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Organized Collective Burial in the Port Cities of Roman Italy

DORIAN BORBONUS

Abstract

Italian port cities were characterized by a high degree of connectivity that created unique social conditions and a distinctive funerary culture. My paper posits that human migration led to collective organization and, closely related, organized collective burial. There are two categories of evidence for this sort of burial: epigraphic sources attest that associations (collegia) maintained communal burial sites and funerary monuments with large capacities would be suitable for such a burial community. Even though epigraphic and architectural evidence usually do not overlap, the two types of evidence can be analyzed separately. One of the main questions relates to the external and internal group dynamics of burial communities. Externally, striking objects and buildings show that the public face of burial communities was on par with that of individuals and households. Internally, collective action maintained the cohesion of the group, which was, however, also subject to an internal hierarchy. My conclusion is that burial communities could provide a meaningful social environment in ports and other cities with substantial migrant populations.

Personal encounters with death and the duty of burial are universal human experiences that cut across social boundaries and chronological divides. The experiences themselves vary tremendously, of course. This is why the human response to death and the physical manifestations it has generated are simultaneously wide-ranging and sensitive to the social and cultural realities of past societies.1 I have previously argued that the specific practice of collective burial can be traced across the ancient Mediterranean (and, in fact, well beyond) to various historical contexts where this form of burial became relevant and appealing for a variety of reasons.2 Here, I will apply this thesis to Italian and other Mediterranean port cities, and ask to what extent organized collective burial reflects the social realities of port cities.

It has long been recognized that Roman port cities were sites of economic, social, and cultural interactions. Past studies of trade networks and social conditions in Roman port cities have traditionally focused on specific sites and their urban geography, most prominently Ostia.3 More recently, port cities have been conceptualized as a distinct category that presents urban characteristics and social configurations unique enough to merit targeted analysis. Several monographs and recent conference volumes have highlighted the distinctive sociology of port cities.4 One hallmark of this recent research is the integration of historical inquiry into social networks and cultural landscapes with material culture studies and archaeological data. Specific areas of focus are the urban.
layout and the public buildings of port cities.\(^5\) The cemeteries of port cities are only sporadically considered, even though port cities have been assigned an important role in explanations of changes in funerary culture and behaviour. For example, J. Ortalli surmises that integrated coastal sites like Ravenna and Rimini played an important role in the adoption of inhumation in the second century CE.\(^6\) Likewise, G. Piccottini and M. Verzár Bass explain the stylistic similarities of memorials in northern Italy and Dalmatia in terms of coastal trade routes.\(^7\) These examples illustrate the trend to emphasize the connectivity of port cities and invoke their exposure to cultural inspirations in order to explain changes in usually conservative mortuary behaviour.\(^8\)

This contribution takes a different approach. I will return to the topic of port cities as sites of cultural exchange later on, but my main focus is exploration of the consequences of their unique social conditions for burial culture. As in Rome itself, the populations of Italian port cities were mobile and contained a substantial number of migrants and individuals in socially dependent positions. Arguably, the traditional Roman practice of providing burial through the family or patronage may not have been an option for every urban resident of such a population. Alternative means to acquire a burial site would plausibly have been attractive and the arrangement that can be documented best is organized collective burial. By this, I mean burial in communities beyond biological families or households that exhibit some level of formality. This formality can either be organizational in nature, for example in the configuration of a collegium, or physical, for example in the employment of a monument or burial area that is designated for collective use. Organized collective burial is closely related to collective organization more generally, and in the Roman world this is represented by the popularity of collegia in various contexts.\(^9\) These two related forms of organization could provide their members with concrete benefits and a social community.

Organized collective burial occurred across the Roman world wherever collegia existed, but examples are concentrated in Italy and especially Rome.\(^10\) As a phenomenon that characterizes port cities and other highly connected settlements, its study can provide two forms of insight. First, the alignment of funerary architecture to types prominent in Rome itself, and especially the spread of columbarium-style monuments, illustrates the close relationship between Italian ports and the capital. Secondly, the organization of burial communities and the material manifestations of their burial grounds can tell us something about the social strategies of urban populations. In what follows, I will analyze the archaeological and epigraphical records in order to document organized collective burial in port cities and thus to explore how burial communities were defined structurally, symbolically, and ritually. More specifically, I will aim to answer and discuss three questions. What was the nature of burial communities and who belonged to them? What does the physical appearance of communal burial grounds imply about the public presentation of these burial communities? What internal group dynamics can be gleaned from the evidence? Answering these questions reveals that organized collective burial was an effective strategy by which to address the contradictory situations between marginalization and social integration that characterized both port cities and the Roman capital alike.

**Evidence for Organized Collective Burial**

One of the primary questions to answer about organized collective burial is how to identify it in the record. Two forms of evidence exist: epigraphical and architectural. Both of these shed light on the communities that were buried together and their internal structures and organization. It is important to consider both types of fluctuations of which are largely explained through external forces (2015).

9. The literature on collegia is vast; the historiographical overview by Perry (2011) provides a useful orientation regarding the major trends and protagonists in the relevant scholarship.

10. For examples, see Schiess 1888, 135–140.

---

8. An example of this explanatory model at work on a larger scale is Ahrens’ analysis of cremation in Asia Minor, the
evidence together, however, because each one provides distinct information and thus illustrates different aspects of collective burial.

Epigraphic evidence provides more concrete information, since it permits us to identify directly the nature and operation of the organizations that provided and regulated burial privileges for their members. Thus, there are inscriptions that identify communal burial plots or specify the regulations of associations regarding communal burials. For example, an inscription from Antium specifies that two magistri, two quaestores and two ministri of an unspecified association provided for a building (aedes) in opus quadratum, complete with gates and a calendar (ostia et fastus). The inscription illustrates a leadership circle within the collegium that simultaneously provided patronage and assumed official roles. The named individuals are of various legal statuses, indicating that the association recruited members of both slave and non-slave status. A wider view of the operations of associations can be obtained from their charters, although no examples are attested from a port city. Nevertheless, the inscriptions describe their funerary procedures in detail, especially when it comes to financial matters such as membership fees and fines. As a general overview, what emerges from this evidence is that collective burial was painstakingly administered and operated in the social context of a community that also met on a regular basis for other purposes.

