

MARY TALIAFERRO BOATWRIGHT

HADRIAN AND THE CITY OF ROME



PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

MCM · LXXXVII

CHAPTER ONE

THE PRINCEPS AND THE CITY

HADRIAN was directly and personally interested in the workings and welfare of the city of Rome. Augustus had established the principle that the improvement and embellishment of the capital city was the responsibility of the princeps, and should not be left, as it had been under the republic, to the whims and fortunes of Rome's political elite.¹ Yet one must not assume without corroboration that Hadrian followed that precedent as had most of the intervening emperors, particularly given the facts that he spent more than half his rule in travels outside of Rome, that he moved the imperial (summer) residence out of the city, and that he is alleged to have died hated by the people of Rome (e.g., Dio Cass. 69.23.2; *HA*, *Hadr.* 25.7, 24.3–5, 27.2, *Pii* 2.4–6).² We lack for Hadrian's rule any document such as the *Res Gestae* of Augustus, in which he proclaims his personal responsibility for and pride in the renovation of Rome.³ Nor do Hadrian's biography, the later epitomes, or Dio's

¹ Although G. Bodei Giglioni (in *Lavori pubblici e occupazione nell'antichità classica* [Bologna 1974] 137–39) stresses that during the triumviral period and later Octavian had pressed his peers to undertake financial responsibility for the execution of public works (cf. Suet. *Aug.* 29.4), Gros, *Aurea Templa* 37–38, rightly notes that the works he delegated to them were never as important as the ones Augustus undertook himself. After Augustus' monumental building in Rome was generally left to the imperial family (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 3.72.1–2). For the "beneficent princeps" principle, see, e.g., Z. Yavetz, *Plebs and Princeps* (Oxford 1969) 131–39; and H. Kloft, *Liberalitas Principis* (Cologne 1970) 115–18, 166–70, with particular regard to building in Rome. P. A. Brunt, "Free Labour and Public Works at Rome," *JRS* 70 (1980) 85, articulates the skeptical view that although "[e]mpersors like Augustus frequently take credit for the erection of new buildings . . .

[i]t seems improbable, and is certainly not recorded, that they engaged in personal supervision of the work." For public building and maintenance during the republic, see D. E. Strong, "The Administration of Public Building during the Late Republic and Early Empire," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London* 15 (1968) 97–103.

² For the journeys and Rome's reaction to them, see Chapter 5; for the early and late years of the reign, see Chapters 3 and 6.

³ Gros, *Aurea Templa* 15–52, esp. 44, uses this and the contemporary evidence of poets and others to establish Augustus' primary concern with the physical and moral renewal of Rome, a theme brilliantly elaborated by P. Zanker in the Jerome Lectures of 1984, "A Cultural Program for the Roman Empire: Art and Architecture in the Augustan Age" (publication forthcoming).

Except for his administrative reform (which may incidentally account for Hadrian's reputation for meddlesomeness: Dio Cass. 69.5.1; cf. *HA*, *Hadr.* 11.4), Hadrian seems to have taken care to respect the political and social prerogatives of the senate while making the government more efficient (cf. Dio Cass. 69.7).³⁵ Indeed, Hadrian's building activity in the capital city involved large segments of the upper classes, without whom Rome and the empire could not function. The senatorial and equestrian ranks benefited indirectly by means of their possession as rentiers of the *figlinae* around Rome from which bricks and tiles were made.³⁶ They certainly also profited from the quarrying and transport of marble and other materials to Rome, from engineering contracts, and from their control of mines and foundries. Yet the traditional scorn evinced by the upper classes toward commerce (affirmed even in the laws against demolition cited above) makes it unlikely that these benefits were ever explicitly spelled out.³⁷

Hadrian's building programs also directly involved the senatorial class in a distinctly honorable way. The construction of temples and public buildings in Rome was traditionally within the purview of the senate: although a republican general or a princeps might vow an edifice, customarily approval by the senate had to be decreed before anything could be constructed or restored (cf. Suet. *Tib.* 30.1). The senate's power in this sphere was grounded in its control of the finances of the republican state, and whereas as a rule Augustus and his successors financed their buildings from the imperial fiscus, the senate continued to exercise its right to approve such construction.³⁸ Thus, for ex-

the right side, is produced by Valentini and Zucchetti, 1.37–47, who also discuss its find-spot on the Capitoline. Palmer (1975) 82, suggests that "Hadrian was honored [by the dedicants of the base] because he had partially lifted from the magistri vicorum the contribution toward *venationes* [combats of wild beasts], which had become a heavier burden when the superintendence of the regions was transferred from aristocratic magistrates to the lowborn *curatores*"; this assumes his earlier argument that *venationes* given at the Ludi Augustales were to be at least partially financed by the *magistratus vicorum*: (1974) 286–88; (1975) 78.

³⁵ For example, Garzetti, 402–403.

³⁶ Steinby, "Ziegelstempel" 1514–15; P. Setälä, *Private Domini in Roman Brick Stamps of the Empire* (Helsinki 1977) 210–29, 242–44;

T. Helen, *Organization of Roman Brick Production in the First and Second Centuries A.D.: An Interpretation of Roman Brick Stamps* (Helsinki 1975) 22–23; and E. Champlin, "Figlinae Marcianae," *Athenaeum* 71 (1983) 258. See also Steinby, "Edilizia" 220–21.

