use before the death of the Empress Faustina (176), and in CIL 240 C. Fulvius Plautianus is mentioned as consul bis, which points to the years 203–205.

Two persons appearing as officinatores in binominal stamps are encountered in pelvis stamps found in Pompeii, which shows that their activities started before the year 79. They are Cn. Domitius Arignotus (S. 283–4, CIL 1094, 1024) and St. Marcius Lucifer (no. 35 in the officinator list). In the binominal stamp CIL 1024 of Cn. Domitius Arignotus, dominus is D P L (\(=\) Domitia P.f. Lucilla), which in Dressel’s normal chronology points to a time not before the year 123, but he dates this stamp of Arignotus to 108 or immediately afterward.\textsuperscript{81} – St. Marcius Lucifer appears in the Pompeian pelvis stamps both as slave and free, and Plotia Isaurica and Arria Fadilla appear as domini in his brick stamps; on the evidence of Arria Fadilla Dressel dates his last stamps to 123–127. The career of Lucifer is so long that it is difficult to imagine him a paid foreman; at the time when his last stamps were in use he must have been extremely old.

Continuity of the Functions of officinatores: officinator gentes

If officinator has been freed by dominus mentioned in the same stamp, it is possible, as noted earlier, that the incentive for the officinator’s work is to be found in the dominus: such cases may be regarded as evidence that domini represented continuity in brick production. If, on the other hand, officinator has been freed by another officinator mentioned in other stamps it is similarly possible that the incentive has come from another officinator; in this case officinares might be seen as representatives of continuity.

For this chapter I have gathered data on 11 officinator-gentes appearing in brick stamps. In these cases the gentilicium is so uncommon that the persons concerned are probably connected; in each case, moreover, there are connecting factors other than the name.\textsuperscript{82} I assumed at an earlier stage that the same gentilicium for dominus and officinator points to a patronus-libertus relation. The clear social disparity observed between the domini and officinares, and the fact that the positions of dominus and officinator did not belong to the same career are sufficient grounds for this assumption. But if two officinares have the same gentilicium (and praenomen), the possibility of blood relationship must also be considered. Blood relationship, however, cannot be verified from data appearing in stamps because filiation is missing from the names.
Rustii

*L. Rustius Lygdamus* appears in three stamps, CIL 1418, 1419 and S. 541 (dolium). Both his brick stamps are from the year 123, in CIL 1419 he is alone, in CIL 1418 Se(ia) Is(aurica) is *dominus*; in neither stamp is the name of *figilinae* mentioned. *Rustius Felix* (without *praenomen*) appears in only one stamp, CIL 422; in this stamp the name of *figilinae Pubilianae* is mentioned, and *Flavius Aper* is *dominus*. —Because *Flavius Aper* often appears as successor to *Seia Isaurica* as *dominus* (e.g. in *figilinae Pubilianae*), the two *Rustii* can be linked together. *Rustius Felix* continued the work of *L. Rustius Lygdamus* as *officinator*.

Fadii

*L. Fadius Pass( )* appears as *officinator* in three stamps, in all of which *Seia Isaurica* is *dominus*, but they are all from different *figilinae*: CIL 12 from *figilinae Aristianae*, CIL 207 from *figilinae Fabianae* and CIL 674 from *figilinae Tur( )* (evidently = *Tonneianae*); stamps CIL 207 and 674 are from the year 134. — *Fad(ius) Euhelpristus* (without *praenomen*) appears in two stamps, CIL 209–210, in both of which *Flavius Aper*, the successor of *Seia Isaurica* is *dominus*. Stamp CIL 209 contains the name of *figilinae Fabianae* and also the consular date 157. — Between the two *Fadii* arises the same connection as between the two *Rustii* above; the consular dates additionally show that the *Fadii* belong to different generations.

In the case of the *Rustii* and the *Fadii* we observe that a person of earlier occurrence in stamps signifies the *praenomen*, but a later person does not.

C. Cominii

*C. Cominius Proculus* (no. 21 in the *officinator* list) is mentioned in three stamps. *Dominus* in CIL 1210 is Iulius Step(hanus) and in CIL 1051 Dom(itia) Lucil(la); in CIL 1211 only Felix Caric(us), a slave of *C. Cominius Proculus*, is mentioned; stamp CIL1210 is from the year 127. — In stamp CIL 754 a–b of *C. Cominius Sabinius dominus* is Aug(ustus) n(osfer), in Dressel’s opinion M. Aurelius or Antoninus Pius (or Faustina). — In this case the connection between *officinatores* is weaker than in previous cases; the uniting factor apart from names is the circumstance that M. Aurelius was heir to *Domitia Lucilla* and her successor as *dominus* of brick stamps.

Q. Oppii

The *Q. Oppii* who appear in brick stamps can be divided into three groups: 1) those who appear alone: *Natalis* and *Priscus*; 2) those who appear both alone and with *dominus*: *Iustus* and *Verecundus*; 3) those who appear only with *dominus*: *Proculus*.
and Stabilis. Also to be added is Q. Oppius Terminalis, who appears in a sarcophagus stamp. The name of Stabilis appears without praenomen, with the others the praenomen is Q.

The time boundaries are stamp CIL 2476, where the Domitius brothers are mentioned and which is therefore from the year 94 at the latest (Cn. Domitius Lucanus died then), and CIL 706, which has a consular date of 134. The factors uniting the Q. Oppii besides their common name are the names of members of the gens Domitia occurring in their stamps.

The earliest of these persons are Q. Oppius Terminalis, in whose only stamp the name of the Domitius brothers appears, and the Oppii appearing in stamps alone, Q. Oppius Priscus (CIL 1347) and Q. Oppius Natalis (CIL 1345, 1346 a–d); their stamps belong to a time when the name of the landowner was not yet declared in a stamp, i.e. to the first or early second century.

Q. Oppius Verecundus and Q. Oppius Iustus (no. 42 in the officinar list) are slightly later than the above, or it may be better to say that their work extended to a later period. Both appear in some of the stamps alone without dominus, Verecundus in CIL 1348 a–c and S. 351, and Iustus in CIL 1342 and 1344, of which the former bears the consular date of 123. Both Verecundus and Iustus have a stamp for the year 123, in which dominus is Domitia Lucilla and the place of manufacture is marked D L or DE LIC (= de Liciniano or Licinianis); these stamps are CIL 272 and 273. In addition Iustus has stamp CIL 1046 for the year 129 with Domitia P.f. Lucilla as dominus, but the place of manufacture is not mentioned.

The third and evidently latest group of the Oppii is composed of Q. Oppius Proculus and Oppius Stabilis, in whose stamps CIL 364 and 706 Caesar (apparently Hadrian) is dominus. The stamp of Stabilis has the date of 134.

Through stamp CIL 363 a connection arises between Q. Oppius Iustus, who worked on the land of Domitia Lucilla, and Q. Oppius Proculus, who worked on the land of Caesar. In this stamp a societas formed by Oppius Iustus and Oppius Proculus appears as officinar, and Caesar as dominus. Since the name of figilinae Oceanae is mentioned in the stamp it is possible that CIL 364 of Proculus and CIL 706 of Stabilis are also from figilinae Oceanae.

Also appearing in stamps are two slaves of Q. Oppius Iustus, namely Restitutus in pelvis stamp CIL 2486 and Fortunatus in brick stamp CIL 1343, which is from the year 126.

The stamps of the Q. Oppii fit well into the picture I have given of the development of the content of brick stamps. Persons can be arranged in the time scale according to whether they appear in stamps alone or with dominus. The name of the landowner (dominus) does not occur in stamps until the decade of 120. It is highly probable that the stamps of the Q. Oppii in which dominus is unmentioned, i.e. all stamps of Natalis and Priscus and some of Iustus and Verecundus, were also used on the lands of the Domitii (in style the stamps are similar). The name of the Domitii is missing from these stamps only because it was not yet customary to mention the name of the landowner (cf. p. 102 above).
L. Lurii

As a group the L. Lurii resemble the Q. Oppii: they too appear both in first century one-name and in second century binominal stamps. The L. Lurii can be linked together mainly on the strength of their common name: in their late stamps common domini do not occur in the same manner as Domitia Lucilla and Caesar appear in the stamps of the Q. Oppii.

The following L. Lurii appear only alone in stamps: Aprio CIL 1247, Blandus CIL 1248, S. 511 (pelvis Pompeiana), Martialis CIL 1249–1251, Proculus CIL 1253, Verecundus CIL 2459 (dolium), Verus CIL 1962 and additionally the slaves of Proculus, December CIL 1254 and Crescens CIL 2458 (pelvis).

Three L. Lurii appear in one-name and also in binominal stamps, namely Crescens, who is evidently the same person as the earlier mentioned Crescens, slave of L. Lurius Proculus, CIL 280, S. 61; Myrinus CIL 1252, S. 200–1; Primitivus CIL 208 = S. 50, S. 512 (dolium). All three have one stamp in which dominus and place of manufacture are mentioned: in CIL 280 of Crescens Caes(ar)n(oster) and figlinae Lusianae; in S. 200 of Myrinus Iulius Rufus and figlinae Viccianae; in CIL 208 = S. 50 of Primitivus Seia Isaurica and figlinae Fabianae.

Absolute time references for the work of the L. Lurii are obtained from stamp S. 511 of Lurius Blandus, which was encountered at Pompeii and was therefore in use before the year 79, and from stamp S. 61 of L. Lurius Crescens, which has the consular date of 123. The work of the L. Lurii appears to have extended little later than the decade of 120, the latest probably being stamp CIL 208 = S. 50 of L. Lurius Primitivus. On the other hand some L. Lurii may have been at work long before the year 79, as the forms of the stamps of L. Lurius Martialis and L. Lurius Blandus suggest.

Between the L. Lurii and the Statii Marcii (to be examined later) a connection of some sort seems to have existed. Pointing to it are CIL 1248 a and 1962 of the L. Lurii Blandus and Verus, and CIL 1275 b and 62 of the Statii Marcii Fortunatus and Lucifer, which are very similar to each other but clearly different from other stamps. Also, L. Lurius Myrinus and Statius Marcius Antiochus mention the name of figlinae Viccianae in their stamps.

Aristii

A. Aristius Thallus (no. 9 in the officinator list) and the Aristii Success(us) (CIL 735) and Aug(ustalis?) (CIL 733–4), who both appear without praenomina, belong clearly to at least two generations. All stamps of A. Aristius Thallus contain a consular date, the years being 123, 134 and 138. In stamp CIL 733 of Aristius Augustalis there is a consular date, the year 148, and in the only stamp of Aristius Successus the year is 150. These three Aristii are connected not only by a common
name but by the appearance in their stamps as *dominus* of the later Emperor L. Verus.

The career of *A. Aristius Thallus* was examined earlier (see p. 116). *Aristius Augustalis* may well have been his immediate successor as regards the chronology. In CIL 734, an undated stamp of *Augustalis*, the name of the future Emperor is in the form *L. Ael(ius) Caes(ar or -aris) Com(modi) f(ilius)*, which can be interpreted as pointing to the year 138 or at least not much later. So the following years would be arrived at as working periods for the *Aristii: Thallus 123–138, Augustalis 138–148, and Successus 150–*.  

Also encountered in the stamps are *A. Aristius Menander* (CIL 829–831, S. 230) and his two slaves *Primus* (CIL 832) and *Tertius* (CIL 833), whose stamps lack the name of *dominus* and whose possible link with *A. Aristius Thallus* thus cannot be proved. Consular dates for the years 123, 124 and 128 appear in the stamps.

### C. *Nunnidii*  

The four *officinatores* bearing the name of *Nunnidius* in brick stamps belong to at least two generations, *C. Nunnidius Fortunatus* (no. 39 in the officinator list) and *C. Nunnidius Restitutus* (no. 40 in the officinator list) to the earlier and *Nunnidia Sperata* (S. 215) and *C. Nunnidius Felix* (CIL 737–8; S. 216) to the later. The stamps CIL 846–8 and S. 236 of *Fortunatus* are from the year 123 and *Q. Asinius Marcellus* is *dominus* in them. Stamps CIL 860–1 are from the years 141 and 142, and *Asinia Quadratilla* is *dominus*. In his only undated stamp, CIL 862, *Fortunatus* is alone without *dominus*. – In the stamps CIL 286 = S. 69 and CIL 289 of *Restitutus* the name of *figilinae Macedonianae* is mentioned and in both *T. Statilius Maximus* is *dominus*; the former is from the year 123 and the latter from 134. In CIL 1158, also from 123, *Flavia Procula* is *dominus*; in the only undated stamp, CIL 1278, *Q. Marcius Hermogenes* is *dominus*. In stamp CIL 286 = S. 69 the *societas* of *Nunn(idii) Rest(itutus) et Leon( )* appears as officinator. – In all stamps of the second generation *Nunnidii, Sperata* and *Felix*, the Emperor L. Verus is *dominus*, in the early stamps still as a private person. The only stamp of *Nunnidia Sperata* is from the year 153. Stamps CIL 738 and S. 216 of *Felix* are from the period before 161, when L. Verus became Augustus; in CIL 737 L. Verus is already Augustus.  

