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ABSTRACT

From the first to the fifth centuries A.D., the inhabitants of many Roman North African towns went to a macellum to buy food for their dinner banquets. The typical macellum plan consists of an enclosed structure with a peristyle court lined with shops. The archaeological evidence suggests that the Roman North African macella were often bold and innovative variations from the Italian macella.

Since many of the Roman North African macella were excavated in the early 1900s, there have been relatively few recent publications and excavations undertaken on these significant buildings. One exception is C. De Ruyt’s book, Macellum. Marché alimentaire des Romains (1983). De Ruyt catalogued the remains of eighty-three macella found in Sicily, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Hungary, England, Spain and North Africa. Additionally, De Ruyt’s book includes a detailed study of the origins of the macellum type, information about the market’s urban and historical context, and evidence for the varieties of foods sold.

This thesis, using De Ruyt’s book as the starting point for research on the macellum, focuses specifically on
the Roman North African *macella*, since there are still problems to be resolved concerning these buildings. For example, was there a *macellum* which was essentially Roman North African in design? Did the market-type in North Africa simply imitate the plans of earlier Italian *macella*? What does the placement of the *macellum* within an urban setting tell us about its importance and function? What was the role of patrons in the construction and restoration of these markets?

The thesis on Roman North African *macella* is divided into four chapters: Chronology, Typology, Urban placement and Patronage (euergetism). Archaeological and epigraphical evidence is included for Roman North African *macella* not listed in De Ruyt’s catalogue.
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Nabers, Macella

INTRODUCTION

The macellum (market) was an integral part of daily life in Roman North Africa from the end of the first century B.C. to the mid-fifth century A.D. The macellum provided specialty foods for urban dwellers, located in towns along the Mediterranean coast or farther inland. Remains of macella throughout the Roman empire attest to the commercial and economic importance of these buildings in daily urban life.

The earliest examples of this building type are found in Morgantina, Sicily,¹ Pompeii,² and Alba Fucens.³ The numismatic evidence from the macellum at Morgantina and the use of opus incertum in the perimeter walls of the macellum at Pompeii and Alba Fucens date these three structures to the middle of the second century B.C. The macella at Morgantina

¹ For the macellum at Morgantina see R. Stillwell and E. Sjögqvist, "Excavations at Serra Orlando," AJA 61 (1957) 151-155; N. Nabers, Macella 116-153; De Ruyt, Macellum 109-114.

² For the Republican macellum at Pompeii see A. Maiuri, "Pompei. Saggi negli edifici del Foro, I. Macellum," NSc (1942) 253-266; E. La Rocca et al, Guida archeologica di Pompei (Verona 1976) 125-126; De Ruyt, Macellum 137-140.

rectangular, enclosed structure, a peristyle court lined with one or more rows of permanent shops, multiple entrances and hydraulic installations. Evidence such as measures, weights, fish-hooks, and animal bones also identify these structures as macella. The most dominant feature in the macella at Pompeii and Morgantina is the remains of a circular tholos, located within their interior courts. The tholos likely functioned as a monumental enclosure for a fountain.

However, not every Republican macellum shared identical architectural elements. For example, the earliest phase of the mid-second century B.C. macellum at Alba Fucens consists of a rectangular structure lined with shops. There is neither evidence for a tholos nor for interior porticoes. The absence of these features indicates that regional influences must also be taken into account.

C. De Ruyt's book, Macellum (1983), is a valuable starting point for research into the origins of the macellum. De Ruyt, using literary and etymological evidence, argues that the macellum originated as a specialty market in Rome, during the latter part of the third century B.C. De Ruyt's proposed third century B.C. date for the first macellum at Rome is

---

4 For the origins of the tholos in Greece see F. Robert, Thymélé (Paris 1929); F. Seiler, Die griechische Tholos. Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung, Typologie, und Funktion kunstmässiger Rundbauten (Mainz 1986).

5 De Ruyt, Macellum 26.
third century B.C. date for the first macellum at Rome is based on ancient literary testimonia from authors such as Livy and Plautus. Livy recorded that the macellum at Rome was reconstructed in 209 B.C., after a fire destroyed this building and the forum area. The reconstruction of this macellum implies that it was built at an earlier, although unknown date. The Comedies of Plautus, dating between 194-186 B.C., also provide evidence that a specialty market known as a macellum existed in Rome by this time. One of Plautus' characters alludes to the varieties of meat and fish sold in the Republican macellum - and to the fact that these foods were very costly items:

Venio ad macellum, rogito pisces; indicant/ caros; agnam caram, caram bubulam;/ vitulinam, cetum, porcinam: cara omnia.10

Ancient sources, such as Plautus, Livy and Varro,

---

6 De Ruyt, Macellum 236-252, provides a detailed chapter on the earliest literary evidence for a macellum in Republican Rome. De Ruyt, 158-159, postulates the location of this first macellum amongst a series of third century B.C. buildings, located near the street of the Carinae. However, the plan of this macellum is unknown until further excavations are undertaken.

7 Livy, 27, 11, 16: Locaverunt inde reficienda quae circa forum incendio consumpta erant septem tabernas, macellum, atrium regium.

8 Plaut., Aul. 264, 373; Pseud. 169; Rud. 979; Amph. 1012.

9 For the date of the Comedies of Plautus see F. Della Corte, Da Sarsina a Roma. Ricerche plautine (Florence 1967) 47-69.

10 Plaut., Aul. 373-375.
provide evidence for a number of other specialty markets in Republican Rome, for example the Forum Piscarium (fish), Forum Boarium (meat), Forum Holitorium (vegetables), Forum Cuppedinis (delicacies), and Forum Coquinum (poultry). These markets were apparently contemporary with the earliest macellum at Rome. The specific name of each market implies that each had a separate commercial function; whereas the literary evidence from Plautus suggests that the macellum, from its origin, combined the different functions of the other specialty markets into one specialty market. Although the names of the specialty markets lived on as the designations for certain areas of Rome’s urban centre, Varro implied that the macellum eventually absorbed these other markets into one location.12

De Ruyt13 argues that the name macellum was adopted into Latin from the Greco-Semitic makellon-mikla, meaning ‘enclosure’. The name macellum was used to define a new architectural form with a precise function. According to De Ruyt, the basic architectural macellum-type consists of an independent structure which occupies a quadrangular space

11 See De Ruyt, Macellum 239-246.

12 Varro, Ling. V.147: Haec omnia posteaquam contracta in unum locum quae ad victum pertinebant et aedificatus locus, appellatum macellum....

13 De Ruyt, Macellum 225-235.
limited by four walls surrounding a central open court.\textsuperscript{14} De Ruyt attributes the origin of this architectural type to the Hellenistic agora\textit{i} tetragonai found in the cities of Asia Minor, such as Priene, Ephesus, Miletus and Cos.\textsuperscript{15} The plans of these agora\textit{i} consist of a series of free-standing colonnades with shops surrounding a central court. De Ruyt also argues that the Romans adapted the idea of specialization of function from these commercial agora\textit{i},\textsuperscript{16} since epigraphical evidence from the agora\textit{i} at Cos and Priene suggests that they were specialized food markets: an agora sitop\textit{ó}lis (grain market) at Priene and an agora icthyo\textit{ó}lis (fish market) at Cos.\textsuperscript{17} For De Ruyt, the macellum was part of the urbanization process in Rome, which led to a specialization of function in specific areas.\textsuperscript{18} This specialization of function coincided with the forum becoming the political and religious centre of Rome.

De Ruyt alleges that the Republican macellum in Rome

\textsuperscript{14} De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 284.

\textsuperscript{15} De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 275-280.

\textsuperscript{16} De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 282.

\textsuperscript{17} For the inscription at Priene see F. Hiller von Gaertringen, \textit{Inschriften von Priene} (Berlin 1906) 72, no. 81; Cos: A. Maiuri, \textit{Nuova Silloghe epigrafica di Rodi e Cos} (Florence 1925) 147, no. 440.

\textsuperscript{18} De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 275-280, 282-283.
had a tholos - at least by the time of Varro (80-67 B.C.).\(^{19}\)
However, the diffusion of the tholos-type was not systematic for the tholos of each macellum varies greatly in size and decoration. The remains of a very elaborate tholos have been found in the macella at Pompeii (A.D. 62-79),\(^{20}\) Puteoli (Flavian),\(^{21}\) Rome (Macellum Magnum, Neronian),\(^{22}\) Perge, Pamphylia (second century A.D.),\(^{23}\) and Aezani, Phrygia (second century A.D.).\(^{24}\) An example of a smaller and more simply designed tholos is found in the macellum at Aquincum, Hungary (second century A.D.).\(^{25}\)

---


\(^{20}\) For the imperial macellum at Pompeii see A. Maiuri, *L'ultima fase edilizia di Pompei* (Spoleto 1942) 54-61; Nabers, *Macella* 154-179; De Ruyt, *Macellum* 141-149.


\(^{23}\) For the macellum at Perge see A.M. Mansel, "Bericht über Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen in Pamphylien," *AA* 90 (1975) 76-83; De Ruyt, *Macellum* 129-133.

\(^{24}\) For the macellum at Aezani see De Ruyt, *Macellum* 22-25.

\(^{25}\) For the macellum at Aquincum see De Ruyt, *Macellum* 37-42.
According to De Ruyt,26 the tholos was one of three possible elements found within the interior court of a *macellum*; it certainly was not found in every *macellum*. The other two elements are a fountain or statue. Thus the interior designs of *macella* without a tholos are often unique: the first century A.D. *macellum* at Baelo, Spain27 (oval court, no porticoes or tholos) and the second century A.D. *macella* in Herdonia (Apulia),28 and Alba Fucens (Samnium)29 (circular courts, no porticoes or tholos). Additionally, the interior courts of the *macella* at Ostia30 and Rome31 (*Macellum Liviae*) contain the remains of a rectangular fountain in place of a tholos. A statue likely adorned the centre court of the *macellum* at Baelo, Spain.32


29 For the imperial phase of the *macellum* at Alba Fucens see De Ruyt, *Macellum* 30-35.


31 For the *Macellum Liviae* see De Ruyt, *Macellum* 163-172.

32 Didierjean (supra n. 28) 49; De Ruyt, *Macellum* 46.
De Ruyt\textsuperscript{33} also summarizes the theory on the origin of the Roman \textit{macellum} of N. Nabers, \textit{Macella} (1967). Nabers\textsuperscript{34} argues that the \textit{macellum} was Punic in origin because the Latin word \textit{macellum} is, in his view, derived from the Semitic word \textit{mikla}, meaning 'enclosure'. Although there is no evidence to support Nabers' hypothesis, he argues that the Punic \textit{macellum} consisted of a simple, closed and inward-facing structure, with a \textit{tholos} in lieu of permanent shops. Nabers cites the \textit{macellum} at Lepcis Magna as an example of the Punic type, since the market had no permanent shops, and the patron, Annobal Tapapius Rufus was Punic. According to Nabers, the Punic-type \textit{macellum} (no shops and double \textit{tholoi}) was introduced to Italy by the Carthaginians, during the Punic Wars.\textsuperscript{35} This enclosed market type was supposedly first adopted by the Greeks in Magna Graecia, who then added the characteristic porticoes and shops of their \textit{agorai}.\textsuperscript{36} The peristyle enclosure \textit{macellum}-type with \textit{tholos} then spread from Magna Graecia to Rome and North Africa.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{33} De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 280-282.

\textsuperscript{34} Nabers, \textit{Macella} 65-76.

\textsuperscript{35} Nabers, \textit{Macella} 70-73.

\textsuperscript{36} Nabers, \textit{Macella} 75, 310, 348-349.

Support for the Punic origin of the macellum is found in two recent articles by M. Gaggiotti (1989). Gaggiotti suggests that the Latin word macellum is derived from the Semitic mà'kal, meaning "a place to eat." According to Gaggiotti, the origin of the Latin macellum does not refer to its typology (structural), but to its function - as a place where one conducted activities related to food. Gaggiotti also suggests that the octagonal form and mercantile function of the double tholoi in the macellum at Lepcis Magna were derived from simple, round huts, known from ancient literary sources as magalia/mapalia. These huts were inhabited by the nomadic population of the Punic hinterland, who also likely used them for purposes of trade.

Ward-Perkins (1970; 1985) argued that the tholos-type macellum originated in Magna Graecia and Campania, since the earliest evidence for this building type, which he called

---


39 Gaggiotti, "Macellum e magalia" (supra n. 38) 774.

40 Gaggiotti, "Considerazioni sulla <<punicità>> del macellum romano" (supra n. 38) 790-792. Gaggiotti's article is thought-provoking in its implications; however, archaeological evidence for the magalia/mapalia is necessary to validate his theory.
'Pompeian', is found at Morgantina and Pompeii. This 'Pompeian-type' macellum features a dominant tholos. According to Ward-Perkins, the 'Pompeian-type' macellum spread from Magna Graecia to Rome, North Africa and Asia Minor. R.J.A. Wilson (1990) concurs with Ward-Perkins' theory, although he suggests that more Hellenistic examples are needed to establish more precisely the origin of the macellum.

The scholars mentioned above appear to be most interested in the historical and typological origins of the macellum. Each of these modern scholars' theories on the historical origins of the macellum is important. However, each of these theories still raises unanswered problems. For example, there is no archaeological evidence to prove De Ruyt's hypothesis for the origin of the Republican macellum in Rome - only the ancient literary evidence. There is also no

---


42 Ward-Perkins, JRS 60 (1970) [supra n. 41] 16, did acknowledge that there were exceptions to the tholos-type, such as the macella with circular courts at Herdonia and Alba Fucens (second phase). He attributed these exceptions to local Republican precedent; however, his suggestion is contradicted by the earlier, Republican macellum at Alba Fucens, which has a square plan and does not have a tholos in its centre court, see De Ruyt, Macellum 26, fig. 9.

concrete archaeological evidence to prove Nabers' and
Gaggiotti's hypotheses that the macellum was Punic in origin.
Finally, there is no archaeological evidence to prove Ward-
Perkins' theory that the macellum originated in Magna Graecia,
since no macellum has been found in any of the Greek sites in
Magna Graecia.

This thesis will focus specifically on problems
related to the North African macella. The main questions are
the following: Is the tholos an essential feature in Roman
North African macella? Is there evidence for a macellum which
is truly Roman North African in design, or do these markets
simply imitate the Italian macellum plan? What does the
market's placement within the urban setting tell us about its
importance and function as a public building? What can be
inferred from the epigraphical evidence about the patrons who
financed and built these markets? When did the macellum
become obsolete in North Africa and what kinds of factors
affected its obsolescence?

This thesis contains four chapters and a catalogue of
twenty-one Roman North African macella. In addition to the
sixteen markets cited by De Ruyt, evidence is included for
five more Roman North African macella (Cyrene, Mactar,
Volubilis, Ammaedara and Thubursicus Numidarum).

The first chapter focuses on the chronology of the
Roman North African macella. Epigraphical evidence provides
fairly accurate dates for the construction and later phases of some markets. However, the chronology of other markets is more problematic, as their date of construction can only be surmised by means of analogies with other macella or by studying their urban placement in relation to other public structures with known dates.

The second chapter contains a typological analysis of the Roman North African macella. This chapter is divided into sections dealing with the basic elements of the fundamental macellum plan; the architectural similarities and variations of this basic macellum plan; and the anomalous macellum at Lepcis Magna, with its absence of shops and double tholoi.

The third chapter consists of the problems of the placement of the macellum within the urban plan of each Roman North African town. Since the market was usually located near the centre of town with easy access provided by major and minor roads, topography and the amount of available space for the market's construction near the forum played a big role in the market's placement. Other factors such as the development of a new quarter and specialty of function also determined the market's placement within an urban centre.

The fourth chapter explores the topic of patronage of Roman North African macella. Epigraphical evidence, cited in the first chapter, provides significant information about the civic and social status of these market benefactors.
Many Roman North African macella were excavated in the early twentieth century (1890s-1920s), so much of the significant research on these macella belongs to that period and, therefore, the archaeological evidence is limited. In addition to the recent research undertaken by De Ruyt, Nabers and Ward-Perkins, Jouffroy (1986) and Romanelli (1970) provide information about the remains and distribution of Roman North African macella. Also included is any new evidence about the other previously excavated macella catalogued by De Ruyt, such as those found in Thuburbo Maius (Alexander, 1980) and Hippo Regius (Corbier, 1981). Recent articles on urbanization, such as those of Février (1982), Duval (1982) and MacDonald (1986), and on

44 H. Jouffroy, La construction publique en Italie et dans l'Afrique romaine (Strasbourg 1986).

45 P. Romanelli, Topografia e Archeologia dell'Africa Romana (Enciclopedia Classica, 3.10, 7) (Torino 1970) 146-152.

46 Alexander, CMT II.1, 9-19.


euergetism, such as those of D'Escurac (1980),\textsuperscript{51} Fentress (1984)\textsuperscript{52} and Février (1989)\textsuperscript{53} are also significant to the study of Roman North African macella.

\begin{flushright}


\textsuperscript{52} E. Fentress, "Frontier Culture and Politics at Timgad," \textit{BAC N.S.} 17 (1984) 399-407.

\textsuperscript{53} P.A. Février, \textit{Approches du Maghreb romain} (Aix-en Provence 1989).
\end{flushright}
CHAPTER ONE:  CHRONOLOGY OF ROMAN NORTH AFRICAN MACELLA

This chapter discusses the chronology of the twenty-one Roman North African macella listed in the catalogue.¹ Twelve macella² yield sufficient archaeological or epigraphic evidence to provide a fairly accurate chronology of their date of dedication, as well as any later restorations. The chronology of three macella,³ can only be suggested from the insufficient archaeological evidence and/or publications. Six macella⁴ are identified by inscription alone; two of these six inscriptions are undated. These latter six macella are included, however, in order to provide as complete a coverage as possible of the Roman North African macella. The macella are arranged in chronological order, beginning with the earliest certain chronological evidence for a Roman North African macellum.

¹ See Catalogue: D and E for chronological and inscriptional evidence.


³ C. 4, C. 13, C. 21.

⁴ C. 10, C. 11, C. 16, C. 20 are dated; C. 8, C. 9 are undated.
1. **THE MACELLUM AT LEPCIS MAGNA** (C. 3, Fig. 3)

a. **Dedication Date (9/8 B.C.)**

The macellum in Lepcis Magna is the earliest known Roman North African macellum dated by inscriptional evidence. A large inscription⁵, once adorning the west facade, records that this macellum was dedicated to Augustus⁶ by Annobal Tapapius Rufus, a local magistrate, in 9/8 B.C.:


b. **Tiberian Restoration (A.D. 31-37) (?)**

Two fragmentary pieces of a monumental inscription were found reused in the stylobate of the trapezoidal room located outside the east perimeter wall of the macellum. This inscription, dedicated to Tiberius, can be dated between A.D.

---

⁵ IRT 319; This inscription was first published in R. Goodchild, "Two Monumental Inscriptions of Lepcis Magna," PBSR 18 (1950) 72-77. For Neo-Punic inscription see G. Levi Della Vida, "Due iscrizioni imperiali neo-puniche di Leptis Magna," AfrIt 6 (1935) 3-15.

⁶ The titles in the inscription indicate that the emperor is Augustus; for dating see IRT 319, n. 3: Augustus held trib. pot. for the 15th time from July 9 B.C. - 30 June 8 B.C.
Although these fragments do not record the particulars of this restoration or of its patron, Bandinelli inferred that the benefactor was the proconsul C. Vibius Marsus. He also suggested that the restoration, undertaken by Marsus, consisted of the construction of the first limestone porticoes in the market. 

According to De Ruyt, however, this inscription did not refer to the porticoes, since porticoes would have been a necessary component in this large macellum from the very first, in order to protect the perishable produce and shoppers from the hot sun. Thus the exact nature of the Tiberian restoration within the macellum remains unsolved at present.

---

7 IRT 332; For discussion of Tiberian date based on Tiberius' titles see N. DeGrassi, "Il mercato romano di Leptis Magna," QAL 2 (1951) 50.

8 R. Bianchi Bandinelli et al, The Buried City: Excavations at Leptis Magna (New York 1966) 78; Nabers, Macella 203, concurs. However, DeGrassi (supra n. 7) 50, only suggests that the inscription refers to the construction of the porticoes. See also Chapter Two, n. 139. For C. Vibius Marsus see IRT 308. Marsus was proconsul of Africa Proconsularis in A.D. 27-30, see PIR 3 (1898) no. 388.

9 De Ruyt, Macellum 105.
c. Mid-First Century A.D. Restoration

During the mid-first century A.D., stone tables were installed between the intercolumniations of the outer octagonal portico of the north tholos.\(^\text{10}\) A dedicatory inscription\(^\text{11}\) is carved on the face of each table with the name of the two aediles, Tiberius Claudius Amicus and Marcus Heliodorius Apollonides. These aediles financed the tables at their own expense:

\[ \text{Ti. Cl. Amicus M. Heliodorius Apollonides aed. mensas p. s. d. d.} \]

\(\quad\)

\(\text{d. Flavian or Trajanic Restoration (?)}\)

Squarciapino and Bandinelli allege that the north tholos was reconstructed in limestone during the Flavian or Trajanic period because the columns and capitals exhibit a sense of delicacy and spaciousness noted in other Flavian or Trajanic buildings at Lepcis Magna. The use of limestone for its construction is typical of other first century A.D.

\(^{10}\) Bandinelli (supra n. 8) 79.

\(^{11}\) IRT 590. The inscription is datable by the use of irregular first century A.D. letter capitals, see IRT p. 156. The name Tiberius Claudius Amicus itself is a chronological pointer, suggesting a date of the mid-first century A.D. or later. Additionally, the abbreviated nomen (Cl.) also likely indicates a later first century date or later, see E.W. Haley, Migration and Economy in Roman Imperial Spain (Barcelona 1991) 125.
buildings in Lepcis Magna. Haynes, however, suggested that both the north and south tholoi were originally constructed in limestone. In fact, the earliest attested use of limestone from the local quarries on Ras-el-Humma in this macellum are the two blocks of the Neo-Punic dedicatory inscription (9/8 B.C.) from the south tholos.

e. Severan Restoration

During the Severan period, the macellum was lavishly restored in marble. The restoration of the macellum was part of an extensive Severan building program in Lepcis, the emperor's native town. This program included a new forum, basilica and triumphal arch. The south tholos was restored in imported marbles likely at the same time as the principal entrance of the market was moved from the west to the south-

---

12 M. Squarciapino, *Leptis Magna* (Basel 1966) 73; Bandinelli (supra n. 8) 78. The Arch of Trajan at Lepcis appears to exhibit this sense of spaciousness and delicacy noted by the authors of the north tholos, see pl. 12 in D.E.L. Haynes, *The Antiquities of Tripolitania* 2nd ed. (London 1959). For other first century A.D. limestone structures at Lepcis see Chapter Three, 117-118.

13 Haynes (supra n. 12) 91.


east side.\textsuperscript{16} Imported marbles were also used for the interior porticoes.\textsuperscript{17}

\textbf{f. Fourth Century A.D. Restoration (A.D. 324-326)}

A large fragmentary inscription,\textsuperscript{18} found in the market's ruins, records the restoration of the porticoes between A.D. 324-326 by Laenatius Romulus,\textsuperscript{19} governor of Tripolitania:

\begin{quote}
Quod inter cetera Lepcimagnensium moenia quae cum sui magnitudine et splendore concordant etiam porticum macelli in ruinam \{la\}bemque conversam remanere nudam ult[\ldots c. 15\ldots]eneret quod esset in usi ac f[\ldots c. 20\ldots] hort[\ldots a]nte clementia \ldots dddd. n]NNN\textsuperscript{20} F[1.]
\text{CONS[t]ANTINI MAX [vict. semp. aug. et Fl. Iul. Cri]SPI}
\end{quote}

\begin{itemize}
\item [\textsuperscript{16}] Haynes (supra n. 12) 91. See Chapter Two, 96-97 for south tholos.
\item [\textsuperscript{17}] See Chapter Two, 94; Bandinelli (supra n. 8) 78.
\item [\textsuperscript{19}] For Laenatius Romulus see Chastagnol (supra n. 18) 539-552.
\item [\textsuperscript{20}] For discussion of date see \textit{IRT} 468 n. 1: [DDDD] NNNN or [DDDDD N]NNNN indicates that the inscription was likely inscribed between A.D. 317-323, when there were two Augusti and three Caesars. Chastagnol (supra n. 18) 541-552, suggests that this \textit{macellum} inscription should be dated between 8 November, 324 (elevation of Constans II to Caesar) and the spring of 326 (death of Crispus). He bases this date on Constantine's title \textit{Victor} in an inscription from the \textit{Forum Vetus} at Lepcis Magna (\textit{IRT} 467 = \textit{AE} 1948, 37). This title implies Constantine's victory over Licinius, which took place at the end of September 324. Therefore, Chastagnol proposes that the names of Licinius senior and junior (as suggested by \textit{IRT} editors) should be omitted from the \textit{macellum} inscription and be replaced with Constans II.
\end{itemize}
De Ruyt suggests that the inscription, recording Laenatius' construction of a portico, may be referring to the double portico on the west side, or to the reconstruction of the portico on the south side, with its extra wide intercolumniations.\(^2\)

**g. Final Phase (beginning fifth century A.D.) (?)**

Four coin hoards, with coins dating from Constans (A.D. 337-350) to Honorius (A.D. 393-423) and Arcadius (A.D. 395-408), were found buried in the market.\(^2\) The evidence of the coins of Arcadius and Honorius suggests that these hoards were buried in the first half of the fifth century A.D., when the walls had not yet collapsed, but the market was no longer in use.\(^3\) Goodchild proposed that the inhabitants of the huts built over the north tholos were responsible for hiding these

---

\(^1\) De Ruyt, *Macellum* 106; See Chapter Two, 93. Bandinelli (supra n. 8) 79, suggested that this inscription refers to the double colonnade on the east side, in front of the trapezoidal room.


