

## The Slave and Freedman Personnel of Public Libraries in Ancient Rome

---

GEORGE W. HOUSTON

*University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*

**SUMMARY:** The lower-level personnel in Roman public libraries of the early Empire were part of the emperor's domestic staff, just as they had been household slaves in late Republican libraries. This observation carries important implications. The book collections, at least in origin, were the emperor's private possessions, not public services like the roads, and he might closely control their use. His slave *vilici*, not equestrian procurators, ordinarily directed the daily work of the staff, and the commissioners of all the libraries (originally Greek intellectuals, and not always procurators) may have served primarily as scholarly advisers. No evidence supports the idea of a centralized library administration.

### INTRODUCTION

BEGINNING IN THE 30s B.C. with Asinius Pollio's new library in the Atrium Libertatis, and continuing until at least the 220s A.D., the Romans built a series of public libraries in the city of Rome. We can identify about a dozen of them,<sup>1</sup> and one—the library in the Forum of Trajan—is known archae-

<sup>1</sup> For the sake of brevity, I will in this paper refer to the library associated with the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine as the "Apollo Library," the library in the Portico of Octavia as the "Octavian Library," and the library next to the Basilica Ulpia in the Forum of Trajan (usually known now as the Ulpian Library) as the "Trajan Library." For lists of libraries, evidence, discussions, and earlier bibliography see Callmer 156–67, Tønsberg 22–60 (in Danish), Blanck 160–67, Casson 80–92. Up-to-date accounts of individual libraries are available in Steinby (henceforth *LTUR*), as follows: library of Asinius Pollio 1: 196, Apollo Library 1: 55–56, Octavian Library 4: 141, library in the Templum Novum Divi Augusti 1: 197, Domus Tiberiana library 1: 196, Templum Pacis library 4: 69, Trajan Library 2: 353–54, Capitoline library 1: 196, Athenaeum 1: 131, library in *Pantheon* 1: 197. There may have been libraries in the great *thermae*, too. See *LTUR* 5: 68 for the *Thermae Traiani* and 5: 54 for the *Thermae Diocletiani*, but on these note the doubts expressed in Dix and Houston.

ologically and can be reconstructed in some detail.<sup>2</sup> We know that there were equestrian procurators whose charge was the libraries, although we do not know exactly when the emperors began to appoint such procurators (Hirschfeld 302–4, Bruce 1983). Occasional references in literature give us some idea of scholarly activity within the libraries, and on rare occasions we hear of some specific book or work contained in a library's collection.<sup>3</sup> All of this has been studied repeatedly, and the main outlines of Roman library history are reasonably well established.

It is still possible, however, to extend our knowledge of these institutions. We know the names of, and a little something about, some two dozen members of the lower-level slave and freedman personnel in the public libraries. While this material, primarily epigraphical, has not been ignored in the past, it has never been treated systematically or fully exploited.<sup>4</sup> In this paper, I will set out what is known about the slaves and freedmen who worked in Rome's libraries and then consider some of the implications of this material. A proper assessment of these men will help us form a more precise conception of the nature of the libraries themselves, and it may suggest new ways to consider the rôles of the equestrian administrators.

#### A CATALOGUE OF THE KNOWN PERSONNEL

In Table 1 I set out all the evidence I have found for slave and freedman personnel in the public libraries of Rome in the early Empire.<sup>5</sup> I have been inclusive rather than selective, and will consider problems (as with Scirtus, no. 14) in the notes to the Table or in the discussion that follows. I have arranged

<sup>2</sup> See the discussion and stunning reconstructions in Packer 1: 120–25 and 1: 450–54 with figs. 75–78.

<sup>3</sup> Thus, for example, Aulus Gellius describes sitting with friends in the library in the *domus Tiberiana* and being presented with the works of a certain M. Cato Nepos, whereupon a discussion of the identity of this Cato Nepos ensues (Gel. 13.20). For a generally reliable discussion of such references see Langie 113–20. Fedeli 48–58 also provides references to most of the anecdotes, although less systematically.

<sup>4</sup> Kuebler 1004 provides a list. Halkin 98–102 discusses the *servi publici* and provides references to most of the known slaves *a bybliotheca* and *vilici a bybliotheca*. Hirschfeld 304–5 considers these men within the context of the Roman library administration generally, as does Tønberg 124–29. Helpful comments on the activities of the slave staff, but no comprehensive examination of them, are in Boulvert 58 and 162. Fehrle 84–86 discusses the titles and the limitations of our evidence. Casson 97–98 provides a brief general survey.

<sup>5</sup> For now, we can give “public library” a straightforward but tentative definition: a library paid for by the emperor or the state and open, at least in theory, to the general public, as opposed to libraries maintained by individuals or organizations such as *collegia* for their own use. We will be able to add some precision to this definition as we proceed.

the men in rough chronological order; despite the many uncertainties in dating, this seemed to be more useful than, say, an alphabetical listing. I give each individual a catalogue number and in the rest of the paper refer to the men by these numbers (see Table 1).

Twenty-six men, then: five certainly or very probably freedmen (nos. 1, 2, 3, 13, 14), eleven certainly slaves (nos. 4, 9, 11, 12, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24), the other ten probably slaves.<sup>6</sup> Six of the slaves are called *vilicus* (nos. 6, 8, 17, 22, 23, 24) and so probably had some administrative or supervisory responsibilities (as we will see), but there are no other clear indications of an administrative hierarchy among the slave personnel. Five of the slaves were assigned to the Apollo Library (nos. 4, 5, 11, 12, 16), and five to the Octavian Library (nos. 6, 7, 8, 18, 20); no other specific libraries are named on inscriptions.<sup>7</sup> Men assigned to named libraries generally seem to have worked in either the Greek section (nos. 7, 11, 20; cf. no. 23) or the Latin section (nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 16; cf. no. 17) of their respective libraries. Nine of the slaves (nos. 4, 9, 11, 12, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24) and four of the freedmen (nos. 1, 2, 13, 14) certainly belonged to the *familia Caesaris*, and at least two—both of whom worked in the Octavian Library—were public slaves, or the property of the state (nos. 18, 20).

## THE LATE REPUBLICAN CONTEXT

The titles of these men do not tell us what their tasks and responsibilities were, and to understand them and their work better we will look briefly at the men who worked in private libraries in the late Republic, since these were the institutions that provided the obvious and most accessible model for those who were establishing the libraries of the early Empire.<sup>8</sup>

In Cicero's household, the men who worked in his libraries on a day-to-day basis were, so far as we can tell, slaves, but there seem to have been no men, and certainly no significant number of men, who were assigned to work

<sup>6</sup> On inscriptions of the slaves, which are earlier, the word for library is usually spelled *bybliotheca*, and I will use that spelling when I refer to the slaves. In literature, and in many inscriptions of the second century, the word is more commonly spelled *bibliotheca*. I will use that spelling when referring to libraries generally or to upper-level administrators.

<sup>7</sup> Onesimus (no. 23; see n. 1 in Table 1) may have been assigned to a library in one of the imperial baths, but his inscription does not specify a particular bathing establishment.

<sup>8</sup> In the section that follows I am much indebted to Dix 1986, with whose general conclusions I agree, and especially to his excellent chapter on the libraries of Cicero, pp. 98–190. The reader is referred to Dix for a full discussion of the material that I here summarize briefly. A brief overview of these matters, reaching rather different conclusions, is in Casson 69–73.