³⁷ J. H. D'Arms, *Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge, Mass. and London 1981) 149–71, citing for upper class involvement in profitable commerce, e.g., J. B. Ward-Perkins, "The Marble Trade and Its Organization: Evidence from Nicomedia," in *The Seaborne Commerce of Ancient Rome*, ed. by J. H. D'Arms and E. C. Kopff (Rome 1980) 325–36.

³⁸ F. J. Hassel, *Der Trajansbogen in Benevent* (Mainz 1966) 2 nn. 6, 7, lists the imperial monuments and statues, erected with senatorial approval, that are known from inscrip-

ample, the senate's participation in the Temple of Venus and Roma is marked by the presence of both *SPQR* and (*Ex*) *S.C.* on coins showing the *aedes* (see Chapter 4), and the dedicatory inscription of the Temple of the Deified Trajan and Plotina erected by Hadrian begins *Ex S.C.* (*CIL* 6.31215 and 966; cf. *HA*, *Hadr.* 6.1, and Chapter 3).

In other ways as well the senate's involvement with almost every aspect of Roman religion committed it to involvement in Hadrian's building programs in the city. A prerequisite for the Temple of the Deified Trajan and Plotina and for the Temple of the Deified Matidia was official deification. This could be obtained only by senatorial decree.³⁹ The Hadrianic restoration of Vespasian's pomerium was also undertaken by senatorial decree, although, as we shall see in Chapter 2, one that came on Hadrian's initiative.

Such religious responsibilities of the senate, often overlooked in histories of the principate, demanded the collaboration of this body with Hadrian. In this light, it may be significant that most surviving Hadrianic buildings in Rome are religious rather than secular. Some of these, the Temples of Venus and Roma and of the Bona Dea and the Auguratorium, the last of which Hadrian restored *sua pecunia* (*CIL* 6.976; cf. Chapter 7), evoked Rome's beginnings and probably appealed to the sentimental traditionalism of the senate; the selection may have been determined through Phlegon's antiquarian researches. Other new or restored buildings, such as the Pantheon, Saepta, Divorum, Temple of the Deified Trajan and Plotina, and Temple of the Deified Matidia, appealed to the senate's reverence of earlier "good" emperors. Although senatorial approval of such constructions strengthened the imperial cult, and thus ultimately the princeps himself, in no case can we discern that Hadrian had to force or attempted to force the senate's hand.

This final group of buildings suggests another motivation for Hadrian's work in the capital: emulation of Trajan. Hadrian's adoptive father had en-

tions; his main argument, however, that *SC* on a dedicatory inscription implies financing by the senate, has been corrected by Leon, *Bauornamentik*, 234. For senatorial cooperation, see, too, H. Bardon, "La Naissance d'un temple," *REL* 33 (1955) 166–82; and J. Stambaugh, "The Functions of Roman Temples," *ANRW* II.16.1 (1978) 558, 564–66. Hirschfeld, *Verwaltungsbeamten* 265–66, less convincingly holds that the senate was consulted only exceptionally. For the vexing question of whether only the imperial family could

erect or renew public buildings from the Augustan period to the fourth century (cf. Tac. *Hist.* 4.9), see P. Veyne, *Le Pain et le cirque* (Paris 1976) 686–89 (although Leon supersedes Veyne's note 405); and n. 39 below.

³⁹ See M. Hammond, *The Antonine Monarchy* (Rome 1959) 203–209 (hereafter Hammond, *AntMon*); for the senate's general supervision over religious matters, including religious buildings, see Brunt, "Role of the Senate" 437–39.

deared himself to the Romans by the magnificence of the complexes for which he took credit, although much of the work was really the completion of enterprises initiated by Domitian.⁴⁰ In part, Trajan's fame as a builder is tied to the survival of contemporary or later praises, such as those of Pliny for his work (cf., e.g., *Pan.* 51.3). Yet the Baths of Trajan, his Forum, and his Markets were splendid and highly useful additions to the city, as was the completed restoration of the Temple of Venus Genetrix and of the Circus Maximus, for example.⁴¹

Many of these constructions and restorations were heavily publicized: we have records of them on Trajanic coinage, in the Fasti Ostienses, and in other inscriptions. Numerous coins showing architecture carry the legend SPQR OPTIMO PRINCIPI, apparently indicating that all of Rome felt it participated in or benefited from the work.⁴² The constructions seem carefully calculated to win and maintain popularity for Trajan in Rome. The Baths and the Circus were aimed to please the population as a whole. The Forum was closely associated with both the military and the civic life of Rome, and with the praetorian prefects in particular. The Markets, with space apparently reserved for the prefect of the *annona* (grain supply) and other administrators, housed central offices for much of the commerce of Rome.⁴³

Trajan's popularity emphasized the importance of imperial building at Rome, and Hadrian followed his lead. Hadrian, too, was interested in more than providing employment, for his villa at Tivoli could and did engage vast numbers of construction workers and artisans. In Rome, however, among his first works were his Temples of the Deified Trajan and of the Deified Matidia, Trajan's niece. Hadrian was also responsible for the basilicae named for Matidia and Marciana, Trajan's sister. The buildings showed that Hadrian was assuming his father's roles, a theme adumbrated by the early Hadrianic coins depicting a phoenix.⁴⁴

More private reasons also impelled Hadrian in his programs in Rome. The sources unanimously agree on Hadrian's passionate fascination with architec-

⁴⁰ In brief, see Garzetti, 330. Blake/Bishop, 10–39, discuss Trajan's buildings in Rome in more detail.

