

# ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

**VOL. XXXII**

HELSINKI 1998 HELSINGFORS

## INDEX

OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Iiro Kajanto in memoriam</i>	9
NEIL ADKIN	<i>The Ninth Book of Quintilian's Institutio Oratoria and Jerome</i>	13
GÉZA ALFÖLDY	<i>Drei Bauinschriften aus Gabii</i>	27
E. BADIAN	<i>Two Numismatic Phantoms. The False Priest and the Spurious Son</i>	45
LILIANE BODSON	<i>Ancient Greek Views on the Exotic Animal</i>	61
CHRISTER BRUUN	<i>Missing Houses: Some Neglected Domus and other Abodes in Rome</i>	87
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>Visceratio</i>	109
WALTHER LUDWIG	<i>Martin Crusius und das Studium des Griechischen in Nordeuropa</i>	133
SILVIO PANCIERA	<i>Ancora nomi nuovi o rari da iscrizioni latine di Roma</i>	149
MARK POBJOY	<i>The decree of the pagus Herculaneus and the Romanisation of 'Oscan' Capua</i>	175
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Three Notes on Roman Nomina</i>	197
W. J. SCHNEIDER	<i>Philologisch-kunstgeschichtliche Bemerkungen zu drei Stücken der Anthologia Latina</i>	225
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CLXXIII–CLXXVI</i>	235
RISTO VALJUS	<i>An Oriental Baker at Ostia</i>	259
TOIVO VILJAMAA	<i>Participium coniunctum – Syntactic Definitions of the Participle in Ancient Grammars</i>	265
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	277
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	319
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	321
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>	325

## MISSING HOUSES: SOME NEGLECTED *DOMUS* AND OTHER ABODES IN ROME

CHRISTER BRUUN

The study of the Roman *domus* is now a fashionable topic. The subject has caught the attention of historians and archaeologists for obvious reasons. So much can be learned about Roman society, culture and customs by focusing on the living conditions and the organization of household space in the Roman world at different times and places.<sup>1</sup>

The Roman *domus* can be studied from many angles and perspectives. To mention the two most important sites, in Pompeii scholars are dealing with uniquely well-preserved houses in a country town, while in Ostia the archaeological remains (spanning a different period) are rich too, although

---

\* It is my pleasure to thank Dr. Jean-Pierre Guilhembet (Univ. d'Orléans) for useful hints on the content and Prof. Robert Morstein-Marx (Univ. of California at Santa Barbara) for comments on style and language.

<sup>1</sup> This is not the time nor the place for providing a bibliography of recent research in this regard. A few hints must suffice, see J.-P. Guilhembet, "Sur un jeu de mots de Sextus Pompée: *domus* et propagande politique lors d'un épisode des guerres civiles", MEFRA 104 (1992) 787–816; K. Dunbabin, "Triclinium and Stibadium", W. Slater (ed.), *Dining in a Classical Context*, Ann Arbor 1991, 121–148; A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum*, Princeton 1994; J.-P. Guilhembet, "La densité des *domus* et des *insulae* dans les XIV régions de Rome, selon les *Régionnaires*: représentations cartographiques", MEFRA 108 (1996) 7–26; F. Pesando, *Domus. Edilizia privata e società pompeiana fra III e I secolo a.C.*, Roma 1997; R. Laurence & A. Wallace-Hadrill (eds.), *Domestic Space in the Roman World: Pompeii and Beyond* (JRA Suppl. 22), Portsmouth RI 1997; M. George, *The Roman Domestic Architecture of Northern Italy* (BAR Int. Series 670), Oxford 1997. Naturally, interesting expositions on living and housing in ancient Rome have been long in existence, see, e.g., L. Friedlaender, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*<sup>10</sup>, Leipzig 1922, I, 2–7, 240–242; II, 330–339.

the *domus* of Rome's harbour are not so decorative and fewer everyday objects have been found in situ.

In the capital the situation is different. The literary and epigraphical sources are richer than for any other city in the Roman world, while the archaeological remains registered in the recent volume II of the *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* (*LTUR*) are few.<sup>2</sup> There is a fair chance that we know more about what went on in the aristocratic houses in Rome than about where they were situated and what they looked like.

Nevertheless, there is scope for scholarly progress in all directions. The archaeological material, especially that which has not been included in the *LTUR*, ought to be analyzed and interpreted. There is also more information on housing in the literary sources than recent research has been aware of.

The objective of the present paper is modest and limited: to survey the information we have in literary and epigraphical sources on *domus* and *insulae* in Rome, or to be more specific, *domus* and *insulae* that can be attributed to a particular owner known by name. Whether such a philological inventory can be of any use remains to be seen, but the format adopted is modelled on standard and recent topographical works of reference.

## 1. A philological-archaeological inventory of *domus* in Rome

In the second volume of the *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* there are 545 entries under the heading *domus*.<sup>3</sup> The number of entries by far overshadows anything that previous topographical dictionaries have to

---

<sup>2</sup> *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* (= *LTUR*) II, ed. E.M. Steinby, Rome 1995, on which see my review in *JRA* 10 (1997) 389–398, where, without details, I briefly touch upon the arguments of this study. It must be added that the *LTUR* only included archaeological material when the owner of the remains of a *domus* is known or can be surmised. This means that much anonymous evidence was left out.

<sup>3</sup> See *LTUR* II, 22–217; where one can also find references to some 27 other houses included elsewhere in the *LTUR* volumes. Thus, for "domus: Verginia A.f." one is referred to "Pudicitia Plebeia", in a future volume.

offer.<sup>4</sup> There are so many entries that the material lends itself to statistical analysis:

Number of entries in <i>LTUR</i> II	Archaic 10	Republican 96	Imperial: <i>fistulae</i> 207	Imperial: other 103	Late Antique 129
-------------------------------------	---------------	------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------

This table is drawn up according to chronological criteria, with a further division according to the source material for the imperial period. This division shows that over 40 % of all the entries are based on lead pipe (*fistula*) stamps dating to the Empire; here we find a large part of the new entries. The rest of the material is relatively evenly divided between the Late Republic, the Empire, and Late Antiquity (including a dozen *domus* identified on the basis of *fistulae*). Undoubtedly the *LTUR* constitutes major progress in the recording of information on Roman *domus*, but in drawing up the entries the contributors became involved in serious problems of historical method that have not always been solved in an optimal way. Then there is material that ought to be added. The following pages are dedicated to a discussion of the Republican material, while problems concerning *domus* from the imperial period whose identification depend on *fistulae*-stamps have been discussed elsewhere.<sup>5</sup> Something will be said about Roman *insulae* as well, and here one can now make use of the dozen or so entries in *LTUR* III (Roma 1996), a list that needs completion.