TABLE 1. SLAVE AND FREEDMAN PERSONNEL IN ROMAN IMPERIAL PUBLIC LIBRARIES

<i>Name and References</i>	<i>Title or Task</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1. C. Iulius Hyginus Augusti libertus Suet. <i>Gram.</i> 20	praefuit Palatinae bibliothecae	Freedman of Augustus.
2. C. Melissus, manumissus (sc. a Maecenate) Suet. <i>Gram.</i> 21	curam ordinandarum bibliothecarum in Octaviae porticu suscepit	Freedman of Maecenas.
3. Incertus Ov. <i>Tr.</i> 3.1.67–68	custos . . . sedibus illis praepositus (Apollo Library)	Ca. A.D. 10. Probably a freedman. <sup>a</sup>
4. Callisth<e?>nes Ti. Caesar(is) Aug(usti) <i>CIL</i> 6.5189	a bybliothece latina Apollinis	Slave of Tiberius. His mother, Iulia Acca, died aged 48.
5. Diopithes <i>CIL</i> 6.5189	a bybliot(hece) latina Apollinis	Brother, it seems, of Callisthenes (no. 4), and so presumably a slave of Tiberius.
6. Hymnus Aurelianus <i>CIL</i> 6.2347= <i>CIL</i> 6.4431= <i>ILS</i> 1971	a bybliothece Latina porticus Octaviae [ <i>vacat</i> ] vilicus	From the <i>monumentum Marcellae</i> , and so Julio-Claudian, after A.D. 10. <sup>b</sup> Probably identical with Hymnus, <i>de biblyiothece</i> [sic], known from <i>CIL</i> 6.4432 (also from the <i>monumentum Marcellae</i> ). <sup>c</sup>
7. Laryx <i>CIL</i> 6.4433	[de?] porticu Octav(iae) [a? by]bliothe(ca) Graec(a)	From the <i>monumentum Marcellae</i> , and so Julio-Claudian, after A.D. 10. I take this man as identical with another Laryx, a <i>bibliot(heca)</i> and husband of Onomaste, known from <i>CIL</i> 6.4434, also from the <i>monumentum Marcellae</i> .

8. Montanus Iulianus <i>CIL</i> 6.4435	vilic(us) a bybliotheca Octaviae Latin(a)	From the <i>monumentum Marcellae</i> , and so Julio-Claudian, after A.D. 10.
9. Apollo[nius] Caes(aris) <i>CIL</i> 6.4233	[a?] bybl[i]otheca]	From the <i>monumentum Liviae</i> , and so Julio-Claudian. <sup>d</sup>
10. [C?]harop(s?) <i>CIL</i> 6.4420	ad byblio(thecam)	Assigned in <i>CIL</i> to the <i>monumentum Marcellae</i> , but perhaps from nearby; thus Julio-Claudian or somewhat later. <sup>e</sup>
11. Alexander C. Caesaris Aug. Germanici ser(vus) Pylaemenianus <i>CIL</i> 6.5188= <i>ILS</i> 1589	ab bybliothecae graeca templi Apollinis	Slave of Caligula. Died aged 30.

<sup>a</sup> The title *praepositus* would, if used on an inscription, certainly indicate freedman status: we find it as the name of a supervisory position from the early second century on (Weaver 228). Here, however, we have the text not of an inscription, but of the poet Ovid, and we are dealing with the early years of the Empire, before *praepositus* became a standardized title, so that we cannot be quite sure of this man's status.

<sup>b</sup> Manacorda's article is an important reevaluation of the inscriptions assigned in *CIL* to the columbarium known traditionally as the *monumentum Marcellae*. Manacorda identified many of the stones that were actually in the columbarium when it was excavated and distinguished them from others found nearby and later attached to the walls of the columbarium. The inscriptions that were found in the columbarium do not support the thesis that this was a burial place for the slaves and freedmen of Marcella in particular, but they do indicate a connection between the columbarium and Octavia (sister of Augustus and mother of the two Marcellae) and her family. Manacorda believes that the inscriptions mentioning librarians probably did come from within this columbarium (Manacorda 259), and he is able to confirm that the columbarium was put into use in A.D. 10 (Manacorda 253).

<sup>c</sup> There is some reason to doubt that the two men named Hymnus are identical. Hymnus is a very common name among imperial slaves and freedmen: there are more than forty instances in the Index to *CIL* 6. Also, the Hymnus known from *CIL* 6.4432 is not called *vilicus*, while the Hymnus of 6.4431 is. But on the whole the two men seem likely to be identical, and I will regard them as such.

<sup>d</sup> This columbarium, discovered in 1726, seems to have been in use from late in the reign of Augustus to the time of Claudius. See the notes of Mommsen, quoted by Henzen at *CIL* 6.2 p. 878.

<sup>e</sup> Manacorda 251 with n. 7 suggests that this particular inscription may not have come from the *monumentum*, but from nearby.

TABLE 1. (CONTINUED)

<i>Name and References</i>	<i>Title or Task</i>	<i>Comment</i>
12. Antiochus Ti. Claudi Caesaris <i>CIL</i> 6.5884	a bybliothea latina Apollinis	Slave of Claudius.
13. Ti. Claudius Aug(usti) l(ibertus) Hymenaeus <i>CIL</i> 6.8907	medicus a bybliotheceis	Freedman of Claudius or Nero.
14. Ti. Claudius Aug(usti) l(ibertus) Scirtus <sup>f</sup> <i>CIL</i> 10.1739	proc(urator) bybl(iothecarum? or -iothecae?) <sup>g</sup>	Freedman of Claudius. Bay of Naples? <sup>h</sup>
15. Festus <i>CIL</i> 6.5190	a bibliotec(a)	Two women in his family were Iuliae, so probably Julio-Claudian in date. <sup>i</sup>
16. Liberalis [...] <i>CIL</i> 6.5191	[a bybliothe(eca)] latina Apollinis	Probably Julio-Claudian, but perhaps later.
17. Saturninus Caes(aris) ser(vus) Väänänen 41–42	vil(icus) [ <i>vacat</i> ] a bybl(iotheca) Lat(ina)	Nero and later: his wife is called Neronis Caesar(is) ancill(a).
18. Soterichus publicus Vestricianus <i>CIL</i> 6.5192= 6.2349= <i>ILS</i> 1970	a bubliothece [sic] porticus Octaviae	Probably Julio-Claudian, but quite possibly later. <sup>j</sup> Died aged 28.
19. Incertus <i>CIL</i> 6.5347	a byblio(thea)	Probably Julio-Claudian.
20. Philoxenus Iulian(us) public(us) <i>CIL</i> 6.2348= <i>ILS</i> 1972	de porticu Octaviae a bibliotheca Graeca	
21. Alexio Caesaris Aug(usti) <i>CIL</i> 6.8743	ab bybliothece	Probably Julio-Claudian. <sup>k</sup>

<sup>f</sup> Chantraine 39 n. 87 suggested that this Scirtus can be identified with the [...] iirtus l(i)bertus) a by(b)liotheca) known from the *Fasti Antiates ministorum domus Augustae* (Degrassi 13.2.201–7). The identification is quite likely. First, it is not easy to find a name other than Scirtus that ends in -iirtus. (Solin 3: 1436 lists none in his reverse index of names.) Second, the name Scirtus is quite rare, appearing only eight times in the inscriptions of Rome (Solin 1: 406). If we have two men, both of whom are associated with libraries and named [Sc]iirtus, they are probably identical. Chantraine also argued, on the basis of Scirtus' nomenclature in the *fasti*, that he had been a slave of Claudius and manumitted before Claudius became emperor; taking the status indication Aug. l(i)bertus) only when Claudius became emperor.

<sup>g</sup> We do not know Scirtus' precise position. His sepulchral inscription was almost certainly found somewhere on the Bay of Naples, suggesting that he was procurator not of libraries in Rome but of one or more libraries in imperial villas on the Bay. But if Chantraine is correct in identifying Scirtus with the [...] iirtus known from the *fasti Antiates* (see n. f), we would have evidence that Scirtus had worked in the neighborhood of Rome, and could more confidently assign him to the libraries of Rome. If we do assign Scirtus to Rome, it is conceivable that he was a freedman procurator not of all the libraries but of one particular library. Since his inscription does not give the name of a specific library, however, it is probably best to take him as a director of all the libraries in Rome, as scholars have generally done. So, for example, Hirschfeld 302 n. 7 and Boulvert 162. We now know that there had already been a freedborn director of all the libraries under Tiberius (Ti. Julius Pappus, no. 28 in Table 4 below), and so it might seem unlikely that Claudius would appoint a director who was only a freedman; but given Claudius' inclination to appoint freedmen to administrative and advisory positions, this is perhaps not a problem.

<sup>h</sup> Mommsen included this inscription among those assigned to Puteoli, but it first came to light in a private collection in Naples and is of unknown provenience (“*sine loco*,” Mommsen ad loc.).