*C. Nunnidius Fortunatus* is one of the rare *officinatores* about whom information has survived in other sources than brick stamps. In the cemetery of Isola Sacra at Ostia a monument of *C. Nunnidius Fortunatus* has been found. He had it erected "*sibi, libris, libertis libertabusque, posterisque eorum*". In the words of Thylander "*la tombe pourrait dater de l’époque de Trajan ou de celle d’Hadrien*"; if the person concerned is the same as in the brick stamps then this dating is somewhat early (although *Fortunatus* erected the monument in his lifetime), for *C. Nunnidius Fortunatus* still produced bricks at least in the year 142. If the persons of the brick stamps and the monument are one and the same – there is no other uniting
factor than the name – then it seems obvious that this officinato lived in Portus or Ostia. Where was his officina located? We do not know.

Vismatii 90

Vismatius Successus is encountered in stamps both as officinato and as dominus. Only in his new stamp (see p. 131, n. 2) is the place of brick manufacture mentioned: it is figlinae T(empesinae). Bloch dates his other stamps (CIL 1518–1525; S. 397–402) on grounds of building-historical comparison to a period of a few years near 120. 91 In the stamps of Successus five free officinatores appear: Clodius Victor, Lusenus Celer, Lusenus Ampliatus, Veturius Severus and Vismatius Felix, the last-mentioned undoubtedly a freedman of Successus; five slaves also appear: Maius, Primus, Tiridas, Crescens and Fortunatus, the last two of whom are encountered later free. Of these officinatores Vismatius Felix (no. 61 in the officinato list) and the former slaves Vismatius Crescens and Vismatius Fortunatus (no. 62 in the officinato list) appear later in stamps in which Successus is not dominus. Stamp CIL 31 of Vismatius Felix is from figlinae Brutianae, dominus is Rutilius Lupus and this stamp too is from about the year 120. Vismatius Crescens appears alone in stamp CIL 407, where the name of figlinae Ponticulanae is mentioned. Dressel has dated this stamp by its form to the time of M. Aurelius or Commodus; if the person concerned for the whole period is the same Crescens, the dating of Dressel does not appear believable. Also known from dolium stamp CIL 2497 is Tertius, a slave of Vismatius Crescens. Fortunatus, another slave of Vismatius Successus, is encountered as a free man in stamp CIL 607 of the year 123; the other stamps of Vismatius Fortunatus, S. 180–181, are from 125 and 126. In all these stamps Q. Aburnius Caedicianus is dominus, and in CIL 607 and S. 181 the name of figlinae Tempesinae is mentioned, which also appeared in one stamp of Vismatius Successus, the patronus of Fortunatus.

In addition to these three freedmen of Vismatius Successus three Sex. Vismatii are known from the stamps (they used the praenomen whereas the former Vismatii did not); their relation to Vismatius Successus does not become clear from the stamps. In stamp CIL 644 of Sex. Vismatius Neritus the name of figlinae Tonneianae is mentioned and dominus is Quintilla Saeniani (who appears in other stamps with the name Pedania Quintilla). Dressel considers it possible that Sex. Vismatius Neritus is also concealed behind the letters S V N, which appear in CIL 42, a stamp of figlinae Brutianae; if this is so, then through figlinae Brutianae arises a connection between Vismatius Felix and Sex. Vismatius Neritus. – In stamps CIL 640 = S. 192 and CIL 1517 of Sex. Vismatius Himerus there is no mention of dominus, but in the former the name of figlinae Tonneianae is mentioned. – The stamps of Neritus and Himerus belong to the early second century. Sex. Vismatius Restitutus clearly belongs to a later period. Faus(tina) Aug(usta) n(ostra) is dominus of his stamp CIL 730; the stamp is therefore from the period between 146 and 176.
Lanii

Eight officinatores with the name Lanius appear in brick stamps, four with the praenomen L., the other four without praenomen. The Lanii are a late officinator line whose stamps include some of the latest which can be dated.

The earliest is Lanius Vin(dex?), whose only stamp, CIL 1441, can be dated to the decade of 130 or thereabouts on the evidence of Q. Servilius P(udens), who is mentioned in it as dominus. A central figure among the Lanii is L. Lanius Festus (no. 31 in the officinator list), whose name occurs in five stamps. In CIL 239 he appears alone, in other stamps the name of dominus is also mentioned. Appearing as domini are Faustina Augusta, Commodus Augustus n(aster), C. Fulvius Plautianus and Aug. nn; from these names we see that the work of Festus began not later than the year 176 and ended not earlier than 203. – L. Lantius Crescens can also be dated; in his only stamp, CIL 623, Comm(odus) Augustus(nus) is dominus, showing that the stamp belongs to the time when Commodus was Augustus, namely 177–192. – The other Lanii, L. Lanius Substitutus (CIL 767–8), L. Lanius Felicissimus (CIL 755), Lanius Fortunatus (CIL 159), Lanius Pisentinus (CIL 166) and Lanius Rufinus (CIL 602) mention only Aug. n., Augg. nn. etc. as dominus, that is to say one or two Emperors without individual name; thus their stamps can be dated no more than summarily at the end of the second or beginning of the third century. – The Lanii, like others, appear to have belonged to at least two generations.

The Group of figlinae Marcianae

In Roman brick and other ceramic stamps there appear 21 Statii Marcii, 5 C. Satrinii, 15 C. Calpetani and several slaves of persons with these names. These persons are linked together by the name of figlinae Marcianae, which occurs in many of their stamps. The stamps of persons belonging to the figlinae Marcianae group form, with those of gens Domitia, a body of stamps in which long-term continuity of operation can be observed. The name of figlinae Marcianae appears in Roman brick stamps from the first half of the first century to the beginning of the third, and again after the blank period of the third century in the form officina Marciana. Persons with the name C. Calpetanus occur in stamps in an almost unbroken series from the early first to the beginning of the third century.

The development of content in brick stamp texts is illustrated in the stamps of the St. Marcii and C. Calpetani in the same way, as in those of the L. Lurii and Q. Oppii. They appear in second century binominal stamps as officinatores. This
accords with the conclusion reached by analysis of stamp texts, that among the persons of binominal stamps officinator represents the traditions of the persons of earlier one-name stamps and dominus is the new person in binominal stamps.

For the dating of early stamps of the figlinae Marcianae group – which lack name of dominus and consular dates as internal criteria – two reference points are available: stamps occur in bricks of the ships of Nemi and in ceramic objects discovered at Pompeii (pelvis and dolia). For the Pompeian stamps the year 79 is merely terminus ante quem, but there is good reason to suppose that the bricks of the ships of Nemi were produced only a short time before the ships themselves were built, namely a little before the year A.D. 40.92

Stamps of the following members of the figlinae Marcianae group were on bricks of the ships of Nemi: St. Marcius Optatus (CIL 1282), St. Marcius Rabbaeus (S. 81, 616), St. Marcius Stator (S. 337), St. Marcius (without cognomen) (CIL 1966 = S. 618), Atimetus, slave of St. Marcius Neo (CIL 1280 = S. 336), C. Satrinius Communis (CIL 306–8) and C. Calpetanus Auctus (S. 72 b).93

In the Pompeian stamps occur six St. Marcii and three of their slaves, two C. Satrinii and six of their slaves, also two slaves of C. Calpetanus Livianus (S. 515–529, 543–550, 475–6).

Only one person appears both in the ships of Nemi and in Pompeii, namely C. Satrinius Communis; his stamp CIL 308 is encountered in two Nemi bricks and one Pompeian dolium.

St. Marcius

In early stamps, including those of the ships of Nemi and Pompeii, it is the St. Marcius who occur most often. This may indicate that the St. Marcius were the first of these lines fo function in figlinae Marcianae, which in turn makes it probable that the name of figlinae Marcianae derives from the name of the St. Marcius. The name of figlinae Marcianae seems to have established itself by the decade of A.D. 30, as it appears in four stamps of the ships of Nemi. Perhaps the earliest reference to the St. Marcius is a dolium stamp, CIL 2466, found on the bed of the Tiber, with the text ST MARCIVS ST F = Statius Marcius Stati filius (Dressel supports the completion: St. Marcius Stator fecit). Filiation and absence of cognomen point to an early period, perhaps to Republican times. Other early evidence is provided by dolium stamp CIL 2467 with the text ST MARCI TRIFERNA F. The cognomen is undoubtedly a somewhat altered form of the ethnicon Tifernas = 'native of Tifernum', and may – since the name in question is an early one – indicate the original home district of its bearer.94

Seven St. Marcius are known among Pompeian pelvis, namely Fuscus, Tognaeus, Primigenius, Florens, Lucifer, Restitutus and Celer, also slaves of the two last-mentioned named Lucifer, Albanus and Quietus; Lucifer, then, appears as both slave and free (S. 515–529). Appearing in dolium and other ceramic stamps discovered at Rome are St. Marcius Triferne, Demetrius, Optatus and Secundio
(CIL 2460–7), and in first century brick stamps St. Marcii Suavillus, Demetrius, Fortunatus, Acanthus, Stator, Optatus, Rabbaeus, Antiochus and Secundio, also Atimetus, slave of Neo, and Hilario, Demetrius and Philippus, slaves of Helenus (CIL 310–1, 1271–1285, 357, 672 = S. 203, S. 155–7); Demetrius, then, appears as both slave and free.

Among the St. Marcii only Rabbaeus mentions in his stamps the name of figlinae Marcianae. Later in the first century the St. Marcii appear to have moved away from figlinae Marcianae. In stamp CIL 357 of St. Marcius Secundio the name of figlinae Ociiana occurs, and in CIL 672 = S. 203 of St. Marcius Antiochus the name of figlinae Viccianae.

Only three St. Marcii seem to have extended their activities into the second century, the "historical" period of brick stamps. St. Marcius Lucifer (no. 35 in the officinator list), who already appeared in Pompeian pelvis stamps both as slave and free, is encountered in the early decades of the second century as officinator in figlinae Caepionianae. Domini in his stamps are Plotia Isaurica and Arria Fadilla. St. Marcius Bassus (no. 33 in the officinator list) also acted as officinator at figlinae Caepionianae in the time of both Plotia Isaurica and Arria Fadilla. In his stamps the consular date of 123 occurs. The third St. Marcius of the second century is St. Marcius Fortunatus. In one of his four stamps, S. 155, the name of figlinae Subortanae is mentioned, with Caes(ar), either Trajan or Hadrian, as dominus.

C. Satrinii

The C. Satrinii are easily placed in order of time. C. Satrinius Communis is the earliest (CIL 306–309; S. 77–79, 549, 590, 573, 574). Some of his stamps were in the ships of Nemi and also at Pompeii. Possibly the son of Communis, and in any case later than he, is C. Satrinius Celer (CIL 303–305, 141, 388). Four or six — the number is a matter of interpretation — slaves of C. Satrinius Celer appear at Pompeii in pelvis stamps (S. 543–548). The name of figlinae Marcianae is most commonly mentioned in the stamps of C. Satrinius Communis and C. Satrinius Celer.

The C. Satrinii too appear to have moved away from figlinae Marcianae later. In Celer's stamp CIL 141, the specimen stamp (i) on page 32 above, the name of figlinae Castricianae appears, and in his second stamp CIL 388 (specimen stamp (53) on page 94 above) the name of figlinae Ociiana. Clemens, a slave of Celer appearing in one Pompeian pelvis stamp (S. 547), is encountered later freed with the name of C. Satrinius Clemens. In his stamp CIL 384 = S. 96 is also the name of figlinae Oceanae.

Among binominal stamps of the second century only Satrinius Fortunatus (without praenomen) appears, his only stamp CIL 110 is from figlinae ab Euripo with the Emperor Antoninus Pius as dominus. — C. Satrinius Priscinus, whose possible connection with the other C. Satrini cannot be proved, appears as dominus in stamp S. 372 and alone in CIL 1412.
C. Calpetani

I have already examined the background of the central member of the Calpetanus line, C. Calpetanus Favor, and his relation to C. Calpetanus Livianus, whose two slaves appear in Pompeian pelvis stamps (see p. 30 above). The earliest C. Calpetanus is Auctus (CIL 302, S. 72–3), whose bricks were found in the ships of Nemi. In his stamp CIL 302 the name of figlinae Marcianae is mentioned. The relation of Auctus to C. Calpetanus Livianus and C. Calpetanus Favor remains obscure. The activities of C. Calpetanus Favor (no. 14 in the officinator list) can be placed at the end of the first century and the beginning of the second. The Emperor Trajan is dominus in his stamps CIL 312–4, but Hadrian, the following Emperor, does not appear; the conclusion from this is that the work of Favor ended before the death of Trajan in the year 117.95 In the stamps of Favor CIL 312–5 the name of figlinae Marcianae appears. Seven slaves of Favor are known from stamps: Venustus (S. 474), Jmamus (CIL 2423), Crescens (CIL 2422), Facundus (CIL 903 = Steinby 1974 p. 88), Hermes (CIL 904), Mnester (CIL 905) and Secund(us) (an unpublished stamp discovered by us at Ostia). Of these Crescens, Hermes and Mnester are later encountered free.

C. Calpetanus Favor seems to have been a man of distinction in his trade, for later his name came to be attached to the figlinae where he had been officinator (figlinae Favorianae; see below).

