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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is two-fold: first, to examine and re-assess the material remains of Roman Corinth in the light of modern scholarship; secondly, to use this evidence, in combination with the literary sources, and thus to define, more clearly than has been done hitherto, both the nature of the original foundation and the way in which it developed. The work depends primarily on material remains, since the literary sources are limited and often overworked. A vast amount of material has been made available from the excavations of the American School over the last sixty years; there are scattered reports of earlier work going back to the 1890s; and there is a substantial body of unpublished material. Aerial photographs, taken in the 1940s and 1960s, which have not been studied before, have made it possible to form a much better idea of the city as a whole and to reconstruct the basic road system.

The end of the Antonine period provides a convenient, if somewhat arbitrary, date at which to conclude the study in general, since most of the excavated areas and literary references date from before this time.

My conclusion is that the evidence now available shows that Roman Corinth, far from being simply a continuation of Greek Corinth, as most scholars have assumed, was founded as a Roman colony, in accordance with normal Roman practice, and that it retained its Roman identity throughout the period under discussion.
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INTRODUCTION

Corinth has always been regarded as one of the leading cities of ancient Greece, but modern historians have, on the whole, concentrated on the archaic and classical periods, and have tended to disregard the Roman city. There has also been an implicit assumption that the city founded by the Romans was not a conventional colony, but simply a refoundation and continuation of the Greek city. The purpose of this thesis is, therefore, twofold. First, it is an examination and re-assessment of the material remains in the light of modern scholarship. Secondly, this evidence, combined with the literary sources, is used in an attempt to define more clearly the nature of the original Roman foundation and the way in which it developed.

While Greek Corinth has been the subject of several detailed studies, the most recent of which is that of J. B. Salmon, there has been no comparable work on Roman Corinth.¹ The Roman period from 228 BC to AD 267 is covered in a survey article by J. Wiseman.² This is a useful account, especially of the published archaeological evidence, but it is necessarily brief and omits discussion of important questions. Much useful material is also contained in the same author's topographical survey of the Corinthia, which covers human activity in the region from prehistoric times to the end of antiquity.³ Both the Corinthia and Cleonaea have been examined as part of the Doxiades Institute's research project on ancient Greek cities, but, again, Roman Corinth forms only a small part of the study.⁴ Results of major excavations have been published in a series of final publications by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, current excavations are now reported annually in Hesperia, and certain aspects of Roman Corinth have
been treated in short articles. The fact remains, however, that there has been no large-scale historical treatment of Roman Corinth.

This thesis is not intended to fill that gap, but to provide a basis for such a study. The work depends primarily on material remains, since the literary sources are limited and often overworked. A vast amount of material has been made available from the excavations of the American School over the last sixty years; reports of earlier work, going back to the 1890s, are scattered in time and place of publication; and there is also a substantial body of material that has never been published. Much of this evidence, both published and unpublished, calls for re-assessment in the light of modern knowledge and expertise. In spite of the mass of material, the picture presented here is necessarily incomplete. Not only is much of the Roman city unexcavated, and likely to remain so, but the epigraphic evidence is tantalisingly fragmentary. On the other hand, the existence of early aerial photographs, taken in the 1940s and 1960s, which have never been studied, has made it possible to reconstruct the basic road system and to form a much clearer idea than hitherto of the organisation of the city as a whole.

Priority has been given, first, to examining the dating and function of some of the main buildings in the city centre, in particular Temple E, which is the most important temple of Roman Corinth; secondly, to identifying and recording the roads and structures in the suburban areas, since the evidence here is being steadily destroyed by modern building and farming methods, and there are no adequate records. It has not been possible to include a separate discussion of the Roman tombs and burial practices, nor of private housing, but the omissions do not alter the basic conclusions as to the nature of the city.
The end of the Antonine period provides a convenient, if somewhat arbitrary, point at which to conclude the study in general. Most of the excavated areas of the city date from before this time; the Antonine city was also described in some detail by Pausanias and, in a literary context, by the sophist, Aelius Aristides. An exception has been made, however, in Chapter Five, where all the evidence gathered from surface survey and from study of the aerial photographs has been included, regardless of date, in order to make it generally available. There certainly are later remains, but they have not been excavated, on the whole, and there are only very occasional references to the city in the literary sources. From such evidence as does exist, it appears that Corinth continued to flourish during the 3rd century, and suffered to only a limited extent during the attack of the Heruli in 267/268. John Chrysostom, writing probably in the latter half of the 4th century, refers to Corinth in his time as the first city of Greece, being not only a centre of commerce, but also having a glorious tradition of philosophy and rhetoric. His words recall the description of Aristides some two centuries earlier.

Underlying the discussion of the material remains there is the attempt to define more clearly than has been done hitherto the character of the city. It has been a commonplace among scholars, of whom J. H. Oliver may be taken as representative, to regard the refounding of Corinth in 44BC with the status of a colony as simply an unfortunate interlude in the long history of a great Greek city. In my view the evidence shows that this opinion is essentially incorrect. The objection may be raised that I have over-emphasized the Roman aspects of Corinth. If so, it is done in an attempt to redress the balance, since the study of Roman Greece has been dominated by Athens, and this has inevitably coloured the perception of historians. The situation of the cities of Greece under the Empire was a
complex one in that they were part of the Empire, yet at the same time they were encouraged to preserve their traditions and cultural heritage. The fact that Corinth had been one of the leading cities of classical Greece, and regained its prominent position in the province after it had been refounded, has obscured the fact that it was founded as a Roman colony, in accordance with traditional Roman practice, and that all the evidence now available points to the fact that it retained its Roman identity throughout the period under discussion. Corinth viewed from a Roman perspective assumes a different appearance from that seen by historians and archaeologists who have been conditioned to think of it as essentially Greek.

Finally, it is to be hoped that not only will this new evaluation of Corinth be useful in itself, but also that it will contribute to a better understanding of the life of the province as a whole.
Notes to Introduction

1. Salmon, Wealthy Corinth.

2. Wiseman, ANRW.

3. Idem, LAC.


5. John Chrysostom, Homilies (J. Migne, Patrologia Graeca LXI, col. 9ff.). Corinth was badly damaged by two severe earthquakes in 365 and 375. A devastating attack by the Visigoths in 395/6 marks the end of the city as it had been during the previous four hundred years, and the beginning of its transformation into the Corinth of the Early Christian period.

6. See, for example, J. J. Oliver, Hesperia 47 (1978), pp. 185-191.
CHAPTER ONE
THE COLONY AND ITS ANTECEDENTS

The Land

The Corinthia, the land of the Corinthians, is the term used throughout antiquity, and today, for the area surrounding Corinth. The modern Corinthia, however, extends much further west and south than in ancient times, taking in the territories of ancient Sicyon, Phlius, Pelleus and Aegira. It is both a geographical and an administrative unit. Ancient Corinthia (fig. 1) was more restricted, a political rather than a geographical entity. It extended from the river Nemea (Zapantis) in the west to the Saronic Gulf in the east. The southern boundary left the Nemea valley at a point north-west of Mt. Apesas (Phokas), cut across the valley of the Longopotamos (Rachiani) river, leaving the small state of Cleonae to the south, then turned south itself to run along a broad range of mountains from just east of the Tretus pass, which was in Nemean territory, until it reached the sea, probably near Cape Trachyli, possibly slightly further north (see below). These southern mountains form a substantial barrier between the Corinthia and the territory of Argos and Epidaurus.

The territory of Corinth also included the Isthmus, the neck of land joining the Peloponnese to central Greece, and, north of the Isthmus, the great spur of Mt. Geraneia and the promontory of Perachora jutting out into the Corinthian Gulf. It is almost as though the sea had taken great bites out of the land to both east and west, leaving just a narrow strip joining the two parts of the Corinthia. The boundary with Megara lay in the Geraneian mountain range: it began on the coast of the Halcyonic Bay, somewhere between Oenoe, which was Corinthian, and Pagae, which was Megarian, ran via the border fort of Lysi, guarding the pass from Boeotia
into the Corinthia, and descended to the coast of the Saronic Gulf north of Crommyon, before the Scironian Rocks begin.3

The map shows more clearly than any verbal description the relationship between the geographical and political boundaries. The river Nemea provided a clear division between Sicyon and Corinth, which was, no doubt, just as well since both states must have cast covetous eyes on that part of the fertile coastal plain belonging to the other.4 The mountain ranges provide less clearly identifiable boundaries, to us at least, and they were occasionally in dispute, as in the case of the border between Corinth and Epidaurus in the region of Cape Trachyli. This was the subject of arbitration by the Megarians between 242 and 235 BC. The final decision, recorded in SIG 3 471, includes a detailed description of local landmarks. Wiseman has discussed this at length and demonstrated convincingly both that the ancient Spiraeum referred to by Ptolemy and by Pliny, is Cape Trachyli, and also that the boundary ran along the summits west of Trachyli.5 The interesting point here is that this means that the bay of Sophikos and the plain of Angelokastro, which has a large area of arable land, were Corinthian; also that the Corinthians had an excellent anchorage at Korphos, probably the best natural harbour in the Corinthia.

Only the small state of Cleonae actually joined Corinthian territory with no obvious boundary, although Wiseman thinks that the border may have been marked by an ancient road, which he suggests linked Tenea and the valley of the Longopotamos, more or less on the line of the modern road.6

Corinth also, of course, controlled the coastline round the Bay of Corinth, the south coast of the Halcyonic Bay and the Saronic Gulf west of Crommyon. There is a notable absence of good, natural harbours near the main centres of population but, on the other hand, the coast is sheltered to some extent from violent storms and winds in both gulfs and, in the Greek
period, it was common practice to beach sailing vessels or anchor them off an open shore. Artificial harbours were built at Lechaeum and Cenchreae to accommodate the larger ships of the Roman period.\textsuperscript{7}

In area the Corinthia is approximately 700 sq. km., the land mass to the south being about twice that north of the Isthmus.\textsuperscript{8} It is not large, less than a third the size of Attica, for example, but size is less important than geographical situation, communications, and the natural resources a city could command within her territory.

The terrain of the Corinthia is extraordinarily varied. As any visitor knows, it is dominated by the distinctive outline of Acrocorinth, which is not particularly high, but the grey-brown rock rises sharply from the slopes surrounding it, green or golden according to the season. The views from the summit are dramatically beautiful and also give a very good idea of the way in which the land varied (see pls. 1-3). To the north is the coastal plain, proverbially fertile in classical times,\textsuperscript{9} and still mainly agricultural today, in spite of the modern building and occasional light industry. Inland, the land rises in two terraces or shelves all along the coast to beyond Sicyon; sometimes the terrace rises sharply, sometimes there is a gradual slope from one level to another. On the uppermost terrace, at the foot of Acrocorinth (a surprisingly long way down when seen from the top), lies the city of Corinth\textsuperscript{10} and due north, about 2 kms., is the port of Lechaeum, although very few traces of it can now be seen. In the distance, on the farther side of the bay, Perachora is clearly visible, as is the spur of the Geraneian mountains disappearing into the distance. The slopes are thickly wooded, and in places the land falls straight into the sea, with just a small harbour at the Heraeum. The upper valleys, though, could be cultivated and the plain of Loutraki, now being eaten up by modern villas, is reasonably good agricultural land.
Following Strabo's example, one can survey the whole of the Corinthia from the top of Acrocorinth. Looking round in a clockwise direction, one can see the Isthmus clearly, and presumably, in classical times, it would have been possible to see the constant movement of baggage animals and ships being dragged slowly along the line of the diolkos. The diolkos ended on the Bay of Corinth exactly where the Corinth Canal begins and where, until recently, landing stages could be seen. The diolkos ran for about 7 km. across the narrow neck of land to Schoenus (Kalamaki) on the Saronic Gulf, which was also the port for the Isthmian Sanctuary of Poseidon. The Isthmus is really a plateau about 7 sq. km. in extent and is much more ridged and uneven than it appears from Acrocorinth. The land looks dry and brown in summer and the soil is thin, but certain areas can be cultivated successfully.

Further to the east, the shelf on which Corinth is situated runs down towards the bay and port of Cenchreae. The land is reasonably fertile and remains of elaborate brick-built tombs indicate that it was popular in the Roman period. Occasionally, smoke rises from modern blasting operations, not far from the ancient quarries which ran in a line from Examilia to Cromna.

As one's gaze moves further round, the land starts rising, with the valley of the Xerias river standing out clearly, since the main modern highway to Argos runs through it. The slopes are heavily wooded. Then, to the south, Acrocorinth drops sharply to an east-west valley cut by ravines, and then rises again in a series of narrow valleys and steep hills into the mountain range of the Argolid. The lower slopes are suitable for farming or pasture, but the upper regions become barren and bleak. Next, looking to the west, the grassy slopes of Penteskouphi, really part of Acrocorinth, are prominent in the foreground, while behind, the land is rough and treeless,
cut by ravines, an impressive but bleak landscape; in the distance are the hills and mountains rising to Mt. Apesas. Then one has come full circle back to the fertile coastal plain, with Sicyon in the distance.

The well-known saying 'Corinth is beetle-browed and full of hollows' is apt. It is due to a combination of the geological formation of the land, which is mainly limestone and marl alternating with conglomerate, and the action of the rivers, which cut through the upper hills and slopes in deep, jagged gullies. The winter storms and rainfall turn small streams and dry beds into torrents and, when in spate, they rush down the hillsides with great violence, washing away top-soil, shrubs and even trees. The water penetrates the limestone and glomerate layers and erodes the softer marl beneath, leaving jagged projections or cliffs, which then often fall away, looking as though they have been smashed with a gigantic hammer. Neither limestone nor marl make for fertile soil, and it is only where the conglomerate layer has been made friable, and detritus washed down and collected, that land can be cultivated on the upper slopes. However, where river action is more gentle, alluvial plains are formed, as on the coast, which are very suitable for agriculture.

The three main rivers, the Nemea, Longopotamos and Xerias, all flow north from the mountains to the coastal plain and then into the Gulf of Corinth. There are also small streams running down from the Geraneian range, bringing silt down to the plain of Loutraki, and other streams flowing from the Oneian range into the Saronic Gulf. But throughout antiquity, and until very recently, the Corinthians have relied on the artificial collection of water and irrigation for their crops, helped by the fact that the geological formation of the land provides natural collecting points for the water as it seeps through the conglomerate and is trapped on the clay levels. Rainfall is plentiful in the winter months and can
usually be conserved and used for most of the year. I have seen natural springs still running in October at Vrysoúla and Kokkino-vrysi on the outskirts of Corinth after several months of drought. The ancient description of Corinth as 'well-watered' is no exaggeration. It was only in the Roman period, when provision had to be made for lavish public baths and other civic amenities, that an aqueduct was needed to supplement the local water sources.

Strabo describes the Corinthia as 'not very fertile', although he does admit that the coastal plain is the best land south of the Isthmus. One also has the testimony of many ancient sources as to the productiveness of this area. Strabo may have been making a comparison with northern Greece or other parts of the Mediterranean where the land is, indeed, richer. But his knowledge of the classical world is patchy and it is possible that his views were coloured by the fact that he came from Amaseia in Pontus, which Strabo describes as fertile, well-watered and wooded, in all 'beautifully designed for habitation'. The same could not really be said of Corinth. It is always tricky to draw parallels between ancient and modern conditions, but, nevertheless, it does appear that much of the land in the Corinthia is good and profitable, if it is farmed correctly; that is, allowing some of the land to lie fallow, choosing the right crops (not the citrus trees and apricots so prevalent today), and not attempting to farm pastures that are really only suitable for sheep and goats. Careful husbandry must have been the keynote for Corinthian farmers. It is also possible that when Strabo visited Corinth in 29 BC, not so very long after its foundation, the whole area was still suffering from the effects a prolonged civil war, and also perhaps from the introduction of colonists from Italy who were unfamiliar with local conditions.
At the beginning of October 1977, I spent a week filming the Corinthia from the air, as well as other parts of the Peloponnese and Attica. The great advantage of this type of survey is that one can work at a low altitude, often less than 300 feet, and, at the same time, it is possible to cover a good many square miles, at varying altitudes, in order to examine certain features of the terrain. One can see the area both as a whole and in great detail, a combination that is not possible by any other means. Any impression must be subjective, but certain features stand out. Although there had been some rain during the previous week, the land everywhere was very dry. It was remarkable, however, how prosperous the Corinthia looked, and how much land was in use, either for crops or pasture, and not just on the coastal plain and round the city, but also in the higher valleys. The contrast with Attica and other parts of the Peloponnese, filmed at the same time, was striking and could not be attributed entirely to modern irrigation.

Ancient Corinth must also have had substantial timber reserves on some of the mountain ranges (also obvious from the air), as well as excellent supplies of local limestone, enough for her own building requirements and for export. There are traces of extensive quarries all over the Corinthia. Corinthian contractors supplied the stone for the Asclepius temple at Epidaurus, and building stone from the Corinthia was used at Delphi in the 4th century. Timber from Corinthian territory was also used at Epidaurus.

In sum, it was not a large territory, but one whose prosperity was solidly based on agriculture and natural resources, as well as on the specialised crafts and international trade for which Corinth is generally better known.

It is easy to produce general statements about communications and the road system of the Corinthia. It is obvious, for example, that roads must
have followed the mountain passes and river valleys, sometimes along the actual bed of the stream, but ancient roads were designed for men or animals not for modern transport, and they have often fallen into disuse, leaving few traces. Useful work has been done on the roads in the Corinthia by Wiseman, and Pritchett has investigated some of the topographical problems of the Greek period, but the details are often far from clear.²³

The traveller coming into the Corinthia from Attica or Megara would probably take the coast road along the cliffs to Crommyon, and then to Schoenus at the eastern end of the diolkos. But this could be a difficult and dangerous route because of the Scironian Cliffs, and it was not until the time of Hadrian that the fine carriage road described by Pausanias was constructed.²⁴ Another route from Megara and Boeotia, a well-used one according to Wiseman, was over the mountain pass at Lysi, down to Loutraki and into the Isthmus. Yet another possibility was to go along the north coast via Oenoe, into the Perachora valley and then to Loutraki.²⁵

In the Isthmus itself, there seems to have been a network of roads, of which Wiseman has identified at least eight.²⁶ Passage was not concentrated on the west side of the Isthmus, as it is today, by the one bridge over the Corinth Canal. The main road from Schoenus ran to the port of Cenchreae, then on to the plain of Solygeia, and over the mountain pass to Epidauria. Another important road connected the Sanctuary at Isthmia, for which the port was Schoenus, to Cromna, which seems to have been a road nexus. There it was joined by the road from Cenchreae, ran to Examilia, and then to the Cenchreae Gate of Corinth.²⁷ This was the route taken by Pausanias, who travelled along the new Hadrianic road to Schoenus, stopped at Isthmia, made a detour to Cenchreae, and then went on to Corinth. Alternatively, one could leave the Isthmus at the west end of the diolkos and go along the coast via what is now New Corinth to Lechaeum. From there another major
road ran up to Corinth. These routes between Corinth, her ports and the Isthmian Sanctuary must always have been busy, and particularly so at festival times.

It is likely that the route from Corinth to Sicyon, about 26 km., did not go along the coast, but a short distance inland, since both Corinth and Sicyon lie on an upper plateau and there would have been no need to keep to the coast. It could not have run too far inland, however, because of the valleys and general erosion of the land. The large, early Christian basilica at Skoutela, about 2 km. north-west of Corinth, and the graves in the vicinity, indicate that a major road passed through there.28

For the traveller going inland from Corinth, the main route was to the west, over the saddle between Acrocorinth and Penteskouphi, and up the Longopotamos valley to Cleonae, which Strabo says is about 80 stades, just over 14 km. distant.29 Traces of the road have been reported by R. S. Stroud, who also confirms that Strabo is correct in his estimate of the distance. From Cleonae two routes, one for wheeled traffic and one for men in good shape, as Pausanias puts it, led south to Nemea, Mycenae, and eventually Argos.30

There were two roads leading out of Corinth to Tenea. The mountain route referred to by Pausanias,31 according to Wiseman, must have left from the same saddle as the Cleonae road, and then gone along the east/west valley to a point near the modern village of Solomos in the Xerias valley. There it joined the more important road from the southeast gate of the city, went up the Xerias, and eventually followed the right fork of the river to Tenea, which Pausanias says was about 60 stades, about 10.5 km., from Corinth.32

It appears that the same routes were in use in both Greek and Roman times. Presumably because Roman Corinth was not of major strategic
importance, there was no major road-building in the vicinity, although, given the evidence from aerial photographs of Roman roads in the area round Dyme (see p. 39), we cannot be absolutely certain. The one exception, although it was not actually in the Corinthia, is Hadrian's Scironian Road, which must have required constant and expensive maintenance to keep it in good repair.

The sea often provided a quicker and more convenient means of transport. It was only 10 km. from Corinth to Perachora across the Bay of Corinth. For most of antiquity, the voyage across the Saronic Gulf to Athens must have been preferable to travelling along the Scironian Road. The fact that Strabo and the elder Pliny give distances along the coast and by sea, as well as by land, implies that they were significant. The sea was, of course, always used by preference for the transport of goods. Stone from the Corinthia was sent to Delphi in the 4th and 3rd centuries BC, presumably from Lechaeum, and we find stone being shipped to Delphi again by Herodes Atticus in the 2nd century. Sea routes were often crucially important in the Greek period when it was necessary to avoid hostile Corinthian territory. Otherwise every traveller by land from central Greece to the Peloponnese had to pass through Corinthian territory. This factor was of little importance in the Roman period, but the seas continued to provide excellent communications between Corinth and other parts of the province: with the northern coast of the Corinthian Gulf, with the cities of Boeotia, and with Aegina and Athens. Within Greece, Corinth lay at the centre of a network of communications by land and by sea - a factor that is sometimes overlooked in the emphasis on Corinth's international sea links with the ports of Italy, Asia Minor and other parts of the Mediterranean.

This, then, was the Corinthia, the region which was to become the territory of the new Roman city: a comparatively small area of land in
Roman terms, with a widely varying terrain, major resources, and splendidly situated, both within Greece and in the wider area of the Mediterranean. \(^{35}\)

### Corinth Before 44 BC

Parts of the Corinthia have been inhabited since neolithic times, but the pattern of the major settlements was established during the archaic period. The urbanization of Corinth itself is now thought to have taken place at the end of the 7th century BC. \(^{36}\) It became one of the most important city-states of mainland Greece, with extensive trading links overseas and a flourishing home economy based on agriculture and a variety of industries. Corinth dominated the fertile plain on which much of her agricultural prosperity depended, while trade was channelled through the ports of Lechaeum on the Corinthian Gulf and Cenchreae on the Saronic Gulf. The city also controlled the passage of goods and people across the narrow land bridge of the Isthmus. Although Corinth was primarily a commercial power, which only became involved in military actions when its vital interests were threatened, the ancient sources make it clear that the city was also a major artistic and cultural centre. \(^{37}\)

Apart from Corinth, there were a number of other flourishing towns in the Corinthia. It is not certain to what extent Lechaeum had a separate existence, apart from its function as a port of Corinth, but it is evident that Cenchreae was a walled town from at least the 4th century BC. \(^{38}\) Tenea, in southern Corinthia, is generally regarded as the largest town after Corinth, and Crommyon, on the Corinthian/Megarian border, was clearly important. \(^{39}\) Other towns mentioned in the literary sources include Asae, Mausus, Melissus and Petra. \(^{40}\) There has been no systematic survey of the classical Corinthia similar to the Messenia project, nor has it been studied as intensively as Attica, but Wiseman has observed Greek classical remains
at over 50 sites. There seems to have been settlement wherever the land was reasonably fertile.\textsuperscript{41} It is likely that all these inhabitants of the Corinthia regarded themselves as citizens of Corinth, and there may have been a loose deme structure, but little is known for certain about the political organization of Corinth in the Greek period.\textsuperscript{42}

Corinth maintained its prominent position among the Greek states until it was destroyed by the Romans in 146 BC. The reasons for the destruction have been much discussed. Cicero seems to represent later Roman opinion accurately when he says that the city was regarded as a threat, and that the Roman Senate considered that Corinth had both the resources and position, strategic and moral, to challenge their power in Greece.\textsuperscript{43} Whether the Romans were correct in their perception is another matter. Left to its own devices, Corinth seems to have preferred commercial to political power, but its natural advantages were such that anyone wishing to control Greece would want to control Corinth.\textsuperscript{44} However, once the Romans had decided to use force against the Achaean League, of which Corinth was the most prominent member, her destruction became almost inevitable.

With the victory of Mummius in 146 BC, the city of Corinth ceased to exist. Most scholars, on the basis of the literary evidence, have thought that the city was totally destroyed, razed to the ground, as Strabo and Diodorus say,\textsuperscript{45} but it has become increasingly clear, mainly from the archaeological evidence, that this was not so. Wiseman, in his ANRW article, has summarized both the archaeological and, particularly, the literary evidence, showing that this impression of total devastation derives largely from the rhetorical and poetic contexts of works often written well after the event.\textsuperscript{46}

There is no doubt that Corinth was sacked and burned, and her artistic treasures looted. The scale of the looting and the wanton destruction of
works of art, observed by Polybius and recorded by Strabo, seem to have shocked cultured Romans, but it was the normal consequence of defeat. However, damage to the city buildings was selective, apparently by design. The North Stoa, which had served as an arsenal, was demolished with great ferocity. A columned hall, west of the South Stoa, which the excavator, C. K. Williams, suggests was a government building associated with the levying of taxes, was also demolished. On the other hand, the Archaic Temple seems to have escaped destruction, although the roof was badly damaged. The current excavator, H. S. Robinson, is now of the opinion that the large timbers of the roof may have been removed by the Romans and used for rebuilding the fleet or for some similar purpose. The structure of the South Stoa, one of the largest and most splendid buildings in Greek Corinth, was left virtually intact, and the water supply of Peirene remained in working order. Another curious aspect of the sack is the way in which the inscriptions, particularly those of a public nature, were treated. Their condition suggests that they were deliberately smashed into tiny fragments and scattered, although the find spots are sufficiently close to indicate that they were originally set up in public areas of the city. As F. W. Walbank has pointed out, the destruction of Corinth by senatorial decree was quite distinct from the initial seizure and plundering. The accounts of Florus and Zonaras make this clear, and Florus also says that it was destroyed tuba praecinente, which certainly gives the impression that it was a formal act. The conclusion must surely be that Mummius' intention was to destroy Corinth as a political entity, but not to obliterate the city, as happened at Carthage. He may have been acting on his own initiative but more probably in accordance with a senatorial decree, since some of the Senate's commissioners were almost certainly in Greece at the time. This decision would account, not only for the destruction of the
public inscriptions (to the despair of all epigraphers working at Corinth),
but also for the fate of the public buildings, including the theatre which
was the normal meeting-place for the citizens of Corinth, and sometimes for
the Achaean League.54 Such destruction made it clear to everyone that never
again would Corinth be allowed to become a focus of opposition to Rome.

After the conquest, the inhabitants of Corinth were enslaved, while
prisoners from other states, rounded up in the city, were set free. There
is no evidence that the male Corinthians were slain, as is normally alleged.
Indeed, Zonaras describes the city as being empty of men when Mummius took
it.55 It must have been the descendants of these enslaved Corinthians whom
Cicero reports having seen as slaves in the Peloponnese in his youth, by
that time indistinguishable from freeborn Argives and Sicyonians.56 It is
likely that many prudent Corinthians had left the city before Mummius' attack, and that, during the two days he waited to enter Corinth, more
slipped away along unguarded stretches of the city wall, or over the rugged
and unfortified slopes of Acrocorinth. Natural places of refuge would have
been Tenea or Cleonae, the larger cities of the Peloponnese, and possibly
Athens, to judge by the Corinthian tombstones found there, which date from
the late 2nd or early 1st century BC.57

The land belonging to Corinth was treated in the usual manner as
praedia populi Romani. It became ager publicus, to be let out by the
censors for the benefit of the Roman people.58 It is not so clear what
happened in other parts of the Corinthia. We do know that Tenea escaped
Corinth's fate because it had sided with Rome against the Achaean League.59
According to Pausanias and Zonaras, the Romans tore down the walls of the
fortified towns in Greece, including presumably those of Crommyon and
Cenchreae.60 It is probable that the land of many medium-sized communities,
if they had opposed Rome, became nominally ager publicus, but was retained
on payment of a stipendium to Rome. The leniency with which the non-Corinthian prisoners taken by Mummius were treated suggests that this was so. These communities would, then, be unaffected by the destruction of Corinth, except to the extent that the commercial, as well as the political, focus of the region had been removed. In some cases, the effect of this must have been considerable. However, it is worth bearing in mind that in 146 BC Greece was still nominally independent, as a result of the proclamation of Flamininus in 196 BC. That this freedom was still in force in ca. 115 BC seems clear from the letter of Q. Fabius Maximus to Dyme. The value of such freedom was, of course, limited by the general supervision of the governor of Macedonia, and the exactions that could be made upon any community in case of need.

After the destruction of Corinth, the city's entrepreneurial trade was diverted elsewhere. Delos benefited most, particularly as a staging-post between East and West Mediterranean, and Athens profited to a much smaller extent. The diolkos must have remained in use, since M. Antonius' fleet was transported across it in 102 BC, but we do not know how much trade it carried. J. Day thinks that ships sailing up the Gulf of Corinth unloaded their cargoes at either Thespiae or Pagae (where important groups of negotiatores grew up in the 1st century BC), and from there the goods were carried to central and northern Greece. Archaeological evidence shows that the Sanctuary of Poseidon at the eastern end of the diolkos was abandoned, and literary sources say that the celebration of the Isthmian Games was transferred to the control of Sicyon. According to Strabo and Pausanias, Sicyon also held a large part of Corinth's territory. However, there is no reason to think, as most historians do, that Sicyon was given it officially or in perpetuity. It is much more probable that the Sicyonians simply farmed some of the ager publicus as possessores. It is hardly
likely that those excellent and fruitful lands, so valuable to the Roman people, as Cicero and Livy emphasize, were simply given away. Sicyon's parlous financial condition in the 1st century BC is also an argument against the city having received such a bonus.

As for the site of Corinth itself, no doubt, from a distance it looked as Ser. Sulpicius described it to Cicero in 45 BC - prostrata et diruta - but Cicero himself had seen in his youth 'Corinthians' living among the ruins. One of the earliest excavation reports, a lecture by T. W. Heermance delivered in Athens in the 1890s, refers to 'miserable huts' along the Lechaeum Road near the Propylaea (and also conveniently near to Peirene). Traces of roads, showing a long period of use, have been found across the court of the Asklepieion and beneath the Roman forum pavement; and a poros foundation wall was built above the Sacred Spring between 86 BC and the construction of the forum. The excavator, C. K. Williams, also cites the evidence of coins, amphora handles and pottery 'to show the possibility that strata and architecture do exist at Corinth between 146 BC and 44 BC'. As he says, some of these coins and other finds may be associated with tourists. I would put the fragments of dot-barbotine ware, found in the forum area and probably manufactured in Italy between 130 BC and 70 BC, in this category too. Cicero must have been just one of many Romans visiting the ruins of the famous city, and one does get the impression that wealthy Romans liked travelling in comfort. We do not know who the inhabitants of Corinth at this time were, but Williams has suggested that there was some activity in the Greek temene, which would account for the continuity of cult places from the Greek to the Roman period. It is unlikely, however, that the habitation was substantial or officially sanctioned. The Squatter Period seems an appropriate description of the years between 146 BC and the founding of the Roman colony.
Circumstances and Date of Foundation

The circumstances in which Corinth was founded appear to be clear and well-known, documented by a number of ancient authors. From the ashes of the city devastated by Mummius in 146 BC, the new Corinth arose, phoenix-like, in 44 BC, the very same year that Carthage, too, was refounded. Nearly all writers link the destruction and rebirth of these two great cities, a sequence which appealed clearly to the Romans' cyclical view of history, and their taste for anniversaries. Equally readily accepted by modern historians is the assumption that Corinth soon became not only as wealthy and prosperous as in the past, but also a Greek city rather than a Roman one. Both these assumptions are worth considering in more detail. 75

Strabo and Diodorus Siculus are the only contemporary writers who refer to the founding of Corinth, which they both attribute to the deified Julius Caesar. 76 According to Diodorus, Caesar's motives were pity for Corinth's fate, when he actually saw the ruined site, and a desire for personal glory. There is no other evidence for this visit, and Diodorus is writing in a highly coloured and rhetorical context, but it is quite possible that Caesar did pass through Corinth at some time. Strabo mentions briefly, in a discussion of Carthage, that the two cities, Corinth and Carthage, were restored by Caesar at the same time. Strabo himself actually did visit Corinth in 29 BC, soon after its restoration, which adds considerably to the value of his description of the city and the Corinthia. In this long passage, he says that Corinth was refounded on account of its natural advantages, and that the colonists belonged for the most part to the freedman class. According to Strabo, they appear to have had little regard for the religious practices of the ancient city, to judge by the way in which they rifled the tombs there. (An observation amply borne out by the archaeological evidence, 77 and one which indicates that the colonists had
few links and little feeling for the Greek city.) However, Strabo is mainly concerned with the physical features of Corinth and the surrounding territory, and in giving an account of past history; he is not really interested in more recent political events.

Next in date to refer to Corinth is Plutarch, writing in the late 1st or early 2nd century. Not only was he a highly educated Greek, born and living in mainland Greece, and thoroughly familiar with the history of his country, he also had close connections with Corinth, where his friends held high office. He mentions dining in Corinth during the Isthmian Games at the invitation of Lucanius, the archiereus, and one of his essays is dedicated to Cn. Cornelius Pulcher, who was patron, duovir quinquennalis and agonothetes at Corinth. Unfortunately, Plutarch's brief reference to the founding of Corinth is not part of the main narrative in his Life of Caesar, but cited merely as an example of the way in which Caesar courted his soldiers with newly planted colonies such as Carthage and Corinth. There is no mention of the urban population of Rome having been settled at Corinth, but a possible indication that there may have been some veterans, although not, one assumes, for military purposes.

Appian of Alexandria gives, in some ways, the most interesting account of the founding of Corinth. He moved to Rome after 116 and draws heavily on earlier sources. Mention of Corinth comes in an account of the founding of Carthage. 'Returning to Rome not long after, and the poor asking him for land, he (Caesar) arranged to send some of them to Carthage and some to Corinth.' Appian also says that it was Augustus who, on finding a document among Julius Caesar's papers, founded Carthage. It is not clear whether this was the original note made on the site of Carthage or, more likely, draft legislation covering the foundation of Carthage and Corinth. Appian is the only writer to refer to a memorandum, and the words 'I have
ascertained' imply that he has done some personal investigation to establish that 3,000 colonists were sent to Carthage from Rome, and that the rest came from the surrounding countryside. He does not give any indication of the number of settlers sent to Corinth, where the circumstances were, in any case, different. At Carthage there may well have been local inhabitants of Roman origin, dating from the time of G. Gracchus' ill-fated colony of 123 BC. However, there is some reason to assume the presence around Corinth of Roman citizens farming the ager publicus or acting as negotiatores.

Of the remaining writers who refer to the founding of Corinth, Pausanias' account, written in the latter half of the 2nd century, and so valuable in other respects, is very brief. 'It was afterwards refounded by Caesar, who was the author of the present constitution of Rome.' By which he must be attributing the foundation to Augustus. However, he confuses Augustus with Julius Caesar since, in mentioning the temple of Octavia in Corinth, he says that Augustus was emperor of the Romans after Caesar, the founder of the present Corinth. Pausanias also says, 'Corinth is no longer inhabited by any of the old Corinthians, but by colonists sent out by the Romans'. There is no further detail as to their origins, and the implication is that none of the local inhabitants were enfranchised as happened, according to Pausanias, at Patrae.

Finally, Dio Cassius and Zonaras. In spite of his provincial origin, or perhaps because of it, Dio has little interest in the provinces. He is writing long after the event and, as he himself complains, is at the mercy of earlier writers. The historical drama of the two great cities of Corinth and Carthage, linked in their destruction and rebirth, is uppermost in Dio's mind, together with the fact that Julius Caesar took pride in restoring such ancient cities. For he attributes firmly the founding of both colonies to Julius Caesar. His account adds nothing to what is already
known. Nor does that of Zonaras, writing in the 12th century and heavily dependent on Dio Cassius and Plutarch as his sources. He simply records that Carthage and Corinth were both colonized by the Romans, and regained their former state.87

Is it possible to be more precise about the actual date of the foundation of Colonia Laus Julia Corinthiensis?88 Although the ancient authors are agreed that Corinth owed its being to Julius Caesar, we do not know whether the official founding and settlement began before or after his death, nor when it was completed. Roman historians are not noted for their precision in dating and, since we do not have a consular date nor a foundation charter, they could have been using an approximate date for the foundation of Roman Corinth, and linking it rhetorically with Carthage, founded at about the same time. Numismatic evidence suggests that Carthage was actually settled by Lepidus between 42 and 40 BC.89

Modern historians are divided in their opinions. Lenschau (RE Supp IV 1033) gives 46-44 BC; Larsen (p. 446) refers to Lenschau, with the proviso that the establishment may not have been completed until after Julius Caesar's death. Adcock (CAH, IX, p. 708) avoids the issue but connects the founding of Corinth with that of Sinope which he dates, by coins to 47 BC. Kent (Corinth VIII, 3, p. 17) says firmly that the foundation date is 44 BC. Wiseman (ANRW) sticks to the ancient authors without further discussion (although it is not all clear from Appian, as he says it is, that colonists actually proceeded to Corinth before the death of Caesar).90 There is also a footnote in The Athenian Agora, Vol. I, in which Harrison quotes Dinsmoor as saying that the foundation date is 45 BC, but with no information as to why (p. 14, n. 12).

The question seemed to have been solved when M. Grant identified as an issue of the Corinthian mint an unpublished coin with the bare head of
Julius Caesar and the inscription CAESAR, indicating that it was issued in his lifetime. Therefore, according to Grant, the colony must have been formally established and the mint in operation before March 44 BC. This evidence has been accepted by Vittinghoff (Römische Kolonisation und Bürgerrechtspolitik, p. 86, n. 5), Weinstock (Divus Julius, p. 299), who thinks the colony was firmly established in 46 BC, and Brunt (Italian Manpower, p. 598), who feels that the numismatic evidence shows that the colony was founded in 44 BC but not necessarily by March. Recently, however, this coin has been shown by M. Amandry not to have been issued by the Corinthian mint after all, and so it has no bearing on the foundation of Roman Corinth.

The first full publication of the Corinthian coinage was made by K. M. Edwards in 1933, in which she incorporated the earlier work of H. B. Earle Fox. Since 1970, catalogues of excavation finds have been issued regularly in Hesperia, but the coinage of Roman Corinth has not been subjected to detailed scrutiny in recent years. However, Amandry has now undertaken a study of duovirate coins of Corinth, which were issued from the time of the colony's foundation until 69, and has produced a chronology for this period which also has a bearing on the foundation date (see p. 27).

Amandry has approached the problem by establishing a precise date for one of the quinquennial years, that of AD 66/67, which he regards as having been definitely held by Piso and Cleander. He has then worked back in multiples of five to a foundation date of 45 BC. Although Amandry does not actually say so, this must mean that colonisation was sufficiently complete in 45 BC to allow for the lex data and forma to be erected in that year, since the official 'birthday' of the colony, from which the quinquennial years were counted, was the date of the erection of these inscriptions in the forum. His argument is convincing, but there is one weak point.
THE DUOVIRI MONETALES (according to M. Amandry)

| I   | L. Aeficius Certus; C. Iulius                   | 44 or 43 BC |
| II  | P. Tadius Chilo; C. Iulius Nicephorus          | 43 or 42   |
| III | M. Instieius C. F. Tectus; L. Cas(sius?)       | 42 or 41   |
| IV  | Cn. Publilius; M. Antonius Orestes             | Q 40       |
| V   | P. Aebutius; C. Pinnius                        | 39 to 36   |
|     | M. Instieius C. F. Tectus                      | Q 35       |
| VI  | C. Heius Pollio Pamphilus; Q. Caecilus Niger   | 34 to 31   |
| VII | M. Antonius Theophilus; P. Aebutius            | Q 30       |
| VIII| C. Heius Pollio; C. Heius Pamphilus            | 29/28 to 26/25 |
| IX  | P. Aebutius Sp.f.; C. Heius Pamphilus          | 17/16      |
| X   | M. Novius Bassus; M. Antonius Hipparchus       | 10/9 to 5/4 |
|     | P. Aebutius Sp.f.; C. Iulius Heraclanus        | Q 5/4      |
| XI  | C. Servilius C. f. Primus; M. Ant. Hipparchus  | 2/1        |
| XII | P. Aebutius Sp.f.; C. Iulius Heraclanus        | Iter Q 1/2 |
| XIII| C. Mussius Priscus; C. Heius Pollio            | 4/5        |
| XIV | A. Vatronius Labeo; L. Rutilius Plancus        | 12/13 to 15/16 |
| XV  | P. Caninius Agrippa; L. Castricius Regulus     | Q 21/22    |
| XVI | L. Arrius Peregrinus; L. Furius Labeo          | 32/33 or 33/34 |
| XVII| P. Vipsanius Agrippa; M. Bellius Proculus      | 37/38      |
| XVIII|Octavius; Licinus                               | 42/43 to 45/46 |
| XIX | L. Paconius Flam(ininus?); Cn. Publicius Regulus | 50/51   |
| XX  | M. Acilius Candidus; Q. Fulvius Flaccus        | 54/55 or 55/56 |
| XXI | Ti. Claudius Optatus; C. Iulius Polyaeius       | 57/58 or 58/59 |
| XXII| L. Rutilius Piso; P. Memmius Cleander          | Q 66/67    |
| XXIII|P. Ventidius Fronto; Ti. Claudius Anaxilaus     | 67/68      |
| XXIV|L. Caninius Agrippa                             | 68/69      |
Early in the reign of Augustus, the date for the annual entry into office of the duovirs was changed from 1st January to 1st July. (We do not know the exact date, but it was effected by a Lex Petronia which was in force in Pompeii in 32 BC, but may have been later in the overseas colonies.) Amandry is quite aware of this law and uses the change to account for the unusual consecutive issues of coins bearing first the names of the duovirs, C. Heius Pollio and C. Heius Pamphilus, and then the same names with the addition of ITER, which is contrary to the normal practice of requiring an interval of five years between duoviral offices. He puts forward the attractive hypothesis that the duovirs held office for a further six months from January to June to bridge the gap caused by the implementation of the Lex Petronia, and that this six-month period was their second term of office. However, he ignores the possibility that, since the periods of office are distinguished on the coins, the period January to June was regarded as a whole year. (This is curious since Amandry uses much the same argument himself in discussing the question of the tribunates of Nero and their dates.) The January/June period means an extra calendary year, which would have to be taken into account in ordering the quinquennial years, and this would bring the foundation date to 44 BC. Nor can we rule out the other possibility, that, in re-organising the administration of the provinces, Augustus may have changed the quinquennial year.

To my mind, therefore, although Amandry's argument is, in essence, convincing, it does not produce incontrovertible evidence for a foundation date of 45 BC, but rather the exclusion of an earlier date, and the strong probability that the foundation of Corinth took place in 44 BC. This still fits the circumstances, literary and otherwise, better than any other date.

Amandry dates to 44 BC or 43 BC an early issue of duovirrate coins bearing the exceptionally full ethnic LAUS IULI CORINT, which is
particularly appropriate for a foundation issue. One of the first actions of a new colony was to issue coins. Grant cites some colonies that only minted once or twice to commemorate their founding. He also proposes that funds were provided for the new mint of a colony by Rome, or sometimes possibly by the deductor and other wealthy men interested in the new settlement. It would be odd, therefore, if a colony of considerable economic significance, such as Corinth clearly was, with a flourishing mint, did not issue coinage immediately after her foundation. The issue of 44 BC or 43 BC, with its very full ethnic names of the duovirs, L. Aeficius Certus and C. Julius, and the laureate head of Julius Caesar, thereby acknowledging him posthumously as the founder in spirit if not in fact, seems highly appropriate for a foundation issue.

Weinstock thought, on the strength of a coin wrongly attributed to the Corinthian mint, which has the bare head of Julius Caesar on the obverse and a hexastyle temple containing a statue on the reverse, that there was a cult to Caesar at Corinth during his lifetime. There is now no evidence for this. A cult to the deified Julius Caesar is attested by a fragmentary inscription - DIVO IV(lio) CAESARI (sacrum) - but there is no date for it. An inscription (Corinth VIII, 2, no. 50) identifying C. Julius Spartiaticus as flamen divi Iulii is dated to early in the reign of Nero.

The name of the colony, Laus Iulia Corinthiensis, is occasionally cited, by Wiseman for example, to justify the attribution of the foundation of the colony directly to Julius Caesar, but this is not necessarily so. Up to 27 BC Octavian also used just Iulia in the names of colonies founded by himself, or for which he claimed credit. The tribe of the colony was originally thought to be Fabia, the tribe of Julius Caesar, but West demonstrated that it is almost certainly Aemilia, presumably after the deductor or original patronus. Since then, L. R.
Taylor has pointed out that not one of Julius Caesar's overseas colonies, and only two of those founded by Augustus, are in the Fabia tribe.\textsuperscript{106}

It seems clear that the original impetus for the founding of Corinth came from Julius Caesar. That the decision was actually implemented by Augustus, as the literary sources indicate, is highly improbable if not impossible. The young Octavian did not return to Rome until May 44 BC and he did not become a senator until January 43 BC. Meantime, Antony was consul and had taken possession of Julius Caesar's papers. (It may have been among these papers that Appian's memorandum was found.)\textsuperscript{107} We know that a number of draft documents, including the \textit{Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae Ursonensis}, were enacted into law by Antony. and it seems quite possible that the legislation dealing with the foundation of Corinth and Carthage was also dealt with by a consular law.\textsuperscript{108} It is also possible, though much less likely, that the enabling legislation was initiated by Octavian in 43 BC, although at the time he must have had other things on his mind. We know of other Antonian foundations from Julian plans;\textsuperscript{109} at least one early Corinthian coin issue bears the head of Antony; and his close associates are named among early magistrates there.\textsuperscript{110} The colony was also one of his bases in Greece until it was seized by Agrippa in 31 BC,\textsuperscript{111} and it was to Theophilus, his δολαρχής at Corinth, that Antony sent his friends after his defeat at Actium.\textsuperscript{112} It is likely that, in implementing Julius Caesar's plans for the founding of Corinth, Antony was aware of the military significance of Corinth, as well as its economic potential.

That the foundation should later be attributed by ancient writers to Augustus rather than to Antony is in no way surprising. The name of Antony was subjected to \textit{damnatio memoriae} in 30 BC, and there are obvious reasons why Augustus should disregard his acts and himself take credit for the implementation of his adoptive father's proposals. In the case of colonial
foundations, he also took credit for his fellow triumvirs' foundations as well.\textsuperscript{113}

To summarize, the most likely timetable seems to be that the founding of Corinth was the decision of Julius Caesar, implemented by Antony soon after March 44 BC, and the \textit{deductio} took place as soon as the sailing season allowed, from May onwards.\textsuperscript{114} I see no evidence and find it hard to believe that substantial official emigration took place before the enabling legislation had been passed. The surveying of the site and its \textit{territorium}, the drawing-up of the constitution, together with the selection, transport and settling of a large number of colonists and their families, would have taken a considerable time. Since the normal sailing season ended in mid-September, most colonists would have arrived by the beginning of October at the latest.\textsuperscript{115} One has to assume that enough of the work had been completed by the end of the year to allow for the erection in the forum of the foundation charter and \textit{forma} recording the work of the land surveyors, thus officially bringing the colony into existence on that date.\textsuperscript{116}

We do not know for certain how the constitution of a new colony was set in motion, but by analogy with communities in Italy, and such contemporary foundations as Urso in Spain, the most likely procedure was that the new members of the \textit{ordo decurionum} were chosen by the author of the enabling legislation or by the \textit{deductor}, possibly before departure from Rome.\textsuperscript{117} They are likely to have been prosperous men, promised a substantial holding in the new colony, who would form a suitable ruling class within the community. Once the colony was established, new members would be added at the quinquennial census from those who had held the aedileship. Similarly, the first magistrates were chosen in advance and the normal procedure would have been for them to hold office until December 44 BC, thus allowing time for the new assembly of the people to elect the duoviri for 43 BC. These
officers would be the first to issue coinage, that issue which bears the laureate head of Julius Caesar and the full ethnic of the new colony. Alternatively, the establishment of the colony may not have been sufficiently advanced to allow for the setting-up of the foundation charter until 43 BC, but this seems less likely, since the evidence with regard to the quinquennial years, which are dated from the foundation of the colony not from the first coin issue, favours either 45 or 44 BC but not 43 BC.

There is no record of a _lex data_ or _forma_ for Corinth, nor is the name of the _deductor_ known, although Kent has suggested that it may have been P. Vatinius, a close associate of Julius Caesar, consul briefly in 47 BC and author of the _Lex Vatinia_. His name figures among the tribes of Corinth, the names of which are otherwise mainly connected with the immediate families of Julius Caesar and Augustus. The names of twelve tribes are now known or surmised from epigraphic sources: Agrippia, Atia, Aurelia, Calpurnia, Claudia, Domitia, Hostilia, Livia, Maneia, Vatinia, Vinicia, and either Sae- or, Wiseman thinks more probably, Ael(ia). He suggests that the Claudia tribe was added during the reign of either Tiberius or Claudius, and Aelia in the time of Hadrian. The citizens of Corinth were divided into these tribes for voting purposes on the model of the _comitia tributa_ at Rome. From the time that the foundation charter was set up, as the _Lex Ursonensis_, para. 12 indicates, a colony's constitution was in effect, with its assembly of citizens, annually elected magistrates, priests, and all the minor officials and regulations detailed by the _Lex Ursonensis_. In the well-known words of Aulus Gellius, 'coloniae quasi effigies parvae simulacraque populi Romani'.

The refounding of Corinth, a great commercial centre of the past was entirely in keeping with Julius Caesar's economic and colonial policies of relieving economic distress at home, particularly at Rome, and of developing
the provinces. Since the suppression of the pirates by Pompey, the East Mediterranean had become, in effect, a free trade area in which Corinth, with its unique situation, linked to both East and West, with excellent port facilities, was a key factor. The proposed cutting of a canal across the Isthmus was an ambitious but eminently sensible scheme which would have further encouraged trade. Presumably, Julius Caesar also envisaged that a revitalized Corinth would be good for the economic welfare of Greece in general, although it is doubtful whether this was, in fact, so.

There is no doubt that Greece had suffered badly during the first half of the 1st century BC, not only from the ravages of the Mithridatic Wars but also from the pirates in the Mediterranean, who virtually controlled the sea and made normal trade impossible. Then, just as Greece was recovering, came the struggle on Greek soil between Caesar and Pompey, both of whom drew heavily on the cities for men and supplies. In 49 BC Cicero forecast a disastrous war and one in which 'no part of Greece could escape being plundered'. As far as the actual theatre of war, in north and central Greece, was concerned, this was no doubt true, to go by Caesar's sack of Gomphi - intended as an example, to be sure. On the other hand, some parts of the country seem to have escaped fairly lightly; the war scarcely reached Sparta and Messenia. The well-known letter of Ser. Sulpicius in 45 BC, consoling Cicero on the death of his daughter and referring to the cities of Aegina, Megara, Piraeus and Corinth as 'nunc prostrata et diruta ante oculos facient', must be regarded as partly rhetorical. Corinth certainly was still in ruins and Megara had been devastated, its inhabitants sold into slavery, by Caesar's legate, Calenus, in 48 BC. Piraeus and Attica suffered at his hands, too, but, as Day points out, not only is there archaeological and epigraphical evidence pointing to a revival of Piraeus and Athens during the 60s and 50s, but Caesar restored the freedom of Athens
and provided funding, probably in 47 BC, for a great new market-place, to be completed a generation later with further funding from Augustus.\textsuperscript{127}

In the long term, the rapacity of some Roman officials must also have contributed to the unhappy state of the cities in particular. In 77 BC Julius Caesar had prosecuted Cn (?) Dolabella (unsuccessfully) for extortion, as well as C. Antonius, but the most notorious offender was L. Calpurnius Piso, proconsul in 59-57 BC, whom Cicero prosecuted with the words 'Achaea exhausta, Thessalia vexata; laceratae Athenae, Dyrrachium et Apollonia exinanita; Ambracia direpta....'\textsuperscript{128} Significant in another way are the frequent references in Cicero's correspondence to Atticus' financial dealings with Greek cities, his difficulties in 'extracting a few pence' from Sicyon;\textsuperscript{129} his loans (at a healthy rate of interest) to the Athenians, as well as his gift of corn to them.\textsuperscript{130} Buthrotum, too, was having difficulty in paying its taxes.\textsuperscript{131} Then there are Cicero's general references to armed bands, stragglers from Pompey's army, roaming the country.\textsuperscript{132} It all adds up to a fairly gloomy picture. The conclusion must be that much of Greece required help if it were to regain a reasonable level of prosperity, and this was presumably Julius Caesar's intention. He seems to have been generally regarded as a benefactor in Greece, \textit{εδεργήτης} at Thespiae, and \textit{αυτήρ} at Megara, which seems a little odd in the circumstances.\textsuperscript{133} Of the magnificent public works with which Suetonius says that Caesar adorned the cities of Greece (and Asia), we only know of the Market at Athens, but it was a major undertaking and clearly designed to promote the economic prosperity of Athens.\textsuperscript{134} Similarly, his intention of founding a colony at Buthrotum in Epirus cannot simply be regarded as a means of punishing the Buthrotians for not paying their taxes, but rather as a way of stimulating prosperity in that region. Buthrotum was well situated, opposite Corfu on the narrowest crossing point from Italy. The grant of
freedom to Thessaly, however, was, in the opinion of Larsen, simply restoring the status quo of before the civil war. Caesar's refounding of Corinth and the proposed cutting of the canal across the Isthmus were by far the most important of his projects in Greece.