<sup>i</sup> Callisthenes, Diopithes, Alexander, Festus, Liberalis, and Soterichus (nos. 4, 5, 11, 15, 16, and 18) are all known from inscriptions found in a columbarium discovered in 1852 in the Vigna Codini. Most of the datable inscriptions in this columbarium date from the reigns of Tiberius through Claudius, but some urns and stones were introduced in later periods, continuing to the time of at least Marcus Aurelius. See further Henzen at *CIL* 6.2 p. 941. Where our inscriptions from this columbarium cannot be dated from internal evidence, I have assigned them a date of “probably Julio-Claudian.”

<sup>j</sup> Soterichus' inscription comes from the columbarium described in the preceding note. There are, however, indications that he should be dated in the latter part of the first century or even later. The abbreviated formula DMS, which appears on Soterichus' inscription, is usually a sign of post-Neronian date, and Soterichus' cognomen Vestricianus ought to indicate that he was given to the state by someone named Vestricius. The only prominent family of Vestricii we know of dates to the time of Domitian and Trajan: Vestricius Spurinna, the friend of Pliny, and his son (see Schuster). If we could date Vestricianus securely in Flavian or later times, there would be interesting consequences. The Portico of Octavia burned in A.D. 80, along with the books in it, according to Dio 66.24. If Vestricianus post-dates the fire, then the library must have been rebuilt, presumably by Domitian. Also, Vestricianus would be the latest attested *servus publicus* working in a library in Rome.

<sup>k</sup> The date is inferred from the formula *Caesaris Aug(usti)*. Most datable examples of this formula date to the Julio-Claudian period, though there are some examples from the Flavian period and perhaps later. See Chantraine 190 and Weaver 50.

TABLE 1. (CONTINUED)

<i>Name and References</i>	<i>Title or Task</i>	<i>Comment</i>
22. Alcimus Caes(aris) <i>CIL</i> 14.196 (Ostia)	vilic[us] a bybliotheca	Date uncertain.
23. Onesimus Cae[s(aris) n(ostri)] <i>CIL</i> 6.8679	vilic(us) thermar[um ...] bybliothec(ae?) Gra[ec(ae?)]	Date and exact title uncertain. <sup>l</sup>
24. [Eutyc?]hes Caes(aris) n(ostri) servus <i>CIL</i> 6.8744	vilicus [a byblio]theca	Dated 1 October A.D. 126. A dedication, not a sepulchral inscription. <sup>m</sup>
25. Incertus M. Aurelius, in Fro. <i>M. Caes.</i> 4.5 (p. 61.17 van den Hout)	bibliothecarius (Bibliotheca Tiberiana)	Status uncertain, but probably slave. 140s A.D., after 143.
26. Incertus Gel. 13.20.1	Unknown (Bibliotheca Tiberiana)	Status uncertain, but probably slave. Date ca. A.D. 150–70.

<sup>l</sup> For a discussion of Onesimus and the problems his inscription presents see Houston. Note also *CIL* 6.4461 (from the *monumentum Marcellae*), an Onesimus *a porticu* (mentioned in the context of librarians by Manacorda 259 n. 45); but *CIL* 6.4461 is apparently complete, and so unlikely to have referred to an *a bybliotheca a porticu Octaviae*.

<sup>m</sup> The restoration of this man's name is completely uncertain, and I use the suggestion of Henzen in *CIL* purely *exempli gratia*. The restoration [*a byblio]theca*, on the other hand, is highly probable: the only possible alternative is [*a pinaco]theca*, an extremely rare title. It appears only once in the inscriptions of Rome: *CIL* 6.10234, Flavius Apollonius, *a pinacothecis*.



in his libraries on a full-time basis.<sup>9</sup> No one called *bibliothecarius* or *a bibliotheca*, or any equivalent term, is attested in Cicero's letters, despite his frequent references to his and his brother's libraries; it appears that Cicero's libraries, being part of his house, were cared for and managed on a day-to-day basis by household slaves who would have had other tasks as well, instead of by a full-time staff.<sup>10</sup>

Occasionally, Cicero did have need of specially trained library staff, and at these times we find him seeking assistance from Atticus, who had men whose sole concern was books.<sup>11</sup> Thus in 56 B.C., when Cicero was restoring his library after returning from exile, he asked Atticus to send him two *librarioli* to act as *glutinatores* (*Att.* 4.4a.1); we hear later that the two men have added labels to volumes, and built and perhaps painted bookcases.<sup>12</sup> Even here, where we have men trained to work with books, they seem to perform a variety of tasks: these men are simply *librarioli*, men who know what to do in a library, and are no more specialized than that.

Similarly, when the owner of a collection of books wanted to organize his collection into a systematic library, or when someone wanted to create a completely new library, he would ordinarily engage a scholar to do the sorting, listing, and shelving required. Thus in 56 B.C. Cicero engaged the celebrated Greek scholar Tyrannio to organize (or reorganize) his library at Antium (*Att.* 4.8.2); two years later he sought the help of Tyrannio again, in connection with his brother Quintus' library (*Q.fr.* 3.4.5); and Julius Caesar famously

<sup>9</sup> The only named slave who can reasonably be assigned to Cicero's libraries is Dionysius, who stole a considerable number of books in the fall of 46 B.C., fled to Dalmatia (*Fam.* 13.77.3), and was still missing eight months later (*Fam.* 5.9.2). Even he was not exclusively, or always, a librarian: at other times he seems to have been a reader (*ibid.*) and a messenger (*Att.* 9.3.1). Similarly, in Atticus' household, according to Nepos, all the slaves were trained in multiple skills, so that even the *pedisequi* could both read and make copies (*Nep. Att.* 13.3).

<sup>10</sup> Ordinary maintenance and cleaning of the library room(s) would presumably be the responsibility of those who cleaned and maintained the house or villa generally. As for the book collection, Dix 1986: 135 suggests that slaves who ordinarily worked as readers, copyists (=clerks), or letter-carriers might all have been educated in a way that would make them suitable to work, as needed, in the library.

<sup>11</sup> Horsfall 88–89 provides a useful corrective to the usual modern view that Atticus was a publisher in the sense of making money from the sale of books. He argues that Atticus simply used his slaves to make copies of books for his friends and to do other work on books.

<sup>12</sup> *Cic. Att.* 4.5.3, cf. Dix 1986: 177 n. 144. For the tasks that a *glutinator* working with books might undertake see Turner. Turner suggests that they might be expected to attach the titles to papyrus rolls, strengthen rolls by pasting slips on their backs, and mend broken rolls. Cicero apparently did not feel that he needed to have any such specialists among the slaves in his household or library.

engaged the great polymath Terentius Varro to assemble and set up “the biggest possible Greek and Latin libraries.”<sup>13</sup>

Our group of imperial slaves called a *bybliotheca* or some equivalent fits comfortably within this context. Most of them are domestic slaves, like the library workers in the households of Cicero and Atticus.<sup>14</sup> Like Atticus’ slaves, they seem to be assigned to work exclusively in the libraries, but (as with Atticus’ *librarioli*) we do not find indications of sub-specialties within the libraries. No known library worker was concerned, for example, with what we would call acquisitions, or cataloguing, or circulation. This is all more or less predictable, and it makes sense. When the emperors established libraries, they could easily staff them by following Republican precedent and detailing appropriate slaves in their households to the libraries. While these libraries may have been large by ancient standards, they were not so large or complex that the workers in them would need to be assigned to distinct areas of professional responsibility.<sup>15</sup> An *a bybliotheca*, that is, might be expected to do any and all tasks in a library, just as the men Cicero borrowed from Atticus worked on books but also built shelves.

#### THE IMPERIAL VILLA AT ANTIUM

We can observe the emperors adopting Republican practice in another, more limited, context, and that is the imperial villa at Antium. From this villa we have a list of the officers of the *collegium* of freedmen and slaves employed at the villa, extending from A.D. 31 to 51.<sup>16</sup> In the list we find slaves who performed a number of tasks around the villa. There are, for example, gardeners (*topiarii*, in

<sup>13</sup> Suet. *Jul.* 44.2: *destinabat* (sc. *Caesar*) . . . *bibliothecas Graecas Latinasque quas maximas posset publicare, data Marco Varroni cura comparandarum ac digerendarum* (sc.) *bibliothecarum*). Caesar’s project was, of course, cut short by his death, but various scholars have suggested, quite plausibly, that Asinius Pollio could well have had Varro organize the library in the Atrium Libertatis. See Dix 1986: 199–200.