Most numerous, however, are inscriptions that refer to individual transactions, like the burial of an individual by fellow association members or the acquisition of a burial plot with the approval of a collegium’s officials. Instances of the latter demonstrate that the composition of the group was actively regulated. Other inscriptions simply commemorate individuals who held a position in the collegium, with their official title or privileges. Clearly, pride in these positions made them relevant enough to be included in brief epitaphs (presumably at the expense of other information) and presented to an audience of fellow collegium members. While these hints do not provide quite as much detail as full collegium charters, they are unmistakable signs of organized collective burial and thus permit the firm identification of the practice. The body of epigraphic evidence also illustrates the distribution of organized collective burial. The epicenter of the practice was Rome, but it was also fairly common in other Italian cities, both in ports such as Antium and Misenum, and in other settlements. Beyond the Italian peninsula, collective burial was popular in Gaul, especially in the area around Arles, and it is also attested in other provinces and port cities such as Malaca, Narona, Ephesus, and Carthage.

In contrast to epigraphic evidence, physical remains by themselves allow only a tentative attribution to a burial community. In Rome, the quintessential architectural form associated with collective burial is the columbarium, a subterranean chamber with a regular grid of semicircular niches that provided access to immured terracotta cinerary urns. Columbarium tombs ranged in size and could hold between about 100 and over 1,000 burials; they were often used for the burial of the freed and enslaved staff of particularly large aristocratic households, like the gens Statilia or the familia Caesaris. These tombs provide a tangible image of how collective burial might have looked in practice, but epigraphic evidence is still vital for their interpretation as such. Association with the aristocratic households of Rome can be made only through the many funerary inscriptions from

---

11. *CIL* X 6679; although it is not specified, it is likely that the building in question was a funerary one, because the same donors are also said to have sponsored the “first games” (*ludios primi*).

12. The duoviri and magistri have *tria nomina*, indicating their citizen status, whereas the quaestores and ministri are identified with single names, indicating the possibility that they were slaves. A similar inscription is *CIL* XI 1449 from Pisa, which appears to list collectively all the members of the association.

13. The inscriptions in question have all been treated in detail elsewhere, especially that of the *cultores Dianae et Antinoi* (Ebel 2003, 12–75) and that of the *familia Salvani*

14. *CIL* X 3441 (Misenum) and *CIL* X 6699 (Antium); Permission from *CIL* XI 1495 (Napoli); from a procurator: *CIL* X 1747 (Puteoli); from collegii: *Aquil* 1.680 (Aquilae).


16. A numerical impression of the distribution is provided by a list compiled by Schiess that includes 190 instances from Rome, 119 from the rest of Italy (Antium: Schiess 1888, no. 198 = *CIL* X 6666; Misenum: Schiess 1888, nos. 256–257 = *CIL* X 3441, 3483) and 54 from provincial contexts (Schiess 1888, 111–140).
columbarium tombs. These inscriptions thus help to identify the social group that was united in a burial monument. Inscriptions also provide evidence of the activities of associations whose officers managed these valuable resources.\(^\text{17}\)

Columbarium tombs characterize the funerary landscape of Rome, but they were also employed in Italian ports, especially in Puteoli and Ostia. A later type, the aboveground columbarium, was used in Isola Sacra. All of these port-city columbaria employ the essential constructional element of the columbaria of Rome, namely semicircular niches; this makes them easily recognizable as columbaria. However, their capacities do not quite reach the scale of the columbarium tombs of Rome. This observation is significant because capacity is a principal indicator of organized collective burial, since tombs with capacities vastly exceeding the needs of biological families or even extended households were arguably intended for wider burial communities. The capacities of the tombs from Isola Sacra that are attributed to individuals and families exhibit a range of between ten and 35 burials. With a typical columbarium tomb in Rome having a capacity of several hundred occupants, clearly these two burial communities had very different compositions.\(^\text{18}\)

The central question here is where to place the cutoff between a family tomb and a collective tomb if no other evidence exists. Perhaps 100 is a good working number; but such a criterion may be too speculative to provide any real insight. Furthermore, it is possible to estimate capacity for architectural monuments only; in undifferentiated burial grounds, the size of the plot does not necessarily correspond to the projected number of burials.\(^\text{19}\)

Epigraphic evidence and archaeological remains thus convey different kinds of information. Inscriptions are more concrete, in the sense that they reveal the definitional basis of burial communities, and also their daily operation and public representation. The physical remains of collective tombs, on the other hand, provide a more tangible impression of their monumentality and thus their relationship to the outside world, as well as the internal dynamics of the burial community. However, a central problem remains due to the fact that there is almost no overlap whatsoever between these two types of evidence for the port cities of Italy.

Organized Collective Burial in Italian Port Cities

Within the Italian peninsula, four major port cities provide substantial evidence for organized collective burial. The aforementioned divide between epigraphic and archaeological evidence is evident for all four. Generally speaking, Puteoli and Aquileia provide strong epigraphic evidence for organized collective burial, whereas the evidence is largely archaeological in nature for Ostia and Portus. In the following pages, I will proceed by presenting the available evidence in detail, before integrating the information as much as possible.

There is ample evidence from Puteoli that attests to the operation of various collegia of professional and religious natures. Some of these can be tied to burial activity. An unmistakable case is a collegium baulanorum. To judge by the name, this may be an association that comprised residents of Bauli, located between Puteoli and Misenum, where two inscriptions mentioning this association have been found. Since Bauli is also the location of aristocratic and imperial villae, Th. Mommsen surmises that this was a collegium of imperial slaves.\(^\text{20}\) One of the inscriptions records the burial of 20-year-old Eunea, carried out by Artichnus with the permission of the collegium through a procurator named Corinthus.\(^\text{21}\) The other commemorates the 42-year-old Herodes from Ascalon whose burial plot had been bought by the vilicus Demetrius from the collegium. All the individuals named in the two inscriptions are commemorated with a single name, making it probable that they were

\(^{17}\) Borbonus 2014, 130–132, 139–142.