Since the wealth and prosperity of Corinth in former times was well-known, it is likely that Corinth received a substantial body of colonists. The number of settlers sent out to a Roman colony varied enormously. It was as low as 300 in early times but gradually increased until in 123 BC Gaius Gracchus was proposing 6,000 for Junonia, although apparently this was more than the current law allowed. In 63 BC Rullus was proposing a settlement of 5,000 at Capua. P. A. Brunt has discussed the question at some length and come to the conclusion, taking into account the number of colonies created and the number of people settled by Caesar and Augustus, that each colony must have received between 2,000 and 3,000 settlers. The higher number is given by Strabo for Augusta Praetoria (Aosta) in Cisalpine Gaul. B. Levick, on the other hand, estimates that the Pisidian colonies settled by Augustus were much smaller, six towns had 9,500 settlers between them. Clearly, the purpose of the colony, military, economic or both, and the fertility of the site, were all factors to be taken into account. The obvious parallel with Corinth is Carthage, although the size of the original settlement there is obscured by the fact that, according to Appian, the 3,000 sent from Rome were augmented by an unknown number of periokoi, possibly the descendants of those people settled in 123 BC. Also, Carthage had an enormous and fertile territory to be settled. Corinth, on the other hand, had a small territory, but its known history and economic potential must have ensured that it came within the 2,000-3,000 limits, and possibly at the upper end of the scale. This number refers, of course, to heads of families, and so the total number of
people settled would be between 7,500 and 10,000 approximately.\textsuperscript{142} The local inhabitants of the region had no claim to Roman citizenship, as at Carthage, nor do any of them seem to have been incorporated into the city at a later date, as was done by Augustus at Patrae.\textsuperscript{143} It is quite possible, though, that some of them were already Roman citizens, settled in the vicinity, and that they would join the colony on an individual basis. The local Greek population would become incolae, as at Augusta Praetoria, allowed to remain in the colony and its territorium, but without the voting rights and privileges of citizens.\textsuperscript{144}

The Territorium: Size and Distribution

A colony consisted not only of a city, but also of the surrounding land. From the earliest times, the possession of land and its division among the settlers was one of the fundamental aspects of a colony. In the Roman provinces the land would almost always be ager publicus, belonging to the state.

We do not know the size of the territorium of Roman Corinth, but the general, and natural, assumption is that it was the same as the land associated with the city destroyed by Mummius. References in writers of the Roman period, such as Strabo, the elder Pliny and Pausanias, indicate that this was so.\textsuperscript{145} Strabo is particularly significant here since he was writing so soon after the founding of the colony. This was the land that had become ager publicus in 146 BC, with the exception, presumably, of the land sold by the quaestor at the direction of the Senate in 111 BC.\textsuperscript{146} Land, on the other hand, that had been occupied on tenure of possessio, by the Sicyonians, for example, would be re-possessed by the state and re-allocated to the colony. It is not clear what happened to communities such as Tenea and any others who did not have their land confiscated by the
Romans in 146 BC. Disputes would have had to be settled by the commissioners and their surveyors at the time of the founding of the colony.\textsuperscript{147} We do not hear, at any rate, of outcries such as those of the Buthrotians, when they found their lands being given away to new colonists by Julius Caesar.\textsuperscript{148} The boundaries of the \textit{territorium} and its internal divisions, once surveyed, would be recorded on the \textit{forma}, which was set up in the colony, and a copy of which was also kept at Rome. No examples have survived, but there are frequent references to such proceedings and documents in the \textit{Gromatici Veteres}.\textsuperscript{149} The extent of a colony's jurisdiction normally coincided with its \textit{territorium}.\textsuperscript{150} There is no doubt that the inhabitants of Roman Corinth knew exactly where their boundaries were, but, to date, no boundary markers nor inscriptive evidence of the Roman period have been found to identify the boundaries more precisely for us. This is not entirely surprising, since markers would be in precisely those outlying areas where there has been little or no excavation. What is more, good quality, cut stone blocks are very likely to have found their way into later buildings.

There can be no doubt that the land round Corinth had been surveyed and bounded before the foundation of the colony. It was the usual procedure as soon as conquered territories came into the public domain. The \textit{ager publicus} was, after all, one of the main revenue-producing assets of the state, and it was in the interests of the state that it should be surveyed and let profitably as soon as possible. More specifically, the \textit{Lex Agraria} of 111 BC contains a section at the end referring to Corinth and, in spite of the fragmentary condition of the tablets, it is clear that some of the \textit{ager publicus} there was to be sold, once it had been measured and boundary markers set up.\textsuperscript{151} Whether the land had been or was to be centuriated is not clear.
Because no traces of centuriation have been found so far round Corinth, the conclusion has been drawn that it did not exist, 'and that, as scholars think likely, Julius Caesar's foundation was not an agrarian colony'. However, patterns of land usage have only become apparent with the development of aerial photography, and the picture with regard to the Roman Empire as a whole is far from complete. There are many areas where evidence of centuriation is lacking and, even so, it is known to have existed. For example, Emerita Augusta (Merida) in Spain, one of Augustus' veteran colonies, had an enormous territory, splendid public buildings are still visible, but there is not a sign of centuriation. Yet it is clear from Frontinus and Agennius Urbicus' commentary that it was centuriated, and there are details of the various allocations of land. The Arausio (Orange) cadasters also refer to centuriated land, and yet the several centuriation schemes are very difficult to make out. In his book, Ancient Landscapes: Studies in Field Archaeology, Bradford says:

'During the last ten years I have many times examined suitable air photographs of Orange and its environs in the hope of confirming traces of centuriation. On a first inspection of the terrain from the air, it appeared doubtful if positive evidence of rural limitatio still existed. But later experience, gathered from a search for such remains all over Europe, inclines me to the belief that faint traces are, in fact, visible.'

Bradford goes on to make the very good point that the topographic remains would not arouse any interest if it were not for the epigraphical evidence; and also that Orange is a good example of how a system of limitatio can disintegrate. Nearer home, to Corinth that is, there is the remarkable system of centuriation, probably Augustan in date, associated with Pola and other colonisation schemes on the west coast of the Adriatic. The system stretches south from Pola, a colony created between 42 BC and 27 BC on the
Istrian peninsula, which has a magnificently centuriated territory, and also includes Zara and Salona on the Dalmatian coast, both of which were Greek settlements before being re-established by the Romans.\textsuperscript{156}

As for Greece, it is perfectly true, as Dilke says, that in areas which were unchanged in organization, we would not expect to find much centuriation.\textsuperscript{157} But in precisely those areas which the Romans did re-organize, there are traces of \textit{limitatio}. An important, though limited, survey done by Chevallier in July 1958 showed definite evidence of centuriation round Nikopolis, which was clearly linked with the city layout; and, in Thessalonika, faint traces at Pella, and possible traces of land use round Dion, Kassandreia and Philippi. On the northern coast of the Peloponnese at Dyme, he reports not only clear evidence of centuriation, but also 'sur ce territoire de magnifiques voies romaines', which is disconcerting when roads have been considered generally bad in Roman Greece. The only area round Corinth investigated by Chevallier was the Isthmus, where he found no traces of regular division, but, as he says, there have been severe earth movements in the area.\textsuperscript{158} In addition, there has been major building activity of all kinds through the centuries. It is a great pity that Chevallier did not investigate the area of the coastal plain and the plateau west of Corinth, which would have been much more likely to reveal information. Instead, his conclusion was, 'La colonie césarienne répondait, d'ailleurs, à une conception très particulière'.

In fact, no serious attempt has been made to investigate the existence of centuriation round Corinth and, indeed, any such attempt is fraught with difficulties. First, the whole area, not just the Isthmus, is subject to earthquakes. The land round Cenchreae has altered in level considerably, and so, probably, has the coastal plain; secondly, flash floods can sweep away evidence of boundaries; and thirdly, there were Slavic invasions and
subsequent abandonment of the land during the 8th century, followed by the long period when Greece was under Turkish domination. During this time there was little continuity of farming methods, particularly as the Turks had a tendency to move populations around. Therefore, the ancient field and road boundaries to be found in many parts of Europe, which have remained the same for centuries, may not be found. On the other hand, the abandonment of much of the land, as happened when the inhabitants of ancient Corinth removed to New Corinth in 1858, is not necessarily a bad thing, since it meant that the ground remained undisturbed until recently in some areas. Much more serious is the advent, in recent years, of new methods of farming which involve deep ploughing, irrigation systems, and the clearing of ancient remains from the fields, either to allow for cultivation or for modern building. Any worthwhile investigation of the possibility of centuriation round ancient Corinth will have to be done in the very near future. The ideal solution would be a thorough aerial survey, as proposed by Chevallier, but the present attitude of the Greek Government makes this unrealistic.

There are, however, two sets of aerial photographs which, if not ideal, do provide a possible source of information. The first set was taken by the RAF in 1945 but, as Bradford found, they were taken at too great an altitude to give any definite information on their own. A second set of some hundreds of aerial photographs was taken by the Topographical Service of the Greek Ministry of Public Works for the production of a map of the city of ancient Corinth in the early 1960s. They cover the area from the coast to the village of Solomos in the south, and from the hill of Penteskouphi in the west to the Xerias valley to the east. These photographs have never been studied in detail with a view to extracting information about land use. They cover some of the same ground as the RAF photographs from a much lower
altitude. They have the great virtue of preceding much of the major building in the area, as well as the construction of the Corinth/Patras highway, and the irrigation canal bringing water from the Arcadian mountains to the coastal plain. These photographs do have the disadvantage of being taken vertically rather than at various angles and different times of year, as are photographs taken for specifically archaeological purposes, but they overlap to a sufficient degree, and were taken over a sufficiently long period of time, to make them well worth studying. They are remarkably detailed and a potential source of valuable information, all of which, however, also has to be checked on the ground.

A careful examination of the aerial photographs of the lower Xerias valley, to the east of the city, shows that there are certain traces which reappear sufficiently frequently to be regarded as man-made rather than as natural features. (See pls. 4-6). The traces are very slight and no definite pattern of centuriation can be established, nor can reliable measurements be made so far, although I hope that it will be possible to do so in the future. In my view, the indications are sufficient to say that some system of centuriation was used at Corinth. In short, there is no real evidence that Corinth differs significantly from other Roman colonies of the period. Looked at, too, from the purely practical point of view, hundreds, if not thousands, of colonists had to be settled and provided with a means of subsistence as quickly and efficiently as possible. The practice of centuriatio was the normal and obvious way of doing this.

To return to an earlier point. Behind the remarks of Dilke, that Corinth 'is not agrarian' and of Chevallier, that the colony is 'très particulière' lies the assumption that Corinth is somehow different from other Roman colonies. Whatever the future development of Roman Corinth may have been, I suggest that, to begin with at least, we are looking at a
city and a community in which each citizen had a stake in the land. A stake that varied in size, no doubt, according to the man's rank, and one which he may have found it expedient to sell at some later stage. There must always have been a tendency for the small, colonial farmer to be swallowed up by a larger landowner, some of whom may have been well-established around Corinth before the foundation of the colony. More probably, the ordinary colonist, in the early years of the colony, would have kept and farmed his plot, while also making a living in some other way, as many Corinthians and people in other parts of the Mediterranean still do today. I would suggest, too, that a sound agricultural base, making Corinth largely self-sufficient, was one of her economic strengths, underpinning her undoubted commercial prosperity. 163

In spite of the absence of information in the ancient sources, it may be possible to get some idea of the amount of arable land available within the Corinthia for distribution to colonists, and so an estimate of the number of colonists. The ekistical study of the Corinthia sponsored by the Doxiades Institute in Athens has a useful appendix giving recent data regarding the population and rural economy of the area. 164 It includes figures from the agricultural censuses of the Greek Government in 1911 and 1961 and, in particular, the amount of arable land being farmed. The reason given by the compilers of the Report, Faraklas and Sakellariou, for selecting the first date is that they consider that by 1911 the unnatural conditions arising from the Turkish occupation of Greece had more or less righted themselves.

'We consider that the oldest statistical data which do not reflect the consequences of the conditions which prevailed during Turkish rule are those obtained from the 1907 and 1920 population censuses and from the 1911 agricultural land livestock censuses. Subsequent censuses showed an improved situation.' 165
This improved situation was due to such factors as new types of seed, the use of fertilizers, and the introduction of agricultural equipment. The description by H. N. Fowler of the coastal plain west of Corinth during the 1920s is worth quoting in this context.

'Several flourishing villages maintain themselves there, raising ample crops for independent support in the matter of food supplies, and producing annually large amounts of grain, wine, tobacco, fruits and cheese, and a huge quantity of dried currants to market in their prosperous emporium of New Corinth. In the spring the hills and plain are covered with waving fields of grain; later in the summer when the higher slopes are dry and brown, a vast expanse of fresh green vineyards stretches from the hills to the sea; with here and there a spot of pleasing verdure where one of the numerous springs issues into the plain.' 166

With the exception of the tobacco and the reference to New Corinth rather than just Corinth, this might well be a description of the situation in antiquity, when possession of this land gave rise to a proverbial saying expressing the ultimate to be desired in terms of wealth and prosperity. 167

The second set of figures for arable land in use quoted in the Doxiadès study comes from the 1961 census, chosen partly because of the improved situation, but also because the census was done village by village, so that it is possible to relate it fairly accurately to the area of the Corinthia in antiquity. The figures are also important for another reason. Even in 1961 the rural economy of the Corinthia, as of Greece as a whole, was still primitive. Donkeys and horses were used for transport, oxen or manpower for ploughing, and there was little reliance on modern, mechanical aids. Since then the change has been dramatic. The irrigation scheme of the early 1960s and the introduction of new crops, particularly citrus fruits, and the explosion of tourism, with the resulting increase in prosperity, have altered farming methods and the use of the land out of all recognition. These factors were not relevant in 1961, however, and the figures from the
1911 and 1961 censuses combined give a reasonable picture of the land use in the Corinthia when farmed by the traditional methods.

The Doxiades Report divided the Corinthia into twelve districts (see fig. 1). My Figure 2 gives the 1911 and 1961 figures for arable land being farmed in these districts, and also the population figures for 1907, 1920 and 1961, to which I shall refer later.

There are various curiosities in the figures for individual areas, the drop in land use in Sophiko, for example, but the main point for the present argument is that the total of arable land in use in 1911, namely 321.18 sq. km., is remarkably similar to the 1961 total of 297.06 sq. km. Fifty years has produced very little overall change. The average of the two figures, 309.12 sq. km. can legitimately be regarded as the proportion of land considered to be worth farming. I think it is reasonable to assume, given the general similarity in crops, livestock and working methods, that the Romans would have considered the same amount of land, at the very least, to be worth farming and therefore suitable for allocation to colonists.

The size of the actual plots distributed in the Roman period is unknown. We do know that the norm under the Empire was 66 2/3 iugera, but also that it varied considerably in the late Republic. The low figures of very early times must be disregarded, as should be the 12 iugera proposed for distribution to each colonist in Campania by Rullus in 63 BC. Campania was a peculiarly fertile area and by no means typical. On the Dalmatian coast the allotment was 50 iugera, early holdings at Arausio may have been 33 1/3 iugera, and they may have been as low as 30 iugera in Italy itself. 168 50 iugera is approximately 31 acres and this is a reasonable size for a peasant family, both in antiquity and also today, enabling it to be self-sufficient. So, for the moment, let us assume that this was the amount given at Corinth. This would allow for approximately 2,500 (2472.96
to be precise) plots for settler families. However, it is clear that Corinth had other advantages besides those of agriculture. It is more than likely that many of her freedman-colonists had trades and skills unrelated to the land, and they were not all expected to exist entirely on their small-holdings. So let us say that they each had a plot of 30 iugera, still a substantial piece of land. This means that there would be approximately 4120 (4121) plots for the settlers.

However, one also has to take account of the fact that the amount of land allocated varied substantially according to the social position and influence of the colonist. Also, a portion of the ager publicus - we do not know how much - was sold in 111 BC. Some of this land is likely to have been on the highly desirable coastal plain, so let us take out the whole of this area from west of Schoenus (Kalamaki) to the Nemea river, and from the coast up to the first plateau, including the site of Corinth itself. This area also includes the Loutraki plain as well as part of the Isthmus which, for reasons given below, may not all have been available for distribution. This area is 149 sq. km., nearly half that cultivated in this century, and possibly too big an area to deduct, but it does allow for the existence of some large estates, and bigger plots for some new colonists, and also for the fact that a few communities may have retained their land, although I suspect that they were often pushed into the marginal areas. Subtracting this area of 149 sq. km. from the total of land being farmed leaves 160.12 sq. km., which is enough for 2,135 ordinary settler families. This figure is within the limits arrived at earlier in comparison with figures of colonies known or deduced elsewhere, although it is towards the lower limit.

There are other factors to be taken into account, apart from the possibility that plots may have been smaller than 30 iugera. The Romans may well have considered as suitable farming land some areas not cultivated in
the 20th century. Wiseman has indicated that traces of Roman occupation exist where there is no record of land use in the 1911 and 1961 censuses. One example is Penteskouphi, which has no arable land in either census, yet there was Roman settlement in the region of Bayevi, and it is evident today that the land is suitable for some kinds of farming. Wiseman also notes clear evidence of a population in the Roman period farming the large area of arable land round Angelokastro. This area is not included in the Doxiades figures. I would say, therefore, that the figures for cultivable land and numbers of colonists are all on the low side. They are also, it should be stressed, hypothetical, although no more so than those of Levick and Bradford, which are generally regarded as acceptable.

Any attempt to estimate the population of the Corinthia at the beginning of the Roman period is hazardous. There is simply not enough evidence. There are, however, one or two observations worth making on the modern population figures and their possible relevance to the ancient situation. Figure 2 shows that the total population (not heads of families) in 1907 was 19,908 rising to 22,797 in 1920. By 1961 it had risen to 45,151, of which nearly 16,000 were living in New Corinth. The prosperity of New Corinth was based on the fact that it was the focus of the agricultural region, and also had a small, but flourishing export trade, mainly in currants. With the exception of Loutraki, which had a population of just under 5,000, the rest of the population in 1961 was scattered, as it always had been, in small farming communities throughout the Corinthia. The increase in population between 1920 and 1961 was due partly to growing agricultural prosperity, but also to the enormous numbers of refugees from Asia Minor which had to be absorbed by mainland Greece during the 1920s. The point worth remarking is that, despite the pressure from refugees, the region does not seem to have been capable of supporting more than 45,000
inhabitants without some industrialization and a radical change in the traditional farming methods, which did not happen until after 1961. There is a parallel between the Corinthia of the first part of the 20th century and the Corinthia of the later 1st century BC in that they were both agricultural regions which experienced a sudden large influx of population, and which had one large metropolitan centre. (A population of 16,000 is small for a city by modern standards, but normal for the ancient world.) I suggest, therefore, that we should be thinking of the population of the Corinthia in terms of numbers far below those generally cited for Greece in antiquity. At the beginning of the Roman period, at least, the population of the whole Corinthia is not likely to have been more than 50,000. 173

To return to the distribution of land in the colony. If one accepts the figure given above, 309 sq. km., for cultivated land, it leaves a substantial amount of the territorium unallocated - approximately 375 sq. km. This was normal procedure in a colony and it would include marginal areas, such as the pastureland on Acrocorinth, which Strabo says was uninhabited, 174 and land considered unsuitable for allocation. The territory cut by ravines might well have come in this category. It is worth noting, though, that then, as now, a determined farmer would be able to terrace and use such land, or else graze his flocks on it. Possibly some of the dispossessed inhabitants did so. In addition, some land was deliberately kept in the public domain. It is clear from the Lex Ursonensis, para. 82, and from Frontinus, that the general rule was for some lands and woods to be leased out for the benefit of the colony as a whole. They provided a source of revenue for the city, as well as supplies of timber. 175 Corinth must have had substantial timber reserves in the Geraneian mountains and on the lower slopes of Mt. Oneum. It is probable that quarries came in the same category. There is no evidence that the
Corinthian quarries were imperial property, and it is likely that they continue to be owned and worked by the colony. Both timber and stone would have been useful for public building. Most of the public buildings at Corinth are of the local limestone, especially those built up to the mid 1st century. Roads, public thoroughfares, road allowances and rivers were also regarded as public property and, at Corinth, I would include the diolkos, together with a suitable allowance, in this category. Strabo implies that the city of Corinth drew revenue from the use of the diolkos in addition to the land tax on those crossing the Isthmus.

It appears, too, that some sanctuaries and their land were also in the public domain. An inscription (Corinth VIII, 3, no. 306) records an official letter from the governor of Achaia approving the sale of some of the land at Isthmia to one Priscus, who was proposing to provide accommodation there. Kent dates this inscription to within ten years of 170, about two hundred years after the founding of the colony. The actual word in the inscription is ῥόος, which Kent translates as ager publicus. If this is so, one wonders why it was necessary to have the official approval of the governor of the province for a sale already agreed by the city council of Corinth. It is much more likely that major sanctuaries and their land were in a different category again and came also under the control of the provincial governor. In any case, the main point is that the land at Isthmia was not available for general distribution. It was normal practice in pre-Roman Greece for sanctuaries to be endowed with lands for their upkeep, and it looks as though this had been the case at Isthmia and the practice was continued by the Romans.

Lastly, there is the land used for the city itself, which would have been laid out at the time the colony was founded, with the same formality, and in accordance with the standard procedures. The Roman city was very
much smaller than its Greek predecessor, if one goes by the area enclosed within the 4th century walls. However, it is clear that there were always large areas of open and probably cultivated ground within these walls. Strabo says that the circuit of the city (and he means the Greek city) was 40 stadia or 7.4 km., and that the entire perimeter, including Acrocorinth, was 85 stadia or 15.72 km. These figures have little relevance to Roman Corinth. Substantial numbers of Roman graves have been found within the walls, near the amphitheatre and along the road leading from the Cenchreae Gate to the forum, as well as to the south and west. These tombs give an indication of the extent of the original Roman city. I shall be discussing both the extent and the layout of the city in Chapter II.

The Early Colonists

It is clear from the literary sources that the majority of ordinary colonists at Corinth were freedmen and the urban poor of Rome with, possibly, a sprinkling of veterans. There is no mention of the agrarii whom Cicero says were settled at Buthrotum. Many such men of the freedman class would have had a trade or a skill, as well as a patron. Crinagoras' contemporary description of the colonists as παλιμπρητοί, good-for-nothing slaves, is best regarded as a poetical canard. There is no reason to think that there was any connection between the majority of these settlers and the previous inhabitants of Corinth. They or their families could have come from anywhere in the Mediterranean world. The way in which the graves of Greek Corinth were ransacked and re-used by the early settlers is further proof of their lack of interest in their predecessors. And, indeed, it is unlikely that the first colonists, having recently attained Roman citizenship with all its privileges, would wish to be associated with the Greek past, now represented by provincials of inferior status.
As in other Caesarian colonies, freedmen could hold public office, and they appear to have been proud of their freedman origins. On the marble cornice block of a small building or temple is the inscription LIBERTI QUI CORINTHI HABITANT, for which West suggests an early date, possibly in the reign of Augustus. The donors were probably organized in a collegium libertorum or they may have contributed to the building on an individual basis.

Among other early inscriptions at Corinth is one recording the names of (Marcus) Antonius Milesius, son of Glaucus, and (Marcus) Antonius (?), who contributed to the restoration of the Sanctuary of Asclepius shortly after the battle of Actium. Their names indicate that they or their families received citizenship through Antony and, within a short time of their arrival in Corinth, they were prosperous enough to have their names recorded as benefactors on the epistyle of the Asclepieum. Antonii are frequently found in the early years of the colony, and the interdict by the Senate in 30 BC on the conjoining of the names Marcus and Antonius was soon disregarded. Marcus Antonius, often with a Greek cognomen, remains a common name at Corinth.

As so often happens, there is little epigraphic evidence for ordinary people at Corinth, and it is difficult to date, but there is considerably more information about the wealthier members of the city community. From the time of Gaius Gracchus it was clear that colonies had become a means by which men with some capital could invest in a new settlement. These men were intended to be the future ruling class of the new colony. No poor man could hope to be a member of a local senate, even less could he aspire to public office. The provision in the Lex Ursonensis which requires that decurions should possess a house in the city, implies that some of them would be living on their property in the country. In Urso, too, magistrates
had to contribute 2,000 sesterces to the cost of public shows. This was in a small city and one should expect the standard of wealth, and the demands made upon the magistrates, to be substantially higher in a city like Corinth.

The names of a number of the early duoviri at Corinth are known, and most of them can be connected with the powerful Roman familiae swarming all over the Mediterranean in the 1st century BC, usually as negotiatores. Amandry's revised list of the duoviri, based on numismatic evidence, is given on page 27. The order in the early years differs considerably from that of Edwards and Kent, but all three place the same pairs of magistrates near the beginning of the colony. The majority are freedmen of Greek origin, such as C. Julius Nicephorus, who owed his enfranchisement to Julius Caesar, as did the C. Julius who held office with L. Aeficius Certus. The latter probably belonged to the same familia as a Marcus Aeficius M.f. Apollonius, living in Cnidus, who erected a statue to G. Julius Theopompus, a close friend of Julius Caesar. It is likely that both were connected with the millionaire equestrian, Aeficius Calvinus.

M. Insteius C.f. Tectus is one of the few duovirs known from both coins and inscriptions. He was a close and questionable associate of Antony, and Cicero refers to him as a bath-keeper and brigand from Pisaurum. He was tribune-elect in 43 BC, was at the siege of Mutina with Antony, followed him to Greece in 42 and then took up residence at Corinth, becoming duovir and duovir quinquennalis. He is last heard of commanding the centre of Antony's battle-line at Actium. Since Insteius is such an uncommon name, it is likely that he was the patron of Titos 'Istiblos Eutuxos at Mytilene, and possibly had a representative at Attaleia, too.

The connection of several more duoviri with Antony is clear. M. Antonius Orestes, was of Greek origin, enfranchised by Antony.
Antonius Theophilus, is well-known from Plutarch as the διοικητής of Antony at Corinth, to whom Antony commended his friends after Actium. 199 He was the father of another duovir, Hipparchus, whom the elder Pliny refers to as a freedman of Antony who had once stood in the slave market. 200

Other well-known families are represented by these early duoviri. P. Tadius Chilo, another enfranchised Greek, is connected with the banking family of the Murrii; 201 and C. Pinnius must have been a member of the Pinnii family, which had enormous investments in the East. The son of Cicero's friend, T. Pinnius, lent Nicaea in Bithynia 8,000,000 sesterces. 202 C. Pinnius held office with P. Aebutius, whom Grant thinks is a cliens of the ancient Aebutii family, and their coinage also bears the head of Antony. 203 Another friend of Cicero, Castricius, had involved financial dealings with Smyrna and Tralles in Lydia. 204 He may be connected with the wealthy L. Castricius Regulus who was prominent at Corinth at the end of the 1st century BC, and was the first agonothetes of the Isthmian Games. 205

The Heii are also much in evidence at Corinth, where no fewer than three members of the familia hold office at much the same time, and on several occasions. 206 They should be associated with the wealthy C. Heius, a Mamertine and leading citizen of Messana, who suffered at the hands of Verres. 207 Other Heii are to be found at Sparta, 208 and especially at Delos, which is not surprising in view of the trading links between Campania, Sicily and Delos. 209

In spite of Antony's defeat at Actium, power seems to have remained in the hands of the same social group, partly, no doubt, due to some fast footwork. Plutarch records M. Antonius Hipparchus, son of Theophilus, as being the most influential of Antony's freedmen and the first to go over to Octavian. 210 The coins of his duovirate, held with Novius Bassus, have the head of Augustus on one side and the laureate head of Julius Caesar on the
other. The Heii remain very prominent and the Novii and Mussii continue to represent banking interests. Later, members of the same families are found holding office, and this pattern of an hereditary upper class is continued well into the 2nd century.

Other prominent men may have been distinguished citizens of Achaia, admitted to Roman citizenship at Corinth. It is likely that the Greek Gellii, a well-known Corinthian family, owed their enfranchisement to L. Gellius Poplicola, who served in Greece under Antony, became consul in 36 BC, and fought for Antony at Actium. A certain Marius Barbatius, a comparatively rare name, may well have received citizenship through Barbatius Pollio, a supporter of Antony and provincial quaestor in 41 BC. He must have been one of the original colonists since he is of the Aemilia tribe. His son, also Marcus Barbatius, became sufficiently distinguished to hold office as praefectus i.d. in the early Empire, probably in 17/18.

The Cornelii are very much in evidence from early days, although there is no record of them holding the duovirate. One intriguing inscription highlights social relationships in this Roman colony of freedman origin. An inscription records that a certain Quintus Cornelius Secundus of the Aemilia tribe and his wife, Maecia, their two sons, Cornelius Secundus Maecianus and Quintus Cornelius Secundus, together with their sister, Cornelia, who married her grandfather's freedman, Q. Maecius Cleogenes, joined together to build a macellum and piscarium. Another almost identical inscription refers to the building of a piscarium with two tanks, funded by the same family.

This generous gift to the city was given by the members of one family, which was probably among the original settlers, and it highlights the attitude of wealthy citizens towards their community. It may also, of course, be connected with a bid for public office. Another pleasing point about this
inscription is that it looks as though, in time-honoured fashion, the trusted employee, Cleogenes, married the boss's daughter, or granddaughter.

I have gone into the detail of some of these early magistrates and prominent citizens, not only because of their intrinsic interest, but also to emphasize that they were very much part of the network of Roman familiae, with contacts that extended all over the Eastern Mediterranean. Grant describes the early duoviri of Corinth as financiers and adventurers "providing a curious illustration of the new society which was riding on the crest of the wave of the Revolution and of the ruling classes in this great Eastern colony". True enough, but there is nothing curious about it. In other words, these new Corinthians were entrepreneurs, eager to seize onto a good thing, and ready to exploit their resources and connections as far as possible. Just the sort of people one might expect to find in any new colonial foundation or commercial venture. Their modern equivalent might easily be found in the towns and businesses of North America being opened up in the last century and the beginning of this one. Just the sort of people, too, to make a commercial success of their city. As part of the Roman world, their interests required the maintenance and strengthening of links with the commercial interests of Rome. Conversely, they had little incentive to become involved with the native population of Achaia. The only exception would be the few wealthy families, such as the Euryclids of Sparta, who, almost inevitably, would acquire Roman citizenship and be absorbed into the ruling society of the province.
Notes to Chapter One

1. The most important ancient sources are: Strabo, VIII, 6, 20-23, in the Budé edition by R. Baladie (which includes W. Aly's 1956 reading of the Vatican Palimpsest), Paris, 1978; Pausanias, II, 1-5, 5; and also scattered references in Pliny, NH IV, 4-6. The most useful modern works are: Corinth I, 1,; Doxiades Report; Wiseman, LAC; Philippson, Die griechischen Landschaften, Band II, Der Peloponnes, Frankfurt am Main, 1959, especially sections II and III, on the geography and geology; and Baladie, who provides a discerning commentary on Strabo's account of Corinth, as well as useful observations on conditions in the Peloponnese in general.
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3. Strabo, VIII, 6, 21 fin. and 22. As P. W. Wallace, Hesperia 38 (1969), p. 496, n. 8, points out, Strabo has not made a mistake in referring to the Geraneian mountain-range as the Oneian Mts., as many scholars assume (see also E. Meyer, RE XVIII, 1942, col. 440). Pausanias (I, 44, 4) also says that Pagae is Megarian, and indicates (I,44, 10) that the Megarian-Corinthian border came after the Scironian Rocks; at I:1, 1, 3 he says that Crommyon is Corinthian. See Wiseman, LAC, pp. 20-22, for a discussion of the border and of the area in general.


5. See Wiseman, LAC, pp. 136-138, which also includes references to Corinth I, 1, Ptolemy and the elder Pliny.

7. For instance, the Athenians continued to beach their boats on the open shore of Phaleron, despite having one of the best natural harbours in the Mediterranean at Piraeus. For the size of ships and the use of harbours in both the Greek and the Roman periods, see L. Casson, Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World, Princeton, 1973, especially ch. 16. At Lechaeum there are elaborate earthworks of the Roman period, two large outer harbours, and an inner harbour with a large Roman monument (see J. W. Shaw, AJA 74, 1969, pp. 370-372), but there has been no excavation, so it is impossible to say anything about the Greek period. Xenophon's reference to ship-sheds in the town (Hell., IV, 4, 12) does not imply harbour installations. The results of the excavation of the Roman harbour at Cenchreae, where, again, the Greek harbour has not been found, are published by R. Scranton, J. W. Shaw and L. Ibrahim Kenchreai, Eastern Port of Corinth, I, Topography and Architecture, Leiden, 1978.

8. Fowler (Corinth, I, 1, p. 34) estimated the area to be not much more than 270 square miles (about 700 sq. km.). He assumes, as does Wiseman, that the boundary runs along the ridge west of Cape Trachyli until it reaches the sea. The detailed topographical survey carried out by the Doxiades Institute (p. 48) gives a much lower figure of 586 sq. km. (about 226 sq. mi.) for the State of Corinthia. The authors assume that the political boundary does not follow the geographical boundary on the south, but runs north of the Selondas valley and Korphos (see map). They regard the wide mountain belt separating the Corinthia from the Argolid and the Epidauria as no-man's land, or, at any rate, not part of the Corinthia. However, Wiseman has produced a convincing argument to the contrary, and this extra land, including the plain of Angelokastro, would account for most of the discrepancy of 114 sq. km. between the two figures. The Doxiades figures are, in themselves, confusing: on p. 3 and p. 5 the authors say that the total area of Corinthia-Cleonaea is 1,000 sq. km., 334, sq. km. north of the Isthmus and 666 sq. km. south of the Isthmus (these calculations were made by Sotirios Lagadomios for maps of the Hellenic Army Geographical Service with a scale of 1:5,000 - 1,200,000). The State of Cleonae is given as 135 sq. km. (p. 122). Therefore, according to Doxiades' own figures, the Corinthia should be 865 not 586 sq. km. The authors are dealing sometimes with Corinthia-Cleonaea as a geographical, rather than as a political, entity, but, as their own maps show (see Map
25b), from the archaic period on, they regard these boundaries as more or less identical, except in the upper Xerias (Leukon) valley. It is a pity that, with the resources available to them, the authors of the Doxiades Report did not produce clearer and more reliable figures.

9. E.g. Aristophanes, Birds, 967-968; Athenaeus, V, 219; Lucian, Icaromen, 18; Livy, XXXVII, 31, 1.

10. Strabo describes Corinth as ἐπὶ τραπεζάδους χωρίου (VIII, 6, 21), a reasonably accurate description.


It is clear that Strabo is surveying systematically the views from the summit of Acrocorinth (see Wallace, op. cit., note 3). H. A. Thompson tells me that in the 1930s, on a clear day, one could also see the Athenian Acropolis.

12. The diolkos was excavated by N. Verdelis: he published the results, with excellent photographs, in Ath. Mitt., 71 (1956), pp. 51-59; Ath. Mitt.,
73 (1958), pp. 140-145; Prakt. (1960), pp. 136-143; and Prakt. (1962), pp. 48-50. It is a paved way with parallel grooves ca. 1.5 m. apart; almost 2 km. are visible, varying in width from 3.6 to 6 m., and 10 m. wide at the Corinthian Gulf end. By 1983 the platform at the edge and under the water had been partly destroyed, as had some of the paving slabs with masons' marks on them. See Wiseman, LAC, p. 45, and Baladie, pp. 250-263.

13. Corinth I, 1, p. 68, fig. 45, shows a brick-built tomb that was still standing in the 1920s. See also H. S. Robinson, Hesperia 41 (1972), pp.355-356, and W. W. Cummer, Hesperia 40 (1971), pp. 205-231, for tombs at Cenchreae. A vaulted chamber tomb of the more elaborate variety found at Corinth was excavated by C. A. Morgan at Hexamilia (AJA 42 (1938), pp.369-370). It had a facade with two columns and a poros architrave. In the walls were eleven niches which each had a terracotta pot sunk in the floor. A poros sarcophagus was built into the floor. It dates from the 1st century but was robbed in the 4th or 5th century. The masonry foundations of other tombs can be seen in the area and are found built into the cliffs.

14. See Wiseman, LAC, p. 68 and fig. 76, for a photograph of the enormous quarry near Hexamilia.

15. Strabo, VIII, 6, 23: Κόρινθος ὅρθρος τε καὶ κολλαίνεται.

16. The very clear description given by H. S. Robinson, Hesperia 31 (1962), p. 126, is worth quoting: "The terrain at Corinth consists of a surface layer of conglomerate, sometimes as little as 2.00 m. thick, resting upon clay. The conglomerate is porous, the clay is not; surface water penetrates the conglomerate but forms a shallow deposit over the clay. Whenever a natural scarp exposes both the conglomerate and the underlying clay, the water between the two formations may come forth as a natural spring.... The Corinthians early learned to exploit this natural supply by cutting back the clay to form a projecting ledge of conglomerate from which water dripped constantly and by digging tunnels into the clay from the exposed scarp.... The shelf (above of conglomerate) both increased the quantity of water available, by drip from above, and created shade to keep the water cool."
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δεξίωσε δυ' αὐτόν, ἢ τὸ παλαιόν ὑπολήπτεον τὴν Πειρήνην ἐπι-
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Williams, EMC/CV n.s. 2, 1983, p. 203). See also W. R. Biers, Hesperia 47,
1978, pp. 171-184. It is not known where the aqueduct entered the city of
Corinth. It is interesting that the same water-source now supplies the
modern irrigation-channel of the 1960s.


20. Strabo, XII, 3, 39 fin.
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Greece.
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23. Wiseman, LAC, passim, and W. K. Pritchett, Studies in Ancient Greek
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and Part 3, Ancient Greek Roads, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1980, chap. 5.

24. Pausanias, I, 44, 6, who describes it as wide enough for two
carriages to pass one another.


29. Strabo, VIII, 6, 19. He also says that it is visible from Acrocorinth.

30. R. S. Stroud, unpublished paper delivered to the American School of Classical Studies in Athens during the 1979-1980 academic year. He reports rock-cuttings for the ancient road and impressive remains of a stone bridge carrying the carriage-road over a ravine. See also Wiseman, *LAC*, p. 93, note 3, on Stroud's observations.


33. *e.g.* Strabo gives the following distances by sea: Cenchreae to Schoenus, 45 *stadia* (VIII, 6, 4); Malea to Schoenus, 1,800 *stadia* (op. cit.); Salamis is about 100 *stadia* from Attica, Megara and Epidaurus (VIII, 6, 16); Piraeus about 350 *stadia* from Schoenus and the same distance from Sunium (IX,9, 2). Pliny is not always accurate: Corinth is certainly not 60 *stadia* from the shore of the Corinthian Gulf (though it is roughly that distance from Cenchreae [NH, IV, 4, 11]); however, he emphasizes distances by sea, in the same manner as does Strabo; *e.g.* 88 miles from Leucas to Patras and 85 miles from Patras to the Isthmus (op. cit.); Cape Skyli to the Isthmus, 80 miles (NH, IV, 5, 18); he says that the harbours of Piraeus and Phaleron are 55 miles from the Isthmus, and that the Scironian Rocks are 6 miles long (NH, IV, 7, 23).

34. Stone from the Corinthia was used in the Temple of Apollo: see *FD*, III, 5 (1970), no. 19, lines 27-28; also note 22.
35. Since this chapter was written, Salmon, Wealthy Corinth, has been published. In Ch. 1, he gives a more detailed account that I have done of the climatic conditions and resources of the Corinthia. See also R. S. Stroud's review in AJA 89, 1985, pp. 697-699.


37. E.g. Diodorus Siculus, XXXII, 27, 1: "Οἱ περὶ τῆς Κορίνθου καὶ τοὺς ποιητὰς προειρημότες ἠσαν "καρδινθως ήστρων οὐκ ἄσημων Ἑλλάδος."
See also Cicero, pro leg. Man., V, 11: totius Graeciae lumen... Strabo (VIII, 6, 23) quotes Polybius' eye-witness account of the sack (Polybius, XXXIX, 2, 1, lost, except for Strabo's citation of it). See Florus, I, 32, and Pausanias, II, 16, on the vast quantity of treasure and works of art carried off from Corinth. Strabo's account of the history of Corinth (VIII, 6, 20) emphasizes its huge wealth during the Greek period, and this former wealth and prominence are also the theme of an epigram of Antipater of Sidon (Anth. Pal., IX, 150).

38. Pseudo-Scylax, Periplus, 54, calls it τῆς Χορίνθου; frequent references in Thucydides also testify to its importance (III, 491; V, 28; 44; 51).

39. For Tenea, see Wiseman, LAC, pp. 92-93, on the ancient literary references and modern archaeological finds. For Crommyon, see Wiseman, LAC, pp. 18-19.

40. See Wiseman, ANRW, p. 445, where he summarizes the evidence.


42. See Wiseman, ANRW, pp. 462-464, for a discussion of the evidence.

43. Cicero (loc. cit. note 37) also says that Corinth was destroyed because the Roman envoys were insulted; this is repeated by Livy (Per., LII)
and by Strabo (VIII, 6, 23). Elsewhere (de off., III, 46) Cicero says that it was done utilitatis specie. He also remarks, however (de off., I, 40), nollem Corinthum, sed credo aliquid secutos, opportunitatem loci maxumum, ne posset aliquando ad bellum faciendum locus ipse adhortari. This reason is repeated at length in de leg. ag., XXXII, 87: qui tres solum urbes in terris omnibus, Carthaginem, Corinthum, Capuam, statuerunt posse imperii gravitatem ac nomen sustinere.... Corinthi vestigium vix relictum est. Erat enim posita in angustiis atque in faucibus Graeciae sic, ut terra claustra locorum teneret et duo maria navigationi diversas paene coniungeret, cum pertenui discrimine separantur. Haec, quae procul erant a conspectu imperii, non solum adflixerunt sed etiam, ne quando recreata exsurgere atque erigere se possent, funditus, ut dixi, sustulerunt. On the reasons for the destruction, see, most recently, F. W. Walbank, An Historical Commentary on Polybius, Volume III, Oxford, 1979, pp. 728-729. He disposes of the commercial reasons originally invoked by Mommsen, partly because there is evidence that Italian commercial interests were already well-established at Corinth, as well as at Delos. He considers the motives to have been primarily political. E. S. Gruen (JHS XCVI, 1976, pp. 46-69) thinks that the war was the result of a tragic miscalculation on both sides, and that, because of conditions in Macedon in 146 BC, Rome was forced to intervene militarily in the affairs of the Achaean League which she had, hitherto, preferred to ignore.

44. E.g., Polybius, XVIII, 11 and 45; Appian, Mac., VIII.
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46. Wiseman, ANRW, pp. 491-492.
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52. See Corinth VIII, I, nos. 1-9, 11, 23-61, and Corinth VIII, 3, nos. 1-49: the find-spots of the various fragments of these public inscriptions are listed in these reports.

53. Walbank, loc. cit., (note 43). See Florus, I, 32, 5: Tum ab incolis deserta civitas direpta primum, deinde tuba praecinente deleta est. See also Zonaras, IX, 31. Macrobius, Sat., III, 9, 13, refers to the ground being cursed, but there is no other reference to this happening; presumably it is poetic license on Macrobius' part.


57. IG II-II 2, 9058-9081.

58. Cicero, de leg. ag., I, 2, 5: deinde agrum optimum et fructuosissimum Corinthium qui L. Mummio imperio ac felicitate ad vectigalia populi Romani adiunctus est....

59. Strabo, VIII, 6, 22.

60. Pausanias, II, 1, 2. Zonaras (IX, 31) says that the walls only of some cities were demolished.

61. See E. G. Hardy, Roman Laws and Charters, Oxford, 1912 (reprinted New York, 1975), pp. 77-78. The Lex Agraria of 111 BC refers to such a
situation (paras. 78-80), and since the same law also deals with Corinth, I think it reasonable to assume that the same situation applied there (see note 151). See also Hardy, ns. 24 and 30.


64. See Corinth VIII, 2, pp. 1-4, no. 1, for the Latin elegiac verses that celebrated the transport of M. Antonius' fleet across the Isthmus; see also L. R. Taylor and A. B. West, AJA 32 (1928), pp. 9-22. For a discussion as to whether the diolkos remained in use during the period 146-44 BC, see Baladie, pp. 257-261.


66. Pausanias (II, 2, 2) says: "δὲ Ἰσθμίας ἄγην ὀδὴν ἀναστάντων ὑπὸ Μοῦμιου Κορινθίων ἔξελθεν, ἄλλ' ἔσον μὲν χρόνον ἔρημωντο ἡ πόλις, Σικυωνίως ἔγειρεν ἐπετέραπτο τὰ Ἰσθμία, οἰκισθέος δὲ αὖθις ἐς τοὺς νῦν οἰκήτορας περιήλθεν ἡ τιμὴ." For the archaeological evidence, see Broneer, op. cit, (note 27), p. 4. In spite of the reference in Polybius (XXXIX, 6) to Mummius having carried out repairs at the Isthmian Sanctuary, the condition in general was ruinous. Broneer considers it likely that the celebration of the Games was transferred literally to Sicyon shortly after 146 BC, and this, indeed, is the sense of the passage from Pausanias cited here. It would also be reasonable, given that Sicyon is a considerable distance from Isthmia. However, see Walbank, op. cit., (note 43), p. 736.

67. Strabo actually says (VIII, 6, 23): "τὴν δὲ χάραν Ἐσχον Σικυώνιοι τὴν πλεῖστην τῆς Κορινθίας. A number of historians say that the land was given to the Sicyonians: e.g., Fowler (p. 15), Larsen (p. 312), Wiseman (ANRW, p. 493, note 199). Similarly, Walbank (p. 729) says "The territory was partly handed over to Sicyon and partly made into ager publicus." However, this is not really the sense of Ἐσχον. A. Griffin, Sikyon, Oxford, 1982, p. 88, more accurately: She [Sikyon] took over part of Corinth's
Possessores were protected against another party seizing the land, but not against the State repossessing itself at will: see Hardy, op. cit., (note 61), pp. 2-52, "Introduction to the Lex Agraria."

68. See note 58, and also Cicero, de leg. ag., II, 19, 51, on the land being ager publicus; see Livy, XXVII, 31, 1, on the fertility of the land between Sicyon and Corinth.

69. Sicyon was having serious difficulties in repaying loans from Atticus: see Cicero, ad Att., I, 19, 1; I, 31, 1; II, 21, 6. It also had to sell off its art treasures: see Pliny, NH, XXXV, 1, 27.

70. Letter of Ser. Sulpicius Rufus to Cicero in 45 BC: Cicero, ad Fam., IV, 5, 4; Corinthians living among the ruins: Cicero, Tusc. Disp., III, 22, 53.


72. See Corinth XIV, pp. 82-84; also C. K. Williams, Hesperia 47 (1978), pp. 22-23.


74. Williams, loc. cit. (note 72); see also Kent, p. 20, n. 10.

75. For instance, Corinth VI, p. 6, and A. H. M. Jones, The Greek City, Oxford, 1940, pp. 61 and 66.

76. Diodorus Siculus, XXX, 27, 1: διελθμενος την κόρινθον ο ιοδισς Καίσαρ διὰ τὰς πράξεις ἀνομοσθείς ἔδεις εἰς τοιαύτην ἥλθεν συμπάθειαν καὶ φιλοδοξίαν ὡστε μετὰ πολλῆς σπουδῆς πάλιν αὐτήν ἀναστήσατε; Strabo, VIII, 4, 9: κόρινθον μὲν οὖν κατέσκαψαν Ῥωμαίοι καὶ ἀνέστησαν πάλιν; VIII, 6, 23: πολλὰ δὲ χρόνον ἔρημη μείνασα ἡ κόρινθος, ἀνελθρήτη πάλιν ὑπὸ Καίσαρος τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὴν εὐφυτίαν, ἔποευθος
πέμψαντος τοῦ ἀπελευθερικοῦ γένους πλείστους; ΧVII, 3, 15: ἡρωμαμένης
d᾽ ὀδὸν ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον τῆς Καρχηδόνος, καὶ σχεδὸν τι τῶν αὐτῶν χρόνων,
δυνηρὶ καὶ Κόρινθος, ἀνελήψῃ πάλιν περὶ τοὺς αὐτοῖς πως χρόνους ὅπως
Καῖσαρος τοῦ Θεοῦ.


78. Plutarch, Caesar, 57, 4: ἀδέσις ἀνελάμβανε τὸν ἑμὸν ἑστιάσει
καὶ συνεργεῖται, τὸ δὲ στρατωτικὸν ἀποκλαίει, δὲν ἐπιφανεῖται Καρχηδόν
καὶ Κόρινθος ἦσαν, αἷς καὶ πρῶτον τὴν ἀλώσαν καὶ τότε τὴν ἀνάληψιν ἐμα
καὶ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον ἀμφοτέρους γενότεκχοι συνέτουχε.

79. Plutarch, Mor. 86B, Corinth VIII, 3, pp. 64-65, no. 138; Mor. 675D,
Corinth VIII, 2, pp. 53-55, no. 70.

80. Appian, Pun., 136: χρόνῳ δὲ αὖθις, ὅποτε Γάιος Καῖσαρ ὁ καὶ δικαίω-
tάτωρ διστερον αὐτοῖς διηνεκῆς γενόμενος ..., λέγεται, τῇ Ἀρχηγοῖν παρα-
στρατοπεδεῖδον, ὅπε ἐνυπνόῳ στατείν πολὺν ἄδην κλαῖοντα ἐνοχληθῆναι, καὶ
ἀδίκα δαυτῇ ἐς μνήμην ὑπογράψασθαι Καρχηδόνα συνοικίζειν. καὶ μετ᾽ ὅδε πολὺ
tῶν ἀδρῶν αὐτῶν ἐς Ἡρώη ἐπανελθόντα περὶ γῆς παρακαλοῦσιν, συνέτασσεν ὡς
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Ῥωμαίοι κατέσχον, καὶ Καρχηδόνα κατέσκαψαν τε καὶ συνήθησαν αὖθις μετὰ ἐτή
τῆς κατασκαφῆς ἐκατόν καὶ δύο.
81. It was normal for desirable areas of ager publicus overseas to be let out to Roman citizens or to their representatives. Those parts of the ager publicus that were sold in 111 BC (see p. 37) must have been bought by Roman citizens. Cicero's letters are full of references to his friends in Greece: for instance, in 45 BC he is writing to Ser. Sulpicius on behalf of his good friend M. Aemilius Avianus, living at Sicyon (ad Fam., XIII, 21 and 27); similarly, he writes on behalf of L. Mescinius, heir to his cousin M. Mindius, a banker in Elis (ad Fam., 26 and 28 a). In other letters he mentions Manius Curius, who has a banking business at Patrae (ad Fam., XIII, 17), and T. Manlius at Thespiae (ad Fam., XIII, 22). Most of these men were equestrians and wealthy businessmen.