<sup>14</sup> We will discuss the *servi publici* attested for the Octavian Library below.

<sup>15</sup> We do not have reliable figures on the size of imperial libraries. Occasionally we hear about the size of a private library, for example one of 62,000 volumes (*HA Gord.* 18.2), but the source of this figure—the *Historia Augusta*—makes it unreliable. For the libraries in the Forum of Trajan, Packer 1: 454 estimates a total capacity of twenty to forty thousand volumes, on the assumption that scrolls would not be piled more than two deep on each shelf. Even if scrolls were piled three or more deep in places, the collection in this library—perhaps the largest of Rome’s libraries—is not likely to have exceeded seventy thousand volumes. We might guess, then, that public libraries in Rome ordinarily contained anywhere from ten to fifty thousand volumes.

<sup>16</sup> The *Fasti Antiates ministrorum domus Augustae*: Degraffi 13.2.201–7.

the fragment placed between A.D. 32 and 36), stewards (*atrienses*, A.D. 37 and in several later years), men who tended the furnishings of the villa (*a supellectile*, A.D. 37 and 48), a messenger (*tabellarius*, A.D. 43), men who apparently tended the physical plant, such as plasterers (*tectores*, A.D. 41 and 48) and a tile-worker (*tegularius*, A.D. 50), and a great variety of other workers as well.<sup>17</sup> Among them are at least four men assigned to the library, two freedmen and two slaves (see Table 2).

In name, title, and status, these four men look very much like the personnel attested for the public libraries in Rome. They belong, of course, to a single villa, and to that villa's library, presumably a private one, and in that they are different from our imperial librarians, who worked at any one of a number of locations. But if Augustus started with a private household in Rome something like this one at Antium, and then began to create public libraries, it is easy to conceive of him assigning appropriately trained members of his own *familia*, whether already called a *bybliotheca* or not, to the new library or libraries.

#### SLAVES A *BYBLIOTHECA* DOMESTIC, NOT ADMINISTRATIVE

Most of the men in our catalogue are called simply a *bybliotheca* or some equivalent, and all of the men so designated are slaves. If the libraries, either individually or collectively, were regarded by the emperors as an administrative unit (in Roman terms perhaps a *ratio*), we would expect to find in the epigraphical record some of the clerical or financial positions so characteristic of the imperial administration. There ought to be, for example, at least some freedman secretaries (*commentarienses* or *a commentariis*), accountants (*tabularii*), clerks (*adiutores*), or perhaps money handlers (*dispensatores*, *vicarii*) or junior administrators of various sorts, but none of these appears in our inscriptions.<sup>18</sup> The absence of such titles and positions carries interesting implications.

<sup>17</sup> A brief introduction to the villa at Antium, with earlier bibliography, is in Coarelli 293–96. For the titles given staff in a large household see Treggiari 1975 (Livia's *familia*) or Buonocore 32–35 (*familia* of the Volusii Saturnini). Neither of these households had men a *bybliotheca*.

<sup>18</sup> These titles are too common to need documenting here, but it will be useful to note a few of the kinds of public services for which such clerks and accountants are attested. We find them working in the offices of the *annona*, both in Rome and at Ostia, in the offices of the aqueducts, public works, gladiatorial costumes and other offices associated with the games, and many other services. Further examples will be found in the *CIL* Index of Volume 6, and in the *DizEpig* articles on *commentarii* (and the *a commentariis*) by de Ruggiero and on *dispensatores* by Vulić. *Dispensatores* are slaves, the others usually freedmen.

TABLE 2. LIBRARY WORKERS FROM THE IMPERIAL VILLA AT ANTIUM<sup>a</sup>

<i>Name and References</i>	<i>Title or Task</i>	<i>Comment</i>
[. . .]irtus l(ibertus) <sup>b</sup> Degrassi 13.2.203	a byb(liothece)	Freedman. A.D. 37.
Claud(ius) Atimetus Degrassi 13.2.205	a byb(liothece)	Freedman. A.D. 43.
Chresimus Degrassi 13.2.207	a byb(liothece)	Slave. A.D. 44.
Bathyllus ver(na) Capr(ensis) Degrassi 13.2.207	a bybl(iothece)	Slave. A.D. 48.

<sup>a</sup> The *fasti* also list two *glutinatores*, under the year A.D. 38. In literature, we sometimes hear of *glutinatores* or glue in the context of libraries: thus Cic. *Att.* 4.4a.1, as noted earlier, and Varro, quoted by Charisius (1.87–88 Keil: “Varro, talking about libraries, used this form [i.e., *gluten*, not *glutinium*]”). If we could be sure that *glutinatores* always worked on books or in libraries, we could assign these two slaves (named Eros and Aphrodisius) to the library at Antium, and we would have our first (and perhaps only) evidence for some form of specialization in an imperial library. Unfortunately, *glutinator* is used in other contexts as well, and it never appears in an unambiguous context in inscriptions. Glue—*gluten*, *glutinium*, and other forms—was crucial also in woodworking, as for example in veneering (Plin. *Nat.* 16.226), and the word *glutinium* denotes a variety of substances used for joining metals, as well (Plin. *Nat.* 33.94); see further Mols 95–96. At Antium we find numerous men concerned with the physical plant, such as the plasterers and tile-workers noted earlier, a stone-cutter (*lapidarius*, A.D. 49), and a floor-layer (*pavimentarius*, A.D. 49), so that the *glutinatores* here may have been employed not in the library but in the carpentry shop.

<sup>b</sup> This man has been identified with our no. 14, Ti. Claudius Aug. l. Scirtus; see notes f and g in Table 1.

In his fundamental study of the *familia Caesaris*, Paul Weaver noted that the imperial *familia* can be divided into two basic groups. One group consisted of “. . . the staff engaged in the personal service of the emperor as the greatest of the noble Roman magnates, an extension of the domestic household of any wealthy Roman,” while the other group consisted of those staff who assisted the emperor in his duties as magistrate (Weaver 5). The former included the staff of the imperial palace on the Palatine and the various villas and other properties of the Emperor, and their duties “ranged from the menial, such as *custos* . . . through those with some degree of responsibility or

skill [such as the] *topiarius* (ornamental gardener) . . . and *archimagirus* (head chef) . . . to the managerial posts of *procurator* and *subprocurator domus Augustianae*.” The second (administrative) group included, among other things, the men we might think of as concerned with public services, such as aqueducts, roads, public works, and the *vehiculatio*, and in many such units we find *dispensatores*, *commentarienses*, and *tabularii* (Weaver 6–7). Needless to say, the domestic/administrative distinction is a modern, not an ancient, one, and the borders between the two categories were often blurred, as Weaver remarked (Weaver 5–6). Still, in broad outline the distinction is clear and useful, and it was real enough in practice.

Given the available evidence, the imperial staff in the libraries fit most easily within Weaver’s first group, the domestic staff.<sup>19</sup> We can compare them to the numerous personnel in charge of certain types of property, such as the *a supellectile* (ILS 1772–74), the *a veste* (ILS 1756, 1763), the *ab auro* (ILS 1811–16), and many others (Boulvert 25–32). We see librarians listed along with exactly this sort of domestic in the *fasti* of the villa at Antium (among them an *a supellectile*), and it is not difficult to conceive of the *a bybliotheca* as in charge of the collection of books, parallel to the slave in charge of, say, the collection of silver dishes. Of the twenty-one men in Table 1 who were certainly or probably slaves, not one has a title that implies an administrative or financial function, making it very difficult to assign them to Weaver’s second group.<sup>20</sup> Further, one of our staff is a freedman *medicus*, Hymenaeus (no. 13), and *medici*, as we will see later, are regularly found within the emperor’s domestic staff, but almost never in administrative units.

If our slaves were simply and solely domestics, then the libraries of Rome were in the first instance not an administrative unit, more or less parallel to the aqueducts, the *vehiculatio*, the roads, and the like.<sup>21</sup> Rather, they were part

<sup>19</sup> I owe this insight to Paul Weaver. In his book, Weaver included the libraries among the administrative units concerned with services (Weaver 7). At the Eleventh Epigraphical Congress in Rome (1997), however, he told me that he now takes the librarians as domestics, and with me explored some of the implications of that reinterpretation. I am most grateful to him for his generous help and guidance on this matter.

