D.4. THE “HORACE’S VILLA” BRICKSTAMPS AND THE BRICK PRODUCTION OF THE CENTRAL ANIO RIVER VALLEY

BY GIORGIO FILIPPI

D.4.1. INTRODUCTION

With the notable exception of “Horace’s Villa,” our knowledge of the stamped brick and tile production of the central Anio valley is still filled with too many gaps to permit anything more than a preliminary account.

The lack of a valid interpretative model for all stamped bricks that have survived from antiquity and the numerous unanswered questions draw our attention to two essential aspects of this kind of source material. We must bear both aspects in mind, if we are to use stamped bricks and tiles correctly for a historical reconstruction of archaeological sites and of the territory: the stamp’s meaning as well as its location and date of production.

The meaning of the stamp and the partial nature of the written text

The stamped brick or tile attests the ownership of the object at the moment of its production. From the beginning, the epigraphic text was partial, because—for obvious limitations of space—it necessitated a choice of how much to communicate to the person who was supposed to read it. Scholars have offered various explanations for the meaning and custom of stamping bricks. In particular, some consider it unlikely that products exclusively destined for one’s own everyday use were marked in this way. If this were the case, the stamp by itself would not be sufficient to identify the owner of the villa where it was found. In contrast, other scholars claim that the stamps—both of a public character as well as those made for the producer’s own use—can indicate “the ownership of the object being built, referring to the building to which the bricks belong and for which they were made.”

The place and date of production and of use

Since we have few data relative to the place and time in which stamped bricks were made, sold, and used, the study of the context in which the stamps were found can contribute the most to their proper interpretation. Therefore, a serious historical analysis must be based on an ensemble of documentary sources (literary, archaeological, and topographical).

D.4.2. HISTORY OF THE FINDS

Publication of the first brickstamp from Horace’s Villa (CIL XIV 4092.13 = CIL XV, 1972a)

In 1887 Hermann Dessau published in CIL XIV a rectangular stamp, with letters in relief, carrying the text 

\[ \text{Naevi} \]

preserved by the German Latin philologist Alexander Riese (1840-1922). The entry gave the provenance as the ruins which were thought to belong to the Sabine villa of Horace near Roccagiovine.

---

1. We do not know if all the producers stamped their bricks, what percentage of the bricks were stamped, and what meaning the stamps had to those who made them.


4. In such a case, “è in linea di principio da escludere una loro comparsa sul mercato,” Manacorda 2000 (as n. 2), 132-133, 139, 141.
In 1891, the same stamp was inserted by Heinrich Dressel into the fifth chapter of CIL XV, among the fragmentary or poorly interpreted *lateres urbani*. The entry recorded two stamps, both with a lacuna at the beginning of the text and both carrying the same text, NAEVI. The first (1972a) was discovered near Licenza at “Horace’s Villa” and was taken by Riese to Frankfurt. The second (1972b=CIL XIV.4090.73), described by Stevenson, came from the territory of Grottaferrata and was kept in the museum of the monastery there.

Regarding the first stamp, since the name of the site of Horace’s Villa at Licenza is “Vigne di S. Pietro,” it is necessary to clarify the reason for the different toponym reported in CIL, which gives the find spot as the *colle del poetello*.

In 1857 Wilhelm Henzen and Pietro Rosa hypothesized that Horace’s Villa was located in a place called “Colle del Poetello” near Roccagiovine, where there are remains of a Roman villa. Their argument was based on the alleged derivation of “poetello” from the Latin *poeta*. In 1886 this hypothesis was demolished by Tito Berti, who pointed out that “poetello” in the local dialect simply meant “hillock” (“poggierello” in standard Italian).

To solve the long-debated question about the exact location of Horace’s Villa, archaeological excavations were undertaken from 1911 to 1914 on the Vigne di S. Pietro site in Licenza. The connection of Horace’s property with both Roccagiovine and Licenza can be explained by the fact that it was situated quite close to these two towns.

Although a certain amount of confusion remains about the exact find spot of the brickstamp, the available evidence strongly suggests that it must have been the villa in the Vigne di S. Pietro at Licenza.

The supplementation of the text—i.e., the addition of the praenomen *Manius* to the edition of CIL, which reports a lacuna—has been made possible by Pasqui’s excavations of 1911-14, whose finds are housed in the Museo Oraziano in the Orsini Palace at Licenza (fig. 1). Now, for the first time in the 90 years since the conclusion of Pasqui’s work, our epigraphical knowledge is extended.

In 1926 Giuseppe Lugli published the excavation results from the villa, utilizing the unpublished catalogue compiled by Pasqui. However, Lugli’s entries do not agree with the Pasqui manuscript and are the result of an erroneous interpretation of the data.

Pasqui’s catalogue, published for the first time in this report by Frischer (see G.1.12), includes (in *Category F: Construction Material*) 12 brickstamps that were housed in the museum at the conclusion of the excavations (fig. 1). A direct study of the material, which is presently preserved in the storehouse of the Soprintendenza Archeologica per il Lazio, has permitted us to verify that, of the four examples cited by Lugli as certain identifications of the stamp in CIL XV, three are erroneous. Moreover, of the remaining six stamps

5. Mari 1994, 66 n34.


9. For the history of the excavations, see Frischer, B.4.

10. Since, as will be seen, the documentation of Pasqui’s excavations was changed in the publication of Lugli, until now the new acquisitions have not entered the scholarly literature. E. M. Steinby hesitantly considers our stamp (1972a) a variant of CIL XV.1315, in *Indici complementari ai bolli doliari urbani* (CIL XV.1) (Rome 1987) 136, 401.


13. Storehouse at the Santuario di Ercole Vincitore (Tivoli). I thank Dr. Maria Grazia Fiore for having granted me the opportunity to inspect the material on September 4, 2002.
recorded by Lugli as having a rectangular form and as unpublished, one has a semi-circular form, another is circular with a central disk and three can be identified from CIL XV.\textsuperscript{14}

The recent excavations conducted by the American Academy (1997-2001) have brought to light seven brickstamps belonging to two types that had been discovered earlier (indicated on table 1 with the abbreviation VH).\textsuperscript{13} Altogether, 27 stamps are known from Horace’s Villa. Of these, we have performed autopsy on 26. They belong to ten distinct types, of which four were hitherto unpublished (table 1).

Because of the rarity of the CIL XV 1972 a compl. type and the limited area in which it has been found, we added to our catalogue two examples of the same type that are preserved in the Ashby Collection at the American Academy in Rome and in the monastery of San Cosimato at Vicovaro.

