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STUDIES IN THE CAMPANIAN 'VILLAE RUSTICAE.'

By R. C. CARRINGTON.

(Plate xv).


I. INTRODUCTION.

The remains of 39 villas have been discovered, up to the present, in the region which was covered by lapilli and ash during the eruption of Vesuvius in A.D. 79. Twelve of these were excavated between the years 1749 and 1782, in the vicinity of Castellammare di Stabia; the rest have been excavated during the last half-century, either in the immediate neighbourhood of Pompeii or in the territory of the modern comuni adjoining it (Boscoreale, Scafati, Gragnano). A list of 36 of the villas arranged in the chronological order of their excavation is given in Rostovtzeff's Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire.¹ Rostovtzeff concludes his note with the words 'Useful work could be done by a scholar who would devote a little time and care to a study of the Campanian "villae rusticae," and endeavour to investigate the history of the buildings.' Unfortunately all of the villas were buried again after their excavation,² and, in investigating the history of the buildings, we have only the scanty information furnished by the reports, which often amounts to nothing at all. Inability to see the buildings, however, would not be such a great disadvantage if, at the time of the excavation, adequate records had been made of the building materials used, and the methods of their use. But in no case was this done completely, and in only a few cases was it done at all; and as a result, we have to be content with the few data furnished by wall-decoration, eked out by an occasional mention of e.g. opus reticulatum, or of the use of alternate courses of bricks and of tufa cut like bricks. Furthermore, in the descriptions of the implements and furniture found in the villas, there is occasionally great lack of precision. Instead of being told

¹ P. 496, ch. i, p. 26. Rostovtzeff's list comprises 36 villas. The following, though unimportant, are also to be noted:—no. 37 (Scafati), Notizie degli Scavi, 1922, p. 478, no. xii; no. 38 (Valle di Pompei), ibid., 1928, p. 375 D; no. 39 (Scafati), loc. cit., no. xv-iii.

² A map, showing the sites of the villas, will be found on plate xiv. Nos. 1—12 are taken from the map in Ruggiero, Degli Scavi di Stabia dal 1749 al 1782: the rest the writer has investigated personally.

² No. 13, the well-known villa at Boscoreale, in which was found a store of silver plate, was not filled in immediately, but was subsequently neglected, and little of it can now be seen.
merely that a large mass of agricultural implements came to light, we should like to know precisely what implements were found, and in what number, since this would be important evidence for deciding what particular type of agriculture the owner of the villa practised. Again, in some cases it was found impossible (through permeation of water from the River Sarno), or was thought unprofitable (because of the paucity of finds) to complete the excavations, and thus our evidence is only partial. This article contains an attempt to extract from the reports on the excavations evidence for the main types of villa found in antiquity in the vicinity of Vesuvius, the kind of men who owned them, the forms of production in which these men engaged, and the dates of the erection of the buildings, to bring the history of these villas into relation with the history of Pompeii, and finally, to draw conclusions about the development of agriculture in the most fertile district of the Italian peninsula during a period of 150 years. We are unable, however, owing to the nature of our evidence, to find an answer to all the enquiries we should like to make. Conclusions can be only general, drawn from a survey of all the villas considered together.

II. THE OWNERS.

To only 9 out of the 39 villas can owners or managers be assigned, but the few names which we possess suffice to give us an idea of the types of landlord which were to be found in the district. They are, in the order in which it will be most convenient to treat them:—

No. 31 (Boscoreale). The emperor.
No. 29 (Boscoreale). Numerius Popidius Florus.
No. 27 (Boscoreale). Asellius (praenomen and cognomen unknown).
No. 19 (Scafati). Gnaeus Domitius Auctus.
No. 23 (Boscotrecase). Lucius Arellius Successus.
No. 13 (Boscoreale). Lucius Caecilius Aphrodisius.
Tiberius Claudius Amphio.
Lucius Brittius Eros.

1 The following are the villas of which too little survives, or too little was excavated, to make them profitable for study and which, for that reason, are not considered further:—
No. 9. Stabiae. Ibid., plate xvi.
No. 12. Stabiae. Ibid., plate xix.
No. 18. Scafati. Ibid., 1900, p. 223 ff.
No. 36. Scafati. Ibid., 1923, p. 284 ff.
At the time of writing, no. 24, the Villa Item or 'Villa of the Mysteries', lying a short distance from the Porta di Ercolano of Pompeii, is still in process of being excavated and is not yet officially open for public inspection. There is every indication that, when the excavation is complete, this villa will furnish valuable information on ancient agricultural processes, but for the present it has seemed better not to include it in this survey.

2 The evidence on which no. 31 is assigned to the emperor is discussed in Rostovtseff, loc. cit. The evidence for the other names varies. For nos. 13, 19, 20, 23, 29, it consists in a name on a seal. The words Aselli Tballus on a seal give both the owner and the manager of no. 27. A travertine cippus, set up in memory of his wife, Plautia Tertulla, gives us the name of the owner in no. 7, while that of P. Fannius Synistor (no. 16) occurs on the neck of a measuring vase and in a graffito from the apodyterium.
No. 20 (Near the Porta del Vesuvio, Pompeii). Titus Siminius Stepanus.
No. 7 (Stabiae). Gaius Pomponius Trophimus.
No. 16 (Boscureale). Publius Fannius Synistor.

The first of the villas had once belonged to Agrippa Postumus, the grandson of Augustus, who was put to death at the beginning of the reign of Tiberius. We may infer that after his death his farm was confiscated by Tiberius, and thereafter remained part of the patrimony of the emperor, since the person in charge at the time of the eruption was an imperial freedman named Ti. Claudius Euthychus. This villa, finely situated on the slope of Vesuvius, whence it enjoyed an unimpeded view of the Gulf, was one of a class of which there were numerous examples on the Bay of Naples, luxurious villas and estates owned by well-known Romans and used by them as occasional residences. They had a ‘rustic’ portion attached to them, partly to pay for their upkeep, and partly to flatter the owner’s pride by providing him with home-made wine.

Numerius Popidius Florus was a member of a native Pompeian gens which had long been prominent in the political life of the city. In the last years of Pompeii, the branch of this gens which was most in evidence bore the praenomen Numerius, and to this branch the owner of villa no. 29 must have belonged. He bears a thoroughly Roman cognomen, and was, therefore, probably freeborn. His villa was discovered in the Contrada Pisanella, in the Comune di Boscoreale, only two miles from Pompeii. There is, thus, nothing to invalidate the assumption that he was the descendant of an aristocratic Pompeian family of long standing, owning this country villa and estate as one source of the fortune which was liberally spent for the city’s embellishment.