---

<sup>4</sup> The first modern and still easily accessible inventory of Roman *domus*, by G. Calza, *DizEpi* II.3 (1910) 2044–2067, esp. 2047–59, registered some 180 *domus*. S. Platner – Th. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, Oxford 1929, 154–198, and L. Richardson jr., *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, Baltimore 1992, 111–141, both list some 235 *domus*.

<sup>5</sup> See Bruun 396–398 for a discussion of the methodological problems involved in the interpretation of the *fistula* stamps and their sometimes doubtful value for the identification of Roman *domus*.

## 2. Houses in Cicero's *Pro Caelio* and a question of principle

Our discussion will set out from the author's first acquaintance with the *domus* section in the *Lexicon* – the entries on Marcus Cicero and M. Caelius Rufus – prompted by teaching an undergraduate class on the *Pro Caelio*.

Many a Latin student will have read Cicero's entertaining speech in defense of young M. Caelius Rufus, delivered in 56 B.C. Cicero's successful defense apparently managed to obfuscate the real issues by alleging that Clodia, widow of Q. Metellus and sister of Publius Clodius (the demagogue/popular leader), was behind the charges against Caelius, maliciously seeking revenge for having been jilted by Caelius. But why did Caelius seek such questionable company in the first place? It was all an unfortunate coincidence, Cicero tells us. In order to take a more active part in civic activities, Caelius had to leave his paternal house, moving closer to the centre of things, and also, very commendably, closer to such bulwarks of the *res publica* as Crassus and Cicero himself. Caelius ended up on the Palatine. But alas, there he was also very close to Clodia. She turned out to be practically his neighbour. And so the liaison, naturally only of brief endurance, could not be prevented. Boys will be boys.

*Cum domus patris a foro longe abesset, quo facilius et nostras domus obire et ipse a suis coli posset, conduxit in Palatio non magno domum.*  
(Cic. Cael. 18)<sup>6</sup>

The prosecution had objected to Caelius' morals on more grounds than one. It had also been alleged that he was guilty of living above his station, that his lodgings represented a case of conspicuous consumption. Not true, countered his friend and mentor, with characteristic irony.

---

<sup>6</sup> "For the elder Caelius lives too far from the Forum, and in order to be able to visit our homes more easily, and receive visits from his own friends, his son leased a house on the Palatine, at a moderate rent", translation by M. Grant, Cicero, Selected Political Speeches (Penguin Classics), 175. Cf. the commentary by R.G. Austin, M. Tulli Ciceronis Pro M. Caelio Oratio<sup>3</sup>, Oxford 1960, 67–68.

*Sumptus unius generis obiectus est, habitationis; triginta milibus dixistis habitare. Nunc demum intellego P. Clodi insulam esse venalem, cuius hic in aediculis habitat decem, ut opinor, milibus.* (Cic. Cael. 17)<sup>7</sup>

These few lines of Latin prose contain a welter of references to housing in Late-Republican Rome. We hear about five people living or owning houses in Rome: Caelius *pater*, M. Caelius Rufus, Cicero, M. Licinius Crassus (who should be the other person referred to in the expression *nostras domus*, as being the second prominent defender and "character-witness" of Caelius at the trial),<sup>8</sup> and P. Clodius Pulcher. We also have four different terms denoting houses and housing: *domus*, *habitatio*, *insula*, and *aediculae*.

The reader keen on a better grasp of the neighbourhood where these people lived, will find information on four people in the *Lexicon* (my paraphrase of the Italian entries):

p. 73: "Domus: M. Caelius Rufus" (the only reference is to Cic. Cael. 17–18). Caelius moved to an *insula* owned by Clodius on the Palatine. The apartment of Caelius was likely located in connection with Clodius' own abode ("dimora"), rather than in any *insula* owned by Clodius on the Palatine.

p. 85–86: "Domus: P. Clodius Pulcher" (with numerous literary references, Cic. Cael. 17–18 among them<sup>9</sup>). This *domus* was located on the Palatine, next to Cicero's, which lay at a lower level. The house, very large not least because neighbouring houses had been joined to it – perhaps the house of one of his sisters, the house of Q.

---

<sup>7</sup> "He is only blamed for expenditure of a single kind – the rent of a house, which you claim is thirty thousand sesterces a year. But I can see what you are driving at. For Publius Clodius' block of houses, in which Caelius rents an apartment for, I believe, ten thousand, is up for sale. And so, consequently, what you have done is to give a fictitious figure, as a favour to Clodius and in order to help his deal", this rendering, making Cicero's irony explicit, by Grant 175; cf. Austin 66.

<sup>8</sup> The possibility is suggested by Austin 68; accepted by Richardson 122, but not by several other scholars, including LTUR II, 128–129.

<sup>9</sup> Cic. Phil. 2,48 can be added.

Seius Postumus, Cicero's house – is called an *insula*. Here the apartment leased to Caelius Rufus must have been located.

p. 128–129: "Domus: M. Licinius Crassus" (with references to Cic. Cael. 4.9; Pers. 2.36; Plut. Crass. 1.1, and Varro Men. 36). The location of the house is unknown. Richardson places it on the Palatine, but for no good reason.

p. 202–204: "Domus: M. Tullius Cicero (1)" (this, the longest entry on any private *domus*, is based on copious references in Cicero's writings, but not including Cael. 18). It was situated on the Palatine, but there is a vivid debate on where exactly it was located, three different suggestions having been advanced. [The question is important, since placing Cicero's house will help locate many adjacent buildings as well. CB] Many have suggested the northern slopes of the Palatine, between the so-called Clivus Victoriae and the *Nova via*; some in the Northwestern corner above the *vicus Tuscus* (considered impossible); lately Carandini suggested a site along the *Sacra via*, with the *domus Publica* laying to the East.

Thus far the *Lexicon*, but the passages from the *Pro Caelio* quoted above provide information also on a fifth person:

"Domus: (M.?) Caelius *pater*. Prominent equestrian (Cic. Cael. 3–4), his origins apparently in the Praetuttian region (Cael. 5),<sup>10</sup> his *domus*, during the late 60s B.C. also inhabited by his son M. Caelius Rufus, located longe a Foro (Cael. 18)."

### 3. A list of houses – for what purpose?

At this point we need to consider whether Caelius *pater* warrants an entry in the *LTUR* at all. The entry lacks precise topographical information and mentions an otherwise completely unknown figure. What justification could there be for including it in a topographical dictionary? The answer is: All the justification in the world, because the entry is no different from a large part of the entries under the heading *domus*.

---

<sup>10</sup> For the argument see Austin 146–147.

If one wanted to prune the *domus*-section in the *Lexicon*, there might be better grounds for questioning the entry on M. Caelius Rufus. He never owned his residence on the Palatine, we know that he rented it from Clodius. An inclusion of the building, or rather the apartment, under Clodius is sufficient, either among the entries on *domus*, or those on *insula*.