\(^3\) Goodchild (supra n. 22) 115.
coin hoards in the market.\textsuperscript{24}

2. The \textit{Macellum} at Volubilis (c. 21)

\textbf{Dedication Date} (end first century B.C./beginning first century A.D.) (?)

The dedication date of the \textit{macellum} at Volubilis is problematic since there are neither inscriptions nor detailed excavation reports for analysis. Euzennat suggests that the \textit{macellum} antedates the \textit{Forum Novum}, since the plan of the \textit{Forum Novum} took into account the pre-existing \textit{macellum} to the south.\textsuperscript{25} The \textit{Forum Novum} was constructed when Volubilis became a \textit{municipium}\textsuperscript{26} during the reign of Claudius. A pre-Claudian date for the \textit{macellum} is also suggested by the 'pseudo-cyclopean' construction technique used in the foundation wall.\textsuperscript{27}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{24} Goodchild (supra n. 22) 116.
\item \textsuperscript{25} M. Euzennat et G. Hallier, "Les forums de Tingitane. Observations sur l'influence de l'architecture militaire sur les constructions civiles de l'occident romain," \textit{AntAfr} 22 (1986) 82, n. 37, 85. Euzennat previously wrote that the \textit{macellum} was datable to the Severan period, see M. Euzennat, "L'archéologie marocaine 1955 à 1957," \textit{BAMaroc} (1957) 208.
\item \textsuperscript{26} J. Gascou, \textit{La politique municipale de l'empire romain en afrique proconsulaire de Trajan à Septime-Sévère} (Rome 1972) 27, 45.
\item \textsuperscript{27} The foundation wall consists of large, roughly cut polygonal blocks with the spaces filled by smaller, irregular-shaped stones. Other examples of polygonal masonry at Volubilis datable to the
\end{itemize}
3. THE MARKET AT CYRENE (C. 1, Fig. 1)

a. Dedication Date (Augustan or Julio-Claudian) (?)

Determining the dedication date of the market at Cyrene is also problematic. The earliest possible dates for the construction of this market are Augustan or Julio-Claudian. A date before the reign of Augustus is unlikely because of local unrest. The market could be contemporary with or slightly later in date than the Augustan period forum at Cyrene. The market is likely contemporary with the establishment of a new urban sector aligned with Valley Street. This market replaced earlier structures which followed a different alignment conforming to the east-west contours of the south hill.

First century B.C. are noted by A. Jodin, Volubilis Regia Ivbae (Paris 1987) 75, 115, in the west wall of insula 32 (North quarter) and part of the perimeter wall of insula 8. A possible Iberian influence for this construction technique was suggested to me by Dr. E. Haley.


30 Ward-Perkins and Gibson (supra n. 28) 334-335, 353-354; J. B. Ward-Perkins and S. Gibson, "The 'Market Theatre' Complex and Associated structures, Cyrene" LibSt 18 (1987) 71: The authors also suggest that the use of limestone for the market’s pavements and porticoes antedates the first attested use of marble in secular architecture at Cyrene in the Hadrianic restoration of the Trajanic baths in the sanctuary of Apollo. However, this argument is not valid since it implies that limestone would no longer be used for
b. Severan Restoration (A.D. 195)

An inscription from the frieze of the monumental Severan propylon, located north-east of the market proper, is dated to A.D. 195. This inscription does not mention the market, but refers to a statue of Septimius Severus in his chariot; this statue once adorned the top of the propylon. The marble portico adjoining the Severan propylon and the restoration of the market’s porticoes and pavements in exotic marbles are also attributed to the same building program in the Severan period. Additionally, the lower stretch of Valley Street was also likely monumentalized during this time. 32

c. Final Phase (A.D. 365)

The market in Cyrene was destroyed by the earthquake of A.D. 365. In the third quarter of the fourth century A.D., a theatre was constructed over the south half of this market. The cavea of the theatre utilized the natural concavity of the south hill. The market’s south wall formerly abutted against secular buildings once marble was introduced.

31 For inscription and discussion of date based on Severus’ titles see J.M. Reynolds, "Inscriptions in the Market Theatre and its Immediate Neighbourhood," LibAnt 14 (1977) 375. See also Chapter Two, 58.

32 Ward-Perkins and Gibson (supra n. 28) 336; Ward-Perkins and Gibson (supra n. 30) 52-54, 70. See also Chapter Three, 115.
this south hill. The north half of the market was dismantled and a series of east-west walls were built over this section. The southern pair of walls constituted a rectangular stage building; the northern pair constituted an unknown structure.\textsuperscript{33}

4. THE MACELLUM AT THUGGA (C. 14, Fig. 8)

a. Dedication Date (A.D. 54)

An inscription,\textsuperscript{34} found re-used in a conduit nearby the macellum, records the dedication of this structure by M. Licinius Rufus, a patronus pagi et civitatis, in A.D. 54:


\textsuperscript{33} Ward-Perkins and Gibson (supra n. 28) 349-350; Ward-Perkins and Gibson (supra n. 30) 64.

\textsuperscript{34} L. Poinssot, "Les fouilles de Dougga en 1919 et le quartier du forum," \textit{NouvArch} 22 (1919) 157, no.9 = \textit{AE} 1922, 109; \textit{ILAfR} 1923, no. 559; De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 217.

\textsuperscript{35} The name and titles of M. Licinius Rufus are inscribed on several contemporary inscriptions which identify him as the patron of the market. This identification also indicates that the emperor referred to in the first two lines is Claudius. Claudius was one of the four emperors in the first two centuries who held \textit{trib. pot.} fourteen times. Thus this inscription can be dated between 25 January - 13 October A.D. 54, see C. Poinssot, "M. Licinius Rufus, Patronus Pagi et Civitatis Thuggensis," \textit{BAC} N.S. 5 (1970) 223; Poinssot (supra n. 34) 158, also attributed the inscription to the reign of Claudius on the basis of parallel contemporary inscriptions, which have similar engraving techniques and composition.

b. Restoration (A.D. 180-192)

An inscription,\textsuperscript{36} found re-used in the Byzantine fort, records the dedication of a portico in the macellum by local magistrates, Q. Pacuvius Saturus and his wife, Nehania Victoria, during the reign of Commodus:


The various titles of Commodus suggest that this restoration inscription dates between A.D. 180-192.\textsuperscript{37} The dedication of the market’s portico is also recorded on the dedicatory inscription of the Temple of Mercury at Thugga. The Temple of Mercury was also built by the Pacuvii.\textsuperscript{38} The restoration inscription from the market also mentions the construction of

\textsuperscript{36} L. Poinssot, "Inscriptions de Thugga découvertes en 1910-1913," \textit{NouvArch} 21 (1916) 93, no. 47; Poinssot (supra n. 34) 160; \textit{CIL} 8 26530, 26533; De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 218.

\textsuperscript{37} R. Cagnat, \textit{Cours d'épigraphie latine} (Paris 1914) 203-204.

\textsuperscript{38} For inscription see Poinssot (supra n. 36) 22, no. 14. Inscriptions from both structures were likely made in the same workshop, see Poinssot (supra n. 36) 92. See also Chapter Four, 131-132.
an unknown part of the macellum: [et...]um macelli. De Ruyt suggests that this word refers to a sacellum. A plausible candidate for this structure is the apse on the south side of the market, which contained a statue of the genius macelli.

c. Final Phase (sixth century A.D.)

The macellum in Thugga was destroyed and re-used for the construction of the Byzantine fort during the sixth century A.D.

5. THE MACELLUM AT HIPPO REGIUS (C. 6, Fig. 6)

a. Dedication Date (first/second century A.D.) (?)

The dedication of the macellum at Hippo Regius can not be precisely dated. A fragment of an inscription, found in the market's ruins, is dedicated to Claudius or a later

39 De Ruyt, Macellum 218. See also Poinssot (supra n. 34) 161, who suggested porticum [et arc]um macelli for the lacuna; however, there is no evidence of an arch to support this proposed restoration.

40 See Chapter Two, 80.

41 Poinssot (supra n. 34) 197.

42 J. Lassus, "Le marché d'Hippone," Libyca 6 (1958) 246. Lassus suggested that the inscription likely refers to the titles of Claudius: Tiberius Claudius Caesar Germanicus, but that it may be later, as the first two lines are apparent indications of an imperial genealogy. Thus this inscription could also refer to Nero's titles after adoption: Tiberius Claudius Drusus Germanicus Caesar.
emperor. However, this inscription provides inconclusive evidence for a first century A.D. date of construction, since there is no reference to the building which was dedicated:

...Di.../ ...Augu.../ ...Ti Claudi...

In fact, this inscription could be referring to the dedication of an entirely different building.\textsuperscript{43} Since the \textit{macellum} has the same alignment as the forum, it is perhaps contemporary with the replanning of the forum in A.D. 77-78.\textsuperscript{44} The \textit{macellum} could also have been constructed when the streets were paved and the sewers were installed in the second century A.D.\textsuperscript{45}

\textbf{b. Fourth Century A.D. Restoration (A.D. 364-367)}

Two fragments of an inscription, found near the southwest angle of the facade, allude to a later restoration of the \textit{macellum} at Hippo Regius. The first fragment\textsuperscript{46} refers to a

\textsuperscript{43} De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 94.

\textsuperscript{44} De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 94.

\textsuperscript{45} J.B. Morel, "Recherches stratigraphiques à Hippone," \textit{BAAlg} 3 (1968) 76; De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 94. Lassus also suggested a second century A.D. date for the \textit{macellum} as part of the new urbanized layout because the neighbouring streets and buildings exhibited features of earlier irregular planning, see J. Lassus, "Hippo Regius, Hippone," \textit{PA} 13 (1958) <1960> no. 4426.

\textsuperscript{46} P. Corbier, \textit{ZPE} 43 (1981) 89 = \textit{AR} 1982, 943. For a date of February 1 364 - August 24 367 see Lassus (supra n. 42) 246, following E. Marec.
restoration during the reigns of Valentinian and Valens (A.D. 364-367):

Beatissimo s(a)eculo dd. nn. Valentiniani et V[alentis] / invictiss(i)morum clementissimorumque principum / [---]polleni atq(ue) praeclera sunt macelli ma/[rmora --- te]riem longa incuria ac discissione [---/---]am non[---/---]iam reip(ublicae) [--- /---]o procons[--- / ---]nusta[---].

The second fragment,\(^47\) records the great age of the market:

...iae vetus[tatis].../ ...[m]acelli totiu[s...  

These fragments likely refer to the addition of the East Court, and the movement of the market's principal entrance to the north-east side of this court.\(^48\) De Ruyt \(^49\) also notes that the geometric mosaic pavement of the East Court, decorated with meanders and swastikas, confirms this fourth century A.D. date.

\(^47\) Lassus (supra n. 42) 246.

\(^48\) De Ruyt, Macellum 94. See also Chapter Two, 54.

\(^49\) De Ruyt, Macellum 94. I have not found a depiction of the mosaic from the market at Hippo Regius to confirm this dating. Two mosaic pavements from the macellum at Thuburbo Maius have swastika and meander patterns; one is datable to the beginning of the third century A.D., while the other is late fifth/early sixth century A.D.: see infra, 37. From the description of the mosaic in the East Court, the overall pattern of swastikas and meanders is a typical example of fourth century A.D. mosaics in which the "patterns are distributed over the floor in symmetrical and schematic arrangement": K.M.D. Dunbabin, The Mosaics of Roman North Africa (Oxford 1978) 34.
c. Final Phase (fifth century A.D.)

The *macellum* at Hippo Regius was destroyed after the Vandals invaded in the fifth century A.D. After this invasion, the site of the market was used for a cemetery and the walls of the market were utilized like a quarry.\(^\text{50}\)

6. THE MARKET OF COSINIUS AT CUICUL (C. 15, Fig. 9)

a. Dedication Date (A.D. 138-161)

Two inscriptions record the dedication of the *macellum* in Cuicul by L. Cosinius Primus, a magistrate, during the reign of Antoninus Pius\(^\text{51}\):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{L. [Cosinus]ius L. f. Arn. Primus aed. q. II vir quinq.}\hspace{1cm} \\
\text{(pon)\textit{t}. f\{l. p.p. macellum cum columnis et statuis et}}\hspace{1cm} \\
\text{ponderario et thol[ol] quod pro honore fl. pp. e[x] HS XXX}\hspace{1cm} \\
\text{m. n. taxaverat multiplicita p[ecunia]ia a fundamentis fecit}}\hspace{1cm} \\
\text{idemq. dedica[vit curante C. Cosinio Majximo fratr[e].}\hspace{1cm} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ob honorem fl. p[p.]} / [HS XXX m. n. m]acellu[m] a}\hspace{1cm} \\
\text{f[un]d[amentis] / [multiplic]ata pecunia fecit [idem] /}\hspace{1cm} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{50}\) Lassus (supra n. 42) 246-247; J. Lassus, "L'archéologie algérienne en 1958. Hippone (Hippo Regius)," *Libyca* 7 (1959) 316; De Ruyt, *Macellum* 94.

\(^{51}\) The dates of these two dedicatory inscriptions are based on another inscription which refers to a more complete list of Cosinius' titles and can be dated between A.D. 138-161, see R. Cagnat, "Le marché de Cosiniius à Djémila," *CRAI* (1915) 318-319, no. 3.

[q. dedicavit curante C. Cosin[io]/ Maximo f[r]atre.]

The construction of the macellum commemorated Cosinius' election to the flaminatus. The inscription also records Cosinius' brother, C. Cosinius Maximus\(^5^4\) as the overseer of the market's construction. The Market of Cosinius at Cuicul was likely dedicated after the construction of the curia and capitolium. These latter two structures are also datable to the Antonine period.\(^5^5\)

**b. Final Phase (sixth century A.D.) (?)**

The market was not likely in use when the Byzantine occupation of the city was limited to a wall around the newer south quarter. This wall excluded the old forum and market from the Byzantine town.\(^5^6\)

**7. THE MACELLUM AT GIGTHIS (C. 2, Fig. 2)**

---

\(^{53}\) Cagnat (supra n. 51) 320, no. 4; Ballu (supra n. 52) 222; AE 1914, 42; De Ruyt, Macellum 67.

\(^{54}\) Another inscription referring to L. Cosinius Maximus is dated by Cagnat (supra n. 51) 316-317, no. 1, to the end of the second century/beginning of the third century A.D. on the basis of its lettering.

\(^{55}\) Y. Allais, Djémila (Paris 1938) 15, 35-36; De Ruyt, Macellum 67.

\(^{56}\) Allais (supra n. 55) 31-32.
a. Dedication Date (second half of second century A.D.) (?)

The exact dedication date of the *macellum* at Gigthis is unknown. Constans, the excavator, proposed a date sometime during the second half of the second century A.D.\(^7\) Since the *macellum* has the same alignment as the forum, it was likely constructed after the Hadrianic forum was completed.\(^8\)

b. Third Century A.D. Restoration

A later restoration of the *macellum* at Gigthis radically altered the original plan. A large hemicycle with shops was added, and the portico was now horseshoe-shaped, following the curve of the hemicycle.\(^9\) The exact date of this restoration is uncertain. Constans, having noticed similarities in the plans of the markets at Gigthis and Thamugadi, proposed a restoration date after the first quarter of the third century A.D.\(^6\) De Ruyt also concurs with Constans' third century A.D. restoration date.\(^6\)


\(^{58}\) De Ruyt, *Macellum* 79; See also Chapter Two, 85.

\(^{59}\) See Chapter Two, 81-85.

\(^{60}\) Constans (supra n. 57) 91. See also R. Cagnat, "Gigthis," *BAC* (1902) 188; R. Cagnat, "La ville antique de Gigthis, en Tunisie," *JSav* 15 (1917) 298-299.

c. Final Phase (fifth century A.D.)

An inscription,62 engraved on a statue base in the vestibule, indicates that the market was still in use during the late fourth century A.D.:


This statue was dedicated to T. Archontius Nilus, a local patron and governor of Tripolitania. Gigthis was temporarily abandoned after the Vandals invaded Tripolitania in A.D. 430. During the Byzantine period, the capitals and columns from the macellum were re-used for several houses along the road leading to the sea.63

8. THE MACELLUM AT THIBILIS (C. 19, Fig. 12)

Dedication Date (second century A.D.) (?)

The exact dedication date of the macellum at Thibilis is unknown. An inscription,64 inscribed on a statue base,

62 CIL 8 11031; De Ruyt, Macellum 79. For discussion of the inscription's date see Constans (supra n. 57) 21, n. 2.

63 Constans (supra n. 57) 22, 91.

64 A. Ballu, "Announa," BAC (1909) 78; ILAlg II, no. 4641; De Ruyt, Macellum 206.
records a dedication to Mercury by M. Livius Felix, a local magistrate, during the second century A.D.:


Presumably this inscription does not date the whole market; it only indicates that the market was in use during the second century A.D.

9. THE MACELLUM AT AMMAEDARA (C. 4, Fig. 4)

Dedication Date (late second century A.D.) (?)

There is no archaeological evidence from the partially excavated macellum in Ammaedara to indicate a chronology for this structure. Perhaps the market was constructed in the late second century A.D. as part of an urban renewal of this town, for a dedication to Marcus Aurelius records the construction of a platea nova.

---

65 M. Livius Felix is known from two other funerary inscriptions, which Ballu (supra n. 64) 78, dated to the second century A.D.

66 The court of the market was excavated in the 1930s, but the material is unpublished, see A. Ennabli, "Ammaedara," PECS (Princeton 1976) 50. See also F. Baratte et N. Duval, Haidra, Les ruines d'Ammaedara (Tunis 1974) 46; N. Duval, "Topographie et urbanisme d'Ammaedara (actuellement Haidra, Tunisie)," ANRW II.10.2 (1982) 646, 664, n. 37, 665, n. 65.

67 CIL 8 11529: [pla]teae novae [de]rectae a porta milit[ari]; Duval (supra n. 66) 646, n. 39.
10. THE MACELLUM AT BULLA REGIA (C. 5, Fig. 5)

Dedication Date (late second/early third century A.D.)

The exact date of the dedication of the macellum at Bulla Regia is unknown. Unpublished inscriptions,\(^{68}\) found in the market’s ruins, mention the Aradii, a prominent family of senators and consuls in the third and fourth centuries A.D. It is, therefore, quite possible that the macellum was financed and constructed by this family. The macellum was also likely constructed after the Hadrianic forum was completed.\(^{69}\)

11. THE MACELLUM AT THUBURBO MAIUS (C. 12, Fig. 7)

a. Dedication Date (A.D. 168-211)

The exact dates for the construction of the macellum (Court A) at Thuburbo Maius and the two adjoining peristyle

---

\(^{68}\) A. Beschouh, et al, *Les ruines de Bulla Regia* (Rome 1977) 89. The inscriptions mention L. Aradius Roscius Rufinus [----, Q. Aradius Rufinus Optatus Aelianus and Ti. Aradius---, see Y. Thébert, "La romanisation d’une cité indigène d’Afrique: Bulla Regia," *MEFRA* 85.1 (1973) 290, n. 2. L. Aradius Roscius Rufinus is probably the same as L. Aradius Roscius Rufinus Tiberianus in A. Pelletier, "Les sénateurs d’afrique proconsulaire d’Auguste à Gallien," *Latomus* 23 (1964) 512, n. 10. This latter inscription is datable to the first half of the third century or later. For more about the Aradii see Chapter Four, 134-136.

\(^{69}\) P. Quoniam, "Fouilles récentes à Bulla Regia (Tunisie)," *CRAI* (1952) 467, n. 3.
courts (Courts B and C) are uncertain. Since the macellum was connected to the south-east corner of the forum, it was likely constructed after the forum and capitolium were completed by A.D. 168.\textsuperscript{70} A mosaic pavement, found in a shop in Court A, confirms that this construction occurred sometime during the second half of the second century A.D.\textsuperscript{71}

The editors of the Corpus des mosaïques de Tunisie propose that the two adjoining peristyle courts (Courts B and C) were constructed consecutively after the macellum between A.D. 168-211.\textsuperscript{72} The three structures of the market complex were, therefore, completed in time for the dedication of the Temple of Mercury in A.D. 211. This temple consecrated the commercial sector of the town.\textsuperscript{73} The dates of the mosaic pavements from Courts B and C confirm this proposed chronology

\textsuperscript{70} The forum was completed during the reign of Antoninus Pius, see A. Lézine, Thuburbo Maius (Tunis 1968) 10,16. For the dedication of the capitolium by A.D. 168, during the reigns of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus see A. Merlin, Le forum de Thuburbo Maius (Tunis-Paris 1922) 11-12; Merlin, 50, suggested that the rectangular plan of the macellum was similar to other second century A.D. macella with rectangular plans; De Ruyt, Macellum 212.

\textsuperscript{71} Merlin (supra n. 70) 49; for parallel contemporary mosaics with identical treatment and composition in Thuburbo Maius, see Alexander, CMT II.1, 13-14; nos. 24A, 51A, 72, 90, 106A.

\textsuperscript{72} Alexander, CMT II.1, 2-3. De Ruyt suggests only that the two peristyle courts were constructed at a later, unknown date, see De Ruyt, Macellum 212.

\textsuperscript{73} Alexander, CMT II.1, 3.
between A.D. 168-211.\textsuperscript{74}

b. Late Fifth/Early Sixth Century A.D. Restoration

The rectangular annexe located south of Court C was reconstructed into an apsidal-shaped structure with a new mosaic pavement. A number of coins from the Vandal period, found in the ruins of this apse, provide a \textit{terminus post quem} of A.D. 428-484 for this mosaic.\textsuperscript{75} However, this reconstruction in no way suggests that the market (Court A) was still in use at this time.

12. THE MARKET OF SERTIUS AT THAMUGADI (C. 18, Fig. 9)

a. Dedication Date (first quarter of the third century A.D.)

Three inscriptions, found in the market's ruins, record the construction of a \textit{macellum} in Thamugadi during the first quarter of the third century A.D. This market was dedicated by M. Plotius Faustus Sertius, a Roman knight, and his wife, Sertia Cornelia Valentina Tucciana to their hometown:

\textsuperscript{74} For contemporary parallel mosaics to the mosaic pavements found in the court and annexe (Room 6) of Court C, see Alexander, \textit{CMT II}, 16-17; 7-8, nos. 3-4. The mosaic pavement from Court B also dates to the beginning of the third century A.D., see Merlin (supra n. 70) 50-51. However, the only parallel mosaic, with identical composition, but different treatment, is from the apsidal room in Court C, which dates to the end of the fifth/beginning sixth century A.D., see Alexander, \textit{CMT II.1}, 19.

\textsuperscript{75} Alexander, \textit{CMT II.1}, 15-16, 19. See also Chapter Two, 91.
M. Plotius Faustus eq. r. a militiis III, fl. pp. / sacerdos ur/bis, ad exor/nationem operis macelli/ quod cum Varentina con/iuge patri/ae suae fecit/ sibi posuit.  

Corneliae/ Valentinae/ Tuccianae/ fl. pp. bonae/ memoriae/ feminae ad/ exornatio/nem operis/ macelli quod/ patriae su/ae fecerunt/ Faustus mari/tus posuit.  

Sertii/ macellum/ et aream/ eius/ patriae/ suae/ fecerunt.

The early third century A.D. date for these inscriptions is indicated both by the omission in the first inscription of the tribal designation, and by the lack of imperial epithets in any of the military units. Additionally, Lassus, noting the similarity in style between the decorative consoles which once supported the hemicycle's roof and the consoles from the so-called Arch of Trajan in Thamugadi, suggested a third century A.D. date for their use.

---

76 Boeswillwald, Timgad 187; CIL 8 2399 = ILS 2753; De Ruyt, Macellum 198. For a more complete record of Sertius' titles, see Boeswillwald, Timgad 185; CIL 8 2395.