\(^{18}\) The capacities of tombs in Isola Sacra have been compiled by Hope (1997, 74, table 1); the capacities of columbarium tombs in Rome can be found in Borbonus 2014, 19, table 1.

\(^{19}\) An area of 200 by 282 square feet, given by C. Veienus Trophimus to the people of Tolentinum (CIL IX 5570) has been calculated to be sufficient for 564 burial plots (Purcell 1987, 36–37; Schrumpf 2008, 140). This calculation is, however, based on the assumption that the burial plots were the same size as those allocated in a different gift at Sarsina (CIL XI 6528).

\(^{20}\) See Mommsen’s commentary in CIL X 1.213.

\(^{21}\) Two parallels exist in Puteoli: the burial of two possible slaves by a collegium salutarium (CIL X 1588) and the burial of the 25-year-old Antonius by his brother and collegae (CIL X 2072).
either enslaved or peregrini. The latter status certainly applied to Herod, who apparently, like his more famous namesake, stemmed from Ashkelon in Philistia. The nature and physical setup of the collective burial ground or monument is unknown, but it is clear that the association managed it; this, in turn, gave it control over the burial community through the granting (and presumably refusal) of access.

An idea of what a collective burial ground might look like is furnished by a single inscription describing the agrum of a corpus Heliopolitanorum. The inscription itself is of uncertain origin, but cultores Iovis Heliopolitani Berytenses are attested in Puteoli. Since we are probably dealing here with a group of Syrians from Beirut, this latter association was defined in religious and ethnic terms. The operation of the corpus probably extended to funerary matters, as indicated by the agrum owned by the corpus. The funerary nature of the agrum is not explicitly mentioned, but it is likely: the inscription specifies that those who act against the laws or spirit of the corpus were denied access; this is in effect a denial of ius monumenti, which is common on funerary inscriptions. There are other examples of suburban properties that were used for funerary and other purposes. The agrum Heliopolitanorum is clearly multifunctional in nature: a cistern and tabernae are explicitly mentioned. The nature of the latter is a little unclear; while shops in cemeteries are attested elsewhere, their operation in this agrum would seem to be inhibited if access was really limited to members of the corpus.

The only material evidence for organized collective burial at Puteoli is a building complex in the Via Celle necropolis that illustrates the monumental dimensions of communal funerary architecture (Fig. 1). The excavation of the site is poorly documented and therefore observations are limited to the extant architecture. Accordingly, the complex cannot be dated with a great deal of accuracy. Nonetheless, the construction method of opus vittatum points to the second or third century CE. What is sufficiently clear, however, is that the site combined funerary and other functions, similar to the agrum of the corpus Heliopolitanorum.

The complex is situated along the Via Campana, just outside the city, and stretches along about 30m of the road. It consists of a central courtyard with a funerary monument (A), circumscribed on three sides by other structures. To the north are two sizeable rooms with black-and-white mosaics (B), divided by a central corridor. Behind these rooms is a small courtyard
C) and a three-storeyed building containing a cistern in its northeastern corner (D). East of the courtyard, further service quarters and a heated balneum have been documented recently.\(^{31}\) To the south is a sizeable hall (E) that was accessible both from the courtyard and directly from the street. The interior features floor mosaics, marble revetment, and a central niche framed originally by an aedicula. In a later phase, burials were sunk into the floor, arcosolia were constructed along the sides and a high podium was added in front of the rear wall. Centrally situated in the courtyard is the main funerary monument (Fig. 2). Its entrance faces away from the street and the rectangular burial chamber features two arcosolia, a central base that was possibly meant for a sarcophagus and numerous formae below the floor. The total number of burials is not documented, but appears to be substantial.

Since no epigraphic evidence whatsoever has been documented, the interpretation of this as a monument for organized collective burial cannot be proven beyond doubt. Consequently, the nature of the group that used the complex is a little ambiguous. For example, the suggestion that the complex was used by a Christian group appears to be based on the debatable hypothesis that it is to be identified with a praetorium Falcidii that is mentioned in the Atti Vaticani.\(^ {32}\) Based solely on the material remains, the combination of numerous burials with other spaces points to a facility that was used by a collegium or similar organization.\(^ {33}\) In support of this interpretation is the fact that the closest parallels

---

33. A similar arrangement characterizes a third-century complex on the Via Appia, in the area archeologica del Sepolcro degli Scipioni, where a funerary monument (only the base is preserved) within a courtyard was situated next to a three-storey building that featured sizeable rooms with black-and-white mosaics, thus possibly combining funerary activities and convivial meetings. This complex has more commonly been identified as a Late
for the large apsidal hall are similar structures of *collegia* in Ostia and other Italic cities.\(^{34}\)

Two similar multi-functional complexes are documented in the località di Cupa Cigliano, where two adjacent monuments combined a subterranean burial chamber underneath a funerary *triclinium*. The burial chambers contained both cremations and inhumations in *arcosolia* and *formae*. Both monuments were later reused for secondary *formae* inhumations, even within the *triclinia*. No epigraphic material has been recovered from the two buildings, and thus their attribution remains unknown. The arrangement is strikingly similar to that of the funerary complex on the Via Celle, however, and it unmistakably combines dining and burial within the same building.\(^{35}\)

Aside from Puteoli, the only other Italian port city that has produced epigraphically attested instances of organized collective burial that can be reconstructed with any amount of detail is Aquileia. The cemeteries of Aquileia are, for the most part, known through inscriptions, and only a few areas are documented archaeologically, most notably a famous stretch along the Via Annia (Fig. 3). The distinctive local type of burial monument is an enclosure tomb in which a plot of standard size inside a perimeter wall provided space for a primary monument and surrounding burials.\(^{36}\) All the archaeologi-
cally documented examples were family plots, but a similar arrangement may have been used for collective burial grounds, two of which are known from inscriptions and other objects.

