

view that the trial, leading to Drusus' attempt at reform, was the cause of the Social War. Again, however, note the nineteenth-century naïveté of J-K-K *ad loc.*: 'Die Chronique scandaleuse der politischen Prozesse erschien den senatorischen Kreisen als die eigentliche Zeitgeschichte' (p. 77): it is good to know that English-speaking students will be better served. Many will still find it difficult to believe that Cicero's *annos prope quinquaginta continuos* (*Verr.* 1, 38, on the time the equites had served on the extortion juries) can mean 'forty-one years, with a break of five or six in the middle'—despite D.'s ingenious advocacy of this (124). The spelling 'Caelius' for 'Coelius' (and especially for the *cos.* 94) should at last be abandoned, even by editors of Cicero. (It very properly is by Malcovati and J-K-K, and it was not used in L.) On 134 (foot of page) it should be made clear that the reference is to M. Brutus *pater* (not to the son, also mentioned in s. 130). 135, line 4, for 'first century' read 'second century'. 137: P. Orbius was not *praetor* in Asia (except in the wider and non-technical sense of the word that often confuses commentators). Vergilius' prosecution of Sulla did not imply that his *imperium* was illegal (*ibid.*)—merely that, although not legally required, it was good form for an honest man to come and stand trial in such circumstances, as (e.g.) M. Antonius had done (*Val. Max.* III, 7, 9); in any case, it was not a question of *imperium*, but of *rei p. causa abesse*. In the stemma of Metellus Scipio (153) the consulship of Q. Scaevola should be 117. In s. 217 (158) *Titinia Cottae* is rightly taken to mean 'T., wife of C.'—indeed, despite a common error, no other meaning is possible. The nonsense-word *postsubhorrescere* is made up (190) and fathered on Sisenna: even he would have objected! On *C. Hirtilium* (190), the statement that 'some prefer the spelling *Hirtuleium*' is quite misleading: that is an *emendation*, neither the only nor a necessary one. (See Malcovati.) If we emend *T. Postumius* (s. 269) to *L. Postumius* (with Münzer and others—see 196), he is the man who was appointed to Sicily in 49 (*Att.* VII, 15, 2) and was therefore quite probably *praetor* by 54 (see *MRR* II, 222): old references to precisely 57 are indeed unfounded. The note (219) on L. Memmius should be ignored: whatever the true answer, the facts are very different and more complex.

The book concludes with (App. A) a selection of fragments of orators, taken from *ORF*<sup>2</sup>, which will be interesting and useful to any students whom their teachers can persuade to dip into them; a list of textual points on which D. differs from Wilkins (App. B); and a brief discussion of the *lex Thoria* (App. C), in which D. restates his view with revisions in answer to my criticism of the earlier version. Full discussion will have to wait for another occasion. But in view of my challenge to would-be interpreters to translate their versions (*Studies* 236 f.), it must be noted that D. fails to do this for his new version of the text (*agrum publicum vitiosa et inutili lege uectigalem leuauit*), though it is not easy to see real sense in that piece of Latin.

More will also have to be said on D.'s most important contribution: the view that there is a recoverable principle for the arrangement of orators in the *Brutus*, or at least in important parts of it: chronology and status and, over a specified part, strictly dates of birth. This theory (elaborated by D. in *AJP* 1966, 290–306) will have to be fully investigated beyond the limits of a review, just as its establishment went well beyond the limits of the book. Nor has it been possible to deal with the large amount of useful material on rhetoric, which is D.'s special field: on this, a less competent reviewer has little to add. It is to be hoped that D. will go on to edit other *rhetorica*: a new *de oratore* would be welcome, especially as Wilkins's edition, now reprinted, will again become the standard English edition.

The two works here reviewed provide a reliable basis for scholars who constantly refer to the *Brutus* and will help to make it accessible to the larger numbers of students who ought to be using and reading it. Henceforth there will be no excuse for continuing to neglect it in standard Classics courses.

E. BADIAN

J. S. WACHER, ed., *THE CIVITAS CAPITALS OF ROMAN BRITAIN: PAPERS GIVEN AT A CONFERENCE HELD AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER, 13–15 DECEMBER 1963*. Leicester: University Press, 1966. Pp. 124, 10 plates, 23 text figures. 25s.