82. Pausanias, II, 1, 2: ὁστερον λέγουσιν ἀνοικήσαι Καίσαρα, δὲ πολλοῖς εἰς 'Ῥώμῃ πρῶτος τὴν ἐθνομὸν κατεστήσατο ἀνοικήσαι δὲ καὶ Καρχηδόνα ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς αὐτοῦ.

83. Pausanias, II, 3, 1: ὑπὲρ δὲ τὴν ἁγοράν ἐστὶν ὑπατήλας νάδας ἀδελφῆς Αὐγοδόστου βασιλέσσαντος Ἕλληνων μετὰ Καίσαρα τὸν ὀλυστῆν Κορινθίου τῆς υἱῶν.

84. Pausanias, II, 1, 2: Κόρινθον δὲ οἰκεῖσοι Κορινθιέων μὲν οὔδεὶς ἐτί τῶν ἀρχαίων, ἐποικός δὲ ἄποσταλέντες ὑπὸ Ἕλληνων.

85. Pausanias, II, 1, 1; see also Brunt, p. 599, n. 86.

86. Dio Cassius, XLIII, 50, 3: τοῦτοις τε οὖν ἐσεμνύνετο, καὶ ὑπὶ τὴν Καρχηδόνα τὴν τῷ Κόρινθῳ ἀνέστησεν. πολλάς μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἀλλὰς ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι καὶ ἐξω πόλεις τὰς μὲν ἀνωτέρωτης, τὰς δὲ καὶ ἐκ καὶ ἐκ τῆς κατεστησατο. ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν καὶ ἀλλαὶ τισὶν ἐπέπραξεν, τὴν δὲ δὴ Κόρινθον τὴν τῇ Καρχηδόνα, πόλις ἀρχαίας λαμπρᾶς ἐπισθμοῦς ἀπολυμάνας, ζὲ μὲν ἀποικίας Ἕλληνων ἐνδύμασεν, ἀπόκεισεν, ἢ δὲ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἐνδύμασιν ἐτύμησεν, ἀπέδωκεν τῷ μνήμῃ τῶν ἐνοικησάντων ποτὲ αὐτῶς, μηδὲν δὲ τὴν ἑκείνων ἐχθέαν τοῖς χωρίους τοῖς μηδὲν σφας ἀδικήσασι μνησικακήσας.
87. Zonaras, IX, 31: ἡ μὲν οὖν Καρχηδόν καὶ τε Κόρινθος αἱ ἀρχαῖαι ἐκεῖναι τοῦτο τέλος ἀμα ἐσχὸν, χρόνῳ δὲ πολλῷ διστετον ἄποικιαν Ῥωμαίων λαβοῦσαι ήπάθης καὶ εἰς τὴν παλαιὰν ἐπανήλθουν κατάστασιν.

88. On the name of the colony, see O. Broneer, Hesperia 10 (1941), pp. 388-390, and Corinth VIII,3 p. 60, no. 130.


90. Wiseman, ANRW, p. 497. Surely, Appian means that Caesar began arrangements for founding the colony. It would be entirely contrary to normal practice (see p. 31-32) for colonists to go out to a colony before it had been set up.

91. Grant, FITA, pp. 265-266. Grant misread the other coin mentioned here: CREATOR vas- CORIN in wreath [BMC 690]. This has now been shown to bear the duumviral names of Cn. Publicius (Regulus?) and M. Antonius Orestes: see C. H. V. Sutherland, Num. Chron. 8, 6th series (1947), pp. 87-88.


93. Corinth VI which includes finds from 1896-1929, excluding those from the Shear excavations.

94. The latest published list of duoviri, based on numismatic and epigraphic evidence, is in Corinth VIII, 3, pp. 24-25.

95. Coins of Piso and Cleander have on the reverse the types Adventus Augusti and Adlocutio Augusti recording respectively the arrival of Nero in Greece and his proclamation of the freedom of Achaia. Opinion has been divided as to the date of the latter event and most scholars have preferred
to follow Suetonius (Nero 24, 2) in placing it just before Nero's departure in AD 67. Amandry's conclusion in favour of the earlier date has been strengthened by the dating of an issue of the Sicyonian mint with the legend N(eron) K(aisar) Zeus Eleutherios. See B. E. Levy, "When Did Nero Free Achaia? Evidence from the Coinage of Sicyon." Abstract of a paper delivered at the 1984 Annual Meeting, AJA 89, 1985, p. 339.

96. See note 116.


98. See Liebenam, loc. cit. In practice, only the holding of this office in two consecutive years was forbidden.

99. Coin: Corinth VI, 16. See Grant, FITA, p. 266.

100. See Grant, FITA, pp. 290-292.

101. S. Weinstock, Divus Julius, Oxford, 1971, pp. 299 and 405, and pl. 21, 15. All other representations of Julius Caesar at Corinth show him laureate. As Grant, (FITA, p. 266) says, it is based on a denarius of ca. 50 BC and his features are quite unlike those on the other Corinthian coins. The reverse shows a hexastyle temple with a statue in it, OR to the left and an amphora to the right. The names of the duoviri are absent. There is no good reason for regarding the ligature OR as standing for Corinth; the name of the colony is not abbreviated like this on the early coins.

102. Corinth VIII, 3, no. 50. It was found in the theatre, but the original provenance is unknown.

103. Wiseman, ANRW, p. 497.

104. Salmon, Colonization, p. 141.

105. Corinth VIII, 2, pp. 88-89.

107. Cicero, Phil., V, 4, 10 and 12.

108. Brunt, p. 258, suggests that the Lex Antonia dealt with all Caesar's colonies, both those formally authorized and those still in the planning stage.

109. Certainly Urso, probably Lugdunum, Lampsacus, Troas, and, possibly, Dyme. The situation is complicated because some colonies were refounded and their names altered. However, Caesar's overseas colonization plans were extensive, and, as Brunt says (pp. 256-258), very little was actually completed by the time of his death. See Brunt's list of provincial colonies, pp. 589 ff; see also Salmon, Colonization, pp. 134-136; and Grant, FITA, p. 302-303.


111. Dio Cassius, L. 5; Velleius Paterculus, II, 84, 2. The fact that Theophilus was in a position to assist Antony's friends in 30 BC suggests that Corinth had been retaken by Antonian forces before Actium.

112. Plutarch, Antonius, 68, 3.

113. Salmon, Colonization, pp. 138-141.

114. The procedure for establishing a colony is well-known: see E. Kornemann, RE IV (1901), s.v. coloniae, cols. 568-571; J. B. Ward-Perkins, Cities, p. 38; Salmon, Colonization, pp. 19-25; F. E. Brown, Cosa, pp. 5-6, 8-9, and 16-17. Both Salmon and Brown are describing the procedure for early colonies, but, as Salmon says, in all essential respects the foundation of citizen colonies was similar. Brown also gives the archaeological details connected with the founding, together with references to the Cosa excavation reports. Cicero, de leg. ag., II, 32, gives details of the colonial foundation proposed by Rullus in 63 BC for Campania. The most useful source of information in the present context is the Lex Coloniae
Genetivae Iulieae Ursonensis, [ILS 6087] translated with commentary by E. G. Hardy, Three Spanish Charters, Oxford, 1912 (reprinted, New York, 1975). His Introduction is particularly useful. The foundation of Urso was initiated by Julius Caesar at approximately the same time as that of Corinth: thus, its lex data (foundation charter) is of particular significance. Here, as possibly also at Corinth, the normal tresviri coloniae deducendae were replaced by one man, and someone else, presumably under the direction of this man, was responsible for the surveying and allocation of lands. Leges datae were dependent upon the Lex Julia Municipalis (para. 159). In some cases, the Lex Ursonensis is repeating general formulae from the Lex Julia Municipalis, and also from Caesar's Lex Julia Agraria (see paras. 97 and 104 of the Lex Ursonensis). This, together with general similarities between it and other fragmentary leges datae, has led scholars to the conclusion that the Lex Ursonensis is typical of foundation charters issued at this time. On this basis, one can assume that many of the provisions of the lex data of Corinth would have been similar to those laid down for Urso.

115. See L. Casson, Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World, Princeton, 1971, especially chs. 9 and 12. We know practically nothing about the arrangements for transporting colonists overseas, although a little information may be deduced from references to sea-transport in general. Casson (p. 270) gives 27 May to 27 September as the normal sailing season for the whole of antiquity, with outside limits of 10 March and 10 November. No doubt those colonists who could afford it would have travelled to Corinth on a fast passenger sloop, a phaselus, possibly from Brundisium or else in comparatively comfortable deckhouse accommodation on a merchant galley (Casson, p. 80). However, the vast majority, several thousand of the urban poor of Rome, must have been transported at government expense. We do not know how the settlers were chosen, but Cicero's reference (de leg. ag., II, 28, 76) to the decemviri choosing 500 settlers apiece, in the case of the proposed Campanian colony, indicates that patronage was a factor, as one might expect. Presumably, the authorities would wish to dispatch the colonists more or less together and in an orderly fashion. The obvious point of departure was Puteoli, the main port of Rome in the 1st century BC, with vast fleets bringing in grain and other commodities as soon as the sailing season allowed. Many of these freighters were large, 300-500 tons, and
Casson estimates that, when it came to passengers, vessels could take as many as 600 on long voyages (p. 172; see Josephus, *Vita*, 15). There is also the well-known instance of St. Paul's grain-freighter, which, on an off-season run, was carrying 275 passengers (*Acts*, 27, 37). It is a reasonable guess that the grain freighters returning to Alexandria in July or August, and, presumably in need of ballast for the return journey, could be chartered to deliver colonists en route (see G. R. Rickman, *MAAR* 36, 1980, p. 267). The prevailing north and north-west winds at this time of the year would have meant a fairly easy voyage across the Adriatic into the Gulf of Corinth. Philostratus (*Vit. Ap.*, 7, 10) recounts that Apollonius took nearly 5 days to sail from Corinth to Puteoli, with a favourable wind and current, but, for a heavily-laden merchantman sailing in the opposite direction, the time might well have been doubled. No doubt, it seemed very long to those passengers who travelled in the hold, as Lucian describes it, "not even able to stretch their legs on the bare boards alongside the bilge water" (*Jup. Trag.*, 48). Most of them must have preferred to camp on deck in the customary fashion with a temporary awning, surrounded by bundles of belongings, tools of their trade, baskets of food, and the inevitable children, a picture that is familiar from 19th century prints of emigrants to the New World, or to anyone who has travelled on the decks of small steamers around the Mediterranean.

116. See Salmon, *Colonization*, pp. 26 and 31. Although he is referring to the Republic, it is clear, as Salmon says, that the essentials remained the same for centuries. The Urso charter was inscribed on bronze tablets and obviously intended for display in a public place (the surviving tablets are not the originals, however, but probably Flavian copies of the originals: see Hardy, *op. cit.*, p. 10). No *formae* have survived, but we have a reasonably good idea of what they looked like from the illustrations in the *Corpus Agrimensorum* and the Arausio cadasters (see Dilke, pp. 112-113).

117. See Hardy, *op. cit.* (note 61), p. 8, on Caesar's appointment of magistrates at Urso. Similarly, Antony's known associates are among the early duoviri at Corinth. Unfortunately, the *Lex Ursonensis* lacks the first paragraphs, which would have thrown light on the method of setting the constitution in motion.
118. Corinth VIII, 3, no. 18, on the basis of Corinth VIII, 3, no. 222, where Oliver restored VATinia. The possibility that some of the tribal names may have been changed under Augustus adds force to this argument.

119. See Wiseman, ANRW, note 221. The existence of the tribes DOMITIA (Corinth VIII, 3, no. 249) and SAElia (or AEalia) is not as securely attested as is that of the others.

120. It is the extraordinary detail of the Lex Ursonensis that is so valuable: the method of paying out of public monies (para. 69); the number of public slaves allowed to each magistrate (para. 127); regulations for seating in the theatre (para. 127); ban on demolition of buildings without surety for rebuilding (para. 75). One realises both the complexity of the system for setting up a colony, and that the regulations followed well-established formulae, which could be modified or added to in particular circumstances. There is a useful, brief description of the workings of the local government of Corinth in Corinth VIII, 3, pp. 23-28, with references to the detailed analyses of Kornemann (op. cit., note 114) and Liebenam (op. cit., note 97).

121. Aulus Gellius, XVI, 13, 9.

122. Plutarch, Caesar, 58, 4; Suetonius, Caesar, 44, 3. Plutarch makes it clear that this was not a project for the future, but was actually in preparation under the supervision of Caesar's freedman, Anienus. Like other engineering works mentioned in the same passage, the diversion of the Tiber to Terracina, the draining of the Pomptine marshes, and the provision of port facilities at Ostia, it would have been very difficult technically, and enormously expensive. Caesar's engineering projects were all conceived on the grand scale, but were essentially practical in their application. The increase in the size of merchantmen, for example, must have made the use of the diolkos across the Isthmus much less satisfactory than in earlier times, while the wind and treacherous currents round the southern Peloponnese had not changed a bit. The numerous wrecks off Cape Malea testify both to the heavy traffic and to the number of disasters. A canal for the average-size merchantman would have made all the difference, as Nero, Vespasian and Herodes Atticus all realised. (It is worth noting that the Corinth Canal
was finally cut during the 19th century, and that the Pompontine Marshes were effectively drained only during the 1920s.)

123. e.g. forced contributions from free cities: Appian, Bell. Civ., I, 1, 2; fertile plain of Orchomenus used as a battlefield: Pausanias, IX, 33, 6; pirates controlling the seas: Plutarch, Pompeius, 24, 5; effects of Pompey's victory: Plutarch, Pompeius, 26, 7.

124. Cicero, ad Att., IX, 9, 2.

125. Appian, Bell, Civ., II, 64; Dio Cassius, XLI, 51, 4.

126. Cicero, ad Fam., IV, 5, 4.


128. For Caesar's prosecutions, see Plutarch, Caesar, 4, 1-2; Suetonius, Caesar, 4, 1; for Cicero's prosecution of Piso, see Cicero, in Pis., 40.

129. Cicero, ad Att., I, 19, 11.

130. Ibid., VI, 2; C. Nepos, Vit. Att., 2, 4-6.

131. Cicero, ad Att., XVI, 16 a.

132. Ibid., XI, 7, 4, and 15, 1.

133. Thespiae: IG, VIII, 1835; Megara: IG, VI, 62.


135. Larsen, p. 432.

137. For the size of early citizen colonies, see Livy, VIII, 21, and XXXIV, 45; see Salmon, Colonization, pp. 71-72, on the reason for the small numbers of colonists. For the number of settlers at Iunonia, see Appian, Bel. Civ., I, 2, 4, and Pun., 136. For the number proposed for Capua, see Cicero, de leg. ag., II, 76. See also Kornemann, op. cit., (note 114), cols. 571:59 - 572:4, for numbers in other citizen colonies.


139. Strabo, IV, 6,7.


141. See note 80.


143. Strabo VIII, 7, 5 and Pausanias, VII, 18, 7. See also Brunt, p. 599, on Patrae.

144. See Lex Ursonensis, para. 98.

145. See passages referred to in note 1. Strabo (VIII, 6, 22) makes a point of saying that Crommyon is a town in the Corinthia, but that it had belonged to Megara in earlier times. Strabo is referring to distant history, since Crommyon was certainly Corinthian by the classical period, and probably much earlier. He makes no such comment on changes between the Greek and Roman periods. Nor is there inscriptional evidence to that effect.
146. See note 149.

147. Most of our information regarding the surveying and organisation of a colony's territorium comes from the Corpus Agrimensorum. The standard edition is Die Schriften der romischen Feldmesser, Berlin, 1848-1852. It is also known as the Gromatici Veteres. Dilke describes the practices of the agrimensores, and he also reproduces many of the maps and illustrations from the Corpus, which are a valuable source of information. See, in particular, Dilke, pp. 98-107, on boundaries, boundary-stones, and the types of disputes listed in Frontinus, de controversiis. The surveyors were responsible for defining and recording the external boundaries. They had to settle disputes, if they arose, and for this they received training in land law. Externally, boundary-stones would be set up. Internally, the land was usually centuriated, and the divisions clearly marked; the land between centuriation and the boundary was indicated as subseciva; and the public areas were defined. All this was recorded upon the surveyor's map (see Dilke, p. 102, an illustration from Hyginus Gromaticus of the boundary-lines and triangular boundary-marker between the territories of two colonies, called the Iulienses and the Falerenses). On the whole, private estates within the colony were not surveyed, but a boundary-stone was set in place and the name of the owner recorded on the map (Dilke, p. 103). The surveyors were either accompanied by the land-commissioners, or went on ahead, and must have been at work well before the arrival of the colonists. The surveyor also had to take settlers in person to their land, and to record its extent and the owner's name in his ledger (Dilke, p. 97). So far as I know, there are no specific references to Corinth in the Gromatici Veteres, but we can assume that, given a standard and comprehensive system of surveying, in use for many centuries, that the procedures at Corinth would have resembled those employed in other parts of the Empire. Boundary-stones, both external and internal, have been found in the territorium of Philippi. See F. Papazoglou, BCH 106 (1982), pp. 89-106, for an indication of the kind of evidence that one might expect to find in a Roman colony in Greece.

149. See Dilke, pp. 112-113, and his quotations from Hyginus Gromaticus. The maps were usually on bronze sheets, and very detailed. Hyginus says that one map is to be kept in the Emperor's Record-Office, presumably the Tabularium in Rome; the other map may well have been placed on the outside of the local Tabularium in the colony. The Arausio cadasters (actually a large-scale survey for purposes of taxation) are very similar to the maps described by Hyginus, and they were fixed to a long, narrow building near the theatre, which was probably the Tabularium (Dilke, p. 160).
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CHAPTER TWO

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CITY

Excavations have been going on at Corinth since the end of the 19th century. It seems sensible, therefore, to begin this chapter with a brief summary of the work, which is not intended to be comprehensive, but rather to facilitate discussion of the Roman city.

When the American School began excavation at Corinth in the 1890s, the only recognizable monument surviving from antiquity was the Archaic Temple. Investigation was concentrated within a certain radius of the temple in an attempt to find and identify one or more of the buildings referred to by Pausanias in the late 2nd century. The discovery of the theatre in 1896, and the Fountains of Peirene and Glaucce soon after, together with traces of the Lechaeum Road, confirmed beyond doubt the central area of ancient Corinth. By the outbreak of World War I, many of the buildings along the Lechaeum Road and round the Roman forum had been partially or completely excavated and identified, notably the Peribolus of Apollo, the Northwest Shops, Temples C and D, the Babbius Monument and the West Shops, together with the western terrace leading up to Temple E, and the foundations of the temple itself. The eastern boundary of the forum and the Julian Basilica were excavated in 1915. Work was resumed in 1925, with attention being focussed on the southern part of the forum and the South Stoa. The odeum, which had been located in 1907, was excavated, and work on the theatre completed, although the site was not completely cleared. A Roman market was discovered north of Temple Hill and, on the northern edge of the lower plateau, about 200 m. north of the forum, the Sanctuary of Asclepius was excavated (see fig. 3).
In the early years, investigation also extended well beyond the area of Corinth village. To the east of the city traces of an ancient road lead towards a break in the Greek city walls. This is generally considered to be the Cenchreae Gate and the area within the walls the Craneum referred to by Pausanias. A late Roman basilica and tombs along the line of the road were found in this area. Also on the east side of the city, the excavation of a small tract of land near the amphitheatre revealed both Roman and pre-Roman graves. The site of the amphitheatre itself has been known since the 18th century, but it has never been excavated. To the west of the city, the North Cemetery, which contained some Roman burials, was excavated, together with a number of Roman chamber tombs cut into the slopes on either side of a ravine separating the hill of Cheliotomylos and the edge of the plateau. An important chance find in roughly the same direction was the building containing high quality Roman mosaics and known since then as the Roman Villa (see fig. 4). Reports of these excavations have been published in AJA, Hesperia and in the appropriate Corinth final publications.

However, some of the dating and identification in the final publications should be treated with circumspection, as has become clear from certain of the investigations carried out by C. K. Williams, the current director of excavations. Most recently, he has suggested that the Fountain of Glauce, which has always been considered Greek in origin and contemporary in date with the Archaic Temple, was constructed in the early Roman period, although a possible Hellenistic phase could be argued. This is not to belittle in any way the achievements of the early excavators, rather to emphasize the difficulties under which they were working at that time. It is worth remembering that Corinth was one of the earliest and most complex sites to be excavated in Greece. Also, there was almost no comparative material. In the early 1930s, Broneer, in the introduction to his Odeum
publication, comments on the almost total lack of published material on theatres and odea anywhere, not just in Greece. In addition, enormous numbers of workmen, up to two hundred on the theatre site alone, were being employed, and repeated references in the notebooks to the amount of earth being shifted and the speed of excavation make one wonder how much evidence may have been lost or overlooked in the process. It is significant that work in the area east of the theatre, which is being excavated at the present time, is throwing new light on the Roman restoration and alterations of the theatre, as well as on the construction of the theatre entrances.

Compounding these problems is the unfortunate fact that some of the Corinth final publications came out many years after the excavations in question had taken place, and are not necessarily written by the excavator. For example, the Theatre volume came out in 1952 and the Springs volume in 1964, although these monuments were among the first to be discovered. Not, of course, that this is a situation unique to Corinth, but I stress these points to emphasize the importance of examining carefully all the evidence at Corinth, and the possibility that a number of generally accepted conclusions may have to be reconsidered.

Following the activity of the twenties and early thirties, the situation at Corinth changed. Resources, both trained staff and funding, began to be channelled into the new excavations of the Athenian Agora; World War II and the very difficult post-war situation meant that anything more than very limited investigation was impossible; the result was a hiatus in the work at Corinth which lasted, in effect, for over twenty years. When work on a larger scale was resumed in the late 1950s, investigations in the neighbourhood of the Asclepieium revealed a Roman building, thought by its excavator to be a gymnasium; also a bath and fountain-house in the hollow to the west of the Sanctuary, which can be identified with Pausanias'
description of the Fountain of Lerna. On the northern slope of Acrocorinth, the important Sanctuary of Demeter and Core was discovered. Just to the north of the village square, and on the east side of the Lechaeum Road, part of a large and lavishly built bath complex of the late 2nd or early 3rd century was excavated.

By the 1960s the general situation was changing rapidly. Growing prosperity meant a steady increase in building round Corinth, while the construction of the Corinth/Patras highway, and the irrigation canal bringing water to the Vocha plain below ancient Corinth resulted in a large number of rescue digs. The canal, which runs below the edge of the plateau on which the city stands (see fig. 4), cut through a late Roman bath west of the city, farm buildings east of the Roman Villa, a large number of Roman tombs, including one remarkable on account of its wall-paintings, and an early Christian basilica east of the North Cemetery, in the area known as Kritika. At the same time, the ploughing of additional land for cultivation threw up miscellaneous and often unexpected material, for example, a colossal marble head of a deity in the district of Anaplopa west of the city. This led to the discovery of a small domestic establishment, which is particularly noteworthy in view of the paucity of housing of the Roman period recorded so far at Corinth. Little of this material has been published, with the exception of some brief reports in Archaeological Reports, BCH, Klio, and the Greek journals.

Since 1967 the director of excavations has been engaged largely in excavating in the forum and its environs to pre-Roman levels and in re-examining some of the sites of older excavations. Detailed annual reports of this work have been issued in Hesperia. As a result, we now have a clear, though by no means complete, picture of the Roman centre. However,
the organization of the city beyond the immediate area of the forum remains sketchy.

One of the first questions to be asked is: given the information available, is it possible to establish the boundaries of the Roman city? I think that it is, given the Roman attitude towards town-planning, in particular the laying-out of a new city. It is important to remember that Colonia Laus Iulia Corinthiensis was, in Roman eyes, an entirely new foundation. Greek Corinth had ceased to exist as a πόλις with the destruction of its political functions in 146 BC and, although approximately the same site was used, the Romans were founding a new city, not rehabilitating an old one. This was, essentially, a political act, but it was also governed by long-established legal and religious procedures.²²

The procedure for establishing the boundary of a new town-site is well-known. It was the duty of the founding commissioner to plough a furrow, the sulcus primigenius along the line of the boundary where, in earlier times, the city walls would have been built, lifting the plough at the sites of the gates. The plough was of bronze, drawn by a steer and a heifer.²³ It is clear from contemporary references that this ceremony was still carried out in the late Republic and early Empire. Cicero refers to Antony being seduced by the colour and pomp of the ceremony when he planted a colony at Casilinum, apparently ploughing the furrow himself.²⁴ This act of ploughing served to define the legal boundary of the town. As the Lex Ursonensis says of the colony of Urso, burial was prohibited intra fines oppidi...qua aratum circumductum erit.²⁵ Coins from colonies in many parts of the Empire, Philippi in Macedonia Lystra in Lycaonia, Celsa and Caesaraugusta in Spain, record this ceremony. Not all such coins are founding issues, but the repetition of a togate figure, with head covered, steering a plough with a yoke of oxen, indicates clearly that this ceremony
was known and in force well into the 1st century. It is not certain to what extent the ceremony was carried out in all its detail, but given the importance attached by the Romans to the ancient rituals, it is quite likely that it was. As J. B. Ward-Perkins says, "One must not underrate the significance of such rituals which constituted the ultimate sanction for such important aspects of city life as the inviolability of duly established boundaries and the prohibition of burial inside the pomerium i.e. the formally sanctified area that adjoined the city walls." We can be fairly certain, therefore, that such a ceremony actually took place at Corinth and, although walls were not built nor needed, a sanctified boundary and pomerium did exist. The prohibition of burial within the pomerium goes back to the Twelve Tables, hominem mortuum in urbe ne sepelito neve urito, and appears from the section of the Lex Ursonensis referred to above to have been incorporated into the founding charters of Roman colonies. The burial of a dead person or the erection of a monument would violate the sanctity of the city. The prohibition remained in force until late in the Empire, with exceptions only made rarely in very special cases. Therefore, the location of the cemeteries and tombs of Roman Corinth should indicate the extent of the city as originally laid out, and the approximate line of the city boundary and pomerium.

The situation is complicated to some extent by the fact that Corinthians of the Greek period did not have the same restrictions on burial as the Romans did. Certainly there are burial areas well within the Greek city walls. C. K. Williams found sarcophagus lids to the north-east of the amphitheatre, which are thought to be part of the Craneum cemetery discovered by R. Carpenter in 1931. The settlement at Anaploga contains graves of the Hellenistic era in close proximity to a small domestic and industrial establishment and there is a small cemetery on the slope of
Acrocorinth. This accords with the picture of pre-Roman Corinth as a city of clustered settlements separated by open land within its defensive walls. Another problem is the early settlers' habit of using the tombs of the Greek period for their dead, often thrusting aside the original bones and offerings to make room for their own corpses. Roman tombs were also re-used by apparently unrelated families, though usually after a considerable time had elapsed, so one has to be cautious about the dates. Even so, despite these difficulties, it is possible to establish which areas were in use during the early Roman period and up to the middle of the 4th century.

Figure 5 shows the main burial areas of Roman Corinth from 44 BC, with isolated tombs marked by a cross. By far the most important area in both the Greek and Roman periods was in the plain below the lower of the two plateaux on which ancient Corinth stands. The North Cemetery (a) of which a large part was excavated in 1928-30, is largely pre-Roman, but there is a substantial group of Roman burials to the north of the cemetery. Some of them are primary and some are secondary burials. It appears from the pottery that burials took place here from the foundation of Corinth up to the end of the 1st century. In the same direction, along the line of the Corinth/Patras Road below Cheliotomylos (b), numerous, simple, rock-cut graves as well as elaborate brick-built tombs were found. They have not been published, but provisional dating of the pottery gives dates up to the late 3rd and early 4th century. A large number of Roman tombs was found cut into the hillside of Cheliotomylos in the 1928-30 excavations and also on the opposite side of the little ravine to the east of the hill (c). The Roman burials include chamber tombs, rock-cut graves, stone sarcophagi and earth burials. They were used from the Augustan period until the end of the 4th century. More elaborate chamber tombs, as well as single, simple
sarcophagi, were found all along the cliff below the city, following the irrigation ditch, as far as the Stikas Basilica (d). 38 This region, now known as Kritika, is below the "Baths of Aphrodite" where there is a natural, winding descent to the lower plain; this is almost certainly the route taken by the Roman Lechaeum Road. 39 Here, to the east of the modern (1906) road, a large, free standing sarcophagus, decorated with reliefs of the Seven Against Thebes, was found early in the century, as well as two sarcophagus covers with reclining figures. 40 In the 1965-66 excavations another sarcophagus lid decorated with garlands and erotes was discovered, together with a large number of Roman graves. 41 Such sarcophagi, which date from the 2nd century, are unusual at Corinth and suggest that this was an important burial area. Above the Stikas Basilica are two chamber tombs and a number of graves, excavated in 1964, but lack of evidence makes it impossible to tell if they are Christian or pre-Christian. 42 Other isolated tombs have been found in the plain, and especially in the vicinity of the Skoutela Basilica, but they are some distance from the city. 43 It is the part of the plain immediately below the plateau, as well as the cliffs themselves, which seems to have been one huge burial area, stretching the width of the city from east to west.

To the east of the city, a small area was excavated south-west of the amphitheatre in 1929 (e). Although the graves dated mainly from the 4th and 3rd centuries BC, coins and a few other finds indicate that it was also in use in the Roman period. 44 Excavation in the area of the Cenchreae Gate (f) has not revealed any burials specifically of the early Roman period, although Carpenter's excavations showed that it was in use in the 4th century BC. 45 The existence of a large monument base confirmed, in his view, Pausanias' description of the road to Corinth as being lined with tombs and monuments, although Pausanias mentions only those of antiquarian
More significantly, a fine sculptured funerary relief to a Roman legionary, C. Valerius Valens, was discovered in the area of Craneum in 1970. This was a chance find, not properly recorded, and the area has not been excavated, but it is likely that Pausanias' route was also lined with the standard Roman funerary monuments. Certainly, there are a number of Roman chamber tombs lining the road to Cenchreae outside the Greek city walls, and also along the Argos road, but these are too far from the city to be of immediate importance in ascertaining the boundary line.

No major burial area, similar to that to the north, has been discovered to the south, on the slopes of Acrocorinth, possibly because the steep slope and thin covering of earth over the rocky ground would have made it difficult. There is an isolated chamber tomb on the modern road running from Craneum to the water source now known by the Turkish name of Hadji Mustafa, which appears, on the evidence of the pottery, to date from the 5th century. Higher up on the slope is the Sanctuary of Demeter and Core, on the road that Pausanias says leads to Acrocorinth. One might have expected to find burials along this road, but the only ones discovered so far are Christian. After the final destruction of the Sanctuary, in the second half of the 4th century, the precinct may have been in use for a limited time as a Christian cemetery, or else the graves were random burials.

To the west and south-west of the city, evidence of Roman burials is, again, sparse. A group of graves, both Greek and Roman, was found on the road from Hadji Mustafa to the West Gate of Acrocorinth, a short distance east of the West Gate, just above the modern village of Agioi Anargyroi. There are also two graves on the slope above the village, west of the North Ravine. In the Anaploga area, north of the industrial establishment and a Roman road, a cemetery was found which dates from the 6th century BC to late
Roman times. Some of the tombs, which were enclosed by a peribolus wall, seem to be Christian. A few graves have been found beneath the church of Agia Paraskevi, both Greek and Roman, and of later date. There are traces here of a road going in the direction of Sicyon, but, since the graves were found in association with an early Christian wall, I am inclined to think that these Roman burials are late in date. Further west, Roman graves of early imperial date were found built on the line of the Greek city wall, north of the Phliasian Gate, thus confirming that the city did not stretch this far. As elsewhere, isolated tombs have been found at a considerable distance from the city. An elaborate brick-built tomb with a mosaic floor and amphorae set in the niches was found above the road leading west to Sicyon in 1936, but all trace of it has now disappeared.

It is reasonable to assume that the original city limits were within the locations marked on the map (fig. 5). The edge of the lower plateau to the north forms a natural boundary. To the west, the boundary runs through the district of Anaploga. The limit to the east would be west of the amphitheatre. This accords with the reference by Dio Chrysostom to the place where the Corinthians held gladiatorial games being outside the city. It was the usual practice of the Romans to build amphitheatres on the very edge of the city, either just inside or just outside the boundary. There is no definite evidence for the southern limit of the city, but it is likely to have been north of (i.e. below) the Demeter Sanctuary on the upper slopes of Acrocorinth. Pausanias implies that the Sanctuary is on the outskirts of the city, and this would be appropriate for deities associated with chthonic cults. Vitruvius also recommends, "Ceres also should be outside the city in a place to which people never go except for the purpose of sacrifice."
There are no recognizable traces of boundary stones or markers, although we know that these were regularly used and have been found elsewhere, so we cannot be certain about the line of the boundary.\textsuperscript{58} It is, however, a fact that, so far, within the area shown no burials definitely dating from 44 BC up to the middle of the 4th century have been found. With the introduction of Christianity the situation changes, as we should expect. Corinth had a flourishing Christian community and, in some cases, its members used both the old, pagan cemeteries, and even the tombs.\textsuperscript{59} But the Christians also favoured burial near their place of worship and were unaffected by pagan sanctions against burial within the city limits, so one can expect to find Christian graves in the city centre. There is an extensive area of Christian burial near the Asclepieium and Lerna Hollow, probably in association with the Fountain of the Lamps which had religious associations in the late Roman period.\textsuperscript{60} Later, there were burials in the forum itself, particularly on the east side and in association with the early Christian basilica on Temple Hill, and also round the Craneum and Stikas Basilicas.\textsuperscript{61}

The argument for the city boundary proposed above is strengthened by T. E. Gregory in his discussion of the line of the Late Roman fortification at Corinth, although this was not his concern at the time.\textsuperscript{62} The wall was probably built in the first two decades of the 5th century as a response to the invasion of the Visigoths in 395/396 (see fig. 6).\textsuperscript{63} It corresponds closely to the hypothetical line established above. As Gregory says, the purpose of the wall was to protect the civic and governmental centre, as well as having the secondary function of providing a refuge for those living outside in the event of another invasion. He also comments on the fact that the amphitheatre is the only major pre-Christian structure known to be outside the wall. Therefore, the wall encloses all the central buildings of
the city as well as much of the residential area. I suggest that not only were the builders of the Late Roman wall enclosing the civic centre and providing a refuge, but that they were also following a line well-known from early days as the actual city limit, which had been established and maintained by regular and well-known rituals. The wall enclosed all the major civic buildings and a large residential area precisely because that was how the city was laid out to begin with. The only section where there is some discrepancy is where the Late Roman wall incorporates the structure known as the Episty1e Wall and so cuts off the Asclepieium and Fountain of Lerna, which were, according to Pausanias, within the Roman city. Gregory explains the deviation here convincingly by arguing that the Episty1e Wall had been built prior to the sack of 395/396, when the city as a whole was unfortified, to slow up an enemy advancing up the natural slope by the Fountain of the Lamps; and that it was natural to incorporate such a stout construction into the new fortification rather than following the line of the cliff and the classical wall, which was almost certainly in disrepair by now. One of Gregory's interests is in comparing the Late Roman wall with the line of the 4th century BC Greek defences. To my mind, however, the real interest of the wall is that, with one or two small variations for the purpose of defence, such as the Episty1e Wall and the bastion in the south-east corner, it appears to indicate with a high degree of probability the original extent of the Roman colony.

This does not mean, of course, that there was no building outside this city limit. The area east of the city, the suburb of Craneum, was certainly built up. There are not only residential buildings - the wall cuts through a number of small buildings, particularly in the area of the triangular tower - but probably also large public buildings, so far undiscovered, to go by the architectural blocks of the Roman period scattered in the fields. 
There is, too, the amphitheatre, which was probably built well before the 4th century when it is first mentioned in literary sources. To the west, there is the villa at Anaploga, the elaborate building known as the Roman Villa and traces of Roman baths. This spread of habitation and buildings inevitably happened in any Roman city and was, indeed, allowed for by law in that those living within a certain distance outside the pomerium came under the city's jurisdiction.

Gregory also remarks upon the siting of the main Late Roman and Early Christian burial areas, which are all outside the Late Roman wall: namely the Demeter Sanctuary, the vicinity of the Hadji Mustafa Fountain, Anaploga, the Corinth/Patras Road below Cheliotomylos, north of Lerna Spring and the Gymnasium, and the areas round the Stikas and Craneum Basilicas. He suggests that the residents of Late Roman Corinth chose to maintain the ancient practice and were now burying their dead outside the new city wall. A more obvious explanation is that they simply continued to use the existing Roman pagan cemeteries, which were outside the new city wall because they were outside the pomerium and always had been. The only exception is the Lerna area north of the Gymnasium, and this can be explained by the Christian preference for burial near a place with religious associations, in this case, the Fountain of the Lamps. I would, therefore, regard the burial preferences of the Late Roman Corinthians as favouring the idea of an original city limit along the line of the Late Roman wall.

Another small, additional piece of information may be relevant here. There are two known tile works of the Roman period at Corinth. One is sited below the lower plateau where the modern road descends to New Corinth, very near a group of chamber tombs. The other lies to the west at Kokkinovrysi, not far from the Roman Villa. Both are well outside the city limits, though conveniently situated on roads. There is a specific prohibition
included in the Lex Ursonensis prohibiting pottery works or a tile factory producing more than 300 tiles a day within the town of Urso, and it is likely, since the whole law seems to be formulaic, that the same prohibition applied to other colonies of the same period, including Corinth. One might think, otherwise, that, in view of all the building activity at Corinth, a more central situation would have been preferable for one or other of the factories.

The line proposed for the original city limit, closely following the Late Roman fortification, produces a plan that is instantly recognizable. It is roughly rectangular with the forum more or less in the centre (see fig. 6). To the north, the edge of the plateau provides a natural boundary, as does the North Ravine to the west; while the southern limit occurs where the ground starts rising steeply. To the east the limit was arbitrary, since there was plenty of room to extend the city if the Romans had so wished. Presumably, they preferred to keep to their normal city plan. There is a major road, the Lechaeum Road, running north from the forum and traces of other roads running east in the direction of the Cenchreae. It is to be expected that Roman roads would follow the line of the Greek roads through the existing gates in the city wall, since these were dictated in the first place by the terrain and they are the most practical, sometimes the only, routes to and from the city. The city covers an area of approximately 1,500 m. x 1,200 m., that is, some 180 hectares. This is noticeably larger than the built-up areas, as revealed by archaeological survey, of some other well-known cities. Leptis Magna, for example, covered 120 hectares, Ostia 69 hectares, Pompeii 65 hectares, and Timgad 50 hectares. One should not assume, of course, that all the land would have been built up at once, but the size of the designated area does suggest that
Roman Corinth was intended, from its foundation, to be a city of considerable importance.\textsuperscript{72}

For someone on foot, it is a comfortable fifteen minute walk from the forum to Cheliotomylos, just outside the city limit, where the road descends to the plain in the direction of Sicyon. In the other direction it takes about the same time to reach the amphitheatre. It would have taken a little longer to reach the Demeter Sanctuary, since the slope is quite steep. The line of the ancient road is not known, but it would certainly not have followed the long gradient of the present road, which is designed for motor vehicles. One feature of the city which is often not clear from the plans and is sometimes difficult to appreciate on the ground is the fact that the city is situated on two levels, an upper plateau, which is really the lower slope of Acrocorinth, and a lower plateau, which then drops to the coastal plain. Sometimes the drop between the plateaux is quite steep and in other places there is a shallow gradient. The forum and amphitheatre are on the upper plateau, the theatre is cut into the hillside between the two, and the Asclepieium is on the level ground of the lower plateau. These two levels are an important factor in the layout of the city and the line of the roads.

There was no reason, clearly, in the founding commissioner's mind to change the site of the city (as at Carthage) and it is obvious from an examination of the terrain that the original site was a good one, with a pleasant northerly aspect and ample water supplies, and it was the nexus of an existing road system. A number of the Greek buildings were still standing and could be used: in particular, the theatre site, the great Hellenistic South Stoa and the Archaic Temple; possibly other religious precincts were a factor as well. On less practical but also important grounds, the Romans, who always had an eye for a good site, must have appreciated the magnificent backdrop provided by Acrocorinth.
It was the responsibility of the surveyors on the commissioner's staff, not only to fix the city limits, but also to lay out the main public areas, both those required immediately, such as the forum, and spaces for future development, as well as allocating house plots within the city. The surveying of the city site was, as a general rule, separate from that of the surrounding countryside. It must also have been at this time that the loose grid system, which has recently become evident in the centre of the city, was imposed upon the Greek ruins (see fig. 8). The laying-out of the grid system was an integral part of the foundation procedure and the placing of the groma was accompanied by a specific ritual.

The choice of the site of the forum is not as obvious as it might seem. For many years it was assumed that the Roman forum lies over the agora of the Greek city. However, excavation in the area has failed to reveal any of the buildings of the Greek period of the kind that one might associate with the administration of a large and powerful city, such as a bouleuterion or law courts. Much of the excavation undertaken by the present director of excavations, C. K. Williams, has been done with the objective of clarifying the plan of Greek and Hellenistic Corinth. In an article in 1970 he discussed both his own findings and those of the American School excavations since the 1890s. His conclusions are important and I summarise them here.

The area south of Temple Hill was originally a valley running approximately northeast/southwest, as a continuation of the deep valley of the Lechaem Road. Figure 7 shows the original contours of ca. 1,000 BC and the main buildings of the Greek and Roman periods. The ground rose gradually towards the southwest, and there was a continuous ridge between Temple Hill and the site of the Fountain of Glauc. In the Geometric period this valley was a burial ground on which, in the mid-Geometric period, domestic habitation began to encroach. In the 6th and 5th centuries BC it was the site of a
race-course and of various shrines and cult buildings. The main water sources were Peirene and, to a lesser extent, the Sacred Spring. Roads led into the valley from all directions, but the most important was the Lechaenum Road. In the Hellenistic period repeated filling and terracing operations round the Sacred Spring made it possible to change the line of the race-course to the now more level ground along the upper valley; and the South Stoa was built to the south, on the same line as the Archaic Temple to the north. Williams concludes that there was no large, flat space south of Temple Hill suitable for an agora and that it should be looked for elsewhere, perhaps to the north or north-east of Temple Hill. He further concludes that the function of the area was as a centre of cults, with which the race-course was connected. This is so eminently satisfactory a theory that it has been almost universally accepted despite the writer's own much more cautious statement that he puts it forward "as a warning that the area under the Roman forum presently called the Corinthian agora is not securely identified and that the identification is now undergoing examination." 77

This is not the place to discuss the problem of the Greek agora except insofar as it affects the laying-out of the Roman colony. The Romans were practical and flexible in their approach to urban planning, sometimes building on an existing site, sometimes moving the city-centre some distance away. It is, however, curious that if there was a large, flat agora in the centre of Greek Corinth with a range of substantial public buildings, the Romans would appear to have made no use of it. One of the features of the new colony is the extent to which the early settlers renovated or restored existing buildings. One has to assume that if the Greek agora does exist elsewhere, the Romans found it so unsuitable for their purposes that they preferred to go to the very considerable trouble of levelling and terracing the race-course valley for the forum as we know it.
It has been suggested that, if there were a Greek agora to the north or northeast of Temple Hill, the early colonists could have made use of its civic buildings while the area south of Temple Hill was being made ready for occupation. An argument in favour of this suggestion is that the dates for the main buildings in the forum seem to be later than one might expect for a colony founded in 44 BC. Against this, it should be noted that conditions in the last years of the Republic and in the early Empire were not conducive to major building activities. Achaia was the battleground on which the civil wars were fought for control of the Empire, and Corinth was one of Antony's strongholds until it was captured by Marcus Agrippa. As late as 29 BC, as Baladié has pointed out, Strabo could describe Corinth only in terms of a city with a glorious past and that, by implication, it was in depressed present circumstances. Parallels may be found in the prosperous province of Gallia Narbonensis, where there is very little building activity until well into the Augustan period, and there is the same situation in North Africa. There do not appear to have been major imperial donations at Corinth comparable, for example, with the Market of Caesar and Augustus and the odeum of Agrippa at Athens. Rather, the civic buildings at Corinth appear to have been provided by the citizen body or by public spirited individuals, and the wealth of both would depend on the ability to trade freely and profitably. This, in turn, required the kind of settled circumstances that could not be assured until well into the Principate.

The question of the siting of the Greek agora cannot be answered without further excavation. There is, however, good reason for thinking that the forum we see today was that originally laid out by the surveyors when the colony was founded. Not only is it more or less in the centre of the area delineated by the original city boundary (if one accepts the theory
put forward above), but it is the focal point of the main roads running approximately north/south and east/west. One of the most interesting recent developments in the study of Roman Corinth has been the recognition of a grid system round the forum (see fig. 8), and my study of the aerial photographs, combined with surface survey has also made it possible to trace the road system in other parts of the city. 83

The main road into the forum is the Lechaeum Road, an impressive, paved and colonnaded street over eight metres wide and running almost due north/south. It diminishes slightly in width before leading up to the Propylaea, which provides a formal entrance to the forum. 84 Another, narrower road, on exactly the same line, leads out of the forum on the opposite, southern side through the South Stoa to meet at right angles a paved road running almost due east/west behind the South Basilica. 85 On the north side of the forum, below Temple Hill and the Roman market, is another east/west road also at right angles to the Lechaeum Road; it is paved and colonnaded and ends in an impressive gateway leading into a courtyard by the theatre. Approximately 120 m. north of this road, traces of a third east/west road, colonnaded but not paved, were found during an exploratory excavation in 1973. 86

Behind the Julian Basilica on the eastern side of the forum are traces of an important north/south road. 87 Only a short stretch has been excavated, but it appears to run parallel with the Lechaeum Road. Just beyond the western end of the South Stoa, two early Roman roads intersect. The north/south road runs from the direction of Acrocorinth behind the buildings on the West Terrace and past Temple C and the Archaic Temple. The east/west road enters the upper forum through the colonnade of archaic columns spanning the terrace between the South Stoa and the Central Shops. In the second half of the 1st century the area between the West Terrace and
the West Shops became a pedestrian precinct and was incorporated into the original forum. The line of the north/south road was shifted slightly, but it remained in use, and so did its continuation which ran from the main exit at the north-west corner of the forum. There is a parallel north/south road further west behind the precinct of Temple E.

In the theatre area, recent work has exposed a road, called by the excavators "East Theatre Street," which runs from the courtyard northeast of the theatre up past both the theatre and the odeum, parallel with the Lechaeum Road. It is primarily an access road to the theatre rather than a main traffic artery, since there is no continuation north of the theatre court to the Asclepieium and gymnasium, as one might have expected.

Finally, in the forum area, test trenches in 1984 revealed traces of a Roman road running east/west to the north of the courtyard of the Fountain of Glaucie. It is not paved, but since there are at least ten super-imposed Roman surfaces, some with east/west wheel-ruts, it must have been in use for a long time. The line of this road runs from the west end of the Archaic Temple, past Glaucie and East Theatre Street, and then past the southern entrance to the cavea of the odeum. This must have been the route taken by Pausanias when he left the forum going towards Sicyon. His account, combined with the results of recent excavations, indicates that he did not go down East Theatre Street, which comes to a dead end, but that he went past the odeum and then turned north along the western flank of the odeum and theatre. This implies another north/south road running down to Lerna and the gymnasium, and traces of it can be distinguished on aerial photographs (see pl. 10).

Farther away from the city centre, the traces of roads are often less clear (see fig. 11). The east/west road behind the South Basilica is known to continue for at least 400 m. west of the forum in the direction of
Traces of it were found in a test trench dug to the south of Temple E in the summer of 1985 (see p. 321). There is a road of the classical period with hard road metal and deep wheel ruts beneath the church of Agia Paraskevi, and it is possible that the road passing Glauce and the odeum continued in this direction, although it seems to have been used only by foot traffic in Roman times. The paved and colonnaded road running east from the theatre courtyard is an important one. The paving of the road is assumed to be a minimum of 4.75 m. and the side-walks 2.50 m. wide. An earlier, unpaved Roman road lies directly under the street. The line of this road crosses the Lechaeum Road to the south of a large Roman bath complex. On the eastern side of the city, about 650 m. east of the theatre, an east/west roadway was found in 1972. It is on the same line as the most northerly of the east/west roads referred to on p. 103. A diagram in the excavation notebook shows that it was just over 3 m. wide with a drain in the centre of the road. There was no paving nor colonnading but walls, presumably of houses, on either side of the street. The stratigraphy was not closely observed, but finds seem to include 1st century material. This change from an elaborate, paved street with sidewalks and colonnade in the central city area to a narrow, unpaved road or alley as it reaches the outskirts of the city, probably a residential area, is often found in Roman cities.

By far the most impressive entrance into the city is the colonnaded Lechaeum Road. It would have been the most important route for pedestrian traffic, although wheeled transport and commercial goods probably went by a different road (see pp. 359-360). Traces of marble pavement about half a kilometre to the north of the excavated section indicate that it runs straight to the edge of the cliff and north city wall, and then veers slightly east to follow the winding descent down to the coastal plain.
the plain a Roman road was excavated just east of the Church of St. George, parallel with the modern (1930s) road to Lechaum. Both location and direction suggest that this is the continuation of Pausanias' straight road to Lechaum.97 Here the road was about 6 m. wide and the somewhat disturbed road metal consisted of small stones and gravel, with a light curbing of small poros blocks and rubble and mortar at either side. This is typical of Roman road construction outside the city area, where one would not necessarily expect to find paving.98 Indeed, in the early Roman period neither the Lechaum Road in the city nor the important east/west road leading into the theatre court were paved, and this was probably true of all the roads when they were first laid out.

Apart from the Lechaum Road, the most important road in the city centre is that running behind the South Basilica. It links the east and west suburbs of the city with the forum and probably carried much of the traffic coming from the port of Cenchreae. Contrary, however, to the generally held view, it does not run directly to the Cenchreae Gate (see p. 339). These two roads cannot really be called the cardo maximus and decumanus maximus, but they do fulfill much the same functions as those thoroughfares in the typical Roman city plan.99 They were important traffic arteries, bringing people and goods from Corinth's two ports directly to the city centre, and meeting at right angles at the forum.

When the Roman grid system was introduced, the old Greek roads (see fig. 9) were incorporated into it or fall into disuse, although Broneer thinks that those crossing the site of the odeum remained until the odeum was constructed towards the end of the 1st century.100 The grid system appears to have been laid out at the beginning of the colony and to have remained essentially the same until the mid-4th century, although as the city becomes more prosperous roads are paved and sometimes colonnaded. It
is interesting, though, that the most important road, the Lechaeum Road, is not paved until the second half of the 1st century, probably after 77, and the indications are that this is also as true of the east/west theatre road. 101

On the other hand, drains were laid at the same time as the earliest roads, either running alongside or beneath the surface. The Romans used, where convenient, the existing Greek system of underground drains and sewers which conducted water primarily in the direction of Peirene. 102 Typical drains of the early period are found in the theatre area and outside the south-west corner of the forum. The Romans must have realised very quickly, as the early excavators did, that the area would flood in the heavy winter rains with devastating results. Drainage, as well as roads, must have been a priority for the early colonists.

A typical Roman feature of the city plan is that access to the forum from the main roads was limited to pedestrian traffic. The steps leading up to the Propylaea prevented the passage of wheeled traffic from the Lechaeum Road. More unusual is the fact that the part of the Lechaeum Road leading into the forum was designed as a pedestrian mall. As part of the original plan two steps 0.15 m. high were laid across the roadway 107.70 m. north of the Propylaea. 103 The width of the road is 8.40 m. diminishing to 7.025 m. as it approaches the Propylaea, while that of the sidewalks remains constant at 2.62 m. including the gutters. Although such malls are a well-known feature of later urban planning, it is an unusual feature to find in the early Roman period and argues a high degree of conscious organisation of pedestrian and commercial areas associated with the forum.