To the end of the first century and the beginning of the second belong the following C. Calpetani, whose relation to C. Calpetanus Favor remains obscure: Ianuarius (CIL 2424), Achoristus (CIL 899), Fortunatus (CIL 906), Musophilus (CIL 907) and Restitutus (CIL 908); these persons appear in stamps alone, and in their stamps the name of figlinae is not mentioned.

C. Calpetanus Hermes continued the activities of his patronus C. Calpetanus Favor. In his stamps CIL 318–320 Caes(ar) n(oster), evidently Hadrian, is dominus; in CIL 318 the name of figlinae Marcianae is mentioned, and CIL 319 has the consular date of the year 123. Hermes appears to have been followed by C. Calpetanus Mnester, a second freedman of Favor. In both his stamps CIL 707 and 708 Caes(ar) n(oster) is dominus, still evidently Hadrian, and CIL 707 has the date of 138. In the stamps of C. Calpetanus Mnester the name of figlinae is unmentioned.

The history of the liberti of C. Calpetanus Favor ends with Mnester, but the series of C. Calpetani continues. The next is Pannychus (no. 15 in the officinator list) who appears in stamps only as a free man. Domini in his stamps are Caes(ar) n(oster) and Cosin(i)a Gra(tilla). Stamp CIL 960 bears the consular date of the
year 147; the Caesar of CIL 746 may be Hadrian or Antoninus Pius, or M. Aurelius before the year 161. In the stamps of Pannychus no name of figlinae appears.

Pannychus appears to have been followed by CalpetanuS Crescens (no. 13 in the officinato r list), clearly a different person from the Crescens about whom I have spoken earlier, who was first the slave of C. Calpetanus Livianus and C. Calpetanus Favor, and then a free man. The C. Cal(petanus) Cre(scens) appearing in stamp CIL 900, which has the consular date of 137 but no dominus, may be still another person than the two mentioned; in that case there would be three Calpetani Crescentes. Stamp CIL 1144 of Calpetanus Crescens is from the year 151 and mentions Flavius Aper as dominus; in the other stamps the Empress Faustina (the Younger) and Augg. nn. are domini. Dressel considers that the duo Augusti signify Severus and Caracalla, but it is more natural to assume that we are concerned with the period of joint rule, 177–180, by M. Aurelius and Commodus; stamp CIL 218 was taken into use immediately after the death of the Empress Faustina in 176. The gaps are thus filled in the series of stamps. In CIL 218 figlinae Favorianae is declared as the place of brick manufacture; the name of the same figlinae appears also in stamps of subsequent Calpetani, but the name of figlinae Marcianae no longer appears. Figlinae Favorianae undoubtedly signifies the same place as figlinae Marcianae, which still appears in the stamps of other officinatores than Calpetani. The adjective Favorianus, a, um is evidently formed from the cognomen of C. Calpetanus Favor, central personage of the C. Calpetani.

The last Calpetani are Verna (no. 16 in the officinato r list) and Fortunatus. The stamps of Verna compose a perfect parallel to the two last stamps of Crescens (see p. 69 above). In the only stamp of Fortunatus, CIL 219, Augg. nn. is dominus, which indicates some period of joint rule at the end of the second or beginning of the third century. Perhaps one or other of the last-mentioned still appears in S. 52, a fragmentary stamp datable to the early years of the third century, in which only the first part of the name of officinato r, C CAL, has survived. In this stamp C. Fulvius Plautianus is dominus (years 203–205), and the name of figlinae Favorianae is mentioned.
7. Conclusion

Which of the two persons of brick stamps, *dominus* or *officinator*, was the brick producer or enterpriser in the brick industry? – As a result of my investigation I would transfer this role from *dominus* to *officinator*.

*Dominus* is mentioned in the stamp texts as owner of the land on which and of which the bricks were made; nothing else is implied in the expressions *ex figlinis huius* and *ex praedis huius*. The name of the landowner was included in the stamp text only in the beginning of the second century. There is no reason to conclude from this feature of development of the stamp text content that a change took place at that time in the organization of brick production.

Examination of the relations in law of persons of *dominus* and *officinator* revealed nothing to indicate that these persons were members of the same production organizations. More than 80 per cent of the *officinatores* were independent in law on persons of the *domini* mentioned in their stamps.

The above argument on *domini* leads to the conclusion that there is no need to view the *officinatores* as subordinates of the *domini* in a production organization. On the other hand several such cases can be found in which it is far easier to explain the *officinator* as an independent enterpriser than as a foreman subordinate to the *dominus*.

By assigning to *dominus* the role of landowner and to *officinator* the role of brick producer I do not exclude the possibility of cases in which both roles were united in one person. There are stamps in which *dominus* is mentioned but *officinator* is not. In such a case it is most natural to think that the landowner was the brick producer as well. And in cases of one-name stamps in which *dominus* is not mentioned it is by no means impossible that the person mentioned, besides being brick producer, was also owner of the land on which he produced bricks. The components of the text content do not occur consistently in the stamps, this must be borne in mind when conclusions are drawn from brick stamps (cf. p. 46).

The obvious question to be asked next is: What kind of right had the *officinator* to the land owned by the *dominus*? – I have only touched on this problem in my study. The word 'conductor' or 'conductio' occurs in stamps (see p. 97), so it is possible that the contract was *locatio-conductio*, the *dominus* being *locator* and the *officinator* being *conductor*. As a possible juridical form *usus fructus* also may be considered. *Usus fructus* is mentioned in the passage of Paulus Dig. 8, 3, 6 (quoted on page 44) describing a situation resembling that reflected in brick stamps.
Notes to Chapter V

1 The word 'officinator' occurs in stamps CIL 1697 and CIL XIV S 1, 5308, 27.

2 A clear exception is provided by Vismatius Successus, who in the following recently published stamp appears as officinator:

F·T·CALPVRNIAE·SECVNDAE  
O·D·VISMATI·SVCESS  Steinby 1974, p. 98 no. 4

*figlinae Tempesinae Calpurniae Secundae, opus doliare Vismati Successi*

In the previously known stamps CIL 1518–1526, S. 397–402 Vismatius Successus appears as dominus. Steinby in her comment draws attention to the uniqueness of the case. – Other possible cases are M. Aemilius Procclus, dominus in stamp CIL 780, who may be the same as M. A( ) Pro( ), officinar in stamps CIL 1056 and 1057; Flav(ius) Pro( ), dominus in stamp CIL 1055, who may be the same as F( ) Pro( ), officinar in stamp CIL 1054; Iulia Saturnina, dominus in stamps CIL 1218–1220, S. 323, may be the same as Iu[lia sa]turnina, officinar in stamp CIL 365. In these cases it is highly probable, however, that we are concerned with two persons of the same name.

3 SetaHl p. 152.

4 See e.g. quotations p. 93 and p. 132 n. 19 below.

5 See e.g. Hirschfeld p. 159–162.

6 There are three specimens of this stamp, all of unknown provenance. – Shtaerman mentions this stamp as an example of three-stage renting. Shtaerman, p. 80–81, "dreistufige Pacht".

7 CIL 415–419, 430–432, 879; S. 105. Shtaerman also examines these stamps separately; she considers that three-stage renting is involved, and thinks it possible that only the right to sell bricks was leased to the negotiator. Shtaerman p. 82.

8 CIL XV, I p. 6–7.

9 Bloch classes Ti. Iulius Optatus as dominus, BL p. 222, 336: "proprietario delle *figlinae Ocianae*". Dressel classes C. Satrinius Celer as officinar in his comment on CIL 141.

10 PIR² IV p. 241–242, no. 443.

11 This is seen from Dressel’s comments in CIL; see e.g. CIL 462 and 1221.

12 Anteros is "figulo" BL p. 112 and "officinatore" BL p. 177.
13 See above p. 13; Bloch gives a connected report on his conclusions from brick stamps, *BL* p. 316–344.

14 Bloch, *BL* p. 328. Bloch uses for *dominus* the word 'industriale', e.g. *BL* p. 209 and 387.


19 Dressel's conception appears from passages like the following: *CIL* XV p. 7: "Qui praedia possidebat, figilnas in eis positas aut suo nomine exercendas curabat per servum – ita enim videntur esse intellegendi tituli in quibus nomina servi eiusque domini coniuncta exhibentur ( . . . ) – aut conductori (vel conductrici) locabat uni vel pluribus ( . . . ). Lateres huc pertinentes praeter domini nomen (ex praedis vel figlinis illius) exhibent nomina aut servi figuli vel officinatoris sive exercitoris aut conductoris – nam hic quoque saepe incertum, quis eorum nominetur – ita expressa etc." – *CIL* XV p. 7 n. 2: "Ubi nomina liberti eiusque domini coniuncta occurrit ( . . . ), dubitari potest, utrum liberus domini sumptu officinam exercuerit, an a domino eam conduxerit."

20 In stamps CIL 390, 545, 643, 761, 761, 1477 (and perhaps 542).

21 Gummerus, 1498.

22 See above p. 44–45.

23 Examples of those who certainly took no physical part are the officers mentioned on page 110. A similar case is the *scr(iba) librarius* in stamp CIL 1507.

24 Veyne describes pertinently the importance attached to accumulation of landed property by the highest circles of Roman society: Veyne, p. 236–237. He quotes, for instance, the following extract from Pliny: "pulchritudo iungendi ( . . . ); non minus utile quam voluptuosum". Pliny, *Ep.* 3, 19, 2.

25 It is generally understood that in the time of Nerva and Trajan privately owned land increased in ratio to Imperial land in the Roman area and in Italy. Land confiscated in the time of Domitian was restored to private ownership. Cassius Dio mentions (68,2) that Nerva sold fiscal land to private persons, and Pliny relates the same of Trajan (*Paneg.* 50, 5–7). We also know (Pliny, *Ep.* 6, 19) that Trajan encouraged and even ordered new senators to invest their money in Italian land. Again, Trajan is the first Emperor to appear in brick stamps as *dominus*. These data best fit together if we assume that mention of the landowner's name (*dominus*) in a stamp became customary in the early second century, i.e. that proprietary relations remained as before, but an addition was made to the text.

26 I give here an extreme example of how conclusions drawn from brick stamps change when *domini* are regarded as owners of land, not manufactories. – C. Fulvius Plautianus is mentioned as *dominus* in 15 stamps. In all others except S. 311 the following titles are attached to his name: *pr(aefectus) pr(aetorius), e(larissimus) v(ir), co(n)s(ul) ii*. The stamps are therefore from the time between the years 203 (Plautianus was consul for the second time and 205 (he was murdered as an aspirant for power on January 22nd). The stamps show that in almost every case the preceding owner of *figilnae* owned by Plautianus was the Emperor. – Bloch, who regards *domini* as brick
manufacturers, explains the abrupt appearance of Plautianus as dominus in place of the Emperor by asserting that Septimius Severus appointed his energetic chief of staff to reorganize the collapsing brick industry (Bloch, BL p. 300). If domini are regarded as landowners the conclusions may be different. Transfer of Imperial property near Rome to Plautianus may be interpreted as a sign that Plautianus was in the process of assuming power, exactly as historians of the age relate. In 203, the year of Plautianus' second consulship, the death occurred of the Emperor's brother P. Septimius Geta, who had vigorously defended the interests of the dynasty, and in the preceding year Plautianus had achieved the marriage of his daughter to Caracalla, the Emperor's son and heir. We may assume that the transfer of landed property had some connection with these events. For Plautianus see PIR² III p. 218-221, no. 554.

27 CIL XV p. 265-275.

28 According to Dressel. See genealogical table and accompanying text, CIL XV p. 267. In this study the year of Cn. Domitius Tullus' death is an important borderline; this year is deduced from Pliny's letter 8, 18, whose theme is the death and will of Tullus. Sherwin-White says in his comment on this letter: "There are no close indications of time." The year 108 is Mommsen's dating, which later scholars have considered slightly late (see Bloch, BL p. 46); Bloch opts for 106/7 on the evidence of brick stamp discoveries. – The year of Afer's death is mentioned by Tacitus (Ann. 14, 19); the death of Lucanus is the theme of Martial's Epigram 9, 51, the dating being based on that of Martial's ninth book; the years of death of the Domitiae Lucillae are estimated by Dressel from brick stamps.

29 The name of Cn. Domitius Lucanus appears in stamps only in conjunction with that of his brother Cn. Domitius Tullus.

30 The son of Domitia P.f. Lucilla, the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, and the latter's son, the Emperor Commodus, also appear as domini in stamps. No note need be taken of their stamps in this connection.


33 CIL 2417, 2433–2435; 2482–2485, 2496, 2516, 2517; S. 481–503.

34 I have counted as slaves of Domitii those whose masters are mentioned in a stamp as one of the Domitii, and those whose masters are not mentioned.

35 This is an instance of the orbiculus stamp whose lines are intended to be read in order from the inside outward; i.e. reading of the printed text must start from the bottom line. Cf. p. 34, Stamp (iv).