The Aselli, to one of whose branches the third owner belonged, seem to have been a local Oscan gens since the name is found written in Oscan characters on a Pompeian tile. The only mention of the gens in Campania outside Pompeii, is contained in an inscription recording two liberti from Puteoli.7

His cognomen indicates that Cn. Domitius Auctus, if not himself a libertus, was probably the son of one. Not many Domitii have

---

1 Tacitus, Annals, i. 6.
2 Cf. the villa of Cicero at Pompeii, from which some of the letters are addressed (the house in the Via dei Sepolcri has no foundation); those of Pompey and Hortensius at Baulli; of Caesar, Licinius Crassus, the orator, and Piso at Baiae; of Mark Antony and Lucullus at Misenum (Beloch, Campanien im Altertum, ed. 2, pp. 178–9, 185–6, 198–9); that of Catulus on the border of the Lucrine Lake (Cicero, Acad. Prior., iii, 25, 80).
4 C.I.L. x, 846. (=Dessau, I.L.S. 6367). Numerius Popidius N.f. Celsinus was ‘adlected’ into the ordo decurionum for his generosity in rebuilding the Temple of Isis after the earthquake of A.D. 63.
5 The name is found in Oscan inscriptions of the pre-Sullan period. Conway, loc. cit.
7 C.I.L., x, 2109.
8 Cf. Duff, Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire, p. 110.
been found in Pompeii, and in the only other cases (two in number) in which the *praenomen* is preserved, it is Lucius. The *gens* may, however, have been represented by two families, the Lucii and the Gnæci Domitii, or, as at Rome, the *praenomina*, Lucius and Gnaeus, may have alternated in succeeding generations of the same family. One member, at any rate, of a Pompeian branch of the *gens* can be connected with the wine trade, though the precise form which the connection took is doubtful: this is a woman, named Domitia Modesta, whose name occurs on an *amphora*.¹

L. Arelius Successus, too, bears a *cognomen* which denotes a servile origin and was most likely a freedman. Four inscriptions mentioning this *gens* have been found in Pompeii, three of which are relevant to the present purpose. Two of these are from *amphorae*, one bearing the name ‘Mnester Areli,’² and the other ‘Eutychus Areli.’³ If these do not both concern the owner of our villa, they show that the Pompeian Arelii had a family-interest in the wine-trade. That the *gens* was Oscan, is indicated by the inscription which occurs on a monument in the Via dei Sepolcri,⁴ mentioning an Arellia Tertulla, whose father bore the Oscan *praenomen* Numerius.

Of the three men whose names were found in no. 13, L. Caecilius Aphrodisius seems to be a freedman of the family of the Pompeian auctioneer, L. Caecilius Jucundus; and strength is added to this suggestion by the occurrence of L. Brittius Eros among the witnesses in the banker’s tablets.⁵ Several Ti. Claudii also were found there. It seems, then, fairly certain that these three men were citizens of Pompeii, but the precise nature of their relationship to one another is not clear. The residential portion of the villa, though sumptuous, seems designed only for the needs of a single family,⁶ and this makes it hard to believe that the villa was owned by the three men in partnership. They are more likely to have been joint managers of the agricultural part of it. The proximity of the imperial villa no. 31 (both were found at Boscoreale) makes the presence of Ti. Claudius Amphio interesting, but it would be unsafe to build a theory of imperial ownership on this. The connection of the other two with the Pompeian auctioneer suggests that the real owner was a Pompeian citizen.

Finally, we have three men with Greek *cognomina*, who may be either freedmen or resident aliens. The gentile name Siminius is rare, and, except for this example, is only found in Campania at

---

¹ *C.I.L.* iv, 5818.
² *C.I.L.* iv, 5863.
³ *C.I.L.* iv, 2643.
⁵ *C.I.L.* iv, 2. *Tab. Cer. xcvi. 5.* That the Caecili were a *gens* of long standing in Pompeii is indicated by the occurrence of a Q. Caecilius among the *candidati antiqui*, as candidate for the quaeceptorship, an office which no longer existed after the foundation of the colony.
⁶ See below, p. 119.
Called by Lucilius a second Delos, Puteoli was a town in which all manner of foreign merchants must have congregated. In view of this, and in consideration of the well-known Greek influence in all this neighbourhood, our Siminius may have been a Greek domicled in Italy. The other two, with purely Roman gentilicia, were most likely freedmen. Two facts taken together show that in Gaius Pomponius Trophimus we are dealing not with a freedman manager, but with a freedman owner. In the first place, the farm was designed to accommodate a landlord of moderate means, permanently resident, and, in the second place, the name of Trophimus occurs on a cippus, dedicated to the memory of his wife, which was found in the farm.

From this detailed analysis of the names which we possess, may be drawn two conclusions of some interest for the general economic history of Pompeii. In the first place, the ubiquitous freedman, who played a prominent part in the industrial life of the town, had already found his way into the country and had begun to take his place beside wealthy, aristocratic families, as landowner and farmer. We are reminded of the career of Trimalchio, who, having made a fortune in overseas trade, purchased all the estates that had belonged to his patron. The rapid success of freedmen in this branch of business is partially explained for us by a passage in Pliny’s Natural History, where the writer praises the improvements wrought in the cultivation of the vine by certain freedmen, among whom is one, Vetuleius Aegialus, from Campania. Coming from the provinces where methods of viticulture varied, and always having a shrewd eye for the most profitable, these freedmen not only infused new blood into the class of Italian landed proprietors, but brought new methods of agriculture with them and thus made their contribution to the prosperity of Italy during the first half of the first century A.D.

The second conclusion concerns the colony which Sulla settled at Pompeii immediately after the Social War, as a punishment for the help which the town gave to the cause of the allies. Eight of the villas which we have so far considered were found in the vicinity of Pompeii itself, and the ninth in the territory of Stabiae. Of the first eight, five seem to have belonged to Pompeian citizens (nos. 13, 19, 23, 27, 29), one to a resident alien (no. 20), two to men whom we have no reason to connect with Pompeii (nos. 16 and 31). That from Stabiae was owned by a man with a purely Roman gentilicum. Moreover, of the five Pompeian citizens which we have just mentioned, Popidius (no. 29), Asellius (no. 27), and Arelius

---

1 C.I.L. x, 2960. M. Siminius Crescens. We shall see later that no. 20 cannot really be counted as a rustic villa (p. 116), but, as the precise nature of the villa is not really clear, and as the name does not materially affect our main conclusions, it is included here for the sake of completeness.