The first is the area of the *feronienses aquatorum* on the Via Gemina. It was apparently an enclosure tomb measuring 40 by 70 square feet, as specified on a *cippus* that identifies the space (*locus* *monumenti*) as that of the *feronienses aquatorum* and mentions an *ustrimum* behind the monument.\(^{37}\) Perhaps in the center of the locus stood the monumental altar of the

\(^{37}\) *CIL* V 8303 (≡ *IAquil* 1.202).
feronienses aquatorum that listed the names of ten liberti and ingenui on its sides, among which were three members of the gens Kania. The same site also produced two fragmentary statues of young women with jugs on their shoulders and holes in their otherwise unworked backs (Fig. 4). There is some debate about the identification and setup of these statues. The interpretation of the holes as receptacles for wings led E. Maionica to identify them as aurai. Their height (preserved at 70cm and 85cm, but originally “hardly more than 1.20 m”) suggests

38. CIL V 8307 (= 992, IAquil 1.201).
their use as *acroteria* on an otherwise unattested funerary temple, but their unworked backs indicate, rather, that they were attached directly in front of something, perhaps, as G. Reiner proposes, the altar itself.\(^39\) In any case, they are clearly meant as a pair and have an association with water. Their display in the enclosure tomb of the *feronienses aquatores* indicates some sort of connection with the nature of the *collegium*. That this was related to water is clear from its name, the statues, and the patron goddess Feronia. Two further altars to Feronia were dedicated by a Titus Kanius Ianuarius, who also dedicated a fountain.\(^40\)

It may be that the *feronienses aquatores* dealt with water professionally, but in what capacity is impossible to know. Furthermore, all the epigraphic records related to the *collegium* associate closely with the gens *Kania* and especially Titus Kanius Ianuarius, who was apparently a member of the *collegium* (1886, 587) and Aebischer equates the presence of Feronia at Aquileia with its Latin colonization (1934, 12).

---

40. *CIL* V 776 (altar to Feronia), 8218 (dedication to Feronia), 755 (fountain). Ruggiero surmises a military function of the *collegium* (1886, 587) and Aebischer equates the presence of Feronia at Aquileia with its Latin colonization (1934, 12).
priest in the association. This has led D. Steuer-
nagel to surmise that the association was not
very long-lived; but perhaps we should not
overprivilege the epigraphic information – the
operation of the association may just not have
generated many monumental texts, aside from
those identifying the burial area and commemo-
rating the activity of the collegium’s priest. How
precisely the Kanii were associated with the fer-
onienses aquatores is not clear; but there are two
plausible scenarios: either the water-related re-
sponsibilities were in the hands of the gens Ka-
nia whose members thus organized themselves
into a collegium or Kanius Ianuarius was simply
a leading member or even the patron of the col-
egium. There is one other funerary inscription
commemorating six freed and freeborn Kanii
(but not Ianuarius); it does not, however, men-
tion the association.\textsuperscript{41} This inscrip-
tion has no documented context, so it could belong either
to this burial ground or to another monument.
The close connection of the burial ground to the
gens Kania does not automatically make this
plot a family monument. Even though many or
perhaps most individuals buried here may have been members of that gens, there was also clearly a conscious choice to foreground a collective label in the public manifestation of the monument and to depict symbols that were in some way or another connected to the civic or profes-
sional function of the aquatores.

A second collective burial ground in Aquileia
that is relatively well known through inscrip-
tions is that of the collegium sacrum of Mars.
Altogether there is evidence for three altars, one
stele, and two identical cippi, all of which were
recovered from the same property north of the
city. The name of the collegium is preserved on
one of the altars (Fig. 5), which also lists the
names of 15 individuals with different nomina;
two are described as liberti, one as freeborn, two
have single names, and may therefore have been
slaves, and one is identified as a medicus.\textsuperscript{42} Fi-
nally, there is a regulation that those who owed
money (presumably to the collegium) were de-
nied their loculus upon death or withdrawal
from the collegium, a regulation that is reminis-
cent of the similar rule in the corpus Heliopol-
titanorum. The stele specifies that the area was
given by a decree of the decuriones and lists over
25 further names, among which is one liberta,
one freeborn person, and two individuals with
single names.\textsuperscript{43} From the same context comes a
fragmentary votive inscription that commem-
orates the consecration of an altar to Mars and
Mercury by a certain Leontius. A third altar was
set up by the freedwoman Titiana Charis to com-
memorate her husband and five other individu-
als, probably the couple’s slaves and freedmen,
with the permission of the collegium.\textsuperscript{44} Finally,
the two cippi specify the size of the property as
being 45 by 90 square feet, slightly larger than,
but of the same general scale, as the feronienses

\textsuperscript{41} CIL V 1270: family relationships (coniunx, filius/a) con-
nect four of these individuals; two others are identified as conliberti, while a further individual from another
gens is labelled as amica optima.

\textsuperscript{42} IAquil 1.676. The single names are both Fortunatus and thus
this may represent a duplicate reference to the same person.

\textsuperscript{43} IAquil 1.677.

\textsuperscript{44} IAquil 1.680.
aquatores and several times larger than the typical size of excavated plots in Aquileia.\footnote{IAquil 1.2595.}

All in all, we do not learn as much about the visual appearance of the burial area of this collegium, but the typology of the inscriptions is consistent with the local style: an enclosure tomb with an assortment of altars inside. The number of individuals is particularly noteworthy; including those listed on the altar of Leontinus, some 50 persons are individually named. Of these, three are designated as freeborn and five as liberti. Ten have single names and thus may be slaves. The nomina in this group are diverse and altogether nine appear twice, in all but one case (Iulius), in male and female forms. These name pairs occur sometimes right next to each other (in which case they probably represent a couple), sometimes in disconnected positions and, in one case, in different inscriptions. The impression given by these names is that the collegium recruited its members from a variety of families and potentially had a substantial membership. Three named individuals with the imperial praenomina and nomina Cai-
us Iulius and Tiberius Claudius indicate that at least some of the members belonged to families that were at some point connected to the imperial household. The way in which this group is commemorated highlights the individuality of its members, since most of the epigraphic space is devoted to their names, literally covering the entire stone. However, there are also a number of collective notions, such as the name and thus the official dedication of the organization to Mars. The two inscriptions that do not make a reference to Mars instead focus on collective decision-making, in the form of granting a burial location to certain individuals by a decree of the decuriones or by the permission of association members. Finally, there is the shared obligation to support the group through membership dues that required a commitment from all members and at least the threat of exclusion in the case of non-compliance.