In 1963 a conference on Romano-British cantonal capitals was held at Leicester University. That such a gathering was possible is a welcome sign of the lively interest archaeologists have taken in the study of Romano-British towns in the years after the war. Even more welcome is this printed version of the principal papers. The editor and contributors deserve our warmest congratulations on the publication of this book, fittingly dedicated to the late Sir Ian Richmond. It presents a clear view of an impressive number of archaeological discoveries, and deals admirably with many of the problems, often very complicated, connected with them.

Seven papers are published, supplemented by a contribution from J. K. St Joseph, an introduction by Sir Ian Richmond, and a summing-up by A. L. F. Rivet. Very valuable are the index, and especially the bibliography 'covering all the Romano-British cantonal capitals' (p. 15). The 'General' section of this bibliography might have been expanded; especially notable is the omission

of Rivet, *Town and Country in Roman Britain* (1958), which in many respects prepared the ground for the present book. The bibliography mentions 15 cantonal capitals, among them Petuaria (Brough-on-Humber), perhaps the capital of a *civitas Parisorum*, and Verulamium (St. Albans), possibly the capital of the *civitas Catuvellaunorum*. Other towns that may have been cantonal capitals are not mentioned therein, e.g. Maridunum or Moridunum (Carmarthen) in the area of the Demetae, and Camulodunum, possibly the governing centre of the *civitas* of the Trinovantes.

Everyone interested in Roman Britain must be grateful for the many data and ideas, most of them new, which are offered here. It is to be regretted—especially by readers abroad—that the book does not contain a map showing the most important places and areas discussed. The papers are thought-provoking in many ways; on the one hand they give an excellent account of what has been accomplished, on the other they will act as a valuable stimulant to further research, not only on the cantonal capitals themselves, but also, as Richmond's introduction suggests, on the areas, together with the smaller settlements of some importance situated in them, of which they were once the centre. St Joseph's essay deals with some important contributions of aerial reconnaissance to the study of towns in Roman Britain. Air photography offers many possibilities, among other things for the investigation of stratigraphical problems connected with the rise and growth of towns. In the last few years our insight into the earliest stages of the Roman occupation of Britain has improved considerably, thanks largely to the work of G. Webster. His contribution deals with the relationship of civil and military sites in the conquest and early settlement phase of Roman Britain. The surprising fact emerges that early Roman military settlements in the lowland area were essential for the rise of civil, more or less urban communities. Though the rise of Verulamium is probably mainly due to its predecessor, the Belgic Verlamion at Prae Wood, it is strange that Webster has not included this town in his survey, since traces of a military post have been found here too.

From Lady Fox there is a clearly written paper on the origins and early development of Roman Exeter. The arguments for one of her theses, that the earliest Roman occupation there was non-military in character, have been seriously weakened by discoveries made in 1964, which seem to indicate that the town was preceded by a fort. Worth pondering are the remarks of B. R. Hartley concerning the dating of structures, and especially his observations on the value of available sources of dating-evidence, and the ways in which to use them. For the future he rightly demands an improving of our understanding of secondary sources of dating-evidence. Much of what in the past was accepted as established fact in the dating of town walls is now no longer tenable. 'Perhaps the truth of the matter is that we have been too anxious to read into our evidence neat schemes which provide general justification of grants of murage at a specific time'.

Earthwork defences of the second century are the subject of J. S. Wachter's paper. He makes clear that they exhibit a wide range of variations, and draws our attention to the many gaps in our knowledge regarding town defences. Next he distinguishes two groups of towns fortified in (the second half of) the second century. The first, and larger, one is in the south-west; the need for defences here may have been caused by unrest or possibly outright revolt among the Welsh tribes, or even among the Dumnonii of the south-west peninsula. The second group, much smaller than the first, lies on the east coast, which may indicate that the safety of this area was menaced from the sea much earlier than hitherto supposed. Richmond writes on industry in Roman Britain. In a wide-ranging survey of only a few pages many scattered facts are fitted together in order to elucidate some aspects of rural and urban economy. Particular attention is directed to the smaller establishments, in part shops, in part workshops, where goods were manufactured on the spot. Such shops, and small-scale manufacture in general, were important not only in the bigger towns, but also in the small country centres, because of the localization and individualization of industry. S. S. Frere writes an arresting article on the end of towns in Roman Britain. It contains a successful interpretation of historical and archaeological data bearing on the late-Roman period and the time of the 'Saxon Conquest'. The latter is suggested to be the result of a long and complicated history, the beginning of which may go back as far as 369, when Germanic mercenary soldiers were settled in Britain as *laeti* or *foederati* by imperial or provincial officials. Last but not least come Miss J. M. Reynolds' contribution, 'Legal and constitutional problems', and Rivet's summing-up, in which he deals with some historical aspects of the *civitates* of Roman Britain, and makes a praiseworthy attempt to set the development of the tribal cities in their historical context.

