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Sabratha, on the coast of Libya 40 km. to the west of modern Tripoli, was founded by Phoenician settlers in the sixth or fifth century B.C. and grew to be a prosperous town during much of the Roman period, though it did not long survive the coming of the Arabs in the seventh century A.D. Today it ranks alongside Lepcis Magna as one of the major classical sites of the region. The modern exploration of the ruins was begun in 1926 during the Italian colonial period and in the ensuing years much of the heart of the town was laid bare. During the period of the British Military Administration immediately after the end of the Second World War, three seasons of work were carried out by a British expedition under the direction of Mr. John Ward-Perkins, Director of the British School at Rome, and of Miss Kathleen Kenyon. The objectives of the expedition were to study some of the buildings exposed by the previous excavators, and by the application of selective excavation to place them within the historical framework of the town’s development. The present volume provides an account of those excavations and of the studies which accompanied them. It is complementary to the several monographs and articles on individual buildings by Italian authors which have been published in the intervening period and combines with them to amplify substantially our understanding of the history of the town.

JOHN BRYAN WARD-PERKINS, MA, CMG, CBE, FBA, FSA was born in 1912 and educated at Winchester College and New College, Oxford, where he studied Literae Humaniores. His archaeological career included a period as assistant in the London Museum under the directorship of Mortimer Wheeler, prior to military service in the Second World War which introduced him to the classical antiquities of North Africa. Subsequently, as Director of the British School at Rome from 1946, he was able to expand his North African interests and to direct excavations and research at Sabratha and Lepcis Magna. An increasing level of involvement in fieldwork in Italy subsequently eclipsed these researches, of which only certain aspects were published during his lifetime. Of his many publications, his writings on Roman architecture and urbanism are the best known. Mr. Ward-Perkins retired in 1974 and died after a long illness in 1981.

DAME KATHLEEN MARY KENYON, MA, DBE, FBA, FSA was born in 1906 and was educated at St. Paul’s Girls School and Somerville College, Oxford, where she studied history. Her early years in
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Sabratha 1948, the excavation team, showing in the centre of the front row (left to right) Giacomo Caputo (standing), Kathleen Kenyon, John Ward-Perkins (behind column-shaft) and Olwen Brogan (seated).
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Arabic Summary
This volume is published in Great Britain with the agreement of the Department of Antiquities of the Libyan Arab Republic, which retains all rights beyond the present edition of 750 copies. It is based on three seasons of field work carried out in 1948, 1949 and 1951 at Sabratha in Tripolitania, Libya, under the direction of Miss (later Dame) Kathleen Kenyon, then of the London Institute of Archaeology, and Mr J.B. Ward-Perkins, as Director of the British School at Rome. The field work consisted mainly of stratigraphic excavation designed to establish and date the significant phases of the history of the site. It was seen as complementary to the earlier clearance of the central area of the Roman town by Italian scholars, and as an essential preliminary to an account of Sabratha from its Punic origins to its disappearance with the Arab conquest. It was completed as planned. Two associated undertakings, the collection of inscriptions and of Christian antiquities, were published; but almost immediately after the third excavation season other tasks began to preoccupy the directors – Miss Kenyon in particular was under pressure to carry out excavations which it seemed to her impossible to postpone without permanent loss of the evidence that they could yield. In consequence only a small part of the written report on Sabratha had reached even draft stage at the dates of their unexpectedly early deaths, Miss Kenyon’s in 1978 and Mr. Ward-Perkins’ in 1981. By 1981, however, Mr. Ward-Perkins had made arrangements for Dr. Philip Kenrick to prepare Miss Kenyon’s material for publication, with sponsorship and funding from the Society for Libyan Studies (which gratefully received grants in aid from the British Academy and the Russell Trust, and was provided with office space by the University of Reading). Dr. Kenrick was of course expecting to work in association with Mr. Ward-Perkins, whose memory of the excavations remained very sharp; in the event he had no such help, and has had to assume responsibility for Mr. Ward-Perkins’ notes as well as for Miss Kenyon’s.

It is never easy to work from the notes of others, which rarely convey all that was in their minds. In this case, moreover, new information has come to light in the meantime which, to some extent, shifts the focuses of interest and requires modification of the interpretations envisaged in the fifties, when the two excavators were discussing their researches publicly. Thus, among many relevant advances in archaeological knowledge, the dated sequence of North African pottery, whose establishment from the Sabratha finds was a main concern in 1951, has been achieved already from other evidence; several important Sabrathian buildings excavated by Italian scholars in the thirties have now been published, with discussions that offer facts and views which must be taken into account; there has also been a little new excavation on the site by Professor Antonino Di Vita, whose findings include material suggesting that there was serious earthquake damage there on a number of occasions in the Roman period.

Dr. Kenrick has had to discover the evidence for the British excavations, at which he was not present, from records made more than thirty years ago (and, incidentally, to do so without opportunity to check anything on the ground); in addition, to interpret it in the light of present-day interests and knowledge. Using chiefly the field notes and section drawings, the architects’ drawings and the fine pottery, he has produced a remarkably clear and convincing
account of the work done and of the new light that it still throws on the history of Sabratha. It is not, in every respect, what we thought might be emerging in 1951 – it shows, for instance, that there was more urban development in the Punic period than was then suspected and a good deal of building undertaken in the Roman period as a result of earthquake damage, a possibility not then appreciated at all. But in 1986 the original field directors would certainly have recognised these and other new factors, and absorbed them into their thinking. The Society is happy to offer the volume as a good and useful return for the time, energy and money expended in the past. It is grateful to Mr. Hafed Walda for making the Arabic summary. It wishes to express very warm thanks to the Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies for undertaking publication and for contributing to its cost from the Donald Atkinson Fund, to the British School at Rome, the Russell Trust, the Classical Faculty of the University of Cambridge, New College, Oxford and Merton College, Oxford for financial assistance with it.

The Society hopes to have a second and final volume of the Sabratha Report (concerned mainly with the coarse pottery) ready for press in about three years; it is in active preparation by Mr. John Dore, again under its sponsorship and with its funds, this time with provision of space by the University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

Joyce M. Reynolds
President, Society for Libyan Studies
LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 1  Pre-Roman structures beneath the centre of the Roman town ..... facing p. 12
Fig. 2  The Forum: plan of excavations, including the transverse portico across the east end ..... facing p. 13
Fig. 3  The East Forum Temple and surrounding precinct: plan of excavations, showing structures beneath the Period V transverse portico across the west end ..... facing p. 13
Fig. 4  Schematic plan of Forum Period Ia with East Forum Temple Period I ..... 14
Fig. 5  Schematic plan of Forum Period Ib with East Forum Temple Period II ..... 22
Fig. 6  Schematic plan of Forum and East Forum Temple, Period III ..... 25
Fig. 7  Schematic plan of Forum and East Forum Temple, Periods IVA, IVB, V and VI ..... 28
Fig. 8  Plan of early structures at the west end of the south forum portico ..... 35
Fig. 9  Amphorae found in the pit in section AF-AG ..... 45
Fig. 10  Sections on the north side of the East Forum Temple ..... facing p. 50
Fig. 11  Sections at the east end of the East Forum Temple ..... facing p. 51
Fig. 12  Key to conventions used in figures 10, 11, 13-17 ..... 51
Fig. 13  Sections on the south side of the East Forum Temple ..... facing p. 52
Fig. 14  Sections at the junction of the Forum and East Forum Temple ..... facing p. 53
Fig. 15  Sections at the northern junction of the Forum and East Forum Temple ..... 53
Fig. 16  Sections across the Forum ..... facing p. 54
Fig. 17  Sections at the west end of the Forum and against the Capitolium ..... facing p. 55
Fig. 18  Comparative axonometric reconstructions of the East Forum Temple in Periods I and II ..... 56
Fig. 19  Suggested ground-plan of the East Forum Temple in Period I ..... 58
Fig. 20  Suggested front elevation of the East Forum Temple in Period I ..... 59
Fig. 21  Reconstruction of part of the entablature of the East Forum Temple in Period I ..... 60
Fig. 22  Suggested ground-plan of the East Forum Temple in Period II, showing both the Period I footings and the Period II additions ..... 62
Fig. 23  Suggested front elevation of the East Forum Temple in Period II ..... 63
Fig. 24  East Forum Temple: reconstruction of capital and base of the main order of the temple in Period II ..... 64
Fig. 25  Reconstruction of the entablature of the East Forum Temple in Period II ..... 65
Fig. 26  East Forum Temple: details of the Period II colonnades in the surrounding porticoes ..... 66
Fig. 27  The Forum Basilica/Church I: general plan ..... facing p. 69
Fig. 28  Basilica, schematic plan of Period I ..... 70
Fig. 29  Basilica, profile of Period II plinth lining the walls of the Period I tribunal ..... 73
Fig. 30  Basilica and Cruciform Building, schematic plan of Period II ..... 75
Fig. 31  Details of excavations in the Basilica ..... 76
Fig. 32  Basilica and Cruciform Building, schematic plan of Period IIIa ..... 81
Fig. 33  Capital and base from the portico of the South Forum Temple, re-used in the nave of the Basilica in Period IV (and IIIP). ..... 83
Fig. 34  Basilica/Church I and Cruciform Building, schematic plan of Period IIIb ..... 84
Fig. 35  Basilica/Church I and Cruciform Building, schematic plan of Period IV ..... 86
Fig. 36  The Cruciform Building: plan and sections, actual state ..... 88
Fig. 37  The Cruciform Building: schematic plans of successive phases ..... 89
Fig. 38  The Cruciform Building: alternative possibilities for the form of the vaulting ..... 91
Fig. 39  The Cruciform Building: reconstructed plan and cross-section ..... facing p. 92
Fig. 40  The Cruciform Building: reconstructed longitudinal section ..... facing p. 93
Fig. 41  The Cruciform Building: order of the aediculae ..... 93
Fig. 42  Reconstructed front elevation of the Cruciform Building, with cross-section of the south forum portico and the Basilica ..... facing p. 94
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 43</td>
<td>The Capitolium: plan, actual state (1948)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 44</td>
<td>The Capitolium, Period II: hypothetical perspective view, drawn in 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 45</td>
<td>The Capitolium: suggested plans (A) Period I, (B) Period II additions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 46</td>
<td>The Capitolium, Period I: hypothetical front elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 47</td>
<td>The Capitolium, Period I: hypothetical side elevation, with detail of surviving base-moulding of podium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 48</td>
<td>The Capitolium: possible superstructures in Period II implied by the surviving features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 48bis.</td>
<td>Plan of the Capitolium at Abthugni, Tunisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 49</td>
<td>The Capitolium, Period II: hypothetical front elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 50</td>
<td>The Capitolium, Period II: hypothetical side elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 51</td>
<td>The Capitolium, Period II: architectural details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 52</td>
<td>The Capitolium: south elevation and longitudinal section, actual state (1948)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 53</td>
<td>The North West Forum Temple (Temple of Serapis?), plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 54</td>
<td>Regio II, Insula 5: plan of excavations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 55</td>
<td>Regio II, Insula 5, sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 56</td>
<td>Regio II, Insulae 6 and 7, general plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 57</td>
<td>Regio II, Insula 6: plan of excavations, showing numbering of walls and locations of sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 58</td>
<td>Regio II, Insula 6, schematic plan of Periods I and II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 59</td>
<td>Regio II, Insula 6, schematic plan of Period III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 60</td>
<td>Regio II, Insula 6, schematic plan of Period IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 61</td>
<td>Regio II, Insula 6, schematic plan of Period V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 62</td>
<td>Regio II, Insula 6: section N-O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 63</td>
<td>Regio II, Insula 6: sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 64</td>
<td>Regio II, Insula 7: sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 65</td>
<td>Regio II, Insula 7: plan of excavations, showing numbering of walls and locations of sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 66</td>
<td>General plan of Regio II, Insula 10, showing the location of the 'Casa Brogan' excavations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 67</td>
<td>The Casa Brogan, schematic plan of Periods I and Ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 68</td>
<td>The Casa Brogan, schematic plan of Period II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 69</td>
<td>The Casa Brogan, schematic plan of Period IIIb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 70</td>
<td>The Casa Brogan, schematic plan of developments in Period IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 71</td>
<td>The Casa Brogan, schematic plan of Period V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 72</td>
<td>The Casa Brogan, schematic plan of developments in Periods VI and VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 73</td>
<td>The Casa Brogan, schematic plan of Period VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 74</td>
<td>The Casa Brogan, plan of the Period VIII mosaics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 75</td>
<td>The Casa Brogan, schematic plan of Period IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 76</td>
<td>The Casa Brogan: general plan of excavations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 77</td>
<td>The Casa Brogan, sections (1): north and west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 78</td>
<td>The Casa Brogan: key to locations of sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 79</td>
<td>The Casa Brogan, sections (2): central area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 80</td>
<td>The Casa Brogan, sections (3): 'cellar' and outlying trenches to south and east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 81</td>
<td>Excavations to south and east of the Antonine Temple: location plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 82</td>
<td>Sections and plan of trench Y3-4 across the street on the south side of the Antonine Temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 83</td>
<td>Sketch-plan of excavations beneath the temenos of the Antonine Temple in 1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 84</td>
<td>Fine wares from Pit 2 in trench Y3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 85</td>
<td>Fine wares and lamps from Pit 2 in Trench Y3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 86</td>
<td>Amphorae from Pit 2 in trench Y3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 87</td>
<td>Coarse-ware bowls from Pit 2 in trench Y3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 88</td>
<td>Coarse wares from Pit 2 in trench Y3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 89</td>
<td>Coarse wares from Pit 2 in trench Y3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 90</td>
<td>Plan and section of trench N1, behind the Antonine Temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 91</td>
<td>Pottery from phase 5 in trench N1, associated with the construction of the Antonine Temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 92</td>
<td>Coarse wares from phase 5 in trench N1, associated with the construction of the Antonine Temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 93</td>
<td>Plan of the Severan Monument and the adjacent sandstone base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 94</td>
<td>Severan Monument and sandstone base: architectural fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 95</td>
<td>The Severan Monument: hypothetical reconstruction of the base and dedicatory inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 96</td>
<td>The Severan Monument: excavated sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 97</td>
<td>Site S: plan of excavations and visible structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 98</td>
<td>Site S: section between Regio IV, Insula 11 and the theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 99</td>
<td>Plan of excavations against the Byzantine defensive wall in Regio II, Insula 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 100</td>
<td>Section across the Byzantine defensive wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 101</td>
<td>Plan and section of the South Gate of the Byzantine defences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 102</td>
<td>The Byzantine defences: East Gate and South–West Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 103</td>
<td>Section across the main coast road at Site M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 104 Regio II, Insulae 2 and 3, plan ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ......
LIST OF PLATES

Plate 8
(a) The surviving steps of the Period II East Forum Temple
(b) Forum: drain-head in street on south side of Capitolium
(c) Forum: drain-head in street on north side of Capitolium, and channel running towards north forum portico
(d) East Forum Temple: re-built west wall of south portico from the inside

Plate 9
(a) East Forum Temple, south-west corner of precinct: re-built west wall (on right), showing butt-joint in upper courses with front wall of Period IV tabernae
(b) East Forum Temple: transverse portico from the south
(c) Late well against the rear wall of the East Forum Temple

Plate 10
(a) Forum: section AH-AJ, looking north from the south portico stylobate and showing Christian graves
(b) Forum: grave in south portico, showing traces of wooden coffin
(a) Forum: grave XXVI before opening
(b) Forum: grave XXVI

Plate 11
(a) Forum: Period Ib cisterns at the south-west angle. Entrance to Cruciform Building on right, north-west angle of early Basilica in centre background
(b) East Forum Temple: section A-B from the north, showing (in receding order) the foundations of the early city wall, a pier-base of the Ionic colonnade in the west face of the trench, the pre-forum walls D3.6 and D3.7 and the foundations of the north portico stylobate
(c) Forum: amphorae found in situ in the pit in section AF-AG

Plate 12
(a) Forum: Period Ib cisterns at the south-west angle. Entrance to Cruciform Building on right, north-west angle of early Basilica in centre background
(b) East Forum Temple: section A-B from the north, showing (in receding order) the foundations of the early city wall, a pier-base of the Ionic colonnade in the west face of the trench, the pre-forum walls D3.6 and D3.7 and the foundations of the north portico stylobate
(c) Forum: amphorae found in situ in the pit in section AF-AG
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(b) Attic black-glazed pottery: no. 90
Plate 64
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CHAPTER I
GENERAL INTRODUCTION
(P.M.K.)

'The purpose of this volume is to present, in a readily accessible form, the town-plan of Roman Sabratha, together with such other material as is most necessary for its interpretation as a historical document. It records the results of two very different phases of research. The Italian excavations, planned on a very large scale and undertaken with large resources, were primarily topographical in intention. Between 1925 and 1942, three successive Superintendents of Antiquities, Renato Bartoccini, Giacomo Guidi and Giacomo Caputo, cleared and substantially restored some twenty acres in the heart of the ancient city. But the pressure of this and of the even more spectacular excavations at Lepcis Magna proved too much for the resources of a small scientific staff; and little of it had been fully recorded, and still less published, when the work was interrupted by the Second World War. After 1943, the Department of Antiquities decided to suspend large-scale excavations and to concentrate the modest funds available on the upkeep and restoration of the buildings already excavated; and the British School at Rome was invited to help in making good the gaps in the scientific record. The programme of excavation and of survey, undertaken by the School between 1948 and 1951, was thus complementary to that of its predecessors. By carefully controlled stratigraphic excavation of a number of sites within the area already cleared, it aimed to establish a secure chronological framework for the development and decline of the town and of some of the more important individual buildings; and it aimed to record in permanent form as much as possible of the results of the previous excavations, and in particular of those cleared by Guidi and left unrecorded after his death. In the twenty years that have passed since many of the buildings were first uncovered, much has already been lost, and more is disappearing daily, as a result of the combined action of atmospheric salts and of wind-blown sand on the soft, friable sandstone of which the greater part of the town is built.'

* * * *

The preceding paragraph, written evidently some years ago by John Ward-Perkins, is all that existed by way of an introduction to the report when it came into the hands of the present writer in 1982. The excavations of 1948–1951 were under the joint direction of Mr. Ward-Perkins, at the time Director of the British School at Rome, and of Miss (later Dame) Kathleen Kenyon. Mr. Ward-Perkins (hereafter JBWP) concerned himself principally with the architectural studies and with broad questions of the town's development; the actual excavations were under the direction of Miss Kenyon (hereafter KMK), and responsibility for their interpretation and for the study of the finds therefore devolved principally upon her.
The 1948 season was conceived partly as a training excavation, and included students from Oxford, Cambridge and London Universities. The work carried out in 1949 was on a much smaller scale, with fewer personnel and devoted essentially to the further investigation of certain problems raised by the discoveries of the previous season. Following this, KMK spent several months in the British School at Rome in 1950, and collaborated with JBWP on the interpretation and writing-up of the Forum area and of the ‘Casa Brogan’ (Regio II, Insula 10, House G). It was apparent that substantial traces of the pre-Roman town might be found beneath the insulae to the north of the Forum (Regio II, Insulae 6–7) and it was with the specific intention of investigating this area that a larger expedition was again mounted in 1951. On this occasion the work was directed entirely by KMK, as JBWP was engaged on survey work and excavations at Lepcis Magna.

The finds from the excavations were divided equally between the Libyan Government (at that time under British Military Administration) and the excavators, and half of them were therefore brought back to the United Kingdom for study.

The study of the pottery was carried on intermittently during the succeeding years by KMK, with the help of various voluntary assistants (notably Molly Cotton and Olwen Brogan), and with the paid assistance in 1972–73 of Dr. Tony McNicholl. When KMK died in 1978 it was stored at her home at Rose Hill, near Wrexham, whence it was removed to the University of Southampton, which generously undertook to house it on behalf of the Society for Libyan Studies.

The situation in 1982

The writer was appointed by the Council of the Society for Libyan Studies in 1982 to complete the preparation of the report, and the text which follows is based on the documentation and the objects available at that time. The nature of this documentation varied for different excavation areas: in some cases a draft typescript had been prepared together with sections and plans, whereas in others there were only the site notebooks and the original site drawings. The material upon which the report is based is described briefly at the head of each section.

The study of the finds

Some general comment is appropriate here concerning the finds, and particularly the pottery, which is by far the largest category. First of all, it is impossible to provide any reliable quantitative evidence. Some of the pottery was certainly discarded on site, and more was discarded later: there is no record of the principles upon which this was carried out. That which was retained was carefully catalogued, and as each sherd was numbered it is still possible to relate the objects to these catalogue entries. However, the original trench-and-layer designations were replaced by interpretative groupings of material into stratigraphic sequences, sometimes involving large areas and many trenches. The catalogue is based on these larger groups and the original marks on the sherds are now often illegible, or in many cases have been deliberately obliterated. This has the serious disadvantage that where failures of stratigraphy are evident from the presence of intrusive material, it is no longer possible to pin-point precisely where the intrusions were found, and so the testimony of a much larger body of material may be vitiated in consequence. For the same reason, it is useless to question the excavator’s detailed interpretation of the stratigraphy, for the marks on the sherds now relate exclusively to that interpretation. There is therefore a recurrent element of uncertainty in the comments on the dating-evidence, and where this occurs it is noted, though it has rarely been possible to pursue its implications.

The dating-evidence quoted in the report has been provided entirely by the present writer. There was no reference to absolute chronology in the stratigraphic reports (where they existed), presumably because these accounts were written before the study of the finds had been undertaken. A great deal of work was done on the pottery (at least) over the years and both preliminary and, in some cases, final typologies were prepared for most categories. However, the style and content of these sections was considered to be inadequate and inappropriate for publication now, over thirty years after they were conceived. It is also clear that KMK’s method
was to attempt to create a typological sequence of deposits (and hence a chronological framework) across the entire excavation at one go: a series of 'Roman' and subsequently 'Revised Roman' assemblages. It must be said in retrospect that the enormity of this task defeated her – if indeed it was capable of realization at all – and this is probably in part responsible for her failure to complete the report. (The chronology of the pre-Roman levels still remained wholly to be tackled.) In the light of the new study of the finds, the Assemblages defined by KMK, which have already been referred to in print (Kenyon 1958, Comfort 1982), have had to be abandoned as unsound.

Thus the typological superstructure of the work done on the finds was considered in 1982 to be unusable. This is in contrast to the basic catalogue, which remains an important guide both to what was found in each context, and to the distribution of each 'type' across the excavations.

It is a great deal easier today to study the pottery than it was in 1950, as so much of it has become better known in the intervening years. For the purpose of reporting on the excavations, only the fine wares, coins and lamps have been taken into account in providing dating-evidence. This is the result of a deliberate decision, reflecting both the information and the expertise available to the writer, and the relatively smaller returns to be expected from the far greater labour of going through the coarse wares. A study of the Attic black-glazed ware by David Gill is included in this volume (Chapter IX), and an account of most of the decorated and stamped fragments of Italian terra sigillata has been given by Professor Howard Comfort in  *AJA* 86 (1982) 483-507. (Some further fragments have come to light since that article was written.) It is hoped that detailed studies of all categories of pottery from the excavations may be undertaken and published in due course.

The pottery used to provide dating-evidence is described in the text which follows in terms of published parallels, and is not on the whole separately illustrated. The principal sources of reference used are J.W. Hayes, *Late Roman Pottery* (London 1972 and Supplement, London 1980) and P.M. Kenrick, *Excavations at Sidi Khrebish, Benghazi (Berenice)* iii.1, *The Fine Pottery* (Tripoli 1985). The fine wares from Sabratha have been studied and identified by myself or by David Gill (Attic black-glazed ware) unless otherwise stated. In a few cases where significant sherds are missing, identification has been based on drawings and descriptions in the primary catalogue; these are naturally less reliable (particularly in the absence of satisfactory descriptions of fabric). All of the lamp-fragments from significant contexts have been seen and commented on by Donald Bailey.

As for other categories of finds, the coins were sent to the Department of Coins and Medals at the British Museum. Identifications were initially provided by E.S.G. Robinson, R.A.G. Carson and Kenneth Jenkins; the catalogue has now been revised by Kenneth Jenkins and Dr. Andrew Burnett and is reproduced in Chapter VIII. Objects of glass, bone and metal were listed on site in a Finds Register, but no study of them had been undertaken before Dame Kathleen's death; the glass alone has now been studied, and a report by Dr. John Hayes appears as Chapter X.

Illustrations

A few of the drawings, prepared by Carmelo Catanuso, Michael Ballance and Mrs. J. Wain-Hobson, were ready for publication with a minimum of annotation; others (of the Basilica, Cruciform Building and Capitolium) have been supplied by Alec Daykin, but the vast majority have been prepared by myself. Miss Sheila Gibson kindly executed the reconstruction of drawings of the East Forum Temple (figures 18, 20 and 23). Drawings of pottery have been newly prepared by myself, occasionally on the basis of originals by other hands.

The excavation photographs were taken by M.B. Cookson, by KMK and by JBWP. The record as a whole is meagre, and it had been hoped to supplement it by new photographs of the structures visible today. Unfortunately, this was not possible.

Resolution of outstanding queries on site

It was intended that the writer together with Alec Daykin should make a two-week study-visit to Sabratha in order to verify certain points, to make some additional measurements which were
lacking from the record, and to take some new photographs. This project was generously given financial support by the British Academy, and application for permission for the trip was made to the Libyan Department of Antiquities in May 1983. Permission has not, however, been forthcoming despite a professed interest by the Department in seeing the report completed, and this has been an unexpected disappointment. It has meant that some uncertainties in the record which might easily have been resolved must unfortunately remain as uncertainties in the text.

The character of the excavation

The excavation in each area was carried out by local workmen under the direction of a site supervisor, who recorded the layers and features in each trench in a site notebook. KMK retained general supervision of the whole site, and added to each site notebook her interpretation of the chronological sequence in each trench or area. She also kept separate notebooks in which were recorded broader aspects of interpretation and synthesis, and brief notes on the finds. The sections were drawn almost entirely by her, and this is clearly where the emphasis of her excavation strategy lay. Accurate plans of the trenches are in contrastingly short supply: there is rarely more than one measured plan of each trench, made either at the end of the excavation or at the stage which it had reached when the architect responsible happened to be working in that area. As a result, there are a number of instances of superficial structures which had been removed before any plan had been drawn. More regrettable are the trenches whose drawn sections and catalogued finds show that they had potentially much to contribute, but whose evidence cannot be assessed through ignorance of the plan of the structures, and indeed even of the location of the trench! The latter at least was doubtless common knowledge for a while after the excavation, but after the lapse of more than thirty years and the deaths of the directors is now irrecoverable.

The emphasis of the excavation strategy on obtaining sections has been mentioned above. This was a strategy which had become highly developed in Britain in the twenties and thirties, where it was well suited to the investigation of military remains such as native hill-forts and Roman camps. It must be said that it was also highly successful in disentangling the chronological sequence of the Forum and the East Forum Temple at Sabratha. But if it was suited to the investigation of such large-scale structures, it was decidedly not appropriate for the examination of urban residential areas. Here only extended area excavation, a technique not widely developed until much later, would have helped to elucidate the superimposed plans of streets and houses of successive periods. These parts of the excavation were correspondingly less fruitful, and it is impossible to establish the plan of a single pre-Roman building at Sabratha, despite the wealth of evidence from this period. In writing up this aspect of the excavation, the aim has necessarily been limited to showing the chronological span of occupation and its extent at different times, and to saying something of the constructional techniques employed. The results of the excavations have clearly demonstrated the potential of the site to yield more detailed information with the application of modern excavation techniques.

Numeration of finds

The necessity of referring to individual finds cited as dating-evidence requires some explanation of the numbering-system employed. Despite the highly structured nature of the system, the number of inconsistencies which became embodied in it means now that it is unsafe to infer any particular relationship between two contexts on the sole basis that they bear similar or consecutive numbers.

The excavations were divided into areas denoted by letters of the alphabet, to each of which was allocated a notebook (e.g. Site J = Regio II, Insula 5), and contexts were recorded by the trench-and-layer system. Thus an original context designation would take the form

\[
\text{S.p. H25-3} = \text{S(abratha) p(age) H25, (layer) 3}
\]

'Page Hnn' is usually synonymous with 'Trench Hnn', though in some areas (particularly sites A–E) this is not always so. The layers within each trench or area were then grouped by KMK
into a stratigraphic sequence of phases or periods so that, for example, layers S. p. H25-5, S. p. H25-8a and S. p. H104-3 (adjoining trench) were grouped together for dating purposes as 'H25.G'. At this stage the pottery from such layers was conflated and catalogued as a single group: all the sherds were re-marked on a universal numbering system based on these larger groups. A typical number would take the form 'Y.I.xiv.24/3', with the following significance:

Y = North Africa (!)
I = Sabratha
xiv = Site H
24 = H25.G
/3 = Number of individual sherd or catalogue entry
(e.g. 5 sherds of . . .)

It is mostly these numbers which are quoted in the body of the report, with the omission of 'Y.I' for the sake of brevity. The Roman numerals are not consistent in their application, for 'Y.I.i–viii' represent a broadly chronological arrangement of contexts throughout the Forum area (sites A–F) whereas the remaining numbers are generally applicable to single notebooks/areas of excavation without chronological subdivision. There are some further inconsistencies which are not worth describing in detail but which also interfere with the theoretical structure of the numbering system.

By no means all of the pottery was catalogued by KMK, and in cases where uncatalogued material is referred to in the report it is referred to either in accordance with the system described (as e.g. 'xiv.24/uncat.'), or if this is not possible, by the original trench-and-layer designation. Some of the larger pieces of pottery were inventoried on site in a Finds Register. In such cases the object received an identifying number at that stage, and may or may not have been subsequently included in the main pottery catalogue: where it was not, the Register Number (e.g. 'Reg. 454') remains the means of unique identification.

Chronology: general comments

The interpretation of the results of the British excavations at Sabratha, as presented in this volume, has been significantly influenced by the researches carried out in subsequent years by Professor Antonino Di Vita. Di Vita has put forward in various publications (1973, 1976, 1978 and others) his belief that the town of Sabratha was seriously damaged on a number of occasions by earthquakes. His definitive statement on this subject is promised to appear shortly (as chapter I of Tripolitania ellenistica e romana: studi storico-archeologici = Monografie di Archeologia Libica xii, forthcoming): the dates attributed to these earthquakes are as follows.

1) c. 60 B.C.
2) Augustan period
3) c. A.D. 64/70
4) A.D. 306/310
5) 21 July A.D. 365

Of these, only the latest is known from literary sources and the others have been inferred on the basis of archaeological evidence alone.

No such factor was considered by the directors of the British excavations in the interpretation of their findings. However, in the light of Di Vita's statements, I believe that there is clear evidence from the British excavations which is both consistent with, and most readily explained in terms of, the occurrence of earthquakes in the Flavian period and in A.D. 365. I have interpolated this explanation into the relevant sections of text (Forum area, Basilica, Casa Brogan). There are also features of the East Forum Temple which may be related to an earthquake in A.D. 306/310. As far as the two earliest earthquakes are concerned, the British excavations yielded no evidence which calls for such a drastic explanation.

In regard to the earthquake of A.D. 365, the evidence seems to be overwhelming. Widespread destruction at approximately this date was long since noted by the Italian excavators at Sabratha,
but the explanation initially put forward by Bartoccini (1950, 33 ff.) and subsequently adopted by Reynolds and Ward-Perkins (IRT, p. 23) was that the destruction had occurred at the hands of the Austuriani in A.D. 363–365. For this explanation to be sustained, special reasons were adduced by Bartoccini (cit.) to show why Ammianus Marcellinus, in his otherwise detailed narrative of these events, failed utterly to mention a disaster of such obvious magnitude as the sack of Sabratha would have been. It seems now so much more plausible that the buildings of Sabratha should have been destroyed at this time by earthquake – how could a band of marauders have brought about the collapse of all the major public buildings, including the theatre? – that the theory of an Austurian sack can surely now be discounted. I have therefore altered all references in text sections by KMK and JBWP to ‘the Austurian sack of A.D. 363’ to read ‘the earthquake of A.D. 365’.¹

Terminology: the Antonine and East Forum Temples

Throughout this report, the terms ‘Antonine Temple’ and ‘East Forum Temple’ are used, despite the fact that in various publications these buildings are now referred to as the Temple of Marcus Aurelius and the Temple of Liber Pater respectively. This has been done as a matter of convenience rather than as a deliberate rejection of the alternative designations, as the former names were already embedded in both the text and the illustrations in the report.

Limitations of the present study

Had the Sabratha report been completed by its original authors, the descriptive aspects would undoubtedly have been complemented by a broader discussion of the place of Sabratha and of its individual buildings within the framework of Classical Mediterranean archaeology as a whole. JBWP had collected some notes for such a discussion, but they are limited in extent and no text of any kind was drafted. In view of the long delay which has now taken place in the publication of the results, it was felt by myself and others that it would be inappropriate now to pursue such lines of enquiry: the aim of my work under the patronage of the Society for Libyan Studies has been limited to presenting the results of the excavations with the maximum of clarity and the minimum of further delay. If this has been achieved, the foundation upon which broader studies may be based will at least have been laid.

By the same token, studies of the coarse wares and other classes of finds from the excavations which are not mentioned in the present report are obvious desiderata. They may be expected to provide some refinement to the dating-evidence quoted, but not of such significance as to justify further delay in the presentation of the initial report. It is intended that such studies will shortly be undertaken.

¹ It has been suggested to me that the likelihood of a single earthquake having such dire effects in Sicily and North Africa as well as in the Aegean is geologically remote – but this does not detract from the archaeological evidence that there was indeed a serious earthquake in the western region at or around the same period as that recorded in the Aegean.
CHAPTER II
EXCAVATIONS IN THE FORUM AREA

(a) INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY
(P.M.K.)

Part of an introduction to the description of the forum area was written by KMK, upon which certain passages below are based. However, the new assessment by myself of the finds and of the relative chronology of the various structures has resulted in some substantial differences of interpretation between KMK and myself, and the picture presented in the following summary must be regarded as mine rather than hers. An important aspect of these differences which must be mentioned here in order to avoid subsequent confusion, is my conclusion that the principal structures of the Forum which were defined as belonging to Period Ib by KMK are likely to be associated, structurally and chronologically, exclusively with the Period II version of the East Forum Temple. However, KMK's definition of periods is too deeply embedded in all aspects of the documentation for the numbering to be changed at this stage. Therefore, while the order in which the structures are described in section (c) of this chapter conforms to her numbering, the following chronological equivalences should be borne in mind:

Forum Period Ia = Temple Period I,
Forum Period Ib = Temple Period II.

The pre-Roman levels in the forum area were never written up by KMK, and no allowance was made for them in the numbering of periods.

At a distance of about 90 metres from the present water's edge, and at an average height of about 5 metres above sea-level, lies the forum complex (fig. 123 and pl. 2a). As revealed by excavation, this consists of the Forum with the Basilica (later converted into a Christian church) to the south of it, and a group of five temples and other public buildings surrounding it. To the east is a temple integral in structure with the Forum, referred to here as the East Forum Temple, but almost certainly to be identified with the aedes Liberi Patris of which the restoration is recorded in a Constantinian inscription (IRT 55). To the west and on the same axis is a temple which was almost certainly the Capitolium, with a building of cruciform internal plan in the angle between it and the Basilica.

To the north of the Capitolium is a temple whose slightly different axis suggests adherence to an earlier layout, and which may be the Temple of Serapis known from coins of Sabratha of the second-first centuries B.C. (see Chapter IIIe). Along the north side of the Forum lies a building of contemporary origin which was probably the Curia (see Bartoccini 1950), and beyond it towards the harbour is a building which in the final period was a church containing a very fine Justinianic mosaic, but of the earlier history of which nothing is known (Ward-Perkins &
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Goodchild 1953, 12-15, church 2). Against the north wall of the precinct of the East Forum Temple lies a truncated insula belonging to the pre-Roman layout (Regio II, Insula 5) which was partially excavated (see Chapter IVa). Adjoining the south wall of the temple precinct stands the precinct of the ‘Antonine Temple’, dated by an inscription to A.D. 166-169 (see Bartoccini 1964), while to the south of the Basilica, over-riding the early tribunal, is another later temple (the ‘South Forum Temple’: see Joly & Tomasello 1984).

The excavations in 1948-49 were concentrated on the Forum, Basilica and East Forum Temple, and it is principally with these buildings that the following account is concerned.

Pre-Roman settlement (‘Period 0’)

The date and extent of the earliest Phoenician settlement is not known. Beneath the area later occupied by the Roman public buildings were found remains of a series of earlier buildings, some of which may be as early as the fourth century B.C. The nucleus of the earliest settlement lies to the north, immediately adjacent to the harbour: it was probably bounded by a substantial wall, the foundations of which were found underlying the north side of the East Forum Temple, and which has been ascribed tentatively to the fifth century B.C. If this is in fact an early city wall, the city had expanded beyond it some centuries before the Roman period. (A section of similar wailing of the second century B.C., which may have formed part of a larger defensive circuit, was found in the Casa Brogan excavation: see p. 165.) It was not possible to make any coherent plan of the pre-Roman buildings in the later forum area, though in individual trenches a succession of structures was identified. Not only were the original buildings irregular in layout and on different levels, dropping in a series of terraces to west and north, but they had been truncated or removed to varying degrees by the building operations of the Roman period. Within the podium of the East Forum Temple, the floors of the latest pre-Roman buildings were preserved together with the substructures of their walls; this was also the case beneath the west end of the southern portico of the temple. In the Forum itself and the temenos of the temple, the ground-level was substantially lowered in the course of Roman building operations, and the early buildings were obliterated to a much greater extent. As a result, in some areas a considerable succession of pre-Roman structures survives, while in others the Roman levels rest directly on the earliest occupation of the site. In the forum area there were at least two very massive structures, which must have been public buildings [sic KMK], while at the west end are a series of continuous surfaces unassociated with any structures, which may represent an open space, a predecessor in function to the Forum.

The layout of the Roman public buildings thus swept away a whole section of the earlier city, leaving only the insulae between the Forum and the harbour as witnesses to the irregularity of the earlier alignment.

Period I

The first element of the new layout was the East Forum Temple, built around or shortly after the middle of the first century A.D. and constructed throughout of sandstone which was stuccoed and painted. The original building was peripteral on three sides only, with a plain rear wall; the steps at the front of the podium have been obliterated by subsequent alterations. The temple stood within a rectangular temenos which was apparently open towards the front, and lined with porticoes along the sides and rear. There is no evidence as to the original form of the portico colonnades – they may have been Doric as in Period II – but the ground-level was probably uniform with that of the temenos.

To the west of the temple lay the Forum. It is clear at the junction of the north boundary wall of the Forum with the north-west corner of the temple precinct that the temple is structurally earlier than the first forum layout for which there is substantial evidence (defined as Period Ib); there are, however, scanty traces of an earlier layout on the same alignment (Period Ia) which are more likely to be contemporary with the Period I temple. It is at least clear that the design of the temple precinct implies the presence of an open area in front of it.
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Period II

At some point in the Flavian period, the city of Sabratha was affected by a serious earthquake. The character of the disaster is evident from both the fact and the manner in which the East Forum Temple was rebuilt, and there is further evidence from other parts of the site (see p. 5). It was probably the extent of destruction in the central area which provided the opportunity for the construction of a new Forum and of the buildings to the north and south of it.

The size of the East Forum Temple was slightly increased by extensions to front and rear, giving it now a fully peripteral plan, with vastly strengthened foundations; many fragments from the upper parts of the original building were incorporated into the new substructures. The level of the surrounding temenos was lowered and that of the porticoes, which were now fronted by steps, was raised. The porticoes now assumed a standard Hellenistic form, with an outer Doric colonnade, and an inner colonnade of the Ionic order, set at twice the intercolumniation.

In the Forum, a similar differentiation of level was established (Forum Period Ib). The central area was lowered by up to 85 cm., and this was flanked on three sides by raised terraces bounded by steps. The north and south sides were lined with tabernae, shops or offices, which on the north side are integral in construction with the precursor of the later Curia, and on the south side with the Basilica. The character of the structures at the west end, later occupied by the Capitolium, is unknown. The Basilica was central Italian, or ‘Vitruvian’, in plan: the principal entrance led through the forum tabernae and was set in the centre of one of the long sides. This gave access to a rectangular hall with an internal colonnade; an apsed tribunal, flanked by offices, occupied the centre of the southern side opposite the entrance.

The precise form of the feature which separated the temenos of the East Forum Temple from the body of the Forum in this period is uncertain, owing to disturbance by later structures: there may have been some form of raised terrace or portico on either side of the temple.

Period III

The late Antonine period was a time of great building activity at Sabratha, marked notably by the construction of the Antonine and South Forum Temples, and by the laying-out of an entire new eastern quarter of the city. The Capitolium at the west end of the Forum was either built or acquired its final form at this time, the Basilica was extended to the west (Basilica Period II) and the Forum itself was remodelled. The sunken central area was filled in and a system of massive drains was laid along three sides (possibly as part of a more extensive municipal drainage scheme). The tabernae on either side of the Forum were demolished and their place was taken by Corinthian porticoes of grey granite columns with white marble capitals and bases. The entire area was now covered with paving-slabs, of which fragments were found overlying the two lowest steps of the East Forum Temple. The temple and its temenos remained otherwise unchanged at this period, apart from the presence of two or more short walls near the front of the temple on the south side, which may have served as bases of statues.

Period IV

This period encompasses various alterations in the precinct of the East Forum Temple, which seem to imply a period of dereliction during part at least of the third century. In the south portico of the precinct, the construction of a number of small tabernae was begun. The layout of the foundations suggests that they cannot have been intended to coexist with the colonnades of the portico, which had perhaps already fallen or been dismantled. Certainly the western end-wall separating the portico from the Forum was removed. The date of this development can be placed only approximately in the second quarter of the third century or later. However, the incomplete nature of the foundations suggests that the project was abandoned, and the end-wall of the portico was subsequently rebuilt.

The northern portico also underwent some large-scale disturbance which appears to have necessitated the restoration, not only of the portico, but also of the outer wall of the precinct. The debris associated with this suggests in this case that destruction by fire may have been involved.
The dating of this event is extremely problematic, but it is possible that the restoration work both here and in the south portico is that referred to in the Constantinian inscription from which the dedication of the temple has been inferred.

**Period V**

The buildings of Sabratha were again seriously damaged by earthquake in A.D. 365. In the aftermath, the Curia was rebuilt, and so was the Basilica. In the latter case (Basilica Period III) only one wall of the original building was retained (that bordering the Forum), and the new plan was based on the great Severan basilica at Lepcis Magna, with an apse at either end. The occasion seems to have coincided with the rise of Christianity and the decline of the pagan cults, for the new Basilica made extensive use of architectural elements from the Antonine and South Forum Temples, which were evidently not restored. It seems likely that the East Forum Temple also ceased to serve any religious purpose: the precinct was closed off from the Forum by the construction of a transverse portico across the front paved with coarse mosaic, and though a stairway through the rear wall gave access to the temple podium, the building behind can hardly have continued to serve as a temple. Parts of the Forum were re-paved, often using pieces of marble from buildings and inscriptions which had been thrown down in the earthquake: the fate of the forum colonnades is uncertain.

**Period VI**

The last use to which the Forum was put before the Arab conquest was as a burial-ground, serving the church which in the late fourth or early fifth century had succeeded the Basilica (Church 1: Basilica Periods IIIb and IV). This church was restored and refurbished by Justinian, who was also responsible for the construction of Church 2 with its fine mosaic to the north of the Curia. Most of the graves appear to belong to the late sixth and seventh centuries, providing a surprising commentary on the social conditions prevailing in Sabratha at that time.

### (b) PRE-ROMAN STRUCTURES

(P.M.K.)

For lack of an adequate chronology of the pre-Roman pottery, KMK had postponed the study of the early levels in the forum area, which never proceeded beyond the classification of the individual stratigraphic sequences in each trench. Today, the Hellenistic and earlier black-glazed wares are very much better understood, and the relevant material has been reviewed throughout by myself. It gives me pleasure to acknowledge here the assistance of David Gill, who has provided the report on the fifth- and fourth-century black-glazed ware in Chapter IX.

Figure 1 (facing p. 12) is a plan of the central area of Sabratha, from which the public buildings of the mid first century A.D. and later have been excluded: the sources of information are listed in the caption to the figure. It is at once apparent from a glance at this plan that the excavations in the forum area, extensive though they were, were not at any point seriously aimed at investigating the structures which preceded the establishment of the Roman layout in the first century A.D. Certainly, there are stratigraphic sequences which help to date some of the walls revealed and to give an indication of the span of occupation in the area, and comments on the features in individual trenches are included in the 'Notes on Sections', p. 37 ff. But even in those limited areas where the long, narrow sections were opened out into larger area excavations, the structures are still no more than isolated stretches of wall. It is therefore impossible to offer any real picture of house-plans or alignments of streets in this area, and only certain broad generalizations can be made. For the same reason, I have made no attempt in figure 1 to
distinguish walls of different periods from one another, though it is clear that not all of those shown were in existence at the same time.

Probably the earliest structure found in the whole area is a rubble foundation, some 2.50 m. wide, running beneath the northern portico of the later precinct of the East Forum Temple. This must have supported a substantial wall, though its superstructure was entirely removed when it was rediscovered in the fourth century A.D. (see pp. 29 f., 38 and figs. 10, 15, sections A–B, E–F and BE–BF). A wall of this size can only have been a defensive wall, presumably enclosing the original nucleus of the settlement on its northern side. Only in section A–B was any pottery noted in stratigraphic association with it (context i.55a), but the three sherds recorded are all of Hellenistic or later date, and they cannot therefore be regarded as providing a date for the wall. If the wall is to be interpreted as part of the defences of the early settlement, its origin must be placed before the middle of the fourth century B.C. The only occupation-levels which could be attributed with confidence to the fifth century were found to the north of the wall in Regio II, Insulae 5–7 (see Chapter IV), whilst levels of the later fourth century were widespread in the forum area and the first structures in the Casa Brogan in Regio II, Insula 10 are of similar date (see Chapter V). Given that the extent of excavation in levels of this date was very limited in all instances, it might have been expected that the distribution across the site as a whole of the fifth-century fine ware would help to confirm that the earliest occupation was limited to the areas to the north of the wall described. (No coins of the fifth century were recorded at all, but there were many coins of the mid fourth century onwards from throughout the forum area and elsewhere: see Chapter VIII.) Unfortunately, this is not the case. In Table I below, the distribution of the dated sherds of fifth- and fourth-century fine ware (derived from Chapter IX) is shown by area: the order in which the areas are listed moves progressively outwards from the supposed early nucleus of the settlement. Trench S.p. X1, which yielded a remarkable concentration of fifth-century sherds, was dug in the street between the north-east corner of the East Forum Temple precinct and the Seaward Baths. The early levels in which these sherds were found consisted of an alternating succession of dark occupation-layers and cleaner, possibly wind-blown, sand. Similar strata were found in Regio II, Insula 6 and were interpreted as evidence of initially seasonal occupation on the site (see p. 125).

### Table I

**Distribution of Attic Black-Glazed and Decorated Sherds of the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No. of 5th-century sherds</th>
<th>No. of 4th-century sherds</th>
<th>Total for 5th + 4th centuries</th>
<th>5th-cent. sherds as percentage of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reg. II, Ins. 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. II, Ins. 6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. II, Ins. 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench S.p. X1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum + E. Forum Temple, N. side</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum + E. Forum Temple, rest</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilica</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. II, Ins. 10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The figures in Table I show an elevated concentration of fifth-century sherds in Regio II, Insulae 5 and 6, and in trench S.p. X1 which clearly reflects the location of the early nucleus; but it is also clear that they are by no means confined to the areas within the supposed early defences. (Thus they are relatively no less common in the forum area as a whole and in the Casa Brogan than in Regio II, Insula 7.) The interpretation of the foundation beneath the north portico of the East Forum Temple as an early defensive wall rests, therefore, on its character and position. But the part that it played in the evolution of the settlement remains unclear.

Between the late fourth century B.C. and the time when the area was re-planned in the first century A.D., much of it seems to have been occupied by housing. Where there is dating-evidence for walls, the majority of them seem to belong to the second century B.C., and there is evidence from the Casa Brogan immediately to the east to suggest that this was a time of significant expansion at Sabratha, accompanied possibly by the extension inland of the defended area. The quantity of coins and pottery of the late fourth and early third centuries found in the forum area implies a considerable density of occupation throughout, but the trenches in which actual structures could be ascribed to this period were relatively few. In several areas there were rubbish pits, presumably associated with the pre-Roman buildings, and two of these contained stacks of amphorae (see pp. 41, 45, notes on sections Z-AA and AF-AG).

As to layout, there is an evident contrast with the serried rectangles of Roman town-planning. And yet, it is not wholly irregular. To the north of the forum area, it is clear that Insulae 5–8 of Regio II respect the layout of the Punic harbour-side town, even in their Roman form. (For the excavations in this area, see Chapter IV.) A significant feature of this early layout is the winding road that leads inland from the harbour in a south-westerly direction, passing between Insulae 7 and 8, then between Insulae 6 and 5, along the south side of the Temple of Serapis and then curving southwards behind the later Capitolium (see fig. 123 and Ward-Perkins 1982, 41). It is possible that a stretch of wall beneath the north forum portico which approximates to this line represents the south side of the street (see p. 47, notes on section AK-AL). The general alignment of the buildings to the south of this street conforms approximately to that of Regio II, Insulae 5–8 in the eastern part of the area, and there is a slight hint of a clockwise rotation, corresponding to that of the street, as one proceeds westward. (It is curious that these alignments show no regard whatever for the early city wall, which was presumably not only disused but wholly dismantled before they were laid out. On the other hand, the correspondence between the line of the early wall and the orientation of the Roman layout must be entirely coincidental.)

Kathleen Kenyon wrote that there were in the forum area ‘at least two very massive structures, which must have been public buildings’ (p. 8). One of these is in the south-east quarter of the Forum, at the intersection of sections HH–JJ and AD–AE (see fig. 2, facing p. 13, and pl. 5a), and the other is apparently in the north-west quarter, at the intersection of sections AH–AJ and AQ–AR. However, the excavations gave little hint as to either their character or their chronology. (See p. 44, notes on section AD–AE; there was no dating-evidence for the north-western structure).

Towards the west end of the Roman Forum there was very little evidence of any other pre-Roman structures, though this may be due in part to the very extensive disturbance caused by Christian graves in this area. On the other hand, the sections against the front of the Capitolium (fig. 17, facing p. 55, sections AM–AN, AO–AP, AQ–AR, AU–AV) showed a considerable succession of surfaces of compacted sand, dotted with post-holes and in places with fragmentary bases of amphorae set upright in the ground. These post-holes were also a feature of the Roman Forum (see pl. 5c), and it may be supposed that there was in this area an earlier market-place upon which temporary stalls were erected. The finds from these levels are meagre (section AM–AN, context i.141; section AO–AP, contexts i.127–138) but suggest a continuous sequence from the first half of the third century B.C. onwards (nos. i.135/3, i.137/1, bases of bowls from the central Italian ‘Atelier des petites estampilles’). The precise extent of the market-place cannot be determined.
FIG. 1. Pre-Roman structures beneath the centre of the Roman town. The information for the area of the Forum and the East Forum Temple is derived from figures 2 and 3 (overleaf), for the Antonine Temple from figures 82, 83, and 90 (pp. 171, 172, 200). Parts of the insulae to the north of the Forum are shown in outline for comparative purposes, for though the visible walls are Roman in date, they evidently respect the alignment of the pre-Roman layout next to the harbour. (See Chapter V.)
FIG. 3. The East Forum Temple and surrounding precinct: plan of excavations, showing structures beneath the Period V transverse portico across the west end.
(c) THE ROMAN FORUM AND THE EAST FORUM TEMPLE: STRATIGRAPHY AND CHRONOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT
(K.M.K./P.M.K.)

This section is based on an extensive typescript by KMK, marked '2nd draft'. It was in the form of separate stratigraphic reports on the Forum and the East Forum Temple, but included no reference to dating-evidence. It was probably written in 1950, when KMK spent some time in the British School at Rome working in consultation with JB WP on the results of the excavation. I have rearranged the order of the text, so that the Forum and the temple precinct are discussed together, period by period, which I think makes the whole argument easier to follow. I have also made minor stylistic changes, which would doubtless have been made anyway when a final version of the text was prepared. Where I have made more extensive alterations or additions, these are printed within square brackets. The dating-evidence in particular I have added: this is based on a review of the pottery catalogue, and in almost all instances I have also looked at, and provided new identifications for, all the sherds concerned.

The illustrations for this section had reached varying stages of preparation. The sections reproduced in figures 10-17 had been drawn, probably at the time when the text was written, by Mrs. J. Wain-Hobson, and here it has been necessary only to make some minor corrections. None of the existing plans was complete in itself or suitable for publication. The general plan of the Forum (fig. 2) I have put together to the best of my ability from various unsigned pencil drawings of the excavation trenches and from drawings of adjacent buildings by Carmelo Catamuso and Alec Daykin. That of the East Forum Temple (fig. 3) is based on an original survey at 1:50 by Dennis Hickley, which had been redrawn at a smaller scale by Ena Hauerylowicz before it came into my hands. I have been responsible for the shading on both drawings which shows the periods to which the various structures belong; this has been assisted by the site notes and by various other drawings, but there are some details whose chronology, and indeed whose character, is inevitably unclear. The schematic period plans (figs. 4-7) had been partially prepared, but many details were incomplete: they have now been redrawn and completed in accordance with my understanding of the evidence. The text bore only marginal references throughout to trenches and to photographs; I have incorporated these into the body of the text and provided the captions for the plates.

If the arguments presented below sometimes seem complex or difficult to follow, it should be remembered that they represent a unified interpretation of the evidence provided by over 115 trenches, now illustrated by 44 drawn sections. For the excavator to have produced a broadly coherent account from such a mass of material is no mean achievement! By the same token, it is possible that on occasion I have misunderstood a point made by the original author, or that I have unintentionally deepened the obscurity where I sought to bring light. If there are such instances, I must beg the reader's indulgence.

The drawn sections which are referred to in the following pages are illustrated in figures 10-17 following p. 50.

PERIOD I

EAST FORUM TEMPLE, FIRST PHASE (fig. 4)

The surviving remains of the temple complex (fig. 3 and pl. 2b) consist of the foundations and part of the structure of the temple itself, set in the centre of an open, rectangular temenos, which is in turn enclosed on three sides by a double portico. The portico consists of a continuous outer wall, an internal Ionic colonnade and, facing onto the temenos, a Doric colonnade; three steps lead down from the portico to the level of the temenos, 60 cm. below. Across the fourth side, to the west, runs a transverse portico which is clearly a later, added feature.

Two clearly marked structural phases can be distinguished in the surviving remains of the temple. The earlier nucleus consists of the remains of a rectangular podium, 21.70 m. by 18.80 m. This has subsequently been lengthened at the rear by 3.30 m. and in front by 5.90 m.; and
there are a number of internal alterations. Incorporated within the body of the earlier podium are the remains of pre-temple structures, set on a different alignment. The architectural features of the successive temples are discussed below in Chapter IIIa.

A number of trenches were dug in the temenos area to establish the floor levels associated with the different periods. These revealed a consistent succession of strata. Earlier than the temple are the walls and floors of a number of pre-existing buildings (see above, Chapter IIb), laid out in terraces, which drop towards the west and north. All of these were found to have been truncated to a common level of approximately +4.65 m. and sealed by a hard grey level. Above this is a clean yellow sand level, then a coarse grey sand level, divisible in places into two, and finally a mixed brownish sand underlying the surviving paving stones. (See, e.g. figs. 10, 11, sections E-F, R-S.) The latter appear to have been re-laid by the previous excavators, and this level could not therefore be treated as intact. To these various levels correspond different coats of rendering on the walls of the temple.

It became apparent at an early stage of the excavations that none of these levels could be considered to be that of the temenos during the first structural phase of the temple. In the first place, the hard grey truncation layer, though approximately level over most of the area, dipped very markedly towards the north-east corner, where it was as much as 70 cm. below the average level (figs. 10, 11, sections L-M, N-O, P-Q). Secondly, the irregularity of the lower courses of the temple walls above the level of the truncation layer is such that it can have been no part of the original plan that these courses should have been exposed. (See fig. 13, section Z-AA and pl. 3a.) Thirdly, the plinth moulding of the original rear (east) wall of the temple survives near the south-east angle, resting on a projecting levelling-course of dressed masonry, which in turn rests on three courses of rough foundations (fig. 11, section T-U and pl. 3b); the levels of these features indicate an associated temenos level of c. +5.45 m., that is to say 40 cm. above the present level of the temenos and 80 cm. above the average truncation level. This accords with the evidence afforded by the plaster rendering of the surviving south face of the temple podium.

Here, underlying the succeeding renderings which are continued down to meet the several levels described above, can be seen an original rendering corresponding to a level at +5.40 m. (pl. 3a). It is therefore quite clear that the original surface of the temenos, with all its associated make-up,
has been completely removed in a subsequent drastic lowering of level. This lowering, as will be seen below (p. 21), can be associated with the construction of the second temple in Period II.

No evidence survives for the original surface of the portico on the north side of the temple, as the surface had here been cleared in the previous excavations to a depth of 50 cm. below the equivalent surface-level of the south side. On the south side, however, there was a series of consistent levels of which the lowest, which seals both the pre-temple structures and the foundation-trench for the stylobate of the colonnade dividing the temenos from the portico, is on almost exactly the same level as the estimated original level of the temenos. (See fig. 13, sections Z-AA, BB–CC.) It is therefore evident that in the original layout of the temple precinct, the temenos and the porticoes were at the same height.

The northern portico does, however, provide additional evidence that the stylobate was contemporary with the original layout (fig. 10, sections A–B, E–F). In this area, the pre-existing structures were at a considerably lower level (+ 4.38 m.) than that of the highest surviving (and clearly truncated) level at + 5.33 m. in the southern portico. It was therefore necessary to raise the level in the former, and the resulting filling clearly seals the foundation-trench of the stylobate.

For the superstructure of the original portico, no evidence survives. As will be seen below (p. 23), the stylobate was raised in height in Period II, and the colonnade was therefore completely rebuilt. In the final plan, the porticoes were doubled by the addition of an internal Ionic colonnade, the intercolumniation of which is twice that of the outer Doric colonnade. In place of a continuous stylobate, the footings of the inner colonnade consist of isolated piers. These piers everywhere cut the original surface-level of the portico and are clearly a later addition (figs. 11, 13, sections R–S and BB–CC).

In the greater part of both northern and southern porticoes later disturbances or constructions made it impossible to relate the outer precinct wall to the interior structures. But in the south-east corner the relevant levels were intact, and in section V–W (fig. 13) the original level of the portico was found to seal the foundation-trench of the precinct wall, proving it to be contemporary.

At the west end, towards the Forum, the porticoes end in blank walls. On the south side it is clear, both structurally and stratigraphically, that the end wall was completely reconstructed in antiquity, the lower part when the Forum was re-designed in Period III and the upper part, which is extremely rough, again at a later period. On the north side, however, there is stratigraphic evidence that the end wall was contemporary with the stylobate wall. (See fig. 15, sections BE–BF and BG–BH.)

At the north-west angle of the temple precinct it was also clear that the temple was earlier than the first regular layout of the Forum for which there is substantial evidence (Forum Ib: see fig. 15, bottom row of sections). The west wall of the portico was built from a level 1.10 m. below the existing surface, and its foundation-trench and make-up are sealed by a hard mortar floor 40 cm. higher. On the wall itself, particularly on a projecting plinth at the angle, are traces of mortar rendering going down to this level (section BJ–BK). The foundation-trench of the north wall of the Forum Ib structures, on the other hand, cuts through not only this level, but also some additional levels above it, and its foundation-trench is sealed only by a layer immediately beneath the paving-stones of the existing surface (section BN–BO).

**Dating evidence**

[Contexts associated with the initial construction of the East Forum Temple and its precinct (the Period I levels in figures 10, 11, 13–15), and which have yielded relatively sound groups of material for dating purposes, are nos. iii.1, 2, 4–6, 8–11. The quantity of relevant fine ware is not great, but suggests a terminal date shortly after the middle of the first century A.D. This is based on the following pieces.]
A sherd of Berenice Form B217 and three of Berenice Form B237 from a stratigraphically earlier context in section Z–AA (context i.18/48, 47, 50) may add confirmatory evidence, though a rim of Hayes Form 8A in African Red Slip Ware from the same context (no. i.18/42) must be intrusive.

[Two coins were recorded from the Period I level in section Z–AA (context iii.1); no. 56 (‘uncertain C1–2 A.D.’) and no. 62 (‘Uncertain C2 A.D.’). The latter at least is presumably intrusive. The same must be true of a small number of sherds of red slip ware recorded from various contexts and extending to the late second or early third century A.D. The most serious intrusions are recorded from context iii.3, the Period I levels in sections BE–BF and BG–BH (fig. 15): upwards of a dozen sherds of first- to third-century red slip ware, and one of the sixth century. No clear inference can be drawn from this.]

[Outside the north-west corner of the temple precinct, where a stratigraphic succession was established between the construction of the precinct and that of the north wall of the Forum (fig. 15, bottom row), there was no useful pottery from the original construction levels of the temple precinct (context iii.11: two residual sherds of pre-Roman coarse ware), whilst the intermediate accumulations of sand which post-date the construction of the precinct but pre-date the north wall of the Period Ib Forum (context iii.3) yielded three sherds of Italian Sigillata comparable to those listed above (Berenice Forms B217, B237) and one indeterminate sherd of early African Red Slip Ware. This is compatible with the Flavian date suggested below for the construction of Forum Ib (p. 21).]

**EARLIEST FORUM LAYOUT (Period Ia, fig. 4)**

Two principal phases in the history of the Forum are readily identifiable: an earlier phase (Period Ib) with a low-level forum bordered to north and south by rows of tabernae, and a later phase (Period III) with a high-level forum in which the tabernae were replaced by porticoes with Corinthian colonnades. There is, however, some scanty evidence that there was a yet earlier phase (Period Ia), of which the traces have been almost wholly obliterated by the later structures. The traces are so scanty that they are insufficient to indicate the overall plan, but they must be mentioned as representing a possible earlier phase in the laying-out of the Forum.

In the first place, the evidence of the stratigraphy where the tabernae adjoin the north-west angle of the temple precinct (above, p. 15) combines with the dating evidence throughout the forum area and the temple precinct to show that the latter is earlier than the main forum layout of Period Ib. It seems most unlikely that this temple precinct, fronting as it clearly does onto the area of the Forum, should not be contemporaneous with some layout on the same axis in this area.

Of this possible layout, the traces are extremely slight. The most obvious are beneath the Basilica and the west end of the later southern portico of the Forum. Beneath the Basilica, and preceding the first basilica structure, is a wall which continues the line of the southern boundary wall of the temple precinct (see p. 69). There was no equivalent wall on the north side,¹ so the

¹ [This statement conveys greater authority than the very limited excavation on its supposed line can support.]
layout was not a symmetrical one. At the west end of the south portico of the Forum was found a wall on the line of the front wall of the tabernae, but of different and earlier construction. To both north and south of it were a number of cross-walls, those to the north running out towards the Period III colonnade foundation and being cut by it. There can here be no doubt of a layout earlier than that of the main Period Ib Forum. (For the detailed description of the structures at the west end of the south forum portico, see below, pp. 34 ff.)

The other traces are much slighter. Near the south-east angle of the Forum there were found the foundations of an east-west wall on the forum axis, but certainly earlier than the main Period Ib structure, with its outer edge at a distance of 2.25 m. in front of the Period III Corinthian colonnade and with a cross-wall running up to its south side. (See figs. 2, 16, section YY-ZZ; pl. 3c). There can be no evidence as to whether this wall continued along the length of the Forum, since the Period III drain, which here has curved north to join the main channel, for the rest of the length of the Forum runs along its line. It is however noticeable that in the two sections in which the drain was investigated, it seems to have an unnecessarily wide footing course which is exactly on this line (fig. 16, sections AD-AE, AF-AG). The corresponding Period III drain along the north side of the Forum likewise destroyed all possible evidence along most of the length of the Forum. But in the north-east corner, beyond its junction with the main channel, there was a wall on a similar axis to that just described, of similar dimensions and construction, and in exactly the same position with regard to the Corinthian stylobate (figs. 2, 16, section AB-AC).

The evidence does therefore support the possibility that there was an original layout of the Forum [contemporary with the first East Forum Temple], bounded by walls 2.25 m. in front of the Period III colonnade. Nowhere is the evidence clear as to the level of its surface, but it seems likely that it was higher than in Period Ib. This is more in keeping with the apparently simple layout, leaving the considerable operation of removing the pre-forum levels, in part to a depth of at least 85 cm., to the period of the much more elaborate building operations of Period Ib.

It is quite clear that on the north side there were no buildings on the forum axis at this preliminary stage, for the main Period Ib levels immediately overlie structures on the older, irregular axis. On the south side, possibly because the older layout had not extended to this area, there were however the accompanying buildings described above.

Dating evidence

[At no point were levels excavated beneath the walls described above, and there are therefore no finds directly relevant to their dating. (In section YY-ZZ (fig. 16) the lowest level butting against the early wall is described in the site notebook as containing 'coarse Phoenician' pottery only, which was discarded.) The structural history of the East Forum Temple suggests, however, the contemporaneity of the Period Ia Forum with the Period I temple.]

LOW-LEVEL FORUM (Period Ib: see fig. 5 on p. 22)

The main structure of the Period Ib Forum consisted of a row of solidly built tabernae on each of the long sides of the forum square. Those on the south side were partially visible as a result of the earlier excavations, while on the north sufficient portions of a similar range were uncovered in 1948 to establish its plan and its contemporaneity. The tabernae on the south are integral in structure with Period I of the Basilica, the north wall of which forms their back wall and the main entrance of which leads through them. (See below, Chapter IIIb.) The northern range is likewise of one build with the original Curia.

The foundations are well built, with a considerable degree of uniformity, formed of headers 75 cm. long and 45 cm. square in section wherever investigated (pl. 3d). On the north side, the cross-walls are structurally secondary to the back wall, their foundation-trench cutting its foundation-trench. This is clearly only structural, since the building style is identical and the same floor seals both of the foundation-trenches.

It was unfortunately nowhere possible to establish the plans of the east and west ends of the rows of tabernae. At the south-east corner, the Period III drain cut across the end of the row and
the adjoining walls were rebuilt at this stage; but there was here a threshold of an entrance into
the tabernae from the east, presumably from the main entrance into the forum, and a fragment of
contemporary floor in *opus signinum*, badly destroyed by Christian graves (pl. 4a). In the
north-east corner, the drain likewise destroyed the continuation, and beyond that there was
extensive disturbance due to the robbing of the drain, the robbing of the early wall which ran
beneath the length of the north portico of the East Forum Temple (see p. 29 f.) and the insertion of
Christian graves. At the north-west corner it was undesirable to destroy a well-preserved later
floor which included the matrices of several re-used inscriptions. At the south-west corner the
position was complicated by the presence of earlier walls on the same axis, some but not all of
which must have been re-used at this period. (See below, p. 34 ff.)

[In the northern range of tabernae, a pair of cement-lined cisterns was found towards the
western end, which would originally have been covered by flat slabs; near the centre of the range,
another room contained a cistern with a fine barrel-vault of sandstone blocks (pl. 4b), and a small
part of a similar cistern was also uncovered further east. In all three cases, their construction was
probably contemporary with that of the tabernae; the western pair of cisterns was filled in, and
the central one presumed to have gone out of use, at the time of the Period III reconstruction of
the Forum.]

[At the south-west angle of the Forum was found a complex of at least two, and possibly three,
cisterns which are described in detail below (p. 35 and pl. 12a). They seem to have been
constructed in Period Ib to receive rain-water from the roof of the Basilica. They presumably
continued in use during Period III, as they were subsequently provided with an outlet running
northwards, which cuts through the make-up of the Period Ib floor and which must have led into
the Period III drain along the south side of the Forum.]

On the south side of the Forum, the contemporary surface survived in patches at the
south-west angle, and on the north side extensive areas were present beneath the later levels. (See
fig. 16, section AK–AL.) It consisted of a good mortar surface at a height of + 5.26 m., with a
make-up of hard pinkish clay. There is no evidence whether it was ever covered with any form of
paving. This surface was found both inside the tabernae and also in front of them, where it was
cut by the foundations of the Period III Corinthian colonnade. It is therefore clear that the
tabernae were bordered by an area at the same level as their floors. The central area of the Forum,
however, had a surface 93 cm. lower, at + 4.33 m. This level was established by cutting deeply
into the pre-forum levels, which survive round the edges of the area. The highest pre-forum
levels surviving (which may even so have been truncated to some extent) are in the north-west
quarter at + 5.18 m. (fig. 16, section AK–AL) and at the west end at + 5.00 m. (fig. 17 (b)). In
parts of the central area, therefore, the lowering of the forum surface must have involved the
removal of at least 85 cm. of earlier deposits. [It is suggested below, p. 270, that the total absence
of coins of the first century B.C. and of the first century A.D. from the forum excavations may
be due to the removal of the relevant deposits at this stage.]

It has been stated above that this low level did not run right up to the walls of the tabernae, for
they were bordered by an area at the same level as their floors. The tracing of the edge of this
raised terrace was rendered difficult along the north side by the fact that the Period III drain cut its
de edge, and the low-level surface in most of the areas investigated ran as far as the edge of the
disturbances connected with the drain and with the other late structures along this side of the
Forum. In the north-east angle, however, beyond the junction of this drain with the main
channel, the limit of the low level was found at a distance of 2.50 m. in front of the Period III
colonnade, just south of the wall which may belong to the layout of Period Ia (fig. 16, section
AB–AC).

On the south side, however, the rise in level was found in a number of trenches, beginning at a
uniform distance of 5.25 m. north of the Period III colonnade (fig. 16, sections AD–AE and
AF–AG). There seems therefore to be no doubt that the high-level terrace on the south side was
considerably broader than that on the north, despite the asymmetrical plan that this implies.
Neither on the north nor on the south side does the actual boundary feature of the terraces
survive. In each case the evidence consists of the cessation of the hard low-level surface, with
beyond it a high level, either sloping down onto it or stopping abruptly. There must therefore
have been a flight of steps on these lines, without any substantial foundations, which was removed when the level of the Forum was raised.

At the west end, however, the boundary steps do survive, and are here based on a solid block sunk into the earlier levels, which was certainly not the case on the north or south sides. (See fig. 17 (b) and pl. 4c.) The evidence for the substantial removal of earlier levels in Period Ib is very clear in connexion with these steps. On their west sides they cut into a whole series of levels, of which the highest vary from +5.00 m to +4.85 m., while in front of the steps these have been cut away consistently to about +4.50 m., sloping down somewhat thence to the east. These pre-forum levels consist of a series of hard surfaces of mortar and clay and are not connected with any structures, so it appears possible that there had been an open space here over a considerable period (see p. 12). The top of the steps is immediately overlaid by the surface of the High-Level Forum [Period III]. There is a slight suggestion from the appearance of the top step that there may originally have been further steps above, which would have been removed when the uniform level of the later forum was laid down. This receives support from a trench in the south-west corner (fig. 17, section AM–AN; pl. 4c), where behind the steps, and contemporary with them, was found one course of a wall which would have been entirely without purpose if the steps had not continued higher. Behind this wall were found the cut-off bases of a number of amphorae which would have stood about a metre high when intact (pl. 4d), though their upper parts may have been cut off when the steps were built. [A further point is not taken up here by the writers. The levels in the north forum portico (section AH–AL, p. 18) imply that the boundary terraces of the Forum should have been fronted by about six steps. If they were uniform around the perimeter, this would provide confirmatory evidence for a further three steps at the west end and at the east end the terraces would have been continuous with the temenos of the East Forum Temple. I have taken the liberty of illustrating this arrangement in figure 5.]

[It is uncertain what structure closed the west end of the Forum in Period Ib; see the discussion of the Capitolium in Chapter III.] To both north and south the steps come to an abrupt and apparently intentional end, short of their junction with the side terraces. Presumably some feature at the angle was removed when the High-Level Forum was constructed in Period III.

Beneath the greater part of the centre of the Forum were the truncated tops of a number of pre-forum walls, all cleared down to a uniform level. The relative chronology of these structures was difficult to disentangle since their contemporary surfaces had in many cases been removed. Over the greater part of the area, the forum surface consisted of a hard pounded grey level. In some places, however, the truncated tops of pre-forum walls actually served as the surface, forming a stone pavement. (See, e.g. fig. 16, section AD–AE and pl. 5a). If the grey surface had once covered them, it had been worn away. In some areas it appeared that an earlier surface, coinciding with the desired level, was used, for at one point the level to which the steps at the west end descended was cut by their foundation-trench, though elsewhere the corresponding level certainly sealed this trench. [See p. 48, notes on section AQ–AR.]

In nearly all the areas examined, the surface of the Low-Level Forum was pitted with a considerable number of circular holes, ranging from about 12 cm. to 20 cm. in diameter and of varying depth, 25 cm. being fairly typical. [Many of these are shown on the plan in figure 2.] The habit of making such holes seems to have extended over a considerable period. They were found in very large numbers in the forum floor, even in the truncated tops of the pre-forum walls, and some holes are cut into by others. They were found cut actually into the steps at the west end of the Forum (pl. 5c), and in the Period II terrace at the foot of the steps of the East Forum Temple. They also occur in repairs to the surface of the Low-Level Forum. There can therefore be no question about the continuance of the practice during the life of the Low-Level Forum. They are also found in earlier levels cut into by the steps at the west end of the Forum (pl. 5c). The purpose served by the holes is obscure. They were all found filled with blown sand, anything which they contained having been removed and not left to decay; no plan can be observed in their positions. It is possible that they held posts for a series of very temporary booths erected in the market-place. But on the whole it is more likely that they served as stands for pots, also in connection with the use of the area as a market. In the earlier levels a considerable number of jars
was found set in holes in the ground, and some truncated examples in the levels behind the steps are visible in section AM–AN (fig. 17 and pl. 4d).

During the use of the Low-Level Forum, it was re-surfaced a number of times, particularly at the west end. These surfaces gradually raised the level here until it was flush with the top of the second step. The process was presumably one of re-surfacing at intervals after a considerable amount of blown sand had collected.

JUNCTION OF FORUM AND EAST FORUM TEMPLE

For the junction of the temple with the Forum in Period I there is no very clear evidence. What is clear is that it is still with the Low-Level Forum that the second phase of the temple is associated in Period II. What is not quite certain is whether the Period Ib forum is contemporary with the Period II layout of the temple precinct (in which case the Period I temple would have been associated only with the possible earlier Forum Ia), or whether it was built initially to conform to the Period I temple.

[This paragraph is followed in KMK's original text by a statement of tentative preference for the latter possibility. This is founded on the following two factors:

1. The presence of a very broad footing between the temenos of the temple and the Forum (see figs. 3 and 14, section KK–LL–MM–NN and pl. 5b). This was interpreted as the base of a retaining wall and of a flight of steps linking the Forum with the temenos on either side of the temple-front. Its width is more in keeping with the difference in height of 1.08 m. between the Low-Level Forum and the temenos of the Period I temple than to the 50 cm. difference between the same forum level and that of the temenos in Period II.

2. The presence of a surface at the same level as the Period Ib Forum beneath the steps of the Period II temple (see fig. 14, sections SS–TT–UU–VV), implying its prior existence when the temple was rebuilt in Period II.]

[I have come to the contrary conclusion that the Period Ib Forum is precisely contemporaneous with the Period II temple for what I believe are stronger reasons, stated below in the discussion of the dating-evidence for these phases. With regard to the factors cited above, I think that both the character and the interpretation of the broad footing are questionable. To the north of the temple-front a small trench was sunk which did locate a footing in a similar position but rather different in style, leading KMK to suggest that it might at this point have incorporated an earlier structure. I think it far more likely that the broad footing in section KK–LL–MM–NN is to be associated not with the Forum at all, but likewise with the substantial pre-forum structure found to the west of it at the intersection of sections HH–JJ and AD–AE (see fig. 2 and pl. 5a).]

[If, then, the Period I temple was associated exclusively with Forum Ia, any dividing feature between the two will have been removed completely when the forum surface was lowered in (Forum) Period Ib. There may in any case have been a difference in level of only 20 cm. or less. The presence of a low-level surface beneath the Period II temple steps may indicate no more than that the forum surface was lowered immediately prior to the rebuilding of the temple.]

Dating evidence

[The evidence for the date of the Period Ib Forum is drawn from the Period I levels throughout the forum area and from those outside the north wall of the Forum where it joins the precinct of the East Forum Temple (contexts iii b.1, 3–6: figs. 14–17). The following sherds of early African Red Slip Ware were recorded from these levels.]
The finds also include two handles of Italian lamps (nos. iii b.3/17, 4/13) of Loeschcke Type VIII/Bailey Type P which are dated 'late Flavian to Antonine'. There are naturally a few late intrusions, but as they are all attributable to the sixth or seventh centuries A.D. (apart from coin no. 22, of the fourth century) they do not confuse the picture. [Taken at face value, these objects imply a date for the construction of the Period Ib Forum around the very end of the first century A.D. This forum is, however, integral in structure with the Curia and Basilica which adjoin its north and south sides, and it will be argued below that it is also contemporary with the Period II reconstruction of the East Forum Temple. It thus formed part of a very substantial building-programme in the heart of the city. The character of the reconstruction of the temple is consistent with rebuilding following an earthquake, and the destruction caused by such an event would have provided an obvious opportunity for the replanning of the city centre on such a massive scale. The archaeological evidence from these areas does not of itself necessitate such an interpretation, but A. Di Vita has postulated independently that Sabratha was damaged by earthquake in c. A.D. 64/70 (see p. 5), and I believe that the developments in the forum area must be equated with this. This introduces a slight element of conflict with the dating-evidence cited above, for the very heart of the city would not have been left in a ruinous condition for twenty or thirty years: its reconstruction would surely have formed an early priority. It therefore seems likely to me that the reconstruction took place during the seventies of the first century, and that the evidence must be understood to imply the earlier appearance of those objects (African Red Slip Ware and lamps) which have hitherto been dated around the very end of the century (with the reservation that Di Vita's definitive statement concerning the dating of the earthquakes at Sabratha is not yet available).]

**PERIOD II**

**EAST FORUM TEMPLE, SECOND PHASE (fig. 5)**

In Period II, the temple was completely rebuilt and extensive alterations were carried out in the precinct. The architecture of the second temple is discussed on p. 60 ff. As regards the external ground-plan, the effect was to extend the podium of the temple considerably to both front and rear (fig. 3). At the rear (east), a new wall 2.90 m. thick was built, which with an intervening rubble fill gave an additional length of 3.30 m. (See fig. 11, section T–U and pl. 6a.) To the west, the original steps were abolished and the front of the podium extended by 5.90 m. This was approached by a new, and comparatively narrow, flight of steps flanked on either side by platforms 5.75 m. wide, projecting forward 6.20 m. from the top of the steps (see below, p. 61). The new walls and footings incorporated many architectural fragments from the original superstructure (see pl. 14c–d).

It was in connection with these building operations that the level of the temenos was lowered by an average of 67 cm. As has been shown above (p. 14) this lowering was subsequent to the first phase of the temple, but it had been completed before the actual building operations of Period II were undertaken. The very distinctive hard grey layer which truncates all earlier structures firmly seals the foundation-trenches of the side-walls of the temple, (i.e. those walls
that were in use in both periods: see figs. 10 and 13, sections G–H, X–Y, Z–AA), whereas it is cut by, and is earlier than, the foundation-trench of the Period II extension at the rear of the temple (see fig. 11, sections P–Q, R–S). The foundations of the latter, moreover, were never meant to be visible to so great a depth. The layer actually forming the make-up of the floor of the Period II temenos is in fact the layer of clean yellow sand which overlies this truncation level. This layer of sand everywhere corresponds to the lowest level of rendering on the temple walls (but not the earliest: see p. 14). It also seals the foundation-trench of the rear extension, and evens up the depression caused by the fact that the truncation was carried exceptionally low in the north-east corner of the temenos (fig. 11, section P–Q; fig. 10, section L–M–N–O).

Thus it appears that it was at first decided to lower the level of the temenos, possibly to give added height to the enlarged temple and to the surrounding porticoes. When this operation was almost, but not quite, complete, there was a change of plan. It may be that the foundations of the Period I structure were found to be too rough for exposure to this level (as was indeed the case); or perhaps there was some reason connected with the broader topography of the zone. In any case a compromise level of approximately + 4.85 m. was adopted in place of the + 4.65 m. originally intended, and after the construction work had been completed a layer of sand was laid down to bring the surface up to this level. This involved dumping an average thickness of 20 cm. of sand over the whole area previously excavated, increasing to 90 cm. in the north-east corner, where truncation had been carried down especially deep.

That this change of plan was adopted while work in connection with Period II was already in progress, but before its completion, is clear both from the relationship of the truncation and yellow sand levels to the structure of the temple and to its foundation-trenches, and also from the fact that the original project was never completed on the north side. In the extreme north-west corner of the temenos (fig. 10, section C–D), there is no trace of the truncation level nor of the yellow sand level; a hard layer belonging to Period II rests directly upon a make-up overlying pre-temple levels; this make-up was necessary here in Period I because of the drop in the earlier levels, and immediately superposed on it is the grey sand level of the later period. At this point there was evidently no excess truncation and thus no need to make it good with the yellow sand layer. In the north-east corner (fig. 10, section L–M) the truncation is deeper than elsewhere and ends against an earlier wall, on a line oblique to the layout of the precinct. The wall has been
partly cut away, leaving an irregular face of masonry with earlier levels rising behind it, up to
which the yellow sand layer runs. This face, which is 1.25 m. in front of the portico stylobate,
can in fact be nothing but the face of the cutting at the point where the deep truncation was
abandoned.

Though this change of plan resulted in a less drastic lowering of level against the original
temple wall, that part of the earlier foundations that was now left exposed was nevertheless
extremely irregular, and the irregularity was only partly masked by the plaster rendering carried
over the faces of the stones and projecting considerably from the true line of the wall (pl. 3a).
Along the north side a bench was added against the base of the podium contemporaneously with
a raising of level in the temenos, very possibly to hide the untidy appearance of the original
wall. (See fig. 10, section G–H and pl. 7a.) Behind it the original Period II rendering, following the
projecting stones which formed part of the foundations in Period I, is well preserved. At the east
end, this bench runs in front of an inner bench which forms part of the structure of the rear
extension of the temple (fig. 10, section J–K and pl. 7c; cf. fig. 11, sections P–Q and R–S); the
inner bench was presumably carried along the whole of the north side of the temple, though it is
not sufficiently preserved elsewhere for this to be certain. The original Period II rendering is
carried up over it.

For the most part, no true surface remains on top of the yellow sand layer, but in a few places
there are remains of a mortar basis. There is however little doubt that the surface was once paved
and that the mortar formed the bedding for the paving, for the sand would not have survived any
wear. The paving must have been removed later for re-use at a higher level, a process for which
there is clear evidence in the Forum (see p. 000). In places the surviving surface of the yellow sand
is much cut into, presumably where it was disturbed in the process of lifting the paving.

Contemporary with the second phase of the temple and with the lowering of the temenos was
the reconstruction of the surrounding porticoes, which now assumed approximately the aspect
revealed by the original excavations (pl. 6b). The stylobate and the floor-level within the
porticoes were raised, the porticoes themselves were drastically remodelled, and a continuous
flight of steps was added, leading down from the porticoes into the temenos.

The relative chronology of these alterations is established by the fact that, while the steps
belong structurally to the raised, reconstructed porticoes, they can be shown to have been
installed while the work of Period II within the temenos was actually in progress. Their position
was evidently planned at an early stage of the work, for the truncation level does not run beneath
them: indeed it seems probable that they were actually in position before it was decided to
modify the original plan and to raise the level of the temenos. The undersides of the stones of the
lower step are approximately level with the top of the yellow sand; but the rendering on their
faces is (in at least two places) carried down below them, against a backing of rammed earth, as
far as the surface of the truncation level. (See fig. 11, section R–S and fig. 13, section X–Y.) The
steps have not survived on the north side, where all the superstructure and upper foundations
appear to have been robbed in antiquity and the previous excavators have cleared uniformly
down to the first solid level, which is that of the latest paving in the temenos.

At the same time as the steps were added, the height of the stylobate was raised by the addition
of a single course, the floor-level within the porticoes was correspondingly raised by about 30
cm. to the level of the new stylobate, and a second, internal colonnade was added, running down
the centre of each portico. (See fig. 13, sections Z–AA and BB–CC.) The added course cuts
slightly into the preceding surface-level, which is a few centimetres above that of the Period I
stylobate, a difference which may perhaps be accounted for by the use in the early period of a flat
coping slab. The raised stylobate carried a Doric colonnade, of which substantial remains survive
on the south side. All evidence for the character of the corresponding feature in Period I was
destroyed when the stylobate was raised. The internal colonnade, on the other hand, was Ionic,
set at twice the intercolumniation of the other, and the individual columns were based, not on a
continuous stylobate, but on isolated pier-like footings (see pl. 7b). It is stratigraphically certain
that the insertion of these footings belongs to Period II. (See fig. 11, section R–S and fig. 13,
section BB–CC.)

At the west end, the five lowest steps of the stairway at the front of the Period II temple
JUNCTION BETWEEN FORUM AND EAST FORUM TEMPLE

It is clear that the re-designed temple and temenos of Period II are associated with the Low-Level Forum of Period Ib. [The difference in level between the temenos (+ 4.85 m.) and the Forum (+ 4.33 m.) must have been reconciled by a dividing feature of some sort on either side of the temple steps, which led up from the level of the Forum. The character of this feature has been obscured by later constructions and confused by the presence of the broad foundation which KMK interpreted as the base of a flight of steps and which I have suggested to be an unrelated pre-forum feature (above p. 20). Sections MM–NN and OO–PP (fig. 14) show, however, that the present rear wall of the transverse portico divides the Period II truncation and yellow sand layers in the temenos from Period I layers which survive to a higher level (+ 5.00 m.) to the west of it.] It is therefore quite clear that although the existing rear wall of the transverse portico which closes the temenos on the west is late, it must in fact follow the line of an earlier wall, the only direct evidence for which appears in section WW–XX (see p. 43). [It is therefore necessary to infer the presence of a raised terrace (at a level of + 5.26 m. to correspond with the terraces surrounding the Forum?) linking the temenos with the Forum on either side of the temple steps. Of its specific character nothing can be said.]

Dating evidence

[The volume of soil associated with the Period II alterations in the temple precinct suggests that there should be ample pottery evidence from which to establish its date (contexts iii.7, 15, 16; iv.1–23). In point of fact the finds are somewhat meagre. They include sherds of early forms in African Red Slip Ware similar to those from the forum levels of Period Ib (e.g. Hayes Forms 3A/B and 181.1, but also Hayes Form 3C from context iv.1/62 and Hayes Form 10A from context iv.5/33 + 34) and several fragments of Italian lamps of Loeschcke Type VIII/Bailey Type P. There are a few third-century sherds (notably from context iv.4, section V–W( defective stratigraphy?) and one or two obvious later intrusions. However, within the time-span allowed by the stratigraphy (Temple Period II must fall between Forum Periods Ib and III) structural considerations indicate that the Period II reconstruction of the temple and its precinct must be contemporary with the Period Ib Forum. The nature of the second temple and the massive strengthening of its foundations (described in greater detail in Chapter IIIa below) seem obvious pointers to re-building following the earthquake of A.D. 64/70. This is also the most natural explanation for the fact that the temple was rebuilt from its foundations when it had been first erected only a few years before.]

PERIOD III

HIGH-LEVEL FORUM (fig. 6)

The second principal phase in the history of the Forum consisted of a completely new layout, the boundary walls to the north and south alone remaining the same. In the new plan the level of the central area was raised by about 65 cm., allowing for the paving which originally covered the surviving make-up, and the place of the surrounding tabernae and terraces was taken by porticoes bounded by Corinthian colonnades with granite columns.
The evidence for the supersession of the tabernae by the porticoes is very clear on the north side (fig. 16, section AK–AL), where the foundation-trench of the stylobate for the colonnade can be seen cutting the floor of the terrace in front of the tabernae, and the floor belonging to the portico seals the walls of the tabernae. Traces of various mortar surfaces survive in the porticoes, on the uppermost of which there is a floor of polished marble fragments and limestone slabs. Presumably the original floor was of marble, for there are surviving fragments adhering to the bases of the walls.

Prior to the raising of level of the central area, a substantial drainage system was laid down. The main channel comes into the Forum beneath the entrance at the south-east corner, having presumably run down the street leading to the entrance. From there it runs slightly obliquely across the Forum to leave it near the north-east angle. The structure of the drain is integral with that of the stylobate of the Corinthian colonnade, and its direction is accommodated to the latter’s intercolumniation. As the drain can belong stratigraphically only to the High-Level Forum, this serves to provide firm evidence that the Corinthian porticoes and the High-Level Forum are contemporary.

The main channel of the drain is joined by two subsidiary ones, which run along the north and south sides of the Forum respectively. These originate at the ends of the streets on either side of the Capitolium. Here there are narrow cross-channels, set in massive masonry blocks, which served to collect the water running down the streets (pls. 8b, c). From each of these a central channel led the water away at right angles, beneath the sill at the entrance to the Forum. From here, a larger channel curves towards the side of the Forum and runs the length of it to join the main channel.

The side-walls of the drains were built of substantial ashlar blocks, plastered internally, upon which rested flat cover slabs. (See fig. 16, sections AD–AE, AF–AG.) The southern channel is 55 cm. wide at the base, with the top blocks corbelled inwards. At the east end, where it reaches its full depth, there are three courses and the height to the cover slab is 1.25 m. The bottom of this channel was cleared in two places and the fall was found to be 25.5 cm. over a distance of 18 m., which is a gradient of 1:72. The northern channel was only cleared at the north-west angle and the main channel (fig. 14, section HH–JJ) was not cleared internally at all, so its dimensions and gradient are not known.

The fill which was used to raise the level in the central area consisted of tips of sand and some
rubble, put in after the drains were built, and obviously also after the foundations of the new stylobate were built, though this was nowhere actually demonstrable owing either to the presence of the drain along its line or to later structures built against it. The fill just covered the top of the steps at the west end [where the terrace may in fact have been truncated, and upper steps removed: see p. 19]. The top of the fill was flush with the capstones of the drain. On the surface were traces of mortar in places (fig. 14, section HH-JJ), and there is little doubt that this formed a bedding for paving slabs. Two fragments only of slabs were found in position, both beneath the later transverse portico at the east end, but they clearly rested on this level. (See fig. 13, section DD-EE and fig. 14, section UU-VV.) This paving would have added about 12 cm. in height to the level of the Forum. The rest of the paving was no doubt removed when the surface was re-laid at a slightly higher level. Traces of two such higher levels survived, the topmost being associated with the scattered paving stones still in position. As, however, these seem to have been re-laid by the previous excavators, the evidence for these uppermost layers is confused.

At the east end, as is described on p. 27, the paving of this period overlies the lowest steps of the East Forum Temple, from the temenos of which it was probably separated [on either side] by a low terrace.

CAPITOLIUM

[My conclusions differ substantially from those expressed below. See further under 'Dating Evidence', p. 28.]

It is only at this period that there is conclusive proof of the existence of the Capitolium. In the street to the south of it, between it and the Cruciform Building, the construction of the drain-head (which certainly belongs to this period) appears to be contemporary with the construction of the south wall of the Capitolium. (See fig. 17 (a).) There is no structural connection and the drain butts against the footings of the Capitolium; but the latter do appear to be more regular here than they are further west, as if to enable the drain to be built against them. Both structures appear to have been built from the same level, and their foundation-trenches appear to be sealed by the same layer.

Across the front of the Capitolium, its foundation-trench is sealed only by the mortar basis of the paving of the High-Level Forum, which has here replaced the steps of the Low-Level (Period Ib) Forum. (See fig. 17 (b).) There is no doubt at all of the evidence that the temple is later than Period Ib. This is particularly clear in section AU-AV, where a large pit with a grey powdery fill is cut through the level at the back of the steps which is contemporary with them. Into this pit have sagged the levels at the side, and a layer of brown sand across the top seems to have been added to make good this sinkage. This layer is cut by the foundation-trench of the temple. In this particular section, the mortar basis of the paving is missing against the wall, being replaced by red clay which usually represents Italian levelling. But though the evidence here is quite conclusive that the temple is later than Period I of the Forum and no later than Period III, it is not equally so that it is contemporary with Period III, since it is possible that the original terrace was higher, and that its top was truncated when the Forum was levelled over as part of the Period III alterations (see above, p. 19).

EAST FORUM TEMPLE AND JUNCTION WITH FORUM

The only alterations in the temple precinct to be ascribed to this period are those which were necessary at the west end to adapt the plan to that of the High-Level Forum. In this period, for the first time, the line of the forum porticoes was made continuous with that of the porticoes in the temple precinct. The wall at the west end of the southern temple portico was apparently rebuilt on this occasion, foundations and all, for the existing foundations break into those of the temple portico stylobate and bond with those of the Forum. In the north portico, however, the original foundations remained in use.
The paving belonging to the raised level of the Forum was brought forward to overlie the two lowest steps of the Period II temple, the second step being cut into to take the bedding for the paving. (See fig. 14, section UU–VV and pl. 8a.) It is quite clear that at this period the structure which rested on the broad Period I foundations between the temple and the forum was abolished, and the foundations themselves were stripped down to the bottom course. [If, as argued above, p. 20, this foundation belonged to a pre-forum structure, it may already in Period Ib have been reduced to the level of the Low-Level Forum. The robbing which is evident in Period III (see fig. 14, section KK–LL–MM–NN) may therefore have been confined to the removal of a single course of blocks.] On this course as a footing rest two short lengths of masonry, running east and west. (There may have been more, but excavation beneath the transverse portico was limited to those areas from which its mosaic floor was missing.) Each was 1.20 m. wide and c. 3 m. long, and the west end of each runs beneath the later transverse portico wall. (See fig. 2 and fig. 13, section DD–EE.) At the east end they were certainly free-standing, and probably at the west end also; it is hard therefore to believe that they served any structural purpose. They were perhaps statue bases flanking the entrance to the temple. That they belong to this period is certain, for the paving runs up to them and conforms with them.

There must still have been some sort of transverse feature separating the temple temenos from the Forum, for the contemporary temenos level, which is presumably that next above the Period II layer of yellow sand, is not found beneath the eastern part of the later transverse portico. The rear wall of the presumed Period II transverse feature (on the line of the east wall of the later portico: see above, p. 24) must therefore have continued in use into Period III. In two of the trenches, about 2 m. in front of the line of this wall, was found a single course of large blocks, in the top of the better-preserved of which was a shallow channel (see fig. 14, section MM–NN). The contemporary surface-level between this line and the presumed transverse wall appears to have been equivalent to that now established in the Forum; and between the two there is a single paving stone which seems to have been displaced only slightly from its original position. The blocks may have served as a kerb, possibly with a gutter (unless the channelled block is re-used), bounding a narrow feature against the wall which divided the temenos from the Forum. [Is this in fact the terrace which occupied this position in Period II?] The front of this feature is aligned with the lowest of the temple steps visible after the raising of the level of the Forum; and it may be that the platforms flanking the temple steps were cut back at the same time to conform with this line. (The upper part of the footings of these platforms was removed later, when the transverse portico was built, so there is no definite evidence on this point.)

For the rest of the temple area there is no trace of major structural alterations during this period; but a number of floors were re-laid at a higher level, as is shown by a layer (or in some cases two layers) of dumped matter intervening between the floor-levels of Period II and those of Period IV.

**Dating evidence**

[The fine wares from the foundation-trenches and make-up levels for the High-Level Forum (contexts iii b.2; v.2, 4, 7, 11) include the same forms in African Red Slip Ware as those found in the Period Ib levels, with the addition of the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Catalogue nos.</th>
<th>Date range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hayes 23B</td>
<td>v.2/84 (2 rims), 86, 89</td>
<td>Mid C2 to early C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes 181</td>
<td>v.2/94, 94a, 99, 100</td>
<td>Second half of C2 to first half of C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes 182</td>
<td>v.2/101, 11/5</td>
<td>As the preceding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These levels also produced a coin of Hadrian (no. 72), and one sherd of African Red Slip Ware in the bright glossy fabric which is typical of the first half of the third century (no. v.11/8). A late Antonine date is therefore possible for the refurbishment of the Forum, broadly contemporary with the construction of the Antonine Temple and of the South Forum Temple immediately to
The stratigraphy relating to the Capitolium is problematic. I have not altered the text above (p. 26), preferring to defer comment until this point. The relationship between the Capitolium and the drain-head in the street on the south side (fig. 17 (a)) clearly implies that the construction of the Capitolium (in its final form) cannot be later than that of the High-Level Forum of Period III. However, I see nothing in the sections against the front of the Capitolium which implies on stratigraphic grounds that its construction must be later than the establishment of the Low-Level Forum in Period Ib. The foundation-trench for the Capitolium is sealed only by the existing (high-level) paving, which is shown in part to have been re-laid by the Italian excavators. But as it has been argued above (p. 19) that the raised level surrounding the Forum in Period Ib was truncated here in the course of laying out the High-Level Forum in Period III, it is impossible to draw any conclusion about the stratigraphic relationship between the foundation-trench of the Capitolium and the levels of Period Ib. The contrary position is argued above, particularly on the basis of section AU–AV: the section illustrates a pit which post-dates the Period Ib levels, and which is itself cut by the foundation-trench of the Capitolium. Only Hellenistic fine ware is recorded from the foundation-trench in the excavated sections (context v.S), but there is later material from this pit (context iv b.8). Unfortunately, of the seven vessels recorded, five are late-sixth/seventh-century African Red Slip Ware of Hayes Forms 105 and 106! The stratigraphy (and hence the drawn section) is therefore clearly defective and no conclusions can be drawn from it. (See also below, p. 47 f. and Chapter IIIId.)

There is pottery evidence from one further area. A trench was dug beneath the missing north stairway of the Capitolium (trench S.p.E 43, not illustrated), where a number of levels were recorded. These included a large pit (layer 1) which was inferred to represent a robber-trench relating to the removal of a pre-existing wall at the time when the Capitolium was built (or rather, extended). The foundation-trenches for the Capitolium walls were recorded as cutting this pit (though this involved acute observation of stratigraphy very close to the surface). In any case, all of the material from this trench should have pre-dated the construction of the Capitolium.
STRATIGRAPHY: PERIOD III

Steps. The fine ware from the pit (context v.3, = ix.l) included Hellenistic black-glazed wares, terra sigillata and two sherds of African Red Slip Ware of Hayes Forms 7 and 182. If the stratigraphy was correctly observed and these pieces are not superficial intrusions, a late Antonine date is indicated for the latest phase of the Capitolium (on this basis alone), contemporary with the Period III refurbishment of the Forum.