⁴¹ Gullini, "Adriano" 63–80, stresses the urban benefits of Trajan's Forum, Markets, and Baths, though giving much of the credit to Apollodorus.

⁴² Mattingly, *BMC, Emp.* III, pp. lxx–lxxi, for the general honorific significance of this

legend on coins struck in Rome ca. 104–111.

⁴³ For example, Blake/Bishop, 28–29, and J. C. Anderson, Jr., *The Historical Topography of the Roman Imperial Fora* (Brussels 1984) 160–67 (hereafter Anderson, *Hist Top*).

⁴⁴ See, e.g., J. P. Martin, "Hadrien et le phénix. Propagande numismatique," in *Mélanges . . . W. Seston* (Paris 1974) 327–37; Mattingly, *BMC, Emp.* III, p. cxxvii.

ture and other fine arts,⁴⁵ and Dio even attributes the plan of the Temple of Venus and Roma to him, and mentions Hadrian's designs of "pumpkin domes" (69.4.2–6; see Chapter 4). Although we should not use Dio's anecdote as evidence that Hadrian necessarily designed the Pantheon and all the brilliant pavilions and courts of the villa at Tibur and other contemporaneous buildings with segmental domes, the story does affirm Hadrian's taste for such things.⁴⁶

The concern in itself is not at all unusual; Cicero's and Pliny's letters and Pliny the Elder's remarks on the growth of luxury, for example, reveal the interest of the Roman upper classes in the planning and decoration of their houses and of the public buildings they financed and oversaw.⁴⁷ On a larger scale, Vitruvius' address to Augustus is an unequivocal plea for the princeps' personal interest in and respect for the work of a professional architect, whom Vitruvius portrays as a man of liberal education and high ideals rather than simply a builder. A century later, during Trajan's principate, Apollodorus of Damascus commanded supreme respect both in the field, as a military architect, and in Rome, as Trajan's adviser for architectural matters and as a member of the imperial court.⁴⁸ The literary tradition, however, affirms that Hadrian surpassed all his predecessors in his partiality to architecture, sculpture, and painting, for he is said to have practiced these arts actively (e.g., *HA*, *Hadr.* 14.8; *Dio Cass.* 69.3.2).⁴⁹

Although some have argued that Apollodorus must have continued working under Hadrian, we have clear evidence for only one *architectus* who worked in association with the princeps, the Decianus who was commis-

⁴⁵ Besides the references in the text, see *HA*, *Hadr.* 16.10 and *Epit. de Caes.* 14.2. The evidence is sensitively treated by Toynbee, *Hadrianic School* xxiii. Hadrian's interests in literature will be discussed in Chapter 7.

⁴⁶ For example, W. L. MacDonald, *The Pantheon* (Cambridge, Mass. 1976) 12, states: "The architect of the Pantheon . . . [a]lmost certainly . . . was not Hadrian himself . . . [but] there can be no doubt that the conception of the building and the motivating personality behind its creation were Hadrian's." A similar conceptual framework is employed by H. Kähler, in *Hadrian und seine Villa bei Tivoli* (Berlin 1950), hereafter Kähler, *Villa*.

⁴⁷ Some outstanding instances: on the eve of crossing the Rubicon, Caesar studying

plans for a gladiatorial school he was going to build (*Suet. Jul.* 31.1); Cornelius Fronto personally choosing one plan from many submitted to him for a bath (*Aul. Gell. NA* 19.10.2–3). Gros, *Aurea Tempa* 53–77, thoroughly examines the building and decoration of monumental structures in Augustan Rome, and discusses the possible extent of upper-class involvement.

⁴⁸ Vitruvius: P. Gros, "Vitruve, l'architecture et sa théorie, à la lumière des études récentes," *ANRW* II.30.1 (1982) 659–95; and F. E. Brown, "Vitruvius and the Liberal Art of Architecture," *Bucknell Review* 11.4 (1963) 99–107. For Apollodorus, see Leon, *Bauornamentik* 26, with references.

⁴⁹ The recent article of J. Beaujeu, "A-t-il

sioned with the task of moving the colossal statue of Nero (*HA, Hadr.* 19.12). In contrast to Trajan, whose reliance on Apollodorus in his building programs is well known, Hadrian has no real collaborators. This unusual singularity, differing so sharply from the harmonious association of princeps, senate, and court in most activities in the early principate, may account for the silence that shrouds or clouds much of Hadrian's building program for Rome.