36 Bloch considers that Crescens transferred to the service of Domitia Lucilla on gaining his freedom: Bloch, BL p. 345: "(…) Crescens che alla fine del secolo si incontra ancora come servo di L. Munazio Fausto, per entrare, manomesso dal padrone, come L. Munazio Crescens nel 123 al servizio di Lucilla."
37 CIL XV p. 274-5.
38 Bloch, BL p. 333.
39 23 slaves of the Domitia Lucillae are known from stamps, as shown by the tabulation on page 100. 13 of these appear in stamps where dominus is not mentioned.
40 CIL 1434-1439. 41 CIL 1440 and S. 379.
42 A comparable expression is found in CIL 363: ex f(iglinis) (. . .) quas cu(rant) etc.
43 A suitable specimen stamp is (57) on page 95.
44 Dominus is either Plotia Isaurica or Seia Isaurica. Steinby suggests the former on the strength of features observed in the stamp which point to the early second century; Bloch suggests the latter. In my view the arguments of Steinby are convincing. (Steinby 1969, p. 442-443.)
45 See Duff, p. 52.
46 They appear as slaves and as freedmen, CIL 1107-8 and 263-4, 1008.
47 This is seen from the stamp Steinby 1974, p. 103 no. 12.
48 Gaius 1, 165; 3, 45-46; 3, 58, and Gaius Dig. 38, 1, 6.
49 See Duff, p. 50-51.
50 The name of dominus in the stamp is in the form ISAVR, which can mean both Plotia Isaurica and Seia Isaurica; Dressel opted for the latter, but Steinby has advanced good reasons in favour of the former. The name of figlinae in the stamp is in the form CAE, which can equally well mean figlinae Caepionianae of Plotia Isaurica and figlinae Caelianae of Seia Isaurica. (Steinby 1969, p. 339-40).
51 CIL VI 25544. Dressel expounds this case in CIL XV p. 25.
52 Names to be considered are: Cocceius, Ulpius, Pompeius (Plotina), Aelius, Vibius (Sabina), Aurelius, Annius (Faustina major), Ceionius and Septimius. For gentilicia of Imperial freedmen see Chantraine p. 61-65.
53 The full text S. 587 shows that the stamp reads A. lib., not Aug. lib. Dressel, who knew the stamp as a fragment, thought the latter reading possible.
54 Syme, Tacitus p. 794.
55 Zosimus Anni Veri s(ervus) appears in stamp CIL 806. For Vismatius Felix the conclusion is more indirect. Felix lib(ertus) and Succ(essus) (= Vismatius Successus) appear together in stamp CIL 613 of figlinae Tempesinae, and Vismatius Successus appears in stamps of figlinae Tempesinae CIL 612 and Steinby 1974 p. 98 no. 4, see also Steinby's comment.
This opinion is held, for instance, by Duff, p. 89: "After being freed, the slave would, more often than not, continue in the same situation as before manumission"; and by Veyne, p. 223: "Socialement parlant, l'affranchissement n'est rien. La distinction importante n'est pas celle des esclaves et des affranchis: c'est celle qui oppose, d'une part, les esclaves et la majorité des affranchis, qui restaient auprès de leur maître, et, d'autre part, une minorité d'affranchis qu'un ensemble de conjonctures rendaient juridiquement et économiquement indépendants de leur patron"; and Gagé, p. 141. – The main arguments for this opinion are enumerated in these passages.

It must be borne in mind that almost all dominus-officinarius pairs of brick stamps belong to the second century. In Veyne's opinion the patronus-libertus relation had by then lost some of its significance in patronage. The changing position of Imperial freedmen in the Imperial administration is well known, but, as Veyne points out, otherwise we lack information on this change from the second century. See Veyne, p. 227.

Frank, Survey, p. 208. The uniqueness of the Roman brick industry in this respect is stressed by Frank in the concluding sentence of the paragraph on brickmaking in the Survey, p. 209: "This is practically the only instance in a thousand years of Roman history in which wealth derived from industrial success contributed to political distinction."

Duff, p. 92.

Frank gives a similar account in his History, p. 231: "This fact again explains a peculiar business practice in the association of the owner and slave managers of such factories, for brick stamps usually indicate the names of both the owner and the superintendent of the yard, the latter invariably a slave or freedman." Here the word 'owner' refers to the dominus and the word 'superintendent' to the officinatores of the brick stamps. Frank's illustrative examples are from the stamps of gens Domitia, as are those of Duff. – In this passage Frank puts the situation reflected by brick stamps in a wider setting. He continues: "The landlord at this time seldom leased his lands: he rather cultivated them himself, placing a trusted slave or freedman in charge of his property, a position of considerable responsibility and dignity. It is apparent that the superintendent of the brickyards who was permitted to stamp his name upon the brick with that of his master corresponds in every way to the vilicus of the estate." Now in this case too Frank's facts are contested by other scholars. Analysis of Pliny's letters, a good authority on land tenure of this time, shows that the estates of Pliny were cultivated by free tenants (coloni), and the word 'vilicus' does not occur in the letters. (See René Martin in Revue des études anciennes, LXIX (1967) p. 81–85.) – Frank dropped this passage from the paragraph on brickmaking in the Survey, p. 207–209.

Dressel interprets the abbreviation thus, as does Bloch. Indices p. 94.

Pflaum, Carrières I no. 109 p. 262–4; PIR² II no. 1015.
63 No. 20 in the officinato list.

64 For Domitia Lucilla in her late stamps the name Lucilla Veri is used. The consular dates in the stamps where this appellation occurs are for the years 145–155. Cf. CIL XV p. 273.


66 For societas see Berger, p. 708 and Schulz, p. 549–553.

67 Berger, v. consensus, p. 408.

68 Societates of domini other than those mentioned in the text: Aristii Strabo et Celer (CIL 834), L. et P. Cassii (CIL 283, 284; S. 66), Iunius Rufus et R( ) Cap( ) (CIL 683, S. 206), Paccii (S. 353 = CIL 2049), Petronii Mamertinus et Septimianus (S. 411 = CIL 2159), Vitravius Pollio et Fundania Faustina (CIL 520) and Ummidius Quadratus et Anna Faustina (CIL 731).

69 Pliny, Ep. 8, 18. The subject matter of this letter is the death of Cn. Domitius Tullus, his will, and the property of Tullus and his brother Luconus.

70 Ibid. cap. 7.

71 It should be mentioned that Faustina appears far more often in stamps than M. Aurelius (see Indices p. 78, 79). Because M. Aurelius was the son and principal heir of Domitia Lucilla this is somewhat extraordinary. It is possible that M. Aurelius transferred part of his property to Faustina before he became Emperor.

72 Personal data on both, and on other persons mentioned in this chapter, will be found in, for instance, the Oxford Classical Dictionary.

73 Indices p. 78, 79. The stamps of M. Aurelius, L. Verus and Faustina show that precision was observed in the expression of dominus: the private property of Emperors and the Imperial patrimony were separated from each other.

74 RE XX. 2545–8 (Betz). The name in other sources than brick stamps is usually Platorius; for the phonetic structure of the name in literary texts see Bloch BL p. 181.

75 S H A, Hadr. 23, 2–6.

76 Carcopino p. 181, 190.

77 L. Verus appears often as dominus (in 11 stamps), both as Augustus and before his accession. But no earlier Ceiomii are encountered in the stamps, nor any other of his earlier relatives, in so far as these are known. It is therefore possible that other lands in the vicinity of Rome were also transferred to L. Aelius Caesar in the manner described here. The same transfer is perhaps reflected in the stamps of two officinatores bearing the name of M. Valeriius: Priscus (no. 58) and Iulianus (CIL 740). Plaetorius Nepos is dominus in the stamp of the former (year 134) and L. Aureliius Caes(ar) in that of the latter. Cf. also stamps of the C. Numidii p. 123.
78 A. Pontius Clodianus belongs to this group if the consuls Iulianus and Castus were in office circ. a. 134 as Bloch hesitatingly suggests in Indices p. 87.

79 See list p. 139-. The information on well-known persons introduced in the following is found, for instance, in the Oxford Classical Dictionary.

80 Two or three persons named Calpetanus Crescens appear in stamps. The career of this Calpetanus Crescens would be considerably prolonged if C. Cal(petanus) Cre(scens) (CIL 900) in a stamp of the year 137 were counted as the same person.

81 CIL XV p. 273, [p. 44-45].

82 I have verified the rarity of the name by examining the indexes of CIL. Among the names appearing in this chapter the name combination Statius Marcius and the gentiliciun Visnatiu occur only in Roman brick stamps; half the occurrences of the gentilicia Calpetanus, Satrinius, Numnidiu and Lanius are in Roman brick stamps, and the other gentilicia present are also rare.

83 See CIL XV p. 15 and 66; and no. 8 in the officinator list.

84 Depicted in his stamps is a bird, according to Dressel "columba", according to Steinby "passer"; in Steinby’s view "passer" indicates a cognomen, which would therefore be Pass(er); Steinby 1969, p. 442-3.

85 Stamp CIL 2476, whose peculiar text is as follows: Q. OPPI TERMINALIS / DOMITORVM F.

86 CIL 1345 = CIL 1346 c; see Steinby 1974, p. 93.

87 On the evidence of the filiation. The arrangements made by Hadrian to ensure an orderly transfer of power included his own adoption of Arrius Antoninus, who in turn adopted Marcus Aurelius and L. Ceionius Commodus, son of L. Aelius Caesar, the former heir to the throne who had died a little earlier. The adoptions occurred on 25. 2. 138 (see Carcopino 1958 p. 180), and Hadrian died on 10. 7. the same year. The appellation L. Aelius Caes(ar or -aris) Commodi filius seems to indicate the time between these dates, or at least the time preceding Hadrian’s death, because after it Caesaris filius became Augusti filius; the filiation Aug(usti) Pii filius) appears in the name of the future Emperor in CIL 735, which is from 150. The appellation L. Ceio(nius) Com(modus) C(aes(aris) f(ilius), which appears in CIL 732 from the year 138 belongs to the time preceding the adoption.

88 The name also appears in the forms Ninidius and Nyn(nidius).

89 Thylander, Inscriptons du Port d’Ostie, A 74.

90 The name also appears in the forms Vimatius and Bism(atius).

91 Bloch BL p. 113–114.

93 The ships were built in the reign of Caligula and sank soon after his death, see Uculli p. 292–5.
93 There were 142 stamped bricks in all; of these 19 were of the St. Marcii, 17 of the C. Satrinii and 16 of the C. Calpetani.

94 The additional r in the name Trifernus may be explained by the assimilative effect of the second r in the word. The case resembles that of '(lapis) Tiburtinus' – 'travertino' and 'thesaurus' – 'trésor'.

95 Stamp CIL 317, with the consular date of 123 and C. Calpetanus Favor as officinator, is non-existent; Bloch explains his grounds for this in BL p. 335, n. 286.

96 Dressel published the text of stamp CIL 960 in the following form:

\[\text{L ANNIO LARGO C PRAST PACAT COS EX OF C CALP FA OP F EX PR COSIN GRA/} / / /\text{PANNYCHI}\]

Only one exemplar of the stamp is known. Although both Marini and Dressel have seen this exemplar, I suggest a correction in the reading, because in the above form the text is not understandable. My corrected form is as follows:

\[\text{L ANNIO LARGO C PRAST PACAT COS EX OF C CALPETA PANNYCHI OP F EX PR COSIN GRA/} / / /\]

Changes in the CIL text are as follows: 1) At end of line 1 F changed to E, and this E (or final A) connected as ligature with T; a stamp need not be greatly worn for such an error to arise. 2) Line 2 begins at a different point from that adopted by Dressel; such a change is admissible because the stamp is circular and the lines form a closed ring, cf. above p. 32 stamp (i). – With these slight corrections we obtain a normal binominal stamp text with dominus (Cosinia Gratilla) and officinator (C. Calpetanus Pannychus), whereas the text of Marini and Dressel displays three persons, the name of officinator breaking into two: C. Calpetanus) Fa( ) and Pannychus.
List of officinatores Appearing in Stamps of More than One dominus

This list contains all those officinatores who appear in stamps together with more than one dominus. I have counted as different dominii an Augustus, Augusta or Caesar mentioned by individual name, and such a person without individual name (see e.g. nos. 18 and 56); also Caes. n. (= Caesar noster), Aug. n. (= Augustus noster), Augg. nn. (= duo Augusti nostri) and so on are counted as different dominii (see e.g. nos. 3–6, 26, 38).

Under the name of the officinator the following data are recorded: the number of the stamp in CIL XV, 1 (bare number) or Supplement (number preceded by an S.), name of the dominus, the year of the consular date, and the name of figlinae. – Last are enumerated the stamps containing only the name of the officinator.

1

P. Aelius Alexander

1208 Iulius Stephanus a. 123
172 D(omi(nia) P.f. Luc(illa) a. 138
171 Domitia Lucilla Domit.minorib.
173 Dom(itia) Luc(illa) –
717 Caes(ar) –
S. 54

In stamp CIL 1208 the cognomen only of the officinator ALEXAND appears (the stamp is complete). The identification is based on the fact that the same dominus appear in the stamps of Peducaeus Lupulus (no. 44) and C. Cominius Proculus (no. 21). Dressel and Bloch do not identify the Alexander of stamp CIL 1208 with P. Aelius Alexander. – The letters P.A.A. in stamp CIL 93 may also refer to P. Aelius Alexander: Dressel (comment on CIL 93) and Bloch (Indices p. 15) deem this probable.