In addition to the two preceding examples of collective burial plots that can be reconstructed with a relatively high degree of detail, there are sporadic epigraphic hints that the situation they present was common. Thus, several inscriptions make reference to collective burial plots, but little or no evidence about the exact nature of the associated group or the setup of
these burial grounds is available in these cases.\textsuperscript{46}

The situation for Portus and Ostia is an exact reverse of that for Puteoli and Aquileia, since there is not a single piece of epigraphic evidence that explicitly refers to organized collective burial.\textsuperscript{47} This contrasts with the prominence of \textit{collegia} in Ostia and their resulting visibility in the epigraphic record of the city. At least some of these \textit{collegia} must have been involved in the burial of their members, given that this is a well-attested practice in other contexts and, in fact, one of the major benefits of membership. The problem is that this likely activity has left no epigraphic trace, and thus it is impossible to identify concrete material remains of collective burial in Portus and Ostia. The only criterion to do so, as suggested above, may be capacity, and there are indeed a number of funerary monuments with capacities well beyond the needs of even sizable households.

Perhaps the most suggestive one is the third-century Tomb 34 (Figs. 6 and 7). This funerary complex consists of an open courtyard with two rows of \textit{arcosolium} along the walls. Inhumations in \textit{formae} cover the entire area of the courtyard. There is a separate chamber at the back with further \textit{arcosolium} and, in front of this, a portico with a mosaic and well (Fig. 8). Since it is not clear how many burials were placed in each \textit{forma}, estimating the capacity of the complex is complicated.\textsuperscript{48} The important criterion of capacity thus awaits further verification, but, here, it clearly exceeds that of the other tomb monuments at Isola Sacra. A major structural change was implemented in a later phase of the building: the southern corner was cleared of \textit{formae} and an underground room with \textit{opus sectile} floor was installed instead, housing three marble sarcophagi. No \textit{titulus} inscription has been recovered, and, accordingly, the interpretation of this complex is difficult. Nonetheless, two factors stand out: its capacity and hierarchical setup. The capacity clearly exceeds that of a typical family tomb, even when allowing for an extended household. However, the hierarchical setup, with a reserved “special” area, corresponds to the design of second-century CE \textit{mausolea} that were typically owned by individuals and intended for the burial of their dependents. Such a setup, however, does not necessarily rule out the possibility that this tomb was operated by an association. First, associations were not entirely egalitarian and their internal hierarchy could conceivably be reflected in the design of a funerary monument. Second, as F. Feraudi-Gruénais demonstrates, a visually “central” burial does not necessarily house the most important person in the tomb.\textsuperscript{49} Thus, there is a strong possibility that Tomb 34 is in-

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{46} Locus of gentiles sal(viorum?): \textit{IAquil} 1.679: 9,600ft\textsuperscript{2}; locus of gentiles veterani: \textit{IAquil} 1.685 = \textit{CIL} V 884: width of 25ft; locus of sodales: \textit{IAquil} 1.686: 750ft\textsuperscript{2}; locus of vestiaris: \textit{IAquil} 1.687 = Schiess 1888: 201: 3,200ft\textsuperscript{2}; locus of cultures Fortis fortunae: \textit{IAquil} 1.684: 12,540ft\textsuperscript{2}; see also Buora 1995, 82; Hope 2001, 55–56; Liu 2009, 79 no. 98.
  \item \textsuperscript{47} \textit{CIL} XIV 1507 is a funerary inscription on behalf of a \textit{collega} C. Prastina Nereus. This may well be a reference to a burial by a \textit{collegium}, but a person of the same name is commemorated as spouse and patron in a different ep-
  \item \textsuperscript{48} Borg estimates the capacity at 150, based on two inhumations per \textit{forma} (2013, 23), but Baldassarre suggests five inhumations per \textit{forma}, which would produce a total capacity of almost 300, although she provides an estimate of 120 for the \textit{formae} alone (Baldassarre \textit{et al}. 1996, 128–134).
  \item \textsuperscript{49} Feraudi-Gruénais 2003.
\end{itemize}
deed the funerary monument of an association, but, in the absence of any direct parallels, this attribution must remain tentative.

In terms of its appearance, the monument fronts directly onto the street and its lockable door sits on the main axis, thus providing a view of the portico when open. The visual impression of the interior courtyard is characterized by two different “levels” of burials: the formae below the ground were probably barely visible or at least not easily distinguishable from each other. The arcosolia along the walls were “richly painted” and may have contained sarcophagi or pseudo-sarcophagi. In light of the generic nature of the subject matter (birds, landscapes, etc.), it is unlikely that the painted decoration made any biographical references to the buried individuals. The entire courtyard could be observed from any point inside it, and thus provided a “visual snapshot” of the entire burial community. The overwhelming visual impression is that of a largely homogeneous group, in which perhaps two subgroups are distinguished (aside from the separate back chamber that occupies a somewhat distinct position and the subsequently installed sunken chamber in the southern corner). It is difficult to draw any firm conclusions, but the overall visual impression equates well with that of a collegium with members of different status groups and a small leadership circle.