At such a provocative suggestion – after all, M. Caelius Rufus was included by both Platner-Ashby and Richardson – the argument for inclusion comes naturally: Caelius is a well-known character in Roman history, we know that he did live somewhere since his apartment is talked about, we “know” (Cicero tells us) the rent he paid for it and the rent he did not pay for it, and we even know some of his neighbours by name. What more can one ask for admission into a topographical dictionary?

What kind of entries to include depends on what the objectives of the section for *domus* are. What information will warrant an inclusion of a subject? Will there be a place only for “famous” people for whom we have other evidence as well? Are we concerned with urban property, to be precise with the ownership of townhouses, domus? Or are we concerned with economic matters, e.g. rents and prices of land and construction relating to housing? Or do we take a more sociological interest, namely in the composition of neighbourhoods – who lived next to whom, never mind the type of building, or its owner? Another aspect has to do with Roman “Privatleben”: what Romans did and had in their houses. Can and should a topographical dictionary cater to all of these aspects (and there might well be others)?

On these questions of principle there will probably be as many opinions as there are topographers and other interested readers consulting a dictionary such as the *LTUR*. But it should be pointed out, again, that the nature of the evidence for Rome is such that very often we hear more about what happens in and around houses than we hear about topographical coordinates. This is true also for the existent entries in the *LTUR*.

Since it is to be expected that some readers will find it difficult to agree with every aspect of the handling of the entry *domus* in the *LTUR*, it would have been helpful to have an outline of how the editorial committee approached this complicated matter. But the brief “Nota introduttiva” limits its treatment of the entry *domus* to explaining the alphabetical arrangement

(*LTUR* II, p. 5).<sup>11</sup> The rest of this paper is composed on the assumption that information on any of the aspects just listed is worth collecting.

#### 4. Some urban property for Caelius Rufus – after all

To return to Caelius Rufus: Cicero uses four terms for his lodgings in the same passage (*Cael.* 17): *domus*, *habitatio*, *insula*, and *aediculae*. Does this example not show that it is futile to try to distinguish between different types of residences in Rome, that the compiler must be happy for every scrap of information on residing and housing he/she can find?

On the other hand it might be possible to clear up certain things. Evidently Cicero's use of the word *domus* is not to be taken literally here.<sup>12</sup> *Insula*, *habitatio*, and *aediculae* can easily be reconciled; Caelius rented one apartment, perhaps the best apartment, in a building belonging to Clodius.<sup>13</sup>

Where was Clodius' *insula* located? According to the *LTUR*, connected with Clodius' *domus*, and thus really part of it – if true, an interesting piece of evidence on urbanistic patterns in Late-Republican Rome. Clodius had amassed a large conglomeration of real property, which would have

<sup>11</sup> Neither has the matter been dealt with in depth by other dictionaries. Calza 2046–47 briefly discussed semantic questions, pointing out that *aedes* and *domus* often are synonyms. At the outset of the entries in Platner-Ashby, one reads "Domus (names of owners given in the nominative)" (p. 154). Nevertheless, M. Caelius Rufus' Palatine abode appears on p. 174, although he only rented his apartment. Richardson in the New Topographical Dictionary is more ambitious as far as definitions go, for he provides a brief survey of the terms *domus*, *insula*, *atrium*, *horti*, and *villa* (p. 111–112). Still, Caelius Rufus' rental apartment is included here too.

<sup>12</sup> As one gathers from the Oxford Latin Dictionary (OLD), s.v., *domus* can also mean "home" in general.

<sup>13</sup> On the meaning of these terms, all used in the context of rental apartments, see B. Frier, *Landlords and Tenants in Imperial Rome*, Princeton N.J. 1980, e.g. 46. The OLD, 61, s.v. *aedicula*, erroneously assigns the meaning "a small house" to Cic. *Cael.* 17. For the complex term *insula*, see now E. Lo Cascio, "Le procedure di *recensus* dalla Tarda Repubblica al Tardo Antico e il calcolo della popolazione di Roma", *La Rome impériale démographie et logistique* (Coll. EFR 230), Rome 1997, 3–76, esp. 58–63; F. Coarelli, "La consistenza della città nel periodo imperiale: *pomerium*, *vici*, *insulae*", *ibid.*, 89–109, esp. 104–107.

given him plenty of square *pedes* to let out. But there is a chronological problem here. The evidence for swallowing up neighbouring properties cited by the *LTUR* refers to 58 B.C. and later.<sup>14</sup> Caelius' move to the Palatine took place earlier. Since he came to live in the neighbourhood of Cicero's *domus*, the move took place before Cicero's exile and the ensuing destruction of Cicero's Palatine house. Indeed, Cicero connects the move with a certain step in Caelius' public career, and we know that Caelius came back from North Africa in 60 B.C. and then prosecuted C. Antonius Hybrida, who had been Cicero's colleague in the consulship in 63 B.C.<sup>15</sup> Thus, if perchance the site of Clodius' *domus* can be identified, we need not look for rental space once occupied by Caelius Rufus there. Clodius' *insula* was presumably somewhere in the neighbourhood, but we have no way of knowing where.

It goes against the common definition of a Roman *domus* to include Caelius' rented apartment on the Palatine under that particular heading. There is, however, another reason for including Caelius Rufus in the *LTUR*. R.G. Austin, who is the main authority cited in the entry on Caelius, also writes: "Caelius moved later; in 50 B.C. he had a house near the *porta Flumentana* (*ad Att.* vii.3.9)".<sup>16</sup> This was not taken account of in the *LTUR*.

Caelius had acquired urban property by 50 B.C., and in Cicero's correspondence we hear about it twice. The sentence *Sed quid est quod ei* [scil. Caelio Rufo] *vici Luccei sint addicti* (*Att.* 7,3,6) by all appearance should refer to a block of apartments<sup>17</sup> situated in two streets both curiously enough called *vicus Lucceius*.<sup>18</sup> A second reference to property owned by Caelius appears in a larger context in the same letter to Atticus: *Hortensi*

---

<sup>14</sup> *LTUR* II, 85.

<sup>15</sup> For Caelius' early career, see Austin v–vi. It is of course true that Caelius still lived in his rented apartment during the trial in 56 B.C.

<sup>16</sup> Austin 67.

<sup>17</sup> See, e.g., W. Eck, "Domus: L. Lucceius" in *LTUR* II, 133: "Mietshäuser".

<sup>18</sup> On the character of the property bought by Caelius Rufus see also R.E.A. Palmer, "The *Vici Luccei* in the *Forum Boarium* and some *Luccei* in Rome", *BCAR* 85 (1976–77) [1980] 135–161, in part. 136–137, 152. Palmer prefers to interpret "*Vici Luccei*" as a toponym rather than as indicating a previous owner called *Lucceius*. He further suggests that the *Vicus Lucceius* was divided in two by the *Porta Flumentana*, from which originated the talk of two streets by the same name, perhaps one "citerior" and one "ulterior".