Nevertheless, it is clear that for many different reasons and in many ways Hadrian directly participated in the transformation of Rome during his principate. In consideration of the complexities of urban administration today, this conclusion may seem preposterous, but the Roman world is not always analogous to the modern one. The decidedly more personal involvement of the Roman principes in the tasks of governing the Roman world has been mentioned in the introduction. Hadrian was aided in his many bureaucratic tasks by his individual characteristics of organizational skill, which enabled him to create a more efficient and honest bureaucracy, and indefatigable energy, combined with a limitless thirst for knowledge (cf. *Tert. Apol.* 5.7). Yet even Hadrian could never have managed Rome and the empire alone: he needed the cooperation and trust of the senatorial and equestrian classes, and the allegiance of the Roman populace. His building programs in Rome were one way by which he achieved these goals and became one of the most effective emperors of Roman history.

existé une direction des musées dans la Rome impériale?" *CRAI*, 1985, 671–88 (which I read after this book went to press), strengthens my arguments for Hadrian's deep-seated interest in the arts and in the appearance of Rome. From *CIL* 6.10324 (= *ILS* 7213) and other evidence, Beaujeu convincingly suggests that Hadrian appointed a *procurator a pi-*

nacothecis in a temporary position to inventory and rearrange the public collection of works of art in the Campus Martius, in temples, and in the imperial house. Beaujeu associates this Hadrianic work in the Campus Martius with the earlier initiatives of Agrippa and Augustus there.

abbreviated history contain the kind of detail that Suetonius occasionally reports, such as Vespasian's shoveling of the first hod of earth for the reconstruction of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and his rejection of a labor-saving building device on the grounds that it would deprive the Roman populace of work (*Suet. Vesp.* 8.5, 18).⁴ Nevertheless, the evidence for Hadrian's principate, as disparate and deficient as it is, supports the proposition that Hadrian's personal involvement with Rome was broad in its scope and an intense and continuing commitment.

Hadrian's extensive building programs created work for tens of thousands of free men in Rome, although we cannot prove that this was high among his motivations.⁵ After the completion of Trajan's Forum in 113 and Trajan's departure for the Parthian campaigns in 114, monumental building virtually ceased in the city.⁶ Hadrian's projects, some of the largest of which were begun soon after his accession, reemployed huge work forces of both skilled craftsmen responsible for architectural decoration, and unskilled laborers who transported materials, dug foundations, poured concrete, and laid bricks.⁷ Hadrian's individual recognition of the significant role building

⁴ Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius* 119–41, esp. 137, illuminates the unsystematic way in which Suetonius includes material on the imperial administration; his criteria include the relevance of the incident to the individuality of the emperor, and the impact it made on common life.

⁵ See Brunt, "Public Works" 81–100, with comparative figures for work forces in other preindustrial cities during building expansion (pp. 92–93). He convincingly substantiates the traditional view of public works in Rome as a means of securing popular support (and refutes the recent doubts both of L. Casson, in "Unemployment, the Building Trade, and Suetonius, *Vesp.* 18," *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 15 [1978] 43–51, who assumes that slaves did most of the building, and of Bodei Giglioni, who considers Vespasian's expressed policy, noted at the beginning of this chapter, to be an atypical and conscious attempt at economic development: *Lavori pubblici* 175–84). For some detailed evidence substantiating Brunt's conclusions, see M. Steinby, "L'edilizia come industria pubblica e privata," in *Città e architettura* 219–21,

and for a more cautious view of the topic, see J. E. Skydsgaard, "Public Building and Society in Ancient Rome," in *Città e architettura* 223–27.

⁶ Smith, "Grandi Terme" 73–77: during these years Rome lacked both the "Imperial impetus" for more building and money (probably diverted to the war), and Apollodorus also may have been in the east. For stockpiling bricks during this period, see Bloch, *Bolli* 316–20, 113; idem, "Serapeum" 236. In "Apollodorus" 327–30, Heilmeyer's arguments to the contrary are not convincing.

⁷ Leon, *Bauornamentik* 22–25, gives an important and concise overview of the various skilled workers, architects, and contractors involved in imperial projects, as well as discusses the organization of such works (though without figures). Brunt, "Public Works" 83–92, surveys the entire process, including the unskilled labor force. He considers, however, that Hadrian's paramilitary staff of construction workers (see n.8) was only for projects outside of Rome: its notice follows a statement of Hadrian's provincial

played in the economy of Rome is implied by the note of the *Epitome de Caesaribus* crediting him with organizing the workers in the building trades on paramilitary lines (*Epit. de Caes.* 14.5).⁸

The similarities of early Hadrianic decorative work to Trajanic ornament have been used most recently by Leon and Heilmeyer as evidence that Hadrian reemployed already existing schools of sculptors, if not Apollodorus himself, in such buildings as the Pantheon.⁹ Strong and Leon have further tied the notable Asiatic style of later Hadrianic ornament in Rome to the migration west of groups of craftsmen, perhaps from Pergamum.¹⁰ Yet overall in Rome the architectural decoration of Hadrian's buildings is less ornate and less pervasive than that of Domitian's and Trajan's. In part the large scale of many Hadrianic buildings made careful detailing superfluous; there was also a predilection for colored marble rather than fluted columns.¹¹ Furthermore, Hadrianic monuments and remains as preserved in Rome, without ever being at all plain, do not exhibit the extravagant use of sculpture and relief that characterizes Trajan's Forum and the Forum Transitorium.