Other tombs at Isola Sacra are similar to Tomb 34, in terms of their setup and capacity. Thus, a similar setup characterizes the somewhat earlier “Harvest Tomb” (Fig. 9) that features two separate burial chambers; the first (i.e. older) was originally set up for mixed burial customs. The chambers are attached to a courtyard with further burials; here they are divided by burial custom (cremation on one side and inhumation on the other). Once again, the courtyard houses a portico with black-and-white mosaics showing harvest scenes. Tomb 43 has a smaller capacity, but features a pharos mosaic

50. Borg 2013, 23. Some of the arcosolia may have been closed off with marble slabs and stucco.
51. This observation is not meant to imply that there is a literal correspondence between the visual elaboration of a burial spot and the legal status of its occupant, which is rather unlikely (cf. Feraudi-Gruénais 2003). On a more general level, however, a hierarchical architectural space may indicate a hierarchical group.
and a sarcophagus of two potentially freed public slaves, both of which have been interpreted as signs of collective burial.\textsuperscript{52}

At Ostia, the most conclusive evidence for organized collective burial pertains to the first century CE. There is no evidence that collegia bought or erected collective tombs, but from Augustan times onwards enclosure tombs and columbarium tombs were owned by groups of liberti. This ownership model disappeared in the second century CE when temple tombs and columbarium tombs were exclusively in the hands of individuals and married couples. There is a corresponding change in the architectural design; Early Imperial tombs often feature installations for convivial gatherings and funerary rituals that are absent from second-century CE examples.\textsuperscript{53} The architectural design of collectively owned tombs is exemplified by columbaria E1, E3, and E4 in the Via Laurentina necropolis (Fig. 10), one of which was owned by an imperial libertus and his wife and another by an apparently unrelated group of people.\textsuperscript{54} All three follow the same general blueprint. There is a central barrel-vaulted main chamber with niches for cremation burials and a triclinium. The chamber is integrated into a courtyard with further burial niches and aediculae. The courtyard is accessed by a relatively small doorway and contains a stair-case that leads up to the roof of the chamber, which featured a terrace. A hearth was installed underneath the staircases and, outside, a walled-off section has been interpreted as a purpose-built ustrinum. Two of the complexes feature internal wells.

\textsuperscript{52} Borg 2013, 23. Further examples of a similar setup are Tomb 47, with a nymphaeum and probably a funerary temple, and Tomb E43, arranged around a courtyard with two central features.

\textsuperscript{53} Heinzelmann describes the trend from the earlier ownership model to the later one (2000, 60–61, 65–66, 80, 90–91). The ownership of tomb monuments by groups of related or unrelated freedmen is also attested in Rome (for example CIL VI 6150, 11034, 33289–91; cf. Schrumpf 2008, 211–215).

\textsuperscript{54} Several inscriptions from Tomb VL E1 demonstrate its association with the familia Caesars (Heinzelmann 2000, 264). The ownership structure of VL E4 is more complicated: it appears that two independent plots were united into one monument that was owned by several parties (Heinzelmann 2000, 269–270).
These monuments are self-contained building complexes that feature all the functional elements required to facilitate the entire burial process and commemorative gatherings. Such a tomb complex must have been an important site for the burial community, because its self-contained configuration suggests regular meetings with collective rituals that arguably strengthened the internal cohesion of the group. The imposing façades of these complexes display a public presence towards the outside. Although none of the examples fronts directly onto the Via Laurentina outside the city, the monumentality of the façades and the restricted access provide an exclusive visual impression. These tomb complexes date to the first century CE, but their architectural blueprint did not continue long: by the second century CE, newly constructed tombs no longer featured any of the installations and existing facilities were rendered obsolete by structural modifications. It is tempting, if ultimately not provable, to conclude that these changes in funerary architecture correspond to changes in ownership structure. In other words, at a time when conglomerates of freedmen collectively owned funerary monuments they were fitted with installations that facilitated collective activities by that group. By the second century CE, funerary monuments were largely in the hands of individuals and the burial community was thus probably more hierarchical. In such a burial community, collective rituals may either not have been as important to maintain the cohesion of the group or have been carried out largely at a different location, such as the urban residence of the household.

The evidence from Ostia and Isola Sacra does not permit the positive identification of the practice of organized collective burial beyond doubt. Nonetheless, given the capacities of the funerary monuments, their architectural arrangements and the hints from the epigraphic record, it is likely that these funerary complexes functioned as more than family tombs. It seems that they were used by wider groups, although these groups may have been organized quite informally and thus did not produce an epigraphic record of their activities. At any rate, these

---

cases are at the boundary of what I define above as organized collective burial, in the sense that the organization appears to have lacked a defined structure and set of principles.

Analysis
The situation at Ostia and Isola Sacra illustrates an underlying methodological challenge: the historical interpretation of the evidence for organized collective burial is hampered by the fact that the epigraphic and architectural evidence barely overlap. This makes it difficult to determine if and how collective identities were represented through funerary architecture. At Puteoli and Aquileia, where the identification of collective burial grounds is possible on the basis of the inscriptions erected by collegia, the visual nature of these areas is only partially known due to the lack of systematic excavations. At Isola Sacra and Ostia, architectural evidence is abundant, but it cannot be tied unequivocally to organized collective burial. This challenge prevents the formulation of a complete theory regarding organized collective burial in port cities. It is still possible, however, to offer the following observations.

The composition of burial communities appears to have followed a variety of models, from established organizations to more unofficial groups with a common tie but no formal structure. Collegia founded on a cultic and/or professional basis buried their members and celebrated their collective appellation in epigraphic records that were presumably visible to the wider public. At the same time, there is evidence that collegia did not replace family structures; at Aquileia, for example, the gens Kania undoubtedly played an important role among the foronienses aquatores. The same is true at Ostia, where family or household units are the focus of titulus inscriptions that define the ownership of presumed collective tombs. Furthermore, it is possible that groups of liberti pooled their resources in order to finance a tomb monument; this represents a more informal partnership for the sake of a common interest.56 However burial communities were defined, they tended to be hierarchical in nature. This hierarchy is reflected in the evidence in various ways. In inscriptions, the leadership circle appears prominently, defined by their official functions (such as dedicating an altar); regular members are relegated to undifferentiated lists of names, at best. In terms of the architectural layout, there are always different levels of emphasis; some burials are especially elaborate or isolated in separate spaces.57 It does not follow, however, that the visually emphasized burial plots were intended for those individuals who are celebrated in the inscriptions of the collegia.58 Nevertheless, the existence of these visual hierarchies demonstrates that communal burial did not necessarily entail the equality of all group members.