<sup>20</sup> The three freedmen in Table 1 who had specialized tasks did not have titles (such as *a commentariis* or *a rationibus*) that would indicate administrative or financial duties. The three are Hyginus (no. 1), who managed a library, Melissus (no. 2), who organized one, and Scirtus (no. 14), who perhaps directed all the libraries. The only other freedman is Hymenaeus (no. 13), a *medicus*, not an administrator.

<sup>21</sup> We would therefore not expect administrative or financial staff to show up in the libraries, although we occasionally do find financial personnel in one or another of the subdivisions of the emperor’s domestic staff. The *ratio castrensis* itself necessarily has such

of the Emperor's house. The books themselves were a set of possessions that could be put to use by the emperor or presented in public to convey an impression of wealth, power, or culture, but the libraries were not conceived of as a service to the people, at least not in origin. The titles of our men *a bybliotheca* thus suggest that libraries in the first century of the Empire continued to function very much as they had under the Republic: they were the property of a great man, and he made them public in the sense of allowing many others to use them. We need not imagine, though, that he opened his libraries at all times to all persons.<sup>22</sup>

As domestic slaves, and lacking colleagues who handled money or accounts, the men who worked in the imperial libraries would seem to have had no direct way to buy books, to pay for books or other items (such as, for example, new shelving), or to keep records of administrative matters. They did not have a way to carry out or pay for the upkeep of the buildings and any furniture or equipment within the buildings.<sup>23</sup> At least, so the epigraphical record indicates.<sup>24</sup> But surely the libraries did have expenses, and clearly upkeep was nec-

---

personnel (Boulvert 171–73). In arguing that the men *a bybliotheca* were domestics, I interpret the evidence quite differently from Boulvert 162. Boulvert believed there was a central library administration, of which the head was the equestrian procurator. As we will see, that man probably had other things to do.

<sup>22</sup> Marshall 261 reached very much the same conclusions though approaching from a different point of view (that of patronage). For a careful discussion of the evidence regarding access in general to these libraries see Dix 1994, esp. 286–87 and 290. We have anecdotal evidence of the continuing carefully controlled nature of at least the library in the *domus Tiberiana* during the second century. The young Marcus Aurelius advised his teacher Fronto that Fronto would need to negotiate with the librarian in the *Tiberiana* if he wanted access to a certain book (Fro. *M. Caes.* 4.5 (p. 61.17–18 van den Hout) *Tiberianus bibliothecarius tibi subigitandus est*).

<sup>23</sup> The slaves *a bybliotheca*, of course, could have kept some records, but the *a bybliotheca* should be a slave whose principal work is with the book collection itself, not administrative tasks within a library; for those, we would expect functionaries with such titles as *commentariensis a bybliotheca*, *a rationibus bybliothecarum*, and the like.

<sup>24</sup> We should acknowledge immediately the limitations of the epigraphical record, in which there can be surprising gaps. Within the *cura aquarum*, for example, we know from Fron. *Aq.* 117 that there were workers called *vilici*, *castellarii*, *circitores*, *silicarii*, and *tectores*. Of these, only the first three appear in inscriptions. We also know of freedmen *a commentariis* (*CIL* 6.8487) and *tabularii* (*CIL* 6.8488) in the *cura aquae*, but no inscription of a *dispensator* seems to survive. On all of this see further Bruun 190–91. Thus we must be cautious; but it will be noted that several types of worker in the *cura aquae*, both specialists and record-keepers, are attested on inscriptions, so that the absence of administrative and financial personnel in the libraries may be of use to us as we try to analyze the library administration. What I would argue is that the evidence we have at present is entirely consistent with the assumption that the library workers were domestic staff, and

essary. How might these have been handled? On this question we have no direct information and little evidence of any sort, but we can suggest some possible administrative and financial mechanisms. New staff—new slaves *a bybliotheca*—could have been supplied by (or from) the *ratio castrensis* or Palatine establishment generally; just as had happened in Cicero's house, workers might have been detailed, when needed, from other sectors of the household to the imperial libraries.<sup>25</sup> Records and purchases, too, might be handled by slaves in the *ratio castrensis*, and in any case the imperial book collections may well have grown less through purchase than through gifts, inheritance, or copying.<sup>26</sup> If that is so, our library staff would be concerned primarily with sorting and arranging volumes that accrued to the emperor's collection, making and correcting copies, and keeping them in good repair, and not so much (or at all) with purchasing programs.<sup>27</sup> Finally, the maintenance of the library buildings—the physical walls and roofs—may well have been the responsibility not of men assigned to the libraries, but of the *curator operum publicorum* (or his early equivalent), whose office eventually included a complete set of clerical and financial officials.<sup>28</sup> That is, we do have knowl-

---

that assuming the opposite—that there was a library administrative structure—is not supported by the evidence.

<sup>25</sup> On the nature of the *ratio castrensis* see Boulvert 164–78, with discussion of earlier work. I follow Boulvert here, and he in turn largely accepted the thesis of Hirschfeld: the men we find assigned to the *ratio castrensis* were not military (as one might infer from the name) but rather assigned to the Palatine domestic staff. Our earliest evidence for the existence of the *ratio castrensis*, as Boulvert notes, is from the time of Claudius, but there must have been some equivalent palace administration before that, whatever its name, and our early librarians presumably worked within the context of that larger Palatine household.

<sup>26</sup> Gifts might come from embassies, friends of the emperor, or the authors themselves. Emperors received significant quantities of material goods through inheritance, books no doubt among them; see Millar 153–58. Confiscations may also have brought books or whole libraries to the emperor. On confiscations in general see Millar 163–74. Conceivably, books could come to the Emperor as booty, too. That had very probably happened in the Republic; see Dix 1986: 16–17 and 72–73 on Sulla and Lucullus respectively.

<sup>27</sup> Extensive purchasing programs might be undertaken after fires, but even then staff—presumably slaves *a bybliotheca*—might do as much copying as purchasing. Thus in Suet. *Dom.* 20.1, concerning the aftermath of the great fire of A.D. 80: *bibliothecas incendio absumptas impensissime reparare cur[avit Domitianus], exemplaribus undique petitis, missisque Alexandream qui describerent emendarentque*. When an emperor seeks original editions to copy, as Domitian does here, one is reminded of the practice of Cicero and his friends of lending one another volumes to copy out.

<sup>28</sup> See Kolb 308–17 for a list and discussion of the slave and freedman personnel in the office of *opera publica*; this office seems to have been concerned primarily with maintenance, not

edge of mechanisms that could have handled library expenses and maintenance, so that the absence of financial and administrative officers among our library personnel can be reasonably interpreted as an indication that the slaves *a bybliotheca* were, at least in the first century, simply domestic slaves.

This context—libraries as part of the imperial house—is probably where we should consider the freedman *medicus a bybliothecis* of Claudian or Neronian date, Tiberius Claudius Hymenaeus (no. 13). We may note first that it is reasonable to find a doctor *a bybliothecis* if we assume that the men *a bybliothecis* were part of the domestic service, for we have numerous doctors, both slaves and freedmen, attested within the Palatine establishment (Boulvert 179). Doctors are also found attached, logically enough, to military units, to gladiatorial schools, and to Circus factions,<sup>29</sup> but doctors assigned to administrative units are very rare.<sup>30</sup> Why we have a doctor assigned to a particular group of imperial slaves remains a mystery, but perhaps such an arrangement made sense in the first century. At that time all of the existing libraries were on or close to the Palatine,<sup>31</sup> and if the men *a bybliotheca* all belonged to the Palatine domestic staff it is possible that they lived on the Palatine, perhaps together or close to one another, and that it seemed efficient to provide one doctor for this whole group of men. We might assume, however, that eventually the men *a bybliotheca* were tended not by their own doctor, but by the *medici* who dealt with the Palatine staff as a whole.<sup>32</sup>

---

new construction. The earliest known *curator*, Q. Varius Geminus, dates from the end of the principate of Augustus: Kolb 143–46. If the *cura* did not exist before then, maintenance of library buildings may have fallen to the aediles or other magistrates, following Republican practice. So, implicitly, Daguet-Gagey 33. It goes without saying that much of the actual physical work was probably contracted out, not carried out by the staff of the *cura*.