It seems significant that Hadrian's earliest building projects in the capital made extensive use of concrete with brick facing. The reconstructions of Julio-Claudian buildings and other work in the Campus Martius are almost entirely of this characteristically Roman construction, with the Pantheon the most conspicuous example. Certainly concrete is better suited to the flood-prone Campus Martius than are travertine and tufa (cf. Vitruv. *De Arch.* 2.6.1; Pliny *HN* 35.166); but, as Rakob has said, concrete also requires a mini-

activities. Kienast, "Baupolitik" 399, briefly notes the possibilities for employment Hadrian's programs ensured.

⁸ *Namque ad specimen legionum militarium fabros perpendiculatores architectos genusque cunctum exstruendorum moenium seu decorandorum in cohortes centuriaverat* (for on a military model he arranged in cohorts carpenters, surveyors, architects, and every type of person used in constructing or decorating buildings), noted by, e.g., Bloch, "Serapeum" 237, and Brunt, "Public Works" 83 (who suggests that *perpendiculatores* should be understood as *mensores*).

⁹ Leon, *Bauornamentik*, e.g., 210–32, 236–38, 284; Heilmeyer, *Normalkapitelle* 157–61, 177, 181; idem, "Apollodorus," esp. 330; and see Strong, "Late Ornament" 119–22, who

does not, however, postulate Apollodorus' participation.

¹⁰ Strong, "Late Ornament" 133–40; Leon, *Bauornamentik* 238–43, 284; these and other scholars note the similarity of the architraves of Venus and Roma to those of the Hadrianic Traianeum in Pergamum. See Chapter 4, n. 102.

¹¹ Just before his death, J. B. Ward-Perkins suggested provocatively that in A.D. 132 there was "an official stock-taking in order to determine precisely how much marble was already available in the imperial marble yards of the capital," and that it "would have shown large surpluses of many of the commoner marbles [like Numidian]": "Nicomedia and the Marble Trade," *PBSR* 48 (1980) 26.

mum degree of skill on the part of laborers.¹² Thus, a great number of workers could be employed in projects launched at the onset of Hadrian's rule.

The reorganization of the brick industry must be considered in the light of the enormous increase in building activity that occurred at the beginning of Hadrian's principate. Roman brickmakers habitually stamped bricks and tiles, while still fresh and unfired, with "factory marks" usually containing the name of the *officinator*, or that of the proprietor of the yard, or both. Beginning in Nero's time, consular dating, designation of the year by the eponymous consuls' names, was added to the marks on bricks made outside Rome, but it did not appear on those of Rome until the bricks of M. Rutilius Lupus began to carry it in 110. For more than ten years he seems to have been the only proprietor to use this system, but then in 123 there was a sudden widespread use of consular dating in the products of almost all the *figlinae* (brickyards) of Rome. The practice, however, was sporadic in the next years, until it became more common again in 134. Subsequently, it remained in only intermittent use, until it was abandoned in 164.¹³

Bloch, followed by most scholars, has plausibly suggested that these changes in brick stamping reflect an interest on the part of the imperial government in 123 or slightly earlier.¹⁴ Although we still have no real understanding of how the brick stamps functioned in the brickmaking industry, they probably served as a regulatory measure.¹⁵ The intervention seems to have been confined to 123, for the universal use of consular dating was abandoned after that year (despite the mysterious semiresurgence eleven years later). Hadrian's absence from Rome in 123 does not preclude his involvement. Such a widespread occurrence must have been planned well in advance.

Hadrian's interest in the building industry can also be seen in the notice transmitted in the biography that he prohibited throughout the empire dem-

¹² F. L. Rakob, "Hellenismus in Mittelitalien. Baitypen und Bautechnik," in *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien* 372; for the strength of concrete, see, e.g., Lugli, *Edilizia* I. 392–402.

¹³ Bloch, *Bolli* I, 316–34. The resurgence of consular dating in 134 should not be overemphasized, however: in 123, 240 stamps carried such dating; in 134, 40; and in 135, only 10: M. Steinby, "Ziegelstempel von Rom und Umgebung," *RE, Suppl.* 15 (1978) 1503.

¹⁴ Bloch, *Bolli* 320–27; Steinby, "Ziegelstempel" 1503–1504, and "CronFig" 22; and

Castagnoli, *TRA* 27. Bloch's hypothesis that the intervention was suggested by one of the great "latifondisti" of *figlinae*, M. Annius Vetus, *praefectus urbi* from 121 to 125, has been slightly reinforced by Steinby's work ("CronFig" 80). The merely partial resumption of the practice in 134 argues that this resurgence was not imperially ordered.