The first was arbitrarily attributed by J. C. Anderson, author of the catalogue of the Ashby Collection, to the “Tomba della Medusa” situated on the Via Tiburtina just outside the Porta Chiusa, on the basis of a presumably erroneous identification of Ashby.\textsuperscript{16} But in fact, we have to do not with one of the two stamps (CIL XV.1051.10 and CIL XV.2031.4) discovered in that monument in 1839 and erroneously sought by Anderson in the Ashby Collection. Given the rarity and thus far otherwise unique provenance of the stamp, it is much more likely that it should be assigned to Horace’s Villa, which Ashby is known to have visited.\textsuperscript{17} The second is incised on a roof-tile fragment that comes from the archaeological area of San Cosimato.\textsuperscript{18}

D.4. Catalogue

D.4.3. Terminology and criterion of the publication of the stamps

Figure 2 shows the system for classification of bricks and roof-tiles. After the typological naming of the object and the codification of the fragment, the words “+ cut” mean that the piece (brick or tile) has a side that is sawed and may therefore have been used in a brick facing. The dimensions are given in the following order: height x width x thickness. In the case of fragmentary pieces, a portion of an original side that is preserved is considered as the width of the object for the purposes of measuring. The shape of the stamp follows: rectangular, horseshoe (semicircular with disc partially set in), and orbicular (circular with large, medium or small-sized disc, an orbiculus, set in). For the rectangular and horseshoe stamps the first measure is the height, the second the length; for the orbicular stamps, the diameter of the stamp is given first, and then that of the orbiculus. The height of the letters follows, and then the number of auxiliary lines which delimit the lines of the text, beginning from the outside. The number which precedes the transcription of the text refers to CIL XV; in the case of the unpublished pieces, “N.” indicates the place where the unpublished piece would have appeared in the CIL. The term “compl.” explains that the fragmentary or badly preserved text of the stamp as given in CIL XV or N has been completed.

\textsuperscript{14} Numbers 1 and 4 are unpublished and rectangular in shape; no. 3 is unpublished and horseshoe shaped; no. 5 (equivalent to CIL XV.129) is orbicular with medium-sized orbiculus; numbers 2 and 5 (equivalent to CIL XV.1211) are rectangular. The lack of autopsy of the finds has had negative consequences for the study of local production and brick circulation.

\textsuperscript{15} CIL XV.1972a=XIV.4092, 13 compl., N. 933/4.


D.4.3.2. “Horace’s Villa”

1. (LP2)
   **fig. 3.** Fragment (E) of brick, cm. 15.6 x 10.5 x 4.3.8. Orbicular stamp, cm. 7.5?: disc 3.6; letters 1.1, 0.9; aux. lines 2, 2.1.
   \[CIL\] XV.129
   Tert(ius) D(omitiae) L(ucillae) [ex f(iglinis) Can(inianis) op(us) dol(iare) fe(cit)]
   Tit(iano) [et Gall(icanare) co(n)s(ulibus)]
   \[\text{[[(ramus palmae)]]}\]

2. (LP1)
   **fig. 4.** Fragment of brick (?+ cut), cm. 21 x 23.8 x 4.6. Orbicular stamp, cm. 9.3; disc 3.6; letters 1.1, 0.9; aux. lines 2, 2.1.
   \[CIL\] XV.129
   Te[rt(ius) D(omitiae L(ucillae) ex f(iglinis) Can(inianis) op(us) dol(iare) fe(cit)]
   Ti[t(iano) et] Gal(licanare) co(n)s(ulibus)
   \[\text{[[(ramus palmae)]]}\]

3. (LP6)
   **fig. 5.** Fragment (H) of tile?, cm. 19.6 x 15.8 x 3. Horseshoe stamp, cm. 7.4, 3.5; disc 3.2; letters 0.8 – 1.3.
   N. 890/1
   L(uci) Braeti

4. (LP3)
   **fig. 6.** Fragment (E) of tile?, cm. 10 x 6 x 2.7. Horseshoe stamp, cm. 6.7?, 2.8?; disc 2.5?; letters 1.1 – 1.3?
   N. 890/1
   L(uci) Braeti

5. (LP5)
   **fig. 7.** Fragment (E) of tile?, cm. 25.5 x 19.5 x 2.5. Rectangular stamp, cm. 7.3?, 3.3; letters 1, 0.9.
   N.933/4
   Claud[iae]
   Epich[aris]

6. (L10R)
   **fig. 8.** Fragment (E) of tile?, cm 15.8 x 12.4 x 2.2. Rectangular stamp, cm. 3.6?, 3.4; letters 1, 0.9.
   N.933/4
   [Claud]iae
   [Epich]aris

7. (VH 204)
   **fig. 9.** Fragment (G) of tile, formed of two parts joined together, cm. 37.9 x 33.8 x 2.5-2.8. Rectangular stamp, cm. 8.9?, 3.3; letters 1, 0.9.
   N. 933/4
   Claudiae
   Epicharis

8. (L4R)
   **fig. 10.** Fragment (E) of brick, cm. 19.5 x 16 x 4.9-4.2. Orbicular stamp, cm. 10; disc 5.1; letters 1.1, 1.1; aux. lines 1, 2, 2.
   \[CIL\] XV.1033
   [Op(us) d(oliare) Doryph]or(i) Domit(iae) P(ubli) f(iliae) Lucilla
   [Paet(ino) et] Apro(niano) co(n)s(ulibus)

9. (L3R)
   **fig. 11.** Fragment (E) of brick, cm. 18.2 x 13.6 x 4. Orbicular stamp, cm. 9.8; orb. 4; letters 1.1-1.3, 1; aux. lines 1, 2, 2.
   \[CIL\] XV.1210
   C(ai) Comin(i) Proc(uli) [dol(iare) ex p]r(aedis) Iuli Stephani
   Titian(o) et Squil(la) co(n)s(ulibus)

10. (LP4)
    **fig. 12.** Fragment (E) of brick, cm. 16.4 x 8.5 x 4.1. Rectangular stamp, cm. 6.3+, 3.7-4; letters 1.3, 1.1.
    \[CIL\] XV.1211
    C(ai) Comin(i) [Proc(uli)]
    fec(it ) Feli(x Caric(us)]
11. (L1R)

**fig. 13.** Fragment of brick (*bipedalis* or *sesquipedalis*), cm. 29.3 x 34.2 x 4.5. Rectangular stamp, cm. 11+, 3.9; letters 1.3, 1.1.

*CIL* XV.1211

[C(ai) Com]i[n(i) Proc(uli)]

fec(it) Felix Caric(us)

12. (L2R)

**fig. 14.** Fragment of brick, cm. 29.3 x 14.6 x 5-4.8. Rectangular stamp, cm. 7.1+, .4; letters 1.8.

[---]III.

Two identifications can be proposed. In the first case, we may have to do with the stamp *CIL* XV.1340a [*L. Opeilli*] on the basis of the letters and the rectangular form with one line of text;¹⁹ the use of the diptong *ei* for *i* (=*Opilli*) is frequent in the Republican period.²⁰ The second integration derives from *CIL* XV.2381b=XLIV.4092.8 [*C. Caecili Bathyylli*], and is based solely on the interpretation *Y* of the first preserved letter (of which only the lower part of the straight stroke remains), since the form of the only reference copy is not transmitted.²¹

---

19. It has not been possible to find intact examples for the two types *CIL* XV.1340a (*L. OPEILLI*) and 1340b (*L. OPEILL or L. OPHELL*). In the Vatican Museums, Marini Collection, riq. VI, inv. 68721; riq. IX, inv. 69155, are preserved two fragments of the variant c (*L. OPILL*---), which presents a palaeography clearly very different from our stamp. For various forms or variants of the writing of the gentilicium (*Opilius, Opellius, Opifilius*), see W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin-Zurich-Dublin 1966) 115, 276, 443, 452, 462.

20. The *gentilicium Opilius* is twice attested at Rome and once at Praeneste. *CIL* I.2.4.2319 hypothesizes the correction of the types *CIL* XV.1340b-c on the basis of the stamp *L. OPIILI* (*L. Opellii*), discovered in the excavation of the Republican house to the southwest of the House of Livia on the Palatine.