2 See below, p. 121.

3 Petronius, Saturion, 76.

4 xiv, 48 ff.
(no. 23), belonged to local families which can be traced in Pompeii before the time of the Sullan colony, 1 while one of the freedman-managers of no. 13 had been the slave of a family of similar antiquity. 2 This suggests that families of this type predominated in the territory near to the city. May we, then, see here a reason for that absence of violent ill-feeling between the old Pompeiani and the new coloni, which, according to Cicero, characterised the purely economic side of the Sullan settlement? 3 We know that the Dictator Sulla destroyed Stabiae as a punishment for the part it played in the Social War. 4 Can it be, that, when the colony was settled at Pompeii, what was parcelled out among the Sullan veterans was, not a portion of the city’s own territory confiscated for the purpose, but that of her luckless neighbour Stabiae? If so, few of the Pompeiani need have been disturbed (that there was some slight disturbance seems implied in the passage of Cicero), while the indirect result of the settlement was a considerable enlargement of the city’s territory. This theory gives an intelligible explanation of the distinction which Cicero draws between the original settlement and a subsequent dispute. 5 The settlement was such that both Pompeiani and coloni could accept it without ill-will. Difficulties were caused by some technical question connected with the voting at the local elections, the precise nature of which we do not know, but which could be expected to arise when a large new element had been intruded into the population.

III. TYPES OF VILLA.

In discussing these villas, Rostovtzeff 6 notices three different types:—

(1) ‘A combination of a fair, sometimes even luxurious, summer residence and of a real “villa rustica” with rooms appropriated for the agricultural exploitation of a rather large estate.’ ‘It must be assumed,’ he adds, ‘that the owners of these villas did not live in them, but resided in cities, and came to stay in the villas from time to time.’

(2) ‘A real farm-house, modest, spacious, and clean, built for the use of a well-to-do farmer, who probably lived in his villa all the year round.’

1 C.I.L. x, 794—a Popidius holds the quaestorship, an office which can only have existed in the days of the pre-Sullan municipium. Conway, op. cit., nos. 44–5 cites another Popidius as medidix tationis. For Asellius see p. 6, n. 3; for Arelius, P. 8, n. 1.

2 For Caecilius, cf. C.I.L. iv, 29, 30, 36, recording a Caecilius who was a candidate for the quaestorship.

3 Pro Sulla, 21, 62, in causa utrique est atque jucundus (sc. P. Sulla), ut non altera demusse, sed utrique constituise videatur.

4 For the evidence, see Beloch, Campanien, p. 248–9.

5 Cicero (Pro Sulla, 21, 60–62) is clearly drawing a distinction between the colonial settlement immediately succeeding the Social War, which is said to have been regarded by the Pompeiani as not unfavourable, and a dispute which arose and continued for many years de ambulatione ac de suffragis suis, and was decided by the patroni coloniae to the satisfaction of both parties.

(3) 'An agricultural factory run by slaves, and visited from time to time by the owner.'

Certain villas tally readily with one or other of these descriptions. The imperial estate over which Ti. Claudius Eutychus was procurator clearly belonged to the first class. A country inn, like no. 28, selling wine retail, consumed 'on the premises,' can have belonged to neither the first nor the third class. The walls, covered with whitewashed plaster, show that its inhabitants were more than slaves: yet no wealthy landlord would have found it worth his while to sell his produce retail in that manner. The owner must have been a permanent resident, tied to his restaurant for his livelihood. Or again, adjoining no. 25, was a 'solid and elegant' tomb in which were found two travertine portrait busts, and, in the lower of the two storeys of which the interior was composed, a columbarium with thirty-two loculi. The villa is modest in size; its best rooms have only roughly plastered walls; the most expensive kind of household utensil found there was a saucer of Arretine ware. All this suggests that the villa was the home of a farmer-owner, living in the country and having his family-vault situated on his farm. It follows that both no. 25 and no. 28 must be placed in the second class. No. 34, containing factories for the manufacture of cheese, wine, and to all appearance bread, and one room at least which was used as an ergastulum, is a good example of the third class.

With most villas, however, classification is not so easy. Some, though called 'villae rusticae' in the reports, are so 'urban,' both in situation and in decoration that it is best to rule them out of consideration at once, for instance, nos. 4, 11, 20, 21. No. 4 was a large building, which had once contained wall-paintings, though but few traces of them remained at the time of excavation. The excavator could not pronounce on the uses to which the rooms were put, but the existence of an ambulatio and palaestra reminds us of the 'Villa di Diomede' in the 'Via dei Sepolcri' at Pompeii, and suggests that this villa was rather suburbana than rustica in type. The site of no. 11 was on an eminence near Stabiae, looking over the valley of the Sarno towards Pompeii, Herculanenum, and Naples. It had only one storey and no atrium, either 'rustic' or 'urban.' No agricultural implements are recorded as having been found here, and the only 'rustic' building was a kitchen adjoining the entrance. The walls of the room were elegantly decorated, and the floors were of fine mosaic. It was, then, built for other purposes than that of farming, but whether as a permanent residence or as a summer retreat, we cannot say. In no. 20, near the Porta del Vesuvio of

---

1 See above, p. 112, and fig. 16.
2 See below, p. 122, and fig. 16.
3 A photograph of them is given in N.d.S., 1923, p. 432.
4 See below, pp. 124-5, and fig. 16.
5 At Stabiae; Ruggiero, op. cit., plate xi.
6 Ruggiero, op. cit., plate xviii.
Pompeii, no *torcularia* or *cellae* were discovered, and among the objects found there is no trace of agricultural implements. Whereas a true ‘villa rustica’ should be isolated in its own grounds, these buildings formed, not an isolated dwelling but a group of dwellings—a fact which led Sogliano to think that he had lighted upon the remains of the *pagus Augustus felix suburbanus*. The only ‘finds’ which could throw any light on the purpose of the buildings consist of saws and horse harness. Thus, for information about ‘villae rusticae,’ this, as much as the previous villas, is useless. The reports on no. 21, scattered and unsatisfactory, contain no plan. Its situation—just outside the north wall of Pompeii near the Porta del Vesuvio—suggests that it was connected more with the city than with the country. The few objects found in it tell us nothing. A tufa *phallos*, however, was discovered high up on one of the walls. Such emblems are very common inside the city, especially on the walls of shops, but so far none have been found in other ‘villae rusticae.’ This confirms what is suggested by the situation of the villa, that it was a ‘suburban’ and not a ‘rustic’ edifice. These four villas, then, will not be discussed further.