77 Boeswillwald, Timgad 186; CIL 8 2398; De Ruyt, Macellum 198.

78 Boeswillwald, Timgad 209; ILS 5579.

79 Boeswillwald, Timgad 188-189; De Ruyt, Macellum 198.

80 J. Lassus, Visite à Timgad (Alger 1969) 61-62; J. Lassus, "Une opération immobilière à Timgad," MélPig 3 (Paris 1966) 1230, n. 1. Gsell also thought that the consoles from the arch and the macellum are contemporary; see letter from Gsell published by Ch. Saumagne in, "Le plan de la colonie Trajane de Timgad," CahTun 10 (1962) 505. Contra Boeswillwald, Timgad 200-201, who believed that the consoles from both structures were Byzantine in date (mid-fourth/mid-fifth century A.D.); see also A. Ballu, Les ruines de Timgad (antique Thamugadi) (Paris 1897) 214-215. For consoles see Chapter Two, 84.
An inscription, found re-used in the construction of the hemicycle’s wall, records the name of Prastina Pacata, daughter of C. Prastina Pacatius Messalinus, the legate of the Third Augustan Legion in A.D. 143-146:

Prastinae/ C. filiae Pacatae

This dedicatory inscription was likely either re-used as a building element in a later reconstruction of the hemicycle, or was included in the original construction of the hemicycle’s wall.

b. Final Phase (end fifth century A.D.) (?)

The Market of Sertius was no longer in use by the end of the fifth century A.D., since Thamugadi was destroyed by indigenous tribes at this time. During the Byzantine period (sixth century A.D.), a small fort was constructed south of the original perimeter walls which excluded the earlier remains of the Roman colony.

---

81 Boeswillwald, Timgad 203; CIL 8 17898; De Ruyt, Macellum 198, n. 232.

82 For C. Prastina Pacatius Messalinus see AE 1985, 875.

83 Boeswillwald, Timgad 203.

84 Lassus (supra n. 80) 15; P.A. Février, Approches du Maghreb romain (Aix-en-Provence 1989) 126.
13. THE EAST MARKET AT THAMUGADI (C. 17, Fig. 10)

Dedication Date (second quarter third century A.D.) (?)

The exact date of dedication for the East Market at Thamugadi is unknown. Because the west wall extends beyond the insula into the street, the excavators did not believe that this market was part of the original layout of the town in A.D. 100. Thamugadi may have had an earlier market in the same location; however, sondages are necessary to verify if this surmise is correct. Analogies between the East Market and the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 11) suggest that both buildings are approximately contemporary. However, in the absence of any epigraphical evidence, it cannot be presently determined which of the two markets with hemicycle plans was constructed first.

b. Final Phase (end fifth century A.D.) (?)

Like the Market of Sertius, the East Market at Thamugadi was no longer in use by the end of the fifth century.

---


86 De Ruyt, Macellum 203.

87 See Chapter Two, 81-85; De Ruyt, Macellum 203.
14. THE MACELLUM AT THIGNICA (C. 11)

Restoration in A.D. 229

An inscription, found re-used in the walls of the citadel, records the restoration of the macellum which had fallen into ruin, by the municipium of Thignica in A.D. 229:

[[Iul/a/M[ammaea]]] Aug. matre Aug. et castrorum et senatus et patriae, macellum vetustate[te] collapsum m[uni]cipium Septimium Aurelium Antoninianum

Although the names of Severus Alexander and Julia Mammaea were erased in damnatio memoriae, the genealogy and titles identify the emperor and his mother, and date this inscription to A.D. 229. The inclusion of the words 'vetustat[e] collapsum' indicates that this market was likely constructed at a much earlier date than the restoration.

15. THE MACELLUM AT AUZIA (C. 20)

---

88 See final phase of Market of Sertius, Chapter One, 39.

89 CIL 8 1406 = ILS 6795.
Dedication Date (A.D. 230)

Two identical inscriptions,\textsuperscript{90} inscribed on a statue base, record the dedication of a macellum with porticoes, statues and official weights by the res publica Auziensium during the reign of Severus Alexander:

\begin{verbatim}
\end{verbatim}

16. THE MACELLM AT MACTAR (C. 7)

Dedication Date (A.D. 231)

Two fragments of an unpublished inscription record the dedication of a macellum\textsuperscript{92} at Mactar in A.D. 231. The first

\textsuperscript{90} CIL 8 9062 = ILS 5590 is the inscription cited in this chapter; CIL 8 9063; De Ruyt, Macellum 42.

\textsuperscript{91} Claudius divided the kingdom of Mauretania into two provinces, Tingitana and Caesariensis in A.D. 42, see Gascou (supra n. 26) 27. By my reckoning, the dedication date of the macellum should be A.D. 233 (191 + 42) - not A.D. 230.

\textsuperscript{92} M’charek notes that this macellum was excavated in the north-east corner of the forum by M. Khanoussi; however publications of this excavation are unknown, see A. M’charek, "Documentation épigraphique et croissance urbaine: l’exemple de Mactaris aux trois premiers siècles de l’ère chrétienne," L’Afrique Romana 2 (1985) 221. Bourgeois, in a postscript, notes that a market was found in 1979 in the north-east corner of the forum, see C. Bourgeois, "Archéologie de l’angle nord-est du forum de Mactar," BAC N.S. 15-16 (1984) 12. L. Chatelain erroneously identified another structure in Mactar as a macellum, see L. Chatelain, "Le
fragirnente3 mentions the market:

utom cum macello

The second fragment\(^4\) refers to Paelignianus, who was consul in A.D. 231 with Pompeianus.

17. **THE MACELLUM AT LAMBAESIS (C. 16)**

**Dedication Date** (before A.D. 238)

An inscription,\(^5\) found 150 m from the camp of the Augustan Third Legion at Lambaesis, provides evidence for a **macellum** in use there during the third century A.D.:

\[
\begin{align*}
I(ovi) & \quad O(ptimo) & \quad M(aximo) & \quad D(olicheno) & \quad / & \quad p. \quad p. \quad Flavi & \\
\text{Studiosi,} & \quad \text{Sabinius} & \quad / & \quad \text{Ingenuus} & \quad \text{et} & \quad / & \quad \text{Aurelius} & \\
\text{Sed/atus, sig(niferi) Leg(ionis)} & \quad / & \quad \text{III}
\end{align*}
\]

macellum de Mactaris," MBFR 31 (1911) 349-363; this building has since been identified as a 'monument à aubes', see N. Duval et Y. Duval, "Fausses basiliques (et faux martyr): quelques <<batiments à aubes>> d'Afrique," MEFRA 84.1 (1972) 708.


\(^{94}\) Picard (supra n. 93) 23, n. 4. There is no apparent record of the fragment with Paelignianus' name inscribed on it. For Paelignianus see I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* (Helsinki 1965) 185.


\(^{96}\) The name of Flavius Studiosus, a dioecetes, is also found in P. Oxy. 899, dating to A.D. 200 as notes De Ruyt, *Macellum* 96.

\(^{97}\) Sabinius Ingenuus is known from his epitaph: CIL 8 2970.
Aug(ustae), gentes / cura(m) macelli / v(otum)
1(ibentes) a(nimis) s(olverunt) cum a/zutoribus suis.

The inscription is dedicated to Jupiter Optimus Maximus
Dolichenus by three standard bearers of the Augustan Third
legion. Since the inscription only refers to the management
of the macellum, the actual dedication date is unknown.

18. THE MACELLUM AT NEPERIS (C. 10)

Dedication Date (late fourth century A.D.) (?)

An inscription, engraved on a paving stone, records
the construction of a macellum in Nepheris by Covuldus:

Covuldus macellu(m) / de suo pro / pie(tate) fabricabit.

A late imperial date for this macellum is suggested by the
name Covuldus. Covuldus is a vulgar form of Quodvultdeus, a
Christian theophoric name, which came into use in North Africa
during the late empire.100

19. THE MACELLUM AT THUBURSICUM NUMIDARUM (C. 13)

---

98 Merlat (supra n. 95) 285, noted that the name of the legion
was re-engraved on the inscription after the reformation of the
Augustan Third Legion in A.D. 253 (the Legion had been disbanded in
A.D. 238). Therefore, the market was likely constructed before A.D.
238.

99 CIL 8 24039; De Ruyt, Macellum 115.

100 Kajanto (supra n. 94) 59-60, 217. Kajanto, 60, writes "...it is likely that the origin of the Christian theophoric names is
to be found in native Punic nomenclature."
Dedication Date (ca A.D. 360-370) (?)

A macellum,\(^{101}\) partially excavated in the early 1900s at Thubursicum Numidarum, is possibly contemporary with the new forum it adjoined. This forum is datable to A.D. 360-370 by an inscription,\(^{102}\) which records the name of Atilius Theodotus, who was a legate to the proconsul Clodius Hermogenianus, either in A.D. 361-362 or about A.D. 370.

Undatable Dedications of Roman North African Macella

Two macella have dedicatory inscriptions which cannot be dated: the macellum at Madauros (C. 8) and the macellum at Municipium Aurelium Commodianum... (C. 9).

20. THE MACELLUM AT MADAUROS (C. 8)

Two fragments of an inscription,\(^{103}\) found north-east of the forum, record the dedication of a macellum in Madauros\(^{104}\) by Q. Calpurnius Donatus and his family:

---

\(^{101}\) G. Souville, in "Thubursicu Numidarum," PECS (Princeton 1976) 917, provides the only verifiable reference for this apparent macellum.

\(^{102}\) St. Gsell et C.A. Joly, Khamissa, Mdaourouch, Annauna I (Alger-Paris 1914) 21, n. 1, 28, n. 3.

\(^{103}\) ILAlg I, 185, no. 2052; De Ruyt, Macellum 107.

\(^{104}\) Madauros was a Flavian colony founded by veterans, ca A.D. 100, see Gascou (supra n. 26) 32. This foundation date provides a terminus post quem for the construction of the macellum.
Dei Liberi sa[cr(um)] ... Bo[...] / Q. Calpurnius
Donatu[s ...] / aedilicius IIviralicius [... Q.?
Calpurni] / Laeti quond(am) sacerdoti[s fil(ius) opus ?]
/ macelli a solo et stratur[am areae?] / suis sumptibus
fecit et cu[m ....]/rata uxore et Calpur[niis] .... /rata
Matrona et .... / dedicavit.

21. THE MACELLUM AT MUNICIPIUM AURELIUM C[OMMODIANUM...]

(C. 9)

An inscription,105 found on a base, records a
dedication by the curia to Gallia Optata, wife of P. Modius
Felix, who built the macellum in this town:

Galliae Optatae / coniugi P. Modi Fe/licis fili Primi / ad
remuneran/dam liberalita/tem mariti eius / perfecti operis
/macelli / universae Cu[riae].

105 CIL 8 12353; De Ruyt, Macellum 114.
CHAPTER TWO: TYPOLOGY OF ROMAN NORTH AFRICAN MACELLA

No two Roman North African macella have identical plans, but the Roman North African macella do share five architectural elements in common: enclosed structure, multiple entrances, peristyle court, permanent shops, and hydraulic installations. However, several macella have plans which include architectural variations, such as an apse, large hemicycle or tholos. This chapter provides a typological framework for the five architectural elements found in each macellum, as well as their architectural variations.

Eleven macella with detailed plans and sufficient archaeological evidence are included in this typology.¹ Ten macella are excluded from this chapter since they are identified by inscription alone² or their remains and plans provide insufficient data for analysis.³

I. THE ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS OF THE FUNDAMENTAL PERISTYLE PLAN

The Roman North African macella share five basic architectural elements. First, the macella are enclosed structures with solid, single-storey perimeter walls. Second, the macella usually have multiple entrances, in two or more perimeter walls, providing easy access to decumani and cardines. Third, the macella have an interior peristyle court. This court is usually open; the portico is generally covered by a roof. Fourth, the macella have a row of shops along one or more of their perimeter walls. Fifth, the macella have hydraulic installations, such as fountains, pools, wells, cisterns and drains.

The fundamental peristyle plan of the Roman North African macellum is composed of the above five architectural elements. It is called the peristyle plan because the peristyle is the most prominent feature. These five elements are indicative of the commercial nature of the macellum. The enclosed structure contained the smell from the livestock, fish and offal; the open court could be used to set up temporary market stalls; and the covered portico protected the shops' produce from the elements and animal scavengers. The shops provided permanent locations for the storage and sale of food items. Finally, the water supply was essential for
hygienic and commercial reasons, such as freshening produce and washing up after butchering.

II. VARIATIONS FROM THE FUNDAMENTAL PERISTYLE PLAN

This section will define the categories of the three main architectural variations from the peristyle plan: the peristyle plan plus apse, the peristyle plan plus hemicycle, and the peristyle plan plus tholos. Since the Roman North African macella share the five basic architectural elements of the peristyle plan, only the variations will be included in the following categories.

A. Peristyle Plan Plus Apse

The most dominant feature of this variation is an apse, consisting of a semicircular recess covered by a half-domed roof. The apse is elaborately decorated and usually contained statuary. The apse is located opposite a monumental principal facade. Additionally, the width of the apse's opening does not extend beyond the boundaries of the peristyle court.

B. Peristyle Plan Plus Hemicycle

A large hemicycle is the dominant feature of this type. The hemicycle is similar to the apse as it is also a
semicircular recess. Like the apse, the hemicycle is located opposite a monumental principal facade. Unlike the apse, the hemicycle extends beyond the boundaries of the peristyle court. Roofing is optional over the hemicycle; whereas the apse is always covered by a half-dome. Finally, the hemicycle is divided into shops; whereas the apse enclosed statuary.

C. Peristyle Plan Plus Tholos

A tholos, located in the centre of the peristyle court, is the dominant feature of this type. The tholos or kiosk is a circular structure with a domed roof supported by a circular marble colonnade. The tholos may enclose either a fountain or statuary. The peristyle plan plus tholos appears to be the only type in Roman North Africa which may have an additional peristyle court adjoining the market proper.

III. THE FUNDAMENTAL PERISTYLE PLAN: A COMPARISON OF THE FIVE BASIC ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

A comparative study of the five basic architectural elements found in Roman North African macella is essential to understanding the typological structure of these markets.4

4 The macellum in Lepticis Magna (C. 3, Fig. 3) is unique since it contains two tholoi and no permanent shops. Therefore, this market will be treated as a separate entity in Chapter Two, 91-98.
Unless a reference to the additional architectural variations (apse, hemicycle, tholos) is absolutely necessary, they will be excluded from this section.

A. Enclosed Structure

The plans indicate that these macella were enclosed by solid perimeter walls with openings only for doorways. There is no archaeological evidence for windows in these walls. The plans indicate rectangular perimeter walls in the macella at Cyrene (C. 1, Fig. 1) Gigthis (C. 2, Fig. 2), Hippo Regius (C. 6, Fig. 6), East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, Fig. 10), Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 11) and Thibilis (C. 19, Fig. 12); whereas the plans of the macella in Bulla Regia (C. 5, Fig. 5), Thuburbo Maius (C. 12, Fig. 7, Court A), and the Market of Cosinius in Cuicul (C. 15, Fig. 9) are square or nearly square in shape.

1. Construction Techniques

*Opus quadratum* was the most common building material used for all or parts of the perimeter walls. The earlier perimeter walls in the macellum at Gigthis (C. 2, Fig. 2) are constructed in *opus quadratum*; the later perimeter walls are
reconstructed with quarry-stones. The perimeter walls of the macellum at Bulla Regia (C. 5, Fig. 13) are built in opus caementicium. Only the first course, in opus quadratum, remains of the perimeter walls in the macellum at Hippo Regius (C. 6, Fig. 14). The perimeter walls in the macella at Thuburbo Maius (C. 12, Fig. 7) and Thugga (C. 14, Fig. 8) are constructed with quarry-stones.

The perimeter walls of the Market of Cosinius at Cuicul (C. 15, Fig. 15) and the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 16) are constructed in opus Africanum; the corners of the perimeter walls in the Market of Sertius are reinforced in opus quadratum. The perimeter walls of the East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, Fig. 17) are constructed with small stone blocks in horizontal layers; the corners are reinforced by pilasters made of vertically placed parallelepiped stone blocks. The perimeter walls in the macellum at Thibilis (C. 19, Fig. 12) consist of quarry-stones; the corners are

---

5 L.A. Constans, "Rapport sur une mission archéologique à Bou-Ghara (Gigthis) (1914 et 1915) NouvArch 21 (1916) 89; De Ruyt, Macellum 76.

6 De Ruyt, Macellum 48.


8 De Ruyt, Macellum 209, 213.

9 De Ruyt, Macellum 63, 194; for the perimeter walls in the Market of Sertius see also St. Gsell, Les monuments antiques de l'Algérie I (Paris 1901) 199.
reinforced by pilasters made with large stone blocks.  

None of the publications pertaining to these macella mention the height of the existing perimeter walls. The perimeter walls in the macellum at Bulla Regia (C. 5, Fig. 5), measuring 50 cm wide, provide the only example for the width of these walls.  

B. Multiple Entrances

The principal facades of the Roman North African macella are either simple or monumental in appearance, with one or more secondary entrances. The remains of thresholds suggest that the markets' entrances could be secured by wooden doors when the markets were closed.

1. Principal Entrance with Simple Facade

The principal entrance in the macellum at Thibilis (C. 19, Fig. 12) has the plainest design and smallest size of the macella, measuring 1.50 m wide. A monolithic stone threshold provides evidence for a door. The macella in Thuburbo Maius (C. 12, Fig. 7) and Hippo Regius (C. 6, Fig. 6) also have principal entrances with a simple facade. The principal

---

10 De Ruyt, Macellum 199, 204.
11 De Ruyt, Macellum 48.
12 De Ruyt, Macellum 205.
entrance in the south-west side of Court A in the macellum at Thuburbo Maius (C. 12, Fig. 7) has a threshold comprised of round paving stones with holes for the circular hinges of the door. The original principal entrance in the macellum at Hippo Regius (C. 6, Fig. 6) is unknown. However, there is evidence of a portico and threshold outside the row of north shops, suggesting that the earlier principal entrance was likely on the north side. The new principal entrance depicted on the plan (Fig. 6) was moved north-east from the old entrance. This new entrance opens into a large rectangular peristyle court adjoining the market. There are three openings into the market proper from this east court.

2. Principal Entrance with Monumental Facade

Principal entrances with a monumental facade occur in the macella at Cyrene (C.1, Fig. 1), Gigthis (C. 2, Fig. 2), Bulla Regia (C. 5, Fig. 5), the Market of Cosinius at Cuicul (C. 15, Fig. 9), the East Market (C. 17, Fig. 10) and the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 11).

The plan of the macellum in Gigthis (C. 2, Fig. 2) depicts the simplest monumental facade. This facade consists

---

13 De Ruyt, Macellum 209.
14 J. Lassus (supra n. 7) 314.
15 For chronology see Chapter One, 28.
of a single, central doorway which opens onto a large open vestibule, measuring 5.50 x 19 m. Fragments of granite column shafts and grey limestone Corinthian capitals were found in the centre of this vestibule. These columns once supported the roof of a small porch surrounding the principal entrance leading into the market proper.16

The *macellum* at Bulla Regia (C. 5, Fig. 5) has a monumental facade with one principal and two secondary entrances. The exterior portico of this *macellum* is poorly preserved; it consists of nine or more columns which once supported the roof covering the facade's three entrances.17 The remains of a threshold with holes for door-hinges are found in each of the three entrances.18 The *macellum* at Thugga (C.14, Fig. 8) has a monumental facade with likely two central and two lateral entrances opening onto the interior court and side porticoes. This *macellum* also has the remains of an exterior portico (Fig. 8), measuring 4.25 m., which is wider than the exterior portico of the *macellum* at Bulla Regia (Fig. 5). Ten socles remain of the columns which used to

---

16 Constans (supra n. 5) 87; De Ruyt, *Macellum* 77.

17 De Ruyt, *Macellum* 49.

support the roof covering the four entrances of the facade.19

The Market of Cosinius in Cuicul (C. 15, Fig. 9) and the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 11) have a monumental facade with one principal entrance. The exterior portico in the Market of Sertius measures 5.50 m in width;20 whereas the exterior portico in the Market of Cosinius measures 3.50 m. wide.21 This latter portico is shaped like a corridor, with a set of stairways at each end. The exterior porticoes in both macella are comprised of six columns, which supported a roof covering their principal entrances.22 The portico in the Market of Sertius (C. 18, Fig. 11) has a pier at each end of the six columns;23 whereas the portico in the Market of Cosinius (C. 15, Fig. 9) has two piers at the opening of the south stairway and one pier in the north-west corner of the north stairway.24

The principal entrance in the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 11) has the remains of a threshold and

---

19 M. Merlin, "Fouilles de Dougga," BAC (1919) 129; De Ruyt, Macellum 213.

20 Nabers, Macella 289.


22 Boeswillwald, Timgad 185; Ballu (supra n. 21) 218-219.

23 De Ruyt, Macellum 195.

24 Ballu (supra n. 21) 218.
holes for hinges, suggesting evidence for a door.\textsuperscript{25} The principal entrance in the Market of Cosinius at Cuicul (C. 15, Fig. 9) is noteworthy because it is more monumental in appearance than the principal entrances in the other macella. This entrance, measuring 2.55 m wide, consists of an arch supported by two pilasters in opus quadratum with moulded rectangular capitals (Fig. 18).\textsuperscript{26}

The main entrance of the East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, Fig. 10) is the only Roman North African macellum with a semi-circular vestibule, measuring 4.40 m in diameter. This vestibule is paved with small bricks in a herringbone pattern (opus spicatum). Two columns rest on a large threshold, measuring 7.70 m. These columns once supported the roof of the semicircular vestibule.\textsuperscript{27}

The monumental principal facade of the market in Cyrene (C. 1, Fig. 1) is the most ornate of the Roman North African macella. This facade consists of a portico plus an adjoining monumental propylon. Only fragments of the portico and propylon exist to suggest the plan of their superstructure (Fig. 19). The propylon consists of four columns and four

\textsuperscript{25} De Ruyt, Macellum 195.

\textsuperscript{26} Ballu (supra n. 21) 219; De Ruyt, Macellum 63.

\textsuperscript{27} A. Ballu, Les ruines de Timgad. Antique Thamugadi. Sept années de découvertes (1903-1910) (Paris 1911) 14; De Ruyt, Macellum 199-200.
pilasters, which are larger in height than the columns of the adjoining portico. The columns of the propylon are faced with stucco to resemble marble. These columns and pilasters once supported an entablature with a carved frieze. A chariot group of Septimius Severus once rested on the entablature.  

3. Secondary Entrances

The Roman North African macella usually have one or more secondary entrances. These secondary entrances are not as wide as the principal entrances. They are often located on either side of the principal entrance or in the remaining perimeter walls of the market. Secondary entrances provide for a faster flow of shoppers entering or leaving the markets. 

The most monumental in appearance of the secondary entrances found in Roman North African macella is the entrance in the middle of the east perimeter wall of the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 20). This entrance, measuring 2.50 m. wide, projected into the neighbouring street. The entrance is comprised of two columns which supported a roof, thus forming a small porch.  

---


29 A. Ballu, Les ruines de Timgad (antique Thamugadi) (Paris 1897) 212; Boeswillwald, Timgad 184.
and traces of holes for hinges suggest that this east entrance, like the principal entrance, was closed by a door.\textsuperscript{30}

\textbf{C. Peristyle Court}

One of the most distinguishing characteristics of the peristyle plan is the interior peristyle court. The peristyle court consists of a large open courtyard surrounded by a covered portico on two or more sides. In general, the plans of Roman North African \textit{macella} display either rectangular or square courtyards. Two radical variations of peristyle courts are shown in the plans of the \textit{macella} at Gigthis (C. 2, Fig. 2) and the East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, Fig. 10). These \textit{macella} are examples of the peristyle plan plus hemicycle.\textsuperscript{31} The peristyle courts in both markets follow the curvatures of these hemicycles. The peristyle court in the \textit{macellum} at Gigthis is horseshoe-shaped, following the curvature of the hemicycle on the west side. The East Market at Thamugadi has two semicircular peristyle courts which follow the curvature of the double intersecting hemicycles on the south side. The \textit{macellum} at Thuburbo Maius (C. 12, Fig. 7) is the only Roman North African market which does not yield evidence for a

\textsuperscript{30} De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 195.

\textsuperscript{31} See Chapter Two, 81-85 for peristyle plan plus hemicycle.
colonnade in its interior court.\textsuperscript{32} However, this market is the only Roman North African \textit{macellum} with two adjoining peristyle courts.\textsuperscript{33}

1. Paving Materials

a. Courtyards

Large rectangular paving stones are a common feature of the interior courts of the \textit{macella} in Cyrene (C.1, Fig. 21), Bulla Regia (C. 5, Fig. 13), Hippo Regius (C. 6, Fig. 22), Thuburbo Maius (C. 12, Fig. 7), Thugga (C. 14, Fig. 23), the Market of Cosinius at Cuicul (C. 15, Fig. 24), the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 25) and Thibilis (C. 19, Fig. 12).\textsuperscript{34} The paving stones in the interior courts of the

\textsuperscript{32} A. Lézine, \textit{Thuburbo Maius} (Tunis 1968) 16; De Ruyt notes that the paving stones in front of the south-east range of shops do suggest the presence of a portico and that the larger width of the shops in the corners of the market would be better explained by the presence of a portico of equal width: see De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 209, n. 239.