*legata cognovi, nunc aveo scire quid ꝑhominisꝑ sit et quarum rerum auctio-  
nem instituat; nescio enim cur, cum portam Flumentanam Caelius occupa-  
rit, ego Puteolos non meos faciam* (Att. 7,3,9).

Is the second passage, which contains the location "near the Porta Flumentana", a reference to the property that Caelius Rufus acquired in the *Vici Luccei*? This seems to be the common assumption<sup>19</sup> (although not everyone agrees).<sup>20</sup> We know that there was a residential district of some kind *extra Portam Flumentanam* during the Late Republic (Varro rust. 3,2,6; Liv. 35,9,2–3; 35,21,5), and one cannot really doubt that the property acquired by Caelius at least in part was residential.<sup>21</sup> There is thus a case for writing down:

"Insula: M. Caelius Rufus: in the *Vici Luccei, ad portam Flumenta-  
nam* (Cic. Att. 7,3,6. 9)."

## 5. Some new *domus* in Rome

This extensive discussion of merely a few lines in one of Cicero's speeches (which does not even touch upon such vexing questions as the location of Cicero's Palatine house, or Crassus' residence) illustrates the problems facing anyone working on the literary sources for Roman houses and house-owning. It is no surprise that the ancient Latin and Greek sources contain frequent references that might have been included under the entry

---

<sup>19</sup> See D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus III*, Cambridge 1968, 296; Palmer 137; F. Coarelli, *Il Foro Boario dalle origini alla fine della repubblica*, Roma 1988, 151.

<sup>20</sup> See Eck loc. cit., who does not quote Cic. Att. 7,3,9 for the urban properties of L. Lucceius. The whole matter is absent from Platner – Ashby. Frier 1980, 24, seems to regard the property "ad portam Flumentanam" as another urban investment of Caelius'. If the property near the Porta Flumentana is indeed not the property of the *Vici Luccei*, then perhaps Caelius owned what should amount to a residence there. The expression *occuparit* and the context, i.e. the comparison of that property with a seaside residence at Puteoli that Cicero fancies, could well indicate that Cicero is talking about a residence, a private townhouse, or at least an upper-class apartment.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Palmer 136–137, 152. Coarelli 1988, 151–153 seems to imply that the area was taken up by *horrea*, but there is, as we have just seen, undeniable evidence that the Porta Flumentana area (also) was residential during the Late Republic.

*domus*. The following list contains some thirty new entries that might have appeared in the *Lexicon*, besides Caelius *pater* discussed above. It does not pretend to be based on an exhaustive search of all the Greek and Latin literature,<sup>22</sup> but rather on observations made during teaching duties and while writing the review of *LTUR* II mentioned above and researching other topics.

Some preliminary remarks on the relevance of these new *domus* are warranted. It is readily acknowledged that the following list is based on a "maximalist" approach, not concerned with space or editing, only with the information found in the literary sources. The important thing is however that the information we receive from these new entries does not differ in quality from what is presented in the *Lexicon*.

For many of the following entries we lack an explicit mention of *domus* in the ancient sources. But that criterion was never imperative in the existing entries either. Compare, among the literary references in *LTUR* II, the *aedes P. Africani* (p. 88), the *aedes* of M. Iulius Vestinus Atticus (p. 124), or the *regia* of Numa (called so at least by Ovid and Servius; p. 144). It seems the right decision to include under *domus* all the references that indicate an aristocratic mansion. Terminology might change and aristocratic mansions undoubtedly changed in appearance.<sup>23</sup>

Some of the new entries might refer to legendary persons. It is true that Talassius probably is no more than a feeble attempt at etymologizing, but the historicity of his contemporary Titus Tatius (p. 185) cannot be ascertained either. Already Ashby noted that Cassius Argillus is an invented, etymologizing name derived from the Argiletum (*LTUR* II, p. 77; no such insight by Tortorici). Another new and early entry is, e.g., Ser. Sulpicius, the husband of one of the two Fabiae whose quarrel ultimately led to the Licinio-Sextian laws in Livy. Is he historical? Perhaps neither more nor less than the tribune M. Pomponius, tribune of the people in 362 B.C. (*LTUR* II, p. 161). And on the *domus* of the usurper Censorinus, included on p. 78

---

<sup>22</sup> Alas, who can claim to possess the "Gelehrsamkeit" of days bygone. A sentence in the necrologue of Harald Fuchs (1900–1985) in *Gnomon* 60 (1988) 80 deserves to be quoted: "Fuchs durchmusterte in einer ungeheuren Kraftanspannung die gesamte Literatur von Homer bis in die Spätantike..."

<sup>23</sup> There is even an entry under *domus* for the *aediculae* of M'. Manilius, *cos.* 149 B.C. (*LTUR* II, 135).

(mentioned in *Hist. Aug. trig. tyr.* 33,6), the *LTUR* II comments elsewhere that the source is "sicher fiktiv" (p. 100).

Many additions below have in common that the *domus* appears only in connection with an event of some sort, without topographical coordinates. For instance, the *aedes* of Aemilius Papus is mentioned only because it harboured silver treasures, while Fulvius Nobilior's house is referred to because he planned on exposing war booty at his doorpost: *in postibus suis*. Yet should not the latter case rank one notch higher than the only evidence cited for the *aedes* of M. Claudius Marcellus (cos. V in 208 B.C.): *nihil in aedibus posuit* (*LTUR* II, p. 82)?

What is the value of suggesting new entries that lack a real topographical context? Again, the reader will realize that not so rarely entries in the *LTUR* are unable to pinpoint the location of their subject; this is true not just for *domus*. What a reader expects from a dictionary is above all a consistent treatment of the material, and completeness. If an entry is not there, it should mean that there is nothing to find. If an entry is included, one should be given full references, or directions to where sources are listed. (There are some entries for which the literary references could be completed; they will be listed in an Appendix.)<sup>24</sup>

**Q. Aemilius Papus**, *cos.* 282, 278 (RE I Aemilius 112) – Val. Max. 4,4,3; location unknown. *In C. vero Fabricii et Q. Aemilii Papi principum saeculi sui domibus argentum fuisse confitear oportet.*

**M. Buculeius** (RE III.1, 987) and **L. Fufius** (RE VII Fufius 5) – Cic. de orat. 1,179; location unknown: ... *familiaris noster M. Buculeius, ... cum aedes L. Fufio venderet.* The otherwise unknown Buculeius sold a house to Fufius without paying attention to the clauses of the contract. This is a passage famous in juristic literature, because it is relevant to the *servitus luminum*.<sup>25</sup>

**Caeparius** (RE III.1, 1279) – Sall. Catil. 46,4, location unknown. One of the participants in Catiline's plot, *Caeparius, paulo ante domo egressus, ... ex urbe*

---

<sup>24</sup> It must be stressed once more that the following list is no more than a brief addition to the list of houses in the *LTUR*, without any pretence at being complete. Very much fuller treatments of the matter will appear in J.-P. Guilhembet's forthcoming work on *domus* in Rome.