We have no ready criterion for distinguishing the villa of a permanent resident from that of an absentee landlord. It would be convenient if we could assign to the latter category all those which have walls decorated in a well-known Pompeian style. But a consideration of no. 22 shows that such a method would lead to unwarranted simplification. This villa is modest in size; it has a bedroom (no. 3) decorated in the first style and a larger room (no. 4)—possibly the *triclinium*—decorated in the second, but beyond this there is no decoration. The objects found in the course of the excavation consisted of agricultural implements, kitchen utensils, and terracotta vases—all things of strict necessity and nothing of a purely ornamental nature. In villas owned by wealthy, absentee landlords, articles of value, and even silver ware, are not uncommon. There can be little doubt that no. 22 was owned by a resident farmer, who employed a painter from the city to decorate his two private rooms, but who could afford no more. The excavator, Paribeni, gives his impression of the owner—‘un uomo agiato che volesse sorvegliare da vicino la sua azienda agricola, piuttosto che uno scapato che sacrificasse tutte le ragioni dell’ utilità al lusso e alla moda.’ At most, then, in seeking to determine which of these villas was owned by a practical farmer, and which, by an absentee owner, we can arrive only at probability. It will be convenient in this study to follow Rostovtzeff’s division into three classes, but since hard and fast rules are impossible, his first class will be widened to include all those villas in which a

---

1 Ibid., 1895, p. 495. The notice *vacator cave malum* shows that the walls of the buildings were accessible to people who had no right there.

2 Ibid., p. 499.

3 N.d.S., 1923, p. 64 ff. See fig. 16, p. 126.
strongly ‘urban’ tendency is noticeable in the decoration and arrangement of the rooms or in the objects found in them. When this is the case, we must regard the owner as a townsman—whether he actually lived in the town or not—looking to the country merely to find a profitable investment.

That there were many such capitalists in Pompeii may be inferred from the subjects of the wall-decoration and from the *amphora* inscriptions found in a good number of the larger houses. Indeed, such discoveries in Pompeii and the remains of the ‘villae rusticae,’ are mutually complementary, the former showing us ‘at home,’ as it were, those same men whose economic activities are reflected in the latter. A typical example of such wall-decoration is contained in the house of the Vettii, where cupids are represented busily engaged in various processes connected with the production and sale of wine. Less spectacular, but no less important, are the *graffiti* scratched on the *amphorae*. In them we find the names of various types of people—sometimes the name of the maker of the produce which the *amphora* contained, sometimes the name of the one to whom the *amphora* was sent, sometimes those of both. These *graffiti* have been little studied, but their cumulative importance is considerable. One conclusion which can be derived from them is especially interesting in view of what has been said already about the continued predominance, after the planting of the Sullan colony, of the old Oscan aristocracy in the immediate vicinity of Pompeii. The *amphora* inscriptions show that certain of the most prominent Pompeian families, which can be traced back in the history of the city, at any rate, to the Oscan period, had a definite interest in the wine trade, e.g., the Stlaborii, Marii, Popidii, Vibili, Holconii, and others of less note. Furthermore, there is no certain instance of a freeborn member of such a family participating in any form of industry except agriculture: in general, the more ‘urban’ industries (fulling, dyeing, breadmaking, etc.) seem to have been left in the hands of freedmen or newly-enriched parvenus.

These two sets of facts, taken together, suggest that down to the very last years of the existence of Pompeii, its old Oscan families formed an almost exclusively land-owning aristocracy and were little affected by the newer industrial developments, of which there are signs all over the city from the Augustan age onwards.

---

1 When a name occurs in full, it is either in the genitive or the dative case or in the ablative with *ab*. Occasionally two of these occur together (e.g., *C.I.L.*, iv, 5788, 5712), but in such cases, it is quite clear that one person is the sender and the other the recipient. Owing, however, to the abbreviated form in which the names often occur, it is sometimes doubtful whether the sender or the recipient is intended. Obviously we are only warranted in claiming as actual producers of wine those whose names indicate that they are the senders of the *amphora*. As a working formula, the following may be adopted. When a name occurs in the genitive or in the ablative with *ab*, it probably indicates that the bearer of the name produced the contents of the *amphora*; when a name is in the dative, we cannot be certain whether its bearer was an absentee landlord to whom the produce was being sent, or an entirely extraneous person, and, consequently, such names cannot be used as evidence; when only the initials or a truncated form of the name is given, the *graffiti* are useless for our purpose.
Coming to the details of the 'villae rusticae' which we are considering, we are able to assign twenty of them, with greater or less probability, to one or other of Rostovzeff's three classes. The following is a list of these twenty villas, with a brief indication of the evidence which has led me to assign them to the various classes.

**Class 1. Villas owned by absentee landlords residing only occasionally.**

*No. 3 (Stabiae).* This villa was not completely excavated, but the discovery of mosaics and a marble pavement, as well as a glance at the general plan, suggest that the part uncovered belonged to a large and luxurious house.

*No. 13 (Boscoreale)* is a large and elaborate villa, in which the proprietor's apartments are easily distinguishable from the rustic portion. The former contained wall-decoration of the second style, a three-room bathing-establishment with mosaic pavements, a *triclinium, andrium, and lararium.* That the owner was not resident at the time of the eruption is proved by the disorder prevailing in his portion of the house, in contrast with the perfect order of the rustic quarter.

*No. 16 (Boscoreale).* The proprietor's portion was extensive and magnificent, and shut off from the rustic quarters. It possessed three *triclinia,* one opening to the south, one to the north and east (with views of Vesuvius, Stabiae and Mons Lactarius), and one, less splendid, opening on the *cortile.* The owner was clearly a man of great wealth.

*No. 27 (Boscoreale)* was spacious and rich in wall-decoration. The plan was symmetrical and did not include any of the normal appurtenances of a rustic villa, e.g., *torcularia, pistrinum.* The absence of the latter, which was a necessity, and the discovery of a stamp for marking pastry, show that there must have been a *pistrinum* in the vicinity, and suggest that all these were grouped in another, undiscovered rustic building (as in Pliny's well-known villa).