PERIOD IV

EAST FORUM TEMPLE (fig. 7)

Later than Period III and earlier than Period V, a number of building operations were carried out in the temple precinct.

A. South Portico. On the south side of the temple, built up against the south precinct wall and lying between it and the piers of the Ionic colonnade, the construction of a number of small tabernae was begun. The plan consists of a continuous foundation, parallel to the precinct wall and 2 m. in front of it, with a series of partition-walls at right angles, linking the two at intervals of 3.30 m. The wall carried by the long foundation is discontinuous, with doorways 2.40 m. wide opening symmetrically between the partition-walls to form a series of tabernae opening off the portico.

Stratigraphically it is certain that these walls are the latest structures in the portico. They butt against the precinct wall and against the rendering on its basal offset and face, and the foundation-trenches cut all surviving levels. In section Z-AA (fig. 13), the foundations of the front wall are carried extremely deep. At this point there was an underlying, pre-temple, rubbish pit which provided an unsatisfactory basis, and the foundation had to be carried down to undisturbed ground.

It is difficult to understand how these tabernae could have been planned to exist at the same time as the Ionic colonnade, which is very close to them and the intercolumniation of which is ignored in the planning of the doorways. Moreover, to the east the front wall comes to a butt end without a return in any direction, 7.90 m. short of the east wall of the precinct. It seems probable, therefore, that the tabernae were planned but never completed, and that the abandoned stumps of the walls were covered by a level which was removed in the earlier excavations. It may well have been a part of this plan to demolish the Ionic colonnade when they were built. [Or was it the already ruinous condition of the portico which gave rise to the plan in the first place?]

The front wall of the tabernae lines up exactly with the back wall of the forum portico, and it looks as if the intention had been to unify the two plans and to carry through the line of this portico. It is very probable that the intervening west wall of the temple portico was in fact demolished. The existing wall, which is extremely rough and late in appearance, is built over the top of one of the partition-walls of the tabernae, and against the face of the front wall (see pls. 8d and 9a).

B. North Portico. There is no evidence to show whether similar tabernae were planned or constructed on the north side, for here there were large-scale disturbances, and even had they existed all trace would have been removed.

All along the northern front of the north portico, and extending beyond it to both east and west, a tremendous fill of rubbish was found. This included large amounts of burnt material, architectural fragments, plaster, quantities of broken drain pipes and much pottery. It obviously represented the clearing-up after some great disaster. It is most unlikely that a trench of this size would have been dug merely to dispose of this debris, and the explanation of the trench was provided by the discovery at the bottom, throughout its length, of the rubble footings of a wall 2.50 m. thick. The robbing of this broad wall cuts the foundation-trench of the temple precinct.
wall, but equally the foundation-trench of the precinct wall cuts layers which must have run up against the broad wall. (See fig. 10, section E-F and fig. 15, section BE-BF.) The latter must therefore antedate the temple precinct, and it is suggested elsewhere (p. 11) that it may have been a boundary wall of the city at an early period. After some disaster in the temple precinct which provided all the rubbish for the fill and, as will be seen below, rendered necessary the rebuilding of the piers and stylobate of the northern portico, the surviving courses of this wall were rediscovered. The superstructure was presumably of ashlar and was worth robbing, therefore, for building stone to use in the repairs; it was accordingly dug out as far as the rubble footing and the resulting hole filled in with the destruction debris.

The foundations of the piers of the Ionic colonnade were clearly rebuilt at the same time, since they are set completely within the rubbish fill, which at the points where the piers occur extends south of the line of the robbed wall. It is also clear in a number of places that the stylobate of the Doric colonnade was rebuilt, presumably at this period, although the connection cannot be demonstrated stratigraphically. (See the sections in fig. 10.) This is shown by the fact that, where they were examined, the stylobate foundations cut on the south side the filling belonging to Period II with a wide but irregular foundation-trench, whereas elsewhere it is quite clear that this irregular trench is later than the original stylobate. On the other hand, on the north side of the stylobate the filling which must belong to Period I seems to run right up to it. It is thus clear that the foundations were rebuilt from the south side, the stones being replaced against the vertical face which had rested against the original wall. Why it should have been necessary to rebuild the foundations is not clear, but the stratigraphic evidence for the process is definite, and is confirmed by the late contents of the foundation trenches to the south. In section C-D, for instance (fig. 10), the foundation-trench of the footings of the original wall, and in other equivalent sections the discrepancy of the evidence on the two sides of the wall, allow only for this explanation.

Parts at least of the north wall of the temple precinct appear also to have been rebuilt at this time (see below, p. 37 f.), and it was presumably now or later that the apse in the centre of the wall was abolished by the building of a wall across the chord in a style of masonry inferior to that of the rest of the wall.

To this period apparently belongs also the upper coarse grey sand level in the temple temenos, for in the north-west corner of the temenos it runs up to the lowest stylobate step, where this overlies the foundation-trench of the rebuilt wall (see fig. 10, section C-D). When the transverse portico was built in Period V, the Period II-III wall which has been shown to be necessary on an almost identical line, had clearly ceased to exist. It is therefore probable that, with the laying-down of this grey sand level and of the penultimate level in the Forum, the surface of the temenos was carried straight through into the Forum, without any intervening feature.

FORUM

No further major alterations were carried out in the Forum. As has already been mentioned (p. 26), re-surfacings of both the central area and the porticoes can be traced. The first re-surfacing of the central area may have joined it up directly with the temenos of the East Forum Temple. The final paving is apparently contemporary with the transverse portico across the front of the East Forum Temple (Period V). The final paving of the northern portico is also late, for it consists of a patchwork of broken marble and stone slabs. [See p. 33 f.] At the east end this overlies the disturbances connected with the robbing of the broad wall beneath the north portico of the East Forum Temple.

During the life of the High-Level Forum a number of monuments were constructed in it. Traces of heavy foundations along the north and south boundaries must belong to such monuments, while three large foundations can be traced in the central area. More may exist, as by no means the whole area was examined.
Dating evidence

[The pottery associated with the various developments attributed to this period is all broadly similar in character. The African Red Slip Ware shows a substantial preponderance of early third-century material (Hayes Forms 14, 17, 18, 23B, 27/31, 30-33, 181, 182) together with a small number of pieces in the thin, fine central Tunisian fabric which first appears c. A.D. 230 ('Late A Ware'/terra sigillata chiara C). These are distributed as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Catalogue no.</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South temple portico: foundation-trenches of tabernae (contexts vi a.1-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes 50A, 2 sherds</td>
<td>vi a.2/41</td>
<td>c. 230/240-360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes 45 or similar, 2 sherds</td>
<td>vi a.2/42</td>
<td>c. 230/240-mid C4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| North temple portico: robber-trench and foundation-trench fills (contexts vi b.1-8) | | |
| Rim, Hayes 46 | vi b.6/41 | Last quarter of C3-first quarter of C4 |
| Rim, Hayes 48B | vi b.7/72 | c. 230/240-320 (see under Berenice Form B630) |
| Sherd, 'Late A Ware' | vi b.6/45 | c. 230/240- |
| Rim, Hayes 58A | vi b.6/44 | c. 290/300-375 |

| Upper grey sand level in temple precinct (contexts v.8-10, 13; vi c.1-5; vi d.1-7) | | |
| Sherd, 'Late A Ware' | vi d.1/23 | c. 230/240- |
| Sherd, Hayes 50 | vi d.1/31 | c. 230/240-400+ |
| Sherd, African lamp with cross-monogram, Hayes Type II | vi d.1/68 | c. 400-450+ |
| Rim, Hayes 93A | vi.e.8/21 | Mid C5 |
| Rim, Hayes 91C | vi c.2/9 | C6? |

A fragment of a 'wine glass' from context vi b.4 (Chapter X, no. B59) is dated not before the mid fifth century.]

[None of this adds up to very much, and the picture is further confused by the evidence of two additional trenches dug in 1951 in the north-east corner of the temple precinct (trenches S.p. X2 and S.p. Z3). Whereas about 250 sherds of red slip ware from the Period IV levels in other parts of the north portico included only the four listed above which are later than the first quarter of the third century, these two additional trenches yielded some 340 (catalogued) sherds of red slip ware (contexts xxiv.43 and xxvi.42), including the following quantities of later sherds.

| After c. A.D. 230/240: | 15 | (Hayes Forms 44, 45, 50) |
| After c. A.D. 360: | 11 | (Hayes Forms 67, 68 and related; Berenice Form B695 in Tripolitanian Red Slip Ware) |
| Fifth century: | 4 | (Hayes Forms 91A/B, 93, 99; Berenice Form B703 in Tripolitanian Red Slip Ware)]

[The abortive project to build tabernae in the southern portico of the temple precinct (= Period IVa) was perhaps undertaken in the second quarter of the third century. The reasons both for its inception and for its abandonment are wholly unclear.]

[The developments in the northern portico (= Period IVb) are more clear in character, though hardly so in chronology. There was evidently a disaster of some kind which involved burning and collapse, and which was followed by the reconstruction of the portico and of the rear wall from the foundations up. It will be argued below (p. 32 f.) that this reconstruction preceded, and was unrelated to, the building of the transverse portico in Period V, which is attributed to the aftermath of the earthquake in A.D. 365. In view of this, the evidence of the fine wares from the relevant contexts is clearly defective, and one can only say with confidence that the developments in the north portico took place no earlier than those on the south. One further piece of evidence may, however, be adduced. An inscription which is alleged to have been found in the East Forum]
Temple (IRT 55: see p. 67) records the restoration of the temple in A.D. 340–350 and describes it as having fallen into a state of 'antiqua ruina'. A. Di Vita has suggested that one of the occasions when Sabratha was damaged by earthquake was in A.D. 306/310 (p. 5): it is just possible that this restoration was occasioned by that earthquake, and that the destruction and restoration of the north portico also formed part of the same chain of events.

[A period of dereliction of some thirty years may also be suggested by consideration of the upper grey sand level in the temple temenos. The irregularity of the surface beneath the grey sand level (clearly indicated in fig. 11, section R–S and fig. 13, sections X–Y and Z–AA) suggests to me that during the suggested period of dereliction the surface of the temenos became extensively pitted as a result of robbing of the paving stones. It would then have been necessary to import the grey sand in order to re-establish a level surface over the whole area, upon which a new pavement could be laid as part of the Constantinian restoration. (The presence of one fifth-century lamp fragment in the upper grey sand level is inadequate to affect the argument.)]

[In the Forum, foundation-trenches were identified in association with the late monuments which are shown in figure 16, section AD–AE, north end, and section AH–AJ, centre (contexts vi e.1 and 2); the finds from the former include a fragment of a fifth-century African lamp (Hayes Type II). The coins from the forum area show a substantial level of activity during the fourth century (below, p. 270).]

**PERIOD V**

TRANSVERSE PORTICO (fig. 7 and pl. 9b)

The latest structural alteration to the temple precinct comprised the erection of a transverse portico across the west end, dividing it off from the Forum. It is clear from the roughness of the work, from the style of the mosaic floor, and from the fact that its foundation-trenches uniformly cut all other levels that this is a very late feature. (See the sections in fig. 14.)

It has already been argued (p. 24) that the rear wall of the transverse portico follows the line of an earlier wall which divided the Forum from the temple precinct in Periods II and III. This must have been completely removed in Period IV, for with a single exception (p. 43, section WW–XX) the present rear wall does not appear to incorporate anything earlier in the parts excavated. The front wall, which carried a colonnade, overlies, but does not rest on, the front edges of the broad Period I [or pre-forum?] foundation and of the suggested statues bases of Period III. All of these must likewise have disappeared in Period IV, for the levels covering them are cut by the foundation-trench of the new wall.

The building of this portico considerably modified the appearance of the front of the temple. The platforms flanking the steps were apparently abolished, for the rear wall of the portico cuts right across them. The remaining gap of 1.30 m. between this and the front of the main temple podium was presumably filled with rubble. That the temple remained in use [as a building, at least] and was not merely shut off by the portico, is clear from the fact that access to the temple was retained through the portico. This was appreciably narrower than the original entrance, being only about 5 m. wide. It starts from the fifth step (from the bottom) of the Period II stairway. This projects forward 2 m. through the rear wall of the portico, and the mosaic floor is fitted round this projection. Thin and rather irregularly placed walls run back to the front of the podium, and must constitute the substructure of the upper steps. It might be reasonable to suppose that these alterations, which presumably follow a considerable destruction of parts of the temple, were contemporary with the restoration of the north portico of the precinct in Period IV, were it not for the fact that a number of points the transverse portico is demonstrably later. In the first place, its foundation-trench cuts the grey sand level associated with the rebuilt north portico stylobate (see p. 30). Secondly, the west end of the north portico was cut off in its final phase to form a separate room. The east wall of this room is continuous with, and presumably
contemporary with, the rear wall of the transverse portico. Obviously, when this room was
constructed, this part of the internal colonnade of the north portico must have been abolished.
[Why?] That the creation of the room was subsequent to the big debris-filled trench and to the
rebuilding of the piers is shown by the discovery within it of the debris and of a rebuilt pier.

It appears probable that the laying-down of the existing paving, fragmentary in the Forum but
fairly continuous in the north and east parts of the temple temenos, belongs to the period of the
transverse portico. Certainly as it exists it seals the foundation-trench of the transverse portico, as
can be seen in the north-east corner of the Forum and at the junction of the north side of the
temple with the portico. There is an element of doubt, in that it is clear that all the paving has
been relaid by the previous excavators. It does however appear that they were careful to relay the
slabs in their original positions, merely levelling and re-bedding them, and mending them as
required. On the whole, therefore, the evidence of position can probably be accepted. If so, the
reconstruction of the period was very thorough and the resulting general appearance would have
been reasonably orderly, in spite of the oddness of the new entrance to the temple. Even if in fact
the paving stones against the transverse portico had been lifted in order to dig the foundation-
trenches and subsequently reset, a procedure the evidence for which would have been destroyed
in the modern re-laying, it would imply that the rest of the area was still neatly paved. It can
therefore be taken that the central area was in no way ruinous at the beginning of this period.
[But see further, below.]

**Dating evidence**

[The fine wares associated with the construction of the transverse portico (contexts vii.1–3) were
largely uninformative: apart from material of the early third century there was only one small,
later sherd (no. vii.2/12) which might belong to the fourth century. An intermediate level,
pre-dating the portico but post-dating the upper grey sand level in the temenos, yielded a rim of
Hayes Form 76 in African Red Slip ware (no. vi d.i.1/8), attributable to the middle quarters of the
fifth century.]

[There is, however, a strong likelihood that the portico is to be dated to the period of
reconstruction following the disastrous earthquake of A.D. 365 (see p. 5 f.). The character of the
mosaic (pl. 9b) is very like that in the forehall of the late Curia (visible in the foreground of
Bartocci 1950, pl. 15a) and in the Period III Basilica (p. 81 and pl. 23a), both of which are
attributed to the aftermath of this event. It seems highly probable that the East Forum Temple
was reduced to a heap of rubble by the earthquake, and that a decision was taken to close off the
area. The fact that an access onto the temple podium was retained through the rear of the
transverse portico suggests a continued use of some sort, though hardly as a temple. (None of
the other pagan temples was restored after this earthquake.) A report in the Italian
Relazione di scavo
(transcribed by JBWP) dated 21.1.33 records that all the architectural elements of the temple were
found collected together on the south side of the precinct: this accords with the evidence from the
Capitolium (IRT, p. 23) and from the theatre (Guidi 1930, 3, 5, 52) for a systematic recovery of
building-materials in the aftermath of the earthquake.]

[As to later activity in the area, any evidence was almost wholly removed in the course of the
first excavations. The Relazione di scavo reports the presence of late buildings on the north side of
the temple (3.9.32; 31.1.33) and the finding of granite columns from the forum porticoes and of
other marble fragments in the same area (25.6.32; 10.9.32; 21.1.33). A well against the rear wall
of the East Forum Temple opposite section T–U (fig. 3 and pl. 9c) is a late feature built of rough
stones, unmortared and packed round the outside with fragments of paving-slabs. Also late is a
rectangular screened enclosure nearby in the south-east corner of the temenos. It should be noted
that the areas in which the paving of the temenos is best preserved are precisely those in which
late activity is attested. The date of this late activity is uncertain: no coins later than the third
quarter of the fourth century were found in the area, but perhaps a dozen sherds of fifth- or
sixth-century red slip ware are recorded as intrusions in earlier levels. The use of columns from
the Forum is likely to belong to the Byzantine period: the restoration of the forum colonnades
after the earthquake of A.D. 365 is implied by the re-paving of the north forum portico at this
period with salvaged material, including inscriptions (see IRT, 23, 27, 41, 43 and especially 95), and by the retention of the rear wall of the south portico in the Period IIIa Basilica (p. 82). Conversely, the forum colonnades were clearly not standing when the Basilica/Church I was rebuilt on a different plan after the Byzantine conquest in A.D. 533 (Basilica Period IV: see p. 85).]

PERIOD VI

During the Christian period, presumably in the late Byzantine re-organization of the city, large parts of the Forum were used as a burial ground, which is a surprising commentary on the social organization of the period. Graves were found throughout the length of the former south forum portico, and in the south-west part of the Forum they extended almost continuously out to a distance of 21 m. from the portico stylobate, that is to say rather more than half way across (see pl. 10a). These were presumably associated with the church which superseded the late Basilica. Graves were also found at the eastern end of the northern portico, and in this area extend out into the Forum for a distance of 16.50 m., though not so continuously as in the south-western area. (See fig. 16, section AD–AE.) These are presumably connected with the Justinianic church to the north of the Forum (Church 2). No attempt was made to disentangle the succession, but a number of graves are superimposed on one another. Two only were opened, those of a young woman and of a boy or young man. There were no contemporary associated objects. 2 One grave in the south forum portico had traces of a wooden coffin inside the stone cist (pl. 10b).

The fine wares found in the back-fill above and around the graves (contexts viii.1–3) included red slip ware of the second and third centuries A.D., a very few sherds of the fourth, fifth or early sixth centuries, and rather more of the latest African forms of the late sixth and seventh centuries (Hayes Forms 91D, 105 and 106). It may therefore be that the use of the area as a burial ground is confined to the last half-century preceding the Arab conquest in A.D. 643. (See also below, p. 86.)

THE WEST END OF THE SOUTH FORUM PORTICO

(J.B.W.P.)

[The following section is an independent study by JBWP which was not integrated into the over-all description of the forum area by KMK. It is concerned with one small area, which is described in considerably greater detail than other parts of the Forum. For the sake of evenness, I have interpolated only the main conclusions into the preceding text, but the structural sequence identified in the south-west angle of the Forum is of sufficient importance to justify the inclusion of the detailed study here.]

Under the Later Empire, the south forum portico consisted of a spacious colonnade, just over 7 m. wide, bounded on the south by the outer north wall of the Basilica (except at the extreme east

2 [These statements are belied by photographs of five different graves which were opened in the course of the excavations (graves VII, XII, XXVI and XXVII in the western part of the Forum and an unnumbered grave at the west end of the south forum portico: see figure 2). One of the graves (no. XXVI, pls. 11a–b) contained three large pieces of a painted vessel which were noted in the site record as ‘possibly intrusive’: this seems to me unlikely in view of their suggestive positions in the grave and of the substantial cover slabs which were in situ before the grave was opened (pl. 11a). Unfortunately, I have not succeeded in finding any further record of this interesting vessel, nor indeed the object itself.]

[SUBSEQUENT NOTE: One print of the photograph reproduced in pl. 11b has been annotated by JBWP – ‘The pots are bogus’. ]
FIG. 8. Plan of early structures at the west end of the south forum portico.

end, where there was a door opening from the main north-south street of the city), and opening northwards onto the open central area of the Forum. At the west end a triple opening, the full width of the portico, gave access to the Cruciform Building. The columns of the portico itself were of grey granite, and those in the entrance to the Cruciform Building of cipollino; and the whole portico was presumably paved with the white marble slabs of which scanty traces can still be seen, notably two fragments still *in situ* close to the north-west angle. Like the rest of the portico, the western end served as a burial ground in late antiquity; and although excavation revealed the substantial remains of earlier structures, underlying the level of the marble pavement, these were everywhere much disturbed and there was little possibility of tracing a coherent stratigraphy. [These structures are shown in plan in figure 8.]

Among the pre-portico structures, two types of walling could be distinguished: (a) walls or foundations built of stretchers, each up to 1 m. in length and about 50 cm. (or slightly more) in width (pl. 18a); and (b) footings of headers, quite roughly laid and of varying lengths. The first of these wall-types is represented by a wall or footing 13 m. long, running parallel to, and 2.50 m. south of, the south edge of the stylobate of the [Period III] colonnade. At the west end, it is of one build with the footings of the terminal wall of the portico, which later served to carry the two cipollino columns of the entrance to the Cruciform Building; and to the east, the line of the wall is continued by that of the footings of the north frontage of the forum tabernae of [Period Ib]. At the junction of these two there is a pair of blocks which are laid in the same sense as the stretcher wall, but which might belong to either; and from these a second, but rougher, footing of stretchers runs southwards, dressed to a fairly straight face on the east side but (seemingly) quite rough on the west. Apart from the taberna frontage referred to above, the footings of the second type all run from north to south. Two of them lie to the north of the header wall, at a distance of approximately 3.50 m. and 9 m. respectively to the east of the west terminal wall of the portico; a third lies to the south, about 10.50 m. east of the same point.

In addition to these walls and footings, there are the remains of two, possibly three, substantial cisterns, occupying the whole of the west end of the portico south of the header wall described above (pl. 12a). Each of these cisterns consists of a rectangular tank, 80-85 cm. wide, 3.40 m. long and 2.35 m. deep (internal measurements), and is capable of holding some 6,000 litres (= 1,320 gallons). Each tank is roofed with massive slabs, up to 1.40 m. in length, of which those of the westernmost cistern were found mainly in place, whereas all but one had been removed from the next; the presence of a third cistern adjoining the other two (not excavated) may be conjectured from the discovery of what appear to be similar roofing slabs, in position,
immediately to the east of the other two. The tanks had undergone at least one modification since they were installed. An inlet channel at the south-west angle is an original feature; but an overflow outlet at the north-east corner of the second tank is plainly an afterthought, which cuts its way through all earlier features. At the same time a shallow channel was cut through the south end of the partition wall that separates the two tanks; and a corresponding break at the north end is possibly, but not certainly, also a secondary feature. It is probable that the tanks were originally connected by channels at the base of the partition walls. In late antiquity, graves were cut at two points into the fill of the tanks, which must by then have completely silted up.

Apart from the fragments of marble paving preserved near the north-west angle of the portico, at a level corresponding to that of the column-bases of the portico colonnade, the only floor of which traces were found in situ was a pavement, or pavements, of opus signinum, stretches of which were found both to the north and to the south of the stretcher wall, in the area to the east of the cisterns. It lies some 10–15 cm. only below the level of the later marble paving, and it has been very badly broken up by later graves and by other intrusive features. There is only one point at which its relationship to the walls and foundations described above can be securely established; it overrides, and is certainly later than, the eastern one of the two north–south footings that lie between the stretcher wall and the stylobate of the portico colonnade. It seems probable, however, that a packing of red clay, found wherever the ground was undisturbed over the whole area excavated, was put down to serve as a basis for this opus signinum floor, which everywhere rests directly upon it; and this red clay is more informative. It seals, and is later than, the long stretcher wall and both the north–south footings to the north of it; and it is not earlier (but may be later) than the footings of the earliest phase of the wall that divides the south forum portico from the Cruciform Building to the west. On the other hand, it is cut by the stylobate of the portico colonnade [belonging to Period III] and by the outlet from the second cistern. It was not found over the cisterns which had, in any case, been opened and remodelled at the same time as the outlet was cut; but it seals the north wall of the cisterns, which are therefore an earlier feature.

From the above facts, it would appear that four main periods are represented. The first of these [Forum Period Ia] comprises the east–west stretcher wall and the earliest wall on the line of what was later the end wall of the portico, between it and the Cruciform Building; also the two north–south footings to the north of the stretcher wall. The corresponding floor-level is nowhere preserved; but, to judge from the level of the tops of the footings, it can have been little, if at all, below that of the succeeding pavement. In the second period [Forum Period Ib] two at any rate of the earlier walls were levelled, and only the wall at the west end of the portico certainly remained standing. A considerable part, perhaps the whole, of the area comprised within the west end of the later portico was now paved with opus signinum, bedded on a filling of red clay. [The northern limit of this surface would presumably have been the edge of the Period Ib boundary terrace on the south side of the Forum (p. 18), and the southern limit the north wall of the Basilica.] [Period III] saw the construction of the south forum portico in its definitive form, with a colonnade of marble and grey granite and paved throughout in white marble. There is no structural evidence to prove that the portico and the Cruciform Building to the west of it were put up at the same moment; but it will be noted that the entrance to the latter presupposes the existence of a structure of the same width as the portico immediately in front of it; and the two buildings, if not absolutely contemporary, certainly belong to the same general phase of building activity. The fourth and final period [related to the late history of the Basilica/Church 1] saw few structural alterations except at the west end, at the entrance to the Cruciform Building; but during late antiquity the whole space within the portico became riddled with graves, which have almost obliterated the stratigraphy of the preceding periods.

The digging of the cisterns cannot be precisely related to the sequence described in the preceding paragraph, except that the outlet (a secondary feature) is later than the opus signinum floor of [Period Ib]; this outlet presumably implies the existence of the main [Period III] drain along the south side of the Forum. On the whole, it seems unlikely that the cisterns are as early as the earliest walls on the site. The masonry appears to have been crowded into the space available within a pre-existing superstructure, rather than planned with it; and the inlet (an original feature) is so sited in relation to the angle of the earliest basilica (Basilica I) as to show that the
latter was already in existence, or at any rate planned, when the cisterns were dug; this relationship is confirmed by the results of the excavation within the north-west angle of the Basilica (p. 69). They were probably dug in connection with the construction of the Basilica; and in terms of the remains represented within the south forum portico, this took place during [Period Ia], after the building of the stretcher wall, but before the latter was levelled to make way for the opus signinum pavement [of Period Ib].

The two north–south footings to the south of the long stretcher wall were cleared but not excavated. From a superficial examination it is impossible to establish to which period they belong, although the stretcher wall would seem most naturally to belong with the stretcher walls of the earliest period, here and within the north aisle of the Basilica (see below, p. 69).

NOTES ON SECTIONS
(K.M.K./P.M.K.)

There exists an extensive manuscript in KMK's hand with this title. It is concerned exclusively with the Roman period, and apart from some editorial alterations to the existing text I have added to it such comments as I have been able to make on the pre-Roman levels in each trench.

Figure 10. Sections on the north side of the East Forum Temple

Sections A–B and C–D. The pre-existing levels at the north-west corner of the temple precinct are considerably lower than elsewhere. There is therefore no removal of early layers here, but a fill contemporary with Period I to raise the level to that required for the floor of that period (p. 15). Even in the portico this fill does not survive to its full height, presuming that to have been approximately the same as that on the south side, since the previous excavators had removed all levels down to that of the paving of the temenos, which was the first hard level encountered, as there had been considerable destruction in the portico. In both temenos and portico there are well-marked construction levels which seal the foundation-trenches, and above which is the contemporary fill.

When the level of the temenos was lowered in Period II, the excess truncation which took place over the rest of the area did not extend to this corner, and there is no yellow sand layer needed to make it good (p. 22). The layer which truncates the Period I fill is at the right height for the Period II temenos floor.

In Period IV, all levels in the north half of the portico were destroyed with the robbing of the broad early wall (p. 29 f.). In this section, the north precinct wall apparently required rebuilding from the base up; one ashlar footing course of the original wall survives, overlain by the rubble footings of the rebuild. The pier of the Ionic colonnade was also completely rebuilt. It is also necessary from the stratification to postulate a rebuilding of the stylobate of the Doric colonnade. The section shows clearly the fill which was necessary in Period I to raise the level of both portico and temenos to the required height. Yet this fill is cut on the south side by a wide and well-defined foundation-trench for its existing wall, which cannot therefore belong to Period I. Beneath this foundation-trench are wide footings, the foundation-trench of which cuts pre-temple levels and is sealed by a level which corresponds in height to the construction-level north of the wall. These footings must therefore belong to the Period I wall. On the north side, the Period I fill which is of hard clean orange sand, quite different from the later fills, and which is cut by the Period IV fill to the north, runs right up to the back of the stylobate foundations. This can

3 The level to the north was considerably lower (see pl. 39) and a destruction to a low level is therefore not surprising.
only be explained by postulating that the rebuilt foundations were placed flush against the vertical face of the fill which had run up against the original foundations. [The pottery from this fill (context iii.12) and from the layer immediately beneath it (context i a.2) includes African Red Slip Ware of the early third century A.D.: this suggests either that there was a Period IV foundation-trench on the north side of the stylobate which was not recognized, or that the entire fill is to be attributed to Period IV.]

[Pre-Roman levels: It is argued above (p. 11) that the early wall beneath the north end of section A-B is a defensive wall of the fifth century B.C. The fragmentary layers against its southern side (context i.55a) yielded three sherds of fine ware, all of which are Hellenistic or later: they cannot be regarded as relevant to its date. The pre-forum walls D3.6-7 to the south of this (see the plan, fig. 3 and pl. 12b) are probably attributable to the first half of the second century B.C. on the basis of associated Campana A ware, including Berenice Forms B4 and B10 (context i.56). In section C-D, the earliest occupation-levels (contexts i.43-45) suggest a sequence which begins in the fourth or third century B.C. Wall D1.6 at the south end of the section, which appears to follow the Roman rather than the earlier alignment, is dated by pottery from its foundation-trench and from beneath the floor which runs up to it to the Tiberian period (context i.46: much Eastern Sigillata A and Italian Sigillata, latest form Berenice B210 with applied spiral; Italian lamp, Bronner Type XXI, ‘Tiberian–Flavian’; also a coin of 18 B.C., no. 179).]

Section E-F. Here, as in section A-B-C-D, a fill was necessary to raise the height to that required for the Period I portico and temenos.

In Period II, the excess truncation was carried to a considerable depth, especially in the southern half of the section. The irregular, scoop-like, bottom of the truncation, which is typical of the north-east part of the temenos, is clear proof that the extreme low level was never in use as a surface.

In Period IV, the bottom courses of the precinct wall were not removed. There is clear evidence here that the broad rubble footings belong to a pre-temple wall which was only completely robbed at this period (p. 29 f.). The footings as they survive are trench-built into earlier levels. These are cut by the foundation-trench of the precinct wall, which has apparently removed the original surface associated with the broad wall. This foundation-trench is however cut by the great debris-filled robber-trench of the broad wall, of which some of the superstructure must have been left in position beneath the portico of the Period I temple. It must have been rediscovered in Period IV, possibly as a result of the partial collapse of the precinct wall: the filling inside may have been washed out onto the lower level to the north.

The pier of the Ionic colonnade was rebuilt in Period IV, as elsewhere on the north side. Only the bottom ashlar course of the stylobate of the Doric colonnade here survives the ultimate robbing, but it is clear here, as in section A-B-C-D, that it was completely rebuilt at this period. Here on the south side its wide foundation-trench, irregular in filling as well as in section, cuts the Period II yellow sand layer, and it cannot therefore have been original. From the foundation-trench here came a hoard of — century minims.

[Pre-Roman levels: The underlying levels range in date from the fourth or third century B.C. through to Augustan (contexts i.51-55, i a.1: latest sherds Italian Sigillata, Berenice Forms B201, B202; Italian lamps of Loeschcke Type Ia and Bronner Type XXI).]

4 [The section lines here suggest to me that the lowest block of the pier may be original to Period II, and that the lower limit of the robber-trench of Period IV runs across the top of this block.]

5 [This tantalizing statement appears in KM’s manuscript, and I have therefore left it in the text. The hoard is noted in the field book (context S.p.D5-6a, noted beneath S.p.D5-11 as an intrusive feature) and I have also found the cancelled envelope in which the find was returned from the site: the label suggests that there may have been 38 coins. But from this point on they are untraceable, and they do not appear in the coin catalogue! I therefore conclude that either the coins were too badly corroded for identification to be possible, or they proved on closer examination not to be coins. In either case, no further record appears to have been made.]
Section G–H. The foundation-trench for the original north wall of the temple is crossed by the truncation level of Period II. Above it is the yellow sand layer restoring the level to the height finally decided upon for Period II. Corresponding to a mortar streak on this (presumably the basis of paving) is a rendering on the face of the temple wall, which follows the very irregular line of the courses which were part of the foundations in Period I (see pl. 7a). Above this is a thin layer of clean sand capped by another mortar streak, which corresponds to rendering on the face of a bench added against the first Period II rendering, presumably to mask the irregular courses at first exposed. This additional level and bench is earlier than the general grey sand level which probably belongs to Period IV (p. 30), and it may belong to Period III.

Section J–K. This section is against the north side of the extension added to the rear of the temple in Period II. The mortar debris in the foundation-trench humps up against the wall, above the truncation level, and is sealed by the yellow sand layer. Traces of a mortar basis run up to the base of the main wall as in section G–H, and there is again an added layer corresponding to rendering on the face of an added bench.

Section L–M–N–O. The pre-temple levels are rather higher here than in sections A–B–C–D and E–F, but some fill was still necessary to bring the level up to that required for Period I. This section provided the clearest evidence for the fact that the excess truncation was never completed and that the hard grey level at the base of the truncation was never in use as a surface. Both this hard truncation level and the yellow sand fill cease about a metre south of the portico stylobate, against an irregular face which is partly Period I fill and partly the remains of a pre-temple wall, which runs obliquely to the temple structures and was itself partially destroyed by the truncation. This face can never have had any structural significance, and is in fact only the edge of the pit where the deep truncation was abandoned. Against this face runs the yellow sand layer. (The upper part was, exceptionally, brown sand here instead of yellow, but it is clearly all part of the same fill.) The section also illustrates the way in which the excess truncation, which remains very constant in level on the south and east sides, here dips down very deep.

The north end of the section, up to the precinct wall, which is not reproduced here, repeated the evidence of sections A–B and E–F for the Period IV robbing of the broad wall and the rebuilding of the pier. Again there is evidence that the portico stylobate was rebuilt, this time with a foundation-trench visible on both sides. The surface of the area between the pier and the stylobate in this section was apparently disturbed at this period, since the foundation-trench cutting through the Period I fill is sealed by a layer below the height previously needed for the Period I portico floor.

[Pre-Roman levels: Section L–M shows a substantial depth of pre-temple levels: the sequence is practically impossible to interpret (contexts i.57–61) but includes pre-Campana black-glazed ware, probably of the fourth century B.C.]

Figure 11. Sections at the east end of the East Forum Temple

Section P–Q. This section provides evidence that the Period II additions to the temple were built after the lower level truncation had been carried out, since the foundation-trench of the rear extension cuts the hard grey truncation level. The mortar and rubble fill of the foundation-trench rises well above the truncation level, humping up against the wall as in section J–K. It is sealed by the yellow sand layer, which is here still considerably deeper than on the south side. A rendering on the ground-level course of the Period II rear wall, which projects as a bench along the whole of the rear of the temple, corresponds approximately to the top of the yellow sand. The fact that below this course the wall is irregularly built also shows that the extension of the temple was not built until after it had been decided that the truncation level was too low. At the east end of the section is a late base, of which the stratigraphic associations have been destroyed by levelling after the previous excavations.
Section R-S-T-U. The extended rear of the Period II temple enclosed the original rear wall of Period I, with a rubble fill in between the two. At the south end, a short stretch of the base-moulding of the Period I rear wall is preserved, with one well-dressed block beneath (pl. 3b). Below that is an irregular footing-course (the lowest course shown) which must have been below ground-level. The section shows that a level which just covered this course would correspond very closely with the original level in the east portico.

As in section P-Q, the foundation-trench of the Period II rear wall cuts the truncation level. The steps against the portico stylobate were however added with reference to the height of the top of the truncation level, for though the base of the lowest step does not itself quite reach this level, the rendering on its face is carried down against an earth backing to that level, and the yellow sand layer is added against the rendering. The truncation is not nearly as deep here as in section P-Q at the north end. The pier of the Ionic colonnade cuts through the Period I portico level with a wide foundation-trench.

The surface of the yellow sand layer was considerably disturbed before the grey sand, probably belonging to Period IV, was laid down. This may well have been in the course of removing the paving which must originally have formed the surface. The paving stones on the present surface have clearly been relaid by the previous excavators, since they are cracked in many fragments and these have been repaired in mortar. When this was done, the surface was levelled over. On the top of the grey sand are traces of a mortar basis, which probably represents the original position of the paving stones.

[Pre-Roman levels: The earliest levels in the portico yielded fine wares no later than the fourth century B.C. (trench S.p. C9, not catalogued).]

Figure 13. Sections on the south side of the East Forum Temple

Section V-W. The latest pre-temple level here must have been appreciably above that of the Period I portico, for the level of the natural sand is rising steadily in this direction (cf. section Z-AA) and the surviving pre-temple levels are all of a type associated elsewhere with the earlier occupation of the area. The original surface of the portico is flush with an offset on the precinct wall, on which there is a mortar rendering. In section Z-AA the level, which does not run up to the wall owing to later disturbances, would have been at the height of the course below the offset. No trenches were carried up to the precinct wall between these two sections, owing to the large number of architectural fragments which had been collected together along the line of the wall, so there is no evidence as to how the relationship between the surface and the offset were adjusted.

It may be noted that the tabernae of Period IV (cf. section Z-AA) never ran as far as this section (see p. 29), stopping 4 m. to the west.

Section X-Y. This section provided the clearest evidence for the original level of the temenos, since traces of the original rendering on the wall of the temple were preserved (pl. 3a). The lower edge of this is at the level of the top of the second step in front of the Period II portico stylobate, which in section Z-AA is also the level of the Period I surface of the portico. There is therefore little doubt that the temenos and the porticoes were originally at the same level.

The hard grey truncation level of Period II crosses the Period I foundation-trench and runs right up to the temple wall, beneath a strongly projecting stone. As in section R-S, the rendering on the steps against the portico stylobate is carried below the steps themselves against a backing of earth, down as far as the top of the truncation level. The second rendering on the temple wall, however, corresponds to the top of the yellow sand layer. Even at this height, the wall is extremely rough, and the rendering follows a very uneven course over the projecting blocks. The lower edge of a third layer of rendering corresponds to the top of the grey sand level which has been attributed tentatively to Period IV. (See pl. 3a).
Section Z-AA. Between this section and section X-Y, the surface of the natural sand has dropped considerably, and the early buildings were apparently terraced down (see fig. 14, section QQ-RR). The pre-temple levels have nevertheless been considerably truncated by the Period I portico floor, as is shown by the destroyed tops of walls without any associated contemporary surfaces.

The original rendering on the temple wall did not survive here, but the level of the original surface of the portico (confirmed in a number of other trenches) coincides well with the height suggested in section X-Y. This surface is cut into by the top course of the stylobate, which would in any case have been too high for a stylobate in use with the original surface. It is to this course that the steps fronting the portico in Period II lead, and the course and the raised level which runs up to its south side belong to this period. The deep cut beneath the Period II fill in the portico is part of the foundation-trench for the pier of the Ionic colonnade which lies immediately to the west (shown in section BB–CC). As in section X–Y, the lowest rendering on the temple wall corresponds to the top of the Period II yellow sand layer.

The Period II surfaces in both temenos and portico have been disturbed by the cutting of a number of irregular pits, which were filled in and levelled off when the succeeding surface was laid in either area. These surfaces are difficult to assign to periods since they are not associated with structures. That in the temenos may, on the evidence of section C–D, belong to Period IV. For the surface in the portico, the only evidence is that it is cut by the Period IV tabernae (see p. 29). The foundation-trench for the front wall of the tabernae very clearly cuts all surviving levels, and this was confirmed in other sections. The depth of the foundation-trench in this section is probably to be accounted for by the fact that it was cut into an underlying earlier pit, part of which remains, and which would have provided an unsatisfactory basis for the foundations; the depth was not tested in other trenches. The width is probably to be accounted for partly by this fact and partly by the fact that one of the cross-walls of the tabernae lies immediately to the east, and the two foundation-trenches are merging. The contemporary surface, and the one which must have sealed it when the project was abandoned (p. 29), must both have been removed in the previous excavations.

[Pre-Roman levels: The pre-temple levels in the temenos are confused and disturbed, and yielded no useful information; within the portico, wall H (section BB–CC) is the earliest feature, succeeded by walls A and G. These, and the preceding occupation layers, may possibly all belong to the fourth or third century B.C. (contexts i.20, 22–29: much Attic Black-Glazed Ware, two sherds only of Campana A, nos. i.29/3, 4, from the deepest level – intrusive?). They are superseded by wall D (whose continuation was traced in the area excavation to the east) which may belong to the early first century B.C. (context i.21: Eastern Sigillata A, Berenice Form B323). At the extreme south end of the section was a pit, cut both by the foundations of the wall of the temple precinct and by the foundation-trench for the Period IV tabernae, which contained the bases of four amphorae, stacked together in an upright position. The vessels remained at Sabratha and have not been seen by me, but one of them was drawn (Reg. 318): the fabric is described as 'reddish ware, buff slip, slightly gritty texture.' The lower part only was preserved, but the form is similar to that of Reg. 454 and the majority of the amphorae found in the pit in section AF–AG (see below). The amphorae were accompanied by a few sherds of indeterminate black-glazed ware which might be (but are not necessarily) as early as the fourth century B.C. (context i.24).]

Section BB–CC. This section, which represents the other side of the trench shown in section Z-AA, for the most part confirms the evidence of that section. It includes however the pier of the Ionic colonnade and shows that this is contemporary with the level shown in section Z-AA to belong to Period II. The scoop in the surface against the pier is probably connected with the restoration work carried out by the previous excavators.

[Pre-Roman levels: see above, under section Z-AA.]

Section DD–EE. This section was cut within the Period V transverse portico between the
temple precinct and the Forum. At the base is the broad footing [discussed above on pp. 20, 27]. This was removed down to its present level in Period III, and on it was built one of the east-west walls which was probably a base for a statue (see p. 27). Running up to this wall is a paving slab which is clearly in situ and which belongs to the Period III surface of the Forum. Both the paving and the statue base were buried when the transverse portico was built.

**Section FF–GG.** In this section there survives an opus signinum floor which may represent the surface of the latest pre-temple buildings, for the pre-existing level is dropping to the west, and the surface is similar to that of the latest buildings beneath the temple itself. The floor and its associated wall are covered by layers of sand and clay, which are also cut by the Period I foundation of the portico stylobate; but these may well be layers of debris connected with the dismantling of the earlier buildings or spoil thrown out from the foundation-trench for the stylobate.

[Pre-Roman levels: There is little pottery from beneath the opus signinum floor (contexts i.166, 167): the latest sherds are two fragments of Campana A Ware, showing that the floor may belong to the second century B.C.]
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of fifth-century Attic ware (nos. i.149/7, foot of black-glazed bowl with out-turned rim [Ch. IX, no. 80, c. 425–400 B.C.], and i.50a/1, red-figure fragment [p. 296 and pl. 64b, no. 2]).

Section SS–TT–UU–VV. Section SS–TT confirms the evidence of section HH–JJ. The paving slab against the west face of the transverse portico wall was not lifted in the present excavations; it must however overlie the foundation-trench for the transverse portico wall. It has almost certainly been relaid in the restoration work following the previous excavations, but even if this is the case it has probably been merely re-set in its previous position. There is therefore a strong presumption that the latest paved surface was contemporary with the Period V transverse portico (see p. 33).

Section UU–VV shows clearly that the steps of the Period II temple were designed to lead down to the Low-Level Forum of Period Ib. The steps do not descend directly to the level of the Forum, but to a level c. 35 cm. higher. There is no surface corresponding to this in the Forum, and it is therefore clear that there was a low terrace in front of the temple steps of which the edge, with presumably two further steps, lay beneath the line of the later transverse portico wall. In the surface of this terrace were a number of the irregularly placed post-holes which are so common in all the surfaces of the Low-Level Forum (see p. 19).

It appears probable from this section that the foundation (and superstructure) which separated the Forum from the temple precinct in Period I was not carried continuously across the front of the temple, either as a flight of steps or as a broad wall; for beneath the terrace just mentioned is a clay surface which, as the section shows, corresponds closely in level to that of the Low-Level Forum. This would suggest that the boundary feature lay only between the Forum and the temenos on either side of the temple, and that in the centre the forum level ran back to the edge of the temple steps. These steps were however destroyed when the temple was extended forwards in Period II, so there is no evidence as to the level from which they started. The question must remain doubtful, since it is not impossible that the clay surface is a constructional level connected with the new terrace, which coincides only accidentally with that of the forum surface; excavation was not carried sufficiently low to see whether the broad foundation runs through. [I have retained the preceding paragraph as a statement of KMK's interpretation: my own (substantially different) interpretation of these features is argued above, p. 20.]

The section provided evidence that the Period II temple was associated with the Low-Level Forum for an appreciable time, since the front of the lowest step of the temple was considerably eroded at its base, and this erosion was in due course covered by a new surface: there are traces of mortar raising the level of the terrace (see pl. 8a).

The relationship between the High-Level Forum and the temple steps in Period III is very clear. The surface of the Forum, which is flush with the capstone of the drain (see section HH–JJ), runs through to seal the second lowest step of the temple, which has been slightly cut away to take the mortar basis of the paving. One fragment of the paving remains. This and the slab in section DD–EE (fig. 13) are the only fragments surviving in situ of the paving which must originally have covered the Period III Forum; the greater part was doubtless re-used later at the higher level.

Two further steps of the temple were buried when the transverse portico, with its mosaic floor, was constructed in Period V.

Section WW–XX. This section provides support for the suggestion (pp. 24 and 27) that there was an earlier wall on the line of the east wall of the transverse portico. There is in the first place a disturbance cutting the layer of yellow sand which belongs to Period II. This cannot be the foundation-trench for the wall on this line which has been postulated for Period II, since that should have been sealed by the yellow sand level. It may however be a robber-trench, if the wall which is still needed for Period III was on a slightly different line. This Period III wall must be represented by the bottom course in this section, for that has a foundation-trench which cuts the earlier robber-trench and is sealed by the coarse grey sand level which is presumed to belong to Period III. This is cut in turn by the foundation-trench for the Period V transverse portico,
indicating that in Period IV the earlier wall was removed, one course being left in position in this section but not elsewhere.

Figure 16. Sections across the Forum

Section YY–ZZ. This section provided some of the scanty evidence for a layout on the general axis of the Forum prior to the main low-level arrangement of Period Ib. The section is on the line of a north–south wall, and crosses an east–west wall up to which the former runs. The north–south wall runs through beneath the Period III portico stylobate, and is overlain also by the east wall of the easternmost taberna of Period Ib (see pl. 3c).

Though nothing more of the plan of the building to which these walls belong can be recorded, for any continuation to the west would have been destroyed by the Period III drain, their stratigraphic position is fairly clear. It is unlikely that they are substantially earlier than the laying-out of the Roman public buildings, for none of the other early buildings conform to this axis. They are covered by a thick tipped fill which is cut by the foundation-trench of the drain belonging to the Period III Forum; this fill, which seals them, must therefore be the make-up of the terrace which bounded the Low-Level Forum in Period I.

Section AB–AC. In this section there is evidence for a corresponding east–west wall along the north side of the Forum. This is again sealed by a high level which is earlier than Period III, and which must therefore belong to the Period Ib terrace on this side of the Forum. There is no trace of the structure which must have bordered the Period Ib terrace, but it is quite clear that the low level of the central forum area ceases at this point. It is also clear that the wall in question does not represent this structure, since it is covered by a fill which is quite distinct from that of Period III, and which ends on a straight edge to the south.

There are many huge stone blocks in this part of the Period III fill for the High-Level Forum, as there are also in section SS–TT (fig. 14).

Section AD–AE. The surface of the Low-Level Forum was traced across most of the width of the Forum in this section. In the southern part of the section, the original surface consists of the truncated top of a very massive pre-forum structure (pl. 5a). Though this wall is covered by a surface which is clearly associated with the Low-Level Forum, this must be secondary, since there are a number of post-holes in the top of the wall which can only have been made when it was truncated to this level. The overlying level must therefore represent re-surfacing, similar to the series of surfaces which was found at the west end of the Forum (see fig. 17 (b)).

At the south end of the section there is a raised level which is cut by the foundation-trench for the drain belonging to the High-Level Forum of Period III. It is therefore contemporary with the Low-Level Forum and indicates the presence of a raised terrace along the side (see p. 18).

To the north of the point where the pre-forum wall ends, the surface of the Low-Level Forum consists of a hard grey sand layer. The fill which raised the level to that of the Period III Forum is composed of tipped sand and a little rubble. There is consistently an original surface slightly beneath the present one, which last is shown in sections HH–LL and SS–TT (fig. 14) probably to have belonged to Period V.

Towards the north end all levels are cut by a number of Christian graves. Near the northern stylobate are solid foundations which probably belong to monuments in the Forum, but surface disturbances prevented their stratigraphic relationships from being ascertained.

[Pre-forum levels: Only the central sector of this long trench was excavated to below the Period Ib forum level: there was little pottery, and none that provided direct dating-evidence for the intersecting walls A11.1 (in centre of trench) and A11.4. The earliest levels (context i.124) yielded two coins of the late fourth and early third centuries B.C. respectively (see p. 263). There were also five coins of the late fourth to late third centuries B.C. from levels associated with the massive and enigmatic structure uncovered at the junction of this section with section HH–JJ]
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(contexts i.173, i a.11, see p. 263 and pl. 5a). However, the pottery from the same levels included four sherds of Eastern Sigillata A, a rim of Berenice Form B201 in Italian Sigillata and a rim of Berenice Form B405 in 'Tripolitanian' Sigillata, giving a clear indication of a date in the last decade of the first century B.C. The building must therefore, in its latest phase at least, be attributed to this period, though the concentration of early coins suggests that it had important antecedents. The area of this building that was uncovered was insufficient to give any real idea of its character.

Section AF–AG. This section confirms the evidence of section AD–AE that the low-level surface of Period Ib ceases at a point about 5 m. north of the Period III stylobate, and is bordered by a terrace at a higher level which is again cut by the Period III drain. Again, there is no trace of the intervening steps which must have fronted the terrace.

Pre-forum levels: The pre-forum walls in this trench show no obvious pattern and were not closely datable. Of greater interest, though not visibly related to other structures, was a large pit which contained parts of at least 21 amphorae ('pit with storage jars'). Some of these were found stacked together upright and intact (see pl. 12c) and two of them were partly sealed by a broken
base or a stone placed in the mouth. Others were broken and lying at random. The best-preserved examples are shown in plate 13 a-d and two that were drawn are reproduced in figure 9. The vessels themselves have remained at Sabratha and have not been seen by me, but they are described in the Small Finds Register as follows.

Reg. 454 (fig. 9 and pl. 13a, LH end): ‘red-brown ware, gritty texture, buff slip; handles flattened oval in section, rings round base, rim angular.’ There are two crosses at mid-height on the body, but it is not possible to tell from the photograph whether these were inscribed before or after firing.

Reg. 599 (fig. 9 and pl. 13c, second from left): ‘grey ware firing brown at surface, thin buff slip.’ (The photograph shows the base to be slightly more pointed than the drawing suggests.)

The fabric descriptions of the other examples (Reg. 716-731) conform generally to that of Reg. 454.

[The general type of Reg. 454 and of all but one of the other amphorae is Berenice Hellenistic Amphora 10 (nos. D53, D54)/Cintas (1950) type 315. The rim may be rounded, curving smoothly in towards the mouth, or angular, with the mouth slightly inset; the photographs suggest that both variants are represented in the group and there is as yet no clear distinction between them in date. The type is found in Tunisia in contexts at least as early as the fourth century B.C. (information from Dr. M.G. Fulford; see also Riley 1979, 136 and refs.) and JA. Riley has suggested (loc. cit.) that production may have ceased after the middle of the second century B.C.]

[Reg. 599 is the sole representative in this group of a class of amphorae of Tripolitanian origin which has recently been studied in detail by J.H. van der Werff (‘Amphores de tradition punique à Uzita,’ BABesch 52-53, 1977-78, 171-200: Form 3); van der Werff places its period of production between at least the end of the third century B.C. and some time in the first century A.D.]

[The pit yielded much other pottery (context i.36) including several sherds of Campana A Ware (nos. 33, 36, 37, 41: Berenice Forms B4, B10). There was also one sherd of Eastern Sigillata A (no. 95) and one of a Pompeian-Red-related dish (no. 96). If the two last are to be regarded as intrusive, the filling of the pit may be placed in the first half of the second century B.C. (which would accord better with the amphorae), otherwise in the early first century B.C. The stratigraphy suggests that the excavation and filling of the pit took place either within or in association with surrounding buildings, and that it does not bear any relationship to the use of the area at any time as an open market-place.]

Section AH-AJ-AK-AL. A comparison of the levels in the section through the portico with that through the central area shows the extent to which pre-forum levels must have been removed in the central area. They have also been removed to some extent in the portico, but the amount is not clear.

The section through the portico shows the relationship between the tabernae and the stylobate of the Corinthian colonnade. The floor-level of the tabernae, consisting of a mortar surface with an orange clay make-up, is intact. It extends beyond the front wall of the tabernae to the south, and is here cut by the foundation-trench for the Period III stylobate. This extension provides clear additional evidence for a high-level terrace between the tabernae and the Low-Level Forum. The front wall of the tabernae, as also the cross-walls which run up to it, are sealed by the mortar basis of the floor which runs up to the stylobate.

Immediately to the south of the stylobate there is the base of a monument. However, the surface of the Low-Level Forum, with one re-surfacing, is preserved in gaps between this and another monument and also between a number of Christian graves. Beyond the end of the part of the section reproduced there is an almost continuous succession of graves as far as the southern portico, and the earlier levels do not survive (see pl. 10a).

[Pre-Roman levels: A considerable depth of pre-forum levels was excavated in section AK-AL]
and in other trenches in the north forum portico (Area F). However, the area actually exposed is again too limited for much to be said of the character of the structures in this area. It is possible that a stretch of wall to the east of this section, running north-eastswards, marks the southern side of the early street which runs between Insulae 5 and 6 of Regio II (see p. 12). There was much early material from this area (contexts i.92-96), including black-glazed ware of the fourth century B.C. and five coins of the fourth and third centuries (see p. 263); a sixth coin, of Justinian, is clearly intrusive! All but the deepest levels, however, also yielded Campana A Ware, and it is likely that none of the walls shown in this area in figure 1 (facing p. 12) is significantly earlier than the second century B.C. The uppermost levels (contexts i.97–99), which are subsequent to the removal of these walls and which are in turn superseded by the construction of the Period Ib Roman Forum, yielded Campana C Ware, Eastern Sigillata A and one sherd of Italian or 'Tripolitanian' Sigillata, showing that there were continuing developments in the first century B.C.]

Figure 17. Sections at the west end of the Forum and against the Capitolium

Section AM–AN. This section shows that the pre-forum levels west of the Period Ib steps have been considerably truncated, since in the highest surviving level there are the lower portions of a number of large storage jars set in holes in the ground, which might originally have stood a metre high if they were set in the ground intact.

In this section the base of a wall was found to the west of the steps which is apparently contemporary with them. [This lends support to the suggestion that the flight of steps was considerably higher – perhaps six steps altogether – in Period Ib, and that the upper steps and their associated levels were removed in Period III (see p. 19). Such truncation would also have obscured the relationship between the foundations of the Capitolium and the levels of Period I, though it is clearly implied in this section that the fill of the foundation-trench for the Capitolium is contemporary with the truncation of the upper steps and the laying of the Period III forum level.]

Section AO–AP. This section emphasizes the fact that there was an open space in this area for a considerable period before the Forum was laid out. In this section, as in all the others against the Capitolium, there are a whole succession of laid surfaces, of either mortar or clay, nowhere associated with any structure. The latest of these were removed to the east of the steps when the Low-Level Forum was constructed, but the lower ones are preserved beneath the forum surface.

It is very clear in this section that the Capitolium is subsequent in build to the Period Ib Forum. The mortar surface which runs up to the back of the steps, and seals their foundation-trench, is cut by the foundation-trench of the Capitolium. [If the preceding statement is true, it constitutes stronger stratigraphic evidence for the relationship between the Capitolium and the Period I levels than I have admitted to exist (p. 28). But if the steps were originally higher than those now preserved – for which I believe the evidence to be convincing – what is the significance and purpose of a mortar layer (detected only in this section) running back from the third step up? Does it really belong to Period I rather than to the pre-forum levels? I still do not find the stratigraphic evidence as clear as KMK states it to be.] The mortar basis of the paving slabs is shown in this section to be the only level which seals the foundation-trench for the Capitolium; as there was no trace at this end of the Forum of the re-laying of the Period III paving, which was so repeatedly detected at the east end, the slabs and their bedding may here be original to Period III and may suggest that the Capitolium is contemporary with the Period III Forum. [See pp. 26, 28.]

The slightness of the foundations of the Capitolium shown here, in comparison with the massiveness of the superimposed podium, is very remarkable.

There were a number of the characteristic irregular post-holes in the surface of the Period Ib Forum in this trench, but they did not occur on the line of the section. There were also two cut into the lowest step.

As in all trenches at this end of the Forum, there was a series of hard sand surfaces, gradually
raising the level against the steps. Presumably they were the result of a gradual accumulation of blown sand.

Section AQ-AR-AS-AT. Section AQ-AR was not carried right up to the Capitolium, as a huge altar base had been set there.

In the topmost pre-forum level to the west of the steps were a considerable number of post-holes of the type that was so common in the forum surfaces, showing that the practice was long established (pl. 5c).

In this area, the builders of the Low-Level Forum made use of a pre-forum surface, for the level which runs up to the lowest step and which in the other sections is contemporary with the steps is here in fact cut by their foundation-trench. Such a use of pre-existing levels at the desired depth for the low-level forum surface was also detected in other trenches.

There was a large number of irregular post-holes in this section both in the original surface of the Forum and in the re-surfacing levels, extending the whole length of the section (see the plan, fig. 2). There were also post-holes in the two lower steps.

The section shows re-surfacings of the Low-Level Forum which slope gradually down to the west, but which do not occur at all at the east end of the Forum.

The eastern end of the trench, not reproduced in section, was entirely disturbed by Christian graves.

Section AU-AV. There is further confirmation in this section of the relationship between the terrace steps and the Capitolium. The mortar surface at the back of the steps is absent here, but there is a levelling-up of clay and mortar which is contemporary with the construction of the steps and seals their foundation-trench. This is cut into by a pit with a fill of soft grey rubbish soil. The wall of the pit has broken away slightly and sagged forward. This sagging has been partly made good by a levelling of brown sand which seals the top of the pit. This has subsequently been cut by the foundation-trench for the Capitolium. The mortar basis which seals the top of the steps has unfortunately been broken away against the Capitolium, where there is a red clay levelling probably attributable to restoration work in the previous excavations.

[This section and its interpretation are seriously vitiated by the fact that a number of sherds of the seventh century A.D. are alleged to have been found in the pit! (See above, p. 28). There is also a further incongruity in this section as drawn, for it shows the podium of the Capitolium, whereas reference to the plan in figure 2 shows that the trench lay opposite the missing northern stairway. The original section drawing in the site notebook indicates the presence of eight courses of masonry above the foundation, and I can only conclude that this is a subsequent addition, made erroneously to this section instead of section AQ-AR, on the original drawing of which the podium is not shown.]

Sections AW-AX, AY-AZ, BC-BD. The drain-head is certainly contemporary with the Period III Forum. It is built up against the footings of the Capitolium and of the Cruciform Building. As section AW-AX shows, its massive back wall is cut into a series of pre-forum levels and walls with a fairly wide foundation-trench. The topmost pre-drain layer is a distinctive, hard, light grey make-up; this and the foundation-trench are sealed by a grey sandy layer which must have constituted the make-up of the street surface, from which the paving has been removed as have the cover slabs of the drain. In section BC-BD, the foundation-trench of the Capitolium cuts what is quite clearly the same hard, light grey layer, and is sealed by the same grey sandy layer. The two sections do not join, as there was the core of an earlier wall in between. This evidence suggests that the Capitolium is contemporary with the Period III Forum.

---

6 [This is not apparent from the section drawing in figure 17, but it is recorded in KMK's field notes, which include a short section of the other face of the trench, illustrating the point.]
NOTES ON SECTIONS 49

Figure 15. Sections at the northern junction of the Forum and the East Forum Temple

Sections BE–BF and BG–BH. At this point the pre-temple levels were at their lowest, and there was a fill of about a metre contemporary with the Period I temple. This runs up to both the stylobate wall and the west wall of the north portico, demonstrating that they are contemporary. [The pottery from this fill (context iii.3) included a considerable quantity of third-century fine ware, and a few sherds of similar date are also recorded from the levels beneath (nos. i a.9/7, i.103/3, i.106/1). This suggests that the above interpretation of the section is suspect and that some at least of the fill attributed to Period I is likely to belong to Period IV.]

At the north end of section BE–BF there is the same fill of destruction debris as was found all along the inner part of the portico. As in section E–F (fig. 10), this cuts the foundation-trench for the precinct wall. The clay and sand immediately south of the debris fill may represent the robbing of the continuation of the early wall next to it on the south, when the nearby pier of the Ionic colonnade was first inserted in Period II; for the pier (rebuilt in Period IV as in the rest of the north portico) was found in the opposite face of the trench. (See the plan, fig. 3.)

[Pre-Roman levels: The earliest levels in section BG–BH (contexts i.104-108) go back to the fourth or third century B.C., and encompass both the construction and the demolition of wall F22.2. The large pit at the south end of section BE–BF (context i.102) yielded vessels in Campana C Ware (including Berenice Form B63/Lamboglia Form 1: nos. 3, 20) and two rims of dishes in a Pompeian-red-related fabric (as Berenice Form B482: no. 19), indicating a date probably in the first part of the first century B.C. Subsequent to the pit is the construction of walls F21.4 and F21.5, which join to form a ‘T’ in the southern part of the trench: the associated levels (contexts i.100, 101) yielded little fine ware, but this included a sherd of Eastern Sigillata A (no. i.100/2) and a date in the first century B.C. is therefore also possible for this structure, which was probably demolished when the East Forum Temple was built. The presence of intrusive sherds of African Red Slip Ware in some of the pre-Roman levels has been noted above.]

Sections BJ–BK, BL–BM, BN–BO and BO–BP. Sections BJ–BK and BL–BM run north and west respectively from the outside of the north-west angle of the temple precinct. At the angle is a very large block which projects beyond both the north and west faces of the wall. It appears that this must have formed the base of a projecting angle-pilaster, for both faces are rendered; and since the rendering runs over more than one block, it is clearly in position. This rendering is shown in section BJ–BK to correspond to a hard mortar surface which, with an underlying make-up, seals the rather narrow foundation-trench for the precinct wall. The level from which this wall was built and the original surface contemporary with it are thus quite clear, as is shown also in sections BL–BM and BO–BP.

Overlying the original surface was found a series of grey sand surfaces, too fine and too close together to be represented individually in the drawn section. These clearly represent a succession of trodden surfaces on accumulated wind-blown sand, and indicate that this phase lasted an appreciable time before being superseded by the next.

The next phase is represented by the construction of the north wall of the forum tabernae. This was built up against the foundations of the temple wall. It is of a different build from the temple wall, being identical to that of the taberna walls further west with the same distinctive 45 × 45 cm. headers, and its foundations are deeper than those of the temple wall. The clearest evidence that its construction post-dates that of the temple wall was found in section BN–BO, where it is clear that its wide foundation-trench cuts the original surface associated with the temple wall and the accumulated layers above this, and is sealed only by the paving slabs at the level of the present surface.

The superstructure of the temple wall appears to have been rebuilt at this period. On the first course below the paved surface there is a patch of rendering in position on a line c. 20 cm. in front of the present face of the wall, and the block at the junction with the forum wall was roughly dressed back from this line when the forum wall was built. This explains the impression given by section BO–BP that the precinct wall could not have been associated with an original low-level
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The original face of the wall must have been on the line indicated. It is possible that the rebuilding of the precinct wall took place before the forum wall was built, since a red clay layer which crosses the line of the original face is cut by the foundation-trench of the forum wall.

[Pre-Roman levels: There was little fine ware from the pre-forum levels in these trenches. The 'early pit' in section BL–BM (context i a.4) yielded a number of sherds of black-glazed ware of the fifth to third centuries B.C. (including Ch. IX, nos. 6, 52, 104, 145, 146 and a guttus as Morel 1981, F8173), and a base of a small cup in Eastern Sigillata A of the first century A.D. (!). A level in sections BN–BO/BO–BP (context i.109) which lies immediately beneath the first surface associated with the construction of the temple (context iii.11: see p. 16), yielded three sherds of fine ware, the latest of which is a sherd of Italian Sigillata probably of the mid first century A.D.]

Excavation within the podium of the East Forum Temple: trench S.p. D6

[Incorporated within the podium of the temple are substantial remains of a pre-Roman building, which was uncovered to below its original floor-level in the previous Italian excavations (pl. 14a). One of the rooms, however, had a concrete floor which remained intact at a level of + 5.46 m., which suggests that the ground-level originally associated with the building was approximately the same as that inferred for the temple precinct in Period I (p. 14). A small trench was cut through this floor in order to obtain dating-evidence for the building (contexts i.66–75). The results were similar to those in other areas: the visible building is probably no earlier than the second century B.C., indicated by the presence of a few sherds of Campana A Ware (nos. i.71/2, 3, 73/1), though there was also evidence of an earlier wall, and the earliest pottery includes pre-Campana ware and a base of an Attic black-glazed skyphos of the fifth century B.C. (no. i.69/1: Ch. IX, no. 23).]
FIG. 10. Sections on the north side of the East Forum Temple. For key to conventions see fig. 12.
FIG 11. Sections at the east end of the East Forum Temple. For key to conventions see fig. 12.
### Key to Conventions

#### For Forum Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Walls</th>
<th>Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td><img src="/w" alt="Walls" /></td>
<td><img src="/l" alt="Levels" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forum, Period Ia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside N.W. corner of temple precinct:</td>
<td>Original Period I surface</td>
<td>occupation on original surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>Low Level Forum, Period Ib</td>
<td>Hard surfaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurfacing of Low Level Forum: 1</td>
<td>(Period I or II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II</th>
<th>Walls</th>
<th>Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temple precinct: structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>truncation level</td>
<td>yellow sand layer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raised level in porticoes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III?</th>
<th>Walls</th>
<th>Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capitolium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III</th>
<th>Walls</th>
<th>Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Level Forum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar surface</td>
<td>?Contemporary temple levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV</th>
<th>Walls</th>
<th>Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temple precinct, tabernae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuilding of north portico</td>
<td>Debris fill, burnt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debris fill, sand and rubble</td>
<td>Grey sand fill of temenos and contemporary fills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey sand fill of temenos</td>
<td>Resurfacings of temenos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late structures in forum and temple temenos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>Walls</th>
<th>Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transverse portico</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper level of forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI</th>
<th>Walls</th>
<th>Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christian graves</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Surface sand and late disturbances</td>
<td>Modern clay levelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRE - FORUM AND PRE - TEMPLE LEVELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mortar floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus signinum floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand, yellow and brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand with burning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy occupation levels with burning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed clay and sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Fig. 12.** Key to conventions used in figures 10, 11, 13-17.
FIG. 12. Key to conventions used in figures 10, 11, 13-17.
FIG. 13. Sections on the south side of the East Forum Temple. For key to conventions see fig. 12.
FORUM AND EAST FORUM TEMPLE

LEFT: SUCCESSIVE PHASES OF JUNCTION OF FORUM AND TEMPLE TEMENOS
ABOVE: SECTIONS
RIGHT: LOCATION OF SECTIONS

FIG. 14. Sections at the junction of the Forum and East Forum Temple. For key to conventions see fig. 12.
FIG. 15. Sections at the northern junction of the Forum and East Forum Temple. For key to conventions see fig. 12.
KEY TO CONVENTIONS FOR FORUM SECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>WALLS</th>
<th>LEVELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Forum, Period Ia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside NW corner of temple precinct:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original Period I surface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occupation on original surface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Level Forum, Period Ib</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hard surfaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resurfacing of Low Level Forum: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Period I or II)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Temple precinct: structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>truncation level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yellow sand layer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raised level in porticoes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III?</td>
<td>Capitolium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>High Level Forum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mortar surface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?Contemporary temple levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Temple precinct, tabernae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebuilding of north portico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debris fill, burnt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debris fill, sand and rubble</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grey sand fill of temenos and contemporary fills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resurfacings of temenos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late structures in forum and temple temenos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIOD</td>
<td>WALLS</td>
<td>LEVELS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Transverse portico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper level of forum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Christian graves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface sand and late disturbances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern clay levelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRE-FORUM AND PRE-TEMPLE LEVELS

- Mortar floor
- Clay floor
- Opus signinum floor
- Sand, yellow and brown
- Grey sand
- Sand with burning
- Sandy occupation levels with burning
- Clay
- Mixed clay and sand
- Mortar debris
- Burnt

FIG. 12. Key to conventions used in figures 10, 11, 13-17.
FIG. 16. Sections across the Forum. For key to conventions see fig. 12.
**FORUM**

(a) SECTIONS IN STREET AT SOUTH-EAST ANGLE OF CAPITOLIUM

**SECTION AX-AW**
1. Wind-blowed sand
2. Sand and small rubble
3. Grey powdery silt
4. Grey sandy, sealing foundation trenches
5. Hard light grey, cut by foundation trenches

---

**SECTION BD-BC**
- Flank of Capitolium
- Early wall footings

---

**SECTION AY-AZ**
- Capitolium
- Cruciform building
- Base of cross-channel

---

**SECTION AT-AS-AR-AQ**
- Junction of three pre-forum walls
- Rendering

---

**SECTION AN-AM**
- Front of Capitolium (restored) steps
- Jars in situ

---

**SECTION AP-AO**
- Original forum surface
- Paving (restored)
- Podium
- Natural sand

---

**SECTION AV-AU**
- Paving
- Pit

---

**FIG. 17.** Sections at the west end of the Forum and against the Capitolium. For key to conventions see fig. 12.
CHAPTER III
ARCHITECTURAL AND STRUCTURAL STUDIES IN THE FORUM AREA

(a) THE EAST FORUM TEMPLE
(P.M.K.)

The Sabratha archive included no text relating to the architecture of the East Forum Temple, nor indeed any notes. This is very puzzling, for they must surely have existed. The preceding chapter is dependent on the interpretation of the plan of the building at different periods, and this interpretation can hardly have been arrived at without consideration of the superstructure that it carried. The interpretation that follows has been arrived at by the present writer in close collaboration with Mr. Alec Daykin, who was one of the architects with the expedition, but who had no direct responsibility for this building at the time. I am deeply indebted to Mr. Daykin for his time and advice.

The original survey of the temple precinct was carried out by (Father) Dennis Hickley, who also made the drawings of the architectural elements and some preliminary drawings for the reconstruction of the superstructure. The final plans have been prepared by myself, and the reconstructed axonometric and elevation drawings in figures 18, 20 and 23 have been executed by Miss Sheila Gibson, to whom I am indebted in this regard. The evidence upon which these are based is therefore limited not only by the state in which the structures were left following their exposure by the Italians, but also by the drawings and photographs available to me. It has not been possible to revisit the site. The sources of evidence may be briefly summarised as follows.

1) Ground plan of the surviving structures, and interpretative ground plan in which these are distributed between Periods I and II (whence the plan in fig. 3).
2) Drawings of the entablature of either period (figs. 21 and 25).
3) Drawing of the column-base and column-capital of Period II (fig. 24).
4) Drawing of the bases and capitals belonging to the Period II porticoes (whence fig. 26).
5) The stratified evidence from the excavations set out in the preceding chapter.
6) The expedition photographs.

The history of the building

The chronological development of the East Forum Temple and its precinct has been treated in detail in the preceding chapter; for convenience, the main points are summarised here.

The temple and its surrounding porticoes were constructed on ground which had previously been occupied by a disordered array of houses, around or shortly after the middle of the first century A.D. (Period I, p. 15 f.). The temple was of the Corinthian order from the
FIG. 18. Comparative axonometric reconstructions of the East Forum Temple in Periods I and II.
outset. The precise form of the porticoes is uncertain, but at this period the ground-level inside them was probably continuous with that of the temenos in front. There was no inner colonnade.

At some time before the end of the first century A.D., the temple was completely rebuilt (Period II). It was extended to front and rear, and the sides of the podium were substantially strengthened from within, both by the insertion of additional masonry and by the filling of intervening spaces with concrete. Many of the architectural elements belonging to the first building were used for the construction of the footings of the second. At the same time, the level of the temenos was lowered and that within the porticoes was raised. A continuous flight of three steps was placed in front of the porticoes to link these new levels, and an inner colonnade was now inserted. This created a portico of standard Hellenistic type, with an outer Doric colonnade and an inner Ionic one set at twice the intercolumniation.

It has been postulated by A. Di Vita that Sabratha suffered extensive damage in an earthquake in c. A.D. 64–70 (see above, p. 5). Such an event would account very well for the rebuilding of the East Forum Temple and would be chronologically acceptable. (See pp. 21, 24.) Collapse due to earthquake damage would account satisfactorily for the relatively short life of the first temple and for its replacement by a building which was essentially similar in character, but much more solidly built. It is also possible that in such circumstances the column-drums and bases of the first temple were available for re-use, whereas the blocks of the entablature were too severely damaged by falling from a height for them to be usable. Hence their incorporation in the footings of the second building.

Following the rebuilding in Period II, the porticoes of the precinct underwent alteration and reconstruction in the third century A.D., and there may have been a more extensive restoration attested by an inscription of A.D. 340–350 following earthquake damage in A.D. 306/310 (Period IV: see p. 31 f. and below, p. 67). After a further earthquake in A.D. 365, the temple precinct was cut off from the Forum by the construction of a transverse portico across the front of the temple. Although access to the temple podium was retained through the rear wall of the portico, it is impossible to say what remained of the former building or what purpose it now served. The discussion of the architecture of the temple is therefore confined to its appearance in Periods I and II. It is perhaps worthy of note that whereas in the Antonine period other pre-existing temples were refurbished in marble (e.g. the Temple of Serapis and probably the Capitolium), there was no evidence for the use of marble in the East Forum Temple or its surrounding porticoes at any period.

The present condition of the temple (pl. 2b)

The podium of the temple survives to its full height only along the south side, and on this six columns have been re-erected by the Italians. There is no clear record of the extent of preservation before this reconstruction was carried out, and photographs of the area prior to excavation show no features projecting above the ground surface. No satisfactory interpretation can be derived from the present spacing of the columns: this has therefore been disregarded in arriving at an interpretation of the structure, as has the step which now runs between the column-bases. On the west, north and east sides, the masonry has mostly been robbed down to its footings, and the centre of the building has been excavated to expose the pre-temple structures which were buried in the fill of the podium. The front of the temple, towards the Forum, underwent extensive modification during its lifetime as a result of the insertion of the transverse portico (above, p. 32), and the interpretation of the surviving remains is further complicated by the strong likelihood of even later alterations in this area.

In the south portico are now gathered various elements from the superstructure of the temple which were found in the course of the Italian excavations.

PERIOD I (figs. 18–20)

It has been stated in the preceding chapter (p. 13 f.) that the remains of the temple podium
reveal the foundations of two successive structures. These are clearly differentiated in the general plan of the temple precinct (fig. 3) and were readily detectable on the ground (pl. 14b). The present evidence for the appearance of the earlier of these two structures consists of the following.

1) A rectangular foundation of sandstone blocks, whose external dimensions are $21.70 \times 18.80$ m. and which delineates the outline of the podium, with internal divisions which correspond to the lateral walls of the cella and the front wall of the cella.

2) At the south-east angle, a short stretch of the basal moulding of the podium is preserved (pl. 3b), though the height of the podium is unknown.

3) The foundations of the Period II temple incorporate many blocks from the superstructure of the Period I building (pl. 14c-d). From these it has been possible to reconstruct the frieze and entablature of the earlier temple, which were formed of sandstone blocks, stuccoed and painted.

4) There is no record of elements of columns having been found in the foundations of the second temple. There is therefore a strong possibility that the columns were composed of drums which were re-used in the second period, and I have assumed that the diameter (though not the height) of the Period II columns is a reasonable guide to that of the Period I columns (i.e. 1.07 m.). It is possible that the bases were re-used directly; there is no means of knowing whether the capitals of both temples were the same (though it is unlikely that the capitals of Period I would have survived the earthquake).

On this basis, it is clear that the first temple was pseudo-peripteral in plan, with a plain rear wall, colonnades along the sides and a single row of columns across the front. The plan has been reconstructed with a frontal stairway extending across the full width of the podium, though all evidence for this was destroyed when the podium was extended in Period II. The dimensions of the cella are clear from the existing foundations, and the width of it implies a hexastyle
arrangement of the columns across the front. There were probably seven columns along each side (counting the semi-column against the rear wall), with an intercolumniation of 3.35 m. (= 3\(\frac{1}{2}\) diameters) throughout. This is the layout shown in figure 19, from which it will be seen that the resulting structure fits squarely over the existing foundations. The internal dimensions of the cella work out at c. 13.10 × 9.45 m.

The height of the columns is uncertain, but there is some indirect evidence which suggests a height of 8.56 m. (= 8 diameters). In the first place, there is the height of the column-drums. If the height of the base and capital combined is assumed to have been 1.60 m. (= 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) diameters) as in the second temple, an overall height of 8.56 m. would leave 6.96 m. for the shaft. Now the drums of which the re-erected columns are composed display a variety of heights, amongst which 82 cm. and 87 cm. predominate (measured from photographs), and it may be observed that eight drums 87 cm. high would correspond exactly to the height suggested. In the second place, there is the height of the entablature. This is itself partly uncertain, for the reconstruction drawing by Dennis Hickley in figure 21 shows the cornice and frieze, but no architrave. The details have been reconstructed from elements of the Period I entablature which were incorporated in the Period II foundations (pl. 14c–d), a number of which still showed traces of paint adhering to the stucco mouldings. The height of the cornice is 81 cm. and that of the frieze 72 cm.; if the architrave was approximately four-fifths of the depth of the frieze (the canon set by Vitruvius, 3.5.10) it would have been about 58 cm. deep. This would yield a height of c. 2.11 m. for the whole entablature, which is close to two column-diameters, or one quarter of 8.56 m., the height suggested for the columns. This correspondence is again suggestive, but hardly conclusive.

The problem of the architraves will be found to recur in Period II. The intercolumniation is such that the span between the columns was undoubtedly beyond the structural limit of the sandstone of which the temple was built, and the entablature must have been supported on lintels of timber. It is possible that the architrave was wholly of timber, or partly so and partly of sandstone; in either case the stucco rendering would have made the external appearance uniform with the rest of the superstructure.
PERIOD II (figs. 18, 22 and 23)

Comparison of the foundations of Period I and Period II, and of the superstructures that they may be inferred to have carried, shows that the design of the new building was probably determined more by a desire for greater structural solidity than by any wish to change its character. This lends considerable support to the hypothesis that the first temple was destroyed in an earthquake. It is true that the temple was extended to both front and rear, making it completely peripteral; but it was rebuilt in the same materials as before (stuccoed sandstone) and the other principal changes were concerned with a massive strengthening of the foundations on the inside, with the insertion of additional masonry and the filling of the spaces between the cella footings and those of the lateral colonnades with concrete rubble. The columns were set closer
together, and the cella was probably slightly smaller than before. The entablature was deeper, and the columns presumably higher, than in Period I.

The dimensions of the new substructures would accommodate a peristasis of six by nine columns set 3.22 m. apart. This spacing (= 3 diameters) would be exactly systyle and yields a width across the façade of 16.10 m. between centres, 65 cm. less than in Period I. This implies a slightly narrower cella, set a little forward of its previous position, and an internal ratio of 3:2 (i.e. 13.59 m. × 9.06 m.) would place the front wall of the cella squarely over the thickened foundation which was built to carry it.

Across the extended front of the building run two parallel masonry foundations. It was at first imagined that these implied a double row of columns across the front of the Period II temple. However, they are set too close together to conform to any reasonable intercolumniation, and it is now suggested that the inner foundation supported the temple façade, and that the outer one was constructed to retain the front of the podium. It is stated in KMK’s text in the preceding chapter that in Period II the temple was approached by a comparatively narrow central flight of steps, flanked on either side by platforms which constituted forward projections of the podium (p. 21). It was doubtless expected that the evidence in support of this interpretation would be included in the chapter on the architecture of the temple. Unfortunately, no statement of this evidence has come into my hands, and it can only be inferred from the dimensions given in the passage referred to, and their correspondence to certain features on the surviving drawings.

The five lowest steps of the temple were found in position in the centre of the flight, four of them beneath the surface of the transverse portico (see figs. 3 and 14, section UU–VV; also pl. 8a). The forward projection of the flanking platforms was presumably inferred from the foundations shown in a trench across the transverse portico near the southern edge of the temple podium (pl. 15a). The plan (fig. 3) shows a foundation continuing the line of the south side of the podium and forming a return across the front on a line 6.20 m. in front of of the main podium footing. This is the figure stated on p. 21 for the forward projection of the platforms. As to the width of the platform, the foundation shown in this trench does suggest that it was wider than just a die-wall. The site notes relating to the small trench shown in figure 3 between the last mentioned and section UU–VV (trench A20) suggest that the southern edge of the stairway was located here, and this would be in accord with the width of 5.75 m. attributed to the flanking platforms on p. 21. The plan shows a footing on the appropriate line running back towards the temple podium, but this seems to have been found at a greater depth than in the trench to the south, and it appears also to have continued forward beyond the line suggested for the front of the platform. I am therefore doubtful of its significance and period. On the north side of the stairway no evidence survives for the forward line of the corresponding platform, but there is a wall which projects awkwardly through the rear of the transverse portico and which may delimit its southern edge. However, the layout of the walls in this area, and their slightness, suggests the presence of later alterations and I therefore doubt that they contribute significantly to the evidence for Period II. In conclusion, though I know of no parallels for the layout suggested, the very slender evidence which was found and which it has been possible to extract from the excavation records does lend support to that, and not to a more conventional arrangement of steps running across the full width of the temple between narrow die-walls.

As to the elevation of the Period II temple (fig. 23), the evidence is as slender as in Period I. The bases and capitals of several columns are preserved (fig. 24 and pl. 15c), which gives a column-diameter of 1.07 m. as a starting point. Though it has been suggested that many of the column-drums of Period I may have been used to rebuild the temple in Period II, this does not imply that the height of the columns would have been the same, for differences of detail would easily have been taken up in the thickness of the stucco coating. Indeed, the columns must undoubtedly have been higher, for the entablature is considerably deeper than in Period I. The entablature drawn in figure 25 shows a hypothetical reconstruction of the lower part of the architrave in wood. The proportions of the surviving elements suggest the use of a timber beam approximately 22 cm. deep, and of an architrave divided into two fasciae by a plain step close to the lower edge of the sandstone upper member. The total height of the entablature, including a timber beam of this depth, would have been 2.64 m. or nearly 2$\frac{1}{2}$ diameters (= 2.67 m.). It has
FIG. 22. Suggested ground-plan of the East Forum Temple in Period II, showing both the Period I footings and the Period II additions.
been suggested above (p. 61) that the spacing of the columns in Period II was probably systyle, for which Vitruvius recommends a column-height of $9\frac{1}{4}$ diameters (3.3.10): this would be 10.16 m., which is the height adopted in the reconstructed elevation, figure 23.

THE PORTICOES OF THE PRECINCT (plates 2b, 6b)

The excavations established that the porticoes surrounding the temple originated in Period I, but the outer stylobate alone belongs to this period, and nothing can be said of the superstructure that it carried. In Period II the porticoes were rebuilt: the stylobate was raised and fronted by a continuous flight of three steps, leading down to the lower level that was now established for the temenos. The porticoes assumed the standard Hellenistic form with an outer Doric colonnade, and an inner colonnade of the Ionic order, set at twice the spacing and founded on individual piers which were inserted at this period (p. 23). The basal column-diameter of the Doric colonnade was 63.5 cm., and the intercolumniation of the north and south porticoes was 1.85 m. (determined from the excavated piers of the Ionic colonnade). The proportions would therefore have been close to systyle (3 diameters, 1.91 m.), the spacing which has been inferred for the temple itself. The east portico, across the rear of the temple, would have had approximately the same spacing if 21 columns had been employed for the Doric colonnade. However, the position of the one pier of the Ionic colonnade which was determined by excavation on this side (fig. 11, facing p. 51, section R–S) shows that in fact the spacing must have been wider here, employing only 19 columns for the Doric colonnade and yielding an intercolumniation of 2.08 m.

The columns of the porticoes were constructed, like the temple, of stuccoed sandstone, and remained so throughout their history. The capitals and bases are shown in figure 26 and in plates 15b and 15d. There appears to be no direct evidence for the height of the columns. Mr. Alec Daykin has observed (letter of 4.1.1950 to KMK) that a height of 8$\frac{1}{2}$ diameters for the Doric colonnade would correspond exactly to the height of the Period III forum colonnades. The forum...
FIG. 24. East Forum Temple: reconstruction of capital and base of the main order of the temple in Period II.
FIG. 25. Reconstruction of the entablature of the East Forum Temple in Period II.
EAST FORUM TEMPLE: ORDER OF PORTICOES

colonnade, of granite columns with marble capitals, has a height of less than 8½ diameters, upon which he remarked that such a heavy proportion would not have been adopted in such materials unless there were a specific dimensional problem involved. It may be that this proportion was adopted for the refurbishment of the Forum in Period III in order to conform with the porticoes of the East Forum Temple. (It has been suggested above, pp. 26, 29, that there was even an unfulfilled intention to unify the two.) This does therefore provide some indirect evidence for the height of the Doric colonnade in the temple precinct. The roof of the portico must have sloped down in a single pitch from the outer wall of the temple precinct: this is implied by the presence of a portico facing the Antonine Temple, built directly against the south wall of the East Forum Temple precinct.

LATER PERIODS

Developments and alterations in the precinct of the East Forum Temple subsequent to Period II have been discussed in the preceding chapter. The appearance of the front of the temple will have been affected in Period III by the raising of the level of the Forum and associated works (p. 26 f.). The vicissitudes of both the north and south temple porticoes during the third and fourth centuries have been described on p. 29 ff. The condition of the temple itself during the same period is unknown. An inscription found by the Italian excavators, allegedly in the East Forum Temple, records the restoration of a Temple of Liber Pater in the Constantinian period (IRT 55). The fragments are reproduced in plate 16a: the reading given by the editors of IRT is as follows.

```
A[ede]m Liberi Patris quam antiqua ruina cum lab[e... P]... 2 or 3 ]IVS ins[ta]urationem EA[... 5...][RISO]... D(ominorum) n[(ofostorum)] f[avi] Iul(i) Constantii n[aximi et fl[avi] Iul(i) Co]nst(na) max[i]m[i]i triumphato
rum se[mp]er Aug[ustorum² [...] am[... rimum prae[s]dicium v(iri) p(efectissimi) Fl[avi] Victoris Calpurn[i ... 8...] servavit hanc L(ucius) Aemilius Caelestinus duovir [quinquenn]alis fl[am]en
perp(etusus) amori patriae studiose resp[on]dit [... 12...] a v(iro) p(efectissimo)
[p]atrono prov(inciae) dedicat[te ... 25-30 ...] f[ecit ex [decreto ordinis]

¹ DDN[N]. ² Augusti together 340-350.
```

If the inscription is properly to be associated with this building, there is no structural development to which it can be directly linked, save possibly the reconstruction of the porticoes: this point has been discussed in the preceding chapter (p. 31 f.). Repairs to the superstructure of the temple itself would not have been detectable from the present condition of the remains.

The transverse portico of Period V was almost certainly built in the later fourth century following the earthquake of A.D. 365, to close off the ruinous and largely abandoned temple precinct from the Forum. The portico was paved with a coarse black-and-white mosaic, similar to that now existing in the Curia, at the north-west angle of the Forum and in the Basilica (pl. 9b); its superstructure was probably composed of re-used materials brought from elsewhere, but the remains are too fragmentary for any reconstruction to be more than speculative. Its relationship to the temple behind is uncertain: I have suggested above (p. 33) that whatever the nature of the building which now stood on the temple podium, and which was reached by a narrow flight of steps opening through the rear of the portico, its purpose can hardly have continued to be sacred.
The Basilica was originally excavated by Professor R. Bartoccini, and the study undertaken by the British expedition was therefore essentially structural in character. Selected excavations were carried out, but these were intended on the whole to clarify structural relationships. The overall responsibility for this area was assumed by JBWP: a typescript by him (reproduced below) describes the structures of Periods I and II, and breaks off at the beginning of Period III. A summary description of the later phases in which the building became a church has been published by Ward-Perkins and Goodchild (1953, 7-12). In the course of completing the description of the later periods, I have made extensive use of a very useful study of the building by Alec Daykin. Mr. Daykin was the architect responsible for the detailed survey of the building in 1948-49, and his conclusions formed an important part of his B.A. thesis entitled The Basilicas of Tripolitania: a Study of their Development (University of Sheffield, 1951, unpublished). I am deeply indebted to Mr. Daykin for further discussions on this building, and for the preparation of several of the final drawings.

The account given below of the later history of the building will be found to differ substantially from that already published, as a result of my re-assessment of the evidence. Notes made by JBWP in 1953 (after the publication of the article referred to above) hint at an intention to make a similar re-appraisal.

INTRODUCTION (J.B.W.P.)

The Forum Basilica underwent many structural changes during the course of its long history. It occupied a space that was bounded on the north by the Forum and by the buildings immediately to the west of it; on the east by the South Propyleum to the Forum and by the piazza that lay in front of the Antonine Temple; and along a part of the south side by the South Forum Temple. To the west and south-west, the natural slope of the ground rises sharply; and although, on this side, only a small part of the ground has been excavated and that superficially, it is unlikely that there were any substantial public buildings: in this direction, the basilica was probably bounded by private houses. The maximum dimensions of the area so delimited are approximately 72 m. from east to west and 44 m. (or 49 m., including the tabernae along the north frontage) from north to south.

For simplicity and convenience of reference, it will be useful to anticipate the conclusions of the following sections, by outlining the structural history of the building as revealed by the surviving remains. (See fig. 27 and pl. 17.) The first basilica (Period I) was a building symmetrical about its shorter, north-south axis, and it consisted of a rectangular basilical hall, measuring some 26 m. by 48.5 m., with an internal ambulatory and a series of subsidiary rooms opening off the south side, the most important of which was the judicial tribunal, in the centre of the south side, immediately opposite the main entrance on the north. In Period II the basilical hall seems to have remained substantially unaltered, but the tribunal was transferred to a new and larger structure, which was added at the west end of the building. [But see below, p. 79.] The third building (Period III) differed radically from its predecessors. It followed the model of the Severan Basilica at Lepcis Magna, with two longitudinal colonnades in place of the ambulatory of its predecessors, and an apsidal tribunal at either end of the central nave. A considerable part of the earlier building was left outside the outer south wall, so that at this stage the overall internal dimensions of the building were about 22.5 m. by 68 m. This two-apsed basilica was subsequently [converted in Period IIIb into a church (Church 1), and the church was again restored and substantially rebuilt on a shorter plan in the sixth century (Period IV)].

There were thus four distinct major building periods; and in addition to these, we have to take account of the remains of a certain number of structures that antedate the earliest basilica; and of a number of modifications to the successive basilicas that are hardly sufficient in importance to merit the distinction of a separate period number.
Whatever earlier buildings there may have been on the south-western part of the site, all trace of them was destroyed when the original surface-level was quarried away, to provide a level platform for the earliest basilica and for its subsequent western extension. It is only to the north and east of a line running obliquely through the site of the later altar that there is any depth of accumulated earth between the pavement of the basilica and the natural rock; and, wherever this has been trenched, it has been shown to cover the substantial remains of earlier buildings, laid out on the same orientation as the basilica itself and as the adjacent Forum. Over the greater part of the area within the basilica, these earlier levels have not yet been explored. In default of any contrary evidence, however, it may perhaps be assumed that the results obtained by the clearance of the north-west angle of Basilica I are reasonably representative.

The structures exposed in this angle are complex; but a good fixed point is afforded by the footings of the west wall of Basilica I, which cross the present north aisle of Basilica III and of the church at a point about 2.5 m. east of the present west wall of the main hall of the basilica. These footings overlie and incorporate the remains of two earlier structures.

The earlier of these pre-basilica structures consists of walls built of stretchers, just over 50 cm. in width and laid on a slightly wider footing of smaller, very roughly squared blocks. The blocks of the single surviving course are drafted, with a wide, irregular draft (10–15 cm.) which leaves the central part of the face rough, as dressed at the quarry. A length of about three metres of a wall of this sort is preserved, running from east to west; and it is the west end of this that is incorporated within, and earlier than the footings of the west wall of Basilica I. This early wall is of one build with a second wall, running southwards, at right-angles to it, and lying immediately to the east of the west wall of Basilica I (pl. 18a); the south end of this second wall disappears beneath the stylobate of Basilica III (second phase [i.e. Period IIIb: see p. 83]). Parallel with the second wall, and 4.5 m. to the east of it, are the footings and one stretcher block of another wall of similar build. This can be seen both to the north and to the south of the line of the east-west wall, but the actual point of junction is obscured by later masonry.

The fragment of east-west walling referred to in the previous paragraph was later incorporated in a more substantial footing, traces of which have been recorded at a number of points beneath the floor of the north aisle of Basilica III, including two blocks projecting from beneath the terminal wall at the east end. For the greater part of its length it appears to have consisted of header blocks, laid to an average breadth of just under 1 m.; but immediately to the east of the west wall of Basilica I, it makes use of the earlier masonry, adding a second thickness of blocks along the north face of the exposed stretcher wall. It overrides the eastern one of the two north-south stretcher walls described in the previous paragraph; and is itself earlier than, and incorporated within, the footings of Basilica I.

Without further excavation, it is impossible to say on structural grounds what, if any, other walls were associated with this long east-west foundation. It is, nevertheless, possible to suggest its purpose. Not only did it incorporate at least one stretch of earlier wall, running on the same line; but to the west, it is exactly aligned on the southern extremity of the Cruciform Building, which there is good reason to believe conforms to the outline of a far earlier building; and to the east, it is almost exactly aligned on the party wall between the East Forum Temple and the Antonine Temple, another early feature (p. 15). It seems reasonable, therefore, to interpret it as the footing for the southern boundary-wall of the forum complex in the period immediately preceding the construction of Basilica I [= Forum Period Ia: see fig. 4 on p. 14]; and in that case, there were certainly buildings along its north face, lying between it and the open space of the Forum. Whether it also formed part of some monumental building lying to the south, we cannot say. The possibility cannot be excluded; but there is, at present, very little positive evidence of such a building.

A solitary exception is an oblique wall exposed by a grave immediately to the north-east of the eastern apse of Basilica III. This belongs presumably to the irregularly sited group of pre-forum structures located under the Forum itself, under the East Forum Temple and within the temenos of the Antonine Temple.
The earlier, stretcher walls closely resemble those of the earliest period in the western part of the south forum portico; and whether or not they are exactly contemporary, there seems no reason to doubt that they represent the first building on the site to be laid out on a formal plan and oriented on the same axis as the Forum. In terms of the successive constructional phases represented in this part of the south forum portico (p. 34 ff.), the long boundary wall beneath the north aisle of the basilica represents an intermediate stage, after the establishment of these earliest buildings, but before the construction of Basilica I and of the associated cisterns.

**Dating evidence**

[There was no direct evidence for the date of the pre-basilica structures other than the structural relationships enumerated above. The earliest buildings on the alignment of the Forum and the Basilica are likely to be broadly contemporary with Period I of the East Forum Temple, which has been ascribed to the mid first century A.D. (above p. 15 f.). As to the earlier occupation, a pit located in a trench at the western end of the south aisle of Basilica III yielded black-glazed wares of the second, or possibly third, century B.C. (context S. p. C20-5). The coins found in the area also include several examples of the fourth and third centuries B.C. (See below, p. 265.)]

---

**FIG. 28. Basilica, schematic plan of Period I: c. A.D. 70–80.**

PERIOD I (J.B.W.P.) (fig. 28)

The only parts of the earliest basilica that are still standing to any height are the south wall and the rooms opening off it (pl. 16b), all of which lay outside the fourth-century building (Period III) and were early protected by a considerable depth of accumulated debris; and some five or six metres at the west end of the north wall, which remained in use until the sixth century. The west wall, except for the south-west angle, was demolished to below floor-level when the building was enlarged in Period II [?]; and the remainder was incorporated in the perimeter of Basilica III, to which most of the masonry above foundation-level appears to belong. Despite these
alterations, however, the main lines of the original building were traceable with a minimum of further excavation; and the plan may be regarded as securely established in almost all its essential features.

The original basilica consisted essentially of a rectangular hall, measuring 48.5 m. internally from east to west, and just over 26 m. from north to south. Colonnades ran round all four sides to enclose a central area of 14 m. by 34.5 m. surrounded by internal porticoes, of which those to the east and west were slightly wider (5.50 m.) than those to the north and south (4.80 m.). The main entrance was in the middle of the north side. [The building was here integral in structure with the tabernae of Period Ib in the Forum, and the projecting foundations on either side of the entrance suggest some architectural embellishment of which no other trace remains.] On the opposite side a large room, 11 m. square, opened off the middle of the south portico, and this was flanked on either side by two pairs of smaller rooms, which also opened off the south portico. The large central room, which had an apse in the middle of the south wall, was evidently designed to house the magistrate’s tribunal. The smaller rooms may conveniently be termed committee rooms.

The original masonry can best be seen at the north-west angle, where four and a half courses are preserved, including the original angle-pilaster (pls. 12a, 18c). The wall, some 75-80 cm. wide on a wider footing, was composed of courses of sandstone blocks, varying from 50 to 55 cm. in height. The blocks were normally laid as headers, and any irregularities were taken up by the thick coating of plaster with which this sandstone masonry was always covered. The pilaster was 1.00 m. wide, with a projection of 10 cm., and it appears to have been absolutely plain, like the corresponding exterior angle-pilasters of the Basilica Vetus at Lepcis Magna.