\textsuperscript{33} For the adjoining peristyle courts in the \textit{macellum} at Thuburbo Maius see Chapter Two, 88-91.

macellum at Thugga (Fig. 23) and the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (Fig. 25) are arranged in parallel north-south rows.\textsuperscript{35} The interior court of the macellum in Hippo Regius (Fig. 22) has a more decorative variation; a row of rectangular marble paving stones surrounds the limestone paving stones. These limestone paving stones are arranged in a radiating fashion towards the tholos located in the centre of the court.\textsuperscript{36}

The paved courts in the macella at Gigthis (C. 2, Fig. 2), the East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, Fig. 10) and Cyrene (C. 1, Fig. 1) are also variations from the typical rectangular paving stones. The court in the macellum at Gigthis (C. 2, Fig. 2) is paved in white concrete.\textsuperscript{37} The two semicircular courts in the East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, Fig. 26) are paved in the same \textit{opus spicatum} technique as its vestibule.\textsuperscript{38} The limestone pavement in the market at Cyrene (C. 1, Fig. 27) was later replaced by large, rectangular Proconnesian marble slabs.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{35} De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 196, 217.
\textsuperscript{36} Lassus (supra n. 7) 312.
\textsuperscript{37} Constans (supra n. 5) 89.
\textsuperscript{38} Boeswillwald, \textit{Timgad} 315; De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 199-200, 203.
b. Porticoes

Interior porticoes are paved in rectangular paving stones with two exceptions. First, the porticoes in the macellum at Gigthis (C. 2, Fig. 2) are paved in the same white concrete as the interior court. Second, the porticoes in the macellum at Hippo Regius (C. 6, Fig. 6) are paved in marble slabs.

2. Architectural Elements

Corinthian capitals are commonly found in the majority of Roman North African macella. The column shafts consist of a colourful variety of imported marbles and local limestones. The bases are either Attic or Asiatic.

Two macella have interior porticoes decorated with marble column shafts and Corinthian capitals: Cyrene (C. 1, Fig. 1, 27) and the Market of Cosinius in Cuicul (C. 15, Figs. 14, 28). The portico in the market at Cyrene was restored with twenty-four cipollino marble column shafts, Proconnesian marble capitals (Fig. 29) and marble Asiatic bases.  

---

40 See footnote 34 for bibliography of pavements.

41 Constans (supra n. 5) 89.

42 Lassus (supra n. 7) 314.

43 Ward-Perkins and Gibson, LibAnt 14 (1977) [supra. n. 28] 336-337; Ward-Perkins and Gibson LibSt 18 (1987) [supra n. 28] 47. For chronology see Chapter One, 24. For the contemporary use of cipollino in other macella see N. Degrassi, "Il mercato romano di
interior porticoes in the Market of Cosinius at Cuicul (Figs. 15, 28) consist of ten columns and four pilasters with grey and white marble column shafts and white limestone Corinthian capitals. The porticoes once supported a wooden architrave, stone frieze and decorated cornice. The stone frieze displayed the dedicatory inscription of the market. The cornice is elaborately carved with acanthus leaves, dentils and rosettes interspersed with the heads of wild animals in relief, such as bulls, lions, wolves, rams and wild boars.44

The interior porticoes of the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 30) are also elaborate in design. Twenty-four columns once supported the roof of the porticoes on all four sides. The porticoes are comprised of smooth stone column shafts and a type of Corinthian capital with plainly carved acanthus leaves called 'feuilles d'eau' by the excavators (Fig. 31).45 The four columns of the south portico each supported a separate and independent block of the entablature. The entablatures were joined by a semicircular stone arch, which sprang from the top of each individual

Leptis Magna," OAL 2 (1951) 60; Ch. Dubois, Pouzzoles antique (Paris 1907) 296.

44 Allais (supra n. 34) 38, noted that the same grey and white marble of the column shafts in the interior porticoes was also used for the column shafts of the temple of Venus Genetrix at Cuicul.

45 Boeswillwald, Timгад 194.
cornice (Fig. 32).\textsuperscript{46} These arches linked the columns together to form an arcade. Above the arches was a masonry wall, which supported the roof-beams covering the hemicycle.\textsuperscript{47} Boeswillwald found evidence for several columns with these independent entablatures,\textsuperscript{48} which seems to suggest that the north, east and west porticoes were also linked together by arches. However, a recent reconstruction of this market depicts an arcuated portico only on the south side in front of the hemicycle; the other three sides have the usual formation of Corinthian columns supporting a covered roof (Fig. 33).\textsuperscript{49} Additionally, De Ruyt mentions only the arcade of the south portico, but notes that one of the arcades and several of the independent entablatures were restored along the west side.\textsuperscript{50} Perhaps, these entablatures were originally from the arches located above the shops of the hemicycle.\textsuperscript{51}

The interior porticoes in the macellum at Gisithis (C.

\textsuperscript{46} Gsell (supra n. 9) 208.

\textsuperscript{47} Boeswillwald, \textit{Timgad} 199-200. See infra, 83-84 for the evidence of the hemicycles's roof.

\textsuperscript{48} Boeswillwald, \textit{Timgad} 194.

\textsuperscript{49} See P. Romanelli, \textit{Topografia e Archeologia dell'Africa Romana} (Enciclopedia Classica 3.10, 7) (Torino 1970) 150-151, tav. 111.

\textsuperscript{50} De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 196, n. 229.

\textsuperscript{51} Gsell (supra n. 9) 208.
2, Fig. 2) underwent two radically different construction phases. In the first phase, twenty-four columns surrounded a rectangular court on all four sides. The remains of these porticoes consist of Corinthian capitals, smooth, yellow limestone monolithic column shafts and blue-grey marble Attic bases. In the second phase,¹² thirteen columns surrounded a semicircular court on three sides, thus forming a horseshoe-shaped portico. The curve of this portico follows the curve of the newly constructed hemicycle (Fig. 34).¹³ The blue-grey marble Attic bases of the earlier porticoes were re-used in the reconstruction of the horseshoe-shaped portico. The Corinthian capitals are identical in design to the earlier capitals, but smaller in size. Additionally, the columns were quarried from the same yellow limestone as the columns from the earlier porticoes; however, they now have fluted column shafts. An even later restoration of the horseshoe-shaped portico is indicated by the remains of three column drums in white limestone faced with stucco.¹⁴

The East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, Figs. 10, 35) is the only Roman North African macellum with two semicircular peristyle courts. These courts follow the curves of the double

¹² For chronology see Chapter One, 32-33.
¹³ See Chapter Two, 82.
¹⁴ Constans (supra n. 5) 89.
intersecting hemicycles on the south side.\textsuperscript{55} The porticoes in each court consist of ten grey columns with Tuscan capitals.\textsuperscript{56} The six columns of the portico in the \textit{macellum} at Thibilis (C.19, Fig. 12, 36) also have Tuscan capitals.\textsuperscript{57} These columns once surrounded two statues; only the bases survive. One of the bases has a dedication to Mercury, suggesting that this base once held a statue of the god of commerce.\textsuperscript{58}

The evidence for the interior porticoes in the \textit{macella} at Bulla Regia (C. 5, Fig. 5), Hippo Regius (C. 6, Fig. 6) and Thugga (C. 14, Fig. 8) is practically nonexistent. A few remains of Corinthian capitals, bases and column shafts have been discovered in the \textit{macella} at Bulla Regia and Hippo Regius (Fig. 37).\textsuperscript{59}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{55} See Chapter Two, 82.
\item \textsuperscript{56} Boeswillwald, \textit{Timgad} 315; De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 202.
\item \textsuperscript{57} De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 205, suggests that this court was covered because there is no evidence for drainage channels or signs of weathering; however, it seems more likely that the corridors between the porticoes and shops were covered by a roof typical to those of the other Roman North African markets. A more up-to-date plan of the \textit{macellum} at Thibilis is necessary to see whether the columns of the porticoes are aligned with the partition walls of the shops. Only the centre columns are aligned with the partition walls in Gsell's plan, while the other columns are off-axis.
\item \textsuperscript{58} For inscription see Chapter One, 33.
\item \textsuperscript{59} De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 51, 92; Lassus (supra n. 7) 243.
\end{itemize}
D. Permanent Shops

Permanent shops are the most important feature of the peristyle plan. The shops are indicated on the plans by a series of partition walls perpendicular to the perimeter walls of the market. In general, the shops are small in size, averaging 2.50 m x 2.70 m, with entrances opening onto the interior court. Protected by porticoes and with no evidence for windows, the shops were kept dark in order to preserve their perishable contents.

1. Placement of Shops

The shops open onto the interior court of each macellum, with the exception of the row of six shops in the East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, Fig. 10), which open onto a corridor facing the Decumanus Maximus, on either side of the vestibule. The Market of Cosinius in Cuicul (C. 15, Fig. 9) is the only one which possessed shops along all four sides. The plans of the macella in Hippo Regius (C. 6, Fig. 6) and Thuburbo Maius (C. 12, Fig. 7, Court A) depict shops along three sides of the perimeter walls. The majority of plans display shops along two sides: Bulla Regia (C. 5, Fig. 5), Thugga (C. 14, Fig. 8), the East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, Fig. 10). See Catalogue, section B.iv for the measurements of each shop.

60 See Catalogue, section B.iv for the measurements of each shop.

61 Ballu (supra n. 27) 15.
Fig. 10), Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 11) and Thibilis (C. 19, Fig. 12).

2. Shape of Permanent Shops

The shape of the shops is, for the most part, rectangular, with the exception of the shops in the hemicycle macella at Gigthis (C. 2, Fig. 2) and the East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, Fig. 10): the shops in the macellum at Gigthis are semicircular; the shops in the East Market are wedge-shaped.

3. Construction Materials

a. Pavements

The archaeological evidence for the pavements of these shops is minimal. Paved floors in shops were obviously easy to wash down and keep clean. Three of the macella have shops paved with rectangular paving stones: Bulla Regia (C. 5, Figs. 5, 13), Thuburbo Maius (C. 12, Fig. 7), and Thugga (C. 14, Fig. 8). In the macellum at Thugga, the paving stones are aligned with the partition walls of the shops. Concrete floors are found in the shops of the macellum at Thibilis (C. 19, Fig. 12).

62 Bulla Regia: De Ruyt, Macellum 50; Thuburbo Maius: Merlin (supra n. 34) 49; Thugga: De Ruyt, Macellum 215.
The shops in the Market of Cosinius at Cuicul (C. 15, Fig. 9) are paved in opus spicatum.64

The last room of the north-east range of shops in the macellum of Thuburbo Maius (C. 12, Figs. 7, 38) is paved in a black and white geometric mosaic.65 The presence of the mosaic floor and its larger size than the shops, measuring 3.30 m in width, suggests that this room was not a shop, but perhaps the office of the aediles.

b. Walls

Published evidence is scarce for the materials used in the partition walls of the shops. The shops' walls in the macellum at Thuburbo Maius (C. 12, Figs. 7, 39) are constructed in roughly worked limestone.66 Large dressed stones faced both sides of the entrances of the shops in the East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, Fig. 40). The walls of these shops are constructed of small, roughly worked stones.67 Brick was used for the walls of the shops in the Market of

---

63 De Ruyt, Macellum 205.

64 De Ruyt, Macellum 64; parallels for the use of opus spicatum include the vestibule and the semicircular courts in the East Market at Timgad, see De Ruyt, Macellum 199-200, 203.

65 Merlin (supra n. 34) 49; Alexander, CMT II.1, 13.

66 Merlin (supra n. 34) 49.

67 De Ruyt, Macellum 201-202.
Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 41). 68

5. Entrance of Shops

Six Roman North African macella feature stone tables barring the entrances to their shops: Gigthis (C.2, Fig. 2), Hippo Regius (C.6, Fig. 6), the Market of Cosinius at Cuicul (C. 15, Fig. 9), the East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, Fig. 10), the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 11) and Thibilis (C. 19, Fig. 12). These tables are a permanent architectural feature of the six macella, since the ends of the stone slabs were bonded into the masonry of the shops' partition walls. 69 The vendor would have to climb over or under the table in order to enter the shop. These tables would also serve as a barrier to would-be thieves.

The best examples of stone tables barring the entrances of shops are found in the Market of Cosinius at Cuicul (C. 15, Fig. 42). The outside faces of the monolithic stone tables, measuring 2.05 x 1 m, are decorated in simple geometric motifs. Two of the outside faces of these tables are more elaborately decorated with theatre masks, turtles and scorpions. The stone tables rest on dressed stone supports placed edgewise. These supports are richly carved with

68 De Ruyt, *Macellum* 194.

mythological figures of caryatids, satyrs, sirens, griffins, and Heracles with his club and lion skin, as well as the heads of bulls and goats.\textsuperscript{70}

Stone tables also likely barred the entrances of the shops in the macellum at Hippo Regius (C. 6, Fig. 6). Two of the tables, measuring 0.80 x 0.82 m, were found among the ruins both inside and outside this market. Each table rested on stone supports above a marble threshold at the entrance of each shop. The stone supports of one table have a dolphin carved in relief; the stone supports of the other table have human heads carved in relief.\textsuperscript{71}

The East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, Fig. 40), the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 41), and the macellum in Thibilis (C. 19, Fig. 12) have simple sculpted mouldings decorating the faces of the table slabs and stone supports.\textsuperscript{72} The tables barring the shops in the Market of Sertius are made of blue-grey granite.\textsuperscript{73} Several stone table supports in grey limestone or marble have been found in the macellum at Thibilis.\textsuperscript{74}

\textsuperscript{70} Allais (supra n. 34) 39.

\textsuperscript{71} J. Lassus, "Le marché d'Hippone," \textit{Libyca} 6 (1958) 245.

\textsuperscript{72} De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 195, 201, 205.

\textsuperscript{73} Boeswillwald, \textit{Timgad} 198.

\textsuperscript{74} De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 205.
There is no evidence for stone tables barring the shops' entrances in the macellum at Gigthis (C. 2, Fig. 2). However, Constans, the excavator, had no hesitation in restoring stone tables across the fronts of the shops in the same manner as those in the markets at Thamugadi.\(^75\)

**E. Hydraulic Installations**

The hydraulic installations are the fifth and final basic architectural element essential to the fundamental peristyle plan. An abundant water supply was especially necessary for washing and freshening produce and washing down floors and tables after butchering.

**1. Fountains**

Two macella have central fountains: Thugga (C. 14, Fig. 8) and the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 11), measuring 2.50 x 2.50 m\(^76\) and 2.65 x 2.65 m,\(^77\) respectively. The remains of the fountain in the macellum at Thugga (C. 14, Fig. 8) consist of a concrete base faced with a white mosaic. In the base is a cavity, measuring 25 cm in

\(^{75}\) Constans (supra n. 5) 88.

\(^{76}\) Merlin (supra n. 19) 129.

\(^{77}\) De Ruyt, *Macellum* 196.
depth and 30 cm in diameter. Nabers proposes that the cavity once held a pole to support an awning. However, De Ruyt suggests that this cavity was more likely the base of a fountain, noting similarities with the fountain in the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 11). The basin in the Market of Sertius is enclosed by four paving stones. One stone support for this basin is in situ (Fig. 43). Branches of ivy are carved on this support in sculpted relief.

The fountain in the macellum at Gigthis (C. 2, Fig. 2) is enclosed by a small, rectangular structure with an apse, measuring 3.50 x 3.50 m. This rectangular structure consists of four blue-grey marble Attic bases in situ in each of the four corners. A few fragments of the grey granite columns are preserved. An oval basin for a fountain was found within the rectangular structure.

Two semicircular basins are found on either side of

---

78 De Ruyt, Macellum 217.

79 Nabers, Macella 238.

80 De Ruyt, Macellum 217 n. 242.

81 Ballu (supra n. 29) 212; Boeswillwald, Timgad 190; De Ruyt, Macellum 196.

82 R. Cagnat, "Gigthis," BAC (1902) 189.

83 The Attic bases are identical to the blue-grey granite bases of the interior porticoes, with only a slightly larger diameter (0.52 m vs 0.43 m), see Constans (supra n. 5) 89.
the apse in the macellum at Bulla Regia (C. 5, Fig. 5).84 These basins, both measuring 1.75 m in diameter, are fed from two rectangular reservoirs, both measuring 1.95 x 2.40 m. These reservoirs are located in the wall behind each basin.85 The East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, Fig. 10) also has a semicircular basin for a fountain, measuring 1.48 m with a diameter of 90 cm.86 This basin is located in the small triangular room at the intersection of the double hemicycles.87 Additionally, in a later phase, a large stone basin for a fountain was placed in the last shop of the south-east range in the same market.88

The Market of Cosinius at Cuicul (C. 15, Fig. 9) also reveals evidence for two fountains. A circular basin covered with a thick coat of plaster was found in the last shop on the south-east. The presence of this basin suggests that this shop was converted to a fountain house at a later date.89 Additionally, Allais suggested that the tholos located in the

84 Beschoucheh (supra n. 18) 89.
85 De Ruyt, Macellum 51.
86 De Ruyt, Macellum 202.
87 Ballu (supra n. 27) 15; Boeswillwald, Timgad 315.
88 Ballu (supra n. 27) 15-16; Boeswillwald, Timgad 315.
89 Allais (supra n. 34) 40; De Ruyt, Macellum 64.
centre of the peristyle court also likely housed a fountain.\(^90\)

De Ruyt suggests that there was likely a fountain in the centre room on the south side of the *macellum* at Thibilis (C. 19, Fig. 12); however, there are no traces of drains or pipes within this room.\(^91\)

2. Cisterns

Two Roman North African *macella* disclose remains of cisterns: Thugga (C, 14, Fig. 8) and Gigthis (C. 2. Fig. 2).

The *macellum* in Thugga has a large rectangular cistern sunk into the floor along the west perimeter wall, where there would normally be shops matching those on the east side. However, Merlin, the excavator, suggests that the vault which covered the cistern was too thin to have supported structures above it.\(^92\) The cistern in the *macellum* at Gigthis (C. 2, Fig. 2) is located within a rectangular room. This room juts out from the north wall beside the hemicycle.\(^93\) De Ruyt suggests that this rectangular room also served as a public

---

\(^90\) Allais (supra n. 34) 39. See Chapter Two, 87 for description of *tholos*.

\(^91\) De Ruyt, *Macellum* 205.

\(^92\) Merlin (supra n. 19) 129.

\(^93\) Constans (supra n. 5) 90.
latrine, although there is no evidence for benches with the telltale round holes. If this room is a latrine, it is the only example of a latrine in a Roman North African macellum.\textsuperscript{95}

3. Drains

The drains, covered by a rectangular paving stone, are often located in the peristyle courts. The most noticeable evidence for a drainage system surrounds the tholos in the macellum at Hippo Regius (C. 6, Fig. 6). The circular drain branches out to the four corners of the market, where they joined with larger sewers, located outside the market.\textsuperscript{96} The macellum in Thugga (C. 14, Fig. 8) has traces of drains in the north part of the court and under the apse in the south.\textsuperscript{97} The Market of Cosinius in Cuicul (C. 15, Fig. 9) has traces of a drain in the north-east angle of its court.\textsuperscript{98} The macellum in Bulla Regia (C. 5, Fig. 5) and the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 11) have a drain under the fountain in their centre courts.\textsuperscript{99} The market at Cyrene (C. 1, Fig. 44)

\textsuperscript{94} De Ruyt, Macellum 77.

\textsuperscript{95} Only the macellum in Puteoli reveals evidence for latrines, see De Ruyt, Macellum 155, Fig. 57.

\textsuperscript{96} Lassus (supra n. 7) 312.

\textsuperscript{97} Merlin (supra n. 19) 129.

\textsuperscript{98} Allais (supra n. 34) 38; De Ruyt, Macellum 65.

\textsuperscript{99} De Ruyt, Macellum 196, 313.
has traces of three narrow grooves cut in the limestone pavements for lead water-pipes. These grooves lead to the barely visible remains of a small, rectangular structure situated along the centre of the south wall, and they suggest that the function of this building involved the use of running water.  

IV. ARCHITECTURAL VARIATIONS FROM THE FUNDAMENTAL PERISTYLE PLAN

The comparative study of the five basic architectural elements of the fundamental peristyle plan reveals that all the Roman North African macella are based on this scheme. However, several plans depict additional architectural variations from the peristyle plan, such as an apse, hemicycle, tholos, and additional peristyle courts. These architectural variations are problematic to the study of the typology of Roman North African macella. These variations can be classified in two ways: either the macella are separate types, distinct from the fundamental peristyle plan; or the macella are subtypes of the fundamental peristyle plan, since they share the five basic architectural elements which make up this plan. Additionally, the architectural variations

100 Ward-Perkins and Gibson, LibAnt 14 (1977) [supra n. 28] 336.
themselves differ from plan to plan, suggesting that the macella with an apse, hemicycle or tholos cannot be placed within a rigid typological framework.

The comparative study of the architectural variations from the peristyle plan is based on the premise that the macella with an apse, hemicycle or tholos contain peristyle plans, as well as these additional architectural variations. Therefore, they can be loosely classified as subtypes of the fundamental peristyle plan.

A. Peristyle Plan Plus Apse

Two Roman North African macella have plans featuring an apse\(^{101}\): Bulla Regia (C. 5, Fig. 5) and Thugga (C. 14, Fig. 8). Their plans are remarkably similar, consisting of an enclosed structure, with an interior porticoed court, a row of shops on the lateral sides, and an apse located opposite a monumental facade.

The apses in both macella are contained within the boundaries of their porticoed courts. The apse in the macellum at Thugga (C. 14, Figs. 8, 45) has an opening 9 m in

\(^{101}\) Parallels for macella with an apse outside North Africa include Paestum: De Ruyt, *Macellum* 125-129; see E. Greco et D. Theodorescu, *Poseidonia-Paestum I. La << curia >>* (Rome 1980) 10-41, Fig. 43; Puteoli: De Ruyt, *Macellum* 150-158; Dubois (supra n. 43) 286-309.
width, with a radius of 4.50 m; whereas the apse in the macellum at Bulla Regia (C. 5, Figs. 5, 13) has a smaller opening, measuring 6.0 m in width, with a deeper but unknown radius. This latter apse is also enclosed by a balustrade set into a stone threshold. The thickness of the walls of the apse in both markets suggests that these apses were covered by a half-dome; however, no traces remain of the apses' roofing materials.

1. Decoration of Apse

The apses in both macella are more ornately decorated than the shops and other rooms found in Roman North African macella. The apse in the macellum at Bulla Regia (C. 5, Fig. 5) has a pavement of white mosaic. Traces of green marble facings are noticeable at the base of the walls. The apse in the macellum at Thugga (C. 14, Fig. 8) has only traces of its decoration. This decoration consists of paint on its curved wall.

102 Merlin (supra n. 19) 131.
103 Beschaouch (supra n. 18) 89; De Ruyt, Macellum 50.
104 Merlin (supra n. 19) 131; De Ruyt, Macellum 50.
105 Beschaouch (supra n. 18) 89; De Ruyt, Macellum 50.
106 De Ruyt, Macellum 216.
2. Evidence for Genius Macelli

Both apses likely enclosed a statue dedicated to Mercury, the genius macelli. An unpublished inscription dedicated to Mercury was found in the ruins of the macellum at Bulla Regia (C. 5, Fig. 5). An inscription on a statue base with a dedication to Mercury from two local magistrates was found behind the apse in the macellum at Thugga (C. 14, Fig. 8). Additionally, the presence of paint, mosaic pavement and marble facings suggests the possibility that these apses were cultic in function.

3. Large Rooms in Close Proximity to Apse

Both apses have large rooms nearby. The rear of the apse in the macellum at Thugga (C. 14, Fig. 8) has two large rooms of unknown function. One room on the south-east has no access to the apse; whereas the other room on the south-west has one access to the apse. The apse in the macellum at Bulla Regia (C. 5, Fig. 5) has a large room on either side of its apse. The large room on the south-east likely functioned as a vestibule for the secondary entrance in the east side of

---

107 Beschaoach (supra n. 18) 89.


109 Merlin (supra n. 19) 131.
the market. The large room on the north-west is divided into three sections of varying shapes and sizes. One of these rooms—the rectangular room—likely also functioned as vestibule for the secondary entrance in the west side of the market. 110

B. Peristyle Plan Plus Hemicycle

Two plans of Roman North African macella depict a large hemicycle lined with shops: the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Figs. 11, 25) and Gigthis (C. 2, Figs. 2, 34). The plan of the East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, Fig. 10) is more unusual than the latter two markets: this macellum has two intersecting hemicycles lined with shops.

The macella with a hemicycle are somewhat similar to the macella with an apse (C. 5, Fig. 5, C. 14, Fig. 8). Both types contain a semicircular recess in the perimeter wall opposite a monumental facade. However, there are significant differences between the hemicycles and apses themselves. First, the hemicycle consists of a large, semicircular recess, which extends beyond the boundaries of the interior porticoes in each market. The outer walls of the hemicycles abut against the lateral perimeter walls in the macellum at Gigthis (C. 2, Fig. 2) and East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, Fig. 10); whereas

110 De Ruyt, Macellum 51.
the outer walls of the hemicycle in the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 11) abut against part of the south-east and south-west indentations of the lateral perimeter walls. Additionally, the interior colonnades of the macellum at Gigthis (C. 2, Fig. 2) and the East Market (C. 17, Fig. 10) follow the curve(s) of their respective hemicyles. However, the rectangular portico of the Market of Sertius (C. 18, Fig. 11) does not follow the curve of its hemicycle. This design is an intermediate step between the rectangular porticoed courts found in Roman North African macella datable to the first and second centuries A.D. and the curved courts of the macellum at Gigthis (C. 2, Fig. 2) and the East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, Fig. 10). The apses consist of a smaller semicircular recess, which does not extend beyond the boundaries of the interior porticoes.