*No. 29 (Boscoreale)* contained elegant wall-decoration and an excellent set of baths and water-supply. One portion of the building was entered from outside and not from the *cortile,* and consisted of dormitories for slaves. The owner was a Pompeian citizen.

*No. 30 (Boscoreale)* contains elegant wall-paintings of the third style.

---

1 If the plan of the villa, its size, decoration, and furnishings, or the objects found in it, are as luxurious as their counterparts from the wealthier houses found in Pompeii itself; if, that is, they signify a copiousness of wealth and a breadth of culture such as we should not expect a permanently resident farmer to display, that villa is assigned to the first class. Clearly the most difficult distinction to draw is that between the first and second classes, and, as we can no longer view the buildings, classification will largely depend on the impression created on our minds as we read the reports.

2 Ruggiero, op. cit., plate 3, fig. 2a.


5 *N.d.S.,* 1921, p. 426. See fig 16.

6 *ibid.,* p. 442. See above, pp. 112.

7 *ibid.,* p. 461.
FIG. 16. PLANS OF CAMPANIAN ‘VILLAE RUSTICAE.’
The Roman numerals indicate the style of the wall painting. In the scale in the centre, for '23' read '28.'
Adapted, by permission, from the Notizie degli Scavi.
No. 31 (Boscoreale) was owned by the emperor, who could have visited it but rarely, if at all. There was an elegant and well-decorated proprietor’s wing, and a large rustic atrium.¹

No. 33 (Gragnano). The ambitious plan of the villa suggests that it was more than a mere farm-house. It consisted of two distinct portions, (i) an atrium (A) with the surrounding rooms decorated in the fourth style, (ii) rustic rooms round a cortile (C).²

No. 35 (Scafati). The north side of the cortile had wall-paintings of the fourth style. The owner seems not to have been much in residence, since no water was ‘laid on,’ but rain-water was collected.³

Class II: Real farm-houses owned by permanently resident farmers.

No. 1 (Stabiae). The walls were either entirely bare or roughly plastered, only the bathroom being painted. The plan was neither large nor elaborate. Thus, it can hardly have been a summer residence. On the other hand, silver-ware and a bust of a philosopher, found here, show that the inhabitants were more than slaves under a vilicus.⁴

No. 2 (Stabiae) was unambitious in plan and humble in its appurtenances. The walls were undecorated and may originally have had plaster.⁵

No. 5 (Stabiae) seems rather ‘urban’ in plan, since the main entrance led into the atrium and not into the cortile, as is usual in a ‘villa rustica.’⁶

No. 7 (Stabiae). The travertine cippus, set up by C. Pomponius Trophimus to his wife, shows that the owner was, or that a past owner had been, a permanent resident.⁷

No. 10 (Stabiae). One room of this house, apparently with its front on a road, was used as a shop for selling wine. Another room, the window of which overlooks the main entrance to the farmyard, and which, therefore, probably belonged to the ‘ overseer,’ opens off a painted room that must have been used by the owner, suggesting that owner and ‘ overseer’ were one and the same person. No wealthy capitalist would have found it worth while to sell wine retail.⁸

No. 14 (Boscoreale). Part of the house, with a separate entrance, had roughly plastered walls and, in one room, rough wall-paintings.⁹

No. 22 (Boscoreale). See above, p. 117.

No. 25 (Boscoreale). The living-rooms had walls covered with rough plaster. The bathrooms comprised a frigidarium and a caldarium. Adjoining the villa was a family tomb, with the busts of a man and a woman, and 32 loculi. ¹⁰

¹ Ibid., 1922, p. 459. See above, pp. 112, and fig. 16.
² Ibid., 1923, p. 271. See fig. 16.
³ ibid., p. 280.
⁴ Ruggiero, op cit., plate ix.
⁵ Ibid., plate x, fig. 1a.
⁶ Ibid., plate xii.
⁷ Ibid., plate xiv.
⁸ Ibid., plate xvii. See below, p. 124, n. 3.
⁹ N.d.S., 1897, p. 391 ff.
No. 28 (Boscoreale) was a country inn, run by a permanent resident. It had a seat (9) along the wall facing the road, a kettle for warm drinks, a trough (8) for watering beasts, weights and a balance, a stable (C) and granary (3). Graffiti, such as Cerdo hic bibit, were found. The owner produced his own wine.¹

CLASS III: LARGE-SCALE FACTORIES OWNED BY ABSENTEE LANDLORDS AND RUN BY SLAVES.

No. 26 (Boscoreale). The floors were all of beaten earth, the walls entirely rustic, and no costly articles were found. All this suggests that the villa was inhabited only by a vilicus and slaves.²

No. 34 (Gragnano). This villa contained many small rooms, with walls entirely bare, arranged round a courtyard (A) after the manner of the ‘Gladiatorial Barracks’ at Pompeii. A set of stocks found in one of the two atria (B) indicates that it was used as an ergastulum.³

Results of the enquiry.

Of these twenty villas, then, nine seem to belong to the first class, the same number to the second, and the other two to the third. The statistics, of course, give nothing more precise than a rough indication of the state of affairs prevalent in the district, but they warrant the general conclusion that, in this part of the country, absentee investors and permanently resident farmers were about equal in number, while slave-run factories were in a minority. In part the latter fact can be explained by the character of the countryside. Most of these villas were situated either on the slopes of Vesuvius, at that time covered with grass, and not the grey waste of lava that they are to-day,⁴ or on the hills that fringe the valley of the Sarno to the south. The volcano had long been quiescent and was regarded as extinct. Free from its terror, the countryside must have been unrivalled as a site for summer residences, and an owner of an estate here would naturally reside on it at least part of the year; hence the paucity of mere slave-run factories.⁵ On the other hand, the volcanic soil was very fertile—too valuable to waste—and purely summer residences would have been especially uneconomic, and we may assume that the number of ‘outsiders’ owning luxurious mansions was relatively low. Romans seeking diversion went to the northern shore of the Bay of Naples and to the Phlegraei Campi, where the land was cheaper and the situation, indeed, pleasanter. Roughly, half the owners were permanent residents and, of the others, the large majority must have been citizens of neighbouring towns. Of five villas, which we assign to the first class, and the names of

¹ Loc. cit. C.I.L. iv, 6867–9. See below, p. 123, and fig. 16.
² ibid., p. 423. See fig. 16.
³ Ibid., 1923, p. 275. See fig. 16.
⁴ Cf. Strabo, v, 247. ἀγροὶ περιοικομένων παγκάλωτοι πλῆν τῆς κορυφῆς.
⁵ One of the two villas of the third type (no. 34) was found low down in the Sarno valley, the part of the district least suitable for a summer residence.
whose owners we possess, only one is known definitely not to have belonged to a local man—that of the emperor. The agricultural industry round the valley of the Sarno at the beginning of our era was not run by large-scale enterprise from the capital or from other big cities, but, in the main, by local residents.