On the south side of the forum the steps and passage through the South Stoa prevented wheeled traffic entering from the Cenchreae Road. 104 Entrance to the forum from the east was by the narrow, steep road to the
north of the Julian Basilica. We do not know what was there before the building of the Basilica, which S. Weinberg dates to ca. 40, but there must always have been a steep slope or steps down into the forum. A great cutting was made in the ridge running north/south along the east side of the forum to take the cryptoporticus of the Julian Basilica, and the building is set into the slope so that the road to the west is on the same level as the main floor of the Basilica, while on the forum side a flight of steps leads up to the main floor and the cryptoporticus is at ground level. It would make sense for there to be an entrance through the main exedra of the Basilica, but there is no archaeological evidence to confirm or deny that this was so.\textsuperscript{105} In the south-east corner of the forum a minor road or passage ran along the side of the South-East Building directly into the colonnade of the South Stoa. At the other, west end of the Stoa there was the entrance through the arcade of archaic columns onto the central terrace of the upper forum, while access to the lower forum was by means of ramps or steps from the road behind the West Terrace.

The precision with which the roads were laid out indicates the work of a surveyor, or more probably a team of surveyors. They, like modern surveyors, must have had some sort of datum point. In the town this was conventionally the \textit{decussis} of the \textit{cardo maximus} and the \textit{decumanus maximus}, where the \textit{groma} was set up and the main roads running north/south and east/west were sighted.\textsuperscript{106} It was an important point and the setting up of the \textit{groma} was accompanied by the appropriate ritual. In the case of Corinth the first line to be sighted with the \textit{groma} is likely to have been the Lechaeeum Road. The Romans tended to use existing features if they fitted into the required scheme, and the Lechaeeum Valley provides the best and most obvious access to the area south of Temple Hill. Once the Romans had decided on this area as their city centre, the physical contours demanded
that the main access road from the coast and lower plateau should be through the Lechaeum Valley. Any road through the valley will run in a northerly direction, as the *cardo* in a Roman city normally does, (and as the road's Greek predecessor did). As has been said above, the line of the Roman Lechaeum Road is continued in the road leading out of the forum through the South Stoa. On this same line, in the forum and in front of the east wall of the eastern exedra of the Bema there is a curious stone base, consisting of a single block 0.81 m. x 0.85 m. (see fig. 10). The foundation for the base predates the marble pavement, which is laid with reference to it. The purpose of this base has not so far been explained. R. L. Scranton, the author of the final publication on the Lower Agora says, quite correctly, that the cuttings on the top preclude the restoration of a statue directly on the preserved base; later he refers to it as an altar. The treatment of the upper surface of the stone is as follows: there is a drafted edge approximately 15 cm. round all four sides and at the centre the stone has been roughly chiselled suggesting anathyrosis. In the centre of the drafted edge on each side is a small, round cutting, and at the centre of the anathyrosis, on the same axis as two of the opposed holes, are two deeper and bigger circular cuttings. A shallow groove joins these cuttings with the corresponding holes near the edge, and another, similar, shallow groove runs from the right hand edge to the centre of the stone. There may, or may not, be a similar groove joining the fourth hole. (See fig. 12, and pl. 13, also pl. 66, in *Corinth I*, 3.) This could be a re-used block forming the lower part of a base or altar, in which the various holes may simply be cuttings for dowels and pour-holes for molten lead. The arrangement, however, is not typical, so far as I am aware, of either Greek or Roman work. The two deeper holes at the centre might possibly be the remains of lewis holes for lifting the block, but the four outer holes appear to have
some more specific purpose and, combined with the shallow grooves linking three, possibly four, in a cruciform pattern, suggest that the block could be the base for some sort of surveying instrument, such as a *groma*. We have no other bases with which to compare it but the indications are that this is the base on which the *groma* was originally set up, and it was kept in the same position when the marble pavement was laid so that it could be referred to, and presumably used if necessary, just as modern surveying points are used.

The position of this base is particularly significant. If an imaginary line is drawn through it along the length of the forum, at right angles to the Lechaeum Road and its southern continuation, it will be parallel to those east/west roads now known to exist behind the South Basilica and to the north of the theatre. It is, in fact, the central point of the Corinth grid system, although this is not immediately obvious. The axis of the actual forum is skewed slightly north of the east/west axis in order to keep the line of the South Stoa, which forms the southern boundary and is paralleled to the north by the Archaic Temple, the Romans having decided to keep both these buildings. Temple E, the great Roman podium temple which dominates the forum from its hill to the east, is aligned with the monumental stairway leading up to its precinct, and it is clearly related to the forum, but instead of being on the same axis, as one might have expected, and which would certainly have been possible, it is aligned more closely with the general east/west axis and meets the line of the Lechaeum Road more or less at right angles. These careful adjustments in the orientation cannot be accidental. They must indicate that the relationship of main roads, forum and temple was worked out from the beginning. It is an interesting example of how the essential features of the basic Roman city plan, which consists of a predominantly north/south and east/west grid plan,
and a major temple facing east and overlooking the forum, is imposed upon and integrated with existing features (compare figs. 8 and 9). The plan for the forum also involved extensive levelling of the valley from east to west, and the southern upward slope was disguised by the building of a terrace dividing the forum into two separate but connected areas. An ingenious feature of this terrace is the way in which an outcrop of rock on this southern slope was disguised by the building of a tribunal or bema. This, again, is precisely situated, not in the middle of the central terrace, but slightly to the east and directly in line with the Propylaea so that it dominates the central approach as one comes into the forum. It is the focal point of the forum and must have been planned as such when the area was laid out. In time the forum was surrounded by buildings on all sides, and the development of the general scheme is to be discussed in the next chapter. The important point for the moment is that this scheme was part of the original urban plan for Corinth. The Corinthian forum is one of the largest in existence, and it is so coherent and impressive a piece of planning that it is almost impossible to visualize the area before the Romans put their stamp upon it.

It is worth considering briefly other foundation rites in connection with Corinth, although it is not certain to what extent such ancient rites were maintained into the 1st century BC. The foundation ceremony is said to have included the digging of a mundus or ritual pit into which the new colonists threw earth and offerings. According to tradition, Romulus dug such a pit when he founded Rome and the ceremony is described in detail by Ovid. However, the ancient sources in general are not very clear, and there is confusion, also, between the word mundus meaning a ritual pit and mundus meaning, more generally, a shrine to Ceres or to the Manes, which was opened on certain days (dies religiosi) during the year. Modern authorities
are divided in their opinions and F. Castagnoli, for one, is emphatic in his
denial that the mundus has anything to do with the foundation of a new
city. On the other hand, excavations at Cosa have revealed the existence
of a pit which fits the ancient descriptions of a mundus very well. It
is a deep squarish pit shaped out of a natural cleft in the rock of the Arx
at Cosa. It was sited on the levelled platform in front of the early Temple
of Jupiter and originally covered by an altar. When the later, and much
larger, temple was built, it was so placed that the pit lay beneath its
central axis. The position of the pit, and the fact that it was found to
contain carbonized vegetable matter, has led the excavators to postulate
that it was the mundus of Cosa. F. E. Brown suggests that the foundation
ceremony took place on the levelled platform, where the augur's field of
vision, co-incident with the surveyor's grid, encompassed both the town site
and the territory. There is also some evidence from elsewhere. G. Calza
claims to have found a mundus at Ostia near the intersection of the
decumanus and cardo and in front of the Republican Capitolium. The
foundation of Cosa, not to mention Ostia, took place over 200 years before
the foundation of Corinth, and it could easily be argued that the mundus as
part of the foundation rites had dropped out of use. On the other hand, it
is clear that the Romans clung doggedly to their ancient religious practices
and public ceremonies, maintaining the outward form long after belief in the
efficacy of the ritual had, apparently, disappeared.

The only reason for raising the question of the mundus as far as
Corinth is concerned is that it may provide an explanation for one of the
prominent, and so far unidentified, structures in the centre of the forum
(see fig. 10). Although the pit at Cosa was on the Arx, ancient sources
indicate that the mundus was usually in the centre of the city. Therefore,
the place to look is in the forum near the central point of the grid system.
As Scranton says, there are all sorts of monuments and bases in this area, dating from all periods, and it is impossible to ascertain the full complement at any one period. There is, however, one particular structure dating from the Roman period which is in a prominent position and is so far unidentified. It is a massive concrete foundation almost in the centre of the lower forum, with its longitudinal axis east/west. The monument was razed when the marble pavement of the forum was laid in the late 1st or early 2nd century, which makes reconstruction difficult, but Scranton has identified it as an altar and suggested it was an open enclosure something like the Ara Pacis in Rome. The front area was lower than that at the rear and it was largely open at the east, so that priests could officiate on the inner, higher level looking east through the open end. As far as I know, no excavation has been carried out below the foundations but visual inspection of the remains in 1985 did show that there was an empty space below. The best explanation at the moment of this curious feature does seem to be that it was a pit which was later covered by an altar. The monument does not appear to have been rebuilt after the laying of the marble pavement.

It is curious that such an important and centrally situated monument should have been erased in this way. However, the pit at Cosa was certainly covered over, and the altar removed, after the appropriate ritual of expiation, and the fact that this also happened at Corinth lends some credence to the idea that the structure may mark the site of the mundus. Presumably the later inhabitants of Corinth felt that it was no longer necessary to maintain the location of the mundus in view.

The alternative, by analogy with Cosa, is that one should look for the mundus in connection with Temple E, which is obviously the most important temple of Roman Corinth. However, the massive concrete core of the temple
has precluded excavation and little investigation has been carried out on the terrace in front of it.\textsuperscript{118}

Leaving aside the vexed question of whether the surveyors acted within or without the foundation rites, it is clear that the work of the surveyor and of the augur was closely linked in the initial stages of a new city.\textsuperscript{119} So it is also worth considering for a moment where the actual foundation ritual might have taken place. The essence of the act was that the auguries should be taken and divine sanction invoked for the new foundation. (We come back, of course, to an earlier point. We cannot be sure to what extent the Romans believed in the efficacy of the ancient ritual, but it is difficult not to believe that some such ceremony took place.) Ancient sources describe how the augur would stand on a high point, where his field of vision encompassed both town site and territory. The orientation seems to vary: Varro has the augur facing south; Frontinus has both surveyor and haruspex facing west; and at Cosa, Brown says that the augur faced north.\textsuperscript{120} Probably, in typical Roman fashion, the orientation of the city varied because it depended on essentially practical considerations. Just before dawn the augur would trace the sacred square, the templum, on the sky and then project it onto the future city below. There are several possibilities for the site of such a ceremony at Corinth. Temple Hill and the rise of Temple E are both heights from which some, though not all, the city and territory can be seen. There was almost certainly a shrine, and possibly a small temple, on the hill of Temple E in the pre-Roman period,\textsuperscript{121} but it was not until the building of the Roman city that the temple and its precinct on the hill assume their dominating position in the city plan. The temple does, in fact, hold the position in relation to the forum and the rest of the city that one would expect to find occupied by the Temple of the Capitoline Triad.\textsuperscript{122} It is possible that the inaugural ceremony took place
on this eminence, which was later commemorated by the building of the most impressive temple of Roman Corinth (see Pl. 14). On the other hand, Temple Hill, so distinctive among the ruins of modern times, and clearly a dominating feature of the Greek city, loses its importance in the Roman period. The orientation of the temple is reversed; the precinct is hedged in and surrounded by other buildings which obscure the slopes of the hill; the whole complex is absorbed into the overall plan. It is unlikely, both on this account and also because there was a major, ancient temple already standing there, that Temple Hill was the site of the foundation ceremony. The third possibility is that the ceremony took place on Acrocorinth, from where the augur would be able to survey the whole city-to-be and its territory. This is an attractive thought. Not only would Acrocorinth provide an awe-inspiring setting for the ceremony, but it had long been associated with the cult of Aphrodite. Corinth was a Julian colony; Venus was the divine ancestor and protector of the Julian family and so most suitable as a patron deity under whose protection the new city could be placed. We do not know if Venus was, in fact, the patron goddess of Corinth, but certainly her popularity was as great in the Roman city as it had been in the past.

Without any hard evidence, such as literary references, inscriptions, or the kind of archaeological evidence that Brown found at Cosa, much of what I have just said can only be speculation. It is not, however, entirely without purpose in a situation like that at Corinth, where one has little to go on except the material remains of the buildings. It is only by seeking analogies from elsewhere, and by taking into account the mentality of the Romans and their approach to the planning of their new city, that one begins to understand its organization and to interpret some of its features.
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CHAPTER THREE
THE GROWTH OF THE CITY CENTRE

The Early Period: 44 BC to ca. 27 BC

The existence of standard procedures for the laying-out of a new colony and the relationship of the grid system, both to the structures existing in 44 BC, and also to the buildings erected at a later date, indicate that the existing city centre was part of the original urban plan for Corinth. This does not mean, of course, that the main buildings around the forum were built immediately, nor even within the first decades of the colony's existence. It is also worth bearing in mind that, while it looks from the current plan (see fig. 8) as though we have the whole city centre, the area to the east of the forum and the Lechaeum Road, and behind the Julian Basilica remains unexcavated and some important public buildings may well have been situated there.¹

The actual forum of Roman Corinth, together with the buildings immediately surrounding it, has been excavated and, for the most part, the results have been published.² However, some of the conclusions reached in the early excavation reports have had to be revised in the light of the current excavation programme and the analysis of the ceramic evidence being carried out under the present director of excavations. A brief, reasonably up-to-date, chronological account of the city's development has been given by J. Wiseman, although, since the publication of his article in 1979, there have been further changes and refinements in the accepted dating of some structures.³ It must be emphasized that the evidence provided by literary and epigraphic sources is limited. Numismatic evidence is occasionally useful, but representations of buildings and monuments have to be used with care. The normal method of dating has been archaeological/architectural
sequences, and there is considerable latitude in the dates thus established. I do not intend to duplicate the information and descriptions given by Wiseman, but rather to concentrate on important changes in dating and identification, and to discuss some of the problems in the development of the administrative centre.

The absence of information as to the existence and development of the forum is particularly acute in the very early period, and the suggestion has been made that the first civic offices were located elsewhere. It is worth trying, therefore, to establish a little more precisely the early stages in the development of the forum as we see it. Figure 9 shows the contours of the area south of Temple Hill together with the buildings and monuments existing at the time of the Mummian destruction. Still standing in 44 BC, although damaged, either deliberately or simply as the result of a century of neglect, were the Archaic Temple, the Hellenistic Stoa known as the North Building, the Fountain of Peirene and the South Stoa. The South Stoa was in remarkably good condition, although there are traces of heavy wear across both ends of the colonnade. The small Northwest Stoa, which may simply have been a propylon at the base of the steps leading from the Sacred Spring to the Archaic Temple, had not been destroyed, and the Spring itself was still in existence. The monument bases in the vicinity of the race-track and the Circular Monuments were in place, although, no doubt, the actual statues had been removed during the Mummian sack. Although there is nothing marked on the plan, S. Weinberg has suggested that there may also have been a Hellenistic structure on the site of the later Julian Basilica, as well a Greek predecessor of Temple E, with the same or parallel axis, on the rising ground west of the forum. If so, all traces of them were destroyed by later Roman building.
Massive levelling and regrading of the area was required to produce the flat, open expanse of the forum. The site originally sloped gently upwards from ca. 75.70 m. at the edge of the cliff over Peirene for about 30-40 m., and then rose more steeply to over 81 m. above sea-level in front of the South Stoa. The area of the lower forum was levelled to ca. 78.25 m. above sea-level from Peirene across to the rocky prominence which became the Bema, or speakers' platform, and which provides a focal point in the lower forum. The platform is carefully sited in relation to the entrance from the Lechaeum Road into the forum through the Propylaea. The higher ground behind the Bema was also levelled at approximately 2.30 m. above the lower forum. For just over half the length of the forum a retaining wall was built to divide the upper and lower levels. To the west, where the gradient does not appear to have been so steep, there was a gradual slope from the lower to the upper level.

R. L. Scranton has identified four strata in the fill of the lower forum area over the Hellenistic level. First, an accumulation of gravel from the Squatter Period; then a layer of clay and sand brought up to an even and fairly firm level, which he regards as the surface laid by the early colonists; thirdly, a layer with a cement surface, which, from the character of the fill, cannot be later than Augustan. This was eventually covered by hard limestone paving at some time in the late 1st century. These strata run the length of the forum, except right at the western end, where earlier strata were cut down to bed-rock or prehistoric deposits when the paving was laid. This indicates that the ground level of the lower forum here was slightly higher to begin with than it was at the eastern end.

The fill of the second and third surfaces contained mostly Greek and Hellenistic pottery and coins, with only a very little of the earliest Roman pottery and coins. The footing trench behind the retaining wall of the
terrace dividing the upper and lower areas of the forum contained only Hellenistic pottery, and must therefore be assumed to be among the earliest Roman structures. It does seem clear that the levelling and division of the forum into an upper and lower area was carried out very soon, if not immediately, after the foundation of the colony. It seems likely that it was part of the original plan and layout of the city, since such regrading would be a prerequisite for any substantial building in the forum area.

Much of the immediate colonial activity was concentrated along the Lechaeum Road, which had been re-aligned to run in a more northerly direction than its Greek predecessor. The Fountain of Peirene, the main water supply of the area, had survived the Mummian sack and the Squatter Period functionally intact. It consisted at this stage of a simple, open courtyard facing north and giving access to the draw-basins. Numismatic evidence shows that it was used in essentially the same form until after 17 BC, although there were certain alterations to the tunnel system, both to put it back in good working order and also to provide for a water supply down the east side of the Lechaeum Road. One of the earliest Roman constructions was an east/west stoa over the cliff of Peirene facing south onto the forum. It consisted of a series of small rooms behind a colonnade. The stoa runs from the Lechaeum Road into the unexcavated fill to the East. There is no indication of its function or purpose. The back wall of the stoa is the retaining wall of the cliff and it is likely that, in view of the very early construction date, it should be connected with the levelling of this part of the forum. This stoa was dismantled and replaced in the first years of the 1st century AD.

Also on the east side of the Lechaeum Road, just north of Peirene, the earliest settlers were responsible for a small industrial establishment, probably a bronze smithy. Although it was conveniently near Peirene, it
did not last long. The Greek naiskos on this site, known as Temple A, had already gone out of use and there are no signs in the initial rebuilding of the city of any religious structure here. The area was later to become the Peribolus of Apollo, but this was an open court with shops and porticoes, not a sacred precinct.

On the west side of the Lechaeum Road was the Hellenistic stoa known as the North Building. It was later buried under a range of shops forming the substructure of the Lechaeum Road Basilica, but in 44 BC it is likely that the heavier walls were standing. Certainly no overall renovation or extension was carried out, as was done with the Northwest and South Stoa, but R. Stillwell reports that repairs were carried out at the rear and "certain very poor floors and foundations" constructed within the body of the building to form rooms. They could date from the Squatter Period, but it is equally possible that this was the work of the first settlers, making use of the shell of an existing building which was conveniently near the main water supply of the new city. Stillwell reconstructs the North Building with a massive outer colonnade. On the other hand, J. J. Coulton suggests that the column drum and stylobate on the basis of which the portico was constructed belong to an earlier building, and that the Hellenistic North Building consisted of a simple row of shops with a rather primitive portico. On most plans of Roman Corinth the west side of the Lechaeum Road cuts across the colonnade of the North Building, but if this colonnade did not exist after all, then the North Building could well have continued in use after the re-alignment of the Lechaeum Road by the Roman settlers.

The Lechaeum Road itself ended in the artificial rise later marked by a series of monumental gateways providing the main, formal entrance into the forum. The first Propylaea was not erected, however, until the time of
Augustus. It is a reasonable assumption that the early colonists would have been too pre-occupied with providing essential structures to spend time and money on erecting a purely monumental entrance to their new forum.

The laying out of the principal roads and the refurbishing of the main water supplies are obvious requirements for a new city centre. Equally important was the immediate provision of offices for the administration, as well as the mint, which had certainly begun operations by 43 BC. It is tempting to think that the latter was in the area of the future Peribolus of Apollo, where traces of bronze working have been found and which is conveniently near to a good water supply, but there is no sign that this was so. (And the activity of a mint leaves unmistakable traces.) The location of the mint remains a mystery, and it is an indication that important civic buildings are still to be discovered.

There is more evidence for the existence of some administrative offices. The remodelling of the South Stoa began very early in the colony's life, and alterations continued over a long period. The wagon roads cutting diagonally across both ends of the terrace must date from the Squatter Period. The building itself, however, suffered little damage except for the roof, and there seems to be no evidence that the interior had been used at all, which is curious since it would have provided excellent accommodation for people or for animals. All traces could have been cleared out by the Romans, even from the wells, but it seems unlikely. Possibly the Romans put someone in authority to ensure that this major public building was not occupied or vandalized. One wonders why. It may be another indication that Corinth was not entirely deserted during the Squatter Period. The plan of the South Stoa as it exists today shows an extraordinary variety of self-contained units. Indeed, the history of the South Stoa in Roman times is a neat reversal of the conventional development of Roman town planning.
in which the portico, which developed from the Greek stoa, was used increasingly to mask an assortment of unrelated buildings and to provide a coherent facade along a street, or the side of a forum. At Corinth the existing regular facade, the open colonnade of the South Stoa, was maintained essentially in its original form and remained a dominant feature of the forum, while behind it the Roman colonists adapted the existing Greek units, each consisting of a shop and rear room, at will, with a complete disregard for the original uniformity of plan (see fig. 13). The early settlers, anxious to get the colony organized and to provide themselves with public offices as soon as possible, must have regarded the existence of such a handsome and massively constructed building as the South Stoa, so conveniently to hand, as a real boon. At a very early stage, possibly immediately after the foundation, the South Stoa was renovated. It was reroofed, some of the stonework repaired, and new stucco and paint applied to the whole building. Changes were made to the upper storey, which was either demolished or possibly thrown into one large hall. Little structural change was made to the main floor, and Broneer thinks that the rooms may have functioned in their original capacity as shops for a time, except that most of the wells ceased to be used as coolers and became depositories for destruction debris.

The first major alteration was probably the conversion of unit XVI into a passage or narrow roadway ca. 4.50 m. wide. This road continues south on exactly the line of the Lechaem Road and the groma base by the Bema, and crosses the important road running behind the South Stoa, which comes from the direction of Cenchreae. Broneer puts the construction of this road in about the middle of the 1st century, although he does say that there is no certain evidence as to the date. I would put it considerably earlier for two reasons. First, the well below the road was found empty to a depth of
5.70 m. and contained nothing of Roman date except two 4th century coins which Broneer thinks were washed in by rain. The well, therefore, cannot have been used at all, even as a depository for rubbish. The second, more important, reason for dating the road to the very early years of the colony is that it is part of the grid plan of Roman Corinth, which was unknown until recently. The road provided a convenient entrance from the south into the forum generally and, in particular, direct access from the important roads coming from the east to the public offices in the Stoa. This would have been especially important after the building of the Southeast Building, in the late 1st century BC, had blocked off the eastern end of the upper terrace in front of the Stoa, leaving only a narrow entrance into the portico of the Stoa itself.

The existence of this road at such an early date can be argued. A pavement similar to that of the Lechaeum Road was laid in the latter part of the 1st century, but this could well have been on the bed of the older, unpaved road. It has also been suggested that the road is very much later in date, on the grounds that it provides an unimpressive entrance into the forum and lacks side-walks, but such a narrow road would not be unusual at any time. At Corinth the road through the Stoa is certainly wider than the roadways, if they can be called that, running to the south of the Southeast Building and to the north of the Julian Basilica. That the road through the South Stoa was only intended for foot traffic is indicated by the existence of steps and a gateway constructed on the line of the front wall of the former Greek shop. There is nothing in the excavation reports to gainsay an early date for this road, and the existence of the grid plan favours such a conclusion.

Apart from the road, the Romans began alterations at the east end of the Stoa, that is to say, at the end of the forum, where, in general, the
earliest colonial activity seems to have been concentrated. In the Stoa, Greek units I to VII were altered drastically. The columns of the Greek interior colonnade outside these rooms, which had already been repaired and restuccoed, were replaced by larger, taller columns. Both the front shops and the rear rooms were converted to form three large rooms or halls, designated by Broneer as Rooms A, B and C (see fig. 13). The first three Greek units were thrown into one and extended back on the line of the south wall of the Stoa, which projects here 1.75 m. beyond the line of the middle of the Stoa, to form one large room or hall with interior dimensions of 14.42 m. x 11.77 m. Room B is slightly smaller; the width of two Greek units and measures 9.30 m. x 8.74 m.; and Room C covers approximately one and half Greek units with interior dimensions of 9.03 m. x 7.62 m. The remaining half of Greek shop and rear room VII separates this new Roman block from Room D, which is later in date (see p. 195). It may have been used as storage in connection with the rooms. The difference in the sizes of Rooms A, B and C must have been intentional, since they could have been enlarged by taking in more of the Greek units in the Stoa, or by making a continuous back wall behind rooms D and C. The common partition walls, and the strong probability that the three rooms were roofed together, indicate that they were constructed as a single unit. In addition, it can be inferred that Rooms A and B must have been built in the same period, since the fragments of tiles found in the wells in Rooms A and B (Wells II and V) join, which suggests that the wells were filled up at the same time with debris from the roof. Also, the stucco decoration of the walls in Rooms A and C is identical. (The walls of Room B do not exist.) The fact that the rooms are similar, but of different dimensions, does make it look as though accommodation was being provided for specific purposes and for the use of different numbers of people or officials. On the basis of a fine floor
mosaic showing a victorious athlete and the goddess of Good Fortune which
dates to the late 1st or early 2nd century, Room C has been associated with
the Isthmian Games, possibly the office of the agonothetes. Broneer has
also suggested that the other rooms, too, were connected with the
administration of the Games, and this is generally thought to be the case.

I propose, however, an alternative purpose for this complex, which was
clearly constructed at a very early date: that it provided a curia for
meetings of the decurions, and offices for the duoviri, and for the aediles
and their staff, all of which were essential for the functioning of the new
colony. This possibility has not, as far as I know, been considered before,
although it has long been recognised that such offices must have existed
among the earliest dated structures. Scranton suggested that the
three-roomed building at the west end of the Central Terrace could have been
the early curia and seat of the chief officials, and Winter thought that the
converted upper floor of the South Stoa might have served for this
purpose. The problem seemed to have been solved when a horse-shoe shaped
building in the South Stoa, which has a continuous bench running round the
walls, was excavated. It was immediately regarded by Broneer and others as
the Bouleuterion or Council House of Corinth, and this identification has
been generally accepted. Broneer says (p. 132) that "the peculiar shape
along would offer sufficient evidence". It is precisely this peculiar shape
which should have raised doubts, but has not generally done so.

Apart from the fact that the Bouleuterion bears not the slightest
resemblance to any other known Roman curia, it was built about a hundred
years after the foundation of the colony; it has seating accommodation for
only sixty-nine people, whereas the decurions of Corinth probably numbered a
hundred; and there is no accommodation for the magistrates and their staff
in the hall, nor nearby.
A considerable amount is known from both literary and archaeological sources about the procedures of the Roman Senate and the plan of a typical curia. Since the administration of a colony was based on that of Rome, we can make some assumptions about the type of accommodation to be found in a city like Corinth. The distinctive features of a curia of the Roman pattern are the two or three rows of seats on either side of a wide aisle, and a platform at the far end, opposite the entrance, from which the presiding magistrate(s) could conduct proceedings and receive those entering the chamber on business. It also had to be big enough to hold all the decurions—probably a hundred in a city like Corinth—as well as the magistrates' staff and attendants. Such council chambers have been found elsewhere. At Pompeii the curia has been identified as one of three rectangular halls, facing onto the south side of the forum, with interior dimensions of approximately 16 m. x 10 m. A curia of similar design opening onto the colonnade round the forum has been found in the Trajanic colony of Timgad, and a very impressive building was erected just off the forum at Leptis Magna, probably in the 2nd century. In spite of its temple-like exterior, the interior measurements, ca. 15 m. x 12 m., and arrangements are similar to those of council chambers elsewhere. In speaking of the curia in general, Vitruvius says that it should adjoin the forum and that "it should be constructed with special regard to the importance of the town or city". He also states that it should be either square or oblong with a proportionately high, coffered ceiling.

To what extent does Room A, the biggest of the three chambers, fulfil these requirements? It certainly adjoins the forum, as the Curia Iulia at Rome and those elsewhere do. The interior dimensions of the room, 11.77 m. x 14.42 m., wider than it is long, are satisfactory. A difficulty does exist in the possible existence of two rows of interior columns, which are
shown on the most recent plans. However, the evidence for these columns is very slight indeed, and Broneer himself has suggested that the columns to which the fragments belonged may just as well have come from the north facade of the room. 27 Once the hypothetical interior columns are removed, there is ample space for two or three rows of seating on either side of a wide aisle leading from the entrance, which opens off the portico of the South Stoa, up to a possible platform at the south end of the room. It is not large, but it is adequate in size for a hundred decurions and compares satisfactorily with council chambers elsewhere. 28 Room A could not, in any case, have been much longer if it were to be contained within the existing structure of the South Stoa. Vitruvius states that an oblong room should have a height of half the combined length and breadth; and, if the room were square, the height should be one and half times its breadth. 29 The maximum height of the South Stoa at Corinth, with the removal of the upper storey, was approximately 7 m., which fits Vitruvius' requirements. The cross-beams of the Greek Stoa would lend themselves to the construction of the coffered ceiling prescribed by Vitruvius. So little remains of the interior of Room A that one can make no observations as to whether there might have been niches for statues or a raised platform at the south end. There may have been a double entrance door onto the portico, as Broneer suggested, on the grounds that there was one to Room C, and this would be very appropriate. The new, large, Ionic columns of the interior colonnade of the Stoa would fit with the increased proportions of the new hall and its companion chambers. The portico would also provide a suitable place for members and visitors to wait for meetings to take place.

One small additional point. The walls of Room A are covered with heavy stucco formed into panels. A dado of large panels runs round the room with smaller panels above. This is typical 1st style Pompeian decoration, painted
versions of which remained popular in Greece well after it had gone out of fashion in Italy. It is the type of decoration that is associated with a heavy, projecting stucco cornice, and it is worth noting that Vitruvius recommends a corona of either wood or stucco round the walls of a council chamber to help the acoustics. The walls of Room A are not preserved to a sufficient height to detect any sign of a cornice, but there may have been a practical reason for using stucco panels on the walls and not replacing them with the marble veneer that was so popular in Corinth.

The only other certain feature of the interior is a packed earth floor which is preserved over part of the area and extends over the foundations of the Greek rooms. Since the fill below this floor was consistently pre-Roman, where the fill was undisturbed, it probably constituted the actual floor. Such a packed earth floor might seem inappropriate for a new civic hall, but it is not out of place if one accepts that the conversion was carried out very early, as is indicated by the pre-Roman fill. It was common practice for even the most lavishly built stoas of the Hellenistic period, including the South Stoa itself, not to have a paved floor. In many respects early Roman building practices at Corinth are practically indistinguishable from those of the Greek period and one can assume that they simply went on using the same type of floor. Much of it, in any case, would have been covered by seating, and possibly a platform. The absence of paving does not necessarily mean that it did not exist, since only part of the floor is preserved, and it is possible that elaborate flooring was added later, as it was in Rooms B and C, but in that case it does seem a little odd that no trace of it has survived.

If Room A can be considered to be the curia of Corinth, then the smaller chambers, Rooms B and C, are obvious candidates for the offices of the duoviri, the aediles and their staff. Too little remains of Room B to
say much, except that it must have been well-appointed. The base of the interior walls was covered with marble slabs, and there is a handsome floor of blue and white marble slabs. It is a type of flooring that becomes popular in Italy during the late Republican period and it is associated with 2nd style Pompeian wall-painting. This may or may not be the original floor. The excavation reports give no indication, but the level is .03 m. higher than that of Room A. Broneer, on the evidence of the flooring, dates the room "probably from the early years of Augustus."33

Room C has stucco wall-decoration similar to that of Room A, and double doors opening onto the portico. There is a bench along the south wall which, together with the wall behind, was covered in marble. The elaborate mosaic floor dates from either the late 1st century or possibly the early 2nd century. The crazy-quilt technique, using broken pieces of marble for the surrounding of the figured mosaic, could indicate that there had been another marble floor laid before that which is now in place. The subject of this mosaic, an athlete holding a palm and standing before the goddess of Good Fortune, leads inevitably to the conclusion that, at the time it was laid, the room was connected with the administration of the Isthmian Games. The office of agonothetes was the most prestigious in Corinth, and probably held only by the wealthy, since the holder would be expected to contribute to the cost of the festival. He was probably elected by the decurions, ranked above the duovir quinquennalis, and was closely connected with the administration. It would be natural, therefore, for his office to be near the other administrative offices. There is, however, no evidence that Room C was allocated originally to the agonothetes. The Isthmian Games were not returned to the control of Corinth until after 7 BC, probably in 2 BC, and the indications are that this whole complex of rooms was constructed at an earlier date than this. It is more probable that the original function of
the rooms was as I have proposed and that, as the city grew in size and prosperity, and the festivals at the Isthmus became more important, the accommodation was re-allocated.\textsuperscript{34} For example, the eastern section of the Central Shops includes a large central room, the purpose of which is unknown, but it is well situated in the commercial part of the forum to be a new office for the aediles. The date of the construction of the East Central Shops is uncertain, since it depends on the date of the Bema, but it must have been after the time of Augustus and before the middle of the century. Somewhat later, in the Neronian period, a large and very handsome hall (Room H) was constructed in the South Stoa itself (see pp. 187), and this could well have replaced Room A as a new curia, thus freeing accommodation for the agonothetes and his staff.

One significant point about the siting of Rooms A, B and C is the proximity of the complex to the Southeast Building. This was built in the late 1st century BC at right angles to the South Stoa across the end of the upper terrace. It was demolished and rebuilt in a more elaborate form in the second quarter of the 1st century. It has been identified with some certainty as the tabularium or archive building, and possibly also as a library.\textsuperscript{35} In this case, it is well situated beside the main administrative offices of the city.

The date of this complex of rooms is difficult to determine more precisely than by the very general indications given in the final report: that Room B dates from the early years of Augustus, and that the complex as a whole was "probably constructed in the reigns of Augustus or Tiberius".\textsuperscript{36} A reasonable time must be allowed for the initial refurbishing of the Stoa before the major rebuilding of Rooms A, B and C at the eastern end. Apart from the decoration, the major factor in determining, the date has been the content of the wells which were covered by the floors of the new Roman
building. Broneer cites four wells as particularly significant: well II in Room A, wells IV and V in Room B, and well VII in Room C. All four wells contain pottery dated either at the end of the 1st century BC or else in the early 1st century. In addition, well VII contains pottery and lamps dated to the end of the 1st century, but this material is regarded as having been thrown in subsequent to the construction of the three rooms, probably when the mosaic floor was laid. The evidence of the wells may not be as conclusive as it appears. The marble flooring in Room B may or may not be the original and, if not, pottery could have been thrown in at a later date, as in Room C. Normally, wells are not packed solid, but simply used as convenient dustbins. Usually, but not always, a slab is put across the top. It is, therefore, quite possible for subsidence to occur. This could have happened in Room A, where the well is in a central position with constant tread and wear taking place of it. If subsidence had occurred, the well filled up, and then the packed earth floor replaced, it would be very difficult to tell. Above all, there is the fact that a curia and other civic offices would have been needed as soon as possible. I propose, therefore, that we should regard this complex as dating from the early years of the colony, probably in the 30s or 20s BC.

One might ask what happened before that. Any building available, however temporary, could have been used. On analogy with Rome, any place appointed by an augur as a "templum" could be used for an official meeting. The Roman Senate met on the Capital during the Republic, in the Temple of Mars Ultor after 2 BC, and frequently in the library and portico of the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine under the Julio-Claudians. At Corinth, the Archaic Temple would have made a very suitable location in which to meet. It is not clear when the temple was put back into use, but it may have been earlier than is usually supposed. There would have been a large amount of
regular business to be transacted by the decurions. Corinth can be very
cold and wet for several months of the year and it is reasonable to assume
that during the winter, at least, their deliberations did not normally take
place in the open air. On the other hand, meetings of the assembly of the
people probably were held outside, in the lower forum near the Bema, but
such meetings would have taken place infrequently since they were primarily
for the election of officials and not for discussion.

The Archaic Temple was the other important pre-Roman structure which
influenced the layout of the city centre. H. S. Robinson, who has been
conducting extensive investigations on Temple Hill in recent years, now
considers that the only damage inflicted by Mummius was the removal of the
roof-tiles to get at the massive roof timbers. The subsequent damage to
the fabric of the temple was the result of the weather and general neglect,
and less serious than has generally been thought. The colonists treated the
temple in rather the same way as the South Stoa in that they retained and
refurbished the exterior fabric, probably opening up the quarry in the
north-east corner of the precinct for the purpose, and altered the interior
to suit their own requirements. The Doric columns of the original 6th
century structure were removed, but the rest of the interior arrangements
are not clear. Robinson thinks that the statue base in the west chamber,
which was first noted by Dörpfeld and until now always considered to be
Greek, is Roman in date. If this is so, then the two cellae remained as
they were and were not thrown into one. The major change made by the Romans
was in the use, not in the structure of the temple, the orientation of which
was changed from east to west. Massive quarrying was also started between
the Archaic Temple and the Fountain of Glauce, which probably supplied most
of the stone for the repair of old buildings and the construction of new
ones. The fill in the quarries goes up to ca. 35, which gives the terminus
post quem for the precinct surrounding the temple. However, once the orientation had been reversed neither the quarry to the north-east nor the operations to the west, which did not come near the west front, would have prevented access to the temple itself. 41 Although there is no concrete evidence, I am inclined to think that the rehabilitation of the Archaic Temple would have been one of the priorities of the first colonists.

The identification of the Archaic Temple has been a long-standing problem in the topography of Corinth. It is usually thought of as the Temple of Apollo, but Athena is also a distinct possibility. The evidence has been summarised by Wiseman, who favours Athena. 42 Robinson, however, thinks that it was dedicated to Apollo. All the evidence, apart from a reference by Pausanias, relates, however, to the pre-Roman period. While it is more than likely that the Romans would have known and retained the original dedication, this cannot be taken entirely for granted. In the 2nd century, Pausanias refers to a temple and bronze statue of Apollo on the right of the road leading from the agora to Sicyon, and mentions, a little farther on, the Fountain of Glauce. 43 At that time the area between the temples on the West Terrace and the West Shops had been incorporated into the forum proper, and the exit was marked by an arch to the north spanning the road between the end of the Northwest Stoa and Temple C. Therefore, the road mentioned by Pausanias must be that which runs from the arch to the main entrance of the Archaic Temple precinct, and then turns sharp right past Glauce. The obvious interpretation of Pausanias is that his temple of Apollo was the Archaic Temple, and, it is possible that the large statue base in the western cella, facing the main entrance to the precinct, supported the statue of Apollo. 44 The alternative interpretation, proposed by Scranton, is that Building K, behind the monuments of the West Terrace, was the Temple of Apollo. 45 Apart from the fact that it is not certain that
the building is a temple, it cannot possibly be described as on the right of a road. Nor is there any reason to assume that Pausanias left the lower forum by the ramp in the middle of the West Terrace rather than via the courtyard and steps by Temple D. I see no reason to doubt the traditional identification of the Archaic Temple, at least in the Roman period.

An interesting aspect of the Roman temple, and one that has not been considered, is the possibility that the two cellae may have been used for separate but related cults. The close relationship between Apollo and Augustus comes to mind. A very real possibility is that the eastern cella was dedicated to the Gens Iulia and the temple is that represented on at least one issue of the Corinthian mint. The coin, with the inscription GEN(tis) IVL(iae) on the architrave, is normally regarded as representing Temple E, but, in my view, Temple E is the Capitolium of Corinth (see Ch. IV) and the two dedications are not compatible. The temple to the Gens Iulia must have been dedicated at an early stage in the life of the colony, before the concept of the Gens Iulia was absorbed into that of the Gens Augusta. While it is possible that a large, hexastyle temple was built specifically for the cult at such an early date, it seems more likely that the colonists would have made use of an existing building, or rather, part of a building. Apart from the existence of the coins showing the temple, we know nothing about the worship of the Gens Iulia at Corinth. It is understandable, however, that such a cult should have received prominence in a Julian foundation, where there was also a cult of Divus Iulius, and that it would have been encouraged in the time of Augustus, who saw in the worship of the Gens Iulia recognition of his own divine ancestry.

To those structures which are known to have been in existence in the forum during the first two decades of the colony should be added the large Circular Monument at the eastern end of the Central Terrace. It was
originally thought to have been constructed ca. 15 BC, but excavation in the area in 1980 showed that the base was Greek and should be dated to the 5th century BC. It must have been an important feature of the Greek area and was given equal prominence by the Romans, since it was used to mark the end of the Central Terrace; it would have been very conspicuous from both the upper and lower terraces. There is no indication, however, of its purpose except that it was, presumably, a commemorative monument. All other monuments of the Greek period in the area, as well as the race-course, were swept away and the remains lie buried well beneath the lower level of the Roman forum.

It has already been noted that the Romans did not retain the sacred places of the Greek period when they adapted the valley south of Temple Hill as their forum. There is one possible exception in the sanctuary of the Sacred Spring, which lay just south of the Northwest Stoa (see fig. 9). A monopteros was erected over the Greek temenos in the early Roman period. A large tripod base was also found on the triglyph wall of the Sacred Spring enclosure. It is not clear whether it was placed there because the wall provided a firm footing or because of a connection with the cult of the Sacred Spring. The base has been dated to the early Roman period by L. T. Shoe because of the purely Roman form of the moulding. C. K. Williams has associated both the monopteros and the tripod base with the cult of Dionysus, suggesting that the classical Sacred Spring was sacred to Dionysus and that the memory of this was preserved in the erection of the Roman temple, which housed the xoana of Dionysus referred to by Pausanias. He gives no reason why this particular sanctuary should have been thus preserved. There is, however, a possible explanation if one bears in mind that Antony was not only closely connected with, but also probably responsible for, the foundation of Corinth, and that his supporters were
very prominent there. Antony saw himself as the new Dionysus and was actually honoured as such in Athens.\textsuperscript{51} It is just possible that a Greek sanctuary of Dionysus was retained because of this association. I am not suggesting that Antony was worshipped at Corinth, but simply that his patron god was honoured in this way. The damnatio suffered by Antony after Actium would not have extended to a sanctuary of Dionysus. Such a connection would explain why this was the only sacred site which is known to have been retained by the Romans in the forum area.

There is one more building to add to the small number which can be reasonably thought to have existed at the outset of the colony. It is the structure known as the Roman Cellar Building which lies just outside the southwest corner of the early forum proper, at the corner of two intersecting streets going east/west and north/south, and just south of the south tower of the West Shops (see fig. 14).\textsuperscript{52} The very early date is deduced from the fact that the fill for the foundation contains no pottery of the Augustan period or later. The building has only been partially excavated. The excavated part includes one large room and two small ones. Well-constructed steps lead to a cellar under the large room which contains a well and possibly pithoi. It was in use for a long time with many subsequent changes. A large quantity of pottery was found, mainly connected with the preparation and serving of food. It appears to be a public building rather than a private house and it has been suggested that it was a restaurant. However, the substantial construction and the very early date imply that it was something more important, perhaps a formal dining place for a collegium or religious association.

Two other structures must be considered in the context of the very early forum. The first is the three-roomed building at the west end of the Central Terrace, which has always been regarded as one of the earliest in
Corinth. Scranton proposes that it was begun "in the exact period of the planning of the new Agora", so early, in fact, that construction had started before the levelling of the forum had been completed. This, in his view, would account for the fact that it is considerably lower than the level of the forum - it is, in effect, sunk in a pit. He attributes this to the fact that the original level of the forum was intended to be lower and, when this proved otherwise, the builders raised the level of the building. Scranton is not very happy with this solution, but, as he says, "the problem is peculiar, and although another solution may be possible, it has as yet failed to appear". He also notes that no pottery or coins necessarily later than the 1st century BC were found in significant strata, which also suggests an early date. Recently, however, C. K. Williams has questioned this date, partly because of the unusual plan, and also because the fact that the building is in the forum, rather than with the other small temples on the West Terrace overlooking the forum, suggests that there was no space left on the Terrace. He would prefer a Claudian or even a post Julio-Claudian date. I think that there is reason to put the temple in the Augustan period on historical grounds and I shall, therefore, discuss it later with the other buildings of that period.

The other important structure to be considered is the Bema, or speakers' platform. It was dated by Scranton to ca. 44, when Achaia became, once more, a separate, senatorial province of which Corinth was, in his opinion, the capital. Kent concluded, on inscriptional evidence, that there must have been an earlier phase to the Bema, which Wiseman suggests could just as well be dated to the reign of Augustus, when the province was originally formed, if one accepts that Corinth was indeed the capital of Achaia. The status of Corinth within the province is not entirely clear, however, and, in any case, I do not see the construction of the Bema as
relating primarily to the government of the province, but rather to the administration of the city and the conduct of its own internal affairs. Partly for this reason and partly because of the implications of the epigraphic evidence, I put it among the earliest structures to be built in the forum.

The Bema, or rostra as it was officially called, is the most important structure on the Central Terrace. There is no doubt that it is the speakers' platform of Corinth and that it was here in 51 that Paul was accused before the proconsul Gallio by the exasperated Jews of Corinth. The Bema is the focal point of the lower forum, facing the main basilica of the city and dominating the approach from the Lechaemum Road (see Pls. 16 and 17). The Bema's careful siting with relation to the grid plan, its position on the terrace, not right in the centre, but adjusted in relation to the lay-out of the forum as a whole, plus the fact that it was used to disguise an awkward outcrop of rock, and that it relates to both the upper and lower levels of the forum, all argue that it was part of the original plan. The construction of the Bema has been described fully in the final publication. The podium consists of a hastily built rubble and mortar core which is faced with carefully cut poros blocks, and then revetted with blue and white marble. It had an elaborate, marble superstructure with benches in the corners and piers which formed a triple entrance from the rear. There may have been a mosaic floor. On either side is a schola. They are identical except that the western one is slightly wider than that on the east side. Both are revetted in marble, with a marble bench running round the interior and geometric mosaic flooring, and they are open to the sky. The quality of the marble and the workmanship, especially the carved capitals of the scholae, are very fine. Clearly, the edifice in this form does not date from the very early years of the colony. However, the
evidence now available makes it clear that there were certainly two, and probably three, stages to the Bema.

Corinth VIII, 3, no. 322 consists of seven fragments of a white marble revetment slab on which the text can be partially reconstructed to read *rost*[ra] in[cr]sta(vit) mar[mora]e o[mnia s(ua) p(ecunia)] f(acienda) c(uravit); "he revetted the rostra and paid personally the cost of making all the marble". The encrusting of existing monuments with marble seems to have been a favourite form of demonstrating one's generosity at Corinth. The slab on which the text is inscribed is so similar to the orthostates of the Bema that there can be little doubt that it, too, is one of the revetting orthostates, presumably placed in a prominent position on the podium itself. The discovery of this inscription confirmed previous assumptions that this was indeed the official rostra of the colony. It also suggests very strongly that there were two stages in the construction of the Bema: that it was originally built with a facing of poros blocks, cut, as Kent says, "with unusual care and precision;" and that these blocks were later trimmed to receive the marble revetment. It is puzzling, otherwise, as to why so much care was taken to shape blocks which were to be covered immediately in marble. 60

The second inscription to be taken into account is Corinth VIII, 3, no. 157 [duovir et duovir] q(quinquennalis) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(aciendum) c(uravit). It is cut on a marble architrave block from the eastern schola, which probably faced towards the staircase leading from the lower to the upper level of the forum. The size and shape of the letters on the two inscriptions are very similar, but there is sufficient difference to make it clear that they were cut by different masons. 61 The only means of dating them is by the letter forms since there is no internal evidence. Relying on letter forms alone does present problems at Corinth since there are so few
firmly dated inscriptions with which comparison can be made. Even so, one can say, with reasonable certainty, that an inscription belongs to the first rather than to the second half of the 1st century, and there are certain characteristics typical of the second half of the 2nd century. On the other hand, the chancery script of the Trajanic and, particularly, the Hadrianic periods reverts to the Augustan forms to an extent that can be very misleading. However, when one takes into account that the decoration of the Bema shows a strong Attic influence, typical of the Augustan and early Julio-Claudian periods, and the improbability of one of the main structures in the forum remaining unadorned until the early 2nd century, not to mention the actual construction of the scholae, which must pre-date the Central Shops, there seems little doubt that, in this particular case, Kent's assessment of the date of the inscriptions is basically correct. He dates the inscription on the Bema (322) to the first half of the 1st century, probably the second quarter of the century, and the inscription on the schola architrave (157) to the time of Augustus.

The final publication of the Bema assumes that the podium and the marble scholae were constructed at the same time, but there is no reason why this should have been so. There is no evidence of a poros form of the scholae, indeed the side walls and piers are solid marble. The decoration of the Bema is also subtly different from that of the scholae. While it is quite likely that the donors of the scholae and the revetments of the Bema were two separate people, it is very much less likely that the work would have been carried out at the same time and two different masons used to cut the dedicatory inscriptions. The evidence now suggests that the basic Bema podium was constructed first, with a facing of carefully cut poros blocks; the scholae, with their delicate marble decoration and mosaic flooring, were added next, in the Augustan period; and then the Bema was revetted in
marble, which involved the trimming of the poros facade, in the second quarter of the 1st century. Whether the superstructure was added at the same time, it is impossible to say for certain, but from the phrase *omnia marmora* I am inclined to think that it was. This is a relative chronology. Just how early the poros podium was built is another matter. Poros is the usual building material until well into the 1st century, but the podium would have had to have been built sufficiently early to allow a reasonable length of time to elapse before it was covered in marble. To my mind, the careful siting of the Bema in relation to the basic layout of the forum is a good argument for an early date. The architectural and epigraphic evidence supports, although it does not prove, such a date.

It is worth considering the matter from another angle - the purpose for which the rostra of a Roman city was designed. The basic answer is, of course, that it was a speakers' platform and, in particular, a place where public officials could address the assembly of the people. It then became a centre of ceremonial events and the place from which official announcements were made. Outside Rome the tendency was not to build an independent structure, but to use the platform in front of the main temple. At Corinth, however, there was no large temple actually in the forum, which would provide a suitable platform and this may well be the reason why a rostra had to be specially constructed. The traditional meeting place of the Roman citizen body for all purposes was the forum. Sometimes there was a separate enclosure for voting, as at Rome or Pompeii, but as often as not the open forum was used, especially for large numbers of people. The Romans, by tradition, stood at their assemblies. There is no doubt that the administration of the colonies and municipia of the late Republic and early Empire was thoroughly oligarchic, and that authority was vested in the decurions and city officials. It is also evident that the forms had to be
observed, and that both the decurions and the magistrates were freely elected by the citizens in their popular assembly or comitia. According to the Lex Ursonensis, they also elected the priests and augurs. The comitia's only function was that of election, but in this respect it took an active part in the running of the city. The elections were carried out under the supervision of the duovirs.

Since we know that the administration of Corinth was similar to that of other colonies, we should look for adequate provision in the shape of buildings or public meeting places to allow for the working of this system of government. There is no sign at Corinth of a comitium opening off the forum, as at Pompeii for example. It seems most likely that meetings of the comitia took place in the main area of the open forum in the vicinity of the Bema, and that it was from this platform that the duoviri conducted elections, and from where all the other public announcements were made. It would, therefore, be in connection with the running of the city that the Bema was built. It seems likely, although there is no definite proof, that, as soon as the forum was levelled and divided into two areas, the concrete core of the podium, which is described in the excavation reports as a careless and hasty construction, was built and faced with poros blocks, to provide a basic speakers' platform. It is conveniently near the administrative offices at the east end of the South Stoa, and it is an ideal place from which to address a large crowd.