2

C. Aelius Asclepi(ades)

385 II Aug(usti) Ocean. m.
398 Faustina Aug(usta) Ponticl.

3

Aelius Felix

324 Augg. nn. (= duo Augusti nostri) Marcian.
624 Aug(ustus) n(oster) Terentia.

4

L. Aelius Phidelis (cognomen thus written in all stamps)

625 Aug(ustus) n(oster) Terent.
628 Augg. nn.
S. 190 (=1947) C. Ful(vius) Plaut(ianus) Ter
5

**L. Aelius Victor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>Aug. nn.</td>
<td>Terentian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td>Aug(ustus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6

**Aemilia Romana**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Aug(ustus) n(oster)</td>
<td>Dom. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Aug. nn.</td>
<td>Domit. min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7

**Sex. Alfius Amand(us)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>C. (uriatius) Cosan(us)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>C. (uriatius) C(osanus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Ti. Sentius Satrin(us)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>C. (uriatius) C(osanus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8

**L. Allius Rufus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>652</td>
<td>Sei(a) Isau(rica)</td>
<td>Tonn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653</td>
<td>Flavius Aper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9

**A. Aristius Thallus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1363</td>
<td>P(aetorius) Nep(os)</td>
<td>a. 123 Caepionana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364</td>
<td>P(aetorius) Nep(os)</td>
<td>a. 123 Cepion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365</td>
<td>P(aetorius) Nep(os)</td>
<td>a. 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732</td>
<td>L. Ceio(nius) Com(modus) C(aesaris) f(ilius)</td>
<td>a. 138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10

**Avienus Halys (?)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>Plotia Isaurica</td>
<td>de Mul.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Sentius Satrianus</td>
<td>Cae.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Steinby 1974 p. 97 no. 1

In stamp CIL 339 the name of the officinator, in ablative case, is AVIENO HALITY. In the other stamp the name of the officinator is represented by the initials A. H. only; see p. 79 above.

11

**Caecilia Amanda**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Aug(ustus) n(oster)</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Aug(ustus) n(oster)</td>
<td>Vet./ de Lic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12

Caet(ennius?) Magnio (in 943, 944 cognomen only)

942 Coelius Philetus a. 134
943 M. Coelius Philetus –
S. 586 Coelius Fortunatus – Antull.
1203 C. Iulius Apollinaris –
944

13

C. Calpetan(us) Crescens

1144 Flavius Aper a. 151
725 Faustina –
218 Augg. nn. – Favor
S. 52 (fr.) C. Ful(vius) Pla[t(ianus)] – Faor.

In the fragmentary stamp S. 52 the beginning C-CAL[ of the officinator's name is visible, so the officinator can be also some other C. Calpetanus or some C. Calvius. – There are two or three C. Calpetani Crescentes in the stamps: the others are: 1) C. Calpetan(us) Crescens (CIL 901 = S. 243) = Crescen[s] C. Calpetan[oi] Liviani (S. 475) = Crescen[s] C. Calpetan[oi] Fa[vor]i (CIL 2422) (see p. 28 above); and 2) C. Calpetan(us) Crescens (CIL 900) whose stamp is from the year 137 and lacks dominus, the relevant text of this stamp reads: ex officina L. Mal(ili?) Tr[() (et) C. Cal[petani)] Crescens].

See my comment on no. 18 below.

14

C. Calpetanus Favor

314 imp(erator) Cae(sar) Tra(ianus) Aug(ustus) – Marc.
312 imp(erator) Caes(ar) Ner(va) Tra(ianus)
Aug(ustus) – Marcianis
313 imp(erator) Caes(ar) Tra(ianus) Aug(ustus) – Marc.
316 Amf. Rus. (?) –
315

15

C. Calpetanus Pannychus

960 Cosin(i[a) Gra[tilla]] a. 147
746 Caes(ar) n(oster) –

16

Calpetanus Verna

220 Augg. nn. – Faorian.
221 Fau(stina)

17

Calventia Maximin(a) (Maxima)

214 Aug(ustus) n(oster) – Faor.
215 Augg. nn. – Faor.
216 dom(inor) Augg. nn. – Faorian.
325 Augg. nn. – Marcian.
Calvius Crescens (in 201 Calxius Crescens)

175 Aug(ustus) n(oster) – Dom. minor.
201 imp. M. Aurelius Antoninus – Novis
726 Faust(tina) Aug(usta) n(ostra) –
727 Faust(tina) Aug(usta) –

In stamp CIL 727 the officinator's name is CAL CRESCENTIS (genitive), which can also mean Calpetanus Crescens (see no. 13 above).

Claudius Fortunatus

S. 209 Matidia Aug(ustae) f(ilia) –
S. 210 Matidia Aug(ustae) f(ilia) –
2203 Stertinia Bassula –

Ti. Claudius Secundinus

1082 Lucilla Veri –
718 Caes(ar) n(oster) –
728 Faustina Aug(usta) –
1081, 1083, 1084, S. 590, 2428 (fr)

C. Cominius Proculus

1210 Iulius Step(hanus) n. 127
1051 Domit(ia) Lucil(ia) –
1211 –

Domitius Rufinus

2204 Stertinia Bassul(a) –
2173 Ti. Iulius Iulianus –
2174 Ti. Iulius Iulianus –

In stamp CIL 2174 the societas of Iusta et Rufinus appears as officinator; this Rufinus is evidently the same person as Domitius Rufinus.

T. Flavius Corinthus

858 Asinius A.f. Marcell(us) –
710 Caes(ar) n(oster) –
765 d(ominus) n(oster) imp(erator) –

The officinator has a praenomen only in CIL 710. Bloch considers (Indices p. 31) that T. Flavius Corinthus of CIL 710 is not the same person as Fl(avius) Corinthus of the other stamps.

Fulvius Primitivus

183 Augg. nn. – Domit. min.
184 C. Ful(vius) Plaut(ianus) –
25  

L. Gellius Prudens

55 Plot(tia) Isaur(ica)  
56 EX·P·S  
58 Plotia Isaurica  
82 Arr(ia) Fadill(a)  
57

26  

Hermetianus et Urbicus

367 Augustor(um)  
370 Aug(ustus) n(oster)  

27  

C. Iulius Fortunatus

1432 Seia Isaurica  
711 Caes(ar) n(oster)  
712

The officinator’s praenomen is lacking in CIL 1423.

28  

C. Iulius Priscus

211 Faustina Aug(usta) n(ostra)  
1351 Q. P. F.  

The officinator’s praenomen is lacking in CIL 211.

29  

L. Lab(eria) Bars( )

642 imp(erator) Cae(sar) Ne(rva) T(raianus)  
Aug(ustus) Ger(manicus) Dac(icus)  
S. 154 Cae(sar)  

30  

L. Lanius Felicissimus

755 dom(inus) Aug(ustus) n(oster)  
185 C. Ful(vius) Plau(tianus)  

In stamp CIL 185 the bare cognomen FELICISS is used for officinator.

31  

L. Lanius Festus

399 Faus(tina) Aug(usta)  
238 Augg. nn.  
402 Commodus Aug(ustus) n(oster)  
240 C. Ful(vius) Plau(tianus)  
239

In stamp CIL 240 the officinator’s name is L LA FE, which can refer to L. Lanius Felicissimus (no. 30) as well. The identification with L. Lanius Festus is based on the signum ’'leo dextrorum currens'', which appears in CIL 238 and CIL 240.
Maius ser(vus)

618 Lucilla Veri a. 154
620 Faustina Augusta
621 Faustina Augusta

\[622=6.189\]

Statius Marcius Bassus

S. 23=60 Plotia Isaurica
81 Arria Fadilla
340 – Mulionis
79, 80 a. 123

Marcius Fyrmus

545 Caesar – Subortani
1478 Titia Quartilla a. 123

Statius Marcius Lucifer

59 Plotia Isaurica – Caepioniana
83 Arria Fadilla – Caepion

61, 62, 2462–3, S. 519, S. 520, S. 525 (Lucifer St. Marci(i) Restitut(i) sc. servus)

Mercurius Ti. Cl(audii) Quinquatralis sc. servus)
(1077, 1078), Mercurius (716), Merc(urius) servus) (756)

1078 Lucilla Veri –
1077 Lucilla Veri –
716 Aurelius Caesar –
756 Augustus/ustus/usta –

Bloch does not count this Mercurius as the same person in all cases (Indices p. 66).

Myrinus

1420 Seia Isaurica(a) a. 124
288 Statilius Maximus (imus) a. 134 Macedon.
40 Statilius Maximus Severus Hadrianus a. 127 Brut.
41 T. Statilius Maximus Severus
    Hadrianus

142
L. Numerius Iustus

47 C. Ful(vius) Plaut(ianus) – Bucco(nia)
176 Aug(ustus) n(oster) – Domitianas
177 M. Aureli(us) Antonin(us) minores
1124 Domiti(us) Ianuarius

The officinator’s praenomen occurs only in CIL 47.

C. Nummi(lius) Fortunatus

846 Q. Asinius Marcel(lus) a. 123
847 Q. Asinius Marcellus a. 123
236 Q. Asinius Marc(ellus) a. 123
848 Q. Asinius Marcellus a. 123
849 Q. Asinius Marcellus a. 134
860 Asinia Quadratilla a. 141
861 Asinia Quadratilla a. 142

C. Nummi(lius) Restitutus

1158 Flavia Proculla a. 123
289 T. Statilius M(aximus) a. 134 Mace.
1278 Q. Marc(u)us Hermogen(es) –
286 = S. 69 Statilius Severus a. 123 Maced.

In stamp CIL 286 = S. 69 the societas of Nummi(lii) Rest(itutus) et Leon appears as officinator.

P. Octus Antonius

700 Plotina Augusta –
698 Plotina Aug(usta) –
187 = 2036 Aburnius Caecidianus –

In CIL 698 the officinator’s praenomen is M.

Q. Oppius Iustus

272 Dom(itia) Lucilla a. 123 Lic.
1046 Domit(itia) P.f. Lucilla a. 129
363 Caes(ar) n(oster) – Ocean.
1342–4, 2486

In stamp CIL 363 the societas of Opp(ius) Just(us) et Opp(ius) Proc(ula) appears as officinator.
P. P( ) B( )

478–9 M. Annius Verus a. 123 Salar.
486=S.124 Cor(nelia) Mall(iola) a. 123 Sal.
500–1 G(allus) T(urranius?) (et) T(ertulla) a. 123 Salar.

Peduc(aeus) Lapul(us)

244 Iul(ius) Step(hanus) Severo et Arrian. cos G
S. 119 Caes(ar) n(oster) – Rhod.
471 Caes(ar) n(oster) a. 133 Rhodin.
1052 Dom(itia) Luc(illa) –

In stamp CIL 244 the officinator’s name is PAED LVP.

Pet(ius) Proculus

S. 32 Arr(ia) Fad(illa) a. 123 Cep.
90=S. 30–1 Arr(ia) Fad(illa) a. 123
95 Antoninus a. 124 Caep.

Pomp. Felix

1301 Mem(mia) Macrina a. 134
1058 Dom(itia) Luc(illa) a. 136
1059 Domitia P.f. Lucill(a) a. 137

Sex. Pompeius Heli( )

400 Faus(tina) Aus. (=Augusta) n(ostra) – Ponticulanis
757 Aug(ustus) nos(ter) –
758 Aug(ustus) –

The officinator’s cognomen is lacking in stamp CIL 400.

Q. Pomponius Ianuar(ius)

808 Annius Verus
465=S. 577 Agat(hyrsus) Aug(ustae) l(ibertus) a. 123
S. 578 Agat(hyrsus) Aug(ustae) l(ibertus) a. 123
A. Pontius Clodian(us)

1023 Domiti(a) Lucil(ia) a. 123
1039 Domitia P.f. L(ucilla) a. 123
S. 276 Domitia P.f. L(ucilla) a. 127
S. 146 M. An(nius) Lib(o) Iuliano et Casto cos.

Bloch places the pair of consuls Julianus and Castus tentatively circ. a. 134 (Indices p. 87).

Procilia Phila

301 Mammi( ) a. 124
1217 Julia Albana

Sex. Publicius Consors

45 Aurel(ius) Cae(sar) et Faustin(a) –
S. 102 Faustina Aug(usta) Pontices
186 Faustin(a) Aug(usta) Domit. m.
44 Augg. nn. Bucconian.
46 Aug(ustus) n(oister) –
S. 44=154

T. Rausius Pamphilus

67 Plotia Isaurica Caepionial.
65 P(lotia) Is(aurica) Caepion.
66 P(lotia) Is(aurica) –
S. 28 Arria Fadilla Caepion.
84 Ar(ria) Fad(illa) Caep.
85 Ar(ria) Fa(dilla) Caepionian.
86 A(rria) F(adilla) Caepionianis
101 Curiat(ius) Cosanus Caricet.
102=S. 34 C. Cur(iatiius) C(osanus) Carc[...
524 Trebicia Tertulla Salarese
68

In stamp S. 32 the name of the officinator contains the cognomen PROCLVS only.
53

**D. Rutilius Doretus (?)**

The officinator’s name is represented by the initials D·R·D only in all stamps but the new one found by us at Ostia.

The reading of the new stamp is not certain: the name seems to be DRVALI DORFTI or DRVTLI DORFTI (genitive sing.), which can be emended to DRVTLI DORETI. The gentilicium Druteius, attested in Tuder (CIL XI, 4687), is another possibility. The cognomen Doretus would be explained as the Greek doretos, verbal adjective of doreo.