The position of the main entrance is marked by four blocks of grey limestone, part of the threshold, which are still in position at the north-east angle of the church. To judge from the line of the paved step within the piazza to the east, there was probably a secondary entrance in the east wall, near the south-east corner. The position of the interior colonnade is given in part by the layout of the paving, in part by the surviving seatings for some of the column-bases. The paving itself, which was composed of rectangular slabs of Proconnesian marble laid in long parallel rows, has mostly been removed, except at the east end, where it is badly broken up by tombs; but the hard mortar bedding is in places well preserved, particularly in the south-west part of the building, where it rests almost directly on the natural rock; and from this, and from the actual surviving slabs, it can be seen that in the central nave, and in the corresponding part of the north and south aisles, the lines of paving ran from east to west, parallel with the longer axis; in the east and west aisles, including the four corners of the building, they ran at right-angles to it, from north to south. (See pl. 19a.)

The seatings for the column-bases can best be seen at the south-west angle (pl. 19a), where the pavement bedding has preserved the outline of the base of the south-west angle-column and of the two adjoining bases of the south colonnade, as well as that of part of the adjoining base of the west colonnade (the rest of which was destroyed when a trench was cut for the footings of the south colonnade of Basilica III). Of the twelve columns that comprised the south colonnade, traces were also found of numbers 6 and 7 from the west and the south-east angle-column. The corresponding north colonnade was replaced on almost exactly the same line by the footings of the north colonnade of Basilica III; but there are scanty impressions of numbers 2 and 3 from the west, and the outer angle of the north-east corner-base is clearly marked by the angle of two surviving marble slabs. Of the six columns of the west colonnade, in addition to the two bases already described, the socket of the fourth base from the south is visible beneath the edge of the later monumental foundation that underlies the Christian altar. The footings of the east colonnade have been badly cut about by graves, but parts of all six can still be traced. Enough is visible, therefore, to show that the colonnades were regular and consisted of twelve columns (including the angle-columns) on the long sides, and six (including the angle-columns) on the short sides. The former were slightly more widely spaced than the latter (3.30 m. from centre to centre as opposed to 3.10 m.). The individual bases measured 1.10-1.15 m. square, as nearly as

2 The credit for recognizing the true character of Basilica I is due to R.G. Goodchild.
can be judged from the surviving impressions. The entire superstructure, from the bases upwards, was removed in Period III, and no fragment of it can now be identified. [See JBWP, but see the discussion below of the columns at the entrance to the tribunal.]

The central exedra consisted, in its original form, of a room approximately 11 m. square, with an apse (radius 2.60 m.) in the middle of the south side. It opened to the north onto the south portico of the basilica, through a tetrastyle colonnade in antis (pl. 19b). The latter was found fallen, but has been restored on the evidence of the impressions of the column-bases. The columns, which have a maximum diameter of 73 cm., are very closely set (about 2.10 m. from centre to centre). The original bases have not been preserved; but three of the four capitals survive, and are unusually well-preserved and elaborate specimens of the architectural stucco-worker's art (pl. 20). ['These columns, including their capitals, are built of soft, friable sandstone, ... and finished in a fine marble stucco only 0.5 cm. thick. All detailing was carved before being finished with a fine skim. The Corinthian capitals are a tour-de-force of plasterwork. Slight traces of dark red ochre can be seen which suggests that they were finally painted like examples in the Museum - backgrounds in Indian-red with blue, green or yellow acanthus, and cream caulicoli.' (Daykin 1951, 132.)]

UBWP appears to have accepted without question the spacing of the columns as restored by Caputo, but as Mr. Daykin has pointed out to me recently this restoration is architecturally unsound. Vitruvius, in the design of his basilica at Fano (to which the Sabratha example conforms in general terms) took special measures to enhance the visibility of the tribunal (5.1.7), which would have been seriously impaired at Sabratha by a colonnade so closely set. Caputo's provisional plan of the exedra (1950, 11), shows a continuous stylobate of header-blocks, upon which he has restored the columns centrally above alternate pairs of blocks. (He makes no mention of actual impressions of column-bases, as suggested above by JBWP.) This is the arrangement shown in the general plan (fig. 27, facing p. 69), in which the stylobate is partly masked by the restored column-bases. If, on the other hand, the columns were placed over every third pair of headers, the spacing would correspond to that of the main order of the nave of the basilica, and the outer columns would stand immediately next to the antae at either side. This arrangement seems inherently more probable, and I have taken the liberty of showing it in figure 28. Furthermore, Daykin has suggested that the capitals at the entrance to the tribunal are probably identical to those of the main order (shown thus in the reconstructed cross-section of the Basilica, fig. 42, facing p. 94). The colonnade across the front may therefore have been uniform in all respects with the main order of the basilica colonnades. In the Fano basilica, the main order was in fact interrupted in front of the tribunal (Vitruvius 5.1.7); the general plan of the Sabratha example in figure 27 shows tentative traces of column-bases in the corresponding positions, but Daykin has expressed to me doubts whether in the circumstances they should be regarded as authoritative.]

The walls of the exedra were in their original form about 80 cm. thick along the outer perimeter of the building, and some 60 cm. thick for the party walls between the tribunal and the flanking committee rooms. Along the inner faces of the two flanking walls there projected rough footings of sandstone blocks (pl. 21a), about 2 m. broad, and, between them, the central part of the room is now earth-paved. There must formerly have been a pavement at a higher level, and this may well have been of wood. Recessed into the earthen part of the floor are four (perhaps originally five) socketed stone bases, but there is nothing to show whether these, too, are original features.

This early room was later altered by the suppression of the apse and by the insertion, along the east, south and west faces of the room, of a massive moulded plinth, with a shallow, rectangular projection in the middle of each face. (See figs. 29 and 30.) Of these three projecting features, that in the middle of the south wall is more pronounced (76 cm.) than those of the two side walls (18 cm.; see pls. 18b and 21a). The top of the plinth must have been about 1.60-1.70 m. above floor-level. Along the two side walls it rests upon the rough projecting footings described in the

3 By Professor Giacomo Caputo [who carried out the excavations in this area]; see Reports and Monographs of the Department of Antiquities in Tripolitania 2 (1949) 6.
previous paragraph, and along the south wall a similar footing was inserted to carry it across the mouth of the destroyed apse. Of the apse, all that remains is a part of the footings exposed in the narrow gap between the outer south wall of the remodelled exedra and the outer north wall of the precinct of the South Forum Temple. From the level of the base-mouldings of the plinth it is clear that, as in the preceding period, the floor was some 50 cm. higher than the level now exposed.

[Figure 29 shows the profile of this plinth. The detailed mouldings cut in the sandstone masonry are overlaid by very much simpler mouldings in stucco. This may suggest some refurbishment during Period II (i.e. in the third or fourth century), but the presence of a similar phenomenon elsewhere at Sabratha where the stucco must surely be original suggests that the difference between the mouldings may be due less to chronological succession than to differing intentions on the part of stone-mason and stucco-worker: cf. Joly & Tomasello (1984) figs. 14 and 40 (South Forum Temple, Antonine Temple).]

The committee rooms that flanked this central exedra have been so altered and overlaid by later
masonry that it is not easy to be sure of the original layout. The larger of the two rooms to the east was about 6.60 m. square and appears to have been open to the north, to judge from the easternmost of what were presumably two symmetrical antae, 45 cm. deep, of which the original plaster surface can be seen incorporated within the masonry of a later blocking wall. This blocking wall is of good masonry, 75 cm. wide, with a gap at the centre which may represent a door; and there are the remains of a projecting base, of uncertain period, in the middle of the south wall. The corresponding room to the west is still overlaid with the remains of the late domestic architecture that Caputo found covering the whole area to the south of the Period III Basilica, including the South Forum Temple. [See Joly & Tomasello 1984, loose plate I.] The same is true of the westernmost room of this south range; and although the corresponding room to the east has been completely excavated, it has been so stripped and altered that one can only recognize the bare outline of the room. It measures just over 3 m. by 9 m., and it may have been subdivided; and it will be noticed that, both here and at the west end of the south range, the outer wall is sited so as to fall just short of the angle-pilaster of the main building.

There can be little doubt that the central exedra, with its apse and probably wooden floor, served as the tribunal of the Period I Basilica: it is enough to quote the obvious parallel it affords to the basilica that Vitruvius built at Fano (5.1.6-10). The suppression of the apse presumably indicates that it was no longer needed for judicial purposes, and this can hardly have taken place before the building of the new tribunal to the west of the basilica, in Period II [but see below, p. 79]. On the other hand, a secure terminus ante quem is afforded by the north precinct wall of the South Forum Temple, which overlies the footings of the dismantled apse. In terms of the chronology of the main basilica, therefore, the alterations to the south wing fall within Period II, and are either contemporary with or later than the addition of the western extension; they are, on the other hand, earlier than (or possibly contemporary with) the building of the South Forum Temple.

In late antiquity the whole of the south wing was suppressed: blocking-walls were built across the entrances to the exedra and to the committee rooms from what had been the south portico of the basilica; and within them were stacked a number of statues, inscriptions and other objects. This cannot have taken place later than the construction of Basilica III, the south wall of which was built when there was already well over a metre of accumulated earth and debris in what had been part of the south portico of Basilica I, and now became a narrow passage between the south wall of this and the south wall of the new Basilica III. Caputo is probably right in attributing this deposit, like the construction of Basilica III, to the aftermath of the disasters that took place in the third quarter of the fourth century [upon the character, though not the date, of which a quite different interpretation is placed in this report: see p. 5 f.]. It includes a fine series of imperial statues of the late first and second centuries; and if, as seems likely, these statues are part of the contents of the southern range of rooms before they were dismantled and abandoned, the central exedra must presumably have served as a shrine of the imperial state cult. Whether it was so from the outset (it will be recalled that the tribunal of Vitruvius’s basilica at Fano served also as an aedes Augusti), or whether it became so only after the removal of the tribunal to another part of the building, we cannot say for certain. The early date of some of the statues and the existence from the beginning of heavy, non-structural footings along the two side walls, suggest that it may well have been used as an imperial shrine already in Period I.

**Dating evidence**

[The first basilica is integral in structure with the Period Ib Forum (see p. 17) and must therefore be contemporary with it, i.e. of the Flavian period (p. 21). There is little to add to this in the way of evidence from the basilica itself. A trench in the south aisle of the Period III Basilica, not precisely located, included a level described as the fill of the foundation-trench [of Period I]

---

4 Caputo (1950) 7-28. The inscriptions are IRT 37 (Julia Domna) and 169 (third century); IRT 109 was found at a higher level, re-used in one of the late houses overlying this wing and the precinct of the adjoining temple.

5 The identifications suggested by Caputo (1950) range from Vespasian to (possibly) Julia Domna; also a colossal head of Caligula.
PERIOD II

New construction: present
Earlier structures: conjectured

PERIOD II: THE WESTWARD EXTENSION (J.B.W.P.) (fig. 30)

Whatever the reason that may have determined the enlargement of the early basilica, it is evident that the form that it took was partly determined by the plan of the buildings already existing on and adjoining the site of the extension. The northern part of the west wall is in fact an earlier wall, built of stretcher blocks and belonging to the partially excavated complex of early buildings that opens off the alleyway separating the Cruciform Building from the Capitolium. This early wall, which turns westwards at a point 6.30 m. south of the north-west angle of the extension, serves also to delimit the Cruciform Building, the west wall of which was built up against it. The northern limit, too, of the extension, which continues the line of the long east-west pre-basilica wall beneath the north portico of Basilica I (see p. 69), was determined by the pre-existence of the south wall of the Cruciform Building or (as seems rather more probable) of the building that preceded it.² Within the area of the extension, traces can be seen of at least one earlier building, in

² Excavation of the short stretch of foundations that links the west wall of Basilica I and the south-east angle of the Cruciform Building failed to reveal conclusive evidence of the date of the Cruciform Building in relation to the westward extension of the basilica. On balance, however, the evidence is in favour of the Period II basilica extension having been the earlier of the two. At the point of junction, the position of the foundation-trench for the footings of the Cruciform Building suggests that the few surviving blocks of the extension foundations were already in place when it was cut; the remaining blocks would have been removed to make way for the deeper, and altogether more massive, foundations of the Cruciform Building. It was at this stage that the drain feeding the cisterns in the south forum portico finally went out of use (see p. 36 f.).
two short stretches of footing exposed within the central room of the western range and within the western apse of Basilica III, running from east to west on a line that corresponds with that of the earlier building incorporated in the west wall (see fig. 30 and pl. 21b).

In the southern part of the extension it is possible that some of the structures described below (p. 78) are earlier than Period II. On the other hand, the level of the natural rock rises sharply at
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At this point, and at the south-west angle it was necessary to quarry it away to secure a level platform within the extension; and immediately outside the south wall, and cut by it, are the partially excavated remains of two well-built walls of stretcher blocks (not shown in fig. 27), which run at an oblique angle to it and suggest that here, at any rate, the pre-Period II structures were not aligned on the same general axis as were the basilica and the buildings immediately to the north and north-west of it; a similar oblique wall, with drafted quoins, is exposed behind the central apse. On the south side, it was evidently the requirement of symmetry, rather than the need to respect pre-existing buildings, that determined the limit of the Period II extension.

Not only did the new building incorporate earlier structures, but it remained in use and was variously modified over the course of at least four centuries. The main lines of the Period II building seem to be clear enough—a western range of rooms, preceded by a hall or forecourt; but a number of details are either irretrievably lost or buried beneath the bulk of the western apse of Period III.

The western range consisted of three rooms, a rectangular central room with a large apse, which must have served as a tribunal, and, flanking it, a pair of smaller square rooms. The northern shoulder of the apse coincides with the angle of the earlier building described above, and the Period II masonry is built up against it. There is no corresponding straight joint at the south angle. Instead, there is a vertical joint, five courses high, against the south face of the shallow rectangular feature that projects from the centre of the curve, and this may perhaps represent the incorporation of earlier masonry. Above this height, however, the masonry is continuous; and there can be little doubt that the body of the apse and the west wall to the south of it was built as an integral part of the Period II extension. The footings of the partition walls that separate the three rooms of the western range are unusually broad (1.50 m.), whereas the present façade wall (so far as can be determined in the present state of the excavations, this seems to be an original Period II feature) is far less substantial [and might belong only to Period IIIb?]. Of the three doorways in this façade, the thresholds of those opening into the flanking rooms are of grey limestone and may well be original; that of the central room is of marble and probably dates from the conversion of this room into a baptistery in Period IIIb. There are traces of the original marble veneer in both the flanking rooms, in the same white marble, flecked with black and grey, as was used, for example, in the porticoes of the South Forum Temple. Nothing remains of the original ornament of the central room.

Between the western range of rooms and the main body of the basilica, there was a rectangular area, measuring 14 m. from east to west by 19 m. from north to south. What exactly occupied this space, it is no longer possible to say: the evidence is fragmentary and, in part, seemingly contradictory. In the northern half the excavations of 1948 revealed, beneath the raised floor of the Period III western apse, the south face of a well-built wall exactly aligned on the south face of the partition wall between the tribunal and the room adjoining it to the north (fig. 31 and pl. 21b). Two courses of this wall are preserved to a height of just over one metre above the footings, which are rather broader and are on a level that corresponds with that of the footings of the western range of rooms. These footings rest in turn on the northern edge of the earlier, pre-Period II footing described above (p. 75 f.). It follows from these facts that, in the period immediately preceding the building of the Period III apse, there was at this point a substantial wall running from east to west and separating the space to the north of it, about 5 m. wide, from whatever lay to the south of it, on the main axis of the extension. Immediately outside the apse, to the west, the ground has been badly disturbed by Christian burials: it is possible that further traces of the footings of this wall might be revealed by careful excavation; but the wall itself must have been completely dismantled in Period III, except for the surviving fragment within the apse.

The southern half of the extension failed to reveal any certain trace of a symmetrical wall. As a result of the northward shift of the axis of the basilica in Period III, any corresponding structures would have lain well to the south of the area covered by the raised floor of the apse; and outside

7 [Pencilled note by JBWP: 'Point to be checked again.']
the apse, not only have any earlier structures been stripped to pavement-level, but this is in places only a few centimetres above that of the natural rock. All that is here preserved (pl. 21c) is the south-west angle of a room or sunken space, comprising a single course of header blocks laid to a width of about 1 m. and, from this angle, a somewhat narrower footing that prolongs the line of its outer, south face westwards, to join the façade wall of the western range of rooms at a point just south of the partition wall between the tribunal and the room adjoining it to the south. The inner faces of the angle were veneered with thin limestone slabs, and the floor between them was paved with marble at a level about 30 cm. below what appears to have been the general level of the pavement over the greater part of the extension during Period II. The footings of the Period III apse rest directly upon the walls that delimit the marble pavement and upon the marble pavement itself.

There would seem to be only two possible explanations of the apparent discrepancy between the north and south sides of the Period II extension: either that it was, in fact, asymmetrical, which seems prima facie improbable, but is the most natural interpretation of the surviving remains; or else that there was a stage intermediate between the marble-paved structure and the Period III apse, but that all trace of this was removed by the builders of the latter and by the Christians who buried their dead in the strip of ground immediately to the west of the Period III apse. In the latter case, there remains the further question, whether the marble-paved structure belongs to an early building that was demolished to make way for the Period II extension, or whether it represents an original phase of the Period II building, which was only later remodelled to the form that is still preserved on the north side (which must, in any case, belong to the Period II extension in its latest stages, since the wall is still standing a metre above the Period II pavement-level). In the latter case, the surviving remains might reasonably be interpreted as those of a portico, running round the three sides of an open courtyard and providing covered access from the main basilica to the tribunal and its flanking committee rooms; if there ever was such a portico, the masonry of its northern half must lie irretrievably buried beneath that of the Period III apse. Against this interpretation, it must be admitted that the surviving angle resembles that of a closed room rather than an open courtyard; and the drain outside the north-west angle of Basilica I, which was ideally placed to have carried off the rain-water of such a courtyard, was in fact deliberately put out of use by the builders of Period II. [The cisterns formerly fed by this drain, however, continued in use and were fitted with an overflow leading to the new forum drain ([Forum Period III): see p. 36.]

With the wall beneath the northern part of the Period III apse, we are on firmer ground; there can be no doubt whatever that this was actually standing at least a metre above pavement-level at the end of Period II. This fact is certain; but what it represents architecturally, it is not at all easy to say. The plan (assuming a symmetrical wall to the south) suggests some sort of basilical structure; and in that case, it is just possible that the present façade wall of the western range of rooms is a later addition, and that the tribunal occupied the whole of the central space between the west wall of Period I and the Period II apse: this would account for the size of the footing between the present tribunal and the rooms to the north and south of it. On the other hand, the surviving remains on the line of the wall dividing the hypothetical nave and north aisle are those of a wall and not, as one would have expected, of a colonnade; and although this is not, in itself, an insuperable difficulty, there seems little chance of finding further evidence, for or against, without demolishing a great deal of later masonry.

There is the same difficulty in determining the form at this period of that part of the west wall of Basilica I which also became the east wall of the Period II extension. At the only point where any considerable stretch of it could be examined, in the south aisle of the later church, it was found to have been completely removed, footings and all, leaving only a shallow trench cut in the rock, which here lies just below pavement-level. Elsewhere, the line of the wall is covered by, or incorporated within, later masonry or pavements. It may have been replaced by a colonnade; on

---

8 The footings of a wall symmetrical with that to the north would have passed across the exposed angle of the marble paving.
the other hand, the fact that the rock-cut foundation-trench is no more than 88 cm. wide\(^9\) suggests that here, at any rate, it continued to be a wall, and that doors were presumably cut in it to give access to the several rooms of the extension.

\[\text{Postscript by P.M.K.} \quad \text{The evidence for the character of the structures to the west of the Period I basilica is confused, as has been shown above in the discussion by JBWP. It is difficult to interpret them as part of a symmetrical layout, and it therefore seems to me seriously questionable whether they are in fact to be interpreted as containing a tribunal at all. After all, the original tribunal, having lost its apse at this time, was refurbished (above, p. 72 f.) and I see no compelling reason why it should not have continued to serve its original purpose. The evidence, such as it is, suggests to me an asymmetrical arrangement of a courtyard of about 13.5 \times 14 m. in the south-eastern part of the extension, with an impluvium in the centre and ranges of rooms opening off it on the north and west sides. One may speculate that these were offices of some kind, presumably associated with the business of the basilica, to which access was obtained through the west end of the basilica, perhaps by means of a doorway rather than by the wholesale removal of the intervening wall. If the west wall of the Basilica I was demolished only when the two-apse basilica was constructed in Period III, this would be consistent with the laying of the coarse mosaic at that time to pave the section of floor which had not until then been continuous with the body of the basilica (see below, p. 82).} \]

\[\text{Dating evidence} \]

[The evidence for the date of the western extension is fragmentary in the extreme. The refurbishment of the Period I tribunal (p. 72 f.) is associated directly with the construction of the South Forum Temple, which has recently been dated between A.D. 166 and 186 (Joly and Tomasello 1984, 104), and the consequent suppression of the original apse. The inference has been that this occasioned the construction of a new tribunal in the western extension that was now added to the basilica. If the former tribunal did not cease to serve its original purpose, and if the western extension did not contain a new tribunal (both of which points seem to me seriously questionable), there ceases to be any implied chronological connexion between the two.]

[The only remaining evidence for the date of the Period II extension appears to be derived from a trench (S.p.C21) immediately behind the northern side of the Period II apse, at the point where it joins the pre-existing east–west wall. There is only the barest description of this trench in the site notebook, and no drawing. However, there is much fine pottery from layer 2, attributable to the second half of the second century A.D., and this is the only context from the entire basilica excavation from which the pottery was catalogued by KMK. The implication seems to be that it was regarded as stratigraphically significant, and therefore relevant to the dating of the Period II extension: I give this information for what it is worth. The date which I have suggested for this context (S.p.C21–2) is based on the presence of Hayes Forms 6, 9A, 14, 23B, 181.1, 181, 182 and 184 in African Red Slip Ware. A fragment of an African lamp of Loeschcke Type VIII has been dated in the 'second half of the second century' (D.M. Bailey). This is a similar range of forms to that upon which the date of Period III in the forum sequence was based (p. 27), and places the western extension of the basilica tentatively amongst a range of building activities which included the replacement of the forum tabernae by porticoes (p. 24), and the construction of the Antonine Temple (Bartoccini 1964), the South Form Temple (Joly & Tomasello 1984) and the Cruciform Building (below, Chapter IIIc).]

[The excavations within the western apse of Basilica III yielded some slight dating-evidence for the Period II east–west wall which was found within the fill of the apse (see fig. 31 and pl. 21b). Most of the fill of the apse consisted of tipped layers of rubble and sand, from the bed-rock up;

\(^9\) The few blocks of the corresponding footing that survive in the north aisle show no trace of any substantial alteration. [Contra, Daykin (1951, 139) points out that the rock-cut foundation-trench does show signs of having been widened precisely at the point where it would have been intersected by the south wall of the Period II extension: this is visible on the general plan, fig. 27.]
but in the immediate vicinity of the earlier walls were found traces of a white mortar floor (layers S.p.K52-7A in section A-B and S.p.K26-7 in section C-D) which is either the actual floor associated with the Period II wall or the bedding for paving-slabs which were subsequently removed. Layers beneath this floor yielded several potsherds of the early third century A.D., but the latest evidence of date is provided by a sherd of Hayes Form 50 or the like in African Red Slip Ware from Layer S.p.K52-9 (from c. A.D. 230) and a barbarous radiate coin of c. A.D. 270–280 (no. 65) from layer S.p.K26-11. This implies a late third-century date for this wall, offering tentative support to the hypothesis (above, p. 78) that Period II as at present defined may embrace two successive layouts of the area.

The Basilica I nave was still in use when a massive rectangular footing, presumably for a monumental group of statuary, was cut into the floor of the central nave immediately in front of the columns of the west portico (pl. 23d). The southern edge of this base is overlaid by the footings of the south stylobate of the church; but, since it was evidently intended to be symmetrical about the long axis of the building, it must have measured about 5.8 × 6.5 m. The footings were trenched into the rock so as to rest flush with the bedding for the marble pavement of Basilica I, which seems to have served all the successive stages of the basilica until its final reconstruction in the sixth century [Period IV]. The altar of the church stood on the same site, and nothing remains therefore of the superstructure of the monument; but its approximate date is given by a coin of Constantius II (A.D. 347–348: no. 15) found in the foundation-trench along the north side, and the base itself seems in turn to show that Basilica I, with its western Period II extension, was still in use up to the middle of the fourth century.

[The coin referred to above is recorded from layer S.p.C22-8, which section E–F in figure 31 shows not to be the foundation-trench for the monument, but to be sealed beneath the Period I floor and several intervening layers: the only fine ware from these levels is Hellenistic. The coin is perhaps most likely to be an intrusion from the foundation-trench for the Period IV stylobate and is therefore not clearly relevant to the date of the monument. The only clear indication given by section E–F is that the monument has been inserted into the Period I floor, for its foundation-trench cuts through the original make-up.]

PERIOD IIIA: THE TWO-APSED BASILICA (J.B.W.P.) (fig. 32)

Soon after the middle of the fourth century the basilica was drastically remodelled. The old building was certainly still in use when the monument described in the preceding section was placed in the central nave, on the site of the later Christian altar; and this evidence is confirmed by the discovery of a fourth-century coin in the debris that had accumulated against the south wall of the early building by the time when the Period III south wall was built. The terminus ante quem is less easily established; but since the Period IIIa building was itself converted into a church at a date that can hardly be later than the second quarter of the fifth century (if indeed as late), it is unlikely to have been built after the end of the fourth century; and in that case, the occasion for its construction may very well have been the destruction of its predecessor in the earthquake of A.D. 365.

The Period I basilica had been centrally planned, with the emphasis on the shorter, north–south axis, leading from the main door in the middle of the north side to the tribunal immediately opposite. The Period II alterations had introduced an important cross-accent (quite how important, it is hard to judge without knowing how far the western extension was open to, and visible from, the main hall); and the placing of a monumental base against the middle of the west portico was a further step in the same direction. The decisive break, however, came in

10 [This statement conflicts with the section against the north side of the monument shown in fig. 31.]
11 [Note my reservations above about the date of the monument – P.M.K.]
12 [I cannot verify this statement or identify the coin referred to – P.M.K.]
Period III. Except for the main entrance, which remained where it had always been, the new building was unequivocally planned about the longer, east-west, axis, with two longitudinal colonnades dividing the main hall into a central nave and two aisles and, at either end of the central nave [?], a raised apse. It follows closely the model established by the great Severan Basilica at Lepcis Magna; only at the two ends did the nature of the pre-existing buildings impose a somewhat makeshift solution of the problem that had been so neatly solved by the four corner-chapels of the Lepcis basilica.

---

* * * *

JBWP's text breaks off at this point, and the remainder of the description of the Basilica has been compiled solely by PMK.

The fact of such radical change, combined with the evidence of structural technique and of the materials used (or rather, re-used) argues strongly that it took place in the third quarter of the fourth century, following the earthquake of A.D. 365. Fragments of coarse tessellated paving belonging to this period and preserved at the west end of the basilica (pl. 23a) are similar to the mosaics of the Curia (rebuilt by A.D. 368: Bartoccini 1950, 33 and pl. 15a) and of the transverse portico in the Forum (pl. 9b). The availability, in quantity, of columns and capitals from the precincts of the Antonine Temple and the South Forum Temple may readily be explained by their collapse in the earthquake and the concurrent (or prior) abandonment of the cults to which they had been dedicated. (The depth of soil which had accumulated above the South Forum Temple by the Byzantine period suggests strongly that the removal of building materials had taken place long before then: see Joly & Tomasello, 1984, 3-8.) At Sabratha, the rise of Christianity appears to be marked with particular clarity in the archaeological record by the coincidental collapse which terminated the existence of the pagan sanctuaries in the earthquake of A.D. 365. (See above, p. 33, for the East Forum Temple.)
Although the Period III basilica occupied the same site as its predecessor, it was substantially a new building. Of the Period I structure, all that remained in use was the outer north wall and a part of the footing of the north colonnade. The span of the central nave was reduced from about 14 m. to 11.40 m. (an indication, perhaps, of the increasing difficulty in obtaining suitable roof-timbers), and the whole of the southern half of the building was shifted a corresponding amount to the north. On this side, a new south wall was built 4 m. north of its former position, on the same line as the south wall of the Period II extension. The construction of this wall is rough, and is typical of the period (pl. 19a); its footings were set in a trench cut through the earlier marble paving. The eastern apse, with an internal diameter of 7.50 m., was set within the east end of the former Basilica I, and was provided with a staircase leading to the galleries above the aisles (pl. 22a). A cross-wall with a doorway at either side closed this end of the building and gave access to the space behind the apse, which was presumably no longer roofed. The corresponding western apse was built within the Period II extension, and may also have incorporated a staircase. The cross-wall was placed flush with the front of the Cruciform Building, and the area behind was presumably again open to the sky, though the outlines of the Period II extension survived to be adapted to new purposes in Period IIIb. Within, the nave of the new basilica was lined with colonnades of twelve columns each, set 12.40 m. apart and with an intercolumniation of 3.17 m. Nine bases were found belonging to the northern range, and one on the south side; towards the eastern end, the plan shows a continuous stylobate rather than individual bases. The colonnades of the succeeding period were formed entirely of re-used elements taken from the ruins of the Antonine Temple and the South Forum Temple, and the absence of other elements suggests that they were already employed in Period III (see fig. 33 and pls. 22b–c). The wide spacing of the columns and the total absence of stone architraves implies that these were of wood.

The building was not wholly symmetrical, for the two apses differ markedly in character. JBWP's notes record that the footings of the eastern apse and its flanking walls rise 10–15 cm. above the level of the Period I marble floor into which they are cut, suggesting that the ground-level at this end of the building was by now slightly higher. There is, however, no distinction between the floor-level within the apse and that in the nave immediately in front of it. A stone bench which runs round the inside of the apse (pl. 24c) rests on the original marble floor, but may be contemporary with the construction of the apse in Period IIIa. At the west end of the Period IIIa basilica, however, the nature of the evidence seems not to have been fully appreciated by JBWP. In his description of the later phases in which the building became a church (Ward-Perkins & Goodchild 1953, 7–10, here Periods IIIb and IV), he implies that only then was the floor within the western apse raised to its present height of 1.74 m. above the level of the nave. This is based on the fact that where the building was extended westwards beyond the west wall of Period I, the marble paving was now supplemented by an area of coarse tessellation which continues beneath the steps leading to the raised level of the apse, suggesting that the steps (and hence the raising of level) are secondary (pl. 23a). However, the excavations within the apse (p. 79 f. and fig. 31) showed both that the fill beneath the raised floor is largely uniform, and that it incorporated an earlier wall which still survives to a height of over a metre above the paving of the nave. The pottery from the fill yielded no fine ware later than the radiate coin already mentioned (p. 80), apart from a single fragment of a fifth-century Tripolitanian lamp close to the surface (layer S.p.K25–2). There is therefore no question of the western apse ever having had a floor at a lower level than it has now: the raised floor must have been original to Period IIIa. It is nonetheless possible that this raised tribunal was at first accessible only means of the side entrance and stairway on the south, and that the frontal stairway (alone) is secondary and is associated with the conversion of the building into a church in Period IIIb. JBWP suggested (Ward-Perkins & Goodchild 1953, 10) that the similarity between a fragment of tessellation surviving within the raised apse (visible in pl. 23b) and that by the foot of the steps (pl. 23a) implied no great interval of time between the two. It now appears that they are contemporary.

The southern range of rooms belonging to the early basilica was probably suppressed at the time when the Period IIIa building was constructed. The construction of blocking-walls across the entrances to these rooms (above, p. 74) was probably part of the clearance operation
following the collapse of the former basilica in the earthquake, and preceding the construction of the new building. JBPW describes the space remaining as a narrow passage, but as there was access to it only from the east end, it can hardly have served as a thoroughfare.

PERIOD IIIb: THE FIRST CHURCH (fig. 34)

In his description of the periods in which the Basilica served as a church, JBPW stated that the building just described was, within a generation, once again substantially replaced (Ward-Perkins & Goodchild 1953, 7): the eastern apse and roughly one third of the nave were abandoned with the construction of a new east wall; the north wall was also wholly replaced and the colonnades of the nave were re-designed. It seems to me highly unlikely that such a radical reconstruction would have been necessary after such a short space of time, added to which there is yet another sub-period of alterations to be interpolated before the more drastic changes just enumerated. However, the principal reason for the chronology adopted by JBPW was the belief that burials within the abandoned east end of the Period III basilica were to be ascribed to the fifth century.
FIG. 34. Basilica/Church 1 and Cruciform Building, schematic plan of Period IIIb: early fifth century?

A.D. (Ward-Perkins & Goodchild 1953, 12). These would not have been placed within the church building.

The dating of the inscribed burials has subsequently been questioned and the opinion expressed that they are definitely Byzantine (see N. Duval, Recherches archéologiques à Haidra i, Inscriptions Chrétienes, Rome 1975, 484 with n. 6). In the light of this re-assessment, I am inclined to the view expressed by Alec Daykin (1951, 144-145) that the first church occupied the whole of the Period III two-apsed basilica, and that the more drastic shortening and reconstruction of the building belongs wholly to the Justinianic period (Period IV). This is the interpretation adopted in the account which follows.

Subsequent, therefore, to the construction of the Period III basilica, which was occasioned by the collapse of the previous building in the earthquake of A.D. 365, the building was converted from civil to religious use and became a Christian church. The precise moment at which this happened, and the physical changes in the structure which it involved, are not wholly clear. Most of the chronological arguments adduced by JBWP in his published account have now been shown to be invalid, but the suggestion that the pre-Byzantine church is unlikely on historical grounds to be later than the mid fifth century is surely reasonable. Conversely, the building does not have the appearance of having been intended as a church from the very beginning of Period IIIa.

Within the life of the Period III basilica there were therefore changes due to change of use, and certain structural changes, all of which are defined for convenience as belonging to Period IIIb, though there is not necessarily any strict chronological relationship between them. On the structural side, new stylobates were laid in the nave, reducing its width once again, to 9.80 m. (between centres). They are formed of blocks which are placed very roughly side by side, and which are traceable for the whole length of the nave on the north side. On the south side, the western part served also in Period IV, but the eastern end of the stylobate is fragmentary and slightly out of alignment. The width of the stylobates suggests that they were designed to carry

13 The texts have recently been discussed and illustrated in a posthumous article by R. Bartoccini: 'Le iscrizioni sepolcrali nella basilica cimiteriale del Foro di Sabratha (Tripolitania)', Rivista di Archeologia Cristiana 51 (1975) 143-167.
paired columns as in Period IV. Probably to the same period belong the buttresses added to the outer face of the south wall of the Period III building.

With regard to the conversion of the basilica into a church, the raised level of the western apse has been argued above to be a pre-church feature. It is however possible that the apse of the basilica was accessible in Period IIIa only through the side entrance on the south, and that the frontal steps are an addition in Period IIIb reflecting the change of use. The rectangular pilasters now standing at the head of the steps (pl. 23c) may have been transferred from the Cruciform Building either now, or more probably in Period IV. (See below.) More obvious additions to the furnishings of the building in its sacred role were an altar in the centre of the nave and a baptistery in the range of rooms (surviving from Period II) behind the western apse. The altar stood partly on the site of the Period II monument, and sockets in the upper surface of the foundations of the monument suggest that it was originally of wood. (See pl. 23d and Ward-Perkins & Goodchild 1953, 7.) It stood beneath a canopy carried on re-used columns, two of red breccia and two of cipollino. The baptistery was formed by the insertion of a small, concrete-lined, rectangular tank against the rear wall of the apse in the central room of the western range; it is possible that the surviving divisions between the rooms belong to this period.

In the centre of the raised western apse, in a position of honour, was found a burial in the form of a robbed stone cist (pl. 23b). JBWP reported that the only object found within it was a ring (Ward-Perkins & Goodchild 1953, 12), but I have not succeeded in finding any other record of this object. Lastly, Daykin (1951, 145) states that a central doorway (filled in by modern restoration work) was cut through the rear of the eastern apse of the Period IIIa building to provide an axial entrance to the church: unfortunately it has not been possible to verify this important observation, which is not recorded in any of JBWP’s notes.

PERIOD IV: THE JUSTINIANIC RESTORATION (fig. 35)

Perhaps as much as a century after the initial conversion of the basilica into a church, during which time the town of Sabratha as a whole was in decline and the region was nominally under the control of the Vandals, the church on the south side of the Forum must have been in a state of decay, not to say ruin. One of the immediate acts of Justinian’s administration following the recovery of the region in A.D. 533 is likely to have been to restore the building. On this occasion the fabric was evidently so ruinous that only the west end and the buttressed south wall of the former building were retained. At the east end the length of the building was reduced by a third and the new east wall was pierced by three arched doorways. A new north wall was built nearly 2 m. south of its former line (again due to the difficulty of obtaining long enough timbers for the roof-span?) and at the north-east corner was added a separate rectangular room. (The remaining walls are surely too slight for it to have been a tower.)

The width of the nave was again reduced (to 8.70 m. between centres): the colonnade on the south side retained its former line, but that on the north was moved inwards by the addition of a further line of blocks against the inner face of the Period IIIb stylobate, which was also partly re-used. The colonnades, of ten bays, are composed of paired columns taken, probably in Period IIIa, from the Antonine and South Forum Temples: their disposition suggests that they carried arcades. A curious feature of these colonnades is that the terminal columns at either end were placed upon capitals instead of column-bases: five of the eight remain in position. (See pl. 23c, in which one of those on the north side of the apse is visible, with part of the screen described below butted against it.)

The nave was re-paved throughout at a higher level, with re-used paving-slabs of grey limestone and with slabs cut from cipollino columns (pls. 19a, 24a). All but the last three bays of the nave were also enclosed by a stone screen. The steps leading up to the apse were relaid in marble, which had the effect of extending the apse forward, and it was probably at this time that the entrance to the apse was framed by the rectangular marble pilasters which now stand there (pl. 23c).

The altar was also rebuilt at some stage: beneath the canopy was inserted a platform of reversed
column-bases from the portico of the South Forum Temple (Daykin 1951, 149), and in the centre of it was placed a marble altar, of which the base, with sockets for four colonnettes and a central reliquary recess, and fragments of the colonnettes themselves are preserved (pl. 24b). The date of this reconstruction is uncertain: the sockets in the floor beneath suggest that the marble altar is not original to Period IIIb, and the character of the later altar is in keeping with the other works carried out in the Byzantine period. However, when the platform for the late altar was dismantled in order to examine the structures beneath, thirty six coins were recovered from the packing between the stones, twenty six of which could be identified to some extent. The chronological distribution of these coins, which extend from Gallienus (A.D. 253-268) to Justinian, is shown diagrammatically in figure 112 on page 272. It seems to me unlikely that such a wide range of coinage would all have been current in Justinian's time, and therefore probable that the installation of the marble altar took place prior to the Byzantine reconquest, if not at the very beginning of Period IIIb.

The source of much of the marble used in the Period IV reconstruction of the church was the Cruciform Building between the Basilica and the Capitolium (see below, Chapter IIIc). This building was now converted into a new and larger baptistery for the church (pl. 25a), and the cruciform shape of the font which was let into the floor confirms the Byzantine date of this final phase in the history of the church (Ward-Perkins & Goodchild 1953, 10). Access from the apse of the church to the new baptistery was provided by cutting a new entrance and stairway through the northern flank of the apse and presumably cutting a corresponding doorway through the south wall of the Cruciform Building (which has wholly disappeared). The former font behind the apse was filled and sealed, and in its place was set an altar beneath a canopy of four marble columns.

The area surrounding the Period IV church now became a cemetery: graves filled the now abandoned east end of the former building and even spilled over into the piazza in front of the Antonine Temple (see pl. 24c and Bartoccini 1964, pl. 22A). They also filled the former south forum portico on the north side of the church and extended well into the Forum (see fig. 2, facing p. 13, and pl. 10a). Some were inserted between the apse of the church and the former baptistery to the west (pl. 24d). A number of these graves bear inscriptions, and they are
conveniently listed with a sketch-plan of their locations in a recently published article by Bartoccini (see n. 13 on p. 84). I have referred above (p. 84) to Duval’s contention, which I accept, that the inscriptions are exclusively Byzantine in date. A grave in the north-west corner of the space behind the western apse yielded a coin of Justinian or Maurice Tiberius (no. 106b), and the pottery associated with the graves excavated in the forum area (p. 34) shows that the cemetery, and by implication the church, continued in use until the Arab conquest.

(c) THE CRUCIFORM BUILDING
(Alec Daykin and P.M.K.)

At the west end of the south forum portico, between the Basilica and the Capitolium, are the remains of a building which is externally (approximately) square with a cruciform internal plan (fig. 36 and pl. 25a). The complex history of this building has already been touched upon in the description of the Basilica in the preceding section, most particularly for its use as a baptistery in the Byzantine period. A summary of its history has also been published by JBWP (Ward-Perkins & Goodchild 1953, 10–12 with fig. 4, reproduced here as fig. 37). This account, being the only statement on the subject by JBWP, runs as follows.

'The Cruciform Building' was certainly a public building, dating from the second half of the second century, and it had elaborate internal marble fittings, which included three daises in three of the arms of the cross, carrying projecting architectural orders. This original building was in due course converted into a place of assembly by the insertion of longitudinal benches, after the pattern of those in the Diocletianic Curia in the Forum Romanum. The date of this alteration, and the relation of the resulting edifice to the Curia on the north side of the Forum, is not known. Later again it became a baptistery. A door was cut in the south wall, connecting it with the church; the marble superstructure of the two lateral daises was dismantled, and the materials re-used in the church; and the central area of the floor was raised, and in the middle of it was installed a font. This was an unusually elaborate version of the cruciform sixth-century type, familiar from Churches 1, 2 and 3 at Lepcis Magna. The platform is octagonal and, instead of four equal arms to the cruciform tank, that to the east is shorter and rounded, and lacks steps. There are sockets for a wooden canopy and for some wooden feature at the west end, and an inlet-pipe in the east arm. In the floor surrounding the font are the sockets for a wooden railing, several times renewed; and the surviving canopy of the west dais was adapted to serve as a throne.'

Previous references to the building in the present volume have established that it succeeded an earlier structure on the same site (pp. 35, 75) and that its initial construction was broadly contemporary with Period III of the Forum (p. 36) and Period II of the Basilica (p. 75), though it is structurally subsequent to the latter. This is consistent with JBWP’s statement, quoted above, that the building belongs to the second half of the second century A.D. A partial study was made of the building in 1948 by Alec Daykin, who has now provided the reconstruction-drawings reproduced in figures 38–42 and the information that accompanies them.

The plan of the building, with its heavy masses of masonry at each corner, shows that it must have been a vaulted structure. When the building was excavated by the Italians, apparently large pieces of fallen concrete vaulting were broken up and removed from the site, but without record of their character. The building was clearly very ornate in its original form, but during its lifetime much of the marble decoration was removed, some of it for re-use elsewhere. The reconstruction of its character has therefore been dependent on the identification of fragments found elsewhere as belonging to this building. The principal sources of these fragments have been the vaults of the Capitolium (suggesting that some of the internal fittings may have fallen during the earthquake of A.D. 365 whereas the main structure was solid enough to survive unharmed) and the Period IV restoration of the Basilica/Church 1 (suggesting that further material was made available when the Cruciform Building was converted into the baptistery for the church).

The geometry of the building is clearly that of the tetrapylon, and there are striking similarities
FIG. 36. The Cruciform Building: plan and sections, actual state.
(described below) between the proportions used in the plan of the Cruciform Building at Sabratha and those found in the (roughly contemporary) Arch of Marcus Aurelius of A.D. 163 at Tripoli (for which see S. Aurigemma, L’arco di Marco Aurelio e di Lucio Vero a Tripoli = I Monumenti Italiani, fasc. xiii (Rome 1938) and Id., L’arco quadrifronte di Marco Aurelio e di Lucio Vero a Tripoli = Supplements to Libya Antiqua iii, Tripoli 1969). The purpose for which the building was originally constructed remains a matter for speculation, given the extent of later
alterations and the lack of any epigraphic evidence. It was presumably intended as a shrine of some sort, but for whom? Perhaps when the original tribunal and aedes augusti within the Basilica were altered and reduced in size following the construction of the South Forum Temple, the Cruciform Building was constructed as a new aedes augusti, in which the statues of the emperors would be housed henceforth? It seems impossible to take this any further.

Figure 38: Alternative possibilities for the form of the vaulting and comparison with the Arch of Marcus Aurelius at Tripoli

Drawings A and B show the internal surfaces of two possible ways in which the Cruciform Building may have been roofed, using a cloister-vault and a cross-vault respectively. They have the same overall height as shown, though it would be possible to reduce the height of B if the main cross-vaults were concentric with the barrel-vaults in the arms rather than springing from the level of their crowns. Solution A corresponds to the minimal volume of construction, and is that adopted in the reconstruction suggested. The type (also known as rectangular domical vault) is well attested in Roman practice from the early first century B.C. on. The earliest known instances are the Tabularium in Rome (78 B.C.) and the arcades beneath the Temple of Hercules Victor at Tivoli (c. 50 B.C.: Boethius 1978, 144 f.; see also Crema 1959, 17 and figs. 55, 57, 58, and G.T. Rivoira, Roman Architecture, Oxford 1925, 77 f.). The closest parallel, both in plan and probably in elevation, to the Cruciform Building at Sabratha is the so-called ‘praetorium’ of A.D. 160–169 at Mismiyeh in Syria (Ward-Perkins 1981, 343 with ill. 221). De Vogüé’s drawing (reproduced by Ward-Perkins) shows the remains of just such a cloister vault as that suggested here.

Drawing D shows the suggested geometry of the Cruciform Building, based on its plan and the adoption of solution A for the vaults; drawing C shows a section through the Arch of Marcus Aurelius at Tripoli drawn to the same scale for comparison. A comparison of the two buildings reveals remarkable proportionate correspondences of design, and where there are differences, these relate to the fact that the Arch is embellished externally, whereas the emphasis in the Cruciform Building at Sabratha is concentrated exclusively on its internal properties. The design of the Arch appears to embody two modules, of 6\(\frac{1}{2}\) (x) and 8 (y) Roman feet respectively. The (y) module alone is used in the design of the Cruciform Building. The span of the main arch and the interior span of the Arch NE–SW, across the Cardo Maximus, are both equivalent to 3x, the barrel-vault on either side having a depth of x. The total depth of the piers of the side arch, including the framing of the principal opening, is equal to y, and the width of the roadway between the framing pilaster-bases is equal to 2y. (Note that 5x is approximately equal to 4y.) The total width of the Arch on this axis is equal to 5y. Critical heights in the elevations tend to conform to multiples of x and y.

The geometry of the Cruciform Building, being based only on the y module, is more straightforward. The span of the lateral vaults is 3y, the principal span across the centre of the building is 4y and the depth of the lateral arms is y, giving a total internal width of 6y. It is plausible to suggest that, as shown here, the whole interior was inscribed in a cube.

Figures 39 and 40: Reconstructed plan, cross-section A–A’ and longitudinal section B–B’

There is a number of uncertainties of detail in these drawings, some of which might have been resolved if it had been possible to revisit the site. They are offered as a plausible rather than necessary interpretation of the evidence.

Comparison of the plan in figure 39 with that shown in figure 36 draws attention immediately to the fact that at some time a small rectangular room has been cut out of the pier at the north-east angle of the building. This feature is puzzling as it seems to interfere seriously with the stability of the building and yet, as fragments of vaulting were found in the ruins overlying the Byzantine features (and evidence of an Arab presence: p. 95), the vault presumably remained intact until after the Arab conquest. The room must therefore have been cut out of the solid pier with some labour and at considerable risk. The room does not appear to have been original to the building, for its south wall is not quite on the right line, and it projects forward to overlie the stylobate of
FIG. 38. The Cruciform Building: alternative possibilities for the form of the vaulting and comparison with the Arch of Marcus Aurelius at Tripoli.
the south forum portico. Whatever the occasion for the construction of this curious feature, it seems likely to be connected with a corresponding (but free-standing) kiosk at the north-west corner of the Forum with which it forms a symmetrical pair on either side of the Capitolium. (See fig. 123.) It is possible that further inspection may provide an answer.

It will also be apparent that whereas the entrance to the building was framed when excavated by two cipollino columns, the reconstruction shows in this position the rectangular marble pilasters which were later re-used to frame the apse of the church (pls. 23c, 25b). It is almost certain that this was the original arrangement, for one of the lateral engaged pilasters and its capital (with side and rear faces prepared for building-in) are preserved in the vaults of the Capitolium (pl. 25c). The front of each of the pilasters was decorated with an acanthus- or vine-scroll (pl. 26a–b), the sides were fluted and the rear face plain. The order of the capitals is composite (pl. 27a).

The interior of the building was paved with marble, and traces of marble veneer were noted at the bases of the walls (pl. 26c). The arms of the cross were framed by flat pilasters which are uniform in style with those at the entrance to the building: fragments of these are preserved in the Capitolium vaults (pl. 27c) as are several composite pilaster-capitals (pl. 27b), whose uncarved parts clearly confirm that they were used in this position. Above the capitals, the walls of the building were lined with an applied marble entablature: no fragments of the architrave-moulding can be definitely identified, but the Capitolium vaults now contain many pieces of cornice-moulding, including both straight runs (pl. 28a, top row: note the re-entrant angle at the right-hand end of the left-hand fragment) and short projecting lengths where the entablature was broken forward over the pilaster-capitals (pls. 28b, 29a).

Above this entablature, the archivolts and all other internal surfaces and mouldings were probably rendered in plaster. Lighting was probably provided by windows in the lateral arms of the cross above the aediculae, and the façade above the entrance may have been left completely open apart from a grille or balustrade. Conversely, the west wall opposite the entrance, which is thicker than the side walls (1.50 m. rather than 90 cm.), was probably not pierced by a window, since the light from it would have shone in the eyes of someone entering the building.

Section B–B' shows part of the south portico of the Forum at its junction with the Cruciform Building. The portico must have carried a flat roof in order to fit beneath the eaves of the Basilica behind it. (See fig. 42.) The order of the portico is unusual in its proportions: the monolithic granite columns, with marble capitals and bases, have a diameter-to-height ratio of 1:8.67 (column-diameter 67.1 cm., total height 5.82 m.). The entasis of the shafts starts unusually high up, suggesting that they were in fact cut down from standard columns of a greater height (probably 6.04 m., ratio 1:9). The reason for this may have been either the necessity of conforming to the eaves of the pre-existing buildings around the Forum, or a desire to match the height of the porticoes surrounding the East Forum Temple (see p. 63). The intercolumniation of the portico (3.21 m., 4.78 diameters) is too wide for marble, and stuccoed timber architraves are likely to have been used. The termination of the portico against the façade of the Cruciform Building is uncertain: there are no traces of an engaged half-column in granite (– how easy would it have been to obtain such a thing?), but there are in the vaults of the Capitolium fragments of a decorated marble pilaster and of a Corinthian capital matching the order of the forum porticoes which may have been used in this position (pls. 29b–c, 30a).

Figure 41: The order of the aediculae

During the lifetime of the Cruciform Building, two of the three aediculae were wholly removed and the third was substantially remodelled. The original height of the plinths (and indeed their precise dimensions in plan) is therefore not certain, but the character of the architectural orders that they carried can be confidently reconstructed by identifying the individual parts. The aediculae were framed by columns of cipollino, and possibly also red breccia: four such columns (including two of red breccia) were subsequently used to support the altar canopy in the church (p. 85 and pl. 23d), whilst two remain (more or less) in position. Two of the Corinthian capitals that they carried survive atop their columns in the church (pl. 30b). Various pieces of architrave
FIG. 40. The Cruciform Building: reconstructed longitudinal section.
can be identified, standing loose in the Cruciform Building (pls. 30c, 31d), built into the late steps in front of the surviving aedicula (pl. 31d) and used for the re-facing in marble of the steps in front of the western apse of the Basilica (pl. 24a). The frieze is decorated with an inhabited acanthus-scroll containing the foreparts of wild beasts and of huntsmen armed with spears (pl. 31a). Finally, there are a number of fragments of the highly ornate cornice (pl. 31b). The upper surface of the cornice-block is rough, indicating that there was no pediment above. In the absence of any fragments suggesting a coffered ceiling, the interiors of the aediculae may have been open behind the entablature.

Figure 42: Reconstructed front elevation of the Cruciform Building, with cross-section of the South Forum Portico and the Basilica

This drawing shows the probable external appearance of the Cruciform Building in relation to the other buildings in its vicinity. It shows that its exterior was substantially masked by other
structures, giving little opportunity for architectural expression: this was a building whose design (in this respect like Hadrian's Pantheon in Rome) was devoted wholly to the expression and exploration of interior space. From the outside the richness which characterises the interior is first met at the entrance to the building within the west end of the south forum portico.

The architrave above the entrance to the Cruciform Building was probably of wood. If so, it is possible that the frieze above was composed of marble veneer decorated with putti supporting festoons. A suitable length of such frieze is preserved in the vaults of the Capitolium (pls. 28a, 28b, middle row), which JBWP has attributed to the Temple of Serapis (p. 116); but the Cruciform Building seems to have an equal, if not stronger, claim. Two hands of markedly differing competence are detectable in the carving of the frieze, and it may be that the inferior version was used for the inner face.

As in the case of the Cruciform Building, the reconstructed section through the Basilica (drawn on the centre-line of the building, passing through the main entrance and the Period I tribunal) makes no claim to be anything more than plausible. It has been assumed that the capitals and the column-drums found in the entrance to the tribunal were uniform with those of the main colonnades (see p. 72). The columns have a basal diameter of 72 cm., diminishing to 60 cm., and a diameter-to-height ratio of 1:9 would yield a column-height (including capital and base) of 6.48 m. The architraves must have been of timber and in the absence of any evidence on this point, the height of the entablature has been drawn as one fifth of the column-height. This yields a total height for the order of 7.79 m., giving the nave of the basilica at ground-level a cross-section exactly equal to two squares up to the nose of the corona (at 7.50 m.), which would be visually the dominant line.

The height of the upper storey of the nave is subject to greater uncertainties, the relative probabilities of which cannot be assessed. Some of the possibilities are a division of the upper cross-section into three squares (height 5.08 m., as shown in fig. 42), a superposed order of stucco pilasters at a scale of five sixths of the height of the main order (height 6.48 m.) and the creation of a visual cross-section for the whole nave up to the roof trusses equal to one square (height 6.68 m.).

The longitudinal section through the tribunal shows its appearance in Period II, when the Cruciform Building was constructed. The former apse of Period I (shown by broken lines) has been suppressed, and a moulded plinth with three rectangular projections has been inserted around the walls. The roof is assumed to have been uniform in height with that over the aisles of the basilica, and the colonnade across the entrance is uniform with that of the main order. The earth floor and stone foundations within the tribunal are shown, though it has been suggested (above, p. 72) that these may in fact have been covered by a raised wooden floor.

THE SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE BUILDING (See figs. 36 and 37)

A summary description of the later history of the Cruciform Building has already been given in the words of JBWP (p. 87 and fig. 37). There is no evidence for the date when the building was transformed into a curia, nor as to the extent of the alterations which accompanied this change of use. The essential feature of this phase was the insertion around three sides of sandstone blocks on top of the original marble paving, raising the floor in three shallow steps to a level 35 cm. above the central area. (See the sections in fig. 36 and pls. 26c, 31c.) Whether the lateral aediculae still existed in this phase or had already been removed, it is impossible to say. The fact that so much of the marble used in the original building was available to the restorers of the church in the Justinianic period (Basilica Period IV) may indicate that it remained in position until then. The problem of attributing a date to the rectangular room cut out of the pier at the north-east angle of the building has already been discussed (p. 90); if the room is not original it may have been contemporary with the alterations just described.

The Byzantine alterations were undoubtedly more far-reaching, not least because the building became a quarry for the restorers of the church. The lateral aediculae were certainly removed then if not before, and their plinths made flush with the floor. (Note the outline of the southern
FIG. 42. Reconstructed front elevation of the Cruciform Building, with cross-section of the south forum portico and the Basilica.
FIG. 43. The Capitolium: plan, actual state (1948).
aedicula, just visible in the background of plate 31c.) A cruciform font set in an octagonal casing was sunk in the centre of the floor, and the whole floor of the building was made good to the previously raised level around the walls. This resulted in the raising of the floor across the entrance to the building also, necessitating the addition of steps leading down to the level of the former (but now undoubtedly fallen) south forum portico (pl. 12a). I have the impression that the Cruciform Building was pillaged of its ornament before the idea was conceived of using it as a baptistery: this would explain why the rectangular pilasters at the entrance (which were presumably still in place, for they would have broken if they had fallen) were replaced by cipollino columns in the same position. The latter were, however, in place before the floor of the building was raised, for their bases are enveloped by the inserted steps. The aedicula opposite to the entrance was retained and re-modelled to contain a throne (pl. 31d): the reconstructions presented in figures 39 and 40 suggest that its height must have been reduced by 27 cm. for this purpose. Steps were added in front, making use of one of the former aedicula-architraves, and a shallow apse was hollowed out of the thickness of the rear wall of the building behind. A cistern set in the floor just inside the entrance to the building (see fig. 36) is presumably also to be attributed to this phase, and would have provided a source of water for the font, which was fitted with an inlet pipe on this side.

The former south wall of the Cruciform Building, towards the Basilica, has all but disappeared (pls. 25a, 31c), and its line is crossed by a surface gully of undetermined date. An access to the church through this wall was undoubtedly created when the building became a baptistery: it is most likely to have been made against the eastern edge of this arm of the building, directly opposite to the stairway which was now inserted in the north side of the basilica apse (see fig. 35 and pl. 31c), but the presence of the gully mentioned above suggests that there was a wider opening in this wall at some time when the building was still in use.

JBWP has recorded the presence of an early Arabic graffito scratched on the concrete surface of the font (Ward-Perkins & Goodchild 1953, 12) – one of the few surviving traces of occupation following the Arab conquest.

(d) THE CAPITOLIUM
(Alec Daykin and P.M.K.)

The description of the Forum and surrounding buildings at Sabratha given in the preceding pages would be glaringly incomplete without some account of the Capitolium, which must have dominated the entire area. Unfortunately, JBWP wrote no text for this section, though there are notes which suggest that he had intended to do so. On the other hand, measurements of the building were made by Alec Daykin in 1948, and a trial reconstruction drawing (fig. 44) was shown to the Society of Antiquaries in a preliminary report on the excavations by JBWP and KMK in January 1949. These and JBWP’s notes form the basis of the interpretation of the character and structural history of the temple presented in the following pages. The records upon which the description is based show that the history of the building is of greater complexity than had at first been supposed, and there are a number of minor uncertainties which call for further inspection. (For instance, there is a conflict between the plan in figure 43 and the elevation in figure 52 regarding the exact position of the break in the coursing of the southern flank-wall opposite the front wall of the cela.) The re-examination of the Capitolium was one of the principal objectives of a planned visit to Sabratha by the present writers in 1983 (p. 3 f.); but as this intention was frustrated we have made the best we can of the records made over thirty five years ago, and wish it to be understood that the resulting account is to be regarded strictly as a provisional statement. A fuller account should probably also include reference to the records made at the time of the original excavation by Bartoccini: a summary account of the original excavation is given in Bartoccini (1927) 44-53.

The salient characteristics of the building as excavated (pl. 32a and figs. 43 and 52) are the
remains of a lofty podium, the central part of which rose sheer from the west end of the Forum, providing a spacious rostrum flanked by lateral stairways. Behind the rostrum, a more conventional stairway running across the full width of the podium formed the approach to a temple of basically Italic type, with a frontal portico and a triple cella behind. At first sight the building appears to be of similar construction to the Antonine Temple—a substructure and cella of rendered local sandstone fronted by a portico and stairways of imported marble. (See Bartoccini 1964.) Closer examination reveals significant differences. Although the construction up to podium-level is substantial, the sandstone walls of the tri-partite superstructure above are thin—even flimsy—compared with those of the Antonine Temple. The latter not only has walls one metre thick but has in addition both external and internal pilasters giving a total buttressed thickness for stability in the region of two metres! The Capitolium walls, on the other hand, are a mere 60–61 cm. thick above floor-level, while at the same time its portico was much larger—25% wider, higher and heavier.

The setting-out of the cella of the Capitolium is also somewhat casual; not only are the walls irregularly spaced internally, but they taper in thickness. The building as a whole is slightly rhomboid in plan, being some 12 cm. out of parallel with the podium at the front of the cella. From an architectural standpoint, the building does not appear to have been designed structurally and qualitatively to receive the much larger-scale and ponderous marble portico. This suggests that the construction of the building was carried out in two distinct periods or phases, even
though the evidence for the date of the first period is weak and it cannot be shown at present that the original design had been completely realised before the ‘marbleisation’ of the second period was put into effect. (See the discussion of chronology below, p. 114.)

PERIOD I: THE SANDSTONE TEMPLE (figures 45–47)

The general form of the temple. The plan is that of a triple-cella, prostyle temple of the Etrusco-Roman type employed in Capitolia for more than three centuries previously. It is a form described in detail by Vitruvius (4.7) in discussing the ideal design of temples of the Etruscan traditional type. Typical examples are to be found, e.g., at Cosa and Signia. In front of the cella the portico, projecting to an equal depth, would have had two ranges of columns four wide — eight in all — centred upon the wall-lines. Here we encounter a variation from the Italic tradition for, since the internal divisions of the cella are equal, instead of the more usual 3:4:3 spacing, the intercolumniations would also have been equal and there would not have been the customary wider central span.

The Podium. The sanctuary of the temple stands upon a high podium which rises in two levels. The lower level, which is almost square between the flanking stairways (12.70 × 12.50 m.), provided a rostrum across the west end of the Forum; the upper level, again almost square if the steps are included (21.75 × 21.55 m.), rises to a total height of 4.20 m. above the level of the Period III Forum, which is equal to that of the Temple of Capitoline Jupiter in Rome. The combined length of the upper podium and rostrum is such that the height of the latter would have masked much of the lower part of the temple from the western half of the Forum. This would have been particularly so if the Period I temple was constructed during the lifetime of the Period Ib Forum, whose surface was yet lower.

Almost all of the original flank wall of the podium is missing on the north side (due to robbing in late antiquity, according to JBWP’s notes), revealing traces of earlier buildings beneath. In view of the alterations in Period II, it is difficult to judge whether or not these earlier buildings co-existed with the Period I temple (see below, p. 99). On the south side the flank wall is unbroken except for a single arched entrance to the favissae beneath the cella at the head of the alley. The front die-wall and the lower flight of stairs on this side, together with the forward half of the rostrum, have been rebuilt by the Italians and the initial layout of the front of the Period I building is therefore obscured.

A photograph taken at the time of the original excavations (pl. 32a) shows the remains of a cross-wall on the back-line of the stair-landing and what appears to be a rectangular free-standing structure in front of the wall on the centre-line of the rostrum. A second wall parallel to and 2 m. behind the first is also shown on an original survey drawing by C. Catanusio (1947). Both may be related to two walls projecting beneath the missing north flank of the later podium: these are shown as cut by the side-wall of the rostrum in the 1948 survey (fig. 43) but their structural relationships require further examination. On the south side the plinth of the die-wall runs back to join a broad footing which projects some 75 cm. into the alley.

There appear to have been no sandstone steps directly beneath those of marble in the lowest flight of stairs and the support for this section and the landing was entirely different from the cement and small stones used everywhere else: the make-up here was composed of cement over a close packing of re-used blocks, some with mouldings, placed longitudinally.

These factors taken together suggest that the original flanking stairs were each in the form of a single unbroken flight, as was more usual, and that the die-walls were originally set two to three metres further back. Interestingly, this would give a plot ratio over the whole podium much closer to the 5:6 breadth-to-length advocated by Vitruvius and would go some way towards an explanation of the somewhat remote positioning of the sanctuary away from the Forum. A careful study of the un-restored parts of the walls of the podium and rostrum is to be desired; the

14 See Boëthius (1978) 131, ill. 127.
The Capitolium: suggested plans. (A) Period I, (B) Period II additions.
cross-walls and other structures would presumably still be accessible to excavation behind the restored front of the rostrum.

No trace of the crowning element of the podium wall could be found. Its height, however, is indicated by the head of the doorway at the rear of the south side, for above the voussoirs of the arch the extrados has been cut down to a general course level (see fig. 52). This would never occur in ashlar working for ordinary walling purposes: to avoid feather-edged course-blocks, the height of adjoining courses would have been adjusted, as may actually be seen to either side in the spandrels. The truncation-line must therefore have been immutable, and this would only be so at the bed-joint of the cymatium.

This crowning moulding would obviously be related in scale and character to the podium base-moulding which has survived and is shown in figure 47. It would normally consist of a corona-block supported by a cyma recta or reversa above an ovolo or torus in the manner of a Lesbian cyma but somewhat flattened.

The Substructure of the Cella. The cella of the temple was not built on top of the podium, but rises from the street-level behind as a separate two-storey structure. The outer walls are built of headers up to the floor-level of the cella, giving a thickness of 1.00–1.10 m., and the favissae within are sub-divided into six rooms of unequal size by a transverse wall, also of headers, and two narrower longitudinal walls 45–50 cm. thick built of stretchers. The outer walls to north and south are pierced by doorways at ground-level with flat arches (pl. 36a) and the two central rooms were entered by doorways in the northern stretcher-wall with flat double-timber lintels, which may be secondary (pl. 36b). The floor of the cella above was supported by timber beams running from front to back, resting on the outer walls and the transverse header-wall. Certain peculiarities in the jointing and drafting of the substructures suggest a structural succession, and it is possible that the first Capitolium made some use of a pre-existing structure.

The stretcher-walls are built of blocks with rough faces and drafted edges (pl. 36b), a style of masonry recorded elsewhere at Sabratha exclusively in pre-Roman contexts such as the early walls beneath the north-west angle of the Basilica (p. 69), the possible defensive wall of the second century B.C. in the Casa Brogan area (p. 165) and a wall of similar date found beneath the street on the south side of the Antonine Temple (p. 170). The faces of the header-walls, on the other hand, are dressed smooth and the angles are properly bonded. Where these two types of walling intersect, it is apparent that the stretcher-walls were there first, for the internal transverse wall is built against them with straight joints, and the eastern (front) wall of the cella also shows signs of at least partial straight joints. At their western ends, the stretcher-walls are bonded into the rear wall, but the drafting ceases short of that point. JBWP noted the possibility that these walls had previously ended slightly to the east, on a line corresponding to an early wall which survives outside the building between the north wall of the cella and the street (see fig. 43).

The evidence of earlier structures in the area of the Capitolium suggests that there was already a change of axis at this point before the temple was built. The buildings of Regio I, Insula 6 behind the Capitolium follow a line which is also apparent in the layout of the Temple of Serapis, and which diverges by about 5° anticlockwise from the axis of the later forum buildings (including the Capitolium). The building immediately behind the Capitolium, which conforms to this earlier axis, was certainly standing to a height at least one course above the floor of the cella when the temple was built, and presumably throughout its life. This is apparent where its side-wall meets the rear of the temple, leaving a narrow wedge-shaped void between the two (pl. 36c). The rear wall of the temple is built against this earlier wall at the south end and its outer face, evidently never intended to be visible, was left rough. Further east, on the other hand, where the north flank of the podium of the Capitolium has been robbed away, structures are exposed which conform to the axis of the Forum and the temple (see fig. 43 and pl. 32b). In view of the major alterations which were made to the temple in Period II, it is difficult now to assess to what extent any of these buildings co-existed with it in Period I (as tabernae facing the street and built into the flank of the temple); but towards the east end of the street, beneath the temple steps where the
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15 Bartoccini (1927, 48) reported that a cache of votive objects was found when this void was excavated.
FIG. 46. The Capitolium, Period I; hypothetical front elevation.
The Capitolium, Period I: hypothetical side elevation, with detail of surviving base-moulding of podium.
head-room would not have been sufficient for them to have existed at the same time, are a threshold block leading into a room with an opus signinum floor and a barrel-vaulted cistern beneath. (The opening into the cistern is in the next room to the east, beneath the modern grille visible at the left-hand edge of pl. 32b.) It is therefore a reasonable possibility that the stretcher-walls within the favisae beneath the cella were retained from a pre-existing building on the same site. This opportunism in the re-use of materials would explain why the substructure of the cella approximates with such apparent casualness to the demands of the design (p. 96).

The Superstructure. In scale, the cella is small in comparison to the massive podium, and the thinness of the upper walling has already been noted. Although the two lateral chambers do not conform to the 3:4:3 width rule, they were at least subdivided in depth in a 4:3 ratio by cross-walls with wide openings. Some strengthening of the outer walls was gained by this. Insufficient evidence remains to show whether the same arrangement obtained in the central chamber. Some precedents exist for internal subdivision, in this manner or by changes in level, in Etruscan and Republican temples. Access to the cella was by means of three doorways in the front wall: part of the central threshold of Garian limestone survives, and the cuttings for the other two are visible.

The limited thickness of the walls has, naturally, a critical bearing on estimates of the wall heights and the related ordination of the portico. There is a dearth of precise information on local constructional practice in sandstone and plaster but the sandstone, being rather porous, soft and brittle when exposed, would not have had a very high load-bearing capacity. In walling, the traditional slenderness-ratio of 1:12 would be just reasonable; 1:14 would be an advisable maximum, and 1:15 or greater risky. This suggests a viable range for the height of the cella between 7.20 m. and 8.40 m., including, of course, the entablature.

The Portico. The breadth of the podium walls tempts one to consider the possibility of a hexastyle (pseudo-)peripteral solution to the plan. That, at least, would account for the indifferent construction of the cella. But two objections may be advanced against this. Firstly, the axes of the lateral colonnades would fall upon the inner edges of the podium walls. To expand the axial spacing to give a sound footing over the walls would not only unduly increase the already wide spans to over 4.10 m., but would break the usual and practical rule of having the columns in line with the longitudinal cella walls so that the responding pilasters are centred between the doors. To displace the axes of the columns would shift the pilasters outwards to either side of centre, thus interfering with the doors. The second objection stems from the curious fact that in this temple there were no alae or wing walls to terminate even the podium: certainly there would have been no means of abutting the end of a peristyle in the correct manner.

The latter point underlines an odd aspect of the whole scheme: there was no back-drop or screen at the rear of this relatively small superstructure and the irregular housing of Regio I, Insula 6 on the rising ground behind must have been as conspicuous as the temple.

Unless excavation can be undertaken in the fill between the southern angle of the later stylobate and the adjacent podium wall to test for the presence of an earlier stylobate bonding to the latter, the idea of a hexastyle sandstone portico must remain highly speculative. A tetra style portico seems therefore in the light of the evidence available to have been the form employed. A relief from the destroyed Arch of Marcus Aurelius at Rome, preserved in the Palazzo dei Conservatori, gives an excellently detailed view of just such a building. It is thought to show (in compressed form) the appearance of the Temple of Capitoline Jupiter after the re-building of A.D. 82.

The possible height of the portico is subject to a number of controlling factors, amongst which the limitations on the height of the cella are in this case exceptionally important. Other factors include the implications of the axial column-spacings and the order employed. Vitruvius quotes

16 E.g. at Pyrgi and Signia: Boethius (1978) 41 ill. 28 and 131 ill. 127.
17 G. Lugli, Roma antica, il centro monumentale (Rome 1946) 25 fig. 6.
two systems of proportions which give very different results, since one clearly applies to temples
of Etruscan type and the other to Hellenistic peristylar buildings.

The first (Vitruvius 4.7.2) advocates that, for triple-cella temples, the column-height (including capital and base) should be one third of the width. This would imply a column-height of only 4.20 m., with a total height to the top of the entablature of 5.25 m. This might be proper for an Etruscan temple, but would be absurdly low and totally unacceptable for a building of the first or second century A.D.

The second system is the ‘Rule of Pythias’\(^\text{18}\) which states that ‘the columnar height plus the axial spacing should be equal to twelve and a half diameters.’ Under this rule, assuming the maximum spacing for timber epistyles (araeostyle: 4½ diameters) we obtain a column-diameter of 87 cm. and a height of 6.97 m. This is remarkably close to the height of 6.72 m. for the columns which is implied by the maximum advisable height for the walls mentioned above (8.40 m.). The proportions of the columns, however, although almost exactly correct for the Tuscan order, would hardly be appropriate for a Capitolium of this period, in which the Corinthian order would almost certainly have been employed (as in the East Forum Temple and the Basilica in its immediate vicinity).

To adopt the widest spacing used for the Corinthian order (diastyle: 4 diameters) would necessitate massive columns 98 cm. in diameter and 8.82 m. high in sandstone (at 1:9) or 9.80 m. high in marble (at 1:10). These dimensions are excessive and the rule does not help: other more pragmatic approaches must be tried.

It may be observed that tetra style porticoes of the Imperial period measured over the axial spacings and up to the shadow-line of the corona tend to be precisely square. This, of course, would only apply to Hellenistic Roman temples of travertine or marble. With the wide portico of the Sabratha Capitolium a square proportion would require a cornice height of 11.70 m. – far too high.

One further approach might be valid: that is to consider the side elevation as a generator of general proportions. The portico would usually have the same overall depth as the cella, and therefore under the simple process of design by squares it would be rational to make the flank of the temple conform to two squares. This would result in a height to the eaves on the side elevation of 8.25 m.

The alternative possibilities for the height of the building discussed above may be summarised as follows:

(a) Maximum safe height of cella walls
(b) Lowest option (Vitruvius’ rule of \(\frac{1}{3}\))
(c) Highest option (square façade)
(d) Mean of (b) and (c)
(e) Axial spacing × Rule of Pythias
(f) Side elevation of two squares

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>8.40 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>5.25 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>11.70 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>8.48 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>8.71 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>8.25 m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a broad measure of agreement between these figures: solution (f) has been adopted in the reconstructions in figures 46 and 47 since this results in a main elevation facing the Forum exactly 1½ squares wide, eminently suited to a triple-cella building. Furthermore, the main elevation over the outside of the bases and up to the apex of the pediment is precisely inscribed in an equilateral triangle, a bonus which would surely have appealed to the Classical mind! If the outcome looks a little low to the modern eye it should be recalled that we are dealing with a sandstone-and-timber building in a provincial town of Punic origin. (Compare the East Forum Temple, whose proportions are lower than this in Period I and slightly higher in Period II: see figs. 20 and 23.)

The Order. Two excellent examples of Corinthian orders in stuccoed sandstone exist in buildings close at hand: the East Forum Temple and the Forum Basilica. (See sections (a) and (b) of this chapter.) Both display a very high level of technical skill. Each is simplified so that the overhang of the acanthus leaves is reduced, particularly so in the case of the East Forum Temple in which the order is on the exterior of the building and exposed to the weather: much of the detail was painted onto the stucco and the balusters and wreathings of the caulicoli were omitted. (See fig. 24 on p. 64 and pl. 15c.) Within the Basilica, on the other hand, the leaves are fully modelled (pl. 20), but in shallow relief and a rhythmic style somewhat reminiscent of the capitals of the Temple of Vesta in the Forum Boarium in Rome.\(^{19}\) In both sets of capitals the lower corolla of leaves is unusually tall, cresting only a little below those of the main ring. This is associated closely with the reduced height of the capital and abacus, which amounts to only one diameter in contrast to the usual range of \(\frac{1}{3}\) to \(\frac{1}{2}\) diameters. Column-drums found in the East Forum Temple show stucco fluting with the lowest third of the flutes filled; the bases are of Attic profile. The columns found in the tribunal of the Period I Basilica were unfluted, and no bases were identified.

The Entablature. As in the East Forum Temple (pp. 59, 61), the entablature would have been supported upon timbers in two layers, corresponding to the two lower fasciae of the standard architrave, pegged and scarfed to act together – i.e. Vitruvius’ compacted beams (4.7.4). The depth of the architrave would traditionally be one sixth of the clear span – roughly 50 cm., – the frieze the same. Above this the cornice would be about 68 cm. high, bringing the total height to 1.68 m. The mouldings would have had painted details.

The local form of entablature on early buildings varies from the classical norm in having an additional outreaching soffit below the cyma so that the latter does not spring directly from the corona but oversails it. This detail appears not only in the Period I East Forum Temple at Sabratha (fig. 21 on p. 60) but also in a cornice in fine, hard limestone, probably part of the entablature of the Temple of Rome and Augustus, at Lepcis Magna. In this cornice and in those of both Periods I and II of the East Forum Temple at Sabratha (for Period II see fig. 25 on p. 65), the facial angle is not the usual 45 degrees but steeper – approximately 50 degrees. These two features suggest that earlier buildings in this region have a distinctive character derived from Punic rather than Italian practice.\(^{20}\) It is likely that the entablature of the Period I Capitolium was similar in proportion and detail to these local models.

Elements of this superstructure (if it existed at all, however briefly) are likely to be present in fragmentary form as packing, or even as re-used items, somewhere in the area, and should be identifiable. Only one or two significant fragments would be necessary to confirm much of the above analysis.

PERIOD II: THE MARBLE TEMPLE (figs. 44, 45, 48, 49-51)

Motives for the re-building of the temple are fairly self-evident. There was a need to provide a building whose dignity and scale would be in keeping with the new colonnaded Forum (Forum Period III) and the new fashion for construction in marble, a suitable visual enclosure of the west end of the Forum and a better architectural relationship with the adjacent and newly constructed Cruciform Building. (See section (c) of this chapter.) It must be seen as part of the transformation which affected the whole city in the second half of the second century A.D. Sabratha was elevated to colonial status during the second century, possibly during the reign of Antoninus Pius (see IRT, p. 24) and the up-grading of the Capitolium would have provided an obvious expression in physical form of this advance in civic status.

In carrying out the programme, the simplest design procedure would have been to replace the

---

\(^{19}\) See BSR 28 (1960) pls. 5, 7.

\(^{20}\) First discussed in a brief report presented by Alec Daykin with KMK to the Society of Antiquaries in January 1950.
sandstone portico in marble, increasing the scale somewhat and omitting the internal columns, thus producing a straightforward tetrastyle Capitolium similar to the temples at Dougga\footnote{Romanelli (1970) pl. 89; Kähler (1970) pl. 53 and fig. 26.} and Tebessa.\footnote{Crema (1959) 525 fig. 686; S. Gsell, *Monuments antiques de l’Algérie* (Paris 1901) i.133 f. with fig. 39 and pl. 19.} Objections to this solution are threefold: a satisfactory enclosure of the west end of the Forum would not have been effected, the junction between the sandstone cella and the portico would have appeared awkward and the scale could not have been much increased upon the existing foundations. The aims were achieved instead by much more drastic alterations, carried out with impressive ingenuity and economy.

**The Podium.** The whole of the pronaos was dismantled and the centre of the podium cut away, down to a level just above the old foundations. In this space was cast a concrete raft of considerable thickness (not ascertained) with side-wings extending to include the flank walls, forming a truncated ‘T’ in plan (fig. 45B). This operation appears to have involved cutting down vertically behind the upper podium steps and shoring up the mass of concrete upon which they are supported, an audacious procedure but one which is confirmed by the fact that the forward edge of the foundation has no projecting toe as elsewhere. The anatomy of the new work is completely exposed on the robbed north side of the temple, where the upper surface of the raft is above street level. (See pls. 32b, 34a.) Some of the uppermost sandstone steps are irregularly set and appear to have been replaced as packing beneath the marble steps which overlay them.

Upon the raft was erected a carefully laid stereobate slightly over 2 m. wide with lateral extensions set back 3.90 m. and extending to the full width of the podium. Sandstone blocks used for rebuilding the gaps in the flank walls are 7 cm. higher than those of the original masonry, and the *ad hoc* notching and joggling on the south side (see fig. 52) testifies to the difficulties of pinning in the new work. On completion, the interior spaces of the new substructure were packed with rubble: this would be the most promising place to look for fragments of the superstructure of the first temple.

At this time, the die-walls and lower flights of approach stairs must have been rebuilt: the front of the rostrum was brought forward, and the steps extended to match by the unusual measure of inserting a landing half-way up. This would make sense as part of the overall scheme for the Period III refurbishment of the Forum: see the discussion of chronology below, p. 114. To match the new marble superstructure of the building, that part of the sandstone steps which was retained was overlaid throughout by marble, and the surfaces of the pronaos and the rostrum were also paved with marble slabs. (See the section in fig. 52 and pl. 33a.) Towards the rear of the platform between the lower stairways is a central drain-head with a limestone rose; the drain, which runs out through the south flank of the building, may imply the presence of an altar in front of the upper steps (as suggested in fig. 44). There are also, towards either side, two limestone sockets, each containing traces of a central copper pin anchored in lead: it is possible that there were others which have not survived, and that a railing stood on this line. (See figs. 43 and 45b.)

**The Plan of the Portico.** The practical difficulties and labour involved in constructing the lateral extensions would hardly have been undertaken without strong motivation, and this is clearly linked to a desire to expand the width of the building to the greatest possible extent. They constitute therefore a crucial factor in determining the possible form of the superstructure of the temple in Period II.

Again, it is tempting to consider a hexastyle façade, but the stereobate breaks back a complete bay at the sides and the central part shows four clear-cut dressings for the base-blocks of a tetrastyle portico. Unfortunately, the upper surfaces of the lateral extensions are either robbed away or badly weathered and there are no longer any visible marks to show what kind of superstructure they carried. However, one of a pair of marble base-blocks which is still in place marks with precision the intermediate axis on the south side of the portico. There is no
Fig. 48. The Capitolium: possible superstructures in Period II implied by the surviving features.
setting-mark or empolion to show whether a column or an anta stood here—merely two X-cramp cuttings.

A variety of possible plan arrangements must therefore be considered. Four of the most feasible possibilities are shown in figure 48.

(E) This is the simplest and most obvious solution—a short side-wall returning along the outside of the podium to give more bulk to the cella and a column in the intermediate position at the side. Weathering on the footing of the pier at the south-east angle of the cella shows that this wall ran towards the edge of the podium on the centre-line of the new foundation, slightly forward of the original front wall of the cella itself.

One objection to this interpretation is immediately obvious: it would have been quite unnecessary to dismantle the side-walls and to insert such massive lateral footings. A short infill wall would have sufficed. A more complex argument arises from elements of the epistyle which have been identified as belonging to this building. (See fig. 48, to the right of plan G, fig. 51 and pl. 34b.) One consists of two horizontal sections of an architrave block which has been split for re-use. Its original length was 3.92 m., which was the ruling span for the building. It possesses on both faces, between a roughly dressed toe projecting 4 cm. and a standard form of tenia, a single smooth surface raking outward to the top at an angle of approximately 4° from the vertical. This simplified treatment seems to be a feature of the interior faces of the architraves of this portico.

A second section of architrave also survives (pl. 34b), again having the same section internally, but with the outer face dressed away in re-use. The ends of the block are intact: its overall length is 4.20 m., but the axial span is only 3.80 m. - 12 cm. less than the ruling span and 8 cm. less than the lateral spans across the front of the portico. This architrave has the angle-mitre and external return of a left-hand side corner unit or a right-hand front unit, but cannot be the latter because of its short span. We therefore have both units of the epistyle on the left-hand side, and the one nearest to the cella has an interior face on both sides! This feature cannot be accommodated by plan E.

(F) This solution shows a means of justifying the massive lateral footings by siting a column upon the forward angle in association with the walls described in plan E above. It also has the advantage of providing suitable locations for the architrave blocks just discussed. That with the interior faces on both sides would be the rearward of the two running forward on the line of the side-wall of the cella, and the rather short block with the angle-mitre would be accommodated if it were placed parallel to the first, with its forward end resting on the additional column and its rear supported by a responding anta projecting from the wall behind. Such a solution would have presented a rich and impressive façade to the Forum resembling, on a smaller scale, the Flavian Capitolium at Brescia.23

Attractive as this plan may be, it should be noted that the lateral extensions are not as regular, carefully laid or properly bonded as the main stylobate and may not have been intended to carry the intense point load imposed by a column. (See pl. 32b.) Walling would have imposed a more evenly distributed loading.

(G) This plan shows the substructures used to support additional side-chapels. Like the preceding, it provides a solution to the problems posed by the architraves, but with less elaboration and expense. The dressing for the base-block of the inner anta (pl. 33b) suggests that there was an opening in this side, and hence that the chapels faced sideways towards the interior of the portico rather than towards the Forum. (See also below under plan H.)

(H) This represents a combination of plans F and G, retaining the effect of the two-bay prostyle portico and providing a forward as well as a lateral opening to the room built on the new

substructure. This suggestion suffers from a number of defects: with a re-entrant epistyle
the corner architrave would not work, for it would have needed mitres at either end, facing
in opposite directions. Also, the span to a stub-wall anta on the outer edge of the podium
would have been too great unless the wall were returned and the anta brought in towards
the centre, a somewhat unsatisfactory expedient (shown by broken lines in fig. 48). There
could not have been a free-standing wing-wall ending in an anta since the corner blocks of
a level cornice still exist (pl. 35a).

It must be concluded that, of the four suggested alternatives, plans F and G offer the most tenable
solutions and that if we restrict the choice to those compatible with the surviving elements, then
plan G must stand as the neatest and most practical design. It is a form of temple descending from
an important line well represented in Rome itself: the Temple of Veiovis on the Capitoline Hill
(tetra style), the Temple of Concord in the Forum Romanum (hexastyle) and the Pantheon of
Agrippa (hexastyle).24

Having arrived at this point, it is reasonable now to take account of two capitolia in central
Tunisia which show remarkable similarities of plan to that deduced for the Period II Capitolium
of Sabratha. The first is at Abthugni (Cagnat & Gauckler 1898, 4 ff. with pls. 3 and 4.1,
reproduced here as fig. 48 bis) and has been dated between the reign of Hadrian and the end of the
second century A.D. This building has two lateral rooms in front of the cella, with their
entrances facing one another across the portico exactly as now suggested at Sabratha. The rooms
are decorated internally with recesses framed by projecting orders carried on consoles. The
Capitolium of Althiburos (Cagnat & Gauckler 1898, 8 ff. with pls. 4.2 and 8: plan reproduced in
Romanelli 1970, pl. 83b) is probably Commodan. It stands on a high podium the means of access
to which is unclear, for there are no frontal steps and the portico must have served as a tribunal.
Here there are also lateral rooms, but they are set further back, flush with the front of the cella,
and there was no access to them from the cella or the front. This presupposes a different use,
whose character must be entirely speculative. Also related in general type to the buildings under

24 Boethius (1978) 164 and n. 27; also Crema (1959) 47 and fig. 33 (Veiovis), Ibid. 176 and fig. 169 (Concord) and K.
de Fine Licht, The Rotunda in Rome (Jutland Archaeological Society Publications viii, 1966) 177, fig. 194 (Pantheon).
discussion is a temple of unknown dedication and date at Henschir Khima (Cagnat & Gauckler 1898, 121 f. with pls. 34, 35) in the form of a temple in antis with flanking rooms which open forward through doorways in line with the central portico. These distinctive types of temple-plan perhaps reflect Punic influence on architectural form and/or cult.

A further point of note is that in the cases of both Abthugni and Althiburos the temple appears to be attached by flanking walls or porticoes to an enclosed forecourt: this renders the appearance of the building from the side or rear architecturally unimportant. At Sabratha, where the Capitolium is not so enclosed and there is indeed an important thoroughfare leaving the Forum along its northern side, the resultant problem does not seem to have been adequately resolved and the building tails off rather unsatisfactorily at the rear. (See further below, p. 113.)

The Superstructure of the Portico. Although the materials of the Capitolium have been extensively quarried for re-use or lime-burning, enough fragments and discarded elements were found on or near the site to make it possible to restore the marble elements with reasonable confidence. Hypothetical elevations of the Period II building are shown in figures 49 and 50 and some of the more significant items are shown in relationship at an enlarged scale in figure 51. (See also pls. 34c and 35b.) A column-height of 9.80 m. (10 diameters) has been assumed, resulting in a height to the cornice of 12.25 m. and to the apex of the gable of 15.20 m. Only the exact detail of the fasciae of the architraves remains to be confirmed by the identification of an intact section. One small piece with a toe on both lower edges but a plain fascia offset, without a bead, is to be found in the Justinianic Basilica (Church 2), but it is not very helpful. Some confusion may be caused by fragments and elements of similar marble and identical moulding profiles which may only be differentiated by their larger scale. They come from a portico of great size - half as large again as the Capitolium - somewhere in the unexcavated area to the west of the Temple of Serapis.25

Some adjustments had to be made on site between the imported (and presumably prefabricated) marbles and the existing and prepared structure. Cuttings on the stylobate to receive the marble base-blocks are peculiarly disposed and twice - sometimes three times - dressed. Three equal axial spacings of the ruling intercolumniation, with the addition of base-widths, would not fit the base-cuttings to the left of centre, while the right-hand angle-column would fall beyond the line of the cella wall and too close to the edge of the stylobate. The centre-line of the portico would also be well out of line with that of the cella, and even more so with regard to that of the podium. The various problems can only be reconciled by reducing the lateral intercolumniations of the façade and using the fixed points in the dressing-marks as controls. The resulting dimensions shown in figure 51 are the outcome of a number of complex trials. It will be noticed that the cuttings to right of centre are open-edged on the inner placement and very wide indeed on the outside angle, testifying to the difficulties encountered by the site architect. The problems involved in establishing the spans on the sides of the portico have already been discussed above, p. 107.

Within the portico, a timber ceiling would have been carried by two large timber beams running back to the façade of the cella and these would have been supported in turn by piers faced with pilasters: the lower blocks of these piers are still extant and show clearly that they are additions. At the outer angles of the cella, where they would have been supporting marble architraves, the piers projected considerably (pl. 33b) and were bonded into the pre-existing walls by cutting and ‘stoothing’. The extent of the projection was here determined by the fact that the side-walls of the lateral chapels were built slightly forward of the cella-wall (above, p. 107) and by the necessity of strengthening the original front wall of the cella itself. It would have been unavoidable that this wall, despite its slenderness and restricted support between the door-openings, should have been increased in height by some four metres in order to close the gap between the old ceiling and the new.

The extended height of this wall, its additional weight, and the heavy loads imposed close to the corners by the marble portico must have given rise to considerable anxiety, especially as the

25 A cornice-height of approximately 18.45 m. is indicated: large indeed!
FIG. 49. The Capitolium, Period II: hypothetical front elevation.
Reconstruction of Side Elevation

Fig. 50. The Capitolium, Period II: hypothetical side elevation.
FIG. 52. The Capitolium: south elevation and longitudinal section, actual state (1948).
raft and the new substructures in front of the cella do not really provide support at the critical points. An ad hoc solution of this problem was achieved by inserting additional massive, square buttresses in the voids on either side of the cella immediately behind the new substructures: these are indicated by diagonal hatching in figure 45B. The fact that they are structurally subsequent to the Period II design and yet integral to its realisation is shown by the fact that although they are not bonded into the substructures of the side-chapels, the west face of this substructure on the north side (where it is most clearly visible) had not been dressed smooth before the buttress was inserted against it (pl. 35c). The lack of forethought represented by these additions is also apparent from the way in which the buttress on the north side projects awkwardly in front of the pre-existing doorway which leads into the Javissae beneath the cella (pl. 36a).

The Cella. How much of the original cella remained intact is a matter for speculation. Certainly it could have been retained without much alteration except, perhaps, for the raising of the height of the doors in keeping with the new height of the portico ceiling. The spaces along the sides between the new screen-walls and the old roof would, however, have had to remain open to the weather if the original roof was retained. There would have been little difficulty apart from rainwater disposal. The upper surfaces of the cornice-blocks at the outer angles above the side-chapels are flat and rough-dressed (pl. 35a); beam sockets on the back indicate the presence of a flat roof over the chapels, but there is no compelling reason for this to have been continued along the full length of the building behind. There would in any case have been no support for its inner edge, unless the old roof were dismantled and the new portico roof carried back over the cella on timber strutting and the rear gable raised correspondingly. Very little of the roof would have been visible from the central area of the city, so there would have been no strong reason to worry about the ridge-line; it is very possible that the rear view of the temple was completely masked by other buildings.

At the rear of the temple, it seems likely in fact that the architect of the Period II alterations had intended a more unified enclosure of the building than was ultimately achieved. This is apparent on the north side, where the Temple of Serapis on the opposite side of the street follows an earlier alignment with which the flank of the Capitolium converges towards the rear at an angle of approximately 5°. The buildings behind the Capitolium also conform to the earlier alignment, resulting in a slight bend in the street. (See fig. 123.) At this point the flank of the podium stops about 2.50 m. short of the line of the rear of the cella, and is separated by a short cross-wall from the wall forming the street-front beyond (shown hatched in fig. 45B). Beneath the paving of the street, however, are footings which continue the line of the podium as far as its theoretical termination; it may therefore have been intended to enclose the whole of the flank of the building behind a uniform screen-wall. Whether the scheme remained uncompleted because the money ran out, or because it was felt that the Capitolium would project too far into the street, we cannot tell.

The 1948 reconstruction-drawing in figure 44 shows the sides and angles of the temple embellished with Corinthian pilasters. In view of the austere character of the portico and its mouldings, it could quite easily be visualised with plain wall-surfaces and with the use of pilasters restricted to the interior of the portico. Only a few fragments of pilaster-capitals survive; stuccoed sandstone capitals could, of course, have been used (particularly along the sides), but so far none have been identified.

26 Bartoccini (1927, 48) observed that the traces of rendering and marble veneer on the rear wall of the cella do not respect the internal divisions of the Javissae, suggesting the existence of a single, rather than a triple, cella. This might represent a modification in Period II, when perhaps the functions of the original three rooms were partly transferred to the new lateral rooms flanking the portico.
CHRONOLOGY

Little dating evidence was obtained by excavation for the Capitolium, and that which was obtained relates only to Period II. The absolute chronology of the building can therefore be expressed only in terms of broad probabilities. JBWP, in his published writings, has attributed the Capitolium to the end of the first century A.D. (e.g. Ward-Perkins 1982, 40), but makes no reference to the possibility of there having been two distinct periods of construction.

Period II therefore offers the easiest starting-point. The character of the alterations to the building – the use of marble and the deliberate increase in scale and grandeur – falls most readily into place as another expression of the prosperity of Sabratha in the second century A.D. This was a period in which the entire town was transformed by grand public works and the laying-out of new residential areas. (See Chapter XI.) It has been suggested above (p. 104) that the re-building of the Capitolium would have been an appropriate symbol of the town’s elevation to colonial status, which took place during the second century, possibly in the reign of Antoninus Pius. The one point where stratigraphic evidence might be brought to bear on the question is at the front of the podium, against which several sections were cut in order to test the relationship between the temple and the Forum. If the hypothesis that the front of the podium was originally set further back (in Period I) is correct, it is the dating of Period II alone that could be established by these trenches. The relevant excavations have been discussed exhaustively in the previous chapter (pp. 26, 28 and 47 f.) and the results are confusing; the balance of the evidence (albeit slender) suggests that the front of the podium is contemporary with the Period III refurbishment of the Forum in the late Antonine period. Indeed, it makes sense that the bringing-forward of the podium and stairways should have formed part of the overall project for the re-designing of the Forum area.

The date of the original building is less easy to establish. It is built on the axis of the Forum, and it is difficult to imagine it existing without the Forum in front of it. However, it has been demonstrated (p. 99) that earlier buildings on the site of the Capitolium conformed to the same axis even before the temple was built: is it possible that it was the Capitolium (or its precursor) which determined the axis of both the Forum (Period Ia) and hence of the East Forum Temple when the latter was built around the mid first century A.D. (pp. 15 f., 17)? At the other extreme, it is possible that the interval between the two periods of the Capitolium was relatively short – even to the point that the building may still have been under construction when the design was changed. Some clue to the length of this interval might be hoped for in signs of repair to the relatively soft materials of the original structure, such as worn steps. (Compare, in this regard, the steps of the East Forum Temple, p. 43.) Unfortunately, it is precisely those steps which would have shown the most obvious signs of wear which are missing. Until further careful excavation of the building can be undertaken, it does not therefore seem possible to go beyond the statement that the sandstone temple of Period I is likely to have been constructed no earlier than the first century A.D. and no later than the first quarter of the second. (Bartoccini, 1927, 50, suggested an Augustan date on the basis of a fragmentary inscription found in the favissae [IRT 14]; but its mere presence does not necessarily imply that it belongs to the Capitolium.)

As to the later history of the building, it seems to have suffered the same fate as the other pagan temples at Sabratha. The superstructure was almost certainly destroyed in the earthquake of A.D. 365 (see p. 5 f.). The substructure, however, must have remained intact, for the favissae became a repository for the systematic collection of marble after the disaster: inscriptions, statues and architectural fragments from surrounding buildings were found there by Bartoccini (1927, 48; see also under IRT 1), and the purpose for which they were gathered up is shown by the re-use of such materials in the buildings which were restored (see p. 315 f.). Later still, probably in the Byzantine period, the carcase of the building sheltered an accretion of late structures (Bartoccini 1927, 48) – a fate shared with many of the other public monuments in the centre of the town (e.g. the East Forum Temple, p. 33, and the South Forum Temple, Joly & Tomasello 1984, 3–8).
One of the earlier surviving buildings of the forum area, if not indeed the earliest, is the temple at the north-western angle of the Forum, excavated by Guidi and identified by him as the Serapeum\textsuperscript{27} (fig. 53 and pl. 37a). The existence of a temple of Jupiter-Serapis at Sabratha is attested by the local coinage.\textsuperscript{28} Its identification with the present building rests upon the discovery of a small marble statue of Serapis within the precinct. There can of course be no certainty that this was not, like the five Serapis-figures found in a nymphaeum in Regio VI,\textsuperscript{29} displaced in late antiquity. On the other hand the presence of Egyptianizing sculptural ornament among the debris of the forum area, which was dumped in the vaults of the nearby Capitolium after the sack of the city by the Austuriani [or rather, its destruction by earthquake – see p. 5 f.],\textsuperscript{c. A.D. 365,} confirms the suggestion; and the North-West Forum Temple is a demonstrably early structure. The identification, if not certain, is both reasonable and probable.\textsuperscript{30}

The temple itself, which faces east and stands within a rectangular colonnaded courtyard, has suffered much at the hands of the later inhabitants of classical Sabratha, and it is by no means easy to make out the original plan. It was built throughout of soft local sandstone, with stuccoed surfaces; and its most immediately striking characteristic is its breadth in relation to its length. There was no porch. A broad flight of steps led directly up to the façade of the cella. Of this the foundations only up to the floor-level survive; but these are sufficient to show that it was not of the customary form \textit{in antis}, but closed, with access to the interior through two symmetrical doorways. The southernmost threshold, of good grey limestone, is still in position. Later this double doorway was suppressed in favour of a single, central door, an alteration that may perhaps be connected with the relaying of the steps in front.\textsuperscript{31} These were at first of sandstone, but were later replaced in an unusual combination of white marble and grey limestone (pl. 37b). Two periods can also be detected in the structure of the podium. This was originally stuccoed with simple horizontal mouldings, which are preserved unaltered on the short western end. Later the podium was lengthened by some three metres to incorporate the colonnade of the existing western portico of the temple precinct (pl. 38a). At the same time the flanks of the temple were elaborated with a series of shallow stucco pilasters, quite plain both in plan and in elevation.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{27} G. Guidi, \textit{Africa Romana} (Istituto di Studi Romani, 1935) 245.
\textsuperscript{28} [JBWP describes this coinage as Augustan and refers to G. Cimino, \textit{Libya} 3 (1927) nos. 19-20. One such coin is included amongst those from the excavation (p. 256 f., no. 36) and this has been attributed by Kenneth Jenkins broadly to the second or first century B.C. At my request, Mr. Jenkins has provided fuller comment on this coinage, to the following effect. The coins showing the temple occur only with a head of Melqart (SNG 35) or Serapis (SNG 36) on the obverse, so strictly we cannot be sure to which of these deities the temple is to be attributed. These coins must have been issued in the early Augustan period. On the other hand, the Serapis head is close in style to that appearing on coins of Zitha (SNG 47; see below, p. 256) which still show Punic, rather than Neo-Punic, letters and are attributed to the second century B.C. It does not seem possible to go further than this.]\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{29} Guidi, \textit{loc. cit.} in note 27.
\textsuperscript{30}[Pencilled note in margin: 'I wonder, on second thoughts. Look again at Egyptianizing stuff.' In a subsequent note, JBWP wrote that 'the identification of the temple seems very far from certain.']
\textsuperscript{31}[A loose note written subsequent to this text comments that all three doorways into the cella may have been contemporary, but that there is no sign of any triple division within the cella.]\end{flushright}
(perhaps they were painted?), created by cutting back the original surface of the wall in between. In effect the temple now became pseudo-peripteral, though it still lacked either the customary porch in front or a frontal colonnade *in antis*.