<sup>25</sup> B. Biondi, *La categoria romana delle "servitutes"*, Milano 1938, 103–104; J.M. Rainer, *Bau- und nachbarrechtliche Bestimmungen im klassischen römischen Recht* (Grazer rechts- und staatswissenschaftliche Studien 44), Graz 1987, 69–70.

*profugerat*. In 46.3 he appears as Caeparius Tarracinensis, perhaps an indication of origin rather than a cognomen. Nevertheless, he had a *domus* in Rome.

**Calpurnius Bestia** (RE III Calpurnius 25) – Cic. Cael. 26; location unknown. A friend of Cicero's and of Caelius Rufus': *fuisse meo necessario Bestiae Caelium familiarem, cenasse apud eum, ventitasse domum*.

**(C. Cornelius) Cethegus** (RE IV Cornelius 89) – Cic. Catil. 3,8; Plut. Cic. 18–19; location unknown. The leader of the Catilinarians in Rome, his house was used as an arsenal: *misi qui ex aedibus Cethegi si quid telorum esset afferret, ex quibus ille maximum sicarum numerum et gladiatorum extulit* (Cic.).

**Claudius** – Oros. hist. 5,17,9; exact location unknown, presumably near the Forum Romanum. During the final moments of the revolt of Saturninus and Glaucia in 100 B.C., *C. Glaucia extractus e domo Claudii trucidatus est*.

**T. Coponius** (RE IV Coponius 9) – Cic. Cael. 24; location unknown. *Habitabat apud Titum, ut audistis, Dio, erat ei cognitus Alexandriae*. The Alexandrian ambassador Dio, who also lived with L. Lucceius, and later was killed, lived with one of the two brothers Coponius (whether in a *domus* or a flat cannot be determined).

**P. (Cornelius) Lentulus (Sura)**, *cos.* 71 (RE IV Cornelius 240) – Cic. Phil. 2,18; location unknown. *Qui autem tibi venit in mentem redigere in memoriam nostram te domi P. Lentuli esse educatum?* M. Antonius had been brought up in the house of the Catilinarian Lentulus, his stepfather.

**Demetrius**, a landscape painter from Alexandria – Val. Max. 5,1,1f; DS 31,18,2; location unknown. *Rex [Aegypti] Ptolemaeus ... cum paucis admodum servis squalore obsitus Romam venerat ad se in hospitium Alexandrini pictoris contulerat*. (Val. Max.) The name is given by Diodorus, the king in exile is Ptolemaios VI, the date 164/163 B.C.

**(K.) Fabius (Vibulanus)**, *cos.* 484, 481, 479 (RE VI Fabius 159) – Liv. 2,48,10; 2,49.,3; location unknown. *Consul (scil. Fabius) e curia egressus comitante Fabiorum agmine ... domum redit (2,48). Consul paludatus egrediens in vestibulo (2,49)*: The leader of the Fabian clan prepares for the expedition to the Cremera.

**Paullus Fabius Maximus**, *cos.* 11 B.C. (RE VI Fabius 102) – Hor. carm. 4,1,9–11; location unknown. *tempestivus in domum / Paulli purpureis ales oloribus / comissabere Maximi*.

**Fulvius Nobilior**, *cos.* 189 B.C. (RE VII Fulvius 91) – Liv. 38,43,10; location unknown. *Qui ob has res gestas triumphum a vobis postulaturus sit ... et cetera spolia eius urbis ante currum laturus et fixurus in postibus suis*. The conqueror of Ambracia was planning his triumph (which he eventually celebrated), after which he intended to affix his war trophies at his door.

**M. Furius Camillus**, *trib. mil.* 401 B.C. (RE VII Furius 44) – Plin. nat. 34,13; Plut Cam. 12; location unknown. *Camillo inter crimina obiecit Spurius Carvilius quaestor, ostia quod aerata haberet in domo* (Plin.). Camillus' house had a door covered with bronze.

**Cn. Genucius**, *trib. pleb.* 473 B.C. (RE VII Genucius 4) – Liv. 2,54,9; location unknown. *Tandem qui obversati vestibulo tribuni fuerant nuntiant domi mortuum esse inventum.* While in office, the tribune was found dead in his home before an important meeting.

(?) **Iulius Ursus**, *cos.* 84, *cos. II* 98 A.D. (PIR<sup>1</sup> V 630) – Dig. 8,5,8,7; location unknown, presumably in Rome, and neighbour of a certain Quintilla: *vaporibus cum Quintilla cuniculum pergentem in Iuli Ursi instruxisset.*<sup>26</sup>

**Latinius Latiaris** – Tac. ann. 4,68; location unknown. *Ac iam ultro Sabinus quaerere Latiarem, ventitare domum, ...* In A.D. 28, the honest Roman knight Titius Sabinus is being set up by Latinius Latiaris, who uses his house for ensnaring Sabinus and hides his accomplices between roof and ceiling.

**C. Manlius** (RE XIV Manlius 15) – Liv. 7,42,4; location unknown. *Nec in T. Quincti villam, sed in aedes C. Manli nocte impetum factum (esset).* Livy refers an alternative version of the events which in 342 B.C. led to the *leges Genuciae*.

**C. Marius** (1) – Plut. Mar. 30,2; location unknown. In 100 B.C., Marius entertained both conservative senators and Saturninus in his house, each party having entered through a different door. This house is not the same that Marius possessed after returning from Asia Minor; then he built a new one (Plut. Mar. 32 – see *LTUR* II, 137).

**Ofonius Tigellinus**, praetorian praefect under Nero (PIR<sup>2</sup> O 91) – Plut. Gal. 17,5; location unknown. T. Vinius left the emperor's company and went to visit Tigellinus, bringing with him his widowed daughter.

**M. Papirius**, former Roman magistrate – Liv. 5,41,2. 9; inside the Archaic wall. *Qui eorum curules gesserant magistratus ... medio aedium eburneis sellis sedere. .... M. Papirius, unus ex eis ...* As the Gauls enter Rome in 390 B.C. (387), they are met by Roman nobles stoically awaiting their fate.

**Q. Pompeius**, *cos.* 141 B.C. (RE XXI Pompeius 12) – Plut. TG 14. He claimed that he was a neighbour of Ti. Gracchus the tribune.