– The identity of D.R.D. and the person of the new stamp was suggested by Steinby (see Steinby 1969, p. 392–3).

54

**Rutilius Successus**

134 Faust(ina) Aug(usta) – Raninianis*
135= S. 43 imper(ator) Com(m)o(dus) Aug(ustus) – Can.
* figl. Raninianae = figl. Caninianae

55

**P. Servilius Firmus**

232 Aburnius Caedicianus – Furianis
233 Aburnius Cae(dicianus) – F.
605=S. 178 Aburnius Caedicianus – T.
604=S. 171 Aburnius Caedicianus a. 123 Tempesini.
S. 172 Aburnius Caedicianus a. 123 Temp.
614=S. 176 Aburnius Caedicianus a. 123 Temp.
S. 175 Aburnius Caedicianus a. 123 Temp.
234=S. 177 Aburnius Caedicianus a. 126 Temp.
1425 Seia Isaurica –
1456 Stati(lius) Maxim(us) a. 138
606, S. 174 a. 123 Tempesinis

In stamp S. 175 the officinator’s name is made up of the cognomen FYRMVS only.

56

**Suc(c)es(sus) serv(us)**

225 Aureli(ius) Caes(ar) n(oster) – Ful.
741 M. Aureli(ius) Antoninus Comm(odus) –
Blok considers (Indices p. 48) the Travius Felix of stamp CIL 383 a different person from that of the other stamps.

M. Valerius Priscus

703 Plotina Aug(usta) —
1366 Pl(aetorius) Nep(os)
1367 — a. 134

Vibius Pudens

S. 182 – 3 Q. A(burnius) C(aedicianus) a. 127 Tempesina
S. 41 = 2071 Lucil(la) Veri — Can.

Vibia Procilla(a) or Procla

1468 Terentius Iulianus —
1147 Flavius Aper —

In stamp CIL 1147 the societas of Tontius Felix et Vibia Procla appears as officinato.

Vismatius Felix(x)

S. 401 = 1525 Vis[m(atus)] s[j]uccessus —
31 Rut(ilius) Lup(us) — Brutiana
613 = S. 582 Temp.

The text of stamp CIL 613 a is: TEMP·SVCC·FELIX·LIB. In this enigmatic text we can discern the names of (Vismatius) Suc(cessus) and his libertus (Vismatius) Felix. This interpretation is given by Steinby in her comment to a new stamp published by her, Steinby 1974, p. 98, no. 4; see above p. 132, note 2.

Vism(atius) Fortun(atus)

1521 Vism(atius) Su[cc(essus)] —
S. 180 Ab(urnius) C(aedicianus) a. 125
S. 181 Aburn(ius) Caeb. (=Caedicianus) a. 126 Temp.
S. 179

In stamp CIL 1521 the officinato is Fortunatus without gentilicium; this is evidently Vismatius Fortunatus before manumission.
M. Ulpius Anicetianus

1263  L. Man( ) Theocritus  
1088  Dom(itia) Luc(illa)  
1089  Lucill(a) Veri  
1086  Lucill(a) Ver(i)  
719   Aurelius Caes(ar) et Faustina Aug(usta)  
472   Caes(ar) n(oster)  
473   Caes(ar) n(oster)  
1533. S. 332 (=2009)

The praenomen M. of the officinator appears only in the stamp CIL 472. – Bloch thinks that the officinator mentioned in stamps CIL 472–3 is not the same as that mentioned in the other stamps (Indices p. 51). The person may, however, be the same in all cases: this opinion is supported by the analogy of the stamps of Peducaeus Lupulus (no. 44.) in which the same domini Domitia Lucilla and Caesar appear, also the name of figilinae Rhodinianae. In such a case there is reason to suspect that there was some connection between the two officinares, e.g. that their officinae were near each other on land that changed owners.
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INDICES

Index of Persons

P. A() A() = ? P. Aelius Alexander 104, 139
A() H() = Avienus Halys(?) 79, 140
Q. A() P() 115
M. A() Pro() = ? M. Aemilius Proculus 131n.2
Abascantus Q. Servili Pudentis 104
Q. Aburnius Caedicianus 65, 66, 96, 107, 124, 145, 148, 149
Q. Aburnius Celer 96
Ab(urnius) G() 107
L. Aelius, see Lucius Verus
P. Aelius Alexander = ? P. A() A() 60, 104, 106, 107, 118, 139
L. Aelius Aprilis 106, 115
C. Aelius Asclepiades 106, 107, 139
L. Aelius Caesar, see Lucius Verus
L. Aelius Caesar 117, 136n.77
P. Aelius Demetrius 106, 107
Aelius Euphemus 106
Aelius Felix 74, 106, 139
L. Aelius Phidellis 106, 107, 139
L. Aelius Sabinianus 106
L. Aelius Secund() 106, 115
L. Aelius Victor 106, 140
Aelia Severa 22
M. Aemilius Proculus = ? M. A() Pro() 131n.2
Aemilia Romana 112, 140
Agathobulus Domiti Tulli = Cn. Domitius Agathobulus 92, 105
Agathyrsus Aug. 11b. 70, 146
Albanus St. Marci Restituti or Celeris 126
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Albius Secundus</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcides</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex. Alfius Amand(us)</td>
<td>61, 81, 88n.82, 117, 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Allius Rufus</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Am() Cip()</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amf. Rus(?)</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoenus duorum Domitiorum Lucani et Tulli</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annius December</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Ann(ius) Hermes</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Annius Libo</td>
<td>104, 107, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Annius Verus</td>
<td>9, 103, 107, 114, 118, 146, 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Annius Zosimus = Zosimus M. Anni Veri</td>
<td>9, 107, 108, 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annia Faustina</td>
<td>22, 136n.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anteros Caesaris n(ostri) s(er(vus))</td>
<td>94, 131n.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonia Manliola</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoninus Pius</td>
<td>22, 76, 77, 79, 81, 114, 127, 129, 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appia Pyramis</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aprilis Aquiliae Sozomenae = C. Aquilius Aprilis</td>
<td>104, 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Aquilius *Aprilis = Aprilis Aquiliae Sozomenae</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquilia Sozomena</td>
<td>104, 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabus Q. Servili Pudentis</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristius Augustalis</td>
<td>122, 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristius Celer</td>
<td>136n.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Aristius Menander</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristius Strabo</td>
<td>136n.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristius Successus</td>
<td>122, 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Aristius Thallus</td>
<td>116 - 117, 118, 122, 123, 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrius Antoninus</td>
<td>88n.73, 137n.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrius Antoninus = Fulvus Antoninus = Antoninus Pius</td>
<td>76, 80, 88n.73, 104, 116, 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arria Fadilla</td>
<td>22, 61, 76, 78, 79, 80, 81, 88n.72, 88n.73, 96, 112, 115, 116, 127, 143, 144, 146, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arria Lupula = Iulia Lupula = Iulia Fadilla</td>
<td>76, 79, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arul(enus?) Epagath(us)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Asinius Marcellus</td>
<td>112, 116, 123, 142, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asinia Quadratilla</td>
<td>60, 116, 123, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atimetus St. Marci Neonis</td>
<td>126, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auctus C. Satrini Communis</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Page References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Avenus (or Avenius) Atticus</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aufidia Restituta</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustalis L. Munati Crescentis</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustalis Publici Crescentis</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustina</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avienus Halys (?) = A() H()</td>
<td>78, 81, 88n.82, 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Caesar, see Marcus Aurelius</td>
<td>105, 107, 118, 144, 147, 148, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Aurelius Caesar (Lucius Verus or Commodus)</td>
<td>136n.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Aurelius Commodus (Lucius Verus or Commodus)</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Aurelius Fulvus</td>
<td>79, 88n.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Bellicius Sollers</td>
<td>58, 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittidius Priscinus</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. C() Primigenius</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caecilia Amanda</td>
<td>112, 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caet(ennius?) Magnio = Magnio</td>
<td>23, 117, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal() Primitivus</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Calpetani</td>
<td>128-129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Calpetanus Achoristus</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Calpetanus Auctus</td>
<td>51, 126, 128, 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Calpetanus C. f. Rantius Quirinalis Valerius P. f. Pomp(tina tribu) Festus</td>
<td>29, 36n.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Calpetanus C. f. Rantius Sedatus Metronius</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Calpetanus C. f. Statius Rufus</td>
<td>29, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Calpetanus C. l. Gryphius</td>
<td>28, 29, 30, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Calpetanus Crescens</td>
<td>129, 137n.80, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Calpetanus Crescens</td>
<td>129, 137n.80, 141, 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Calpetanus Crescens = Crescens C. Calpetani Liviani = Crescens C. Calpetani Favoris</td>
<td>36n.25, 69, 119, 128, 129, 137n.80, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Calpetanus Favor</td>
<td>28, 30, 35, 36n.24, 53, 54, 86n.38, 111, 128, 129, 138n.95, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calpetanus Fortunatus</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Calpetanus Fortunatus</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Calpetanus Glyptus</td>
<td>27, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Calpetanus Hermes = Hermes C. Calpetani Favoris</td>
<td>55, 86n.38, 128, 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Calpetanus Ianuarius</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Calpetanus Livianus</td>
<td>27-31, 128, 129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Calpetanus Mnester = Mnester C. Calpetani Favoris 128, 129
C. Calpetanus Musophilus 128
C. Calpetanus Pannychus 128, 138n.96, 141
C. Calpetanus Restitutus 128
Calpetanus Verna 69, 129, 142
C. Calpurnius Phoebus 59
Calpurnia Secunda 131n.2
Calventia Maximina (Maxima) 74, 112, 141
C. Calvisius (Galvisius) Mnester 60
Calvisius Crescens 142
Caracalla 11, 22, 129, 133n.26
L. Cassius 104, 136n.68
P. Cassius 104, 136n.68
Q. Cassius Caecilianus 28, 104
Cassia Doris = ? Doris Cassiae Veneriae 81, 112
Cassia Veneria 81
L. Césonius Commodus = Lucius Verus 116–117, 137n.87, 140
Cethes() 92
Chresimus L. Munati Crescentis 104
Cl() Fron() 70
Claudius 19, 29
Claudius Celsus 59
Claudius Fortunatus 142
Ti. Claudius Quinquatralis 95, 103, 104, 115
Ti. Claudius Secundinus = ? Ti. Claudius Secundinus L. Statius Macedo 111, 142
Ti. Claudius Secundinus L. Statius Macedo 111
Claudia Marcellina 59, 90
Clemens C. Satrini Celeris = ? C. Satrinius Clemens 81, 82, 127
Clodius Victor 124
+ ) Cocceia A. lib. Primigenia 106, 107, 112, 134n.53
Coelius Fortunatus 141
M. Coelius Philetus 141
C. Coelius Verus 42
C. Cominius Proculus 120, 139, 142

+) In a complete copy of the stamp 745 = S. 587, published by Bloch in Scavi di Ostia I p. 226, the name in ablative case is COCEIA AVG / LIB PRIMIGENI.
C. Cominius Sabinianus =
Commodus 70, 118, 119, 125, 129, 133n.30, 143, 148
Cornelius Atticus 107
M. Cornelius Thalamus 107
Cornelia Malliola 146
Cosinia Gratilla 128, 138n.96, 141
Crescens C. Calpetani Liviani = Crescens C. Calpetani Favoris =
C. Calpetanus Crescens 28, 30, 122
Crescens L. Luri Proculi = ? L. Lurius Crescens 122
Crescens L. Munati Fausti = L. Munatius Crescens 101-102, 133n.36
Crescens Vismati Successi = Vismatius Crescens 124
C. Curiatius Cosanus 61, 76, 78, 80, 82, 140, 147
Cusinius Messalinus 59
December L. Luri Proculi 122
Demetrius St. Marci Heleni = St. Marcius Demetrius 127
Dionysius Domitiae Lucillae 61, 118
Domitii 100-102
Cn. Domitius Adiectus 105, 107
Cn. Domitius Afer 100, 102, 114, 133n.28
Cn. Domitius Agathobulus = Agathobulus Domiti Tulli 92, 105
Cn. Domitius Arignotus 105, 107, 119
Cn. Domitius Asiaticus 105, 107
Cn. Domitius Carpus 105, 107
Domitius Ianuarius 145
Cn. Domitius Lucanus 87n.62, 95, 96, 100-102, 105, 114, 121, 133n.28, 133n.29, 136n.69
Domitius Rufinus = Rufinus 23, 115, 142
Cn. Domitius Trophimus = Trophimus Agathobuli Domiti Tulli 59, 92, 105, 107
Cn. Domitius Tullius 87n.62, 92, 95, 96, 100-102, 105, 114, 121, 133n.28, 133n.29, 136n.69
Domitia Domitiani 22, 58, 59, 60
Domitia Cn. f. Lucilla 100, 102, 105, 133n.28, 134n.39
Domitia P. f. Lucilla = Lucilla Veri 22, 60, 61, 73, 75, 95, 100-102, 103, 104, 105, 107, 108, 111, 112, 115, 116, 118, 119, 120, 122, 133n.28, 133n.30, 135n.36, 134n.39, 136n.64, 136n.71, 139, 142, 144, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150
Doris Cassiae Veneriae = ? Cassia Doris 81
Earinus Lucillae Veri act(or) 111
VI