¹⁵ Bloch, *Bolli* 324–25; Steinby, "Ziegelstempel" 1504, 1514. Bloch, "Serapeum" 237, suggests that it may well have been associated with a grant of fiscal privileges aimed at intensifying brick production.

olition of houses for the purpose of transferring their materials to another city (*HA, Hadr.* 18.2).¹⁶ More doubtful is his connection with the *SC Acilianum* of 122 (*Dig.* 30.1.41, 43; cf. *Dig.* 18.1.52), which amended and tightened earlier laws against demolishing buildings. Beginning in the late republic, a series of poorly known laws was passed in Italy and in Rome against dismantling buildings, including some that explicitly prohibited demolition for the sake of profit. Until the *SC Acilianum* was passed in 122, the most complete of the laws, the so-called *SC Hosidianum* of about A.D. 44–46 and the *SC Volusianum* of 56, contained a major loophole that made it possible for a testator to benefit his heirs by bequeathing them elements of a building (such as columns or beams) or by leaving instructions in his will for the demolition of buildings he owned.¹⁷ The *senatus consultum* of 122 takes its name from M. Acilius Aviola, one of the consuls of the year. Hadrian was away from the capital at the time, but the biography's note of a similar law passed by him, since it is not corroborated by any other source, may reflect his interest in the better documented *senatus consultum*.

Hadrian himself addressed a letter on 1 March 127 to the citizens of Stratoniceia-Hadrianopolis (Lycia), in which he ordered that a Ti. Claudius Socrates either repair his house there or surrender it to his fellow citizens so that it might not become dilapidated from age and neglect (*FIRA* 1.80 = Smallwood, #453).¹⁸ P. Garnsey sees the laws against demolition and Hadrian's letter as motivated primarily by a concern for the physical aspect of cities,¹⁹ but

¹⁶ Benario, *Commentary* 112, remarks that the costs of transport would make demolition for transportation of the materials to another city uneconomical. We should note, however, that such costs are often overestimated, and that the value of dressed marbles and good building timber must have been high.

¹⁷ For these laws: P. Garnsey, "Urban Property Investment," in *Studies in Roman Property* 133–36; E. J. Phillips, "The Roman Law on the Demolition of Buildings," *Latomus* 32 (1973) 86–95 (p. 95 for the "loophole"); and M. Sargenti, "Due senatoconsulti—politica edilizia nel primo secolo dell'Impero e tecnica normativa," in *Studi in onore di C. Sanfilippo* (Milan 1984) 639–55. Such laws seem to have been applicable in Rome itself only after the end of the republic: E. Gabba, "Considerazioni politiche ed economiche sullo sviluppo urbano in Italia nei se-

coli II e I a.C.," in *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien* 320–21. The *SC Acilianum* is discussed specifically by J. L. Murga, "Sobre una Nueva Clasificación del *aedificium* por Obra de la Legislación Urbanística Imperial," *Iura* 26 (1975) 67ff., which I was unable to obtain; I thank Dr. E. Crifó, however, for calling it to my attention.

¹⁸ Also published in *IGRR* 4.1156a; *SIG* 3rd ed., 2.837; and by L. Robert, in *Hellenica* 6 (1948) 80–84.

¹⁹ Garnsey, "Urban Investment" 133–36; and see J. L. Murga, *Protección a la estética en la Legislación Urbanística del Alto Imperio* (Seville 1976) 36–46. For a reaffirmation of a socio-economic aim of the legislation, that of preserving social peace in times of intense building activity, see Sargenti, "Politica edilizia" 646–47.

even if this were the main inspiration, the laws aided the building industry by encouraging the importation and elaboration of material in cities, including Rome.

In connection with the question of demolition we should note that most Hadrianic construction in Rome did not necessitate any clearing away of existing domestic buildings. The Temple of Matidia and other new buildings in the Campus Martius (see Chapter 2) rose on open public land, and Hadrian's Mausoleum, as we shall see in Chapter 6, was built in imperial gardens. So was the new imperial triclinium in the Horti Sallustiani (see Chapter 5).²⁰ The Temple of Venus and Roma replaced the *vestibulum*, the ceremonial court, of Nero's Golden House (Chapter 4). The only new edifice that may have dislodged Roman households was the Temple of the Deified Trajan and Plotina at the edge of the Campus Martius, but as Chapter 3 shows, even this was probably built on vacant land.²¹

The use of Rome's land for housing seems to have been respected: Hadrian did not sacrifice residential areas for the projects that employed so many of Rome's inhabitants.²² Indeed, the retracing and marking of Rome's *pomerium* (sacred boundary) in 121, which Hadrian initiated (see Chapter 2), seems to have involved the creation of a dike in the Campus Martius that rendered usable for housing and storage buildings land along the Via Lata formerly subject to flooding.

Thus Hadrian's building programs and interventions in Rome had a clear socioeconomic pattern, and it improved life for the unskilled masses of the city. There is other evidence of Hadrian's active concern for Rome's masses. The biography, for example, notes that Hadrian always boasted of his love of the plebs (*fuit et plebis iactantissimus amator, HA, Hadr.* 17.8), and he provided the customary games and spectacles for Rome.²³ In a less conventional move, Hadrian apparently involved himself in the religious and social administration of Rome's neighborhoods.

²⁰ For the confusion of public land and imperial property in Rome, see Millar, *ERW* 621–22: there may have been little or no distinction. Homo, *Urbanesimo* 278–89, discusses the restraints the availability of land imposed on monumental building in Rome. In the third century at least some land in the Campus Martius was in private hands: *HA, SevAlex.* 25.