The temple was originally free-standing towards the western end of a porticoed courtyard. Of the original stuccoed sandstone colonnades a part of the westernmost has survived, thanks to its subsequent incorporation within the body of the enlarged temple (pl. 38a). The rest have vanished; but there is no particular reason to doubt that, apart from a somewhat narrower intercolumniation, they followed the same lines as their successors. There was a triple entrance from the street to the east, and single subsidiary entrances from those to the west and south. Later, when the temple was lengthened so as to incorporate the original western colonnade, the remaining three early colonnades were replaced by columns of black breccia and capitals and bases of white marble. At the same time the inner surfaces of the portico walls were veneered with marble, traces of which survive at the south entrance. It is to be presumed that the temple too received some marble ornament.

The alteration and embellishment of the early temple and portico may probably be ascribed to the later second, or possibly to the third, century. There is little likelihood that the architects of Sabratha were using marble in any quantity before their more opulent neighbours at Lepcis Magna; and two of the modifications, the lengthening of an originally free-standing temple to join the rear portico and the addition of shallow pilasters along the flanks, both suggest a certain assimilation to the second-century type established by the rich Antonine Temple to the south-east of the Forum. [See Bartoccini 1964.] If the remains of Egyptianizing marble sculpture found in the vaults of the neighbouring Capitolium are rightly to be ascribed to this temple, they too appear to confirm a late-second century date. They consist notably of a frieze of winged solar discs, and of a related frieze of putti supporting garlands (pl. 28). Despite their somewhat mediocre workmanship, they betray a certain dry classicism which is very remote from the exuberance of the Severan decorative tradition and belongs more naturally to the age of the Antonines.

The date at which the temple was originally built is less easy to establish. It is unquestionably early for it antedates the formal establishment of the Forum [in the mid or later first century A.D.-p. 17]. If the identification as a Serapeum be correct, there seems little reason to question an Augustan date for the original construction. To it, very tentatively, may be ascribed two fragments [sic: no other record of more than one] of an early imperial, possibly Augustan, monumental inscription in stuccoed sandstone (IRT 162, recorded at the north-west angle of the Forum: pl. 38b).

After the [earthquake of A.D. 365], the temple was not rebuilt. It was stripped to pavement-level, and on it were built dwellings, the remains of which have served to obliterate all earlier detail. Steps were added on the north side; and it is noteworthy that, when the outer face of these was stuccoed, the ground-level within the courtyard had already risen noticeably above the earlier pavement-level. It had risen still further by the sixth century, when the footings of an apartment-house were thrust obliquely across the line of the northern portico in a way which shows clearly that the earlier building was by then unrecognizable beneath the ruins. At the east end too there were many changes. In the late fourth century the adjacent north-west angle of the Forum was altered by the partitioning of the west end of the north forum portico into two rooms with re-used marble paving. At the same time the passage into the Forum from the road between the Serapeum and the Capitolium was blocked by the insertion of a door and of a small chamber (a porter's lodge?) paved in characteristic late-fourth-century, coarse white mosaic. The result

32 [Pencilled note: 'Colour as Hymettan, but a definite breccia, white against grey flux.']
33 [The latter frieze has been ascribed by Alec Daykin with, I think, greater probability to the Cruciform Building (p. 94.)
34 [This is based on the assumption that the local coinage which shows a temple is both illustrating this building and Augustan in date: for discussion of both these points see note 28 above, and for further evidence of date the postscript below.]
35 [The original construction of this chamber must have taken place earlier, for its presence is respected by the drain-head across the end of the street to the south, which belongs to the late Antonine period (Forum Period III: see
was to narrow the passage to the harbour-side, in front of the temple and between it and the Curia; and either now or later it was raised by the insertion of a flight of steps at the south-eastern angle (pl. 38c). At the northern end of this passage it is once more clear that by the sixth century all effective memory of the lie of the earlier buildings had been lost.

POSTSCRIPT (P.M.K.)

A single trench was dug across the interior of the cella of the temple in order to obtain dating-evidence for the building. There is no plan of this trench amongst the Sabratha records, but the section shows the presence of wide and well-defined construction-trenches for the cella walls. The levels relevant to the construction of the temple were classified as context x.1: some of the pottery was catalogued by KMK and all of the fine wares and lamps have been re-examined by myself and Donald Bailey. They yielded the following information.

There is much Campana A Ware from these levels, and a few sherds of Campana C (Berenice Form B63/Lamboglia Form 1; sherds of large dishes). There are also five sherds of Eastern Sigillata A including a base of a dish, Berenice Form B314, and a base of a cup, Berenice Form B323. The latter looks late for its type, i.e. probably Augustan. There are also three small sherds of Italian Sigillata. Of three lamp-fragments, one is a wheel-made black-glazed lamp, probably Italian, of the second or first century B.C., one is of Hellenistic type, probably African, of the second half of the first century B.C., and one is a nozzle-fragment of a Bronneer Type XXI Italian lamp, dated Augustan–Tiberian. This material seems fairly clearly to indicate an Augustan date for the building.
FIG. 53. The North West Forum Temple (Temple of Serapis?), plan.
Fig. 54. Regio II. Insula 5: Plan of excavations, showing numbering of walls and locations of sections.
CHAPTER IV
EXCAVATIONS TO THE NORTH OF
THE FORUM

(P.M.K.)

(a) REGIO II, INSULA 5

This insula consists of no more than a small triangle of rooms against the north side of the precinct of the East Forum Temple. It is an obvious remnant of the previous layout of the town, truncated when the East Forum Temple was built in the mid first century A.D. As such, its investigation might have been expected to throw light on that event, and on the earlier history of the area. A small excavation was carried out here in 1948, but it was very tentative and limited in extent, and did not extract more than a small part of the information that might have been obtained. This may have been due to the fact that the excavation was all but ignored by KMK, for though she drew some of the sections and made a few brief notes on the pottery on site, there is no synthesis by her of the excavated levels (as there is for almost all other areas) and the pottery was never catalogued. The account which follows has therefore been based on the original site notes, the sections which were drawn, and a single plan by Carmelo Catamiso, drawn presumably at the end of the season (fig. 54). The fine wares and the lamps have now been reviewed by myself and Donald Bailey. The conclusions which it has been possible to draw are correspondingly limited, but still of interest. Some general remarks are followed by notes on the individual trenches.

The insula had been cleared to a fairly arbitrary level by the Italian excavators, and the first work done on the site by the British expedition involved clearance of the whole area down to a series of opus signinum or mortar floors which existed at a more or less uniform level across the site. At the corner of the street stands a small shrine, in the form of a room 2.55 m. by 1.65 m., plastered internally and with a stuccoed sandstone plinth 1.00 m. wide by 54 cm. deep projecting from the rear wall (pl. 38d). Behind the shrine lies an irregular complex of rooms (pl. 39), whose floors are approximately level with the paving of the street to the north, but about one metre below the late floor-level of the portico of the East Forum Temple. As a result, slightly more than two courses of headers, forming the foundations of the wall of the temple precinct, are exposed on the north side.

The visible walls of Insula 5 are largely uniform in construction, being composed of sandstone stretcher blocks above floor-level, laid upon one or more foundation-courses laid as headers. The dating-evidence for this layout is slender: the presence of a few sherds of Italian and ‘Tripolitanian’ Sigillata shows that it is no earlier than Augustan, and the latest objects suggest
FIG. 55. Regio II, Insula 5, sections. Encircled numbers are ‘Y.I.xvi’ context designations.
that its construction may have taken place as late as c. A.D. 20. (See under section E-F.) This would be contemporary with a major structural phase in the insulae to the north. (See below, pp. 131, 134, 138.) It seems certainly to pre-date the construction of the East Forum Temple in the mid first century (p. 15 f.), and there is some evidence of alterations at the eastern corner of the insula following that event. (See under sections A-B and E-F.)

Owing to the prior removal of overlying levels, the subsequent history of the insula is unclear, as is the purpose of an opening into it through the wall of the temple precinct at the level of the portico floor (visible at the left in plate 39); this may have been a new feature when parts of the wall were rebuilt in the Constantinian period (Forum Period IVb: p. 29 f.). Despite the absence of any steps, it seems likely that the ground-level within the insula was still substantially unchanged at the time. In the first place, the apse which formed part of the original wall of the temple precinct was closed off at this period and dismantled down to the level of the insula floors. (Three courses of ashlar masonry survive below this level, so the purpose is unlikely to have been just the extraction of useful building-stone.) Secondly, the finds from the initial clearance of the area (context xvi.24), though technically unstratified, are largely homogeneous in date. They include 38 identified coins, a remarkable number for such a small area: the coins were widely distributed through the rooms of the insula, and presumably therefore indicate commercial activity rather than a dispersed hoard. They range in date from Marcus Aurelius to Justin II, but between these extremes all but three fall between the second half of the third century (from Claudius II) and the end of the fourth (Theodosius I, Arcadius, Honorius: see p. 267 and fig. 115). It might have been supposed that their loss or deposition was connected in some way with the earthquake of A.D. 365, but the number of coins which must post-date this event (eight) indicates that this cannot have been so. The pattern of the coins is repeated by the fine wares from the same levels: apart from a few pieces of both earlier and later date, there is a concentration of African Red Slip Ware of the last quarter of the fourth century (Hayes Forms 53B, 61B, 67, 68) and a number of fragments of Tripolitanian Red Slip Ware (including Berenice Forms B695, B701) and Tripolitanian lamps. There was clearly, therefore, intense activity of some kind in this insula in the period immediately following the earthquake, the character of which cannot now be defined. Two small circular structures close to the apse of the temple precinct (one of them in fact overlying it; fig. 54 and pl. 39) appear to be kilns: it is unclear whether they belong to the fourth century or (as is more probable) to the Byzantine period.

The excavations beneath the floors of the first-century insula were sufficient to provide dating-evidence for the visible structures, and to reveal the presence of a typical succession of earlier structures beneath. However, the trenches were too limited in extent to give any idea of the character of these structures, which show no regularity in their alignments; in most cases also, only the tops of the earlier walls were exposed and evidence for the date of their construction was not obtained. All that can be said in general terms is that there is definite evidence of continuous occupation in this area from about the mid fifth century B.C.

NOTES ON SECTIONS (See figures 54 and 55)

The section drawings in figure 55 are to some extent schematic, as correlation between the layers shown on the drawings and those described in the site notebook was sometimes difficult, if not impossible. Numbers within circles denote ‘Y.I.xvi’ context groups, defined in this instance by myself for lack of a synthesis by KMK; the finds are still marked and stored in accordance with their original trench-and-layer designations.

Section A-B (trench J2)

Excavation went only as deep as the tops of the early walls in this trench, and the following observations only could be made from the sketch of the section in the notebook.

1. The opus signinum floor at the surface is recorded as running right up to all the walls of the
room, including the temple wall, showing that it is either contemporary with or subsequent to the construction of the temple.

2. The fine ware from the make-up levels beneath the opus signinum floor (context xvi.3) included several sherds of Italian Sigillata (Berenice Forms B211, B214, B229, base of krater), an Italian Bronzeer Type XXI lamp of c. A.D. 25–75 and three fragments of Eastern Sigillata A (Berenice Forms B334, B331, B332). Two of the last suggest a Flavian date for the floor (A.D. 60–100).

3. The foundation-trenches for wall 6 (context xvi.2) and for the temple precinct wall (layer S.p. J2-5c: not shown on drawing) yielded a sherd of Eastern Sigillata A and a base of a thin-walled hemispherical bowl (Berenice Form B459; Tiberian) respectively. The rubble layer beneath the make-up and cut by the foundation-trench for wall 6 (context xvi.1) yielded black-glazed ware and a rim of Berenice Form B208 in Italian Sigillata (from c. 12 B.C.).

The evidence therefore indicates that wall 6 is no earlier than Tiberian, and is consistent with a mid-first-century date for the construction of the East Forum Temple (p. 15 f.). No direct relationship is shown between wall 6 and the wall of the temple; it is possible that the existing opus signinum floor is a Flavian refurbishment following the construction of the temple, rather than an original feature of the building. (The foundational offset of wall 6 suggests that the original floor may have been at a lower level.)

_Trenches J4 and J5_

These trenches formed extensions to trench J2, and no separate sections were drawn. They add little further material, which is in any case of questionable significance in the absence of section drawings. Of note from trench J5 (layer S.p. J5-5a) are a base of an Attic black-glazed skyphos of c. 450–400 B.C. and two other sherds of Attic black-glazed ware of the late fifth or early fourth century (Ch. IX, nos. 3, 22 and 84).

_Section C–D (trench J3)_

This trench revealed a complex succession of structures. The earliest occupation-levels (context xvi.4) are cut by the foundation-trench of wall 31 and are partly sealed by a mortar floor which runs up against the wall (context xvi.5). These levels yielded no diagnostic fine ware, but two fifth-century sherds from layers above (context xvi.6, Ch. IX, no. 21; context xvi.7, Ch. IX, no. 34) give some suggestion of a starting-date. Subsequent to this is the construction of wall 32, beneath wall 5, and this is probably associated with further levels capped by a second mortar floor running up to wall 31 (context xvi.6). This may be tentatively dated in the early third century B.C. by the presence of a black-glazed sherd, probably from the ‘Atelier des petites estampilles’ (Morel 1969); there is also a rim of a black-glazed salt-cellar similar to Agora xii, no. 944 or 946 (but not Attic) and a coin of the mid to late fourth century (no. 504). A fragment of a Loeschcke Type IA Italian lamp (Augustan–Tiberian) is probably intrusive. The next phase seems to be represented by the robbing of wall 32 and a considerable accumulation of layers above (context xvi.7), possibly associated with the continued existence of wall 31. There was little fine ware from these levels, but its appearance gives an impression of a second-century date (some local Hellenistic red-glazed ware, one possible sherd of Campana A).

At some time, for which there is no dating-evidence (context xvi.8), wall 31 was superseded by wall 33 which crosses it at right-angles. The building to which this belonged was in turn demolished when walls 5 and 6 of the visible layout were constructed. There is no direct relationship between the two, and no dating-evidence for wall 6 to add to that from section A–B which suggests a Tiberian date. The make-up beneath the opus signinum floor which runs up to wall 5 (context xvi.9) yielded a sherd of Eastern Sigillata A which may be Augustan (Berenice Form B325).
Section E–F (trench J6)

The original insula frontage of the first century A.D. was here formed by wall 1, the lower part of which was uncovered in the centre of the trench. The levels which run between walls 1 and 8 and overlie an earlier wall beneath (context xvi.11) yielded a rim of Berenice Form B225B in Italian Sigillata (from A.D. 15/20), a possible fragment of ‘Tripolitanian’ Sigillata (Berenice Form B402: Augustan?) and the nozzle of a Loeschcke Type IV or Broneer Type XXI Italian lamp, dated Tiberian–Claudian. A deeper excavation between walls 1 and 2 (not clearly defined: context xvi.10) yielded a sherd of an Attic black-glazed lekythos of the third quarter of the fifth century B.C. (Ch. IX, no. 167) and several other sherds of the fourth or third centuries B.C. (including Ch. IX, nos. 96, 137). Wall 1 was subsequently dismantled in this area, and the frontage was moved forward to wall 2. The associated levels (context xvi.12) yielded no diagnostic fine ware, but it is likely that this modification was made after the East Forum Temple was built in the mid first century A.D., for the new wall runs towards the projecting corner of the temple precinct.

Section G–H (trench J7, sectors J7a, J7b)

Despite the representation on the plan (fig. 54) of a continuous trench joining this section to section J–K, there are apparently neither notes nor a section drawing for the excavation between wall 12a and wall 12 (sectors J7c, J7d). There is therefore no recorded correlation between sections G–H and J–K.

In the lower part of this section is a succession of floors and occupation-levels (context xvi.13) which may be related to a wall-foundation on the east side of the trench. The only fine ware from these levels consists of one sherd of Attic black-glazed ware, two of West Slope Ware and a rim of Hayes Form 8A in African Red Slip Ware (!). The layers above (context xvi.14) are cut by the foundations of wall 34, and they and the foundation-trench on the east side of the wall are sealed by a mortar floor. The pottery from these levels includes three sherds of Campana A (Berenice Forms B9A, B10) which indicate that the building belongs to the second century B.C. The construction of wall 12a is likely to constitute the next major phase: this is probably associated with a mortar floor above a further make-up layer, but there is no physical connexion between the wall and the floor owing to later disturbance. There was no pottery from the foundation-trench for wall 12a, unless a rim as Berenice no. B479.2 in Pompeian-Red Ware from an adjacent level (S.p. J7b–9b) is to be attributed to it; but the make-up levels beneath the floor (context xvi.15) yielded a few sherds of various black-glazed wares, the latest of which is a fragment of Campana C. Wall 12a may therefore belong to the first century B.C., but is more likely to be contemporary with the main part of the visible layout — i.e. early Tiberian. There was no pottery from the foundation-trench for the wall of the temple precinct, but the stratigraphy suggests that it post-dates wall 12a: this is in accord with the evidence from other trenches. Finally, the pit or robber-trench above the remains of wall 34 (context xvi.16) yielded several sherds of African Red Slip Ware, going as late as the sixth century A.D. (Hayes Forms 91C, 103).

Section J–K (trench J7, sectors J7c–J7h)

It has proved impossible, on the basis of the existing records, to correlate with any confidence much of the complex stratigraphy in this trench with the finds recorded from it. Wall 35 is the earliest structure present, and there appear to be two successive mortar floors associated with it. The finds from the levels beneath include a little pre-Campana black-glazed ware, but nothing obviously earlier than the fourth century B.C. The top of the wall appears to have been robbed (leaving a few loose blocks) at the time when wall 11, the boundary-wall of the insula, was built. The foundation-trench for wall 11 yielded (residual) black-glazed ware, and apparently a fragment of a Loeschcke Type IV Italian lamp (Claudian–Flavian: intrusive?); the robber-trench above wall 35 and the hard layer of make-up which seals both that and the foundation-trench yielded a sherd of Italian Sigillata and a rim of Berenice Form B403 in ‘Tripolitanian’ Sigillata (Augustan or later; all context xvi.17). Apparently subsequent to this is a wide cutting near wall
12, which appears to be associated with a drainage channel shown in figure 54 running obliquely through the trench and appearing again on the other side of wall 12. The finds from the fill of this cutting (context xvi.18) include nothing later than the preceding context, apart from a coin of the fourth century A.D. (p. 267, no. 46) which must be intrusive, and it is unclear from the records whether the cutting is associated with the laying of the drain or the robbing of the stones above it. It is however clear from both the plan and the section that the drain was interrupted when wall 12 was built. The finds from the foundation-trench of the latter and the associated make-up levels above (context xvi.19) included four sherds of Italian Sigillata, one of them a Berenice Group B rim (from c. 10 B.C.), a rim of Berenice Form B334 in Eastern Sigillata A (from A.D. 1/10) and a base of a Loeschcke Type IA Italian lamp (Augustan–Tiberian). Traces of an opus signinum floor at the present ground surface are probably original to this period.

Trench J8

This very small trench was dug between the apse in the north wall of the East Forum Temple precinct, and the wall of Insula 5 which fronts the street to the north (wall 11); the intention was probably to establish a relative chronology between the two. This failed owing to the presence of an earlier wall running along the line of the trench and beneath both of the later structures. Overlying this early wall was a uniform fill of rubble running up to both of the walls above (context xvi.20), which yielded two sherds of Italian Sigillata and four of Eastern Sigillata A (none necessarily later than Augustan); also a fragment of a closed vessel in early African Red Slip Ware (Flavian: intrusive?).

Section L–M (trench J9)

This section conforms to the sequence already seen in other trenches. The drawn section shows an early rubble wall (36) which was located in the north face of the trench, but which is not shown on the plan: its direction is unclear, as is the surface with which it was associated. The levels which run against it on the east (context xvi.21) yielded several sherds of Attic black-glazed ware, probably of the fourth century B.C. (including Ch. IX, nos. 118, 119), also two groups of three and seven coins respectively, all of the early third century (see p. 267).

The foundation-trench of wall 4 is clearly shown cutting through the upper layers: that of wall 3 presumably comprises all of the fill shown between it and wall 36, which was perhaps cut through when wall 3 was built. Walls 3 and 4 are likely on structural grounds to be contemporaneous: there was significant dating-evidence only for wall 3, as the fill against it (context xvi.22) yielded a base of Berenice Form B314 in Eastern Sigillata A and a sherd of Italian Sigillata, showing that the wall is likely to be Augustan or later. Across much of the room an opus signinum floor is preserved (pl. 38d), which is presumably contemporary. The superficial disturbance which cut through this floor in the centre of the room and appears on the section (context xvi.23) yielded two sherds of African Red Slip Ware.

(b) REGIO II, INSULA 6

Excavations were carried out in Insulae 6 and 7 in 1951 in the hope of obtaining evidence of the earliest settlement at Sabratha: its location in this area had been inferred from the discovery of an early city wall beneath the north side of the precinct of the East Forum Temple in 1948. The records include interpretations of the sequence in each trench by KMK, but no report on the area had been written. What follows is therefore my interpretation based on these records and on a review of the fine wares and the lamps. I am grateful to David Gill for comments on the early black-glazed ware (most of which appear in Chapter IX).

It must be said at the outset that, as is true for much of the examination of the early levels at
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FIG. 56. Regio II, Insulae 6 and 7, general plan.
Sabratha, the approach adopted for the excavation of this area was unsuited to its character. Only a few narrow trenches were laid down, and the emphasis was on obtaining sections. With hindsight, it is possible to say that only an extended area excavation would have revealed what was going on in the area at different periods; but at the time when the excavation took place this technique had yet to be developed. The result is that though it is possible to indicate the chronological span of occupation, to say something of the construction techniques employed at different times, and to pick out some of the periods when major alterations occurred, it is not possible at any point to say what the layout of the structures was or to interpret their significance. Even the layout now visible at the surface is composed of walls of different periods, and much of the stratigraphy associated with them was removed without record when the buildings were first uncovered by the Italians. I have drawn up a series of plans (figs. 58–61) showing the structures and deposits which belong to the periods defined, but it must be admitted that the results are pretty nugatory. On the whole, it appears that the Italian excavators cleared the area down to the levels of the first or second centuries A.D., corresponding to the level of the paved streets by which the area is bounded. The fact that the walls of the buildings survive to a considerable height above this level (more than one storey in places; see pl. 40) must imply that the buildings survived without substantial further alteration or decay from this time onward (and that they were ultimately protected by a considerable depth of soil). The chronological span of the levels excavated by the British expedition therefore extends from the fifth century B.C. down to the mid second century A.D. Figure 56 is a general plan of Insulae 6–7, showing the structures visible in 1951; a more detailed plan of the excavations in Insula 6 is shown in figure 57 and the relevant sections are shown in figures 62 and 63 (p. 134 and facing).

PERIOD I (figure 58): fifth century B.C.

The earliest levels above the natural sand in sections C–D, E–F, G–H, J–K and L–M consist of floors, pits and dark layers of occupation debris associated with post-holes (not recorded in plan). These features were interpreted by the excavators as evidence that the earliest occupation at Sabratha had been associated exclusively with temporary structures, and was perhaps seasonal in character (Ward-Perkins 1951; Kenyon 1952). Above these earliest levels, but not distinguishable chronologically, were located the footings of a single stone wall which is shown in Section E–F (fig. 63: 'Early wall', un-numbered). The datable finds from these levels (contexts xxi.1–6, 36–42; xxii.19–25) were as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/Cat. no.</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xxi.40/5</td>
<td>C–D</td>
<td>Rim of one-handler, Attic b.g. ware, Ch. IX, no. 76</td>
<td>c. 400–350 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.41/uncat.</td>
<td>C–D</td>
<td>Base of bolsal, Attic b.g. ware, Ch. IX, no. 31</td>
<td>c. 430–410 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.1/1</td>
<td>E–F, J–K, L–M</td>
<td>Base of skyphos, Attic b.g. ware, Ch. IX, no. 10</td>
<td>c. 450–400 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.1/3</td>
<td>E–F, J–K, L–M</td>
<td>Rim of Castulo cup, Attic b.g. ware, Ch. IX, no. 29</td>
<td>c. 460–420 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.2/1</td>
<td>E–F, J–K, L–M</td>
<td>Base of Attic b.g. lamp, probably Howland Type 23C</td>
<td>First half of C4 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.2/1</td>
<td>E–F, J–K, L–M</td>
<td>Sherd of Attic b.g. lamp, Howland Type 23D or 26A</td>
<td>c. 375–275 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.2/2</td>
<td>E–F, J–K, L–M</td>
<td>Part of b.g. salt-cellar, not Attic; shape as Agora xii, no. 861</td>
<td>C5 BC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.2/3</td>
<td>E–F, J–K, L–M</td>
<td>Part of b.g. bowl with incurred rim and groove at lip. Probably not Attic, shape approximating to Morel F2561 or F2783</td>
<td>Late C4 or early C3 BC??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.4/2</td>
<td>E–F, J–K, L–M</td>
<td>2 sherds of thin-walled vessel, Attic b.g. ware, Ch. IX, no. 188</td>
<td>c. 430–400 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.4/2</td>
<td>E–F, J–K, L–M</td>
<td>Sherd of thicker vessel, Attic b.g. ware, perhaps Attic Type A skyphos, Ch. IX, no. 189</td>
<td>C5 BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were also several unclassifiable sherds of good Attic black-glazed ware and four clearly intrusive sherds of later wares (Campana A, late Hellenistic lamp, Italian Sigillata, African Red Slip Ware).

The material listed above indicates clearly that occupation began in the second half of the fifth
PERIOD II (figure 58): mid fourth century B.C.?

The first phase of permanent structures (apart from the early wall described above, which did not survive into this period) is characterized by walls built of small, thin blocks of stone, irregularly coursed but with the face dressed flat (pl. 41a). One wall, V2, is built of finer squared blocks (pl. 41d). A comparable variety of techniques is apparent at this period in the Casa Brogan: cf. plates 44c and 45a. The foundations of these walls are of rubble, set in trenches cut through the Period I levels. The associated surfaces are mostly of clay or mortar, but at the south end of section E–F wall T31 separates a floor of opus signinum from one composed of mud-bricks (pl. 41c).

Figure 58 shows the relative positions of the walls attributed to this period. (Photographs of wall T27 appear to show a doorway [pl. 42a], but there is no reference to it in the records.) It is hardly possible on the basis of these fragments to suggest what kind of buildings are present, but a glance at the general plan in figure 56 confirms the inference already made on other grounds that the visible Roman buildings in this area conform to an axis which had been established at a much earlier period.

Dating-evidence for the walls and floors of Period II is meagre, but the contemporaneity of the features attributed to it is suggested by a general conformity of level and of constructional technique. The relevant finds are the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/ Cat. no.</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xxi.7/3</td>
<td>E–F, J–K, L–M</td>
<td>Part of small bowl with sharply incurved rim: good b.g. ware, pre-Campana or possibly Attic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.7/5</td>
<td>E–F, J–K, L–M</td>
<td>Part of b.g. lamp, probably Rhodian, near Howland Type 32</td>
<td>c. 250–150 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxii.26/1</td>
<td>G–H</td>
<td>Base of fish-plate, Attic b.g. ware, Ch. IX, no. 158</td>
<td>c. 375–325 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxii.26/2</td>
<td>G–H</td>
<td>Rim of bowl, probably a bolsal, Attic b.g. ware, Ch. IX, no. 190</td>
<td>c. 375–325 BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
None of this is very conclusive, but given the evidence that the first stone structures in the Casa Brogan area belong to the late fourth century B.C. (below, p. 144), it is unlikely that those in Regio II, Insula 6 are later. Of peripheral relevance is a pit in section A–B (not shown on the section) which pre-dates wall X5.1 and which yielded a number of pieces of mid-fourth-century Attic black-glazed ware as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/ Cat. no.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xxiv.70/13a</td>
<td>Base of bolsal, Ch. IX, no. 59</td>
<td>c. 380–350 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13b</td>
<td>Base of small bowl, Ch. IX, no. 116</td>
<td>c. 375–325 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>Rim-fragment of one-handler, Ch. IX, no. 77</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b</td>
<td>Rim of bolsal (?), Ch. IX, no. 191</td>
<td>c. 375–325 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a+b</td>
<td>2 sherds</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The earlier level through which the pit is cut (context xxiv.69) is contaminated by later material, but it seems reasonable to regard the pit-group as relevant to the dating of the wall. It seems likely that wall X5.1 represents the eastward continuation of wall T28 in section L–M. (Likewise wall V37a in section N–O, which is undated, must surely be continuous with wall V39 in section G–H.)

In section C–D, the latest floor of Period I is overlaid by a layer of occupation-debris which yielded a coin of the mid to late fourth century B.C. (context xxi.43, no. 363), and then by a fill of mixed material capped by a floor of yellow clay which raised the level by some sixty centimetres. The fill is apparently well dated to the second half of the fourth century B.C. by the following pieces of Attic black-glazed ware.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/ Cat. no.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xxi.44/4</td>
<td>Lamp, Howland Type 25B</td>
<td>c. 350–275 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Incurved rim of bowl, Ch. IX, no. 95</td>
<td>c. 350–275 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. 1174</td>
<td>Rim of kantharos, Ch. IX, no. 73</td>
<td>c. 350–325 BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The clay floor (context xxi.45) yielded three sherds of good black-glazed ware which are not necessarily any later than the material from the fill beneath. Despite the apparently good dating-evidence for these features, their interpretation is problematic as there is no corresponding fill in the adjacent section E–F, and as there are traces of a wall, V29a, whose foundations are set in the upper part of the fill. The wall was probably associated with the floor which seals the fill, though the relationship was obscured when the wall was robbed out. On the other hand, it cannot have been built to retain the raised level, for even the bottom of the foundation is above the contemporary level in section E–F. The problem remains unresolved, for the relationship with the levels in section E–F and any dividing feature that may have existed were destroyed by the insertion of wall T14/V29 in Period IV.

**PERIOD IIa: first half of second century B.C.**

The floors of Period II in sections E–F/J–M show signs of lengthy use and refurbishment, and one of these is accompanied by the insertion of a wall of mud-brick running east–west and shown in section E–F (fig. 63: “Mud-brick wall”, un-numbered). The wall was built directly on the floor, without foundations, almost on the line of the early wall whose remains had already been covered over, and is composed of bricks about 10 cm. thick. Only two courses survive in the
drawn section, but on the opposite face of the trench the core was traceable in the overlying fill to
a height of seven courses; in the centre of the trench was a rough line of stones running
northwards, which may have been the remains of another wall. These presumably represent
modifications to the existing layout rather than a major new structural phase.

Evidence of date was provided by a rim of Berenice Form B10 with red and white painted bands
in Campana A Ware from the floor on which the mud-brick wall rests (context xxi.9/1): this can
be no earlier than the first half of the second century B.C. Between the mud-brick wall and wall
T27 there was one further clay floor laid, and above this was a thin layer of wind-blown sand,
which may be indicative of disuse. This layer yielded a sherd of Hellenistic red-glazed ware and
part of a lamp of the late fourth or early third century B.C. (context xxi.13).

PERIOD III (figure 59): mid second century B.C.

The modifications attributed to Period IIa were followed shortly after by a substantial rise in
ground-level and further alterations of plan, which suggest an interval of collapse and decay
followed by redevelopment. The fill which brought about the rise in level was up to 1.50 m. deep
in section E–F. The lower part of it was composed of clay and stones, which KMK interpreted in
her notes as the fallen remains of walls of stone and mud-brick. The upper part of the fill, by
contrast, was sandy and was interpreted as dumped material representing a deliberate levelling-
up of the ground. Walls which definitely ceased to exist at this period were wall V29a (section
C–D, probably already robbed out), the mud-brick wall and wall T31 (section E–F), wall V39
(section G–H: hence also wall V37a in section N–O?) and wall T28 (section L–M). Wall T27
(section E–F) may have continued in use, for it survives to a higher level, but as there is no
contemporary surface in its vicinity the point cannot be demonstrated. Wall V2 (section J–K) did
survive, for there is a clay floor of this period which runs up to it. (Indeed, plate 41d suggests that
this wall was the most substantial of the pre-existing structures, and hence the most likely to
survive a period of decay.) The clay floor is associated with a new wall, T30, which runs parallel
to wall V2 and just 1.20 m. to the east of it. This wall had deep foundations of small stones
carefully laid in orange clay up to floor-level, and was built of mud-brick above (pl. 42b). There
was no surviving surface to the east of it, for this was removed at a later period.
It is impossible to say what these developments signified in terms of structures, but the quantity of pottery recovered from the large volume of soil associated with them was sufficient to provide firm evidence of date. The relevant contexts (xxi.14–17, 50, xxii.31, 32) yielded much Campana A Ware, including Berenice Forms B3, B4, B6, B9, B10 (with ivy-scrolls), B13 and B14, and one rim of an ‘Ionian’ Megarian Bowl (no. xxi.17/61: see Kenrick 1985, 105 ff.). The character of the palmette and rosette stamps and the foot-profiles of the Campana A bowls suggest that most of it belongs to the first half of the second century B.C., with a terminal date around the middle of the century. There are also a number of lamp-fragments which are consistent with the date suggested.

PERIOD IIIa

The stratigraphy shows that the next major phase (Period IV) is preceded by further minor developments for which little explanation can be offered. Much of section N–O to the north of wall V37a is intersected by a succession of deep rubbish pits. The pottery from pits A and B (contexts xxii.5, 6) and an adjacent level cut by them (context xxii.2) yielded a few sherds of Eastern Sigillata A (Berenice Form B313 or 314), a rim of a Pompeian-Red dish (Berenice Form B482, non-Campanian fabric) and an example of Lamboglia Form 1 (Berenice Form B51) in black-glazed ware (uncertain fabric), all of which suggest a date in the early first century B.C. Pits C and D (contexts xxii.7, 8) yielded much Eastern Sigillata A and Italian Sigillata, including Berenice Group B forms in the latter (from c. 10 B.C.) and a fragment of relief ware (Comfort 1982, no. 66: c. 10 B.C.–A.D. 10); a terminal date early in the first century A.D. is indicated by several fragments of Italian lamps of Loeschke Types I, IA and IV from Pit C. (Two second-century African lamps and a rim of Hayes Form 182 in African Red Slip Ware are clearly intrusive.) The filling of a huge pit at the west end of section G–H (context xxii.33, 34), which contained large boulders at the bottom, yielded two sherds of Italian Sigillata and four of Eastern Sigillata A (Berenice Forms B314, B323) in addition to black-glazed wares, a nozzle of an Italian Vogelkopflampe (second half of first century B.C.) and a nozzle of an Italian lamp near Bailey Q735 (c. 25 B.C.–A.D. 25), indicating an Augustan date. The presence of these pits suggests that this part of the excavated area was waste ground following the redevelopment of the area in Period III.

In sections A–B–C–D, the status and character of wall V28 is enigmatic. This wall is built of sandstone ashlars laid as stretchers above ground, on a foundation of similar blocks, approximately 50 cm. square in section, laid as headers beneath (pl. 42c). The foundation is four courses deep in section A–B, and has a maximum width of over two metres. This is totally out of proportion to the wall which it now carries, and it is possible that the two are unrelated in date and purpose. (The plan in figure 57 shows that the wall has a narrower and more appropriate foundation further west.) The foundation was built within a wide trench which on the south side cuts the Period III fill, showing that it must be later than the mid second century B.C. The cutting is sealed on the north side by a floor of mud-bricks (pl. 42d) and on the south by a clayey fill which is cut in turn by the foundation-trench of wall T14/V29 which belongs to Period IV (early Tiberian). The pottery from the foundation-trench is of little help in defining the date of the foundation more precisely: the fine ware (contexts xxi.52 and xxiv.73) is similar to that from the Period III levels apart from one small sherd which may be Campana C and which may suggest a date in the first century B.C. (section C–D, context xxi.52, uncatalogued). In support of this very tentative indication of date it may be noted that large ashlar masonry makes its first appearance in the Casa Brogan in the first century B.C. (p. 148 ff., walls 19 and 1).

If the superstructure of wall V28 is not to be regarded as contemporary with the foundation beneath, there is no other criterion by which it may be dated. Its style of construction is consistent with subsequent building operations in both Period IV and Period V.
PERIOD IV (figure 60): early Tiberian

The next major development involved the establishment of the basic elements of the layout now visible on the surface. In the eastern part of the area examined, walls T7, T26, T29 and T14/V29 were now built of squared sandstone blocks resting on deep rubble foundations (see plates 41c, 42a). Close to wall T14/V29 in section E–F was a clay-lined oven. The area to the east of wall T26 was covered with a clay make-up layer, and this was covered in turn at the southern end of section E–F by an opus signinum surface (pl. 42a). Wall T27 was definitely suppressed now, if not already in Period III. Further west, in section J–K, the picture is slightly confused. KMK believed that the contemporary levels had been removed at a later date when wall T26 was replaced by wall T29: this seems to me to create greater difficulties than the assumption that wall T29 is contemporary with wall T26. Both walls are built from the same level and are associated with floors at the same level, and if wall T29 and its associated fill were to be dated later, there would be an inexplicable absence of levels in that area contemporary with wall T26. The added fill in section J–K is associated with the suppression of the mud-brick wall T30, and a partial rebuilding above the Period III level of wall V2. The rebuilding of wall V2 from this level (which may have been occasioned by the building of a cistern immediately to the west) is suggested by a change in the style of masonry: above the small stone work of Period II are two courses of larger ashlar blocks with roughly tooled faces and carefully drafted margins (pls. 41b, 41d). KMK noted the contrast between the high quality of the drafting and the apparent casualness with which the blocks are fitted together, and inferred from this that they may have been re-used in their present position. Certainly, this style of masonry seems to belong to an earlier period. (Cf. p. 165 and pl. 53a, defensive wall of the second century B.C.) These two courses were almost completely buried by the fill against them, which was sealed by a hard mortar floor running between walls V2 and T29 at a similar level to the opus signinum floor in section E–F. In section L–M were preserved traces of a thinner mortar floor in the space between walls T26 and T29.

On the west side of wall V2 a large cistern was constructed, roofed with flat cover-slabs. The cistern was built within a wide foundation-trench which is visible in sections G–H and N–O: in section G–H there was a substantial raising of ground-level to make it more or less flush with the capstones of the cistern, and the same is likely to be true in section N–O, though here the stratigraphy is confused. These fills seal the pits of Period IIIa. A mortar floor which covers the
capstones of the cistern in section N–O runs up to wall V6, suggesting that the visible part of the wall is either earlier than the cistern or contemporary with it. (Its earlier history, which was not investigated, is likely to be related to that of wall V2.) Wall V34, whose foundations are shown in figure 57 between walls V1 and V29, was not investigated but is perhaps also likely to belong to Period IV.

The dating-evidence for the developments just described is a little confused, and as the relevant groups of material are dependent on KMK’s interpretation of the stratigraphy with which I disagree in part, the separate strands are now impossible to unravel. The finds from the foundation-trenches for walls T14/V29, T26 and T7 and the associated opus signinum floor and make-up (context xxi.18), from the foundation-trench for the cistern and the associated make-up level in section G–H (context xxi.35) and from the foundation-trench and first covering of the cistern in section N–O (context xxi.10) included Italian Sigillata, Eastern Sigillata A and a few sherds of ‘Tripolitanian’ Sigillata. A terminal date of c. A.D. 15/20 is suggested by the following pieces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/ Cat. no.</th>
<th>Ware</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xxi.18/31</td>
<td>Italian Sigillata</td>
<td>Sherd of bowl, <em>Berenice</em> Form B211</td>
<td>c. AD 5/10–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.35, Reg. 1036</td>
<td>Italian Sigillata</td>
<td>Rim of carinated cup, <em>Berenice</em> Form B225A with applied double spiral</td>
<td>c. AD 10–20+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.35/180</td>
<td>Italian Sigillata</td>
<td>Decorated sherd, Comfort (1982) no. 26</td>
<td>‘Early Tiberian?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.35/179</td>
<td>Thin-walled ware</td>
<td>Sherd of rough-cast bowl in ‘Metallic Glaze Ware’, <em>Berenice</em> Form B459</td>
<td>‘Principally Tiberian’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lamps are mainly datable from the Augustan period or the first century A.D. (without further qualification); one Flavian fragment (Loeschcke Type IV, V or VIII) is intrusive.

The finds from levels of this period in section L–M to the west of wall T26 are catalogued in a single list with those from section J–K between walls V2 and T29 (context xxi.21). They include similar material to that already described, and the following later pieces in addition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Ware</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xxi.21/48</td>
<td>Italian Sigillata</td>
<td>Sherd of plate, <em>Berenice</em> B214</td>
<td>c. AD 30+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Italian Sigillata</td>
<td>Rim of bowl with applied rosette, <em>Berenice</em> B217</td>
<td>AD 35/45+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Italian Sigillata</td>
<td>Rim of dish, possibly <em>Berenice</em> B237</td>
<td>2nd half of C1 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Eastern Sigillata B</td>
<td>Part of dish, <em>Berenice</em> B345 (joining sherd in Period V, no. xxi.22/55)</td>
<td>Mid C1 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware</td>
<td>Sherd, early fabric</td>
<td>Flavian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>2 lamp frags.</td>
<td>Italian or African, Loeschcke Type VIII</td>
<td>C2 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Base of lamp</td>
<td>Italian or African, probably Loeschcke Type VIII, signed ME</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. 1262</td>
<td>Complete lamp</td>
<td>African, Loeschcke Type VIII with ship</td>
<td>2nd half of C2 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. 1263</td>
<td>Almost complete lamp</td>
<td>African, Loeschcke Type VIII, signed LMIRO (?)</td>
<td>2nd half of C2 AD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My assessment of this evidence in conjunction with the interpretation of the stratigraphy set out above is that this material is contaminated by intrusions from Period V, probably in the area between walls T29 and T26 where the stratigraphy is most complex.
PERIOD IVa

There are definite secondary surfaces in section E–F (contexts xxi.19, 20, fill of oven and mortar surface overlying it) and G–H (contexts xxii.36, 37, two successive mortar floors and possible insertion of extra block against cistern). These yielded no fine ware later than the date proposed for the beginning of Period IV, but the handle of a lamp of Flavian date is recorded from the fill of the oven (no. xxi.19/11) and two bases of second-century African lamps are listed from beneath the latest surface in section G–H (Loeschcke Type VIII, both under no. xxii.37/13).

The situation in section N–O is unclear: there appears to have been a definite cutting-down through the levels which run up against the cistern, which was then refilled and made good to something like the former level. The new fill incorporated two large stone blocks, laid without foundations (not shown on the plan in figure 57) and described as ‘Pier’ V37. Their purpose is wholly unclear, and a shallow cut above them suggests that they once supported a superstructure which was subsequently removed. The fine ware from the fill (contexts xxii.12, 13) included examples of Berenice Form B228B and B229B in Italian Sigillata, a base of Dragendorff Form 27 in South Gaulish Sigillata and a few sherds of Berenice Form B459 in thin-walled ware: it is impossible to derive from these any clear indication of the interval between the main Period IV developments and these subsequent activities. The cut (robber-trench?) above ‘pier’ V37 (context xxii.15) yielded only indeterminate sherds of Italian Sigillata and Eastern Sigillata A; it and a large part of the trench was sealed by a thin mortar floor at the present surface, but a number of sherds of African Red Slip Ware recorded in the main fill beneath and ranging in date from the first to the fourth centuries A.D. betoken the presence of later intrusions.

As originally constructed, the cistern was fitted with a draw-hole in the room enclosed by walls V3, V6 and V7. At some subsequent time the opening was closed by the insertion of a stone plug and the whole surface was made good by a new floor of opus signinum (pl. 43a). There is no surviving stratigraphic relationship between this floor and the surfaces in the rest of the trench, and the associated finds (context xxii.11) do not help to establish its date. The plan from which figure 57 was prepared shows what appears to be a draw-hole for the cistern on the south side of wall V7 (cf. fig. 56): this was perhaps created when the other opening was blocked (in connexion with the re-building of wall V7 in Period V?).

Wall V38 at the west end of section N–O is on the same line as wall V4 in section G–H, but it is built from a much lower level and there can be no relationship between the two. Because of later robbing its relationship to adjacent levels in the same section has been obscured. Its construction, with foundations of large blocks, differs from that typical of Period IV, and the presence of a sherd of early African Red Slip Ware in the foundation-trench (context xxii.14) may indicate a Flavian or later date.

PERIOD V (figure 61): second half of second century A.D.

The latest period for which there remains stratigraphic evidence in the area examined is represented by the refurbishment of floors in sections E–F and J–M and by the construction of several new walls. In the eastern part of the area, walls T26 and T29 were demolished, and the space which had formerly been divided into three rooms was now divided into two by the construction of wall T15. Evidence of date is provided by finds from the foundation-trench, from the robber trench above wall T26 and from beneath the latest mortar floors in this area (context xxi.22). These include much early Roman sigillata and a considerable number of sherds of African Red Slip Ware. The most plentifully represented form in the latter is Hayes Form 3C (first half of second century), but there were also one or two sherds of each of Hayes Forms 6, 14, 17, 28, 181 and 182. These are all consistent with a date in the second half of the second century A.D. (compare the finds from trench N1 behind the Antonine Temple, p. 201 ff.) and the intrusive lamps in the Period IV levels (context xxi.21, above, p. 132) must be regarded as providing further confirmation of this date.

In the western part of the area, there is a slight suggestion in section J–K that the upper part of
wall V2 was rebuilt. The shallow foundation for wall V4 (section G–H) cuts the uppermost surviving levels, and this wall is bonded into wall V1, the foundation-course of which is set about 30 cm. higher; the foundation-course of wall V3 is at a similar level, and walls V1 and V3 both butt against wall V2. They are all likely to belong to this period. KMK's notes record that the westerly part of wall V7, to the south of section N–O, appears also to belong to this period, and to represent a rebuilding on a slightly different line of a pre-existing wall. Wall V38 at the west
FIG. 63. Regio II, Insula 6: sections.
FIG. 64. Regio II, Insula 7: sections. (Conventions as in figure 63.)
end of section N–O was removed and robbed out, now or early in the third century: the fill of the robber-trench (context xxii.17) yielded fourteen examples of Hayes Form 3C in African Red Slip Ware, three sherds of Hayes Form 182 and one each of Hayes Forms 30 and 33, also six fragments of Loeschcke Type VIII African lamps (second century A.D.). Other upstanding walls continued in existence: the difficulty of attributing a date to the superstructure of wall V28 has been discussed above (p. 130). Wall X5.2 in section A–B is likewise later than the foundations of wall V28 (first century B.C.?) but otherwise undated.

(c) REGIO II, INSULA 7

It is more difficult to give an account of the excavation in this area than of that in Insula 6: the trenches fall into two essentially unrelated groups, the only plan (from which figure 65 has been drawn) is seriously incomplete, a number of walls were identified only from robber-trenches which are not shown in plan, and KMK's notes are difficult to follow, with many deletions and alterations. The finds from this area, however, make a significant contribution to the whole, and I have therefore felt it desirable to give some account of the stratigraphy, however inadequate. The account is based on two main sections, A–B and E–F, with supplementary information from sections C–D and G–H, all of which are illustrated in figure 64 opposite.

SECTIONS A–B AND C–D (trenches S.p.W1 to 4, 8, 10: plate 43b)

The earliest occupation-levels were not associated with any structures (at least in the area excavated) but yielded pottery of the second quarter of the fourth century B.C. (context xxiii.1: see Ch. IX, nos. 58, 101, 112–115). These are cut by the foundations of walls W34, W35 and W38, which are built of small rough stones set in clay, and are overlaid by an associated mortar floor. The fine ware (context xxiii.2: see Ch. IX, no. 82) is no later than that from the levels beneath but the walls may belong to the second half of the century if they are contemporary with wall W41 in section E–F (see below). The next development was the construction of four ovens built of mud-brick; it is unclear whether the earlier walls continued in existence in this phase, though the associated make-up level was pierced by a number of post-holes which may suggest a different superstructure. The date of the ovens is uncertain, for while the fine ware from this make-up (context xxiii.3) includes a number of sherds of Campana A Ware amongst which are a rim of Berenice Form B4 and a base of a bowl with rounded foot-profile and a central rosette-stamp which is likely to belong to the second half of the second century B.C., the same context yielded a fragment of an Italian Warzenlampe of the second half of the first century B.C. and a handle of a Loeschke Type VIII Italian or African lamp of the second century A.D. The last of these items at least must be intrusive. The fill within the ovens, signalling their demise (context xxiii.4) yielded seven sherds of Campana A and the nozzle of a lamp, probably Italian of c. 25 B.C.–A.D. 25. This fill was sealed by a layer of grey pebbly sea-sand which covered both the tops of the ovens and the remains of the early walls, and which yielded pottery of early Tiberian date corresponding to Period IV in Insula 6 (context xxiii.7: Italian Sigillata of Berenice Group A; Berenice Forms B314, B318, B319, B323, B326 and Hayes, AFC, Form 42 in Eastern Sigillata A; Berenice Form B459 in thin-walled ware; two Augustan lamp-fragments of Bronner Type XXI and one of Bronner Type XXI dated 'Tiberian–Neronian?'). Above this level is an alternating succession of mortar surfaces and occupation-material some sixty centimetres deep which suggests that the area had become a thoroughfare. The fine ware from these levels (contexts xxiii.8–19) belongs mostly to the latter part of the first century A.D. and to the early second (Berenice Groups D and J in Italian Sigillata, several examples of Berenice Form B376 in Cypriot Sigillata – a surprising patch here of this ware, otherwise barely attested in other
EXCAVATIONS IN REGIO II. INSULA 7

FIG. 65. Regio II. Insula 7: plan of excavations, showing numbering of walls and locations of sections. (After a drawing by C. Catanuso.)
excavation areas —, African Red Slip Ware of Hayes Forms 3A, 3B, 5B, 8A, 181.1, many Loeschcke Type VIII Italian lamps); a barbarous radiate coin (context xxiii.10, no. 304) is clearly intrusive.

The inference that the area was now part of a street is confirmed by the construction in the second half of the second century A.D. of a substantial stone drain following its course (see section C–D). The fill of the foundation-trench and the levels sealed beneath the overlying mortar surface (context xxiii.20–23, 25) yielded Hayes Forms 3B, 4A, 5A, 5B, 6, 7A, 7B, 8A, 9A, 11, 23B, 27/31, 181 and 182 in African Red Slip Ware and again many Loeschcke Type VIII Italian lamps. The construction of this drain was clearly part of the extensive late Antonine drainage scheme which included similar works in the Forum (Forum Period III: p. 24 ff.) and in the street to the west of the Casa Brogan (below, p. 158).

The construction of the drain was also contemporary with that of walls W1, W2 and W7 in its immediate vicinity. The drain must have been built first, for wall W1 appears to be built partly on top of it towards the east, and confines the street to a narrower course, now paved, on its south side.

A layer of orange clay across the whole area, the uppermost level now surviving (context xxiii.26) yielded a similar range of African Red Slip Ware to the preceding levels, but a higher proportion of Hayes Forms 181 and 182, a rim of Hayes Form 33 and one of Berenice Form B623, which together suggest a date in the early third century A.D.

SECTIONS E–F AND G–H (trenches S.p.W6, 7, 9: plate 43c–d)

The upper levels in these trenches yielded six sherds of Attic black-glazed ware of the fifth century B.C. (Ch. IX, nos. 5, 166, 168–170, 181), which suggests that there was occupation in the vicinity at this date. The earliest levels however, which consist of a succession of occupation-layers associated with clay floors, post-holes and pits (context xxiii.28–33), yielded only three sherds of fine ware, two of which might belong to the fifth century whilst the third is dated to the third quarter of the fourth (Ch. IX, nos. 1, 109 and 165). The first stone structure is wall W41 in section E–F (not shown on plan); the associated levels (context xxiii.35) yielded much Attic black-glazed ware of the second quarter of the fourth century B.C. or earlier (including Ch. IX, nos. 37, 63, 64, 121, 157, 174, 192, 193) and the following later objects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xxiii.35/17c</td>
<td>Handle-fragment from body, Attic b.g. ware (Ch. IX, no. 72)</td>
<td>c. 350–325 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiii.35/19</td>
<td>Rim of bowl, pre-Campana b.g. ware, profile as Agora xii, no. 835</td>
<td>2nd half of C4 BC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiii.35, uncat.</td>
<td>Rim of plate, Attic b.g. ware with metallic grey slip (Ch. IX, no. 134)</td>
<td>2nd half of C4 or 1st half of C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin no. 306</td>
<td>Punic (A)</td>
<td>Mid–late C4 BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seems likely that this wall belongs to the late fourth century B.C.: the evidence from this trench, together with that from excavations in Regio II, Insula 6 (p. 127) and in the Casa Brogan area (p. 143) suggests that this was the time when building in stone first commenced at Sabratha on a wide scale.

There are layers of clay and burnt matter running up to either side of wall W41 (context xxiii.36) and above these is built wall W42, of similarly rough construction, running parallel to section E–F and butted up against wall W41. The partial dismantling of wall W42 (context xxiii.37) yielded the following datable items.
A date in the first part of the third century is therefore possible for this wall.

The next stratigraphic horizon in this trench is represented by the demolition of walls W41 and W42, which are covered by a thick fill of tipped material capped by a layer of orange clay (context xxiii.38). On this surface was a hearth, represented by a burnt depression, but no walls of this period were found within the trench. The stratigraphy in the centre of section E–F suggests the possibility that there was a wide foundation-trench attributable to this period running at right-angles to the trench, and that its contents were subsequently robbed out. There was apparently a similar robber-trench running parallel to the excavation on its western edge. The excavation of this sector was limited in depth by safety factors, and the bottom of the inferred foundation- and robber-trenches was not investigated. KMK attributed wall W14 at the west end of the section to this phase, as the fill under discussion is level with the top of its footing-course. However, the style of masonry is inconsistent with the date suggested below, and other considerations also indicate that it must belong to the succeeding phase: its foundation-trench, which is not shown on the original section drawing, must have been very narrow on this side. The fine ware from the relevant levels was prolific: amongst the fourth-century or earlier sherds are Ch. IX, nos. 4, 47, 62, 91, 100, 128, 156, 169 and 181. Later pieces were as follows.

None of this offers a very precise criterion of date, but the total absence of Campana A Ware apart from the one piece noted, in contrast to its regular presence in second-century deposits elsewhere, suggests strongly that this context is to be dated in the third rather than the second century.

The next phase is represented by the establishment of the basic layout now visible at the surface, in the late Augustan or early Tiberian period. (Comparison with Period IV in Regio II, Insula 6 suggests that the latter is more likely.) The supposed walls of the preceding phase were robbed out, and above a level of burning is another substantial fill capped by a surface of hard orange clay. Section G–H shows that wall W13 was built at this time, with a deep foundation-trench cutting through the earlier levels. Further north, the fill of the robber-trench previously described runs uniformly up to it. Wall W13 is built of sandstone ashlars similar to wall W14 which was also built now (see pl. 43c) and to walls of this period on other parts of the site.
The attribution of Wall W14 to this phase rather than to the preceding one (as indicated in KMK's notes) is based both on its style of construction and on the evidence of trench S.p. X4 which was cut against the other side of it 3 m. further west (approximate position shown in figure 56, not otherwise illustrated: section but not plan recorded). In this trench the levels associated with its construction (context xxiv.66-67) yielded a sherd each of Italian and 'Tripolitanian' Sigillata (nos. xxiv.67/7, 6), a thin-walled hemispherical bowl with sanded decoration in 'metallic glaze ware', Berenice Form B459 (no. xxiv.67/1) and the base of an Italian lamp, probably Loeschcke Type IA (Augustan–Tiberian; no. xxiv.67/10). A sherd of early African Red Slip Ware (no. xxiv.66/8) and two other fragments of Italian lamps of Loeschcke Type VIII (c. A.D. 90–150, nos. xxiv.67/9, 11) must be intrusive as wall W14 can certainly be no later than this phase.

It is likely, but not demonstrable, that wall 12 at the north end of section E–F belongs in origin to the same structural phase.

The date suggested above for this phase (context xxiii.39) is supported by the presence of large quantities of Italian Sigillata (including Berenice Forms B201, B202, B205, B208 [with double spirals], Comfort 1982, nos. 11 [decorated sherd] and 114 [stamped base]) and of Eastern Sigillata A (including Berenice Forms B326, B333, B334, B335 and Hayes, AFC, Form 46), a few sherds of 'Tripolitanian' Sigillata (including Berenice Forms B409 and B410) and many Italian lamps of Loeschcke Type IA and Bronner Type XXI, dated Augustan–Tiberian. A single sherd of African Red Slip Ware of the third century A.D. (no. xxiii.39/151) is clearly intrusive.

The final phase represented in section E–F (context xxiii.40) is associated with a succession of further clay and mortar surfaces running the entire length of the section and, prior to the first of them, the insertion of a large barrel-vaulted cistern against the south side of wall 12 (pl. 43d). The draw-hole for this cistern appears to be in the adjoining room to the west. It is unclear whether wall 12 was built in this or the preceding phase, for the stratigraphy against it has been affected by the construction of the cistern. The latter is perhaps the more probable, in which case its superstructure must have been altered at this time with the placing of a threshold at the new ground-level. This presumably corresponds to the level of the paving in the street outside, though of this I can find no record.

As already stated, this final phase, the finds from which have been catalogued as a single group (context xxiii.40), incorporates in fact one or more surfaces above that which first seals the roof of the cistern and this has weakened the dating-evidence for its construction. The relevant finds are the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xxiii.40/91</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware, rim, Hayes Form 3B</td>
<td>c. AD 75–150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware, rim, Hayes Form 3C</td>
<td>Early–mid C2 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39, 44, 97</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware, 4 sherds, early fabric</td>
<td>Flavian or later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93, 94</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware, 2 rims, Hayes Form 182</td>
<td>2nd half of C2–1st half of C3 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40, 95</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware, 2 rims, Hayes Form 17, bright slip</td>
<td>Early–mid C3 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware, rim, Berenice Form B613</td>
<td>Early C3 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware, 2 rims, Hayes Form 31</td>
<td>Early C3 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware, rim, Hayes Form 27/31</td>
<td>Early C3 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41, 43</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware, 5 sherds, fabric as Hayes Form 31 etc.</td>
<td>Early–mid C3 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware, rim, Hayes Form 59</td>
<td>c. AD 320–420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware, rim, Hayes Form 67</td>
<td>c. AD 360–470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin no. 328</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C3–C4 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Licinius I</td>
<td>AD 318–320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Theodosius I</td>
<td>AD 379–395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>Theodosius II</td>
<td>AD 402–450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The coins, whose original layer designations are known, were found either in the surface sand or in a shallow superficial cutting, and it must surely be assumed that the two latest dated sherds of
red slip ware were similarly superficial. Beyond that, it may be suggested that the cistern was constructed either in the early third century A.D. (if all of the other sherds are relevant) or that it is contemporary with the other major works (building alterations, laying of drainage system, paving of streets) which took place at Sabratha in the late Antonine period. The later material indicates continuing occupation at a later date (which must in any case be presumed here, in the area between the main public buildings and the harbour), and its presence is presumably due to the chance that the previous excavators had not removed the later levels in this room quite so comprehensively as elsewhere in the area.
FIG. 66. General plan of Regio II, Insula 10, showing the location of the 'Casa Brogan' excavations. (After a drawing by Michael Ballance.)
CHAPTER V

REGIO II, INSULA 10: THE CASA BROGAN

(P.M.K.)

This name was given familiarly to part of an insula to the east of the East Forum Temple, whose excavation was initially supervised by Olwen Brogan (now Mrs. Hackett). The area is also referred to more formally in the excavation records as Site H and as 'Regio II, Insula 10, House G'. In view of the cumbersome nature of the latter designation, and of the absence now of any record of how the subdivisions of the insula were defined or arrived at, the name 'Casa Brogan' is used here for preference. A general plan of the insula, after a survey by Michael Ballance, is shown in figure 66 opposite, and a more detailed plan of the excavation area, based on drawings by Dennis Hickley, is shown in figure 76 at the end of the chapter. Plate 44a shows the area examined at the outset of the excavation.

The Casa Brogan was excavated principally in 1948 and 1949. Three further trenches (Y1, Z1 and Z2) were excavated in Regio II, Insula 10 in 1951, but in the absence of both location- and detail-plans, it is impossible now to make any use of the information that was derived from them. The excavation, in a residential area close to the centre of the Roman town, was set in a house on the western side of the insula where the presence of late Roman mosaics exposed by the Italian excavators suggested the presence beneath of an undisturbed stratigraphic sequence which might provide a key to the interpretation of the pottery from other parts of the site (Ward-Perkins 1949, 22). In the event, depths of up to 3.5 metres of surviving occupational deposits were recorded.

As in other parts of the Sabratha excavation, the surviving notebooks contain an interpretation of the sequence for each trench in KMK's hand, in addition to the bare description of the levels. There was also a manuscript by KMK containing a preliminary draft of her report on the area. However, it was discovered at an early stage that the interpretation set out in this draft had been superseded by a later tabulation of periods in one of the notebooks, which seems to have been drawn up by KMK after the study of the finds. The fine wares have now been reviewed by myself, and Donald Bailey has commented on the lamps for me. In the light of this information, even the second interpretation was not found to be wholly satisfactory, and the account of the building which is set out in the following pages is my own, based upon the evidence of the finds and upon a careful re-evaluation of the drawn sections. This account is, however, wholly dependent on the sequences determined for the individual trenches by KMK, for the marks now visible on the pottery relate only to these, and it is rarely possible to get back to the original layer-numbers.

The drawings have been prepared entirely by myself from the original site records and some preliminary drafts in ink. The sections reproduced in figures 79 and 80 at the end of the chapter include some trenches across the eastern part of the insula, where the recording of the excavation...
was less full than elsewhere. KMK clearly had difficulty in incorporating these into her interpretation and I have also found it difficult to make use of these; they are however included for the sake of completeness and of the few conclusions that it is possible to draw from them. It should also be said at this point that it has been extremely difficult to establish the relative (physical) levels of the various sections. The correlation is based on a number of survey points across the site, but these were few in number, and when extrapolated across the excavated trenches a number of irreconcilable conflicts was found. These were at least partly evident to KMK. In the circumstances, I have abandoned any attempt to show a universal datum-level on the sections: I have matched them to one another using the coursing of the intervening walls where possible, and otherwise the best fit which could be derived from the given levels. The result is less than perfect, and it is possible that in some sections an apparent correspondence between layers on either side of a break is misleading. For this I offer an apology and a note of warning: I have done the best I can. (It will also be observed that certain of the sections are incomplete with regard to the upper levels: this is a feature of the drawings upon which they are based, and I have generally felt it wiser to reproduce the information as it has been available to me, rather than to attempt a questionable reconstruction of the missing parts.)

The stratigraphy of the Casa Brogan is extremely complex, and there are certain difficulties which were perhaps not appreciated at the time of the excavation, and which are almost impossible to resolve now on the basis of the surviving records. This is not, however, to belittle the competence of the excavators, who were clearly often working in trenches which were both deep and narrow, with a substantial weight of masonry threatening them from above. It is a further result of this complexity that it is rarely possible to extrapolate beyond the actual trenches which were excavated, in order to say which of the later walls now exposed on the surface had antecedents in earlier periods: it is therefore only for the latest periods that any extensive plans can be shown.

Summary of the history of the building

Insula 10 of Regio II forms a long narrow strip lying immediately to the east of the forum complex. The initial clearance of the area was carried out by the Italian excavators, and the plan visible today (fig. 66) is a composite affair, including walls which belong to a number of different periods. The levels to which the complex has been exposed are varied, and the remaining surfaces along the central axis of the insula are considerably higher than those adjoining the streets on either side. To a certain extent this difference is real, for in the area of the British excavations it was found that the successive strata were frequently thicker in the centre of the block; but it is also conditioned by the fact that late mosaic floors were found in several of the central rooms, whereas on either side the clearance was carried to a lower level in the absence of such well-defined surfaces.

The plan in figure 66 is dominated by the long wall 1, which runs almost the whole length of the insula, and which for a while served as a party-wall between the houses facing onto the streets on either side, also delineating an alleyway which ran between the properties. But in the excavated area (which was concentrated mainly to the west of this wall) it was shown that wall 1 did not belong to either the earliest or the latest phases of the Casa Brogan. The earliest pottery from the site appears to go back as far as the fourth century B.C., and there may have been a short period of occupation in the area before the first stone structures were erected (Period I). The most clearly defined of these structures is wall 19, which probably represented a boundary between two properties at this time. The house on the west side of wall 19 was substantially enlarged in the early second century B.C., at which time the street to the west and the buildings on the other side of it were constructed (Period II): this was probably the occasion when the insula as a whole was laid out.

During the early first century B.C. the ground-level in the western part of the site was substantially raised, apparently in two stages, and it was at this time that the new spine-wall 1 was constructed (Period III). The relationship between the contemporary levels suggests that the space between walls 1 and 19 now became part of the property on the west side of wall 19. In the
Augustan period a cellar was excavated in the space between walls 1 and 19, and though this room had a fairly brief existence, having been filled in again during the second quarter of the first century A.D., it underwent a number of modifications, including the installation of a vat and a curious circular structure, during its lifetime (Period IV).

At some point around the beginning of the second century A.D., almost every wall which was then standing was rebuilt on the same line, with substantially strengthened foundations (Period V). The character of the reconstruction suggests that it took place as a consequence of earthquake damage, corroborating similar evidence from the East Forum Temple (Forum Period II). The house in the area excavated had by now (if not already in Period III) attained the layout which was to survive without major alteration until the Byzantine reconquest in the sixth century A.D.: it consisted of ranges of rooms around three sides of a courtyard, the fourth side of which lay along the street frontage. Late in the second century A.D. this property was changed in function from residential to some kind of industrial use: concrete-lined vats were inserted into the courtyard and the floors of two of the rooms (Period VII). This use persisted until the second half of the fourth century, and then the vats were filled in and new floors were laid above them; three of the rooms at the rear of the house were embellished with mosaics, and the courtyard appears to have been reduced in size by the construction of extra rooms or corridors at either end (Period VIII).

For how long the occupation of the building continued after this time, and indeed whether it was continuous until the Arab conquest, it is impossible now to say because of the prior removal of the overlying strata. It seems likely, however, that there was a period of decay or abandonment in the fifth century, for the latest superstructure (Period IX), which is likely to belong to the period following the restoration of Byzantine rule in A.D. 533, follows only in part the earlier layout, and makes use of new walls which are built across the mosaics.

**PERIOD I (figure 67)**

The earliest structures found on the site are wall 19 (see fig. 79, sections O–P–Q–R and S–T–U–V), wall 42 (fig. 79, section N–O) and wall 3 (fig. 77, section E–F). Each of these is constructed on trench-built foundations of rubble set in clay. The foundation-trenches go down into the natural sand, but they also cut through levels which already contain occupation-material: it is not possible to draw any distinction in date between the material which is contemporary with these walls and that which is stratigraphically earlier. In sections N–O/O–P the first floors observed were on top of a fill about 40 cm. thick which sealed the foundation-trenches of walls 19 and 42; that on the north side of wall 42 was apparently of mud-brick and was at a slightly lower level than that on the south, which had a mortar surface. In section E–F a hard mortar floor was identified which ran up to wall 3 and sealed its foundation-trench.

The construction of these walls above ground was varied. The east face of wall 19 is of small blocks, irregularly coursed but on the whole carefully dressed and fitted together (the lower part of the wall in pl. 45a and b); the west face is of similar appearance in the northern part (at section E–F: see pl. 44b), but wholly different further south at section O–P (pl. 44c). Here, where wall 42 is bonded into it, the face is far rougher in appearance and is more characteristic of a foundation, though the levels running up to it show that it must have been exposed. Presumably, the east face of the wall was on the outside of the building and correspondingly greater care was taken over its appearance. It is possible that the area crossed by sections E–F and J–K–L–M was an internal courtyard, open to the sky (see Period Ia), and this might account for the difference in character between the west face of wall 19 in sections E–F and O–P. (The interior walls were perhaps rendered, though no trace of this was recorded.) Wall 3 seems to have been built in the manner of the 'finer' style, though this is not entirely clear from the records. Wall 101, running parallel to wall 42 and sited 2.20 m. to the north of it (see fig. 79, section L–M), existed in Period Ia and may have been original to Period I, forming the southern boundary of the suggested courtyard.

Also probably to be attributed to this period are a succession of early levels without associated structures to the west of wall 3 in section A–B–C–D (fig. 77). On the east side of wall 19, there is
a contemporary clay floor in section U–V (fig. 79), and there were also traces of early occupation-levels beneath the ‘cellar room’ in sections Q–R, A′–B′ and C′–D′.

**Dating evidence**

The relevant contexts are nos. xiv.1, 16–18, 27, 28, 42–44, 54, 55, 72–75, 87 and 88. Between them, these yielded two coins and the following datable pieces of fine ware.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28/2</td>
<td>A–B</td>
<td>Part of a bowl in Attic b.g. ware, Ch. IX, no. 111</td>
<td>c. 380 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88/2</td>
<td>N–O/O–P</td>
<td>Part of a bowl with a thick incurved rim, pre-Campana or Attic b.g. ware, approximately as Morel F2714</td>
<td>Possibly late C4 BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 88/3     | N–O/O–P | Rim of krater in Campana C ware, similar to Morel F4741 [intrusive?] | 'First half or mid C2 BC?'
| 88/5     | N–O/O–P | Slightly thickened rim of a b.g. handled cup, not Attic, possibly as Morel F4121 or F4125 | Late C4 BC |
| 88/6     | N–O/O–P | Part of b.g. bowl with a thickened vertical rim, projecting slightly on the outside, possibly as Agora xii, no. 785 | ('c. 420 BC') |
| 54/5     | U–V     | Base of skyphos in Attic b.g. ware, Ch. IX, no. 8 | 450–400 BC |
| 72/1     | A′–B′/C′–D′ | Part of a dish in fine, pale pink clay with flaking, lustrous grey-black slip; profile approximately as Morel F1514c | ('Around 300 BC') |

These items (apart from the rim of Campana C, which must be intrusive) suggest that the structures attributed to Period I were erected around the end of the fourth century B.C. after a
period of earlier occupation of uncertain, but probably brief duration. This is also indicated by
the chronological range of the coins found on the site as a whole (see below, p. 272): apart from
the two listed above, two others have been dated mid–late fourth century B.C. and a further
seven are attributed to the late fourth century or the early part of the third. There were none of
earlier date.

PERIOD Ia (figure 67)

An early modification to the building described above involved the insertion of a stone paving in
the area between walls 3 and 19 and north of wall 101. The paving is composed of rectangular
stone slabs, 10 cm. thick and up to 105 x 50 cm. in plan, laid neatly in rows running parallel to
wall 19 (pl. 44b). The provision of such paving indoors would be surprising, and this is partly
responsible for the suggestion made above that the area in which it was laid was an open
courtyard at the time. The paved area is bounded on the east side by wall 19, and on the south by
wall 101 which must have been built now if not previously. To the north, in section E–F, the
paving was incomplete and the contemporary surface was continued in mortar; but the area
excavated was too small for the somewhat confused character of the features here to be clear. Its
western boundary was not located.

It is clear from section E–F (fig. 77) that the stone paving was not original to the Period I
building, for here it (and its continuation in mortar) overlies the original mortar floor which runs
up to wall 3. An opus signinum floor which runs up to the south side of wall 101 (fig. 77, section
L–M) may be contemporary with the paving, though there is a discontinuity here with the
adjoining section N–O which cannot be resolved from the records: its continuation may be
represented by a clay surface in that section which is level with the highest surviving part of wall
42.

There is no direct dating-evidence for the stone paving, and it is possible that it is
contemporary with Period II: all that is clear is that it belongs stratigraphically after Period I and
before Period III. The finds from beneath the new floors in section N–O (context xiv.89) include
three coins of the fourth and early third centuries B.C. (see p. 266), but the only fine ware was an
intrusive sherd of Italian Sigillata (no. xiv.89/3)! The absence of any other features in this part of
the building which can be attributed to Period II is suggestive.

On the east side of wall 19, the construction of wall 41 which runs parallel to it (fig. 79, section
U–V) is to be placed between Periods I and II. The foundations of the wall are trench-built,
cutting through accumulation on top of the Period I surface and sealed by a clay floor which runs
up to both walls. There is only one sherd of fine ware from these levels (contexts xiv.56 and 57),
a rim-fragment probably from an Attic black-glazed bolsal of the fourth century (no. xiv.57/1),
which does not therefore help to define the date of this development.

The level of wall 47, which follows a similar line further south (fig. 80, section A’–B’) suggests
that it may belong to the same period. There was no fine ware from the clay floor and make-up
level on its western side (context xiv.76).

PERIOD II (fig. 68)

This period saw a major expansion of the building on the west side of wall 19. Excavations in the
north-west quarter (fig. 77, sections A–F, G–H) shows that walls 27 and 38b were built at this
time, and probably also walls 26 and 38a; the rooms which they enclosed were paved with floors
of opus signinum. It is likely that there were contemporary structures running up to wall 27 further
to the south as well, but this area was much disturbed by the construction of vats and a cistern in
later periods which prevented this from being established.

This expansion of the building appears to have been part of a more extensive development in
this area, for section A–B (fig. 77) shows that the building across the street to the west was
constructed from the same level as wall 27, and that a substantial fill in the intervening space seals
both of their foundation-trenches. A thin layer of brown clay capping this fill may have been the first street surface. It may therefore be that the whole area was first systematically built over at this time, and there is evidence from sections J'-K' and L'-M' (below, p. 164 ff.) to suggest that this building activity was accompanied by a newly extended defensive circuit.

**Dating evidence**

The Period II horizons are marked by the first appearance of Campana A Ware from the Naples/Ischia region. The relevant level in section C–D yielded only a single sherd of fine ware (context xiv.45, uncatologued), a rim of a dish in Campana A as Morel F2234e–g ('third quarter of second century B.C.') The fill beneath the street in section A–B (context xiv.30) yielded four sherds of local black-glazed ware, a bowl with rosette-stamps from the central Italian ‘Atelier des petites estampilles’ (first third of third century B.C.) and one definite sherd of Campana A, in addition to two earlier sherds of Attic or pre-Campana black-glazed ware. The expansion of the building and the laying-out of the surrounding insulae may therefore be tentatively attributed to the second century B.C. (Campana A was not exported significantly beyond its area of production until the end of the third century: see Morel 1978, 157 and Id. 1981, 47.)

**Developments east of wall 19**

To the east of wall 19, in section U–V (fig. 79), wall 41 was demolished and wall 40 was built, running on an approximately parallel course but displaced 90 cm. to the east. The space between walls 19 and 40 was now bounded on the south side by wall 7 (fig. 79, section Y–Z), which butts cleanly against wall 19; both of the new walls were built neatly of small stones, similar in character to wall 19, and the accumulated soil between them was surfaced with a new clay floor.
which ran up to all three walls. There was also a clay floor on the east side of wall 40, which appears to continue at the same level throughout section S–T: the interpretation of this latter trench is, however, beset with difficulty and it is possible that these surfaces are not in fact related. (The correspondence of level may be illusory: see above, p. 142.)

The construction of the room bounded by walls 40, 7 and 19 may be broadly contemporary with the Period II developments in the property on the west side of wall 19. The only direct dating-evidence is a single sherd of Campana A Ware from the make-up level (no. xiv.59/1): this is a fragment from the base of a bowl with a rosette stamp approximately as Berenice stamp X11, whose date can hardly be defined more closely than the second century as a whole. It is heavily water-worn.

PERIOD IIIa

The main characteristic of this period is the laying of new mortar or opus signinum floors throughout the building, on top of a substantial fill of clay which is up to 50 cm. deep in places. This fill is clearly shown in sections C–D, E–F/J–K, L–M/S–T and N–O/O–P. In sections C–D and E–F the pre-existing differentials in level between the rooms was retained, but between sections L–M and N–O a more uniform level was established, with consequently very little added fill in section N–O. This levelling-up was accompanied by the removal of walls 101 and 42, and the new clay floor just seals the remaining courses of the latter.

Wall 17 in section L–M (fig. 79) stands directly on the Period Ia paving and the fill and floor of Period IIIa are shown resting against it, implying that it was in position before they were laid down. The irregularity of its face suggests, however, that the lower courses represent foundations inserted from a level above the floor of Period IIIa, and that it is more likely to belong to Period IIIb (see pl. 46a). The stratigraphy on either side of the wall does not seem to demand the presence of a dividing feature in Period IIIa, and it is possible that the foundation-trench for its insertion was sufficiently narrow on the south side not to have been apparent. (KMK’s notes make the point that it may well have been wider on the north side of the wall, which was not examined.)

The purpose of the raising of level in Period IIIa can only be guessed at. The street on the west side of the insula was already at a somewhat higher level (see fig. 77, section A–F), and the intention may have been to raise the floors inside the building more nearly to this level. Clearly there was also some alteration in the layout of the building, involving perhaps the extension of the courtyard following the suppression of walls 101 and 42, but the plan is still too fragmentary for any broad conclusions to be drawn.

Dating evidence

The relevant contexts are nos. xiv.21, 46, 90 and 115. Of these, context xiv.115 (sections L–M/S–T) is the most informative, yielding the following fine ware.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115/3</td>
<td>Base of large plate with a broad band of rouletting on the floor in Campana C Ware.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115/12</td>
<td>Sherd of Eastern Sigillata A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115/13</td>
<td>Part of dish with rolled rim in 'Pompeian-Red' Ware: the form is a shallow variant of Berenice Form B482 and the fabric is composed of a sandy red clay, fired buff at the surface, with a smooth, dull red slip on the inside and over the top of the rim. This fabric is more common at Sabratha than the Campanian fabric (Peacock 1977, fabric 1), but appears to be contemporary with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115/1, 2, 4, 5</td>
<td>5 sherds of other black-glazed wares (pre-Campana, Campana A, local).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The simultaneous presence of Campana C, Eastern Sigillata A and Pompeian-Red Ware indicates a date early in the first century B.C. As to the other contexts, the only fine ware recorded from
the relevant layers in section C–D is a sherd of Italian Sigillata (xiv.46, uncatalogued) which must be intrusive; sections E–F/J–K (context xiv.21) yielded eleven sherds of earlier black-glazed wares (pre-Campana, Campana A) and an intrusive base in Italian Sigillata (no. xiv.21/12), and no finds were separately recorded from sections N–O/O–P (context xiv.90). All of these contexts are, however, clearly sealed by the layers attributed to Period IIIb.

**Developments east of wall 19**

In section U–V, a similar thick clayey fill overlies the top of wall 40, which was either demolished or had fallen into ruin at this stage. This fill (context xiv.60) yielded a coin of c. 208–148 B.C. and several sherds of Campana A Ware (*Berenice* Forms B10, B12), the latest of which was a bowl with everted rim and small leaf-shaped 'palmette' stamps, probably of the second half of the second century B.C. (no. xiv.60/10 + 13: *Berenice* Form B14).

**PERIOD IIIb (fig. 69)**

Above the Period IIIa levels is an even more substantial fill extending throughout the building. A dark layer of occupation material and some cuttings into the previous surface in section L–M imply an interval of time between the two, and the finds from Period IIIb give some slight indication that this may have amounted to perhaps a generation. KMK recorded in her notes the possibility that this fill consisted partly of decayed mud-brick: it may signify the partial collapse of the building, and it was certainly accompanied by some significant changes in its layout. In the north-west quarter, the remains of walls 38a (fig. 77, section G–H) and 38b (section C–D) were buried. At section O–P–Q–R, wall 19 was partly rebuilt: the east face of the new section, which evidently remained exposed, was composed of large, finely dressed ashlar blocks (pl. 45a), whilst
the west face was very rough in construction and was clearly intended to be hidden by the deep fill behind (pl. 46c). This new section of wall was wider than before, and the foundations projected some 10 cm. beyond the west face of the original wall beneath; this widened backing starts at a level approximately 60 cm. below the lowest course of ashlar masonry on the east face, and close inspection of plate 45a suggests that some of the uppermost blocks of the Period I wall may have been reset here. There were no contemporary levels on this side of the wall, as they had all been removed when a cellar was excavated in this space in Period IV; but the characteristics of the re-building in Period IIIb suggest that the ground-level may have been at the base of the new ashlar masonry (which would also be consistent with the appearance of the lower part of wall 1 in section E'-F'). This style of masonry is absent further north at section U-V (pl. 45b), where the wall presumably remained intact.

On the west side of wall 19 in this area, it is clear that wall 380 was now constructed (fig. 79, section L-M-N-O). Only the foundations of this period survive, the upper part having been rebuilt in Period V; but they are cut slightly into the Period IIIa fill, and the fill of Period IIIb runs up against either side.

To the east of wall 19, a new spine-wall, wall 1, was now built. Its foundation-trench is clear in section U-V (fig. 79), and this is sealed by a thick tipped fill similar to that found elsewhere. This probably represents an eastward expansion of the house to the west. The stratigraphy of section W-X, which implies that all the layers on that side of the wall are subsequent to its construction, is problematic (see p. 164). Wall 1 was built of large squared blocks, and its eastern face where exposed further south at section G'-H' is shown in plate 46b.

Wall 17, where it was exposed in section L-M (fig. 79 and pl. 46a), is built of similar large blocks. Further west, in section G-H (fig. 77), it is clearly of later date and appears to have been built from a higher level in Period V; but in section L-M the large blocks go down deeper, and it is unlikely that the builders would have dug its foundations as deep as the Period Ia paving if they were starting from so high up. On the other hand, the irregularity of the south face of the wall indicates that it can hardly have been intended to be exposed, and it is unlikely to belong earlier than Period IIIb (see above, p. 147). I am therefore inclined to suggest that the eastern part of wall 17 at least is to be attributed to Period IIIb, and that the fill of this period in section L-M is shown correctly as running up against it. The style of masonry is certainly consistent with that of wall 1 and of the rebuilt section of wall 19.

The plan of the Casa Brogan at this period is too fragmentary for its character to be certain. No definite floor surfaces were found which could be attributed to it, which is puzzling: it seems unlikely that they would have been removed wholly without trace during the later history of the building. However, in view of the extent to which the rebuilding in Period V was found to adhere to the layout of Period IIIb wherever it was tested by excavation, it is highly likely that other parts of the Period V layout also follow lines which existed in Period IIIb.

**Dating evidence**

The most prolific fills in this period were contexts xiv.47-50 (sections C-D/G-H), 22, 23 (sections E-F/J-K) and 117, 118 (sections L-M/S-T). The individual sherds of importance are too numerous to list in full, but the presence of Campana B Ware (Morel Forms 2257 and 7551), of Campana C (Morel Forms 1252 and 2352), of Eastern Sigillata A (Berenice Forms B313-4, B323) and of Pompeian-Red Ware (fabric and form mostly as no. xiv.115/13: above, p. 147) assures a date in the first century B.C. A fragment of an Italian Dressel Type 2 Warzenlampe (no. xiv.50/29), of the second half of the century, may be the latest object which genuinely belongs here. There are a few later intrusions, which include a coin of the second century A.D. (context xiv. 118, no. 201), but these are insufficient to invalidate the main body of the evidence. There was no fine ware from the relevant layers in sections N-O/O-P (context xiv.91). The attribution of wall 1 and the fill against it in section U-V (context xiv.61) to this period is suggested by the

---

1 This wall is numbered 38 in the site records, inadvertently duplicating the numbers 38a and 38b applied to walls in the north-western part of the site. It is referred to here and subsequently as wall 380 in order to avoid confusion.
presence of sherds of late Campana A Ware (nos. xiv.61/19-21) and of a base of a small dish in Campana C (no. xiv.61/24).

In the street to the west of the Casa Brogan (fig. 77, section A-B) there appears to have been a similar rise in level to that within the building. Whether this was exactly contemporaneous is impossible to say. Traces of two surfaces were noted within the layers attributed broadly to this period: the finds from beneath the lower surface (context xiv.34) included a sherd of Campana A and a coin of c. 208–148 B.C. Those from the layer above (context xiv.35) included a rim of Campana B (Morel Form 2257), several sherds of Campana C (Morel Forms 2266, 2352) and a sherd possibly of Eastern Sigillata A.

PERIOD IV (fig. 70)

The developments attributed to Period IV are concerned exclusively with the space between wall 19 and wall 1 which is represented in sections Q–R (fig. 79), A’–B’, C’–D’ and E’–F’ (fig. 80). The excavation in this area yielded Augustan pottery at a very low level, from layers which rest directly on or cut into those related to the earliest occupation on the site. The only plausible explanation seems to be that a sunken room or cellar was excavated here and that the intervening levels were removed. It has already been suggested (above, p. 149) that the ground-level following the building operations of Period IIIb may have been at the base of the fine ashlar masonry in wall 19, which is approximately 90 cm. above the earliest floor of the cellar.

The history of this room seems to have been very short, the entire span from its construction until the time when it was filled in being confined to little more than the first quarter of the first century A.D. During that time it underwent two internal modifications, and as the area excavated to this depth was restricted to both north and south by the presence of later features, its character was by no means entirely clear. No means of access was identified, and this must have been situated outside the area examined (but see under Period IVc).

**FIG. 70.** The Casa Brogan, schematic plan of developments in Period IV: first quarter of first century A.D.
Period IVa

The earliest features pertaining to the cellar are walls 48 and 49 in the northern part (fig. 80, section A'-B'). These are modest walls, built of small, roughly coursed blocks (pl. 48b). Wall 49 is built up against wall 1 and crosses its foundation-course, indicating clearly that it post-dates the construction of wall 1 in Period IIIb. Wall 48 was built alongside the earlier wall 47, which was demolished now if not previously, and the surface between wall 48 and wall 19 was covered by a mortar floor. The space enclosed by walls 48, 49 and 1 was also surfaced with a mortar floor at a slightly higher level, raised upon a fill of white rubble.

The fine wares from beneath the mortar floor west of wall 48 (context xiv.77) comprised the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Ware Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77/3, 4</td>
<td>Italian Sigillata 2 rims of plates, Berenice B206</td>
<td>From c. AD 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77/5</td>
<td>Italian Sigillata Sherd of cup, Berenice B229</td>
<td>From c. AD 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77/6</td>
<td>Italian Sigillata Sherd of decorated krater, Comfort (1982) no. 19</td>
<td>Augustan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77/7 bis</td>
<td>Eastern Sigillata A Sherd</td>
<td>C1 BC or C1 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncat.</td>
<td>Knidian Grey Ware 2 sherds of carinated cup, Berenice B82</td>
<td>C2 BC–C1 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77/8</td>
<td>Italian lamp Loescheke Type Ia</td>
<td>Augustan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77/9</td>
<td>Italian lamp Bronze Type XXI</td>
<td>Augustan–Tiberian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A date soon after A.D. 1 seems therefore to be clearly established for the initial construction of the cellar. Traces of the same mortar floor were detected further south (see fig. 80, section C’–D’, context xiv.4) but no fine ware was found in association with it.

Period IVb

The next modification of this area involved the removal of walls 48 and 49 and the construction of a room against wall 19 bounded by walls 20a, 25 and 45. The trench-built foundations and the lowest courses of these walls belong to this phase: walls 20a and 25 were subsequently rebuilt, and wall 45 was removed and almost completely robbed out (see pl. 47c). The records also refer to a wall 45a running north–south, but as this was located only from a robber-trench its precise position (both geographical and stratigraphic) is uncertain: it may have been the former southward continuation of wall 47 or wall 48. Traces of a mortar floor are attributed to this phase at the southern end of section C’–D’, but no finds are separately recorded.

Period IVc

The room thus formed was enlarged shortly afterwards, and the floor-level was again raised. Wall 45 was robbed out to the full depth of its foundations in the centre leaving only the stubs where it butted against wall 19 and where it was bonded into wall 25 (sections C’–D’, E’–F’). A thin burnt line seals the top of the robber-trench, and this runs beneath the upper part of wall 25 (see section E’–F’) indicating that the latter must have been rebuilt in this phase. Rebuilding is also evident in wall 20a, for a doorway was now formed in it, and the level of the sill clearly relates to the floor-levels of Period IVc and not to the time when the wall was first built in Period IVb. The superstructure of both of these walls was formed of squared blocks of varying sizes, laid very roughly and strengthened at intervals by the use of orthostats; mud-bricks were also used in parts (pl. 47). Where wall 45 had been removed, the room was extended southwards; wall 25a continues the line of wall 25 beyond a butt-joint, in a similar style of construction but with much shallower foundations. The features in the narrow space between wall 25 and wall 1 caused considerable puzzlement to KMK, who was unable to arrive at a convincing interpretation of them. It seems to me that there may have been a stairway here leading down from the south, composed partly of stone blocks and partly of opus signinum steps laid on a packing of rubble.
The newly raised floor of the cellar was provided with a clay surface, and there was a clay floor at the same level in the room to the north, upon which were traces of an opus signinum surface. Evidence for the date of the Period IVc alterations is provided by large quantities of fine ware from the robber trench of wall 45 and the make-up level beneath the floor of the cellar (sections C’-D’, E’-F’: context xiv.6), and by a lesser quantity from beneath the floor to the north (sections A’-B’, C’-D’: context xiv.79). There is much Italian Sigillata and Eastern Sigillata A, the forms present being Berenice Forms B202, B205, B206, B209, B211 and B229 and Berenice Forms B314, B332 and B334 respectively: these indicate a terminus post quem of A.D. 5/10, barely later than the initial construction of the cellar. The lamps are similar to those from Period IVa; a single sherd of Hayes Form 31 in African Red Slip Ware (no. xiv.6/13) is clearly intrusive.

During this phase, the cellar was put to an industrial use of some kind. The inserted features do not stand directly upon the floor, but upon a thin dark layer of occupation-material which suggests that they are secondary, if only by a small space of time. In the north-west corner of the room was built a raised rectangular vat, rendered internally and over the rim in order to form a waterproof container (pl. 47a). The internal dimensions of the vat are 85 x 80 x 20 cm. deep, and the base is raised 40 cm. above the floor. In the centre of the room was found an enigmatic circular pedestal, 60 cm. high and 1.00 m. in diameter. It is built of rough mortared stones and was rendered across the top and for about 25 cm. down the sides with plaster. (See pl. 47. These photographs were taken in 1949; those taken in 1948 at an earlier stage of the excavation show the rendering in a far better state of preservation.) In the centre of the pedestal is a depression c. 40 cm. in diameter which was not rendered: indeed, the plaster is formed into a lip round the edge of it, which suggests that it was intended as a socket for an object or apparatus of some kind.

In the south-west corner of the room was found an area of stone paving which probably belongs to this phase, though this is not explicitly stated in the records. In the opposite corner an amphora, almost intact, was found resting on the floor (pl. 48a).

Period IVd

The final phase within Period IV, which again seems to be unrelated to any other changes in the Casa Brogan, is defined by the filling-in of the whole sunken area. This fill included collapsed masonry and mud-brick from walls 20a and 25, which were now completely buried: whether this reflects accidental collapse or deliberate demolition, it is impossible to say. KMK considered that there was evidence of extensive rebuilding of wall 1 at this stage (note the narrow foundation-trench shown in section A’-B’, fig. 80), but this seems to me inconclusive. (It is based on the confused stratigraphy between wall 25 and wall 1.) A clay surface was recorded on top of this fill in section E’-F’, but further north in section A’-B’ the surface was removed when vats were inserted in Period VII.

Very large quantities of pottery were recorded from this fill, from contexts xiv.8a and 9 (section E’-F’) and 81 (sections A’-B’, C’-D’). The character of the relevant fine ware was as follows. (Form-numbers refer to the Berenice type series unless otherwise stated.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Ware</th>
<th>Forms noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xiv.8a</td>
<td>Italian Sigillata</td>
<td>B205, B210 (double spirals), B237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stamped/decorated: Comfort (1982) nos. 8-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Sigillata A</td>
<td>B314, B335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Tripolitani’ Sigillata</td>
<td>B403; cup as Oberaden 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian lamps</td>
<td>Loeschcke Type IA, Augustan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African R.S. Ware</td>
<td>1 possible sherd, Hayes 26/181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv.9</td>
<td>Italian Sigillata</td>
<td>B201, B205, B206, B208, B209, B211, B214, B223, B225, B227A, B229B, B231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Sigillata A</td>
<td>B313/4, B323, B325, B327, B330, B334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Tripolitani’ Sigillata</td>
<td>Related to B404; B427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian lamps</td>
<td>Loeschcke Type IA, Broner Type XXI, Augustan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African R.S. Ware</td>
<td>4 small body-sherds and a base, possibly all Flavian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Ware</td>
<td>Forms noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv.81</td>
<td>Italian Sigillata</td>
<td>B202, B205 (many exx.), B208, B225A, B227A/B, B228B, B229B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Sigillata A</td>
<td>B314, B323, B325, B327, B334, Hayes (AFC) 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Tripolitanian’ Sigillata</td>
<td>B406, B409, B427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian lamps</td>
<td>Loeschcke Type IA, Augustan; Loeschcke Type IB, Broneer Type XXI, Tiberian–Flavian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African R.S. Ware</td>
<td>Hayes 20, 182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are clearly a few intrusive items here, such as the sherds of African Red Slip Ware, but they are present in sufficiently small numbers not to interfere with the general picture, which is formed in the main by late Augustan and early Tiberian pieces (Italian Sigillata Forms B210, B211, B225, B227A/B, B228B, B229B and several of the stamped and decorated sherds; Eastern Sigillata A Forms B327, B334, B335; several Tiberian lamp-fragments). There is one rim only of Berenice Group D in Italian Sigillata (Form B214) and one of the corresponding form in Eastern Sigillata A (Berenice B330). In view of the popularity of these forms with applied decoration from about A.D. 30 onwards (see Kenrick 1985, 132 f.), this suggests a terminal date around this time for the filling-in of the cellar. The one sherd of Berenice Form B237 in Italian Sigillata, which should belong to the second half of the first century A.D., must be regarded as an intrusion.

Road levels
A further succession of road surfaces in section A–B (fig. 77) falls stratigraphically between Periods IIIb and V. There are a few sherds of fine ware (context xiv.37) amongst which the latest is a sherd of Berenice Form B217 with applied putto M24 in Italian Sigillata, dated not before A.D. 35/40.

PERIOD V (fig. 71)
The next major change which affected much, if not the whole, of the Casa Brogan occurred in the late first century A.D. or at the beginning of the second. At this time most of the pre-existing walls were rebuilt in much more substantial masonry than before. Wherever they were examined, it appears that they were cut down to the existing ground-level, and the foundations were strengthened by the insertion of under-pinning below the new walls on either side of the surviving structure. This is particularly clear in the case of walls 3 and 19 in section C–D–E–F (fig. 77), and foundation-trenches for new superstructures are evident in respect of walls 27 (fig. 77, section A–B–C–D) and 380 (fig. 79, section L–M–N–O). The western end of wall 17 appears to have been first constructed in this period (fig. 77, section G–H), though it is conceivable that the foundations enclose an earlier wall which was not detected. Further east in section L–M (fig. 79) there was no evidence of rebuilding, though a reconstruction of the parts above ground might have left no obvious sign. Wall 26 was rebuilt from the contemporary ground-level, as is shown by a thin layer of soil which spread over the surviving courses before rebuilding (fig. 77, section G–H). At section S–T (fig. 79) there was further evidence for the rebuilding of wall 19, though without the very substantial under-pinning observed in section E–F. Indeed, it was probably now that part of wall 19 was strengthened by the addition of an entire extra thickness of blocks on the east side, extending southwards from the junction with wall 7 for a distance of 2.70 m. (See fig. 80, section A′–B′. The extra line of masonry is visible on the left-hand side of plate 49a, beyond the nearer vat.) The stratigraphy relating to this addition was destroyed when vats were inserted against it in Period VII, but it seems most likely that it belongs to Period V. South of this addition, there is no evidence of rebuilding prior to Period VIa, and it is possible that that part of wall 19 was not reinstated until then.

Wall 103, to the west of wall 19 and running parallel to it, seems to have been an entirely new feature of this period. It suggests that there was a substantial re-planning of the building
FIG. 71. The Casa Brogan, schematic plan of Period V: beginning of second century A.D.

associated with these operations. The layout was now orientated around a large courtyard on the west, lying along the street-frontage and bounded by walls 27, 17, 103 and either 37 or 36. Beneath this courtyard was built a large cistern with rounded ends, 4.85 m. long by 1.12 m. wide. The cistern had a slightly pitched roof of sandstone slabs, and access was obtained through a man-hole at the northern end, beneath which there were foot-holds in the wall of the cistern. The internal height of the cistern was 2.45 m., yielding a capacity of some 19,000 litres, and the total depth from the top of the man-hole to the cistern floor was 3.80 m. The cistern was fed by means of a mortared drain which led into its northern end from the base of a vertical cutting in the west side of wall 103. There was also a small secondary inlet in the form of a terracotta drain-pipe 1.50 m. from the southern end, which may have been a later insertion associated with the vats of Period VII (pl. 49d: the surface or receptacle from which it led was not preserved).