**Posides**, a eunuch (RE XXII,1, 829) – Iuv. 14,91; location unknown. *Ut spado vincebat Capitolia nostra Posides*, a luxurious residence.

**C. Proculeius** (RE XXIII Proculeius 2) – Quint. inst. 6,3,79; location unknown. He forbade Cassius Severus to enter his house.

---

<sup>26</sup> One may perhaps infer that the property of Iulius Ursus, likely his house, and that of Quintilla were located in Rome, in order to have attracted the attention of the jurists. See the similar conclusion by W. Eck regarding the house of Claudius Hieronymianus, *LTUR* II, 82 (based on Dig. 33,7,12,40). There are two Quintillae of senatorial rank in M.-T. Raepsaet-Charlier, *Prosopographie des femmes de l'ordre sénatorial (I–II s.)*, Louvain 1987, both active under Trajan: Atilia Quintilla (no. 119), and Pedania Quintilla (no. 604).

**(C. Scribonius) Curio**, *cos.* 76 (RE IIA Scribonius 10) – Cic. Phil. 2,45; location unknown. *Quotiens te pater eius [scil. of the younger Curio] domu sua eiecit? quotiens custodes posuit, ne limen intrares?* M. Antonius' friendship with the younger Curio displeased the father.

**Ti. Sempronius Gracchus**, *trib. pleb.* 133 B.C. (RE IIIA Sempronius 54) – Plut. TG 16–17; App. BC 1,15; location unknown. His followers encamped outside the house (Plut. 16); on his last day, his house was visited by a man bringing a bird for taking auspices. When leaving, Tiberius struck his foot against the threshold (Plut. 17).

**Ser. Sulpicius**, *trib. mil.* 377 B.C. – Liv. 6,34,6; location unknown. *Forte ita incidit ut in Ser. Sulpici tribuni militum domo sorores Fabiae ...* In his house, the two sisters Fabiae started the quarrel which in Livy's narrative led to the Licinio-Sextian laws.

**Talassius**, a leading citizen – Liv. 1,9,11–12; location unknown. During the Rape of the Sabines, some men were bringing the most beautiful girl to the house of a man called Talassius.

**Theodorus**, *vates* – Mart. 11,93; location unknown. A fire destroyed the poet Theodorus' house: *Pierios vatis Theodori flamma penates abstulit*. Martial laments that the owner did not perish with his *domus*.

**Sex. Titius** (RE VIA Titius 23) – Cic. Rab. perd. 24; Val. Max. 8,1 damn. 3; location unknown. His political undoing was *quod Saturnini imaginem domi habuerat* (Val. Max.).

**Vitellii** – Liv. 2,4,5; location unknown. *Cum pridie quam legati ad Tarquinius proficiscerentur cenatum forte apud Vitellios esset*. Young aristocrats, the Vitellii among them, conspire against the young Republic.

**P. Volumnius praef. fabrum** of M. Antonius the triumvir (RE VIIIA Volumnius 7) – Nep. Att. 10,2; location unknown. During the second triumvirate, Atticus and Gellius Canus sought refuge with him: *latebatque apud P. Volumnium ... habebatque secum Q. Gellium Canum*.

## 6. On inheritances and sales

As pointed out previously,<sup>27</sup> the registration of inheritances and the buying and selling of houses – very common events in ancient Rome<sup>28</sup> –

---

<sup>27</sup> Bruun 395.

<sup>28</sup> The complicated situation that presents itself to modern scholarship is well illustrated by, e.g., M. Royo, "Le quartier républicain du Palatin, nouvelles hypothèses de localisation", REL 65 (1987) 89–114, esp. 112–114; A. Carandini, Schiavi in Italia. Gli strument

creates problems for the scholar when listing houses. The *Lexicon* has mostly chosen to present all its material in one entry, mostly belonging to the first owner. Successive owners too have a place in the alphabetical list, but the name is accompanied by a mere reference to the main treatment.<sup>29</sup> The twists and turns of the Late Republican real estate market are however not easy to follow, and it seems that sometimes the more important person has become obscured, or the sources might after all refer to separate buildings.<sup>30</sup> The following additions might be suggested:

domus: M. Aemilius Scaurus pater. M. Aemilius Scaurus *praet.* 56 B.C. began building on the lot he had, presumably, inherited from his father, tearing the previous *domus* down. Aemilius Scaurus *senior* does not have an entry. He might have deserved one; according to E. Papi (p. 26), the recent excavations by Carandini have also brought to light remains of the previous *domus*.

domus: Caecilius Metellus Celer, *cos.* 60 B.C. and husband of Clodia. His grandfather Q. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus, *cos.* 109 has received an entry (p. 72), in which also the suggestion is quoted that his grandson had inherited his *domus* on the Palatine, an hypothesis that however "non è confermata da alcuna fonte". If the hypothesis is discarded, the consul of 60 should have an entry. He lived on the Palatine, and Cicero was with him on his deathbed as he struck the wall which separated his house from that of Q. Lutatius Catulus (Cic. Cael. 59–60). Richardson gave them separate entries.

domus: L. Cornelius Sulla, *cos.* 88 B.C. (the dictator). Surprisingly, he does not have an entry in the *LTUR*, although references to his house are frequent. Instead there is an entry for the *domus* of L. Cornelius Sulla (*cos.* 66 B.C.), his nephew, which "perhaps might be" the one once inhabited by

---

pensanti dei Romani fra tarda Repubblica e medio impero, Roma – Urbino 1988, 362–363.

<sup>29</sup> Exceptionally, there are five entries for the piece of land where Cicero's house stood, see under Crassus, M. Livius Drusus, L. Marcius Censorinus, Sisenna Statilius Taurus, M. Tullius Cicero.

<sup>30</sup> Having for some time now studied the entries, the sources, and the different treatments given them by the various authors, I can only admire the editor for having been able to publish the *LTUR* volumes at regular intervals, while at the same time working on the volumes still to come.

the dictator. This is uncertain, and Sulla as the more important and earlier figure ought to have a proper entry.<sup>31</sup>

Q. Hortensius Hortalus, *cos.* 69 B.C. (RE VIII Hortensius 13). There is an entry for Q. Hortensius, *praet.* 45, who "verosimilmente" inherited his father's house. But none of the two references given mention him in connection with a house. Then again, Cic. Att. 11,6,6 (late 48 B.C.) does mention the house of the famous orator, who had died in 50 B.C.: *L. vero Lentulus Hortensi domum sibi et Caesaris hortos et Baias desponderat.*

domus: C. Sergius Orata. Orata, famous for his investment in *balnea pensilia*, sold his house to Marius Gratidianus, then bought it back some time later (Cic. de orat. 1,178; Cic. off. 3,67). Marius has received an entry; Orata's name might at least have been listed, followed by a cross-reference. (On the other hand philological scholarship considers this incident as relating not to a house in Rome at all, but to Orata's property on the Lucrine Lake. This ought to have been taken into account.)<sup>32</sup>

Sometimes perhaps too many houses have been joined in one entry. Since some houseowners have multiple entries (e.g. L. Licinius Sura), one might have separated also the two houses of T. Flavius Vespasianus. The living conditions of Cicero's brother Quintus might also have been exposed more clearly. In his entry, four different urban properties are combined: the *domus Paciliana*, a house on the Carinae, the *domus Liciniana (Luciniana) ad lacum Pisonis*, and Q. Cicero's house in 59 B.C.