²¹ Even if this land southeast of the Via Lata were not pomerrial (i.e., public) land, it could

have been acquired for the fiscus when Trajan bought the land for the Forum and Markets.

²² See, e.g., Garnsey, "Urban Investment" 135, on "wasteful and grandiose building projects" in imperial Rome.

²³ For example, Garzetti, 432–33; cf. Dio Cass. 69.6.1, 8.2, 10.1, 16.3; and *HA, Hadr.* 7.12, 19.4 (noting that Hadrian was careful never to take actors or gladiators from Rome), and 23.12.

Since the time of Augustus, the emperor had left the day-to-day control of Rome to others, and the administration of the city had become a source of prestige and pride for the senatorial and equestrian orders. Augustus' reorganization of Rome's urban administration had created numerous senatorial and lower positions that were autonomous or only nominally under the supervision of the consuls. In the clearest example, when in 7 B.C. the city was divided into fourteen regions, the praetors, aediles, and plebian tribunes drew lots for individual regions, which they supervised with equal powers.²⁴ Similarly, consulars became the *curatores aedium sacrarum locorumque publicorum*, *curatores viarum*, and after Tiberius, *curatores alvei Tiberis* (who were to help prevent flooding in Rome).²⁵ The urban prefect, whose duties included supervising the Roman city police, was of the senatorial class, but somewhat paradoxically, he seems to have always had less independence from the princeps than the others. Other important new magistracies in the city—the prefectures of the praetorians, the grain supply, and the *vigiles*—were equestrian offices and closely dependent on the princeps.²⁶

The varied new magistracies, along with those traditionally concerned with the appearance and upkeep of the city, such as the aedilate, conferred status if not great power on their holders even while Augustus set about adorning and renovating Rome. He and subsequent principes paid out of their private funds for most of the public building in Rome, often inscribing the formula *sua impensa* or *sua pecunia* on their constructions or restorations,²⁷ but

²⁴ See S. Panciera, "Tra epigrafia e topografia," *ArchCl* 22 (1970) 146–48, with earlier bibliography; and R.E.A. Palmer, "The *excusatio magisteri* and the Administration of Rome under Commodus," *Athenaeum* 52 (1974) 278 (the second part of this article is published in *Athenaeum* 53 [1975]; reference to the two sections will be by author's name and year). For the close relationship of senate and princeps that was fostered by Augustus, see P. A. Brunt, "The Role of the Senate in the Augustan Regime," *CQ* 34 (1984) 423–44.

²⁵ Most recently, A. E. Gordon, "Q. Ve-
ranus, Consul A.D. 49," *CPCA* II.5 (1952)
257, 279–83, and G. Molisani, "Una dedica
a Giove Dolicheno nell'Isola Tiberina,"
RendLinc, ser. 8, 26 (1971) [1972] 808–11, dis-
cuss the *curatores aedium*. For the *curatores*
viarum, *alvei Tiberis*, and *aedium*, see O.
Hirshfeld, *Die kaiserliche Verwaltungsbeamten*

bis auf Diocletian (Berlin 1905) 205–11, 258–
72; and in general for *curatores* in imperial
Rome, *DizEpig*, II.2, s.v. *Curator*, 1326–29.
For the Augustan period: Brunt, "Role of the
Senate" 439–40.

²⁶ See, e.g., Brunt, "Princeps and Equites"
JRS 73 (1983) 59–61, on the creation of equestrian
prefects in Rome; and in general, see G.
Vitucci, *Ricerche sulla praefectura urbi in età im-
periale* (Rome 1956); A. Passerini, *Le coorti
pretorie* (Rome 1939); H. Pavis d'Escurac, *La
Préfecture de l'annone. Service administratif im-
perial d'Auguste à Constantin* (Rome 1976); and
P.K.B. Reynolds, *The Vigiles of Imperial
Rome* (London 1926).

²⁷ Gros, *Aurea Tempa* 16, citing Wilcken,
"Zu den impensae der Res Gestae," *Sitzungs-
berichte Berliner Akad. Wissenschaft*, 1931,
772f.: Augustus paid from his *patrimonium*
(inheritance) and *manubiae* (money obtained

senators had administrative authority over lesser projects. The consular *curatores aedium sacrarum locorumque publicorum*, for example, oversaw the upkeep of temples and the safeguarding of temple property, and also assigned public land for private dedications.²⁸ The praetors, aediles, and tribunes in charge of the city's regions supervised the building or rebuilding of shrines to the *Lares Augusti compitales* (e.g., *CIL* 6.452: A.D. 109).

An inscription, recently published by S. Panciera, indicates that under Hadrian the emperor himself assumed responsibility for permission to restore compital shrines of the ruler cult in the city's fourteen regions. He was assisted in his task by the prefect of the vigiles, who in turn had two subalterns for each region, a *curator* and a *denuntiator*, both freedmen. This change, which at first sight may seem trivial, was a significant increase in the emperor's involvement in urban administration, albeit relatively short-lived. By the mid-third and possibly as early as the mid-second century, the urban prefect had assumed primary authority over the regions.²⁹ The Hadrianic change seems due to a personal interest on Hadrian's part in neighborhood life rather than to increasing administrative centralization or the concern for the city's beauty and welfare, of which there is evidence in Hadrianic legislation against heavy wheeled traffic and increased penalties against burial of the dead within city limits.³⁰

from the sale of booty). This was not the rule, of course; Nero's Golden House cost the state enormously (*Suet. Nero* 31). Despite the claims of emperors to have built or restored buildings and parts of Rome *sua impensa*, the distinction between their moneys and the state's could not have been very clear: P. A. Brunt, "The 'Fiscus' and Its Development," *JRS* 56 (1966) 75–91; Millar, *ERW* 189–201.