21. The text is the same as *CIL* XV.2381a=S. 457 from *Tibur*, but it is arranged on two lines, at the end of which is found a vertical *palma*. 

13. (LP7)

**fig. 15.** Fragment of brick, cm. 17.2 x 23 x 3.2. Rectangular stamp, cm. 8.4, 3.6; letters 3.2-2.7.

N. 1370/1-1371

L(uci) Pomp(---)

14. (LP8)

**fig. 16.** Rectangular stamp

*CIL* XV, 1972 a compl.

[M(ani)] Naevi

15. (L7R)

**fig. 17.** Fragment (C) of tile, cm. 21 x 34 x 3.1-2.9. Rectangular stamp, cm. 15.7, 2.5; letters 2-1.

*CIL* XV, 1972 a compl.

M(ani) Naevi

16. (L6R)

**fig. 18.** Fragment (H) of tile, cm. 17.3 x 14.5 x 3-2.5. Rectangular stamp, cm. 15+, 2.5; letters 2-1.

*CIL* XV, 1972 a compl.

M(ani) Naevi

17. (L8R)

**fig. 19.** Fragment (H) of tile cm. 14.1 x 14.5 x 3.2. Rectangular stamp, cm. 12.2+, 2.6; letters 2-1.5.

*CIL* XV, 1972 a compl.

M(ani) Naevi

18. (L8R)

**fig. 20.** Fragment (H) of tile cm. 14.3 x 11.7 x 2.9-2.7. Rectangular stamp, cm. 13+, 2.6; letters 2-1.7.

*CIL* XV, 1972 a compl.

M(ani) Naevi

19. (L5R)

**fig. 21.** Fragment (H) of tile cm. 17.5 x 24.4 x 3.1. Rectangular stamp, cm. 13+, 2.5; letters 2.2-1.7.
CIL XV, 1972 a compl.
M(ani) Naevi

20. (L9R)

fig. 22. Fragment (H) of tile cm. 15.8 x 8.6 x 3-2.8. Rectangular stamp, cm. 7.5+, 2.2+; letters 2.2.
CIL XV, 1972 a compl.
M(ani) Naevi

21. (VH 125)

fig. 23. Fragment (H) of tile cm. 22 x 17.2 x 3-2.6. Rectangular stamp, cm. 15.5, 2.6-2.4; letters 1.7-1.5.
CIL XV, 1972 a compl.
M(ani) Naevi

22. (VH 185)

fig. 24. Fragment (H) of tile cm. 9 x 13.5 x 3.4-3. Rectangular stamp, cm. 8.7+, 2.5; letters 2-1.7.
CIL XV, 1972 a compl.
[M(ani)] Naevi

23. (VH 201)

fig. 25. Fragment (H) of tile cm. 10 x 12 x 3. Rectangular stamp, cm. 5.3+, 2+; letters 1.7.
CIL XV, 1972 a compl.
[M(ani) Na]evi

24. (VH 136)

fig. 26. Fragment (H) of tile cm. 22.6 x 13.5 x 3-3.2. Rectangular stamp, cm. 6.8+, 2.6; letters ?
CIL XV, 1972 a compl.
[M(ani) Na]evi

25. (VH 035)

fig. 27. Fragment (H) of tile cm. 12.5 x 14.2 x 3.5. Rectangular stamp, cm. 6.5+, 2.6; letters 2.
CIL XV, 1972 a compl.
M(ani) N[aevi]

26. (VH 189)

fig. 28. Fragment (H) of tile cm. 14 x 9.2 x 3. Rectangular stamp, cm. 6.5+, 2.6; letters 1.8.
CIL XV, 1972 a compl.
[M(ani) Na]evi

27.

fig. 29. Fragment of dolium cm. 22 x 36 x 11.5; height of lip 8, width 19.5. Two separate rectangular stamps:
a) cm. 3.2 x 12.5; letters 2.1-1.6
b) cm. 3.5 x 12.6+; letters 2-1.7
N. 2437/8
Favoniae C(aii) f(iliae) ((palma ds.))
Q(uinti) Fabrici Fel[icis]

D.4.3.3. The Ashby Collection at the American Academy in Rome

28. (AAR 5142)

fig. 30. Fragment (H) of tile cm. 14 x 9.2 x 3. Rectangular stamp, cm. 9.5+, 2.5; letters 1.9-1.8.
CIL XV, 1972 a compl.
[M(ani) Na]evi

D.4.3.4. Convent of San Cosimato (Vicvaro, ROMA)

29.

fig. 31. Fragment (H) of tile cm. 14 x 9.2 x 3. Rectangular stamp, cm. 15.6, 2.5; letters 2-1.
CIL XV, 1972 a compl.
M(ani) Naevi

D.4.4. Typology of the Brick Material

Most of the stamped material consists of tegulae which, in addition to being used for covering, were often cut up and used for the construction of walls. The typological inclusion of some not easily identifiable brick fragments in this class is determined by a series of assessments (thickness, presence of one side partially surviving, impasto, and comparison among fragments).

Some unstamped lateres used in the villa, which include bipedales, sesquipedales and laterculi
bessales, when examined directly (macroscopically) and then confirmed by laboratory analysis, are in an impasto very similar to that of the stamped tiles of the Naevius production.22

In one wall, the fragment of the rim of a dolium was even found.23

D.4.5. **Typology of the Stamps, Palaeography, and Epigraphical Form**

The forms attested are rectangular (six types), horseshoe (one type), and orbicular (three types). See fig. 2 for the schematic representation of these forms. The arrangement of the words is on one or more parallel lines (straight or curvilinear). Guidelines only appear in the orbicular types. The letters are in relief and are made with an incised wooden matrix. The writing is left to right.

Among the older stamps, that of Naevius has distinctive palaeographic characters, such as obliqueness, variations in height, irregular appearance of the lines and the divaricate form of some of the letters (M, N, V). The circular dividing sign can be felt by touch, because of the way in which the inscription was prepared on the matrix, that is, “in negative.”

As for the form of the texts, they can be grouped into two categories, on the basis of length and content:

A – **Brickstamps of private producers.** This is the most numerous group, consisting of a simple onomastic formula in the genitive.27 The dolium [Cat. 27] carries two separate and complementary stamps.28

B – **Brickstamps of figlinae** (workshops of which the name appears). These bear a more complex and evolved text, typical of the Tiber area, with the generic denomination of the brick product (opus doliare), of the officinator, of the proprietor (dominus), of the places of production (figlinae), and the consular date.29 To this type can also be attributed the simpler text of a stamp that contains the onomastic formula of an already well-known officinator, followed by the nomen servile of his own slave responsible for the production.30

D.4.6. **Prosopography of the Producers: Gentes Active in the Production of the Bricks (Domini and Officinatores)**

A comparison of the family names (nomina) occurring on the bricks and tiles—which sometimes document the existence of individuals and families not attested by other sources—with those of other inscriptions (on stone, etc.) permits us to verify the diffusion of the gentes active in the brick industry and can contribute to the topographical identification of the places of production (figlinae).

Moreover, such a correlation makes it possible to formulate a hypothesis about the origin, mobility and rank of the individuals involved. We can also determine their economic interests in the region, both those resulting from what can properly be called “industrial” activity directed toward a relatively large marketing territory, and those primarily tied to serving the needs of their own fundi. For reasons

---

22. Analysis is in progress at the Gabinetto Ricerche Scientifiche of the Vatican Museums.

23. Cat. no. 27. This class of large containers, used for holding agricultural foodstuffs, was manufactured in the figlinae together with bricks, tiles and other products (mortars, sarcophagi, etc.) with the same type of clay (heavy earthenware); see G. L. Gregori, “Un nuovo bollo doliare di Q. Tossius Cimber,” Epigrafia della produzione della distribuzione. Collection de l’École Française de Rome 193 (Rome 1994) 547-553.