## 7. Landlords and tenants

Financial transactions bring us to the rental market. Many Romans lived in rented property, in Rome as well as elsewhere. Upper-class Romans might rent a whole *domus*, or they might be content with a nice flat, a *cenaculum*, as indeed was Caelius Rufus for a start. The *cenaculum* is a flat comprising many rooms, and therefore completely different from the squalid and dark rooms inhabited by the poor that one perhaps – inspired by

---

<sup>31</sup> Only one source is given for the house of Sulla the nephew, while five are quoted for Sulla the dictator. Val. Max. 3,1,2 is the correct quote; add Plut. Sull. 35,2.

<sup>32</sup> Thus already F. Münzer in RE IIA (1923) 1713–14 no. 33; recently A.R. Dyck, A Commentary on Cicero, *De Officiis*, Ann Arbor 1996, 579.

Fellini's unforgettable *Satyricon* – imagines Roman high-rise buildings to have been full of. High-rise buildings (in common modern language usually referred to as *insulae*, which as noted above is not the only urbanistic meaning *insula* could have) could, to be sure, accommodate different sorts of apartments, with some *cenacula* on the first floor (the "piano nobile"), followed by more modest abodes on the next floors.<sup>33</sup>

This situation raises some fundamental questions. How is one to record inhabitants of rented houses or flats in a topographical dictionary? Or owners of *cenacula*, for that matter?<sup>34</sup> We are back at the methodological questions mentioned above. Are we interested in neighbourhoods – who lived where? Or in social history – who rented what, and at what price? Or is it just property – who owned that particular building, never mind the type? These questions do not seem to have been posed by earlier compilers, and there is no real sign that the existence of rental property and *cenacula* has made an impact on the entries in the *Lexicon*.

There are no entries for *aediculae*, *cenaculum*, *diaeta*, *habitatio*, or *hospitium* in *LTUR* I–III (to mention the terms used for rental flats in the juristic texts).<sup>35</sup> There are however 13 entries for *insulae* with the meaning of "apartment buildings".<sup>36</sup> Here neither Clodius nor M. Caelius Rufus appear as owners; some other names too will be suggested in the following list:<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> For all these aspects, based on archaeological, juristic, literary, and epigraphical evidence, see Frier 1980, 3–46; in agreement, e.g., Rainer 92–94.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Dig. 33,7,7: *Tabernam cum cenaculo Pardulae manumisso testamento legaverat* ... No woman of consequence with the name Pardula seems to be known.

<sup>35</sup> See Frier 1980, 44 and 46 n. 76 for references.

<sup>36</sup> With exclusion of the *Insula Tiberina* and the *Insula Lycaonia*, we have the *Insula Bolani*, *Cuminiana*, *Eutychetis*, *Felicles*, *Saeni Va[-] Aureli[ani]*, *Sertoriana*, *M. Tullius Cicero* (in three different locations), *Vitaliana*, *Volusiana*, *[-]alatiana*, in *Caelio* (*LTUR* III, 96–103).

<sup>37</sup> Most of these are mentioned in B.W. Frier, "Cicero's Management of His Urban Properties", *CJ* 74 (1978) 1–6; Frier 1980, 23–25 (neither used by the *LTUR*). For the sake of convenience, "insula" stands for "tenement building" in the following list. For the meaning of the "terminus technicus" *insula*, see the bibliography above in n. 13.

insula: M. Caelius Rufus, *praet.* 48 B.C. (RE III Caelius 35). He owned property, presumably including tenement buildings, near the Porta Flumentana, in the *Vici Lucei* (Cic. Att. 7,3,6. 9).

insula: Calpurnius Lanarius (RE III Calpurnius 49): v. Claudius Centumalus.

insula: Claudius Centumalus (RE IV Claudius 107). Cic. off. 3,66 (and Val. Max. 8,2,1) mentions an *insula* (also called *aedes*) situated on the Caelian that disturbed the view of the augurs. These had given an order to remove the protruding parts already before Centumalus sold the house to Calpurnius Lanarius. The date is sometime before 91 B.C.<sup>38</sup>

insula: Clodius Pulcher, on the Palatine (see above, ch. 4).

insula in Foro Boario. According to Liv. 21,62,3, writing about 218 B.C., the building was at least three stories high: *in foro boario bovem in tertiam contignationem sua sponte escendisse atque inde tumultu habitatorum territum sese deiecisse*.

insula: M. Licinius Crassus, *cos.* 70 (RE XIII Licinius 68). According to Plut. Crass. 2,5, Crassus owned a large number of *insulae* in Rome, but all details are lacking.<sup>39</sup>

insula: T. Pomponius Atticus, Cicero's friend (RE XXI Pomponius 102). The biographer Nepos writes *Nullos habuit hortos, nullam suburbanam ... villam ... omnisque eius pecuniae reditus constabat in Epiroticis et urbanis possessionibus* (Nep. Att. 14,3). It is difficult to envisage what these profitable urban possessions might be if not tenement buildings.<sup>40</sup> Their location is unknown.

insula: Terentia, Cicero's spouse. This property is referred to in a letter of Cicero from Dyrrhachium in 58 B.C.: *Quod ad me, mea Terentia, scribis, te vicum vendituram ...* (Cic. fam 14,1,5).

---

<sup>38</sup> There are two entries in LTUR II under *domus* for this building: on p. 75 for Calpurnius Lanarius (Eck) and on p. 82 for Claudius Centumalus (Papi). This controversy too has been treated frequently in juristic literature, see, e.g., F. De Robertis, *La espropriazione per pubblica utilità nel diritto romano*, Roma 1972 (reprint, orig. 1936 Bari), 73–77. There is a thorough commentary on this passage in Dyck 576–578, but without expressing an opinion on the kind of building the controversy concerns.

<sup>39</sup> For a discussion, see Frier 1980, 32–34.

<sup>40</sup> Thus Frier 1978, 1; Frier 1980, 24.