Epagathus Claudi Quinquatralis 104
Euhodus C. C() Primigeni 104
Eumenes Marci C. s(servus) 35n.3
Eutychus P. A() A() servus 104
F() Prob() = ? Flavius Prob() 131n.2
Q. Fabius Africani l. Cytisus 28, 29, 30, 31
Africanus Fabius Maximus 30
Facundus C. Calpetani Favoris 128
Fadius Euhelpistus 120
L. Fadius Pass() 120
L. Faenius Rufus 110
Faustina maior 22, 134n.52
Faustina minor 22, 69, 72, 73, 103, 106, 107, 111, 114, 116, 118, 119, 120, 124, 125, 129, 136n.71, 136n.73, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 146, 147, 148, 150
Felix Caricus 120
Flavius Aper 112, 115, 116, 120, 129, 140, 141, 149
T. Flavius Corinthus 142
Flavius Halotus 62
A. Flavius Maximus 60
T. Flavius Phoebus 107
Flavius Posidonius 107
Flavius Prob() = ? F() Prob() 131n.2
Flavia Procula 123, 145
Flavia Seia Isaurica, see Seia Isaurica
Fontius Proculus 112, 115
Fortunatus = T. Travius Fortunatus 23, 62
Fortunatus Q. Oppi Iusti 121
Fortunatus Vismati Successi = Vismatius Fortunatus 124, 149
C. Fulvius Plautianus 107, 116-117, 119, 125, 129, 132-133n.26, 139, 141, 142, 143, 145
Fulvius Primitivus 107, 142
Fulvus Antoninus = Arrius Antoninus = Antoninus Pius 76, 80
Fundania Faustina 136n.68
Fyrmus = P. Servilius Fyrmus (Firmus) 23
A. Gabinius Successus 118
C. Galvisius Mnester, see Calvisius
L. Gellius Prudens 54, 143
Glyptus Calpetani (?) 27, 28, 104
Graphicus serv(us) or Servius Graphicus 118
T. Greius Iunarius 95, 101
Hadrian 22, 104, 105, 107, 117, 121, 127, 128, 129, 137n.87
Hedys Q. Servili Pudentis 104
M. Herennius Pollio 89
Hermes C. Calpetani Favoris = C. Calpetanus Hermes 128
Hermetianus 115, 143
Hilario St. Marci Heleni 127
Hortensius, see Ortensius
Ingenua = Sabinia Ingenua 23, 115
C. Iulius Apollinaris 141
Iulius Fortunatus 60, 143
Ti. Iulius Iulianus 115, 142
C. Iulius Lupio 61
P. Iulius Lupus 79, 88n.70, 88n.72
Ti. Iulius Optatus 94, 96, 131n.9
C. Iulius Priscus 143
L. Iulius Rufus 96, 122
C. Iulius Stephanus 116, 120, 139, 142, 146
Iulius Theodotus 111
L. Iulius Ursus Valerius Flaccus, see L. V. Val.
Iulia Albana 22, 104, 112, 147
Iulia Fadilla = Iulia Lupula = Arria Lupula
Iulia Lupula = Arria Lupula = Iulia Fadilla 22, 79, 80, 82, 88n.69, 88n.72, 149
Iulia Menile 112
Iulia Saturnina 131n.2
Iul[i]a Sa[turnina] 112, 131n.2
Iunius Rufus 136n.68
Iusta 115, 142
Iustinus trium[iciorum servus] 104
L. Lab(eriorius) Bars() 70, 143
L. Lanius Crescens 125
L. Lanius Felicissimus 136, 143
L. Lanius Festus 119, 125, 143
Lanius Fortunatus 125
VIII

Lanius Pisentius 125
Lanius Rufinus 125
L. Lanius Substitutus 125
Lanius Vin(dex?) 125
Larcia Sabina 71
Livius Martialis 115
Livia 28-30
Livia Culicina 28-31
Lucifer St. Marci Restituti = St. Marcius Lucifer 126, 144
Lucilla Veri, see Domitia P. f. Lucilla
Lucius Verus 112, 114, 115, 116, 123, 136n.73, 136n.77, 137n.87
L. Lurius Aprio 122
L. Lurius Blandus 122
L. Lurius Crescens = ? Crescens L. Luri Proculi 122
L. Lurius Martialis 122
L. Lurius Myrinus 96, 182
L. Lurius Primitivus 122
L. Lurius Proculus 122
M. Lurius Valens 118
L. Lurius Verecundus 122
L. Lurius Verus 122
Lusenus Ampliatus 124
Lusenus Celer 124
Q. M() R() 62
Magia Marcella 74
Magnio = Caetennius Magnio 23, 141
Maius Faustinae Aug. = Maius ser(vus) 103, 144
Maius Vismati Successi 124
L. Mal() Thr() 141
Mamm() 112, 147
L. Man() Theocritus 150
St. Marcii 125-127
St. Marcius 126
St. Marcius Acanthus 127
St. Marcius Antiochus 33, 122, 127
St. Marcius Bassus 79, 81, 82, 144
St. Marcius Demetrius = Demetrius St. Marci Heleni 126, 127
St. Marcius Florens 126
St. Marcius Fortunatus 81, 122, 127
St. Marcius Fuscus 126
Marcius Fyrmus 144
St. Marcius Helenus 127
Q. Marcius Hermogenes 123, 145
St. Marcius Lucifer = Lucifer St. Marci Restituti 56, 81, 82, 118, 122, 126, 144
St. Marcius Neo 126, 127
St. Marcius Optatus 126, 127
St. Marcius Primigenius 126
St. Marcius Rabbæus 47, 51, 52, 82, 126, 127
St. Marcius Secundio 82, 126, 127
St. Marcius Stator 47, 126, 127
St. Marcius Suavillus 127
St. Marcius Tognaeus 126, 138n.94
St. Marcius Triferna (= Tifernas) 126, 138n.94
Marcus Aurelius 22, 105, 107, 111, 114, 116, 120, 129, 133n.30, 136n.71, 136n.73, 137n.87, 142, 144, 145, 147, 148, 150
]mamus[ ]C. Calpetani Favoris 128
Matidia 22, 142
L. Memmius Astragalus 107
Memmia L. f. Macrina 23, 107, 112, 146
Mercurius (or Mercurialis) Ti. Claudi Quinquatralis = ? Mercurius (or Mercurialis) 95, 103, 104, 144
L. Mescinius Flaccus 86n.34
Mnester C. Calpetani Favoris = C. Calpetanus Mnester 128
L. Munatius Crescens = Crescens L. Munati Fausti 101-102, 104, 133n.36
L. Munatius Faustus 101, 133n.36
Myrinos 144
Nerva 107, 132n.25
C. Norbanus 28
L. Numerius Iustus 145
L. Numpidius L. i. Philomelus 29, 31
C. Nunnidius Felix 123
C. Nunnidius Fortunatus 60, 183, 145
Nunnidius Leon( ) 115, 123, 145
C. Nunnidius Restitutus  62, 115, 117, 118, 123, 146
Nunnidia Sperata  112, 123
M. (P.) Ocius Antiochus  60, 146
Q. Oppius  120-121
Q. Oppius Iustus  115, 120, 121, 145
Q. Oppius Natalis  120, 121
Q. Oppius Priscus  120, 121
Q. Oppius Proculus  115, 120, 121, 145
Oppius Stabilis  121
Q. Oppius Terminalis  121, 137n.85
Q. Oppius Verecundus  120, 121
Ortensius Proclus  74
P. P() B()  117, 146
Q. P() F()  143
Paccii  136n.68
Peculiaris  65
Pedania Quintilla = Quintilla Saeniani  124
Peducaeus Lupulus  139, 146, 150
Petronius Mamertinus  136n.68
Petronius Septimianus  136n.68
Pettius Proculus = Proculus  23, 81, 88n.82, 118, 146
Philippus St. Marci Heleni  127
A. Plaetorius Nepos  116-117, 136n.74, 136n.77, 140, 149
Plasidiena L. f. Agrestina  28, 29
Plotina Augusta  22, 59, 60, 107, 112, 134n.52, 145, 149
Pomp. Felix  146
Sex. Pompeius Heli()  106, 107, 146
Q. Pomponius Ianuar(ius)  146
Q. Pomponius Mussa  112
Pomp(onius?) Vitalis  118
A. Pontius Clodian(us)  118, 137n.78, 147
C. Pontius Crescens  110
Primus A. Aristi Menandri  123
Primus Q. Sulpici Apthy()  104
Primus Vismati Successi  124
Procilia Phila 112, 147
Procillia Gemella 112
C. Proculeius 29, 36n.21
C. Proculeius C. l. Heracleo 28, 29
Proculeia Stibas 28, 29
Proculus = Pettius Proculus 23
Sex. Publicius Consors 118, 119, 147
Publicius Crescens 104
Publicia Quintina 112
Quartio 75
Quietus St. Marci Celeris 126
Quintilla Saeniani = Pedania Quintilla 124
R() Cap() 136n.68
D. R() D() = ? D. Rutilius Doretus(?) 148
T. R() P() = T. Rausius Pamphilus
T. Rausius Pamphilus = T. R() P() 34, 61, 78, 117, 147
Restitutus Q. Oppi Iusti 121
Rufellius Felix 115
Rufellius P() 115
Rufinus = Domitius Rufinus 23, 115, 142
Rupilia Faustina 114, 148
Rustius Felix 119
L. Rustius Lygdamus 120
D. Rutilius Doretus(?) = ? D. R() D() 148
M. Rutilius Lupus 124, 149
Rutilius Successus 73, 148
Q. S() Scafa 111
Sabina Augusta 22, 70, 71, 87n.49, 107, 117, 134n.52
Sabina Sabinilla 71
Sabinia Ingenua = Ingenua 23, 112, 115
C. Satrinii 127
C. Satrinius Celer 32, 33, 48, 51, 81, 82, 94, 96, 127, 131n.9
C. Satrinius Clemens = ? Clemens C. Satrini Celeris 81, 82, 127
C. Satrinius Communis 48, 49, 51, 81, 128, 137
Satrinius Fortunatus 81, 127
C. Satrinius Priscinus 127
XII

Secundus C. Calpetani Favoris 128
Seia Isaurica = Flavia Seia Isaurica 22, 57, 60, 90, 91, 104, 116, 120, 122, 134n.44, 134n.50, 140, 143, 144, 148
Sentius Augurinus 88n.73
Sentius Satrinus, see Ti. Tutilinius Sentius Satrinus
P. Septimius Geta 133n.26
Septimius Severus 70, 129, 133n.26
P. Servilius Firmus (Fyrmus) = Fyrmus 23, 60, 65, 66, 117, 118, 148
Ti. Servilius Gelos 105, 198
Servilius Processus 70
Q. Servilius Pudens 104, 125
Servilius Sigerus 106
Servius Graphicus or Graphicus ser(vus) 118
L. Sessius Successus 89, 90, 91
Q. Sin() Am() 115
T. Statilius Maximus (? = the following) 62, 96, 116, 123, 144, 145, 148
T. Statilius Maximus Severus Hadrianus (? = the preceding) 63, 64, 112, 115, 123, 144, 145
C. Statius Capito 107
C. Statius Comolvis 107
Statia Primilla (Primula) 112
Stertinia Bassula 142
Suc(c)es(sus) ser(vus) 148
Q. Sulpicius Aphy() 104
Serg. Sulpicius Servandus 70, 71
Syntrophus 63, 64
Terentius Iulianus 112, 149
Tertius A. Aristi Menandri 123
Tertius Domitiae Lucillae 118
Tertius Vismati Crescentis 124
Tetellius Don(ax?) 56
Tiridas Vismati Successi 124
Titia Quartilla 144
Titia Rufina 112
Tontius Felix 112, 115, 149
Trajan 11, 17, 22, 35, 53, 54, 70, 127, 128, 132n.25, 141, 143
T. Travius Felix 81, 82, 88n.82, 149
T. Travius Fortunatus = Fortunatus 23, 62
Trebiitia Tertulla 146, 147
Trophimas 92
Trophimus 59
Trophimus Agathobuli Domiti Tulli = Cn. Domitius Trophimus 59, 92, 105, 107
L. Turnerius Gal() 146
L. Tutilius Ianuarius 107
L. Tutilius Lupercus Pontianus 107
Ti. Tutinius Sentius Satrinus (Satrianus) 76, 80, 87n.51, 88n.75, 140
S. V() N() = ? Sex. Vismatius Neritus 124
L. V() Val() = ? L. Iulius Ursus Valerius Flaccus 70
Q. Valerius Cato 86n.34
M. Valerius Iulianus 136n.77
M. Valerius Priscus 136n.77, 149
L. Valerius Severus 91
Valeria Nice 110, 112
Valeria Polla 23, 149
L. Vallius Proclus 34
M. Jucul() Euc() 115
Venustus C. Calpetani Favoris 128
Vespasian 29
Veturius Severus 124
Vibius Alacinus 71
C. Vibius Eclectus 110
Vibius Pudens 73, 149
Vi(bius?) Ver(na?) 107
Vibia Procilla or Procla 112, 115, 149
Vismatius Crescens = Crescens Vismati Successi 124
Vismatius Felix 107, 108, 124, 134n.55, 149
Sex. Vismatius Himerus 124
Sex. Vismatius Neritus 124
Sex. Vismatius Restitutus 124
Vismatius Successus 104, 107, 124, 131n.2, 134n.55, 148
Vitellius 29
Vitrasius Pollio 136n.68
M. Ulpian Anicetianus 107, 118, 150
Ummidius Quadratus 136n.68
Volusius Pr[o]cul(us) 115
Urbicus 115, 143
Zosimus M. Anni Veri = M. Annius Zosimus 96, 118, 134n.55
Index of Stamps