Where the physical appearance of the collective monuments can be reconstructed, it is clear that they tended to be substantial and representative in character. This is evident from the size of the burial plots, which exhibit a certain range but are nonetheless substantial. The defining capacity of a collective monument is more difficult to determine, because it constitutes a criterion to detect collective tombs when epigraphic information is absent and would present, therefore, a risk of circular argumentation. A general indication is provided by the collegium of Mars, which had at least 50 members, and the funerary complexes of Isola Sacra and Ostia, which could bury well over 100 individuals.59 Collective tombs also tend to occupy fairly prominent locations that are usually visible to the wider public: the complex on the Via Celle at Puteoli is arranged within a row of similarly substantial tombs immediately outside the city and the forma complexes at Isola Sacra apparently replaced earlier tombs in the first row, closest to the street. On the other hand, the funerary complexes at Ostia are somewhat removed from the street. Finally, there is ample evidence that collective burial grounds often included striking commemorative texts and objects, such as

56. See the references n. 53.
57. Similar visual hierarchies were also introduced into the funerary architecture of Rome, where elaborate central aediculae were distinguished from regular burial niches (Borbonus 2014, 98–104).
58. The lack of a direct link between “central burials” and any special status of the individuals buried in such locations has been demonstrated by Feraudi-Gruénais (2003).
59. These numbers are greater than the capacities of family-owned tombs in Isola Sacra, but still somewhat lower than the capacities of columbarium tombs in Rome (see n. 18).
altars, stelae, titulus inscriptions, and statuary. The monumentality of collective burial grounds and monuments indicates that membership of the burial community provided access to a level of privilege that was surely not within the reach of every resident of the ancient Italian port cities.

Thus, collective burial monuments were clearly monumental structures, but, otherwise, their architectural manifestation did not fundamentally deviate from that of family-owned tombs. Rather, they followed locally established typologies in most cases, such as the enclosed plots of Aquileia. The fact that they do not differ visibly from other monuments suggests that collective burial was a strategy employed in order to participate in an established funerary culture, rather than a rejection of this tradition. The only specific architectural configuration that can be associated with organized collective burial is the columbarium type, in which terracotta cinerary urns were immured in the walls and accessed through semicircular niches. This type originated in Rome, but it was adopted and adapted in some Italian port cities, such as Ostia, Puteoli, and Portus, as well as western Mediterranean ports, such as Patras, Corinth, Djerba, and Tarraco.60 The appearance of this archetype from the city of Rome in Italian and Mediterranean port cities surely testifies to the close connection between the ports and Rome, in terms of movement, migration, and social conditions. Likewise, the evidence for associations that buried their members extends to various provinces, especially those of the eastern Mediterranean where koina were active in various port cities.61 This affirms the pivotal role of port cities in processes of cultural transfer, and also indicates that they were not oriented towards maritime routes only, but were also integrated into land-based networks.

Aside from typology, a notable common feature is the presence of installations related to funerary rituals and convivial gatherings. The tabernae and cistern in the ager of the corpus Heliopolitanorum at Puteoli may be examples of this, but more definite evidence comes in the form of the ustrina, triclinia, hearths, wells, and solaria in the funerary complexes at Ostia and the aula, cistern, thermae, and possible dining rooms at the Via Celle complex at Puteoli.62 These installations furnished the physical framework for funerary banquets or similar gatherings that are also known from the charters of collegia. Arguably, such rituals affirmed the symbolic cohesion of the burial community through the interaction of group members. Their communal activities took place in a shared social space that was presumably not accessible to outsiders, since collective burial spaces were typically enclosed and lockable. The significance of communal activities and shared social space is difficult to recover, but it likely depended on the nature of the group. For professional groups or members of the same household or familia Caesaris, communal burial provided recurring opportunities to interact outside of other social situations. For groups that shared a tomb for purely pragmatic reasons, the community may not have been as tight, but there must have been regular encounters at the tomb site that at least put people of similar status groups in touch with each other.

Another way of developing interaction within burial communities was arguably their ability to shape membership and behaviour through collective action. Both aspects could be influenced by the permissions that were granted at the

60. Columbarium tombs in Patras resemble prototypes from Italy. This is perhaps due to the influx of colonists, legionaries, and veterans, who may have aligned the funerary landscape particularly closely with Italian, specifically Roman, prototypes. They may also have been responsible for the presence of Latin inscriptions, the practice of cremation and a prevalence of Iberi (Dekoulakou 2009). This situation is analogous with that in Corinth, where a chamber tomb with a biciptra may represent a “claim to Roman dining culture” (Slane 2012, 449) and three masonry tombs feature 11 cremation niches and one poros sarcophagus. The close connections between Corinthian and Italian tombs suggest that they were commissioned by “new arrivals from Italy” (Slane 2012, 455).

61. For example in Bithynia (Harland 2014, 55–61) and Lydia (Harland 2014, 193–196); see also van Nijf 1997, 38–55; Harland 2003, 84–86.

62. Triclinia and other installations are also attested epigraphically in Rome: for example CIL VI 10237, 10332.
collective discretion of the board of decuriones. Specifically, permissions could be given for non-members to be admitted to the shared burial space or for special objects to be set up. This is especially clear of the collegium of Mars in Aquileia; here, numerous individuals are named in association with a space allotted by the decuriones and an altar was dedicated with the explicit permission of the collegiatii. The granting of such permissions is an expression of collective agency, and eternalizing it epigraphically surely enhanced the formal authenticity of the burial community. The regulations denying burial or access to members who were behind with their dues or had acted against the association may, at first glance, seem to be the flipside of the same agency, i.e. to exclude members and, through the opposing processes of permission and exclusion, shape the membership of the community. However, they also add a different dimension: to establish a code of expected behaviour and thus influence the conduct of group members. Such regulations also established the minimum commitment to the burial community that was expected from each member. Such commitment clearly included a monetary element, since the failure to pay dues is mentioned among the reasons for the denial of benefits.