Second, the hemicyles contain a row of shops; whereas the apses likely enclosed a statue of the genius macelli. Third, a separate roof covering the hemicyles is optional; whereas the apses are covered by a half-dome. Fourth, the peristyle plans with hemicyles have no shops on their lateral walls; whereas the peristyle plans with apses do have shops on their lateral walls. However, there are no shops along the wall containing the apse because shops would take away from the dominant focus of the apse.
1. Shops

The shops in each *macellum* have been discussed with reference to the five basic architectural elements of the fundamental peristyle plan (see Section III.D). Partition walls with stone tables barring their entrances provide evidence for shops in the hemicycles of the *macella* at Thamugadi (Figs. 40, 41) and Gigthis (C. 2, Fig. 2).\(^{111}\)

2. Evidence for Roofing

The hemicycles in the *macellum* at Gigthis (C. 2, Fig 2) and the East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, Fig. 10) do not have a separate roof distinct from the roof of their porticoes, since the curve of the porticoes follows the curve of the hemicycles. However, there is archaeological evidence for a roof covering the hemicycle in the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 11). As previously mentioned, the columns of the interior porticoes in this market supported stone arches. These arches linked together to form an arcade.\(^{112}\) A similar series of nine arches continued around the top of each shop in the hemicycle. This series of arches is joined to the porticoes on the lateral sides by piers with

\(^{111}\) East Market in Thamugadi: Ballu (supra n. 27) 15; Market of Sertius in Thamugadi: Boeswillwald, *Timgad* 198; Gigthis (possible presence of tables): Constans (supra n. 5) 88.

\(^{112}\) See Chapter Two, 64.
half-columns. The arches of the hemicycle are supported by a pier placed at the end of the partition wall of each shop.\textsuperscript{113} A stone wall rose above the top of these arches. Sculptured consoles (Fig. 46), centred above each pier, carried a spiral fluted column which supported the ends of the major roof beams. The other ends of the beams rested on the wall of the arches of the south portico. The arches in the south portico sprang from individual entablatures, which rested on four columns and two half-columns. These entablatures, in turn, rested on four columns, larger in height than the columns of the porticoes on the north, east and west sides. Thus, a monumental facade was created in front of the hemicycle (Fig. 25).\textsuperscript{114}

The bold sweeping curves in the markets at Thamugadi (C. 17, Fig. 10, C. 18, Fig. 11) and Gigthis (C. 2 Fig. 2) are an aesthetically pleasing architectural variation from the fundamental peristyle plan. The hemicycle in the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 11) was a novel solution to the problem of fitting a rectangular structure into a trapezoidal space.\textsuperscript{115}

The architect of the East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, 17)

\textsuperscript{113} Gsell (supra n. 9) 208.

\textsuperscript{114} Ballu (supra n. 29) 214; Boeswillwald, \textit{Timgad} 194, 199-200.

\textsuperscript{115} For chronology of the Market of Sertius at Timgad see Chapter One, 37-40.
Fig. 10) boldly adapted the hemicycle plan to maximize the full potential of its interior space.\textsuperscript{116} The double intersecting hemicycles allowed for the existence of more shops along the south wall than would be normally possible along a straight wall. The semicircular porticoed courts solved the problem of how to cover the shops in the hemicycles.

The hemicycle in the macellum at Gigthis (C. 2, Fig. 2) is the result of a later radical restoration. This restoration was possibly influenced by the macella with hemicycles in Thamugadi, since the plans have such similar features.\textsuperscript{117}

C. Peristyle Plan Plus Tholos

The plans of four Roman North African macella depict a tholos or tholoi: Lepcis Magna\textsuperscript{118} (C. 3, Fig. 3), Hippo Regius (C. 6, Fig. 6), Thuburbo Maius (C. 12, Fig. 7), Court A) and the Market of Cosinius in Cuicul (C. 15, Fig. 9). The tholos is the simplest architectural variation from the fundamental peristyle plan, since the addition of a tholos

\textsuperscript{116} For chronology of the East Market see Chapter One, 40.

\textsuperscript{117} Constans (supra n. 5) 91; R. Cagnat, "La ville antique de Gigthis, en Tunisie," JSav 15 (1917) 298-299; Nabers, Macella 302; De Ruyt, Macellum 79, 288. See also Chapter One, 32.

\textsuperscript{118} See Chapter Two, 91-98 for the macellum at Lepcis Magna.
does not involve a structural change to one of the perimeter walls, as seen in the peristyle plans with apses or hemicycles. The tholoi are either round (Lepcis Magna, Fig. 3; Hippo Regius, Fig. 6) or hexagonal (Cuicul, Fig. 9; Thuburbo Maius, Fig. 7) in shape. Each tholos was once surrounded by a limestone or marble portico. The portico of each tholos likely supported a roof, perhaps domed. However, the exact nature of these roofs is unknown since no verifiable remains have been found.

In general, the tholos in the macella at Hippo Regius (C. 6, Fig. 6), Thuburbo Maius (C. 12, Fig. 7) and Cuicul (C. 15, Fig. 9) is located in the exact centre of each court. The tholos in the macellum at Hippo Regius (C. 6, Fig. 6) is surrounded by porticoes on three sides; the tholos in the Market of Cosinius at Cuicul (C. 15, Fig. 9) is surrounded by porticoes on all four sides; whereas there is no apparent archaeological evidence for porticoes in Court A at Thuburbo Maius (C. 12, Fig. 7).

1. Description of Tholoi

The tholoi depicted in each of the three plans (Figs. 6, 7, 9) are poorly preserved. The marble or limestone superstructures of these tholoi were likely re-used in other building projects or simply went into the lime kilns once the markets were no longer in use.
The tholos in the macellum at Hippo Regius (C. 6, Fig. 6) has the largest diameter of the three tholoi, measuring 9.70 m. The evidence for this tholos consists of a circular base surrounded by three continuous white marble steps (Fig. 47). Nothing remains of the superstructure; however, the use of marble for the steps suggests that this tholos also once had a circular marble colonnade.

The tholos in the Market of Cosinius at Cuicul (C. 15, Fig. 9) is mentioned in the dedicatory inscription of the market: ... macellum cum columnis et statuis et ponderario et thol[o]. The remains of the tholos consist of a small hexagonal structure, measuring 5 m. in diameter (Fig. 48). Only the lowest courses, consisting of six parallelepiped socles which once supported the columns, remain in situ. Fragments of the superstructure include a frieze decorated with garlands and laurel leaves, and a small head of Mercury. The socles formed a balustrade around perhaps a basin for a fountain.

The tholos in Court A of the macellum at Thuburbo Maius (C. 12, Fig. 7) is very poorly preserved. The remains

---

119 Lassus (supra n. 7) 311.
120 Ballu (supra n. 21) 223; AE 1916, 36. For inscription see Chapter One, 30-31.
121 Allais (supra n. 34) 39; L. Leschi, Djémila, antique Cuicul (Alger 1949) 30; De Ruyt, Macellum 65.
consist of a hexagonal masonry base, measuring approximately 4 m. in diameter (Fig. 49).\textsuperscript{122} This base supports a heptagonal limestone block with square projections.\textsuperscript{123} These square projections likely contained socles supporting the columns, in a manner similar to those of the tholos in the Market of Cosinius at Cuicul (C. 15, Fig. 9). De Ruyt also noticed a socle for a statue base in the centre of this block.\textsuperscript{124} The excavators made no mention of finding this feature in the centre court.\textsuperscript{122} However, the hexagonal form, its central location in the court, and the presence of a well nearby, suggest that this structure is indeed a tholos.\textsuperscript{126} Thus the tholos in each macellum likely functioned as a monumental enclosure for a fountain or statue. This is an architectural variation which is both practical and aesthetic.

2. Additional Peristyle Courts

Two of the peristyle plans plus a tholos have an adjoining peristyle court or courts: Hippo Regius (C. 6, Fig. 6) and Thuburbo Maius (C. 12, Fig. 7, Courts B and C). The addition of another peristyle court, which functioned as a

\textsuperscript{122} De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 211.

\textsuperscript{123} Alexander, \textit{CMT} II.1, 13.

\textsuperscript{124} De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 211.

\textsuperscript{125} Merlin (supra n. 34) 50-51.

\textsuperscript{126} Lezine (supra n. 32) 16; Alexander, \textit{CMT} II.1, 13; De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 211.
temporary market on busy market days, is easily comprehensible when looking at the plan of the macellum at Hippo Regius. The large tholos (9.70 m in diameter) in this market takes up most of the interior court; thus there is very little space left within the court for temporary market stalls. However, the reason for constructing two additional courts adjoining the macellum at Thuburbo Maius, within a relatively short period of time,\(^\text{127}\) is left to conjecture. The plan depicting the small tholos (ca 4 m in diameter) in Court A shows that there is sufficient space for temporary market stalls. However, if this court did have interior porticoes, then an additional peristyle court would not be out of order.\(^\text{128}\)

In general, the additional peristyle courts of both markets consist of open courts surrounded by porticoes on three sides (Fig. 6) or four sides (Fig. 7, B and C). The additional courts also share a party-wall with their respective markets. Each party-wall has doorways between the additional court(s) and the market proper.

The long rectangular east court adjoining the macellum in Hippo Regius (C. 6, Fig. 6) has the remains of many column bases from its portico in situ upon a white marble stylobate,

\(^{127}\) See Chapter One, 35-37 for chronology of the macellum at Thuburbo Maius.

\(^{128}\) See De Ruyt, Macellum 209, n. 239.
and four composite Corinthian capitals. The pavement of this east court consists of a black and white geometric mosaic with a swastika pattern.\footnote{Lassus (supra n. 71) 244-245; De Ruyt, Macellum 91.}

Court B of the macellum complex at Thuburbo Maius (C. 12, fig. 7) once was surrounded by a portico of sixteen Corinthian columns in grey limestone; only one of these columns remains. The porticoes in Court C consist of twelve Corinthian columns in the same grey limestone as Court B.\footnote{Merlin (supra n. 34) 50-51; De Ruyt, Macellum 212.}

These porticoes possibly supported twelve smaller columns which formed an upper gallery.\footnote{Alexander, CMT II.1, 15, n. 2. The possibility of a second floor gallery in Court C is based on the unpublished work of modern restorers and, therefore, cannot be verified. Also, to confuse the issue even more, R. Lantier, "Les grands champs de fouilles de l'Afrique du nord (1915-1930)," AA 46 (1931) 546, noted that there was a two-tiered gallery in the square court on the north-east - Court B not Court C!} A rectangular annexe apparently connected the upper and lower galleries on the south-east side of the court.

Both additional courts contain the remains of mosaic pavements. The open court of Court B was once paved in a white mosaic; however, no trace remains today of this pavement. The floors of the porticoes have the substantial remains of a black and white geometric mosaic with a swastika and meander design (Fig. 50). This mosaic pavement went
around a subterranean cistern located near the east column
base of the porticoed court. The presence of a cistern
suggests that this court could be used as a temporary market
when the need arose.

Court C is paved in a black and white geometric mosaic
with a polychrome border (Fig. 51). The floors of the
porticoes were once paved in the same white mosaic as the
court of Court B; however, no trace remains of this pavement
noticed by the excavator. The annexe at the south of this
court was originally paved in a polychrome mosaic with floral
motifs (Fig. 52). In the Late Empire, a large apsidal
structure was built over the annexe. The floor of this
structure is paved in a black and white geometric mosaic (Fig.
52).  

The peristyle courts adjoining the macella in Hippo
Regius (C. 5, Fig. 5) and Thuburbo Maius (C. 12, Fig. 7) are
elegant, yet practical additions to the peristyle plan with a
tholos, serving as temporary markets during busy market days.

V. THE MACELLUM AT LEPCIS MAGNA

The plan of the macellum at Lepcis Magna (C. 3, Fig.

132 Merlin (supra n. 34) 50; Alexander, CMT II.1, 9-11.

133 Merlin (supra n. 34) 50; Alexander, CMT II.1, 15-16. For
chronology see Chapter One, 37.
3) is so unique that this market should be considered a separate and distinct architectural entity. No other tholos in a Roman North African macellum functioned as a vending area for selling commodities.\(^{134}\) No other Roman macellum had two tholoi or was devoid of shops. This market contains no evidence for partition walls signifying the presence of permanent shops along the outer porticoes. No other Roman North African macellum was so large (70 x 42 m) or contained so many columns (100 plus) in its interior peristyle court. The macellum in Lepcis Magna is truly an anomaly, more like a showpiece than a smelly, noisy and busy market (somewhat like the West Edmonton Mall in present times).

The plan of the macellum at Lepcis Magna (C. 3, Fig. 3) depicts four of the five basic architectural elements of the peristyle plan: enclosed structure, multiple entrances, peristyle court and hydraulic installations. Since this macellum has been fully published and written about in detail by many scholars,\(^{135}\) this section will only focus on the more unusual aspects of this market’s plan.

\(^{134}\) There is no apparent evidence for tables placed between the intercolumniations of the tholoi in the macella at Hippo Regius, Cuicul and Thuburbo Maius.

\(^{135}\) For publication of the macellum at Lepcis Magna see DeGrassi (supra n. 43) 27-70; see also Nabers, \textit{Macella} 184-217; De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 97-106.
A. Porticoes

The plan of the *macellum* at Leptis Magna (C. 3, Fig. 3) reveals two unusual features in its porticoes. First, the intercolumniation of the south portico is much wider than those of the other three sides. Perhaps the architects wished to emphasize this side of the market when the new south-west entrance was built.\(^{136}\) Second, the west portico is particularly wide, measuring 9 m; whereas the north and east porticoes measure 4.50 - 4.70 m in width, and the south portico measures 5.50 m in width. The discovery of a large sandstone stylobate, running parallel to the west perimeter wall, led DeGrassi to suggest that there was a double colonnade along the west side of the market.\(^{137}\) DeGrassi's suggestion of a double colonnade is a plausible solution since the roof supported by this double row of columns spans a wider space than the roofs of the other porticoes. This double colonnade could also protect several vendors and their perishable produce from the afternoon sun.

The interior porticoes of the *macellum* possibly total over one hundred columns in number. There are 80 columns in the four porticoes and would have been 30 or more columns in

\(^{136}\) DeGrassi (supra n. 43) 64, suggests that the south portico was likely erected in the Severan period. See also D.E.L. Haynes, *The Antiquities of Tripolitania* (London 1959) 91.

\(^{137}\) DeGrassi (supra n. 43) 64-65; Nabers, *Macella* 203; De Ruyt, *Macellum* 101.
the additional supposed west colonnade.\textsuperscript{138} The columns consist of white marble Attic bases, black granite column shafts and white marble Corinthian capitals (Fig. 53).\textsuperscript{139} DeGrassi suggested that the columns of the four porticoes were linked together by a series of stone arches,\textsuperscript{140} in a manner similar to the arcuated interior court of the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 11)\textsuperscript{141} and the arcuated porticoes of the Severan Forum in Lepcis Magna.\textsuperscript{142} DeGrassi based this suggestion on the archaeological evidence of several small voussoirs, which may have belonged to these arches.\textsuperscript{143} However, Vincifori's reconstruction of the \textit{macellum} at Lepcis Magna does not indicate this arcuated

\textsuperscript{138} DeGrassi (supra n. 43) 63.

\textsuperscript{139} R. Bianchi Bandinelli et al, \textit{The Buried City. Excavations at Leptis Magna} (New York 1966) 78, noted that during the Severan period, the granite columns replaced earlier limestone columns built by the proconsul C. Vibius Marsus between A.D. 31-37. However, the inscription (IRT 322), found re-used in the stylobate of the colonnade in front of the east trapezoidal room outside the market proper, does not mention the dedication of this earlier portico, see Chapter One, 16-17.

\textsuperscript{140} DeGrassi (supra n. 43) 46, 67; De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 101.

\textsuperscript{141} Boeswillwald, \textit{Timgad} 194.

\textsuperscript{142} J.B. Ward-Perkins, "Severan Art and Architecture at Lepcis Magna," \textit{JRS} 37 (1948) 69-70, Fig. 11. The similarities between the column capitals of the \textit{macellum} and the Severan Forum also suggest that the porticoes in the market were part of the Severan restoration of the market, which included the rebuilding in marble of the south \textit{tholos}, see Chapter Two, 96-97, Fig. 84.

\textsuperscript{143} DeGrassi (supra n. 43) 46.
feature (Fig. 54).

B. Tholoi

Two octagonal tholoi, measuring 19 m in diameter, dominate the rectangular court (Fig. 55). The tholoi consist of a ring of arches surrounded by an octagonal portico and a tri-stepped base. Both tholoi were originally constructed in limestone; however, when the principal entrance was changed to the south-west side, the south tholos was rebuilt in sandstone and marble. The north tholos is in a better state of preservation than the south tholos (Fig. 56). The inner ring of this tholos consists of a continuous circular wall of masonry broken by sixteen arches (Fig. 57). Two of these arches served as entrances into the centre of the tholos. Sixteen pilasters, with Corinthian capitals, were applied to the sides of each arch for decoration. The outer octagonal portico (Fig. 56) consists of sixteen limestone columns with Attic bases and Ionic capitals, plus eight composite piers. The composite piers are comprised of a wedge-shaped pier with half-columns applied to the inner faces. The design of this composite pier, therefore, looks heart-shaped in cross-section (Fig.

---

144 DeGrassi (supra n. 43) 51.
145 Haynes (supra n. 136) 91.
146 DeGrassi (supra n. 43) 53.
The exact nature of the roof is unknown. However, this tholos was likely covered by a roof because there is a ridge around the interior of the upper layer of its entablature, which probably supported the ends of the roof-beams.

The south tholos is poorly preserved (Fig. 59). However, there are enough marble fragments to allow a reconstruction similar to the north tholos. The composite piers, Corinthian capitals and bases of the octagonal portico are in white marble with cipollino column shafts. In the centre of this tholos is a circular water basin made of verde antico marble, measuring 2 m in diameter and 10 cm in depth (Fig. 60). This water basin suggests evidence for a fountain.

The tholoi in Lepcis Magna functioned in lieu of

---


148 DeGrassi (supra n. 43) 53-54, 56; De Ruyt, Macellum 102.

149 DeGrassi (supra n. 43) 60. See footnote 43 for parallels of macella with cipollino columns.

150 DeGrassi (supra n. 43) 59; De Ruyt, Macellum 102.
shops. Each tholos contains over thirty places for selling food. Sixteen stone tables with dedicatory inscriptions were placed between the intercolumniation of the octagonal portico. The inner arched ring has fourteen stone counters under each arched opening. DeGrassi suggested that these counters were used for displaying fish. Additionally, a well located between the tholoi provided a source of fresh water to both structures.  

C. Freestanding Stone Tables

Freestanding white marble tables were found at the rear of the south portico (Fig. 61). These tables also functioned in lieu of shops. The tables rest on stone supports, which are carved in relief with figures of dolphins (Fig. 62) and griffins.  One of the stone tables from the north tholos is deeply grooved (Fig. 63). Perhaps these deep grooves were made by ropes attached to the buckets used to draw water from a well located between the two tholoi. The upper edge of the well also displays deep grooves from the ropes (Fig. 64).

The entire arrangement for vending procedures is far more informal than the permanent shops found in the rest of

---

151 DeGrassi (supra n. 43) 54-55, 57.
152 DeGrassi (supra n. 43) 67; Bianchi Bandinelli (supra n. 139) 79.
the Roman North African *macella*. As Nabers so aptly writes:

The arrangement at Lepcis Magna is much better adopted for use as a true public marketing area where any fisherman or farmer could come, set his catch or produce on one of the tables, and move on when his merchandise was sold, whereas the *tabernae* of the other *macella* are better suited for use by more permanent tenants, the professional merchants.\textsuperscript{153}

\textsuperscript{153} Nabers, *Macella* 197-198.
CHAPTER THREE: PLACEMENT OF ROMAN NORTH AFRICAN MACELLA WITHIN
THE URBAN SETTING

The Roman North African macellum is usually found in a significant location within an urban centre, since it served the public on a daily basis. Many of these markets are located in important ancient centres of trade and commerce. Fourteen macella provide sufficient evidence to determine their placement within each town.¹

I. General Background to Urban Setting: Geographic Distribution of Roman North African Macella

(See Maps 1 - 3)

The province of Africa Proconsularis has the largest number of known macella, numbering eleven in total. Next, there are five macella in Numidia, two macella in Tripolitania, and one macellum each in Cyrenaica, Mauretania Caesariensis and Mauretania Tingitana. Archaeological chance is also a relevant factor to consider in the study of the

¹ C. 1, C. 2, C. 3, C. 4, C.5, C. 6, C. 7, C. 12, C. 14, C. 15, C. 17, C. 18, C. 19, C. 21. The six macella with only inscriptive evidence are excluded from this chapter after Section I (C. 8, C. 9, C. 10, C. 11, C. 16, C. 20); the market at Thubursicum Numidarum (C. 13) is also excluded because of the lack of available evidence.
distribution of Roman North African macella. For example, the remains of some sites are simply better preserved than others. At present, there is no evidence for a macellum in other large centres, such as Carthage, Sabratha and Oea, where one would expect a building of this type to exist. The known macella are found in towns located on major trade and/or military routes, either along the coast or leading to the interior. The distribution of macella in Roman North Africa can be considered as indices of a town’s growing prosperity. Three macella are found in seaports. Because these towns are located on the Mediterranean, it is likely that their prosperity was based on trade and commerce. The seventeen remaining macella are found in inland sites. Because these sites are inland, it is likely that their prosperity was based on agriculture, for example, growing wheat and olives for the Roman Annona.

It seems a likely deduction that the probable function of the macellum was also likely influenced by location, either along the sea-coast or inland. Those macella located near the coast would likely be fish-markets; whereas those macella located inland would likely specialize in the sale of meat, lentils and wine.

Most of the Roman North African macella appear to be concentrated in or near the ‘hump’ of Africa Proconsularis, since most of the major towns are located in the area of the hump. The archaeological and epigraphical evidence supports the idea that the rural population, living far from urban
centres, was less 'romanized'. The simple food needs of the rural inhabitants were met by self-sufficiency or by rural, weekly markets, known as nundinae; therefore, permanent markets were not necessary.

II. The Urban Setting

Many factors affected the location of a macellum: the amount of available space near the forum, the existence of earlier structures and roads, and the terrain.

A. Macella Adjoining or Near to Forum

Nine Roman North African macella are either adjoining a forum or are located nearby (within 100 m): C. 4, C. 5, C. 7, C. 12, C. 14, C. 15, C. 17, C. 19, C. 21.

1. Terrain

The macella in Bulla Regia (C. 5, Fig. 65), Thuburbo Maius (C. 12, Fig. 66) and the Market of Cosinius at Cuicul (C. 15, Fig. 67) are located on a lower level than the forum on account of the hilly terrain. Bulla Regia is situated on a gentle hill; Thuburbo Maius is located on the flank of a

---


3 De Ruyt, Macellum 328.
hill; and Cuicul is situated on a mountainous spur between two valleys.  

The *macellum* at Thugga (C. 14, Figs. 68, 69) is located on a slightly higher level than the forum because of the hilly terrain. This *macellum*, constructed on a rocky ridge, was specifically placed to serve the residential sector of the *civitas*. This housing sector is located several meters below the southern apsed-end of the market. Access to the market was provided by stairways located on either side of the apse.  

The East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17) and the *macellum* at Volubilis (C. 21) have two distinct levels on account of the gently sloping terrain. The East Market (Fig. 10) is situated on terrain that slopes downwards from west to east.  

The vestibule and outer range of six shops could only be reached by ascending one of two stairways from the *Decumanus*

---


Maximus. The north-east stairway has nine steps; the central stairway leading to the vestibule has seven steps. The upper level of the market was reached by ascending three steps from the vestibule. The cardo on the higher, west side of the East Market is practically level with the market's secondary entrance since there are no steps leading down from the threshold.

The macellum at Volubilis (Figs. 70, 71) was also constructed on two levels because of the terrain. The three east shops, opening onto a corridor, are situated on a lower level than the adjoining Forum Novum to the north. A stairway connects the market with the Forum Novum, as well as with the Forum Vetus, via the corridor to the east. The presence of a natural limestone crust as the floor in the corridor suggests that this market was built at the expense of a small rocky hill.

Since the buildings in Ammaedara (C. 4, Fig. 72) flank a hill, they follow an irregular fan-shaped plan which adapts

---

8 De Ruyt, Macellum 199.

9 Ballu (supra n. 7) 15.

well to the configurations of the terrain." Thus, the partially excavated macellum has a different orientation from that of the capitolium on the south-west; instead, the market follows the same orientation as the building known as the 'batiment à fenêtres', located directly to the south.