<sup>29</sup> There are lists in Gummerus and Rowland, though neither organizes the material.

<sup>30</sup> Boulvert 179 knows of none within administrative units—none in the *aquae*, roads, *opera publica*, etc.—and only one, other than our man Hymenaeus, who seems to be attached to a specific subsection within the domestic service. This is Gaius Iulius Euxinus, perhaps freeborn, *medicus ex hortis Sallustianis* (CIL 6.8671a, cf. 6.33742).

<sup>31</sup> The furthest distant would have been either the library in the Atrium Libertatis, which was on or near the Capitoline, or the Octavian Library. Each of these would be at most a twenty-minute walk from the farthest reaches of the Palatine. Of course, there may have been imperial book collections (and residences for the emperor's slaves) scattered throughout the city, too, so that all of this is very uncertain.

<sup>32</sup> Jerzy Linderski has suggested to me that the *a bybliothecis* in Hymenaeus' inscription should be taken as topographical by analogy with such inscriptions as CIL 6.9207, an *aurifex de sacra via*, and CIL 6.9884, a *sarcinatr(ix) ab sex aris*. Hymenaeus then would be a doctor who worked at a spot next to a library. I find this an attractive suggestion, although we might have expected the particular library (assuming that the plural *bybliothecis* refers to the Greek and Latin sections of one library) or libraries to be named.



## THE SLAVE *VILICI*

Six of our men, all slaves, are called *vilicus*. We should ask why these men are distinguished from the other slaves *a bybliotheca*, and what their responsibilities might have been. For convenience, I list in Table 3 the known *vilici*, with their catalogue numbers from Table 1.

The title *vilicus* has recently been discussed by Jesper Carlsen.<sup>33</sup> Tracing the word from its origins in agriculture, where it means roughly “steward of an estate,” Carlsen argues that in urban contexts it came to indicate a man who had either or both of two functions: a *vilicus* might be the supervisor of a specific facility (such as a library, a bath, an amphitheater, or a circus), in charge of both maintaining it and keeping it running, and he might be in charge of a group of slaves, to whom he would distribute the tasks that needed to be done.

Within the libraries of Rome, we might suspect, the *vilici* probably supervised the other slave staff. Building maintenance (in the sense of such activities as repairs to the roof) could, as we have seen, be handled by the office of the *opera publica*, but someone would be needed in a library to see that it was kept clean and in order, and to assign the various tasks—of repairing or copying volumes, replacing worn-out volumes with new ones, cleaning, assisting patrons, controlling access, and dealing with newly-arrived volumes—that we have identified as likely responsibilities of our library staff.<sup>34</sup> As we will see below, there is no evidence that higher-level (equestrian) directors were assigned to individual libraries on a regular basis, so that, of all the men associated with libraries who are known to us, the slave *vilici* are the most likely to have served as managers and to have handled these day-to-day responsibilities.<sup>35</sup>

If we can accept the *vilici* as managers or supervisors, it is of interest that in three or perhaps four of our known instances they are assigned not to a whole library but to either the Latin or the Greek section within a library (Latin: nos. 6, 8, 17; Greek: no. 23, perhaps). It seems likely that in our other

<sup>33</sup> Carlsen 27–55, and especially, for *vilici* in libraries, 41 and 43.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Cic. Q.fr. 3.4.5 *de bibliotheca tua Graeca supplenda, libris commutandis, Latinis comparandis, valde velim ista confici*. I take *commutare* as meaning the replacement of worn-out or damaged volumes. There are other possible interpretations. Dix 1986: 102–3, for example, took this as meaning that Cicero and his brother might trade or exchange volumes.

<sup>35</sup> Nor is there evidence of freedman managers after Hyginus (no. 1) and, perhaps, the *incertus* mentioned by Ovid (no. 3). The mundane nature of many of the tasks performed in ancient libraries on a daily basis argues for slave, and against equestrian, library managers as the norm, although equestrian library directors may well have been appointed from time to time in response to specific needs (see further below).

TABLE 3. SLAVE *VILICI* IN THE LIBRARIES OF ROME

<i>Name and Number</i>	<i>Title</i>
6. Hymnus Aurelianus	a bibliotheca Latina porticus Octaviae . . . vilicus
8. Montanus Iulianus	vilic(us) a bybliothea Octaviae Latin(a)
17. Saturninus	vil(icus) . . . a bybl(iotheca) Lat(ina)
22. Alcimius	vilic[us] a bybliothea
23. Onesimus	vilic(us) thermar[um . . .] bybliothe(ae?) Gra[ec(ae?)]
24. [Eutyc?]hes	vilicus [a byblio]theca

cases, too, the *vilicus* worked in either the Greek or the Latin section, and that the distinction was simply not included in all sepulchral inscriptions. We can suggest two reasons, not mutually exclusive, for the assignment of *vilici* to either Latin or Greek sections. First, the Greek and Latin sections may have been contained in separate rooms or separate buildings, so that the *vilicus* would naturally have both a physical area and the slaves working in it under his control.<sup>36</sup> Second, the language skills of a given slave—Latin or Greek—may have determined which section of the library he worked in, and perhaps the *vilici* who directed the work were appointed on the basis of their expertise in one language or the other. In any case, we should imagine the *vilicus* as supervising the day-to-day tasks of the slaves *a bybliothea*. From time to time, he might also meet with the commissioner of all the libraries, either on policy matters or to discuss particular problems in his library.

#### *SERVI PUBLICI* AND THE OCTAVIAN LIBRARY

Not all of the slaves assigned to libraries were the emperor's own, for at least two of those who worked in the Octavian Library were *servi publici* (nos. 18, 20). The status of the other three slaves assigned to this library is not specified in their inscriptions, but none was certainly a member of the *familia Caesaris*, and any or all of them could be *servi publici*. Mommsen (1<sup>3</sup>: 330 n. 1) accordingly took all five men as *publici* and the library itself as municipal

<sup>36</sup> The earliest library for which we are certain there were separate buildings is the Trajan Library. It is possible, but by no means certain, that earlier libraries had separate buildings or rooms. For arguments that the Apollo Library was a single room see Thompson. If the earlier libraries did have just one room we must assume they were divided into Greek and Latin sections, with perhaps a *vilicus* for each section.

("städtisch"), not imperial.<sup>37</sup> Despite some problems,<sup>38</sup> this is probably correct, and we might adduce some support for Mommsen's thesis from the library of Asinius Pollio: it was certainly built before 28 B.C. and quite possibly before Actium,<sup>38</sup> so that it antedates Augustus' control; it was built *ex manubiis* (Plin. *Nat.* 7.115) and so (whatever its exact legal status)<sup>40</sup> was not funded by the emperor, and no certain *Caesaris servi* are specifically assigned to it. That is, Asinius' library in its origins was quite independent of Augustus, and the Octavian Library, too, might have been independent in its early years. If we accept Mommsen's thesis, the status of the slaves raises questions: was this library administered differently from the other (imperial) libraries? Was it perhaps subject to different policies? Would users notice a difference, or might there even be a different set of users?

We do not have direct testimony on these questions, but there are a number of items that can be brought to bear, and together they indicate that no significant distinction was drawn between the Octavian and the Apollo Libraries. Augustus, and not the magistrates, chose the man who set up the Octavian Library, C. Melissus (no. 2).<sup>41</sup> The staff in the Octavian Library looks

<sup>37</sup> Most scholars writing about the Octavian Library have accepted Mommsen's thesis. So, e.g., Hirschfeld 304 and Langie 56. On the individual slaves and their names see also Chantraine 345. The thesis rests additionally upon the statement of Plutarch that Octavia built the library in memory of her son Marcellus (*Marc.* 30.6). When Octavia died in 11 B.C., Mommsen thought, she must have bequeathed library, staff, and an endowment to Augustus, who then gave them to the state. The status of the library raises questions of funding, too: were its expenses paid out of the funds in the *aerarium*, or out of the emperor's own resources, however we may choose to define them? Here we have no hope of a resolution of the question, but for all practical purposes it appears that the emperor could designate funds as he saw fit, both his own and the state's. See on this Lo Cascio 167, summarizing the evidence that shows public funds accruing to what became known as the *fiscus*, and noting that the emperor could, within certain limits, use the funds in the *aerarium*.