24. CIL XV.1211, 1972 a, N. 933/4, N. 1370/1-1371, N. 2437/8, [---]ILLI.

25. N. 890/1.

26. CIL XV.129, 1033, 1210.

27. Six types: CIL XV, 1972a; N. 890/1, N. 933/4, N. 1370/1-1371, N. 2437/8, [---]ILLI.

28. N. 2437/8: the two onomastic formulae include praenomen, nomen and cognomen (the male), nomen and patronymic (the female).


30. This is Felix Caricus, slave of C. Cominius Proculus (CIL XV.1211), who appears in other stamps as officinator of Iulius Stephanus) in 127 A. D. (CIL XV.1210) and of Domit(i)ia Lucil(i) (CIL XV.1051): in general, see Helen, 120, 142.

---
of manpower or management, many *officinatores* and *domini* could belong to *gentes* dwelling in the region only in the period when bricks and tiles were produced.

In the present investigation, special attention has been given to the stamps produced locally (products which, up to now, have not been found in the city of Rome) and the areas covered are the Augustan regions I-VIII (table 3).

**BRAETII**

*L. Braetius*

Owner of a production facility whose bricks have been found until now only at Horace’s Villa.

The status of the individual cannot be given with certainty (see D.4.7).

The family name is rare, attested for the first time in *Regio* I, with the exception of Rome, where it is present two times (see table 3); it can perhaps be related to the *Braetii of Regio VI*.

The uniqueness of the stamp and its close connection to the building history of the villa suggests the possibility that the *figlina* belonged to the owner of the *fundus* where the tiles were used.

**CLAUDII**

*Claudia Epicharis*

Owner of a production facility of bricks found to date only at Horace’s Villa.

This family name is extremely common in Rome and Italy, while in Etruria and Umbria it generally takes the form *Clodius*. It owes its enormous diffusion to the time of Claudius and Nero, who gave this name to their freedmen, from which it passed to their descendants.

The name *Claudia Epicharis* reflects a freedman origin and is the same as that of the woman who took part in the Pisonian conspiracy against Nero in 65 A.D., as described by Tacitus. But such facts are not sufficient in themselves for identifying the woman.

Women with the same name are otherwise attested at Rome in three funerary inscriptions (*CIL* VI.8411; *CIL* VI.29062; *CIL* VI.29081), but the onomastic comparisons do not furnish the basis for even a speculative identification (see Rudich, E.2).

Numerous males and females belonging to this *gens* appear on the stamps of the first and second centuries A.D. Among these can be noted the production of *Claudia Prima*, whose name appears inside a rectangular stamp (*CIL* XIV.4091.31=VIII.2318), which was found in the territory of *Praeneste* and *Tusculum*.

On the basis of the uniqueness of the stamp and its close connection to the building history of Horace’s Villa, it is possible that the *figlina* belonged to the owner of the *praedium* where the tiles were used.

**COMINII**

*C. Cominius Proculus*

This individual is mentioned on three stamps (*CIL* XV.1051, *CIL* XV.1210 and *CIL* XV.1211), the last two of which were found at Horace’s Villa. *Domini* are *Domitia Lucilla* in the first and *Iulius Step(hanus)* in the second, which dates to 127 A.D. The third bears only the name of *Felix Caric(us)*, slave of *C. Cominius Proculus*.

33. Stein, *s.v.* Epicharis, in *RE* XI (1907) col. 34. See Rudich, E.2.

34. Other female family members of the same *gens* are known to have been involved in the brick industry, active as *domini* or *officinatores*: *Claudia Marcellina* (*CIL* XV.934, 935, 936: 13-16 A.D.), *Claudia Prima* (*CIL* XV.2318: first century A.D.) and *Cl(audia) The(tis)* (*CIL* XV.937: end of the first century A.D.).

35. See note 32.

36. Helen, 120, 139, 142; Setälä, 134.
For the diffusion of the family, see table 3.

C. Cominius Proculus was undoubtedly the officinator on the estates of the two domini mentioned above.

The two stamps CIL XV.1210 and 1211 are mainly distributed in Latium. The presence in the ager Statoniensis of CIL XV.1051 together with a product of C. Iulius Stephanus makes it highly likely that the praedia of the latter were near the figlinae of the Domitii, to which the officinator C. Cominius Proculus and his slave Felix Caricus transferred between 127 and 135 A.D.  

DOMITII

Domitia P. f. Lucilla

Daughter of Domitia Cn(aei) f(ilia) Lucilla, she married M. Annius Verus and had two children, Annia Cornificia Faustina and the future emperor Marcus Aurelius.

The gens Domitia is attested everywhere and is especially tied to Regio VII because of vast possessions (including figlinae), which later passed into imperial hands. The first individual of note in this sector was Cn. Domitius Afer, who came to Rome from Gallia Narbonensis, and who invested substantial earnings from oratorical activity in some brick and tile factories.

The family’s practically omnipresent bricks constitute the foundation for the dating of many buildings in Rome and the surrounding area, starting from the time of Claudius.  

At Licenza, two stamps from the figlinae of Domitia Lucilla (the younger) are attested: CIL XV.129, dating to the year 127 A.D., and 1033 from the year 123 A.D.  

In the Tiber valley, some facilities have been identified in the ager Statoniensis, on the basis of some kiln waste and a wide range of products of the Domitii and of the figlinae Domitianae. The figlinae Caninia can be situated in the same area on the basis of the find of two stamps, CIL XV.118b, S.41. The figlinae Caninia also supplied Horace’s Villa with the bricks bearing the name Tertius, a slave officinator of Domitia Lucilla (CIL XV.129).  

With regard to the provenance of manufacture of CIL XV.1033, linked to the name Doryphorus, likewise a slave officinator of Domitia Lucilla, the marketing territory must have comprised Rome and the territory of the Roman Campagna from Tibur to the Alban hills. The most northerly example in the Tiber valley was found in the territory of Capena.

FABRICII

Q. Fabricius Fel[ix]

This individual is mentioned in the second stamp on a dolium found at Horace’s Villa (see D.4.3, cat. no. 27). He may be identified with Q. Fabricius Felix known from the dolium stamp CIL XV.2437 (with a different matrix) from Rome.

41. For the prosopography: Helen, 100-102, 118; Setälä, 108-109.
42. Gasperoni, 205-219, 223-227. The rock inscription, CIL XI.3042 add., located in the territory of Bomarzo and mentioning the iter privatum duorum Domitiorum, conferred a certain importance to the fundus with a private access road owned by the two brothers Cn. Domitius Lucanus and Cn. Domitius Tullus, adoptive sons and heirs of Cn. Domitius Afer (see Gasperoni, 112-118, tav. XXV).
44. For the prosopography, see Helen, 118.
45. See Filippi and Stanco, 107. Other brick constructions owned by the gens Domitia are known in southern Latium.
One may infer a freedman origin and the role of officinator in a figlina of the gens Favonia mentioned in the first stamp.

The family name, attested only once in connection with brick and tile production and in the sector of the dolia, is documented in Latium, Umbria, and Etruria (see table 3).