Judging from the plan of the macellum at Thibilis (C. 19, Fig. 12), this market was likely built on level terrain, since there is no evidence of exterior stairways connecting varying street levels. The available topographical information is insufficient to determine the terrain around the macellum at Mactar (C. 7, Fig. 73). Although the macellum\(^\text{12}\) adjoined the north-east side of the forum, this does not imply that these two structures were built on the same level of ground.

2. Streets

Since a market's main function was to serve the public, the placement of the macellum was also determined by its close proximity to major or minor roads of access. Thus, the principal entrance of a market usually opens onto a major

\(^{11}\) N. Duval, "Topographie et urbanisme d'Ammaedara (actuellement Haidra, Tunisie)," ANRW II.10.2 (1982) 646.

decumanus or cardo. The secondary entrance(s) open onto minor side streets.

The principal entrances of the *macella* at Bulla Regia (C. 5), Thuburbo Maius (C. 12), the Market of Cosinius at Cuicul (C. 15), Thibilis (C. 19) and the East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17) open onto a major road close to the forum.

The *macellum* at Bulla Regia (C. 5, Fig. 65) is not aligned with the forum because of pre-existing roads. The principal entrance of this market opens onto the Cardo *Maximus*. This main road led to the forum, located north of the market. Two secondary entrances on the south-west of the market open onto roads, which lead to housing *insulae*, and also back north to the forum. The north-west corner of the market marks the change in direction of the west cardo from south-west to south-east.

As at Bulla Regia, the placement of the *macellum* complex at Thuburbo Maius (C. 12, Fig. 66) was also determined by pre-existing roads, which do not conform to a regular grid plan. Courts B and C of this complex were superimposed over an earlier indigenous agglomeration, once located beside these
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13 Beschaouch (supra n. 4) 89. It should be noted that the irregular plan of Bulla Regia means that terms such as cardo and *decumanus* can only be used loosely.

14 De Ruyt, *Macellum* 328.
roads. Thus, the market complex has a slightly more eastern alignment than the forum. The principal entrance of the market (Court A) opens onto the Rue du Labyrinthe, which curves sinuously along the south ends of the forum and Courts A and C. Court B opens onto the Rue du Mercure, which separates this court from the Temple of Mercury. Court B is separated from the forum by a series of four trapezoidal-shaped rooms, which provided access from the forum to the market. Court C opens onto Rue de l’Aurige, a principal cardo of this town.

The principal entrance of the East Market at Thamugadi (C. 17, Fig. 74) opens onto the porticoed Decumanus Maximus. The secondary entrance of this market opens onto a minor cardo opposite the ‘maison des jardinières’. The forum is located further to the west along the Decumanus Maximus. The East Market was not constructed when the original grid plan of the colony was laid out, since the west side extends a few metres into the adjacent street. The east side of the market is
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15 Lézine (supra n. 4) 7; Alexander, CMT II.1, 9-10, 15-16.
16 De Ruyt, Macellum 207.
17 Alexander, CMT II.1, 7.
18 Ballu (supra n. 7) 13.
19 The veteran’s colony of Thamugadi is famous for the strict orthogonal lay out of its earliest phase, ca A.D. 100. For plan see, Ch. Saumagne, "Le plan de la colonie Trajane de Tingad," CahTun 10 (1962) 489-508; Lassus (supra n. 4) 245-249.
shares a party wall with a house in the adjoining insula, so that it also interrupts the street between. The portico facing the Decumanus Maximus on the north side of the market is simply an extension of the porticoed gallery of the neighbouring house.\textsuperscript{20}

The principal entrance of the Market of Cosinius at Cuicul (C. 15, Fig. 67) opens onto the Cardo Maximus\textsuperscript{21} beside the forum.\textsuperscript{22} The secondary entrance, in the north-west wall, led to the capitolium. Two nearby streets provided access to the market: the Rue du Marché, which is a minor decumanus bordering the south side of the market, and the Rue des Thermes du Capitole bordering the north-east corner of the market.

The macellum at Thibilis (C. 19, Fig. 75) was easily accessible to the public since it occupied the corner of two intersecting streets, the Rue du Forum and the Rue de

\textsuperscript{20} Ballu (supra n. 7) 15.

\textsuperscript{21} Cuicul was built on a mountainous spur. Therefore, it has only one major thoroughfare (Cardo Maximus) following a north-east-north-west axis. Most of the decumani are, therefore, short and they provide no overall grid pattern in the town. See, W.L. MacDonald, The Architecture of the Roman Empire. II. An Urban Appraisal (New Haven and London 1986) 5; W.L. MacDonald, "Connection and Passage in North African Architecture," Rome and the Provinces. Studies in the Transformation of Art and Architecture in the Mediterranean World ed. C.B. McClendon (New Haven 1986) 29.

\textsuperscript{22} De Ruyt, Macellum 63, 328.
This market was purposely constructed in a central location between the forum to the south and the residential insulae to the north, west and east. The macella in Thugga (C. 14, Fig. 68) and Volubilis (C. 21, Fig. 70) do not have entrances opening onto streets. Instead, each market opens onto its respective forum. The principal entrance of the macellum at Thugga (C. 14, Fig. 68), in its final form, opened onto an elegant piazza known as the 'Place de la Rose des Vents'. This piazza formalized the east end of the forum complex. The macellum at Volubilis (C. 21, Fig. 70) opened onto two fora via a stairway and corridor: a stairway connected the lower level of the market (east shops and corridor) with the Forum Novum, and an entrance in the corridor opened onto the Forum Vetus to the east.

There is not sufficient evidence to determine the road network providing access to the macellum at Ammaedara (C. 4, Fig. 72). The site plan indicates only that the market is located beside the north wall of the capitolium.

---

23 De Ruyt, *Macellum* 204.

24 Poinssot, *Les ruines de Dougga* (supra n. 6) 32. There is no apparent archaeological record for any remains beneath this piazza, so it is not known what the macellum originally faced onto.

25 Jodin (supra n. 10) 113.

26 Duval (supra n. 11) 646.
3. **Macella Located Near Forum as Part of a Larger Building Program**

Three Roman North African *macella* adjoining the forum were part of a larger building project: the *macella* in Volubilis (C. 21), Thugga (C. 14), and the Market of Cosinius at Cuicul (C. 15).

During the Numidian administration in Volubilis (25 B.C. - A.D. 42), the area around the acropolis was re-organized into the *Forum Vetus* (Figs. 70, 71). The original *macellum* belongs in this phase.\(^{27}\) The forum was the centre of distribution for *insulae*, measuring 23 m per side. This formula dictated the size of the contemporary structures, such as the *macellum* (C. 21) to the north and an unknown structure to the east. The later Roman public buildings of the capitolium and basilica in the *Forum Novum* also conformed to this earlier plan.\(^{28}\)

The late second century A.D. restoration of the *macellum* at Thugga (C. 14, Fig. 68) was part of a larger building program to monumentalize the east zone of the forum complex. The original elements of the forum complex date from

---

\(^{27}\) For chronology see Chapter One, 22.

\(^{28}\) Jodin (supra n. 10) 112-114.
a variety of periods. This new building program by the Pacuvii consisted of the construction of the Temple of Mercury, the restoration of the *macellum* (C. 14) and the formalization of the piazza (Place de la Rose des Vents) separating the two structures. Part of the market’s restoration included the construction of an exterior portico to match the portico of the temple of Mercury, facing opposite. The piazza was bordered on the east by a tri-stepped exedra. All the buildings face the east-west axis, giving a very inward-looking feeling to the whole complex. This is partly caused by the steeply falling terrain to the south.

A feature of this forum complex is that pairs of buildings face each other: the *macellum* and the Temple of Mercury (the commercial sector); the apsidal building and the capitolium (the religious sector); and the narrow portico and unknown structure further to the east. The remaining forum (civic sector) takes up one third of the entire area. Another pairing of like elements is indicated by the porticoed terraced courts of the forum on the west and the piazza on the

---

29 For the chronology of the forum complex see Poinssot, *Les ruines de Dougga* (supra n. 6) 11-13.

30 See Chapter One, 26-27; Chapter Four, 131-132.

31 Poinssot, *Les ruines de Dougga* (supra n. 6) 32.

32 MacDonald, *The Architecture of the Roman Empire* (supra n. 21) 257.
east. There are no less than seven apses and exedrae, not including the apsidal-shaped templum Fortunae Augustae located immediately east of the piazza.

The Market of Cosinius at Cuicul (C. 15) was also likely part of a larger building project in the forum area, because the column shafts of this market and the temple of Venus Genetrix have the same grey and white marble. This similar building material suggests that these structures were either contemporary or constructed consecutively.34

B. Macella Located at a Distance from the Forum

Five macella were constructed at a distance of 100 m or more from the forum: the macella in Cyrene (C. 1), Gigthis (C. 2), Lepcis Magna (C. 3), Hippo Regius (C. 6) and the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18).

1. The Macellum at Gigthis (C. 2)

a. Terrain

The macellum at Gigthis (C. 2, Fig. 2) was likely constructed on level ground, since there are no indications of

33 MacDonald, The Architecture of the Roman Empire (supra n. 21) 257, 259.

34 Y. Allais, Djémila (Paris 1938) 16, 38: Allais suggested that the temple was constructed after the market, during the reign of Marcus Aurelius; see also Chapter Two, 63, n. 44.
stairways leading down from its two entrances, although the terrain to the east of the market slopes steeply towards the sea.

b. Placement

The *macellum* in Gigthis is located 150 m south-west of the forum, near the harbour (Fig. 76). The *macellum* is aligned with a road called 'la Rue du Marché' by the excavators. This road turns east from the market and heads directly to the sea. The placement of this market near the coast indicates that it likely functioned as a fish-market.

2. The *Macellum* at Hippo Regius (C. 6)

a. Terrain

The fourth century A.D. East Court of the *macellum* at Hippo Regius (C. 6) was constructed on a higher level than the adjoining market. New pavement was added along part of the street beside the court to compensate for this change in levels. Three steps towards the north end connect the new

---

35 De Ruyt, *Macellum* 75.

36 L.A. Constans, "Rapport sur une mission archéologique à Bou-Ghara (Gigthis) (1914 et 1915)," *NouvArch* 21 (1916) 87, 93. The *macellum* is also aligned with the forum, suggesting that it was built after the Hadrianic forum was completed, see Chapter One, 32.
pavement with the old paving stones (Fig. 77).  

b. Placement

The macellum in Hippo Regius is located 150 m north-east of the forum, near the ancient shore (Fig. 78). As at Githis, the placement of this market near the coast suggests that it functioned as a fish market. Additionally, the macellum at Hippo Regius has a fairly large tholos (9.70 m in diameter). Although nothing remains of the tholos' superstructure, it is plausible that it may have contained a basin for keeping the fish alive until sold.

The macellum at Hippo Regius (Fig. 78) was very accessible to the inhabitants, since it occupied one entire insula bordered by four streets: the Rue de Mercure on the west, the Rue du Concile on the east, the Rue de l'Abondance on the south and the Rue Eupsychia on the north. The principal entrance of the market opens onto this latter north road. The market has the same alignment as the forum even though both structures are located some distance apart. Only the macellum and the forum have rectangular plans which

37 Lassus (supra n. 4) 255.
38 De Ruyt, Macellum 89.
39 For tholos see Chapter Two, 87.
40 Lassus (supra n. 4) 253-254.
establish some regularity on the earlier unplanned indigenous settlement. The later Christian Quarter is located across the road to the east of the market.

3. The Market at Cyrene (C. 1)

a. Terrain

The placement of the market in Cyrene (C. 1, Fig. 79) was partially determined by the terrain, as the south side of the market abuts against the steep slope of South Hill, and the east side is limited by an ascending stepped street (Fig. 80). 41

b. Placement

The location of the market at Cyrene (C. 1, Fig. 79) is partly determined by a pre-existing road known as Valley Street. The market did not follow the orientation of earlier structures found beneath the market’s remains, which aligned with the east-west contours of the south hill. Instead, the layout of the paving stones in the market’s court (Fig. 1) followed the new alignment of Valley Street. Additionally,

this market was also likely planned after the stepped street; otherwise, the east wall of the market and the stepped street could have been laid out with more regularity.42

c. The Market at Cyrene as Part of a Larger Building Program

The market at Cyrene (C. 1) was actually part of two building programs. The first building program, during the Augustan or Julio-Claudian periods, consisted of the rationalization of Valley Street and the construction of the market, as well as the first Building with Wind Swept Capital along the south side of this street.43 During the Severan period, the second building program monumentalized this section of Valley Street. The Severan Propylon and west portico was constructed in front of the market on the north, and the market itself was restored in imported marbles.44

4. The *Macellum* at Lepcis Magna (C. 3)

a. Terrain

The sloping terrain in Lepcis Magna caused the


43 Ward-Perkins and Gibson (supra n. 41) 71; Ward-Perkins and Gibson (supra n. 42) 354.

44 See Chapter One, 24; Chapter Two, 63.
macellum (C. 3) to be constructed on a vast podium of sandstone blocks, reaching a height of 2 m on the north (Fig. 81). ⁴⁵

b. Placement

The macellum at Lepcis Magna was constructed in a new quarter of town, west of the Forum Vetus (Fig. 82). The fact that this macellum was so far from the Forum Vetus suggests that there was earlier development between these two structures. It is unknown whether there would have been available space for the macellum to have been built between the Forum Vetus and the ancient port. ⁴⁶ This port location would have been logical, since the macellum was likely a fish market because the two tholoi contain slanted display tables and a large basin for keeping fish alive until time of sale.

The macellum in Lepcis Magna (Fig. 82) was easily accessible to the public. The principal entrance on the south-west opens onto the major cardo, the Via Trionfale. The Via Trionfale provides access to both the macellum and the

⁴⁵ N. DeGrassi, "Il mercato romano di Leptis Magna," QAL 2 (1951) 36, 43; De Ruyt, Macellum 98.

⁴⁶ Remains of the Punic settlement have been found close to the harbour and in the necropolis, located beneath the theatre, see J. B. Ward-Perkins, "Town Planning in North Africa during the first two centuries of the Empire, with special reference to Lepcis and Sabratha: character and sources," 150-Jahr-Feier Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Rom RM Be 25 (1982) 29-30.
Forum Vetus. The secondary entrances open onto minor cardines and decumani to the east and north. The orientation of this macellum (Fig. 83) is slightly askew of the long, narrow, rectangular insulae, which divide this quarter of the town (Regio V). The alignment of the street on the south-west was determined by the facade of the market.

c. The Macellum at Leptis Magna as Part of a Larger Building Program

The construction of the macellum in Leptis Magna (C. 3) was part of a larger building program to monumentalize the Punic port. Most of the public buildings at Leptis Magna were constructed during the Augustan period: the macellum (9/8

---

47 Ward-Perkins (supra n. 46) 32, suggested that the market was constructed during the Augustan period before the formal layout of the insulae and streets, when there was unplanned ribbon development between the market and the forum. Ward-Perkins' theory of urban development in Leptis was disputed by A. Di Vita, who proposed that the Hippodamian plan was implemented fifty years earlier when this settlement enjoyed a period of independent prosperity, after the sack of Carthage in 146 B.C.; see summary of dispute in Ward-Perkins (supra n. 46) 44-49. There is no evidence to prove or disprove this fifty year gap until it is known just how large the Punic city was before the Roman period.


49 For dating of the market see: IRT 319, Chapter One, 16; theatre: IRT 321-322; north temple: IRT 520; temple of Rome and Augustus: dated by its statuary, see S. Aurigemma, "Sculture del Foro Vecchio de Leptis Magna raffiguranti la Dea Roma e principi della casa dei Giulio-Claudii," Afrtt 8 (1940) 1-94; chalcidecum: IRT 324.
B.C.) and the theatre (A.D. 1-2) were constructed west of the Forum Vetus; the north temple (5 B.C.-A.D. 2) and the temple dedicated to Rome and Augustus (A.D. 14-19) were constructed along the Forum Vetus; and the chalcidicum (A.D. 12) was constructed west of the market, beside the theatre. The use of limestone in all these buildings from the new quarries at Ras-el-Hammam indicates the architectural unity of this program. Additionally, the heart-shaped composite piers found in the market's tholoi, the two temples and the chalcidicum are indicators of a consistent overall building plan. The macellum was also restored in imported marbles as part of another monumental building program during the Severan period. Similarities between the column capitals of the macellum and the Severan Forum suggest that both structures made use of the same craftsmen (Fig. 84).

5. The Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18)

50 Limestone was used only sparingly on the south tholos of the market (the perimeter walls are sandstone) suggesting that the new quarry was not in full production at this time, see Ward-Perkins (supra n. 46) 31.


a. Terrain

The Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18, Fig. 85) is situated on terrain that slopes gently upwards. Several steps were placed in front of the market’s piazza on the west side to join the varying levels of the street and piazza. Additionally, the main entrance leading into the courtyard and shops is raised by two steps, indicating that this market is located on a higher level than its piazza.53

b. Placement

The Market of Sertius (Fig. 74) was also constructed in a new quarter of town at a distance from the forum. This market is located west of the original perimeter wall of the colony because the original plan (A.D. 100) soon became too small to accommodate any new, large structures.54 The placement of the Market of Sertius (Fig. 74) was determined by the Decumanus Maximus. The principal entrance of the market opens onto a piazza facing the Decumanus Maximus. This road, which enters the city through the Arch of Trajan on the east, also serves as the route west to Lammaesis. One secondary entrance of the market opens onto the Voie du Capitole. This street parallels the original west perimeter wall of the

53 Boeswillwald, Timgad 185, 204.
54 Lassus (supra n. 4) 247-249.
colony. The other secondary entrance opens onto an unpaved, narrow, porticoed corridor, measuring 3.30 m wide. This corridor served as a by-pass around the market.\footnote{Boeswillwald, Timgad 184, 203-205.}

c. The Market of Sertius at Thamugadi as Part of a Larger Building Program

The Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (Fig. 74) was also likely part of a larger building program, during the first quarter of the third century A.D. The market’s piazza faces the templum Genii Coloniae, located across the Decumanus Maximus. The possibly contemporary, so-called arch of Trajan\footnote{The contemporary date for the two structures is based on the comparison of similarly designed consoles, see P.A. Février, "Le fait urbain dans le Maghreb du IIIe siècle. Les signes d’une crise?," 150-Jahr-Feier Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Rom RM EH 25 (1982) 62; contra: Boeswillwald, Timgad 200, who dated these consoles on stylistic grounds to A.D. 350-450.} provides a terminal point for this architectural program.

III. Conclusions

In conclusion, the location of a macellum in Roman North African towns provides significant information both about its placement within the urban setting and about its function as a specialty market. The builders of macella gave careful consideration to where these buildings were placed within the urban setting, since they were an essential urban
amenity provided for the inhabitants.

The prime location for a Roman North African *macellum* was a central place, close to the forum. Nine of the fourteen *macella* with sufficient evidence to determine their placement within each town were found either adjoining or near to the forum (C. 4, C. 5, C. 7, C. 12, C. 14, C. 15, C. 17, C. 19, C. 21). Thus the commercial centre was often located near the civic and religious centre of the town. Both structures shared a network of streets which provided easy access for the inhabitants.

A *macellum* might also be built in a new quarter of town at a distance from the forum when there was no available space nearby. This type of planning usually occurred in towns with pre-Roman origins, such as at Lepcis Magna (C. 3), Cyrene (C. 1) and Hippo Regius (C. 6). However, the construction of the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18) in a new urban quarter also indicates that a market could be built at a distance from the forum even in towns which were planned Roman colonies.

Sometimes a *macellum* was part of an urban renewal program which included the construction of other public edifices, such as temples (Lepcis Magna (C. 3) Cuicul (C. 15), Thamugadi (C. 18); a triumphal arch (Thamugadi, C.18); a theatre and *chalcidicum* (Lepcis Magna, C.3); and buildings of unknown function (Cyrene (C. 1) and Volubilis (C. 21)).
some instances, a *macellum* was part of a later building project which included the remodelling of the market, as well as the construction of new buildings. The macella in Cyrene (C. 1), Lepcis Magna (C. 3), and Thugga (C. 8) are examples of markets restored in later building projects. In many of these building projects, the use of similar materials and architectural elements are indices of a conscious effort to unify the overall plan.

It may be possible to infer the function of a *macellum* from its location within the urban setting, in the absence of evidence for the types of foodstuffs sold in Roman North African markets. The *macella* at Gigthis (C. 2) and Hippo Regius (C. 6) were likely fish markets, since they are located close to the sea. The *macellum* at Lepcis Magna (C. 3, Fig. 3) was also likely a fish market, even though it was located in a new section of town which was not particularly close to the harbour. This supposition is confirmed by the presence of slabs in the *tholoi* for displaying fish, as well as by basins for keeping fish alive until time of sale.

One object of interest is a tiny sea-mollusc from the

---

The *macellum* at Pompeii is an excellent source of information about the types of commodities sold in a market. The drains connected with the *tholos* were filled with fish scales, fish bones and fishhooks. Excavations also unearthed jars filled with figs, chestnuts, prunes, raisins, lentils and bread. See A. Maiuri, *L'ultima fase edilizia di Pompei* (Spoleto 1942) 60; A. Mau, *Pompeii. Its Life and Art* (New York 1907) 96; L. Richardson, *Pompeii. An Architectural History* (Baltimore-London 1988) 201.
Indian Ocean. This mollusc, measuring 5 x 4 x 2 mm, was found in the north drain of the macellum at Hippo Regius (C. 6, Fig. 6). The presence of this mollusc indicates that it was an imported object. Perhaps the mollusc shell was sold for other, more decorative purposes since it was too small to provide much nourishment as food!

Since the prosperity of towns located in the interior was based on agriculture, it is likely that the macella in these towns sold specialty items, such as wine, lentils, and exotic fruits and vegetables.

---

58 J. Lassus, "Le marché d'Hippone," Libyca 6 (1958) 247. Lassus notes that this type of mollusc was also found in Monaco by archaeologists.
CHAPTER FOUR: EUERGETISM AND ROMAN NORTH AFRICAN MACELLA

The dedicatory inscriptions from seven¹ Roman North African macella provide significant information about euergetism² and the construction or renovation of these markets. The construction of a macellum was often financed by a powerful, local aristocrat. The most common charge held by these market patrons was flamen or flamen perpetuus. The cursus³ of these patrons contain a number of high ranking offices, priesthoods and honorary titles, suggesting that the gift of a market was considered prestigious. Some of the market patrons extended their local generosity by constructing other public buildings. Junior officials, such as aediles, dedicated items of lesser value, such as vending tables, tables of measures or statues.

The market inscriptions, dating from the first century B.C. to the fourth century A.D., attest to the longevity of


² On euergetism in general see P. Veyne, Bread and Circuses (London 1990).

³ It is fortunate that these market patrons are often found recorded on other inscriptions which provide details omitted from the market inscriptions about their other building projects, military and/or municipal careers.
the market-patronage system in Roman North Africa. The custom of constructing or renovating markets by patrons reached its peak in the third century A.D., under the auspices of several prominent local families.

I. The Major Patrons of the Roman North African Macella

1. Annobal Tapapius Rufus (Appendix, no. 1)

Annobal Tapapius Rufus, the patron of the macellum at Lepcis Magna (C. 3), was a member of the powerful, local Punic family, the Tabahpi (latinized Tapapius). Unlike the other known market patrons who were Roman citizens, Annobal Tapapius Rufus had peregrine status in Lepcis Magna. The market's dedicatory inscription records Tapapius' unique blend of latinized native and Roman offices. He was a sufes, one of the two eponymous Punic magistrates in Lepcis Magna. He was also a praefectus sacrorum, which was a latinized native priesthood. Additionally, Tapapius was a flamen, a priest of

---


5 Thompson (supra n. 4) 240.

6 For dedicatory inscription see Chapter One, 16.

7 IRT p. 80.
the Imperial cult of Augustus. This priesthood, the dedication of the market to Augustus and to L. Crassus Frugi,8 consul, flamen Augusti Caesaris and patron, and the latinization of Tapapius' Punic name attest to Tapapius' transition into a 'romanized' native of Lepcis.

Annobal Tapapius Rufus was also responsible for the construction of the theatre in Lepcis Magna in A.D. 1/2.9 Tapapius' personal wealth (or his family's) must have been vast. He first constructed a macellum which surpassed all other Roman North African markets in magnitude and grandeur. Then, within a decade, he built the elaborate theatre at Lepcis Magna. This theatre remains as the crowning glory of Annobal Tapapius Rufus' career.

Another unique feature of Annobal Tapapius Rufus' dedicatory inscriptions is that they are bilingual: Neo-Punic10 and Latin. Punic was likely the common language spoken by the local indigenous aristocracy, since bilingual inscriptions in Lepcis Magna are attested throughout the first

---

8 For L. Crassus Frugi see B.H. Warmington, "The Municipal Patrons of Roman North Africa," PBSR 22 (1954) 43, no. 120.

9 IRT 321, 322.

Many men were honoured by statues in the macellum at Lepcis Magna, who did not have anything to do with the construction or restoration of this market. For example, an inscription,\(^\text{12}\) inscribed on a statue base from the macellum, records C. Marcius Dento’s erection of a statue to himself. Like Annobal Tapapius Rufus, Marcius was a sues and a flamen perpetuus.