<sup>38</sup> Three of five slaves assigned to the Octavian Library might be imperial, not *publici*, and Dio 49.43 says that the Portico of Octavia (with, perhaps, its library) was built by Augustus, not by Octavia. See further Dix 1986: 214 on these uncertainties.

<sup>39</sup> For its dedication before 28 see Dix 1986: 198. If work on it began soon after 39, it may well have been finished by 31.

<sup>40</sup> When generals built structures *ex manubiis*, the buildings apparently became public property, and that is presumably what happened in the case of Asinius Pollio's new Atrium Libertatis; see Churchill 100 with n. 39, citing earlier discussions. From our point of view, the important questions are who paid for repairs to such buildings, and who appointed staff to them, but I know of no evidence on these matters.

<sup>41</sup> Suet. *Gram.* 21.3 *manumissus* (sc. a Maecenate) *Augusto etiam insinuatus est, quo delegante curam ordinandarum bibliothecarum in Octaviae porticu suscepit*. Kaster 219 discusses this passage, including the implications (not derogatory) of *insinuatus*.

exactly like the staff in other libraries: we find slaves *a bybliotheca* (nos. 7, 18, 20) and slave *vilici* (nos. 6, 8), just as elsewhere, and they are assigned to either the Greek (nos. 7, 20) or the Latin (nos. 6, 8, 18) section. Policies seem to be the same, for when Ovid, writing from exile in about A.D. 10, imagines his new volume of poetry seeking a home in Rome, he has the book approach the Apollo Library, the Octavian Library, and the library in the Atrium Libertatis one after the other, and be refused entry to each in turn (Ov. *Tr.* 3.1.59–72). Finally, it is highly likely that Domitian rebuilt the Octavian Library after it burned in A.D. 80,<sup>42</sup> and the language Suetonius uses of Domitian's actions makes it clear that Domitian had complete control of whatever library or libraries he rebuilt: he paid the bills, and he made the decisions (Suet. *Dom.* 20.1). By this time, then, the Octavian Library seems to have been completely assimilated to the imperial properties. So far as we can tell, the presence in this library of *servi publici* does not signal any difference in the way the library was managed.<sup>43</sup>

#### THE APPARENT DISAPPEARANCE OF LIBRARY PERSONNEL

The slaves and freedmen in Table 1 are known to us primarily from inscriptions, and all of the inscriptions that can be dated even approximately, save one (*CIL* 6.8744, for no. 24), seem to belong to the Julio-Claudian period. This raises questions. We know that there were libraries in the second and third centuries, and there must have been library staff. Why, then, do they not show up in the epigraphical record? It is likely that a combination of factors is at work here. Hirschfeld 305 noted the problem and suggested that the men *a bybliotheca* were replaced in later times by slaves without particular titles, and this may be a good part of the answer. Slaves without occupational titles would be reminiscent of those in Cicero's household, and a high percentage of the sepulchral inscriptions of slaves in the *familia Caesaris* did not include occupational titles, so that there may well have been large numbers of undifferen-

<sup>42</sup> We know the library burned in A.D. 80 (Dio 66.24.2), that Domitian rebuilt one or more libraries that had been destroyed by fire (Suet. *Dom.* 20.1), and that at least the portico of Octavia was definitely rebuilt, only to be burned and rebuilt a second time (*CIL* 6.1034).

<sup>43</sup> We might also compare the *cura aquae*. Agrippa originally provided his own slaves to tend the aqueducts. When he died, he left them to Augustus, who gave them to the state, so that they became *servi publici*. Under Claudius, a second group of slaves, all members of the *familia Caesaris*, was added to the *publici*. These changes in the status of the slave staff do not seem to be related to any significant changes in the management of the water supply from the users' point of view. On all of this see Bruun 208–9.

tiated *Caesaris servi*.<sup>44</sup> It is also possible that the domestic slaves in the *familia Caesaris* tended to be buried, or have their ashes placed, in columbaria, and that fewer such columbaria—that is, columbaria used by members of the *familia Caesaris*—are known from the second and third centuries.<sup>45</sup> Whatever the reason, it is clear that we cannot use the epigraphical evidence to prove either continuity or change after the first century. On the other hand, the evidence we do have from the second century (nos. 24, 25, 26) does not indicate that there was any significant change in the nature of the staff.

#### RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SLAVES A *BYBLIOTHECA*

It may be useful here to summarize and make explicit what has emerged so far from our study of the slaves *a bybliotheca*. These men do not, so far as we can tell, control any funds. That probably means that they were not involved in systematic acquisitions programs, and that they did not undertake repairs to the library buildings. There were, of course, many things they could and no doubt did do. We saw the slaves in Cicero's libraries adding labels to volumes (*Att.* 4.8.2), and from other sources we learn of *glutinatores* (who, as we know from Cicero, might work in libraries) mending and strengthening papyrus rolls (Turner). Presumably some of the slaves in a library were occupied in copying or recopying,<sup>46</sup> and as volumes came in—whether by gift,

<sup>44</sup> As a sample, I counted the *Caesaris servi* listed by Chantraine 176–78 and followed his dates. I excluded several categories of slaves from my count in order to obtain a representative sample. The slaves I excluded were those known only from quarry marks or from brick stamps (since in neither case are occupational titles given), women, and *trierarchi* (for whom see Boulvert 61). Given those limitations, we have the following. Among all attested *Caesaris servi* of Julio-Claudian date, nine (25%) were domestic slaves, three (8%) were administrative, and twenty-four (67%) gave no occupational title. (Most of these are sepulchral inscriptions, put up by the spouse to her husband, who is often categorized as *contubernalis*.) Among all attested *Caesaris servi* who date after Nero, three (8%) were domestic slaves, eight (22%) were administrative, and twenty-six (70%) gave no occupational title. In both the Julio-Claudian period and later, then, some two-thirds of *Caesaris servi* were recorded without reference to their specific occupation. See also on this whole question Fehrle 84–85.

<sup>45</sup> We know of numerous columbaria that originated or were still in use in the second century and later. See von Hesberg. The great columbaria containing the emperor's slaves, however, seem to date primarily from the first century, with the notable exception of those at Carthage. For a list of columbaria that included many members of the *familia Caesaris* (but with no pretensions to completeness) see Weaver 18.

<sup>46</sup> Copyists (*librarii*) are found in the households (but not demonstrably in the libraries) of Cicero (*Fam.* 16.22, *Att.* 12.14.3, *Att.* 13.44.3; *Nep. Att.* 13.3). Cf. the anecdote about the "ships' collection" at Alexandria (Galen 17.1.601 Kühn): Ptolemy ordered that if there were any books on board ships that docked at Alexandria, they were to be copied (presumably by slaves) for the Library.

confiscation, or purchase—someone needed to see that they were in good repair and sort them.<sup>47</sup> Some library staff must have assisted patrons in locating volumes, and our no. 26 is an anonymous person who brings a volume for Aulus Gellius and his friends to see (Gel. 13.20.1). Assisting users of the library—men who came looking for specific volumes or for materials to answer given questions—and fetching and returning volumes may well have been among the principal tasks of the slaves *a bybliotheca*.

#### THE RELATION OF SLAVE PERSONNEL TO HIGHER-LEVEL ADMINISTRATORS

We must now ask whether what we have observed so far is consistent with what we know of the upper levels of the Roman library administration, and we will therefore turn our attention to the freeborn men—most of them of equestrian rank—who are attested as involved in library administration. These men have been treated repeatedly elsewhere, and we will make no attempt to consider their entire careers, limiting ourselves instead to their library activities and directly related questions. We begin, as above, with a list of all the *ingenui* who certainly or probably worked in the libraries of Rome (see Table 4).<sup>48</sup>

The most obvious sub-group of these thirteen men consists of the six (nos. 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35) who were certainly or very probably commissioners of all the libraries in the city of Rome.<sup>49</sup> This office seems to have evolved gradually. We need not assume that it existed under Augustus, when there were only three libraries. The first commissioner known to us, Ti. Iulius Pappus (no. 28), was appointed by Tiberius and has a title that is clearly *ad hoc*, so that he may have been the first such official. Claudius perhaps appointed a freedman, Scirtus (no. 14), as procurator, but by late in the first century we find a freeborn commissioner once again, Dionysius of Alexandria (no. 29). Early in the

<sup>47</sup> Compare Cic. *Fam.* 16.20: Cicero asks Tiro to make a list of a packet of books and put the books away. This and other references to lists are the closest we come in the Roman world to catalogues.