FAVONII
Favonia C. f.
This individual is mentioned in the first of two stamps of a dolium found at Horace’s Villa; the stamp had the function of indicating the dominus and the officinator attached to the production (see D.4.3, cat. no. 27).

The family name is attested for the first time in the context of the producers of bricks and is unknown (except for Rome) in Latium, Umbria, and Sabina. It is present twice in Etruria, at Veii and Capena (see table 3).

According to Dressel, the figlinae Faun(ianae), a brickstamp from which has been found in the interior of the ager Capenas, may be connected to the same gentilicium and interpreted as figlinae Fav(o)n(ianae) (CIL XV.211).

The lack of the cognomen of the woman could perhaps be interpreted as a sign of her fame in a local context.

IULII
C. Iulius Stephanus
This individual is mentioned on eight stamps of the years 123-132 A.D., one of which was found at Horace’s Villa (CIL XV.1210, with the consular date 127 A.D.). The family name is imperial and was widespread from the time of Caesar, Augustus, Tiberius, and Caligula.

Probably of freedman origin, Iulius Stephanus was dominus of praedia with an associated facility for the production of bricks and tiles, in which five officinatores are known to have been active, including C. Cominius Proculus and his slave Felix Caricus (CIL XV.1211; see above on Comini), who both appear in the stamps of Licenza.

The marketing area of the bricks of Iulius Stephanus is well documented in Latium, but the find of another of his stamps on a product in the central Tiber valley makes it very likely that the praedia were near the figlinae of the Domiti.

NAEVII
M’. Naevius
Owner of a production facility of bricks known up to now only from Horace’s Villa and San Cosimato.

All the examples known of this stamp, whose rubbings coincide perfectly when overlapped, seem to come from the same matrix.

The social status of this individual cannot be determined with certainty since his name is incompletely transmitted (see D.4.7).

The family name Naevius united with the praenomen Manius is not found in other stamps.

---

49. For the cognomen Stephanus see Setälä, 134 n2; H. Solin, Die griechische Personennamen in Rom, vol. 3 (Berlin-NewYork 2003) 1267-1272, at 1270.
50. See above, note 30.
51. See above, note 37.
52. For the distribution of the praenomen Manius see Salomies, 35-37, 158, 187. We note here the curious circumstance that Horace, in his Satires, mentions a Naevius (without praenomen). This is doubtless a completely random coincidence, and there are no grounds for positing any relationship between these two individuals; see s.v. Naevius in RE XVI (1935), col. 1558. For an example where it is likely that Horace refers to a historical figure known from Trebula Suffenas, see F. Sciarretta, “Una nota di realismo oraziano: Cervius, personaggio della VI satira del II libro,” Atti e Memorie della Società Tiburtina di Storia e d’Arte 75 (2002) 7-17.
If the *figlinae* where bricks with the name *Naevius* were produced are the same as those operating in modern times in the locality called *Le Moglie* (see D.4.9) and those that were located on the *praedium* of Horace’s Villa, this could corroborate the hypothesis that *Naevius* was a late Republican owner of the property at Horace’s Villa, especially considering the fact that the products of *M’. Naevius* were distributed in a very small area.\(^{53}\)

The *gens Naevia* was rather widely distributed in various zones of ancient Italy (see table 3) in which brick production is known, especially in the late Republican and early imperial periods. The most important are situated in the Cispadane region (Emilia Romagna), between Parma, Piacenza, and *Veleia* (*C. Naevi, L. Naevi*) and in the area of *Lattium*.\(^{54}\)

The production of Rome and its suburbs, already noted by Marini,\(^{55}\) was classified by Dressel in *CIL XV* (1891) in the following way:

- 22 types (for a total of 32 varieties) of the *Caii, Lucii*, and *Publi Naevii* are found in the alphabetic section of the *privati domini*, with the following introductory note: “I have examined all the tiles of the *Naevii*, though they might seem to belong exclusively to the *ager Tusculanus* and *Albanus*, because they often appear in buildings in Rome”;\(^{56}\)
- 7 types (corresponding to 8 varieties) are inserted in the section of the stamps that are fragmentary or poorly transcribed;\(^{57}\)
- 4 types, on the basis of the word *Naeviana* contained in the text, identify the *figlinae Naevianae*.\(^{58}\)

In 1947, M. E. Blake emphasized the importance of these productions, mainly distributed in the *ager Tusculanus* and exported to Rome. The tiles of various freedmen of the *Naevii* extended through the first half of the first century, although some stamps are late Republican or Augustan, to judge by the form of the letters.\(^{59}\)

In 1974, E. M. Steinby considered it probable, “even if it could not be demonstrated with certainty,” that the stamps of the *Naevii* came from the *figlinae Naevianae* and she attributed the Augustan group of stamps to these.\(^{60}\)

Based on the documentation *CIL/post-CIL*, the stamps belonging to the various productions of the *Naevii* in the area of *Lattium* can be summarized as is seen on table 4.

Some *Caii Naevii* (*domini or officinares*) have the same *cognomina*—*Alexander, Dama, Demetrius* and *Philomusus*—as people living

---

\(^{53}\) See above, note 32.

\(^{54}\) C. Zaccaria, *I laterizi di età romana nell’area nordadriatica* (Cataloghi e monografie archeologiche dei Civici Musei di Udine 3) (Rome 1993). In the *Tegulae Veleiates* (Piacenza, Parma and *Veleia*) the following appear among the names of a consular couple: no. 3) *Lucius Naevius* documented between 68 and 36 B.C. (12 stamps); no. 4) *Lucius Naevius Felix*, documented between 14 and 13 B.C. (2 stamps); cf. 75, nn 36-37; 78. For the connotation of the social level of the *Naevii*, producers of roof-tiles at *Veleia*, see M. Torelli, “*Domini nobiles e lateres signati*,” in *La brique antique et médiévale*. *Production et commercialisation d’un matériau*. Collection de l’École Française de Rome 272, eds. P. Boucheron, H. Broise, and Y. Thébert (Rome 2000) 311-321.


\(^{55}\) His work, written in 1798-99, was published posthumously by G. Marini, *Iscrizioni antiche doliari* (Rome 1884) 320-322.

\(^{56}\) *CIL* XV, at 351: “*Naeviorum tegulas, quamquam agri Tusculani Albaniue propriae videntur esse, hic recensui omnes, cum in aedificiis urbanis saepius occurrant.*”

\(^{57}\) *CIL* XV, Chap. V. *Lateres urbani fracti vel male excepti*: 1972-1978.

\(^{58}\) *CIL* XV, Chap. II. *Lateres urbani privati ex officinis nominatis*: 343-346.

\(^{59}\) M. E. Blake, *Ancient Roman Construction in Italy from the Prehistoric Period to Augustus* (Washington 1947) 298-300.

\(^{60}\) Steinby (1974-75), 67-68, especially n8; cf. also 104.
in the same period who are attested on burial inscriptions from Rome. An identification of the first with the latter ones, or at least the existence of family ties, may thus be presumed.

The production of M(anius) Naevius seems to be unrelated to that of other members of the family in the nearby area of Tusculum-Praeneste.

From a preliminary analysis, based on the published data, the marketing area of these products was the Roman Campagna, from the lower Anio valley to the Alban hills, and this fact suggests that the workshops were in a more or less central position and that the distribution occurred by land. An interesting hypothesis of Felice Grossi Gondi associates this production with the fundi Naevianus et Calpurnianus mentioned in an inscription from the villa of Casal Morena in the ager of Bovillae (fig. 35).