2. M. Licinius Rufus (Appendix, no. 4)

In contrast to Annobal Tapapius Rufus, M. Licinius Rufus, the patron of the macellum at Thugga (C. 14), was a Roman citizen.\(^\text{13}\) The market’s dedicatory inscription\(^\text{14}\) indicates that Licinius had very special status in Thugga: patronus pagi et civitatis Thuggensis. In effect, Licinius was a double patron.\(^\text{15}\) First, Licinius was patron to the local pagus, likely comprised of the coloni Carthaginienses.

---

\(^{11}\) J.B. Ward-Perkins, "Pre-Roman elements in the Architecture of Roman Tripolitania," Libya in History Historical Conference 16-23 March 1968 (University of Libya, n.d.) 103.


\(^{13}\) Thompson (supra n. 4) 240.

\(^{14}\) For inscription see Chapter One, 25-26.

These coloni Carthaginienses had large estates in Thugga. Second, Licinius was also patron to the civitas, the indigenous peregrine community.\textsuperscript{16} Although the market’s inscription records that Licinius gave this market to the pagus, it is uncertain whether the peregrine community were allowed the use of this market. However, this market does appear to have been placed specifically to serve the civitas, many of whose inhabitants would have lived immediately south of the market and the other public buildings.\textsuperscript{17}

Licinius was likely one of the coloni Carthaginienses, for the market’s inscription refers to his priesthood (flamen perpetuus) in Carthage (c(olonia) c(oncordia) i(ulia) k(arthago)).\textsuperscript{18} Licinius, however, did have family connections in Thugga, which affected his choice of patronage. He apparently restored the Tiberian templum Caesars, which had

\textsuperscript{16} Warmington (supra n. 8) 50 suggests that the pagus Thuggensis was also comprised of native inhabitants with Roman citizenship. However, inscriptive evidence from the first century AD suggests otherwise, that the pagus was inhabited by coloni Carthaginienses, see chart in Poinssot (supra n. 15) 230-231. The fusion of the civitas and pagus into a municipium did not occur until A.D. 205, so just exactly when Roman citizenship was granted to individual native inhabitants and how this affected the person’s status within the two communities are problematic; see also J. Gascou, La politique municipale de l’empire romain en afrique proconsulaire de Trajan à Septime-Sévère (Rome 1972) 158-162.

\textsuperscript{17} See Chapter Three, 102.

\textsuperscript{18} Poinssot (supra n. 15) 240-241, 242-243, no. 4.
been originally dedicated by his grandmother, Varia Rustica.\textsuperscript{19} Other inscriptive evidence\textsuperscript{20} records that Licinius constructed the temple of Ceres in Thugga.

3. Lucius Cosinius Primus (Appendix, no. 5)

The two dedicatory inscriptions\textsuperscript{21} from the market of Cosinius at Cuicul (C. 15) are the only inscriptions which provide some information about building costs. Cosinius was taxed 30,000 sesterces as his compulsory fee (\textit{summa honoraria}) for entering the priesthood of the Imperial cult, as a \textit{flamen perpetuus}.\textsuperscript{22} This gift was usually pledged before a patron's adlection to that office.\textsuperscript{23} The inscriptions also record that the construction of the market cost Cosinius more than his original pledge (\textit{multiplicata pecunia}).

Like Licinius Rufus in Thugga, Cosinius held offices

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{19} Poinssot (supra n. 15) 220, 236.
\item\textsuperscript{20} Poinssot (supra n. 15) 215-216.
\item\textsuperscript{21} For inscriptions see Chapter One, 30-31.
\item\textsuperscript{23} R. Duncan-Jones, "Wealth and Munificence in Roman Africa," \textit{PBSR} 31 (1963) 161.
\end{itemize}
in dual cities, Cuicul and Carthage. Cosinius was likely originally from Carthage, as his tribal designation was Arnensis, not Papiria, which was the tribe of the citizens of Cuicul. Cosinius had a long municipal career in Carthage and Cuicul before he was adlected to the perpetual flamineate and five decuriae of jurors serving in Rome. However, even after this illustrious municipal career, Cosinius did not receive full membership of the equestrian order. Perhaps Cosinius had no famous antecedents, as entrance into the equestrian ranks was slower for those patrons, like Cosinius, who did not have illustrious family backgrounds.

The market's dedicatory inscription also records that C. Cosinius Maximus (Appendix, no. 6) supervised the construction of the market in Cuicul. C. Cosinius Maximus was the brother of L. Cosinius Primus. Cagnat suggested that Cosinius Primus resided in Carthage, where he held his

---

24 In Cuicul, Cosinius held the offices of aedile, quaestor, duumvir quingennalis, pontifex, flamen perpetuus. In Carthage, Cosinius was an aedile, augur and decurion: AE 1916, 34; AE 1956, 126. See also H.G. Pflaum, "Les juges des cinq décuries originares d'Afrique romaine," AntAfr 2 (1968) 165-166 for evidence.


27 For Cosinius Maximus' cursus inscriptions see Cagnat (supra n. 25) 36 = AE 1916, 32; Cagnat (supra n. 25) 317 = AE 1916, 33.
offices, while Cosinius Maximus attended to their business interests in Cuicul. 28

The euergetism of the Cosinii is noted in eight inscriptions from Cuicul. 29 Four inscriptions refer to the macellum itself. The other four inscriptions are honorific: two inscriptions record the dedication of a biga to Cosinius Primus by his brother and the senate; the other two inscriptions, recorded on statue bases, are dedicated to Cosinius Primus in similar fashion, by Cosinius Maximus and the senate.

4. Q. Pacuvius Saturus and Nehania Victoria (Appendix, nos. 9, 10)

The dedicatory inscription 30 from the macellum at Thugga (C. 14) records the generous restoration of this building by Q. Pacuvius Saturus and his wife Nehania Victoria. A number of parallels can be drawn between the Pacuvii and other market patrons. Like the Sertii at Thamugadi (see below, Appendix nos. 11, 12), the Pacuvii were a married couple and members of the perpetual priesthood. Like Cosinius Primus at Cuicul, Pacuvius was an augur in Carthage. Like

28 Cagnat (supra n. 25) 320.

29 For a list of these inscriptions see M. Leglay, "Djémila: Nouvelle inscription sur les Cosinii," Libyca 3 (1955) 169-171.

30 For inscription see Chapter One, 26.
Licinius Rufus (the original market patron at Thugga), Pacuvius dedicated his restoration to the pagus. Also like Licinius Rufus, Pacuvius likely belonged to the coloni Carthaginenses.31

The Pacuvii were also known for their generosity in other building projects at Thugga. In fact, they remodelled the whole east end of the forum complex. The Pacuvii constructed a temple of Mercury32 in honour of Pacuvius' adlection to the perpetual priesthood. The area between the temple and market was turned into a large piazza, known as the 'Place de la Rose des Vents'.

5. M. Plotius Faustus Sertius and Sertia Cornelia Valentina Tucciana (Appendix, nos. 12, 13)

Three dedicatory inscriptions33 record the construction of a macellum (C. 18) by Sertius and his wife, Cornelia. Sertius built this macellum in honour of his adlection to the perpetual flaminate.34 Cornelia also held this perpetual priesthood, as did Sertius' father, M. Plotius

---

31 Poinssot (supra n. 15) 244-245, no. 17, 251.


33 For inscriptions see Chapter One, 38.

34 A. Ballu, Les ruines de Timgad (antique Thamugadi) (Paris 1897) 213.
Faustus. In contrast to Cosinius Primus, Sertius obtained his priesthood without holding previous municipal offices. Instead, Sertius was a Roman knight, who commanded three different auxiliary units. Because the flaminate in Thamugadi was restricted to those who could afford the 10,000 sesterces *summa honoraria*, the Sertii likely had personal wealth.

In addition to being *flamen perpetuus*, Sertius was also a *sacerdos urbis*. This official cult is attested in only three North African cities: Thamugadi, Carthage and Cirta. Sertius considered this position, as *sacerdos urbis*, as his most significant office in a dedicatory inscription found in the capitolium at Thamugadi. Thus, Sertius had three

---


36 Duncan-Jones (supra n. 26) 156, n. 46a; see Appendix, 234 no. 11

37 Duncan-Jones (supra n. 26) 170, no. 162; for campaign details (*a militis III*) omitted from Sertius' dedicatory inscription of market see Boeswillwald, *Timgad* 185; CIL 8, 2395.


39 Fentress (supra n. 38) 406.

40 D'Escurac (supra n. 35) 199: [M.] Plotius [Fa]ustus sa[cer]dos Ur[bis]... et Cornel[ia] Valen[tila] Tucciana... [uxor] eius flamines p.p. ... patriae suae fecerunt. This inscription, found re-used in the pavement of the capitolium's court, suggests that Sertius and Cornelia were likely responsible for the capitolium's construction.
religious links with Rome through his two priesthoods and his possible dedication of the capitolium. Fentress suggests that Sertius created these links to Rome through religion to make up for his lack of illustrious antecedents, as a nouveau-riche urban landlord.

Sertius and Cornelia were not modest individuals. Eight statue bases recording their patronage were found spread about the ruins of the macellum. One statue of a female was identified as Cornelia by the excavators (Fig. 65).

6. Q. Aradius Rufinus Optatus Aelianus, L. Aradius Roscius
Rufinus = L. Aradius Roscius Rufinus Saturninus Tiberianus
(?) (Appendix nos. 14, 15)

Unpublished inscriptions found in the macellum at Bulla Regia (C. 5) mention three members of the Aradii family:
Q. Aradius Rufinus Optatus Aelianus, L. Aradius Roscius

---

41 Fentress (supra n. 38) 406-407. J. Lassus, "Une opération immobilière à Timгад," MéPig (Paris 1966) 1221-1232, proposed that Sertius actually benefited from building the macellum. Because of the large numbers of skilled workers needed for building the market (and perhaps the capitolium), Sertius partially recouped his fortune by developing land outside the original perimeter walls. Part of this land was used for Sertius' new abode, while the other part was an industrial quarter. Lassus' hypothesis is plausible, although there is nothing in any of the markets' inscriptions that suggest the patrons made any commercial gains from constructing a market per se.

42 Boeswillwald, Timгад 185-187.

43 See Chapter One, 34, n. 68.
Rufinus and Ti. Aradius---. The Aradii were a prominent aristocratic family from Bulla Regia throughout the third and fourth centuries A.D. Q. Aradius Rufinus Optatus Aelianus is the best known of the three likely market patrons. His cursus inscription lists a number of his important posts in the third century: consul, commander of the Seventh Legion, governor of Galatia, Syria-Coele and Phoenicia, vice proconsul of Africa, and possibly governor of Britannia superior. His illustrious family can be traced over six generations into the fourth century.46

Less is known about the other two possible market patrons. If L. Aradius Roscius Rufinus in the unpublished macellum inscription is identical with L. Aradius Roscius


47 See Chapter One, 35, n. 68.
Rufinus Saturninus Tiberianus known from other inscriptions, then we have the following dedicant of the market. L. Aradius Rufinus Saturninus Tiberianus' cursus inscription lists two priesthoods (augur and curionatus) and his post as a triumvir stlitibus iudicandis. He also led one of the six troops of young Roman knights at the time of the transvectio equitum on July 15. Ti. Arad[ius---, the other market patron, may likely be the father of this same L. Aradius Roscius Rufinus.

Thus it is quite plausible that the Aradii donated a market to their place of origin. Perhaps like the Cosinii brothers at Cuicul, L. Aradius Roscius Rufinus supervised the construction of the market, while his brother (?) Q. Aradius Rufinus Optatus Aelianus served his posts in other provinces.

7. Laenatius Romulus (Appendix, no. 16)

Laenatius Romulus was a market patron who was also a governor. In Lepcis Magna, Romulus concentrated on restoring

---

48 CIL 10 6439 (Privernum): L(uicio) Aradio Roscio/ Rufino Saturni/ no Tiberiano/ auguri curioni c(larissimo) v(iro)/ triumviro stliti/bus iudicandis se/viro equestrium/turmarum q(uestori) k(andidato) / Privernates pa/trono di[gn]issimo et prestantissimo. See also Remy (supra n. 44) 474.

49 Remy (supra n. 44) 474.

50 See chart in Corbier (supra n. 46) 691.
porticoes: the portico in the macellum\textsuperscript{51} and the tripartite portico in the Forum Vetus.\textsuperscript{52} The market’s restoration inscription also records that Romulus held the honorific title of vir perfectissimus. A late fourth century A.D. inscription,\textsuperscript{53} inscribed on a statue base in the macellum at Gigthis (C. 2), is dedicated to a local patron and governor, T. Archontius Nilus. Like Romulus, Nilus was a vir perfectissimus and praeses.

II. Market Patrons: Minor Contributors To Macella

A. Senior Official: M. Livius Felix (Appendix no. 7)

An inscription\textsuperscript{54} records that M. Livius Felix dedicated a statue of Mercury in the macellum at Thibilis (C. 19). M. Livius Felix was a local magistrate of the pagus in Thibilis and a flamen of Augustus.

B. Junior Market Officials

An aedilis was the local official in charge of the

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{51} See Chapter One, 20-21 for inscription.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{52} A. Chastagnol, "Un gouverneur Constantinien de Tripolitaine: Laenatius Romulus Praeses en 324-326," Latomus 25 (1966) 540; IRT 467 = AE 1948, 37.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{53} For inscription see Chapter One, 33.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{54} For inscription see Chapter One, 34.}
macellum. The aedilis leased shops, tested the official weights for accuracy, controlled the moneychangers, enforced contracts and controlled prices of the products sold. Some aediles were minor market patrons. They contributed gifts of lesser value.\textsuperscript{55} For example, the aediles, Ti. Claudius Amicus and M. Heliodorius Apollonides (Appendix, no. 2) contributed the vending tables\textsuperscript{56} found between the intercolumniations of the north tholos in the macellum at Lepcis Magna (C. 3). Additionally, the aedilis, M. Marius Aemilianus (Appendix, no. 8) dedicated a table of measures in the macellum at Thibilis (C. 19).\textsuperscript{57}

Boncarth Muthumbalis (Appendix, no. 3), the triumvir macelli at Lepcis Magna (C. 3), dedicated a statue to Liber Pater in a bilingual Neo-Punic and Latin inscription\textsuperscript{58} This triumvir macelli was possibly an assistant to the aediles.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{55} A.H.M. Jones, \textit{The Roman Economy} ed. P.A. Brunt (Oxford 1974) 23. In Lammaesis, the duties of the aediles were looked after by two signiferi, see R.W. Davies, "The Daily Life of the Roman Soldier under the Principate," ANRW II.1 (1974) 326.

\textsuperscript{56} For inscription see Chapter One, 18.

\textsuperscript{57} De Ruyt, \textit{Macellum} 206: M. Marius / Aemilianus / aedilis / mensuras / structor(ias) et / fabril(es) curavit.

\textsuperscript{58} IRT 294: Libero Patri sacr(um) Boncarth Muthumbalis f(ilius) sobti IIIvir macelli ex multis (denariorum) LXII quibus adiecit de suo (denariorum) LII; for Neo-Punic text see G. Levy della Vida, \textit{BASOR} 87 (1942) 30-31.
\end{flushright}
CONCLUSIONS

From the late first century B.C. to the mid-fifth century A.D., the inhabitants of many Roman North African towns went to a macellum to buy special ingredients for their dinners. The macellum was one of the earliest Roman public buildings constructed in North Africa, apart from the forum. The macellum usually occupied a central location within a town close to other public edifices, since it served the public on a daily basis. All Roman North African macella have their origins in the peristyle plan found in the earliest known macella at Morgantina and Pompeii, built during the Republican period. This peristyle plan consists of an enclosed space, multiple entrances, porticoed court, rows of permanent shops and hydraulic installations. The macellum at Lepcis Magna (C. 3) is the one exception among all Roman macella because of its double tholoi and absence of permanent shops. However, as we have seen, no two Roman North African macella are identical.

The earliest type of macellum found in Roman North Africa is the peristyle plan plus tholos. However, the tholos was an architectural element found in the plans of only four of the Roman North African macella: Lepcis Magna (C. 3), Hippo

---

1 See Introduction, 1-2.
Regius (C. 6), Cuicul (C. 15) and Thuburbo Maius (C. 12). The latter three macella share similar features: a nearly square enclosure lined with three or more rows of shops, multiple entrances, hydraulic installations and an interior court with a central tholos. With the exception of the macellum at Thuburbo Maius, a peristyle surrounded the tholos in these macella on all four sides. The tholos in these Roman North African macella likely functioned as a decorative architectural element to enclose a fountain. Thus the addition of a tholos did not structurally change the basic rectangular or square plan of the market, and therefore should be considered as an optional element which was not uniquely Roman North African in design. The additional peristyle court(s) attached to the macella with tholos at Thuburbo Maius and Hippo Regius are a unique feature found only in the North Africa macella. These courts likely functioned as temporary markets on busy market days, although the two courts at Thuburbo Maius may have served other purposes whenever the occasion arose.

There is, of course, the one anomaly among the Roman North African macella with a tholos: the macellum at Lepcis Magna (C. 3). No other macellum is remotely like this market with its double tholoi and absence of permanent shops. Although the macellum at Lepcis Magna was built by Annobal Tapapius Rufus, a Punic aristocrat, the basic architectural
elements are Roman, with the exception of the absence of permanent shops. Additionally, the monumentalizing use of arches and pilasters in the double tholoi is seen in other Late Republican and early Imperial structures in Italy, such as the Sanctuary of Hercules at Tivoli (ca 50 B.C.) and the Tabularium (ca 78 B.C.), and Theatre of Marcellus (dedicated 13-11 B.C.) at Rome.²

The only non-Roman architectural elements in the macellum at Lepcis Magna (C. 3) are the heart-shaped composite piers found in the two tholoi of the macellum and on other contemporary buildings at Lepcis Magna. These composite piers do not influence the overall plan of the macellum and therefore cannot be considered as significant enough to label this market as wholly Punic in design and not Roman.³

The macellum at Lepcis Magna (C. 3) was constructed when romanization was just beginning in North Africa, at the end of the first century B.C. The Punic and Latin dedicatory


³ Heart-shaped piers are found in Hellenistic architecture, see W.B. Dinsmoor, The Architecture of Ancient Greece (New York 1975) fig. 109; T. Fyfe, Hellenistic Architecture (Chicago 1974) 78. Later parallels are also noted in the eastern provinces, see E. Netzer, "The Hasmonean and Herodian Winter Palaces at Jericho," IEJ 25 (1975) 94, fig. 3, 95; T. Wiegand, Baalbek (Leipzig 1923) pl. 4-5.
inscriptions and the latinization of Annobal Tapapius Rufus' name are indicators that this Punic market patron was influenced by Rome. Additionally, this same patron also built the very Roman theatre at Lepcis Magna. The size and grandeur of the macellum at Lepcis Magna elevate it to a category of its own in the study of Roman North African macella. Only the large and grandiose macella at Puteoli⁴ and at Rome (Macellum Magnum)⁵ are comparable to the macellum at Lepcis Magna.

The next type of macellum constructed in Roman North Africa is the peristyle plan plus apse. There are only two known examples of the apsed-type in North Africa: the third century A.D. macellum at Bulla Regia (C.5) and the second century A.D. restoration of the macellum at Thugga (C. 14). As in the peristyle plan plus tholos, the peristyle plan plus apse is not uniquely Roman North African in design. The apsed-type in North Africa is contemporary with or later in date than the Italic macella with an apse at Paestum⁶ (second century A.D.) and Puteoli (first century A.D.).⁷

---

⁴ For the macellum at Puteoli see Introduction, 6, n. 21.
⁵ See Introduction, 6, n. 22.
⁶ For the macellum at Paestum see E. Greco et D. Theodorescu, Poseidonia-Paestum I. La <<curia>> (Rome 1980) 10-41, fig. 43; De Ruyt, Macellum 125-129.
⁷ For the macellum at Puteoli see Introduction, 6, n. 21.
The peristyle plan plus hemicycle has the most innovative design of all known Roman North African macella with plans. The addition of a large hemicycle or hemicycles lined with shops creates a major structural change in the appearance of the two markets at Thamugadi (C. 17, C. 18) and the second phase of the macellum at Gigthis (C. 2), which has no parallels outside of North Africa.

Since the early third century A.D. Market of Sertius (C. 18) is the only market with a hemicycle datable by inscriptive evidence, and since the dating of the other macella with hemicycles at Thamugadi (C. 17) and Gigthis (C. 2) is based on analogies with the Market of Sertius, evidence for the origin of this new radical design is not to be found. This third century A.D. hemicycle plan likely did not evolve from the peristyle plan with apse. Apart from a major difference in size between the two variations, the functions of the apse and hemicycle were entirely different. The hemicycle was used for commercial purposes; whereas the apse was used for religious purposes, albeit in connection with the commercial function of the market.

Perhaps the third century A.D. hemicycle plan of the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi (C. 18) was influenced by the much earlier Market of Trajan at Rome. The Market of Trajan

---

8 Ward-Perkins (supra n. 2) 88-93, figs. 39-43.
is not a *macellum*, since it does not contain the basic elements of the fundamental peristyle plan. However, this market does contain a large hemicycle lined with shops - the very element which makes the *macella* with a hemicycle so unique in North Africa. Additionally, since Sertius was a Roman knight, it is very likely that he saw the Market of Trajan while performing his duties at Rome. Nevertheless, the fact that there is a one hundred year interval between these two markets, and that the two markets are located a great distance apart suggest that the influence of the Market of Trajan on the Market of Sertius is rather remote.

The origin of the peristyle plan plus hemicycle was likely affected by a broader fashion for hemicycles in architecture, such as exedrae and curving porticoes, although the function of the latter was not usually commercial in nature. Curved porticoed piazzas are found in Gerasa during the late first century A.D. (?)⁹ The second century A.D. 'Place de la Rose des Vents' at Thugga, is also an example of a large exedra with curving portico. This exedra, adjoining the porticoes of the temple of Mercury and the *macellum*, formalized the east end of the forum complex.

Another example of a large hemicycle with partition walls and an arcuated portico is found at Lepcis Magna. This

⁹ See Ward-Perkins (supra n. 2) 335, fig. 216.
hemicycle,\(^{10}\) located opposite the *nymphaeum* near the Severan forum, was part of the Severan building program at Lepcis Magna. The date of this hemicycle is thus likely contemporary in date with the Market of Sertius in Thamugadi (C. 18). The function of the hemicycle at Lepcis Magna is unknown, although the arcuated portico in front of the hemicycle with partition walls is somewhat similar in design to the arcuated portico and hemicycle in the Market of Sertius at Thamugadi.

A *macellum* was one of many public buildings erected by patrons in Roman North Africa. However, the inscriptive evidence suggests that the *macellum* was a prestigious building to construct. The majority of market patrons dedicated a *macellum* in honour of their election as *flamen perpetuus*. In the third and fourth centuries A.D., consuls, governors, senators and knights also constructed or restored *macella*. There was no apparent personal financial gain for the market patrons, but as local landowners, the *macellum* would have facilitated the marketing of their crops.\(^{11}\)

The epigraphical evidence suggests that there was a more or less equal distribution of *macella* constructed during the first to the third centuries A.D. The construction of *macella* in North Africa peaks during the Severan period. The


\(^{11}\) As suggested to me by Dr. E. Haley.
Severan restorations were grandiose, as exemplified by the macella at Lepcis Magna (C. 3, Fig. 3) and Cyrene (C. 1, Fig. 1). The decline in the construction and restoration of Roman North African macella likely began in the fourth century A.D.: two restorations occurred in the still thriving seaports of Hippo Regius (C. 6) and Lepcis Magna (C. 3); and two new constructions at Thubursicu Numidarium (C. 13) and Nepheris (C. 10). However, Lepelley\(^\text{12}\) lists abundant epigraphical data for the construction and mainly restoration of public edifices other than markets in the Late Imperial period, such as baths, theatres, circuses, temples and amphitheatres. This evidence obviously suggests that urbanization continued to be an important factor in town planning in Roman North Africa. The decline in the construction and restoration of these macella does not so much reflect a decline in euergetism, as suggested by De Ruyt,\(^\text{13}\) as it reflects a shift in what the patrons chose to build. During the first three centuries A.D., the patrons considered the construction of a macellum as prestigious; whereas during the fourth and fifth centuries A.D., these patrons considered it more prestigious to restore or construct other public edifices, such as baths, temples, circuses,


\(^{13}\) De Ruyt, *Macellum* 380.
theatres, amphitheatres and Christian churches. A good example of this preferential change in euergetism is seen in the market of Cyrene (C. 1) which was replaced by a theatre, after it was destroyed by the earthquake of A.D. 365.