Bare numbers refer to CIL XV, 1;  S. = Supplement to CIL XV,1; Steinby = I bolli laterizi degli antiquari del Foro e del Palatino, ed. Margareta Steinby;  LSO = Lateres signati Ostienses (Acta Inst. Rom. Finlandiae VII).

| Bare Numbers | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 63 | 64 | 65 | 66 | 67 |
|              | 9 | 70-71 | 10 | 70-71 | 11 | 57 | 12 | 57, 127 | 13 | 71 | 14 | 70-71 | 18 | 9 | 31 | 124, 149 | 40 | 144 | 41 | 144 | 42 | 124 | 44 | 147 | 45 | 147 | 46 | 147 | 47 | 145 | 50 | 106 | 51 | 106 | 53 | 65 | 55 | 54, 65, 143 | 56 | 143 | 57 | 143 | 58 | 84n.8, 143 | 59 | 56, 144 | 60 | S.23, 144 | 61 | 144 | 62 | 81, 122, 144 | 63 | 65, 84n.8 | 64 | S.24, 65, 84n.8 | 65 | 34, 61, 147 | 66 | 147 | 67 | 61, 78, 147 | 68 | 147 | 69 | 73 | 81, 112 | 70 | 74 | 81, 86n.39, 112 | 71 | 75 | 81, 112 | 72 | 79 | 144 | 73 | 80 | 144 | 74 | 81 | 144 | 75 | 82 | 143 | 76 | 83 | 144 | 77 | 84 | 147 | 78 | 85 | 147 | 79 | 86 | 78, 87n.66, 147 | 80 | 88 | 115 | 81 | 89 | 115 | 82 | 90 = S.30-31 | 23, 81, 146 | 83 | 93 | 104, 139 | 84 | 95 | 23, 81, 146 | 85 | 98 | 61, 81, 140 | 86 | 99 | 61, 81, 140 | 87 | 101 = 77-78, 147 | 88 | 102 = S.34 | 77-78, 87n.66, 147 | 89 | 104 | 81, 140 | 90 | 106 = S.36 | 77 | 91 | 107 | 77 | 92 | 108 | 77 | 93 | 109 | 77 | 94 | 110 | 77, 81, 127 | 95 | 111 | 77, 81, 140 | 96 | 116 | 96 | 97 | 117 | 87n.56, 96, 101 | 98 | 118 | 101 |
120  101
121  101, 104
122  104
123  101, 104
124  86n.39, 101
125  86n.39
127  101
128  101
133  72
134  73, 148
135  56.43  148
136  71
137  70-71
139  71, 112
140  112
141  32, 48, 53, 127, 131n.9
142  70-71
144  53
145  53
146  53
147  53
148  53
(150 on page 60 must be 863)
151  81
154  56.44  147
157  84n.8
159  125
166  125
171  139
172  60, 139
173  60, 139
174  112, 140
175  142
176  145
177  145
181  112, 140
182  112
183  142
184  107, 142
185  143
186  147
192  112, 140
193  112, 140
194  112, 140
195  112, 140
196  112, 140
201  142
203  23, 112, 115
205  23, 112, 115
207  57, 120
208 = 5.50  57, 122
210  57, 120
211  143
214  74, 112, 141
215  74, 112, 141
216  74, 112, 141
217  106
218  69, 129, 141
219  129
220  69, 141
221  69, 141
222  107
225  148
226  71
232  23, 148
233  23, 148
234 = 56.177  66, 148
235  81, 149
238  143
239  125, 143
240  119, 143
244  146
245  9, 107, 118
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>107, 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>134n.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>134n.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>70-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>136n.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>104, 136n.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286=</td>
<td>S.69, 86n.39, 115, 123, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>62, 115, 123, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291=</td>
<td>S.70, 86n.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294=</td>
<td>S.572, 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>63, 86n.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>74n.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>112, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>51, 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>33, 48, 82, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>48, 82, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>48, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>49, 51, 126, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>51, 126, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>51, 126, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>51, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>51, 52, 82, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>47, 51, 82, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>53, 128, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>35, 128, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>35, 128, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>128, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>*non-existent stamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>86n.38, 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>55, 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>74, 106, 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>74, 112, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>77, 79, 81, 82, 88n.72, 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>77, 79, 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>77, 79, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>63, 82, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>115, 121, 134n.42, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>112, 131n.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>115, 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>115, 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>81, 82, 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384=</td>
<td>S.96, 53, 81, 88n.85, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>106, 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>48, 82, 94, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>92, 97n.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>106, 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>119, 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>106, 146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a complete copy of the stamp 745 = S.587, published by Bloch in Scavi di Ostia I p. 226, the text is as follows:

EX FIG CAES N AB COCCEIA AVG / LIB PRIMIGENI.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference 1</th>
<th>Reference 2</th>
<th>Reference 3</th>
<th>Reference 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>754</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td>125, 143</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>756</td>
<td>105, 144</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>36n.25, 129, 137n.80, 141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757</td>
<td>74n.59, 106, 146</td>
<td>901 = S.243 = S.473</td>
<td>28, 141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758</td>
<td>106, 146</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>761</td>
<td>112, 97n.20</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>86n.38, 128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>767</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>768</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>769</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780</td>
<td>131n.2</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>786</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>23, 141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>799</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>23, 141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806</td>
<td>118, 134n.55</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>23, 141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>128, 138n.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>831</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>832</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>134n.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>833</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>61, 118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>834</td>
<td>136n.68</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>846</td>
<td>123, 145</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>847</td>
<td>123, 145</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>107, 119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>848</td>
<td>123, 145</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>849</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>851 = S.237</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>852</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>854</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>86n.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>858</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>86n.39, 118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td>123, 145</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>121, 145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>861</td>
<td>60, 123, 145</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>862</td>
<td>123, 145</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>60 (instead of CIL 150 read CIL 863)</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>120, 142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>879</td>
<td>131n.7</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>887</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>131n.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1055</td>
<td>131n.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1056</td>
<td>131n.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1057</td>
<td>131n.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1058</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1059</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1063</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1064</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1069</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1070</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1071</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1072</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1073</td>
<td>104, 115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1074</td>
<td>104, 115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1075</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1076</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1077</td>
<td>36, 103, 104, 115, 144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1078</td>
<td>115, 144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1079</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1080</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1081</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1082</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1083</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1084</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1085</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1086</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1087</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1088</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1089</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1092</td>
<td>S.282 74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1094</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1107</td>
<td>134n.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1108</td>
<td>134n.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1124</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1136</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1157</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1144</td>
<td>129, 141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1147</td>
<td>112, 115, 149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1158</td>
<td>115, 123, 145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1163</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1180</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203</td>
<td>23, 141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1208</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210</td>
<td>120, 142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1211</td>
<td>120, 142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1214</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1216</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1217</td>
<td>112, 147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1218</td>
<td>131n.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1219</td>
<td>131n.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1220</td>
<td>131n.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1221</td>
<td>94n.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1235</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1236</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1247</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1251</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1254</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1259</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269</td>
<td>35n.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1271</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1273</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1275</td>
<td>81, 122, 127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1276</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1277</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1278</td>
<td>115, 123, 127, 145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280</td>
<td>S.356 126, 127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1281</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1282</td>
<td>126, 127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1283</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1284</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1285</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1441</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301</td>
<td>86n.39, 146</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302</td>
<td>86n.39, 112</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1342</td>
<td>121, 147</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>112, 149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1343</td>
<td>121, 147</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>97n.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344</td>
<td>121, 147</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1345</td>
<td>( = 1346c)</td>
<td>121, 137n.86</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346</td>
<td>(c = 1345)</td>
<td>121, 137n.86</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1507</td>
<td>110, 132n.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>104, 124, 131n.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1363</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>104, 124, 131n.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>104, 124, 131n.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>104, 124, 131n.2, 149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>104, 124, 131n.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1367</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>104, 124, 131n.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1369</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>104, 124, 131n.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>S.401 104, 124, 131n.2, 149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377</td>
<td>86n.39</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>104, 131n.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378</td>
<td>86n.39</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>131n.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>69n.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1412</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>2469 86n.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1418</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>S.190 139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1419</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>S.618 126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1423</td>
<td>57, 60</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Steinby p. 97 no. 1 79, 88n.67, 140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1425</td>
<td>57, 60, 148</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>S.332 150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1427</td>
<td>80, 87n.51</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>S.187 145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1432</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2049</td>
<td>S.535 136n.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1434</td>
<td>104n.40</td>
<td>2071</td>
<td>S.41 73, 149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1435</td>
<td>104n.40</td>
<td>2158</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1436</td>
<td>104n.40</td>
<td>2159</td>
<td>S.411 136n.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1437</td>
<td>104n.40</td>
<td>2173</td>
<td>23, 142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1438</td>
<td>104n.40</td>
<td>2174</td>
<td>23, 115, 142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1439</td>
<td>104n.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1440</td>
<td>104n.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2197 107
2200 38, 107
2203 142
2204 23, 142
2417 100n.33
2422 28, 128, 141
2423 128
2424 128
2428 142
2433 100n.33
2434 100n.33
2435 100n.33
2458 122
2459 122
2460 126
2461 126
2462 126, 144
2463 126, 144
2464 126
2465 126
2466 126
2467 126
2469 = 1787 86n.34
2470 86n.34
2476 121, 137n.85
2482 100n.33
2483 100n.33
2484 100n.33
2485 100n.33
2486 121, 145
2496 100n.33
2497 124
2516 100n.33

S.23 = 60 132n.15, 144
S.24 = 64b 84n.8
S.25 61
S.26 61
S.28 86n.39, 147
S.29 115
S.30 = 90 146
S.31 = 90 81, 146
S.32 23, 81, 146
S.33 115
S.34 = 102 77, 78, 147
S.36 = 106 77
S.37 77
S.41 = 2071 73, 149
S.43 = 135 148
S.44 = 154 147
S.50 = 208 122
S.52 129, 141
S.54 139
S.59 56, 107
S.60 107
S.61 122
S.66 136n.68
S.69 = 286 115, 123, 145
S.70 = 291 86n.39
S.72 51, 126, 128
S.73 51, 128
S.77 = 306c 49, 51, 127
S.78 51, 127
S.79 48, 51, 127
S.81 51, 82, 126
S.82 86n.34
S.84 55
S.96 = 384 81, 127
S.102 147
S.105 131n.7
S.107 = 420 90
S.117 = 460 148
S.119 146
S.120 86n.39
S.124 = 486 146
S.144 71, 87n.49
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.145</th>
<th>71, 86n.39, 87n.49</th>
<th>S.243 = 901 = S.473 28, 141</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.146</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>S.244 86n.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.147</td>
<td>86n.39</td>
<td>S.276 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.148</td>
<td>70-71</td>
<td>S.282 = 1092 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.154</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>S.283 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.155</td>
<td>86n.39, 127</td>
<td>S.284 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.156</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>S.290 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.157</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>S.311 83n.1, 87n.58, 132n.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.170</td>
<td>608 107, 132n.16</td>
<td>S.322 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.171</td>
<td>604 148</td>
<td>S.323 131n.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.172</td>
<td>66, 148</td>
<td>S.332 = 2009 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.174</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>S.336 = 1280 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.175</td>
<td>23, 66, 148</td>
<td>S.337 47, 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.176</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>S.351 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.177</td>
<td>234 66, 148</td>
<td>S.353 = 2049 136n.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.178</td>
<td>605 23, 148</td>
<td>S.372 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>S.378 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.180</td>
<td>124, 149</td>
<td>S.379 104n.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.181</td>
<td>124, 149</td>
<td>S.397 104, 124, 131n.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.182</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>S.398 104, 124, 131n.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.183</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>S.399 104, 124, 131n.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.187</td>
<td>2036 132n.18, 145</td>
<td>S.400 104, 124, 131n.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.189</td>
<td>622 144</td>
<td>S.401 = 1525 104, 107, 124,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.190</td>
<td>1947 139</td>
<td>S.402 104, 124, 131n.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.191</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>S.410 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.192</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>S.411 = 2159 136n.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.200</td>
<td>122, 96n.17</td>
<td>S.419 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.201</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>S.473 = 901 = S.243 28, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.203</td>
<td>672 33, 127</td>
<td>S.474 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.206</td>
<td>136n.68</td>
<td>S.475 28, 126, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.209</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>S.476 28, 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.210</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>S.501 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.215</td>
<td>86n.39, 112, 123</td>
<td>S.511 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.216</td>
<td>86n.39, 123</td>
<td>S.512 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.230</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>S.515 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.236</td>
<td>123, 145</td>
<td>S.516 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.237 = 851</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>S.517 126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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