As we have seen, Caelius is among those known to have lived in rental property in Rome. He is not the only tenant with an entry under *domus* in the *LTUR* II. For Aemilius Lepidus Porcina, *cos.* 137 B.C. (p. 26), the sole reference to his habitation states that he was censured because he paid too high a rent for his house (Vell. 2,10,1). E. Papi rightly comments that we are dealing with a "locazione". But here we are dealing with a *domus*, and since the landlord is unknown, we receive an additional reason for including the building as a *domus* under Porcina's name (another possible reason being an interest in rental prices).

The situation is different when dealing with rented apartments, *cenacula*. Archaeological investigations in Ostia show, as does a study of the best-known ancient high-rise building in Rome (that below the stairs leading to S. Maria in Aracoeli),<sup>41</sup> that very often the groundplan of a building, which is frequently all that remains, does not reflect the spatial division of the upper floors. This unfortunately means that there is rarely any chance of identifying an apartment mentioned in our literary sources, even though archaeologists might stumble upon the foundations of the very building.<sup>42</sup> Should inhabitants of flats still be recorded in a topographical dictionary? Perhaps, again, individual cases must be judged on their own merits. Some tenants have been included in the *LTUR* (under *domus*), others have not. The following list of tenants relies heavily on Frier's *Landlords and Tenants*:<sup>43</sup>

Aelii Lamiae, a senatorial family (Cic. ad Q. fr. 2,3,7)

Ancarenus Nothus (CIL VI 7193a)

L. Annaeus Seneca, the philosopher (PIR<sup>2</sup> A 617)<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> J.E. Packer, "La casa di via Giulio Romano", *BCAR* 81 (1968–1969) [1972] 127–148.

<sup>42</sup> For this aspect see Frier 1980, 13–15. The same would seem to hold true for the plans of buildings in the Severan *Forma Urbis*.

<sup>43</sup> See Frier 1980, 41–45. The sources contain more references to anonymous upper-class tenants.

<sup>44</sup> Frier's interpretation of Sen. epist. 56,1. 4 to mean that Seneca rented lodgings in Rome near the Meta Sudans – also pointing at the term *migratio* in epist. 56,15 typically used by tenants who abandon their leaseholds – has not been favoured by other scholars due to the mention of that very monument in the passage. The letter is commonly thought

C. Avianius Evander, a famous sculptor (Cic. fam. 13,2)

L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, *cos.* 58 B.C. (RE III Calpurnius 90) (Cic. Pis. 61)

L. Cornelius Sulla the dictator, *cos.* 88 B.C. (RE IV Cornelius 392). Sulla lived on rent in the beginning; he paid 3,000 *sestertii* yearly for his abode, while above him lived a freedman who paid 2,000 (Plut. Sull. 1).

Gabba, court jester under Augustus (RE VII.1, 418–419) (Quint. inst. 6,3,64)

D. Iunius Iuvenalis, the satirist<sup>45</sup>

Novius, a neighbour of Martial (Mart. 1,86)<sup>46</sup>

Paulus, the Apostle (Act. ap. 28,30)

Q. Tullius Cicero (and family) (Cic. ad Q. fr. 2,3,7)

L. Valerius Martialis, the poet (PIR<sup>1</sup> V 77)<sup>47</sup>

A. Vitellius, *cos. ord.* A.D. 48, the future emperor (PIR<sup>1</sup> V 499) (Suet. Vit. 7,2).

to describe a surrounding at Baiae, while Rome's Meta Sudans is dated to the Flavians, after Seneca's death. But the excavator of the remains of the area of the Meta Sudans, Clementina Panella, now argues that quite possibly there was a Neronian antecedent to the Flavian Meta, and that Seneca once lived as its neighbour, see C. Panella, "La valle del Colosseo nell'antichità", *BollArch* 1–2 (1990), 34–88, esp. 60–62; eadem, "Meta Sudans", *LTUR* III, 1996, 248.

Eck in *LTUR* II, 31 takes Sen. epist. 83,5. 7 to mean that Seneca lived in a *domus* with a bath, not too far from the Circus Maximus.

<sup>45</sup> That Juvenal lived on rent is clear also from the entry under "domus" in *LTUR* II, 124–125 (R. Rodríguez Almeida).

<sup>46</sup> The Novius of Mart. 1,86 is not explicitly mentioned in the *LTUR*, but the tacit assumption of E. Rodríguez Almeida (*LTUR* II, 145) is that he is identical to (Novius) Vindex in Mart. 9,43,14 and 9,44,1, since Novius Vindex' house is by Rodríguez Almeida located next to Martial's. That topographical information appears only in Mart. 1,86. The identity is not likely, and in any case, the context in 1,86 makes it very likely that we are dealing with a *cenaculum*, see Frier 1980, 44; P. Howell, *A Commentary on Book One of the Epigrams of Martial*, London 1980, 290–291.

<sup>47</sup> The sources adduced by Frier 1980, 44 for Martial's living, more numerous than those cited in the *LTUR* entry, make it clear that Martial at least at some point lived in a rented flat. This is not the right place for discussing the evidence in detail, but it ought to be done.

**APPENDIX: additional literary sources for entries on *domus* included in *LTUR* II**

domus: T. Annius Milo: add. Cic. Mil. 24 and 38 (the former reference is mentioned elsewhere, on p. 89)

domus: M. Antonius triumvir: add. Cic. Phil. 1,2.

domus: Appuleius Saturninus. He died in 100 B.C., not 99. The reference to Orosius should be hist. 5,17,6, not 5,17,8–10.

domus: Baebius Tamphilus. There is no entry for Baebius. One must look under "domus: Tamphiliana" (whither there is no reference), whence we are directed to "domus: T. Pomponius Atticus": add Cic. Att. 13,45,1.

domus: Q. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus *cos.* 109 B.C.: add Oros. hist. 5,17,3.

domus: P. Clodius Pulcher: add Cic. Phil. 2,48

domus: P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus Aemilianus: not "nominata unicamente" in Liv. perioch. 72; add Cic. Mil. 16.

domus: Germanici: add Tac. ann. 4,68.

domus: M. Licinius Crassus *cos.* 70 B.C.: add Plut. Cic. 8 and 15.

domus: M. Livius Drusus *trib. pleb.* 91 B.C.: add Val. Max. 3,1,2; Plut. Cat. Mi. 2,1. 3.

domus: L. Lucceius: add Cic. Cael. 54.

domus: C. Marius (2): not mentioned "solo da Plutarco (Mar. 32)"; add Plut. Sull. 8.

domus: M. Pomponius *trib. pleb.* 362 B.C.: not "nominata unicamente da Valerio Massimo", add Liv. 7,5,3.

domus: M. Porcius Cato Uticensis: add App. BC 2,99; Lucan. 2,238. 327.

domus: L. Tarquinius Priscus: add Liv. 1,39,5.

domus: M. Tullius Cicero: add Cic. Cael. 18.