There are two other aspects of the Bema worth considering. When there was no special enclosure available in a Roman city, and sometimes when there was, voting could take place on the platform in front of the main temple. The normal procedure was for voters to mount one side of the platform, cast their votes in urns and descend on the other side. It is just possible that voting actually took place on the Bema, with access provided by means of the
steps or ramps on either side, or perhaps wooden steps were erected temporarily. Another possibility is that the square paved area in front of the Bema was used (see fig. 10). It is clear, especially when one stands on the Bema, that the two are related. The pavement is ca. 8.50 sq. m., placed on the axis of the Bema about 17 m. to the north. The slight foundations and the fact that it overlies a drain indicate that it did not carry a heavy superstructure. Scranton suggests that it was a platform with an inner enclosure raised a step higher and, from the evidence of four post-holes placed at regular intervals along the side of the base facing the Bema, enclosed on that side by a rope or chain supported by poles. His suggestion that it provided a dry area to which visitors could be assigned, on analogy with the Graecostasis in Rome, is sensible, and also explains why it was covered over when the forum was paved. I wonder, though, whether it could not also have been used in connection with voting procedures. It would also have been a good place for formal oaths to be administered, such as the oath which the scribes of the duoviri and aediles were required to take regularly at a public meeting in the forum before they made up the accounts.

The second point is that there is a series of dowel holes in the marble revetment of the Bema podium. Scranton suggested that they marked the attachment of imitation beaks of ships or rostra and that this would account for the platform being called the rostra at Corinth, in imitation of the rostra at Rome. This seems unnecessarily fanciful. The term "rostra" certainly originated in the adornment of the ancient Roman rostra, but it had also passed into the language as the name of the speakers' platform. Another explanation for the dowel holes and other cuttings is that they were for the provision of notice boards on which announcements could be made. The Lex Malacitana provides for the posting up, by the person responsible for conducting elections, of the names of the candidates "so that they may
be read from the level ground". Details of public lease contracts, sureties and securities also had to be posted "so that they may be read from level ground in whatever place the decurions or conscripti may determine".72 Provision for such a public bulletin board was found by the excavators of Cosa, prominently placed in the forum opposite the comitium.73 The facade of the podium of the Bema, which is about 2.30 m. high, would be just the right height for the display and reading of public notices, and it would have been thoroughly accessible in the lower forum where everybody passed by and could get close to it. The provision of benches in the scholae on either side suggests that the Bema was a place where people naturally congregated, either for business purposes or just to pass the time of day.

It is clear that the Bema was used by other dignitaries when they were in the city. It is the obvious place from which to address a large crowd. The best-known example is, of course, the appearance of the Apostle Paul before the proconsul of Achaia in 51.74 That it was also the place from which formal announcements were made is shown by a 2nd century inscription (Corinth VIII, 3, no. 306) giving the text of an official letter written by the governor of the province in which he approves a building project at the Isthmian sanctuary. It ends with the formula, data --- X1111 KAL DECEMBR ET PRO ROSTRIS LECTA IX K DECEMBR "[Given (to my secretary) at ---] on November 18, and read from the rostra on November 23." However, the important point about the Corinthian Bema is that it was a speakers' platform - a necessary element in any colony or municipium - and that it was built primarily in connection with the government of the city. It is, therefore, highly probable that in its basic form it was one of the earliest structures to be built in the forum. Its subsequent embellishment belongs to a later stage in the development of the civic centre.
To summarise. In the first two decades or so of the colony, the forum consisted of little more than a large, open space, on more or less level ground (see fig. 14). A low retaining wall, dividing the eastern half of the forum into an upper and lower level, petered out just west of the Bema. Further west there was probably a gentle slope between the two levels. The line of the terrace was marked by the Circular Monument and the podium of the Bema. On the south side ran the immense length of the South Stoa. The public buildings were concentrated at the east end of the forum, in the South Stoa, and perhaps in buildings on the site of the future Julian Basilica and Southeast Building. The site of the Propylaea was marked only by an artificial rise, to the east of which there was a simple, one-storey stoa, built on the cliff of Peirene, and overlooking the forum. To the west of the future Propylaea was the small Northwest Stoa, or propylon, and the steps leading up the Archaic Temple. In front of it was the buried temenos of the Sacred Spring, later the site of a Roman monopteros. In the centre of the forum there may have been an altar marking the site of the mundus. On the west side of the Lechaemum Road, the North Building had been patched up for immediate use, and, on the other side, Peirene, with its open courtyard, was in good working order. To the north of Peirene was a small industrial establishment, probably a bronze smithy. A terrace wall ran along the west end of the forum, with ramps or steps giving access to the north/south road running behind it. Temple D may or may not have been in existence this early. To the south-west, beyond the limit of the actual forum, was the Roman Cellar Building. There does not seem to have been any other development at the west end of the forum. It could not have been a very impressive sight, but the basic layout of the forum had been established, and other public buildings and facilities could be added as they were required and as the city prospered.
There are two more public buildings to be taken into account when discussing the city centre. First, the theatre, which had survived from the Greek period, although it was damaged during the sack and the subsequent century of neglect. It underwent at least two major reconstructions and there is evidence of other repairs, which may have been due to earthquake damage. Since the theatre is set into a sloping hillside it would have been particularly vulnerable to earth tremors. It is not clear what condition it was in at the time of the founding of the colony. A temporary wooden "Phlyakes" stage was set up on the site of the theatre soon after 44 BC, but the first thorough rebuilding was not started until the time of Augustus.75

Secondly, there is the Fountain of Glauc, which is about 100 m. west of the Archaic Temple (see Pl. 18).76 It consists of a roughly cut cube of rock standing now above ground, but which was originally part of the ridge extending west from the Archaic Temple; the roof of Glauc is on a level with the stylobate of the temple. The main water supply was contained within the four large reservoirs cut in the rock, while a draw basin and a small, subsidiary reservoir provided access to the water. The parapet, the platform on which one stood to draw water and the vault of the ceiling over the platform were all cut from the living rock. It was designed for constant, heavy use, and this is borne out by the signs of wear on the parapet. One of the curious features of Glauc is that it was not built over a natural spring, as one might expect in a place like Corinth, where there are many natural sources welling out of the scarp, but the water was piped in from a considerable distance.77 The reservoirs are irregular in shape and give the impression of having been roughly hacked out of the rock, although the cutting of the channels and stuccoing is carefully done.

Since its discovery in 1900, it has been assumed that Glauc was a Greek fountain house of great antiquity, and that the Romans, in their
quarrying, simply isolated the cube-like structure and, having carried out some minor repairs and alterations, continued to use it. Recently, however, a test excavation in the precinct of Temple C, has suggested to the director of excavations that not only the precinct, but also the court north of Glaucace was built over a single fill descending to the floor of the Roman quarry. This fill was dumped in the first third of the 1st century, and the courtyard built over it. As a result of this investigation and other architectural considerations, the date of the whole fountain-house is in question. In the words of the director of excavations, "the evidence suggests that it is early Roman in date, although a Hellenistic first phase might be argued". If this is so, then Glaucace is a most unusual building and requires further consideration, although the problems cannot be discussed fully here.

Since the Romans regarded the provision of water to be one of the essential requirements of urban living, it is to be expected that they would pay attention to the supply at Corinth. What is not so clear is why they should have gone about it in such an inconvenient way. The construction of Glaucace by the Romans would have involved quarrying all round to leave an odd-looking cube, and then cutting down to a considerable depth in front of the fountain house in order to extract the stone from the reservoirs in the interior - and Chamber IV is a particularly awkward boomerang shape. The more normal and efficient method of working would have been to quarry the stone, including the upper part of Glaucace, to the existing ground level and then work down, leaving a platform into which cisterns of the required depth could be cut, and over which vaults could then built in the usual way. It would be easier to understand the apparently roundabout way of working if the cube of rock had been turned into a naturalistic, rocky cavern, but there is no sign that this was intended. Then there is the question as to
why Glauce was built so uncomfortably close to the precinct of Temple C, so close that the corner of the fountain-house was shaved off by the colonnade of the temple, when both structures were apparently built in the early 1st century. Since the water supply was piped in, there appears to be no good reason why the Romans should not have built the fountain house a little further to the west. Finally, why did the Romans call it the Fountain of Glauce if it was an entirely new foundation.\(^79\)

There is no obvious answer to these questions. The recent observations as to the date must be given their full weight. However, until they can be confirmed by further investigation, I prefer to regard Glauce as a pre-Roman structure (although not necessarily dating back to the 6th century), the surroundings of which were altered by the Romans. When they settled at Corinth, the Romans found an existing, possibly Hellenistic, fountain house which needed only a small amount of repair and alteration to be serviceable. They also urgently needed building stone, and the old quarry near the fountain house was an obvious source, so they quarried round Glauce, and then built a new courtyard in front of it when the quarry had been filled in. Such renovation of an existing building is a familiar occurrence at Corinth. What is curious, however, is that, although Glauce was right in the city centre, no attempt was ever made to elaborate or adorn the fountain house as was done with Peirene and Lerna.

One essential element of a Roman colony has been missing from my discussion so far. There is no altar, temple or obvious provision for the practice of the official religion of the state. Yet it was in the forum that the religious life of the city was centred. Not only do the circumstances of the founding of a colony demand that it should be put under the protection of the gods, in particular the Capitoline Triad, but the worship of the Triad was essential to the Roman citizenship of the colony.
There is no reason to think that a Capitolium would have been erected at the outset of the colony, but an altar and precinct for the worship of the Triad were essential requirements. The normal position for such a temple or altar is either in or overlooking the forum, and the site is carefully chosen so that either it is on a natural eminence or else it is placed on a high, artificial podium so that it dominates the city centre. It would be extraordinary if Corinth, which follows the conventional pattern of colonial settlement in so many ways, should have been the exception in this one respect. There is also the perfect site, to Roman eyes, on the rise to the west of the forum, and this was precisely where the major temple of Roman Corinth was, in due course, erected. No one would have doubted that this was the Capitolium of Corinth, if it had not been for Pausanias, who not only calls it the Temple of Octavia, but also refers to a Temple of Zeus Capitolinus elsewhere. The identification of Temple E poses, as Georges Roux says, "un des problèmes les plus délicats de la topographie corinthienne" (page 112). It is sufficiently complex to require a separate chapter (see p. 235 ff.).

The Development of the Forum from ca. 27 BC to the middle of the 1st century

As most commentators have observed, the first monumental development of the city centre took place during the reign of Augustus and continued throughout the first half of the 1st century. A relative chronology can often be established, but it is difficult to assign any one building to a definite date in the absence of firm epigraphic or numismatic evidence.

In the upper forum, the Southeast Building was constructed in the late 1st century BC, at right angles to the South Stoa. In its original form the building consisted of two rooms separated by a passage and with a colonnaded portico opening onto the upper terrace. It has been identified as a
tabularium, and possibly later also a library. If one accepts that the curia was located next to it, at the extreme end of the South Stoa, then this identification becomes even more likely. The Southeast Building was part of the general continuing development of the east end of the forum. To the north, the early stoa over Peirene was demolished and, in the very early years of the 1st century, it was replaced by another rather more substantially built, stoa with a colonnade, but without rooms behind it. At the same time, a long, simple building was erected at the eastern end of the Central Terrace. This building was the predecessor of the East Central Shops and it may have had the same function.

The first, poros Propylaea was built on the artificial rise marking the formal entrance from the Lechaeum Road into the forum. The monumental, three-arched gateway was built in poros, but recent work suggests that it was decorated with marble panels carved with bucrania, garlands of fruits and leaves, and sacrificial animals being led in procession - a traditional Roman theme. The Propylaea is generally thought to have been built in the late 1st century BC at the same time as the large Lechaeum Road Basilica. The Basilica is a conventional Roman design with a colonnaded central hall, and a tribunal flanked by two small rooms at the north end. The formal entrance from the forum was at the south end and it, too, was flanked by two small rooms. The room to the west of the entrance was modified to take account of the small Hellenistic stoa which was still standing at the bottom of the steps leading up to Temple Hill. There is no reason to doubt that the Basilica was primarily intended for the transaction of legal business. Although the building is known as the Lechaeum Road Basilica, and the row of shops built into the artificial terrace supporting it faces onto the Road, the Basilica does relate primarily to the forum and faces almost directly onto the Bema.
To the east of the Propylaea, the Fountain of Peirene was re-organised at some time during the Augustan period. An ornamental, two storey facade was built in front of the original, rock-cut chambers, which were converted into water-basins. The screen may have been intended to disguise the back of the Stoa which had been built on the cliff of Peirene overlooking the forum. Further along the Lechaemum Road, the bronze smithy and workshop were replaced by a large, colonnaded precinct with shops opening off it, which is known as the Peribolus of Apollo. Whether there was a small shrine or statue from which it took its name is not clear. Considerably later in the century, during the Claudian or Neronian period, an elaborate new courtyard was built for Peirene, the northern exedra of which infringed on the Peribolus, and at this point the shops on the south side must have gone out of use. Further north, again, on the other side of the Peribolus, a small bath and latrine were built. No date is given in the excavation reports, where it is simply referred to as being of early Roman plan, but the remains suggest that it predates the shops on the east side of the road. One can see here, from an early date, the development of the kind of amenities - shops, a fountain house, somewhere comfortable to sit or stroll, and a bath building - that the Romans required near any civic centre. Contrary, however, to the final report, there seems to be no evidence for a colonnade on the west side of the Lechaemum Road, nor for the existence of shops on the east side, until the latter half of the 1st century. The building of the Basilica and the shops below it, together with the Propylaea, is dated to the late 1st century BC with the other building and alterations taking place soon afterwards.

In the actual forum, the northern flank below Temple Hill was defined by the new Northwest Stoa which stretched from the Lechaemum Road Basilica to the north of the West Terrace. It incorporated the small Hellenistic stoa
at its eastern end and it almost certainly post-dates the Basilica. The Romans cut well into bedrock at the west end of the Stoa, and they also provided a sunken area with a terrace wall along the south facade to provide access to the ground floor of the Stoa. The upper storey of the Northwest Stoa formed the southern boundary of the new Roman precinct of the Archaic Temple, which was now to be entered from the west with the entrance on the axis of the temple. The Stoa is so similar in plan and construction to stoas of an earlier period that it was long thought to be Hellenistic in date, with only the upper storey built in the Roman period. The intention may well have been to provide a facade similar to that of the South Stoa in an attempt to unify the appearance of the forum. The presence of Arretine and other early Roman fabrics on the bedrock of the sunken area suggests that the Northwest Stoa was built either in the mid-Augustan or possibly in the Tiberian period.

On the south side of the forum the conversion of the rooms of the South Stoa continued piecemeal and slowly. The most important conversion was that of Units XII and XIII into a richly decorated Fountain House, the most elaborate of all the constructions in the South Stoa. Room F, which is decorated in a similar fashion, together with the connecting rooms, must have been part of the same complex. The richness and delicacy of the decoration make it clear that this was not a public fountain house, and Broneer's suggestion that it was connected with cult practice seems plausible, but there is insufficient evidence to identify the cult. The Fountain House complex is usually dated to shortly before the middle of the 1st century, but this depends on the similarity between the decoration of the Fountain House and of the Bema complex and East Central Shops, for which Broneer accepted Scranton's dating in the forties. As has been already discussed, there is reason to question Scranton's dating. There are
definite similarities between the type of flooring in the Fountain House and Room F, and that in the Odeum of Agrippa in Athens, constructed in 15 BC, and also between the only surviving pilaster capital of the Fountain House and those of the Odeum. In addition, the latest deposit in the well, which was firmly sealed by the marble flooring of Room F, is dated provisionally in the first quarter of the 1st century.  

It does seem that a pre-Claudian, either late Augustan or Tiberian, date would be more appropriate for the Fountain House. Minor alterations were made to other rooms and service areas in the Stoa during the Augustan period; some of them were certainly used as storage rooms, while the service area behind unit XXXII was converted into a latrine. The individual rooms seem to have been used for a variety of purposes which cannot now be determined.

The temples and monuments along the West Terrace of the forum are currently under review by the director of excavations, and changes in dating and in the details of construction may be expected. Temple D, which was probably a simple Doric construction in poros with marble columns of the Tuscan order, is normally regarded as Augustan in date; so is Temple G, a somewhat larger podium temple also built in poros. A charming little marble tempietto was the gift of the Corinthian duovir, Babbius Philinus, who also donated the neighbouring Poseidon Fountain. This fountain has been thought to be a free-standing, open-air monument, but C. K. Williams has recently associated certain blocks with the fountain which suggest that it was contained within a fountain house.  

Scranton thought that both the tempietto, and also the fountain, which because of the relationship between the two structures must post-date the former, were built in the reign of Tiberius, but he came to this conclusion on rather tenuous grounds. He considered that the style of the building was appropriate to this period. He may, in addition, have been influenced by the fact that Babbius Philinus
has also been regarded as the donor of the second Southeast Building, which was constructed, according to the excavator, in ca. 40. The restoration of Babbius Philinus' name on the epistyle frieze of this building was proposed by West on the grounds that at that time he was the only person known to have held the offices of duovir and pontifex. It is astonishing that this attribution should have continued to be generally accepted, by Kent among others, in view of the fact that we have inscriptional evidence for very few of the duovirs of Corinth, and that in any one year there would probably have been at least three, and possibly six, men holding the office of pontifex, any one of whom could also have been duovir. T. Manlius Iuvencus (Corinth VIII, 3, no. 154) for example, held both offices and, since there is good reason to think that he was holding public office during the later years of Tiberius, he could equally well have donated the Southeast Building. It could also have been the gift of someone otherwise unknown.

Recently Williams has observed that the column capitals assigned by Scranton to the Babbius Monument are considerably later in date than the rest of the building, and also that, in both plan and decoration, the tempietto is remarkably similar to the small round Temple of Roma and Augustus, which was erected on the Athenian Acropolis soon after 27 BC. The Corinthian monument is built of Attic marbles and the blocks carry masons' marks so that they could be erected in the correct sequence. As he says, there is little doubt that the building was carved in Athens from an Athenian prototype and then transported to Corinth. There is no reason why a copy of the Athenian temple should not have been made some 50 years later to a Corinthian order, but it is more likely that it would have been made closer to the date when the original was built, and possibly when masons from the same workshop were available. Independently of Williams'
observations, G. Molisani has dated the inscription on the podium of the Babbius Monument to the late Augustan period. Another inscription (Corinth VIII, 2, no. 100) associates the names of Cn. Babbius and one of the Heius family. The Heii were prominent in the earlier part of Augustus' reign, no fewer than three of them holding duoviral office, and on more than one occasion. The latest mention of a member of the Heius family is in the early years of the 1st century when C. Heius Pamphilus was agonothetes. His career probably falls between 25 BC and AD 10. If Babbius was a contemporary of these Heii, then it does seem that he would have been active in the reign of Augustus rather than later. For all these reasons, the elegant little tempietto which he donated to the city should be dated to the Augustan period, to be followed a little later, as Scranton suggests, by the Poseidon Fountain.

Of the buildings on the West Terrace, Temple F is the most interesting, both in design and in execution. It is a tetrastyle Ionic building raised on a three-stepped base above its rectangular podium, and it is reached from the forum by a flight of steps between massive balustrades. It is richly and delicately carved, and the style of some of the decoration is reminiscent of the Erechtheum. On the marble facade, in the centre of the tympanum, there was a circular attachment, probably in bronze, to the left of which there is part of the dedication - (V)ENERI. The most unusual feature of the temple, however, is the niche or apse in the back wall of the cella, which was presumably for the cult statue. As Scranton says, this is the finest of all the buildings on the West Terrace. In the final publication, Temple F was identified as the Temple of Tyche referred to by Pausanias, on the assumption that Tyche could be equated with Venus Victrix. Since then C. K. Williams has proposed a much more convincing interpretation of Pausanias, according to which Temple F housed Pausanias' statue of
Aphrodite, sculpted by Hermogenes, and was, therefore, dedicated simply to Venus, as the inscription indicates.\textsuperscript{102} The temple is customarily dated to the early Tiberian period, but P. Gros, in his analysis of apsidal temples, has proposed that it could be as early as Augustan.\textsuperscript{103} He regards it as having been built in direct imitation of the Temple of Venus Genetrix at Rome, which had been dedicated by Julius Caesar in 46 BC and was completed by Augustus. The temple in the Forum Iulium was, in Gros' view, the first to be erected with an apse on the axis of the building facing the entrance. When one considers the origin of Corinth, its cult of \textit{Divus Iulius} and the \textit{Gens Iulia}, as well as the emphasis placed by Augustus on Venus as his divine ancestor, then it does seem very natural for the Corinthians, in the time of Augustus, to have erected a temple to Venus which was small, but richly decorated, and which reproduced the one really distinctive feature of the Temple of Venus Genetrix at Rome. There is less reason to date the temple in the reign of Tiberius, although it is by no means impossible.

According to Williams' new interpretation of Pausanias' description of the forum, Temple G, next to Temple F and south of the central passage on the West Terrace, housed the statue of Clarian Apollo, and the three-roomed building just below the West Terrace in the actual forum becomes the Temple of Mercury (formerly thought to be Temple D). It is convenient, therefore, to discuss the building in this context, and it is possible that its proximity to the temples of Clarian Apollo and of Venus, or Venus Genetrix, may be of some significance.

The complex does present real problems which may or may not be open to solution. It consists of a central apsidal room flanked by two smaller rectangular rooms, all three opening onto a porch with four heavy central piers and two lighter columns, one at either end.\textsuperscript{104} The foundations, which are set in a pit, are built of poros blocks. The floor of the central room,
which is original, is a simple design of reddish and blue coloured slabs with white slabs round the edge. It seems likely, from the condition of the floor, that there was a table at the back, bases for light statues on either side, and benches in the corners. The poros walls were plastered, with no indication of marble revetments. Scranton proposed a poros or wooden architrave for the facade over the piers in front of the central room and flat lintels over the doors to the rooms on either side. There is no real evidence of the type of roof except that the absence of drainage indicates that there must have been one. The sacred character of the building seems assured by the altar base in front, on the axis of the central room.

Three-room complexes are not unusual in the Graeco-Roman world, but it is difficult to find good parallels for this particular building. 105 Scranton regarded it as having been built at the very outset of the colony, but Williams has suggested that it could well date to the second half of the 1st century, citing examples from the East after ca. 50, and also pointing out that the facade is difficult to parallel in early Roman public architecture. 106 An argument against such a late date is the fact that the materials used for the building were poros and wood, with simple marble flooring, and no evidence of the marble veneer that was so popular at Corinth in general. Although poros was used for public buildings throughout the 1st century, it is also true that temples were either built in marble or decorated with marble from an early date. It does seem odd that this particular temple, which is prominently placed in the forum, should have been built in such a simple style unless it dates from the early years of the colony.

Scranton bases his very early date for the temple on the fact that there was no pottery nor coins necessarily later than the 1st century BC in significant strata (p. 125), and also on the fact that the foundations were
sunk in a pit, which was the result of the building having been begun before the levelling of the forum had been completed. This ingenious proposal becomes less likely when one bears in mind that there had been a certain amount of light industrial activity during the late 6th and 5th centuries BC in this area, and that there was also a bronze foundry located to the north of Temple G, with a key-hole pit, the fill of which was 1st century. It is possible that when the Romans came to build the three-roomed temple, they found that the ground was not firm enough for the foundation. There may well have been a pit of some kind which they cleaned out, making a rectangular hole, deeper at the back, in which to set firm foundations for the new building. This would have nothing to do with a change in the surveyors' original level for the forum. We do not know when the bronze foundry was in use. It could have been in the Greek period or at the beginning of the colony, at the same time as the bronze smithy just off the Lechaeum Road. In any case, it is unlikely to have been in use after the building of the terrace wall and the construction of the buildings on the West Terrace. One piece of evidence does support this idea. In the final publication, Scranton, who was unaware of any previous industrial activity in the area, says that "quantities of broken stone and debris, evidently from some metal-working establishment (for bits of slag and bronze corrosion are abundant) were filled to the top of the first course" in the pit round the foundations. This would make sense if the material came from industrial activity, either on the very spot or from nearby, which had been shovelled out and replaced round the foundations. It does also seem clear that after the initial levelling of the forum, the west end was left vacant until the time of Augustus. Williams has pointed out that "pottery is not an aid in the search for the precise date of construction," but Scranton's comments on the date of the pottery and coins must be taken into account. His
observations, combined with the materials used in the construction of the building, do suggest that, on balance, the temple should be dated in the Augustan period.

The next point to be considered is the identification of the building and whether it has any bearing on its tri-partite plan. Williams' identification of the temple as that of Hermes or Mercury is more convincing than the original suggestion that it was a Dionysian. Its situation actually in the forum may have been chosen because Mercury was patron god of the mercatores, or possibly because there was no room on the West Terrace, since the buildings there may well also date from the Augustan period. It is worth considering, too, the connotations of Mercury in the Roman world towards the end of the 1st century BC. The association of Mercury with Augustus is well-known. Immediately after Actium the young Octavian is identified with Mercury as a bringer of peace, and his image in the guise of Mercury appears on coins, altars and works of art. Not only was Octavian bringing peace, but he was also restoring commerce and prosperity, the sphere of activity presided over by Mercury. What could have been more appropriate than for the Corinthians, who must have suffered badly in the civil wars, to celebrate both the bringer of peace and the promoter of commercial enterprise. Worship of the living emperor was not directly encouraged among Roman citizens, although Augustus was flexible in his policy in the East, and, contrary to the usual opinion, temples were erected to him in his lifetime in Italy. The cult developed slowly. In 12 BC, when Augustus became Pontifex Maximus, he revived the Lares Compitales, substituted his own Lares for the old ones and added his own Genius as an object of worship. Mercury, too, was connected with the Lares Compitales and this, together with his existing identification with Augustus, led to a situation in which the worship of the Lares Augusti, the Genius Augusti, and
Mercury were intimately connected. It would be understandable if a temple were erected to Mercury, and to the Lares and Genius of Augustus, at Corinth, probably after 12 BC. The Iuno of Livia could also have been involved. It is a possible explanation for the composite nature of the building, which does look as though it was designed for the worship of more than one object, or different aspects of the same object. We know nothing about the purpose of the individual rooms. The table at the back of the central room could have held the Lares and representations of the Genius, similar to those seen in Pompeian paintings, but this is only speculation.

What may have happened after the Augustan period is difficult to say. The worship of the Lares Augusti was normally entrusted to a collegium of freedmen and, when other aspects of the cult were absorbed into the imperial cult proper, with its attendant college of wealthy Augustales, the Lares Augusti remained a servile cult, tended by minor municipal officials. A fragmentary inscription found at the south-west corner of the forum confirms that such a cult existed at Corinth. It commemorates the erection of a monument or statue by the Collegium Larum Domus Divinae, and that the two senior members of the collegium, Titus Flavius Antiochus and Tiberius Claudius Primigenius, were in charge of the work. Both men were freedmen or of servile origin. The inscription is dated to the reign of Hadrian, but it reasonable to think that the cult started considerably earlier. Other inscriptions relating to the cults of the imperial house have been found at the other end of the forum, which is also where the Augustales erected a large statue. There were probably several shrines of the imperial cult in Corinth. Perhaps the main focus of worship was transferred elsewhere, leaving a small servile cult in the three-roomed temple, with the worship of Mercury becoming predominant. Pausanias, in the 2nd century, mentions two statues of Mercury, one of which was in the temple. He may not have been
aware of any other association or, if he was, he might have preferred not to mention it, since he was offended by the placing of imperial statues in sanctuaries of the gods. Just one more small point may be relevant in discussing the date and purpose of the temple. It is very close to the temples on the West Terrace which have been identified as those of Clarian Apollo and Venus, both special gods of Augustus and his house. Is there, perhaps, some significance in the grouping of these shrines with that of Mercury, or Mercury Augustus? It was an association familiar in Augustan thinking.

In the centre of the West Terrace there was a ramp or flight of steps, and on the same axis, outside the forum proper, was the massive podium temple known as Temple E. I believe that it is the Capitolium of Corinth and that it was probably constructed, in its first phase, during the reign of Augustus; also that the front wall of its precinct was probably on, or parallel with, the later range of West Shops.

At some time after 30 the first Southeast Building was demolished and rebuilt. According to Weinberg, this was to allow for the construction of the Julian Basilica, which he dates to about 40. The Southeast Building was rebuilt on a more elaborate plan at the same time, immediately to the south of the new building. The Julian Basilica must have provided an impressive facade for the whole eastern end of the lower forum. It also disguised cleverly the abrupt change in level at the east end of the forum. The cryptoporticus was on a level with the forum, from where a flight of steps gave access to the main floor, which was level with the higher ground behind. Whether there was at any time an entrance into this main floor from the road which runs behind the Basilica is not clear. The building is a familiar Roman design, with the main entrance on the long axis and opposite it an exedra. It bears a distinct resemblance to Vitruvius' basilica at
Fano, although the exedra is much smaller and it would not have accommodated a magistrates' tribunal, as Vitruvius intended. It is also possible that there was an entrance instead of the exedra, which would have provided access from the important road just to the east directly on to the main floor of the Basilica.\textsuperscript{117} That the Julian Basilica was an important civic building is evident from the number of inscriptions of public importance, many of which were inscribed on the marble revetment of the main floor, and the dedications, both to and by prominent Corinthian citizens, which can be associated with it.\textsuperscript{118} The Basilica also contained a large number of imperial statues and portraits, from which it gets its name, and it has been suggested that it was a centre of the imperial cult.\textsuperscript{119} It is possible that there was an aedes in the central exedra (which would, of course preclude it from being an entrance to the Basilica), but since the statues seem also to have been placed round the walls and between the columns of the main floor, it is likely that some of them were simply the type of dedications to be found in many public or semi-public buildings, for example, the Building of Eumachia and the macellum at Pompeii. The quality and quantity of the statuary should probably be seen simply as evidence of the wealth of Corinthian businessmen. In expressing their loyalty to the imperial family, they may also have been celebrating the political and economic stability which was the basis of their own prosperity. Weinberg suggested in his final publication (p. 107) that the commercial aspect of the Julian Basilica was predominant, and he compares the building with the Building of Eumachia, which was the headquarters of the fullones of Pompeii.\textsuperscript{120} He also suggests that the cryptoporticus of the building was open to the public and took the place of the more conventional portico opening off the forum. I doubt that this was so, since the only means of entrance seems to have been two small doors, one on either side of the main staircase.\textsuperscript{121} This restricted access,
both to the cryptoporticus and to the building as a whole, suggests that the Basilica was designed for the use of a particular group of people and not for the public in general. I would take the comparison with the Building of Eumachia further than Weinberg does. I see the Julian Basilica as the headquarters of the Corinthian business community, the ancient equivalent of a guildhall or exchange, used for large-scale commercial negotiations, such as the buying or auctioning of cargoes. In a city like Corinth there must have been a good deal of trading in which the goods remained in the ports or in warehouses. Samples of goods may have been displayed or stored in the cryptoporticus, but I doubt if there was much retail trade. The building may well have been the meeting-place of one or more collegia, and this might explain the number of dedications and the semi-private, semi-public character of the inscriptions. I also believe that the siting of the Basilica should be seen in connection with the so-called "shops" of the Central Terrace, which were probably not so much shops in the normal sense, but rather the offices or chief places of business of the merchants and traders engaged in the entrepreneurial trade and associated activities, such as banking, from which Corinth derived much of her wealth. According to this reasoning, the size and prominence of the Julian Basilica, which would also have had some of the aspects of a private club, reflects the importance of the city's commercial interests. 122

The date of the building of the Central Shops is uncertain, but coins of Tiberius found below the floor give a terminus post quem. 123 They are almost certainly later than the Bema and, in particular, its scholae, the construction of which Scranton originally put in the forties, but which could well be earlier. The shops were built in two sections. The East Central Shops, which also include the three shops to the west of the Bema, were built against the retaining wall of the terrace. The West Central
Shops are both deeper and wider, but similar in construction and probably not much later, if at all, in date. As a whole, the range serves to define, clearly but unobtrusively, the upper and lower levels of the forum. The rooms are quite small, they have concrete vaults, were probably closed by grilles, and have no storage capacity. The floors are of beaten earth sealed with a thin layer of clay. One room is revetted in marble and many others have traces of wall decoration. East Central Room V, for example, had a dark blue dado with yellow panels above, separated by bands with floral and leaf motifs.\textsuperscript{124} There is no evidence to suggest the sale of perishable commodities and, although I do not rule out the possibility that some of the rooms were shops for luxury goods, as a whole they do seem to be more suitable for offices or other commercial purposes.

The central room of the eastern section is considerably larger than the shops, with a porch and a door leading into the room. There is a handsome marble floor; round the walls is a base revetment in marble, and a dado of thin marble slabs, above which the walls were decorated with fine painted plaster. The stylobate of the porch shows signs of considerable wear. Bases to support something heavy were incorporated into the original construction in the middle of the back wall and towards the rear of the side walls. I have already suggested that this room may have been for the use of the aediles or other city officials. On the other hand, G. Roux has proposed that it was the cult room of Artemis of Ephesus, which was seen by Pausanias in the forum, and that the side bases supported a screen to conceal the cult statue at the back from view.\textsuperscript{125} It would not have been unusual to have such a shrine in an essentially commercial setting, but there is insufficient evidence to come to a definite conclusion.\textsuperscript{126} All that can be said is that the room was purpose built at the same time as the shops and, from the condition of the porch, it was much frequented.
By the early thirties, according to H. S. Robinson, quarrying round the Archaic Temple had been completed. Subsequently, Temple C was constructed on the filled-in site of the quarry. It has been identified as the Temple of Hera Acraea, but there is little hard evidence to support this identification and it is safer to regard it as an unidentified temple of the Roman period. The precinct was likely to have been built at the same time or possibly a little later. It is out of alignment with the temple and I suggest that this may have been done not only to avoid encroaching onto the Fountain of Glaucce, but also to keep the front wall on line with the existing precinct of Temple E. After the construction of the Temple C precinct, the colonnade of the Northwest Stoa was prolonged to form a gateway, with a central arch and a smaller opening on either side, across the road leading away from the forum.

At some time before the middle of the century a macellum of conventional Roman plan was cut into the bedrock of Temple Hill to the north of the precinct of the Archaic Temple. It is a rectangular enclosure with some forty shops opening off the four inner porticoes. There was an upper storey, which probably consisted of storage rooms entered from the individual shops below, and also provision for water and drainage. The facilities are in marked contrast with those of the Central Shops and there is no doubt that these shops were intended for the sale of perishable goods.

By the middle of the 1st century the city centre had acquired the form that it was to retain for the next three hundred years. Figure 15 shows the buildings and the most important monuments that were in existence by ca. 50. The lighter lines indicate structures about which there is some doubt. Contrary to the generally held view, neither the Bouleuterion nor the South Basilica were in existence at this time. The area later occupied by the South Basilica was still covered by private houses. In due course many
buildings would be rebuilt or refurbished. Sometimes this was necessary because of damage caused by earthquakes; or benefactions were made by wealthy citizens anxious to express their civic pride and to display their wealth. The two circumstances may sometimes have been connected, since Corinth is very prone to earthquakes and there must have been a number of occasions when existing buildings were damaged and needed repair and new revetting. Corinthian inscriptions and much of the plain marble revetment are fragmented to an unusual degree. The inscriptive evidence also suggests that, while many donors were wealthy enough to make substantial benefactions, only a few were in the position of Babbius in being able to finance an entire building. They could, however, pay the cost of embellishing part of the Bema, or for the reconstruction of the interior of the Southeast Building. The incrustation of existing buildings seems to have been a favourite form of public donation.

The building material in general use is the local poros stone, with marble becoming increasingly popular for decoration as time goes on. The use of poros rather than concrete and brick has been remarked upon as an example of the way in which the early Roman colonists used traditional Greek rather than Roman building materials and techniques. The reason for this was, however, not so much that the Corinthians were following a Greek tradition, but that they had a natural supply of excellent building stone almost literally on the doorstep, in the quarries round the Archaic Temple, as well as a quantity of ready cut blocks at hand in the damaged buildings of Greek Corinth, a great deal of which we know to have been re-used. There was no need for the colonists to use brick and concrete except when it was more convenient or efficient to do so, as for example in the construction of temple podia or for the vaulting of the Central Shops. Later, in the 2nd and 3rd centuries, the situation changes and both concrete and brick are
used in the great bath-buildings, in chamber tombs, and in at least one large private house. As far as building methods are concerned, it is difficult to say for certain what is Greek and what is Roman workmanship in the early period. The blocks of stone were usually re-cut and it is not surprising that traditional Greek stone-working techniques were often used. Some characteristics, such as claw-chisel work, can be identified as early Roman, and there is a distinct difference between Greek stucco and the generally coarser Roman variety used at Corinth. The use of the Tuscan order and the Roman Ionic base shows the influence of Italic traditions. On the other hand, P. B. Haskell, in her study of construction methods, considers that the best parallels for the techniques used in early Roman Corinth are to be found in the soft stone working tradition of the Hellenistic mainland, as exemplified in the Hellenistic Metroon at Athens.

When it comes to the architectural decoration of public buildings and the use of marble, the influence of Athens is very marked. The most notable example is the Babbius Monument, which was actually made in Athens, modelled on the Temple of Roma and Augustus on the Acropolis, and then shipped to Corinth for assembly. Attic marbles were used in the decoration of the Bema complex and the Fountain House in the South Stoa, and the decoration was in a style harking back to the Erechtheum. The same can be said of some elements of Temple F, in spite of its distinctively Roman plan. In the use of mosaic and opus sectile flooring, parallels have drawn with styles popular in Campania, as well as those found in such Roman influenced buildings in Athens as the Odeum of Agrippa. This may simply have been due to the widespread use of pattern books. On the other hand, it would be in no way surprising that the early Corinthians should turn to a neighbouring centre of artistic expertise, such as Athens, for the adornment of their
public buildings. It is a trend that seems to continue well into the 2nd century. 134

As far as building forms are concerned, the Corinthians seem to have been essentially pragmatic, drawing on Greek or Roman precedents as appropriate. Certain buildings, such as the podium temples, the Lechaeum Road Basilica, and the macellum north of the Archaic Temple are traditionally Roman in plan. So, too, is the Julian Basilica, with some adjustment made to cope with the peculiarities of the site and the specific function of the building. The theatre, also, was rebuilt on Roman and not Greek lines. On the other hand, the Northwest Stoa resembles so closely earlier Greek stoas in plan and workmanship that it has only recently been recognised as having been built in the early 1st century. The Corinthians could well have decided to build a basilica parallel to the forum and similar to contemporary buildings in Italy. That they chose not to do so must have been due to the wish to provide a coherent framework for the forum and to balance the facade of the South Stoa on the opposite side of the forum. In the late 1st century BC Peirene was given an ornamental, two-storey facade, with the Ionic order superimposed over Doric. This may have been due to Roman influence, but it also had good Hellenistic precedent. 135 Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the planning of the forum area is the Lechaeum Road, which was designed as a pedestrian mall from the outset. It was colonnaded in the later 1st century and is one of the earliest examples of monumental street planning. 136 J. B. Ward-Perkins, who regards the external influences on Corinthian architecture as being predominantly Italian, sees in the colonnading of the Lechaeum Road a reflection of the city's commercial activities in the Levant. He also sees Greek influence in the formal grouping of shops (or offices) in orderly units. This may well be true in the forum area, but recent excavation just
east of the theatre suggests that not far away there is the mingling of shops, small industrial establishments and eating-places, which is typical of Ostia and Pompeii. Whether the same pattern is to be found in other parts of the city remains to be seen.

It is clear that by the middle of the 1st century Corinth was a flourishing city with a wealthy upper class. There is no reason to think that the city had suffered in any way under Augustus from having been the headquarters of Antony. Although Augustus may have favoured Patrae as a centre of trade and Roman influence by giving it colonial status and an enormous territory, Corinth, too, seems to have become a thriving economic centre. This is certainly implied by Strabo's comments that "Corinth was always great and wealthy" and "Corinth is called wealthy because of its commerce, since it is situated on the Isthmus." It has already been noted that Strabo's physical description of Corinth in 29 BC, when he visited the city in the aftermath of the civil war, is at variance with such comments and that the city was probably in depressed circumstances at that time. Strabo actually wrote his Geography, however, many years after his visit to Corinth, probably between 7 BC and 2 BC, and his use of the present tense suggests that in the intervening twenty-five years Corinth had regained a substantial proportion of her former commercial activity and was known, once more, as a wealthy and prosperous city. It seems likely that in his writing Strabo was conflating his early personal observations and Corinth's current reputation. It was also about this time, probably in 2 BC, that the Isthmian Games were returned to the control of Corinth. There must, therefore, have been a sufficiently large pool of wealthy citizens available to undertake the considerable financial burden involved in acting as agonothetes. Conversely, there can be little doubt that the city profited from the influx of visitors, who were drawn both to the
Isthmian Games and also to the Caesarea which were held at the Isthmus every two years.

During the early 1st century the status of Achaia changed twice. In 15, at the request of the Achaians, Tiberius merged the province with Macedonia and Moesia under the control of an imperial legate; it was returned to the Senate, with certain safeguards, by Claudius in 44. It is not clear to what extent Corinth was affected by these changes. There is a general assumption that Corinth was made the seat of government when the province of Achaia was formed in 27 BC although there is no conclusive evidence that this was so. Scranton thinks that the transfer of government would have relieved the Corinthians of the burden of supporting the governor and his administration, and therefore released funds for building projects. He also suggests that the return of Achaia to independent status could have been marked by the building of the Bema in 44. However, such indications as there are suggest that Corinth's prosperity was not bound up with that of the province as a whole. No doubt, the city benefited in general from the administration of such competent legates as Poppaeus Sabinus and Memmius Regulus, who held office from 15 to 44. The imperial legates generally enjoyed a more modest life-style than the senatorial appointees, and the burden of support would have been spread over a greater number of cities in the enlarged province, but the most significant benefit to Corinth during this period must have been the general one of peace, ordered government and the opportunity to trade with other parts of the Mediterranean. It cannot be assumed that Corinth was the permanent or chief seat of the governor of the province in either 27 BC or in 44. However, as the most important city in the Corinthia it must surely have been an assize centre for most of the time, and as such it would have been visited regularly by the governor and would have benefited from the
activity generated by the assizes. It may have been on such an occasion that Paul was brought before the governor.

There is some evidence from the archaeological record that Corinth suffered damage in an earthquake in 22/23. Also in 23, the Senate agreed to remit for three years the payment of taxes by the town of Aegium, which is on the coast some distance to the west of Corinth and in the same earthquake zone, and this suggests that the damage in the area was severe. There is some evidence from the archaeological record that Corinth suffered damage in an earthquake in 22/23. Also in 23, the Senate agreed to remit for three years the payment of taxes by the town of Aegium, which is on the coast some distance to the west of Corinth and in the same earthquake zone, and this suggests that the damage in the area was severe.143 Literary sources mention food shortages in the Mediterranean during the forties and early fifties.144 Although there is no specific reference to Corinth, the appointment of two separate men as curatores annonae, an office that was filled in time of need, or possible need, rather than as a regular appointment, indicates that there was a problem then too.145 The fact that T. Claudius Dinippus held the office no less than three times, and was honoured by most of the tribes of Corinth, suggests that the grain shortage was prolonged and severe. It is likely, though, that the poorer classes were the most affected and it is difficult to say if there would have been any effect on the general building programme.

The tenor of my discussion so far has been that the forum area was developed considerably earlier than is normally considered to be the case. In only a few instances, the Bema and the Babbius Monument for example, is there sufficiently good evidence to advance with reasonable confidence the dates usually given. Other buildings, such as Temple F and the Dionysion, could date from the Augustan period, but they may also be later. The whole problem is complicated by the extent to which the chronology is relative. K. Slane has also pointed out that in the forum area in general, with the exception of some Tiberian deposits in the South Stoa, there is a noticeable dearth of pre-Claudian pottery.146 This is in contrast with the good late 1st century BC to mid-Augustan deposits near the theatre. Whether this is
an accurate picture, or whether it is the result of early excavation practice, and the jettisoning of large quantities of pottery which would now be kept for study, it is impossible to say for certain.

In this situation it is more important than usual to consider the historical circumstances. I find it difficult to believe that a city which by 2 BC could be described as wealthy and prosperous, about which Horace, some years previously, could quote the old proverb, "non cuivis homini contingit adire Corinthum", and which had regained control of the prestigious Isthmian Games, should have been lacking in all but the most basic civic amenities. Corinth was also issuing considerable quantities of bronze coinage at regular intervals. This was intended primarily for local use, but it is still an indication of the city's commercial activity. Yet, the first major building programme, which included the Lechaeum Road Basilica and shops, the Propylaea and the second stoa over Peirene, is put in the middle to late years of Augustus. While it is understandable that there should have been very little building in the difficult years before Actium, it does seem odd that for nearly thirty years afterwards, almost a generation, no important development of the city centre should have been undertaken by the Corinthians. Common sense suggests otherwise. I believe, in the absence of definite evidence to the contrary, that building in and round the forum began considerably earlier, perhaps not long after Octavian's visit to Corinth in 29 BC, and as soon as the city could take advantage of the general peace to secure its own prosperity.

One of the notable features of the development of the civic centre is the extent to which, in this period, it is either financed by the city itself or is due to the generosity of the citizens. There is no literary or inscriptive evidence to suggest that there were important imperial donations, although this cannot be regarded as conclusive, given the paucity
of such evidence in general at Corinth. I have suggested elsewhere that the Capitolium - Temple E - may have had imperial encouragement, either directly or indirectly, but there is no hard evidence to that effect. This is perhaps surprising since the Corinthians were not slow to emphasize their Julian links and to show their attentiveness to the imperial family. The city is unique in its provision of a temple to the Gens Iulia; an aedes was erected by a group of private citizens to Apollo Augustus; there were cults to the Providentia Augusta and Salus Publica, which probably date to the reign of Tiberius; and also a Claudian cult of Victoria Britannica. Not only the most important members of the imperial family, but also junior members, including Agrippa Postumus, appear on the coinage, and there are many other marks of respect, such as individual dedications and honorary statues. The best known of the individual donors is Cn. Babbius Philinus, although he can no longer be credited with the gift of the second Southeast Building. It was, however, the gift of another local dignitary. The four Hermidii gave not only the aedes to Apollo Augustus, but also ten shops; Q. Cornelius Secundus and his family gave a macellum and another building. One of the most intriguing buildings or monuments is that erected by the liberti qui Corinthi habitant. In addition there were the smaller benefactions in the form of the revetment of various buildings. At the Isthmian sanctuary, L. Castricius Regulus renovated existing buildings and constructed another, probably a stoa. His activities have been dated to ca. 1 BC when Corinth was once more in charge of the Games. No doubt there were other benefactions there as well. In contrast to later times all these donations appear to have been made by local citizens.

This must have been a time of intense building activity in the city, marked perhaps by temporary set-backs such as the earthquake in 22/23 and problems with a food shortage in the forties and fifties. In addition to
the construction in the forum and along the Lechaemum Road, the theatre was remodelled on Roman lines with a new *scaenae frons*, either in the reign of Augustus or early in that of Tiberius. It appears to have been damaged in the earthquake of 22/23, as a result of which the original Roman fabric was buttressed. To the north was a colonnaded court which Stillwell thinks was planted as a garden. He regards it as contemporary with the first Roman stage building. To the east a courtyard was paved at the expense of Erastus pro aedilitate. He was probably the friend of Paul mentioned in *Romans* XVI, 23, and the gift would, therefore, have been made before the middle of the century. The filling in of the quarries round the Archaic Temple suggests that an important stage in the building of the city centre had been completed by about 35.

Two other sites which are not discussed elsewhere should also be mentioned here. The ancient sanctuary of Demeter and Core which is on the slopes of Acrocorinth and outside the city limits, was brought back into use in the Claudian period. There is little or no evidence of activity there before about the middle of the century. It is tempting to see here a connection with the grain shortage which occurred at about the same time. Also in the Claudian period, to go by the numismatic evidence, a temple to Venus was built on Acrocorinth. Strabo does refer to a ναός Αφροδίτης on the summit, but this can scarcely be the distinctively Roman podium temple which appears frequently on the coinage from the Claudian period onwards. The restoration of these two Greek sanctuaries may have been undertaken on the initiative of the Corinthians. On the other hand, there is a well-documented Athenian programme to restore those sanctuaries in Attica which needed repair or had fallen into disuse, and this has now been dated to the reign of Claudius. T. L. Shear has pointed out that the restoration may well have begun with the emperor himself, since there is
specific evidence of imperial benefactions to Athens at this time. It is possible, given Claudius' antiquarian interests and concern for Greece, that he also encouraged, and perhaps financed, the restoration of the Corinthian shrines.

The Later Development of the Forum

During the next two decades, at some time in the Neronian period, the area between the West Terrace and the precinct of Temple E was incorporated fully into the forum area. Some buildings had already crossed the line of the West Terrace, and the arch spanning the road between the precinct of Temple C and the end of the Northwest Stoa marked the exit from the forum in that area. Now, the line of the road at the south-west corner was altered slightly, and the area was closed off by a new structure, with a terrace in front, known as the Long Rectangular Building. An arch spanned the road between it and the end of the South Stoa. This involved substantial alteration of the ground level, which was cut down at the south and levelled up towards the north. It was probably in this connection that substantial towers were built at either end of the terrace wall to the west. On this line a row of vaulted shops fronted by a colonnade was constructed, divided in the centre by an imposing flight of steps leading up to Temple E. The back wall of the shops forms the front wall of the precinct of the second Temple E. They are known as the West Shops and are unpublished, but the indications are that they are the same date as the Long Rectangular Building. This was an important extension of the civic centre, by which a number of pedestrian areas, namely the forum itself, the Lechaeum Road, the precinct of Temple E, the Capitolium, and the precincts of Temple C and the Archaic Temple, were all linked together. Wheeled traffic and people not having business in the immediate area would now probably take the road
west of Temple E, particularly after the construction of the odeum in the 70s, when the roads which had crossed that site were destroyed.

In the same period two important additions were made to the public buildings in the South Stoa. The area just west of the Cenchreae Road, occupied by Greek units XVII to XIX, was converted into the horseshoe-shaped building which is known as the Bouleuterion, and a large, elaborately decorated hall (Room H) was constructed out of Greek units XXII to XIV. The road itself was also raised and paved. These alterations have now been dated by J. W. Hayes, on ceramic evidence, to the Neronian period. Previously it had been thought that the Bouleuterion, for which, as Broneer remarks, there was very little dating evidence, was Claudian in date, and that the large hall which is known as Room H, was built towards the end of the 2nd century. Room H is a convenient but misleading way of referring to the largest hall or chamber (14.18 m. x 13.75 m.) to have been constructed in the South Stoa. It is thought to have had a series of arches, with a wide (2 m.) central door and windows on either side, opening onto the colonnade of the South Stoa, and a bench or dais along the south wall of the chamber, opposite the entrance. The lower part of the walls was veneered in coloured marble and the floor was paved with thin marble slabs. The flooring cannot, according to Broneer, have been intended for heavy wear and it does not show signs of long-continued use. He has suggested that it may have been the office of the duoviri or for the use of the governor of the province. However, because of its size and plan, as well as the revised date, I think that it could also have been built to provide more fitting accommodation for the city council. The new dating also accords approximately with the laying of the mosaic in Room C, which is clearly connected with the Isthmian Games. Perhaps it was in the Neronian period that the decurions decided that more and larger administrative offices were
needed and, therefore, Room H was built and the other offices were re-organised, although we cannot be certain exactly how they were allocated. Recent investigation in the Southeast Building has produced many fragments of 4th style wall-painting and it seems that the interior of this building was redecorated at about the same time. 162

On the other hand, the so-called Bouleuterion was not, I suggest, necessarily connected with the civic administration. It consists of a horseshoe-shaped chamber measuring 13.85 m. x 11.80 m. at the widest point. The main door, just over 2 m. in width and flanked by two narrower doors, opened onto a shallow porch with an apse at either end. Four columns have been restored, forming a colonnade opening onto the South Stoa. The floor is packed earth and there is no evidence of a roof, although Broneer suggests than an awning may have been used when necessary (p. 130). The lack of evidence for a roof is not, however, conclusive, since the walls of the shops on either side could have been used to support a wooden roof. Round the interior of the room, there is evidence of a continuous bench, which was divided by arm supports to provide seating for sixty-nine people. Even if one allows that the rooms on either side were used in connection with the Bouleuterion, it does not provide adequate accommodation, nor is it a recognisable pattern, for a curia. There is no place for the presiding magistrates and their attendants, and it is difficult to see how the normal procedures of a Roman curia could have been followed in it. The building is, however, just the right size and shape to have been designed for musical, literary and, in particular, rhetorical performances. This would not preclude its use for meetings of a different kind as well, but I propose that its primary function was that of a small, intimate auditorium which provided accommodation for events too small or informal to take place in the large theatre.
By the sixties and seventies Corinth was not only a prosperous city commercially, but it was probably also becoming a place of some significance culturally, or at least it had pretensions to being so. The cosmopolitan gatherings at Isthmia and the presence of foreign merchants and communities in the city itself would have been a factor in such a development. The references to Corinth in literature are extremely sparse, but we do know that Demetrius the Cynic was living and teaching at Corinth in the fifties and early sixties, and Philostratus implies that he had a considerable following there. Apollonius of Tyana also visited Corinth at about this time. At a somewhat later date Corinth was certainly frequented by well-known sophists and scholars. By the middle of the 1st century the stigma of its servile origin - and I doubt whether it ever worried the Corinthians themselves very much - had probably faded in the minds of most people.