IV. THE CHIEF FORMS OF PRODUCTION.

It is possible, by taking the villas one by one, and by considering at once the use to which the rooms were put, so far as this can be ascertained, the implements and furniture found, and the subjects represented in the wall-paintings, to form an idea of the nature and extent of the productive activities which were pursued on each particular farm. We should expect a priori to find these activities concerned in the main with the growing of the vine and the olive. Such was the case generally in Italy, and is a state of affairs reflected all through the writings of Cato, Varro, and Columella. Small crops, such as beans and lupins, must have been grown on all the farms, including the large wine and oil factories, since even at the present day farmers in the district, who rely on the vine and the olive for their main sustenance, find it convenient to grow them between the rows of vines or among the olive trees. No. 14 is the only villa on which we find beans actually mentioned: Faba mālxxxvii was scratched in charcoal on the granary wall. They, or something similar, must, however, have been common and hardly concern our discussion of the broader social and economic questions arising out of a study of the villas. Wine and oil, then, were the staple products of all the villas with which we are dealing, though in all but nineteen of them the limited area excavated or the paucity of finds makes it impossible to point to actual traces surviving of such forms of production. For these nineteen villas the evidence is of various kinds, consisting now in the existence among the buildings of a cellā vinaria or a cellā olearia for storing large quantities of wine and oil (nos. 2, 10, 13, 14, 16, 19, 25, 28, 29, 32, 33, 35), now in the discovery of a torcularium (nos. 2, 8, 10, 14, 15, 19, 25, 28, 30, 33, 34), or a trapezium (no. 26), now in small implements suitable for the cultivation of the vine and the olive, such as picks, hoes, and pruning-hooks (nos. 13, 19, 26, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35), or wall-paintings containing Bacchic scenes (nos. 14, 16, 29, 30, 35), now in the discovery of pali intended for use in propping up the vines or in the mention of such pali in graffiti (nos. 25, 31, 33).¹ The nineteen² villas on which such

¹ No. 25. Palus acutus DCCCXL qui non acuti CDXX summa MGCC (C.I.L., iv, 6886). No. 31.
² These nineteen villas, arranged in the classes to which they were assigned above, are:

Class I (absentee landlords, residing only occasionally), nos. 13, 16, 29, 30, 31, 33, 35.

Class II (permanently resident farmers), nos. 2, 5, 10, 14, 25, 28.

Class III (large-scale factories run by slaves), nos. 26, 34.

evidence occurs, suggest several interesting conclusions. In eleven of them, the production of wine and oil is the only large-scale activity for which we have any evidence at all,¹ and these eleven farms all fall within the first or the third of the three classes into which the villas were divided in the last section, i.e., among the villas owned by non-resident or only occasionally resident landlords. The eight remaining farms, on the other hand, which show signs of some other form of production besides that of wine and oil, fall, with two exceptions,² wholly within the second class, i.e., among the permanently resident farmers. This would suggest that the real farm-houses of the second class were less specialised in their activities than the larger enterprises of the first. In each one, there is the usual toculusarium and cella for the crushing of the grape and the storing of the wine, as well as a pistrinum and other indications that bread for domestic use was made on the spot; but in each one, also, there is something more. No. 10 was a combination of farm and shop, in which wine was both produced and sold retail.³ No. 28 was a country inn with accommodation for travellers and their equipment.⁴ Nos. 5, 14, and possibly 25, produced cereals.⁵ These villas are interesting because they make it quite clear that, while the more capitalised establishments of Classes I and III concentrated on the intensive cultivation of a single crop, the small farmers, who in number were roughly equal to the absentee investors, in general found it profitable to carry on a variety of interests.

Della Corte remarks⁶ that, between the villas discovered on the lower slopes of Vesuvius and those of the Sarno valley, no difference in type is to be noted, and from this he draws the conclusion that the valley of the Sarno, which to-day has been rendered eminently suitable for grain by the opening of numerous irrigation canals, was in antiquity covered chiefly with vineyards and olive-groves. A consideration of no. 34, however, which was discovered in the Comune di Gragnano, low down in the Sarno valley, is enough to show that generalisations are dangerous. It was run by slaves,⁷ managed by a vilicus,⁸ and, as was noticed by the excavator, was concerned with at least two different forms of business—the production of wine and the

¹ Viz.: Class I, nos. 16, 29, 30, 31, 33, 35; Class III, no. 26; unclassifiable, nos. 8, 15, 19, 32.
² Viz.: nos. 13 and 34. No. 34 is discussed on pp. 31-2. No. 13 contained a large threshing-floor, indicating the cultivation of cereals.
³ One room, jutting out from the rest of the building, and with a wide opening apparently fronting on a road, contained two moderately large dolas, reminding one of the taberna vinaria of Varro, De ling. lat., lib. viii, 555, p. 185. The existence of a toculusarium shows that the villa produced wine, though the cella attached to the press is not very large.

⁴ See above, p. 122.
⁵ Nos. 5 and 14 contained threshing floors, the former's being a large one. In no. 25 a plough was found which seems to have served for some form of agricultural production other than that of the vine.
⁶ N.d.s., 1925, p. 271.
⁷ See above, p. 122.
⁸ The discovery of earrings and bracelets in one of the rooms suggests that, if women were not employed on the farm, at least the vilicus had his wife to supervise the cheese factory which it contained.
making of cheese. But its industrial enterprise seems not to have ended here. The villa contains the best and most scientifically arranged pistrinum in any yet unearthed. The room in which this was situated was itself very large for ordinary domestic purposes; the mill was heavy and required more than the energy of slaves to pull it round; the circular oven was nearly two and a half metres in diameter. If we compare the oven with that of the large Pompeian bakery in Regio vi, Insula iii, no. 27, which is roughly three metres in diameter, it is hard not to believe that we have here yet a third branch of industry comprised in this large establishment. If this is so, whence came the grain which was prepared in the interesting apparatus with which the pistrinum was furnished? Where is it more likely to have been grown than on the spot? Without further evidence, we must not accept too readily Della Corte’s generalisation about the resemblance between the villas of Vesuvius’ slopes and those of the Sarno valley, since one of the latter has been found to be different from anything found elsewhere. There is really no strict uniformity in the industries carried on in these villas. On the whole, as we should expect, the larger the establishment, the more specialised its activity, but even in the largest and most ‘capitalised’ of them, factories making three different products existed side by side.