Some still unpublished examples recorded in the central Tiber valley and in the inner Cassia and Flaminia areas suggest a more complex and articulated situation regarding the topographical location of facilities, which includes the territory north of Rome. Indeed, as brick distribution along the river valley occurred downstream, failing further evidence, the place of discovery may become important for the location of kilns.

**POMP-**

L. Pomp( )

Owner of a production facility of bricks documented up to now only at Horace’s Villa and in the urban area of Trebula Suffenas (Ciciliano). The social status of this individual cannot be determined with certainty because his name is incompletely preserved (see D.4.7).

The family name, rendered in abbreviated fashion, offers various possible supplements, among which Pomp(eius) and Pomp(onius) are attested at Trebula and Tibur.

**D.4.7. Social Status, Role of Persons and Condition of Ownership of the Workshops**

The use of the “onomastic formula” in the instrumentum does not on the whole correspond to the evolution evidenced in other epigraphic sources; the absence, therefore, of other elements, such as the cognomen and the patronymic/name of owner, does

---


63. Five types were reviewed by G. Filippi and E. A. Stanco in the Tiber valley north of Rome: two from the ager of Capena (*CIL XV.1315a, 1325*); one from *Crustumerium* (*CIL XV.1326*); and two from Baccano (*CIL XV.1331*).


D.4. The “Horace’s Villa” Brickstamps and the Brick Production of the Central Anio River Valley

not constitute an indicator of social status and cannot be used as a chronological criterion.

Free men and freedmen, as well as slaves, were employed in the production of bricks, so it is not easy to establish the juridical status of these last on the basis of their gentilicium only.

In the group of stamps in category A, in which just one person is mentioned, it is not possible to establish either the conditions of ownership or possession (dominus or officinator) of the factories, nor the social class to which the person belonged. It seems highly likely, however, that the one-name onomastic formula in the genitive (praenomen + gentilicium, or gentilicium + cognomen) refers in many cases to the dominus. It is possible, furthermore, that some people are not just freeborn, but that they also belonged to the upper-middle classes and were involved politically in the life of the municipium and the ager, as in the case of C. Biculeius Priscus, owner of a brick facility at Trebula Suffenas, who made the municipium of Tibur the heir of his property. The cognomina of Greek origin are normally to be attributed to officinatores. Of particular interest is the presence of a woman, Claudia Epicharis.

In the group of stamps in category B, several persons are mentioned, among whom it is not always possible to establish a clear relationship (e.g., the officinator produces for the dominus, either as contractor or as employee of the dominus). Note the following examples:

CIL XV.129 bears the name of the officinator (a slave of Domitia Lucilla) + the name of the figlinae Can(inianae) + the generic name of the production (opus doliare) + the verbal form (fecit) and the consular date (=127 A.D.).

CIL XV.1033 bears the generic name of production Op(us) d(oliare) + the name of the officinator (a slave of Domitia Lucilla minor) + the consular date (=123 A.D.).

CIL XV.1210 bears the generic name of production Dol(iare) + the name of the officinator (C. Cominius Proculus) + the name of the owner of the praedium (Iulius Stephanus) and the consular date (=127 A.D.).

CIL XV.1211 bears the name of the slave (Felix Caricus) of the officinator (C. Cominius Proculus) who actually made the product.

D.4.8. Chronological Framework

The chronology of the stamps from “Horace’s Villa” spans the first century B.C. to the second century A.D. (table 2).

Four stamps have consular dating (CIL XV.129=Cat. nos. 1-2; CIL XV.1033=Cat. no. 8; CIL XV.1210=Cat. no. 9). For the others, the chronology must be established by comparison of internal elements, such as the onomastic formula, the palaeography and the shape. This is because no precise excavation context is known. Hence, these stamps cannot be associated with dateable masonry structures or other finds, or compared with examples of the same type from dated contexts.

In our present state of knowledge, however, the contribution of palaeographic dating of brickstamps is rather limited; because of a lack of specific studies, it is difficult to attribute the inscriptions to well-defined styles or to reconstruct the evolution of a graphic scheme. However, it is possible to make comparisons between the graphic form on the stamps and that of datable inscriptions on stone, even if these are texts of a profoundly different nature. The palaeographic characters of the earliest stamps find analogies in Republican epigraphy, and with those bearing so-called “big and beautiful” letters typical of the Augustan period. The stamps with consular dating and those with a definite prosopographic reference also allow the graphic forms to be fixed within limited chronological periods.

The diffusion of a particular surname can also help to fix the dating within a brief span of time. For the dating of the stamp of Claudia Epicharis between

66. CIL XV.2380 a-b=XIV.4092. 6-7; CIL XIV.3654.

67. The following features suggest a date in the late Republican period: the one-name onomastic formula, the form of some of the gentilicia, the praenomen Manius, and some letter forms (see D.4.5).
the middle of the first century and the beginning of the second century (Nero-Trajan), the key is not the rectangular shape and the simple onomastic formula, which generally persist in city areas in all periods. Rather it is the cognomen of Greek origin, which does not survive long in Latin and Greek onomastics in Rome.68

It is generally considered among scholars that in Rome and in the Tiber valley there was a typological evolution in the shape of the epigraphic design, and that the dating of the semicircular stamps (see N. 890/1, cat. nos. 3-4) should be placed between the reigns of Tiberius and Nero.69 The evidence offered now, however, by comparing three semicircular, horseshoe shaped, stamps from the valley of the Anio, does not confirm this hypothesis (see D.4.9.3).

The chronology of “production” of the brickstamps does not necessarily coincide with that of “use.” Therefore, the limits of the chronological indications supplied by the stamped bricks are borne in mind whenever conclusions or general historical considerations are drawn.70

D.4.9. Production and circulation of the stamped bricks

D.4.9.1. Market areas

On the basis of the lesser or greater area of diffusion of the products, it is possible to identify a local market, the so-called municipal market. This includes productions of privati domini and smaller figlinae, which were distributed over a limited radius, and which rarely reached Rome. This market is to be distinguished from the wider “urban” market, of Rome and Ostia, the largest centers for the arrival and distribution of goods in the middle Tyrrenian area in Roman times (fig. 35).71

The brickstamps, for the most part, distinguish in a fairly detailed way the commercial activity of

68. H. Solin, Die griechische Personennamen in Rom, vol. 2 (Berlin-New York 2003) 937. The cognomen Epicharis is found 30 times of which about 22 are between the first and second century, five are from the second and third centuries, and only three are between the third and fourth century.

69. Steinby (as n. 38), 19-20.

70. Bricks and tiles are materials that last a long time and have distinct uses. Bricks are used in floors, arches and—mostly in pieces—for masonry facings, while tiles serve as the covering of roofs, even if they are sometimes broken up, trimmed, and reused next to bricks, probably for reasons of economy. The possibility of dating structures by the stamps on bricks or tiles varies, depending on where these materials were used in the floors and walls (as facing), or for roofs. In the latter case it must be remembered that the material is portable, subject to wear, and easily removed and substituted.