There was in most areas a further rise in ground-level from that of Period IIIb, though definite mortar floor-surfaces were identified only in sections L–M/S–T and U–V. In sections N–O/O–P a deep trench had been dug and refilled, for which no obvious explanation was found, unless it was associated with the construction of the cistern close by to the west.

Stratigraphically subsequent to the main fill of this period was the reconstruction of wall 7 on the east side of wall 19, for in section Y–Z (fig. 79) the foundation-trench for its upper part can be seen cutting through the fill. However, it can hardly be doubted that this operation too was part of the whole scheme of reconstruction, and the floor which overlies the fill in this section seals the foundation-trench and runs up to the wall. (Similar considerations apply also to wall 27 in figure 77, section C–D.)

Wall 1 is the only wall which shows no obvious sign of rebuilding in this period, though it is possible that (as has been suggested for part of wall 17) the superstructure may have been replaced without those parts below the contemporary ground-level having been disturbed.
Dating Evidence

The relevant contexts are nos. xiv.38 (section A-B), 51 (sections C-D/G-H), 24 (sections E-F/J-K), 119 and 120 (sections L-M/S-T), 92 (sections N-O/O-P) and 62 and 63 (sections U-V/Y-Z). The latest fine ware recorded from these contexts is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Ware Form</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92/46</td>
<td>Eastern Sigillata A Rim, Berenice B331</td>
<td>c. AD 60-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92/48</td>
<td>Eastern Sigillata A Rim, Hayes (AFC) 61?</td>
<td>First half of C2 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92/125</td>
<td>Cypriot Sigillata Rim, Berenice B385</td>
<td>First half of C2 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119/11</td>
<td>Italian lamp Loeschcke VIII</td>
<td>Late Flavian-C2 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120, Reg. 808</td>
<td>Italian lamp Loeschcke VIII with dolphin</td>
<td>Late Flavian-C2 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119/9</td>
<td>Italian or African Lamp Loeschcke VIII</td>
<td>C2 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119/7</td>
<td>African lamp Loeschcke VIII with bust of actor</td>
<td>C3 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62/11</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware Rim, Hayes 3</td>
<td>From c. AD 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120/8</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware Rim, possibly Hayes 9</td>
<td>From c. AD 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51/2</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware Knob of lid, Hayes 20</td>
<td>Late Cl–early C2 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119/4</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware Base of early jug</td>
<td>Probably from c. AD 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/12, 120/7</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware 4 sherds, early fabric</td>
<td>Probably from c. AD 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119/3</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware Rim, Hayes 181</td>
<td>Late C1–C2 AD?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/13</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware Sherd, Hayes 50 or similar?</td>
<td>From AD 230/240?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apart from a single lamp and a single sherd of red slip ware, which may be intrusions from the layers above, these pieces suggest a date early in the second century A.D.

The nature of the building operations described above is somewhat unusual. They represent neither the simple modification of an existing building, nor its wholesale demolition and replacement by something completely different. Certainly most, if not all, of the superstructure is new in this period, and there are some important changes of plan; but there is also an extensive replacement of earlier walls along pre-existing lines. The key to this is surely the massive strengthening of the foundations that is apparent in several of the sections. This is characteristic of another of the buildings excavated at Sabratha and already described: the East Forum Temple. It was suggested in Chapter IIIa that the peculiar features of that building were to be explained by its collapse in an earthquake which has been dated to A.D. 64/70 (pp. 5, 57) and its subsequent restoration. In the Casa Brogan too, this would explain both why the building needed to be so extensively rebuilt, and the fact that the rebuilding followed so closely the layout of the preceding structures. The coincidence seems to me so striking that the same phenomenon must have been responsible for the peculiarities of both buildings. The associated finds suggest clearly in this case that rebuilding did not take place before the beginning of the second century A.D.

The only direct dating-evidence for the construction of the cistern consists of some fragments of glass found in the rubble against the cistern wall (context xiv.137; see Ch. X, nos. A19–21), one of which (no. A19) has been dated approximately to the second half of the first century A.D. The cistern is unlikely to antedate the construction of wall 103, with which it seems to be associated, and there is definite stratigraphic evidence that it does antedate the construction of the adjacent vats in Period VII. On balance, it seems most likely that it would have been dug as part of the major building programme defined as Period V.

PERIOD VI (fig. 72)

This period encompasses further minor alterations in the space above the former cellar. These are not clearly recorded either in section or in plan, and it is therefore difficult to give an adequate account of them. In the upper levels, a single course of each of two insubstantial walls was found, and their positions are shown tentatively in figure 72 as walls 20 and 21. (See also pl. 48c.) Wall 21 appears in section E’–F’ (fig. 80), and the approximate position of wall 20 has been added to
section C’–D’. There is a considerable accumulation of occupation debris in the space enclosed
between these walls and wall 1, and there was a hearth against wall 1. The character of this
material suggests casual occupation by squatters, but it appears to be confined to just the one
room, which is puzzling. There was much pottery from these levels (context xiv.10 and 11),
amongst which the latest African Red Slip Ware belonged to Hayes Forms 9B, 14, 23, 181 and
182. However, the clearest evidence of date was provided by seven coins (see p. 265 f.), of which
two were of Antoninus Pius, three of Faustina II (A.D. 161–176) and one was a sestertius of
Marcus Aurelius issued in A.D. 173/4. These and the pottery were found in the occupation layers
associated with walls 20 and 21, and therefore relate to the period of use of the walls rather than
providing a term. inus post quem for their construction. There is no clear term. inus post quem for
the walls, for the levels into which they were cut have been attributed to Period IVd. It is just
possible that the clay floor which overlies the Period IVd levels belongs in fact to Period V, and
that the early sherd. of African Red Slip Ware recorded in Period IVd as intrusive (p. 153, context
xiv.9) should be regarded as a genuine guide to the date of this floor. In any case, the insubstantial
foundations of walls 20 and 21 are wholly out of character with the building operations of Period
V, and they must certainly be subsequent to that. A span of the second and third quarters of the
second century A.D. may be tentatively inferred for the existence of walls 20 and 21.

The somewhat incongruous character of the features just described is consistent with an even
more surprising piece of evidence from section L–M. This section (fig. 79) shows a grave, cut
deeply through the Period V levels, which contained a human skeleton laid on its back. The
pottery from the fill of the grave (context xiv.122) included a few sherd. of residual fine ware,
but an almost complete glass bowl from the same context (Ch. X, no. A24) must be associated
directly with the burial. Dr. Hayes reports that this piece is unlikely to be later than the mid
second century A.D. The implication of this burial and of the features attributed above to Period
VI is that within a very short interval following the extensive rebuilding of Period V, the
inhabitants of the Casa Brogan were leading an extraordinarily debased existence near the very
heart of an otherwise flourishing town.

Period VIa

Section E’–F’ (fig. 80) shows that these walls were subsequently removed and robbed out,
leaving only a single course of each in position. At the same time, it appears that the upper parts
of walls 1 and 19 were rebuilt in this area. It is not possible to suggest why this was necessary, or
whether in fact these walls had not previously been restored after the earthquake. (The
strengthening of the east face of wall 19 stops just south of wall 380: this may for a while have
been the position of a break or opening.) In the room to the west of wall 19 (fig. 79, section O–P)
there was additional make-up of this period, but its significance is obscured by the insertion of a
vat in Period VII. Wall 18, which runs between walls 19 and 1 to the south of the former cellar, is
attributed to this period by KMK, but the only section-drawing on which it is shown (fig. 80,
section C’–D’) does not show the stratigraphy in its vicinity. This wall was provided with
substantial foundations, consisting of two courses of large blocks laid as headers (pl. 47 b). The
make-up which fills the various foundation-trenches and the robber-trenches above walls 20 and
21 is sealed by two successive mortar floors, of which the upper one is contemporary with
rendering on walls 1 and 19.

The date of these developments is determined essentially by the coins and pottery from the
Period VI occupation-levels. The additional make-up in sections O–P (context xiv.93) and E’–F’
(contexts xiv.12, 13) yielded no demonstrably later finds. The fact that the vats of Period VII
were built against rendering on various walls which was attributed to this period by KMK
implies that they are subsequent to Period VIa, though possibly not by a long interval.

Period VII (fig. 72)

This period saw a marked change of use for large parts of the Casa Brogan. No less than seven
cement-lined vats were found to have been constructed in different parts of the building. Those
under cover were round-ended. Nos. 2–5 were in the large room to the east of wall 19 (pl. 49a and fig. 80, sections A’–B’, C’–D’) and their dimensions are c. 2.15 × 0.70 m. (nos. 2 and 3; the ragged outline of no. 3 is due to later disturbance) and 1.60 × 0.85 m. (nos. 4 and 5); they are 85–90 cm. deep. Vat 1 in the adjacent room to the west (pl. 49b and fig. 79, section N–O) is larger but shallower: 2.40 × 1.85 × 0.45 m. deep. In the courtyard adjacent to the street-frontage were inserted two rectangular vats, nos. 6 (1.50 × 1.15 m.; pl. 49c) and 7 (1.28 × 1.17 m.; pl. 49d and fig. 77, section O’–P’), both of which were about 1.60 m. deep. Between vats 6 and 7 and the cistern beneath the courtyard was a long cement-lined trough about 55 cm. wide and 30 cm. deep, running from north to south and sloping down with a gradient of about 1 in 60 in the short stretch that was excavated. Neither end was located, though at the north (‘head’) end there were traces of a right-angled turn towards the mouth of the cistern. Possibly the trough was used to deliver water raised from the cistern to some activity in the southern part of the complex. A secondary inlet to the cistern next to the trough, which may belong to the period of the vats, has already been mentioned above (p. 154).

Wherever examined, these vats were found to have been set in a solid matrix of concrete, which had necessitated the excavation and removal of earlier levels to an appropriate depth. (See, for example, fig. 80, section A’–B’.) The purpose of these installations can only be guessed at, for no associated finds were recorded which offered any clues. They do not show any of the familiar attributes of an oil-processing plant, nor were any shells recorded which might suggest dye production. Alternative possibilities may be tanning, fulling or the preparation of fish products.

**Dating evidence**

As the levels of this period consisted almost exclusively of concrete rubble, there were few associated finds. The matrix of vat 1 (context xiv.94) yielded half a dozen sherds, amongst which
the only fine ware was residual. The matrix of vats 2–5 was more fruitful (context xiv.83) and the latest fine ware here was two rims of Hayes Form 181 in African Red Slip Ware and one of Hayes Form 182. In section O′-P′ (fig. 77) the sandy fill above the cover-slabs of the cistern (context xiv.138), which was cut by the foundation-trench for vat 7 and the trough above, also yielded fragments of Hayes Forms 181 and 182 in addition to earlier fine wares. None of these items, however, implies a later date than that already established by the precedence of Period VIa. The installation of the vats must therefore have taken place after A.D. 173, but probably before the end of the second century.

Road levels

The latest level in the street outside which bears any stratigraphic relationship to the Casa Brogan is the clay/mortar surface which seals the foundation-trench for the rebuilding of wall 27 in Period V (fig. 77, section A-B). This level also seals a pit which is partly visible in Section A-B. Above this, two further mortar surfaces were recorded, which are cut in turn by the insertion of a solidly built stone drain. The drain is sealed only by the paving slabs at the level to which the street had been exposed by the Italian excavators. These final levels (contexts xiv.39–41) yielded residual fine ware and some scrappy fragments of African Red Slip Ware: the latest sherds are possibly to be identified as Hayes Forms 16 and 27, giving a very tentative indication that the street was paved during the second half of the second century (i.e. broadly contemporary with Periods VI and VII in the Casa Brogan). This is certainly consistent with a picture of prosperity and ambitious municipal undertakings at Sabratha in the late Antonine period, for it is the time when the Forum and Capitolium were substantially remodelled (Forum Period III, Capitolium Period II) and when the Antonine and South Forum Temples were built.

PERIOD VIII (fig. 73)

After an interval of nearly two hundred years, the Casa Brogan reverted to purely domestic occupation, and this attended by a higher degree of sophistication than before. All of the vats were filled in. No floor as such was recorded above the filling of vat 1 (fig. 79, section N-O), but the room to the east occupied by vats 2–5 was now furnished with a mosaic floor (mosaic 1), as were three other rooms to the south (mosaics 2–4). In the courtyard a succession of two consecutive floors is apparent, but they yielded no useful dating-evidence to indicate the span of time between them. In section O′-P′ above vat 7 (fig. 77), both of these floors were of mortar, but above vat 6 (pl. 49c), whilst the lower floor was of mortar, the upper one appears to have been formed at least partly of flagstones. (It is difficult to be certain of this without inspection on site.) The courtyard appears to have been reduced in size at this time to a much smaller area around the mouth of the cistern, for wall 13 rests upon the upper of these two surfaces and must be subsequent to it (see pl. 49c), whilst it appears from section G–H (fig. 77) that wall 15 was also first built at this time. (The chronology of walls 36 and 37, either of which may have formed the southern boundary of the courtyard at different times, was not investigated.) To the north of wall 15, a new mortar floor was laid which extended continuously across the threshold of the doorway in wall 17 and into the room to the north. There was also a corresponding mortar floor of this period in sections E–F/J–K (figs. 77, 79), and section J–K shows that the wall closing this room on the north side (numbered 26, though it is not continuous with wall 26 further west) was a new feature of this period.

Mosaic 1, in the largest room, included an emblema on the east side against wall 1, which implies that the opening now apparent in wall 1 at that point was undoubtedly a doorway in Period VIII. This shows that by this time, if not earlier, the Casa Brogan had undergone a second eastward expansion, now enclosing at least three further rooms to the east of wall 1. The central room of these three, from which doorways lead into the other two and westwards into the ‘mosaic room’, was clearly a courtyard: it has a mortar floor, beneath which are two vaulted cisterns connected to one another at their northern ends and to which access was obtained through an opening in the south-east corner. A glance at the general plan of the insula (fig. 66,
facing p. 141) suggests the possibility that the 'industrial' occupation formerly carried on within the house may not in fact have ceased at this time; but that the owner of the property, evidently prospering at his business, succeeded in buying the house adjacent to his own on the eastern side of the insula. He then expanded his own house across the former spinal alleyway to increase his comfort; the alley was re-routed round the extension, and his business occupation was transferred to the series of vats and cisterns (which were now constructed?) in the remaining rooms which lay along the eastern street-frontage. However, for lack of a detailed examination of these structures and their chronology, this must remain in the realms of speculation.

It is difficult to comment on the mosaics without personal inspection. The information available to me has amounted to

1. brief notes made by JBWP in 1946;
2. a few photographs taken by JBWP in 1946 and 1948;
3. some further photographs taken for me by Professor Barri Jones in 1984, three of which are in colour;
4. a plan drawn in 1948 by Dennis Hickley, which shows the patterns of the mosaics in outline but without indications of colour.

It is upon these that figure 74 and the following description are based.

The texture of the mosaics is in general fairly coarse, being in the region of 9 tesserae to 20 cm., whilst the emblema in mosaic 1 is composed of smaller stones which yield 17 tesserae to 20 cm. The colours and materials employed have been recorded by JBWP as follows.
FIG. 74. The Casa Brogan, plan of the Period VIII mosaics (partly schematic).
Mosaic 1: Main part: black, grey and buff stone, and white marble (pl. 50a–b). Emblemata: red marble castellated surround; black stone, white marble and a little buff stone; the rest glass (pls. 50c, 51a).

Mosaic 2: Black, purple rosettes, dull pink stone, white and grey marble and cipollino (pls. 51b, 52a).

Mosaic 3: Dull pink stone frame; circles cipollino with outer rings of dull pink and black: black ran out half way (pl. 52b).

Mosaic 4: Rectangular grid of dull pink enclosing alternate circles and oblique squares with rosettes.

Apart from the emblemata in mosaic 1, mosaic 2 shows a more ambitious design and more competent execution than the others, though there are in all three small errors in execution. (These are mostly not shown in figure 74 as they were not indicated on Dennis Hickley’s drawing, and the photographic coverage is insufficient to be sure in many instances.) Traces only of mosaic 4 survive, both above and below the step which runs across the room: the pattern is shown in outline in figure 74 as the description and the photographic coverage are insufficient to be sure of the colours used.

The emblemata in mosaic 1 occupied a rectangle approximately 1.75 × 1.65 cm. against the opening in wall 1 on the east side of the room. (The emblemata was lifted in 1948 prior to the excavations. The peripheral details are not quite correct in figure 74, as the drawing was prepared from plates 50c and 51a before photographs of the whole emblemata came to light.) It portrays an inscribed tabella ansata within a circular wreath, and the corners of the rectangle are filled by canthari with tendrils issuing from them (plates 50c, 51a). The inscription, which faced the reader as he left the room, has been published as IRT 174, and I am grateful to Joyce Reynolds and Dr. Robert Ireland for further discussions on this difficult text. Problems of orthography and latinity aggravate those of the physical lacunae in the text in attempting to arrive at a convincing interpretation. The following reading is now tentatively suggested.

CONCESIT FORTVNA
MICHI TAM GRATQ
GRATIA INPROBI QV
ID (P)RODES QVOD
5 MEA FATA S[VNT S]VA
DEO BOS N[VNC BIB]ATIS
PARCIT[ER ... PL]ACEATIS

1. 1 FORTVNA is certain: there is not sufficient room for FORTV[NAM as in IRT.
1. 5 The top of the eighth letter ('S') is clear and there can be no doubt about S[VNT at the end of this line and the beginning of the next. The space remaining allows little scope for anything other than S[VNT. (Miss Reynolds has suggested S[VADENT, which would give better sense, but I doubt that there is enough room.)
1. 6 The reading 'BOS' is given as definite in IRT, though the 'S' no longer survives. The top of an oblique stroke surviving to the right of it implies that the next letter must have been 'A', 'M' or 'N'.

The spelling is consistent with the efforts of a sub-literary composer at the date suggested below for Period VIII (concesit for concessit, michi for mihi, bos for vos) and this gives rise to further ambiguity in interpretation. The text as it stands may be translated ‘Fortune has inclined to me who am so grateful. Favour (or gratitude) of a wicked man, what are you worth?’ After this point the grammar and sense appear confused beyond the limits of intelligibility: to what does the relative clause quod mea fata sunt (‘what my fates are’ – ?) refer? (Miss Reynolds’ suggestion suadent would yield ‘What my fates recommend, I urge you to (follow, viz.) …’). The text ends with an exhortation to a life of rectitude and thrift, though the precise reading cannot be restored. The general sense is ‘I urge you now to live frugally and to please …’ (the fates?). T]ACEATIS (‘hold your tongue’) is a possible alternative for the last word, and the fact that the mosaicist ran out of space in the last line implies the presence of eight or more letters in the missing part.
Dr. Ireland suggests an alternative interpretation of the first part of the inscription which is not without difficulties, but which does offer a slightly more coherent rendering of the text as a whole. He points out that gratia in line 3 may be a phonetic spelling of the accusative gratiam, which would be understandable at a period when all vowels were tending towards nasalization, obscuring the phonetic distinction between the nominative and accusative inflexions. Gratia(m) would then be taken as the object of conces(s)it, yielding ‘Fortune has granted grace to me, who am so grateful.’ The rest of lines 3–5 would then yield ‘Wicked man, why do you enviously complain that my fates are such?’ on the assumption that inprobi is another phonetic variant for the vocative inprobe, and that QV/ID PRODES is a mosaicist’s error for QV/ID RODES. (Note the curious shape of the ‘P’.) The grammar is poor, but this interpretation does have the attraction of making sense (of a sort!) of the whole text.

The sentiments expressed in this text (even if the restoration is uncertain in detail) are pious commonplaces, though without direct parallel in literature or the epigraphic record. It seems likely that the composition was an original effort on the part of the mosaicist or his client.

**Dating evidence**

The relevant contexts are nos. xiv.53 (sections C–D/G–H), 25 and 26 (sections E–F/J–K), 95 (section N–O), 84 (sections A’–B’/C’–D’), 14 (section E’–F’) and 141–143 (section O’–P’); the latest finds from within them are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/ Cat. no.</th>
<th>Ware</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53/uncat.</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware</td>
<td>Rim, Hayes 50A</td>
<td>From AD 230/240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/25</td>
<td>African lamp</td>
<td></td>
<td>Probably C3 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Coin 42</td>
<td>Trajan</td>
<td>AD 98–117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coin 97</td>
<td>Hadrian</td>
<td>AD 117–138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coin 63</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270–280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/9, 14</td>
<td>African R.S. Ware</td>
<td>4 sherds (Hayes 50?)</td>
<td>From AD 230/240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Coin 122</td>
<td>Constantius II</td>
<td>AD 352–357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Catalogued erroneously under 92/23:
- African R.S. Ware Rim, Hayes 45C? Early-mid C4 AD
- African R.S. Ware 2 rims, Hayes 50B? c. AD 350–400+
- Tripolitanian R.S. Ware Rim, Hayes 1/Berenice B694 C4 AD

84 The fill of vats 2–5 yielded much fine ware. Vat 3 had suffered obvious disturbance from a late pit dug through the overlying mosaic, and no finds were catalogued from this vat. The pottery which was catalogued showed clear contamination also of vat 2 (above which the mosaic was fragmentary), for this alone yielded sherds of the seventh century AD. Apart from these, the latest African R.S. Ware consisted of numerous fragments of Hayes Forms 45 and 50. There were, however, a number of sherds of Tripolitanian R.S. Ware of the fourth or fifth century A.D., including Berenice Forms B695 and B696 and a Hayes Type II Tripolitanian lamp.

The latest clearly datable object relevant to Period VIII is the coin of Constantius II, showing that the refurbishment of the Casa Brogan with mosaics, and possibly its eastward expansion across the insula, are to be placed in the second half of the fourth century A.D. (A coin of similar date, no. 233, was found above the drain leading from wall 103 to the western cistern: see p. 266.) This was a period which saw the erection of a new Basilica and a new Curia in the Forum, projects which I have suggested above were occasioned by an earthquake in A.D. 365 (pp. 5 f., 33). There is no direct evidence to connect the developments in the Casa Brogan in Period VIII with this earthquake, but there is an obvious likelihood that minor earthquake damage would have provided an occasion for such building alterations. Their occurrence and nature provide further evidence of the continuing vigour of the urban community at Sabratha in the latter part of the fourth century.
PERIOD IX (fig. 75)

This period encompasses the latest upstanding walls on the site. There is no stratigraphy associated with them, for the relevant levels had been removed in the course of the initial exposure of the area by the Italian excavators, and there is therefore no direct evidence of date. It is clear, however, that there was a final phase of occupation in which the house was partly rebuilt on a reduced plan which differs in some respects from the layout of Period VIII. Several of the new walls were built across the mosaics, which suggests that they were associated with a higher ground-level after the mosaics had become buried. The most likely occasion for this rebuilding is the period following the Byzantine reconquest of the region in A.D. 533, by which time the Casa Brogan and surrounding buildings may already have been abandoned and ruinous. The latest finds from the site include two six-century coins from the uppermost level in section G'-H' (p. 266, nos. 180a + b), a coin of Justin II (ibid., no. 50) found in a crevice in the upper part of wall 7 and the few late-sixth or seventh-century sherds mentioned above from an intrusion into vat 2 (nos. xiv.84/49, 51, 57: Hayes Forms 104B and 105/6 in African Red Slip Ware). These suggest that occupation of some sort probably persisted until the Arab conquest.

The layout of the Casa Brogan in this final phase was confined to the central core of the insula. The plan shown in figure 75 is derived from a drawing by Dennis Hickley, and without the opportunity of studying the structures at first hand I am unable to comment upon it in detail. It seems that the uppermost courses of all the walls which survived into this period were rebuilt with re-used blocks, very roughly fitted together. (There has also clearly been some modern restoration.) The central area where the mosaics were was presumably the most ruinous, for here...
part of wall 19 was not rebuilt, creating a large room with an east–west axis, and walls 18 and 28 which had enclosed mosaic 2 were replaced by walls 2 and 9 respectively, both on new lines and standing on the edges of the mosaic (pl. 51b). The northern part of the room containing mosaic 1 was subdivided by a new wall (4) running east–west and a yet smaller subdivision was obtained by the insertion of wall 6. (The space between wall 6 and wall 19 appears to have no means of access and its purpose is obscure.)

The labour involved in these restorations was substantial, and represents more than casual occupation amidst decaying ruins. It must reflect a serious attempt to sustain some of the comforts of urban life during the last century of tenuous Byzantine rule at Sabratha.

POSTSCRIPT: THE EASTERN PART OF THE INSULA

The foregoing description of the excavations has included little or no reference to sections W–X, G’–H’, J’–K’ or L’–M’. The reason for this is two-fold. Firstly, they presented individual difficulties of interpretation to KMK and hence to an even greater extent to me. There are also no plans to accompany sections G’–H’ and J’–K’. Secondly, they are widely scattered and have no direct structural links with other parts of the excavation (except in the case of W–X). It will have been evident from the description of the Casa Brogan that the extreme complexity of its stratigraphy is difficult to interpret even where the trenches are close together: it is therefore quite impossible to present any coherent account of excavations so widely separated as these remaining trenches. I have attempted in the following notes to draw together the few points of significance which do emerge from these sections.

Sections W–X and G’–H’ (figs. 79 and 80)

The general plan of the insula (fig. 66) shows that for part of its history wall 1 formed the rear wall of the west-facing properties, and that these were separated from those facing east by a narrow alley, the line of which was crossed by both these sections. Section W–X was probably uninformative because of the mischance that the trench was laid out parallel to, and between, two walls of different periods, both of which had been extensively robbed out. The only clear feature is a floor ('clay' on original section drawing, 'cement' in notebook) which runs up to wall 1 and seals its foundation-course. This should be contemporary with wall 1 (i.e. Period IIIb, mid first century B.C.), and the accumulation of a variety of thin strata above would be consistent with the subsequent history of this space as an alley, initially at a lower level than the building to the west of it. However, the evidence of the pottery hardly supports this interpretation. The fine ware from beneath the floor (context xiv.97) consists of three sherds of black-glazed ware which need be no later than the fourth or third century B.C.; that from the layers above (contexts xiv.98, 100) includes much black-glazed ware, some of which is Campana A of the second century B.C., and two sherds only of terra sigillata (nos. 100/2, Italian, and 98/3, possibly 'Tripolitanian'). It is possible that when the early levels were dug out between walls 1 and 19 to create the cellar in Period IV, the material thrown up was dumped in the alley: it is otherwise difficult to account for the almost total lack of later pottery from these contexts.

In section G’–H’ the early levels cut by the foundation-trench for wall 1 (contexts xiv.64–66) yielded nothing necessarily later than the third century B.C., and this is true also of the fill of the foundation-trench and the make-up beneath the clay surface which was observed here (context xiv.67). The layers above include a layer of wind-blown sand (context xiv.68) which yielded fine wares typical of Period III, and a variety of tip-levels and intersecting pits (contexts xiv.69–71). These upper layers yielded similar fine wares, a number of Warzenlampen of the second half of the first century B.C. and a little terra sigillata and African Red Slip Ware. The surface-level to which the previous excavations had been carried is arbitrary.

Section J’–K’ (fig. 80)

Despite the direct proximity of this section to section G’–H’ there is no clear correlation between
the stratigraphy of the two, and that despite the apparent superficiality of wall 57. This is partly because of the presence of a deep pit shown beneath wall 57 at the western end of section G'–H'. This pit was observed also in the trench to the east, but it does not appear on the drawn section J'–K', which is displaced 90 cm. to the south of the line of G'–H'.

The earliest levels in this section comprise a succession of two clay floors and a thick floor of mortar, which between them account for a rise in level of 1.20 m. above the natural sand. The finds associated with them include a sherd of a fourth-century B.C. Attic lekythos with a net-pattern (no. xiv.102/3: p. 296 and pl. 64b, no. 6) from beneath the second floor, and several sherds of black-glazed ware which may be no later than the fourth century B.C. from beneath the third (including Ch. IX, no. 68: context xiv.103). This latter context also yielded a coin of the mid to late fourth century B.C. (p. 266, no. 137), and one sherd of Campana A, which implies a late-third or second century date for the floor, unless it is intrusive. The mortar floor is cut by the deep rubble-filled foundation-trench for wall 56. The wall appears however to be associated with the same floor, for its superstructure starts at this level and the foundations are overlaid by a thin streak of mortar which seals the cut in the floor. The masonry of this wall consists of finely fitted ashlar blocks laid as stretchers, approximately 1.15 m. long by 50 cm. deep, with drafted edges and roughly tooled projecting faces (pl. 53a). The appearance is unlike that of any other wall found in the Casa Brogan area, but is similar to early walling found beneath the Basilica (p. 69 and pl. 18a) and in the street to the south of the Antonine Temple (p. 170 and pl. 53d). Only a single thickness of ashlar masonry is preserved, but KMK noted the possibility that it might have formed the facing only of an originally thicker structure with a rubble core. The wall can only be dated by its relationship to the preceding mortar floor: it may therefore belong to the fourth century B.C. or, if the sherd of Campana A is not intrusive, to the late third or second century. (Wall Y4.1 south of the Antonine Temple was built in the second century B.C. or earlier: see p. 172.) There is corroborative evidence for a second-century date from section L'–M' (see below).

Above the thick mortar floor, and subsequent to the construction of wall 56, is a further succession of floors and occupation-layers. Once again, the level to which this area had previously been cleared is arbitrary and corresponds to no particular historical period. The finds from the upper levels (contexts xiv. 105–113) yielded pre-Campana wares and a little Campana A, but nothing at all which need be later than the second century B.C. (apart from a glass fragment from context xiv.111 of the late first century A.D.: See Chapter X, no. A1). Wall 57 rests on the surface and is presumably later than any of the surviving levels. A later wall 58 is also recorded above wall 56, though this is not shown on the section.

The section demonstrates that there was occupation in the eastern part of the insula as early as on the western side, including substantial stone structures from the second century B.C. onwards, if not earlier. In view of the lack of correspondence between this section and section G'–H', it is impossible to say anything about the layout of these structures and their relationship to the building examined to the west.

**Section L'–M' (fig. 80)**

At the bottom of the west end of this trench was found a very broad foundation of rubble set in clay, upon which wall 50 was subsequently built (pl. 53b). This was inferred by KMK to be the same wall (56) as that whose west face was found in section J'–K' further south. Wall 50 was either built on the west face of this foundation, or may indeed have been the original west face, whose rubble backing was subsequently removed. The foundations of wall 56 are trench-built, cutting partly into wind-blown sand and partly through a stony make-up level which is composed of similar material to the actual foundation. The wind-blown sand (context xiv.124a)

---

2 An added difficulty is the impossibility of correlating the physical levels in section G'–H' with any survey datum, and hence with section J'–K'. KMK had attempted to establish the level by reference to the height of mosaic 3 on the other side of wall 1. This is invalidated by the fact that the survey level used relates to mosaic 2 and not mosaic 3. I have used the level of wall 57 for mutual correlation, though it is clearly not the same block which appears in both sections.

3 Thus KMK, by analogy with section J'–K'. The point was apparently tested by cutting a small trench, H32W, on the opposite side of the wall, but the record of this trench reveals nothing of the structures found in it!
yielded a few sherds of pottery, which included one sherd of pre-Campana black-glazed ware and a rim of Berenice Form B10 in Campana A Ware, implying a date for wall 56 after the beginning of the second century B.C.

The levels associated with wall 56 were wholly removed at some later period, along with the whole of its superstructure (with the possible exception of the west face). This was the occasion when the room now visible at the surface was first built: wall 50 on the west was either built on the west face of the earlier foundations, or represents all that was retained of the previous wall. Wall 55 on the east side and wall 54 on the north were constructed of ashlars on rubble foundations which were not readily distinguishable from the stony make-up into which they were cut; wall 54 was pierced by a doorway towards its eastern end (pl. 53c). The room thus created was surfaced with a floor of hard, sandy yellow clay, overlying a white mortary level which must be related to the dismantling of wall 56 and the construction of the new building. There is no clear evidence for the date of this development, for only one sherd of coarse ware was found beneath the floor (context xiv. 132). There are, however, two sherds of fine ware from a second clay floor which immediately overlies the first (context xiv.125). These are a fragment of Italian Sigillata and a rim of Hayes (AFC) Form 43 in Eastern Sigillata A which is possibly late Augustan.

Above this second surface is a thin accumulation of burnt occupation-material and a partly-preserved mortar floor. The finds from this level (context xiv.126) include two examples of Hayes Form 181 in African Red Slip Ware and a coin of the second century A.D. (see p. 266).

After this latest floor was laid down there was a further accumulation of burnt material, and the room was then filled in with tipped soil and rubble containing much pottery, to a depth of 1.40 m. The doorway in wall 54 was blocked with rough masonry, presumably to provide a foundation for the new wall above. The pottery from this fill (contexts xiv.127, 128) included African Red Slip Ware of Hayes Forms 3B, 20 and 181, a sherd of Cypriot Sigillata of the first half of the second century A.D. (no. xiv.128/6: Berenice Form B385) and an Italian or African lamp of Loeschcke Type VIII (no. xiv.127/26: second century A.D.), as well as much residual terra sigillata of the first century A.D. The fill is therefore probably to be dated around the middle of the second century, and not long after the laying of the latest floor beneath. The fill is sealed by a thick mortary layer which is probably a floor: this is the level to which the room had been cleared by the previous excavators and it corresponds closely to the level of the paving in the street outside. The superstructures of walls 50, 54 and 55 are slightly displaced at this level relative to the walls beneath (see pl. 53c), but for lack of any stratigraphy above it is impossible to tell whether they represent Byzantine work or are to be dated in the intervening period.

The principal interest of this isolated section, then, lies in the massive early wall 56. This is far more substantial than just the wall of a building, and indeed it is comparable to the broad foundation found beneath the northern portico of the East Forum Temple and interpreted as the remains of an early city wall. (See p. 11.) The width of wall 56 must have been at least 2.50 m. It is certainly later than the wall beneath the temple portico (unless the dating-evidence is contaminated), and there can hardly be any direct relationship between the two. Nonetheless, its scale can hardly be explained otherwise than as a defensive wall, and it may be that it represents an extension in the second century B.C. of the earlier defensive circuit. Only further excavation could establish the plausibility of this explanation.
FIG. 76. The Casa Brogan: general plan of excavations, showing numbering of walls. Mosaics and walls of exclusively Byzantine date are omitted (cf. figs. 74 and 75). (After a detailed survey of the excavations by Dennis Hickey and an outline plan of the peripheral structures by Michael Ballance.)
FIG. 77. The Casa Brogan, sections (1): north and west, with key to conventions.
FIG. 78. The Casa Brogan: key to locations of sections.
FIG. 80. The Casa Brogan, sections (3): ‘cellar’ and outlying trenches to south and east.
CHAPTER VI

ASPECTS OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(a) EXCAVATIONS AROUND THE ANTONINE TEMPLE

(P.M.K.)

The Antonine Temple and its immediate surroundings were initially uncovered between 1926 and 1937, and a description of the temple by Professor R. Bartoccini has appeared in print (Bartoccini 1964).

The work of the British expedition to Sabratha included the excavation of two trenches in this area, in 1948 and 1951 respectively. (See fig. 81.) The first (trench N1) was situated in one of the row of rooms behind the podium of the temple which faced onto the street immediately to the east. It is clear from the plan that these rooms must have been contemporary with, and integral to the construction of, the temple precinct: this was confirmed by the excavation and a useful group of stratified pottery was obtained, whose terminus ante quem is established by the dedication of the temple in A.D. 166-9 (IRT 21; Bartoccini 1964, 27). The second trench (trench Y3-4) was presumably dug in order to investigate the history of the street on the south side of the temple, which it transected, and the date of the insula to the south, whose irregular outline betrays the influence of the pre-Roman layout. In the event, the principal interest of this section lay in the discovery of a large and closely datable pit-group of the Augustan period. This section is discussed first.

The records upon which the following account is based are similar in the case of both excavations. There are site notebooks, original section drawings, and a measured plan of trench N1. No report had been prepared, but the site notebooks do include interpretative notes by KMK, upon which the account which follows (and the presentation of the published section drawings) is wholly dependent. Much of the pottery (but not all of that from trench Y3-4) had been catalogued by KMK. The fine wares have now been reviewed and newly described by the writer; Donald Bailey has provided comment on the lamps and Michael Fulford has contributed the reports on the coarse wares from Pit 2 in trench Y3-4, and from the Phase 5 levels in trench N1. To both of these I express my thanks.

TRENCH Y3-4 (fig. 82)

No accurate plan of this trench seems to have been made, nor do the records include a location plan. However, the position of the trench shown in figure 81 has been deduced from the dimensions of the drawn sections and from sketches in the site notebook: it is unlikely to be seriously inaccurate. The plan included in figure 82 is a sketch compiled by the writer from the available information: the principal elements are as follows.
At the north end, the trench ran obliquely up to the south precinct wall of the Antonine Temple. An earlier wall (wall Y4.1), built of stretchers with drafted edges, emerged at a slight angle from the east face of the trench, and was found to have been cut by the foundations of the Antonine Temple (pl. 53d). The wall was probably reduced to its two surviving courses at the time when the temple was built, though it must already have been buried and partly robbed out long before then. At the southern end of the trench, the foundations of the street-front of Regio II, Insula 3 were uncovered, and the photograph shows that these were formed of sandstone header blocks (pl. 54a). Some three metres out from this wall, well into the line of the street, was found a very large pit (Pit 2), approximately 2.50 m. in diameter and 2.25 m. deep from the present surface. This pit contained a loose fill of domestic rubbish, including much fine ware and sixteen coins. The finds are described in detail below.

The stratigraphic relationships between these structures, and the phases to which they have been attributed, are shown in figure 82, sections A–B and C–D. Phase 1 consists of levels associated with wall Y4.1, comprising its foundation-trench and associated make-up, capped by a level of clay which may have been a floor. Two courses of the wall are preserved, of which the upper one is composed of blocks with carefully drafted edges (pl. 53d). There was no fine ware from these levels, and only two sherds of coarse ware are recorded (context xxv.20). The only evidence for the date of this wall is therefore provided by the levels above (phase 2). It may be noted, however, that its structural characteristics are very similar to those of the early walls.
FIG. 82. Sections and plan of trench Y3-4 across the street on the south side of the Antonine Temple.
beneath the north-west angle of the Forum Basilica (p. 69 and pl. 18a). The wall appears to follow approximately the same alignment as those found by Bartoccini beneath the south-west angle of the temenos of the Antonine Temple (see fig. 83 and Bartoccini 1964, pl. 16).

![Fig. 83. Sketch-plan of excavations beneath the temenos of the Antonine Temple in 1937. (After an unpublished drawing by Luigi Turba.)](image)

Above the floor just described is a succession of further levels (Phase 2) which are interpreted in KMK's notes as occupation-levels and subsequent floors associated with the same building. A sequence of similar levels towards the south end of section A-B, cut off by pit 2, were taken to represent the continuation of the same surfaces, and the finds are consistent with this (contexts xxv.21 and 22). The fine wares include a number of small sherd sand Campana A, amongst which are a rim of a fish-plate, Berenice Form B3, several bases probably of the mid second century B.C. (nos. xxv.21/8-9), and a rim-fragment of Berenice Form B8 or B9 (no. xxv.21/10). There is also a fragment of Hellenistic red-glazed bowl of Berenice Form B186 (no. xxv.21/36) which is attributable broadly to the second century. There are a few sherds of possibly earlier date, but the evidence is sufficient only to say that the structure of which wall Y4.1 forms part was in existence by the second century B.C. (A lamp fragment of the first or second century A.D., no. xxv.21/33, is presumably intrusive.) In common with many of the coins found in the 1951 season, two coins recorded from phase 2 are unfortunately missing.

Phase 3 is represented by the cutting of pit 1, which was not completely excavated. The fine ware from this pit (not catalogued: layers S.p. Y4-12, 14, 15) also included Campana A Ware and the following forms were noted: Berenice Forms B4, B8 and a rather poor rim of Form B9 or B10. A late-second-century date is possible.

Phase 4 saw the construction of Regio II, Insula 3, with a wide rubble-filled foundation-trench which cut through the phase 2 levels at the south end of the section. The foundation-trench is sealed by a thickish fill without any obvious traces of a surface prior to traces of mortar at the present surface-level. This fill appears to correspond to a similar series of layers to the north of pit 2, which seal and have sagged into the upper part of pit 1. In the northern stretch there are fragmentary mortar streaks which may represent successive (street) surfaces. The Roman street was presumably not paved, and the level to which the area had been exposed by the Italian excavations is arbitrary.

The character of the finds from the phase 4 levels (context xxv.23) suggests that there is contamination by later material, and the site notes relating to the north end of the section also warn of this possibility. The fine ware includes much Campana A and other black-glazed sherds of varying quality; but there are also several sherd sand Eastern Sigillata A of the first century B.C. (nos.
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xxv.23/34–38, Berenice Forms B313, B323), a fragment of a Hellenistic wheel-made lamp of similar date (no. xxv.23/uncat.) and four sherds of Italian Sigillata. The last-mentioned include a decorated sherd for which Howard Comfort has suggested a date around the mid first century A.D. (no. xxv.23/31 = Comfort 1982, 491, no. 12), a fragment of a plate bearing the stamp MARC in planta pedis (Reg. 1294), and a rim of a dish, now missing, but apparently of Berenice Form B237 which should belong to the second half of the first century A.D. (no. xxv.23/33). Three of the four sherds of Italian Sigillata were found at the north end of the trench, and it is likely that the missing piece was also. (It is not possible to discover this without verifying the mark on the actual sherd.) The inference that these sherds are intrusive is based on the following two factors.

Firstly, the evidence from the excavation of the Byzantine wall in Regio II, Insula 1 suggests that that insula was laid out in the Flavian period (below, p. 227 f.), and the excavations in the Forum have shown that the establishment of a regular layout was initiated in that area around the mid first century A.D. (see Chapter IIc, Forum Period Ia). It therefore seems unlikely a priori that Regio II, Insula 3 should have been laid out on such an irregular alignment as late as the second half of the first century A.D. The second, and far more compelling reason for scepticism, is the evidence of pit 2 in the section under discussion, which is described in detail below. Regardless of stratigraphy, the finds from this group represent a remarkably coherent body of material, almost wholly free from both intrusion and residuality, attributed to the decade 10–1 B.C. If that is accepted, as I believe it must be, the drawn section shows with equal clarity that pit 2 is cut through the phase 4 levels, from a surface close to or slightly above the level to which the street had been cleared by the Italians. Therefore, if the four sherds of Italian Sigillata are discounted, on the grounds that they belong either to the robber-trench of phase 6 or to intermediate surfaces at the north end of the section, the remainder of the evidence suggests that Regio II, Insula 3 was laid out at some time during the first century B.C., and definitely prior to 10 B.C.

Phase 5 comprises the cutting and re-filling of pit 2. This large pit, clearly visible in plate 54b, was cut from the present surface-level or slightly above, through the earlier levels, including pit 1, deep into the natural sand. The steepness of its sides shows that it must have been re-filled almost immediately. The fill of the pit (context xxv.24) contained much pottery, charcoal (and probably other carbonized remains), bones, metal objects and sixteen coins. This suggests that it was essentially a dump of domestic refuse, which carries the further implication that the area in which it was dug was a back-yard or waste ground at the time, rather than a street. Any relationship between the pit and the early wall Y4.1 was obscured by the subsequent robbing of the wall in phase 6, but it seems likely that the structure to which the wall belonged had already ceased to exist before the insula to the south was built. The finds comprising this remarkable assemblage are described in detail below. Of the sixteen coins, unfortunately only one can now be found (no. 369, mid–late fourth century B.C.: see p. 268), but the fine wares indicate a well-defined date for the group of c. 10–1 B.C. (see below, p. 199).

There are clear signs of settlement at the top of the pit, which was subsequently made good by the laying of successive mortar surfaces. The fine wares from these upper levels (contexts xxv.25–27) differ little in character from the main fill: apart from two sherds of African Red Slip Ware (no. xxv.25/20, Hayes Form 181 or 182; no. xxv.24/289, a Flavian body-sherd, listed in error with the main fill) which are presumed to be intrusive, a short sequence of infills are suggested by the following pieces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Ware</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xxv.25/24</td>
<td>Italian Sigillata</td>
<td>Stamped base of cup, Comfort (1982) 497, no. 43</td>
<td>Late Augustan/Tiberian?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Italian Sigillata</td>
<td>Berenice B208</td>
<td>From c. 12 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Eastern Sigillata A</td>
<td>Berenice B333</td>
<td>c. 10 BC–AD 20/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv.26/9</td>
<td>Italian Sigillata</td>
<td>Base, Berenice B211?</td>
<td>c. AD 5/10–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv.27/12</td>
<td>Eastern Sigillata A</td>
<td>Hayes (AFC) 46</td>
<td>Early Cl AD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 6 relates to the construction of the Antonine Temple and is therefore dated to A.D. 166–9. A narrow foundation-trench for the precinct wall was identified at the north end of section A–B, and to this period also is attributed the robber trench above the remaining courses of wall Y4.1, shown in section C–D. The fine wares from these levels (context xxv.28) were not
FIG. 84. Fine wares from Pit 2 in trench Y3-4: Hellenistic fine ware (nos. 1-9), Italian Sigillata (nos. 10-32) and Eastern Sigillata A (nos. 33-44). Scale 1:3 (stamps on Italian Sigillata, 1:1).
particularly informative, including much residual black-glazed ware and early Roman *terra sigillata*, and only two sherds of early African Red Slip Ware (nos. xxv.28/9, Hayes Form 9A, and no. 28/23). The contemporary ground-level had been removed by the previous excavators: KMK’s notes put forward the suggestion that the street may have been terminated at its western end by a flight of steps leading down to the main *cardo*, which runs northwards towards the Forum.

**Phase 7**, the latest phase in this sequence, comprises the fill of pit 3, which does not appear on either of the sections, but which is shown in the sketch-plan intersecting the top of pit 2. The pit contained a very loose fill of sand and stones and the fine ware from it is entirely residual, consisting of black-glazed ware, Italian Sigillata and Eastern Sigillata A. There were no other associated features.

**THE POTTERY FROM PIT 2 (CONTEXT Y.I. XXV/24)**

In the catalogue below, the number of each entry is followed by a figure in parentheses: this is the number of the piece in KMK’s catalogue, which is marked on the sherd preceded by ‘Y.I. xxv.24’, except where the item was included in the Small Finds Register for the excavation as a whole, in which case it may bear the Register number alone (e.g. ‘Reg. 320’). Certain numbers in KMK’s catalogue embrace more than one sherd or vessel.

**FINE WARE (P.M.K.)**

*Hellenistic fine ware* (fig. 84)

1. (37) Not illustrated.
   Part of plate in Attic Black-Glazed Ware, Ch. IX, no. 129: 375–325 B.C.
   Also: 2 sherds of good black-glazed ware (36a, b – not seen), possibly Attic.

2. (242 + Reg. 1298) Not illustrated.
   Two fragments of a broad cup with vertical wall and vertical handles decorated above with horizontal spurs and lateral volutes. Fine brown clay, fired buff to cream at the surface; unslipped.

3. (288) D. c. 44 cm.
   Rim-fragment of thick plate with sloping floor and down-turned rim. Sandy red clay showing a little golden mica, with cream-coloured surface (slip?) on outside, and burnished red-brown slip on inside and over rim; uneven trickles of red slip on outside also.
   The fabric is very similar to that of the ‘Pompeian-Red’ piece no. 64. The shape suggests a date in the second or first century B.C. (Cf. Berenice Form B118.)

4. (Reg. 1299) D. 15.2 cm., H. 4.8 cm.
   Hemispherical bowl with grooved bead-rim. Sandy grey clay containing some fine mica; inside smoothed and with dull brown-black slip, outside knife-finished, fired grey-buff and unslipped apart from some trickles running down from the rim.
   Similar: 4 other rims of basically the same form but with slightly varying treatment at the lip (23, Reg. 1287, uncat.).
   The fabric could be related to that of the preceding piece. The form is reminiscent of Lamboglia Form 1 in the Campana B and C wares. It is common at Sabratha and occurs in several qualities. (See also nos. 106, 107 below.) Presumably first century B.C., and perhaps later.

5. (280) D. 37 cm.
   Rim of large dish. Finely granular grey clay containing a little mica, with traces of semi-lustrous black slip. Surfaces poorly finished.
   Possibly Campana C from Sicily (Lamboglia Form 7): cf. Morel F2266a and F2284a, ‘c. 110±50 B.C.’
6. (279a) D. (foot) 10 cm.
   Base of large dish. Finely granular grey clay with very worn upper surface. Possibly unslipped.
   Similar: another base (uncat.) with ungrooved resting-surface and partial semi-lustrous black slip.
From the same, or a similar vessel to the preceding.

7. (279b) D. (foot) 17 cm.
   Base of large dish. Fabric as the preceding: upper surface completely abraded, traces of partial slip around foot on underside.

8. (328) D. 17 cm.
   Rim of small dish. Fabric as the preceding; partial semi-lustrous black slip.
Campana C? Clearly similar in character to no. 5, but there is no close parallel in Morel’s series.

9. (218) D. 17 cm.
   Rim of small dish. Fabric as the preceding; slight traces of black slip.
Campana C? A shallow variant of Lamboglia Form 19? Cf. Morel F1252 (Campana C) and F1163 (Sardinian). Second–first century B.C.
Also: 4 rims, 4 bases and 6 unclassified sherds of various black-glazed wares.

Italian Sigillata (fig. 84)
The Italian Sigillata from this deposit shows great uniformity of fabric, though two fine sub-divisions in the colour of the body-clay are apparent. The texture is in all cases fine and without obvious inclusions. The clay may be pale pink (= fabric 1), or of a slightly yellower shade which may be described as pinkish-buff (= fabric 2). In either case the slip is finely smoothed, of medium lustre and red-brown in colour. On some pieces the slip is worn over the rim, and not all of the pieces are wholly slipped beneath the foot.

10. (93) D. 16 cm.
    Rim of dish, fabric 1.
    Similar: two body-sherds (93, 107), fabric 2.
Goudineau Type 1: ‘from before 40 B.C.’

11. (76) D. 32 cm.
    Rim of platter, fabric 1.
    Similar: two rims (uncat.), possibly part of the same vessel.
Not directly paralleled by Goudineau, but probably contemporary with his Type 6 – i.e. c. 30–20 B.C.

12. (96 + 102 + 107) D. c. 58 cm.
    Large platter, fabric 2. Many fragments.
Goudineau Type 15, Fellmann Type Ib: from c. 15 B.C.

13. (94) D. 16 cm.
    Rim of plate, fabric 1: small counterpart to the preceding.

14. (83 + 97) D. 38 cm.
    Rim of platter, fabric 2.
    Similar: rim, D. c. 44 cm., fabric 1 (101).
Goudineau Type 17a, Fellmann Type 1c: from c. 12 B.C.

15. (Reg. 1331) D. 16.5 cm.
    Rim of plate, fabric 1 (strong pink): small counterpart to the preceding.
16. (103 + 107) D. 31.5 cm.

17. (70) D. c. 42 cm.
   Rim of platter, fabric 2: variant of the preceding (Service 1') rims.

18. (91) D. 17 cm.
   Rim of plate, fabric 2.
Goudineau Type 19a: from 25–20 B.C.

19. (107 + 321) D. (foot) 18.0 cm.
   Base of large platter with low, broad foot and external concave moulding; fabric 2, unslipped within foot. A broad band of fine rouletting above foot, small inscribed circle at centre, radial stamp: L.IEGIDIVS/CALVIO in double rectangle (CVA/R 819c).

20. (Reg. 1198) D. (foot) 15 cm.
   Base of platter with similar foot to the preceding; fabric 1, unslipped within foot. A band of fine rouletting above foot, radial stamp: EPAPHRA/RASINI in rectangle (CVA/R 1510).

21. (99) D. (foot) 21 cm.
   Base of large platter with heavy square-cut foot; fabric 2, unslipped within foot. A broad band of rouletting between double grooves above foot, radial stamp: MENELAV/A.VIBLSC in rectangle (Comfort 1982, no. 40, dated c. 10 B.C.)

22. (96) D. (foot) 19 cm.
   Base of large platter with heavy foot, convex on outside; fabric 1, underside of preserved fragment partially slipped. A broad band of rouletting between shallow grooves on floor.

23. (323) D. (foot) 17 cm.
   Base of platter with square-cut foot of medium height; fabric 1, unslipped within foot. A band of rouletting between grooves above line of foot, light groove at outer edge of sherd.

24. (107a + Reg. 1158) D. (foot) 9.5 cm.
   Base of plate with chamfered foot and external concave moulding; fabric 2, underside partially slipped. A band of fine rouletting on floor, central stamp: A.SE[...? in hatched double rectangle.
   Similar: small sherd of foot with similar profile (107).

The foot-profile is early (see Goudineau 1968, 239 f.) and is most readily paralleled at Bolsena by examples from level B–2C (e.g. ibid., nos. B–2C–4, 7, 10, 13), which is dated c. 30–15/12 B.C. The stamp is not listed in CVA/R, but may belong to the circle of A. Sestius: cf. CVA/R 1792–1819, especially no. 1812 which shows various hatched frames. Probably c. 20–10 B.C.

25. (107b) D. (foot) 8.5 cm.

26. (90) D. 17 cm.
   Rim of krater (?), fabric 1.
   Cf. Berenice no. B249 (c. 10–1 B.C.)

27. (78) D. 10.2 cm.
   Rim of cup, fabric 2.
Goudineau Type 2: from before 40 B.C.

28. (79) D. 14.5 cm.
   Rim of cup, fabric 1.
Goudineau Type 16, Fellmann Type 1b (variant): c. 15 B.C.
29. (98) D. 14.5 cm.
Rim of cup, fabric 2.
Goudineau Type 18, Fellmann Type 1c: from c. 12 B.C.

30. (92) D. 9 cm.
Rim of cup, fabric 1. Similar to the preceding, with inflections of the wall reduced to a minimum.

31. (95) D. (foot) 6.2 cm.
Base of conical cup, fabric 1.
The angular junction between wall and floor is characteristic of the conical cup Goudineau Type 27/Berenice Form B208. This profile of foot is first attested at Bolsena in level B-2B (Goudineau 1968, nos. B-2B-2, 3, 11), which is dated between 15/12 B.C. and A.D. 1/3.

32. (324) Body-sherd, 3.0 × 3.7 cm.
Fragment of Aco-beaker with raised 'thorn' decoration. Fine pink clay with semi-lustrous red-brown slip on outside only.
Also: 32 unclassified body-sherds, many of which probably belong to the vessels listed above.

Eastern Sigillata A (fig. 84)
The fabric of the following pieces is typical, and does not call for detailed description here. The body-clay is fine and varies in colour between cream and pale pinkish-buff. The orange tone found in some later vessels in this ware is absent. The slip is red-brown and similar in tone to that of the Italian Sigillata; it is, however, less glossy and frequently worn and uneven. Double-dipping streaks are often apparent.

33. (68) D. 37 cm.
Part of large dish with upcurving rim.
Antioch Shape 124p/Berenice Form B313: late second century B.C. to end of first.

34. (69) D. 26.5 cm.
Part of large dish with upcurving rim.

35. (63) Rim-fragment.
Part of large dish with short flat rim.
Antioch Shape 105p/Berenice Form B317: c. 50-1 B.C.

36. (80) D. (foot) 11.5 cm.
Base of large dish, form as nos. 33 or 35.

37. (326) D. (foot) 19 cm.
Base of large dish, probably corresponding to no. 34.
Also: 16 body-scherds of large dishes, attributable to the preceding or similar vessels.

38. (71) D. 27.8 cm.
Part of flat-based dish with short flat rim.

39. (64) D. 13.5 cm.
Part of small dish with flat floor, sloping wall, everted bead-rim and ring-foot.

40. (77) D. (foot) 5.4 cm.
Base of small dish, possibly the same vessel as no. 39.

41. (65) D. 16.0 cm.
Part of hemispherical cup with plain rim.
Similar: 2 rims, D. 9, 15 cm. (67, 72).
42. (61 + 66) D. 12.2 cm.
   Part of hemispherical cup with pronounced bead-rim.
   *Antioch* Shape 164/*Berenice* Form B323B: date as no. 41.

43. (327) D. (foot) 5.2 cm.
   Base of hemispherical cup, form as nos. 41 and 42. Broken away neatly above the foot to
   form a counter.

Also: 5 body-sherds of hemispherical cups as nos. 41–43.

44. (82) D. (foot) 6.0 cm.
   Base of conical cup with ring-foot and stepped underside.
   *Antioch* Shapes 453, 455, 457; *Berenice* Form B334: ‘c. A.D. 1/10–50/60.’

'Tripolitanian' Sigillata (*fig. 85*)

This name has been proposed by the writer (Kenrick 1985, 283) for a class of *terra sigillata* which
was common at Berenice, and for which there is evidence in Tripolitania, at Carthage and
possibly in Sicily. The earliest stratified deposit in which the ware was found at Berenice was
Tiberian (Deposit 46), but an Augustan date was suggested for the beginnings of the industry on
stylistic grounds. The occurrence of the following pieces in Pit 2 is therefore of cardinal
importance for the dating of this ware.

The fabric of 'Tripolitanian' Sigillata is described in the following terms in Kenrick (1985) 283.
'The body-clay is finely granular, of an orange or pale orange-buff colour; it contains a small
quantity of fine mica, and sometimes a few dark particles. The slip is evenly applied but varies
between orange and red on different vessels . . . It regularly covers the whole vessel, but may be
patchy inside the foot; surfaces are well smoothed and the slip, though porous, usually has the
high gloss of western *terra sigillata*. It is characteristically dull on the inside of the foot.
Brush-marks are never visible, in contrast to Eastern Sigillata B with which its appearance may
most readily be confused.' The pieces listed below conform to this definition.

45. (86 + 88) D. 16.7 cm., H. 3.5 cm.
   Dish with flat floor, sloping wall, plain rim and oblique ring-foot. Two bands of coarse
   rouletting on floor. Inside of foot unslipped.
   *Berenice* Form B400.

46. (235) D. 17 cm.
   Part of dish with sloping wall and plain rim; slight groove on inside of lip, perhaps a
   concave moulding on inside at base of wall.
   Approximately similar to *Berenice* Form B406.

47. (87) D. c. 35 cm. (very approximate)
   Rim-fragment of large dish with sloping wall and broad flat rim, hooked upwards at the
   outer edge.
   *Berenice* Form B414.

48. (84) D. 10 cm.
   Part of conical cup with steep, slightly flaring, wall, offset at mid-height on inside and
   offset lip.
   *Berenice* Form B425.

Also: 2 body-sherds of large dishes or plates.

Unslipped thin-walled wares (*fig. 85*)

The fabric of most of the following pieces is uniform, and is as follows unless otherwise stated.
The clay is fine, without obvious inclusions apart from an occasional trace of lime, and is
orange-brown in colour. Surfaces are carefully smoothed on the outside, but there are generally
fine turning-marks on the inside; the outside surface is also fired slightly darker in colour than the
FIG. 85. Fine wares and lamps from Pit 2 in Trench Y3-4: 'Tripolitanian' Sigillata (nos. 45-48), thin-walled wares (nos. 49-62), Pompeian-Red Ware (nos. 63-65) and lamps (nos. 66-76). Scales 1:3 (fine wares) and 1:2 (lamps).
core or the inside. Vessels of this kind were made in many different parts of the Roman world, and the study of their sources still has a long way to go: the pieces listed here are likely to be imports from some part of Italy or Sicily, but it is not at present possible to be any more specific than that.

49. (230) D. (rim) 10 cm.
   Part of ovoid beaker with convex vertical rim.
   Moevs (1973) Form VI.

50. (224) D. (rim) 6.3 cm.
   Part of ovoid beaker with small everted rim. Fine multiple rouletting on body.

51. (225) D. (rim) 7.0 cm.
   Part of ovoid beaker with small inset rim. Fine multiple rouletting on body.

52. (227b) D. (rim) 7 cm.
   Part of ovoid beaker with plain inward-sloping rim. Angle of rim uncertain (small uneven sherd). Fine multiple rouletting on body.

53. (226) D. (base) 5.0 cm.
   Lower part of ovoid beaker with flat base. Scar of lower handle-attachment on edge of sherd; body decorated with combed vertical lines.
   Moevs (1973) Form XV.

54. (312) D. (base) 4.8 cm.
   Part of globular beaker with flat base.

55. (329) D. (base) 3.8 cm.
   Flaring disk-base of a globular beaker, or possibly an unguentarium. Traces of darker colouring on both inside and outside surfaces may indicate the former presence of a slip.

56. (223 + 228) D. (rim) 7.8 cm.
   Several non-joining fragments, almost certainly of a single cylindrical beaker with a high, plain rim separated from the body by an offset or groove. The body is decorated with very fine, uniform raised 'thorns'. Comfort (1982) no. 41.


57. (231) D. (base, max.) 7 cm.
   Part of cylindrical beaker with small moulded foot.
   Moevs (1973) Form XXXIII; Mayet (1975) Form XII.

58. (329) D. (rim) c. 7.5 cm.
   Part of tapering beaker with plain vertical rim. A band of fine oblique striations on body, probably produced by a blade in the final stages of smoothing.

59. (227a) D. 14 cm.
   Part of bowl with vertical wall and plain rim. Fine oblique striations on body, similar to those on no. 58.

60. (232) D. (rim) 12 cm.
   Part of hemispherical bowl with internal bead at lip. Finely granular red clay with a grey core and whitish surface (slip?). A scar on the edge of the sherd at the lip suggests that there may have been a handle.

61. (229) Body-sherd, 3.6 × 2.3 cm.
   Fragment of a bowl showing a broad raised band applied en barbotine, decorated with impressed vertical lines.

62. (222) D. 11.1 cm.
   Part of deep cup with curving body and tall flaring rim, marked off from the body by an offset. Two grooves low on exterior.

Also: 8 unclassified body-sherds of thin-walled vessels.
Pompeian-Red Ware (fig. 85)

63. (320) D. 50 cm.
   Flat-based dish with low curving wall and rolled rim. Granular red-brown clay containing moderate quantities of quartz sand and muscovite and biotite mica; internal dull red slip, fired partly white, especially over the rim. Three bands of multiple grooves on floor.
   Berenice Form B482: first century B.C. The fabric may be Peacock's (1977) Fabric 2, of possible Aegean or Anatolian origin.

64. (119) D. 27 cm.
   Rim, similar to the preceding but more rounded. Finely granular red-to-grey clay with burnished brown-to-black slip on inside and over rim. Outside surface fired (slipped?) cream.
   Similar: rim fragment (290).

65. (89) D. 34 cm.
   Part of dish with curving wall and plain vertical rim. Granular brown clay containing mica and shiny black particles; highly micaceous, dull, burnished red slip on inside and over rim. Lower part of outside shows burning.
   Berenice Form B479: Augustan and first century A.D. The fabric is Peacock's (1977) Fabric 1, identified as Campanian.

LAMPS (D.M. Bailey)

The lamps are illustrated in figure 85 and plate 55.

66. (366) Heavy, blunt nozzle-fragment from a mould-made lamp. Soft grey clay, darker at surface, unslipped. (Not photographed.)
   African or Italian, first century B.C.

67. (166, 167: not illustrated) Two fragments of a mould-made lamp in a fine grey clay, unslipped but burnished on underside.
   African: akin to Bailey Q627 and the parallels quoted thereunder. Second half of first century B.C.

68. (170) Upper part of a Dressel Type 2 Warzenlampe. Fine orange-buff clay with semi-lustrous red to black slip.

69. (158: not illustrated) Fragment of a Dressel Type 2 Warzenlampe in fine grey clay with traces of dull black slip.
   An African copy?

70. (152) Part of an early Italian Dressel Type 4 Vogelkopflampe. Fine, hard cream clay with uneven, dull, orange to brown slip.
   Pavolini (1981, 162) dates these to c. 50 B.C.-A.D. 15.

71. (148) Nozzle of an early Italian Vogelkopflampe as the preceding. Similar fabric.

72. (161 + 274) Part of lamp with recessed, fluted discus and embryonic volutes on either side of the nozzle. Fine orange clay with traces of uneven orange to red slip.
   Italian, transitional between Dressel Types 2-4 and Loeschcke Type IA: early Augustan.

73. (150) Nozzle of lamp with flanking volutes. Fine orange clay with dark brown slip.
   As no. 72.

74. (367) Part of lamp with pattern of parallel and converging lines on body. Fabric as no. 72.
   As no. 72.
As nos. 72–74: parts of three other lamps (149, 161, 169).

75. (145, 154) Two fragments of a Loeschcke Type IA lamp with fine oblique striations on discus. Fabric as no. 72, with good red-brown slip.
   Similar: three small fragments of other lamps (153, 159, 160).
   Italian, Augustan.

76. (Reg. 1311) Base of lamp with cursive signature, FAVSTI/MARII. Fabric as no. 72.
   Italian. This precise reading is not previously noted, but FAVSTI is well known: see Bailey (1980) 95. Augustan.
   Also: 3 handles of either Dressel Types 2–4 or transitional lamps as nos. 72–74 (146, 147, 168) and 14 unclassified fragments of Italian lamps of the Augustan period.

AMPHORAE (M.G. Fulford)

A. Tripolitanian and African forms (fig. 86)

Fabric. The characteristics shared by the fabrics of Tripolitanian amphorae and coarse wares are, unfortunately, very similar to those shared by wares produced in central and northern Tunisia. The difficulties of distinguishing between these wares are noted by Peacock in his characterisation of the North African quartz-limestone fabrics found at Carthage (Fulford & Peacock 1984, 14–18).

The Sabratha wares therefore fall within the North African fabric range as defined at Carthage. Typically, the hand specimen shows a hard, red (10R 5/6–2.5YR 5/6) fine sandy clay (quartz generally <0.05 mm.) with a hackly fracture. The clay also contains moderate but variable amounts of white specks (<2.0 mm.). This calcareous material often appears on the surface as voids surrounded by white reaction rims. The colour of the body-clay is usually even, but the core is occasionally reduced to grey with oxidised margins. The outer surface is usually white or cream, sometimes against a reduced background. This description fits well with that of certain Tripolitanian kiln waste (see L. Jones, 'The petrology' in Arthur 1982, 69–71).

In the catalogue of these wares, only idiosyncratic details are noted.

77. (330) D. (rim, internal) 13 cm.
   Hole-mouth jar. White surface over the exterior.
   Common in Tunisia from the fourth/third centuries B.C. and in Hellenistic contexts at Sabratha (e.g. p. 46 with fig. 9, Reg. 454 and pl. 13) Cintas (1950) no. 315; Hayes (1976) 112, Early Amphora 1; Berenice Hellenistic Amphora 10 (Riley 1979, fig. 70, no. D53).

78. (196) D. 15 cm.

79. (293) D. 17 cm.
   With an everted and rounded rim. No. 79 has a reduced fabric rich in white specks, reminiscent of fabric 2.6 at Carthage (Central Tunisian); both examples with traces of a cream-white surface.

80. (331) D. 17 cm.

81. (193) D. 14 cm.
   With prominent grooves around the underside of an everted rim; internal surface of the rim slightly concave; white surface over the exterior and the upper surface of the rim.
   Cf. Van der Werff (1978) fig. 10, nos. 6, 9, his Form 2.

82. (174) D. 15 cm.

83. (332) D. 15 cm.
   As nos. 80 and 81, but in a fine light brown clay (5YR 6/6) with no white specks visible in the hand specimen; white surface over the exterior and upper surface of the rim.

1 Colour codes in this and the following section refer to the Munsell Soil Color Charts (Baltimore, various dates).
FIG. 86. Amphorae from Pit 2 in trench Y3-4. Scale 1:3.
84. (173) D. 16 cm.
85. (183) D. 14 cm.
86. (333) D. 17 cm.
87. (334) D. 16 cm.
88. (335) D. 16.5 cm. Similar: one other rim
With a slight, but distinctive, beading just below the upper surface of the rim.
These, and the larger example no. 89, can be paralleled by Berenice Early Amphora 11b (Riley 1979, nos. D163–165) and at Uzita (Van der Werff 1978, fig. 12, no. 9, his Form 3).
89. (171) D. 17 cm.
A larger version of nos. 84–88.

Discussion (nos. 78–89). These types can be compared with the Punic amphora forms 2 and 3 of Van der Werff’s classification (1978, figs. 10, 12). The vessels are characterised by their cigar-shaped body, short neck and everted rim; the handles are attached to the upper part of the body, below the neck. (Cf. p. 46 and fig. 9, Reg. 599.) Van der Werff notes that although the origin of his Form 2 should be sought in Byzacena, he recognizes evidence of Tripolitania production as well. His Form 2 dates from the second century B.C. and is common in contexts of the second half of that century, but is still found, as here at Sabratha, in Augustan contexts (Van der Werff 1978, 179). His Form 3, however, is considered to be of predominantly Tripolitanian origin and dating from the fourth/third centuries B.C. Although he notes evidence of local production down to the Augustan period, Form 3 apparently ceases to be exported sooner than his Forms 1 and 2. Continued production of this form into the first century A.D. in Byzacena is also argued for by Van der Werff (1978, 181).

90. (169a) D. 17 cm.
With handles attached to a taller neck and a heavy, ‘pulley-wheel’ rim; white surface on the exterior over a reduced background.
Ostia Form LXIV = Tripolitana I; Berenice Early Amphora 11a (Riley 1979, no. D161); attested at the kiln site at Sidi as-Sid (Arthur 1982, fig. 5, nos. 1, 2).
91. (292) D. 13.5 cm. Similar: 9 other rims
Thinner-walled vessels with light rims; a shallow but distinctive groove around the upper surface of the rim, which is sharply undercut beneath; traces of the handle(s) attached immediately below the rim; a white surface on the exterior over a reduced background.
92. (175) D. 15 cm.
With a plain, rounded rim, bent outwards to create a seating for a lid (?); white surface over the exterior.
On the basis of the rim alone, the type is reminiscent of the later Ostia Form IV = Africana I and would, therefore, be intrusive. It is also similar to Ostia Form LIX (Panella 1973, 632, fig. 49, where an undated vessel from Tipasa is illustrated). A similar rim is recorded at Berenice from a probable Hellenistic context (Riley 1979, no. D103).
93. (190) D. 12 cm.
Amphora or flagon. Cream sandy clay (5Y 8/4) with a cream surface (5Y 8/4) all over.
94. (211) D. (rim, max.) 10 cm.
With a pointed, inturned rim; hard, fine red clay (10R 6/6) with a white surface all over. Berenice Mid Roman Amphora 1b (Riley 1979, nos. D216, 217). Riley notes that the type is usually found in first-century A.D. contexts in Tripolitania and Italy, the earliest being an Augustan–Tiberian level at Lepcis Magna (Riley 1979, 177–179). Panella has argued for a Tripolitanian or Byzacene origin; the latter is more likely (Panella 1973, 467–471, 632, figs. 45–46).
95. (336) Base of Ostia Form LXIV = Tripolitana I; white surface outside.

B. Miscellaneous forms and fabrics (fig. 86)

96. (189) D. 11.5 cm. Similar: 4 other rims
   Dressel 2–4; red-brown clay (2.5YR 6/8) with much black sand and occasional white
   particles <1.0 mm.; brown (2.5YR 6/6) to grey surfaces.

97. (197) D. 13 cm.
   Dressel 2–4 or Rhodian; hard light brown gritted clay (5YR 7/6; inclusions <1.0 mm.)
   with a cream/yellow surface outside (10YR 7/4), reddish-yellow inside (7.5YR 7/6).
   Possibly Aegean; similar rim at Berenice, Early Roman Amphora 3 (with horned handle: Riley
   1979, no. D116).

98. (339) D. 14.3 cm.
   Dressel 2–4; fine, sandy, light brown clay (5YR 6/8; quartz <0.5 mm.) with traces of a
   white surface all over.
   Possibly Italian.

99. (337) D. 14.8 cm.
   Dressel 1B(?). With a slightly overhanging rim; fine, light brown clay (5YR 6/6), closely
   comparable with nos. 82 and 83 above, and a plain, light brown surface (7.5 YR 6/6).
   Probably Italian.

100. (172) D. 15.5 cm. Similar: one other rim
    Dressel 6. With collared rim; hard, fine, yellow-red clay (7.5YR 7/6) with a yellow-
    brown, plain surface (10YR 7/4).
    Probably North Italian, dating from the Augustan period (see Riley 1979, 151–156).

101. (338) D. 18 cm.
    With a high collared rim; light brown heavily gritted clay (sub-rounded inclusions 1.0
    mm.); light yellow surface (2.5YR 8/4).
    Spanish: cf. Haltern Form 70, Camulodunum Form 185A, dating from the late first century B.C.

102. (195) D. 16 cm. Similar: one other rim
    Dressel 7–11(?). Abraded rim-fragment: fine, light yellowish-brown clay (7.5YR 7/6)
    with a plain light brown surface (10YR 7/4).
    Cf. Ostia Form LII, from the late first century B.C. However, the fabric does not fall within the
    expected range for Spanish vessels, and these pieces may be variants of Van der Werff's (1978)
    Form 2.

Quantification: amphorae

On the basis of a rim count (the only means of comparison available for this material: see below,
p. 197), two thirds of the vessels appear to be Tripolitanian or North African, and about 20 per
cent are of Italian origin. The detailed breakdown is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Number of rims</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa/Tripolitania</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy: Campania</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other regions</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>5.0/7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>10.0/12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE OTHER COARSE WARES (M.G. Fulford)

**Fabric.** Descriptions are not listed for each type unless the fabric falls outside the range of characteristics shared by Tripolitanian and North African (Tunisian) wares as described above for the amphorae (p. 183). The overwhelming majority of the domestic wares are of Tripolitanian or North African (Tunisian) origin. Surfaces may be assumed to be plain and oxidised except where otherwise stated.

**Bowls: (a) small (fig. 87)**

103. (340) D. c. 25 cm.
   With a shallow groove around the upper surface of the rim; white surface outside.

104. (26) D. uncertain.
105. (29) D. 20 cm. Similar: 2 other rims
   With an undifferentiated rim; either with traces of a white surface over the upper part of the exterior, or with a plain red-brown surface all over.

106. (23) D. 13 cm.
107. (24) D. uncertain Similar: 9 other rims
   As nos. 104 and 105, but with two or three parallel shallow grooves immediately below the rim; a white surface over the upper part of the exterior, otherwise plain. Reminiscent of Lamboglia Form 1 in Campana B and C Wares: see also no. 4 above, listed with the fine wares.

108. (302) D. 14 cm.
109. (27) D. 13.5 cm. Similar: 5 other rims
   As nos. 104 and 105, except that the rim turns upwards to be almost vertical; white surface over the upper third of the exterior, otherwise plain. The profile of no. 109 suggests that it might have been a lid.

110. (21) D. 14 cm.
111. (304) D. 17 cm. Similar: 13 other rims
   With a plain, pointed rim; generally, white surface over the upper third of the exterior but, occasionally, a white surface over the whole interior.

112. (341) D. 16 cm.
   As nos. 110 and 111, with white surface over the interior as well as the upper third of the exterior; a band of light rouletting over the reserved area outside.

**Bowls: (b) large (fig. 87)**

113. (17a) D. 22 cm.
114. (17b) D. 21 cm.
115. (342) D. 23 cm. Similar 13 other rims
   With flat rim; white surface over the rim and upper part of the exterior. A creamy sandy fabric with a white surface all over, as no. 115, also occurs.

116. (343) D. 36 cm. Similar: 2 other rims
   With a ‘reeded’ rim; a white surface over the interior and on the upper surface of the rim.

117. (8) D. 40 cm.
118. (14) D. 41 cm.
119. (344) D. 25 cm.
120. (345) D. 26 cm. Similar: 39 other rims
   The commonest bowl in this group. Considerable minor variation in the treatment of the rim, which is usually wedge-shaped in profile; a shallow groove or offset is usually present on the upper surface of the rim. Limestone inclusions occasionally <8.0 mm.; one
FIG. 87. Coarse-ware bowls from Pit 2 in trench Y3-4. Scale 1:3.
example with a cream fabric and white surface (no. 120). Otherwise surfaces are white all over; rarely, left plain, when occasionally reduced rather than oxidised.

Berenice Early Roman Plain Ware 1 (Riley 1979, nos. D801–810): Riley notes that the form occurs occasionally in Hellenistic deposits but is common in early first-century-A.D. contexts (1979, 329–331); 11 examples have also been recorded at Uzita (Van der Werff 1982, 142: Groot Vaatwerk Schaal Form 2) and the form is also present at Carthage.

121. (346) D. (foot) 8.5 cm.
122. (347) D. (foot) 7.5 cm. Similar: 10 other bases
Bases which probably belong to the preceding form.
123. (348) D. (top of rim) 35 cm.
With flanged rim; white surface all over.
124. (20) D. (top of rim) 36 cm.
With flanged rim; decorated with irregularly spaced groups of finger-impressions; white surface all over.

Bowls: (c) in ‘hand-made’ fabrics (fig. 87)

125. (349) D. 40 cm. Similar: 4 other rims
Pantellerian ware. With roughly burnished red-brown to black exterior.
For details of the fabric see Peacock’s description (Fulford & Peacock 1984, 8–10) and the petrological report below, p. 198, Group 1(a).
126. (278) D. uncertain
With a deep groove around the upper surface of the rim; roughly tempered with sub-angular inclusions of grog (<2.0 mm.); grey with a red-brown interior, burnished dark grey on the outside.
The fabric is similar to that of the bowls/braziers below, nos. 183–189 and is probably local: see the petrological report, p. 199, Group 5.

Casseroles: (a) wheel-thrown (fig. 88)

127. (247) D. c. 20 cm. Similar: 2 other rims
Rim with reverse ‘S’ profile; fine, hard, red clay (10R 6/6) with black exterior.
This casserole type is present in pre-146 B.C. destruction layers at Carthage, where it is common (Cf. Byrsa i, 204, fig. 28.10; 209, fig. 39.24–25; 223, fig. 72.1). The close similarity in both form and fabric to the Carthaginian examples suggests a common origin, perhaps in northern Tunisia.
128. (350) D. c. 20 cm.
As no. 127, but the rim is simpler and the fabric slightly coarser — a fine, hard, red clay (2.5YR 6/6) with blackened exterior.
Possibly a Tripolitanian version of no. 127 (but cf. Byrsa i, 223, fig. 72.41).
129. (116) D. 28 cm. Similar: 1 other rim
Similar to no. 127, but the rim is folded inwards on itself; partially blackened exterior.
Cf. Byrsa i, 209, fig. 39.23; Rood Byzaceens Gebruiksaardewerk Form 3 (21 exx.) at Uzita (Van der Werff 1982, 114–115).
130. (351) D. 36 cm. Similar: 2 other rims
Similar to no. 129, with the rim folded inwards on itself; simple convex profile to the rim externally; traces of a white surface over the exterior of the rim and upper part of the body.
131. (6) D. uncertain
132. (352) D. 24 cm. Similar: 3 other rims
Similar to no. 130, except that the rim is not folded in on itself; white surface against a reduced background all over.
Cf. Rood Byzaceens Gebruiksaardewerk Form 7 (6 exx.) at Uzita (Van der Werff 1982, 118).
FIG. 88. Coarse wares from Pit 2 in trench Y3–4: casseroles (nos. 127–142), dishes (nos. 143, 144), jars (nos. 145–149) and lids (nos. 150–166). Scale 1:3.
133. (3) D. 27 cm.
   Similar to nos. 127 and 129, with a flat top to the rim; fine, light brown clay (7.5YR 7/6) with a plain, light brown surface.
   Probably imported.

134. (4) D. 20.5 cm.
   With a small, out-turned rim, internally cupped; white surface over the upper part of the body against a reduced background all over.

135. (300) D. 23.0 cm. Similar: one other rim
   Flat rim, internally cupped; fine, micaceous, dark red-brown clay (2.5YR 5/4) with fine grey/white inclusions (<0.5 mm.).
   Riley notes that the form (in a variety of fabrics) is common in the western Mediterranean in the first century A.D. (1979, 250 f.). This type is not in the North African tradition ‘a patina cenerognola’. See also the petrological report, p. 198, Group 2(b).

136. (299) D. 21 cm.
   As no. 135, but with a more pronounced lid-seating.

137. (285) D. c. 37 cm.
   As nos. 135 and 136, but with a heavier rim and thicker body; dark grey clay with numerous white/grey inclusions (<1.0 mm.); dark grey-black exterior.

138. (266) D. 17 cm.
   Necked, with a rounded rim, concave on the interior; grey clay with numerous grey/black grits (<1.0 mm.) and oxidised margins.
   Imported, Pantellerian: see petrological report, p. 198, Group 1(c).

Casseroles: (b) ‘hand-made’ (fig. 88)

139. (275) D. 18 cm.
140. (282) D. 20 cm.
141. (283) D. 27 cm. Similar: 8 other rims
   Pantellerian ware, with roughly burnished brown to black exterior as no. 125.
   This form is also found at Carthage in association with later first-century B.C. and early first-century A.D. fine wares (Harbourside site, report forthcoming). See the petrological report, p. 198, Group 1(b).

142. (353) D. 15 cm.
   Pantellerian: as nos. 139–141 but smaller, in a grey clay with reddish margins and a yellow surface (7.5YR 7/4); fine black (<1.0 mm.) and rare white grits (<1.0 mm.).
   See the petrological report, p. 198, Group 1(a).

Dishes (fig. 88)

143. (31 + Reg. 1333) D. 19.6 cm.
144. (210) D. 26 cm.
   ‘Orlo bifido’ type: fine, yellow-brown clay (5YR 6/8–7.5YR 7/6) with a reddish-yellow to dark red surface (5YR 7/6–10R 5/4).
Jars: (a) wheel-thrown (fig. 88)

145. (34) D. c. 16 cm.
With rolled-over rim: fine, sandy, light grey clay with oxidised margins; white surface over exterior and rim.

Jars: (b) hand-made (fig. 88)

146. (354) D. 26 cm.
With everted rim: grey clay with light brown margins (7.5YR 7/4); heavily tempered with grey and black grits, normally <1.0 mm., occasionally <2.0 mm.; roughly smoothed surface, partially blackened over the rim inside and out.
Imported: see the petrological report, p. 199, Group 3.

147. (277) D. 30 cm.
With everted rim: light brown clay (2.5YR 6/6) tempered with numerous black, white and grey grits (usually <1.0 mm., occasionally <2.0 mm.); light brown surface, roughly burnished over the exterior with partial blackening.
Imported, Pantellerian: see the petrological report, p. 198, Group 1(c).

148. (355) D. uncertain
Bead rim: soft, fine, yellow-orange clay, tempered with ill-sorted grog inclusions (<8.0 mm.); a plain, but smooth yellow-orange exterior (10YR 7/4).
Probably local.

149. (259) D. c. 30 cm.
Bead rim: hard, fine, reddish-orange clay (10YR 6/8), tempered with ill-sorted inclusions of grog and limestone (?) (<3.0 mm.); a plain, but smooth light brown surface (10YR 7/6).
Probably local: see the petrological report, p. 199, Group 4.

Lids: (a) small (fig. 88)

150. (127) D. 9 cm.
Characterised by a broad, flat rim, concave on the underside; generally oxidised on the underside, but the upper surfaces are either oxidised or reduced (and plain): white surfaces are rare.

151. (356) D. 10.8 cm.
Similar: one other rim
Similar to no. 150, but the rim does not lie flat; it retains a concave underside; both oxidised and reduced surfaces occur.

152. (Reg. 1308) D. 10.0 cm., H. 2.5 cm.
Similar: one other rim
With a thickened rim; the underside horizontal or very slightly raised outwards; traces of a white surface over upper and lower surfaces against a reduced background.

153. (133) D. 10.0 cm.
Similar: one other rim
As no. 150, but in a reduced grey clay, rich in limestone (<0.5 mm.); traces of a white surface against a reduced, grey background all over.

154. (309) D. 9.2 cm., H. 3.1 cm.

155. (Reg. 1309) D. 9.8 cm., H. 2.4 cm.
Similar: 3 other rims
With the rim turned under, creating a distinct 'lip' on the underside; surfaces plain or partially or completely white against an oxidised or reduced background.

This type compares closely with examples present at Carthage before 146 B.C. (cf. Byrsa i, 208, fig. 36.33 bis).
THE POTTERY FROM PIT 2 IN TRENCH Y3-4

156. (112) D. 9.6 cm.
   Similar to nos. 154 and 155, but with a distinct convex profile to the upper side of the rim; white surfaces against a grey background on the upper side.

157. (111) D. 10 cm.
   Similar profile to no. 156, but with a simple everted rim as nos. 152 and 153; white surface against a grey background on the upper side.

Lids: (b) large (figs. 88, 89)

158. (122a + 137) D. 29.7 cm., H. 6.9 cm.
159. (357) D. 28 cm.
   Similar: 17 other rims
   The rim is 'squarish' in profile, with very little or no differentiation in thickness before the knob, which is hollowed underneath and has the appearance of a base from the outside; usually a plain red or red-brown surface (2.5YR 6/6; 10R 6/6), except for the rim which is usually blackened on the edge; white surfaces are rare.

160. (113) D. 26 cm.
   Similar: 15 other rims
   Similar to nos. 158 and 159, but the profile of the rim is rounded; the lower part of the profile has a distinctive shallow 'S' character. Plain, light red-brown surfaces (2.5YR 6/6); blackening of the edge of the rim is rare.

161. (128) D. 29 cm.
   Similar: 5 other rims
   With a distinctive chamfered finish to the rim; generally thicker-walled than nos. 158-60; plain, red-brown surfaces with blackening around the rim; the fabric is distinguished by moderate to numerous white specks. No examples with a white surface.

Very similar to lids recorded in contexts before 146 B.C. at Carthage (cf. Byrsa i, 209, fig. 39.32).

162. (120) D. 30 cm.
163. (121) D. 22 cm.
   Similar: one other rim
   With a rounded and thickened rim: yellow-brown clay and surfaces (5YR 6/4-7.5YR 7/4) with traces of overall blackening.

164. (122b) D. uncertain
   Similar: one other rim
   As nos. 162 and 163, but in a distinctive reddish-brown fabric containing much black sand. Peacock (1977) fabric 1: Campanian, the lid-form which accompanies dishes in Pompeian-Red Ware (see nos. 63-65 above).

165. (125) D. 42 cm.
   With a thickened rim and a distinctive lip on the underside; dark red (10R 6/4) to grey clay with a red or blackened surface all over.

166. (Reg. 1306) D. (knob) 4.2 cm.
   Similar: 2 other centres
   Centre only, with a pierced knob; perhaps originally intended to be similar to no. 158; traces of a partial white surface on the upper side.

167. (135) Centre only
168. (358) Centre only
   Similar: one other rim
   With a solid knob; plain red surface (2.5YR 6/4-6/8) all over.

Closed forms (fig. 89)

NOTE: Where insufficient survives to be certain whether a vessel had one or two handles, the description is qualified 'one-handled (?)'.

169. (250a) D. (rim) 3.1 cm.
   Similar: 2 other rims
   One-handled, small neck and simple, rounded rim; white surface all over against an oxidised background.
FIG. 89. Coarse wares from Pit 2 in trench Y3–4: lids (nos. 167, 168), closed forms (nos. 169–182), braziers/bowls in hand-made fabrics (nos. 183–189) and miscellaneous (nos. 190–197). Scale 1:3.
170. (250b) D. (rim) 4.0 cm.  
As no. 169, but with a down-turned rim; white surface all over against an oxidised background.

171. (252) D. (rim) 6.0 cm.  
Similar: 2 other rims  
With a simple, out-turned rim; white surface all over the outside and partially over the inside.

172. (204) D. (top of rim) 8 cm.  
Similar: one other rim  
With an inturned rim; white surface all over.

173. (359) D. (rim) 7 cm.  
With a narrow neck and a ‘cupped’ profile: light orange-brown clay (2.5YR 6/8) with a yellow-orange surface all over (7.5YR 7/8).

174. (255) D. (rim) 8.5 cm.  
One-handled(?); carinated neck, bead rim; white surface over the exterior.

175. (198) D. (rim) 9 cm.  
With a cordon below a vertical rim: fine, light brown clay (7.5YR 7/6) and darker brown surface (5YR 5/6) with a white surface over the exterior and the inner surface of the rim.

176. (254) D. (rim) 12 cm.  
177. (256) D. (rim) 10 cm.  
Similar: 2 other rims  
One-handled (?), with an everted rim with lid-seating; fine, light red clay (10R 6/6) with a white to cream surface all over.

178. (258) D. (rim) 15 cm.  
One-handled (?); similar to nos. 176 and 177, but with a heavier rim; fine, light brown clay (5YR 6/6) and surface (10YR 7/4); burnt (?).

179. (360) D. (rim) 11 cm.  
With an everted, triangular rim; light red sandy clay (10R 6/8) with ill-sorted limestone inclusions (usually <1.0 mm., occasionally <3.0 mm.); white to cream surface all over.

180. (361) D. (rim) 13 cm.  
With a collared rim: light red sandy clay (10R 6/8) with fine white specks <0.5 mm.) and a white surface all over.

181. (191) D. (rim) 13 cm.  
Similar: one other rim  
One-handled (?), with a ‘pulley-wheel’ rim; fine red clay (10R 5/6) with a white surface all over.

182. (Reg. 1295) D. (max.) 7.0 cm.  
Body only, one-handled; fine red clay (10R 5/6) with numerous white specks (<0.5 mm.) and reaction rims; cream surface over whole of exterior.

Braziers, and braziers or bowls, in hand-made fabrics (fig. 89)

As no reconstruction of a profile was possible, it was difficult to distinguish between sherds which definitely belonged to braziers and those, in similar fabrics, which belonged to bowls. In some cases the estimated diameter of the rim seems too great for certain vessels to have been braziers. For a petrological report on these wares, see p. 199, Group 4.

183. (57) Preserved H. 9.3 cm.  
Similar: one other example  
Brazier handle, in a very roughly made fabric: the clay has a fine matrix, densely tempered with ill-sorted and irregular inclusions, most of which seem to be of grog, ranging up to 10 × 5 mm. in size, but more commonly <5.0 mm. The core is reduced, the margins oxidised with a grey or oxidised (10R 6/8) surface, very roughly smoothed.

For an idea of form, see Riley (1979) figs. 113–115.
184. (58) D. (max.) c. 30 cm.  
Similar: 2 other rims  
Brazier (?); incurving rim to which small lugs have been luted; fabric as no. 183 but grog inclusions commonly <5.0 mm.; roughly smoothed yellow-brown surface (7.5YR 8/4).

185. (362) D. (max) c. 40 cm.  
Brazier (?); incurving rim to which small lugs have been luted; fabric as no. 183 but grog inclusions commonly <5.0 mm.; roughly smoothed yellow-brown surface (7.5YR 8/4).

186. (236a) D. (max.) c. 27 cm.  
Similar: one other rim  
Brazier (?) with inturned rim around which runs a pronounced groove; surface indications suggest that lugs or handles were attached to the rim; the clay has a fine brown matrix (7.5 YR 7/6), tempered with moderate amounts of grog, <3.0 mm., and so finer than nos. 183-185; roughly smoothed brown surface (7.5YR 6/4).

187. (363) D. (max.) 45 cm.  
Similar: 16 other rims  
Brazier or bowl with curving wall and inturned rim; no trace of attached lugs. Fabric as nos. 183-185: the roughly smoothed surface is pale yellow (10YR 8/2), showing reddening where the grog inclusions (<5.0 mm.) protrude.

188. (60) D. (max.) 30 cm.  
Similar: one other rim  
Brazier or bowl as no. 186, but with a distinct beading around the rim; fabric and surface also as no. 186.

189. (236b) D. (base) 17 cm.  
Similar: 2 other examples  
Base of brazier with trace of (triangular?) opening in the wall: fabric and surface treatment similar to nos. 183–185.

See the petrological report, p. 198, Group 2(a).

Also: a total of 15 body-sherds in a similar grog-tempered fabric to nos. 183–185. These sherds are distinguished by holes 20 mm. in diameter pierced in them at approximately 30 mm. intervals. One of these sherds has an external horizontal lug.

Miscellaneous (fig. 89)

190–192. (248a–c) Total of 5 sherds  
Body sherds decorated with impressed ovolo designs: fine yellow to light brown clay (5YR 6/6–10YR 8/2); surface plain and cream.

Probably Punic: cf. Byrsa i, 137, fig. 33.

193. (364) Preserved L. 8.8 cm.  
‘Frying-pan’ handle: fine, light red clay (2.5YR 6/6) with numerous white specks; white surface all over.

194. (233) D. (rim) 2.4 cm.  
Neck of unguentarium: fine orange-brown clay with an uneven, slightly darker slip over the rim and the inside and outside of the neck.

Also: a sherd from the body of a (piriform?) unguentarium in similar fabric, with a dark brown slip on the inside.

195. (365) D. (foot) 2.4 cm.  
Solid base of fusiform unguentarium. Fine light red clay (2.5YR 6/8) with a blackened surface all over.

196. (263) D. (foot) 1.6 cm.  
Base of fusiform unguentarium: fine reddish-yellow clay (2.5YR 7/6) with traces of a white/cream surface outside.

197. (365) Re-used amphora sherd, cut into a circular counter approximately 3.2 cm. in diameter and 1.0 cm. thick. Fine dark red clay (10R 5/4) with numerous white specks <1.0 mm.; blackened ‘exterior’. The ‘interior’ is marked by two shallow drill-holes, 3 mm. and 5 mm. deep respectively.
QUANTIFICATION OF THE COARSE WARES (M.G. Fulford)

The discussion below must be prefaced by the cautionary note that it is not now known for certain to what extent any of the sherds from the deposit were discarded, either on site or at any subsequent time before the death of Dame Kathleen Kenyon in 1978. However, the character of the material available for study suggests that (a) no sherd of fine ware has been discarded, however small, and that (b) though body-sherds of coarse ware have been almost wholly discarded, all rims and some or all of the bases were kept. A comparison of the relative quantities of different rims now present in the assemblage is therefore likely to provide a valid account of its original composition.

The table below quantifies the surviving coarse-ware rim sherds according to their functional groups. Body sherds and bases (or lid-tops) have been omitted from this analysis. The table also distinguishes the hand-made vessels from the wheel-thrown, and those definitely not made in North Africa (from northern Tunisia to Tripolitania) from the rest. This does not imply that the imported non-African wares necessarily came from further afield than some of the African wares: Pantelleria, for example, which is the most important source is not significantly more remote than northern Tunisia which could have been the source of some of the casseroles. It is not possible to distinguish consistently in the hand specimen sherds from the various pottery-producing regions between Tripolitania and the north of Tunisia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>No. of rims</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>No. of rims</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowls, small</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowls, large</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowls, large, hand-made</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Pantelleria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casseroles, wheel-thrown</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casseroles, hand-made</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jars, wheel-thrown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jars, hand-made</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lids, small</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lids, large</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Campania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed forms</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braziers (hand-made)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazier/bowl (hand-made)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hand-made wares account for 47 sherds or 17.5% of the assemblage. Of the imported (non-African) wares, Pantellerian rims (17) account for 6.3%. The combined total of amphorae and coarse wares amounts to 308 rims, of which the amphorae account for 13%, the coarse wares 87% and the non-African vessels in both categories add up to 39 rims, or 12.7% of the combined group. Regarding the functional range, the group is dominated by bowls and lids, the latter being a little more than twice as common as the casseroles, the form with which they are usually linked.

For comparison with the above figures, the total number of fine-ware rims recorded is 59, which yields the following composition for the whole pottery assemblage (not including the lamps).
Seventeen sherds of pottery were thin-sectioned and then examined under a polarising microscope. The selection was limited to a sample of the range of hand-made vessels present and of those wheel-made vessels whose fabrics, in the hand specimen, were clearly different from the North African quartz-limestone wares which account for the majority of the sherds present. The material was divided into five groups, three of which originated outside Tripolitania. All of the sherds are from Pit 2 in trench Y3-4 with the exception of one sherd which is from trench N1 behind the Antonine Temple, in Group 1(c) (below, p. 209, no. 56).

**Group 1(a)**
Nos. 125 and 142: aenigmatite (cossyrite), aegirine augite, anorthoclase felspars, quartz, volcanic glass, trachyte lava and haematite.

**Group 1(b)**
Nos. 139-141: anorthoclase felspars, quartz, haematite and volcanic welded tuff.

**Group 1(c)**
Nos. 138 and 147 from Pit 2 in trench Y3-4 and no. 56 from trench N1, phase 5: anorthoclase felspars, aenigmatite, aegirine augite, trachyte lava, quartz, grog and (possibly) shell.

The minerals listed above are all characteristic of the geology of the island of Pantelleria and hence it can be assumed that the sherds in question originated there (see D.P.S. Peacock, ‘Carthage and Cossyra: a ceramic conundrum’ in Actes: Colloque sur la céramique antique, Carthage, Tunis 1982, 91-98; also Fulford & Peacock 1984, 8-10). Group 1(b) lacks aenigmatite and aegirine augite, while some grog and shell are present in small amounts in Group 1(c). It should be noted that the range of Pantellerian forms present in the two Sabratha groups complements that recorded by Peacock, mostly on the basis of fourth- to seventh-century A.D. material from Carthage (Fulford & Peacock 1984, 156-159, figs. 55, 56).

**Group 2(a)**
Nos. 136, 137, 189: quartz, sodic plagioclase and orthoclase felspars.

**Group 2(b)**
No. 135: quartz, including distinctive fragments with no sign of current transport, sodic plagioclase and orthoclase felspars, some muscovite and rare hornblende.

The minerals present in these specimens point to an origin in an area of granitic or metamorphic rock, although the character of the quartz in no. 135 is more indicative of a volcanic origin. Although it is impossible to be more precise about their origin, their mineralogy, particularly that of no. 135, recalls that of sherds of similar form from Berenice (Riley 1979, 250).

---

2 I am grateful to Professor K. Bailey of the Department of Geology, University of Reading, for his assistance with the identifications.
Group 3
No. 146: numerous very large crystals of anorthoclase felspar, sub-ordinate quartz and rare green pyroxene.
An origin in a volcanic region is indicated; given the difference in character of the inclusions from Group 1, an alternative source, perhaps southern Italy, may be postulated.