The celebrated visit of the emperor Nero, accompanied by an enormous retinue, in 66 and 67 must inevitably increased the importance of Corinth as a social as well as a cultural centre. He arrived in September 66, made his proclamation of the freedom of Achaia, which also included immunity from taxation, soon afterwards at Isthmia, and then passed the winter at Corinth. It is probable that he also inaugurated the cutting of the Corinth Canal soon after his arrival, since the work was well advanced by the time it was abandoned at the beginning of 68. Nero's arrival, his proclamation, and the visit in general are amply recorded on the Corinthian coinage. The large number of issues made in 66 and 67 must be attributed to the influx of visitors to Corinth and the consequent need for small change. One of the issues shows a tetrastyle temple with a standing male figure which is assumed to be Nero. The distinctive circular object in the pediment suggests that the temple represented might be Temple F.
Temples of Venus often became centres of imperial worship in the provinces, apart from which Nero's Julian ancestry would make such an association plausible. The temple could, however, also be that of Clarian Apollo (Temple G) with whom Nero saw himself as having a special relationship; nor can one rule out the possibility that the temple represented is so far undiscovered.

Another coin shows a standing female figure with patera and cornucopia which represents the Genius of the colony. This representation of the Genius is a distinctively Roman type and the existence of such a cult at Corinth had been surmised by West on the evidence of two fragmentary inscriptions. More recently an inscription has been associated with the Long Rectangular Building which refers to a sacerdos genii coloniae. This may simply be the title of the dedicator, placed in a prominent position on the architrave of the building, or it could indicate that the Neronian Long Rectangular Building was connected in some way with the cult of the Genius. M. Amandry has suggested that the coins which bear a representation of the Genius may refer to the dedication of the building.

All in all, quite apart from the archaeological evidence, the climate would have been right at Corinth during the reign of Nero both for an extension of the public, administrative buildings, and also for the building of an auditorium for small, cultural events.

It is difficult to tell how much of the extensive building programme at the end of the 1st century and the beginning of the 2nd century was part of the continuing development of the civic centre, and how much was the result of damage caused by the major earthquake in 77. Plutarch, who had close friends at Corinth, records that Corinth was one of a number of cities which suffered considerable damage. Other literary sources refer to damage over a wide area, and Vespasian is credited with having given help to those cities
which had been badly affected.\textsuperscript{172} The fact that Corinth was officially renamed \textit{Colonia Laus Iulia Flavia Augusta Corinthiensis} towards the end of Vespasian's reign suggests very strongly that the city received imperial help almost immediately.\textsuperscript{173} Other dedications to both Titus and Domitian indicate that imperial interest continued for some time. On the other hand, Vespasian rescinded the freedom and immunity from taxation granted by Nero to Achaia, and from which Corinth, like the rest of the province, had presumably benefited.\textsuperscript{174} Under Vespasian the Corinthian mint ceased to issue its own coinage. No coins have been found which can be dated to the period 68-81. However, this change should probably be seen not in relation to internal circumstances at Corinth, but rather as part of Vespasian's re-organisation of the mints and the distribution of coinage in the eastern Empire.\textsuperscript{175} The right to strike coinage was regained under Domitian and is recorded on a coin with the legend PERM(isu) IMP(eratoris).\textsuperscript{176} The names of the duovirs no longer appear on the coins, but are replaced by the head of the emperor.

An important addition to the entertainment facilities was made in the late 1st century when the odeum was built on the slope to the south of the theatre. It is a typical Roman plan and designed to hold about 3,000 spectators.\textsuperscript{177} Broneer has suggested that, because of alterations to the foundation for which there is no other obvious reason, that the building may have been started just before 77 and damaged in the earthquake. The whole area seems to have suffered badly, including the theatre. A major restoration of the theatre took place after 77, although it was probably not started immediately. A cornice inscribed with the name of Trajan, and dated to \textit{ca}. 101, suggests that some of the work should be associated with him.\textsuperscript{178} The restoration must have been completed, according to the director of excavations, by the end of the first quarter of the 2nd century, although he
emphasizes that the chronology is not entirely clear. In connection with
the building in this area, the road to the east of the theatre, which had
curved round the cavea with a gradient shallow enough for wheeled traffic to
negotiate the slope, as is shown by the ruts, was now straightened to run
directly up the steep slope to the south. 179

There was also considerable building activity along the Lechaeum Road
in the late 1st century. Shops and a colonnade were built along the east
side, and a colonnade was added in front of the existing shops on the west
side. 180 In the Fountain of Peirene a large open-air basin in the centre of
the court supplemented the rock-cut basins, the court itself was paved with
mosaic, and the vestibule to the east of the facade was enhanced with
wall-painting and mosaic. 181 At about the same time the road itself was
paved, and the Augustan three-arched Propylaea was replaced by a single
monumental arch encrusted with marble and surmounted by a quadriga. It is
shown on a coin of Domitian, and it is likely that fragments of a white
marble revetment slab on which the inscription has been restored with the
name of Domitian belonged to it. 182 The Lechaeum Road Basilica may have
suffered in the earthquake of 77, but the inscriptive evidence suggests
that it was rebuilt rather later and dedicated in the time of Hadrian or
Antoninus Pius. 183 The Northwest Stoa was also repaired and remodelled to
provide access to the road to Sicyon at the west end. 184 This was in
conjunction with the re-organisation of the rather untidy cul-de-sac at the
west end of the Stoa, which included the construction of a flight of steps
from the forum up to Temple D (Tyche), and the rebuilding of this small,
early temple in marble. The other early temple on the West Terrace, Temple
G (Clarian Apollo) was also partly rebuilt in marble. 185 It is generally
assumed that Temple E was damaged in the 77 earthquake and rebuilt in the
reign of Domitian or early in the 2nd century, but for reasons discussed
elsewhere, I prefer a somewhat later date. The paving of the whole forum, which involved the destruction of the large altar in the centre of the lower forum and the covering of the paved area in front of the Bema, was dated by Scranton to either the late 1st or early 2nd century and, more recently, trial excavations at the north-east end of the forum tentatively confirm the earlier date. It would make sense for the paving of the forum to have been laid at the same time as the paving of the Lechaeum Road. 186

The result of all this activity would have been that a visitor to Corinth at the end of the 1st century saw a forum which, in terms of size and general appearance, compared favourably with that of many other cities of the Empire. The changing levels had been disguised, and the great open space of the forum defined by the magnificent colonnade of the South Stoa, was picked up in the line of the shops and monuments along the Central Terrace, and reflected in the two-storey colonnade of the Northwest Stoa opposite. Temple E and its precinct would have dominated the view to the west, its bulk emphasized by the colonnaded West Shops below, on either side of the monumental stairway, and by the small temples and monuments ranged along the West Terrace. At the opposite end, the plain stuccoed front of the Julian Basilica provided a rather austere, but impressive facade across the entire eastern end of the lower forum; while a vista of the colonnaded mall leading north towards the coast would be visible through the newly built and decorated monumental arch, which formed the main entrance to the forum.

The most important addition to the buildings in the forum at about this time was the South Basilica. Although it looks on the plan of the city centre like a separate building, it was really a very large extension of the facilities contained with the South Stoa. Because of its close relationship with these public offices, it was probably intended for similar
administrative purposes. On account of the similarity between the Julian Basilica and the South Basilica, it has been assumed that they must have been constructed at the same time, but this now appears not to have been so.187 The terminus post quem is given by a coin found during the original excavation, but not identified at the time, nor taken into account in the final report. This coin was noted by Hayes in his 1973 study of pottery from the South Basilica as "said to be Domitian of Thespiae, but better described as illegible".188 On close examination the coin does appear to be as described, with the head of Domitian on the obverse, for which BMC Thespiae 28 is a good comparandum and possibly the same die; and on the reverse, a standing female figure with hand outstretched, similar to that on BMC Thespiae 27 and 29. The coin is also the same fabric as several other examples of the Thespiae mint in the Corinth collection.189 In the excavation note-book the find-spot is described as "found below layer of poros chips all across core at level of top of 6th inner wall course".190 The core of the Basilica was filled up, as each course was laid on the inner rectangle, with a poros chip layer level with the top of each course. It provides, therefore, a closed context. Another coin of later date than the Claudian period was also noted in the final report. This duoviri coin of 68/69 was originally regarded by C. H. Morgan as giving the terminus post quem for the construction, but it was disregarded by Weinberg because, at that time, all the other evidence pointed to an earlier date and he thought that the duoviri coin must relate to a later repair.191 It would be unwise to rely for dating entirely on the evidence of a single coin, or even two coins, but differences in the construction and decoration of the two Basilicas have also been commented upon recently by P. B. Haskell and this would seem to confirm the new date for the South Basilica.192 The fact that two buildings identical in plan should have been built at an interval of
some fifty years raises the interesting possibility that plans and records of public buildings were kept, and that they were available for re-use.

The South Basilica is connected with the South Stoa by a broad marble staircase leading up to the main floor. Until this time the original Greek shop units between the early administrative block containing Rooms A, B and C and the delicate little Fountain House of the early 1st century had remained unchanged. Units X and XI were now demolished to allow for the construction of the staircase, and at some time in the 2nd century the remaining Greek units in the eastern half of the Stoa were replaced by the hall (9.40 m. x 8.30 m.) known as Room D. It was entered from the colonnade of the South Stoa through a portico. The lower part of the interior walls was veneered in marble and there was a bench running round both the main chamber and the portico. At the back, opposite the entrance, was a deep exedra with two shallower niches on either side. Peculiarities of construction show that this exedra was added to the room at a later period. The floor of both chamber and portico was paved with thin marble slabs. There were two marble bases on either side of the doorway which must have supported statues, one of which was, according to the inscription, dedicated to C. Cerealis, procurator of Achaia under Hadrian. This does suggest that the chamber was an administrative office connected with the procurator, and the bench would then be for the convenience of people waiting for an audience.

With the construction of Room D, the conversion of the eastern half of the South Stoa, which had been taking place piecemeal over the previous hundred and fifty years, was completed. To the west of the Cenchreae Road, beyond Room H, a number of the original Greek units seem to have been retained in their original form for much longer, although they were, no doubt, used for a variety of purposes. The last major conversion in the
Stoa, during the period under discussion, was the large Roman latrine which was built at the end of the 2nd century. It was an unusually spacious and elegant latrine with seating for at least twenty-five people arranged round a colonnaded courtyard. Access was by means of a large hall or open court with an impluvium, which opened off the South Stoa and from which two staircases led up to the latrine. The building has not been completely excavated and Broneer suggested that it might have belonged to a large complex, such as a gymnasion, further south. It is more likely that it was a self-contained building intended to provide facilities for people frequenting the forum, and particularly for those using the various offices and the auditorium in the South Stoa. Style seems to have been as much a consideration as convenience. In its size and appointments it is reminiscent of the latrine built earlier in the Roman agora at Athens, which has been described as an adaptation of the Athenian lesche or lounge. Apart from this late construction there seems to be a distinct shortage of latrines in the city centre of Corinth. A small one was provided behind Unit XXXII in the South Stoa, and there is a well-preserved latrine in the baths to the north of the Peribolus of Apollo. One would expect to find more provision had been made near the forum, especially in the vicinity of the theatre and odeum, but this may, of course, simply be an accident of excavation.

It is natural to assume that the presence and activities of the emperor Hadrian in Achaia stimulated public building at Corinth just as it did elsewhere in the province. Unfortunately, the epigraphic evidence is too fragmentary to determine the precise dates of his visits. A dedication to Hadrian as saviour and benefactor of Hellas was set up by the Achaians (presumably the Achaean League) on the occasion of his first visit, which was probably when he passed through Corinth from Epidaurus en route to
Athens in the autumn of 124.\(^1\)\(^9\) One of his later visits was commemorated by a coin with a galley and the inscription COL L IVL AD AVG.\(^2\)\(^0\) Elsewhere in Achaia his activities are conveniently recorded in numerous inscriptions, statues and honours; he is thus known to have been in the Peloponnese in 125 or 126. At some point Hadrian presented Corinth with an aqueduct and baths, and repaired the road between Corinth and Megara.\(^2\)\(^1\) A new tribe was named after him, and part of a cuirass of outstandingly fine workmanship, found in the odeum, is probably part of a commemorative statue.\(^2\)\(^2\) At the request of Cn. Cornelius Pulcher, a distinguished patron of Corinth, the emperor granted the city immunity from taxation.\(^2\)\(^3\) C. Cerealis, Hadrian's procurator for Achaia, whose statue was erected in the ante-room of Room D, was also put in charge of the new imperial quarries at Karystos.\(^2\)\(^4\) If Cerealis had supplied marble or supervised projects at Corinth initiated by Hadrian, then it would have been very appropriate for the Corinthians to have set up his statue in the entrance to the office of the procurator at Corinth.

No doubt, such imperial patronage stimulated private generosity, some of which went towards embellishing the city centre. About 125 the Corinthian magistrate Antonius Sospes and his family paid for the revetting in marble of the poros facade and walls of the court of Peirene, and a new entrance was cut through the north exedra.\(^2\)\(^5\) It was probably in connection with these renovations that the interior walls of the water chambers were painted with garland motifs and protected by grilles. Also at about the same time, or a little earlier, the Peribolus of Apollo was rebuilt, without its shops, but with a handsome Ionic colonnade and a large, comfortable exedra on the south side. Fragments of the dedicatory inscription on the architrave have been preserved, from which it can be deduced that one of the donors belonged to the Aemilia tribe and was probably, therefore, a
The baths to the north were also renovated. These may have been the baths donated by the Hadrianic senator, Eurycles Herculanus, who had long-standing, family connections with Corinth. The latter were sufficiently splendid to catch the attention of Pausanias. A particularly impressive undertaking was the sculptural decoration of the stage building of the theatre. The new and enlarged Lechaean Road Basilica, which had been rebuilt as a long, colonnaded hall, its interior walls revetted with marble, was dedicated either in the reign of Hadrian or of Antoninus Pius. At about the same time another macellum was built north of the Basilica, on the Lechaean Road. And it appears, from numismatic evidence, that the single monumental arch erected in the time of Domitian had projecting columns added to it in the Hadrianic style. Also in the Hadrianic period, the interior colonnades of both the Julian Basilica and the South Basilica were replaced in marble. It is less easy to put a date to the reconstruction of the Southeast Building and the laying of the mosaic floors. Weinberg puts it in the second quarter of 2nd century, although he also thinks that the mosaic flooring could date from the late 1st century. E. Ramsden suggests for the flooring a late 1st century/early 2nd century date in her study of mosaics in Greece. A fragmentary inscription, pieces of which were found in or near the Southeast Building, has been restored to give the name of the dedicator, Cn. Babbius Philinus, and also the word PR(aescr)IPTA, which suggests that it relates to the Southeast Building. However, Kent dates the inscription, presumably on letter forms although he does not say so, to near the middle of the 1st century. If this is the case, then it is unlikely to be associated with this reconstruction. The most ambitious project in this period was the rebuilding of Temple E, the Capitolium, which was probably completed in the time of Hadrian or early in the reign of Antoninus Pius. It was rebuilt in
marble on a marble encrusted podium, and stood in a greatly enlarged, paved precinct surrounded by massive colonnades. It was certainly funded by a private individual and his sons.\textsuperscript{214}

At a somewhat later date, but probably in the Antonine period, an ornamental entrance facade on the line of the Greek shop fronts was added in front of the staircase leading up to the South Basilica, and in connection with this the pretty little Fountain House was altered.\textsuperscript{215} In fact, there seems to have been almost unceasing rebuilding and beautifying of the existing public buildings during this period. The Fountain of Peirene was again altered and enlarged in the second half of the 2nd century. The court was converted to the square form which can be seen today and three large exedrae were added on the east, west and north sides. The eastern exedra cut into the exedra in the Peribolus of Apollo. At the same time, covered passages on either side of the northern exedra linked the Peribolus and the Fountain conveniently together, replacing the previous entrance through the exedra. There were niches for statuary in the curving walls of the exedrae and the water chambers were re-decorated with delightful representations of fish and marine life.\textsuperscript{216} These alterations to Peirene are usually associated with Herodes Atticus, but an inscription (Corinth, VIII, 3, no. 337), which clearly refers to the building of the exedrae and the revetment, makes no mention of the donor's name. The finding of a statue base with a dedication to Regilla, the wife of Herodes, in Peirene was taken by both Meritt and Hill as confirmation that the alterations should be attributed to Herodes himself. However, as Kent has pointed out, the base is not original but a replacement made over a century later, nor was it found in situ.\textsuperscript{217} It is, therefore, of little value in this respect, and there is no evidence that Herodes funded the renovations to Peirene.
Also in the latter part of the 2nd century, a row of vaulted shops, with a larger central room and a colonnaded portico, was built in front of the Northwest Stoa. The date and the function of the Shops is not certain. According to representations on coins of the Antonine period, the Propylaea seems to have been remodelled again, with subsidiary arches on either side of the main arch. This must have been the gateway surmounted with two gilded quadrigae which was remarked upon by Pausanias. The final stage in the development of the architectural scheme on the north side of the forum was the building of an elaborate ornamental screen, with a Corinthian entablature and decorated with colossal figures of captives, across the front of the Lechaeum Road Basilica. The intention must have been partly to provide a continuous facade onto the forum between the North-West Shops and the Propylaea, which would have been balanced by the colonnade to the east of the Propylaea. It also resulted in the formation of a court in front of the Basilica, and a very imposing, rather grandiose, entrance to the Basilica itself. The Captives' Facade, which is closely related to the Northwest Shops, was originally thought to be Antonine; it was then dated to the Severan period, and has now been put back, on stylistic criteria, into the Antonine period. H. von Hesberg has also recognised some blocks, including epistyle frieze blocks, as Augustan in date. These changes in dating, and the apparent rebuilding of an earlier structure, are a good illustration of a problem that is endemic in the study of Corinth as a whole. In the absence of specific literary or epigraphic evidence, it is very difficult indeed to assign building activity to precise dates, or sometimes even to establish a reliable sequence.

This was the city centre described by Pausanias when he visited Corinth in the 170s. The plan is shown in Figure 8. There were minor alterations after his time. Coins of the Severan period give an architectural view of
Peirene as it is today, with a monumental facade in front of the chambers and a statue of Scylla in the basin in the forecourt, which suggests that the fountain house underwent further changes. A Greek inscription (Corinth VIII, 3, no. 343) referring to Peirene and carved on a marble balustrade, which may have surrounded the basin, could well be associated with the dedication of this statue. Although Herodes Atticus can no longer be credited with the improvements to Peirene, he is known to have financed a thorough remodelling and roofing of the odeum. The interior was lavishly revetted and decorated with coloured marble and statuary, and, in addition, a colonnaded courtyard was built to connect the odeum and the theatre. A significant alteration on the West Terrace in the forum was the destruction of the Poseidon Fountain and the building in its place of two small, almost identical temples. Enough remains of the dedicatory inscriptions to determine that they were erected between 184 and 190 by the emperor Commodus. Although they are commonly referred to as the Temples of Hercules and Poseidon, there is no firm evidence that this was so. On analogy with twin temples and rooms elsewhere, there is the possibility that they were connected with the imperial cult. Otherwise the forum remained virtually unchanged until the second half of the 4th century, when two devastating earthquakes, followed by the invasion of Alaric, caused major destruction.

General Observations

There is little remarkable or innovatory in the individual buildings of the forum area. The Bema is an interesting creation, but it is really only an elaborate version of a conventional structure. Some of the smaller buildings, in particular the Babbius Monument and the Temple of Venus on the West Terrace, must have been very attractive, but scarcely original. The
fact that the plan of the South Basilica duplicates that of an earlier building argues a certain general conservatism. By far the most impressive building complex must have been the rebuilt Temple E, the Capitolium, which dominated the forum from the west. In themselves, however, both the temple and its precinct were conventional enough structures, as were the other temples, basilicas and rows of shops with their porticoes. The paved and colonnaded Lechaeum Road must also have been impressive, especially when seen through the Propylaea, stretching away into the distance, and, although it was a formula that was to become very familiar, it does predate other monumental streets in Greece.\textsuperscript{224} The real interest of the architectural scheme lies in the skill and ingenuity with which so many buildings of different form, scale and function were successfully integrated.\textsuperscript{225} That this was possible was due to the soundness of the original design. The growth of the city centre should be seen as the gradual implementation and continual adaptation of a basic plan established at the outset of the colony.

Although there is increasing use of marble as a building material rather than the local poros, particularly in the construction of temples, the quality of the materials used is not outstanding. Scranton also remarks that some of the construction is careless and hasty. It is worth noting, for example, that the capitals at the west end of Temple E, where they were not very obvious, are of stuccoed poros, not marble. In contrast, the interiors of many of the buildings, such as the Julian Basilica and the public offices in the South Stoa, were lavishly veneered in expensive marbles and decorated with sculpture. The quality of the decoration suggests that many Athenian craftsmen found a ready market for their skills in Corinth, particularly during the 1st century. The decoration of the ancient Fountain of Peirene became increasingly elaborate, with its marble
panels, sculpture in the niches of the exedrae and above the chambers, as well as other pieces of sculpture which may also have acted as fountains. One gets the impression from Pausanias' description of the forum that it was the cumulative effect of the monuments, the quantity of sculpture, and the ornate fountains that took the eye rather than any single, outstanding building. Many of these monuments and statues are shown on the coins of the Antonine and Severan period and, again, the impression given is one of great variety and richness.

The outstanding feature of the forum as a whole is the way in which different activities were concentrated in certain areas, and yet there was a unity in the design, which depended not upon rigid organisation or symmetry, but upon the careful balancing of the different elements and a number of adjustments in the scale and positioning of new structures as the city developed. The result was a city centre which functioned efficiently and which was also satisfying aesthetically. The division of the forum into upper and lower levels was necessitated originally by the irregular, sloping site, and it was given definition by the construction of the Central Terrace. This resulted in the administrative offices and the political centre of the city being concentrated in the upper forum, where a multiplicity of different buildings was concealed behind the splendid facade of the South Stoa. Commercial activity was concentrated in the lower forum, while other facilities, including shops, were readily available in the Lechaeanum Road and the markets to the north. The so-called shops in the lower forum were not for the sale of perishable commodities, but should be regarded, for the most part, as the head offices of the merchants and traders who were active in Corinth; and the massive Julian Basilica, which was clearly intended to dominate the lower forum, was primarily the headquarters of the Corinthian businessmen, the ancient equivalent of a
guildhall or bourse. Given the social make-up of Corinth, many of the same men who frequented the Julian Basilica would also have held city magistracies and occupied the administrative offices in the upper forum. I think that one can see in the lower forum an ensemble which resembles in some respects the Forum of the Corporations at Ostia. R. Meiggs describes the accommodation there as being "for the benefit of private traders from Ostia and overseas who found it convenient to have representatives in such a conspicuous setting. In their offices there was no room for the stocking and sale of goods; but here orders could be conveniently processed and progressed". This description could equally well apply to the lower forum at Corinth, which was also the financial and economic heart of the city.

Provision for the other important aspect of city life, formal religious functions, was concentrated at the western end of the forum. Here the small temples of the West Terrace were clustered below the Capitolium, which was originally set slightly apart and above the forum, but later integrated into it by what amounts to a forum transitorium between the West Terrace and the West Shops. This, in turn, provided the main access to Temple C and the spacious precinct of the Archaic Temple. The more personal religious needs of the people would have been provided for in sanctuaries such as that of Demeter and Kore, of Asclepius, and of Isis, which lay outside the forum area.

This division of the forum into different areas for different functions would have been by no means obvious or exclusive. The broad terrace in front of the South Stoa and the public offices must have been a particularly agreeable place in which to sit or stroll, and watch what was going on in the forum below; and it is easy to assume that the Lechaeum Road, a pedestrian mall with shops, baths, an increasingly lavishly decorated
fountain house, and shady colonnades, was equally popular. To anyone entering the forum by the main entrance from the Lechaeum Road, the focal point would have been the Bema, which was carefully framed by the Propylaea. In another, very real, sense the Bema was the focal point of the whole forum. It was the place where the citizen assembly could meet, or where individual groups could air their grievances, and it was the place to which the city officials or the governor of the province would come from the offices in the upper forum and address the people in the forum below. At the same time, there was nothing rigid nor exclusive in this separation of function, but, rather, easy access and interchange between the lower and upper levels, and from one part of the forum to another.

It is worth emphasizing a point made earlier, which is that the whole of the city centre of Corinth may not have been excavated yet. It was normal Roman practice to separate markets for perishable goods, such as fish, meat and vegetables, from the more formal areas of the forum proper. It is clear that, in the centre of Corinth, the markets north of Temple Hill and the Lechaeum Road Basilica, together with the shops along the Road, and the shops in the Lechaeum Road provided for some of the needs of the crowds in the forum. Even so, there is a singular dearth of provision near the forum for the kind of merchandise that would have been needed and provided locally, such as wine, pottery, shoes and clothing. No doubt, large cargoes and goods in transit were stored in warehouses at Lechaeum and Cenchreae, or at either end of the diolkos, but there must surely have been considerable passage of goods through Corinth itself, as well as trade within the city. There would probably also have been warehouses in the city for the holding of grain, and the appointment from time to time of a curator annonae suggests that the distribution of grain was important. Nor is there any obvious provision for the control of weights and measures, which one would
expect to find in or near any ordinary commercial forum. It is just possible that the central room in the East Central Shops belonged to the aediles, but it could equally well be a cult room, or else have had an entirely different, unknown function. The whereabouts of the mint is also a problem. It did not coin every year, but it was one of the most prolific mints in the province, providing small change for use all over the Peloponnese and beyond. The actual procedure for the distribution of coinage in commercial centres such as Corinth is not very clear, but neither the mint itself nor the centre for distribution were likely to be far from the administrative centre. The site of a mint need not be large, but it must be near water, and it does leave unmistakable traces of its activity.

I suggest, therefore, that there may have been a commercial extension of the forum to the east of the Lechaeum Road or on the high ground behind the Julian Basilica, and that it provided some of the facilities which have not been discovered so far at Corinth. Such a site would have been more accessible than the excavated forum from the main route leading from Lechaeum harbour. This was not, in my view, the stepped and paved Lechaeum Road, closed to wheeled traffic, but the road climbing the scarp further to the east which was suitable for wagons. The site would also have been conveniently near the main road from Cenchreae. The paved road behind the Julian Basilica, which was evidently important and in use over a long period, would then have provided access to both the excavated forum and also to whatever lay further east. However, the existence of such a site and the date at which it might have been developed can only be speculation, at least for the present.
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11. Corinth I, 6, pp. 64-65.


14. Corinth I, 1, pp. 212-228. Other evidence of occupation was noted when excavations began; see Ch. I, p. 16 and n. 71.

15. Coulton, p. 53.


17. The excavation of the South Stoa has been carefully reported and documented by O. Broneer, (Corinth I, 4) and details in the following paragraphs are taken from his final report. He does, however, comment (Preface, p. viii) "that the Roman buildings within the Stoa have been less minutely examined than the original Greek building".

18. Broneer (pp. 98-99) thinks that the rooms on the ground floor of the South Stoa served primarily as shops or restaurants. Subsequent study of the deposits had led C. K. Williams (Pre-Roman Cults in the Area of the Forum of Ancient Corinth, unpub. PhD., diss., Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1978, pp. 52-54) to suggest that the two-room suites of the South Stoa may have provided facilities for a number of cults and religious societies. The original function of the rooms, however, is not likely to have affected their use in the Roman period and I have continued to refer to the rooms as shops for convenience.

19. Corinth I, 4, pp. 128-9. The jog in the road to the south was presumably to keep the line of the Lechaeum Road and, at the same time, to take up the width of only one shop unit, which would have been quite adequate for foot traffic. This implies that the rooms on either side of the road were in use at the time that it was constructed. The conversion of Room F (together with the Fountain House) to the east is generally dated to
about the middle of the century, but there is some reason to think that it should be put in the pre-Claudian period, possibly in the time of Augustus. The latest deposit in the well of Room F is dated provisionally to the first quarter of the 1st century, (see note 92). On the continuation of road to the south, see p. 317.

20. J. W. Hayes, *Hesperia* (1973) p. 418. Hayes considers that the paving of the Cenchreae Road was part of the same project as the Bouleuterion for which pottery and numismatic evidence suggest a date between 55 and 70. C. K. Williams has raised the possibility of a 3rd century date in discussion.

21. For details of the alterations, see *Corinth* I, 4, pp. 104-110.


23. *Corinth* I, 4, p. 132. However, W. A. McDonald, op. cit. (Ch. I, n. 54) s.v. Corinth, does cast doubt on the identification, referring to the plan as unique (p. 179) and exceptional (p. 255). His analysis of buildings identified as bouleuteria shows that, although the seating may be curvilinear, the ground plan of all but two is rectangular, the exceptions being Olympia and Corinth.

24. The horseshoe-shaped building was originally thought to have been constructed in the time of Claudius, but has now been put in the Neronian period, (see pp. 187-188).

25. The evidence has been collected and discussed by R.A. Talbert, *The Senate of Imperial Rome*, Princeton, 1984. See, in particular Ch. 3. The Curia Julia, which can be taken as a model, was begun by Julius Caesar and dedicated by Octavian in 29 BC. The surviving building, which was rebuilt by Diocletian, was associated with two other buildings, which probably contained records and documents relating to the Senate. The interior measures 25.63 m. x 17.73 m. with a central aisle leading from the entrance to the raised suggestus. On either side were three stepped benches. The presiding magistrates were seated on the suggestus, from which they could see the senators seated on the benches. Anyone addressing the
Senate must have faced the presiding magistrate with his back to the entrance. It is clear from literary references that there had to be a wide, central aisle for the voting groups to be formed. There are also references to senators moving, if not rushing, about. There also had to be accommodation in the curia for shorthand writers, plaintiffs, defendants and witnesses at trials. It is unlikely that the decurions of Corinth were present at the type of trial that took place in the capital, but prosecutions regarding, for example, maladministration while in office, could certainly have been brought. There would also have been a considerable amount of ordinary business, such as the giving of reports, reception of envoys, as well as the counting of votes.


27. Corinth I, 4, p. 105.

28. The number of decurions could vary, but in a prosperous city it was usually 100. See Cicero, de leg. ag. II, 35, 96 on the appointment of 100 decurions, 10 augurs and 6 priests for the new colony of Capua; also Hardy, op. cit. (Ch. I, n. 61), p. 76.

29. Vitruvius, loc. cit. (n. 26).

30. Vitruvius, V, 2, 2.


32. Coulton, p. 146. None of the flooring of the Greek period in the South Stoa has survived, but there are traces of the fine, water-tight cement which was probably used in the shops round the curbs of the wells.

33. Corinth I, 4, p. 106.

34. See Kent, Corinth VIII, 3, p. 28-30 on the administration of the festivals and his commentary on no. 152 for the date of the return of the Isthmian Games to Corinth.
35. Corinth I, 5, p. 10.

36. Corinth I, 4, p. 110.

37. Op cit., p. 109. In his original report (AJA 37 [1933], p. 562) Bronner mentions that the floor over Well VII broke through when a workman stepped on it.

38. The most recent publication on Temple Hill is H. S. Robinson, Hesperia 45 (1976), pp. 203-239. The fill in the quarry to the north-east, from which stone was taken to repair the temple, (see p. 237) is dated to the first third of the 1st century and this is generally assumed to be the date when the temple was back in use. The Doric columns from the interior were used in a colonnade placed across the west end of the upper terrace to form an entrance to the forum from the south-west. Excavations of 1961 suggested that their re-use might be dated in the first half of the 1st century, but this is by no means certain. Wiseman (ANRW, p. 517, n. 314) refers to a part of one of the columns from the temple embedded in a pier of the Lechaeum Road Basilica (Corinth I, 1, p. 201) as evidence for the early rebuilding of the temple. However, the pier is part of the construction of the second not the first basilica.

39. See Ch. I, p. 13 and n. 50. Professor Robinson has been generous in discussing his later work on Temple Hill and some of his conclusions with me. Evidence from elsewhere does suggest that Mummus' troops did not deliberately destroy the sanctuaries.

40. Corinth I, 1, p. 115 and fig. 82.

41. The wide staircase to the south-east of Temple Hill provided access from the forum to the temple until it was blocked by the building of the Northwest Stoa in the early Roman period (on date see C. K. Williams, Hesperia 38 [1969], pp. 52-55). It is clear that the walls and porticoes of the precinct could not have been laid out until after the quarry was filled in. The operations to the west, probably on the site of a 2nd century BC quarry, were very extensive and resulted in a totally different configuration of the ground. See Robinson op. cit. (note 38) p. 209-10.
The ground level in front of the west facade of the temple is the same as the top of the Fountain of Glauce, but the ridge in between has been quarried away. Professor Robinson confirms, however, that, in his view, the temple could well have been in use while quarrying was going on to the west. Corinth was prospering and there was lively building activity in the last 1st century BC and the early part of the 1st century. Common sense suggests that the Corinthians would not have waited some 80 years or more before repairing one of the most important monuments in the city centre. It is much more likely that the temple was being used both before and while the surrounding precinct was constructed. Quarrying operations must have made life distinctly unpleasant at times for the early Corinthians, not to mention inconvenient, but, no doubt, like the inhabitants of any other new city, ancient or modern, they became used to living in the middle of a construction site.

42. Wiseman, ANRW, p. 530 and notes.

43. Pausanias II, 3, 6. ἕτεραν δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἁγορᾶς τὴν ἐπὶ Σιυκώνα ἐρχομένους ἔστιν ἰδεῖν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς δοξῆς ναὸς καὶ ἄγαλμα χαλκοῦ Ἀπόλλωνας καὶ ὀλύτον ἀπωτέρω χρήμη χαλουμένη Γλαύκης.

44. One should imagine Pausanias going along the road to where there was an imposing ramp or flight of steps leading into the temple precinct, on the axis of the Archaic Temple. He investigates the cella and sees the statue of Apollo, does not bother about the other cella, and then heads straight out along the road leading directly from the entrance of the precinct past Glauce.


46. Corinth VI, nos. 40-43; BMC 516, 518, 522.

47. For inscriptionsal evidence of cult, see Ch. I, pp. 29-30 and n. 102.
48. C. K. Williams and P. Russell, *Hesperia* 50 (1981), pp. 20-21. The podium is related to the branch of the Greek Lechaeum Valley Road which passes to the south, and also to the western arm of the paving of the parabolic terrace, by the race course, on which the monument stands.


50. C. K. Williams and J. E. Fisher, *Hesperia* 44, (1975), pp. 28-29. See also Corinth I, 6, pp. 116-199 on the Sacred Spring and the structures in the temenos; and C. K. Williams, *Hesperia* 39 (1970), pp. 21-30, where he also reconstructs the tripod base. In a study of the Sacred Spring subsequent to the 1975 Hesperia report (see note 18), Williams does not mention the possibility that the Greek sanctuary was that of Dionysus, but suggests tentatively that it may have housed the Corinthian cult of Kotyto, daughter of Timandros. In this case it is difficult to see any continuing connection with a cult of Dionysus in the Roman period.


52. C. K. Williams, *Hesperia* 46 (1977), pp. 58-62; K. S. Wright, *Hesperia* 49 (1980), pp. 135-175. The building was seriously damaged in the reign of Tiberius, perhaps in the earthquake of 22/23, and restored immediately. The basement was filled in ca. mid-1st century, but the building survived with modifications until the late 6th century. The fill of the basement contained many fragments of good quality painted wall plaster indicating that the walls were decorated with painted panels in different colours; horizontal relief mouldings were decorated in low relief with a tongue and leaf motif. K. S. Wright points out that the large quantity of serving platters in comparison with individual plates, and the large proportion of glass vessels, suggests that it was a public building rather than a private house. The building is oriented north/south and lies to the west of the road running from Acrocorinth past Temple E and the Archaic Temple. To its north is the road running from the west onto the upper terrace of the forum.
There is a minor road to the west of the building; the southern limit is unexcavated. The building therefore occupies the width of a small city block. This may be a small indication that the area outside the forum was divided into insulae.


54. C. K. Williams, Hesperia, Supp. XX, p. 179, n. 18.

55. Corinth I, 3, p. 130.

56. Corinth VIII, 3, no. 322 and Wiseman, ANRW, p.156.

57. O. Broneer, Hesperia 8 (1939), pp. 181-190; Corinth VIII, 3, no. 322.


59. Corinth I, 3, pp. 91-109. Part of a row of at least three marble seats was found in excavations behind the South Stoa. H. S. Robinson suggests that they may have been part of the seating on the Bema (BCH (1966), p. 751).


61. The size of the letters on the two inscriptions is very similar: 0.071 m. on 322 (except line 1) compared with 0.072 m. on 157, but there are distinct differences in the shape of individual forms. The C is wider and more open on 157 than on 322; the Os and Q are slightly different; the apices are sharper and the serifs more pronounced on 322 than on 157. It is clear that the inscriptions are the work of two different masons.

62. For example, Kent regards 314, which refers to Eurycles Herculanus, as "unmistakably Augustan", citing the tail of the Q, and the G, which is a simple C with the addition of a short upward stroke. However, there are now
very strong historical and epigraphic grounds for dating this inscription, which refers to building activities at Corinth, to the Hadrianic period (A. J. S. Spawforth, *ABSA* 73 (1978), p. 249-260).

63. Scranton, pp. 91 and 98, emphasises the extent to which the decoration of the Bema is influenced by that of the Erechtheum in Athens. The mouldings on the bases of the two scholae and the fragment of a base attributed to the Bema are of the Attic Ionic type (see L. T. Shoe, op. cit., (n. 49) and *Hesperia* 38 (1969), p. 195). She has suggested that the introduction of the Attic Ionic base at Corinth took place c. mid-1st century, which might seem to militate against an early Augustan date for the scholae. However, she is using the conventional dating of the buildings cited (n. 33), which is open to question in some cases. There is reason to think that the Babbius Monument, which is dated by Scranton to the time of Tiberius is considerably earlier (see pp. 165-167). As Shoe says, the bases of the Ionic half-columns of the upper storey of Peirene's poros facade are also of the Greek form, and the facade is dated to the early 1st century. Possibly the introduction of the Attic base came earlier than is usually supposed, or perhaps there was a period when both Roman and Attic types were being used. There is also an Attic Ionic base, not mentioned by Shoe, to the east of the main arch of the Propylaea (*Corinth* I, 1, p. 175), for which an Augustan date does seem likely. It seems that, in any case, one cannot be precise as to the date of the change.

64. In Rome itself the original rostra was closely related to the Curia and Comitium, and placed between them and the forum. It was destroyed when Julius Caesar replanned the forum, and the new rostra, completed by Augustus, was erected on the north-west side, from where it dominates that part of the forum. The platforms in front of the Temple of Castor and the Temple of Julius Caesar, (E. Nash, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, New York, 1981, vol. I, pp. 272-279, and vol. II, p. 512), were also used as speakers' platforms.

65. This possibly applied at Philippi as well, where there is a rostra very similar in position to that at Corinth. Although the forum here was redesigned in the 2nd century, it reproduced in essentials earlier structures. The rostra is in the centre of the north side. (P. Collart,
op. cit., (Ch. II, n. 26), p. 332 and pl. XLVI, 1.) There is another parallel in the Bema in the Athenian agora, referred to by Athenaeus (V, 212e, f) as having been erected by the Roman generals. Since Athenaeus is referring to an incident which occurred in 88 BC, the Bema must have been built before then, and after the construction of the Stoa of Attalos. It is a substantial structure with steps at opposite corners and placed centrally in front of the Stoa. Before the building of the Odeum of Agrippa it would have been an excellent point from which to command the attention of the crowds in the Agora. (H. A. Thompson and R. E. Wycherley, The Athenian Agora XIV, Princeton, 1972, pp. 51-2.)

66. This is clear from the provisions of the Lex Iulia Municipalis, para. 132 of 45 BC. On voting procedures at Rome, see L. R. Taylor, Roman Voting Assemblies, Ann Arbor, 1966.

67. Lex Ursonensis paras. 62-3. More details are given in the Leges Malacitana et Salpensana, which refer to the system of administration current in the latter half of the 1st century in two Spanish municipia. Given that the administration of a colony and of a municipium was almost identical, and the similarity between the provisions of the Lex Ursonensis and the administrative proceedings of the late 1st century, we can assume that similar provisions were in force in other colonies, including Corinth.


70. Lex Ursonensis, para. 81.

71. Corinth I, 3, pp. 100-101 and n. 18. On the other hand, there were ships' prows on the speakers' podium in front of the Temple of Roma and Augustus in the forum at Leptis Magna (Ward-Perkins, RIA, p. 373), so it is not impossible.

72. Lex Malacitana, paras. 51 and 63.
73. Brown, *Cosa*, pp. 41-2. Although much earlier in date, there is also the rectangular enclosure round the Eponymous Heroes at Athens which held ephemeral notices. It is not known whether its successor was used for a similar purpose in the Roman period. (See Thompson and Wycherley, *op. cit.*, [note 65], pp. 38-41.) Cuttings should also be visible on the poros blocks. Unfortunately they have been roughly cut on the outer face and it is impossible to make out a pattern of cuttings which might suggest the attachment of notice-boards (*AJA* (C. H. Morgan, *AJA* [1936], p. 473).

74. See note 57.

75. *Corinth* II, pp. 6-13 and 135; *Corinth* IX, 2, p. 130.

76. *Corinth* I, 6, pp. 200-228. The total capacity of Glauce has been estimated as 527 cu. m. The feet of amphorae constantly balanced on the parapet have worn distinctive holes in the rock.

77. One channel is thought to come from Hadji Mustafa 580 m. to the south, but it is likely that there was another source as well, otherwise it is difficult to account for the way in which the line of the water supply veers to the west instead of coming straight down from Hadji Mustafa.


79. The identification is due to Pausanias (II, 3, 6). H. A. Thompson has reminded me that Pausanias refers to the fountain in the Athenian Agora, known as the Southeast Fountain House, as the Enneakrounos (I, 14, 1), yet the Enneakrounos of the Greek period has now been located near the Ilissos (J. Travlos, *op. cit.*, [Ch. I, n. 127], p. 204). If the transfer of an ancient name from one site to another could happen at Athens between the Greek and Roman periods, there is all the more reason to think that it could occur at Corinth where there was not the same continuous occupation. The Greek Glauce associated with the legend of Medea may well, therefore, have been situated somewhere else.
80. For details of the Southeast Building in both phases, see Corinth I, 5, pp. 3-31.

81. C. K. Williams, Hesperia 1981, pp. 28-9 and n. 24. This possibility was considered and rejected by Scranton (Corinth I, 3, pp. 76-77 and n. 7) who considered that the foundation cuttings were for an early Greek stoa.

82. The Propylaea was rebuilt completely at least once and underwent a number of alterations. Final publication, Corinth I, 1, pp. 159-192. Information with regard to the reliefs is from C. M. Edwards, who is making a study of the material, which is kept in the Corinth storerooms. Other fragments which may be associated are decorated with a cuirass and a sacrificial vase.

83. Corinth I, 1, pp. 193-211. No precise date can be given for the first Basilica. It is very similar in design to the basilica at Pompeii.

84. If H. von Hesberg Ath. Mitt., Captives' 98, [1983], pp. 215-238 is right in his Augustan date for certain blocks from the second century Captives' Facade (see p. 200), then there may well have been some sort of ornamental screen or facade in front of the basilica, although not in the same place as the later facade.

85. Corinth I, 6, pp. 69-78.

86. Identified on the basis of Pausanias' comment (II, 3, 3). Final report, Corinth I, 2, pp. 32-38; later alterations, see p. 197 below.

87. Originally cleared in 1929; see C. K. Williams, Hesperia 43, 1974, pp. 25 and 29. This bath building is often identified as that referred to by Pausanias as the Baths of Eurycles. If so, Eurycles must have been responsible for a 2nd century rebuilding not this early Roman bath (see note 207). It is also possible that Pausanias was referring to a completely different bath building.

88. Corinth I, 2, pp. 89-107, and 128-9; C. K. Williams, Hesperia 38, 1969, pp. 52-55.
89. Arch. Rep., 1978-79, p. 10 and fig. 9. The south stoa of the Roman precinct of the Archaic Temple, when built, had a common rear wall with the Northwest Stoa.

90. Corinth I, 4, pp. 115-128. Full details of this and the other conversions in the South Stoa are given in Broneer's final publication.

91. Broneer (Hesperia 11 [1942], pp. 154-156) suggests that there was a dual cult and that the heads of two deities, a bearded male and a female head, which recur on the simas of the building, and found concentrated in the area of the Fountain House, represent the objects of the cult. He offers no positive identification, but points out the male head is reminiscent of Olympian Zeus. Poseidon is another possibility.

92. Flooring, see Corinth I, 4, p. 127 and refs. in notes; pilaster capital, see p. 120 and n. 18, also W.-D. Heilmeyer, Korinthische Normalkapitelle, Rom. Mitt., Suppl. XVI, 1970, pp. 61-63 and pl. 12. Information on date of the well deposit from K. Slane (by letter).


95. Corinth I, 3, pp. 24-36. Two inscriptions (Corinth VIII, 2, no. 132 and 3, no. 155) identify the tempietto as the gift of Cn. Babbius Philinus. The fountain was identified from the description of Pausanias (II, 2, 7).

96. Corinth VIII, 2, no. 122 and 3, no. 323.

97. Corinth VIII, 3, no. 323 and Broneer in Corinth I, 5, pp. 27-28. There were 3 priests at Urso (Lex Ursonensis, para. 67) and 6 at Capua (see note 28).

98. I am grateful to C. K. Williams for allowing me to read this unpublished paper.
99. Lecture delivered at the American School of Classical Studies, Athens. Molisani is engaged in a study of the Latin inscriptions of Corinth and Athens.

100. Corinth VIII, 3, no. 150.


102. Scranton (Corinth I, 3, pp. 67-72) decided that Pausanias described the monuments on the West Terrace beginning at the south, whereas Williams (Hesperia, 44 [1975] pp. 25-29) proposed that he began his description at the northern end. This accords better with the find-spots of some of the sculpture and inscriptive material associated with the monuments. Although the statue originally thought to be that of Tyche has now been identified as Core (B. S. Ridgway, Hesperia 50 [1981], p. 440 and n. 75); and the head (S-72-4) identified as Hermes is more likely to be that of Perseus (M. C. Sturgeon, Hesperia 44 [1975] pp. 280-290), Williams' interpretation of Pausanias remains the more convincing.


105. As Scranton observed, the three-roomed building on Tenos, identified by A. K. Orlando as a fountain house of Poseidon and Amphitrite (AE [1937], pp. 608-620), is remarkably similar in plan. C. Picard, however, identified it as a stibadeion of Dionysus, comparing it with similar structures at Thasos and Delos (CRAI [1944], pp. 137-157). He does not refer to the building at Corinth.

106. C. K. Williams, op. cit. (note 54).

107. C. C. Mattusch, Hesperia 46 (1977), pp. 380-381. There were a number of pits of the Greek period and evidence of metallurgical activity in the area which is now covered by the west end of the South Stoa. (C. K. Williams, Hesperia 40 [1971], p. 23; 41 [1972], pp. 169-70, and 42 [1973],...
pp. 12-19.) The turning post of the first race-course is just behind the three-roomed building and obviously any pits would have been filled in by that time, but the ground may still not have been firm enough for the foundations when the Romans came to build on the site.


109. Williams, op. cit. (note 54).


111. See L. R. Taylor, TAPA 51 (1920), pp. 116-133, on the development of the worship of Augustus.


113. Corinth VIII, 3, no. 62. Kent regards the collegium as "somewhat in the nature of a private club" not a cult. I doubt that such a clear distinction can be made. The original provenance of the base is unknown.

114. Augustales monument, see Corinth I, 3, pp. 142-143. Only one inscription (Corinth VIII, 2, no. 13) is to the Lares Augusti; Corinth VIII, 3, nos. 52, 53, and 59 mention Augustales. See also Corinth VIII, 2, nos. 68 and 73 for Domus Augusta and Domus Divina.

115. e.g. Pausanias I, 40, 1; V, 20, 9; and VIII, 2, 5 on the practice of deification.


117. Vitruvius V, 1, 8. Road and possible entrance, see Corinth I, 5, pp. 51 and 108-9.
118. Corinth II, 5, pp. 54-55. There are also a number of fragments too small to identify with certainty that may also belong to the Julian Basilica.

119. The sculptures have been variously dated; those of Augustus, Gaius and Lucius are now regarded as posthumous. They are discussed by B. S. Ridgway (Hesperia 50, [1981], pp. 432-434) who gives references to other publications in footnotes.


121. No evidence remains to confirm whether or not there were doors on either side of the main staircase and Weinberg infers this from the existence of such doors in the South Basilica (Corinth I, 5, p. 108). If they did not exist, then the only means of communication between the main floor and the cryptoporticus would have been internal, which would make access to the latter even more restricted.

122. The parallel between the mediaeval guildhall and buildings like the Julian Basilica and the Building of Eumachia should not be carried too far. M. I. Finley (The Ancient Economy, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1973, pp. 137-8) emphasizes that there was no ancient equivalent to the mediaeval guilds, nor did the collegia have a political function. On the other hand, in a city like Corinth many of the same individuals would have been involved in its economic activity and also held political office. There is very little evidence on which to base any theory as to the function of the Basilica (although there is more for the Building of Eumachia), but it is reasonable to suggest that the building was intended to provide for the specialist needs of the important business community in the city.


124. Op. cit., p. 114. This is good quality work, similar in style to some of the fragments of wall-painting found in the recent excavations east of the theatre.

126. For example, the shrine in the macellum at Pompeii and the temple in the centre of the Forum of the Corporations at Ostia.

127. Filling of quarry, see note 38. Temple C final publication, Corinth I, 2, pp. 131-165, in which Scranton proposed that the Roman temple replaced an archaic sanctuary of Hera Acraia. The temple was originally dated in the late Augustan or Tiberian period and the precinct somewhat later, but still in the 1st century. Subsequent investigation within the precinct showed that the front wall goes right down into the quarry and was probably constructed as the quarry was filled in (note 78). Temple and precinct may well have been built at the same time.

128. Corinth I, 2, p. 109, where the arch is dated in the reign of Augustus, but it could not have been constructed until after the precinct wall had been built.


131. See Ward-Perkins, RIA, p. 258.

132. The house is unpublished, see pp. 332-333.


135. Ward-Perkins, loc. cit. (note 131) regards the poros facade of Peirene as having Italian precedents, but see M. Lyttelton, Baroque Architecture in Classical Antiquity, London, 1974, p. 39 on the use of such
facades in Hellenistic architecture; also L. T. Shoe, op. cit. (note 49), p. 302. She points out, too, that the Ionic half-column bases in situ in the upper storey are not the Roman but the Greek form, which suggests that the date of the facade may not be as early as is sometimes conjectured. It could also be that the Roman base was not used exclusively, even at an early date, especially if Greek masons were employed.


137. See C. K. Williams and O. H. Zervos, Hesperia 55 (1986), which includes references to excavation in preceding years.

138. Strabo VIII, 6, 23, and XVIII, 6, 20.

139. On the date of Strabo's work, see Baladie, pp. 11-13. Book VIII must date from before the disgrace of Eurycles of Sparta, which G. W. Bowersock (JRS 51, pp. 112-118) puts in 2 BC.

140. Corinth VIII, 3, no. 152. Kent puts the date between 7 BC and AD 3. Strabo also says (VIII, 6, 22), when speaking of the Isthmian sanctuary, that it was where the Corinthians used to celebrate the Games, implying that they did not do so at the time he was writing.