71. The interpretation of the archaeological evidence (brickstamps) and of the local premises (raw materials and fuel) necessary for the production of bricks and similar products, together with the study of ancient and modern toponymy, have led E. Stanco and myself to assume that the area of the most important kilns supplying the Roman market was between Orte, Orvieto, Todi and Amelia. Here, all the necessary elements are present: navigable water courses, large quantities of fuel (wood, a very expensive resource but essential for the brick industry), and banks of the raw material—clay—which constitutes the bed of the whole basin of the Tiber. These are sufficient conditions for maintaining that the farther north a certain brickstamp is found, its kiln should be sought nearby. The hypothesis, therefore, that bricks could have gone up the Tiber as ballast in ships or as return cargo is shown to be without foundation; see Filippi and Stanco, 106. Many scholars, however, believe that the ca. 80 imperial-age figlinae doliares, whose whereabouts are not known and which are named on brickstamps from the excavations of Rome and Ostia, were situated in the city or the immediate suburbs.

72. There are, however, some rare examples of brick production limited to the specific needs of a given community, such as the military legions or some inhabited centers. The differentiated production of one dominus could come into this category, part destined for commercialization, and part for secondary private use, such as the construction of a villa on which the figlinae depend. Good examples are: the Villa of Settefinestre in Etruria (cf. D. Manacorda, as n. 2), the Villa of Bruttii Praesentes in the Sabine area (CIL XV.331=IX.4884), and
individuals linked by economic interests at a specific time and place of production; thus, our primary objective is the investigation of the workshops and the contextualization of the stamps with reference to the territory in which these workshops occur.

Previous studies on Rome and Lazio have been complicated by the ambiguity caused by the contrived grouping of the texts gathered in *CIL XV*, published in 1891. The large number of finds in Rome, resulting from excavations and systematic searching in the second half of the nineteenth century, in comparison with *Latium vetus* and the surrounding regions, has resulted in the use of the term “urban” *opus doliare* to indicate not only that the place of finding was in the city, but also that they may have been produced there.

Recently, however, the investigation of the stamped bricks and their topographical distribution in the valley of the Tiber has shown that the greater part of “urban” production took place along the valley at a distance sometimes more than one hundred kilometers north of Rome. The finding of one or more brickstamps in an area further away than any previous finds provided two important results: one, it demonstrated that the market extended at least for a radius as wide as that evidenced by these localities; and two, it enabled scholars to localize some of the factories.73

It must be noted that if the presence of a stamped brick at a particular site is not sufficient on its own to localize the factory, being a product of the “industrial” type with the stamp of an activity aimed at a fairly extensive market,74 the absence of such a brick is not proof of the contrary.

The fact that the brickstamps, which allow the identification of the producer/owner, the place, and/or the period of production, come from known factories gives the inscriptions their importance, both in support of and against accepted theories.75 In some cases the name of the producer/owner corresponds with the *dominus* of the villa where the brick was found.

The topographical location of the workshops and kilns, therefore, is fundamental for a clearer understanding of the production and the commerce of the bricks, for our knowledge of the *gentes* active in making them, and for better use of the epigraphical data.

**D.4.9.2 Production workshops**

As is well known, the brick industry is closely linked to the natural components of the territory (raw materials, watercourses, wood), and to the human resources available (including the economy of the *fundī*, manpower, industrial and marketing activities, roads, and transport).76 Any villa was, by and large, in a position to produce tiles, for which highly specialized manpower was not necessary; *bipedales* and *dolia*, on the other hand, were usually produced in the larger workshops. From an economic point of view, if a piece of land (*praedium*) was available, even a small one, as long as it had a bed of clay under

---

73. A new edition, therefore, of the brickstamps of *Latium* is to be hoped for, with criteria (epigraphical and topographical) different from those of *CIL XV*, along with new studies on prosopography and economic history in antiquity. This would require various phases of research and study. First, it would be necessary to gather and publish the greatest possible number of brickstamps from a particular region or a fairly extensive piece of territory. The second step would be to combine them in such a way as to find the places of production by means of an interpretative model of the distribution.

74. Since the rules of the market and of commerce in general are multiform and not to be placed into predetermined schemes, it often happens that in a zone where the existence of a Roman kiln is attested, brickstamps of various *figlinae* are found; for this reason identification and attribution to one of the known *figlinae* are all the more difficult.


76. Filippi and Stanco, 104-105.
it and a plentiful supply of water, the plant would have no expenses other than wood and manpower.

Since brick products are heavy, transporting them over land could markedly increase their price in comparison with the lower cost and greater speed of water transport. Thus, it has been observed that in the Tiber valley, kilns were generally positioned upstream and near the principal watercourse or one of its subsidiaries, in order to transport the bricks downstream. Downstream river transport was easier than upstream animal haulage, which was very expensive for heavy loads.

D.4.9.3 The Anio River Valley

Natural resources and environment

Clay material adequate for satisfying the demands of a principally local market is available more or less everywhere in the middle Anio valley, from Tivoli to Subiaco, even if in limited quantities. These small deposits were occasionally used by local kilns even up to the beginning of the last century.\(^ {77}\) The abundant forests of the area provided the necessary quantities of fuel for baking the bricks. However, the clay deposits were not sufficiently large to be exploited economically for industrial purposes.\(^ {78}\)

Unlike those in the valley of the Tiber, the clay deposits of the Anio valley are often in logistically difficult areas and are not suitable for high-quantity production and commerce. In fact, the morphology of the territory in the area is characterized by rough and tortuous paths, leading down to the via Valeria, which in Roman times was well maintained,\(^ {79}\) but whose use for the heavy transportation of bricks was expensive. Water transport was not a possibility, because above Tibur, the watercourses, consisting of the Anio and its tributaries, were not navigable because of the small volume of water, which was mostly in the form of torrents.\(^ {80}\)

\(^{77}\) A census of the brick kilns of the district is underway, in which in practically every town there is historical evidence of brick production. From 1900 to 1933, the period in which the railroad operated between Mandela and Subiaco, the transport into the central Anio valley of heavy material (including building material) occurred by train. Until 1950, there were five workshops in existence at Subiaco. One was a little south of the town in Via Monasteri (property Zappalà, today occupied by an electrical box) and four toward Affile in the locality of Canalis (property Catarinuzzi). Near Agosta two have been noted, in the locality Strette-Santi‘Iorio and Ittiole (property De Angelis). Large facilities have also been noted near the railroad station of Oricola (property of Fratelli Nitoglia).

\(^{78}\) The clays most commonly used for manufacturing tiles, bricks and similar materials are the grey-blue sandy ones, which are found along watercourses. The map of the clay pits “in use” or “abandoned” of B. Camponeschi and F. Nolasco, Le risorse naturali della Regione Lazio 6 (Rome 1980) fig. 36, 1:100,000, does not show any clay pits in our area; the clay pit at Arsoli, however, is mentioned at 335.


\(^{80}\) This led to a certain isolation of the area, also from the economic point of view.
The production of bricks took place, therefore, where there were deposits at hand sufficient for meeting a purely local market. This is shown by the positioning of the kilns, which was linked to the vicinity of the settlement (villa, vicus or castrum).

**Territory and documentary sources**

The geographical area in which “Horace’s Villa” lies is the valley of Licenza (vallis Digestiae, a tributary of the middle Anio valley). Licenza belonged administratively to the territory of Varia, situated between Tibur, Carsioli and Trebula Suffenas, through which passed the via Valeria. Considering the vastness of the area under consideration — the Anio valley from Castel Madama to Subiaco — the number of samples of stamps in relation to the number of unmarked bricks present in the territory seems very small. In fact, there have been very few finds other than those of “Horace’s Villa.” Some of these finds follow.