²⁸ Gordon, "Veranius" 280–83, suggests that the two *curatores* may have split these duties. An excellent example of their supervision, which incidentally underscores Hadrian's interest in the city and its beautification, is the statue base inscribed to Sabina, dedicated by the African city of Sabratha, and found in the Forum of Caesar in Rome: (front) *Diva Sabinae Aug(ustae)] Sabrathensis ex Afr[ica]; (side) Iussu imp. Caesaris Traiani/ Hadriani Aug. p. p. / locus adsignat. a Valerio Urbico et/ Aemilio Papo cur. operum locor. / public. ded. Idib. Dec. / P. Cassio Secundo et Nonio Muciano cos.* ([front] To the

deified Sabina Augusta, the people of Sabratha, Africa. [side] By order of [the emperor Hadrian], father of his country: the place assigned by Valerius Urbicus and Aemilius Papus, the supervisors of public works and places, was publicly dedicated on the Ides of December in the consular year of P. Cassius Secundus and Nonius Mucianus: 13 Dec. 138; *NSc*, 1933, 432–34 = *AE* 1934, 146 = Smallwood, #145b).

²⁹ Panciera, "Topografia" 138–51; Palmer (1975) 62–63, 79, 82. For the role of the urban prefect: Palmer (1974) 277–78. Palmer also discusses Hadrian's personal excuse to certain *magistri vicorum* from paying the cost of wild beast hunts: (1974) 285–88; (1975) 57–59 and *passim*.

³⁰ Centralization: the urban prefect, for instance, has duties of the urban praetor and aediles at least as early as Hadrian's reign: Palmer (1974) 275; and Vitucci, *Praefectura urbi* 69–71. Brunt, "Role of the Senate" 436 n. 68, notes that by Hadrian's period the emperor

Other evidence corroborates Hadrian's concern with Rome's populace. The biography notes that Hadrian frequently went among the public and even bathed at the public baths (*HA, Hadr.* 17.5). More important, his trusted freedman P. Aelius Phlegon wrote, among other works, a topographical study of the city.³¹ Nothing remains of this "On the Places in Rome, and the Names by Which They Are Called" (*Suda*, s.v. Phlegon, iv, 745 Adler), but it may have been similar to earlier antiquarian studies of the city's regional history, such as that of Varro. Gros has argued that Varro's antiquarian research was essential to Augustus' building program in Rome;³² such information illuminated Rome's past and the traditions of its neighborhoods, enabling the princeps to build and restore edifices and monuments of high popular appeal. It complemented the drier data on the population and neighborhoods of Rome available in records for grain distribution and similar archives.³³

A fragmentary monument of 136, the Capitoline Base, seems to affirm Rome's reciprocal appreciation. The base, found on the Capitoline in the fifteenth century and now in the Museo dei Conservatori, must have been part of a larger monument. It now carries on its front a dedication to Hadrian by the *magistri vicorum urbis regionum XIIII*; on the right side it lists each *vicus* (neighborhood) and the names of its freedmen curatores, denuntiatores, and four *magistri vicorum* (chief officers of the urban neighborhoods) for regions I, X, and XIII, and on the left, each *vicus* and the names of the corresponding officials in regions XII and XIII (*CIL* 6.975, cf. 31218 = *ILS* 6073 = Smallwood, #146). There is no trace of writing on the back, and no companion piece has ever been found listing officials of other regions. The reason for the dedication is not given; nevertheless, in its list by name of the regions' *vici*, and its annotation of their magistrates' names and status, it is one of our most important documents of Rome's neighborhood life,³⁴ and its date in Hadrian's principate is suggestive.

had assumed formal control of public finance. Legislation: *HA, Hadr.* 22.6 (against wagons) and *Dig.* 47.12.3.5 (strict fines against burying cadavers); cf. Garzetti, 410–11.

³¹ E. Frank, "Phlegon (2)," *RE* 20.1 (1941) 261–64; and *FGrHist* II B, #257, pp. 1159–96. There were many other antiquarians writing at this time, such as Suetonius, who wrote the books *On Rome and Its Customs* and *On Games*. Phlegon and Hadrian were thought to be so close that Hadrian's biography alleges

Phlegon's books were actually written by Hadrian, and that the princeps had Phlegon publish under his own name Hadrian's autobiography: *HA, Hadr.* 16.1.

³² Gros, *Aurea Tempa* 23–24, who notes Augustus' reliance on other antiquarians as well.

³³ For such records, see, e.g., Brunt, "Fiscus," 89–90.

³⁴ A better edition of the dedication and names of the *vici*, as well as a photograph of