141. Tacitus, Ann. I, 76, 4. He makes it clear that this was at the request of the provincials themselves - Achaiam ac Macedoniam onera deprecantis levari; op. cit., I, 80, 1. On the return to the Senate, Suetonius, Claudius 25, 3; Dio Cassius LX, 24, 1.


144. Famine in Achaia, probably in 51, Eusebius, Chron. II, 152f; Hieronymus, Olymp. CCVII; elsewhere in the Mediterranean including Rome, Tacitus, Ann. XII, 43; Suetonius, Claudius 18. Famine during the 40s, Dio Cassius LX, 11; (in Judaea, Josephus, Ant. Iud. XX, 101f; Bell. Iud. II, 220). One cannot assume from references to famine elsewhere, however, that Achaia and Corinth were affected since shortages could be very local, e.g. the well-known famine in Antioch in 362-3, when there was grain about 100 km. away.

145. Corinth VIII, 2, nos. 83 and 86; Corinth VIII, 3, 158-163.

146. By letter.


148. Corinth VIII, 2, nos. 86-90, 110 and 120.

149. Corinth VIII, 3, no. 321.

150. Corinth VIII, 2, no. 121.

151. Benefactions attested epigraphically are listed in Corinth VIII, 3, p. 21, but it should be noted that the dates assigned are subject to revision. There are also a number of fragments too small to restore, or sometimes to classify, with one word or a few letters which suggest that they, too, refer to the revetment of a building e.g. Corinth VIII, 3, no. 339.


154. This is the opinion of N. Bookidis who directed the excavation. A scattering of finds from the period 146 BC to 44 BC suggests that it was not entirely deserted during the Squatter Period (Hesperia 47 [1978], p. 22).
155. Strabo VIII, 6, 21. Coins showing the temple, in a variety of forms, on Acrocorinth are among the most detailed issued by the Corinthian mint, e.g. (Claudius) NCP pl. G xcviii; (Domitian) Corinth VI, no. 105; (Hadrian) NCP pl. FF xvi; (Marcus Aurelius) BMC pl. xx, 15.


158. The West Shops were to have been published by W. B. Dinsmoor, Sr. The relevant notebooks seem to have disappeared and his notes and plans have not been available. Excavation in 1976 suggested an Augustan date for the building of the south tower of the West Shops (Hesperia 46 (1977), p. 62 and Wiseman, ANRW, p. 518, n. 324), but the dating of the material in the foundation trench was not conclusive and C. K. Williams now prefers a Neronian date.

159. Corinth I, 4, pp. 129-144.


161. Broneer (pp. 108-9) suggested the second half of the 1st century, perhaps after the earthquake of 77, since, at the time of publication, it was thought that the South Basilica had been built earlier and damaged by earthquake. This now appears not to have been so and there is no reason to relate the laying of the mosaic floor to repairs necessitated by the earthquake. S. E. Ramsden, (AJA 83 [1979], p. 297) follows Broneer.

162. C. K. Williams, Hesperia 48 (1979), pp. 105-7. The designs include architectural motifs and scenes with figures, one of which may represent Briareos arbitrating in the division of the Corinthia between Poseidon and Helios. The material is being studied by U. Pappalardo. It does not alter the dating of the phases of the Southeast Building (information from C. K. Williams).

164. Suetonius, *Nero* 22-24; Dio Cassius LXIII, 11, 1; Pliny N.H. IV, 22, Plutarch, *Flam.* 12, Pausanias VII, 17, 3; Philostratus *loc. cit.* and V, 41; Nero's address, *SIG*³, 814. On the date of the proclamation of freedom, see Larsen, pp. 438-9 and n. 5. As Amandry has pointed out, *op. cit.* (Ch. I, n. 92), issues of the Corinthian mint which celebrate the proclamation of freedom should be dated in the same year as those recording the arrival of Nero in Achaia i.e., the duoviral year 66/67. (*Corinth* VI, nos. 63 and 64). This is confirmed by Levy's recent observations on the coinage of Sicyon (see Ch. I, note 95).

165. Work on the Corinth Canal is discussed by Wiseman, *LAC*, pp. 48-50. He makes the point that the undertaking was a massive, but realistic engineering project, and also that the work had progressed substantially by the time it was abandoned.

166. *Corinth* VI, no. 55.


168. The temple on the coin does appear to have Ionic capitals, as does Temple F, but architectural details on coins are notoriously difficult to interpret with certainty and we have very little evidence as to the superstructure of Temple G.

169. Coin, *Corinth* VI, no. 57; inscriptions, *Corinth* VIII, 2, nos. 4 and 5.


171. Construction work at Corinth is often related to earthquake damage, but, unless this can be related to specific archaeological evidence of the collapse of buildings or to precise literary references to Corinth, not simply Achaia or other areas of the Mediterranean, it is not necessarily so. Corinth is in a tectonic zone which is notoriously prone to earthquakes;
Athens or other parts of the Peloponnese may be unaffected by these tremors. Even when it can be established that earthquakes occurred at Corinth, as in 77 and the mid 4th century, this does not mean that all parts of the city could have been equally affected. There seems to be no evidence that the Archaic Temple was ever severely damaged or had to undergo repairs as the result of earthquake, probably because it was built on solid rock. On the other hand, the theatre and district to the east, which are on a steep slope, certainly were damaged more than once. M. Henry (Phoenix 39 [1985], pp. 36-61) is mainly concerned with the widespread earthquakes of the 4th century and the testimony of Libanius, but her discussion is also relevant to the earlier period.

172. Plutarch, de anim. fr. VII, 4; Suetonius, Vespasianus 17, refers to earth tremors per totum orbem; Orosius VII, 9, 11 to earthquakes in Cyprus and Rome; Malalas, Chron. X, p. 261 to an earthquake at Corinth, adding that it was in June. See Corinth VIII, 2, pp. 18-19, where West discusses the evidence and concludes that the date of the earthquake at Corinth was in 77.

173. Corinth VIII, 3, no. 82, a dedication to Vespasian, attests epigraphically the new official name, which was known previously from coins of Domitian, Corinth, VI, nos. 91-106. The city reverted to its original name after the death of Domitian: Corinth VI, no. 109 a coin with the head of Trajan, has the legend COL IVL LAV COR. Dedications to Titus and Domitian, Corinth VIII, 3, 84-86.


176. NCP pl. B, xxi.

177. Corinth X.


180. C. K. Williams et al., *Hesperia* 43 (1974), pp. 29-33. He thinks that the shops on the east side were built at the same time as the road was paved. C. J. Williams, (note 136) thinks that the eastern shops and colonnade, which are constructed in poor quality limestone, predate both the paving of the road and the earthquake. Parts of the colonnade were replaced in marble on the original foundations, presumably as a result of earthquake damage, when the road was paved after 77. She also suggests, on stylistic grounds, that the date of the Corinthian order of the western colonnade may be later than Flavian.


182. Coin, NCP pl. F, xcvii; inscription, *Corinth* VIII, 3, no. 86.


185. *Corinth* I, 3, pp. 11-16; 54-57.

186. C. K. Williams, op. cit. (note 54). More recently he has suggested, in discussion, that, because of the relationship between the steps leading up to the Julian Basilica and the paving of the forum, it may have been put down at an earlier date.


189. I am grateful to O. H. Zervos, A. Burnett and I. Carradice for examining this coin and giving me their expert opinions.

190. Field Notebook 151, pp. 8-9.


194. Corinth VIII, 3, no. 137 (where it is said, incorrectly, that the fragments were found in the anteroom of the Bouleuterion).

195. Corinth I, 4, pp. 151-152. The bath complex in the west half of the Stoa was built after 267 and the destruction of Room H, and is therefore later than the period under discussion.

196. H. A. Thompson and R. E. Wycherley, op. cit. (note 65), p. 197. The latrine in the Roman agora at Athens also has an entrance hall and measures 16.20 x 11.74 m. The South Stoa latrine is 11.90 m. wide with, presumably, more seats in addition to the 25 excavated along the unexcavated south side. The latrine in the Roman baths at Philippi cited by Broneer (p. 153, n. 46) was of the conventional Roman type and clearly for the use of those frequenting the baths.

197. The small latrine west of Glauce is late, probably 4th century, (Hesperia 53 [1984], pp. 100-101).


199. Corinth VIII, 3, no. 102.


201. Pausanias II, 5, 5 (baths and aqueduct); I, 44, 6 (Scironian road).

202. The existence of the tribal name Aelia is likely but not certain, see Wiseman, ANRW, pp. 497-8; cuirass statue, Corinth X, pp. 125-133, n. 6.

203. Corinth VIII, 1, no. 80. He was probably an Epidaurian who had taken up residence at Corinth. He held the most important magistracies there and
also had a distinguished career in the imperial service. He was a friend of Plutarch. On his career see Corinth VIII, 2, pp. 55-57 and Corinth VIII, 3, pp. 64-65.

204. R. MacMullen, HSPh. 64 (1959), pp. 207-235 has pointed out that two of the ways in which the emperor might give help with building programmes were by crediting taxes for the purpose and by providing materials; also that he appointed men of high rank to oversee the work.

205. Alterations, Corinth I, 6, pp. 92; paintings, pp. 113; inscription, Corinth VIII, 3, no. 170. The name of his son-in-law, P. Aelius Apollodotus, without patronymic, indicates that he obtained Roman citizenship in the reign of Hadrian possibly through the influence of his father-in-law. Sospes must have been a wealthy and well-connected man; he was a friend of Plutarch (Mor. 723-724; 739E-740A), he held the office of curator annonae and was agonothetes three times (Corinth VIII, 3, no. 226).

206. Corinth I, 2, pp. 38-54; inscription, Corinth VIII, 2, no. 123.

207. C. K. Williams, Hesperia 38, 1969, pp. 62-63. Pausanias refers to two baths by name, the Baths of Hadrian and the Baths of Eurycles. Eurycles has long been associated with this bath north of the Peribolus of Apollo (Corinth XVII, p. 63, n. 3). A. J. S. Spawforth (ABSA 73 [1978], pp. 257-260) has shown that the Eurycles who had close ties with Corinth was almost certainly the 2nd century C. Iulius Eurycles Herculanus rather than his Augustan ancestor.

208. M. C. Sturgeon (Corinth IX, 2, p. 130-137) puts the friezes in the Hadrianic or very early Antonine period.

209. See note 183. Macellum, see Corinth I, 1, pp. 142-147. The exact date cannot be established. Stillwell regards the work as characteristic of the late 1st and early 2nd century, and connects it with the building of the Basilica.

210. NCP pl. F xcviii.
211. Corinth I, 5, p. 57.


213. Corinth VIII, 3, no. 327.

214. Corinth VIII, 3, no. 333.

215. Corinth I, 4, pp. 115 and 123.

216. Alterations, Corinth I, 6, pp. 93-103; paintings, pp. 113-115. S. Walker questions aspects of Hill's reconstruction and thinks that the exedrae had flat roofs rather than semi-domes. Quoted by Ward Perkins, RIA, p. 479, n. 255.

217. Corinth VIII, 3, p. 22, n. 15, where Kent refers to Meritt (Corinth VIII, 1, no. 86) and Hill (Corinth I, 6, p. 103).

218. The Northwest Shops were thought by Stillwell in the final publication (Corinth I, 2, pp. 120-126 and 129-130) to have been built in the same general period as the second Lechaeum Road Basilica, and that they should, therefore, be dated early in the 2nd century. The Shops are closely related to the Captives' Facade, which Stillwell thought was built after the Shops. The Facade was put by both Stillwell (Corinth I, 2, pp. 55-87) and Johnson (Corinth IX, pp. 101-107) in the Antonine period. Further study of the Northwest Shops in 1963 by C. K. Williams (Arch. Rep. 1963-64), p. 7) led to the conclusion that they were built in the early 3rd century at the same time as the Captives' Facade. Williams suggested that the Facade should be dated to 195 or later, and that it might have been built to commemorate Septimius Severus' Parthian victories (AD 23 [1968] Chr., p. 135, n. 4). More recently scholarly opinion has swung back to an Antonine date (see note 220) and this would also put back the date of the Shops.

220. See note 218 for the Antonine date proposed originally and Williams' revised dating. C. C. Vermeule (Roman Imperial Art in Greece and Asia Minor [Cambridge, Mass., 1968], pp. 83-88) favours an early 3rd century date, as does B. S. Ridgway, Hesperia 50, (1981), p. 444. W.-D. Heilmeyer op. cit. (note 92) dates it before the middle of the 2nd century. H. von Hesberg, op. cit. (note 84), puts the Facade in the 2nd century. Although he recognises certain blocks as Augustan in date, in the last quarter of the 1st century BC, he adds that the Augustan structure could not have been in the same place as the later Facade. Most recently, E. B. Harrison has also concluded that the Facade is Antonine in date (information from C. K. Williams).

221. Coin, Price and Trell, pp. 80-81. Inscription, Corinth VIII, 3, no. 343. It could also refer to a seated statue of Peirene which appears frequently on coins of the Antonine period and which was presumably dedicated at that time.

222. Philostratus, Vit. Soph. II, 551. Since Pausanias does not mention Herodes' benefaction, it is likely that it was made after he visited Corinth, probably about 175 (Corinth X, pp. 145-146).

223. Corinth I, 3, pp. 36-51; Corinth VIII, 3, nos. 111 and 112. The money for the temples was left in the will of Cornelia Baebia, who was probably a member of the well-known family of Cornelii at Corinth. See Scranton (Hesperia 13 (1944), pp. 346-348) for a discussion of whether Commodus usurped the dedication of the temples or whether there was a connection between Cornelia Baebia and the emperor. A pair of small imperial temples was erected in the upper square of Ephesus in the reign of Augustus (S. R. F. Price, Rituals and Power [Cambridge, 1984], pp. 139-140) and twin shrines to Augustus and Roma (?) at Athens (H. A. Thompson, Hesperia 35, [1966], p. 173).

224. The colonnaded street was introduced at Athens early in the reign of Trajan, ca. 100 (T. L. Shear Jr., Hesperia 50 [1981], pp. 368ff.). Later in the same article Shear refers to the colonnading of the Lechaemum Road as Claudian, but the evidence is against such an early date. On the development of the colonnaded street in general, see C. J. Williams, op.
cit. (note 136).

225. See Corinth I, 3, pp. 152-4. Although I have questioned some of Scranton's dating and interpretation, his general remarks on the organisation of the forum are valid and perceptive.

The large podium temple overlooking the forum and known simply as Temple E is one of the most important monuments of Roman Corinth. It was discovered and excavated many years ago, and the final report published in 1940, but since then it has attracted little attention.\(^1\) It has been identified as the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus or, more often, as the Temple of Octavia, both of which are referred to by Pausanias, but neither identification can be regarded as satisfactory.\(^2\) The identification of Temple E as the Temple of Octavia has resulted in misinterpretation of the numismatic evidence, leading to the conclusion that the temple was dedicated at one time to the Gens Iulia and was, therefore, a centre of the imperial cult. Certain features of the building were overlooked at the time of the original publication and, in addition, our knowledge of Roman Corinth has increased considerably in recent years. It is worthwhile, therefore, in the light of the evidence now available, considering again the form, date and identity of the temple. This involves a discussion of Octavia as the possible recipient of cult, the significance of the coins usually cited in connection with Temple E, and the worship of Jupiter Capitolinus at Corinth. My conclusion is that Temple E is the Capitolium of Corinth.

According to the original publication, Temple E had two phases. The first building was a podium temple built in the Claudian period, which was replaced by a second podium temple during or just after the reign of Domitian. The remains which are visible today on the rise overlooking the forum are those of the later building, which has been restored as a hexastyle, fully peripteral temple with a long, narrow cella ca. 24.50 x 10 m., and a shallow pronaos with two columns in antis (see
fig. 17 and pls. 14 and 15). The architectural fragments set up on the podium and shown in the photograph belong to the temple, but are not an accurate restoration. The temple stood in a spacious, colonnaded precinct, about two-thirds the length of the actual forum, and approached from it by a monumental flight of steps set precisely on the main east/west axis of the forum. (The temple actually faces slightly north of east.) In the early period Temple E was separated from the forum by an open space and a road running north/south from Acrocorinth and past the Archaic Temple in the direction of the theatre. Later this area was regraded and became a pedestrian extension of the forum. The earlier temple stood on the same site in exactly the same relationship to the forum, but a few metres further east. It appears to have been slightly larger than its replacement.

The hill on which the temple stands is not entirely natural. In laying out the forum at Corinth, the early Roman colonists made drastic alterations in the existing configuration of the site, transforming a shallow valley, which sloped gently up, both towards the south and Acrocorinth and also toward the west and Temple E, into a level area divided by a terrace into an upper and a lower section. In the course of quarrying round Temple Hill and the Fountain of Glauce, they took out the ridge to the north of Temple E, thereby isolating and accentuating the natural rise on which the temple stands. The ground slopes down towards the south-east, and the lower foundation had to be built up a little over four metres at the south-east corner to provide a solid base for the podium. The temple was set back about 100 m. west of the terrace wall marking the original western end of the forum, and the foundation on which it stands is eight to nine metres above the forum pavement, about a metre higher than the base of the other major religious building in the city centre, the Archaic Temple.
In spite of the subsequent changes in ground level, it is clear that the great mass of Temple E must have dominated the Roman forum at all times. It requires a certain effort of the imagination, when standing on the site today, to visualize the forum of, say, the time of Pausanias, but there is no doubt that the columns of the facade, which are just visible in their truncated form from the centre of the forum today, would, at their full height of about 9 m., topped by pediment and acroteria, have been visible along the main axis of the forum, with the open space in the middle of the West Terrace, which leads to the monumental staircase, drawing the gaze. The small temples ranged along the West Terrace, and backed by a parallel row of vaulted shops at a higher level, must have added to the tiered effect and the impressiveness of the vista. The temple would have been best seen from the centre and far end of the forum, where most visitors entered, either through the Propylaea or by way of the road through the South Stoa. As one moved nearer to the west end, then the temple would be increasingly masked by the buildings in front of it. In contrast, the Archaic Temple, so distinctive among the ruins today, and clearly a dominating feature of the Greek city, had its orientation reversed, and its temenos hedged in and surrounded by other buildings. It was, in effect, demoted and absorbed into the overall city plan. It is clear that the Romans intended Temple E to be the chief religious centre of their city.

Temple E is carefully sited both in relation to the forum and to the grid plan of roads in the centre of the city. It is not on the same axis as the actual forum, which was dictated by the Archaic Temple and the South Stoa. Nor does the axis of Temple E meet at an exact right-angle the north/south line of the Lechaeum Road, which passes through the groma, although there is no practical reason why this should not have been so. Instead, the temple has been skewed slightly to the north-east so that it
relates both to the grid plan and to the forum. I do not think that this orientation was accidental, but, given the carefully thought-out relationship of the other components of the city centre and the main roads, that provision was also made for an important building on the rise overlooking the forum from the time of the foundation of the colony. This is not to say, of course, that an actual temple was constructed at the outset of the colony. But the site is a text-book illustration of the Vitruvian precept: aedibus vero sacris, quorum deorum maxime in tutela civitas videtur esse, et Iovi et Iunoni et Minervae, in excelsissimo loco unde moenium maxima pars conspiciatur, areae distribuantur. The significance of the worship of the Capitoline Triad in a Roman colony, combined with the position and size of Temple E, suggests both that it was the Capitolium, and that the site was incorporated in the initial plan of the colony.

Although there are strong indications that Temple E was the Capitolium we do not have any epigraphic evidence to identify the temple, and the cella is destroyed to such an extent that it is impossible to tell whether there were three cult statues in it. On the other hand, the cult of Jupiter Optimus Maximus is attested at Corinth by a fragment of a poros altar; we also know, from inscriptions, that a priesthood of Jupiter Capitolinus existed at Corinth from at least the 1st to the 3rd century. The real impediment to identifying Temple E as the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus is provided by Pausanias, who was, undoubtedly, referring to Temple E when he mentioned the Temple of Octavia. To make matters worse, he also says, ὑπὲρ δὲ τὸ θεατρὸν ἐστὶν ιερὸν Διὸς Καπετωλίου. This sanctuary, which has not been found, must be well away from the city centre if it is beyond the theatre. S. E. Freeman, the author of the original publication, nevertheless favoured the idea that Temple E was the Temple of Jupiter
Capitolinus, because of its size and position, and indulged in some rather tortuous reasoning to prove that Pausanias, having reached the theatre on his tour of Corinth, was looking back and up at Temple E when he referred to the sanctuary. It is quite clear that this would be impossible, since his view would have been impeded by both the intervening buildings and the precinct of the temple itself. In addition, it goes against the natural sense of the Greek. The relationship of the excavated sites to one another makes it clear that, in describing the monuments of Corinth, Pausanias is using the word ὑπὲρ primarily in the sense of "beyond" rather than "above".8

Most other scholars have concurred with G. Roux that when Pausanias says, ὑπὲρ δὲ τὴν ἁγοράν ἐστιν Ὄκταβίας ναὸς ἀδελφῆς Ἀγγοῦστου, he is referring to Temple E. Pausanias came to Corinth from Cenchreae, and he would probably have entered the forum either at the eastern end or through the South Stoa, from where the great bulk of the temple complex would have been very prominent beyond the forum. He refers to it at this point, therefore, and not as he approached nearer to it, when it would have been obscured by the intervening buildings. Roux accounts for the name given to the temple by Pausanias by assuming that Temple E was also the temple of the Gens Iulia, and that there was within it a cult statue with the features of Octavia, the sister of Augustus. He points out, correctly, that the numismatic evidence which Freeman used to date the earlier Temple E to the Claudian period is unreliable and that the building could well be earlier. He cites, as evidence for an earlier date, coins of Augustus and Tiberius, which have, on the reverse, a hexastyle temple inscribed, on the architrave, with the words, CAESAR, AUGUSTUS, or GENT(i or is) IVLI(ae).9 He also points out that other Corinthian coins show the Gens Iulia personified, holding a patera and sceptre. This interpretation of the coins was first
put forward by F. Imhoof-Blumer and P. Gardner in the 1880s and has been generally accepted. ¹⁰

It is a convenient but unacceptable solution to the problem. Roux was right to question the Claudian date for the building of the temple, and I shall return to this later. The main objection to the theory lies in the use that he and other scholars have made of the numismatic evidence. First, let us consider the coins with a hexastyle temple on the reverse and GENT IVLI on the architrave. It is a prolific series of coins and there are two versions of the temple: one with the columns evenly spaced, and the other with the columns grouped at either side to indicate the existence of a cult statue within; on some coins there are faint traces of a statue in the centre. There are four obverses: a radiate head of Augustus; Tiberius laureate; a readily identifiable portrait of Livia with her hair in a nodus; and a female veiled head often identified as Livia (see Pl. 20a-d).¹¹ The radiate crown is a mark of Divus Augustus and the coin cannot, on that account, have been issued in the reign of Augustus himself, in spite of what Roux says. All these coins bear the name or names of the duoviri, L. Furius Labeo and L. Arrius Peregrinus. In the publication of the coins of Corinth, the year of office of Labeo and Peregrinus is dated loosely between 4/5 and 22/23, but subsequently J. H. Kent corrected it to ca. 29 without explanation. This is correct, since Tiberius did not permit portraits of his mother, Livia, to appear on the coinage until after her death in 29. Michel Amandry, in his current study of the duoviri coinage of Corinth, has concluded that the date of issue was either 32/33 or 33/34.¹² This means that the date of issue of all the coins showing a temple inscribed GENT IVLI was towards the end of the reign of Tiberius. And it is this temple which is presumed to have within it a cult statue of the Gens Iulia under the guise of Octavia.
If, as has been assumed, the coin represents the building or dedication of the temple, it is difficult to see what possible reason there could have been for the Corinthians, in the reign of Tiberius, to honour the long-dead sister of the emperor's adopted father in this way, with an important temple. Octavia died in 11 BC and, although she is generally regarded as having been a member of the Julio-Claudian family, and was certainly very much a part of Augustus' dynastic plans, she had no blood relationship with Tiberius and was of little significance to him.13

Alternatively, the coin may simply have commemorated an event in the life of the city in which the temple figured prominently. In this case, one has to assume that the temple was built before 32/33 and dates from a time when a cult of Octavia was in existence in Corinth. It is, however, extremely unlikely, for the reasons given below, that Octavia would have been the main recipient of cult during Augustus' reign, or at any time after her formal separation from Antony.

Next there is the question of the other Corinthian coin involved in the matter, the reverse of which shows a seated female figure with her feet on a footstool and holding a patera and sceptre. The head on the obverse is almost certainly that of Drusus Caesar, who died in 23, and the coin was issued by P. Caninius Agrippa and L. Castricius Regulus in 22/23. Imhoof-Blumer and Gardner first identified the seated figure as the cult statue of the Gens Iulia temple.14 It may well be that the original of the seated female type was a cult statue, possibly set up at Rome, but it becomes a very popular coin type normally associated with Livia. M. Grant regards the provincial issues as being in direct imitation of the official asses issued at the beginning of the reign of Tiberius.15 Sometimes, as at Emerita, Caesaraugusta and Italica, the legend IULIA AUGUSTA makes it clear that Livia, the widow and priestess of the divine Augustus, is represented.
Elsewhere the figure is a personification of Vesta, Salus, Iustitia or Ceres, sometimes with the recognizable features of Livia or, more often, probably intended to be equated with her in the public mind. Such representations had a wide distribution all over the Empire, and over a long period, but, and this is the important point, it is essentially a coin type and not a copy of a statue in the city where the coin was issued. Nearly all the coins at Corinth show the female figure seated right and holding a patera and sceptre, but M. Amandry, in his study of the duovirate coinage, refers to three unpublished coins, issued by the same duoviri, which bear a similar female figure, but seated left and holding ears of corn. This must signify Ceres, whether or not the figure is equated with Livia. A similar figure at Thapsus is actually identified as Ceres Augusta, and the type is repeated at Rome under Claudius with the legend DIVA AUGUSTA. The evidence indicates that the Corinthian coin may well represent Livia, either personifying a virtue or in the guise of a goddess, but there is nothing at all to suggest that the figure represents Octavia in any form. Nor is there any good reason to think that it represents the cult statue in the Gens Julia temple. What is more, if, contrary to circumstances elsewhere, the coin does represent the cult statue, then it is likely to have had the features of Livia rather than those of Octavia, which would not explain why Pausanias identified the temple as that of Octavia, the sister of Augustus.

One must consider next whether Octavia could have been the direct recipient of cult at Corinth and, if so, when the Corinthians might have honoured her in this way. One small point, which nevertheless tends to be overlooked, was that Octavia was never a member of the Julian family. She was born into the Gens Octavia and remained in that gens all her life, regardless of the fact that her brother, Octavian, was adopted by Julius Caesar. If one considers the status of the imperial ladies, it is
significant that, while Augustus' daughter, Julia, was a member of the Gens Iulia by reason of her birth, even Augustus' wife, Livia, was not a Julian during his lifetime, despite her unique position in the state and in the developing worship of the imperial family. At the beginning of his reign Augustus placed great importance on his position as the adopted son of Divus Iulius, carefully fostering the worship of the Gens Iulia and controlling the honours paid to his own family as part of the imperial cult. As Augustus' reign gathered stability the concept of the Domus Augusta came to embrace that of the Gens Iulia, and in this Octavia was certainly included, as her position amid the imperial family on the Ara Pacis indicates. She was not, however, one of the most important members of the imperial family and, while she could well have been included in honours paid to the Domus Augusta as a whole, I find it difficult to believe that Augustus would have permitted the most important temple in a colony such as Corinth to be dedicated to his sister alone or that he would have allowed a cult statue with her likeness to represent the Gens Iulia. It is quite possible, of course, that the Corinthians acted on their own initiative and did not ask for Augustus' permission before dedicating their temple. There was a good deal of laissez-faire about Augustus' religious policy, particularly in the Greek East where Roman citizens were living in a Greek environment, and, if the Corinthians had acted on their own initiative, possibly prior to Augustus' accession to power, then it is doubtful whether he would have interfered with their practice, if indeed he had known about it.

Augustus does appear to have been genuinely fond of Octavia. He showered honours upon her, which included, after 35 BC, the inviolability of a tribune, the right to manage her own affairs, and to have statues erected in her honour, all distinctions which she shared with Livia. Many other honours were paid to Octavia, particularly in the Greek East: her head
appears on the coinage with that of Antony, she is honoured in inscriptions, and she is even deified with Antony at Athens, being equated with Athena Polias. The most likely time for Octavia to have become a recipient of cult at Corinth would seem to be during the time she was in the East as the wife of Antony. She spent most of the years 39-37 BC in Greece, based for the most part at Athens, but it is likely she visited Corinth more than once. From its foundation until the battle of Actium Corinth was an Antonian stronghold. His proteges held the chief municipal offices there, and it is very likely that his fleet was based at Corinth for some of the time. It is just possible that the Corinthians followed the example of the Athenians in making Octavia the recipient of cult with or without Antony.

I am, however, unhappy with this solution. All these honours of a religious kind were paid to Octavia by Greek cities, or by associations of Greek citizens, in the Greek East. Her cult at Athens was short-lived and there are no instances of cult being paid to her later, as was the case with Livia, for example, at Rhamnous. Livia was honoured, too, at the Isthmian and Caesarean games sponsored by Corinth, but there is no mention of Octavia.

The fact that Corinth had been a leading city of classical and Hellenistic Greece and, as time went on, was absorbed into the culture of the Greek East under the Romans, tends to obscure the fact that the city founded in 44 BC was a Roman colony, peopled by Roman citizens, Roman in organization, official language, coinage and general attitudes. In matters of religious observance, particularly when they impinge upon political affairs, one must look for precedents to Rome, not to the cities of the Greek East, particularly at the outset of the colony. There is, to my knowledge, no evidence of any cult, altar or temple erected to Octavia in
a Roman city, except for Pausanias' reference to a Temple of Octavia at Corinth.

If one considers this situation, it becomes increasingly difficult to accept that such a temple existed, particularly when it is clear that the site of Temple E was reserved for cult from the beginning, and when the size and position of the building indicates that it was for the most important official cult of the city. One can always say, of course, that Pausanias made a mistake, but he is very precise. He says, ὑπὲρ δὲ τὴν ἀγορὰν ἔστιν Ὀκταβίας ναὸς ἀδελφῆς Ἀβγοῦστου βασιλεῦσαντος Ῥωμαίων μετὰ Καίσαρα τὸν οἴκοτέτην Κορινθίου τῆς ἕτη. It sounds rather as though Pausanias himself had queried the name of the temple and been given this additional information in reply, which he then set down for his readers, like the conscientious travel guide he is. However, in the absence of the coin evidence, and given the other circumstances, it is difficult to accept or explain Pausanias' identification. Yet, I believe that by examining all the evidence relating to Temple E, it is possible to provide a solution to the problem, and to form a clearer idea of the history and identity of Temple E.

First, we should examine more closely the scanty remains of the first Temple E. It was built on a rectangular platform of stone and concrete, 44 x 23.50 m. This was not intended to be seen, but simply to provide a firm, lower foundation, and such a massive piece of construction indicates, as Freeman says, a heavy superstructure. Built into the podium of the later temple, which was set partly on the same foundation, but also extended some 10 m. further to the west, are a number of reused wall-blocks; in the absence of any other suitable building near at hand, these are likely to have come from the earlier temple. There are also a number of impressions in the later podium of blocks which are now missing, as well as parts of drums, and impressions of drums, of fluted Doric columns. Both these
fragments and the wall-blocks are of stuccoed poros. There are also two fragments of Ionic poros anta capitals. Given this admittedly meagre amount of information, it is, nevertheless, reasonable to suppose that the earlier temple was of stuccoed poros, with columns of either the Doric or Ionic order. Freeman also thinks that there were steps at the east end, because of the absence of a euthynteria course; on the other hand, P. B. Haskell has suggested that it was a krepidoma temple. My own observations lead me to believe that we can be more precise as to the form of the earlier temple. First, there are two distinct levels of concrete in the existing podium. One can differentiate clearly between the lower level, which is related to the foundation of the earlier temple, and the second level, which is part of the podium of the second temple. Secondly, a careful look at the plan of the excavation shows that at the east end the row of stone blocks forming the edge of the opus incertum platform is set back just under 2 m. (see fig. 16). Excavation notes at the time of the building of the museum and driveway into the excavation area, which impinge on the site of the temple, indicate that there was a similar course to the north; from this it is reasonable to assume that the blocks did not extend all along the east side of the foundation, but that there was a gap of 8.50 m. in the middle, where there was just plain concrete. The important point is the return of the blocks. There must have been a reason for this to have been done. The logical answer is that there was a flight of steps built up from the east, and that the return marks the side or "cheek-wall" of the steps. It was not necessary to continue the poros blocks across the middle of the platform because this part would be covered by the steps. One might expect to find some trace of the side and cross-wall, but everything above the level of the foundation here was removed when the second temple was built further to the west, and the area paved. It now lies beneath the museum driveway and is
inaccessible. It is difficult, however, to think of another good reason for the return of the stone blocks at this point.

At the west end of the lower foundation, immediately adjoining but not bonded into it, is a wall consisting of two rows of stone blocks held together by concrete in the joints. This wall extends some 4.10 m. to the south of the lower foundation. To the north of the foundation, on exactly the same line, is a cutting of the same width, suitable for the bedding of a wall similar to that on the south side. One course of this wall is in situ below the concrete of the later podium. There is no doubt that the wall extended along the entire west end of the early temple, and also projected well beyond it. It is not part of the temple and is not load bearing. It is also clear that it was built at about the same time as the earlier temple and is not related to the later replacement. Freeman regards the purpose of this wall as "decidedly problematical", possibly providing a terrace behind the temple or, more likely, providing a buttress for the foundation on the south side, and carried out on the north side for the sake of appearance only. This is quite impossible, since the wall does not actually touch the foundation, nor act as a buttress, but runs along the back of it. Roux considered that the wall buttressed the podium of the later temple, since it appears from the report to abut it, but there is no reason why a solid mass of concrete should need buttressing in this way. 27 There is a perfectly simple explanation for the existence of this wall, if one studies both the plan and also the existing remains on the ground. The "buttress" wall is not bonded into the back wall of the temple, but runs parallel, with a slight gap between the two, and it extends for an indefinite distance to the north and to the south of the temple. It is simply the back wall of the precinct of the temple. In typical Italic fashion, the temple was built against the rear wall of a precinct rather than standing alone or detached
from the surrounding porticoes as its replacement was. It has been assumed, hitherto, that the first Temple E stood in isolation on its hill, but this now appears not to have been so. There are no recognizable traces of structures along the sides of the precinct, but it would have been odd to have had just a back wall and it is probable that there were also flanking walls or porticoes. The first temple appears, from the size of the lower foundation, to have been somewhat wider than its successor, but the side walls of its precinct could have been quite close, forming a long, narrow enclosure. They would either have been swept away, when the second temple was built and the pavement of the enlarged precinct laid down or, just possibly, they were incorporated into the massive new colonnades of the later temple. The extent of the first precinct is, therefore, unknown; it could not, however, have been wider than that of the second temple because the precinct wall of Temple C, which adjoins it to the north, is dated to the early 1st century.

The important point is that one can recognise here a familiar component of Roman town planning: a podium temple, standing on a platform and approached by a flight of steps, which is set on the main axis and against the rear wall of an enclosed space, entered from the centre of the opposite side (see fig. 15). The emphasis is strictly frontal. That is as far as one can go with any degree of certainty. There is no real indication of the plan of the temple, nor of its interior arrangement, although one can make a few observations. The platform is approximately twice as long as it is wide. This would, of course, be suitable for a canonical, hexastyle temple, but the evidence indicates otherwise. It is likely that there was a deep pronaos with peripteral columns and a small cella. One might attribute the elongated foundation to local Greek influence, but there are also examples of such proportions in a purely Roman context. Given the Roman plan of
the precinct, it is likely that the temple was planned on Italic rather than Greek principles. The flight of steps is only just over a third of the width of the temple, rather than stretching the entire width of the east end, as in the case of the later temple. The question of whether the order was Doric or Ionic cannot be resolved. Possibly some fragments belong to the temple and others to the surrounding portico. It is worth noting that by the Augustan period Doric was generally out of fashion for temple buildings. It may be, however, that the early Corinthians were conservative in their building habits. Certainly both the Tuscan order and the Italic base are found in early buildings at Corinth, and poros was the normal building material at Corinth until well into the 1st century.29

Until now the first Temple E has been dated to the Claudian period on the evidence of a single coin of Caligula, which Freeman describes as "resting on the hardpan near the bottom of the lowest course at the south end of the (buttress) wall". This description does not tally with the detailed information given in the excavation notebook, and it cannot be regarded as in any way reliable.30 It is much more probable that the coin was lost at the time when the "buttress" wall or, as we can now call it, the back wall of the precinct, was being dismantled, prior to the building of the second temple. The coin cannot, in any case, be used to date the construction of the first temple.

With the disappearance of the only piece of apparently solid evidence as to the date of the first Temple E, is it possible to come to any conclusions about it? I believe that it was built in the Augustan period, and that the plan of Temple E, as it has been newly determined, is important, both in dating the complex, and also in accounting for the fact that it was called the "Temple of Octavia". In my opinion the two problems are related, and the solution lies in considering together the building plan
and the name. The temple is placed against the back wall of a precinct, which implies that it is an enclosed space with an entrance opposite the temple facade, which is exactly where the steps lead up from the forum area. The plan bears a close resemblance to the Forum iulium and the Forum Augustum in Rome. The idea is essentially one of an enclosed space with a temple, and possibly other buildings, within it. The basic idea became extremely popular and it was employed at Rome for other buildings besides fora, the most important in the present context being the Porticus Octaviae, the only building which can be definitely associated with Octavia. The rebuilding of an earlier porticus was undertaken by Augustus in honour of the original founder and his ancestor, C. Octavius. Additional work was undertaken by Octavia and libraries were added by her or in her name as a memorial to her son, Marcellus, after his death in 23 BC; the whole building became known as the Porticus Octaviae. The most important elements in the complex were the free-standing temples of Jupiter Stator and Juno Regina, but the precinct also enclosed a curia, a schola, the libraries, a collection of statuary and art objects, as well as the standards repossessed from the Dalmatians and placed there by Octavian after his triumph in 29 BC.

It is a big leap from the Portico of Octavia in Rome to the Temple of Octavia in Corinth, but I am going to suggest that a similar process may have taken place there. The principal temple of Roman Corinth was built on the hill overlooking the forum and, either at the same time or soon after, an enclosed precinct was also built and named in honour of Octavia. An architectural plan similar to one popular in the capital is not surprising, nor that it was carried out using the material and the techniques in use locally. This combination of western Roman architectural forms with local Greek building practices can be paralleled in other early buildings at Corinth. The precinct might well have included altars and shrines of
divinities other than those worshipped in the main temple, as well as honorific statues of the imperial family. I do not rule out entirely the existence of a dedication to Octavia, although not in a central position.

One must also bear in mind that "templum" in Latin does not necessarily mean our English "temple" nor the Greek "ναός", but signifies, rather, an enclosed and sanctified building or space, including, for example, the curia, the rostra, or a quadriporticus. The obvious example at Rome is the Templum Pacis, which is often called the Forum of Vespasian, and equated with the other imperial fora. It was originally designed as a quadriporticus and contained a formal garden, libraries and works of art as well as the temple. If, then, the Temple E complex was named in honour of Octavia, there is no reason at all to assume that the temple within it had anything to do with her. Just as the Forum Iulium contained a temple to Venus Genetrix, the Forum Augustum a temple to Mars Ultor, and the Porticus Octaviae temples to Jupiter Stator and June Regina, so the complex at Corinth contained a temple to which we cannot, for the moment, give a name. That the whole complex should be known in Latin as the Templum Octaviae and that this should be translated into Greek as the "ναός 'Οκταβλάς" would be understandable, if inaccurate. It could have happened as Greek rather than Latin came to predominate in Corinth. It must be acknowledged that Pausanias is usually scrupulous in his use of terms and one might have expected him to use τέμενος rather than ναός in this case, but it would not be the first time that Pausanias had been at the mercy of his local guide. One can reasonably assume that he accepted the name used in Corinth, although he did check it, as his narrative makes clear. It is worth noting that the Templum Pacis is referred to consistently by the Greek writers as the τέμενος τῆς Εἰρηνῆς. None of the examples quoted provide an entirely satisfactory parallel, but they show that there can be a certain variation
in nomenclature. In the case of the Templum Pacis, the name is right for the temple and ignores the other elements in the complex, whereas the names given to fora and porticoes focus on the complex as a whole and ignore the temples. I am proposing an amalgam of the two. One has to imagine that Pausanias, standing in the middle of the forum at Corinth, looked up at the mass of the Temple E precinct at the far end and asked his guide what it was. To which the guide, thinking that he was referring to the most obvious feature, the surrounding colonnade, replied "the precinct of Octavia" without intending to refer to the temple within. Pausanias, however, took the name of the part to refer to the whole. There is no reason to think from Pausanias' own account that he actually entered the precinct of Temple E, nor that he had any interest in it, beyond noting its existence beyond the forum. This, I suggest, is the answer to the problem posed by Pausanias' references to the Temple of Octavia. It is only a hypothesis and the evidence is slight, but it does have the merit of accounting for a "Temple of Octavia" which is clearly the principal temple of Corinth, while at the same time not proposing the existence of a cult of Octavia that is unsubstantiated anywhere else in the Roman world, and which goes against the known policy of Augustus and his successors.

Any why should Octavia have been commemorated in this fashion at Corinth? Although Augustus was fond of her and she was generally regarded as a member of the imperial family, she is not honoured elsewhere in the same way as Livia, nor as Augustus' daughter, Julia. The explanation could lie in the fact that Corinth had been one of Antony's main bases in Greece. It was to M. Antonius Theophilus, his συμπάθητος at Corinth, and a former duovir, that Antony commended his friends after Actium. Theophilus was the father of Hipparchus who was, according to Plutarch, the most influential of Antony's freedmen and the first to go over to Octavian.
Power seems to have remained in the hands of the same social group at Corinth due, no doubt, to some fast footwork. Families such as the Heii, the Novii and the Musii continue to be prominent after Actium as they were before. Hipparchus himself held office as duovir at least twice between 17 and 1 BC. A good way of demonstrating one's enthusiasm for the new ruler would be to finance or take responsibility for a major public building, and to dedicate it in the name of his sister, Octavia, who just happened to have been the wife of Antony and probably well-known at Corinth. One can also be less cynical about attributing personal motives to individuals, since the Corinthians as a whole were assiduous in their attentions to the imperial family.

That the building of Temple E was begun after rather than before Actium is a reasonable supposition, quite apart from the connection with Octavia, who died in 11 BC. The construction of such a large building at an earlier stage in the life of the colony would almost certainly have been beyond the means of the first colonists, whose main effort were, concentrated on renovating existing Greek structures and providing themselves with essential public buildings. The requirements of the cult on the site of Temple E could have been met quite adequately with an altar and a simple precinct. Corinth must also have been affected by the civil wars. Strabo, who visited the city in 29 BC, comments only on the past glory of the city, which implies that the present inhabitants were living in depressed circumstances. Octavian was also in Corinth during the spring of 29 BC, having passed the winter on Samos, and it is possible that, as at Philippi and elsewhere, he settled additional colonists there. Several of the tribes of Corinth are named after his relatives or close associates. The Corinthian Caesarea were also established at about this time in honour of Octavian and, almost certainly, to commemorate his victory at Actium.
addition, it is possible, although by no means certain, that when the new province of Achaia was formed in 27 BC, Corinth became the seat of the provincial government. It was only a senatorial province and therefore not likely to have received massive imperial donations, but, even so, some money may have been forthcoming. It would have been an appropriate time, in any case, for the new princeps to promote the building of a temple in a city founded by his adopted father and bearing the name Laus Iulia. Another possibility is that the building was sponsored by Marcus Agrippa. He was in the East as Augustus' legate between 23 and 21 BC, and again from the latter half of 17 BC to the beginning of 13 BC, and he may even have spent the winter of 16/15 BC at Corinth. As well as having a tribe named after him, Agrippa was also made a patronus of the city. Given Agrippa's outstanding record for civic building, it is unlikely that he would have neglected so potentially important a city as Corinth, although we can attach no specific elements of any building programme to his name. Without definite literary or epigraphic evidence, this can only be speculation, but, even so, it is reasonable to date the building of the principal temple of Roman Corinth to some time between 29 BC and the end of the century, whether financed solely by the Corinthians or with outside help.

Since there is now no reason to connect Temple E, as opposed to its precinct, with Octavia, nor to think that it contained a cult statue in the likeness of Octavia, the next question to be considered is whether one can come to any conclusions as to the deity or deities worshipped in the temple. The early Roman settlers at Corinth, as elsewhere, made use of some existing Greek buildings, sometimes as a temporary measure, sometimes retaining them permanently. We have seen already that the site of Temple E was incorporated in the initial layout of the city. This raises the possibility that there was already a sanctuary or temple on this spot, dating from the
Greek or Hellenistic period, and that the early Roman colonists made use of it for a time. There are some grounds for thinking that this might have been so.

The high ground of Temple E was one of the first areas in Corinth to be inhabited; there are signs of human habitation dating from the Neolithic period onwards. Apart from traces of domestic buildings, the contents of two wells near Temple E suggest that in the late archaic period there was a sanctuary near the site of the Roman temple. Fragments of a terracotta group representing a combat with Amazons were found in a well just beyond the south-west corner of the podium, and more terracotta fragments from acroteria and other sculptural figures were found nearby. Some of the figures appear to have come from a temple pediment, and it has been suggested that the subject is Hercules and the Amazons. This is, of course, a popular subject in the period in question and one can draw no conclusions from it. Pottery from another well at the north-west corner of the Roman temple has been assigned definitely to the last quarter of the 7th century BC. The type of vessel and the fact that the material was all dumped at the same time makes it likely that this is a deposit of votive offerings removed and buried to make way for the offerings of other worshippers. Other wells and cisterns probably belong to houses of the Greek period, of which there are a few architectural remains, but they were filled in the 6th and 5th centuries. Apart from a very little from the 4th century, there is almost no Greek material later than the 5th century BC in the area to the east and west of the Museum. This is in marked contrast with the area west of Temple E where numerous house walls of the 4th and 3rd centuries BC were discovered.

At the very end of the 4th century, there was a major change in the use of the area. An extensive levelling operation took place, in which the east
slope was cut down, covered with a hard packing of clay and stones, and two lines of curbing put in, probably to form terracing. One significant point made by the excavator is that "the clay surface of the packing is very hard, suggesting many feet had once trodden upon it". It does seem probable that there was some sort of sanctuary or Hellenistic temple constructed on the high ground of Temple E, perpetuating, possibly, an earlier archaic sanctuary. It is, perhaps, to such a building that some of the fragments built into Temple E belong. Two, in particular, must predate the lower foundation of the first temple: a Doric poros architrave block and an Ionic cornice poros block, both coated in white stucco with a red pattern, as well as the Doric column drums and blocks mentioned above in the core of the podium. Equally, of course, the blocks could have been brought up from some other building, but there is a natural tendency for architectural blocks to move down rather than up, particularly if they are large. All other traces of a temple - and there is always the possibility that there was only a sanctuary without a temple building - must have been swept away in the Roman building of the first Temple E, since no other evidence remains. There is simply the fact that this site, a very attractive one, inhabited since the earliest times, right in the centre of Greek Corinth, was partially cleared of its domestic habitation at the end of the fourth century; it would be curious, indeed, if it were then left totally unoccupied. The likelihood of there having been a temple actually on the site of Temple E, and not totally obscured by the Roman building, is given added weight by S. S. Weinberg's observations of the orientation of the buildings in the forum in the Hellenistic period; namely, that the line of the second race-track was determined by structures at either end of the forum area, and that this orientation was preserved in the orientation of the Roman West Terrace and West Shops, and the front line of the Julian
Basilica at the east end. One has, therefore, to assume that this orientation was fixed "by a Greek predecessor of Temple E with the same or parallel axis".53

One of the most notable aspects of the planning of Corinth is the ingenious way in which the Romans imposed the typical layout of a Roman city centre upon existing structures of the Greek period, re-using them for their own purposes. We must, therefore, consider seriously the possibility that there was a sanctuary or a Hellenistic temple on this site, and the Romans made use of it, as they did other Greek buildings, at the very beginning of the colony for their own religious purposes, consecrating it as a "templum", and then replacing it at a later stage with the massive Temple E. In the absence of an existing temple which could be adapted, the requirements of Roman religious ritual could, however, have been satisfied with an altar or some other simple structure erected in 44 BC as soon as the colony was founded.

Were it not for Pausanias' reference to a temple of Zeus Kapetolios beyond the theatre, the natural assumption would be, of course, that Temple E belonged to the Capitoline Triad. It is the obvious conclusion, given the size and position of the temple, combined with the fact that Corinth was a Roman colony. Very few pre-Augustan colonies outside Italy have been explored thoroughly and we do not know whether the building of a Capitolium normally accompanied the original foundation of a colony. It comes as a surprise to discover how late some of the best-known Capitolia are, even though it is not always possible to be certain that the existing remains do not obscure an earlier building. The cult of the Capitoline Triad is first mentioned in connection with an overseas colony in the Lex Ursonensis of 44 BC, but only with regard to gladiatorial and theatrical shows, and this does not necessarily prove the existence of a temple as
opposed to a simple altar. The emphasis in the *Lex Ursonensis* indicates that the cult was of prime importance, which is not surprising since it was the official cult of all Romans and central to the Roman citizenship of the group. Since colonies were regarded as miniature copies of the Roman state, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the cult was an essential part of a colony’s religious and political existence from the outset. At Corinth the natural place for the Capitoline Triad is on the site of Temple E. The imposing size and grandeur of the temple, in both its phases, together with the fact that it occupies the elevated position commonly assigned to a Capitolium, must give one pause for thought. Capitolia also tend to be part of a larger architectural design, such as a forum, and we have seen that this is the case with Temple E. It is, therefore, worth exploring further the statement of Pausanias: οπέρ δὲ τὸ θεάτρων ἐστὶν ἐκεῖν Δίὸς Καπετῶλου φωνῇ Ῥωμαίων κατὰ Ἑλλάδα δὲ γλώσσαν Κορυφαῖος ὀνομάζονται δὲν.

It is normally assumed that Pausanias is referring here to Jupiter Capitolinus and therefore his temple would be the Capitolium of the colony, but there is a problem in making this simple equation. There is ample evidence to confirm that Ζεὺς Καπετῶλος is the natural translation of Jupiter Capitolinus. The cult of Ζεὺς Καπετῶλος was well-known in the Greek world. It is attested, for example, at Antioch in Caria, Teos, Smyrna and Serdica. In Greek eyes he was, however, rather different from the Jupiter worshipped by the Romans. To the Greeks Jupiter Capitolinus was essentially the god of oaths and the protector of treaties, copies of which were kept on the Capitol in Rome. It was primarily in this capacity that Jupiter Capitolinus was honoured in Greek cities, and not as Jupiter Optimus Maximus, the chief god of the Triad.

Why then, if Ζεὺς Καπετῶλος was familiar to the Greeks did Pausanias feel it necessary to gloss his words – κατὰ Ἑλλάδα δὲ γλώσσαν Κορυφαῖος
This is particularly odd when Zeus Koryphaios is a totally separate cult from that of Zeus Kapetolios. It is not one of the best known titles of Zeus, but it is an adequately attested Greek mountain cult, similar to that of Zeus Akraios, and often associated with the weather. His sanctuary or temple was sometimes on the mountain top, but could equally well be at the foot. I see two possible answers. First, that Pausanias was making a casual comment to the effect that Kapetolios simply means "of a high place" just as Koryphaios does, etymologically. On the other hand, it is also possible that there was, or had been, a cult of Zeus Koryphaios at Corinth which was absorbed into that of Zeus Kapetolios. Pausanias, who is always interested in cults of earlier times, could have been making passing reference to this. In either case I think that we should recognise that the Zeus worshipped "beyond the theatre", whether he is Kapetolios or Koryphaios, has nothing to do with the Jupiter of the Capitoline Triad - we are talking about two quite separate cults.