In connection with the two last-mentioned articles, which, in so far as they deal with the legal position of the *civitates* and their urban centres, have been read by this reviewer with more than usual interest, some remarks are appropriate. Towards the end of her article Miss R. says: 'Obviously I have offered nothing here but a series of possibilities and guesses'. On the one hand this is an attractive expression of realism, on the other a clear sign of the difficulties experienced by anyone who tries to evaluate the extremely scanty evidence for the organization of local government in Roman Britain. It is a pity that, in defining the *civitas*, Miss R. conforms without further question to the views of Frere (*Antiquity* xxxv (1961), 29 ff.). The book under review would have been

the ideal place for a critical examination of the discussion between Frere and Mann about the precise content of the concept *civitas*. (Part of the problem, with special reference to F.'s views, is well discussed in Rivet's summing-up, pp. 103-5; cf. further J. C. Mann in *Antiquity* xxxiv (1960), 222 ff.; *ibid.*, xxxv (1961), 142 ff.; *Latomus* 22 (1963), 777 ff., and especially in M. G. Jarrett and B. Dobson (edd.), *Britain and Rome* (1965), 109 ff.).

We need not doubt that in Britannia, as in Gallia and the Rhine-Danube area, so-called peregrine *civitates* were formed soon after Roman rule was established. Such *civitates* were communal or municipal units of local government covering a certain territory made up of one or more tribal areas. These organizations constituted a stage in the transition from pre-Roman tribal society to urban community. The degree of autonomy such units possessed certainly differed from case to case. The Romans generally allowed recently conquered tribes to retain their own political systems (hence the great variety in the ways the different *civitates* were governed), but in some cases the Roman authorities will have been obliged to exercise a greater amount of control than in others. In proportion as the romanization of the native inhabitants progressed and they grew more dependable, so the degree of autonomy they enjoyed within the framework of the Roman Empire increased. When at its inception a *civitas* did not yet possess a *caput* or governing centre, this was deliberately founded, or sprang up soon after. Mostly such a centre was not a town according to Roman constitutional law. In essence the organization of the *civitas* was based on the tribe, not the town. As a *civitas* developed, its constitutional pattern (and other institutions) more and more approximated to that of a Roman town, and it was increasingly identified with its governing centre.

There is epigraphical evidence showing that, on a level below that of the *civitas* government, the *civitas* capital, where this government had its seat, sometimes also possessed certain powers, which it could exercise through magistrates of its own. The citizens of a governing centre are called *vicani* in some inscriptions. They could act in some ways independently of the cantonal government: among other things they were entitled to allot pieces of public land and to erect public monuments. Cf. *AE* 1962, 232: *loc(o) adsig(nato) a vic(anis) Nide(nsibus)*, i.e. the citizens of Nida (Hedderheim), the capital of the *civitas Taunensium*. From *CIL* XIII, 2949 (*ILS* 7049) it appears that the *vicani* of Agedincum (Sens), the capital of the *civitas Senonum*, were accustomed to elect their own aediles. One of the aediles, C. Amatius Paterninus, is, in the same inscription, not only called *aedil(i) vikan(orum) Agied(incensium)*, but also *aedil(i) c(ivitatis) S(enonum)*. Evidently there were two governing bodies in Agedincum, on two different levels: that of the town, representing the *vicani* and that of the *civitas*, whose authority must have extended over the whole territory of the Senones. What is the meaning of the term *vikani Agiedincenses*? Are they the inhabitants of the *vicus* of Agedincum (Frere), or members of the constituent *vici* (wards) of Agedincum (Mann)? In other words, was Agedincum only a *vicus* on the territory of the *civitas Senonum* (Frere), or was it, as *civitas Senonum*, a real, if peregrine, city, an *oppidum* or *polis* with as its territory the whole area of the Senones (Mann)?