Group 4
Nos. 149, 184, 185, 187 and brazier body-sherds: grog, quartz, small felspars and shell.
The mineralogy of these hand-made sherds, whose temper is dominated by grog, is quite compatible with a local origin in Tripolitania.

Group 5
No. 126: very occasional grog, quartz and shell (?); very fine grained.
The nature of the inclusions is consistent with a local origin.

THE DATE OF THE ASSEMBLAGE (P.M.K.)
For lack of all but one of the sixteen coins originally recorded from this deposit, the establishment of its date is dependent essentially upon the fine wares and the lamps. The datable items are attributable in the main to the first century B.C., with a heavy preponderance in the Augustan period. The Italian Sigillata consists principally of ‘Service I’/Berenice Group A shapes as found at Oberaden (occupied 12–9 B.C.), and the only representative of ‘Service II’/Berenice Group B which was introduced c. 10 B.C. (see Kenrick 1985, 141) is one base of a conical cup, no. 31. The stamps on the Italian Sigillata tell the same story: three of the five (on nos. 19–21) are radial two-line stamps, typical of Service I vessels down to 15/10 B.C. (Goudineau 1968, 353). No. 24 has a central rectangular stamp, still early in character and combined with an early foot-profile, whilst no. 25, albeit fragmentary, shows a rounded end to the stamp-frame and should be somewhat later, i.e. not earlier than the last decade B.C. On the other hand, the almost total absence of Berenice Group B forms, which flooded the market so rapidly once they had been introduced, suggests that the terminal date of the deposit can hardly be later than the turn of the era. Confirmatory evidence is provided by the Eastern Sigillata A, the majority of which may be attributed comfortably to the second half of the first century B.C.: the latest items comprise nos. 39 and 40, possibly part of a single vessel dated not before c. 10/1 B.C., and no. 44, the base of a conical cup with a stepped underside. This form is an imitation of the Berenice Group B conical cup with moulded rim (Berenice Form B208) and J.W. Hayes has suggested (AFC) that the stepped underside, a feature peculiar to Eastern Sigillata A, was introduced at about the turn of the era. The latest datable pieces of fine ware in the deposit are therefore nos. 24, 31 and 44 and it seems reasonable to suppose that its terminal date falls in the decade 10–1 B.C. The lamps are consistent in character with the rest of the fine ware but do not contribute to a further refinement of the date suggested.

Of some interest in its implication for the dating of the less-well-dated material found in the deposit is the extremely low level of residuality amongst the fine wares and the lamps. Of the 76 entries in these categories, only nos. 1 and 2, and perhaps four or five unclassified sherds of black-glazed ware, would have been definitely not in current circulation in the last quarter of the first century B.C. Pit 2 is likely, therefore, to have been dug and filled within a relatively short space of time and without significant contamination by earlier material already in the ground.

TRENCH N1 (fig. 90)
The site notes and the section drawing for this trench show mutual discrepancies which cannot now be resolved. Fortunately, it is only the latest levels here which are of real importance, and these are straightforward.
As in the case of trench Y3-4, the section drawing in figure 90 shows a sequence of phases based upon KMK's notes. **Phase 1** (contexts xviii.2–4) comprises a sequence of early occupation levels which does not appear on the section drawing, but which is shown in a sketch in the notebook towards the bottom of the west end of the section. The associated pottery is meagre, but includes a sherd of Attic black-glazed ware (uncatalogued), possibly of the fourth or third century B.C. **Phase 2** is described as a pit (context xviii.5), which is cut by the trench-built rubble foundations of the pre-temple walls N1.3 and N1.4. Bones and shell are noted amongst the contents. Two coins from this context are of the fourth century B.C. (nos. 31 and 225: see below, p. 268); the fine ware includes Attic or pre-Campana black-glazed ware of the fourth or third century, but a terminal date for the deposit in the second century B.C. is assured by the
presence of two sherds of Berenice Form B4 (nos. xviii.5/7 and 11) and one of Berenice Form B8 (no. xviii.5/12) in Campana A Ware. (A fragment of a Loeschcke Type VIII Italian lamp, no. xviii.5/40, of c. A.D. 90-150, must be intrusive.) There was therefore certainly early occupation here in the second century B.C., and the settled area of the town may have extended this far inland already in the fourth century. (Cf. the evidence of pre-Roman occupation beneath the Forum Basilica, p. 70.)

**Phases 3 and 4** comprise clay floors and accumulations of burnt occupation debris, presumably associated with the structure represented by walls N1.3 and N1.4. The fine ware from phase 3 (context xviii.6) includes early Roman *terra sigillata* and a few sherds of early African Red Slip Ware (nos. xviii.6/6-8: Hayes Forms 6, 8A and 181.1 (?) are identifiable). A date around the end of the first century A.D. is therefore likely for this building. Its irregular alignment was presumably determined by that of other structures in the vicinity. The fine ware from phase 4 (context xviii.7) includes one sherd of Late Italian Sigillata, and one of early African Red Slip Ware (nos. xviii.7/1 and 2). One block of wall N1.3 survives, but only the foundations of wall N1.4 were found: both were presumably demolished at the time when the Antonine Temple was built. The shallow cutting in the phase 3 and 4 levels at their western end is not explained in the notes, nor are any finds from it separately identified.

The levels of **Phase 5** are associated with the construction of the Antonine Temple, and it is these which are of prime interest in this section. The wide, rubble-filled foundation-trenches of the Antonine Temple precinct, and of the wall along the street frontage to the east are clearly visible, as is a uniform fill of rubble extending right across the earlier surfaces. No floor level is now preserved, but this will presumably have been at the height of the offset above the foundation courses of the walls enclosing the room. This implies a general raising of level by about 65 cm. The pottery from this level is plentiful (context xviii.8), and in view of the firm historical date provided by the dedication of the Antonine Temple in A.D. 166-9, it is described in detail below.

**POTTERY ASSOCIATED WITH THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE ANTONINE TEMPLE**

In the catalogue below, the number of each entry is followed by a figure in parentheses: this is the number of the piece in KMK's catalogue, which is marked on the sherd preceded by 'Y.I. xviii.8.' Certain numbers in KMK's catalogue embrace more than one sherd or vessel.

**FINE WARE (P.M.K.)**

In comparison with the group of Augustan pottery from Pit 2 in trench Y3-4 (above, p. 175 ff.), the fine ware from the context under consideration here comes from a much wider span of time. Some is clearly residual, whilst other pieces which may have been in current circulation when the Antonine Temple was built, belong to forms which had already been in production for some time. This earlier (or potentially earlier) material may be summarised as follows.

**Italian Sigillata:**
1 rim, *Berenice* Form B217
2 sherds, including a stamped fragment (Comfort 1982, no. 80: L. RASINIVS PISANVS)

**Eastern Sigillata A:**
Base of cup and 2 sherds

**Pompeian-Red Ware:**
1 sherd

**African Red Slip Ware:**
2 rims, Hayes Form 3B ('c. 75-150')
3 rims, Hayes Form 3C ('early-mid C2')
1 rim, Hayes Form 5A ('Flavian')
2 rims, Hayes Form 8A ('c. 80/90-180+')
4 rims, Hayes Form 9A ('c. 100-180+')
1 rim, Hayes Form 20 ('Late C1-early C2')
8 bases and 29 sherds in early fabric
FIG. 91. Pottery from phase 5 in trench N1, associated with the construction of the Antonine Temple: African Red Slip Ware (nos. 1-17), amphorae (nos. 24-32) and coarse-ware bowls (nos. 33-41). Scale 1:3.
The later pieces of African Red Slip Ware, whose presence in this context is of particular significance or interest, are the following. They are illustrated in figure 91.

1. (76) D. 21 cm.
   Rim of bowl, Hayes Form 14. Finely granular orange-red clay with barely lustrous slip of the same colour; surfaces poorly smoothed.

2. (38) D. 10 cm.
   Hayes Form 17: two small rim-sherds of different vessels. The illustrated example has the bright lustrous slip commonly associated with Hayes Forms 31-33; the other has a similar slip but contrasting body-clay (orange rather than red).

3. (78) D. 20 cm.
   Rim of casserole, Hayes Form 23B. Typical fabric.

4. (70) D. 24 cm.
   Rim of casserole, Hayes Form 23B. Typical fabric.

5. (26 + 58) D. c. 35 cm.
   Rim of dish, Hayes Form 27/31. Finely granular orange clay with thick, semi-lustrous orange-red slip.

6. (27 + 39 + 40) D. c. 29 cm., H. 4.2 cm.
   Profile of dish, Hayes Form 27/31. Fabric as no. 5. Similar: one rim and one base-sherd.

7. (28) D. 20 cm.
   Rim of bowl, Hayes Form 28. Rather sandy brown clay with highly lustrous but very worn orange-brown slip. (This is probably the coarse fabric which Hayes notes under Form 32.)

8. (46) D. uncertain
   Very small rim-fragment of a dish, Hayes Form 31. Typical fabric: finely granular orange-red clay with thick bright slip of the same colour.

9. (41) D. c. 40 cm.
   Rim of plate, Hayes Form 33. Fabric as no. 8.

Also: 3 body-sherds and 3 base-sherds of Hayes Forms 31-33, typical fabric.

10. (42) D. 7.7 cm.
    Rim of beaker, Hayes Form 139, 140 or similar. Finely granular red clay with lustrous slip of the same colour on the outside only.

11. (148) D. 4.6 cm.
    Part of small flagon (?) with narrow neck and everted rim. Finely granular orange-red clay with a thin, dull slip of the same colour.

12. (114) D. 19 cm.
    Rim of dish, Hayes Form 181.1. Fabric as no. 13 but burnt brown/black.

13. (59) D. c. 14 cm.
    Small rim-fragment of shallow dish, Hayes Form 181.1. Finely granular red clay, red slip on inside and over top of rim only, line burnishing on inside, upper part of outside partly discoloured white (stacking/firing).

14. (53) D. 30 cm.
    Rim of dish, Hayes Form 181. Fabric as no. 13. Also: 2 rims and 7 body-sherds of similar form and fabric.

15. (50 + 51) D. 27 cm., H. 3.0 cm.
    Lid, Hayes Form 182, with raised ‘foot-ring’. Soft, sandy red clay with red slip on upper side and over rim, smoothly burnished and slightly lustrous.

16. (60) D. 22 cm.
    Rim of lid, Hayes Form 182. Fabric as no. 15; more open rim.

17. (49) D. 30 cm.
    Rim of lid, Hayes Form 182. Hard, finely granular red clay with thin red slip on upper side and over rim; upper side burnished, rim dull and discoloured unevenly grey and white. Similar: rim, thinner; body-sherd.
Also: 2 sherds of casseroles, one with slip on both surfaces, the other slipped on the outside only.

**Discussion.** The stratigraphic position of this material has been described above (p. 201); the context was not sealed, but as the previous excavations appeared to have cleared the ground to slightly below the top of the deposit, there should be little or no contamination by later material. There are certainly no obvious later intrusions (e.g. of Byzantine date).

The assemblage of fine wares includes many examples of red slip ware forms which were current during the first half of the second century A.D. What is of particular interest here is the presence of a number of sherds with the thick bright slip which has hitherto been described by Hayes as characteristic of the early to mid third century (Hayes 1972, 289, and under Forms 18 and 28-33). These include nos. 2, 5-9, and with the additional sherds noted thereunder amount to a total of 8 rims/15 sherds out of a total of 36 rims/94 sherds of fine ware in the whole assemblage. The forms occurring here in this fabric are Hayes Forms 17, 28, 31, 33 and the transitional Form 27/31 which seems to be particularly characteristic of Tripolitania and Cyrenaica. (See Hayes 1972, 53 f. and Kenrick 1985, 349 f. under Berenice Form B616.)

Thus both the new fabric and the new forms of the early third century are present in this assemblage which should be dated before A.D. 169. In the absence of any more obvious pointers to the presence of intrusive material (e.g. fourth- to seventh-century sherds) there must be a strong presumption that these products were already in circulation (at least in North Africa) before that date.

**LAMPS (D.M. Bailey)**

18. (101) Not illustrated.
   Small fragment from discus of a mould-made lamp. Fine orange clay with lustrous orange-red slip.
   Italian, shape as Bailey Q735-741. Augustan.

19. (96) Plate 54c
   Small fragment from discus of a mould-made lamp with radiating lines. Fine buff clay with lustrous brown slip.
   Italian, Loeschcke Type VIII? Probably c. A.D. 90-150.

20. (98) Not illustrated.
   Handle-fragment of a mould-made lamp. Fabric as no. 19.
   Similar: small fragment of another lamp (99).
   Italian, Bronner Type XXI. Neronian-late Flavian.

21. (93) Plate 54c
   Part of discus of a mould-made lamp in a fine orange clay with dull, worn orange-red slip.
   Wreath on discus.
   Similar: 3 small fragments of other lamps (94, 95, 97).
   Standard Italian Loeschcke Type VIII lamp (Bailey Type Pi). About A.D. 90-150 or a little later.

22. (100) Plate 54c
   Small fragment from the upper part of a mould-made lamp. Fabric as no. 19.
   Italian? Loeschcke Type VIII. Second century A.D.

23. (102) Not illustrated.
   Fragment from underside of a mould-made lamp. Fabric as no. 19.
   Italian, Loeschcke Type VIII? Probably c. A.D. 90-150.

This group of lamps is consistent in character with the range of fine wares described above.
AMPHORAE (M.G. Fulford)

Fabric. The majority of the amphorae and the coarse wares are of Tripolitanian or North African origin. The difficulties of distinguishing individual sources within this range of quartz-limestone fabrics have been outlined above on page 183, to which the reader is referred for a detailed description. The fabrics of the vessels of presumed Tripolitanian or North African (i.e. Tunisian) origin are not described individually in the catalogue below unless they betray noteworthy characteristics. Surfaces may be assumed to be plain and oxidised except where stated otherwise.

Tripolitanian and African forms (fig. 91)

24. (105) D. 12 cm.
   With a rounded rim and upright neck: fine light brown clay (5YR 6/6) with some fine white specks; grey margins and a yellow-green surface (5Y 6/6).

25. (89) D. 14 cm.
   With an everted and undercut rim: yellow to brown sandy clay (about 10YR 6/6–7.5YR 6/6) with white specks, usually <0.5 mm., but occasionally <2.0 mm.; red margins with a white/off-white surface all over.
   Tripolitanian: cf. Van Der Werff 1978, Form 3, dating from the late third century B.C. to the first century A.D. The distribution of known finds is concentrated around Sabratha. Residual in this group.

26. (81) D. 16.4 cm.
   With everted, 'wedge-shaped’ rim: grey sandy clay, fine white specks common, occasionally ranging up to 3.0 mm.; traces of a white surface outside and over the rim.
   Probably Tunisian; recorded at Carthage, where probably residual (cf. Fulford & Peacock 1984, Amphora Form 54, fig. 40, no. 74 in fabrics 2.1, 2.2, or rarely 2.6 (= Central Tunisian)).

27. (91) D. 16 cm.
   Similar to no. 26: red sandy clay (2.5YR 5/6) with grey margins; dense, ill-sorted white specks (<4.0 mm.); white surface all over.
   Tripolitanian, a variant of Ostia Form LXIV = Tripolitana I; recorded at Carthage, where residual (Fulford & Peacock 1984, Amphora Form 54, in fabrics 2.2, 2.6); similar from the kilns at Sidi as-Sid (Arthur 1982, fig. 5, no. 3).

28. (92) D. 14 cm.
   With distinct concavity around the outer surface of the rim, undercut beneath: dark red clay with light red-brown margins (2.5YR 6/6) and surfaces; white specks (<0.5 mm.) common.
   Tripolitanian: cf. Ostia Form XXIV = Tripolitana II; Berenice MR Amphora 14 (Riley 1979, no. D259), commonly exported from the early second century A.D.

29. (103) D. 14 cm.
   Similar to no. 28, but without the distinct undercutting of the rim: fine, hard red clay (10R 5/6), fine white specks common; white surface on a blackened exterior.
   Tripolitanian: cf. Ostia Form XXIV = Tripolitana II; Berenice MR Amphora 14 (Riley 1979, no. D258); from the kilns at Sidi as-Sid (Arthur 1982, fig. 5, no. 5), exported from the early second century A.D.

30. (104) D. 16 cm.
   With a slightly everted rim, concave inside and out: fine, hard red clay (10R 5/6) with numerous white specks (<0.5 mm.), many of which are evident on the surface; the latter is blackened with traces of a white surface on top.
   Tripolitanian: cf. Ostia Form II = Tripolitana III; recorded at Carthage, where residual (Fulford &
Peacock 1984, Amphora Form 58 in fabric 2.7 (= Tripolitanian); Van Der Werff 1978, fig. 10, no. 7; at the kilns at Ain Scersciara (Arthur 1982, fig. 9, no. 6). This is an early context for a form which is generally attested from the early third century A.D.

31. (106) D. 12.5 cm. Similar: one other rim
   With rim slightly out-bent, thereby slightly 'cupped': fine red clay (2.5 YR 5/8) with rare, fine white specks; traces of a white surface over the exterior.
   African (?): resembles Ostia Form IV = Africana I; Berenice MR Amphora 17(b) (Riley 1979, nos. D283, D287). This form is attested from the late second/early third century, but the similarity with this piece is not so striking.

32. (90) D. 18 cm.
   Rim with a slight inturned flange: fine, flaky orange clay (2.5YR 6/8) with ill-sorted white specks (<0.5 mm.); a worn white surface all over.
   North African/Tripolitanian, but not to be confused with Berenice MR Amphora 1(b) (Riley 1979, no. D216). The worn and friable nature of the fabric suggests the piece may be residual here.

Discussion. Although this is a small group in which some pieces are probably residual, it is entirely Tripolitanian or Tunisian/Tripolitanian in origin.

THE OTHER POTTERY (M.G. Fulford)

Bowls: (a) small (fig. 91)

33. (73 + 153) D. 18 cm. With a pair of shallow grooves below the rim: fine, hard, sandy red clay (10R 6/8); plain red surface (10R 5/6) with white reaction rims evident.
   The resemblance to Lamboglia’s Campana Ware Form 1 is probably coincidental and in the detail of fabric and surface finish the type is different from otherwise similar small bowls in the Augustan group previously described (above, p. 187 and fig. 87, nos. 106, 107).

34. (71) D. 19 cm.
   As no. 33, but with a blackened exterior with traces of a white surface over the lower part.

35. (148) D. 16 cm.
   With a hooked rim: fine grey clay with oxidised margins: numerous white specks, both in the fracture and on the surface (<2.0 mm.); plain, dark brown (2.5YR 5/3) to black surface with traces of a white surface over the rim.
   Recorded at Carthage (cf. Fulford & Peacock 1984, Coarse Ware Form 39) but from a later context.

36. (67) D. 14 cm. Similar: 2 other rims
   As no. 35, but with a white surface over a blackened, plain exterior; red inner surface (10R 5/8).

Bowls: (b) large (fig. 91)

37. (62) D. 35 cm.
   With broad, everted rim: powdery clay with rare, ill-sorted calcareous inclusions (<3.0 mm.) and traces of white-painted decoration on the worn upper surface of the rim.
   Residual(?).

38. (63) D. (max.) 30 cm.
   With reeded rim: fine red clay (2.5YR 5/6) with numerous white specks (<0.5 mm.); white surface all over.
39. (64) D. (max.) 44 cm.
With flange: grey sandy clay with very numerous white specks (<0.5 mm.); white surface with a greenish tinge all over.

40. (65) D. 35 cm.
Inturned rim with a groove on the upper surface: reddish-yellow clay (2.5YR 6/8) with a grey core; abundant fine white specks; white surface inside and on the rim.

41. (135a) D. c. 40 cm.
Hand-made, with ‘almond’ rim: Pantellerian ware with black, roughly burnished external surfaces.
Similar to vessels in the Augustan group previously described (above, p. 189 and fig. 87, no. 125).

Casseroles (fig. 92)

42. (1) D. 22 cm.

43. (4) D. 24.5 cm. Similar: 15 other rims
With expanded rim and seating for a lid: fine red clay (10R 5/6) with fine white ‘specks’; plain surfaces, red inside, usually blackened outside with a white surface over, otherwise oxidised. This is the most numerous of the casserole types in this assemblage.
Tripolitanian or central/southern Tunisian. The form is common in Tunisia at Uzita (Van der Werff 1982, 120-121, fig. 6, no. 10: Rood Byzaceens Gebruiksaardewerk Form 10) and at Raqqada (Ennabli et al. 1973, fig. LIII, D1). At Sabratha itself it has been recorded in a context of c. A.D. 300 (Di Vita 1978, pls. 59-61), and at Lepcis Magna in contexts of the second half of the second and early third century (G. Pisani Sartorio in *Libya Antiqua* 6–7, 1969–70, 246–247 and pls. 61, 62, nos. 18, 19, 21). Conversely, the form is very rare at Carthage to the north and is absent at Berenice to the east. This form should not be confused with the casserole in Pantellerian ware which occurs in the Augustan group (above, p. 191 and fig. 88, no. 140). It is contemporary with the much more widely distributed northern/central Tunisian casserole (Hayes 1972, Form 197) which is not recorded in this group and which is, in any case, rare in Tripolitania. This form, in this fabric, is recorded beyond Tunisia/Tripolitania at Ostia from c. 225 (*Ostia iii, 416, fig. 331*) and at Luni (Frova 1977, 186, pl. 124, 2–6). A similar type is recorded from the kiln at Sidi as-Sid (Arthur 1982, fig. 7, no. 21).

44. (154) D. 16 cm.
With a simple, slightly everted rim: red-brown surface (2.5YR 5/6) with bands of burnishing around the outside. The form is similar to nos. 42 and 43.
Tripolitanian or central/southern Tunisian. The form is found in quantity at Uzita from c. A.D. 175/200 (Van Der Werff 1982, 124–125, fig. 6, no. 12: Rood Byzaceens Gebruiksaardewerk Form 12). Outside of North Africa it has been noted at Ostia (*Ostia i, 88, fig. 271*) in a context of c. A.D. 240.

45. (9) D. 18 cm.

46. (10) D. 20 cm.

47. (79) D. 25 cm. Similar: one other rim
With the rim bent outwards and folded in on itself: fine red clay and inner surface (10R 5/6), blackened exterior with a white surface over.
Probably Tripolitanian.

48. (12) D. 24 cm.

49. (14) D. 19.5 cm. Similar: 4 other rims
With everted rim, with a concave upper surface: fine red clay and inner surface (10R 5/6), blackened exterior with a white surface over.
Tripolitanian or central/southern Tunisian: the form is common at Uzita (Van der Werff 1982, 119–120, figs. 6, 9: Rood Byzaceens Gebruiksaardewerk Form 9). This and the smaller version, as nos. 50–53 below, are the second most common form of casserole in this group. Production in
Tripolitania as well as Byzacena, as suggested by Van der Werff, is very probable. Outside North Africa, small numbers have been found at Ostia from the early second century (Ostia iii, figs. 321–323) and at Luni (Frova 1977, 185, pl. 122, no. 8). This form in this fabric appears to be present at Berenice (Berenice Early Roman Cooking Ware 4), but care must be taken in distinguishing the North African fabric from others (Riley 1979, 250–251; see in particular fig. 100, no. D454).
50. (15) D. 13.5 cm.

51. (17a) D. 15 cm.

52. (17b) D. 15 cm.

53. (74) D. 15 cm. Similar: one other rim

54. (18) D. c. 28 cm.

55. (135b) D. 24 cm.

56. (136) D. 30 cm., H. 4.2 cm.

57. (156) D. 25 cm.

58. (116) D. 19 cm. Similar: 5 other rims

59. (129) D. c. 40 cm. Similar: 5 other rims

60. (118) D. 24 cm. Similar: one other rim

61. (121) D. 21 cm. Similar: one other rim

62. (119) D. 18 cm. Similar: one other rim

63. (124) D. 21 cm. Similar: one other rim

64. (126) D. 25 cm. Similar: one other rim

65. (125) D. uncertain

66. (128) D. 24 cm. Similar: one other rim

The form is present in the Augustan group (p. 191 and fig. 88, no. 141) and is therefore probably residual here.

**Dish (fig. 92)**

58. (116) D. 19 cm. Similar: 5 other rims

59. (129) D. c. 40 cm. Similar: 5 other rims

60. (118) D. 24 cm. Similar: one other rim

61. (121) D. 21 cm. Similar: one other rim

62. (119) D. 18 cm. Similar: one other rim

63. (124) D. 21 cm. Similar: one other rim

64. (126) D. 25 cm. Similar: one other rim

65. (125) D. uncertain

66. (128) D. 24 cm. Similar: one other rim

'Throw rim' type: sandy red clay (2.5YR 5/6) with varying amounts of fine white specks; the rim is almost always blackened, but sometimes with a white surface over.

Tunisian/Tripolitanian. The fabric of these sherds is indistinguishable from that of the lids from Carthage in fabric 2.1, lid types 1–4, 6, 7, 9–17 (Fulford & Peacock 1984), but that is not to presume that they are all from the same source. The fact that no examples of the casserole (Hayes 1972, Form 197) with which they are usually associated were found in this group suggests that these lids accompanied the casseroles that are recorded in this assemblage. Since the majority of these vessels appear to be of Tripolitanian or central/southern Tunisian origin on the grounds of their fabric and known distribution, it is logical to suppose that the lids also are likely to be of...
similar origin. This tentative assumption should not, however, preclude the possibility that 'black rim' lids were also imported on their own from northern or central Tunisia. Allowing for some residual items (compare the lids in the Augustan group above, p. 192 f. and figs. 88 and 89, nos. 150–168), this assemblage gives an indication of the variety present in a well-dated group of the later second century.

67. (130) D. 19 cm. Similar: one other rim
   With a rounded rim: blackened exterior with white surface on the rim.

68. (110) D. (top) 6 cm.
   Lid top: dark red (10R 4/4) fine to medium sandy clay (i.e. coarser than that of nos. 58–66) with numerous white reaction rims on the surface.
   Possibly residual Punic.

**Mortarium (fig. 92)**

69. (66) D. 34+ cm.
   Fine, hard, red clay (2.5YR 6/6) with black and glassy inclusions (of volcanic type); numerous trituration grits of black lava. The rim is broken and the fractures abraded.

**Closed forms (fig. 92)**

70. (149) D. (rim) 3.0 cm.
   Rim of small flask or jug: hard, fine, red-brown clay (2.5YR 5/6) with fine white specks; plain red-brown surface (2.5YR 5/6).

71. (147) D. (rim) 5.0 cm.
   As no. 70, but with an out-turned rim; the outside shows traces of burnishing and localised blackening.

72. (146a) D. (rim) 7 cm.
73. (146b) D. (rim) 6 cm.
   With a deeply scored groove around the upper surface of the rim: hard, sandy, red-brown clay with some fine white specks; a red-brown surface inside (2.5YR 5/6) and white surface over the outside with localised blackening as no. 71.

74. (157) D. 14 cm.
   With a triangular rim: hard, fine, sandy, yellow-brown clay (2.5YR 7/4); yellow-brown surface (2.5YR 8/4) with a greenish tinge; a band of red-brown paint around the outside of the rim (shown stippled in figure 92).
   Probably residual Punic.

75. (150) Not illustrated.
   Part of rim of a pinched-mouth jug: hard, sandy red-brown clay (2.5YR 5/6) with some white specks; traces of a white surface over the exterior; red-brown interior (2.5YR 5/4).

**Braziers (?) (fig. 92)**

76. (134a) D. 23 cm.
   Similar: one other rim
   Brazier or bowl, hand-made fabric: with a groove around the upper surface of the rim and immediately beneath the rim outside; evidence of a possible lug attached to the upper surface of the rim; fine, sandy light brown clay (5YR 6/8) tempered with grog and ill-sorted limestone inclusions (some particles up to 12 × 3 mm.); plain brown surface (2.5YR 6/8), very roughly smoothed with finger-marks evident; very roughly made.
   Probably local.

77. (139) D. uncertain
As no. 76, but with double grooves around the upper surface of the rim: flaky fabric with traces of blackening on the rim.

QUANTIFICATION OF THE COARSE WARES (M.G. Fulford)

The table below quantifies the surviving coarse-ware rim-sherds according to their functional groups. Body-sherds and bases/lid tops have been omitted from this analysis. The table also distinguishes the hand-made vessels from the wheel-thrown and those that were definitely not made in Tunisia/Tripolitania from the rest. With one certain and one possible exception these are of Pantellerian origin, but of these the bowl and casserole fragments may be residual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>No. of rims</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>No. of rims</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowls, small</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>Pantelleria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowls, large</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowls, hand-made</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casseroles, wheel-thrown</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>Pantelleria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casseroles, hand-made</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pantelleria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish (hand-made)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lids</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortarium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed forms</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazier/bowl (hand-made)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>4.9/6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 6 hand-made rims amount to 7.3% of the assemblage.

The combined assemblage of amphorae and coarse wares amounts to 92 rims, divided in the proportion 10.9% amphorae to 89.1% other coarse wares. In this combined assemblage, the non-North African element amounts to 4 or 5 rims, equivalent to 4.3 or 5.4%.

Although the ratio of amphorae to other coarse wares is very comparable with that recorded in the Augustan group (p. 197), there is a very significant difference in the relative proportions of bowls (two thirds less) and casseroles (almost four times as many). Given that there are few other significant differences it can be suggested that by the later second century the casserole had assumed some of the functions attributable to the bowl in the early Roman period. This is given further support by the lack of sooting on the examples in this group. Hand-made wares, of which some may be residual, account for less than half of the proportion recorded in the Augustan group. Non-African imports in the group as a whole are negligible: in fact, only one or two such vessels may be contemporary with the deposition of the group.

The proportion of fine ware in this group relative to other categories of pottery is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of rims</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine wares</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphorae</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other coarse wares</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIG. 93. Plan of the Severan Monument and the adjacent sandstone base.
The very marked difference between these figures and those recorded for the Augustan group (p. 198) gives rise to a suspicion that in the present instance a greater proportion of coarse ware may have been discarded on site (or at least prior to cataloguing). The significance of the relative proportions of coarse-ware forms recorded may therefore be diminished.

(b) THE SEVERAN MONUMENT

The following account is derived from two separate, but largely overlapping, typescripts by JB WP, of which the former was probably written c. 1950 and the latter is dated 1979. I have used principally the more recent text, but have added to it the discussion of the inscription and of the superstructures of both monuments which appears only in the earlier version; on the other hand, I have suppressed a general introductory paragraph which forms part of the 1979 text and which suggests that JB WP was contemplating publication of the monument in the form of an independent article. Comments on finds and dating enclosed in square brackets are my own interpolation.

[The writer Procopius, describing the building activity which followed Justinian’s reconquest of North Africa, refers to ‘a very noteworthy church’ at Sabratha, which has been identified with that] excavated before the last war immediately to the north of the Curia, between the west end of the Forum and the harbour (Ward-Perkins & Goodchild 1953, Church see fig 123). The great vinescroll mosaic pavement is indeed noteworthy, the work of skilled craftsmen brought in for the purpose from somewhere in the eastern provinces, and the church also incorporated a number of prefabricated fittings of Proconnesian marble. But in striking contrast to the refinement of these imported elements, the actual structure was a remarkably crude affair, built out of assorted blocks of reused masonry by local craftsmen with very little regard for the niceties of building practice.

Amongst the material so re-used are a number of blocks from a monument in honour of the emperor Septimius Severus built of an unusual, fossiliferous yellow limestone. The fine building stones of Tripolitania all come from the Gebel hill country, the north escarpment of which leaves the coast between Lepcis Magna and Oea, swinging inland in a great arc to enclose the broad coastal plain of the Gefara in which Sabratha lies. The local building stone of Sabratha is a quaternary sandstone, which it is easy to quarry but which weathers so poorly that it can only be used beneath a thick protective coating of stucco. This and mud-brick were the standard local building materials. Any finer stone had to be imported by sea, and in practice, apart from the marbles of Numidia and the Aegean and occasionally the red granite of Aswan, the only such stone to be imported in any quantity was the grey Gebel limestone that was used for paving the streets. The nearest source for this would have been Lepcis, and in the context there can be no doubt that this was the source also of the stone for the Severan Monument. The yellow limestone of this is in fact indistinguishable from that of the great quarries opened on Ras el-Hammam to supply the bulk of the fine building stone used in the great Severan building programme at Lepcis.

The stone for the buildings of Byzantine Sabratha came partly from ruined buildings within the Byzantine wall circuit, where for example the solid podium of the South Forum Temple was systematically quarried out, and partly from the area outside the walls, which both practical and defensive considerations made an obvious source for the building of the latter. Here, a short distance to the west of the theatre, the Italian excavators had already exposed the footings of a large rectangular base, the facing blocks of which were of the same distinctive yellow limestone as those found re-used in the Justinianic church. (See fig. 93 and pl. 56a.) In the absence of any convincing alternative it seems virtually certain that the one was the immediate source of the other and that the builders of the church singled out this stone for incorporation in what was to be the outstanding new building of the sixth century.
Severan Monument: (a) base-moulding from the upper part, (b) cornice-moulding from the lower part, both re-used in Church 2.

Sandstone base: (c) cornice-moulding, (d) base of angle-pilaster, (e) capital of angle-pilaster.
The wider significance of this identification rests in the fact that the parent monument occupied a commanding position at the junction of the two street grids which together made up the framework of the fully-developed classical city. The western part (Regions I and VI and the eastern parts of II and V) was based on the intersection at right-angles of a stretch of the great east–west coast road (here, by convention, the main decumanus) with the main north–south street, leading up from the harbour and the Forum towards the interior. The eastern part was based on the alignment of the adjoining stretch of the same coast road which swung southwards by about sixteen degrees at the point where it left the formal limits of the earlier city. It was a commonplace of Roman planning to mask the visual anomalies resulting from such shifts of alignment by siting some emphatic feature such as an arch or a large free-standing monument at the main points of junction. Along the main east–west street there are the remains of what may have been a tetrapylon at the point where it changes direction; but the Byzantine wall is here following the north side of the street, the frontages of which are in consequence very badly robbed, and it is hard to be sure. The Severan Monument on the other hand stood at an open street intersection which is still incompletely excavated, but of which the main lines can be reconstructed with confidence. Viewed from the west it stood at the north-east end of a substantial secondary decumanus, precisely at the point where it met, at an angle, two of the streets of the eastern grid, one continuing eastwards to the theatre, the other running northwards along the eastern frontages of Reg. V, Ins. 7–10 (see fig. 124). The latter probably continued southwards (it has not been cleared), but what can be seen of Insulae 11 and 12 suggests that, if so, the southward prolongation conformed to the earlier rather than the later grid.

Two further points of a topographical character. One is that immediately to the east of the Severan Monument the road widened out into an open space, or largo, and along the south side of this there are the footings of a second monumental base, built in this case of sandstone (see fig. 93). The other is that, although the alignment of the theatre conforms closely to that of the adjoining street grid, there is a discrepancy of some 4½ degrees between the two. (See fig. 124 and pl. 56a.) It is very hard to see how this could have arisen if the new eastern street grid was already in existence when the theatre was laid out. It seems far more likely that of the two the theatre was slightly the earlier, having been established on open ground at the edge of the city and conforming substantially to the general alignment of the coast road and of the buildings strung out along it, before these were formally laid out as the basis of a systematic grid. The siting of the theatre at Lepcis Magna offers an almost exact parallel.

The presence of a closely dated monument at this crucial street intersection has potential implications for a number of chronological questions, both relative and absolute, and accordingly in 1948 a small excavation was undertaken here in order to establish the terms of the problem and, if possible, the outlines of a constructional sequence.

The structure of the Severan Monument

The monument itself consists of the remains of an elaborate base, built of carefully dressed blocks of the hard yellow limestone already described, rising from a massive concrete foundation (pl. 57a). Some idea of the original bulk of the superstructure can be obtained from the depth of the foundations, which range from 1.45 m. to 1.70 m. of solid concrete. All that now survives in position however is a rectangular plinth, 7.40 m. by 8.80 m. and 52 cm. high, and upon it, set back 14 cm. from the face of the plinth, rather more than half of the blocks of a second course of masonry, 54 cm. high. Upon the latter have been replaced several blocks of a third course with a bold cornice-moulding; but none of these is in position, and it is on other grounds clear that there was originally at least one more plain course intervening between plinth and cornice. The outer blocks of each course were held in place by dove-tailed metal cramps, the sockets for which can be seen to have been cut when the course was already laid in position.

Among the blocks re-used in the Justinianic church north of the Forum (fig. 94) are a number with the same cornice-moulding as that of the blocks found beside the base itself; several blocks with a base-moulding, which must belong to a vanished upper feature of the monument; and three blocks from a monumental inscription recording the titles of Septimus Severus and the circumstances of the erection of the monument in his honour (IRT 33; pl. 57b–d).
FIG. 95. The Severan Monument: hypothetical reconstruction of the base and dedicatory inscription.
The reconstruction of the text of this inscription (fig. 95) is less hypothetical than might at first sight appear to be the case. Two of the blocks adjoin and come from near the right-hand end of an upper course, on which are set out the imperial titles. From these, and in particular from the position of the concluding letters of the shorter third line, it is possible to calculate with some accuracy the length of the whole. It is evident that it occupied one of the longer sides of the monument, presumably that which faced the onlooker approaching the theatre from the south-west; and it is probably not over-fanciful to suggest that, in an inscription of this quality, the second line is unlikely to have overlapped the first and that the figure for the tribunician power is therefore a single digit. The spacing of line 2 requires the restoration of the title Parthicus maximus, assumed in 198. Tribuniciae potentiae V (10 Dec. 196–9 Dec. 197) is therefore excluded, and we are left with tribuniciae potentiae X (10 Dec. 201–9 Dec. 202). Severus was consul for the third time on 1 January 202, and throughout 202 he was imperator XI.

The third block belongs to a lower course, recording the circumstances of the erection of the monument. The exact length of this part of the text cannot be calculated with certainty. The calculation depends in part on the number of courses between plinth and cornice. It is possible that there were two only, in which case the right-hand margin of the text of lines 4 and 5 is determined by the two uninscribed blocks which remain in position at the south angle of the south-west face. (The corresponding course of the other long face has survived intact and is uninscribed.) This hypothesis however involves a very awkward bond between the two inscribed courses; and it seems more probable that there were three courses, rather than two, between plinth and cornice, the upper two inscribed, the lowest plain. If this was the case, the demands of symmetry and the provision of a reasonable bond require something approximating to the layout suggested in figure 95. Line 5 is inscribed in letters of the same size as those used in line 1 for the name of the emperor, and may perhaps therefore be taken to record the name of the dedicating proconsul. The name of the proconsul of Africa for the year 202 is not recorded, nor is any proconsul of this name known under Severus. In any case the character and purpose of the inscription are clear. It records an honorary dedication to Septimius Severus, certainly after A.D. 198, and very probably of the year 202.

Of the superstructure of the monument nothing can be said with certainty. The surviving base-moulding (fig. 94a) suggests a second, rectangular feature, probably set well back from the cornice of the lower part; and upon this again there was presumably a figure or group of figures, very possibly, to judge from the size of the base, a quadriga.

The sandstone base

Beside the Severan base to the east, set back about 4 m. from the edge of the street, are the foundations of a second base (fig. 93). This consists of a somewhat irregular rectangle of sandstone blocks; measuring some 11.40 m. by 5.20 m., and trenched two courses deep below ground-level. The three lowest courses consist of an outer skin only of masonry enclosing a rubble core, which is subdivided into three compartments by two transverse partitions of laid blocks. Above this level the superstructure was of solid masonry.

Of the superstructure no distinctive feature remains in position; but re-used in some late walling immediately to the south are a number of architectural fragments which almost certainly belong. These also are cut in the local sandstone and are for the most part sadly battered; but enough remains to distinguish several fragments of a cornice, and the capital and base of an angle-pilaster (fig. 94c–e and pl. 58a–b). No trace survives of the inscription which, like the rest of the monument, may have been cut in sandstone and surfaced in stucco, or was alternatively inset on a marble panel; nor is there any means of determining the height of the monument or the purpose which it served.

The excavations

Several sections were cut here in 1948 to test the relationship of the Severan Monument to the adjacent buildings, and despite their limited extent they yielded positive and seemingly consistent results. These are set out in figure 96, the details of which are largely self-explanatory.
At this point the underlying rock is less than a metre below the paved Roman road surface and it is covered by a layer of sand with a thin capping of humus. The Severan Monument proved to rest on massive foundations, dug down to the rock and constructed of layers of concreted rubble. Its relationship to the street on the north side is clearly established in section D–D'. (See also pl. 58c.) There was already a road here, with a succession of battuto surfaces of crushed sandstone, resting on an artificial make-up of earth, rubble, sand and stones. Spilling out over this battuto level, with a substantial spread of building debris, is the uppermost layer of the concrete foundations, which were carried on upwards for another 20–30 cm. and finished off with the limestone paving blocks which constitute the surface to which the previous excavators had cleared the street.

The battuto road surface, in one case with two successive patchings of the surface, was picked up again a short distance to the east, in sections A–A' and B–B'. (See pl. 58d.) In both of these sections it was clearly later than the bottom three courses of the foundations of the south outer wall of Insula V.10, which were trenched right down to bedrock. Of the visible frontage of the insula, part only of a single course has survived, and that very incompletely exposed, but in section B–B' at any rate this course was clearly already in place when the battuto street level was established, and it was still in place when the battuto was replaced by the limestone paving. In other words, the establishment of the road with its successive battuto surfaces is closely related to the building of the insula, whereas the Severan base relates to the level of the paved street.

On the south side of the street the story is slightly more complex. The largo is not an original feature. When this area was first laid out, this was simply a street about six metres wide, bounded on the south side by a building of which the walls, foundations and all, were robbed out when the Severan Monument was built, leaving only the floors of opus signinum and the pattern of the robber trenches. The sequence is perfectly clear in section C–C', against the east face of the Severan base, where floor and robber trenches are both sealed beneath a thick layer of yellow limestone chips, the working-floor from the dressing of the masonry of the monument. Section A–A' adds the further detail that the robbed east–west façade wall was the first of the structures represented in these sections, to all appearances built when this area was still open ground, with only a shallow accumulation of drift sand and humus over the natural sand and bedrock. The only other feature associated with this early ground level is the small pit visible at the south (right-hand) end of section A–A'.

The largo was never paved. It presumably had a battuto surface, but of this and of any later levels the previous excavators had left no clear trace. The sandstone base occupied the western half of the south side. It was built to the same surface level as the Severan Monument but, if the stratigraphy was correctly observed (and one was dealing with a disturbed, superficial level), the foundation trench was cut after that level had been established. Confirmation of this point would be welcomed and could no doubt be very easily obtained in the area immediately to the south of section C–C', but on the evidence available the sandstone base is probably later than its Severan neighbour.

It will be seen that there are minor discrepancies between sections A–A' and B–B'. In A–A' the make-up of the street to the first battuto level postdates the building of the robbed-out wall on the south side, and the story is substantially repeated on the north side, where only the bottom course of the foundations antedates, and the next two courses both postdate, the same make-up. In section B–B' on the other hand all three foundation courses are cut from an intermediate level. It would take further, more extensive excavation to determine whether this is a meaningful difference. A simple reading of the available evidence is that the laying-out of the buildings on either side of the street and the levelling-up of the street itself were all part of a single process and that the discrepancies are no more than might be expected with a number of gangs of workmen engaged in laying out a new urban quarter.

**Dating-evidence and conclusions**

[The earliest evidence of occupation in the area consisted of a dark layer of humus immediately above the natural sand. No structures were found associated with this layer in the limited area...]
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FIG. 96. The Severan Monument: excavated sections.
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investigated, but it yielded much black-glazed fine ware of the last three centuries B.C. and possibly earlier (context xix.1), and one sherd of Italian Sigillata which may be Augustan; a sherd of African Red Slip Ware of the third century A.D. which joins another from a later level is here presumed to be intrusive. In the absence of structures it is difficult to draw any conclusions about the extent of occupation in the area before its inclusion in a formal layout. The levels in section A-A' beneath the opus signinum floor, and those outside the building but antedating the establishment of the first road surface (context xix.2), included black-glazed wares, two sherds of terra sigillata and three of African Red Slip Ware. The last may be datable within the late first century A.D. (Hayes Forms 181.1, 194; sherd in early fabric: nos. xix.2/15, 6, 4), but the meagre quantity of material is insufficient to preclude a later date. It is therefore possible, but not demonstrable, that there was an interval between the construction of the building with the opus signinum floors and the formal layout of the road and the insula to the north. The levels associated directly with the construction of the first road surface and of the insula to the north (context xix.4) yielded only residual fine-ware sherds which do not help to establish its date.

The next development was the establishment of the largo by means of the removal of the building with the opus signinum floors, the erection of the Severan Monument and the raising of the street surface which was then paved with limestone blocks. In view of the historical date provided by the inscription on the monument, the finds from the associated levels are of enhanced interest. Amongst earlier material, the robber-trenches of the ‘opus signinum building’ yielded a rim of Hayes Form 182 and a large part of a Hayes Form 18 dish in African Red Slip Ware (context xix.5, nos. 6, 3 + 4). The red slip ware from the construction trench of the Severan Monument and from beneath the limestone paving of the street (context xix.6) includes Hayes Forms 3, 6, 9, 10, 16, 17, 23B, 28, 181, 182 and 184, but notably not Hayes Forms 30–33. Several of the pieces (Forms 17, 18 (from the preceding context), 28 and some body-sherds) display the thick bright slip which Hayes has suggested to be typical of the early to mid third century (Hayes 1972, 289), but which has been recorded at Sabratha from layers associated with the construction of the Antonine Temple in A.D. 166–169 (see above, p. 204). The lamps are mostly African, of Loeschcke Type VIII; a base of a fourth-century lamp of Bronze Type XXVII or XXVIII (no. xix.6/70) is the only obvious intrusion in this context.

No pottery was recorded in direct association with the sandstone base, for which only a very narrow foundation-trench was noted (section A-A’), and the finds associated with the water channel shown in section C–C’ (context xix.8) are similar in character to those from the level into which it was inserted. In the earlier version of this text, JBWP suggested that this channel was built to carry rain-water from Insula V.10 to a cistern somewhere to the south of the Severan Monument, and that it is symptomatic of the breakdown of the municipal water supply, perhaps after the middle of the fourth century.

The subsequent history of the area has been obscured by the removal of the overlying levels by the previous excavators, up to the point when most of the base of the Severan Monument was removed in the thirties of the sixth century, for re-use within the Byzantine city. It is a reasonable guess that by that date the surviving bottom course was already buried beneath the sand and other debris that had accumulated in the street, but only systematic excavation of the adjoining insulae could tell us more about the process of decline and abandonment. [Cf. the sections across the Byzantine Wall and at Site M below, sections (d) and (e) of this chapter.]

In terms of what we know of the city’s eastward development all of this makes excellent sense. The sequence may well have been rapid. A battuto road surface needs constant repair, and the three successive surfaces exposed in section A–A’ can certainly not be taken to imply any lengthy period of use. The theatre is usually regarded, on stylistic grounds, as late Antonine, and the absence of any hint of reference to the highly prestigious Severan building programme at Lepcis Magna, begun very soon after 193, is very striking [but see below, p. 226]. It could well have been begun in the seventies of the second century, which was a moment of considerable prosperity at Sabratha, and have been followed early in the eighties by the laying-out of the new street grid. The temple of Hercules, which occupies a complete insula of the new layout, was dedicated (or rededicated) in 186 [IRT 29]. The new grid conformed as best it could to the theatre, and in particular it took account of the need for direct and dignified access to the main
FIG. 97. Site S: plan of excavations and visible structures.
west entrance into the orchestra and so to the ceremonial seating of the lower cavea. With the completion of the theatre nothing would have been more natural than to pave this access street and to embellish what had become a prominent street junction with an imposing monument in honour of the new African emperor.

(c) EXCAVATIONS TO THE SOUTH OF THE THEATRE (SITE S)
(J.B.W.P./P.M.K.)

[The following section is taken from a typescript by JBWP, probably written c. 1950, to which I have made the additions which appear in square brackets.]

The site

The excavation of the Severan Monument in 1948 established that the formal laying out of Insulae 10 and 11 of Regio V and, by inference, of the adjacent insulae also, antedates by an appreciable interval the erection of the Severan Monument. This conclusion, useful as it was, did not in itself resolve the major chronological problem of this quarter of the city. The date of the theatre had yet to be determined. Argument from its topographical relationship to the developing city-plan, from the architectural forms employed and from the stylistic analogies to the sculptural ornament, is sufficient to establish it within the late Antonine or Severan periods, with a strong probability in favour of the earlier date. But within these limits the extensive excavations of the substructures of the theatre itself and of the portico behind it can alone afford conclusive evidence. This was an undertaking beyond the Expedition’s means. In the meanwhile however it seemed useful to define the problem more precisely; and accordingly in 1949 a trial excavation was undertaken in the insula immediately to the south of the cavea (Regio IV, Insula 11: see figs. 97, 124 and pl. 56a). A secondary purpose of this excavation was the examination and, if possible, the dating of a pair of superimposed mosaics preserved within the insula.

The dumping of large quantities of excavated material, to provide a level approach to the theatre from the south, has considerably altered the configuration of the ground at this point. In antiquity the quarries were continuous along the southern edge of the coastal ridge. The northern limit passed through the middle of Insula 6 of Regio V, the cellars and eccentric orientation of which mark a limited encroachment in classical times; and Insula 11 of Regio IV is crowded into the narrow space between the quarry and the outer wall of the cavea. Excavation confirmed, what was indeed already obvious from the plan, that the insula was laid out after the theatre was already built.

The insula has been extensively robbed and the footings in part re-buried. The east corner alone is preserved above floor-level; but if some early footings at the north-east corner of Regio V, Insula 6 are rightly to be associated with this surviving corner, it was part of a long, narrow insula, or perhaps a pair of related insulae, some 75 m. in length by 20 m. broad. The surviving remains, scanty though they are, are by no means uniform, and at least three successive building-phases can be distinguished, one of which at any rate remained in use for a considerable time.

Of the original structure the only feature above ground-level that has survived is a projecting pilaster, moulded on three faces, which has been incorporated into the later masonry of the east wall. For the rest, footings alone remain, consisting of a single course of headers and comprising the greater part of the north wall, some internal partitions, and possibly a part of the east wall. In the area excavated in 1949 the partition footings were represented in part by robber-trenches below the later pavement.

The east corner of this building was later entirely remodelled. The two outer walls alone were retained, and within them, obliquely to the axis of the insula, was inserted a rectangular chamber,
approximately 7 m. by 9 m., with a small, very slightly raised apse projecting into the angle. The
footings were shallow and have for the most part disappeared, together with the superstructure.
Only the apse is standing in part above floor-level, with faint traces of the original painted plaster
rendering. The most tangible surviving element is the mosaic pavement, of which several
stretches are preserved. These belong to a simple, repeating pattern of squares and swastikas,
executed in tesserae of brownish-black limestone against a white limestone ground, the surface of
which is badly weathered. [Pl. 59a is the only photograph of this mosaic that I have been able to
trace.] The average size of the tesserae, as laid, is [17] tesserae to [20] cm. [estimated from
photograph]. The materials and techniques are characteristic of a group of second- and
third-century mosaics that is widely represented at Sabratha.

Of the purpose of this building there is no hint. It is however clear that it remained in use for a
considerable time, long enough for the original pavement to become badly worn and for a new
and more elaborate pavement to be laid on top of it. This consisted of a grid of squares in the
same brownish-black limestone against a ground of whitish marble tesserae; and framed within
it, immediately in front of the apse, an elaborate polychrome panel (pl. 59b–c). This panel
consists of an outer border of rosettes contained in a geometrical framework, and in the centre
nine squares, divided from each other and from the outer frame by a vine-rinceau, and each
containing a medallion. Five of the nine medallions are substantially preserved, and these display
a variety of designs, combining rosettes, geometric figures and free plant forms into elaborate
concentric patterns. The most striking and attractive of the medallions depicts a loose bunch of
five pinkish-orange buds set in a circular, geometric frame (pl. 59c). The workmanship of the
body of the mosaic is coarse, [blank space in text for size of tesserae: no record found] and
contrasts both with the modest refinement of its predecessor and with the vigorous but detailed
treatment of the polychrome panel, in which, as there is an average of [16] tesserae to [20] cm.
[estimated from photograph]. The ground of the polychrome panel, like that of the body of the mosaic,
is of whitish marble, and the coloured tesserae are partly of marble, partly of limestone.
Conspicuous among the latter is the soft, yellowish-brown limestone which is used for paving in
many of the later buildings at Sabratha.

The third and final structural phase is represented by a pair of parallel footings running in a
gentle curve, backed against the outer wall of the cavea of the theatre at its south-western point.
Their purpose is obscure; and the removal of the associated levels when the theatre was excavated
precludes further enquiry. What is certain is that when these curved footings were laid, the insula
had already been abandoned and its northern wall demolished.

In addition to the buildings already described, there are several features which are certainly
additions or modifications to the original structure, but which cannot be assigned with
confidence to any particular phase. Three of these are sufficiently determinate to merit brief
mention. The first is a stretch of walling, which follows the line of the north wall of the insula
but is not the actual original wall, and backed against it a small, rectangular, concrete-lined vat.
The second is an angle of masonry added at some relatively late date to the east corner of the insula.
The third is an irregular patch of limestone paving, also seemingly late, in the south corner. It
overlies a footing which may well belong to the original layout of the insula.

Excavations 1949

(i) Excavation within the insula. Excavation within the insula was very limited in scope,
and concerned primarily with the lifting of the polychrome mosaic panel, for eventual
consolidation. It soon became apparent that there was little stratification beneath the bedding of
the earlier of the two mosaics. Apart from the robber-trench left by the removal of the footings
of the partition walls of the original building, the only structural features encountered were some
blocks of sandstone masonry near the centre of the west end of the room. With these exceptions,
the mosaic bed was found to rest on a deposit of clean sand [but see below], and this in turn
shades imperceptibly into the natural sand. The absence of sherds and of other human debris
shows that this area was not occupied prior to the building of the insula; and the fact that the
latest surviving floor-level barely clears the footing-course of the earliest building has ensured an
almost complete absence of intermediate stratified material.
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[The stratified finds from this area are admittedly meagre, but do not merit quite such a curt dismissal. In the first place a coin of A.D. 270–280 (no. 213) was found in the bedding of the polychrome mosaic. Secondly, there were sherds from beneath the earlier mosaic (layers S.p. S10–3a and 6a): these include six sherds of black-glazed ware, four of which are Campana A, probably of the second century B.C. It cannot therefore be maintained that the area was wholly unoccupied prior to the building of the insula.]

(ii) Section between the north wall of the insula and the theatre (fig. 98). A section cut between the north wall of the insula and the outer wall of the theatre cavea established beyond question the priority of the latter. At the point chosen, opposite the entrance to the theatre immediately to the west of the entrance on the central axis, the footings of the theatre are intact up to, and including, the limestone threshold. Those of the insula also are intact, although the wall itself has gone. The intervening levels have been somewhat truncated in modern times, during the excavation and restoration of the theatre. Fortunately however the missing strata concerned the later history of the site, and the significant early levels are substantially present.

Immediately above the natural sand is a shallow, intermittent layer of dirty sand (level 1). At this point at any rate the builders of the theatre were breaking fresh ground. The first major deposit consists of 45–60 cm. of tips of grey and brown sand mingled with tips of white powdered sandstone and sandstone rubble (level 2). The bulk of this deposit represents the throw-up from the foundation trench for the outer wall of the cavea, the footings for which were carried down five courses, to a depth of 2.65 m., to secure a bedding of solid rock. The bottom four courses consist of roughly squared sandstone blocks; and when these had been laid, and before the addition of the final, more carefully dressed footing-course, the whole up-cast deposit was sealed by a heavy cement working-floor. This must correspond to some phase of the construction of the interior of the theatre, as also must the immediately succeeding levels, which consist of tips of sand and fragments of sandstone, with a generous admixture of ash and of burnt material (level 3). These in turn are capped by a layer of sandstone fragments, which is associated with the laying of the topmost course of the outer cavea footings (level 4). Any further levels, which may have followed this, have been removed in recent times. The line of truncation slopes down towards the south end of the trench, truncating the upper levels, which also slope more gradually in the same direction, and cutting the cement working-floor about 70 cm. short of the insula wall. Below it, however, some 50 cm. of the deposits thrown up from the foundation-trench of the theatre are undisturbed, and through them is cut the foundation-trench of the insula.

The three facts established by this section are as follows: firstly, that the theatre is earlier than the insula; secondly, that the theatre was built, in part at any rate, on ground that was previously unoccupied; and thirdly, that there are available for future excavation extensive deposits contemporary with the building of the theatre, which may reasonably be expected to yield stratified evidence of the date of construction.

Stratified finds

[The finds from this trench receive no mention in the preceding passage, and the final sentence seems to imply that the excavation, despite its very clear stratigraphy and the substantial depth of deposits associated with the construction of the theatre, did not yield any useful dating-evidence. This is not, however, the case: though the finds from this area were never catalogued by KMK, the pottery is preserved and I have seen upwards of fifty sherds of fine ware from the theatre section (trench S.p. S14). In the absence of objects from layer 1(c) (= level 5 in fig. 98) and from layer 4(c) (foundation-trench for insula wall), the whole may be regarded as a homogeneous group deposited at the time when the theatre was built. The majority of the fine ware is African Red Slip Ware, amongst which the following forms are represented: Hayes 6, 10A, 14 (several exx.), 14/17, 27, 28, 181 (many exx.), 182 (many exx.). A few of these pieces and of the unclassified body-sherds have the thick bright slip which is typical of the early to mid third

3 This confirms the observations of Guidi (Africa Italiana 6, 1935, 35).]
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century' (Hayes 1972, 289). The occurrence of similar sherds in a context associated with the construction of the Antonine Temple in A.D. 166-169 has been discussed above (p. 204); if the conclusion that the relevant pieces are not intrusive in that context is valid, then it must be admitted that no chronological distinction can be drawn between the assemblages of fine ware associated with the construction of the Antonine Temple, that of the Severan Monument in A.D. 202 (pp. 217, 219) and that of the theatre. The problem is not a lack of dating-evidence, but a lack of precision within it. The lamps, mostly African of Loeschcke Type VIII, would be equally at home in Antonine or Severan contexts.

Chronological conclusions

The limited extent of the excavation and the particular circumstances of the site ensured a minimum of stratified finds, and these all of a character insufficiently distinctive to define the date of the theatre more precisely within the limits already established. [Sic JBP, in ignorance of the extent of the pottery evidence which I have set out above; but his dismissal of its value is, alas, amply justified!] Guidi, in publishing the first account of the theatre,4 cited a number of close architectural parallels from North Africa, notably the theatres at Timgad (dated 167-169), at Dougga (dated to Marcus Aurelius), at Djemila (undated, but ascribed to the latter part of the second century) and at Khamissa (undated, but ascribed to the second or early third century);5 and in Rome, the Severan Septizonium.6 The late Antonine or Severan date, which these monuments suggest, would accord well with the evidence of topography. The excavation of the Severan Monument has shown that this was the period when the south-eastern quarter of the city was developing. The theatre can hardly be much later than the insulae which lie immediately to the west; it might even be slightly earlier. In either case the building can hardly be earlier than the middle of the second century, or later than the early years of the third.

Within these limits, the sculptural ornament favours an earlier rather than a later date. Among the figured panels on the face of the pulpitud7 there is no hint of the powerful new currents which set in at Lepcis under Severus. It has been suggested that the central scene, with its frontal grouping,8 is influenced by the frontality of the well-known Triumph panel from the four-way arch at Lepcis.9 But the pediment of the Commodoan temple to the Genius Coloniæ Oeensis10 shows that similar frontal grouping was already established in the provincial sculptural repertory well before the close of the second century; and had the central scene, which symbolizes some aspect of the relationship between Roma and the Tyche of Sabratha, been carved under Severus, it is hard to believe that the Tripolitanian-born emperor, so lavishly portrayed elsewhere, would not have had an honoured place.11 The four-way arch at Lepcis, with its rich series of sculptured panels, was completed in A.D. 203. If the theatre at Sabratha had been still incomplete at that date, it would surely have reflected some echo of the stirring historical and artistic events that were taking place in its wealthy neighbour.

4 Guidi (1930).
5 TIMGAD: E. Boeswillwald, R. Cagnat & A. Ballu, Timgad (Paris 1905) 93 ff., pls. 13-15. DOUGGA: Carton, Le théâtre romain de Dougga (Paris 1902). DJEMILA: S. Gsell, Les monuments antiques de l’Algérie i (Paris 1907) 186 ff., fig. 61, pl. 44. KHAMISSA: ibid., 189 ff., fig. 62, pls. 46, 47. [See also now Caputo (1959) passim.]
6 C. Huelsen, Das Septizonium des Septimius Severus (Sechszundvierzigtes Programm zum Winckelnannsfest) (Berlin 1886); A. Bartoli, 'I documenti per la storia del Septizonio Severiano e i disegni inediti di Marten van Heemskerk', Bollettino d’Arte (1909) 253 ff.
7 Guidi (1930) figs. 18-36; [Caputo (1959) figs. 54-83].
8 Guidi (1930) fig. 29; [Caputo (1959) figs. 70-73].
9 Africa Italiana 4 (1931) 104, fig. 73; CAH Plates V, 176(c); JRS 38 (1948), pl. X.1; [Haynes (1955) pl. 3].
11 Miss Toynbee suggests that the scene, which links Roma and Sabratha, perhaps refers to the projected African expedition of Commodus. [Caputo (1959, 19) reports the suggestion of I. Scott Ryberg that the officiating priest on the left may be identified with Septimius Severus, attended by Caracalla and perhaps Plautianus. He admits that the figure is too damaged for this to be definitely confirmed, but maintains that the possibility cannot be excluded. He suggests that the central scene may be related to the occasion of the 'pacification' of the interior by Severus in A.D. 204.]
FIG. 98. Site S: section between Regio IV, Insula 11 and the theatre.
The architectural ornament points in the same direction. It is careful, academic work, rather lifeless, and wholly lacking in the vigour, verging on vulgarity, that characterises the Severan work at Lepcis. In contrast to the full-blooded undercutting of the individual Severan mouldings and friezes, light and shade are used in a broader, architectural sense only, as in the elaborate orders of the scaenae frons, to which the carved detail is purely secondary. The parallels to the capitals, cornices and friezes of the theatre are all to be found in the late Antonine buildings at Sabratha: the Antonine Temple, dedicated in 166, the Commodan Temple of Hercules and the undated, but surely pre-Severan, South Forum Temple. The resemblance between the pilaster capitals of the room to the south of the stage and those of the portico surrounding the Antonine Temple is particularly striking. The sculptural evidence, then, while it can hardly on its own be regarded as conclusive, is strongly in favour of a date during the last few decades of the second century, perhaps under Commodus.

[This text was, of course, written before the appearance of Caputo's monograph on the theatre in 1959. There is no unified discussion in that work of the date of the theatre, which the reader is left to infer from a number of disparate points. In discussing the central scene of the reliefs on the pulpitum (1959, 19 f.), Caputo transmits the suggestion that Septimius Severus and members of his family are represented, and he associates the occasion tentatively with the return of Severus from his Saharan campaign in April 204 (see n. 11, above). In discussing the theatre as a whole (1959, 29 f.), he prefers a Severan date on the basis of the above and of Guidi's suggestion that there are close stylistic similarities between the Sabratha theatre and the Severan buildings at Lepcis Magna. Ward-Perkins, in the text reproduced above, emphatically denies that there are such links and uses this as an argument in support of the chronological priority of the theatre at Sabratha. I am not competent to adjudicate between these conflicting claims.]

If the theatre is late Antonine, it follows that the earliest possible date for the insula which lies to the south is the closing years of the second century; and it may well be later. Unless it was drastically remodelled almost as soon as it was built, the room with the mosaics can therefore be little, if at all, earlier than the middle of the following century; and taking into account the heavy wear to the original pavement before it was superseded, the year 300 would seem to be a reasonable terminus post quem for the polychrome panel. [Note the coin of A.D. 270-280 mentioned on p. 223.] A terminus ante quem is afforded by the [earthquake of A.D. 365], after which date the outlying residential insulae were almost certainly abandoned. The excellent condition of the surviving patch of flooring suggests that it had perhaps not been laid very long before it passed out of use. In round figures, the following chronology may be suggested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 170–190</td>
<td>Building of theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 200 (or later)</td>
<td>Laying-out of Regio V, Insula 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd half of 3rd century</td>
<td>E. corner of insula remodelled; first mosaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towards middle of 4th century</td>
<td>Polychrome mosaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 365</td>
<td>Insula abandoned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subsequent history of the insula is attested only by the two enigmatic curved foundations described above (p. 222). In the theatre, Guidi found unmistakable evidence of destruction by fire, after which it was never rebuilt (1930, 50–51). There were traces of sporadic occupation by later squatters, who built hovels in the cavea and on the stage, tethered their beasts to the seats, and scribbled Christian and other graffiti on the walls (ibid., fig. 42). Otherwise it served as a quarry. A capital from the scaenae frons was found in the Byzantine church which succeeded the Basilica in the Forum (ibid., 22); two of the limestone brackets for the staffs supporting the awning are now in the Antonine Temple; and many other marble details were found stacked, awaiting removal, in the rooms flanking the stage.

---

12 *IRT* 21; [Bartoccini 1964].
13 *IRT* 29.
11 [Joly & Tomasello (1984).]
FIG. 99. Plan of excavations against the Byzantine defensive wall in Regio II, Insula I.
In 1948 the south gate of the Byzantine defensive circuit was surveyed and six trenches were opened just east of a dog-leg in the course of the wall where it runs along the southern side of Regio II, Insula 1. (See fig. 123.) Apart from a brief note on the excavation in the first interim report (Ward-Perkins 1949, 24) no report of any kind was found in the papers of either KMK or JBWP. The following text is therefore entirely new: it is based on the descriptions of the trenches and the interpretative notes (by KMK) in the site notebook (site G, trenches 1–6), and on the plan and section drawings reproduced in figures 99 and 100. The drawings had already been prepared, and have received very little further modification.

The plan shows clearly two trenches against the inner face of the wall, and one against the outer face running across the former main coast road. Unfortunately, the identities of trenches G1 and G2 alone are certain, and these are labelled on the plan. The small trench opposite to G2 is probably G6; trenches G4 and G5 were small excavations against the outside of the wall, perhaps beyond the limits of the plan in figure 99, and the location of trench G3 (which did not extend beyond superficial clearance) cannot be determined. The interpretative notes made by KMK are confined largely to trenches G1 and G2, to which the section in figure 100 refers. The evidence from the other trenches, so far as it goes, appears to support that from G1 and G2.

Pre-Byzantine phases

In trench G1 (section A–B) was found a series of occupation levels immediately above the natural sand and preceding the construction of the Roman insula. This consisted of a succession of clay floors, burnt material and sandy make-up layers. There was relatively little fine ware from these levels (contexts xv.1–10), but the fabrics and forms present suggest that the area was not occupied before the first century A.D. (This is implied by the presence of Italian Sigillata, of derivatives of Pompeian-Red Ware, of a thin-walled hemispherical bowl as *Berenice* no. B455.1, and of an Italian lamp of Loeschke Type III/Bailey Type D. Three coins of the second and third centuries A.D., nos. 92a–c, were ascribed to these levels by the excavator. They were found together, close to the rebuilt wall on the west side of Room 1, and presumably relate to later activity in this area: see below, p. 230.) These early levels were cut by the foundation-trenches for the Roman insula, and sealed throughout by a make-up level of hard orange clay; this had been covered in turn by a mortar floor which survived in parts, and which ran up to all the walls. The trench revealed parts of two rooms of the Roman insula, whose walls survived close behind the Byzantine wall to the full height of the ground floor (pl. 60a). The walls were solidly built of sandstone ashlars, laid as stretchers above ground and founded on two wider courses in which the blocks were laid as headers. (See pl. 60c.) Where it was present, the mortar floor just covered the foundation courses, and extensive areas of plaster rendering were preserved on the walls above. A doorway between the two rooms had been bridged by the use of a pair of narrow wooden lintels, concealed by rebates which had been cut in the undersides of the blocks of the course above. (The present wooden lintel which appears in the photographs is clearly a modern replacement.) A doorway in the wall on the east side of Room 1 (visible in pl. 60a) was only partially exposed; a second doorway in this wall is recorded in the site notes, and is probably indicated by broken lines marked on the plan (fig. 99). Along the east side of Room 1, sockets for joists in the course above the door lintels indicate the former existence of an upper storey (pl. 60b), and one block of the corresponding course was preserved on the west side of the room. The absence of sockets at the same height on the east side of Room 2 suggests that the ceiling of this room was higher. The fill of both rooms, which presumably consisted of material fallen from above, included fragments of black-and-white mosaic and much painted plaster; fragments of the latter showing birds, festoons and various border patterns were recorded, as well as fragments of plaster cornice-mouldings.

The fine ware from the construction levels of this building (context xv.11) includes two sherds of early African Red Slip Ware (nos. xv.11/2, 3), one of which belongs to Hayes Form 8A. It
FIG. 100. Section across the Byzantine defensive wall.
seems likely, therefore, that the insula was laid out towards the end of the first century A.D., at much the same time as the construction of the Period Ib Forum.

The occupation of the building is represented by a thin layer of accumulated debris in both rooms, which continues through the intervening doorway beneath the stones with which it was blocked at some point late in its history. The latest finds from this layer (context xv.12) were several sherds of Hayes Form 58A in African Red Slip Ware (c. 290/300–375) and a coin of A.D. 270 (no. 5). The overall chronological range of the coins found in all trenches in this area was confined (with one pre-Roman exception) wholly to the second, third and fourth centuries A.D. (see p. 272) and this corresponds to the pottery evidence sufficiently closely to suggest that it represents the span of occupation of the Roman insula. There is nothing necessarily later than A.D. 365, and the building was probably abandoned following damage caused by the earthquake in that year (see p. 5 f.). It is unquestionable that the building had long been derelict at the time when the Byzantine defences were constructed.

In trench G2 (section C–D), which ran at right-angles to the outer face of the Byzantine Wall and partly across the decumanus (here the main through-road along the coast) outside, a corresponding sequence was identified. A succession of early occupation levels (context xv.18) yielded fine ware that was predominantly of the early first century A.D. (Italian Sigillata of Berenice Groups A–C, Eastern Sigillata A, ‘Tripolitanian’ Sigillata). These early levels were cut by the foundation-trench for the front wall of the insula, three courses of which were found in situ beneath the Byzantine Wall. The two courses which are visible in plate 60d are clearly distinguishable from the Byzantine Wall above by reason of their more regular build. Section C–D in figure 100 shows the fill of the foundation-trench for the insula wall (context xv.19) to be uniform with a make-up level which extends across the street; the notes suggest that this is sealed by a partly preserved mortar surface (context xv.20) which is shown on the section to run up to the insula wall and to be level with its highest surviving course. KMK’s notes admit to uncertainty regarding the relationship between the construction of the insula and the laying of the paved surface in the street.

It is clear from the site notes that considerable difficulty was experienced in interpreting the stratigraphy in this trench during excavation, and that much of the sequence was identified only subsequently, in the course of drawing the section. The labelling of the finds does not therefore correspond adequately to the final interpretation, and the groups in which they have been catalogued have clearly been vitiated both by poor differentiation from levels above and beneath, and by the presence of substantial intrusions which were not recognized during excavation. The catalogued finds from the insula foundation-trench and the associated make-up level (context xv.19) and from the overlying mortar surface (context xv.20) are attributable broadly to the first century A.D.: the sherds are mostly small and do not support any more precise statement. They are consistent with a date around the end of the first century A.D. suggested above for the construction of the insula on the basis of the relevant finds in trench G1. This conclusion cannot be vitiated by the reported presence in the same contexts of a number of sherds of African and Tripolitanian Red Slip Wares which range in date between the fourth and seventh centuries A.D.: these are undoubtedly intrusive.

The notes and the pottery catalogue differentiate the street paving and the thin sandy make-up immediately beneath it from the mortar surface already mentioned, which they overlie in the southern part of the section. Unfortunately, the majority of the fine ware recorded from this context (xv.21) consists of African and Tripolitanian Red Slip Wares of the third to sixth centuries A.D. and there is a coin (no. 534) of the fourth century. It is clearly impossible that this major thoroughfare should not have been paved until late antiquity, and had it indeed been so there would yet have been a succession of surfaces beneath corresponding to the preceding centuries of its existence. The evidence of the finds is therefore clearly unusable in attempting to date the laying of the street paving: the stratigraphy illustrated in section C–D indicates that the paving is certainly no earlier than the construction of the adjacent insula to the north. It could be contemporary or a little later: a date in the second century is perhaps most likely. (Compare the street on the west side of Regio II, Insula 10, p. 158.)

After the paving of the street are shown two successive beaten surfaces overlying accumula-
tions of rubble and preceding the construction of the Byzantine Wall. No pottery was recorded in association with the first (context xv.22), which seems to have been recognized only after excavation. The establishment of this level followed the cutting of a small trench at the side of the street, interpreted as a robber trench for the removal of the kerb-stones. Three sherds of fine ware were recorded from the accumulation between the first and second beaten surfaces (context xv.23): the latest of these may be attributable to the fourth century, but in view of the contamination of the layers beneath by substantially later material, no significance can be attached to this.

The Byzantine Wall

The Byzantine defensive wall was presumably built in the immediate aftermath of the reconquest of the region from the Vandals by Belisarius in A.D. 533. At the point where the excavation took place, the wall is built throughout its thickness of rectangular sandstone blocks (pl. 60d), similar to those used in the surrounding early Roman buildings and presumably extracted from their ruin. It is 3.15 m. wide at the base with its outer face set on the line of the former insula frontage and resting directly on the foundation courses of the earlier wall. The wall was built within a broad foundation-trench which was dug about 75 cm. deep from the contemporary ground level; the base of the wall was therefore at approximately the same level as the early Roman street paving, and slightly above the floor level of the insula to the north. At this time the insula had long been abandoned, and though the tops of the decayed walls would have been visible, the rooms were choked with debris from the collapse of the upper parts of the building. The surface level in the street had also risen through the accumulation of rubble above the paving, presumably originating likewise from the collapse of the buildings on either side. All that remained of the former thoroughfare was a narrow beaten track.

Behind the wall (section A–B) a broad bank was raised, covering the remaining traces of the earlier building with rubble gathered from the vicinity and creating a surface at least 3.10 m. above the base of the wall (or 2.00 m. above the external ground-level: the highest surviving block of the wall itself rises to 2.80 m. above this level). It was as part of this operation, according to KMK’s notes, that the wall running along the west side of Rooms 1 and 2 in trench G1 was extensively rebuilt with roughly inserted header blocks (pl. 60c). It is difficult to see why this should have been done, as it must have involved extensive excavation below the contemporary ground level if its ascription to this period is correct. No foundation-trench for this rebuilding was identified during excavation (though there was evident contamination of earlier levels: see above, p. 227), and it cannot therefore be securely dated within the stratigraphic sequence. However, the style of the work is clearly akin to the construction of the Byzantine Wall (cf. pl. 60d). It may be that the explanation for its presence is to be found on the other side of the rebuilt wall, which was not excavated. A glance at the plan in figure 99 suggests that there might, for instance, have been a tower here overlooking the re-entrant angle in the defences.

The outer face of the defensive wall was less well preserved than the inner face, and the early stages in the excavation of trench G2 involved the removal of large quantities of tumbled blocks. The three lowest courses were however preserved to the full width of the wall. (See fig. 100, section C–D and pl. 60d.) The erosion of the uppermost of these courses showed very clearly the lowest level at which the wall had been exposed to the elements, and hence the contemporary ground-level after the construction of the wall. This was found to correspond to a final narrow road surface on top of a rubble layer which was continuous with the back-fill of the foundation-trench for the defensive wall. Above this surface was a thin layer of further accumulation prior to the massive collapse of the wall itself.

The Byzantine defensive wall is, of course, more closely dated by its implied association with the known history of the region than could possibly be achieved from a study of the associated finds. The extensive levels associated with its construction (contexts xv.15–17 in trench G1, xv.24 in trench G2) yielded a substantial quantity of fine ware, the vast majority of which need be no later than the late fourth century A.D. (African Red Slip Ware of Hayes Forms 58, 60, 61A, 62A, 67, 68; Tripolitanian Red Slip Ware of Hayes Form 7 and Berenice Forms B694–696;
Tripolitanian lamps (Hayes 1972, 314). The only definitely later sherds are the following pieces of African Red Slip Ware.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xv.24/uncat.</td>
<td>Base, Hayes 99 (?)</td>
<td>C6 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.16/7</td>
<td>Rim, Hayes 101 (?)</td>
<td>Mid to late C6 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.15/5, 6</td>
<td>4 rims, 1 base, Hayes 105</td>
<td>AD 580/600-660+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It thus seems that the material used to create the bank behind the wall was entirely re-deposited and that its content relates almost exclusively to the earlier history of the area. There is only one sherd which may be contemporary with the construction of the wall and six others are intrusive.

The intermediate level in trench G2 between the construction of the Byzantine Wall and its collapse (context xv.25) yielded no fine ware that was necessarily later than the wall, but the superficial level containing the fallen blocks from the wall itself (context xv.26) yielded a number of examples of the latest forms in African Red Slip Ware (e.g. Hayes Forms 103B, 104A, 104B, 105/6, 108). This is slightly surprising, for the actual collapse of the wall presumably occurred only long after the Arab conquest and the abandonment of the site. It is therefore implicit either that the domestic refuse of the final phase of occupation was left on top of the wall, falling outwards and mingling with it as it collapsed, or (perhaps more probably) that the rubbish was thrown over the wall to form a stratum pre-dating its collapse which failed to be distinguished by the excavators. In either case it is reasonable to infer that the wall was manned until the arrival of the Arabs in A.D. 643 (see R.G. Goodchild in Antiquity 41, 1967, 122).

Other parts of the Byzantine defences

Amongst the drawings made by the Expedition are a measured sketch-plan of the Byzantine east gate and detailed drawings of the south gate and of the south-west tower. There is no accompanying text, but as these structures are otherwise unpublished, the drawings are reproduced here in figures 101 and 102.

The South Gate (fig. 101 and pl. 56b) has been described as follows by Denys Haynes (1955, 109). ‘Like the rest of the Byzantine defences, the gate was built of re-used materials; in its original form it consisted of two rectangular towers flanking a narrow gateway, of which the limestone threshold survives in situ. The exterior faces of the two towers were nearly flush with the curtain wall: only their lowest courses are preserved, but the eastern tower shows traces of a guard-room. Modern steps [visible in pl. 56b; not shown in fig. 101] lead down from the inside of the gate to the [early] Roman street, the level of which was considerably below that of the Byzantine street. At a later date a new doorway was constructed to the south of the old by adding a rectangular pier to the outer face of each tower. By this time the ground level had again risen considerably, and a step up to the new doorway was formed from a split cipollino column.’ The drawn section indicates that the Byzantine street level immediately inside the gate was c. 1.25 m. above the level of the early Roman paving. This may be compared with a rise in street level of 1.20 m. over the same period of time at site M (below), and a much smaller accumulation of only 40 cm. in trench G2 (above, p. 230 and fig. 100, context xv.24). In the absence of stratified finds, it is impossible to tell at what time the outer gate was moved forwards to project beyond the line of the wall. This addition is identified as such by the straight joint between the projecting side-walls and the original structure.

The East Gate, of which there is only a sketch, redrawn in figure 102a, was evidently of similar dimensions, though in this case the whole structure projects beyond the wall, rather than being built behind it as was initially the case at the South Gate.

The South West Tower, which projected at the angle in the Byzantine defences to the west of the South Gate, was surveyed and the structure visible in 1948 is reproduced in figure 102b. A
FIG. 101. Plan and section of the South Gate of the Byzantine defences.
note on the original drawing indicates that the lowest part of the tower was constructed with an ashlar facing enclosing a rubble core, but that above this the tower was built of ashlar blocks throughout. The blocks belonging to this upper part are shown stippled on the plan. The remains of the tower have subsequently been dismantled by Prof. A. Di Vita, who has shown that many of the blocks used in its construction had originally formed part of the nearby Punic-Hellenistic Mausoleum B (Di Vita 1976, 275).

(e) SECTION ACROSS THE COAST ROAD (SITE M)  
(P.M.K.)

In 1948 the stretch of the main coastal road ("decumanus") which lay within the circuit of the Byzantine city walls had not been cleared apart from a few metres on either side of the point at which it crosses the principal cardo, which runs northwards from the Byzantine south gate towards the Forum. On the east side of the junction the previous excavators had left a clean vertical face which showed clearly the successive surfaces above the original street paving. In 1948 therefore the exposed section was recorded, and a small excavation was carried out in order to obtain dating-evidence for the phases that were visible. The location of the site, known as Site M, is shown in fig. 123 and the section is illustrated in figure 103 and plate 59d. It was hoped that the information from this site would be complementary to that from the Byzantine Wall excavation previously described, which included a section across the same street at a point c. 50 m. further east. The account which follows has been compiled from the information in the site notebook (which included a brief synthesis of the stratigraphy by KMK) and from a fresh study of the fine wares and lamps.
FIG. 103. Section across the main coast road at Site M.
At the base of the section is the paved surface of the early Roman street. No attempt was made to excavate beneath it and there is therefore no dating-evidence associated directly with it: the paving is perhaps likely to have been laid in the second century A.D. (see p. 229). At the south end of the section, the kerb of the street and the building frontage were in situ and exposed. At the north end, the kerb was in place but the original street frontage was not visible; some of the paving-blocks in the street were missing, and the date of their removal is probably indicated by a coin of the fourth century A.D. (no. 533: see p. 268) and by four sherds of African and Tripolitanian Red Slip Wares of the late fourth to fifth centuries A.D. found at the level of their former position (context xvii.2: including stamped decoration of Hayes Style A(iii) in African Red Slip Ware and Berenice Form B696 in Tripolitanian Red Slip Ware). The second road surface was a beaten track above a layer of drifted sand about 20 cm. thick; at either side of the street it is associated with a thicker accumulation of rubble, which suggests some collapse of the flanking buildings. Only four sherds of pottery are recorded from the sand layer beneath this beaten surface (context xvii.4): they are all small, but all probably belonging to vessels in Tripolitanian Red Slip Ware of the fourth to fifth centuries A.D.

Some time after the initial layer of sand had accumulated – long enough for a definite beaten surface to have been established – there was a substantial further collapse of rubble and building materials which raised the ground level by another 50 cm. There was much pottery from this level (context xvii.6), which indicated a date in the first half of the fifth century A.D. (African Red Slip Ware of Hayes Forms 67, 70, 71A, 89; Tripolitanian Red Slip Ware of Hayes Form 6 and as Berenice no. B700.2; Tripolitanian lamps), and a coin (no. 173) of A.D. 335–341. These objects suggest that the flanking buildings were still occupied until the first half of the fifth century. After that time the quarter was abandoned and left to decay in its own time: the beaten surfaces show that the former street was still subject to occasional use as a thoroughfare, and the intervening levels of rubble mark only the progressive stages of natural decay. The width of the roadway had diminished from 4.50 m. between the kerbs of the paving to a mere 1.70 m. across the second beaten surface. The fifth and final surface visible in the section is associated with renewed activity in the immediate vicinity. On the north side of the street a new building was constructed of squared blocks, roughly laid. A wall running back from the road lies parallel to the section, and along the street frontage runs another wall with deeper foundations. The foundation-trench for the latter cuts partly through the earlier levels, and its filling is continuous with a layer of rubble about 40 cm. thick which forms the basis of a new roadway 2.30 m. wide, which runs up to the wall of the building. The pottery from this layer (context xvii.9) includes vessels of the sixth century (African Red Slip Ware, Hayes Form 104A; Tripolitanian Red Slip Ware, Berenice Form B702) and the latest pieces are a rim and two bases of Hayes Form 105 or 106 in African Red Slip Ware (c. 580/600–660 +). The building was presumably constructed at the end of the sixth century or early in the seventh; the excavation was not extended to investigate its nature or purpose.

Comparison of the section at site M with the excavation across the Byzantine Wall some fifty metres to the east shows that the two sites tell a very similar tale. This entire area of the early Roman town, once a street of substantial stone houses with upper storeys, seems to have been progressively abandoned in the years following the earthquake of A.D. 365: there was then no further activity until the Byzantine reconquest in A.D. 533. The former decumanus, which was the principal street leading to the eastern quarter of the town and which would once have been the route taken by traffic passing through Sabratha in its journey along the coast, was barely used. Indeed, its insignificance at the time of the Byzantine re-conquest is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the street was blocked once and for all by a southward turn in the new city wall immediately to the west of the section that was examined. Why the wall was laid out on this course, to enclose the extra space on either side of the cardo, remains unclear. The section at site M lies within the space enclosed, but yielded no evidence of continuing occupation up to the time when the wall was constructed. Further excavation of the insulae immediately inside the wall may eventually provide an answer.
Amongst the drawings in the Sabratha archive, there are a number of detailed plans of individual insulae executed by Mr. Michael Ballance. These were made at the instigation of JBWP, who presumably intended to use them in a general study of the types of housing represented at Sabratha, but no such study was ever written. No serious study of this nature can be presented on the basis of the plans alone, for as exposed, the visible buildings show a considerable history of alteration during their existence, which could not be unravelled without further extended examination on site. However, the plans are of considerable interest as they stand, and it seemed worthwhile to include them in the report, accompanied by some brief comment. They have been re-drawn for publication by myself. Two area plans have been used elsewhere in the report, and those reproduced in figures 104–107 should be compared with figures 56 (Regio II, Insulae 6 and 7) and 66 (Regio II, Insula 10).

The area of the earliest settlement at Sabratha, to the north of the Forum, has been discussed in Chapter IV. Here (see fig. 56, facing p. 125) the visible layout is essentially a product of the Tiberian period, with modifications in the second century A.D., but the alignment of the buildings and the layout of the streets was pre-determined by the earlier history of the area from the fourth century B.C. onwards. The northern part of the area has been lost to coastal erosion, though the approximate position of the original harbour-front has been detected by underwater investigations (see Chapter VII and fig. 108). The insulae form fairly compact rectangles, and the best-preserved (Regio II, Insula 6) had a length-to-breadth ratio of approximately 3:2 (length 50+ m., max. breadth 36 m.). This insula is composed of tightly packed houses opening onto the surrounding streets. Some of the houses must certainly have contained courtyards, for this would have been the only means of providing light in the centre of the block, but it is not possible from the plan alone to infer which of the enclosed spaces was open to the sky. The ashlar masonry of some of the walls is preserved to a sufficient height to show the presence of an upper storey, though there are no obvious signs of staircases and these must have been of wood. An ample array of cisterns shows that rainwater was assiduously collected and this was presumably always the staple source of water supply; there is no definite evidence of wells in this area, though it is possible that some of the unexamined draw-holes may belong to wells rather than to cisterns. (I am aware of only two wells at Sabratha that have been identified as such: one against the rear wall of the East Forum Temple, p. 33, and one in Regio VI, against the base of Mausoleum A, for which see Di Vita 1978.)

Insula 7, immediately to the east, was divided internally by a street or passageway for at least part of its history (see above, p. 137), and the question of lighting does not arise in the same way. The upstanding remains of this insula suggest non-residential use in the Roman period: the presence of elaborate tanks and a mill imply an industrial process. (The street was named ‘Via degli oleifici’ by the Italian excavators, but no olive press as such is marked on the plan.) The long rooms behind with their buttressed walls have the appearance of warehouses, which are obviously to be expected in the vicinity of the harbour.

Insula 10 of Regio II, to the east of the main public buildings of the Roman town (fig. 66, facing p. 141) is the largest single insula that has been exposed in the Sabratha excavations. The excavation of a limited part of it in depth, designated the ‘Casa Brogan’, has been described in Chapter V. The plan is basically well ordered, forming a slightly tapering rectangle of 115 m. by 27 m. (ratio 4.25:1). Alone of all the exposed insulae, it was provided during much of its existence with a spinal alleyway which runs almost the entire length of the block. The Casa Brogan excavations showed that the housing in this area has a very long and complex history, extending from the late fourth century B.C. until the Byzantine period, and some of the visible irregularities are undoubtedly due to the superposition of features of different periods. Ward-Perkins (1982, 41) read the plan of the insula as a response to a new regularity imposed on the town plan in the first century A.D. following the construction of the Roman Forum and the East Forum Temple. But the excavations showed that the basic axis of the layout is original to the fourth century B.C., and that the positions of many of the individual walls were established no
later than the first century B.C. It is possible, therefore, that the axis of the new Roman Forum was chosen to conform to this major element of the earlier town, rather than *vice versa*. It seems to me a possibility (and at present it can be stated no more strongly than this) that the unusual plan of the developed insula with its spinal alley was conditioned by the position of the city wall in the second century B.C. The Casa Brogan excavation located what appears to be the foundation of a defensive wall, running parallel to the axis of the insula, beneath the rooms on the eastern frontage (see p. 165). It may be that while this wall was in existence the insula consisted only of the narrow strip of buildings on the west side of the alley, and that the eastern range of rooms was subsequently added in the space which became available when the wall was demolished (in the Augustan period? – see p. 166).

The presence of stone stairs in various parts of the insula attests the existence of upper storeys; as in *Insula* 6, there are numerous cisterns for rainwater storage, and a large number of vats show that the buildings in this block served industrial as well as residential purposes.

To the south of the Antonine Temple, *Insulae* 1–3 of *Regio* II show progressive stages of adjustment from a rather haphazard layout towards a strict rectangularity based on the line of the main coastal highway, which here intersects the axis of *Regio* II, *Insula* 10 at right-angles. The dimensions of *Insula* 1, the most regular of the three, are 57 m. by 19.5 m. (ratio 3:1). The stages of adjustment are visible in the plan of *Insulae* 2 and 3 overleaf (fig. 104). Limited dating-evidence for the development of this area was provided by trench Y3–4, which showed that the west end of *Insula* 3 was constructed in the first century B.C. (p. 172 f.), and by the section across the Byzantine Wall on the south frontage of *Insula* 1, which showed that that insula is to be dated towards the end of the first century A.D. (p. 227). The layout of *Insula* 3 suggests that it may not all be of one build: the plan suggests that it is composed of perhaps five properties, four of which were quite substantial courtyard-houses. One of the rooms at the east end of this insula contained an enclosed circular floor, and there is a similar feature in *Insula* 2. One of these was surveyed at a larger scale (not illustrated), but no suggestion was made as to their purpose.

*Insula* 2 is of more regular construction and is probably of one build throughout; it was perhaps planned at the same time as *Insula* 1. The internal design is now also more akin to standard Hellenistic practice in Magna Graecia and Sicily: the properties face onto either street and back onto a common spine-wall which runs the length of the insula. The height to which the walls of this insula are preserved is illustrated in plate 61a, which also shows one of the best-preserved stone staircases, again demonstrating the presence of an upper floor. (The technique of construction of these upper storeys was probably varied. In several instances the fallen material within the building suggests that the upper walls were of mud-brick; but in at least one case in *Regio* II, *Insula* 6, a drawn section [trenches X3 + X6, not illustrated] shows rendered ashlar masonry rising several courses above the beam-sockets for the upper floor.)

The insulae of *Regio* VI, to the south of the Byzantine Wall and west of the main cardo, have been excavated in recent years by Professor Antonino Di Vita and fall outside the scope of this volume. They are however illustrated by Di Vita (1976, fig. 1, = Ward-Perkins 1982, fig. 2), and it is worth noting in passing that he found structures against Mausoleum B which conform to the later alignment and which he dates to 60/50 B.C., whilst the insula as a whole (*Insula* 11) was certainly laid out no later than the turn of the era (in Ward-Perkins 1982, 48). The southward expansion of the town during the first centuries B.C. and A.D. appears to have been piecemeal in terms of chronology, but increasingly regular in plan.

(The only inconsistency with an alternative hypothesis, that the whole of this area was laid out by the Augustan period, is the evidence cited for a Flavian date for *Regio* II, *Insula* 1 on the basis of the section across the Byzantine Wall. There was evidence in this section of occupation in the first century A.D. before the Flavian period [p. 227], and it may be that the late-first-century material relates to reconstruction following the Flavian earthquake, and not to the original construction of the insula. Further excavation would be necessary to test this possibility.)

The eastern quarter of Sabratha, around the theatre, has often been cited as an example of deliberate town-planning – of an Antonine housing estate, as it were, comparable in design to the Trajanic colony at Timgad in Algeria. Questions of chronology in this area have been discussed above in relation to the Severan Monument and to the theatre (sections (b) and (c) of this chapter).
FIG. 104. Regio II, Insulae 2 and 3, plan.
and will not be entered into again here, beyond stating that the span of occupation probably runs broadly from the late Antonine period until the earthquake of A.D. 365. Occupation after this date is likely to have been on a severely reduced scale, though the construction of Churches 3 and 4 in Regio III towards the end of the fourth century (Ward-Perkins & Goodchild 1953, 15 ff.) surely implies that the area was not wholly abandoned. Several insulae in this area were surveyed, and their plans are reproduced in figure 105–107. Plate 61b gives a general impression of the remains exposed by the Italian excavations.

The overall layout is based on insulae which contrast strongly with the earlier parts of the town in their compactness: the largest of those illustrated here (Regio IV, Insulae 1 and 3, fig. 106) have a size of 27 m. by 21 m., and the length-to-breadth ratio varies between square (1:1) and 4:3. The individual plans, as in other parts of the town, are confused by a history of alterations, but an original division of each insula into four units (each with a small central court or light-well?) is generally apparent. The clearest example is Regio III, Insula 1 in figure 105. (It is possible to see in this plan a hypothetical division into eight properties, but I think that this would create insurmountable problems with lighting.) Certainly there were subsequent changes in property-boundaries within each insula, and a tentative interpretation by Michael Ballance of where these lay in the latest period is indicated by the lettering on the plans. Only in Insula 3 of Regio IV (fig. 106) was an attempt made to define the sequence of alterations on the basis of wall-joints, masonry styles and masons’ marks, but this too can only be regarded as tentative. (Masons’ marks are extremely common at Sabratha, and a study of their character and distribution could well be rewarding.) The presence of an imposing main entrance on the west side of this insula and of a portico surrounding all four sides of the block suggests that the entire insula was eventually combined into a single property.

Cisterns are ever-present features of these houses, as elsewhere in the town, and again some insulae (Regio V, Insulae 3 and 4, fig. 107) possess traces of stone staircases which indicate the presence of upper floors.
Approximate sequence in insula 3:
Visible foundations
Secondary blocking

FIG. 106. Regio IV, Insulae 1-4, plan.
For later periods, there is no totally new housing of any substance at Sabratha apart from Insula 5 of Regio I (see figs. 122 and 123). This block partially overlies the former precinct of the Temple of Serapis and stands opposite Church 2 which is Justinianic. It is reported to be of Byzantine date (p. 116), but was not studied by the British expedition.
FIG. 108. The harbour: location of visible features.
INTRODUCTION

The underwater survey of the harbour remains at Sabratha was carried out in 1966 by members of the Cambridge University Underwater Exploration Group. The team consisted of undergraduates from the University, led by Robert Yorke, and included Michael Dallas, David Davidson, James Ward, Gordon Parker and Christopher Kemball.

The programme of work was carried out with the permission of the Libyan archaeological authorities and was financed by sponsorship from the Royal Geographical Society and generous contributions from Trusts and industrial organizations. Three weeks were spent on site at Sabratha and this was followed by further investigations of harbours on the Tunisian coast.

Underwater search was undertaken by diving and snorkelling. Submerged remains were mapped on the sea bed using a grid of ropes and measuring tapes, and the overall location of each grid was surveyed into the main plan by triangulation from a shore base-line. Extensive use was made of aerial photographs to help in the identification of objects submerged in the relatively shallow water and all objects, when found, were also recorded by underwater photography.

SABRATHA HARBOUR

The excavated ruins of the Roman town stretch along the sea shore two kilometres from the modern village of Sabratha, and show by their layout the most likely places where harbour remains may be found. During the time that the team spent at Sabratha, a sea area one kilometre by half a kilometre was systematically searched, but attention was initially focussed on the reef which runs parallel to the shore (see figure 108). This was found to be capped with concrete for 180 m. of its length. Although the concrete had been considerably eroded by wave action, it was rectangular in its plan at the western end of the reef and 20 m. away, in the water, a large number of squared blocks lay adjacent to the reef. This suggests that there may have been a building on this end of the reef in ancient times.

Underwater search of the bay disclosed that a line of large boulders ran for 320 m. from the small island at the extreme western end of the bay towards the reef. The top of this breakwater was 30 cm. below the surface (and was plainly marked in rough weather by the surf breaking on it). The breakwater terminated 75 m. from the reef, leaving a deep channel between the two. There were no signs of building or rock-cutting on the small island.

The abundance of pottery fragments found by divers during the survey was of particular
interest. These piles of sherds were usually fairly localised and among them perfect specimens of a small pottery jug and a shallow dish were found. These and other objects found were handed over to the site superintendent. The areas where the sherds were found would have indicated the regular anchorage places of waiting or unloading boats.

To the north of the Seaward Baths a complex system of rectangular blocks was discovered running 75 m. out towards the reef (see figure 109). Unfortunately, it was partly obscured in places by sand and large growths of the Mediterranean sea-weed, *Poseidonia*, but the visible remains which were surveyed consisted of lines of blocks lying in two metres of water, sometimes two or more courses deep. In the area of the blocks there were a number of sandstone and cipollino columns. It is suggested that the blocks were the remains of a quay which might have had a porticoed building or warehouse built on it, similar in style to those at Lepcis Magna.

On the western shore of the bay a small quay of cut blocks and numerous parallel rock-cuttings was found. Further east, below the tuna factory, a circular structure lay at the water’s edge. This
could perhaps have been the foundation of a light tower since it lay on a line directly inshore from the entrance to the harbour.

Information relating to changes in sea-level was scarce. On the shore beneath the Temple of Isis, the drainage channels from the ruins of the baths are still above sea-level, implying that there can have been little change in sea-level since Roman times. The depth of water in the channel to a tank found near these remains and the height of the drainage channels of the circular foundation near the tuna factory tend to confirm this view.

It has previously been conjectured that the harbour at Sabratha lay only within the reef and that a causeway connected the eastern end of the reef to the land in the vicinity of the Temple of Isis. However, no indications were found under water that the reef had been extended to the shore at the eastern end of the bay and so this supposition seems unlikely. The discovery of the breakwater considerably enlarges the area that would have been suitably sheltered for mooring boats and the position of the two quays suggest that boats could have been loaded and unloaded at both ends of the harbour.
CHAPTER VIII
COINS FROM THE EXCAVATIONS
(ANDREW BURNETT, KENNETH JENKINS AND P.M.K.)