We do know from epigraphic sources that there was a cult of Jupiter Capitolinus at Corinth. An inscription on a statue base records that G. Curtius Benignus Iuventianus was theocolus Iovis Capitolini. This is only one of several inscriptions mentioning this priestly office, but it is significant in that the restoration is certain, and the deity in question is definitely Jupiter Capitolinus. In this and every other case, the religious office forms part of a cursus honorum on the base of a statue. Corinth VIII, 3, no. 152 commemorates Sextus Olius Secundus, praefectus fabrorum, theocolus Iovis Capitolini who was also honoured with the ornamenta of aedile, duovir, duovir quinquennalis and agonothete. The inscription was put up by his relatives and there are reasonably good grounds for dating the inscription to the latter half of the reign of Augustus. Sex. Olius Secundus is otherwise unknown and, although definitely
a citizen of Corinth, did not actually hold the municipal offices mentioned. The same is true of the previously mentioned Benignus Iuventianus. He did, however, hold the office of imperial priest of Neptune and was isagogus to two agonothetes. This dedication was also made by relatives, in this case the parents, and the implication is that he died young. The inscription probably dates from the late 1st or early 1st century. In contrast, G. Cutius Lesbicus actually was prefect, aedile, duovir and agonothetes of the Isthmian and Caesarean games, as well as being theocolus Iovis Capitolini; he also held another unspecified priesthood. The date could be anywhere between the mid 1st and late 2nd century. Another honorand is unknown, but he, too, was prefect, aedile, theocolus Iovis Capitolini and Irenarches Iani. This memorial was erected at public expense by the decurions "ob iustitiam". In all these cases, whether they are private or public dedications it is clear that the position of theocolus Iovis Capitolini ranks with other important municipal offices.

The title theocolus is very curious indeed in connection with a Roman cult. The basic meaning is "cult official" or "attendant" and in every other known context it is related to a Greek cult. The best-known for whom there is ample epigraphic evidence of the Roman period, are those of Olympia. The term is not confined to cults of Zeus, however, but can apply to other gods as well, Asclepius in Attica and Amphissa, Artemis in Zakynthos, and also Kronos at Corinth. The importance of the office seems to vary; at Dyme the θεόκολος was eponymous, while at Olympia the twelve not only had priestly functions, but also controlled matters of state in general. Clearly, it is a lowly-sounding title which belies in some, if not all, cases the importance of the office.

Why, in a purely Roman context at Corinth, is this Greek title used rather than pontifex or flamen? There is no obvious answer, but I suggest
that there was a cult of Zeus in Greek Corinth which has not so far been recognized. It survived the period 146-44 BC and the Romans then adapted or incorporated it into the Roman cult of Jupiter Capitolinus, but retaining, in the title of the chief priest, the theocolus, the memory of its Greek origin. As both O. Broneer and C. K. Williams have pointed out, there was certainly some continuity of cult between the Greek and Roman periods. The Asclepieum and the sanctuary of Demeter and Core were both re-established by the Romans. These sanctuaries, too, are at some distance from the forum and, as Williams has observed, the evidence at present indicates that there was very little continuity of cult in or round the forum; the Olympian gods, in particular, seem to have had their sanctuaries elsewhere in pre-Roman Corinth.

One can only speculate as to why this cult should have survived or been re-established. R. Mellor has shown that in Greek cities the cult of Zeus Kapetolios was associated with treaties between Rome and the individual city or league of cities concerned. This could have happened at Corinth before 146 BC. One of the occasions that comes to mind is the proclamation of the freedom of the Greeks which took place at the Isthmus in 196 BC. The preliminary meeting and a subsequent conference took place at Corinth, and Corinth itself was handed over to the Achaean League. If a sanctuary to Zeus Kapetolios had been set up at this time by the Achaean League rather than by the Corinthians alone, then the maintenance of the cult would have been the responsibility of the other cities of the Peloponnese as well as Corinth. This could account for the survival of the cult during the period 146-44 BC.

The important point, however, for the present discussion is not so much its origin, but that a cult of Jupiter Capitolinus, with a theocolus as chief priest, is not to be identified with the cult of the Capitoline Triad,
whose rites would have been the concern of the chief magistrates of the colony together with the pontifices and augures. Nor will the sanctuary of Jupiter Capitolinus beyond the theatre be the Capitolium. In these circumstances the natural assumption that Temple E, because of its position and size, is indeed the Capitolium becomes more compelling.

There is another piece of evidence which increases the likelihood that this is so. Corinth stopped issuing coins after the death of Galba, but resumed minting under Domitian. The imperial permission is recorded on a coin with the legend, PERM(issu) IMP(eratoris), and a characteristically Corinthian representation of Isthmus seated on a rock and facing Ino holding Melikertes. The names of the duovirs no longer appear on the coins, but are replaced by the head of the Emperor. The outstanding feature of the imperial coinage from Domitian to Geta is that the coins represent traditional Corinthian themes, buildings or statues, a great many of which can be positively identified. It is of particular interest, therefore, to find a coin of Domitian issued by the Corinthian mint and showing a Capitolium with three cult figures clearly visible (see Pl. 20e). M. J. Price and B. L. Trell think that it is a copy of the Capitolium at Rome and they cite, as supporting evidence, another Corinthian coin which they think represents the Meta Sudans. The latter identification is questionable. Price and Trell refer to the Corinthian coin as being an exact copy of the Meta Sudans coin issued by the Roman mint. I cannot see this. In particular, the streams of water on the Roman coin, which identify it so clearly as a fountain, are missing. There are several versions of the Corinthian coin, all slightly different, including one from the reign of Hadrian. According to Pausanias, Corinth had a large number of splendid fountains, several of which appear on coins and have been positively identified. The city may well have had a fountain similar to the Meta
Sudans and it is unnecessary to assume that the Corinthian coin is a copy of the fountain at Rome. Imhoof-Blumer and Gardner originally identified the building on the coin as either a fountain or an obelisk. There are large areas of Corinth away from the main forum area which remain unexcavated, and it is unwise to conclude that, because a coin cannot be identified with the known remains, it does not exist at Corinth.

The other Corinthian coin, the important one in this discussion, shows a Capitolium which could represent the temple at Rome, and it may be connected with the rebuilding by Domitian. It would also be most appropriate for the principal temple of Corinth to appear on a local issue. Indeed, in view of the predominance of Corinthian types at Corinth - to the extent that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to identify with certainty a coin representation that is definitely not Corinthian - it is much more likely to be the temple at Corinth. I regard this coin as an important piece of evidence in establishing the existence of a conventional Capitolium at Corinth. The coin shows a large central seated figure within the temple, flanked by two standing figures. The building has acroteria and pedimental sculptures, but no other details can be made out satisfactorily.

Few further details can be added to our present knowledge of the first temple. We can deduce that it was a hexastyle, podium temple built in poros with a coating of stucco and placed against the back wall of a precinct. The side walls must have been on the same lines as those of the later colonnades, but they may well have been closer to the temple, forming a narrower precinct. Nor is it clear where, in the first instance, the front wall of the precinct came, but it was probably parallel with the line of the West Shops which are thought to have been built in the Neronian period. Nor is there any evidence for a gateway or imposing entrance. The plan of the precinct may have resembled that at Brixia, which has side colonnades
and a low retaining wall on either side of a wide staircase leading up to the piazza. The Capitolium here was remodelled in 73/74, when the four Republican temples were replaced by an imposing new podium temple, but the plan of the precinct goes back to the Republican period. 74

This early precinct of Temple E is likely to have been the location of some of the architectural fragments found in the vicinity, and particularly in the area of the West Shops and south-west forum. 75 Some of them are of high quality and so far unassigned to a particular building; in particular, two anta capitals with lotus and palmette decoration, previously thought to belong in the 4th century BC, have now been redated to the Augustan period. Because of the working of the back, the excavator considered that they must have been placed against a wall of unbaked brick. 76 Some of the otherwise unplaced fragments of the Ionic order may also be associated either with the temple or with the porticoes.

As long as Temple E was identified as the temple of the Gens Iulia or of Octavia, then it was natural that it should also be regarded as the principal temple of the imperial cult. It becomes difficult to believe, however, that the Capitolium would be identified as the temple of the Gens Iulia as positively as the legend of the Tiberian coin suggests. The inscription GENT IVLI across the temple facade seems to indicate that the whole building was dedicated primarily to the worship of the Gens Iulia. In view of the previous discussion, I doubt very much whether this coin does, in fact, represent Temple E rather than another temple in Corinth. This Gens Iulia coin is very rare indeed among the provincial coinages and it raises some interesting questions, but they are peripheral to the present discussion.

However, even if Temple E is not primarily the temple of the imperial cult, it is more than likely that worship of the imperial family was
associated with the cult celebrated there, although necessarily in a subordinate capacity. The type of building devoted to the imperial cult varies enormously, as K. Tuchelt and S. Price have shown. Only the most elaborate resembled the standard temple of the traditional gods. More often the precinct of such a god would contain a separate imperial building, or a shrine, or simply an honorific statue. Shrines of the imperial cult could also be found in other public buildings such as porticoes, markets and basilicas. At Corinth the collection of official statues and portrait heads found in the Julian Basilica at the east end of the forum suggests that there may have been a niche there dedicated to the imperial family. An inscription refers to an aedes and statue dedicated to Apollo Augustus, together with ten shops, which indicates that the shrine was part of a larger building. The Augustales dedicated a colossal bronze statue in the middle of the forum Divo Augusto. Other inscriptions of various dates testify to the worship of Divus Augustus, the Domus Augusta and Divus Iulius. One can reasonably expect, therefore, to find dedications and statues of the imperial family in the principal temple of the city. Unfortunately, very little sculpture has survived which can be associated definitely with Temple E, and most of it comes from the second building. This is not surprising in view of the fact that the earlier temple was completely rebuilt, and the second one was destroyed in the mid 4th century.

Apart from the statues and portrait heads found in the Julian Basilica, other early imperial sculptures at Corinth include a posthumous portrait of Julius Caesar, of unknown provenance, and an unpublished head of the Augustan period, which is particularly interesting in view of the dearth of female portraits at Corinth. The head has not yet been studied in detail, but the quality of the carving and the type of hair style put it in the Augustan period. It is difficult to identify the imperial ladies of the
Augustan period, with the exception of Livia, but in this head there is an obvious resemblance to the early portraits of Augustus, in particular the long, prominent nose, tight, curly mouth and jutting chin. It could well represent Octavia, although it bears little resemblance to the few known portraits of her. The head comes from a statue and was found in the south-west corner of the forum, not far from Temple E, and in an area where a number of other imperial statues and dedications have been found. They may have been set up in front of the West Shops, or else on the terrace of the Long Rectangular Building, but it is also possible that they come from the precinct of Temple E and were moved to the south-west corner during building-work, or else that they were finally discarded there. The latter is a distinct possibility in view of the generally battered state of the pieces, and the fact that this was an area of the forum that was extensively re-organised in the 5th and 6th centuries, after the destruction of Temple E.

One other fragment of a statue, found during the early excavation in the south-west forum, is of interest. It comes from a life-size figure of a man, with an eagle standing upright, its wings back, against his right leg. The leg is bare and behind is a cloak falling partly over the eagle down to the calf (Pl. 19). It is certainly Roman work. The sculpture was originally identified as Ganymede, but this seems an unlikely subject for a full-scale Roman statue set up in this part of the forum. Also, the eagle is very small and its stance unlike that of the usual Ganymede sculptures. It is much more likely that the fragment comes from an imperial statue and is a version of the well-known figure of Claudius in heroic guise, holding a patera in one hand, and with an eagle, symbol of Jupiter and his imperial authority, against his leg. If this is so, we have, in the head of
Octavia and a statue of Claudius, two useful additions to the meagre list of early imperial figures to be found at Corinth.

Several later imperial statues and dedications have also been found in the south-west corner of the forum. There is a fragmentary head of Trajan and an over lifesize head of the elderly Antoninus Pius together with fragmentary dedications to Faustina (it is not clear which one) and to Commodus.

At some point the first Temple E was replaced by another, more lavish, building, the remains of which are visible today. The temple was built of marble, the podium revetted with marble, and the cella paved in coloured marbles; the courtyard was also paved. It is worth noting, though, that some of the capitals at the west end of the peristyle of the temple, where they would have been less visible than elsewhere, were of poros with marble stucco. The fragmentary inscription on the architrave – ets LIBERI EIUS SP – makes it very probable that the rebuilding was financed by a local man rather than by an imperial donor. In the original publication the second phase was put in the late 1st century or early in the 2nd century. The most interesting aspect of the rebuilding is that the temple, still a hexastyle podium building, was kept on the same axis, but moved some 10 m. to the west. The back wall of the original precinct was demolished and the area extended considerably so that the temple building was now free-standing in the middle of a large courtyard surrounded by massive colonnades. It becomes, in effect, a temenos rather than a forum, and similar to such buildings as the Temple of Divus Claudius at Rome, the Caesareum at Cyrene, and the Temple of Domitian at Ephesus.

A coin of Domitian found in the strosis of marble chips below the pavements of the courtyard gives a terminus post quem for the rebuilding of the temple, and it has been thought likely that the earthquakes of 77, which
caused major damage at Corinth, destroyed or damaged Temple E to such an extent that rebuilding rather than restoration was called for. There was certainly a good deal of building activity at Corinth during the Flavian period, including the odeum and, almost certainly, the South Basilica. Temple D was rebuilt, Temple G restored in marble, and alterations made to buildings along the Lechaeum Road, as well as to the road itself. In some cases, as with the theatre, this can be attributed to earthquake damage directly. There is no definite evidence of imperial donations, but the fact that Corinth was, for a time, known as Colonia Laus Iulia Flavia Augusta Corinthiensis implies strongly that the Flavian emperors took an interest in the city and may well have funded some of the rebuilding. It is tempting to think that the rebuilding of Temple E took place under Domitian and that the Domitianic coin referred to earlier was connected with it. However, we cannot be sure that a temple built on a solid concrete raft would have been severely affected, even by a major earthquake, nor that it would have been replaced so soon, since it was a very big undertaking. At Pompeii, for example, the Capitolium had still not been put back in operation, after an earthquake sixteen years previously, when the city was destroyed. More important, the very fine pedimental sculptures of the temple fit most comfortably into a Hadrianic or early Antonine date.

Most of the sculpture found on the site of Temple E belongs to the second phase; it was found within a few square metres west of the podium, at the same level, in or on a deep bed of marble chips. It is clear that both pediments were filled with figures; a fine fragment of a nereid riding on a dolphin and a coin of Caracalla, recently recognised as representing Temple E, indicate that there were central and lateral acroteria. The pedimental sculptures so far identified include a seated figure of Apollo, a draped, reclining male figure, a standing female figure, and another female
figure whose drapery shows she is in swift motion. These sculptures have not been studied in detail since the original report, but the observations made at that time remain valid. The same Pentelic marble was used for most of the figures and the same sculptors worked on more than one piece. They are all based on 5th century BC types and there is a strong resemblance to the Parthenon pediments, both in the overall composition, as far as it can be ascertained, and in the individual figures. These are not slavish copies, however, but close adaptations. Presumably there was a particular Corinthian flavour to the pedimental compositions.

To these sculptures should be added another seated figure, also from a pediment, representing Roma. It was found near the West Shops and was originally identified as Enyo or Nike and thought to be work of the 4th century BC. The figure, which is headless, is in Amazonian dress and seated on a rock, beside which is a helmet, cuirass and shield; she holds a spear in her left hand and a dagger in her right. It is a representation familiar from sculpture and coins, and entirely appropriate in connection with a temple associated with the religious and political authority of Rome. This type of archaizing was very much in vogue during the 1st half of the 2nd century, and E. Harrison has attributed the remarkable burst of copying of the Parthenon sculptures to the early Antonine period. The accessibility of the Parthenon sculptures for such detailed copying was, she suggests, due to the likelihood that repairs were being made as a result of a fire in the Parthenon, which is known to have occurred not long before AD 138. Given the way in which Corinth was influenced by Athens artistically, and the extent to which the Corinthians imported the products of Attic ateliers, it seems likely that this was a major factor influencing the decoration of the newly rebuilt Temple E.
In addition to the pedimental sculpture, there is also a significant quantity of free standing sculpture, which Freeman describes as Praxitelean in style; for example, the well-preserved head of Tyche, and an Aphrodite-type head. Another head was originally identified as female, possibly Melpomene. These figures are of the type that one might expect to find in the precinct of the temple, possibly set up in the porticoes.

The main cult figure may be represented by a number of fragments of a colossal marble statue and pieces of drapery which have a guilloche pattern along the edge. From a fragment of the left foot Freeman estimated that the statue would stand about 10 m. high, but it could equally well have been a seated figure. The fragments are far too few and too small for one to be able to hazard a guess as to the identity, but Capitolia often contained a colossal, seated Jupiter flanked by two smaller, standing, female figures, just as is represented on the Corinthian Capitolium coin. There are, also, Corinthian coins of Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius that may be relevant here. The reverses show a seated figure of Zeus in a himation, seated on a throne, holding a Nike in his right hand and resting his left hand on a spear. It bears a close resemblance to the Phidian Zeus at Olympia. It may, of course, be the cult statue of another temple in Corinth, or simply a copy of the Olympian Zeus, although this is unlikely for the reasons given above. It is also possible that it represents the main cult statue in the rebuilt Temple E. There is a parallel in the great Temple of Zeus at Cyrene, which contained a colossal cult statue based on the Phidian Zeus and dated to the Antonine period.

The second Temple E was surrounded by a massive colonnade enclosing an area approximately 125 x 85 m. The actual traces are slight, but enough to enable the plan to be restored. There were porticoes on the north, west and east sides, and the back wall of the West Shops enclosed the court at the
east end. The heavy foundation noted by Weinberg north of the podium and parallel with it is on the line of the front of the north portico. It is heavy construction, similar to that of the podium, and going down to prehistoric fill.\textsuperscript{95} It may be an indication that the porticoes had two storeys, but there is no evidence as to the architectural details, nor which of the many unassigned architectural fragments might be attributed to the precinct.

Although the porticoes have been restored in their basic form, it is very possible that there was another entrance to the west or the south, and that other complexes opened off the large courtyard. Only the north-west corner has been thoroughly investigated, and here a double door in the back wall leads into a building consisting of a marble-floored atrium and two adjoining rooms. The building was originally excavated in the 1930s, and was then thought to be part of a freestanding house. It has still not been fully excavated and the area is very disturbed by later construction, but it is bounded by a north/south gravel road to the west, and there is a large concrete base outside the north/west corner, which must be outside the building, so that it does not appear to be very extensive. It is now clear that the atrium and the adjoining rooms formed a kind of annexe to the precinct of Temple E. Both the annexe and the corner of the colonnade are built on fill which was dumped in the early Roman quarry before about 30. The annexe, which was built right in the quarry, has a rubble concrete foundation, while the portico is built partly on solid bedrock but, where it juts into the quarry, also on masonry. The difference in the foundations implies that the two buildings were constructed at different times. The exterior walls of the annexe are not aligned with the walls of the precinct, which is curious and may also indicate that it was constructed earlier, possibly in the middle of the 1st century, and then incorporated into Temple
E. The 1965 excavators also tried to establish the line of the foundation trench of the north wall of the colonnade to the east of the annexe, but without success. The area between the north portico and the odeum, which is bounded to the east by the Fountain of Glaucce, and to the west by the Roman road, has never been properly excavated. However, one of the test trenches dug in 1930 before the building of the Shear House, which now occupies the site, revealed the foundation of a large Roman building, which was then thought to be "probably a stoa". It is about 15 m. south of the odeum and 35 m. north of the portico of Temple E. In the same trench were found fragments of a marble statue of Athena which, given the history of Corinth, is almost certainly Roman. We now know that there was a road running past the forecourt of the Fountain of Glaucce and south of the odeum, and that Pausanias must have come along it during his tour of Corinth. It is possible that there was a sanctuary on the other side of the road from the odeum of which the "stoa" was part, but, if so, it is strange that Pausanias did not mention it. Given the absence of a back wall to the northern portico of the Temple E precinct, I am inclined to think that there was another sanctuary, containing the statue of Athena, opening off the large court and colonnade at this point. Like the atrium annexe, it may already have been in existence at the time of the building of the second Temple E. The greatly enlarged precinct could have been designed with the purpose of co-ordinating existing religious structures in one complex. I suggest this because Temple E is beginning to resemble complexes in some other cities of the East, the upper square at Ephesus, for example, where a number of religious buildings, altars and sanctuaries are integrated into one complex. This cannot be determined, of course, without further excavation, but it is worth noting that we already have, in the vicinity of Temple E, the Roman Temple C, the Fountain of Glaucce, the atrium annexe, and
a building with a statue of Athena. Also a stele recording a letter from Trajan to the Synod of Isthmia was found just north of the annexe, and the editor thinks it could have been housed in the headquarters of the Technitai of Dionysus in the same area. The surroundings of the Temple E precinct to south and west have not yet been excavated.

The atrium annexe provides some of the very sparse epigraphical material relating to Temple E, all of it imperial dedications. The earliest in date is a dedication to the deified Augusta, grandmother of the emperor Claudius, which must date from after Livia's deification by Claudius in 42. The white marble slab has a roughly tooled surface and a smooth, narrow band along the edges. The back, which is smooth, decreases in thickness from top to bottom, and it is almost certainly a revetment slab. The other two dedications are also revetment slabs, in honour of Faustina and Marcus Aurelius. Because of the reference to Sarmaticus in the imperial title, the latter must date from between 175 and 180. From the similarity of the slabs, it is probable that it is the younger Faustina, who died about 175, who is commemorated. The inscription to Livia was originally thought to relate to the actual atrium building, but this is not necessarily so. The annexe was built over extensively in later times, with much of the material coming from earlier buildings nearby, and revetment slabs are particularly convenient for re-use. It is much more likely that all the inscriptions came from the precinct of Temple E and were associated with imperial statues set up within it. Two more similar dedications, to a deified Faustina and to Commodus, were found in fill in the south-west forum, where some of the imperial portraits already mentioned were excavated.

The function of the annexe building is not clear. It does not seem suitable for an aedes or sanctuary, but these could take a variety of forms, and were not necessarily the conventional altar or temple. It could have
been accommodation for a priest or connected in some way with temple ceremonies. It may have been a meeting-place of some kind. One small piece of evidence is available to suggest this. When the atrium annexe was excavated in 1933, eighty-five coins were recovered. There was an unusually high proportion of coins from cities of the Peloponnese, all post Septimius Severus, when the right of the coinage was granted to many Greek cities. By this time the building was certainly part of the Temple E complex, even if it were not to begin with, and this unusual range of coins indicates that the cult practised here drew visitors from an area well beyond Corinth. 103

As I have said already, there is no reason to assume that Temple E was rebuilt in the reign of Domitian or at the very beginning of the second century. The pedimental sculptures suggest that a Hadrianic or early Antonine date is more likely, although that does not preclude the possibility that the new temple was projected at a considerably earlier date. There was major building activity at Corinth in the time of Hadrian, as elsewhere in Greece. 104 It is in this context that I think one should see the rebuilding of Temple E and the extension of the whole precinct, possibly to include some of the other neighbouring cult sites. That it was undertaken by a private citizen and his sons seems certain in view of the inscription on the facade. Such an undertaking would have taken a number of years, so the pedimental sculptures could well have been executed at a late stage in the late Hadrianic or early Antonine period. 105

Corinth in the 2nd century was one of the few wealthy cities in Achaia, as well as being a centre of the provincial administration; it also controlled the festivals and imperial contests at Isthmia. The scale and lavishness of the rebuilding of Temple E demonstrates its continuing importance in the life of the city, and possibly in the province as well. This building was, of course, the temple which was seen by Pausanias and
referred to by him as the ναὸς Ὀκταβεγγας. It is represented on a coin of Caracalla which has, hitherto, been thought to show the harbour at Lechaen.106 The coin shows the forum defined by shops or porticoes on either side and, at the far end, a monumental flight of steps leading up to a large temple (see Pl. 20f). The representation is schematic in that the range of Central Shops and the South Stoa have been combined, and there is no attempt to represent the small buildings of the West Terrace. The flight of steps up to the precinct has also been combined with the steps of the podium temple, which is precisely what one would expect on a coin representation. The fish-tailed deities holding dolphins in the forum may represent statues, but are more likely to be simply emblems of Corinth. Tritons and dolphins are common motifs in Corinth.

The representation is schematic, but one feature stands out, and that is the way in which the temple dominates the forum. No doubt, that was the engraver's intention. The temple is represented as tetrastyle, and other details can be distinguished, such as the prominent lateral and central acroteria. There is an altar placed to the far left of the temple, which, according to another numismatic convention, probably actually stood in the normal place in front of the facade. There are also trees on either side of the temple building; the obvious assumption is that they represent trees planted within the temple precinct. We know that trees were associated with sanctuaries. Philo says that the Caesareum at Alexandria contained gardens, and recent work in the Templum Pacis in Rome has made it clear that not only was the sanctuary extensively planted, but the trees and shrubs were part of the formal design. Trees, represented by drilled holes on the Marble Plan, were also planted in the Temple of Divus Claudius. With our increasing knowledge of the Roman taste for formal planting in public areas, in the forum at Cosa, for instance, we should perhaps think of fora and temple
precincts being much more extensively landscaped than has so far been recognised. Whether the Temple E precinct contained a few, large, shade trees, or whether the trees shown on the coin represent a more elaborate design, it is impossible to say, since the original paving has been destroyed. The trees were, however, a sufficiently distinctive aspect of the temple to warrant being shown on the coin. The presence of trees or shrubs, which would have to be watered for part of the year, may provide an explanation for the sections of terracotta water-pipes, which have been found at the west and east ends of the later precinct, and whose function has not so far been explained.

We know little more about the temple or its precinct. There is evidence that it was damaged by fire in the middle of the 4th century, and, although the colonnade of the West Shops, which form the eastern limit of the precinct, was rebuilt in the reign of Valentinian, the temple was not repaired. It may have been at this time that some of the imperial dedications were moved out of the precinct to the south-west corner of the forum. There is no evidence that the temple was destroyed by Alaric. Rather, the deliberate, manual destruction of the pedimental and other sculptures indicates that it was the Christians of Corinth who delivered the coup de grâce, presumably for ideological reasons. Unlike so many pagan temples, Temple E was not converted into a Christian church of any magnitude, although a few traces on the podium suggest the existence of a small apsed, religious building. It is probable, however, that there was a church in the vicinity because of the large number of graves. Walls and a subterranean, vaulted tomb of the late Roman period were found near the annexe, Byzantine tombs were cut into the concrete of the podium, and simpler burials found all round. Some of the building blocks of the temple were eventually re-used on the site, but many were removed to the forum.
There seems to have been no incentive to repair the centre of pagan worship in Corinth after the disasters of the late 4th century. When the urban renewal of Corinth began in the 5th century, there was, instead, a distinct shift to the east, and the site of Temple E became a cemetery.

The conclusions reached in this chapter can be summarised as follows. The chronology of Temple E is different from that proposed in the original report. The first temple was built in the Augustan period, possibly on the site of an earlier Greek or Hellenistic sanctuary. In the early years the colonists may have made use of an existing building or simply made do with an altar. It was a conventional Roman podium temple set against the back wall of its precinct. A solution has been offered for the problems posed by Pausanias' "Temple of Octavia": he was referring, inadvertently or not, to the whole sanctuary and not to the temple contained within it. There is no longer any reason to assume the existence of an otherwise unsubstantiated cult of Octavia at Corinth. The cult of Zeus Kapetolios, also mentioned by Pausanias, whose sanctuary was "beyond the theatre" is a cult of Greek origin and is to be differentiated from that of the Capitoline Triad. It is, therefore, highly probable that Temple E is the Capitolium of Corinth; this would be in keeping with its size and position in relation to the rest of the city. The Capitolium at Corinth is represented on a coin issued by the Corinthian mint during the reign of Domitian. Temple E was rebuilt lavishly in marble, probably in the Hadrianic or early Antonine period, rather than in the reign of Domitian or early in the 2nd century. It was set a little further to the west than its predecessor, in the middle of a greatly enlarged precinct, surrounded by a double colonnade, planted with trees and adorned with statues and other dedications. The very different form of the sanctuary reflects eastern influences, and the resemblance to other centres of ruler cult, together with the sparse epigraphic evidence,
suggests that the imperial cult was associated with the primary cult of the traditional gods. In addition to the small annexe opening off the north-west corner of the colonnade, there is some evidence to suggest that at least one other cult building was incorporated into the complex. The temple was damaged and went out of use in the second half of the 4th century; it was not rebuilt.

It is not possible, at this stage to go further, but it is to be hoped that further excavation of the Temple E area will enlarge and, no doubt, correct in some respects the picture presented here. If the above conclusions are correct, then Temple E becomes one of the earliest Capitolia to be found in a colony overseas. The Italic form of the earlier temple adds to our knowledge of Corinthian architecture; it is in line with the general development of early Roman Corinth, in that western building types are combined with the use of Greek materials and techniques. The recognition of the form and identity of the temple highlights an aspect of early Roman Corinth that is often overlooked, namely, that in layout, organization and religious practice, Corinth was a Roman colony and not simply a restoration of the Greek city.
Footnotes to Chapter 4

1. S. R. F. Price and H. A. Thompson read an earlier draft of this chapter and I am most grateful for their comments. I am much indebted to J. M. Reynolds who has been generous in both commenting on and discussing the material, although she is not, of course, responsible for what I may have made of her suggestions. M. J. Price kindly allowed me to use the collection and the library of the Department of Coins and Medals, British Museum, and discussed the Corinthian coins with me. An abbreviated version of this chapter was read at a meeting of the Classical Association of the Canadian West in February 1986, and a revised version has been submitted to Hesperia. The original publication of Temple E was by S. E. Freeman, Corinth I, 2, pp. 166-236. The most important discussion since has been by G. Roux, pp. 112-116 and pp. 126-127. See also C. K. Williams, "The Refounding of Corinth: Some Roman Religious Attitudes" (forthcoming paper, Society of Antiquaries).

2. Pausanias II, 4, 5; II, 3, 1. As Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, see Freeman, p. 165 and pp. 235-236; as Temple of Octavia, see W. B. Dinsmoor, Hesperia, Supp. VIII, p. 115, n. 22; Roux, p. 113; C. K. Williams, op. cit. (note 1); Wiseman, ANRW, p. 522.

3. A good example of the careful planning of the forum is the siting of the Bema. It is not centred in front of the South Stoa, in the middle of the row of Central Shops, which would be logical. Instead it is placed slightly to the East where it a) disguises an awkward outcrop of rock, b) is the focal point for people entering the forum from the Lechaemum Road through the Propylaea, the main entrance, and c) enables a speaker to command the attention of a large crowd in the forum below. This combination of circumstances cannot have happened by chance. It is a nice example of Roman flexibility in adjusting to the existing circumstances rather than simply imposing a "drawing-board" plan.

5. For the definition of a Capitolium and a useful collection of material on Capitulia, including earlier publications, see I. M. Barton, _ANRW_, II, 12, 1 (1982), pp. 259-342.

6. Poros altar, _Corinth_ VIII, 3, no.60. It was found in the central area of the odeum; the original provenance is unknown. Priesthood of Jupiter Capitolinus, see pp. 259-260 below.


8. See _Corinth_ I, 1, p. 31, n. 1.

9. Roux p. 113 and Williams (op. cit. note 1). They both refer to coins inscribed CAESAR and AUGUSTUS. I have been unable to locate and therefore examine any of these coins. It seems highly probable that they were misread or wrongly attributed. M. Amandry and H. D. Schultz have informed me (by letter) that they are of the same opinion. It is not clear from _NCP_ (see p. 22) if the obverses were the same as those of the GENT IVLI coins; if so, they cannot date from the Augustan period for the reasons given on pp. 7-8. In view of their uncertain existence they should not be taken into account. See also O. Zervos, _Hesperia_ 52 (1983), p. 45. "All known varieties of this college of duoviri have identical reverses: a hexastyle temple, its epistyle inscribed GENT IVLI."

10. _NCP_, p. 22 and pl. E xciv and xcvi. This explanation was adopted by H. N. Fowler, (Corinth I, p. 85 and n. 1), who refers to the temple rather curiously as the Temple of Augusta; and more recently by N. D. Papahatzis, Παυσανίου Ἑλλάδος Περιηγήσεως βιβλίο 2 καὶ 3, Athens, 1976, p. 67, n. 2; O. H. Zervos, op. cit. (note 9); Williams, (op. cit. note 1).

11. Augustus, _BMC_ 522 and Edwards 40 (wrongly identified as Tiberius); Tiberius, _BMC_ 518 and Edwards 43; Livia (portrait), _BMC_ 516 and Edwards 41; (veiled head with stephane, Edwards 42. See also Grant, _Aspects_, pp. 14-15 for a full description.

12. M. Amandry, op. cit. (Ch. I, note 92).


15. See Grant, pp. 108-125. He gives details of Tiberian issues showing seated figure with patera and sceptre: (Paestum) p. 2, no. 4; (Panormus) p. 5, no. 11; (Carthage?) p. 6, no. 15; (Hippo Diarrhytus, with legend IVL AVG) p. 7, no. 18; (Thapsus, with legend THAPSVM IVN AVG) p. 9, nos. 23 and 25; (Dium) p. 11, no. 33; (Cnossus) p. 17, no. 49; (Antioch in Pisidia) p. 18, no. 52. See also Grether, _op. cit._ (Ch. III, note 112) pp. 235-6 and references. The seated figure is repeated later e.g. under Nero, with legend SALVS, (BMCRE Vol. 1, p. 212, no. 87); and under Galba, with legend SALVS AVGUSTA (BMCRE Vol. 1, p. 328, no. 119).

16. At Thapsus (see Grant, _Aspects_, p. 8, no. 21) the legend, CERERI AVGVSTAE THAMPSITANI (sic), shows that this is Livia as Ceres. Under Claudius the seated figure is holding a sceptre and ears or corn; the legend, DIVA AVGVSTA, makes it clear that the figure is Livia (BMCRE Vol. 1, p. 195, no. 224).

17. See Grether, (note 15).

18. I am inclined to think, however, that this would not have been so. One of the most telling points to emerge from F. Millar's analysis of the relations between the emperor and the cities of the empire is the extent to which the emperor was in touch with events in the provinces and the vast number of embassies seeking his approval for building projects and dedications. (The Emperor in the Roman World, London, 1977, passim).

20. Dio Cassius, XLIX, 38, 1.


22. Duoviri connected with Antony include M. Insteius Tectus, who is last heard of commanding the centre of his battle-line at Actium (Plutarch, Antonius, 65, 1); M. Antonius Theophilus, his διοικητής at Corinth, and Theophilus' son, Hipparchus, (op. cit., 68, 3) whom the elder Pliny refers to as a freedman of Antony's who had once stood in the slave market, (NH, XXXV, 200); M. Antonius Orestes was probably enfranchised by Antony. Other Antonii are frequently found at Corinth in the early years of the colony. Antony's head appears on coins issued by the duovirs, Aebutius and Pinnius, between 39 and 36 BC. M. Amandry has suggested that coins bearing the heads of Antony, Octavia and Octavian, issued in the name of L. Sempronius Atratinus, were struck at Corinth (Israel Numismatic Journal, 6-7 [1982-3], pp. 1-5). This coinage was clearly intended for payment of the fleet, and it is a reasonable assumption that Antony was not only in control of Corinth, but also used it as a naval base.

23. The Temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous was rededicated to Livia in 45/46, three years after her deification (IG II² 3242). See W. B. Dinsmoor, Hesperia 30 (1961), pp. 179-204. For honours paid to Livia at the Caesarea, see Corinth VIII, 3, no. 153.

24. It is sometimes suggested that, since a large proportion of Corinth's original settlers were freedmen (Strabo, VIII, 6, 23), the new colony was Greek rather than Roman in spirit. This is an unjustified assumption since they or their families could have come from anywhere in the Mediterranean world. There is no reason to think that there was any connection between the majority of the settlers and the former inhabitants of Corinth. The way in which the graves of Greek Corinth were ransacked and re-used by the early colonists is proof of their lack of interest in their predecessors (Strabo, loc. cit.). Indeed, it is unlikely that the first colonists, having
recently attained Roman citizenship with all its privileges, would wish to be associated with the Greek past, now represented by provincials of inferior status.

25. Re-used wall-blocks and impressions of Doric column drums are visible in Freeman, figs. 115-117; for Ionic anta capitals, see Freeman, pp. 205-207, nos. 115 and 116.


27. See Freeman, pp. 176-177 and figs. 106, 108, 112 and 114; Roux, p. 114; also O. Broneer, review of Pausanias en Corinthie (Gnomon 32, [1960], p. 301), who agrees with Roux as to identification and date, but thinks that the wall is probably a terrace wall, contemporary with or earlier than the foundation of the first temple.

28. For example, the three Republican temples in the Largo Argentina; the Temple of Jupiter Stator; and the temples of the Forum Holitorium: see A. Boethius (rev. edd., R. Ling and R. Rasmussen), Etruscan and Early Roman Architecture, Harmondsworth, 1978, pp. 155-156 and figs. 156 and 157.

29. Roman Ionic base: L. T. Shoe, op. cit. (Ch. III, note 49); Tuscan order: Scranton, pp. 10 and 64; poros building material: Lechaeum Road Basilica, first Propylaea, Northwest Stoa, Augustan; Julian Basilica, Claudian; odeum, late 1st century.

30. Freeman, p. 178. The information in the excavation notebook no. 127, p. 194ff, reads as follows: "This general complex will be drawn up later. Impossible to describe wall without drawing and too complex for notebook; evidence here is permanent. In digging down to stereo in this 1.60 x ca. 1.40 we found a Greek fill - 4th century and slightly earlier. No Roman or Byz. One tin of sherds and a few describable objects." The latter included the coin of Caligula. Against it is a later entry "found at south end of west line of stones in wall. Could date wall." Later in the final publication (p. 232) Freeman describes the coin as "discovered in the
footing-trench of a buttress-wall". However, the wall was not dismantled and it is clear, both from looking at the site and from reading the notebook, that the coin was not found in or under that wall but beside it, in the fill of the Greek cistern. It cannot be used, therefore, to date the construction of the wall.


32. It is also possible that there was a temple already in existence and that the new precinct was built round it.

33. See note 29. It is also worth bearing in mind the developments in the Athenian Agora during the Augustan period. The massive Odeum of Agrippa was placed in the middle of the market square, backed up against the Middle Stoa. The overall effect was to change an essentially open area into an enclosed and colonnaded square, dominated by a large building placed on the central axis, in other words a forum with the odeum taking the place of a temple. See H. A. Thompson, Hesperia 19 (1950), pp. 94-98. It seems inevitable, whether they were adding to an existing complex or starting from scratch, that the Romans should put their own immediately recognisable stamp on the development.

34. See, most recently, F. Castagnoli, PBSR, Vol. LII (1984), pp. 3-20.


36. Kent, Corinth VIII, 3, pp. 8-18) puts the change in official use of the language in the Hadrianic period, but there must always have been a substantial Greek speaking population in Corinth. See also Ch. VI.

37. e.g., Josephus, Bell. Iud. 7.158; Dio Cassius, 65.15.1; see also Anderson, Op. cit. (note 35), p. 110.

38. Julia's honours in the East appear, however, to stem from her position as M. Agrippa's wife and the mother of Augustus' heirs as much as
the fact that she was Augustus' daughter. See Hanson and Johnson, op. cit. (note 21).

39. Plutarch, Antonius 68, 3; 73, 2.

40. Corinth IV, nos. 28 and 30.

41. Strabo VIII, 6, 20-21; see R. Baladié, pp. 249-250.

42. For the tribes known to date, see Wiseman, pp. 497-498. Some of them, such as Livia, Agrippia, Vinicia and Domitia, may have been added or renamed after Actium; perhaps also Atia, named after the mother of Augustus and niece of Julius Caesar. There is, so far, no tribe named after Octavia.

43. O. Broneer, op. cit. (Ch. I, n. 27), pp. 67-68, thinks that the Caesarea were instituted in honour of Julius Caesar, but the evidence collected by West (pp. 64-65) indicates otherwise at Corinth. We do not have the complete programme of the Caesarea, but it certainly begins with Augustus and not with Julius Caesar, as do the Caesarea established later at Gytheum. Broneer also thinks that the Corinthian Caesarea were celebrated at Sicyon, together with the Isthmian games, prior to the return of the latter to Isthmia under the control of Corinth. However, since the Caesarea seem to have been exclusively thymelic, there would have been no difficulty in holding them at Corinth.

44. The evidence is circumstantial; see Wiseman, ANRW, pp. 500-501 and notes 243-245; also Ch. VI.

45. On methods of financing building in the provinces, see R. MacMullen, op. cit. (Ch. III, note 204) although much of his evidence is later in date. A grant from the aerarium Saturni or a remission of taxes might well have provided Corinth with the necessary funds.

46. See J.-M. Roddaz, Marcus Agrippa, Paris, 1984, pp. 419-450, for details of Agrippa's movements and activities in the East. From ca. 28 - 21 BC Agrippa was married to Octavia's daughter, Marcella.
47. Tribus Agrippia, West 110; Patronus, West 16.

48. Hesperia 17 (1984), pp. 197-241; Weinberg's report of the excavation of the areas to west and east of the Museum was partly based on the notebooks of J. H. Kent. The salient points are given in this and the following paragraph.


51. C. H. Morgan, AJA 41 (1937), p. 552; see also C. K. Williams, Hesperia 48 (1979), p. 144 and note 55. The presence of houses close by does not preclude the existence of a temple; compare the mixed domestic and industrial area round the Hephaisteum at Athens.

52. Freeman, p. 205, nos. 113 and 114.

53. Corinth I, 5, p. 38. W. B. Dinsmoor also proposed the existence of a Hellenistic temple on the site of Temple E, but the suggestion has been rejected for lack of evidence. As Weinberg says, (Hesperia 17 [1948], p. 240), this is probably because the Romans removed everything down to the hard clay floor.

54. Lex Ursonensis, paras. 70 and 71. The duovirs are required during their term of office to give munus ludosue scaenicos to Jupiter, Juno and Minerva for the greater part of four days; similarly the aediles are expected to give shows for the greater part of three days while in office to Jupiter, Juno and Minerva.

56. Pausanias II, 4, 5.

57. See, for example, the bilingual text of a dedication by the Lycians of a statue of Roma to Jupiter Capitolinus and the Roman people commemorating the restoration of their freedom (CIL 1² 725). It is dated to the early 2nd century BC.

58. All the known instances of Ζεύς Καπητόλιος are listed in RE s.v. "Zeus", cols. 1045-1461.


61. This raises the possibility that the sanctuary of Zeus Kapetolios or Koryphaios could be W. B. Dinsmoor's "largest Temple in the Peloponnesos" (op. cit., note 2). This suggestion was made by B. H. Hill to Dinsmoor, but rejected by him on the grounds that Pausanias would probably have remarked on the size of the temple if he had actually seen it. Pausanias is not entirely reliable in this respect, though. For instance, he describes the large, hexastyle Temple of Poseidon at Isthmia as not very big. That the temple was standing in Roman times is implied by the Roman stucco covering the original face of one of the epistyle blocks (op. cit., p. 114, note 21).


63. Corinth VIII, 3, no. 198.

64. Corinth VIII, 3, no. 195. In addition to inscriptions already mentioned, theoculus Iovis Capitolini is restored in Corinth VIII, 3, no. 194; theoculus alone can be restored in Corinth VIII, 3, no. 203. With the
exception of Corinth VIII, 3, no. 195, a large but still portable, marble fragment which was found in a Byzantine grave on the podium of Temple E, all the other fragments were found in the southeast forum, the South Basilica or the southwest forum, which is where the majority of honorific statutes of the period were erected, often by the family posthumously.


66. L. Ziehen, RE, s.v. θεοκλός, cols. 1998-9; Kent 207.

67. On present evidence Zeus was by no means a prominent deity in pre-Roman Corinth. In E. Will's discussion of the cults (Korinthiaka, Paris, 1955, p. 236, note 7) Zeus is relegated to a final footnote.

68. O. Broneer, op. cit. (Ch. III, note 91, pp. 128-161; C. K. Williams, op. cit. (Ch. III, note 18).

69. See note 59.

70. Both pontifex and augur are attested at Corinth, e.g. Corinth VIII, 2, nos. 81, 122, 132; Corinth VIII, 2, nos. 154 and 156.

71. NCP, p. 12 and Pl. B xxi.

72. Price and Trell, p. 82 and fig. 142.

73. NCP, p. 15 and Pl. C xlvi and xlvii; Price and Trell, figs. 112 and 113, and comments, pp. 61 and 82.

74. See. Ward-Perkins, RIA, p. 177 and fig. 106.

75. The area referred to in excavation reports as the south-west forum stretches from the west end of the South Stoa to the south tower of West Shops. The strip of land behind the West Terrace was originally outside the forum proper and was incorporated into it with the building of the West Shops.
76. A-355, found in West Shops; O. Broneer, AJA (1935), p. 66; B. S. Ridgway, Hesperia 50 (1981), p. 430. Other early buildings in the south-west forum might provide a possible location, but they are probably private rather than major public buildings.


78. For dates and discussion of Roman imperial portraiture at Corinth, see C. E. de Grazia, op. cit. (Ch. III, note 134). Augustus, Johnson 134; Gaius, Johnson 136; Lucius, Johnson 135. See also Ridgway, op. cit., note 76, pp. 432-434, on Julio-Claudian sculpture.

79. Corinth VIII, 2, no. 120. The original provenance is unknown. It was first seen by Spon and Wheler (Voyage d'Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grèce et du Levant, 1678), built into a Turkish house a short distance to the north of the Archaic Temple.

80. Corinth VIII, 3 no. 53, Corinth I, 3, pp. 142-143.

81. e.g. (Divus Augustus) Kent 51, 52, 72; (Domus Augusta or Divina), Corinth VIII, 2, nos. 68 and 73, referring almost certainly to the provincial imperial cult; (Lares Domus Divinae) Corinth VIII, 3, no. 62; (Divus Iulius) Corinth VIII, 3, no. 50. Corinth VIII, 2, no. 68 also refers to a flamen divi Iulii.


83. S-1751.

84. The best-known statue of Claudius as Jupiter is that in the Vatican Museum, illustrated in M. Bieber (Ancient Copies: Contributions to the History of Greek and Roman Art, New York, 1977), fig. 92, together with another version in the Villa Borghese, fig. 93. Compare also Claudius as Jupiter at Olympia. A recently published relief from Aphrodisias (Arch. Rep. [1984-5], p. 91, fig. 25) shows Augustus in a similar pose with the imperial eagle by his side and crowning a trophy.

86. *Corinth* VIII, 3, no. 333. As Kent points out, the rest of the inscription probably contained the father's name in full, in which case there would not be room for the name of the deity to whom the temple was dedicated.

87. *Corinth* VIII, 3, no. 82.

88. Roma, Johnson, p. 21, no. 11. There is only one other sculptural version of Roma known at Corinth; a monument on the Lechaeum Road was in the form of Roma seated on a throne representing the seven hills of Rome (H. S. Robinson, *Hesperia* 43 [1974], pp. 470-484). A turreted head appears frequently on the coinage, sometimes being referred to as Tyche, although the legend ROMA makes the identification clear. A rare coin of Geta (F. Imhoof-Blumer, *Monnaies grecques*, Paris, 1883, p. 162, no. 25) of the Corinthian mint is described as having on the reverse Roma seated on a rock, right hand resting on a spear and parazonium in the left. Representations of Roma are collected and discussed in C. C. Vermeule, *The Goddess Roma in the Art of the Roman Empire*, Cambridge, Mass., rev. ed., 1974. Vermeule points out that, under the influence of the cult statue in Hadrian's temple of Venus and Rome, the fully-draped Minerva type of Roma superseded almost entirely the Amazonian type in a sculptural context. This cannot be used as a means of dating the Corinthian Roma, however, since the temple was not completed until very late in the reign of Hadrian, or early in that of Antoninus, and time must be allowed for the influence of the cult image to make itself felt.

Persephone - and the same may be true of the Corinthian pediment. I am grateful to B. S. Ridgway for this information.

90. There are also two Caryatids which are fine and remarkably accurate copies of the Erechtheum figures (S-74-26 and S-1768, *Hesperia* 44 (1975), pp. 22-23, nos. 26 and 27, Pls. 7 and 8). The excavators put them in the Neronian period, but B. S. Ridgway has suggested an Antonine date (*Hesperia* 50, 1981, pp. 438-439). She has subsequently told me (by letter) that E. Schmidt (*Geschichte der Karyatide* [Würzburg, 1982], p. 105-106) favours a date in the first half of the 1st century, probably Augustan. They were found in the south-west corner of the forum, but may also have come from the precinct of Temple E.

91. Freeman, p. 216, no. 6 (Inv. 1510). This head has now been joined with a torso (op. cit., p. 220, no. 11 (Inv. 1539)), by E. J. Capps, Jr., (AJA 54, [1950], p. 266). Capps thought the figure was male, but there is some doubt as to whether this is so.

92. Fragment of colossal left foot (Inv. 1531, Freeman, p. 213, no. 1), found south of podium. A number of fragments have been found at different times, in trenches dug in the north-west corner of the precinct in 1933, and more in 1963 and 1965 in the annexe (*Hesperia* 36 [1967], pp. 1-12). There are about thirty fragments of one or more colossal, draped, marble figures; also, at least twenty pieces from a cuirass statue, possibly more than one, over life-size, and probably representing imperial figures. Some of the pieces of drapery have red paint under gold. It has been suggested that a large, concrete base against the exterior north wall of the annexe may have supported a colossal marble statue (*BCH* 90 [1966], pp. 751-753 and fig. 2), but it is a curious place, at the corner of a small building, right on a gravel road, for an important statue. It would not, in any case, have held all the figures suggested by the fragments. It is far more likely that they came from the precinct of Temple E. Also found in the excavation of 1933, a head of Dionysus (Inv. 1669).


96. J. K. Anderson, (Hesperia 36 [1967], p. 10) thinks that the annexe was built later than the precinct, but H. S. Robinson, who carried out the earlier investigations (Klio 46 [1965], p. 292 and fig. 15), says that the atrium floor rested directly on the quarry fill, and construction probably followed shortly after it was dumped, soon after 30.

97. Corinth X, p. 77. In addition Broneer suggests that it is not unlikely that an Ionic column capital of stuccoed poros (fig. 48), found in the odeum, but difficult to assign to it, may have come from this building.


99. Another possible comparison may be made with the Asclepieum at Messene where a number of small cult rooms, as well as the Sebasteum, open off the colonnade round the Temple of Asclepius. See F. Felten, Antike Kunst, 1983, pp. 84-105.


101. Diva Augusta, Corinth VIII, 3, no. 55; Faustina and Marcus Aurelius, Corinth VIII, 3, nos. 109 and 110.

102. See note 90.


105. B. S. Ridgway tells me (by letter) that she feels fairly confident that the sculptures should be dated Late Hadrianic or very early Antonine, and doubts they could be much earlier.
106. NCP, p. 143 and Pl. FFvi; identified as Temple E and the forum of Corinth by Price and Trell p. 85 and fig. 148. This identification is not accepted by C. K. Williams, op. cit. (note 1), partly on the grounds that the temple is shown as tetrastyle prostyle, not peristyle hexastyle as the archaeological remains suggest. This is unimportant given the numismatic conventions. A good example at Corinth of the variety of representations of the same temple is the temple of Venus on Acrocorinth which is shown as hexastyle, tetrastyle, distyle, prostyle and peripteral, see NCP, pp. 26-27 and Pl. G xccvi-cxxxiii. Williams sees the colonnades or porticoes, not as the forum, but as the temple precinct put in front of the temple, but this goes against the other numismatic convention of "behind" = "above". It seems unlikely, especially when the bird's eye view of the forum is so obvious and convincing.


108. In north-east corner of precinct behind West Shops, Weinberg, op. cit. (note 48), p. 240 and fig. 1; in north-west corner, Anderson loc. cit. (note 96). Pipes are in situ resting on hard early Roman fill, but did not continue south to link up with rock-cut channels.


110. The latest commentator on Pausanias, Ch. Habicht, Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece, (Sather Classical Lectures 50), Berkeley 1985, does not consider the problem of the Temple of Octavia at Corinth. M. Torelli, who is preparing a new edition of Pausanias II, has told me, in discussion, that he has also come to the conclusion that Temple E is the Capitolium, and not the temple of the Gens Iulia, although his reasoning is, in some respects, different from mine.