There are three possible meanings of the term *vicani*: inhabitants of villages on city territories, of villages in the military zones, or of the different wards within a town. Mann considers it impossible that Agedincum, after all the capital of the Senones, should merely have ranked as a *vicus*. He is right in saying that in no inscription or other source the word *vicus* ever appears describing the capital (or *oppidum*) of a *civitas*. Inscription *RIB* 707 (dating from the time of Antoninus Pius; *aedilis vici Petu[ar(iensis)]*; on the side panels: *c(ivitas) / [P(arisorum)]*?), found at Brough-on-Humber (Petuaria), makes it appear possible, but we cannot be certain. *CIL* XIII, 4301 and 4303 (= *ILS* 4818), found at Divodurum (Metz), the cantonal capital of the Mediomatrici, shows that this town possessed *vici*, wards. 'Since it is impossible to see how an organization called a *vicus* can have been subdivided into *vici*, it follows that Divodurum did not rank as a *vicus*' (Mann).

I cannot see the impossibility of the *vicus Pacis* and the *vicus Honoris*, as constituent wards of Divodurum, being parts of a town that itself merely ranked as a *vicus* of a *civitas*. There are different kinds of *vici* (cf. Festus, *de verb. sign.*, s.v. *vici*), which must not be mixed up. A *vicus* as ward within a town is in my opinion not the same as a *vicus* ('village') on the territory of a city, any more than *vicus* in the meaning of ward is the same as *vicus* in the meaning of single alleyway in a town. The aediles elected by the *vicani* of Agedincum did not function at *vicus* (= ward) level, as Mann thinks, but at town level.

According to M.'s reasoning the terms *vikani Agiedincenses* and *vicani Nidenses* should be taken as meaning 'members of the constituent *vici* of the town or *oppidum* of Agedincum (or Nida)'; not 'inhabitants of the *vicus Agedincum* (or Nida)'. However, it is hardly possible for such expressions as *vicani Iuliacenses* (*AE* 1955, 35) or *vikani Contiomagienses* (*AE* 1959, 76) to bear any other meaning than: 'inhabitants of the *vicus Iuliacum* (or Contiomagus)', both of them 'villages' on the territory of a city. Though M.'s arguments should certainly not be disregarded, it still seems to me preferable to assume that in general the capitals of peregrine *civitates* only ranked as *vici* on the territories of these *civitates*.

Miss R. is undoubtedly right in arguing that in Roman Britain local government was not

uniformly organized, and that it is a basic fact in this respect that many tribes survived as corporate bodies. But it does seem to be doubtful whether we are justified in inferring 'tribal' (or 'cantonal') activity from the words of some inscriptions recording working-parties on Hadrian's Wall. The inscriptions in question are *RIB* 1962 (*civitas Catuvellaunorum*), 1843 and 1844 (*civitas Dumnoniorum*), and 1672 and 1673 (*civitas Durotrigum Lindiniensis*). The dating of these inscriptions, which refer to a period of rebuilding, is very uncertain; some scholars connect them with the Severan restoration of the Wall, others prefer the year 369 (cf. *RIB*; Rivet, *Town and Country* 109 and 155; id., *Civitas Capitals* 109; E. Birley, *Research on Hadrian's Wall* (1961), 210, in connection with *RIB* 2053; Frere, *London Institute of Archaeology Bulletin* 4, 1964, 79). In my opinion the word *civitas* in these inscriptions has the meaning of town, not of tribe or canton (if we accept this, the reading of *RIB* 1672 and 1673 is easier; they probably refer to Lindinis (Ilchester), a town of the Durotriges). For the later development of the concept *civitas* see *inter alia* Frere, *Antiquity* xxxv (1961), 30 ff.; J. E. Bogaers, *Berichten van de Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek* 10-11 (1960-1), 310, note 252. Inscription *RIB* 946, found at Carlisle and dating from the years 180-192, may serve as illustration: a *praefectus alae* is mentioned '[*e civi*]tat(e) Traia[nens(ium)]', a native of (the territorium of) Colonia Ulpia Traiana, Xanten.