From S. Maria dei Morti near Marano Equo, on the left bank of the Anio, halfway between Vicovaro and Subiaco, comes a fragment of tile with an unprecedented brickstamp, *C(aius) A(vi)ili* (fig. 32). The *gentilicium A(ufilius)*, which has no precedents locally and originates in the central Italian area, appears in an inscription from Hadria (Atri, Teramo) and in the variants *Auvilius* from Corfinium and *Afilius* from Praeneste, all from the Republican age. The palaeography and the onomastic formula indicate dating to the middle of the first century B.C. The formula is typical of the “one-name” stamps of private producers.

The territory of Anticoli Corrado, from which come some important Latin inscriptions, has yielded the *dolium stamp* *DEFRV*. Nero’s villa in Subiaco has not produced any stamped bricks so far. We also have little knowledge about the brick production in areas adjacent to the one under consideration, with the exception of the *ager Tiburtinus*.

From Trajan’s villa in the upper Anio valley at Arcinazzo, which is outside the territory under consideration but part of the district of Subiaco, products have been found from the age of Trajan also known in Rome, Grottaferrata and the *ager Praenestinus*. From a geographical point of view,

---

81. *CIL* XV.357. The administrative details of Subiaco (Sublagueum) in Roman times are not certain.

82. Subiaco, Museo di S. Scolastica, deposit, box no. 70. Fragment H of tile (?), formed of two matching pieces, which measure 24 x 18 x 3 cm: one side still has the original edge, 12.9 cm long.

83. Solin and Salomies, 27. *CIL* I.3293 from Hadria; *CIL* XIV.3049=I.68 add. from Praeneste. M. Buonocore, *Supplementa Italic* 3 (Rome 1987) 172, n39 from Corfinium. See *CIL* VIII.25770. The forms *Auffilenus, Afilius, Ofilius* and *Ofillius* can be considered other variants of the same *gentilicium*.

---


85. Gregori 1999 (as n. 84) 36 n37, transcribes the text DEF.RV and proposes to interpret it with hesitations as *De (figlinis) Rufianis* or *De (scil. figlinis) F(uri) Ru(fii)*.


this area was better linked to Praeneste and Labicum in Roman times.

In the ager of Trebula Suffenas, bordering on our area and very similar from a geomorphological point of view, several brick facilities and two dolium stamps are known. Relevant in this regard are the figilinae owned by C. Biculeius Priscus, a member of the ruling class in Tibur. Two kilns have also been identified in the territory. The first, identified by C. F. Giuliani about 500 meters to the east of Ponte di S. Cecilia, was attributed by him to the gens Caecilia (as is known, the present-day town of Ciciliano derives from the fundus Caecilianus), whose products reached Castel Madama. No stamped products have been found at the second, discovered by F. Sciarretta near the Fontana dell’Acquaone. In the territory of Carsioli, CIL IX (1883) records 13 “urban” brickstamps of uncertain provenance, preserved at Arsoli, as well as two local productions.

was given by Sandro Gabrieli of Arcinazzo Romano, and comes from the small valley between the villa and the cistern called “Le Peschiere.”

89. See above, note 66.
92. At issue are brickstamps preserved with inscriptions from Rome recorded by H. Stevenson in 1878: CIL IX.6078.4, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 20, 21, 104, 151, 174, 211=CVL.1019a.8, 364.11, 189.2, 842.11, 515a.10, 1229a.12, 282, 283.10, 1244b.24, 1648, 1499, 684.3. To these should be added CIL IX.6 and the twosignaculas6078.197=CVL.8220,6083.6=CVL.779
93. Lugli 1926, “where the Roscio stream flows into the Licenza (Piani a Otto),” reports large blocks of limestone “of uncertain use” (col. 509, no. 10). On this flat terrain, today uncultivated, are visible piles of stone rubble with large quantities of kiln waste (blackish and overbaked bricks); see Mari 1994, 38, 71 n41, fig. 10.
the products, the kiln could have been in the Licenza valley. In this connection, it is worth noting that, at the beginning of the twentieth century, near the spring in the locality known as Le Moglie, very near “Horace’s Villa,” there was a functioning kiln for the production of bricks, in which vitrified waste materials of baking have been found. This kiln (fig. 33) could have been active in antiquity and may have belonged to the same fundus of the nearby Villa of Horace, making it likely that the kiln was prepared and used for the specific needs of one or more owners of the villa.

Another possible production site has been identified on the other side of the valley, near the top of Colle Franco, in the locality known as I Limiti. There a bed of clay is visible on the surface and a large quantity of tiles and coppi (semicircular cover-tiles), concentrated in a very small area, has come to light in the course of agricultural work.

The evidence of three stamps examined in our study helps us to narrow down the chronology of the semicircular form. The production of C. Aufilius, on the basis of onomastic and of palaeographic arguments, takes the use of the horseshoe design back to the Republican age and locates its occurrence outside the area of Rome. Mari’s convincing identification of Erasinus Aug(usti) ibertus, mentioned in the stamp of the Arcinazzo villa, with Trajan’s imperial freedman known from a funerary inscription on the via Appia, demonstrates the continued use of the semicircular form of stamp in the age of Trajan (98-117). On the basis of these considerations, the stamp of L. Braetius should be placed between the first and the early second century A.D.

From the first quarter of the second century A.D., there is evidence at Licenza of a change in the provisioning of bricks. The owner of the property seems no longer to use local products, or the kiln on the grounds of the fundus, but turns to the market supplied by bricks produced at industrial levels like those of Iulius Stephanus and of the Domitii, located in the central Tiber valley. Since these goods came from a distance and would have incurred transport costs, the choice of such a product must have depended on their higher quality and lower price when compared with the local products.

The paucity of the samples available so far does not allow us to establish whether such a purchase of bricks involved only one class of opus doliare, as, for instance, the bipedales, which must have been well manufactured to be used in the brick work, nor whether it was related to a crisis in the local “artisan” workshops as a result of competition from the “industrial” workshops in quality and price.

Certainly, the small local formations of clay were enough to satisfy the local market even in modern times, as is shown, for example, by the brick kiln C(asa) M(assimo) Arsoli, halfway between Vicovaro and Subiaco, set up by Clement X in 1670 and active until the end of the nineteenth century (fig. 34).

94. The area of the kiln, in operation at the beginning of the twentieth century, has yielded discs of vitrified baking; see Mari 1994, 38 and n65; Z. Mari, “Il popolamento di età romana nella parte meridionale del Parco dei Monti Lucreti. II – La villa romana,” in Monti Lucreti: Parco Regionale Naturale. Invito alla lettura del territorio, ed. G. De Angelis (Tivoli 1995) 557-598, at 594.

95. The stamps of Lucius Braetius and Claudia Epicharis, which are not found elsewhere, also suggest a possible local production. The factory of Lucius Pomp(onia?)’, whose products reached Trebula Suffenas, can be located between the Anio valley and the Empiglione valley; see above, notes 64-65. The stamps of these factories, mainly roof-tiles, were destined to satisfy the demands of the local market, gravitating to centers such as Varia and Trebula.

96. The site was pointed out to me by Sig. Antonio Muzzi of Licenza.


99. See above, notes 37 and 42.

100. Fragment of flat tile, with three sides surviving: cm 16.5 x 14.7 x 2.5. This kiln was at the center of the town and was set up after the plague of 1656...
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