INTRODUCTION (P.M.K.)

The coins found at Sabratha were noted in two lists. The first (nos. 1-241, from the 1948 and 1949 excavations) appears to have been compiled after cleaning, for it includes barely any illegible coins, and there is the evidence of cancelled envelopes to show that many 'coins' sent in from the sites as such and noted in the site notebooks, were discarded at the finds shed either because they were not coins or because they were beyond hope of legibility. No record was made of the discarded items, as they were not individually numbered at this stage, and it is sometimes difficult, therefore, to verify the presence or character of 'coins' noted in the site notebooks (see, e.g., p. 38). The 1951 coins, however, which comprise the second list (nos. 301-410), appear to have been numbered at an earlier stage, for the list includes a number of coins which are described as 'disintegrated'.

All of the coins were brought to England, and a first batch (nos. 1-98) was examined at the British Museum in 1949 by E.S.G. Robinson and R.A.G. Carson. These were subsequently returned to Libya. Most of the remainder were also sent to the British Museum, and further identifications were provided by R.A.G. Carson and Kenneth Jenkins. In 1978, when KMK died, these coins were still at the British Museum, but seventy coins from the 1951 season (nos. 341-410) had been referred to by her in a letter of 1966 as missing and unidentified at that time. In 1982, during the unpacking of the Sabratha finds following their transfer to the University of Southampton, about twenty of the missing coins came to light, in addition to thirty others which had not been included in either of the coin lists. A further nine coins had lost their contexts and probably belong amongst the fifty which remain unaccounted for. (These have all been added to the lists as no. 501-539.) These coins, together with those already stored at the British Museum, have now been re-examined by Kenneth Jenkins and Andrew Burnett, and their catalogue appears below. Included in it are the identifications by Robinson and Carson of the coins which were returned to Libya and which have not been available for re-examination. The 59 coins listed as fragmentary or illegible have been omitted, as it is clear that the figure does not represent the total in this category (see above) and they cannot therefore safely be included in any numerical analysis.

Two of the coins were presented to the British Museum by the British School at Rome, nos. 8 (Augustus) and 13 (Decentius): their museum registration numbers are 1951-6-6-1 and 2 respectively.
CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF COINS

An asterisk following the catalogue number indicates that the coin has not been seen by the present writers, and that the identification given is derived from index cards compiled by E.S.G. Robinson and R.A.G. Carson.

I. Punic Coins (G.K.J.)

In the lists which follow, the mints suggested for Punic coins are those which seem best to correspond to the present state of knowledge. It should be emphasized, however, that the whole question calls for considerably more research, and the commoner types of bronze coins tend to be found almost equally in the different areas of the Carthaginian domain. Thus clear and unequivocal attributions are not always to be deduced from the find-spots (except in the case of Sardinian issues, found much less frequently outside Sardinia). With the lists of each type we give here indications of comparative find-spots known, though neither these indications nor the references given under the heading 'Comparative Punic Finds' are to be taken as in any way exhaustive.

A. Bronze: Sicilian mint (?). Mid to late fourth century B.C.

SNG 94; Müller ii, p. 145.

Obv. Head (male?) to left wearing wreath of corn ears and earring.

Rev. Prancing horse to right.

14-17 mm. Die-axis irregular.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Trench/layer</th>
<th>'Y.I' context</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28*</td>
<td>S.p. A6-3</td>
<td>v.2</td>
<td>3.67 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31*</td>
<td>S.p. N1-5</td>
<td>xviii.5</td>
<td>4.53 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33*</td>
<td>S.p. B3-6c</td>
<td>i.18</td>
<td>2.49 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85*</td>
<td>S.p. A23-9</td>
<td>iii b.5</td>
<td>5.04 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>S.p. E30-13</td>
<td>i.133</td>
<td>3.32 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106a</td>
<td>S.p. K63-2</td>
<td>(Basilica)</td>
<td>5.07 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>S.p. A2-10</td>
<td>iii b.5</td>
<td>2.28 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>S.p. H33-6</td>
<td>xiv.103</td>
<td>4.06 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>S.p. J3a-7a</td>
<td>xvi.7</td>
<td>5.07 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148a</td>
<td>S.p. A3-4</td>
<td>v.2</td>
<td>3.45 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148b</td>
<td>S.p. A3-4</td>
<td>v.2</td>
<td>2.45 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>S.p. F2-7a</td>
<td>i.96?</td>
<td>2.28 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>S.p. B60-5</td>
<td>i.115</td>
<td>3.30 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>S.p. B60-5</td>
<td>i.115</td>
<td>3.30 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>S.p. W7-17b</td>
<td>xxiii.38</td>
<td>3.50 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>S.p. W7-18b</td>
<td>xxiii.35</td>
<td>2.11 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>'S.p. W12a'</td>
<td>? (xxiii)</td>
<td>3.21 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>S.p. T4-17</td>
<td>xvi.43</td>
<td>5.93 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>S.p. X5-16</td>
<td>xxiv.73</td>
<td>3.67 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>S.p. J3b-6b</td>
<td>xvi.6</td>
<td>4.43 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>'Dump +'</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.60 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>'Context lost'</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.32 gm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The normal fabric of these coins shows a rounded edge; some specimens have a bevelled edge (here nos. 118 and 148b only) but it is impossible to establish whether this is significant. The possibility that the head with corn ears may be male rather than female would perhaps be
supported by the appearance of an undoubtedly male head flanked by corn ears on coins of type D below, and of a male head with corn wreath on Punic coins minted in Sicily during the second Punic war (e.g. SNG 378). If so, the deity in question seems unlikely to stand for the older East Phoenician corn-god Dagon, evidence for whom in the west is virtually non-existent (see Gsell 1913, iv.335 n. 4); it remains feasible however for the god on the coins to stand for the Greek Triptolemos, from his association with the Greek rites of Demeter certainly practised at Carthage.

Other finds: Sicily (Selinunte, Motya, Erice, Gela, Morgantina), Malta (Mqabba), Pantelleria, Africa (Carthage excavations, Tunisia IGCH 2272, Lepcis Magna), Sardinia (Cagliari Museum, Antas, Olbia, Monte Sirai, Seui, Perdasdefogou). This type has in the past sometimes been considered to be Greek Sicilian of the time of Timoleon, but the spread of the finds clearly confirms that it is Punic.

B. Bronze: Sicilian mint. Late fourth century B.C.
SNG 102; Müller 317–318.

Obv. Palm tree.
Rev. Horse's head to right.
15–19 mm. Die-axis irregular.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. No.</th>
<th>Trench/layer</th>
<th>'Y.I' context</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21*</td>
<td>S.p. A2-9</td>
<td>i.122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32*</td>
<td>S.p. H27-10n</td>
<td>xiv.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78*</td>
<td>S.p. H25-9p</td>
<td>xiv.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>S.p. C12-1 i</td>
<td>vi d.1</td>
<td>4.80 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>S.p. E28-4a</td>
<td>iv b.3</td>
<td>5.66 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>S.p. A17-10d</td>
<td>i.173</td>
<td>4.05 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>S.p. X6-13d</td>
<td>xxiv.83</td>
<td>5.01 gm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This type is often overstruck on Type A (above): here no. 174 is probably such an overstrike. The present type however is known overstruck by an early-third-century coin of Syracuse (BMC Syracuse 467, probably of Hiketas, 287–278 B.C.; another overstruck specimen illustrated by Recupero, 1808, no. 33).

Other finds: Sicily (Selinunte, Motya, Morgantina), Malta, Sardinia (Cagliari Museum, Olbia, Seui).

C. Bronze: Sicilian mint. Late fourth–early third century B.C.
SNG 109; Müller 163; Jenkins & Lewis (1963) appendix 3.

Obv. Female head to left, wearing wreath and (a) pendant collar (as SNG 115) or (b) plain collar (as SNG 118).
14–17 mm. Die-axis irregular.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. No.</th>
<th>Trench/layer</th>
<th>'Y.I' context</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22*</td>
<td>S.p. A6-5</td>
<td>iii b.5 (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26*</td>
<td>S.p. D3-26</td>
<td>i.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27*</td>
<td>S.p. E6-4b</td>
<td>iii c.2 (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34*</td>
<td>S.p. F6-11</td>
<td>i.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43*</td>
<td>S.p. F2-7</td>
<td>i.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This type is datable to before 282 B.C. (destruction of Gela), as pointed out by Orlandini (AIIN 9/11, 1964, 49-52). The obverse type with the pendant collar is clearly adapted from the general style of the gold and electrum coins minted at Carthage during the same period. It would be impossible to be specific about the details in the case of the excavation specimens.

**Other finds:** Sicily (Selinunte, Erice, Solunto, Lilibeo, hoard of uncertain Sicilian find-spot in the British Museum, Monte Iato, Cinisi, Vetram, Heraclia Minor, Gela, Morgantina), Malta (IGCH 2270), Pantelleria (IGCH 2298), Sardinia (Cagliari Museum, Olbia, Monte Sirai, Seui), Africa (Tunisia IGCH 2272, Carthage excavations, Carthage National (ex-Lavigerie) Museum, Tripoli hoard and single finds, Lepcis Magna). Further references for Sicily are given by Buttrey in his recent publication of the Cinisi hoard: he argues for Panormos as the mint. This is reasonable, from the hoards, though it remains true that this type of coin is by far the commonest represented in the excavations at Selinunte.

**D. Bronze: Sicilian mint. Early third century B.C.**
SNG 120; Müller ii, p. 145.

**Obv.** Male head to left, flanked by corn ears.

**Rev.** Horse prancing to right.
14-17 mm. Die-axis irregular.

This type is comparatively rare, and is virtually always overstruck on type C (above). The head on the obverse is unquestionably male, though wearing an earring like that of type A: this is perfectly in order for a Punic male head, as compare the Melqart head on the silver coinage of
RŠMLQRT (Jenkins, Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau, 50, 1971, pl. 21, R1). Possibly we have here, as in type A above, a head of Triptolemos.

**Other finds:** Sicily (Selinunte), Sardinia (Cagliari Museum), Africa (Carthage excavations).

E. Bronze: Sardinian (some perhaps Sicilian) mint. Early third century B.C.

SNG 144-178; Müller 268 etc.; Forteleoni (1961) series I B.

**Obv.** Female head to left (Demeter), wearing corn wreath and either (a) pendant collar with convex truncation (as SNG 144-153) or (b) plain necklace with concave truncation (as SNG 154-178). The excavation specimens appear to be all of the (a) type.

**Rev.** Horse’s head to right; letters, symbols etc. in field (three dots as SNG 154, no. 51 below; letter ־י as SNG 165, nos. 153a, 200, 321; pellet below with globule in right field as SNG 171, no. 404; only pellet below visible, no. 511). 17-19 mm. Die-axis irregular.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Trench/layer</th>
<th>'Y.I' context</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45*</td>
<td>S.p. 'E9-8'  [6b]</td>
<td>(Forum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51*</td>
<td>S.p. A10-12</td>
<td>i.124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64*</td>
<td>S.p. J9-5b</td>
<td>xvi.21</td>
<td>(7 exx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70*</td>
<td>S.p. H27-9</td>
<td>xiv.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79*</td>
<td>S.p. F16-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>S.p. A2-10</td>
<td>iii b.5</td>
<td>3.44 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150a</td>
<td>Basilica +</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.38 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150b</td>
<td>Basilica +</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.70 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153c</td>
<td>S.p. J9-5</td>
<td>xvi.21</td>
<td>2.64 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>S.p. E30-10</td>
<td>i.131</td>
<td>2.44 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Forum, transverse portico refill</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.58 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>S.p. G104-2</td>
<td>xix.4</td>
<td>2.06 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>S.p. N1-5</td>
<td>xviii.5</td>
<td>3.29 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>S.p. V3-14</td>
<td>xxiii.34</td>
<td>4.06 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>S.p. V3-16</td>
<td>xxiii.31</td>
<td>4.05 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>S.p. V3-16</td>
<td>xxiii.31</td>
<td>3.05 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>S.p. X4-9a</td>
<td>xxiv.66</td>
<td>4.59 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>S.p. X6-10b</td>
<td>xxiv.86</td>
<td>4.78 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>S.p. X6-12</td>
<td>xxiv.84</td>
<td>3.22 gm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Context lost]</td>
<td>3.08 gm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both varieties of this type (a) and (b) referred to above are given together by Forteleoni in his work on the Sardinian mintage as series I B; however, he does not distinguish systematically between the two obverse types, and it remains possible that variety (a) may after all be Sicilian rather than Sardinian. The style of (a) with the pendant collar and truncation of convex form is clearly derived from the style of the gold and electrum coins of the Carthage mint, as also remarked above with regard to type C. The date of type E (a) should thus be approximately similar, though variety (b) may well continue further into the third century than (a). There seems to be, at present, no positive evidence for the date.

The coins of type E as a whole are extremely common; unfortunately the varieties (a) and (b) have often been listed together without distinction, which detracts from the value of some excavation accounts. For instance, the summary of coin finds from the Selinunte excavations shows that type E is the commonest found there after type C (above), but it is difficult to get an
impression of the relative quantities of the varieties included in type E. It should be emphasized that, so far as can be determined, all the Sabratha specimens are of variety (b).

Other finds: Sicily (Selinunte, Motya, Erice, Solunto, Morgantina), Sardinia (Antas, Cagliari Museum, Olbia, Monte Sirai), Malta (Museum), Africa (Tunisia IGCH 2272, Carthage excavations, Wadi Soffeggin, Tripoli single finds, Lepcis Magna), Pantelleria (IGCH 2298), Corsica, S. France.

F. Silver: Carthage mint. c. 300-241 B.C.
   SNC 143; Müller 114.
   Obv. Head of Demeter to left.
   Rev. Horse stepping to right, head turned back; below, letter āyin.
   20 mm. Die-axis regular (360°).

This is the only silver coin of Carthage found at Sabratha. The denomination, given in SNC as 1/3-shekel, is probably rather 1/2-shekel; the 1/3 division of a 7.50 gm. shekel would be 5.00 gm., and specimens are known weighing as much as 5.37 gm. The 1/2-shekel could conceivably form part of a weight system which is known, consisting of 24 - 12 - 6 - 3 - 1 1/2 shekels, and of which the 6- and 3-shekel denominations are also known as coins (SNC 179; Jenkins & Lewis 1963, pl. 27.1, 3). The 1/2-shekel is also a coin denomination mentioned in the so-called 'Marseilles tariff', an inscription detailing the tariffs for various types of sacrifice and originating in Carthage; the date of this inscription is likewise of the third century B.C. (cf. G.C. Picard, The life and death of Carthage, London 1968, 178, 226-227; CIS i.165; Fevrier, Cahiers de Byrsa 8, 1958-9, 35 ff.)

G. Bronze: Sardinian mint. c. 264-241 B.C.
   SNC 192; Müller 284 etc.; Forteleoni (1961) 1-27.
   Obv. Head of Demeter to left.
   Rev. Horse's head to right; symbols, letters etc. in field (rev. palm-tree as SNC 195, no. 23 below; obv. three pellets, rev. palm-tree as Müller 308, no. 29 below).
   26 mm. Die-axis irregular.

H. Bronze: Sardinian mint. c. 264-241 B.C.
   SNC 207; Müller 191; Forteleoni (1961) 79.
   Obv. Head of Demeter to left.
   Rev. Horse standing to right; below, letter beth (?)
   21 mm. Die-axis irregular (c. 270°).
Finds of the group to which this specimen belongs are overwhelmingly from Sardinia: few come from elsewhere (e.g. Malta Museum).

I. Bronze: uncertain (possibly Sardinian) mint. Mid third century B.C.
   
   *Cf. SNG 224-5; Müller 274.*
   
   **Obv.** Demeter head? (effaced)
   **Rev.** Horse's head to right.
   
   10 mm. Die-axis – ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Trench/layer</th>
<th>‘Y.F’ context</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>'S.p. V15'</td>
<td>?? (xxii)</td>
<td>1.06 gm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The identification of this variety is uncertain: the reference given is purely *exempli gratia*, the reverse type on the specimen being smaller.

J. Billon: Carthage mint. c. 241–221 B.C.

*Cf. SNG 190; Müller 104.*

**Obv.** Head of Demeter to left.
**Rev.** Horse standing to right, palm-tree behind.

23 mm. Die-axis regular (360°).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Trench/layer</th>
<th>‘Y.F’ context</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The identification of this specimen is less than certain owing to poor preservation; the weight is correspondingly low and should be closer to c. 12 gm.

Other finds are rare: a few in Malta Museum.

K. Bronze: Carthage mint. c. 241–221 B.C.

*SNG 274; Müller 226.*

**Obv.** Head of Demeter to left.
**Rev.** Horse standing to right, head turned back; above, globe within crescent.

15–16 mm. Die-axis regular (360°).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Trench/layer</th>
<th>‘Y.F’ context</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80*</td>
<td>S.p. A11-7</td>
<td>i a.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>S.p. F21-17</td>
<td>(E. Forum Temple) 1.95 gm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140b</td>
<td>S.p. C18-3</td>
<td>(S. forum portico) 1.37 gm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Carthage mint, indicated by the regular die-axis, is confirmed by the finding of specimens in the excavations at Carthage.

L. Bronze: Carthage mint. c. 221–202 B.C.

*SNG 307 ff.; Müller 201 etc.*

**Obv.** Head of Demeter to left.
**Rev.** Horse standing to right, head turned back (letters etc.: rev. letter *alef* as SNG 302, no. 24 below).

19–24 mm. Die-axis regular (360°).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Trench/layer</th>
<th>'Y.I' context</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24*</td>
<td>S.p. E20–7a</td>
<td>+ (Forum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>S.p. G1 +</td>
<td>+ (Byz. wall)</td>
<td>5.98 gm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possibly the commonest bronze type of the second Punic war period.

**Other finds:** Algeria (Bougie hoard *IGCH* 2296), Tunisia (hoard *IGCH* 2295, Carthage), Libya (Lepcis Magna, Tripoli single finds), Malta (Museum), few from Sicily or Sardinia.

**M. Bronze:** Carthage mint. c. 220–210 B.C.

SNG 326–329.

**Obv.** Head of Tanit to left.

**Rev.** Horse walking right; behind, caduceus, Punic letter (illegible).

22 mm. Die-axis regular (360°).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Trench/layer</th>
<th>'Y.I' context</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>S.p. A190–A2(b)</td>
<td>(S. Forum Portico)</td>
<td>8.02 gm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N. Billon:** Carthage mint. c. 221–202 B.C.

SNG 352; Müller 181.

**Obv.** Head of Demeter to left.

**Rev.** Horse standing to right; above, star.

16 mm. Die-axis regular (360°).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Trench/layer</th>
<th>'Y.I' context</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>S.p. A11–7</td>
<td>i a.11</td>
<td>1.79 gm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**O. Bronze:** Carthage mint. Second century–146 B.C.

SNG 409; Müller 242.

**Obv.** Head of Demeter to left.

**Rev.** Horse stepping to right; letter (?) below.

28 mm. Die-axis regular (360°).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Trench/layer</th>
<th>'Y.I' context</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The bronzes of this type correspond to the late silver issues with ‘serrated’ edge (e.g. SNG 403) which appeared in the Cani hoard (Jenkins & Lewis 1963, 53).
Other finds: Africa (Carthage excavations), also Mazin hoard, Yugoslavia (ICCH 644).

Comparative Punic finds (select bibliography)

Sicily: Cinisi Numismatic e antichità classiche (Quaderni Ticinesi) 9 (1980) 137–143
Heraclea Minoa AIIN 5/6 (1959) 296–299
Lilibeo AIIN 12/14 (1967) 229; NSc 1967, 404; 1971, 763; Kokalos 13 (1967) 81
Monte lato Schweizer Münzblätter 22 (1972) 33
Morgantina Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Numismatica, Roma 1961 (1965) 135–150
Motya J. S. Whitaker, Motya (London 1921)
Vetrana IGCH 2157
Uncertain find-spots: hoards in British Museum (IGCH 2194) and Palermo Museum (IGCH 2163, 2205)

Malta: Museums (Valletta, Mdina)
Mqabba IGCH 2269
Uncertain IGCH 2270

Pantelleria IGCH 2297, 2298

Sardinia: Antas Studi Semitici 30 (Rome 1969)
Bulteo (= Salaro) IGCH 2278
Cagliari Museum E. Acquaro, Le monete puniche del Museo Nazionale di Cagliari (Rome 1974)
Monte Sirai Studi Semitici 20 (Rome 1966)
Olbia Studi Sardi 9 (1950) 5–120
Orgasolo IGCH 2277
Perdasdefogou IGCH 2293
Seui IGCH 2288


France: Marseille region IGCH 2355
Monaco IGCH 2354

Africa: Bougie IGCH 2296
Cap Bon IGCH 2268
Carthage excavations: Ferron & Pinnard, Cahiers de Byrsa 5 (1955) 78–79; 9 (1960–61) 85–86; excavations 1974, coins listed by P. Gandolphe but not yet published: types include SNC 94, 102, 109, 120, 144, 222, 224, 255, 273, 302, 307, 397, 409
Lepcis Magna AJA 69 (1965) 123–132; Quaderni di Archeologia della Libia 9 (1977) 62
Teboursouk IGCH 2305
Tripoli Hoard of type SNC 109 (seen at British Museum, unpublished); single finds (Coll. Spaer, Jerusalem)
Tunisia, uncertain find-spot: IGCH 2267, 2272, 2295
Wadi Soffeggin IGCH 2294
II. Other pre-Roman Coins (G.K.J.)

Cyrene: bronze. Late fourth century B.C.

*BMC Cyrenaica*, p. 43, no. 188

*Obv.* Horse's head to right.

*Rev.* Six-spoked wheel.

21 mm. Die-axis 360°.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Trench/layer</th>
<th>'Y.I' context</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Brettii: bronze. Late third century B.C.

*BMC Italy*, p. 329, no. 82.

*Obv.* Head of Zeus to right.

*Rev.* Eagle standing on thunderbolt to left. Above, symbol hammer (right), symbol cornucopiae (left). Legend: 'BPET[...]'  

20 mm. Die-axis 30°.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Trench/layer</th>
<th>'Y.I' context</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Leukas: bronze. Third century B.C.

*BMC Thessaly to Aetolia*, p. 178, no. 74 (e.g.)

*Obv.* Head of Apollo to left.

*Rev.* Prow of ship to left. Legend?

12 mm. Die-axis 180°.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Trench/layer</th>
<th>'Y.I' context</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>S.p. W7-17a</td>
<td>xxiii.37</td>
<td>1.70 gm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This identification is not certain, and it cannot be claimed that the legend can be read; however, it is difficult to find anything closer to the specimen in question.

Numidia, Massinissa and his successors: bronze. c. 208-148 B.C.

*SNG* 504-517; Mazard (1955) 19-56.

*Obv.* Bearded laureate head to left.

*Rev.* Horse galloping to left.

(Punic letters obv. MN, rev. HT as Mazard 1955, 19, no. 98 below; letters obv. MN as SNG 510, no. 222 below; rev. pellet as SNG 505, nos. 30 and 237 below.)

25-27 mm. Die-axis regular (360°).
It is not certain that all the Numidian coins of this type were minted by Massinissa, though his is the only name which occurs in full on some rare varieties (Mazard 1955, 17-18). As Mazard points out (p. 27), the varieties showing the letters MN and the pellet mark are both present in the Mazin hoard (ICGH 644) whereas other letter-groups (GN, AL) and also countermarked specimens are not; this should give at least some indication for the chronology of the Numidian coins, though it should be remarked that among the Ptolemaic coins in the Mazin hoard those given as 'Ptolemy X' are really of Ptolemy VI, leaving the latest datable hoard specimens those of Ptolemy VIII (145-116 B.C.).

Zitha: bronze. Second century B.C.
müller iii.59, no. 69 ('Suthul'); iv.66 ('Zitha').
Obr. Head of Mercury to right.
Rev. Wreath, within which the Punic letters ST.
19 mm. Die-axis regular (360°).

Müller's first suggestion for the mint, Suthul near Guelma, south of Bône, Algeria, had little plausibility. Provenances seem not to be known, apart from this specimen from Sabratha, which clearly supports the attribution to Zitha, the present-day Ziane, in southern Tunisia near the island of Djerba (P-W 10A, col. 460). Another sign that this is the right area is the fact that another issue of Zitha with obv. Head of Serapis (e.g. SNG 47) closely resembles the Serapis on coins of Sabratha (SNG 36). The similarity of the Zitha and Sabratha coins in question has a further bearing on the date of each, since the Zitha coins show Punic letters, whereas the Sabratha ones have Neo-Punic, but should clearly come not too long after.

Accepting the legend ST as the name of Zitha, it may be further remarked that we must reject Müller's suggestion (ii.21) that a word TTY which is found on coins of Oea could also stand for Zitha: it must rather be a personal name.

Sabratha: bronze. Second-first centuries B.C.
SNG 36; Müller 49.
Obr. Head of Serapis to right.
Rev. Temple of five columns; below, legend in Neo-Punic, § B R T 'N
27 mm. Die-axis regular (360°).
The comparison with Zitha is noted above. For other coins of Sabratha, see below under Augustus.

III. Roman and Byzantine Coins (A.M.B.)

Such a small group of coins does not allow much comment, although the general picture seems typical for a Roman site in North Africa: few coins from the first and second centuries, a much greater number from the late third and fourth centuries, the fifth hardly represented, a relatively large number of pieces of Justinian, followed by one or two coins of the late sixth and seventh centuries. There are some local provincial coins of Augustus (from Sabratha and Lepcis Magna), and one small bronze from the mint of Alexandria (reflecting the general proximity of Egypt), but otherwise all the early coins come from the central western mint at Rome. For the later empire the distribution of mints is, as far as one can tell, also typical since most of the coins come from the mint of Rome, until the Byzantine period when the mint of Carthage became the main source of supply. All these features characterize Sabratha very much as a typical site in the western part of the empire.

The presence of coins of the usurper Magnentius reflects the proximity of Africa to the mint of Rome, but most of the third-century coins come from further north, since the majority are barbarous copies of coins of Claudius II and the Gallic usurper Tetricus I. Similar coins are now known from Sabratha itself and generally from North Africa. These coins appear to have been produced in Gaul, and the problems posed by their travel to North Africa are no different from those posed by a similar export of Gallic imitations and coins to the Iberian peninsula and western Asia Minor.

The pattern of coins of the late empire is like that of the coins from the recent excavations at Carthage, inasmuch as there is a preponderance of the smallest denomination, the nummus, over the larger bronzes produced at the time. This preference for the nummus seems to be very much an African phenomenon, and contrasts with sites in the Balkans and the East, where the larger coins predominate.

---

1 The comparison is with the coins from Carthage, e.g. J.H. Humphrey (Ed.), Excavations at Carthage 1975 conducted by the University of Michigan i (Tunis 1976) 157 ff. The same holds true for the many coins from the British excavations at the same site, as yet unpublished.

2 A modern discussion of the chronology and mintage of these barbarous radiates is given by G.C. Boon in R. Reece & J. Casey (Eds.), Coins and the Archaeologist (Oxford 1974) 115 ff.

3 Libya Antiqua 1 (1964) 134.


5 And, perhaps, the very south of Italy: there are a number of such pieces (from a hoard?) in the Museo Civico at Nicotera, Calabria.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Trench/layer</th>
<th>'Y.I' context</th>
<th>Description/reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Augustus (31 B.C.—A.D. 14)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S.p. D2-11</td>
<td>(E. Forum Temple)</td>
<td>Lepcis Magna. Müller Suppl. 5a, SNG 10 var. (head 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19*</td>
<td>S.p. H11-2b</td>
<td>(Casa Brogan)</td>
<td>Sabratha. Müller 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>S.p. D1-8</td>
<td>i.46</td>
<td>Rome. Denarius, 18 B.C. BMC 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Claudius I (A.D. 41–54)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>S.p. H28-2 (?)</td>
<td>xiv.143 (?)</td>
<td>As. RIC 66d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Possibly confused with no. 221, Heraclius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56*</td>
<td>S.p. B4-7c</td>
<td>iii.1</td>
<td>As</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>S.p. B140-4</td>
<td>vii.1</td>
<td>As</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trajan (A.D. 98–117)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>S.p. H25-2</td>
<td>xiv.26</td>
<td>As</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hadrian (A.D. 117–138)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12*</td>
<td>S.p. D2-15</td>
<td>vi b.2</td>
<td>Denarius, 125–128. BMC 368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66*</td>
<td>S.p. A17-3c</td>
<td>(Forum)</td>
<td>As, 125–128. RIC 668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72*</td>
<td>S.p. E25-2</td>
<td>v.4</td>
<td>Sestertius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97*</td>
<td>S.p. H12-2</td>
<td>xiv.26</td>
<td>As</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>S.p. K14-4</td>
<td>(Basilica)</td>
<td>Quadrans. RIC 624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antoninus Pius (A.D. 138–161)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37*</td>
<td>S.p. H12-8a</td>
<td>xiv.11</td>
<td>Uncertain bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55*</td>
<td>S.p. H12-8</td>
<td>xiv.11</td>
<td>Dupondius, 145–161. RIC 808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faustina I (A.D. 141–161)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92a*</td>
<td>S.p. G1-7b</td>
<td>xv.10</td>
<td>Sestertius. RIC 1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94*</td>
<td>S.p. C21-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sestertius. RIC 1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 161–180)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>S.p. H12-8</td>
<td>xiv.11</td>
<td>Sestertius, 173/4. BMC 1470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96*</td>
<td>S.p. J1-1m</td>
<td>xvi.24</td>
<td>Sestertius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faustina II (A.D. 161–176)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9*</td>
<td>S.p. H12-8</td>
<td>xiv.11</td>
<td>Sestertius. BMC M. Aurelius 902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11*</td>
<td>S.p. H12-8</td>
<td>xiv.11</td>
<td>Dupondius or as. BMC M. Aurelius 980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncertain, second century A.D.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40*</td>
<td>S.p. G1-5b</td>
<td>xv.16</td>
<td>Denarius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62*</td>
<td>S.p. B4-7c</td>
<td>iii.1</td>
<td>As</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91*</td>
<td>S.p. H32-7</td>
<td>xiv.126</td>
<td>As</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>S.p. H101-6c</td>
<td>xiv.118</td>
<td>Halved as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Severas Alexander (A.D. 222–235)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71*</td>
<td>S.p. J5-2</td>
<td>(xvi)</td>
<td>Sestertius. RIC 635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92b*</td>
<td>S.p. G1-7b</td>
<td>xv.10</td>
<td>Dupondius. RIC 584 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. no.</td>
<td>Trench/layer</td>
<td>'Y.I' context</td>
<td>Description/reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximinus I (A.D. 235–238)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95*</td>
<td>S.p. J1–1m xvi.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sestertius. <em>RIC 145</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gallienus (A.D. 253–268)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>Basilica, packing of altar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rev.: Salus. Otherwise illegible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>Basilica, packing of altar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Illegible fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Claudius II (A.D. 268–270)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60*</td>
<td>S.p. J1–1ed xvi.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Illegible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Claudius II, deified (A.D. 270)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td>S.p. G1–6b xv.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Illegible reverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52*</td>
<td>S.p. B1 + (E. Forum Temple)</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>RIC 262</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67a*</td>
<td>S.p. E19–2a viii.2</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>RIC 262</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>E. Forum Temple, dump</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>RIC 262</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216a</td>
<td>Basilica, packing of altar</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>RIC 262</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>? (Record confused)</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>RIC 262</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>S.p. J1 + xvi.24</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>RIC 266</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>S.p. Y1–6a xxv.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Illegible reverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>S.p. Y1–1 xxv.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Illegible reverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barbarous radiates (A.D. 270–280)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65*</td>
<td>S.p. K26–11 (Basilica)</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Rev.: Annona</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67b*</td>
<td>S.p. A2–g i.122</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Rev.: Pax</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>S.p. B60 + (E. Forum Temple)</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>As Claudius II, RIC 262</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>S.p. G6–3 (Byz. wall)</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>As Tetricus I, RIC 100</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206a</td>
<td>Basilica, packing of altar</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>As Tetricus I, RIC 166</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>S.p. S10–2a (Reg. IV, Ins. 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>As Tetricus I, RIC 132</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>S.p. G2–2a xv.26</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>As Claudius II, RIC 266</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>S.p. X2–5 xxiv.43</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>As Claudius II, reverse illegible</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barbarous radiates (A.D. 270–280) with uncertain obverse and reverse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63*</td>
<td>S.p. H25–2 xiv.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75*</td>
<td>S.p. G2–3a xiv.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87*</td>
<td>S.p. G1–5b xiv.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92c*</td>
<td>S.p. G1–7b xiv.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>S.p. J1–1f xvi.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>S.p. J6–1a xvi.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>S.p. G1–4a xiv.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134a</td>
<td>S.p. E24–3 viii.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134b</td>
<td>S.p. E24–3 viii.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>S.p. J1 + xvi.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206b</td>
<td>Basilica, packing of altar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>S.p. W2–6 xxiii.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>S.p. J1 + xvi.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>[Context lost]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncertain, third or fourth century A.D.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>S.p. W7–3a xxiii.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diocletian (A.D. 284–305)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6*</td>
<td>S.p. G1–4b xiv.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Radiate, before 296. Cohen 34 = <em>RIC 322</em> (Antioch)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. no.</td>
<td>Trench/layer</td>
<td>'Y.I' context</td>
<td>Description/reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>S.p. W6-1</td>
<td>xxiii.40</td>
<td>LICIT vi, Cyzicus 9 (A.D. 318-320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>Basilica, packing of altar</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPQR OPTIMO PRINCIPI: as RIC vi, Rome 348c (mint mark illegible) (A.D. 310-313)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reverse: SOLI INVICTO COMITI (A.D. 313-318)

| 7*      | S.p. D3-2   | (E. Forum Temple) | Constantine I |

Reverse: PROVIDENTIAE CAESS (A.D. 324-330)

| 17*     | S.p. J1-1g  | xvi.24          | Constantine II Caesar. Rome mint. LRBC 507 (T) |
| 211     | S.p. J1-1   | xvi.24          | |

Reverse: GLORIA EXERCITVS (2 standards, A.D. 330-335)

| 1*       | Temple of Scapiss | | Constans Caesar. Cohen 46 |
| 14*      | S.p. J1-1f      | xvi.24        | Constantius II Caesar. Cohen 104 |
| 156      | S.p. J1-1ea     | xvi.24        | Constantius II Caesar. Cyzicus mint. LRBC 1237 (B) |

Reverse: GLORIA EXERCITVS (1 standard, A.D. 335-341)

| 152      | S.p. J1-1fa    | xvi.24        | Constantine II Caesar. Rome mint. LRBC 602 (T) |
| 171      | S.p. E43-2     | (Forum)       | Uncertain obverse and mint |
| 173      | S.p. M2-6      | xvii.6        | Uncertain obverse and mint |
| 223      | S.p. J1-1f     | xvi.24        | Constans Caesar. Rome mint. LRBC 592 (T) |
| 521      | Basilica, packing of altar | | Constantinopolis. Aquileia mint. LRBC 686 |

Reverse: two victories (A.D. 347-348)

| 136      | S.p. J1-1fa    | xvi.24        | Uncertain obverse and mint |
| 155      | S.p. J1-1ed    | xvi.24        | Uncertain obverse and mint |

Reverse: VOT XX MVLT XXX (A.D. 347-348)

| 15*      | S.p. C22-8     | (Basilica)    | Constantius II. Cohen 228 |
| 73*      | S.p. J3b-1     | xvi.24        | Constantius II (?). Mint uncertain |
| 77*      | S.p. J1-1f     | xvi.24        | Constantius II. Mint uncertain |
| 228      | S.p. J1-1ed    | xvi.24        | Constantius II. Antioch mint. LRBC 141 |

Magnentius and Decentius (A.D. 350-353)

| 13       | S.p. G1-1      | (Byz. wall)   | Decentius. Rome mint. LRBC 654 (B) |
| 320      | S.p. Y1-5b     | xxv.5         | Magnentius. Arles mint. LRBC 437 (P) |

Reverse: FEL TEMP REPARATIO (horseman) (A.D. 352-357)

| 122      | S.p. H13-2     | xiv.95        | AE 3. Constantius II. Cyzicus mint. LRBC 2496 (Δ) |
| 187      | S.p. J1-1g     | xvi.24        | AE 2. Constantius II. Mint uncertain |
| 204      | S.p. D2-1      | (E. Forum Temple) | AE 3. Constantius II. Mint uncertain |
| 233      | S.p. H02...    | (Casa Brogan) | AE 3. Constantius II. Mint uncertain |

Reverse: SPES REIPVBLICE (A.D. 357-361)

<p>| 224      | S.p. J1-1ed    | xvi.24        | Constantius II. Mint uncertain |
| 519      | Basilica, packing of altar | | Constantius II. Otherwise illegible |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Trench/layer</th>
<th>'Y. I' context</th>
<th>Description/reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constantius II (A.D. 337–361): otherwise illegible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46*</td>
<td>S.p. J7c–4</td>
<td>xvi.18</td>
<td>Securitas Reipublicae. Siscia mint. LRBC 1278 (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47*</td>
<td>S.p. H1... (Casa Brogan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valens (A.D. 364–378)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59*</td>
<td>S.p. J1–1f</td>
<td>xvi.24</td>
<td>Securitas Reipublicae. Mint uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76*</td>
<td>S.p. E +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216b</td>
<td>Basilica, packing of altar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Basilica, packing of altar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>Basilica, packing of altar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratian (A.D. 367–383)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61*</td>
<td>S.p. J1–1g</td>
<td>xvi.24</td>
<td>VOT XV MVLT XX. Mint uncertain, A.D. 375–378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114b</td>
<td>S.p. E17–3</td>
<td>viii.2</td>
<td>Gloria Romanorum. Lyon mint. LRBC 367 (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodosius I (A.D. 379–395)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>S.p. J7f–1</td>
<td>xvi.24</td>
<td>VOT X MVLT XX. Constantinople mint. LRBC 2159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>S.p. W7–3a</td>
<td>xxiii.40</td>
<td>VOT X MVLT XX. Mint uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse: SALS REIPVBLCIAE (A.D. 388–402)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>S.p. A40–3d</td>
<td>(Forum)</td>
<td>Arcadius. Mint uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>S.p. H1, wall 4</td>
<td>(Casa Brogan)</td>
<td>Uncertain obverse and mint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>S.p. J1–1d</td>
<td>xvi.24</td>
<td>Arcadius. Mint uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157b</td>
<td>S.p. J1–1i</td>
<td>xvi.24</td>
<td>Uncertain obverse and mint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>S.p. E33–2a</td>
<td>(Forum)</td>
<td>Uncertain obverse. Constantinople mint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206c</td>
<td>Basilica, packing of altar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206d</td>
<td>Basilica, packing of altar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>S.p. J7f–1</td>
<td>xvi.24</td>
<td>Arcadius. Mint uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>S.p. J1–1ec</td>
<td>xvi.24</td>
<td>Uncertain obverse and mint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Basilica, packing of altar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>Basilica, packing of altar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain, fourth century A.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41*</td>
<td>S.p. A23–6</td>
<td>iii b.5</td>
<td>Uncertain vota type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48b*</td>
<td>S.p. H1 +</td>
<td>(Casa Brogan)</td>
<td>Uncertain vota type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83*</td>
<td>S.p. J1–1eb</td>
<td>xvi.24</td>
<td>Uncertain vota type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>S.p. M2–9</td>
<td>xvii.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>S.p. G2a–1</td>
<td>xv.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain, fourth or fifth century A.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39*</td>
<td>S.p. G4 +</td>
<td>(Byz. wall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44*</td>
<td>S.p. J7f–3</td>
<td>(xvi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48a*</td>
<td>S.p. H1 +</td>
<td>(Casa Brogan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53*</td>
<td>S.p. E32–3a</td>
<td>(Forum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58*</td>
<td>S.p. K49–2</td>
<td>(Basilica)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68*</td>
<td>S.p. E33–1</td>
<td>(Forum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69*</td>
<td>S.p. J3b–1</td>
<td>xvi.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81*</td>
<td>S.p. E5–2</td>
<td>viii.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82*</td>
<td>Basilica, packing of altar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86*</td>
<td>S.p. G1–5d</td>
<td>xv.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>S.p. J1–1fa</td>
<td>xvi.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116*</td>
<td>S.p. J1–1ec</td>
<td>xvi.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>S.p. G4–1</td>
<td>(Byz. wall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>S.p. H102–1/3</td>
<td>xiv.135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. no.</td>
<td>Trench/layer</td>
<td>'Y.I' context</td>
<td>Description/reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Basilica +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>S.p. H1, wall 4 (Casa Brogan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Capitolium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182a</td>
<td>Basilica, packing of altar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182b</td>
<td>Basilica, packing of altar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>S.p. E6–2 viii.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>S.p. 'R10–2' (Reg. IV, Ins. 11?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>S.p. A3–2 (Forum)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Basilica +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>S.p. Z2–8 xxvi.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theodosius II (A.D. 402–450)**

| S.p. W6–1 xxiii.40 | CONCORDIA AVGG (cross) |

**Justinian (A.D. 527–565)**

| S.p. K57–2 (Basilica) | 5 nummi. Mint uncertain |
| S.p. A19–1 (Forum) | 10 nummi. Constantinople mint. DO 81 |
| S.p. F2–6 | 50 i.96 |
| Basilica, packing of altar | Nummus. Carthage mint. DO 302 |
| S.p. E13–6 iii c.2 | Nummus. Carthage mint. DO 309 |
| Basilica, packing of altar | Nummus. Carthage mint. DO 303 |
| Basilica, packing of altar | Nummus. Carthage mint. DO 300 |
| Basilica, packing of altar | Nummus. Carthage mint. DO 309 |
| Basilica, packing of altar | Nummus. Carthage mint. DO 302 |
| Basilica, packing of altar | Nummus. Carthage mint. DO 302 |

**Justin II (A.D. 565–578)**

| S.p. J1–1i xvi.24 | Follis. Constantinople mint |

**Heraclius (A.D. 610–641)**

| S.p. H21–13c (Casa Brogan) | 10 nummi. Sicilian mint. BMC 411 |
| S.p. A25–1a (?) (Forum?) | Follis. Constantinople mint. DO 71d |
| (Possibly confused with no. 220, Claudius I) | |

**Vandals**

| Basilica, packing of altar | 4 nummi. BMC Vandals 12. The attribution of the coin is not certain, but it is probably a Vandal issue of the late fifth century. |

**Uncertain, sixth century A.D.**

The following three coins, with an imperial head and a palm-tree, were attributed by Wroth to the Vandals (BMC Vandals 68), but are probably coins of the Byzantine emperors, since the legend of some of the pieces ends AVG. As most find-spots are in Africa, they may certainly be assigned to the mint of Carthage, and attributed either to Justinian, who produced many such small coins at the Carthage mint, or Maurice Tiberius, who issued larger bronze coins from Carthage with a similar palm-tree (DO 256).

| S.p. K63–2 (Basilica) | |
| S.p. H103–1 (Casa Brogan) | |
| S.p. H103–1 (Casa Brogan) | |
COINS LISTED BY CONTEXT

In the following list, contexts are identified where possible by their ‘Y. I’ designation, which represents a conflation of trench and layer numbers into what KMK believed to be homogeneous stratigraphic groups. For the complexities of this numbering system, see the Introduction, p. 4 f. Where this conflation was not carried out, or where individual layers were not included in the stratigraphic sequences, the original (‘S. p.’) trench and layer numbers are given and the coins are arranged in chronological order. Where there is no direct reference to any quoted context in the preceding chapters, a brief description of the find-spot of the coin is given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Page reference or description</th>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forum (in this section and the next, the dividing-line between the Forum and the East Forum Temple is taken as being the rear wall of the transverse portico)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.95</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4–early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.96</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4–early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Punic (G)</td>
<td>c. 264–241 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Justinian</td>
<td>AD 527–565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.96 (?)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Punic (A)</td>
<td>Mid–late C4 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.97 (?)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Punic (G)</td>
<td>c. 264–241 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.122</td>
<td>Section HH–JJ, pre-forum level at east end</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Punic (B)</td>
<td>Late C4 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4–early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270–280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.124</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4–early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.131</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Punic (E)</td>
<td>Early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4–early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4–early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
<td>Punic (E)</td>
<td>Early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.133</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Punic (A)</td>
<td>Mid–late C4 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.173</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Punic (B)</td>
<td>Late C4 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i a.11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4–early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4–early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Punic (K)</td>
<td>c. 241–221 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Punic (N)</td>
<td>c. 221–202 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii b.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Punic (A)</td>
<td>Mid–late C4 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Punic (A)</td>
<td>Mid–late C4 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Punic (E)</td>
<td>Early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii b.5 (?)</td>
<td>Western half, unclassified context</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4–early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii c.2</td>
<td>Western half, unclassified context</td>
<td>189a</td>
<td>Justinian</td>
<td>AD 527–565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii c.2 (?)</td>
<td>Western half, unclassified context</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4–early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv b.3</td>
<td>Western half, unclassified context</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4–early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv b.4</td>
<td>Western half, unclassified context</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Punic (B)</td>
<td>Late C4 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv b.5</td>
<td>Western half, unclassified context</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4–early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4–early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Punic (A)</td>
<td>Mid–late C4 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>148a</td>
<td>Punic (A)</td>
<td>Mid–late C4 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Page reference or description</td>
<td>Cat. no.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.2 (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>148b</td>
<td>Punic (A)</td>
<td>Mid-late C4 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Punic (D)</td>
<td>Early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Sabratha</td>
<td>C2-C1 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4-early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Hadrian</td>
<td>AD 117-138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C1-C2 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114a</td>
<td>Zitha</td>
<td>C2 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67a</td>
<td>Claudius II</td>
<td>AD 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67b</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270-280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>134a</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270-280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>134b</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270-280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114b</td>
<td>Gratian</td>
<td>AD 367-383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4-C5 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4-C5 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>145b</td>
<td>Trasamund</td>
<td>AD 496-523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. C18-3</td>
<td>W. end of S. forum portico</td>
<td>140a</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4-early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. E30 +</td>
<td>W. end of Forum</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4-early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. 'E9-8'</td>
<td>W. end of Forum (context does not exist: layer possibly should be 6b)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Punic (E)</td>
<td>Early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. F16-7</td>
<td>N. forum portico</td>
<td>79a</td>
<td>Punic (E)</td>
<td>Early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Transverse portico refill'</td>
<td></td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Punic (E)</td>
<td>Early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. C18-3</td>
<td>W. end of S. forum portico</td>
<td>140b</td>
<td>Punic (K)</td>
<td>c. 241-221 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. E20-7a</td>
<td>W. end of Forum</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Punic (L)</td>
<td>c. 221-202 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. A190-2b</td>
<td>E. end of S. forum portico</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>Punic (M)</td>
<td>c. 220-210 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. A17-3c</td>
<td>Forum, central</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Hadrian</td>
<td>AD 125-128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. E43-2</td>
<td>Beneath N. steps of Capitolium</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>GLORIA EXERCITVS</td>
<td>AD 335-341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. E+</td>
<td>W. end of Forum</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Valens</td>
<td>AD 364-378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. A40-3d</td>
<td>S.E. corner of S. forum portico</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SALVS REIPIVBLICA</td>
<td>AD 388-402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. E33-2a</td>
<td>W. end of Forum</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>SALVS REIPIVBLICA</td>
<td>AD 388-402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. E32-3a</td>
<td>W. end of Forum</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4-C5 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. E33-1</td>
<td>W. end of Forum</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4-C5 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Capitolium'</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4-C5 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. A3-2</td>
<td>E. end of Forum</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4-C5 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. A19-1</td>
<td>N. end of section AD–AE, surface</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Justinian</td>
<td>AD 527-565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. A26A-4</td>
<td>Forum, central</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Justin II</td>
<td>AD 565-578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. A25-1a</td>
<td>Section UU–VV, superficial</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Heraclius</td>
<td>AD 610-641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. B23-1</td>
<td>'Forum square' (precise location of trench unknown)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Uncertain Vandal</td>
<td>C5-C6 AD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**East Forum Temple**

<p>| i.18 | 16   | 33  | Punic (A) | Mid-late C4 BC |
| i.46 | 38   | 179 | Augustus  | 18 BC         |
| i.56 | 38   | 26  | Punic (C) | Late C4-early C3 BC |
| i.115| Section OO–PP, pre-temple level | 212 | Punic (A) | Mid-late C4 BC |
| i.a.3| Section L–M, pre-temple level | 217 | Punic (A) | Mid-late C4 BC |
| iii.1| 15   | 56  | Uncertain | C1-C2 AD     |
| iii.2| 15   | 181 | Numidia   | C2 AD        |
| iii.3| 49   | 166 | Punic (C) | Late C4-early C3 BC |
| iv.5 | 24   | 183 | Augustus  | 31 BC–AD 14  |
| vi.a.2| 31   | 20  | Numidia   | c. 208-148 BC|
| vi.b.2| 31   | 12  | Hadrian   | AD 125-128   |
| vi.d.1| 31   | 108 | Punic (B) | Late C4 BC   |
| xxiv.43| 31   | 353 | Barbarous radiate | AD 270-280 |
| S.p. B4 dump| S. temple portico | 118 | Punic (A) | Mid-late C4 BC |
| S.p. F21-17| W. end, N. temple portico | 131 | Punic (K) | c. 241-221 BC |
| S.p. B17-9 | S. temple portico? | 240a | Punic (L) | c. 221-202 BC |
|            |      | 240b | Cyrene     | Late C4 BC   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Page reference or description</th>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.p. B17-9 (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>240c</td>
<td>Brettii</td>
<td>Late C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. D2-11</td>
<td>N. temple portico, section E-F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>31 BC-AD 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. B1 +</td>
<td>S. portico, section V-W</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Claudius II</td>
<td>AD 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Dump of trench in N.E. corner of precinct'</td>
<td></td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Claudius II</td>
<td>AD 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. B60 +</td>
<td>Section WW-XX</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270-280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. D3-2</td>
<td>N. portico</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Constantine I</td>
<td>AD 313-318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. D2-1</td>
<td>N. portico, section E-F</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>FEL TEMP REPARATIO</td>
<td>AD 352-357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Basilica/Church 1** *(The designation 'Y.I.xi' was reserved for this area but never used)*

Coins incorporated or inserted into the structure of the marble altar-base in the centre of the nave, see p. 86

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Page reference or description</th>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.p. K4-4</td>
<td>North-west angle</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Claudius II</td>
<td>AD 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Period II extension</td>
<td></td>
<td>Constantine II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. C22-8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Constantius II</td>
<td>AD 347-348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. K49-2</td>
<td>S. aisle, precise location unknown</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4-C5 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. K63-2</td>
<td>87. Grave behind W. apse</td>
<td>106b</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C6 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstratified</td>
<td>150b</td>
<td>Punic (E)</td>
<td>Early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150a</td>
<td>Punic (E)</td>
<td>Early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4-C5 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>231</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4-C5 AD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Casa Brogan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Page reference or description</th>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xiv. 8a</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>Numidia</td>
<td>c. 208-148 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv. 9</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>Numidia</td>
<td>c. 208-148 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv. 11</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Numidia</td>
<td>c. 208-148 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Antoninus Pius</td>
<td>AD 138-161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Antoninus Pius</td>
<td>AD 138-161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Faustina II</td>
<td>AD 161-176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Faustina II</td>
<td>AD 161-176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Page reference or description</td>
<td>Cat. no.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv.11</td>
<td>(cont.)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Faustina II</td>
<td>AD 161–176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius</td>
<td>AD 173/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Punic (B)</td>
<td>Late C4 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Trajan</td>
<td>AD 98–117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Hadrian</td>
<td>AD 117–138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270–280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Numidia</td>
<td>c. 208–148 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Punic (A)</td>
<td>Mid–late C4 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above xiv.51 (p. 155)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Punic (F)</td>
<td>c. 300–241 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Numidia</td>
<td>c. 208–148 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Numidia</td>
<td>c. 208–148 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Punic (A)</td>
<td>Mid–late C4 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Punic (B)</td>
<td>Late C4 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Punic (E)</td>
<td>Early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>AD 352–357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>FEL TEMP REPARATIO</td>
<td>AD 352–357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Punic (A)</td>
<td>Mid–late C4 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Numidia</td>
<td>c. 208–148 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>Early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Numidia</td>
<td>c. 208–148 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Numidia</td>
<td>c. 208–148 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>Early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Claudius I</td>
<td>AD 41–54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In or near vat 6</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4–early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. H30–13</td>
<td>Section A’–B’</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Punic (D)</td>
<td>Early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. H11–2b</td>
<td>Section G–H</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Numidia</td>
<td>c. 208–148 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. H1 +</td>
<td>Unstratified</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>31 BC–AD 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. H20, ‘above drain in wall [103]’ (which leads to cistern)</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>FEL TEMP REPARATIO</td>
<td>AD 352–57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. H1, ‘footings of wall 23’</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Constantius II</td>
<td>AD 337–361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. H1, ‘wall 4’</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>SALVS REIPVBCLAE</td>
<td>AD 388–402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstratified</td>
<td></td>
<td>48b</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. H1, ‘wall 4’</td>
<td>48a</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4–C5 AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. H21, ‘in crevice, upper stone of wall 7’ (section Y–Z)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4–C5 AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. H103–1</td>
<td>Section G’–H’, superficial</td>
<td>180a</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>AD 610–641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180b</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C6 AD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Byzantine Wall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Page reference or description</th>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xv.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>92a</td>
<td>Faustina I</td>
<td>AD 141–161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92b</td>
<td>Severus Alexander</td>
<td>AD 222–235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92c</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270–280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270–280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Claudius II</td>
<td>AD 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.14</td>
<td>Section A–B, disturbed context</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4–C5 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270–280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>405</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C2 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270–280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>534</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270–280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>231</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270–280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Page reference or description</td>
<td>Cat. no.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.26 (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270–280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>FEL TEMP REPARATIO</td>
<td>AD 352–357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. p. G1 +</td>
<td>Section A–B, unstratified</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Punic (L)</td>
<td>c. 221–202 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. p. G6−3</td>
<td></td>
<td>415</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270–280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. p. G1−1</td>
<td>Section A–B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Decentius</td>
<td>AD 350–353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. p. G4 +</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4–C5 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. p. G4−1</td>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4–C5 AD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regio II, Insula 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>xv.6</th>
<th></th>
<th>122</th>
<th>Punic (A)</th>
<th>Mid-late C4 BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xv.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Punic (A)</td>
<td>Mid-late C4 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4–early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Constantius II</td>
<td>AD 337–361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Punic (E) (7 exx.)</td>
<td>Early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.24</td>
<td>121. Superficial</td>
<td>153a-c</td>
<td>Punic (E) (3 exx.)</td>
<td>Early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius</td>
<td>AD 161–180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Maximinus I</td>
<td>AD 235–238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Claudius II</td>
<td>AD 268–270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Claudius II</td>
<td>AD 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270–280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270–280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270–280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>502</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270–280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>PROVIDENTIAE CAESS</td>
<td>AD 324–330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>211</td>
<td>PROVIDENTIAE CAESS</td>
<td>AD 324–330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>GLORIA EXERCITVS</td>
<td>AD 330–335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>GLORIA EXERCITVS</td>
<td>AD 330–335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>GLORIA EXERCITVS</td>
<td>AD 330–335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>GLORIA EXERCITVS</td>
<td>AD 330–335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>GLORIA EXERCITVS</td>
<td>AD 335–341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
<td>GLORIA EXERCITVS</td>
<td>AD 335–341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>(Constantinian)</td>
<td>AD 347–348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>(Constantinian)</td>
<td>AD 347–348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Constantius II</td>
<td>AD 347–348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Constantius II</td>
<td>AD 347–348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Constantius II</td>
<td>AD 347–348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>157a</td>
<td>FEL TEMP REPARATIO</td>
<td>AD 352–357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
<td>FEL TEMP REPARATIO</td>
<td>AD 352–357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>Constantius II</td>
<td>AD 357–361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Valens</td>
<td>AD 364–378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Gratian</td>
<td>AD 375–378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>Theodosius I</td>
<td>AD 379–395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Theodosius I</td>
<td>AD 383–388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Theodosius I</td>
<td>AD 388–402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Arcadius</td>
<td>AD 388–402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>503</td>
<td>Arcadius</td>
<td>AD 388–402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Honorius</td>
<td>AD 388–402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>157b</td>
<td>Uncertain obv.</td>
<td>AD 388–402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4–C5 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4–C5 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4–C5 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Justin II</td>
<td>AD 565–578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. p. J5−2</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Severus Alexander</td>
<td>AD 222–235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. p. J7f−3</td>
<td>(Section J–K)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>C4–C5 AD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regio II, Insula 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>xxi.17</th>
<th></th>
<th>130</th>
<th>Punic (H)</th>
<th>c. 264–241 BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xxi.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Numidia</td>
<td>c. 208–148 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Page reference or description</td>
<td>Cat. no.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.18 (cont.)</td>
<td>336b</td>
<td>Numidia</td>
<td>c. 208–148 BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.43</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>Punic (A)</td>
<td>Mid-late C4 BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.52</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4-early C3 BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.31</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4-early C3 BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.34</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Punic (E)</td>
<td>Early C3 BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.41</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>Punic (E)</td>
<td>Early C3 BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.46</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4-early C3 BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv.73</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>Punic (A)</td>
<td>Mid-late C4 BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv.83</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>Punic (B)</td>
<td>Late C4 BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv.86</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>Punic (D)</td>
<td>Early C3 BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. 'V15' (xxii) Incorrect label</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>Punic (I)</td>
<td>Mid C3 BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.p. X3–7b</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>Abbasid</td>
<td>C8 AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regio II, Insula 7**

| xxiii.10 | 304 | Barbarous radiate | AD 270–280 |
| xxiii.35 | 306 | Punic (A) | Mid-late C4 BC |
| xxiii.37 | 345 | Leukas? | C3 BC? |
| xxiii.38 | 305 | Punic (A) | Mid-late C4 BC |
| xxiii.40 | 328 | Uncertain | C3–C4 AD |
| xxiv.66 | 332 | Licinius I | AD 318–320 |
| xxiv.66 | 327 | Theodosius I | AD 379–395 |
| xxiv.66 | 331 | Theodosius II | AD 402–450 |
| S.p. 'W12a' (xxiii) Incorrect label | 354 | Punic (A) | Mid-late C4 BC |

**Regio II, Insula 10 (E. side, precise location of trenches unknown)**

| xxv.5 | 339 | Claudius II | AD 270 |
| xxv.7 | 320 | Magnentius | AD 350–353 |
| xxvi.35 | 352 | Claudius II | AD 270 |
| xxv.7 | 303 | Uncertain | C4–C5 AD |
| S.p. Z1 | 309 | Hadrian | AD 117–138 |
| S.p. Z1–21j | 382 | Punic (E) | Early C3 BC |

**Sections east and south of Antonine Temple**

| xviii.5 | 31 | Punic (A) | Mid-late C4 BC |
| xvii.24 | 225 | Punic (E) | Early C3 BC |
| xxv.24 | 369 | Punic (A) | Mid-late C4 BC |

**Other sites**

| xvii.2 | 235 | Uncertain | C4 AD |
| xvii.6 | 235 | GLORIA EXERCITVS | AD 335–341 |
| xix.4 | 219 | Punic (E) | Early C3 BC |
| xxiv.15 | 333 | Numidia | c. 208–148 BC |
| xxiv.16 | 351a | Punic (C) | Late C4-early C3 BC |
| S.p. 'R10–2' Trench doesn’t exist: almost certainly should be 'S10–2' = Reg. IV, Ins. 11 | 208 | Uncertain | C4–C5 AD |

| S.p. S10–2a | 223 | Barbarous radiate | AD 270–280 |
| 'Dump 24.9.48' | 213 | Punic (O) | C2–146 BC |
| 'Dump 18.9.48' | 169 | Punic (A) | Mid-late C4 BC |
| Records contradictory, context uncertain | 226 | Claudius II | AD 270 |
| Labels lost, contexts unknown | 508 | Punic (C) | Late C4-early C3 BC |
| 512 | Punic (C) | Late C4-early C3 BC |
COINS LISTED BY CONTEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Page reference or description</th>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labels lost, contexts unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>513</td>
<td>Punic (C)</td>
<td>Late C4–early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>511</td>
<td>Punic (E)</td>
<td>Early C3 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>510</td>
<td>Numidia</td>
<td>c. 208–148 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>506</td>
<td>Barbarous radiate</td>
<td>AD 270–280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION (P.M.K.)

It is a familiar circumstance of stratigraphic excavation that very few of the coins recorded are from contexts where they contribute directly to the dating-evidence, and this is certainly true of the coins from Sabratha. However, the chronological range of the coins found in different areas may give an oblique indication of the relative intensity of occupation in those areas at different times. A series of histograms has therefore been drawn for the Sabratha coins (figs. 110–116), on the following basis. The horizontal axis is divided into quarters of a century, and against this the number of coins potentially attributable to each quarter-century is plotted vertically. Each coin occupies the same surface-area on the histogram: if its date-range falls within a single quarter-century, it occupies a whole vertical unit within that space; but if it spans more than one quarter-century, it is divided appropriately between the relevant spaces. (Thus for a coin attributed to the 'second century A.D.', one quarter of a coin is attributed to each quarter of the century; for 'Marcus Aurelius' (161–180) three quarters of a coin would be attributed to '150–175' and one quarter to '175–200'.) The resulting profile represents the probable frequency of coins found in a particular area in terms of dates of issue. It relies on the fairly crude assumption that the coins within any given date-range (e.g. A.D. 527–565) are evenly distributed through that range in terms of date of issue (an obvious absurdity, for instance, when there is only one coin), though the possibility that they may be concentrated at one end or the other is allowed for by identifying in each histogram the individual 'blocks' from which it is built. Thus, for instance, in figure 110, the histogram suggests that the coin-list starts in the mid fourth century B.C. However, the first block of coins extends as far as the end of the fourth century (Punic coins, type (a), 'mid to late fourth century'), so that though it is possible that some of the coins were issued in the third quarter of the century, the only necessary inference to be drawn from them is that they were issued before the end of the century. The method is not particularly precise, but then neither is the nature of the evidence. 9 (The questions of lapse of time between issue and arrival at Sabratha, and of period of use before loss defy any kind of assessment.)

As a basis for comparison with the individual areas discussed below, figure 110 shows the incidence of all the identifiable coins from the whole excavation. The salient characteristics are the numerical dominance of the early coins (42% of the total number of coins falls within the first two hundred years represented), an almost total absence of coins dated between the mid second century B.C. and the reign of Augustus, and substantial peaks in the later third and fourth centuries A.D. The pattern of distribution for the Roman period has been described above by Andrew Burnett as 'typical for a Roman site in North Africa' (p. 257). The inferences drawn from the histograms which follow are necessarily broad, but they help to complement in a small way the detailed assessment of the stratigraphy and the finds in the relevant chapters. The extent of stratified deposits in any one area is necessarily related to the occurrence of actual physical change, and an area which is well used but kept scrupulously clean betrays little of its history in

9 Dr. Richard Reece has kindly pointed out to me that the internal distribution of the large block of coins attributed broadly to the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. should probably be assumed to correspond to that of the more closely dated coins falling within that period. This would have the effect of further augmenting the figures for the fourth century at the expense of the fifth.

10 This dominance may be accentuated artificially by (a) the extensive removal of late Roman levels in the earlier excavations and (b) the likelihood that the illegible coins which have been excluded belong preponderantly to the late Roman period (Andrew Burnett, pers. comm.). Neither factor can be quantified.
terms of pottery and larger objects. The loss of coins (and hence their presence in the ground) is less restricted in this respect, and they may therefore show evidence of activity where other finds are lacking.

**Forum and East Forum Temple (figure 111)**

The very large proportion of coins of the late fourth and early third centuries B.C. found in the Forum is particularly striking. It reinforces the evidence of contemporary fine wares for extensive activity in the area at that time, despite the fact that most of the stone structures appear to belong to the second century B.C. or later. Presumably at the earlier period the area was either occupied by flimsier accretions against the early city wall, or served as a much-frequented market-place.

Coins of the first century B.C. and the first century A.D. are poorly represented in the coin list as a whole (see fig. 110): they are almost totally absent from the Forum square, in contrast to the presence of three coins of Augustus from the precinct of the East Forum Temple. This may be in part a reflection of the bodily removal of the relevant levels when the surface of the Forum was lowered in Period 1b at the end of the first century A.D.

The chronological distribution of the coins from the Forum square is thereafter similar to that for the site as a whole, coming to an end at the end of the sixth century A.D. A single seventh-century coin, of Heraclius (no. 221), is omitted from the histogram as there is a possibility that it has been transposed with a coin from the Casa Brogan. The absence of coins later than the third quarter of the fourth century A.D. from the precinct of the East Forum Temple stands in marked contrast to this. This difference may be due (at least partially) to the fact that the area was systematically cleared to a lower level during the original Italian excavations, for there is some ceramic evidence of later activity (see p. 33).
FIG. 111. Chronological distribution of coins: Forum and East Forum Temple.

**DISCUSSION**

**FORUM SQUARE - 69 coins**

**EAST FORUM TEMPLE - 27 coins**

_Basilica/Church 1 (figure 112)_

The actual excavations in the Basilica were very limited in extent as the building had been almost completely exposed by the Italians, and there are correspondingly few coins from the area. The two coins of the second century A.D. are of some interest, for they were found associated with the drain at the north-western corner of the building, and behind the western extension of Period II respectively (no. 185, Hadrian; no. 94, Faustina I): they may be relevant to the dating of Period II, though neither of them was securely stratified. Two thirds of the coins found in the Basilica were discovered when the late marble altar-base in the centre of the nave was dismantled in order to examine the structures beneath, and these are shown separately in figure 112. They presumably represent the offerings of the devout, inserted into crevices in the stonework. It seems unlikely that all of these coins were in current circulation in A.D. 533, which would be a necessary consequence of JBWP's suggestion that the marble altar was not built until after then (Period IV); rather, the range of date which they display suggests strongly that the structure into which they were inserted (over an extended period) was original to the first church building (Period IIIb) in the late fourth or early fifth century.
**COINS FROM THE EXCAVATION**

**BASILICA/CHURCH 1 - 38 coins**

![Graph showing chronological distribution of coins for Basilica/Church 1.](image)

**FIG. 112.** Chronological distribution of coins: Basilica/Church 1.

**CASA BROGAN - 48 coins**

![Graph showing chronological distribution of coins for Casa Brogan.](image)

**FIG. 113.** Chronological distribution of coins: The Casa Brogan.

*Casa Brogan* (figure 113)

This histogram calls for little comment except to note that it shows, more than other areas, a continuity of activity right through from the fourth century B.C. until the seventh century A.D. For the latter part of this period, the evidence of the coins help to make good the loss of the relevant stratigraphy in the previous clearance of the area. A coin of Claudius I (no. 220) is omitted from the histogram as the records note the possibility that it has been transposed with a coin of Heraclius from the Forum.

*Byzantine Wall* (figure 114)

Of the eighteen datable coins found in this small excavation, all but one could be placed in a bracket between the beginning of the second century A.D. and the earthquake of A.D. 365. Despite the fact that many of them were found in superficial contexts or in association with the construction of the Byzantine wall, the correspondence of their chronological range with that of the stratified pottery related to the underlying insula of the early Roman layout suggests that they reflect accurately the period of occupation of the insula. The total absence of Byzantine coins is striking.
Regio II, Insula 5 (figure 115)
The majority of the coins from Insula 5 were found in superficial levels (see p. 121), and on this histogram alone those which were more securely stratified are distinguished by the use of hatching. The chronological distribution of the coins from this insula is peculiar on two counts: firstly, the number of very early coins is sharply augmented by the discovery of ten identical coins in two groups in a single early context (p. 124); and secondly, the number of superficial coins is extraordinarily high whilst reflecting a relatively narrow range of date in the fourth century A.D. The significance of this latter phenomenon is discussed in the description of the area (p. 121).
Regio II, Insulae 6 and 7 (figure 116)

The excavations carried out in these insulae were in any case relatively small, but the number of coins included in the histograms has been diminished by the loss of many of the coins which were found in the 1951 season: these amount to fourteen from Insula 6 and sixteen from Insula 7. What is left has little to tell: the density of early occupation is evident in both areas, and for the Roman period the difference between the two histograms shows probably that the previous excavations had removed the upper levels more completely in the area of the Insula 6 excavations than in the area examined in Insula 7.

The Abbasid coin of the eighth century A.D. from trench S.p. X3 in Insula 6 (see fig. 56, facing p. 125) is of interest as one of the few remaining items of evidence for continued occupation at Sabratha after the Arab conquest, despite the fact that it is recorded from a wholly improbable context which contains no fine ware later than the fourth or third century B.C.!
CHAPTER IX

ATTIC BLACK-GLAZED POTTERY

(DAVID W.J. GILL)

DISCUSSION

The Attic black-glazed ware from Sabratha is represented by nearly 200 classifiable sherds, ranging in date from the middle of the fifth century down to the beginning of the third. An attempt has been made to divide the material into two broad groups belonging to either the fifth or the fourth century, though some fragments could not be closely dated. Such a division is not as arbitrary as it may seem as there is a marked decrease in the level of Attic imports in the second decade of the fourth century. Where possible, a narrower division has been used. The chronology for the ware follows that proposed by Sparkes and Talcott except for a few amendments explained in the catalogue. In the catalogue either close parallels are given or similar examples are noted from Phoenician or native provenances in the West. The chronological distribution of the datable sherds is shown in table II and figure 117.

In the fifth century the predominant shapes are Attic Type A skyphoi and bolsals, along with examples, often single, of kraters, mugs, Corinthian-type skyphoi, Castulo Cups, one-handlers, bowls, lekythoi and lekanides. Type A skyphoi are extremely hard to date, though none seems to fall in the first half of the fifth century. None of the bolsals is earlier than c. 430 B.C. The earliest possible sherd comes from the rim of a Castulo Cup (no. 29), a type which became popular in the second half of the fifth century and even appears in fourth-century contexts. Many of these fifth-century sherds come from the north side of the Forum which may indicate the area of the original Phoenician settlement. Both Kenyon and Haynes have suggested that the settlement dates back to the sixth century, but the dating of the black-glazed ware suggests that it did not appear at Sabratha until the second half of the fifth century, which supports the soundings made by Di Vita to the south of the Forum. Of course the evidence of the black-glazed material does not necessarily rule out an earlier occupation by Phoenicians, and it should be remembered that remains at Lepcis Magna go back to the seventh century. The slight peaks in the import of Attic black-glazed ware in the 420's and 400's probably have no significance, but the distribution shows that of the datable pottery approximately 25 per cent belongs to the fifth century (460-400 B.C.)
in marked contrast to 75 per cent attributed to the fourth. Few studies have been made of the volume of Attic pottery at individual sites, but one such has been undertaken by Boardman, who has shown that, at least for figured wares, there is a noticeable decline at most sites after 450 B.C. (e.g. Athens, Etruria, Campania, Rhodes). The Sabratha import pattern appears to be fairly constant throughout the second half of the fifth century, and may be compared to what is known of imports at Al Mina in Syria and to some extent at Spina near the head of the Adriatic. Jully's studies of Athenian pottery in Languedoc, Rousillon and Catalonia show different levels of trade, suggesting that Sabratha was not using the same traders.

In the fourth century the main shapes are bowls, plates and fishplates – a change in the character of Attic imports. Following a prominent low of imports in the second decade of the fourth century there is a large increase in the second quarter which drops back in the third, though this is probably due to the availability of Italian black-glazed fabrics. The fourth-century sherds are far more widespread throughout the city, which suggests an expansion of the settlement in the early fourth century – this in turn suggests increased trade, of which the pottery is a reflection. It should be noted that similar amounts of fourth-century Attic black-glazed material are found in Spain, especially on native sites, which may suggest that Sabratha was either on the same trade route or used the same traders. Surprisingly, there are few points of contact with southern Italy or Sicily.

The high level of Attic pottery imports at Sabratha does not necessarily reflect direct trade between Athens and the Phoenicians, though we should note the presence of a possible Greek

---

8 See p. 313.
9 S. Moscati (The World of the Phoenicians, London 1973, 226) has suggested that 'Carthage often acted as an intermediary for the merchandise of other nations. So Greek objects found their way to the West through the Carthaginian merchants.' Cf. B.R. MacDonald, The distribution of Attic pottery from 450 to 375 B.C.: the effects of politics on trade (Ph.D. thesis, University of Pennsylvania 1979) 177: "the presence of Attic pottery at sites in northern Africa and southern Spain, especially by the late fifth and early fourth centuries, may indicate an increased role played by Punic merchants in the distribution of Attic pottery." A Phoenician route to Spain may be indicated by a wreck off Majorca carrying, among other items, large quantities of fourth-century Attic pottery (Salvador 1972).
DISCUSSION

ATTIC BLACK-GLAZED WARE

CHRONOLOGICAL DISTRIBUTION

FIG. 117. Chronological distribution of Attic Black-Glazed Ware from the excavations.

trademark on the base of a bowl (no. 91), indicating a batch of at least ten such vases. Phoenicians are known at Athens: Xenophon records the great Phoenician ship (τὸ μέγα πλοῖον τὸ φωνικοὶ) in the Piraeus with a hold capacity of δεκάλιον, and their cults were established in the harbour area. Phoenician trade in Attic pottery has been demonstrated by the graffito on a foot of a krater from Galera in Spain, dated to c. 430 B.C., which appears to give a batch of four kraters but in Phoenician script. Such trade is reflected in Pseudo Scylax 112, dated to around the middle of the fourth century B.C., where goods being traded on the Atlantic coast of Africa by Phoenicians include κέραμον Ἀττικὸν καὶ χόρδος. Tripolitania may have been on one of the routes to Sicily, as is reflected in Gyllippus's voyage to Syracuse (via Selinus!), which may be another explanation for the presence of Attic pottery. However, even if there was direct trade between Athens and Tripolitania, we need not see the Attic pottery as anything more than 'space-fillers in more valuable cargoes' or perhaps as ballast in a returning merchant ship which had just delivered a cargo of luxury items to Athens.

10 Xenophon, Oeconomicus viii.11–16.
11 See W. Judeich, Topographie von Athen (Munich 1931) 454.
13 C. Müller, Geographi Graeci Minores i (Paris 1882) 94.
14 Thucydidès vii.50.
16 For unusual ballast compare in the nineteenth century the use of copper cash, 'the currency of the poor', in opium ships returning from China: A.J. Broomhall, Over the Treaty Wall (Hudson Taylor and China's Open Century ii, Sevenoaks 1982). Haynes (1955, 25) has noted that Tripolitania 'was well placed to tap the resources of the Sudan . . . gold, precious stones, ivory and ebony, negro slaves; while Tripolitania itself was rich in ostriches, whose eggs and feathers were highly prized;' cf. D.B. Harden, The Phoenicians (Harmondsworth 1980) 156.
CATALOGUE

SHAPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Nos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oinochoe</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mug, Pheidias shape</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos, Corinthian type</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos, Attic type A</td>
<td>7-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castulo Cup</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsal</td>
<td>30-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>73-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-handler</td>
<td>75-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, small bowl and saltcellar</td>
<td>78-126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>127-134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>135-165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>166-167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekanis</td>
<td>168-169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragments</td>
<td>170-193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KRATER

1. Handle.
   Context xxiii.29/8 (p. 137).

OINOCHOE

2. Above a groove, ribbing and cross, which probably came in the handle-panel.
   Context xxiv.59/15a (trench S.p. X3: see p. 296).
   Early fourth century B.C.

3. Handle fragment, triangular in section with three ridges on one side.
   Cf. Agora xii, pl. 7, no. 125.
   400-390 B.C.

4. Handle-fragment, triangular in section.
   Context xxiii.38/40 (p. 138).
   Cf. handle of a chous found at Vari: BSA 68 (1973) 375 fig. 5.4.
   400-390 B.C.

MUG, PHEIDIAS SHAPE

5. One half of double handle with shouldering.
   Context xxiii.39/uncat. (p. 139).
   Excavations in the Agora at Athens suggest that the double handle with shouldering appeared around 450 B.C. and continued down to the end of the century: cf. Agora xii, 72-74.
   450-400 B.C.
CATALOGUE

SKYPHOS, CORINTHIAN TYPE

6. Underside is reserved and ruddled with two painted circles.
   Context i.a.4/14 (p. 50).
   450–425 B.C.

SKYPHOS, ATTIC TYPE A

7. Wall and handle; thin U-shaped handle.
   Context i.20/8 (p. 41).
   450–400 B.C.

   Context xiv.54/5 (p. 144).
   Cf. Agora xii, pl. 16 and fig. 4. Other skyphoi of similar date are known from Lepcis Magna (Quaderni di Archeologia della Libia 9, 1977, pl. 3.5), Motya (Annual of the Leeds University Oriental Society 4, 1962–63, 121; Mozia v, pl. 28.1c; Mozia vii, pl. 45.2), Nora (MonAnt 13, 1903, col. 214 fig. 46; Bartoloni & Tronchetti 1981, fig. 8, 63.9.9), Aleria (Jehasse 1973, pl. 111.2028) and Ibiza (Barcelona 8.214: Trías de Arribas 1967/8, pl. 155.1).
   450–400 B.C.

9. Pl. 62a. Foot, burnt. The underside is reserved with two painted circles and a circle and band.
   450–400 B.C.

10. Foot.
    Context xxii.1/1 (p. 125).
    450–400 B.C.

11. Pl. 62a. Foot. The underside is reserved with painted band and circle, two circles and dot.
    Context xxiv.2/1 (trench S.p. X1: see p. 296).
    450–400 B.C.

12. Foot.
    Context i.95/10a (p. 47).
    450–400 B.C.

13. The underside is reserved and painted with a band, band and thick dot.
    Context i.95/10b (p. 47).
    450–400 B.C.

14. The underside is reserved.
    Context xxiv.10/1 (trench S.p. X1: see p. 296).
    450–400 B.C.

15. Foot. The underside is reserved and painted with two circles.
    Context xxiv.2/3 (trench S.p. X1: see p. 296).
    450–400 B.C.

16. Handle.
    Context xxiv.2/4c (trench S.p. X1: see p. 296).
    450–400 B.C.

17. Foot. The underside is reserved.
    Context i.78/2 (East Forum Temple, south side).
    450–400 B.C.
18. The underside is reserved.
   Context xxvi.18/2a (trench S.p. Z2: see p. 296).
   450–400 B.C.

19. Foot. Reserved line above foot, resting-surface and underside.
   Context xxii.25/3 (p. 125).
   450–400 B.C.

20. Wall, traces of handle root.
   Context xxii.25/uncat. (p. 125).
   450–400 B.C.

21. Foot, slightly misfired to brown both inside and out. The resting surface and underside are
   reserved.
   Context xvi.6/uncat. (p. 122).
   450–400 B.C.

22. Foot. The resting-surface and underside are reserved.
   450–400 B.C.

23. Foot. Reserved line at junction at foot and wall.
   Context i.69/1 (p. 50).
   450–400 B.C.

24. Pl. 62a. Foot. The underside is reserved with two painted circles.
   Context i.18/20b (East Forum Temple, south side).
   5th century B.C. (?)

   Cf. Agora xii, pl. 16, no. 350.
   375–340 B.C.

   Context i.34/uncat. (Forum, south of centre, unclassified).

27. Rim.
   Context xxiv.6/6 (trench S.p. X1: see p. 296).

28. Rim.
   Context xiv.37/1 (p. 153).

CASTULO CUP

29. Fig. 118. Rim turns out slightly; reserved inside the handles and on panel between.
   Context xxi.1/3 (p. 125).
   Cf. Agora xii, 101–102; Vickers (1979) 40 fig. 7 and pl. 9a–b; Niemeyer (1982) 403–405. Later
   Castulo Cups are painted inside their handle-panels. The name is derived from the site in
   Spain where many were found (Blázquez 1975). Other examples are known from
   Lepcis Magna (Quaderni di Archeologia della Libia 9, 1977, pl. 15.11), Carthage (e.g.
   A.78.IV.38: Archaeometry 25.1, 1983, 84 fig. 4.2), Gouraya (Gsell 1903, 21 fig. 9 below),
   Tharros (e.g. London, British Museum 56.12–23.71–75) and Nora (Bartoloni & Tronchetti
   1981, fig. 7, 41.7.1, fig. 14, 206.31.16 and 207.31.17, fig. 15, 299 quater.34.8). Brian
   Shefton reports an example from Lixos.
   460–420 B.C.
FIG. 118. Attic Black-Glazed Ware, nos. 29 and 79. Scale 1:2.

BOLSAL

30. Concave lower wall and step. The underside is reserved and rudded with a painted band and central medallion (?). Stamped decoration: two palmettes survive, the complete one is very distorted and shortened. Misfired to green on part of inside. Context xxiv.6/1 (trench S.p. X1: see p. 296).


c. 425 B.C.


32. Foot. Concave wall; the underside is reserved and there is a painted band. Context uncertain ('S.p. X1–30' – does not exist!) 430–410 B.C.

33. Pl. 62b. Base of a large example. Concave lower wall. The underside is reserved and rudded, with painted band (a pair of incised circles at the outer and inner edges) and medallion (a pair of incised circles within edge, circle and dot). A graffito: χ. Stamped decoration: on a circle, seven linked palmettes. Context i.9/21 (East Forum Temple, south side).


c. 400 B.C.

34. Foot and floor. Concave lower wall, slightly undercut. Reserved: the bottom edge of the inside of the foot and underside which is decorated with a painted band and circle, circle and dot. Stamped decoration: four linked palmettes (now two and a half). Large example. Context xvi.7/uncat. (p. 122).

c. 400 B.C.


c. 400 B.C.
36. Foot, burnt. Attic? Concave lower wall; reserved band at the outer edge of the underside.
   Thick fabric.
   Context ia.9/8 (north portico of East Forum Temple, disturbed pre-Roman context).
   c. 400 B.C.

37. Rim.
   Context xxiii.35/uncat. (p. 137).
   400–375 B.C.

38. Foot. Concave lower wall with a broad incised circle above. Grooved resting-surface.
   Underside misfired to red with central rising cone and no distinct junction between foot
   and floor. Stamped decoration: four palmettes (two complete) and rouletting.
   Context xiv.67/25 (p. 164).
   Cf. Agora xii, pls. 24, 53 and fig. 6, no. 558. Close are examples from La Bastida (Archivo
   de Prehistoria Levantina 5, 1954, pl. 12.59) and Lepcis Magna (Quaderni di Archeologia della
   Libia 9, 1977, pl. 26.2).
   380–350 B.C.

   Black underside. Stamped decoration: two (surviving) palmettes and rouletting.
   Context i.13/16 (East Forum Temple, south side).
   For the profile see Salvador (1972) 308 fig. 26, from a wreck off Majorca. For the
   decoration see examples from Cigarralco (MadrMitt 9, 1968, fig. 30.1 and 2; García Cano
   1982, fig. 19.1 and 2) and Castillico de las Peñas (García Cano 1982, fig. 13.1).
   380–350 B.C.

40. Wall fragment. Concave lower wall with reserved line towards top.
   Context xxiii.23, Reg. 1169 (p. 137).
   c. 350 B.C.

41. Rim and handle.
   Context i.187/uncat. (East Forum Temple, S.W. corner).
   Early 4th century B.C.

42. Foot, floor and lower wall. Concave lower wall, undercut with a reserved groove at top.
   The underside is black with no distinct junction between foot and underside. Stamped
   decoration: palmettes and rouletting. Worn.
   Context i.93/3a (p. 47).
   380–350 B.C.

43. Foot. Concave lower wall with reserved line at top. Grooved and reserved resting-surface.
   No distinct junction between foot and underside. Traces of rouletting.
   Context xvi.11/uncat. (p. 123).
   380–350 B.C.

44. Handle-fragment. Rim turns out slightly.
   c. 350 B.C.

45. Concave lower wall with reserved line above. Step inside foot which is reserved. Black
   underside with no distinct junction between foot and underside. Inside there are traces of
   rouletting.
   Context xxiii.39/uncat. (p. 139).
   380–350 B.C.

46. Two fragments of wall. Groove above concave lower wall.
   Context xxvi.40/uncat. (East Forum Temple, N.E. corner of precinct).
   380–350 B.C.
47. Foot. Concave lower wall with reserved line above. Reserved and grooved resting-surface. Black underside with no distinct junction between foot and underside. Inside, rouletting.
Context xxiii.38/uncat. (p. 138).
380–350 B.C.

48. Foot, Attic? Reserved at the top of the concave lower wall. Reserved and grooved resting-surface. The underside and the inside of the foot misfired to red.
380–350 B.C.

49. Rim and handle.
Context i.95/9 (p. 47).
380–350 B.C.

50. Foot and lower wall. Concave lower wall which is reserved above. Grooved and reserved resting-surface. Black underside with no distinct junction between foot and underside. Inside, rouletting and tip of palmette.
Context i.181/uncat. (Forum, central).
380–350 B.C.

51. Rim and handle fragment.
Context i.10/uncat. (East Forum Temple, south side).
380–350 B.C.

52. Lower wall. Concave and reserved above.
Context i.a.4/uncat. (p. 50).
380–350 B.C.

Context xiv.65/3a (p. 164).
380–350 B.C.

Context i.14/11 (East Forum Temple, south side).
380–350 B.C.

55. Foot. Concave lower wall. Reserved bottom inside of foot and edge of underside.
Context i.166/1 (p. 42).
c. 400 B.C.

56. Rim-fragment with handle root.
Context i.34/6 (Forum, south of centre).

57. Concave lower wall.
Context i.26/5 (p. 41).

Context xxiii.1/uncat. (p. 135).
380–350 B.C.

59. Foot. Concave lower wall, reserved line above. Grooved and reserved resting-surface; black underside. Inside, rouletting and tip of palmette.
Context xxiv.70/13a (p. 128).
380–350 B.C.
60. Foot. Concave lower wall with reserved line above. Reserved and grooved resting-surface; black underside. Inside rouletting.
   380–350 B.C.

61. Wall and handle roots.
   380–350 B.C.

62. Foot. Reserved and grooved resting-surface; black underside (misfired). No distinct junction between foot and underside. Stamped decoration: palmette cross and rouletting with 'tram tracks'.
   Context xxiii.38/uncat. (p. 138).
   380–350 B.C.

63. Foot. Grooved resting-surface; black underside with central rising cone. Concave lower wall with reserved line above. Inside, rouletting.
   Context xxiii.35/16a (p. 137).
   380–350 B.C.

   Context xxiii.35/16c (p. 137).
   380–350 B.C.

65. Foot. Grooved and reserved resting-surface; black underside. Inside, rouletting.
   380–350 B.C.

66. Foot and floor. Reserved and grooved resting-surface; black underside. No distinct junction between foot and underside. Concave lower wall with reserved line above. Misfired inside in parts. Inside, palmette cross (poor) and simple rouletting.
   380–350 B.C.

   380–350 B.C.

68. Rim. Iron deposit on outside.
   Context xiv.103/uncat. (p. 165).

69. Concave lower wall, incised groove above.
   Context i.13/13c (East Forum Temple, south side).
   c. 400 B.C.

   Context i.158/3 (Forum, east end).
   380–350 B.C.

   Context i.153/2a (p. 42).
   380–350 B.C.

72. Handle-fragment.
   Context xxiii.35/17c (p. 137).
   375–325 B.C.
CATALOGUE

KANTHAROS

73. Rim and neck: kantharos with moulded rim and spurred handle.
   Context xxi.44, Reg. 1174 (p. 128).
   Cf. Agora xii, fig. 7, no. 701; see also examples from Olynthus (D.M. Robinson,
   Excavations at Olynthus V: Mosaics, Vases and Lamps of Olynthus found in 1928 and 1931,
   Baltimore 1933, pl. 148.505), Cigarralejo (MadrMitt 9, 1968, fig. 14.1 and 2; García Cano
   1982, fig. 19.3 and 4) and Vari (BSA 69, 1973, 375 fig. 5.21 and 22).
   350-325 B.C.

   Cf. Agora xii, pl. 28 and fig. 7., no. 676; see also an example from Cigarralejo (García Cano
   1982, fig. 20.1 and 2).
   c. 325 B.C.

ONE-HANDLER

   Context xiv.6/50 (p. 152).
   Cf. Agora xii, pl. 31.750.
   450-425 B.C.

76. Fragment with broad rim. The handle does not appear to have been rounded.
   Context xxi.40/5 (p. 125).
   400-350 B.C.

77. Rim and wall.
   Context xxiv.70/14a (p. 128).

BOWL, SMALL BOWL AND SALTCELLAR

78. Pl. 63a, Foot. Reserved resting-surface and line at junction between foot and bowl.
   Stamped decoration: tips and parts of four palmettes, and enclosed between two circles a
   frieze of smaller palmettes (anti-clockwise).
   Context xxiv.2/2 (trench S.p. X: see p. 296).
   For the frieze see examples inside bowls from Athens (Agora xii, pl. 58.795) and Kiton
   (Kition iv, pls. 48.60 and 55.60). Similar friezes are also found on stemless, e.g. from the
   Rheneia pit (C. Dugas, Exploration archéologique de Délos xxi, Les vases attiques à figures
   rouges, Paris 1952, pl. 50.157) and the Agora (Agora xii, pl. 52.511).
   430-410 B.C.

79. Fig. 118, pl. 63a. Wall. Reserved around foot. Two incised lines either side of the ridge on
   the wall. Groove around foot. Stamped decoration: palmettes, enclosed ovules, linked
   palmettes.
   For the profile see an example from Kiton (Kition iv, pls. 48 and 55, no. 60). For the
   decoration, see inside Rheneia Cups from the Rheneia pit (C. Dugas, cit. under no. 78, pl.
   50.151 and 152) and on a fragment from La Bastida (Archivo de Prehistoria Levantina 5,
   1954, pl. 14.74). This piece is perhaps also close in shape to a low stemless cup now in
   Newcastle (Sotheby’s Sale Catalogue, 10-11 December 1984, lot no. 58, face-view
   illustrated).
   430-420 B.C.
80. Floor-fragment of bowl with out-turned rim. Underside reserved on part of the inside of the foot, base decorated with a painted band and circle. Stamped decoration: the tip of a palmette and enclosed dot-like ovules. Context i.149/7 (p. 42). 425-400 B.C.


82. Foot. Reserved line at junction of foot and body; reserved and grooved resting-surface. Black underside with no distinct junction between foot and underside. Stamped decoration: two alternately linked palmettes. Context xxiii.2/2 (p. 135). 375-350 B.C.

83. Pl. 63a. Foot. Reserved line at junction of foot and body; reserved and grooved resting-surface. Black underside with no distinct junction between foot and underside. Stamped decoration: five (surviving) alternately linked palmettes around ovules. Context xxiv.30/3 (trench S.p. X2; see p. 296). For the use of ovules and palmettes on a fourth-century bowl, see Agora xii, pl. 59 and fig. 8, no. 826. For the pattern used in conjunction with rouletting, see an example from Salamis in Cyprus Jehasses 1978, 47 fig. 31.232). 400-380 B.C.


89. Foot. Reserved resting-surface. Black underside with central rising cone and no distinct junction between foot and underside. Stamped decoration: two (surviving) palmettes and rouletting.

Context xxv.10/5a (trench S.p. Y2: see p. 296).

375–350 B.C.

90. Pl. 63b. Foot. Reserved at junction between foot and body; reserved and grooved resting-surface. Black underside with central rising cone and no distinct junction between foot and underside. Stamped decoration: six alternately linked palmettes and rouletting.

Graffiti: X between two of the palmettes, and XΩ on the underside.

Context i.105/3 (p. 49).

For the decoration, see examples from La Bastida (Archivo de Prehistoria Levantina 5, 1954, pl. 1.1: bowl with incurved rim), Ascoy (Cieza) (García Cano 1982, fig. 1.7: bowl with incurved rim), El Cigarralejo (Archivo de Prehistoria Levantina, 10, 1963, pl. 2.11), Orleyl (Castellón) Grave II (Lazaro Mengod et al. 1981, figs. 15 and 17.2: bowl with incurved rim), a tomb between Cherchel and Cap de Ténès (Bailey 1975, pl. 144b, top centre: bowl with incurved rim), Salamis (Cyprus) (Jehasse 1978, 47, fig. 31 and pl. 3, no. 229) and the Athenian Agora (Hesperia 3, 1934, 317 fig. 3 and 431 fig. 115, no. A7: bowl with out-turned rim). On the example from the Agora there is a graffito ME similarly within the decoration.

375–350 B.C.

91. Pl. 64a. Base of bowl. On the underside is a possible batch-mark, △[... Worn.

Context xxiii.38/27b (p. 138).

For the graffito type, see Johnston (1979) fig. 14p, q and s.

375–350 B.C.

92. Foot. Reserved band between foot and body; reserved and grooved resting-surface. Black underside with central rising cone and no distinct junction between foot and underside. Stamped decoration: two (surviving) alternately linked palmettes and rouletting.


375–350 B.C.


Context i.187/uncat. (East Forum Temple, S.W. corner).


375–350 B.C.

95. Fragment of bowl with incurved rim. Good paint.

Context xxi.44/7 (p. 128).

375–350 B.C.


Context xvi.10/uncat. (p. 123).

For the decoration, see Agora xii, pl. 59, no. 875.

c. 400 B.C.

97. Rim-fragment.

98. Rim-fragment of bowl with incurved rim.  

   375-350 B.C.

100. Rim of bowl with incurved rim. Traces of rouletting.  
    Context xxiii.38/uncat. (p. 138).  
    375-325 B.C.

101. Fragment of bowl with incurved rim.  
    Context xxiii.1/3 (p. 135).  
    375-325 B.C.

102. Rim-fragment, bowl with incurved rim.  
    Context i.50/13 (East Forum Temple, south side).

103. Fragment of bowl, out-turned rim.  
    Context i a.8/2 (between East Forum Temple and Forum).

104. Foot. Black underside with no distinct junction between foot and underside.  
    Context i a.4/uncat. (p. 50).  
    375-325 B.C.

    Context xiv.65/2 (p. 164).  
    For foot and decoration, see Agora xii, pl. 33 and fig. 9, no. 882.  
    c. 380 B.C.

    Context i a.10/3 (Forum, S.E. quadrant).  
    See no. 105.  
    c. 380 B.C.

107. Rim of small bowl.  
    Context xiv.98/uncat. (p. 164).

108. Rim of small bowl.  
    Context xiv.98/uncat. (p. 164).

109. Rim-fragment, probably from a small bowl.  
    Context xxiii.29/10 (p. 137).  
    c. 400 B.C.

110. Foot. Grooved and reserved resting-surface. Black underside with no distinct junction between foot and underside.  
    Context i.135/2 (p. 12).  
    375-325 B.C.

111. Foot. Reserved line at junction of foot and wall; broad resting-surface, concave inside. Black underside with central rising cone. Stamped decoration: palmette cross.
112. Foot. Reserved and grooved resting-surface. No distinct junction between foot and underside. At centre of underside, a reserved medallion with a painted band and graffito. Stamped decoration: palmette cross.
Context xxiii.1/uncat. (p. 135).
Compare nos. 105, 106 and 111.
390-370 B.C.

113. Floor of bowl. Reserved around foot. Black underside with no distinct junction between foot and underside. Stamped decoration: on circle, linked palmettes.
Context xxiii.1/uncat. (p. 135).
375-350 B.C.

114. Incurved rim of bowl.
Context xxiii.1/uncat. (p. 135).

115. Incurved rim of bowl.
Context xxiii.1/uncat. (p. 135).

116. Foot. Reserved line at junction between foot and body. Black underside with no distinct junction between foot and underside. Inside, rouletting.
Context xxiv.70/13b (p. 128).
375-325 B.C.

117. Fragment of bowl with projecting rim.
Context xxiv.70/17 (p. 128).
For the shape, see *Agora xii*, fig. 9, no. 880 and two examples from Al Mina (Oxford 1956.426 and 1956.428).
400-375 B.C.

118. Out-turned rim of bowl. Reserved line below rim.
Context xvi.21/uncat. (p. 124).

Context xvi.21/uncat. (p. 124).
375-350 B.C.

120. Footed saltcellar.

121. Rim of saltcellar.
Context xxiii.35/20 (p. 137).
*Cf. Agora xii*, pl. 34 and fig. 9, no. 949.
350-325 B.C.

122. Incurved rim of bowl.

123. Incurved rim of bowl. Graffito: †.
124. Foot. Reserved resting-surface.
   375–350 B.C.

   375–350 B.C.

   Context xxiii.38/uncat. (p. 138).
   4th or 3rd century B.C.

---

PLATE

127. Pl. 64a. Floor. Black underside with central rising cone. Stamped decoration: on a circle, palmettes (originally four) within rouletting.
   Context iii.3/13 (p. 49).
   375–350 B.C.

   Context xxiii.38, Reg. 1312 (p. 138).
   For the profile, compare Agora xii, pl. 59 and fig. 10, no. 1046 and London, British Museum 1960.3–1.1 (from Al Mina).
   400–375 B.C.

129. Rim of small plate. Inside, rouletting.
   Context xxv.24/37 (p. 175).
   For the profile, see Euhesperides 26, also with a single band of rouletting: I am grateful to Professor Barri Jones for allowing me access to the drawings of material from his excavations (see Libyan Studies 14, 1983, 109–114). Also close is an example from a wreck off Majorca (Salvador 1972, 309 fig. 27a).
   375–325 B.C.

130. Two rim-fragments. Inside, rouletting.
   Context v.2/40 (p. 27).
   For the profile, compare Reading University, Ure Museum, 83.9.15 (Al Mina MN5513–MN2); also a similar example from a wreck off Majorca (Salvador 1972, 309, fig. 27b).
   375–325 B.C.

   375–350 B.C.

132. Foot. Reserved line at junction between foot and body; reserved line at outer edge of underside. Stamped decoration: tips of palmettes.
   Context i.154/6 (p. 42).
   375–350 B.C.

133. Floor-fragment. Concave and black inside foot. Inside, two impressed circles and rouletting.
   Context xxiii.39/45b (p. 139).
   375–325 B.C.
134. Rolled rim of plate.  
   Context xxiii.35/uncat. (p. 137).  
   350-early 3rd century B.C.