V. THE DATES OF THE VILLAS.

It is possible, chiefly on the basis of Mau’s classification of Pompeian wall-painting into four styles and the respective periods to which he assigns them, to come to certain tentative conclusions on the history of the ‘villae rusticae.’ The first style coincides throughout with the so-called Tufa Period of construction, which falls between the second Punic War and the Social War, and thus covers roughly the second century B.C. The second style extends roughly from the foundation of the Sullan colony in Pompeii to the time of Augustus, whose conquest of Egypt opened the way for Alexandrian motifs and led to the third style. The fourth style came into vogue about the middle of the first century A.D., and remained till the destruction of the city. The data, however, for investigating the history of the villas are limited in two ways. In the first place, Mau’s conclusions were only worked out after many of the villas excavated had been

---

1 In the villa were found a cella (p. 120, no. 34, F), a torcularium, a large room containing wooden beams (E), perhaps for splitting up into vine-props, and two hoes. Furthermore, skeletons of oxen were discovered in a stabulum (no. 2), and, most important of all, a large bronze vessel, suitable for the handling of large quantities of milk, which suggested to the excavator that part of the farm (D) was used as a cheese factory. Milk could readily be obtained from the Mens Lactarius, the modern Monte Lattare above Gragnano, the milk from which was famous in antiquity for its richness and medicinal properties. Cf. Beloch, op. cit., p. 245.

2 A special apparatus was discovered, designed for the preparation of grain, of which, at the time of writing the report, Della Corte promised a special study.

3 Cf., Mau-Kelier, Pompeii—Its Life and Art, p. 388. Cf. fig. 16.
filled in: hence, in these cases, no method of classifying the wall-decoration existed, and, instead of classification, we find appreciative epithets without historical significance. For none of the Stabian villas have we any evidence at all as to date, and the same is true of many of those excavated later. In the second place, the reference of a wall-painting to a particular style, and so to a particular period, only gives us a terminus post quem for the existence of the villa, since wall-decoration could be renewed. This means that the villas in which the only datable material consists of wall-painting of a late style are useless for our purpose; the buildings themselves might have been constructed much earlier. Only if there is independent evidence that such buildings do not belong to an earlier period, can we regard them as contemporary with their wall-paintings. First- or second-style decoration, being of 150 or 100 years' antiquity at the time of the eruption, is more important for our purposes. Ten villas in all contained wall-decoration which, at the time of the excavation, could be assigned to one or the other of the four styles, but three of these\(^1\) have to be ruled out at once, since independent evidence that the buildings do not long antedate the wall-paintings is completely lacking. It will be convenient to consider the remaining seven in the chronological order of the earliest dates at which we can prove that they were in existence.

No. 22. Of first-style wall-painting this villa contains the sole example, and even here, one room only was found so decorated. A glance at the plan,\(^2\) however, shows that, with the possible exception of an outhouse of uncertain purpose, all parts of the villa must have been built at the same time. The villa, then, belongs to the period preceding the sending of the Sullan colony, roughly to the second century B.C. Of its later history, little can be said. One room was decorated in the second style, and the report states (without, however quoting the evidence for the statement) that certain modifications had been made in the original disposition of the rooms with the object of rendering the building more 'rustic.' It concludes with the remark that the owner did not follow the general tendency deplored by Varro, to separate the villa more and more from agricultural purposes, and to fill it, in the manner later described by Pliny, with libraries, museums, aviaries, and fish-ponds.\(^3\)

No 13. This villa also, though its earliest wall-paintings are of the second style, contains some indication of having been built in part before the advent of the colony. In the kitchen was a lararium, said by the excavator to be of very ancient structure, and in the same room was a receptacle made of large blocks of tufa, such as best suit the Tufa Period preceding the foundation of the colony. Along the

---

\(^1\) The wall-paintings belong to the third (no. 30) or fourth (nos. 33 and 35) styles. Of the earlier history of the villas we know nothing.

\(^2\) Fig. 16.

\(^3\) N.d.S., 1923, p. 65.
wall dividing the cortile from the cella were found many tiles bearing Oscan inscriptions. The villa, then, appears to go back at any rate to the beginning of the first century B.C. The cortile in its present form was more recent, being surrounded by walls faced either in brick or in opus mixtum (one course of tufa bricks alternating with two of red brick), but the ruins are dilapidated and overgrown with weed, and a thorough examination of them is impossible.

No. 29. The earliest wall-decoration found in the villa of N. Popidius Florus belongs to the second style. The remains of two columns built into the walls of the rooms to the north of the cortile show that, originally larger, it was later restricted to make space for two extra rooms. As one of these rooms was decorated in the second style, the cortile must belong, at latest, to the earlier part of the period covered by this style. The whole villa, with the exception of a small room obviously added later, forms an integral whole with the cortile, and is to be assigned to the same period. The sun-dial of Nocera tufa is in keeping with an early date. The villa, then, was built at latest at the beginning of the first century B.C.: the size of the original cortile was restricted during the first half of the century, and one of the rooms thus formed was used as a dining-room. With the exception of one room, which was decorated in the third style, the house remained unaltered till after the middle of the first century A.D., when it was largely redecorated in the fourth style. After this redecoration, and, therefore, within a decade or two of the eruption, the dining-room ceased to be used as such and was converted into a kitchen and workshop. This is a further example of an increase in the 'rustication' of a villa.