Conclusion

The presence of organized collective burial in Italian and other Mediterranean port cities indicates that it was an appealing communal ritual. However, it is also clear that the practice was not limited to ports, and perhaps existed in any highly connected city. Furthermore, the form that collective burial took was variable and this diversity appears to have been caused both by local architectural traditions and funerary customs, and by cultural transfer. In fact, one of the reasons that organized collective burial is difficult to document is that it often adopted the form of familial monuments and the demarcation between the two forms of organization is not clear-cut. This causes some difficulties of identification, but the similarity between collective and familial tombs may be significant. We could read this situation in one of two ways: it may indicate an "imitation" of tomb architecture that suggested "legitimate" family status, but it may equally signify that no significant distinction was made between these different forms of social organization.

Despite the fact that tomb architecture was often shaped by local traditions, there was a noticeable trend to adopt columbarium architecture from Rome in port cities, especially in Ostia, Portus, and Puteoli in Italy, and Patras, Corinth, Djerba, and Tarraco. This indicates that the funerary culture of these port cities was aligned closely with that of the Roman capital, even though the external trade connections of these cities produced substantial human movement and vast cultural throughput.

The alignment with the imperial center leads me to one last consideration, namely the orientation of port cities and their cemeteries more generally. In his analysis of urban planning in Mediterranean port cities, F. Pirson notes that they tended to have a twofold orientation: toward the sea and towards their hinterland. The urban architectural elements that were oriented towards the sea tend to be the port facilities themselves, along with urban defences, economic facilities, and public administrative buildings. Two of the cities he discusses, the Lycian ports of Patara and Phaselis, constitute examples of "sepulchral representation", since substantial tomb monuments faced the port basin directly. In the case of Patara, a port that "attained supra-regional significance" as a node in the military supply host meals (II, 8–10) and misbehaviour at meetings and meals (II, 23–28). Similar fines are set out in an inscription from Simitthus, to penalize the failure of officials to carry out their duties (CIL VIII 14683; cf. Schiess 1888, 84–85, 101; whether the entity in question here was actually a collegium has been questioned: Schmidt 1890, 599–611).

63. Another example is the collegium baulanorum at Puteoli, but the situation here is less explicit because one case involves the permission granted by an individual and the other the sale of a burial plot without the explicit mention of a permission.

64. In the case of the corpus Helisopolitanorum, it remains unclear what a potential breach of expected behaviour entailed, but an impression can be gleaned from the charter of the cultores Dianae et Antinoi (CIL XIV 2112), in which fines are imposed for the non-payment of membership dues for six months (column I, lines 22–23), committing suicide (II, 5–6), the failure of magistri to
chain, several temple tombs were distributed in isolated positions around the harbor basin. In Phaselis, a single temple tomb was located on a coastal road, but, instead of facing the road, it was oriented towards a bay that was used as a harbor. To these examples may be added a similar scenario at Ephesus, where the largest of the extra-urban cemeteries, consisting of uniform “burial houses” and “detached sarcophagi”, stretched out along both sides of the harbor canal during the second and third centuries CE. From these examples, it appears that, in Asia Minor, the seaward orientation of cemeteries was common.

Such a seaward orientation is less common in Roman Italy. All of the collective monuments I have mentioned in this chapter are situated towards the hinterland. This is, of course, not only a characteristic of collective monuments, but also of the larger cemeteries in which they are located. In fact, there are very few examples of tomb monuments that directly face the sea. Of these, the most famous is the Mausoleum of Munatius Plancus that sits on a promontory outside Gaeta and dramatically overlooks the Tyrhenian Sea. At Ostia, two monuments outside the Porta Marina were located between the city and the shore. One of these is the tomb of the duovir Poplicola, which includes a celebration of his naval accomplishments and thus a specific reference to a marine theme. This monument and another tomb nearby are not oriented towards the sea, but instead face the nearest street, which suggests that their visibility from the sea was not the only consideration in their placement. Similarly, the main street through the cemetery at Isola Sacra stretches along the coast, but all the tombs are oriented towards the street. The arrangement of the cemetery associated with the naval base of Classis near Ravenna is a little less clear: here the tombs stretch along the beach, but no published data or maps indicate their orientation.

It appears, therefore, that in the port cities of Roman Italy, tomb monuments and cemeteries were predominantly located on the land side and oriented towards the streets that connected these cities to their hinterlands. If funerary monuments are sites of social representation, they primarily targeted audiences that approached the port from the land as opposed to the sea. It may be that tradition dictated the location of tombs or that they were poorly suited for coastal monumentality. In other words, their predominant location on landward streets may not be indicative of the predominant orientation of port cities as a whole. However, if tomb monuments constitute our main evidence, as they do for the purpose of this book, they are likely to illustrate the inward dimension of port cities more than their outward dimension. Considered in this way, the alignment of collective tomb monuments in port cities with the columbarium architecture of Rome is perhaps not so surprising. Thus, tomb monuments are perhaps well suited to illustrate the interplay between the inward and outward orientations that port cities represent: the people who occupied and visited the tombs may have been from far-flung parts of the Empire or have regularly travelled the Mediterranean, but the visual appearance of the monuments was rooted in local architectural traditions or closely aligned with the imperial center in Rome.

67. Steskal (2017a and 2017b) provides brief overviews of the cemeteries and recent work undertaken to document the remains.
68. Fellmann 1957, 9–11; Morello 1997, 66–82; Watkins 1997, 158–160. However, the location of the mausoleum may be conditioned not only by the coastal setting but also by the mythological connotations of the Monte Or-lando (Gros 2006, 427).
70. The topography of the area has been treated most comprehensively by Maioli 1990, 375–414, esp. 390–412, figs. 1–2.
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