FISH PLATE

135. Fragment.  
   Context i.26, Reg. 292 (p. 41).  
   For the profile, see Agora xii, fig. 10, no. 1071. Fishplates are known at Lepcis Magna (Quaderni di Archeologia della Libia 9, 1977, pl. 4.9-11, 13 and 43, pl. 15.13, pl. 21.4 and pl. 25.8), Carthage A.74.III.31 and A.78.XI.228 (see Archaeometry 25.1, 1983, 77-86), Nora (Bartoloni and Tronchetti 1981, fig. 8 no. 51.8.2, fig. 9 nos. 70.11.4 and 71.11.5 and fig. 10 nos. 99.16,1, 100.16.2 and 101.16.3) and a tomb between Cherchel and Cap de Ténès (Bailey 1975, pl. 144b top right). Brian Shefton reports a fragment amongst the sherds from the excavations of Charles Daniels in the Fezzan. Several were found in the Majorca shipwreck (Salvador 1972, 307 fig. 25).  
   c. 350 B.C.

136. Rim-fragment. Reserved groove at edge.  
   Context S.p. R1-4 (Regio III, Church 3).  
   375-325 B.C.

137. High, heavy foot. Reserved resting-surface; black underside. Traces of central depression.  
   Context xvi.10/uncat. (p. 123).  
   375-325 B.C.

   Context xvi.18/uncat. (p. 124).  
   375-350 B.C.

139. Rim-fragment.  
   Context xxiv.52/uncat. (trench S.p. X3; see p. 296).  
   375-350 B.C.

140. Reserved and grooved resting-surface. Reserved groove around central depression. Black underside.  
   Context i.130/3 (p. 12).  
   375-325 B.C.

141. Rim-fragment.  
   Context 'S.OV6.14' (??).  
   375-325 B.C.

142. Rim-fragment.  
   Context i.58 (East Forum Temple, north side but south of early city wall).  
   375-325 B.C.

143. Two fragments of foot. Reserved above foot, resting-surface, bottom inside of foot and outer edge of underside. Groove around central depression.  
   Context i.180/uncat. (Forum, west end).  
   375-325 B.C.

144. Rim-fragment.  
   Context i.10/uncat. (East Forum Temple, south side).  
   375-325 B.C.
145. Black lipped foot with broad resting-surface. The underside has a reserved band towards the edge with traces of a graffito. Reserved groove around central depression. Context i a.4/10b (p. 50). 375-325 B.C.


152. Two rim-fragments. Reserved groove at outer edge. Context ia.3/6c (East Forum Temple, north side). 375-325 B.C.


154. Rim. Reserved groove at outer edge. Context i.66/2 (p. 50). 375-325 B.C.


159. Rim.
   Context i.47/10 (Forum, south of centre).
   375–325 B.C.

160. Rim. Groove at outer edge.
   375–325 B.C.

   For the decoration on the underside, compare Cambridge, Museum of Classical Archaeology, CAM 257 (Marion).
   375–350 B.C.

162. Rim. Groove at outer edge.
   375–325 B.C.

   Context xiv.153 (Regio II, Insula 6, unclassified).
   See no. 161.
   375–350 B.C.

164. Rim.
   Context i.13/7 (East Forum Temple, south side).
   375–325 B.C.

165. Foot of large vessel, possibly a fishplate. Painted and grooved resting-surface.
   Context xxiii.29/9 (p. 137).
   350–325 B.C.

LEKYTHOS

166. Three fragments, neck and handle. Step on shoulder.
   Contexts xxiii.39 + 40, uncat. (pp. 139, 140).
   See Agora xii, pl. 38.
   440–400 B.C.

167. Fragment of squat lekythos.
   Context xvi.10/uncat. (p. 123).
   450–425 B.C.

LEKANIS

168. Lid fragment.
   Context xxiii.40/uncat. (p. 139).
   See Agora xii, pl. 41.
   450–420 B.C.

169. Lid fragment, as Agora xii, no. 1226.
   Context xxiii.38/29 (p. 138).
   450–420 B.C.
170. Floor of bowl. Black underside with two concentric impressed circles. Stamped decoration: two concentric impressed circles, linked palmettes. 
   Context xxiii.39/44a (p. 139).

   c. 400 B.C.

   Context i.26/4 (p. 41).
   For the profile, see an example from Nora (Bartoloni & Tronchetti 1981, fig. 9, no. 72.11.6); cf. also nos. 105, 106, 111 and 112.
   400–380 B.C.

   Context i.95, Reg. 373 (p. 47).
   For profile and decoration compare Agora xii, no. 887.
   350–325 B.C.

   Context xxiv.73/6 (p. 130).
   375–350 B.C.

   Context xxiii.35/18 (p. 137).
   375–350 B.C.

   Context xxiii.39/44b (p. 139).
   Similar decoration occurs on a bowl with incurved rim from La Bastida (Archivo de Prehistoria Levantina 5, 1954, pl. 6.10).
   375–350 B.C.

   Context i.135/6 (p. 12).
   375–350 B.C.

   Context uncertain ('xxiv.5a' – incomplete designation).
   375–325 B.C.

   Context xxvi.40 (East Forum Temple, N.E. corner of precinct).

179. Floor-fragment. Traces of rouletting.
   Context xxiii.38/uncat. (p. 138).
   375–325 B.C.

180. Floor-fragments. Underside black with central rising cone.
   Context xiv.98/uncat. (p. 164).
   375–325 B.C.


188. Two fragments of thin-walled vessel (e.g. bolsal). Context xxi.4/2 (p. 125). c. 430-400 B.C.

189. Fragment of a thicker-walled vessel (e.g. Attic Type A skyphos). Context xxi.4/2 (p. 125). 5th century B.C. (?)  


192. Handle-fragment from bolsal or skyphos. Context xxiii.35/17a (p. 137). 375-325 B.C.

193. Handle-fragment from bolsal or skyphos. Context xxiii.35/17b (p. 137). 375-325 B.C.

NOTES ON TRENCHES WHICH ARE NOT DESCRIBED ELSEWHERE (P.M.K.)

A number of the pieces listed in the foregoing catalogue were found in trenches which are not
otherwise described in the report. The reason for their exclusion is generally either that there exists no plan of the trench which can be used as a satisfactory basis for its interpretation, or that the precise location of the trench is unknown. The trenches in question were all excavated in 1951, and their approximate locations were as follows.


**Trench S.p. X2** (contexts xxiv.27–44): immediately inside the north-east corner of the East Forum Temple precinct.

**Trench S.p. X3** (contexts xxiv.45–60): Regio II, Insula 6, east side, to the south of the other excavations in this insula (see fig. 56, facing p. 125).

**Trench S.p. Y2** (contexts xxv.8–18): Regio II, Insula 2, precise location unknown.


**SHERDS OF DECORATED ATTIC VESSELS (P.M.K.)**

Only six sherds of decorated Attic ware were found in the excavations, and they are shown in plate 64b. Professor John Boardman has offered the opinion that none of them is necessarily to be dated earlier than the late fifth century B.C. The contexts and descriptions of the fragments are as follows.

1. Red-figure sherd, fragment of krater (?). Ovolo at upper edge of sherd, part of figure-scene below. Context v.1/17 (should be Forum Period III, but contaminated: see p. 27).

2. Fragment of black-glazed krater, showing edge of ovolo bordering a red-figure scene. Context i.50a/1 (p. 43).


4. Rim of cup with everted lip. Black spiral on reserved surface. Context v.2/228 (p. 27).

5. Fragment of red-figure vessel: large palmette. Context xxi.6, Reg. 1175 + 1176 (p. 125).


CHAPTER X
THE GLASS
(JOHN HAYES)

GENERAL REMARKS

The total quantity of glass from the excavations is not great: despite the careful standards of recording, only about 540 fragments were kept, including 13 (at most) pieces of window-glass, 5 pieces of bracelets, one counter, one dipping rod(?), 4 possible pieces of cullet and a modern bottle-base (the last associated with a superficial burial in Regio II, Insula 7, trench S.p. W3-2a). Of the c. 515 fragments of Roman vessel-glass, some 167 give no indication of form and a further sixty or so can only vaguely be classed as of either open or closed shape. Details of the remaining c. 290 pieces follow. An over-all breakdown by category is shown in table III. Only one tolerably complete vessel was found (the bowl no. A24). Most of these are arranged here typologically, but the finds from one area, the Casa Brogan, which are rather more numerous than the average and concentrated in the early Imperial period, are treated separately by context (series A below), to give an impression of the distribution-pattern of finds.

Most of the glass presented comes from types manufactured in the first and second centuries A.D., and it would seem that the maximum usage of glass here occurred c. A.D. 50–150. The types present find parallels mainly in the western Empire (chiefly Italy and western North Africa); many, especially the earlier (first century) ones, may be imports from Italy. Eastern (Syro-Palestinian and Egyptian) types are generally lacking, but this may be due to a general lack of identifiable third–fourth century types. A number of 'wine-glass' goblets of fifth–sixth century type represent the Vandal/Byzantine period; these, with their fused-on bases, correspond in general terms to the type commonest at Carthage,¹ though the metal here seems different, and manufacture in the region might be postulated (if they do not originate in the Italian orbit). Late lamp glasses are here rare, as seems generally the case in North Africa, with its large production of clay lamps.² Of the earlier types of glassware, none need be earlier than the Augustan period, and the few recorded from pre-Augustan contexts are likely to be intrusive.

Luxury glass (and indeed coloured glass of all varieties) is scarce: one may note in passing a single fragment of a millesimi dish (no. B7) and two or three pieces of the facet-cut colourless wares of the late first/second centuries (nos. B11, B12; also no. A14?).

### TABLE III
GLASS FRAGMENTS: FREQUENCY BY COLOUR AND SHAPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessels</th>
<th>Number of fr. (after joining)</th>
<th>Percentage of total vessel-glass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moulded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blue-green (natural)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colourless</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coloured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>millefiori</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulded?, facet-cut</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colourless</td>
<td>2 (3?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mould-blown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yellow-green</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colourless</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blown</td>
<td>c. 393</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blue-green etc.</td>
<td>c. 88</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colourless</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misc. coloured</td>
<td>c. 490</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>c. 515</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Individual forms (commoner shapes)**

- Pillar-moulded bowls: 9 (1.7)
- Beakers/bowls with wheel-cut grooves, including 'pressed bases': 30 (5.8)
-Indented beakers: 9 (1.7)
- Beakers, bulging cut rims (all dates): 10 (1.9)
- Unguentaria (all types): 33 + (6.4)
- 'Wine-glasses' (late): max. 31 (6.0)

**Other glass objects**

- Window-glass: max. 13
- Bracelets, counter, dipping-rod?: 7
- Cullet?: 4
- Modern bottle: 1

TOTAL NO. OF GLASS FRAGMENTS: c. 540

### CATALOGUE

**A. FINDS FROM THE CASA BROGAN (fig. 119)**

The pieces listed below are arranged by level in accordance with the site phasing presented in Chapter V. A few scraps from poor contexts have been omitted. Items are free-blown unless otherwise specified.

**Pre-Augustan layers**

Associated finds are no later than the second century B.C., but the type should be late first or early (?) second century A.D. (cf. Period V material; the context is superficial).

A2. Rim, closed(?) form.
D. 9.3 cm. Blue-green. Folded outwards.
Context xiv.118 (Period IIIb, p. 149).
Phase dated second half of first century B.C., but item presumably no earlier than mid first century A.D., and probably later: intrusive.

Period IVc (c. A.D. 5/10: p. 151)

D. c. 17.5 cm. Light green. Pitted, with thick crust of decay. Lathe-polished, slight groove inside rim.
Context xiv.8, Reg. 667.
Cf. Hayes (1975) no. 43. In context.

Period IVd (c. A.D. 30: p. 152)

A4. Two wall-fragments of ribbed bowl, Goethert-Polaschek Form 4. (Cf. the decorated type Isings 17).
Light blue-green, undecorated.
Context xiv.81, Reg. 1405.
Cf. no. A26.
Similar (as no. A26): one wall fragment, coloured blue, context xiv.81/263.

A5. End of dipping-rod (?)
Pale green (?), with thick black decay. Unfluted.
Flattened terminal knob.
Context xiv.81, Reg. 591.

A6. Base-fragment of 'Hofheim bowl' (Isings Form 12, Goethert-Polaschek Form 30), spiked.
Light blue-green. Pitted.
Context xiv.81, Reg. 593.

A7. Fragment, closed form?
Blue-green.
Context xiv.81.
Also: one dark blue fragment (found with no. A6); one plain body-fragment (found with no. A4).

Period V (early second century A.D.: p. 155)

A8. Beaker/bowl rim ('Hofheim bowl', Isings Form 12, Goethert-Polaschek Form 30, or close).
Context xiv.92, Reg. 411 (first piece).

A9. Beaker rim, as no. A31 (same vessel?)
D. 8.5 cm. Colourless (ivory film). Rim ground (?) and grooved.
Context xiv.92, Reg. 411 (second piece).

D. 4.3 cm. Light blue-green.
Context xiv.92, Reg. 421 (first piece).
From a tall slender beaker; cf. Hayes (1975) nos. 133, 134.
A11. Wall fragments of beaker.
D. below rim c. 8 cm. Light turquoise (thick ivory crust). Conical form; two fine grooves near top.
Context xiv.92, Reg. 421 (second piece).
Also: 2 fragments, blue-green; one fragment of small closed vessel, colourless (?).
A12. Fragment of closed form.
D. c. 8 cm.
Thickish turquoise glass (thick crust), undecorated.
Context xiv.92, Reg. 456.

A13. Dish rim.
D. c. 20 cm. Greenish (?), heavily decayed (black crust).
Folded out, rolled.
Context xiv.92, Reg. 416.
Possibly Isings Form 42b.

A14. Base fragment of footed beaker (?)
D. 4.2 cm. Colourless, thick. Fire-polished; tooling-marks on top.
Context xiv.92, Reg. 413.
Perhaps from a conical beaker, Isings Form 21; cf. no. B12.

A15. Rim of indented beaker.
Context xiv.120.
Also: edge of base of a small closed vessel, blue-green.

A16. Bowl rim, Isings Form 42.
D. c. 15 cm. Colourless. Polished rim.
Context xiv.120.

A17. Rim of closed (?) form, with heavy outward fold.
D. 8 cm. Light blue-green.
Context xiv.120.

Blue-green (not thin).
Context xiv.119.

**Probably Period V, various locations**

D. 6.8 cm. Light yellow-green. Small bulging rim (cut and polished?). Palm-branch motifs.
Context xiv.137 (p. 155).
Probably c. A.D. 50-100.

A20. Base and one side of cylindrical beaker.
D. (base) c. 7.5 cm. Light turquoise. Flat; no pontil-mark. Two wheel-cut grooves and pair of wheel-incisions on wall.
Context xiv.137 (as no. A19).

D. 5.4 cm. Turquoise, thick.
Context xiv.137 (as no. A19).
Also from same context: fragment of bowl rim (cf. no. A24), pale green, fire-polished; fragment of beaker, light blue-green, one cut groove.

A22. Base of modiolus (cf. Isings Form 37), or possibly a large beaker.
D. c. 8.4 cm. Light bluish-green; medium thickness. Folded foot.
Context xiv.120? (S.p. H101–3-4c).

A23. Wall fragment of carinated moulded bowl, ribbed (for type, see no. B6).
Blue-green.
Context xiv.120? (as no. A22).
Grave, Period VI

Section L–M, context xiv.122 (p. 156). This material seems only marginally later than the Period V finds, and contains basically similar types.

A24. Bowl, Isings Form 42a.
   Context xiv.122 ('taken from section, 3.8.49').

   Type late first or (first half of?) second century A.D.

A25. Wall fragment of moulded bowl with short ribs (Isings Form 3c).
   Light blue-green.
   Context xiv.122 (residual).

   Context xiv.122, Reg. 811 (presumably residual).

A27. Beaker/bowl base, 'pressed' type.
   D. 4.7 cm., complete. Light blue-green.
   Context xiv.122, Reg. 809.

Cf. no. A21.

Section L'–M', levels of the second century A.D. (p. 166)

A28. Fragments of thin beaker with wheel-incisions (cf. no. A31, but a different vessel).
   Context xiv.126, Reg. 530.

A29. Fragment of beaker base, 'pressed' type.
   D. c. 4.0–4.4 cm. Light turquoise.
   Context xiv.127, Reg. 529.

A30. Three fragments of thin beaker (?), pale green.
   Context xiv.127, Reg. 564.

A31. Rim of beaker ('Hofheim bowl', Isings Form 12).
   D. (rim) c. 8.3 cm. Pallid green. Ground rim with cut grooves on outside; fine grooves at belly.
   Context xiv.127, Reg. 520 (first piece).

Cf. no. A9.

A32. Rim of beaker.
   D. c. 6.2 cm. Pale blue-green (pitted). Bulging rim, cut and polished. Undecorated.
   Context xiv.127, Reg. 520 (second piece).

A33. Wall fragment of deep pillar-moulded bowl (Isings/Goethert-Polaschek Form 3b).
   Light blue-green (pitted), very thick at base.
   Context xiv.127, Reg. 563.

A34. Dish base (cf. Isings Forms 48, 49).
   D. 17 cm. Light blue-green. Tubular pushed-in foot.
   Context xiv.128, Reg. 508.

Cf. no. B25.

A35. Rim of beaker/bowl (Isings Form 12 or similar).
   D. (rim) c. 6.5 cm. Light blue-green. Grooves on outside.
   Context xiv.128, Reg. 558.

Also from same context: 4 beaker fragments, light blue-green.

Period VI (second–third quarters of second century: p. 156)

A36. Flat base fragment of closed (?) form.
   Thin, pale green.
   Context xiv.10, Reg. 56.
Period VIa (after A.D. 173; p. 156)

A37. Wall fragment of beaker.
   D. 8+ cm. Light yellow-green. Wheel-incisions.
   Context xiv.12.

A38. Fragment of bottom of beaker/bowl.
   Pale glass.
   Context xiv.12.
   Cf. 'Hofheim bowl' (Isings Form 12). Residual?

Period VII (late second century; p. 157 f.)

   D. uncertain. Pale green, thinnish. Ground rim, with cut groove below; 4 fine grooves on wall.
   Context xiv.94, Reg. 407.
   Close to Lancel Form 18.
   Also from same context: loose base fragment (D. c. 4 cm.), perhaps part of the same vessel.

A40. Toe fragment of slender drop-shaped unguentarium (Isings Form 27)?
   Light blue-green, medium-thick.
   Context xiv.138, Reg. 480.

Probably Period VII

A41. Flat base of bowl (?).
   Pale green.
   Context xiv.139, Reg. 474 (section O'-P').
   Also from same context: base fragment of small closed vessel, colourless.

Period VIII (second half of fourth century A.D.; p. 162)

Some items should be later than the date indicated for this period; some are residual.

A42. Rim of moulded bowl with low ribs, Isings Form 3b variant.
   D. c. 15 cm. Light blue-green. Groove inside rim.
   Context xiv.14 (residual).
   Also from same context: 2 fragments of closed form, pallid. (More from context xiv.25.)

A43. Base of bowl (?), tubular.
   D. 5.2 cm. Light green.
   Context xiv.141.

A44. Scrap of rim of beaker (?).
   Light blue-green. Bulging, ground.
   Context xiv.143a, Reg. 481.

A45. Fragment of rim of flask.
   D. c. 5.2 cm. (one side restored). Green (no decay). Plain green coil added.
   Context xiv.84, Reg. 458 (vat 5).

Third century or later.

A46. Handle of jug, from a medium-sized vessel.
   Width c. 2.7 cm. Blue-green, bubbly. Flat strip, with internal gather at lower end.
   Context xiv.84, Reg. 459 (vat 4).

A47. Base of cylindrical (?) indented beaker.
   Base 3.2 × 3.2 cm. Light lime-green. Four indentations. No pontil-mark.
   Context xiv.25.
   Cf. Lancel Form 20c.
FIG. 120. Glass vessels, nos. B1–33. Scale 1:2.
CATALOGUE: FINDS FROM THE CASA BROGAN

Finds from unclassified or superficial contexts

A48. Base fragment of flask (?).
   D. c. 6.9 cm. Blue-green.

A49. Rim of unguentarium.
   D. c. 4.1 cm. Pale blue-green. Fire-polished (and ground?).
   Context S.p. H40–2e (or 2c? Trench at south end of Regio II, Insula 10, precise location unknown).

A50. Rim of bowl, Isings Form 42 variant.
   D. c. 10.6 cm. Colourless, of fine quality. Plain threads on outside.
   Context xiv.121 (sections L–M/S–T, unstratified).

A51. Rim of bowl or dish.
   D. c. 11.4 cm. Pale olive. Neat fire-polished rim. Traces of spiral thread on outside.
   Context S.p. H1–1–3, Reg. 59 (superficial).

Summary of finds

Total 86+ items (one near complete), including:

- early moulded bowls (incl. pillar-moulded) 5
- mould-blown beaker 1
- coloured, blown glass 1+
- facet-cut beaker? 1
- ribbed bowls, blown 2
- dipping-rod 1

The types belong predominantly to the first and second centuries A.D.

B. OTHER FINDS (figs. 120–121)

Moulded (early types)

B1. Fragment of bowl with short thick ribs.
   Colourless. A rim fragment may belong.
   Cf. the Hertford Heath example, Archaeologia 101 (1967) 52, no. 9; also Crowfoot (1957) 406–407, fig. 93.1 from Samaria. In context.

Plain moulded bowls (see also no. A3):

B2. Rim, D. 19 cm. Pale blue-green. Fire-polished, ground (?).

   Context xxi.21, Reg. 1115 (c. A.D. 15/20 with later intrusions: p. 132).

From other contexts: 1 wall fragment, amber; 1 rim?

Pillar-moulded bowls (see also nos. A25, A33, A42):

B4. (Restored.) Rim fragment, shallow type (Isings Form 3a, Goethert-Polachek Form 3a).
   D. c. 21 cm. Pale blue-green. Oblique rib; no internal grooves.
   Context xvi.3, Reg. 286 (Flavian: p. 122).

B5. Rim fragment, as no. B4 but deeper.
   D. 26 cm. Light blue-green. No internal grooves.

As nos. B4–5: 6 fragments, all blue-green.
Cf. no. A23.

Millefiori:
B7. Rim of dish, Goethert-Polaschek Form 7.  
D. c. 18 cm. Opaque black matrix, decayed, with light yellow (?) rods with red surrounds (at surface only?). Ground groove inside rim.  
Context xxiii.40, Reg. 1109 (late Antonine or later: p. 139), residual.  

Mould-blown (early types)
See also no. A19.

B8. Scraps of rim and wall of small beaker (?).  
Context iii b.5, Reg. 313 (Flavian: p. 20).

B9. Wall fragment of cylindrical beaker.  
D. (wall) 4.4 cm. Lime-green (pitted). Cut groove below decoration.  

B10. Wall fragment of bowl or closed form (?). Colourless. Hollow knobs, apparently set horizontally.  
Context xxiii.21 (late Antonine: p. 137).

Moulded (?) and facet-cut
B11. Rim of small bowl, Goethert-Polaschek Form 23.  
D. c. 10.8 cm. Colourless, fine quality. Cut egg-and-dart band on hanging lip, ground grooves on top of rim.  
Context S.p. Y1–7b, Reg. 1110 (= xxv.5: Regio II, Insula 10, precise location of trench unknown).

B12. Fragment of conical beaker, Isings Form 21, Goethert-Polaschek Form 35.  
D. (lower moulding) 7+ cm. Colourless, fine quality. Zone of oval facet-cutting above a small moulding.  
Context as no. B11, Reg. 1111.  
For a possible foot of this type, see no. A14. For discussion of similar beakers, see especially E. Welker, Die römischen Gläser von Nida-Heddernheim (Frankfurt a.M. 1974) 55–62, with nos. 146–149, pls. 9 and 21.1–2.

Other moulded (?) types
B13. Fragment of large vessel, form uncertain (dish/bowl) with inturned rim?).  
D. (max) c. 35 cm. Greenish-colourless. Polished; inner edge of mouth grooved.  
Context xxiv.43, Reg. 1113 (fourth century A.D., disturbed: p. 31).

Blown ribbed bowls, early type
Wheel-cut beakers/bowls

See also nos. A8-11, A20, A31, A39; also Berger (1960) 43 ff. (Vindonissa).

**B14.** Rim of bowl, 'Hofheim' type (Isings Form 12, Goethert-Polaschek Form 30)?
D. 7+ cm. Pale lime-green. Cut grooves, ground rim.
Context xxi.22 (second half of second century A.D.: p. 133), residual.
Cf. no. A8, also the base no. A6. Also one body fragment from context S.p. F6-2a, Reg. 188 (north forum portico, unstratified).

**B15.** Rim of conical beaker.
D. c. 7.4 cm. Pale blue-green (hard black crust of decay). Wheel-cut grooves.

**B16.** Body fragment of beaker.
D. c. 7.5 cm. Blue. Wheel-incision on wall.
Context xxi.47 (Regio II, Insula 6, unclassified).

**B17.** Base of small cylindrical beaker.
D. (base) 4.6 cm. Colourless (yellowish cast). Pair of wheel-cut grooves above base.
Context xxiii.21 (late Antonine: p. 137).

As nos. B14-17 or related: c. 8 fragments.

Variant (jar):

**B18.** Rim of small bowl/jar.
D. 8.2 cm. Colourless (ivory-cream crust). Three fine grooves on belly. Rim fire-polished.
Context S.p. E44-2c, Reg. 810 (Forum, west end, unstratified).

'Pressed' bases (see also nos. A10, A21, A27, A29):

**B19.** Beaker base, complete.
D. 4.1 cm. Pale turquoise-green (sultry crust). No pontil-mark.
Context vii a.1, Reg. 253 (Forum, west end, probably surface).

Similar: one from context xxiii.11 (late first/early second century A.D.: p. 135).

**B20.** Beaker base, complete.
D. 4.0 cm. Light blue-green (dark crust).
Context S.p. E4-1, Reg. 46 (Forum, west end, surface sand).

Variant (?):

**B21.** Thick base with added foot.
Blue-green. No pontil mark.
Context xxi.21 (A.D. 15/20, disturbed: p. 132).

Type unusual.

Indented beakers, and related

See also nos. A1, A47.

**B22.** Base of beaker (greater part).
D. (foot) c. 5.8 cm. Pale green (milky decay). Bottom thick; coil foot added. Remains of fluting on wall. Joining pieces from contexts xv.15, Reg. 53 and xv.16, Reg. 79 (after A.D. 533, but associated finds mostly no later than fourth century: see p. 230).

Drawn: similar base fragment (same vessel?), pale lime-green, originally with four large indentations, from context xv.17, Reg. 192 (contemporary with contexts xv.15 and 16).

Other indented beakers: 4 body fragments (3 are colourless).

**B23.** Fragments of bowl (part restored).
D. (rim) c. 9.6 cm. Colourless (thin cream crust). Rim ground, fine incisions on outside.
Fig. 121. Glass vessels, nos. B34–60. Scale 1:2.

Large indentations (four?).
Cf. Lancel Type 20b.

Beakers with bulging rims

See also nos. A32, A44. For shape, cf. Isings Forms 32, 109 and Goethert-Polaschek Form 52a. Early and late?

B24. Rim, D. 9.1 cm. Light green, very thick, good quality.
Context xvi.24, Reg. 217 (superficial, but accompanying finds mainly fourth century A.D.: p. 121).
Also: several thin-walled fragments, as no. A32, mostly blue-green.

Various open forms

B25. Flat base of dish.
D. (foot) 19 cm. Pale greenish (pale crust). Tubular (pushed-in) foot at edge.
Context v.8, Reg. 58 (fourth century A.D.? p. 31), residual.
Cf. Isings Forms 48, 49.

D. c. 12 cm.? Colourless, ground.
CATALOGUE: OTHER FINDS

**B27.** Footring of bowl.
D. (base) 5.2 cm. Light blue-green, good quality.
Context xxiv.67 (late Augustan/early Tiberian: p. 139).

Other footrings (open forms): two, greenish (D. 8.5+ cm., from context S.p. F26-3, N.E. corner of Forum, possibly Period III; D. c. 20 cm., from context xxiv.44, N.E. Corner of East Forum Temple precinct, late level).  

**B28.** Rim of dish/plate.
D. 17 cm. Blue-green. Fire-polished.
Context S.p. T2-1 (Regio II, Insula 6, unstratified).

**B29.** Rim of dish.
D. 21 cm. Colourless. Cut and polished.
Context xxiii.40 (late Antonine or later: p. 139).

**B30.** Rim of large dish.
D. 27 cm. Light green (black crust). Fire-polished rim; slight moulding on wall.

**B31.** Rim of dish/bowl.
D. 17.4 cm. Dull greenish (hard black crust). Fire-polished rim; slight moulding on wall.
Context xvii.6, Reg. 663 (first half of fifth century A.D.: p. 235).

**B32.** Rim of dish/bowl.
D. 14 cm. Light turquoise. Neatly fire-polished.
Context xix.6, Reg. 503 (before A.D. 198: p. 219).

**B34.** Rim of dish/bowl.
D. c. 12 cm. Pale green. Handle (part preserved) against edge of rim.

**B35.** Rim of dish.
D. 25 cm. Pale blue-green (black crust). Frilled strip on outside of rim.

Cf. Isings Form 43. One other fragment with attached frill (different rim-form) from context vi c.4, Reg. 252 (fourth century A.D.? p. 31).

**B36.** Flat base of bowl.
D. preserved c. 11 cm. (rim missing). Colourless (pitted).
Context S.p. C7-1a, Reg. 241 (East Forum Temple, east side, superficial).

**B37.** Base of small dish/bowl.
D. (base) 3.1 cm. Blue-green, thickish. Coil foot.
Context xxiii.10 (late first/early second century A.D.: p. 135).

**B38.** Base, form uncertain.
D. c. 6.6 cm. Light turquoise. Heavy tubular footring.
Context S.p. E37–3, Reg. 674 (Forum, west end, unclassified).

**B39.** Base fragment of bowl.
D. (base) 5.1 cm. Light green, pinprick bubbles. Tubular pushed-in foot (cf. no. A24).
Context iii.10, Reg. 420 (shortly after mid first century A.D.: p. 15).

Other tubular feet: 4 fragments.

**B40.** Rim of beaker/jar.
D. c. 7.0 cm. Colourless, fine quality (creamy decay). Rim fire-polished; plain thread added below.
Context xix.6, Reg. 610 (before A.D. 198: p. 219).

Closed forms

**B41.** Rim of flask.
D. c. 10 cm. Light olive-green. Fire-polished rim; plain coil added below.

**B42.** Rim of flask.
- D. 4.0 cm. Light green. Added plain thread.
- Context S.p. D2–1, Reg. 49 (part) (East Forum Temple, north side, superficial).

One other rim with threads (more open form, perhaps a beaker).

**B43.** Fragment of a broad flat handle with four sharp ribs (originally five?) on outer face, possibly from a cylindrical/square bottle.
- Width 4.0+ cm. Light green.
- Context xvii.10, Reg. 661 (Site M, late level), residual.

Other handles: 4 fragments only.

**B44.** Rim of unguentarium/flask.
- D. 3.5 cm. Pale blue-green (thick ivory film). Fire-polished rim.

**Unguentaria**

First-century types (see also no. A49):

**B45.** Rim.
- D. 2.2–2.3 cm. Light blue-green. Rim folded, one side distorted.

**B46.** Base fragment, piriform type.
- D. 3.8 cm. Blue-green. No pontil mark.
- Context xv.15, Reg. 306 (see under no. B22).


**B47.** Toe of fusiform unguentarium (Isings Form 9) or lamp (?).
- H. (extant) 4.0 cm. Blue-green. Flattened knob at bottom.
- Context S.p. A120–6b (Forum, unstratified).

Bullet-shaped base (as no. A40): 2 fragments.

Small conical body (early? second century):

**B48.** Base fragment.
- D. c. 3.2 cm. Light green (thick black crust).
- Context v.2 (late Antonine: p. 27).

Candlestick type:

**B49.** Rim, with tubular fold.
- D. c. 4.0 cm. Pale blue-green.

**B50.** Neck.
- Extant height of neck 7.4 cm. (rim lost). Pale greenish (thick black crust). Shallow body?
- Context xxiii.21 (late Antonine: p. 137).

Also from same context: two similar necks, lacking constriction at bottom.

**B51.** Body fragment.
- D. preserved est. 9.5 cm. Pale greenish (thick black crust). High-bodied.
- Context S.p. Y1–17 (= xxv.4: same trench as no. B11 etc.)

**B52.** Base fragment.
- D. 11 cm. Colourless. Probably this form.

Similar: 1 fragment?
**Late lamp-glasses**

B53. Hollow toe etc., also loose fragments flaring out at junction with bowl above. Light green (black crust). Plain coil (or ring off pontil) forms knob at bottom. Context S.p. C23-1 (Basilica, surface).

Two rolled rims may belong here.

**Late goblets** (‘wine glass’ shape, Isings Form 111)


As nos. B54–56: c. 10 rims, also body fragments.

**Stems/feet:**


Differs from Carthage series; mid fifth century at earliest.


Mid fifth century at earliest.

As nos. B57–60: nine other foot fragments (one possibly folded, rest all fused-on type), generally from superficial contexts.
CHAPTER XI
CONCLUSIONS
(P.M.K.)

The preceding chapters have comprised more or less independent studies of individual buildings or areas affected by the work of the British expeditions. The time is perhaps now ripe for a complete re-assessment of the history of Sabratha in the light of this and other volumes which have now been published on individual monuments. This lies beyond the scope of the present chapter, but in the following pages I shall attempt to draw together some of the disparate threads which have emerged in the preceding chapters, into a unified picture of the information gained from the work done in 1948–51. By way of introduction, I shall quote from a piece of draft typescript by JBWP, which may have been intended to serve as an introduction to the volume.

'Such prosperity as Sabratha later achieved is owed to the fact that, in a coast where harbours were notoriously rare, it possessed a small, but adequate, natural harbour (see Chapter VII). In this respect, Sabratha was better served than either of its neighbours, Lepcis and Oea; and this advantage must have been held to outweigh the relative inaccessibility of the olive-farms of the Gebel, which were an early source of wealth to Lepcis. Sabratha was separated from the Gebel by the barren and ill-watered plain of the Gefara, and the narrow coastal strip can barely have sufficed to support the local population. The bulk of the city’s wealth must have come rather from the trans-Saharan luxury trade. Of the three natural trade routes up from the interior, that which passes between the Hamada el-Hamra and the sand sea, through Ghadames, was the least liable to interruption by the restless tribesmen of the northern Fezzan and the Syrtica. Sabratha and Oea were well placed to serve this route; and the former’s badge in the Piazzale of the Corporations at Ostia, an elephant, suggests that it made good use of its opportunities.

'\ The earliest settlement, as revealed in the excavations of 1951, lay at the water’s edge, in the area between the later Forum and the harbour (see Chapter IV). Here the earliest traces of occupation were found to consist of a series of floors and layers of charcoal, separated by bands of clean, wind-blown sand. These layers contained a great deal of pottery, mainly fragments of large Phoenician storage jars, but including also some sherds of Greek pottery which can be dated to the latter part of the fifth century B.C. (pp. 125, 137). A few isolated post-holes were found, but no solid structures. The probable interpretation of this deposit is that the port was first used by Phoenician traders, who came periodically to trade with the natives. They did not establish a permanent settlement, but camped beside the harbour; and in the intervals between their visits, the wind-blown sand accumulated over the remains of their camps.'

Possibly the earliest structure of substance revealed by the excavations was a massive linear

---

1 G. Becatti, Scavi di Ostia iv. Mosaiici e pavimenti marmorei (Rome 1961) 69 and pl. 93, no. 95.
For excavations in this area since 1948, see RomMitl 83 (1976) 273 ff. and fig 1.

Sabratha (1948): Key Plan

FIG. 122. Sabratha, general plan of main excavated area in 1948, showing the numbering of the Regiones and Insulae.
CONCLUSIONS

A foundation running beneath the later north portico of the East Forum Temple (p. 11): its size and character suggest that it may have been the foundation of the earliest city wall, but this interpretation is not without its difficulties and the area in which the earliest Attic pottery was found extends beyond it.

The second half of the fourth century B.C. saw the first appearance of buildings of stone. The excavations were nowhere extensive enough to reveal much of a plan, but the presence of buildings and occupation-levels of this period was detected in the area north of the Forum, beneath the East Forum Temple and in the Casa Brogan. The alignment of these buildings is of some interest. North of the Forum, excavations showed that as was already suspected, the oblique alignment of the Roman buildings in that area reflected that of their precursors (see Chapter IV). Within the Forum area and that of the Antonine Temple to the south of it the evidence, such as it is, suggests an approximate, but hardly regular, adherence to the same oblique axis (see fig. 1 facing p. 12). (None of this, curiously, pays any regard to the line of the supposed early city wall.) Beneath the western part of the Forum there was an apparent absence of stone buildings, but in contrast a succession of surfaces, much pitted by post-holes. It is possible, therefore, that this area had served as an open market-place from the early history of the town.

The walls of this period are typically built of small stones on clay-and-rubble foundations, either entirely rough (e.g. pls. 41a, wall V39; 42a, wall T27) or to some extent coursed and dressed flat (e.g. pls. 41d, bottom of wall V2; 44b, 45b bottom of wall 19; 44c, wall 42). To the east of the Forum, Ward-Perkins has suggested (1982, 41) that the layout of the huge Insula 10 of Regio II, which conforms both to the alignment of the Forum and to that of the more regular insulae further south, was a response to the imposition of a new regularity on the town plan in the first century A.D. However, the excavations in this area showed that the axis of the visible layout was established in its essentials in the fourth century B.C. and remained unchanged throughout the subsequent history of the town (see Chapter V).

The next phase of significant change appears (from the British excavations) to have occurred during the first half of the second century B.C. In most of the areas where earlier structures were recorded, there was evidence of extensive re-building at this time (e.g. Period III in Regio II, Insula 6, Period II in the Casa Brogan). In the Casa Brogan area there was a considerable expansion of the existing building, associated with the first establishment of the street to the west and of the insula which fronts it on the opposite side. There was also evidence of occupation at this date, associated with a stone building, in trench Y3-4 on the south side of the Antonine Temple (p. 170 f., phases 1 and 2), which suggests that the nucleus of the town certainly now extended this far at least. Di Vita has placed the construction of the two Punico-Hellenistic mausolea to the south west of the central area in this period, and has suggested that the defeat of Carthage by Rome in 202 B.C. (followed by its ultimate destruction in 146) gave to the cities of Tripolitania an independence which enabled them for the first time to enjoy the fruits of their own prosperity (Di Vita 1976, 273-274). The plausibility of this suggestion is increased by the evidence from the British excavations.

Walls attributed to this period show a variety of techniques of construction: foundations are still generally trench-built of rubble set in clay, but the superstructure may be of mud-brick (e.g. pl. 42b, wall T30), of small stone-work as before, or of larger ashlar blocks (e.g. pl. 14a). There is also a finer style of ashlar work composed of blocks with rough faces but carefully drafted margins, which occurs in the second, and perhaps first, century B.C. (pls. 18a, 36b, 53a, 53d).

The full extent of the town in the second century B.C. cannot be precisely defined, though its limits to the south must clearly lie to seaward of the two mausolea. To the east, there was evidence in the Casa Brogan excavation of a massive wall of the second century B.C. running parallel to the later east frontage of the insula and slightly inside it (see p. 165 f., with fig. 68 on p. 146). The dimensions of its foundations, comparable to those of the supposed fifth-century wall, suggest once again that it may have formed part of the town's defences and perhaps of a newly extended circuit which conditioned the form of subsequent expansion in this area (p. 237). Beyond the nucleus of the early town, occupation-levels yielding black-glazed wares (but not structures) were recorded in the excavations beside the Severan Monument (p. 218 f.) and south of the theatre (p. 223); their significance is unclear.
During the first century B.C., the southward expansion of the town clearly continued. Of significance here is evidence from the section across the street on the south side of the Antonine Temple that the west end (and hence the whole?) of Regio II, Insula 3 was built at this time (p. 172, phase 4). The date is not closely defined, but was certainly earlier than the end of the century. Di Vita has reported that buildings against the base of Mausoleum B in Regio VI were established on the alignment of the later insula in 60/50 B.C., and that the main layout of this insula was established around the turn of the era at the latest (in Ward-Perkins 1982, 48).

Ward-Perkins' contention that this development, in which the insulae are of the long Hellenistic type, took place largely in the first century A.D., can no longer be sustained as a valid generalization, though the section across the Byzantine Wall showed that Regio II, Insula 1 was laid out only in the Flavian period, succeeding prior occupation of uncertain character which is no earlier than the first century A.D. (see p. 227). The tracing in detail of the development of this part of the town, which is evidently regular in layout but apparently piecemeal in chronology, clearly requires further investigation.

Major building operations (as opposed to internal alterations, which were often of indifferent quality) were executed from now on in well-dressed and carefully laid ashlar masonry, which remains standard through the early Imperial period: this is well exhibited in the first century B.C. in walls 19 and 1 in the Casa Brogan (pls. 45a, 46b) and subsequently in much of the upstanding remains of the town (e.g. pls. 40, 61a). The blocks are laid as stretchers above a footing-course of headers on a rubble foundation. The height of walls constructed in this manner undoubtedly varied: there is evidence for the construction of upper storeys in mud-brick, but at least one example survives of ashlar masonry continued for several courses above the beam-sockets for an upper floor (p. 237). (These comments apply, of course, only to domestic architecture: public buildings were constructed of stone throughout.)

Returning now to the central area, the first century A.D. saw the gradual emergence of a regular, monumental complex in the heart of the town. The earliest stages of this process may have been marked by the construction of the Temple of Serapis (Chapter IIIc) and of the Capitolium (Chapter IIIId), though the original date of neither building has been established with certainty. The western part of the Forum had probably already been an open space since the earliest days of the settlement (see above), but it did not attain its full extent until the previous irregular array of buildings to the east was swept away to provide a site for the East Forum Temple around the mid first century A.D. (p. 14, fig. 4). This process of regularization was soon advanced, in a sense, by events of an unexpected character. A serious earthquake in the time of Vespasian brought about the collapse of the East Forum Temple, and doubtless of many other buildings. The occurrence of this and other earthquakes at Sabratha has been postulated by Di Vita, who has dated it c. A.D. 64/70 (see p. 5). His full statement of the evidence has yet to appear, but one of the key factors is the re-building of the Temple of Isis on the eastern outskirts, which was completed in A.D. 76-79.2 The character of the re-building of the East Forum Temple is certainly best understood in terms of such an event (see Chapter IIIa); though the stratigraphic evidence for the date of the re-building is poor, it is likely to have been contemporary with the Period Ib re-building of the Forum and the initial construction of the Forum Basilica (and the precursor of the fourth-century Curia) which took place before the end of the first century A.D., and most probably as a direct consequence of the destruction of pre-existing buildings in the earthquake (see p. 20 f.). Further evidence in support of this hypothesis was found in the Casa Brogan area, in the character of the extensive reconstruction which took place there in the late first or early second century (Casa Brogan Period V, p. 153 ff.).

The early years of the second century A.D. were probably taken up for some while with the process of recovery and reconstruction following the earthquake, but after the middle of the century the town entered on a new period of both expansion and renewal which is staggering in its extent. The town plan of Sabratha has often been cited as an example of the contrast between the piecemeal growth of the original nucleus and the regimented layout of the eastern quarter

---

2 G. Pesce, Il tempio d'Iside in Sabratha (Monografie di Archeologia Libica iv, Rome 1953) 47, 64; see also IRT 15.
which was so obviously the result of deliberate planning. The insulae in the latter area are more compact and are readily comparable, for instance, to those of the Trajanic period at Timgad in Algeria (see p. 237 ff. and figs. 105-107). The establishment of this quarter is dated well before the end of the Antonine period by the fact that the Temple of Hercules in Regio V, Insula 7 had already been modified by A.D. 186-193 (see IRT 29). The difficult question of whether the theatre is to be regarded as late Antonine or Severan has been discussed on p. 223 ff.

But this eastward expansion was not the only undertaking of the period. There was further expansion to the south, demonstrated by the dating of the Office Baths in Regio VII, which conform to the same axis, also in the second half of the second century. But even within the centre of the town there was new building activity on an unprecedented scale. The Forum was again re-modelled, the tabernae now being replaced by Corinthian porticoes (Forum Period III: p. 24 ff. with fig. 6); the Capitolium and the Temple of Serapis to the north of it were both extensively altered and embellished with marble (see pp. 104 ff., 116); alterations were also made to the Forum Basilica (Basilica Period II, p. 75 ff. with fig. 30), and in the space between the Basilica and the Capitolium was added the highly ornate Cruciform Building (see Chapter IIIc). To the south of the Forum area the Antonine and South Forum Temples were built within their own precinets (see Bartoccini 1964 and Joly & Tomasello 1984). It is apparent that many of the streets of the town were now for the first time paved, and this was carried out in conjunction with the establishment in the central area of a municipal drainage system. Large stone-built drains of this date were found beneath the Forum (see p. 25 and pls. 8b–c), in the street to the west of the Casa Brogan (see p. 158 and fig. 77, section A–B) and north of the East Forum Temple in Regio II, Insula 7 (see p. 137 and fig. 64, section C–D). It can hardly be doubted that the laying of these drains was connected with the provision of a public water supply to the town by one Flavius Tullus, an event recorded in an inscription recovered from the vaults of the Capitolium (IRT 117 and Bartoccini 1964, 22-24). The inscription, which was set up by C. Flavius Pudens, the son of Flavius Tullus, has been dated tentatively by the editors of IRT to the late second century (IRT, p. 26).

The late Antonine period probably marked the zenith of Sabratha’s prosperity. There is no new building of demonstrably Severan date apart from the Severan Monument in Regio V (see Chapter VIIb), unless the theatre is also to be attributed to the early third century. There is evidence of decay and of an unfinished project to build tabernae in the precinct of the East Forum Temple in the late third century (Forum IIIa, p. 29) and Di Vita has postulated that the town was again damaged by earthquake in A.D. 306–10 (see p. 5). The evidence upon which this has been based is, as far as I know, confined to the area of his excavations around the mausolea in Regio VI; but it is possible that there is further confirmation in a vast tip of burnt debris in the north portico of the East Forum Temple, and in the inscription which records its restoration in A.D. 340–350 from a state of ‘antiqua ruin’ (Forum Period IVa: see p. 29 ff.).

Worse things were to come. It is again Di Vita who has postulated that the earthquake which caused so much damage in the Eastern Mediterranean in A.D. 365 overthrew Sabratha as well. The evidence for this seems to me overwhelming, and the explanation put forward by Bartoccini (1950, 33–35) and adopted by the editors of IRT that the destruction was caused by an (unrecorded) attack by the Austuriani in A.D. 363 is no longer plausible. The fall of so much solid masonry could hardly have been brought about by a band of raiders. All of the public buildings were extensively damaged, and the decline of the old religious order is demonstrated with particular clarity by the fact that none of the pagan temples was subsequently restored. Following, doubtless, on extensive loss of life, the outlying areas were abandoned: indeed, the excavations detected evidence of this as close to the centre of the town as Regio II, Insula 1 (p. 229). And yet, sufficient vitality remained for extensive restoration to be carried out in the heart of the town. That this was tackled systematically, making best use of the resources available on site, is shown by the fact that marble of every description – fragments of buildings, inscriptions – was gathered up into the vaults of the Capitolium for re-use (p. 114).

---

Some of it certainly was re-used: a number of inscriptions were found forming a late paving in the north forum portico (IRT 23, 27, 41, 43, 95), and indeed one inscription has been reconstructed from fragments found set in the portico floor and stacked in the Capitolium vaults respectively (IRT 95). Another instance is a re-used base found in the Curia, recording its restoration (IRT 111; Bartoccini 1950, 36). Similarly, the theatre became a quarry for building-materials and the Italian excavators found many architectural elements stacked in the two lateral rooms behind the stage (Guidi 1930, 3, 5, 52).

In the Forum area, in addition to the re-paving of the north forum portico, the Curia on the north side was re-built (see Bartoccini 1950) and so was the Basilica on the south (Basilica Period IIIa: p. 80 ff. with fig. 32). The extent of destruction may be gauged from the fact that only the north wall of the previous building was re-used. Otherwise, an entirely new plan was adopted, a two-apse basilica on a longitudinal axis in imitation of the great Severan Basilica at Lepcis Magna. The new building made extensive use of columns from the Antonine and South Forum Temples. At the east end of the Forum, the precinct of the East Forum Temple was closed off behind a new portico paved with mosaic (see Forum Period V, p. 32 ff. with fig. 7 and pl. 9b). Access to the temple podium was retained through the rear wall, but the building and its precinct presumably no longer fulfilled any public or sacred purpose.

The survivors of the catastrophe who carried out these restorations have left evidence of occupation in much of the original nucleus of the town, though the relevant levels were largely removed without record in the first excavations on the site. The Casa Brogan was one of the areas where the evidence was largely intact (hence its selection for excavation), and here it seems that the owner was able to expand his property at the expense of his neighbours, even diverting the spinal alley which had hitherto run the length of the insula, and to embellish his house with mosaics (see p. 158 ff., Period VIII). Towards the end of the fourth century or early in the fifth, two churches were built in the eastern quarter of the town (fig. 124, Churches 3 and 4: see Ward-Perkins & Goodchild 1953, 15-19) and the re-built Basilica on the south side of the Forum was also converted into a church (Church 1, Basilica Period IIIb: p. 83 ff. with fig. 34).

After this, the picture is less clear owing to the prior removal of the relevant strata, but the Vandal period was one of decline, followed by only a very tentative revival when the region was recovered to Byzantine rule in A.D. 533 by Belisarius. A new defensive wall was built (see Chapter VId and fig. 123), enclosing only the core of the earlier town and closing permanently the former coastal road which had presumably ceased to serve any purpose as such. The church occupying the former basilica next to the Forum was restored (Basilica Period IV: p. 85 ff. with fig. 35) and another was built to the north of the Curia (fig. 123, Church 2: see Ward-Perkins & Goodchild 1953, 12-15). The handsomeness of the remarkable mosaic in this new church (commented on by Procopius, De Aedif. 6.4.13) contrasts strongly with the re-used materials of which its superstructure was built (see p. 213). There was also new building for residential purposes: a substantial and wholly new block facing Church 2 (figs. 122 and 123, Regio I, Insula 5) is apparently of Byzantine date (p. 116) and there was evidence of renewed occupation in the Casa Brogan area (Period IX, p. 163 f.). Much of the central part of the town may have been covered by an irregular sprawl of buildings such as those recorded on the site of the former South Forum Temple (Joly & Tomasello 1984, 3-8 with loose plates 1 and 2). Most of the Forum and of the piazza to the south of it in front of the Antonine Temple became a burial-ground littered with graves (see p. 34, Forum Period VI, with pls. 10-11, p. 86 fig. 35 and Bartoccini 1964, pl. 22a).

The extent to which Sabratha continued as a focus of habitation after the Arab conquest in A.D. 643 is difficult to assess, as much of the potential evidence has been swept away without record. There are, however, a few signs of Arab presence on the site: a graffito on the font in the former Cruciform Building (p. 95), others inside the cells of the Antonine Temple (Bartoccini 1964, 41 f. and pls. 24, 25) and two Abbasid coins of the eighth century found in Insulae 2 and 6 of Regio II respectively (p. 263). However, the period of its importance as an economic and political entity had long since passed away.

The preceding sketch has attempted to gather together the main points established in the course of the present report. It is far from being comprehensive: there is already much other material in print which I have not had the opportunity to consult, and it is clear that there remains...
FIG. 124. Sabratha, plan of eastern quarter (surveyed in 1948 by Alan Wells).
FIG. 125. Sabratha, plan of buildings on the eastern outskirts of the town (surveyed in 1951 by Carmelo Catanuso).
much work to be done at Sabratha itself. There has been no reference in these pages to bath-buildings, an important element of any Roman town. JBWP had begun to assemble notes on the subject, but these do not offer the basis of a text and the subject remains essentially to be tackled. There are aspects of the buildings described in this report which require further examination, and as far as possible these have been indicated. It is a pity that it was not possible to revisit the site for this purpose. There is still work to be done on the finds from the British excavations, but this is now in hand and it is hoped that a further volume may follow in due course. Other aspects of Sabratha are still amenable to further excavation: the history of the town’s defences in particular would repay further careful investigation. (I have made no reference to the enigmatic wall which crosses the site of the Temple of Isis and which has been interpreted as a defensive wall of the fourth century A.D.)

However, the excavators’ declared responsibility of publishing their discoveries has moved significantly towards fulfilment: the record would have been fuller had either of the directors of the expeditions given more attention to the report in earlier years. (One must suspect that in the circumstances, a responsibility shared became a responsibility shelved!) But the amount of information which it has been possible to extract from the available records reflects considerable credit on those who made them.

---

4 See Pesce (op. cit. in n. 2), p. 69.
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<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54, 55</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56, 57</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50a</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55a</td>
<td>11, 38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62, 63</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>vi a.1-4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64-66</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>vi b.1-8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-96</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>vi c.1-5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-99</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>vi d.1-7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69-71</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100, 101</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>vi d.i.1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72-75</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>vii.1-3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>viii.1-3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104-108</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>ix.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>x.1</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127-138</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>162, 163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87, 88</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>xiv.1</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153-155</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166, 167</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8a</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ia.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10, 11</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12, 13</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>98, 100</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, 50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22, 23</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>105-113</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25, 26</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27, 28</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>117, 118</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15, 50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>119, 120</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, 16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>124a</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii a.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii b.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39-41</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>127, 128</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42-44</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.1-23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xv.1-10</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>xvi.1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>xxiv.20</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>S.p. C9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>201 ff.</td>
<td>S.p. C20-5</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>xix.1</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>S.p. C21</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>S.p. C22-8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>S.p. D5-6a</td>
<td>38 n. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>S.p. J4</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>S.p. J5</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>xxi.1-6</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>S.p. K25-2</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>S.p. K26-7, 11</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>S.p. K49-5</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>S.p. K52-7a, 9</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi.1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>S.p. S10-3a, 6a</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>19, 20</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>S.p. S14</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>132, 133</td>
<td>S.p. X1</td>
<td>11, 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>S.p. X2</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>36-42</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>xxii.2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>7, 8</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>12, 13</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>19-25</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>31, 32</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>33, 34</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii.2</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>36, 37</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>xxiii.1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii.2-4</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The centre of Sabratha, seen from above. In the centre, left and right, are the Basilica and the Antonine Temple respectively, with the Forum and the East Forum Temple beyond; on the near side of the Basilica is the South Forum Temple.
(a) The Forum area from the west, showing in the foreground (left to right) the Capitolium and the Cruciform Building, in the centre the Forum and the Basilica/Church 1 and beyond them the East Forum Temple and the Antonine Temple.

(b) The East Forum Temple from the south.
(a) East Forum Temple: south side of podium at north end of section X–Y, showing successive layers of rendering and the irregularity of the lowest courses. The uppermost rendering is modern. (See pp. 14, 23, 40.)

(b) East Forum Temple: rear of Period I podium. (See pp. 14, 40, 58.)

(c) South-east angle of Forum, looking south through the Period III colonnade. In the trench in the foreground are traces of walling attributed to Period Ia. (See pp. 17, 44.)

(d) Inner face of the north boundary wall of the Forum, near the entrance to the Curia. (See p. 17.)
(a) South-east angle of Forum: threshold and associated *opus sigrinum* floor at eastern end of Period I tabernae. (See p. 18.)

(c) West end of Forum: steps of Period Ib boundary terrace at section AM–AN. Note additional course of blocks behind, which suggests that the flight of steps may originally have continued to a higher level. (See p. 19.)

(b) Forum: Period Ib barrel-vaulted cistern in north portico. (See p. 18.)

(d) West end of Forum: bases of jars found *in situ* behind Period Ib steps at section AM–AN. (See pp. 19, 20.)
(a) Forum, south-east quarter: pre-forum walls in section AD-AE, truncated and forming part of the Forum surface in Period 1b. (See p. 12.)

(b) Forum, east end, trench at section KK-LL, looking east: foundations of transverse portico above, single course of early retaining wall (?) at bottom of trench. (See p. 20.)

(c) Forum, west end: section AQ-AR from the west, showing typical pitting in the Period 1b surface and steps, and in earlier levels in the foreground. (See pp. 12, 19.)
(a) East Forum Temple: rear of Period II podium. (See p. 21.)

(b) East Forum Temple: the Period II portico on the south side of the temple precinct, looking towards the Forum. (See pp. 23, 63.)
(a) North side of East Forum Temple, showing original Period II rendering covering the uneven Period I foundations, and added 'bench' to the left. (See p. 23.)

(b) East Forum Temple: foundation-pier beneath Ionic column at south-east angle of portico. (See p. 23.)

(c) North wall of East Forum Temple, showing Period II extension at east end and added 'bench' in front of Period I footings in foreground. (See p. 23.)
The surviving steps of the Period II East Forum Temple. The mortar basis of the Period III forum paving rests on the second step, and the transverse portico mosaic covers the fourth step. (See pp. 24, 27.)

Forum: drain-head in street on north side of Capitolium. (See p. 25.)

Forum: drain-head in street on south side of Capitolium. (See p. 25.)

East Forum Temple: re-built west wall of south portico from the inside. (See p. 29.)
(a) East Forum Temple, south-west corner of precinct: re-built west wall (on right), showing butt-joint in upper courses with front wall of Period IV tabernae (on left). (See p. 29.)

(b) East Forum Temple: transverse portico from the south. (See p. 32.)

(c) Late well against the rear wall of the East Forum Temple. (See p. 33.)
(a) Forum: section AH-AJ, looking north from the south portico stylobate and showing Christian graves. (See pp. 34, 46, 86.)

(b) Forum: grave in south portico, showing traces of wooden coffin. (See p. 34.)
(a) Forum: grave XXVI before opening (grave XXVII beyond and beneath). (See p. 34.)

(b) Forum: grave XXVI, showing skeleton of a young woman and fragments of accompanying (?) painted vessel. (See p. 34.)
(a) Forum: Period Ib cisterns at the south-west angle. Entrance to Cruciform Building on right, north-west angle of early Basilica in centre background. (See pp. 35, 71, 95.)

(b) East Forum Temple: section A–B from the north, showing (in receding order) the foundations of the early city wall, a pier-base of the Ionic colonnade in the west face of the trench, the pre-forum walls D3.6 and D3.7 and the foundations of the north portico stylobate. (See p. 38.)

(c) Forum: amphorae found in situ in the pit in section AF–AG. (See p. 45.)
(a) East Forum Temple: pre-Roman structures exposed within the podium of the temple. Trench S.p. D6 was cut through the concrete floor on the right. (See p. 50.)

(b) The foundations at the north-west corner of the East Forum Temple. The close-fitting blocks of the Period I substructure are clearly differentiated from the less regular blocks added in Period II at a fractionally higher level. In the background can be seen the concrete rubble of the infill between the podium and cella foundations which was also added in Period II. (See p. 58.)

(c-d) Fragments of the painted stucco entablature of the Period I East Forum Temple, found in the Period II foundations. (See p. 58.)
(a) East Forum Temple: footings of the platform flanking the Period II temple steps on the south side (trench A10). (See p. 61.)

(b) East Forum Temple: capital from the Ionic colonnade in the surrounding porticoes. A corresponding base is visible in plate 7b. (See p. 63.)

(c) East Forum Temple: column-capital of Period II. (See pp. 61, 104.)

(d) East Forum Temple: capital and base of the Doric colonnade in the surrounding porticoes. (See p. 63.)
(a) Inscription recording the restoration of the Temple of Liber Pater in the time of Constantius and Constans (*IRT* 55), Allegedly found in the East Forum Temple. (See p. 67.)

(b) Basilica: the exedra and committee rooms of Period I from the east, with the south wall of the Period III basilica to the right. (See p. 70.)
(a) Basilica: pre-basilica stretcher wall at the north-west angle, uniform in construction with the Period Ia walls at the south-west angle of the Forum. (See p. 69.)

(b) Basilica: projecting plinth inserted in Period II across the apse of the Period I tribunal. (See p. 72.)

(c) Basilica: the surviving pilaster at the north-west angle of the Period I building. (See p. 71.)
(a) The south-west angle of the Period I Basilica from the east. The bedding of the original paving slabs is clearly visible, with surviving fragments of the paving. To the left of the figure the seating of the south-west angle-column is partly visible, and the seating of the adjacent column of the western range is behind and to the right of the figure. The south wall of the Period III Basilica occupies the centre of the photograph, and the higher level of the Period IV cipollino paving is also visible to the right of it. (See pp. 71, 82, 85.)

(b) The tribunal of the Period I Basilica from the North. (See p. 72.)
(a) Basilica: stuccoed sandstone capital from the colonnade at the entrance to the Period I tribunal. (See p. 72.)

(b) Original drawing by Alec Daykin of the capital shown in (a) above.
(a) Basilica: west wall of Period I tribunal, showing broad foundation in floor and inserted Period II plinth. (See p. 72.)

(b) Basilica: excavation within the western apse of Period III, showing the footings and two courses of a Period II wall running east-west, and beneath that the footings of an earlier wall running in the same direction. (See p. 76 f.)

(c) Basilica: sunken structure behind the south side of the Period III western apse. (See p. 78.)
(a) The Period III Basilica from the piazza to the east, showing the eastern apse and external staircase. (See p. 82.)

(b) Capital from the portico of the Antonine Temple, re-used in the nave of the Period IV (and III?) Basilica. (See p. 82.)

(c) Capital from the portico of the South Forum Temple, re-used in the nave of the Period IV (and III?) Basilica. (See p. 82.)
(a) Basilica: detail of flooring at west end, showing the coarse mosaic of Period III adjoining the original marble paving of Period I. Both are overlaid by the sandstone steps of Period IIIb (?) and the (re-used) marble steps of Period IV. (See pp. 81, 82.)

(b) Basilica/Church 1: burial within the raised western apse, looking east. Note the small surviving fragment of the tessellated floor of the apse. (See pp. 82, 85.)

(c) Basilica/Church 1: the western apse. (See pp. 85, 92.)

(d) Basilica/Church 1: the position of the Period IV altar, showing (a) the foundations of the Period II monument beneath, (b) the columns carrying the altar canopy and (c) the sockets for the presumed wooden altar of Period IIIb. (See pp. 80, 85, 92.)
(a) Basilica/Church 1: the steps of the western apse, showing the original sandstone steps of Period III rising behind the added marble steps of Period IV. In the foreground the Period IV paving overlies the original paving of Period I. (See pp. 85, 93.)

(b) Basilica/Church 1: base of Period IV (?) altar, composed of reversed column-bases and other re-used marble elements. (See p. 86.)

(c) Basilica/Church 1: Christian graves within the eastern apse of the Period III Basilica. (See pp. 82, 86.)

(d) Basilica/Church 1: Christian graves behind the western apse. (See p. 86.)
(a) Aerial view of the Cruciform Building from the south.

(b) Rectangular marble pilaster from the entrance to the Cruciform Building, now in the western apse of the Basilica/Church 1. (See p. 92.)

(c) Engaged marble pilaster from the entrance to the Cruciform Building, now in the vaults of the Capitoline. (See p. 92.)
(a) Detail of the pilaster shown in plate 25b.

(b) Detail of the pilaster shown in plate 25c.

(c) South-east corner of the Cruciform Building, showing a fragment of the original marble paving and traces of the marble veneer on the walls. The floor-level was later raised as at the right. (See pp. 92, 94.)
(a) Rectangular composite capital from the entrance to the Cruciform Building, now in the western apse of the Basilica/Church 1. (See p. 92.)

(b) Composite pilaster-capital from the interior of the Cruciform Building, now in the vaults of the Capitolium. (See p. 92.)

(c) Part of decorated pilaster from the interior of the Cruciform Building, now in the vaults of the Capitolium. (See p. 92.)
(a-b) Fragments of architectural ornament found (and now displayed) in the vaults of the Capitolium, and belonging probably to the Cruciform Building and the Temple of Serapis. (See pp. 92, 94, 116.)
PLATE 29

(a) Fragments of the applied cornice-moulding from the interior of the Cruciform Building, now in the vaults of the Capitolium. (See p. 92.)

(b-c) Fragments of decorated marble pilaster in the vaults of the Capitolium, possibly used to terminate the south forum portico against the façade of the Cruciform Building. (See p. 92.)
(a) Corinthian pilaster-capital in the vaults of the Capitolium, possibly used with the preceding. (See p. 92.)

(b) Corinthian capital from the aediculae in the Cruciform Building, now in the nave of the Basilica/Church 1. (See p. 92.)

(c) Cruciform Building: architrave from one of the aediculae. (See p. 93.)
(a) Part of the frieze above the aediculae in the Cruciform Building. (See p. 93.)

(b) Block of cornice belonging to one of the aediculae in the Cruciform Building. (See p. 93.)

(c) Interior of the Cruciform Building from the west, showing the Byzantine font, the blocks of the raised floor inserted when the building became a curia, and traces of the original marble paving beyond. (See pp. 94, 95.)

(d) The surviving aedicula at the rear of the Cruciform Building, showing two of the former architraves from above the columns of the aediculae (one re-used as a step). (See pp. 93, 95.)
(a) The Capitolium, seen from the Forum at the time of the original excavations. (Photo: Dept. of Antiquities, Tripolitania.)

(b) The Capitolium: the robbed north flank of the podium, showing the character of the Period II substructures and the projecting remains of earlier buildings. (See pp. 99, 105, 107.)
(a) The Capitolium: surface of the platform in front of the upper steps, showing the marble paving of Period II and the central drain-head. To the right are visible the original sandstone steps of the upper flight belonging to Period I, partly overlaid by the rubble packing for the (missing) Period II steps of marble. (See p. 105.)

(b) The Capitolium: the surface of the podium, looking northwards across the front of the cella. In the foreground is visible the seating of an anta-base on the line of the south wall of the cella. (See pp. 107, 109.)
(a) The Capitolium: detail of the northern wing of the Period II substructure, showing the concrete raft on which it is built overlying earlier foundations along the street-frontage. Scale 30 cm. (See p. 105.)

(b) Underside of marble architrave, lying near Church 2 and attributed to the Period II Capitolium. (See p. 107.)

(c) The Capitolium, Period II: marble column-capital from the pronaos. (See p. 109.)
(a) Angle-block from the cornice of the Period II Capitolium above one of the side-chapels, showing the flat upper surface and beam-sockets. (See pp. 108, 113.)

(b) The Capitolium, Period II: marble angle-block from the pediment, with statue-base. (See p. 109.)

(c) The Capitolium: north side of podium, showing in the centre the added buttress behind the lateral substructure (left), butted against it but not bonded in. (See p. 113.)
(a) The Capitolium: added buttress on the north side, seen from behind. Note the straight joint against the cella wall on the right, and the partial masking of the entrance to the favissae. (See pp. 99, 113.)

(b) The Capitolium: inside the favissae, looking through the doorway in the northern stretcher-wall towards the southern one. Note the drafting of the masonry and the fact that it does not respect the doorway, which may be secondary. (See p. 99.)

(c) The Capitolium: the rear wall of the cella (left), at the point where it abuts the earlier buildings of Regio I, Insula 6 (right). (See p. 99.)
(a) The precinct of the Temple of Serapis, from the south.

(b) The steps at the front of the Temple of Serapis. The original sandstone steps are visible in the upper courses; those in the foreground are of grey limestone (lowest two) and white marble, and belong to the second period of the temple. (See p. 115.)
(a) The west end of the Temple of Serapis, showing the foundations of the rear extension and the surviving bases of the original sandstone portico. (See p. 115.)

(b) Fragment of a monumental inscription recorded at the north-west angle of the Forum and possibly attributable to the Temple of Serapis: ...]MYTH-VMBA[... (IRT 162: See p. 116.)

c) Late steps at the southern end of the street between the Temple of Serapis and the Curia. (See pp. 117.)

(d) Regio II, Insula 5, shrine at corner of street. (See pp. 119, 124.)
Regio II, Insula 5, general view showing the north wall of the East Forum Temple precinct behind. Note the opening through this wall at the left, which corresponds to the ground-level inside the temple portico. (See pp. 37, 119, 121.)
Regio II, Insula 6, seen from the west.
(a) Regio II, Insula 6: section G–H, looking east. Wall V39 is in the foreground, with the blocks of the Period IV cistern behind. (See p. 127.)

(b) Regio II, Insula 6: upper part of wall V2 in section J–K, showing the (re-used?) drafted masonry of Period IV, with upper courses of Period IV or later above. (See p. 131.)

(c) Regio II, Insula 6: south end of section E–F, showing wall T31 in the foreground, with an associated mud-brick floor which runs beneath the foundations of wall T7 beyond. (See pp. 127, 131.)

(d) Regio II, Insula 6: lower part of wall V2 in section J–K, showing in descending order (re-used) Period IV masonry, original Period II masonry and rubble foundations. (See pp. 127, 129, 131.)
(a) *Regio II, Insula 6*: section E–F, looking south, showing the foundations of wall T26 to the right, wall T27 (with doorway?) in the centre of the trench and the *opus signinum* floor of Period IV beyond. (See pp. 127, 131.)

(b) *Regio II, Insula 6*: section J–K, looking east, showing wall T30 in the foreground and wall T29 beyond. (See p. 129.)

(c) *Regio II, Insula 6*: the foundation-courses of wall V28 at section A–B. (See p. 130.)

(d) *Regio II, Insula 6*: wall V28 at section A–B, showing the projecting foundation-blocks (beneath the scale) and remains of associated mud-brick floor. (See p. 130.)
(a) Regio II, Insula 6: capstones of Period IV cistern in section N–O, showing blocked draw-hole. (See p. 133.)

(b) Regio II, Insula 7: section A–B from the east, showing oven 2 in the foreground, oven 1 in the middle distance and the late Antonine drain in the background on the left. (See p. 135.)

(c) Regio II, Insula 7: the south end of section E–F, showing wall W14. (See pp. 137, 138.)

(d) Regio II, Insula 7: the north end of section E–F, showing the cistern and the doorway in wall W39 beyond. (See pp. 137, 139.)
(a) The Casa Brogan from the south-west at the outset of the excavations.

(b) Casa Brogan: the west face of wall 19 at section E–F, showing successively the masonry of Periods I, V and IX. In the foreground is the stone paving of Period Ia. (See pp. 143, 145.)

(c) Casa Brogan: the junction of walls 19 and 42 (sections N–O/O–P). (See p. 143.)
(a) Casa Brogan: the east face of wall 19 at sections Q–R and E'–F', showing the Period I masonry below and Period IIIb ashlar masonry above. (See pp. 127, 143, 148.)

(b) Casa Brogan: the east face of wall 19 at section U–V, showing Period I masonry at the bottom and the larger blocks of the Period V reconstruction above (from just below the tip of the scale). (See pp. 143, 149.)
(a) Casa Brogan: looking north along section L–M, showing the Period Ia stone paving with wall 17 beyond and wall 19 to the right. (See pp. 147, 149.)

(b) Casa Brogan: the east face of wall 1 at section G′–H′. (See p. 149.)

(c) Casa Brogan: the west face of wall 19 at sections N–O/O–P. The main part is attributed to Period IIIb, and the uppermost ashlar courses to Period Vla. (See pp. 149, 156.)
(a) Casa Brogan: the cellar room from the south, showing wall 19 on the left and wall 20a in the background. (See p. 151 ff.)

(b) Casa Brogan: the cellar room from the north, showing walls 25 and 25a on the left (with possible stairway behind) and wall 18 in the background. Note the stone paving of Period IVc at the extreme right-hand edge of the photograph. (See p. 151 ff., 156.)

(c) Casa Brogan: the cellar room from the south-west, showing wall 25 with adjoining wall 25a to the right (from the nearside of orthostat), foundations of walls 45 below and wall 1 behind. The scale stands on the Period IVc floor. (See p. 151 ff.)
(a) Casa Brogan, cellar room. Amphora found in situ in the north-east corner. (See p. 152.)

(b) Casa Brogan, the cellar room: junction between wall 49 (left) and wall 1 at section A'-B'. (See p. 151.)

(c) Casa Brogan: walls 20 (foreground) and 21, looking south-west. (See p. 155.)
(a) Casa Brogan: the Period VII vats in the room east of wall 19 (nos. 2-5), showing the concrete rubble in which they were set and the (Period V?) strengthening of wall 19 on the left. (See pp. 153, 157.)

(c) Casa Brogan: outline of vat 6. Wall 27 is to the right, wall 13 in the background, the Period VIII (?) stone paving overlying the vat in the foreground. (See pp. 157, 158.)

(b) Casa Brogan: vat 1 from the south, with the fill removed but the foundations of the Byzantine wall 4 in situ. Wall 19 is on the right, wall 380 behind. (See pp. 157, 164.)

(d) Casa Brogan: vat 7 from the east. The scale stands in the north-south trough, and the cover-slabs of the Period V cistern are visible in the foreground, with secondary piped inlet to the right. (See pp. 154, 157.)
(a) Casa Brogan: the southern edge of mosaic 1, showing the top of wall 18, with its Byzantine replacement, wall 2, to the left of it and built over mosaic 2. The top of wall 19 is in the background. (See pp. 161, 164.)

(b) Casa Brogan: mosaic 1, looking north-west and showing the top of wall 19 at the edge of the mosaic on the left and the Byzantine wall 4 crossing the mosaic behind. The space from which the emblema was removed is visible at the right. (See pp. 161, 164.)

(c) Casa Brogan: detail of the emblema in mosaic 1, showing the motifs surrounding the central inscription. (See p. 161.)
(a) Casa Brogan: detail of the emblema in mosaic 1, showing the inscribed *tabella ansata*. (See p. 161.)

(b) Casa Brogan: Byzantine wall 2, resting on mosaic 2. (See pp. 161, 164.)
(a) Casa Brogan: mosaic 2 from the east. (See p. 161.) (Photo: G.D.B. Jones)

(b) Casa Brogan: part of mosaic 3. (See p. 161.)
(a) Casa Brogan: the west face of wall 56 in section J'-K'. (See p. 165.)

(b) Casa Brogan: foundations of wall 56 in section L'-M'. (See p. 165.)

(c) Casa Brogan: section L'-M' from the west, showing wall 55 in the background and wall 54 (with part of blocked doorway) on the left. (See p. 166.)

(d) Trench Y3-4, north end, showing the wall of the Antonine Temple cutting the early wall Y4.1. (See p. 170.)
Plate 54

(a) Trench Y3-4, south end, showing pit 2 in the foreground and the street-front of Regio II, Insula 3 behind. (See p. 170.)

(b) Trench Y3-4: pit 2 from the north-east. (See p. 173.)

(c) Lamps from phase 5 in trench N1, east of the Antonine Temple (see p. 204). Scale 2:3.
Lamps from pit 2 in trench Y3-4, south of the Antonine Temple (see p. 182 f.). Scale 2:3.
(a) Aerial view of the theatre and surrounding buildings. The Severan Monument and the adjacent sandstone base are visible at the extreme left, and the remains of Regio IV, Insula 11 at the bottom.

(b) The Byzantine South Gate, from the inside. The steps which rise from the early Roman paving to the Byzantine street-level are modern. (See p. 231.)
(a) The base of the Severan Monument from the north-east. (Photo: C.D.B. Jones)

(b–d) Blocks from the dedication of the Severan Monument, re-used in the Justinianic Church 2 north of the Forum. (See p. 215.)
(a) Pilaster-capital from the sandstone monument. Scale 15 cm. (See p. 217.)

(b) Pilaster-base from the sandstone monument. Scale 15 cm. (See p. 217.)

(c) Severan Monument: north face of monument (section D-D') showing concrete foundations. The small scale on the right rests on an earlier road surface, immediately overlaid by building debris from the construction of the monument. (See p. 218.)

(d) Severan Monument: north end of section A-A', showing successive street-surfaces and front wall of Regio V, Insula 10. (See p. 218.)
(a) Regio IV, Insula 11: detail of earlier mosaic. (See p. 222.)
(b) Regio IV, Insula 11: central panel of later mosaic. (See p. 222.)
(c) Regio IV, Insula 11: detail of central panel of later mosaic. (See p. 222.)
(d) Site M: section across main coast road, looking east. (See p. 223.)
(a) Byzantine Wall: trench G1 from the north. (See p. 227.)

(b) Byzantine Wall: detail of trench G1, showing lintels of doorways and sockets for joists supporting an upper storey. (See p. 227.)

(c) Byzantine Wall: insula partition-wall on west side of trench G1, showing original (stretcher) construction with traces of rendering, and late re-build using irregular header-blocks. (See pp. 227, 230.)

(d) Byzantine Wall: outer face of wall at trench G2, showing two courses of early Roman insula wall at base and irregular Byzantine work above. Note signs of basal erosion at level of top of scale, and early Roman street-paving in foreground. (See pp. 229, 230.)
(a) Part of the south frontage of Regio II, Insula 2, showing a stone staircase leading to a former upper floor. (See p. 237.)

(b) Part of Regio IV seen from the theatre, with Insula 4 in the foreground and Insula 3 beyond. (See p. 239.)
(a) Attic black-glazed pottery: bases of skyphoi nos. 8, 9, 11 and 24. Scale 1:1.

(b) Attic black-glazed pottery: no. 33, base of bolsal with graffito on underside. Scale 1:1.
(a) Attic black-glazed pottery: bases of bowls nos. 78, 79 and 83. Scale 1:1.

(b) Attic black-glazed pottery: no. 90, base of bowl with graffito on underside. Scale 1:1.
(a) Attic black-glazed pottery: nos. 85, 86, 91 (underside, showing batch-mark) and 127. Scale 1:1.

(b) Figure-decorated sherds of Attic ware from the excavations. (See p. 296.) Scale 2:3.
جديدة كاملة والمتميزة في بازيلكا ذات المحبين على محور طولى تقليدياً للبازيلكا السورية في ليدة الكبرى. وإنشاء هذا المبنى الجديد أدى إلى استغلال كامل لأقصى من المعبد الأسطواني والمعبد الجنوبي للسوق. وقد أطلق فداء المعبد الشرقي للسوق عند نهاية الشرقية للسوق خلف رواب جديد مبلي بالفسفاسية، وباشر المدخل لحصيفة المعبد عبر السوق الخلفي ولكن لم يعد المبنى أولاً دهولاً، وظيفته العامة.

وبالرغم أن الذين عاشوا الكارثة وقاموا بعمليات الترميم قد تركوا اثاراستيطانية في نواة المدينة الأصلية، فإن مخلفات مستوطتهم الاستيطانية قدازيلت بدون تسجيل عند بداية أول الحفريات في الموقع.

كان منزل بروجن من اهدال المناطق التي أزالته تحتفظ بالدليل الكامل، ويبدو أن مالك هذا المكان استطاع توسيع منزله على حساب جيرانه واستغلال الزقاق الرئيسي الذي يجري طول الجزيرة وكذلك استطاع تزويق منزله بالفسفاسية. وعند نهاية القرن الرابع وبداية القرن الخامس الميلادي بنى كنيسة في الحي الشرقي من المدينة، وجرى توثيق بازيلكة (التي اعيد بناؤها)، الواقعة إلى جهة الجنوبية من السوق، التي كنيسة.

وبعد ذلك، تبدو الصورة أقل فضحاً نتيجة لعدم تسجيل محتويات الطبقة المعنية عندازاتها، ولكن من المعروف أن فترة الوداد كانت فترة احتكاط تبعتها فترة ازدهار عندما أعاد بيليزياريوس سنة 1336م، ضم المدينة إلى الحكم البيزنطي. فبنى سور جديد للدفاع، ثم وضع سوي قلب المدينة المباركة وأغلق الطريق الساحلي تناهيًا، والذي يفترض أنه قد وقف في اديائه مهمته. ولم تحتمل الكنائس المقابلة على بازيلكا السابقة بجانب السوق. وبناء كنيسة أخرى إلى شمال الكوريا. ويعكس جمال الفسيفساء الراقية في هذه الكنيسة الجديدة تعابير قوي بينها وبين جزءها العلوي المشيد من مواد بناء سبق استعمالها. على كل حال، 1433-1434م اصبح السوق مكاناً للدفن مشبوه بالمقابر. وهذا ما شاهده مليشيا الاحتفالات النهائية لهذه المدينة التي لم تكن عظيمة ولكن بكل تأكيد كانت في احدي أيام مدينة مزدهرة.
وليُعتبر امتداد المدينة باتجاه الشرق وبناء المساكن الأولى في هذا العصر، ولكن نجد محاولة التوسع باتجاه الجنوب والذين تعودت أن تؤدي توسيع حسابات المكتبات والتي ترجع إلى النصف الثاني للقرن الثالث الميلادي والتواصل على نفس المجهر.

وفي مركز المدينة أخذت النشاطات المعمارية شكل جديد لم يسبق له مثيل وعند تشكيك السوق واستبدال المنازل بيوات كورنيت وزين الكابيتول ومعبد سيبايس بالخان، والديكورات من منطقة السوق جرى بناء المعبد الأثيوبي والمعبد الجنوبي للسوق وكل منهما إضافة

وينتمي أن معظم شوارع المدينة قد قدرت لأول مرة واقترحت هذا مع تأسيس شركة لمجاري محلية في المنطقة الوسطى، وذلك التصوير على شركة مبارك واسعة سياسية من الحجر، ترجع إلى هذا التاريخ، تحت إشراف السوق في الشارع الواقع إلى الغرب من منزل بروجان وفي شمال المعبد الشرقي للسوق، ومن العناصر التي أثرت إظهار هذه المباني إلى المشروع العام في-zone المدينة بالهيئة، فإن فلاديوس طوبوس وجد في النصف الثاني من القرن الثالث الميلادي يمكن تأكيد

فويزك الكابيتول، وقد أثر هذا النصف الذي نص من قبل سفلاديوس، قام في القرن الثالث الميلادي.

وهيما مثل العصر الأثيوبي المشارع نتائج بارزة في زوايا السوق في أواخر القرن الثالث الميلادي، واشترى دوي في هذا الظاهرة إلى دمار المدينة مرة أخرى نتيجة لزلزال وقع في السنوات ما بين 304-305 م، واستمرت في ذلك على جزء عامي على للدليل المصور في منطقة حفريات حل النصب، ولكن من الممكن إضافة تأكيدات لهذا الرأي يوجد حفارة كبيرة مملوءة بركام جديد في منطقة الرواق الشمالي للمعادل الشرقي للسوق، وفي النصف الذي يعبر عن أن المعبد قد كرس للحين لثابرات والذي يسحر ترميزها - من حالة دمار قديم في السنوات ما بين 340، 350، 360، 370

وستخدام الحياة العامة، والتراعي أكثر انسيابيته في قصر قديم يرى في النصف الأول من القرن الثالث الميلادي، أثرت ثلاث شمالي، والتفصيلات التي اوردها برايتون وتبنيها محرر كتاب "نقوش طرابلس الرومانية" والكتابة بثان الدمار قد حدث بسبب هجوم في مسجل" لقب "الاستوريان" في سنة 32 م لا يمكن التوقيع عليها.

وتبعت كل العناصر العامة لدمار المشارك، وتفعيل ذلك ببعض الفترات المسيحية، المعاصرة والتي نحنها أهال وعندن ترميم المعابد في العالم، ويندش شك تبع هذا خسائر كبيرة من الأراضي وحجر المنطقة الوارف في ضواحي المدينة وتشمل الحفريات على أمل لحروب ذلك على الحدود، حتى بالقرب من مركز المدينة، وبال🎉 من ذلك تظل هناك ضابط كاف لإجراء ترميمات شاملة في قلب المدينة، وعرف ذلك بطرق منفصلة باستخدام كل المواد المتوفرة في الموقع وازه ذلك حقيقة تجميع رخام كل الأزمنة والتي تشمل أجزاء من مبانى وقوس في القبة الكابيتول للاستعمال، واذا فقد أعد استعمال بعض منها: عدد من النقوش قد استعمل لتبليط متأخر في الرواق الشمالي للسوق، ومن المؤكد أيضا أنه قد تم ترميم تقريبا من عددٍ كدر بعضها وجد في مساحة الرواق وهمش التغيير في القبة الكابيتول، ومثل هذا

نجد أن السمار أصبع كمقطع لممواد البلاط، وعثر إعداد المرفأ الإيطالي على عدد من الفنون، المعاصرة من منطقة حفريات في خلفية المسار.

في منطقة السوق، بالإضافة إلى إعادة سفوح الرواق الشمالي للسوق أعيد بناء كل من الدوار على الجهة الشمالية والبابا على الجهة الجنوبية، وبالأمكان قياس مدى الدمار بلاحظة أنه لم يعيد استعمال من المباني السابقة إلا الحافز الشمالي فقط، بدأ عن ذلك تبني خطأ.
ويالامكان التحقق من ذلك بإجراء حفريات جدية.

وإذا استنفدنا عن نواة المدينة العريقة، فإن نتاج مسواتي الاستطلب يقتصر على الأواخر ذات الصلة السوداء (وجود مباني) وقد سجل هذا في الحفريات بجانب النصب السوري ونجد السيرتحل وهذا يضمن تفسيره.

خلال القرن الثاني ق.م استمرت المدينة في التوسع في اتجاه الجنوب وأُكمل ذلك العثور على دليل من دخان عبر الشارع الواضح بالجهة الجنوبية من المعبد الأثيوبي في منطقة النهاية الغربية ونلاحظ هنا عدم دقة التاريخ إلا أنه بالأمكان إرجاعه إلى تاريخ ما قبل تاريخ محاورات حفريات الرفوح إلى دولة قبل الميلاد.

أشار د. هيناف بأن المبنى القديم من قاعدة النصب (ب) أُسس على نفس نظام تصفيف الجزيرة المتاخرة في السنوات ما بين 700-600 ق.م، وهذا يبدو أن وضع أساسات هذه الجزيرة يرجع إلى بداية العمر الحجري على استعداد.

وتعدد حول واحد يكتشف أن الرؤية القاتلة بأن تطور هذه الجزئي ذات الطابع الهلنستي الطويل المدى، حيث في القرن الأول الميلادي بالرغم من أن قطرة من جزء السور البيزنطي في الجهة الجنوبية يدل على أن أساساته وضعت في العصر البيزنطي وتعابق على فترة استثنائية لم يكن أقدم من القرن الأول الميلادي، ولا يمكن الاعتماد على هذا الرأي كدعم.

ويبدو من التوابع التفصيلي النمو هذا الجزء من المدينة ان تخطيط المدينة كان تلقائي وبسيط ولكن السهل الزمني يحتاج إلى مزيد من التحري والدراسة.

والرجوع إلى المنطقة الشمالية يبدو أن بناء المعبد الشرقي للسوق قد تم في منتصف القرن الأول الميلادي، وقبل بناء هذا المعبد شغل هذا الموقع مكان موزع بشكل غير منظم وبناء على هذا يمكن اعتباره كواحة لبداية تطبيق مبادئ تخطيط المدن الرومانية على تخطيط مدينة مل块. أشار د. هيناف بناء هذا السوق على ساحة شبه سوق وتقدم المبادئ لن تتعلم تخطيط المعماري للسوق السابق، ولقد ساعدت هذا النمو أحداث ذات طبيعة مجهولة، وبناء على رأي د. هيناف بناء المعبد الشرقي على أساسات قوية ضخمة، واعيد تشكيك الأروقة المحيطة به، ووضع المهندس المقابل له واعدة متاجر على الجهتين الشمالية والجنوبية على معتبة عالية تقاربها مستوى منخفضي تحسنته، بالإضافة إلى هذا اضيفت باريكا أسطولية مركزية أو المعرفة بالتفرغية إلى الجهة الجنوبية وكذلك مكان لمدة تتلقى الكوريا المتاخرة في الجهة الشمالية، وبدون شك ان تصفيف العبوات التي كانت موجودة في المنطقة قبل التوسع نتيجة للزلازل قد أتاح الفرصة لهذｔ التطور.

لقد استغرقت عمليات إعادة البناء والقضاء على آثار الزلازل السنوات المبكرة من القرن الثاني الميلادي، ولكن بعد منتصف هذا القرن دخلت المدينة عهدًا جديدًا بالتجديد والتوسع بدون الدهر، غالبًا ما أُعتبر تخطيط مدينة ملكل كثيرة أبرز التباح بين النمو التدريجي لدوائر المدينة والتفكير المحكم للمنطقة الشرقية والذي يبدو واضحًا فيه فلورا حادة، ونلاحظ أن الجزء في المنطقة الأخرى مزدحمة ويمكن مقارنتها بجعل في مدينة تتوارد بالأجراز التي ترجع إلى الفترة الإغريقية، وبالرغم من التغيرات التي حدثت أخيرًا يمكن تمصير تخطيط التسمية العقاري الأصلي، ويخذ كان تأسيس هذا الحي بقبل نهاية العهد الإغريقي المبكر 1916-183 م.
خشية وحفر قمامة تمادعي الحفائر إلى الاستنتاج بأن أقدم المستوطنات كانت ذات طابع موسمي وؤمناً، وتكون أساطير البيئي المستثنى والمكتشف تحت الجزء الجنوبي من فناء معيبد السوق الشرقي ويمثل موازياً لسيرة الشمالية على كيانات هائلة من الركام الذي يمثل أحياناً إلى عرض 500 متر، ونتيجة لقرنه لم يكن مميزاً يصعب تأريخه استناداً على دليل مباشر ولكن بصورة عامة يتجلى أنه مثل معالم مبكر، وذلك من المستقبل ان تكون هذه الأساطير بعرض 500 متر قد بنيت لتدهم حائط منزل، وهذا يجعلنا نستطيع بأن هذا المبنى يمثل خط لسورة المدينة المكرس.

ونتيجة لانتظاد العمران في القرن الرابع إلى الجنوب هذا الحائط، يمكننا أن نستطيع أن يوجد هذا الحائط قد سبق تاريخ هذا العمران وعليه يمكن نسبته إلى القرن الخامس قبل الميلاد.

وشهد النصف الثاني من القرن الرابع ق.م، ظهور أول بيتان حجري، ومع أن الحفريات لم تكون كافية لكشف جزء كبير من مخطط المدينة، إلا أنه تم اكتشاف مبانٍ ومستودعات استيطانية ترجع إلى هذا العصر في منطقة شمال السوق وتحت معبد السوق الشرقي وفي منزل بروجان.

ومما أثار الاهتمام طريقاً طريقة صف المبانى الواقعة شمال السوق، فضلاً عن داخل منطقة السوق والمنطقة الواقعة إلى الجنوب منه والتي تشمل المعبد الأثري، تلاحظ الالتزام غير الدقيق بنفس التخطيط السابق المبنى على مبدأ المحور المحوري.

(ومن الغريب أن هذا التخطيط لم يبدد أي اهتمام لسورة المدينة المستوردة المكرس).

غياب المبانى الحجرية من الجزء الغربي للسوق وذلك تعابير السطوح الأرضية المملوءة ببحيرات المياه، والبنايات الخشبية يقودنا إلى استنتاج احتمال استعمال هذه المنطقة كسوق مفتوح في الفترة الأولى المكرسة لهذه المدينة.

من خلال الحفريات البريطانية تظهر المرحلة التالية والتي تمثل مرحلة نزيف مهم ظهرت في النصف الأول من القرن الثاني ق.م، ففي أغلب المناطق التي سجلت فيها المباني مبكراء وجاء هناك دليل على أعادتها بناء مكثفة في هذا الوقت ففي منزل بروجان هناك دليل على إعادة توسيع مبانى كانت موجودة أصلاً للإشارة بناء الشزر الواقع إلى النهاية للجزة لدرجة الواجهة لها إلى الشارع الواقع على الجهة المائية، وبهذا يكون دليل استيكان برجع لهذا التاريخ له علاقة بالمباني الحجرية في خندق عبر الشارع الواقع على الجهة الجنوبية للمعبد الأثريون، وهذا يوضح بأن مركز المدينة بالضرورة قد امتد إلى هذا البحر، والدیدرالذكر هنا أن دي فيتاك قد أرجع تاريخ بناء المباني اليونانية والمباني اليونانية الغربية إلى هذه الفترة. ولم ينفد من هذا الحد بل أضاف بأن هزيمة الرومان لمصرح سنة 40 ق.م (والتي تتبعها السحق النهار لمرحلة) 40 ق.م قد أدى إلى استقلال مدن طرابلس واتاحة لها فرصة التصحر الكامل ولأول مرة استعمال هذه المدن تتمتع بしまう ازدهارها، ولهذه هذا الرأي ظهر زيد من الأدلة من خلال الحفريات البريطانية.

لم يكن بالإمكان تحديد مساحة المدينة بالكامل بدقة في القرن الثاني ق.م، بالرغم من وضح الحدود الجنوبية والتي يمتد ألاّبها البحر من موقع النسائي، والشتر هناك دليل في حفريات منزل بروجان لا تصح فرض يرجع إلى القرن الثاني ق.م، وينتهي محاكاة المواجهة الشرقية المتأخرة للجزيرة ويدخلنها نسبياً. بعيد إعداد أساطير يمكن مقارنتها بالسور المنسوب للقرن الخامس، ومرة أخرى يحتمل استمراره كجزء من دفاعات المدينة بعد توسع محيطها.
يتطرق موضوع البحث في هذه الورقة إلى دراسة مكانة باحثان مرموقان: الراحل د. جون وارد بيركنز، المدير السابق للمدرسة البريطانية في روما والبروفيسور دي فيتا، والمدير الحالي للمدرسة الإيطالية باكينا. ولقد أشرف كل منهما على حفريات في صيراطه، فأولاً شملت حفريات مناطق متعددة من المدينة في الفترة الواقعة بين 1948-1951م، والآخر تركز حفرياته في المنطقة الواقعة إلى الجنوب من السور البيزنطي في الستينات.

تشارك إثرها بخصوص التسلسل الزمني لتطور المدينة، وكان آخر ظهور لهذا التضارب في بحث قدمه الدكتور وارد بيركنز في روما سنة 1979 مم، والذي نشر في (وارد بيركنز 1984) واتبع ذلك بمحاضرة تعقيبية القافلة البروسفوريس دي فيتا، ختمها بإرجاع اختلاف الرأي بينهما إلى عدم نشر النتائج التفصيلية للمكتشفات والذى ادى إلى ان كل منهما يملك جزء من الحقيقة، وليس الدليل.

ومن ذلك الحين، توفي الدكتور بيركنز وكلفت جمعية الدراسات الليبية بإعداد مكتشفاته ومكتشفات مدان كان ليجين في الفترة ما بين 1951-1984 للنشر، وكان البلدان الزمني لذلك يقضى بأن يكون البحث أحد للنشر مع نهاية سنة 1984، وفي ضوء الأدلة التي ستكون متوقعة في ذلك الحين.

ويمكننا الآن إضافة بعض التعليقات الجديدة إلى تاريخ صيراطه. ولها فان أشكر

هذا الإجابة، ليس هذا تغريدة فقط لممارسة البنى في الحفريات، ولكنها مجهودات جهاد في ادراك واعادات البحث بصفتها سكينية المدرسة البريطانية في روما في ذلك الوقت، بالإضافة إلى هذا كل فراغ من مجهوداتها الدبلوماسية والبيئية. في الدور化身 التي تلعبه، والذي لم يتغير على تقرير وجهات النظر المختلفة. بل تعددت إلى تصنيف وظائف العلاقات المتمثلة لأدوار الحفريات المشتركة، والعلاقات بين الشخصيات المتمارسة لدراسة الحفريات المشتركة، والإمكانيات التي تأسفها في هذه الورقة. معتمدة على نتائج حفريات جون بيركنز الا انها لن تنتهك كل الانطباعات مع الآراء التي عبر عنها، والسبب الرئيسي لذلك معرفة قبل 30 سنة، والتواريخ التي سيأتي سردنا هنا قد بنيت على تأريخ العمالة المكتشفة وعلى المراجعة الحديثة لتأريخ الآراء الغزارية الخارقة من قبل، وكذلك على دراسة المساحيق من قبل د بيلى، ولاتزال الآراء الغزارية الحشنة واللتي الأخرى ت缄ب د بيلى.

والدليل على أقدم استيطان في صيراط أتي الينا عن طريق شقخف الآراء الاتفاقية المطلقة بالأسود وقليل من شقخف الأخرى الحمراء وبعض المحاصيل الآتي، والتي يرجع تأريخها إلى المعنى الثاني من القرن الخامس قبل الميلاد. (وهنا! اعتبر من تغرير وشكي لدافيد جيل لمساعدته وابداؤه لمياهه الصفر عند التطور لدراسة الآراء الغزارية المطلقة بالأسود والذي يعتبر ذكر من رأي آخر) والمقدرة عليها في منطقة السوق وفي منزل بروجان شرقي السوق وفي الحفريات الواقعة بين السوق والميناء، وباستثناء ما جرى واحد لا يوجد مباني حجرية ترجع إلى هذا التاريخ وانما وجدت في مستويات الاستيطان حفر لأساسات ركائز
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archaeology brought her wide-ranging experience from excavations at Zimbabwe in Southern Rhodesia, Samaria in Palestine and many sites in Britain, the most important of which was Verulamium. In 1935 she became Secretary of the newly established Institute of Archaeology in London and from 1948 to 1962 was Lecturer in Palestinian Archaeology in the same institution. Between 1962 and her retirement in 1973 she was Principal of St. Hugh’s College, Oxford. Her collaboration with Ward-Perkins at Sabratha was succeeded by responsibility for the revival of the British School of Archaeology at Jerusalem. Her epoch-making excavations at Jericho and four seasons of work in Jerusalem itself occupied much of her scholarly energies for the remainder of her life, though shortly before her death in 1978 she had turned her attention once more to the completion of the embryonic report on her work at Sabratha.

PHILIP MICHAEL KENRICK, MA, DPhil, FSA was conceived but not yet born when the first season of British excavations at Sabratha took place in the summer of 1948. He was educated at Rugby School and Balliol College, Oxford, where he read Literae Humaniores and continued his studies with the graduate Diploma in Classical Archaeology and doctoral research on the fine wares from the Hellenistic and Roman site of Berenice (Benghazi) in Libya. He has participated in excavations in Britain, Italy, Turkey and Libya, and for three years worked on Romano-British pottery with the Colchester Archaeological Trust. Having worked for Ward-Perkins as a voluntary assistant in the British School at Rome before going up to Oxford, he was requested by him to coordinate the completion of the Sabratha report following the death of Dame Kathleen Kenyon in 1978. This culminated (after the death of Ward-Perkins) in a three-year post as Research Officer in the Department of Archaeology at Reading University, of which the present volume is the outcome. Dr. Kenrick is the author of *Excavations at Sidi Khrebish, Benghazi (Berenice) iii.1,* *The Fine Wares* (1983). He is no longer professionally employed in archaeology.