No. 16. Found in the vicinity of no. 13 at Boscoreale, this villa seems to have been built at a later period. The wall-decoration is of the early second style. In a wall of reticulate facing was found a tufa tablet bearing the words Mario structor. It is unlikely that a builder who had been responsible merely for repairs or restorations to the original building would have set up such a tablet to advertise his work, and we probably have here a relic of the original builder. If so, the villa itself belongs to the period of reticulate wall-facing. The transition from the quasi-reticulate facing of the period immediately following the advent of the colony to the full reticulate facing took place before the age of Augustus,¹ and this piece of wall with its tablet thus suggests that the villa itself, as well as the decoration belongs to the period of the second style. On the 9th of May, A.D. 12, a sale was held in the villa, as we learn from a graffito found in the andrium—vii idus Maias auct(io) fac(ta) Germanico co(n)sp(ule). What was it that was sold on that date? Had the sale concerned another farm, the name of the other farm would surely have been mentioned. We hear in Cato of a lex oleae pendentis vendundae,

¹ Cf. Mau-Kelsey, op. cit., p. 43.
of a *lex vini pendenti vendundi*, of a *lex oleae legendae* and of a *lex vini legendi*.\(^1\) We do not know how the contracts for these works were let out, but, it seems certain that if they were let out by auction, the sale would not take place till the fruit was already on the boughs and could be seen by prospective bidders; and on the 9th of May this was not possible. Hence, it is unlikely that the sale concerned the produce of the farm in question. It looks, then, as though it was the villa itself that changed hands. The purchaser at that time, however, cannot have been the latest owner, P. Fannius Synistor, because an amatory inscription found in the *apodyterium* and addressed to him, implies that he was still in his prime and not in his dotage, and further, the rim of the vase, on which his name was found, was in quite new condition. The villa, then, was erected in the first half of the first century B.C.; in A.D. 12, it was up for sale, and at the time of the eruption it was in the hands of a freedman.

No. 27. A glance at the plan\(^2\) of the villa of Asellius with its perfect orientation and symmetry, shows that it must have been planned and built as a whole. The only subsequent alteration in the building was the destruction of two partition walls and the consequent conversion of three small rooms into a large one—for what reason we cannot say. The second-style decoration shows that the villa existed before the time of Augustus. It was partly redecorated in the fourth style.

No. 31. The peristyle\(^3\) of the residential portion of the villa of Agrippa Postumus was decorated in the second style and we may infer that the whole building was put up in that period. The splendid decorations of the third style, showing strong Egyptian influence, may have been due to Agrippa Postumus himself. Later, an attempt was made to bring the rustic and residential portions of the villa into closer connection by the construction of a small room between them, found decorated in the fourth style.

No. 14. The only portion of no. 14 which departs from the regular quadrilateral plan is that containing the granary, threshing-floor, and straw deposit, which take the form of outhouses adjoining the rest of the building. It is not, however, necessary to regard these as an afterthought, since Vitruvius\(^4\) recommends that all inflammable produce should be stored outside the villa, and some such idea may have been present here. The following considerations suggest that this villa is to be assigned to the early years of the first century A.D.; (i) a pyramid represented in one of the wall-paintings reminds us of the Egyptian *motifs* of the third style;\(^5\) (ii) the wall of the east portico is of *opus reticulatum*, with the edges of the windows and doors which it contains reinforced by tufa, cut in the shape of bricks.\(^6\)

---

\(^1\) *De Agri Cultura*, clixvii.
\(^2\) Fig. 16.
\(^3\) Fig. 16.
\(^4\) Vitruvius, 6, 8, 22.
\(^5\) *N.d.S.*, 1897, p. 386.
\(^6\) *N.d.S.*, 1897, p. 396.
This type of construction belongs to the time of Augustus;\(^1\) (iii) the entrance to the courtyard from the south is edged with rows of bricks, alternating with rows of tufa and limestone, cut like bricks.\(^2\) The earliest datable example of this type of construction in Pompeii is the Temple of Isis, which was rebuilt after the earthquake of A.D. 62. It must, however, have been in use earlier, and, until the history of this method of wall-facing has been fully investigated, we cannot regard it as impossible that it was used as early as the time of Tiberius or the end of the principate of Augustus. We need not, therefore, suppose that the main entrance was a restoration. The villa, then, the home of a resident landlord,\(^3\) seems to have been built during the peace established throughout Italy, by Augustus or his immediate successor.

VI. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.

Thus, more than a century elapsed between the building of the earliest and the building of the latest of the datable villas, a period long enough to have left us indications of a development in the type of a ‘villa rustica’ if such a development was actually going on. Two of the villas (nos. 22 and 29), and possibly a third (no. 13), belong to the second century B.C., the period of peace and prosperity falling between the Hannibalic and the Social Wars, during which were erected many of the buildings at present surviving in Pompeii. Nos. 13 and 29 confirm the inference which may be drawn from Cato’s *De Agri Cultura* that capitalism in agriculture was already developed by the middle of this century. They belonged to a succession of owners of urban culture, whose residence in the villa was only occasional. They were good investments rather than the homes of practical farmers. The villas of Asellius (no. 27), of Agrrippa Postumus (no. 31), and of P. Fannius Synistor (no. 16)—all of the same kind, and all built during the first century B.C.,—show that such villas remained a prominent type throughout the period we are considering. But they were by no means the only kind found. No. 22 dates from the age of Cato, but was the home of a resident farmer, and instead of becoming more luxurious as time went on, tended to become more rustic. These homes of resident farmers were not on the decline, for no. 14, as we have seen, was built during or soon after the age of Augustus, and we have, in all, nine examples of this type of villa in existence at the time of the eruption.\(^4\) There is thus no evidence that, in the fertile district round Vesuvius, capitalism and absentee-landlordism became more widespread in the two centuries that elapsed between the building of the earliest villas and their destruction in A.D. 79.

\(^1\) Mau-Kelsey, *op. cit.*, p. 43.
\(^2\) *N.d.S.*, *loc. cit.*
\(^3\) See above, p. 121.
\(^4\) See above, p. 122.
Nor, again, is there any sign of the villaticae pastiones of Columella\(^1\) —ornithones, leporaria, piscinae, and the like—which extraordinary development appears in literature as early as the time of Varro. They were, no doubt, frequent enough in the luxurious palaces of the northern shores of the Bay of Naples, where the country was hilly and unsuitable for the development of an intense agricultural life, but, between Boscoreale in the north and Gragnano in the south, land was too fertile to waste in that manner. In antiquity it must have been one of the most intensely cultivated parts of Italy, as it is to-day. Wealthy Romans, like Cicero and Agrippa Postumus, might insinuate themselves into this area, but if they did not establish a 'villa rustica,' as did Agrippa, and contribute their share to the economic prosperity of the district, they were an exotic feature deviating from the general economic trend. Pompeii and its vicinity was no garden city or suburb, but the scene of an intense industrial activity.

\(^1\) De Re Rustica, 8, 1, 2.
Sketch-map to show the position of Campanian 'villae rusticae'. (See p. 110 ff.)