Connected with the above is the question—to which my answer is also in the negative—whether we may infer something like tribal administration from *RIB* 311—*respub(ica) civit(at)is Silurum*—found at Caerwent, and dating from the years shortly before 220, and *RIB* 2250—*r(es)p(ublica) c(ivitatis) D(obunnorum?)*—on a milestone found at Kenchester and erected in 283 or 284. After Caracalla, in his *Constitutio Antoniniana* (A.D. 212), had extended Roman citizenship to the *peregrini*, the distinction between genuine Roman or Latin towns and peregrine *civitates* (often already towns *de facto* before that time) disappeared, and the name *civitas* was preferred for urban centres.

Another problem is whether *CIL* xvi, 160—a military diploma from the year 106, issued to M. Ulpius Adcobrovati f. Novantico, (a native of) Ratis, i.e. from Ratae Coritanorum (Leicester)—indicates that Ratae had possibly or probably been promoted to a chartered town. I am convinced it does not. If a place is mentioned as *origo* in an inscription referring to a Roman soldier who is a *civis Romanus* and evidently of peregrine descent, we are not entitled to draw any conclusion as to the status of such a place; cf. C. E. Stevens, *JRS* XLIX (1959), 188 ff.; Bogaers, *op. cit.* 299 ff.

The same holds for the well-known inscriptions from Calleva Atrebatum (Silchester), mentioning a *collegium peregrinorum consistentium Callevae* (*RIB* 69, 70 and 71); they do not tell us anything about any promotion from cantonal capital to chartered town. R. P. Wright comments on *RIB* 69 as follows: 'It is not clear whether the *peregrini* who formed this guild did not possess Roman citizenship, or were "strangers" because their domicile was not Calleva'. In Bogaers, *op. cit.* 306, note 232, I have shown that these *peregrini* must have been 'strangers', i.e. people whose *origo* was not Calleva; they only lived there, had their *domicilium* there: they were *incolae*, not *cives* of Calleva.

Finally I should like to devote a few words to the problem of the status of Verulamium. Miss R. is one of 'those who believe that Tacitus meant what he said when he described Verulamium as a *municipium*, i.e. that it was a chartered town, though whether with Latin or with full Roman status we do not know, already in the first century A.D.' (cf. p. 75, note 24 (C. E. Stevens), and p. 111, note 11, 2 (A. L. F. Rivet)).

The fullest account of all the arguments in favour of the assumption that Verulamium received municipal status—from the Emperor Claudius—is to be found in Frere, *London Institute of Archaeology Bulletin* 4 (1964), 79 ff. The main argument is the passage from Tacitus, *An.* xiv, 33, concerning Boudicca's revolt. After narrating the destruction of the *colonia* of Camulodunum he also mentions the serious consequences of the revolt for Londinium—*cognomento quidem coloniae non insigne*—and the *municipium* of Verulamium. As there are many constitutional inaccuracies in Tacitus' works, there is every reason to doubt whether the word *municipium* is used here in its strictly constitutional sense. Tacitus probably only meant 'town'. In spite of what Sir R. Syme says in his *Tacitus* (1958) II, p. 764, I cannot discover any contrast between the words *municipium* (Verulamium) and *colonia* (Londinium, in a negative sense), as they are used in *An.* xiv, 33. It will further be noticed that, with regard to the same event, Suetonius (*Nero*, 39) speaks of *clades Britannica qua duo praecipua oppida magna civium sociorumque caede direpta sunt*.

Cassius Dio (LXII, 1 and 7) might seem to offer some support to Tacitus' description of Verulamium as a *municipium*. In his story of the Boudiccan revolt Dio refers to the destruction of δύο πόλεις, called a little farther on πόλεις δύο Ῥωμαϊκᾶς, probably meaning the *colonia* of Camulodunum and the *municipium* of Verulamium. It should be realized, however, that Dio may very well have used Tacitus as his source in this case. This is indicated, for instance, by the marked resemblance between the descriptions of the *portenta* preceding the catastrophe in Tacitus (*An.* xiv, 32) and Dio (LXII, 1). But for Tacitus calling Verulamium a *municipium*, it is doubtful if such an idea would ever have occurred to anybody. Anyhow, the arguments in favour of the municipal status of Verulamium can hardly be called convincing. I can see no reason why Claudius should

have founded a *municipium* at Verulamium, or promoted an only very recent settlement there to that status, so soon after the invasion. Nor do the—for the rest very impressive—results of the excavations at St. Albans give adequate grounds for thinking otherwise.

J. E. BOGAERS

M. H. CALLENDER, *ROMAN AMPHORAE*, with index of stamps. London: Oxford University Press for the University of Durham, 1965. Pp. xxix+323, with 7 plates and 27 figs. £10 10s.