Perhaps luxury foods became affordable to a significantly smaller urban population because of an overall decline in their standard of living. Mosaics, such as the Dominus Iulius Mosaic from Carthage,¹⁴ depict immensely wealthy latifundia attended by a large rural population of farmhands. These mosaics suggest that the food was grown specifically for the use of the rich estate owners and their farmhands. Additionally, perhaps commodities were being sold in places other than a macellum, such as the 'monuments à auges'. These buildings were a new phenomenon during the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. and have sometimes been mistaken for macella, since they were enclosed structures with an apse on one end. Although the function of these buildings has not yet been precisely defined,¹⁵ the two parallel rows of troughs found within the interior of each structure suggest that they possibly served some economic function, e.g. the


storage of grain or olive oil.

Man-made causes also likely contributed to the decline of the Roman North African macella. The Vandals' invasion\textsuperscript{16} in the 430s A.D. created unrest, although the contributions to the Roman Annona likely continued in many areas until there was a complete breakdown in trade between North Africa and Rome at the end of the fifth century A.D.\textsuperscript{17} During the fourth and fifth centuries A.D., many towns in Numidia were either disrupted by religious dissension\textsuperscript{18} or destroyed by indigenous native uprisings.\textsuperscript{19} Additionally, during the Byzantine reconquest\textsuperscript{20} (sixth century A.D.), only portions of the earlier Roman towns were enclosed by defence walls, thus excluding many of the Roman public buildings. Examples of these walled towns are found at Cuicul\textsuperscript{21} and Lepcis Magna.\textsuperscript{22}

\begin{itemize}
\item Lepelley (supra n. 12) 36.
\item Thamugadi was destroyed by the Mauri at the end of the fifth century A.D., see Courtois (supra n. 16) 315.
\item For the Byzantine reconquest see Julien (supra n. 16) 256-276.
\item Y. Allais, \textit{Djémila} (Paris 1938) 32.
\end{itemize}
At Thamugadi, a small fortress was constructed to the south of the original perimeter walls of the colony.\textsuperscript{23}

The macella were sometimes re-used for other purposes: a cemetery (Hippo Regius, fifth century A.D.), as a quarry for a Byzantine fort (Thugga, sixth century A.D.), and residential housing (Gigthis, sixth century A.D.), and as residential land (Lepcis Magna, first half of the fifth century A.D.). No doubt numerous marble architectural elements from the Roman North African macella ended up in lime-kilns for other purposes.

In conclusion, the macella are significant to the study of ancient urban society in Roman North Africa, since their ornately decorated remains and their inscriptional evidence reflect the high degree of sophistication attained by the inhabitants. However, new excavations using pollen, flora and fauna analysis are necessary to provide information about the types of foods which were once sold in these specialty markets. Additionally, future sondages would be useful in the older excavations of macella to supply a more accurate chronology of their remains.

\textsuperscript{23} Ch. Courtois, \textit{Timgad, antique Thamugadi} (Alger 1951) 60.
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This catalogue lists all the known North African macella alphabetically within their respective Roman provinces. The provinces are listed geographically from east to west.

Legend

Roman province

Catalogue number, Figure number, Map number

A. Name of ancient site, modern locality, modern country, name of macellum

B. Type; area in sq. m.
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G. Principal modern literature
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Cyrenaica

C. 1 Fig. 1, Map 1

A. Cyrene (Shahat). Libya.

B. 
   i. 
   ii. 27.20 m east-west along north side; north-south dimensions unknown.
   iii. 
   iv. 

C. 

D. 1st cent. A.D. (?) based on urban renewal program in Cyrene at this time; restored after A.D. 195; destroyed A.D. 365; late 4th cent. A.D. theatre built on top of ruins.

E. 


Building consists of a paved open court, slightly trapezoidal in shape, with a covered portico on the north, east and west sides. Small rectangular structure projected axially from the middle of south side. Row of shops of varying sizes on the north; in front of north shops is a monumental propylon with adjoining portico. Principal entrance on north-east.
Triполитания

C. 2 Fig. 2, Map 2

A. Gigthis (Bou-Ghara). Tunisia.

B. hemicycle; 608 sq.m.
   i. 32 x 19 m.
   ii.
   iii. 2.07 x 1.75 m.
   iv.

C. opus quadratum; 3rd cent. A.D. restoration: quarry-stone

D. second half of 2nd cent. A.D. (?); restoration 3rd cent.
   A.D.; still in use late 4th cent. A.D.

E. late 4th cent. A.D. inscription: CIL 8 11031.

F. 1902.

G. R. Cagnat, "Gigthis," BAC (1902) 187-189; L.A. Constans,
   "Rapport sur une mission archéologique à Bou-Ghara
   (Gigthis) (1914 et 1915)," NouvArch 21 (1916) 87-91, pl.
   13; R. Cagnat, "La ville antique de Gigthis en Tunisie,"
   JSAV 15 (1917) 298-299; Nabers, Macella 300-305; De
   Ruyt, Macellum 75-79, fig. 29.

Rectangular building consists of a horseshoe-shaped court
surrounded by a horseshoe-shaped colonnade on north, south and
west sides of the court; an apsidal aedicula is situated near
west end. Large hemicycle on west side of court follows
curvature of court; hemicycle is comprised of 5 shops in form
of semicircular niches. Large room extends from north-west
wall. Principal entrance in the east side leads into a
vestibule with two columns.
Tripolitania

C. 3 Fig. 3, Map 1

A. Lepcis Magna (Leptis Magna). Libya.

B. tholos; 2940 sq.m.
   i. 70 x 42 m.
   ii.
   iii.
   iv. 19 m (both tholoi).

C. opus quadratum; north and east walls: opus africanum.

D. 9/8 B.C.; restored in Tiberian period (?); restored mid 1st cent A.D.; again in Flavian or Trajanic periods (?); again in Severan period; restored in A.D. 317-323; abandoned in 5th cent. A.D.


F. 1929-1934; published in 1951 by DeGrassi.


Rectangular building is comprised of a large interior court with a Corinthian portico on 4 sides; two tholoi on north and south. Two tholoi originally limestone; south tholos restored in marble. Tholoi consisted of circular arched inner chamber surrounded by octagonal portico with heart-shaped composite piers. Stone tables between intercolumniations of outer octagonal porticoes of tholoi. Stone tables lined back of south-east portico. Principal entrance in south side. Secondary entrances in north-west and south-west walls. tabernae adjoined exterior perimeter walls on south, north and north-east.
Africa Proconsularis

C. 4 Fig. 4, Map 2

A. Ammaedara (Haidra). Tunisia.

B. peristyle; ca 300 sq.m.
   i. 15 x 15 m.
   ii.
   iii.
   iv.

C.

D. late 2nd cent. A.D. (?)

E.

F. court partially excavated in 1930's.


Square building. Interior court surrounded by portico with Attic column bases.
Africa Proconsularis

C. 5 Fig. 5, Map 2

A. Bulla Regia. Tunisia

B. apse; 576 sq.m.
   i. 24 x 25 m.
   ii. 11.90 x 12.60 m.
   iii. 3.60 m per side.
   iv.

C. opus caementicium; corners reinforced by pilasters of opus quadratum.

D. beginning 3rd cent. A.D.

E. inscriptions unpublished; however, they mention Aradii family prominent in 3rd cent. A.D.


G. A. Beschaouch et al, Les ruines de Bulla Regia (Rome 1977) 89, fig. 84; De Ruyt, Macellum 48-52, fig. 18.

Almost square building consists of a central paved court, surrounded by portico on north, south and east. 12 shops of equal size along north and south walls. Apse between 2 semicircular basins faces court on west. Larger rooms of varying sizes on north-west and south-west. Facade preceded by portico. Principal entrance in east side. Secondary entrances in north-west and south-west.
Africa Proconsularis

C. 6 Fig. 6, Map 2

A. Hippo Regius (Annaba). Algeria.

B. tholos; 1326 m excluding East Court.
   i. west structure (market): 39 x 34 m.
   ii. west court: 15 x 17 m; east court: 37 x 10.50 m.
   iii. 6 x 4.0-4.5 m; 6 x 2.5 m.
   iv. 9.70 m.

C. opus quadratum (first course)

D. 1st cent. A.D. or 2nd cent. A.D. (?); addition of east court: A.D. 364-367; destroyed 5th cent. A.D.

E. dedicatory inscription: Lassus (1958) 246;

F. 1950's.

   Hippone (Hippo Regius)," Libyca 7 (1959) 311-317, fig. 1; J. Lassus, "Le marché d'Hippone," RAE 103 (1959) 186-188; S. Dahmani, Hippo Regius (Alger 1973) 38-39; De Ruyt, Macellum 89-94, fig. 35.

Rectangular building is comprised of two adjoining structures: market on the west and porticoed court on the east. West market consists of a paved marble court, with tholos in centre; 18 shops of varying sizes along north, south and west walls; Three doorways open through east side onto a long rectangular court with portico on east, west and south sides. Doorway in north-west side of court leads into large room, adjoining exterior north wall of market. Principal entrance in north side of east court.
Africa Proconsularis

C. 7 Map 2

A. Mactaris (Mactar). Tunisia.

B. 
   i.
   ii.
   iii.
   iv.

C.

D. A.D. 231.


F. 1970’s (?)


Building is located on north-east angle of forum.
Africa Proconsularis

C. 8 Map 2

A. Madaurus (M'daourouch). Algeria.

B.
   i.
   ii.
   iii.
   iv.

C.

D.

E. identified by dedicatory inscription: ILAlg 2052.

F. not excavated.

Africa Proconsularis

C. 9 Map 2

A. *Municipium Aurelium C[ommodianum..]* (Henchir-Bou-Cha). Tunisia.

B. 
   i. 
   ii. 
   iii. 
   iv. 

C. 

D. 

E. identification based on inscription *CIL* 8 12353.

F. not excavated.

G. 
Africa Proconsularis

C. 10  Map 2

A. Nepheris (Henchir-Bou-Baker). Tunisia.

B.
   i.
   ii.
   iii.
   iv.

C.

D. Late empire (4th cent. A.D. ?)

E. identification based on inscription: CIL 8 24039.

F. not excavated.

G.
Africa Proconsularis

C. 11 Map 2

A. Thignica (Ain Tunga). Tunisia.

B.
   i.
   ii.
   iii.
   iv.

C.

D. restoration in A.D. 229.

E. restoration inscription: CIL 8 1406 = ILS 6795.

F. not excavated.

G.
Africa Proconsularis

C. 12 Fig. 7, Map 2

A. Thuburbo Maius (Henchir Kasbat). Tunisia.

B. tholos; ca 1100 sq.m.
   i. (A) 25.50 x 23 m.
   ii. (A) 19 x 19 m; (B) 17 x 18.60 m (De Ruyt: 20 x 18 m);
      (C) 18.50 x 14 m.
   iii. 2.18-2.35 x 1.80 m.
   iv. 4 m.

C. quarry-stones; corners reinforced by pilasters of opus quadratum.

D. A.D. 168-211; restoration (Court C) late 5th-early 6th cent. A.D.

E.

F. 1910-1920’s.

G. A. Merlin, Le forum de Thuburbo Maius (Tunis-Paris 1922)
   48-51, pl. 1; A. Lézine, Thuburbo Maius (Tunis 1968) 15-
   16, fig. 1.5; M. Alexander, CMT II.1, 9-19, Pl. 1-6; De
   Ruyt, Macellum 207-212, 298, fig. 79.

Market is comprised of 3 adjoining structures with accesses
between them. Market (A) consists of a quadrangular paved open
court; 19 shops of varying sizes along north, south and east
sides; traces of a tholos in centre court. Court B to the
north consists of a nearly square court with portico on 4
sides. Court C to the south-west is comprised of a rectangular
court with portico on 4 sides; opens onto exedra in south.
Principal entrance in middle south-west side of (A).
Secondary entrances in east and west corners of court (A).
Africa Proconsularis

C. 13, Map 2

A. Thubursicu/Thubursicum Numidarum (Khamissa). Algeria.

B.
   i.
   ii.
   iii.
   iv.

C.

D. A.D. 360-370 (?)?

E.

F. partially excavated in early 1900's.


Building with porticoes.
Africa Proconsularis

C. 14 Fig. 8, Map 2

A. Thugga (Douga). Tunisia.

B. apse; 994 sq.m.
   i. 35.80 x 28 m.
   ii. 27 x 11.50 m.
   iii. 2.70 x 2.80 m.
   iv.

C. quarry-stone.

D. A.D. 54; restored A.D. 180-192; destroyed 6th cent. A.D.


F. 1917-1918.


Rectangular building consists of a paved court with a portico on the east and west sides; fountain in centre of court. 12 shops of equal size along east and west perimeter walls. On east side is rectangular cistern sunk below level of court. To the south is semicircular apse opening onto court; 3 irregular shaped rooms on south end. Principal entrance through a porticoed facade on north. Secondary entrances in south wall on either side of apse.
Numidia

C. 15  Fig. 9, Map 3


B. *tholos,* 528 sq.m.
   i. 24 x 22 m.
   ii. 111. 2.15 x 2.50-3 m.
   iv. 5 m.

C. *opus africanum.*

D. A.D. 138-161.


F. 1915.


Nearly square building is comprised of a paved court with a Corinthian portico on four sides; hexagonal *tholos* in centre. 17 shops of varying sizes on north, south, east and west sides; entrances to shops barred by monolithic carved stone table. *Ponderarium* in middle of south side. Principal entrances in north-west and south-west ends of porticoed facade on west side. One secondary entrance in centre of east wall.
Numidia

C. 16 Map 3

A. Lambaesis (Lambêse) Tazoult. Algeria.

B. 
   i. 
   ii. 
   iii. 
   iv.

C.

D. before A.D. 238.

E. identification and date based on inscription: CIL 8 18224 = ILS 2415; AE 1891, 4.

F. not excavated.


Inscription found in ruins 150 m south-east of camp.
Numidia

C. 17 Fig. 10, Map 3


B. double hemicycle; 609 sq. m.
   i. 30 x 22.30 m.
   ii. 7.30 x 5.85 (both courts).
   iii. 2.40-2.50 x 2.90.
   iv.

C. small stone blocks in horizontal layers; corners reinforced by pilasters made of parallelepipeds.

D. 2nd quarter of 3rd cent. A.D. (?)

E.

F. 1903.


Rectangular building is comprised of two semicircular porticoed courts paved in *opus spicatum*. Row of 10 shops on south arranged in intersecting row of double hemicycles; entrance to shops barred by monolithic stone table. Double row of 6 shops each on north side surround semi-circular vestibule; doorways from vestibule lead into small rooms. 6 of these shops open onto decumanus maximus. Principal entrance in north side. One secondary entrance in west.
Numidia

C. 18 Fig. 11, Map 3


B. hemicycle; 989 sq. m.
   i. 38 x 25 m.
   ii. 24.30 x 15.30 m.
   iii. 2.80 x 2.60 m.
   iv.

C. opus africanum; corners: opus quadratum.

D. 1st quarter of 3rd cent. A.D.

E. dedicatory inscriptions: Boeswillwald, Timjad 187-188; CIL 8 2398; CIL 8 2399 = ILS 2753; ILS 5579.

F. 1893.

G. A. Ballu, Les ruines de Timjad (antique Thamugadi) (Paris 1897) 209-221, pl. 31; Boeswillwald, Timjad 184-210, pl. 33; St. Gsell, Les monuments antique de l’Algérie I (Paris 1901) 206-209, fig. 66; Ch. Courtois, Timjad. antique Thamugadi (Alger 1951) 78-81; Nabers, Macella 288-299; J. Lassus, Visite à Timjad (Alger 1969) 57-62; De Ruyt, Macellum 193-198, fig. 71.

Rectangular building is comprised of a court with portico on 4 sides; square stone basin in centre court. Large covered hemicycle on south side; lined with 7 shops of equal size. Range of 6 shops of equal size on north. Entrances to all shops barred by monolithic stone table. Two rectangular rooms on south-east and south-west sides of hemicycle. Principal entrance in north side leading through porticoed façade to court. Secondary entrances in middle of west wall and south end of west portico.
Numidia

C. 19 Fig. 12, Map 3

A. Thibilis (Announa). Algeria.

B. peristyle; 204 sq. m.
   i. 15.70 x 13 m.
   ii. 5 x 3 m.
   iii. 2.20 x 2.10 m.
   iv.

C. quarry-stone; corners reinforced by pilasters of large stone blocks.

D. 2nd cent. A.D.

E.

F. 1908.

G. A. Ballu, "Announa," BAC (1909) 75-79; St. Gsell et C.A. Joly, Khamissa, Mdaourouch, Announa III (Alger-Paris 1918) 76-78, fig. 2; De Ruyt, Macellum 203-206, fig. 77.

Rectangular building is comprised of a paved central court with a rectangular portico on 4 sides with Tuscan capitals; portico encloses two statues of which only bases remain. 7 shops of equal size on east and west sides; entrances barred by monolithic stone table. 3 large rooms on south. Principal entrance in centre of north wall. One secondary entrance in east.
Mauretania Caesariensis

C. 20 Map 3

A. Auzia. (Souk el-Ghozlan: Aumale) Algeria.

B.  
   i.
   ii.
   iii.
   iv.

C.

D. A.D. 230.

E. dedicatory inscription: CIL 8 9062 = ILS 5590; CIL 8 9063.

F. not excavated.

G.

Inscription suggests *macellum* was comprised of porticoes and equipped with weights.
Mauretania Tingitana

C. 21 Map 3

A. Volubilis (Ksar Pharaoun). Morocco.

B. peristyle; 529 sq. m.
i. 23 x 23 m.
ii.
iii.
iv.

C.

D. 1st cent. B.C./1st cent. A.D. (?).

E.

F. 1956; not formally excavated.


Building is comprised of a central court with porticoes. Principal entrance on north-east side. 3 shops face interior court on west side. 3 shops open onto a corridor situated at a lower level on east side.
Map 1. Cyrenaica and Tripolitania
Map 3. Numidia, Mauretania Caesariensis, and Mauretana Tingitana
Fig. 1. Cyrene: Plan of Market - Theatre
Fig. 2. Gighthis: Plan of macellum
Fig. 3. Lepcis Magna: Plan of macellum
Fig. 4. Ammaedara: Plan of central sector
Fig. 5. Bulla Regia: Plan of macellum
Fig. 6. Hippo Regius: Plan of macellum
Fig. 8. Thugga: Plan of macellum
Fig. 10. Thamugadi: Plan of East Market
Fig. 11. Thamugadi: Plan of Market of Sertius
Fig. 12. Thibilis: Plan of macellum
Fig. 13. Bulla Regia: Interior view of macellum

Fig. 14. Hippo Regius: South-west corner of macellum
Fig. 15. Cuicul: Interior view of Market of Cosinius

Fig. 16. Thamugadi: Side view of Market of Sertius
Fig. 17. Thamugadi: Interior view of East Market

Fig. 18. Cuicul: Monumental entrance of Market of Cosinius
Fig. 19. Cyrene: Reconstruction of Severan propylon

Fig. 20. Thamugadi: East entrance of Market of Sertius
Fig. 21. Cyrene: Limestone pavement of market

Fig. 22. Hippo Regius: Interior court of macellum

Fig. 23. Thugga: Pavement in court of macellum
Fig. 24. Cuicul: Court of Market of Cosinius

Fig. 25. Thamugadi: Aerial view of Market of Sertius
Fig. 26. Thamugadi: Semicircular courts of East Market
Fig. 27. Cyrene: Marble restoration of market

Fig. 28. Cuicul: Interior view of Market of Cosinius
Fig. 29. Cyrene: Proconnesian marble capital from market

Fig. 30. Thamugadi: Court of Market of Sertius

Fig. 31. Thamugadi: Drawing of Corinthian capital from Market of Sertius
Fig. 32. Thamugadi: South portico of Market of Sertius

Fig. 33. Thamugadi: Reconstruction of Market of Sertius
Fig. 34. Gigthis: Interior view of macellum

Fig. 35. Thamugadi: Interior view of East Market
Fig. 36. Thibilis: Interior view of *macellum*

Fig. 37. Hippo Regius: Corinthian capitals from *macellum*
Fig. 38. Thuburbo Maius: Mosaic in Court A of macellum

Fig. 39. Thuburbo Maius: North-west row of shops
Fig. 40. Thamugadi: Shops in East Market

Fig. 41. Thamugadi: Shops in Market of Sertius
Fig. 42. Cuicul: Entrance to shop in Market of Cosinius

Fig. 43. Thamugadi: Fountain in Market of Sertius
Fig. 44. Cyrene: Channels for lead waterpipes in market

Fig. 45. Thugga: Apse of macellum
Fig. 46. Thamugadi: Sculpted console from Market of Sertius

Fig. 47. Hippo Regius: Tholos of macellum
Fig. 48. Cuicul: Tholos of Market of Cosinius

Fig. 49. Thuburbo Maius: Remains of tholos from macellum
Fig. 50. Thuburbo Maius: Mosaic pavement in Court B
Fig. 51. Thuburbo Maius: Mosaic pavement in Court C

Fig. 52. Thuburbo Maius: Mosaic pavements in apse of Court C
Fig. 53. Lepcis Magna: Interior view of macellum
Fig. 54. Lepcis Magna: Reconstruction of *macellum*

Fig. 55. Lepcis Magna: North and south *tholoi*
Fig. 56. Lepcis Magna: North tholos

Fig. 57. Lepcis Magna: Interior view of north tholos
Fig. 58. Lepcis Magna: Heart-shaped piers from north tholos

Fig. 59. Lepcis Magna: South tholos
Fig. 60. Lepcis Magna: South tholos with remains of basin

Fig. 61. Lepcis Magna: Vending tables in south portico
Fig. 62. Lepcis Magna: Vending table with dolphin legs

Fig. 63. Lepcis Magna: Vending table with deep grooves
Fig. 64. Lepcis Magna: Well between north and south tholoi
Fig. 65. Bulla Regia: Plan of site
Fig. 66. Thuburbo Maius: Region of forum
Fig. 69. Thugga: Aerial view of forum complex
Fig. 70. Volubilis: Plan of central sector
Fig. 72. Ammaedara: Plan of site
Fig. 74. Thamugadi: Plan of site
Fig. 77. Hippo Regius: Levels of pavement beside East Court

Fig. 78. Hippo Regius: Plan of site
Fig. 79. Cyrene: Plan of site
Fig. 80. Cyrene: Stepped street beside market

Fig. 81. Lepcis Magna: North-east entrance of macellum
Fig. 82. Lepcis Magna: Plan of site
Fig. 83. Leptis Magna: Aerial view of market and theatre
Fig. 84. Lepcis Magna: Corinthian capitals from macellum and Severan Forum

Fig. 85. Thamugadi: Aerial view of Market of Sertius, Arch of Trajan and Decumanus Maximus
Fig. 86. Thamugadi: Statue of Cornelia from Market of Sertius
### APPENDIX: PATRONS OF ROMAN NORTH AFRICAN MACELLA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patron</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Market Activity</th>
<th>Other Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Annobal</td>
<td>Lepcis Magna (C. 3)</td>
<td>sufes, flamen, praefectus sacrorum</td>
<td>macellum</td>
<td>theatre</td>
<td>9/8 BC/AD 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapapius Rufus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ti. Claudius Amicus; M. Heliodorus Apollonides</td>
<td></td>
<td>aediles</td>
<td></td>
<td>tables</td>
<td>1st cent AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Boncarth Muthumbalis</td>
<td></td>
<td>sobti, triumvir macelli</td>
<td></td>
<td>statue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. L. Cosinius Primus</td>
<td>Cuicul (C. 15)</td>
<td>aed., q., IIvir, quinque., pont., fl. PP., augur</td>
<td>macellum</td>
<td></td>
<td>AD 138-161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. C. Cosinius Maximus (bro. of no. 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>aed., q., IIvir, quinque., pont.</td>
<td></td>
<td>curante macellum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The epigraphical sources for these patrons can be found in Chapter One, Chapter Four, and the Catalogue.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. M.</td>
<td>Marius Aemilianus</td>
<td>aedilis</td>
<td>table of measures</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Q.</td>
<td>Thugga Pacuvius Saturus (C. 14)</td>
<td>fl. perp., augur</td>
<td>rebuilt temple of Mercury</td>
<td>AD 180-192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Nehania Victoria (wife of no. 9)</td>
<td>fl. perp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Q.</td>
<td>Madauros Calpurnius Donatus (C. 8)</td>
<td>aedilicus Irviralicius</td>
<td>macellum</td>
<td>2nd/3rd cent AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. M.</td>
<td>Thamugadi Plotius Faustus Sertius (C. 18)</td>
<td>eq. r., a militis III, fl. pp., sacerdos urbs</td>
<td>macellum capitolium (?)</td>
<td>AD 200-225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Q.</td>
<td>Bulla Regia Aradius Rufinus Optatus Aelianus (C. 5)</td>
<td>cos., sodal. Augustali, vice procos., leg., pr. pr., prae. aer.</td>
<td>macellum (?)</td>
<td>3rd cent AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. L.</td>
<td>Aradius Roscius Rufinus Saturninus Tiberianus = L. Aradius Roscius Rufinus (?)</td>
<td>auguri, curioni, triumviro stilitibus iudicandis, seviro equestrium turmarum, q.k.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Leptis Magna Romulus (C. 3)</td>
<td>praeses, vir perfectissimus</td>
<td>rebuilt macellum (Forum Vetus)</td>
<td>AD 324-326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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