The need for a general treatment of Roman amphorae has been acute for some time. Dressel's studies, basic though they still are, dealt only with some aspects of a large subject, and Grenier's summary account (in Déchelette, *Manuel d'archéologie gallo-romaine* VI, 2 (1934), 601) for all its brilliance was too brief and is now largely out of date. The volume of M. H. Callender thus fills a real lacuna. It is a work of undeniable merits and will be a most useful working tool for archaeologists. But it must be said at once that it is a tool to be used with some caution, and, as with many books that are destined to remain fundamental, it runs a risk of perpetuating and transmitting error and misunderstanding. The remarks that follow are not intended to be a full analysis, which would take up too much space, but are meant simply to raise those points that especially call for discussion and comment, and so to make clear the book's virtues and limitations.

If there is a criticism to be made about C.'s method, it is that he has approached his subject from a point of view that would be called provincial with regard to the ancient world. It is notable to begin with that the title, *Roman Amphorae*, promises more than the book offers. The author confines his field of study to the West and omits the complex and varied world of the Eastern Mediterranean. Yet even within the West his horizon has clear limits: from a vantage-point in Britain, his gaze takes in the plains of Gaul and Germany but stops short at the barriers of the Alps and Pyrenees; the archaeology of Italy, Spain, and North Africa is little known to him. Inasmuch as these countries have provided few studies of importance about Roman amphorae this would not be a serious matter, were it not also true that in antiquity, at any rate until the late empire, the chief producing and exporting countries were those of the Mediterranean basin, and Rome by contrast was a consumer market without equal in the entire ancient world. In studying commerce and in trying to discover where the products originated, is it not more natural to start with the centres of production than with exports to remote lands? Would we base a history of (let us say) Sheffield plate upon what is imported by Italy or India, and would we not reasonably maintain that one should begin with Britain itself, the place of manufacture? From this rather parochial view of the problems of ancient trade there derive other limitations of the book. A reader who is surprised in a book on Roman amphorae to see no chapter on the typology, methods of interpretation, or uses of *tituli picti*, will find the answer in the author's lament (p. xxiii) that so few have survived in Britain owing to its adverse climate. Chapter III ('Uses of amphorae after emptying') offers us a list of amphorae in Britain used as burial-urns, and even a catalogue of all examples from the Hadrianic and Antonine Walls known to have served as *pissoirs*. Thus the book opens with a general problem, but soon reverts to matters of somewhat local appeal.

A second limitation consists in the fact that the book is old, even though it carries a recent date. In his preface (p. vi) the author says that his work was ready in 1950 and has been published as it then stood, without further revision. Yet it is well known that the last few years have added a great deal to our knowledge of amphorae, thanks largely to the achievements of underwater archaeology, and especially to the highly successful efforts of Benoît and Lamboglia. Some of C.'s book is thus already out of date; his Index of amphora stamps remains of immense value, but it is antiquated and incomplete. A reviewer's task—ungrateful to him and doubtless unfair to the author—must be to point out the slips and omissions of which only quite recent studies have made us aware. To take one instance, we can no longer follow C. (p. 9), with reference to form 1 Dressel, that 'it is probable . . . that it was exported to the West . . . mainly from the middle of the first century B.C.'; new finds from the *oppidum* of Entremont, destroyed in 123 B.C., and the *épaves* from the coast of Provence, especially that of the Grand Congloué, must carry the dating back by at least a century. Nor is it possible to accept that the widespread globular type from Spain (form 20 Dr.) 'was exported to the West . . . to at least the end of the second century' (p. 20). As is well known, Dressel found in the Torlonia Gardens in Rome eleven fragments of this form of amphora bearing consular dates from the reigns of Valerian and Gallienus; but Italy, as noted above, seems to fall outside the author's idea of the West. Now from Autun in France there is news of a hoard buried in two amphorae of form 20; it is of silver coins mostly from the period between Elagabalus and—once more—Gallienus (*Rev. arch. de l'Est*, 9 (1958), 275 ff.). As it is hardly conceivable that these amphorae remained in use for more than fifty years before being buried, the find would prove that Baetican oil was being shipped to the West as well as Italy down to about A.D. 260; at which point, for reasons that are not quite clear, it seems to have ceased rather abruptly.