<sup>48</sup> Tables 1 and 4, taken together, provide a list of all known library personnel in the public libraries of the City of Rome. The numeration of men in Table 4 continues from Table 1. As in Table 1, I arrange the men in rough chronological sequence, following Pflaum's order wherever possible. For the careers of the individual equestrians see Pflaum (references in column 1). For discussions of them as a group see Hirschfeld 302–4, Bruce (with caution), Blanck 219–22, Fehrle 81–84. The bibliography given in column 1 of Table 4 is not exhaustive, being intended only to guide the reader to the basic sources.

<sup>49</sup> I use the English word “commissioners,” rather than “procurators,” as a general term for those men who were responsible for all of the libraries of Rome. The titles in Latin vary, so to use procurator throughout would be misleading.

second century we hear of equestrian commissioners—Suetonius (no. 31) and Iulius Vestinus (no. 32), both *a bibliothecis*—and then of equestrian *procuratores bibliothecarum*, [Valerius Euda]emon (no. 33) and Volusius Maecianus (no. 35), both under Hadrian. By this time, the library position is a ducenarian office given to senior equestrian procurators.

These men have generally been considered as a more or less homogeneous group, consisting (except for Scirtus) of senior equestrian procurators, though with titles that vary in typically Roman fashion. If they were all senior equestrians, however, we have an administrative anomaly, for equestrians did not administer sections of the imperial household.<sup>50</sup> We do not find, for example, an equestrian *procurator vestium* or *procurator argenti*, nor would we expect to find them, and correspondingly we should not have both domestic slaves *a bybliotheca* and equestrian *procuratores bibliothecarum*. How are we to understand this?

It is important to note that none of the commissioners in the first century was certainly an equestrian procurator. Pappus (no. 28) was probably not equestrian, and he was certainly not a procurator. Scirtus (no. 14) may well have been a procurator, but he was a freedman and could perfectly well preside over a unit staffed by domestic slaves. Dionysius (no. 29) was a native of Alexandria. He has regularly been regarded as an equestrian, the evidence being his posts in charge of the libraries and of Greek affairs,<sup>51</sup> but we do not know his title,<sup>52</sup> and more importantly he did not have an equestrian procuratorial career. On the other hand, he was clearly a Greek intellectual and scholar, and he seems to have served as an adviser to the emperor.<sup>53</sup> He looks, in short, very much like Pappus (no. 28), also an Easterner and one of

<sup>50</sup> Hirschfeld 307; in n. 3 he deals with a number of apparent exceptions to this rule. In addition to those cases, we do hear of one equestrian *a cubiculo* (M. Aurelius Cleander, Pflaum no. 180bis) and one equestrian *procurator castrensis* (M. Aurelius Basileus, Pflaum no. 327a), and thus some variations were possible, but both of those titles are late and quite exceptional.

<sup>51</sup> Pflaum 1960–61: 111–12 and Stein in *PIR*<sup>2</sup> both take him as equestrian. If Dionysius was an equestrian, he must have been granted that rank by one of the Flavian emperors.

<sup>52</sup> Our only source is the passage in the *Suda* lexicon, where the author says of Dionysius *tôn bibliothêkôn proustê. Proistêmi* is not regularly used to represent the activities of a procurator in Latin: see Magie 27–28. In addition, the *Suda* author does not seem to have thought of Dionysius as an *a bibliothecis*, since he could easily have used *epi tôn bibliothêkôn*, just as in the next clause he says *epi tôn epistolôn*.

<sup>53</sup> He read and responded to letters and petitions to the emperor, and so presumably consulted with him. Pflaum 1960–61: 112 acutely noted that Dionysius may well have met Vespasian in Alexandria in A.D. 69–70 and returned to Rome with him.

TABLE 4. FREEBORN ADMINISTRATORS IN THE PUBLIC LIBRARIES OF ROME

<i>Name and References<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>Title and Selected Administrative Positions<sup>b</sup></i>	<i>Comment</i>
27. <b>Pompeius Macer</b> Suet. <i>Jul.</i> 56.7	cui ordinandas bibliothecas (sc. Augustus) delegaverat	Under Augustus. Organized the Apollo Library. Exact title unknown. <sup>c</sup>
28. <b>Ti. Iulius Zoili f(ilius) Fab(ia tribu) Pappus</b> AE 1960.26; Panciera 112–20	supr(a) bybliotheas omnes Augustorum ab Ti. Caesare usque ad Ti. Claudium Caesarem	Under Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius.
29. <b>Dionysius (of Alexandria)</b> Suda s.v. Dionysios 1173 Adler; Pflaum no. 46; <i>PIR</i> <sup>2</sup> D 103 (Stein)	1) praefuit bibliothecis 2–3) ab epistulis et responsis ad legationes <sup>d</sup>	Second half of first century. Originally a <i>grammaticus</i> in Alexandria.
30. <b>Sextus</b> Martial 5.5		Under Domitian. Title unknown. <sup>e</sup>
31. <b>C. Suetonius Tranquillus</b> AE 1953.73; Pflaum no. 96	1) [a] studiis 2) a byblio[thecis] 3) [ab e]pistulis Imp. Caes(aris) Traiani Hadr[i]an[i Aug(usti)]	Under late Trajan, early Hadrian, or both.
32. <b>L. Iulius Vestinus</b> <i>IGRR</i> 1.136= <i>IGUR</i> 1.62; Pflaum no. 105; <i>PIR</i> <sup>2</sup> I 623	1) a bibliothecis Latinis et Graecis Romae 2–3) a studiis and ab epistulis	Under Hadrian. Before his post as <i>a bibliothecis, archiereus</i> and <i>curator Musei</i> in Egypt.
33. <b>[Valerius? Euda]emon</b> <i>CIL</i> 3.431; <i>IGRR</i> 3.1077; Pflaum no. 110; <i>RE</i> 7A (1948) 2496 (Hanslik)	1) [p]roc(urator) bibliothecar(um) Graec(arum) et Latin(arum) <sup>f</sup> 2) ab epist(ulis) Graec(is)	Under Hadrian. Procurator in Alexandria before his library post. After his post as <i>ab epistulis</i> , financial procurator in three separate posts.



34. C. Annius C.f. Postumus <i>CIL</i> 14.5352 (Ostia); <i>CIL</i> 8.20684 (Saldæ, in Mauretania); papyrus in Daris; Pflaum no. 132; <i>PIR</i> <sup>2</sup> A 681 (Stein)	proc(urator) bibliothecarum divi Traiani (thus on <i>CIL</i> 14.5352) = [p]roc(urator) Aug(usti) a bybliotheis (thus on <i>CIL</i> 8.20684)	Under Hadrian (or Trajan). The library post, his first, was followed by four financial posts, the last being <i>idios logos</i> in Egypt, attested A.D. 157–59.
35. L. Volusius L.f. Maecianus <i>CIL</i> 14.5347 (cf. 14.5348); <i>AE</i> 1955.179; Pflaum no. 141; Fanizza 104–14	1) a libellis Antonini Aug(usti) Pii sub Divo Hadriano 2) praef(ectus) vehiculorum 3) a studi(i)s et proc(urator) bibliothecarum <sup>g</sup> 4) a libellis et censibus Imp(eratoris) Antonini Aug(usti) Pii	Under Hadrian. I omit from his long career both his earliest and his latest posts.

<sup>a</sup> References to Pflaum are all to Pflaum 1960–61. Except for Aelius Largus (no. 37) and Veturius Callistratus (no. 39), the references to Pflaum give not pages but the Pflaum number of the man.

<sup>b</sup> For convenience I give the Latin versions of all titles. Where I give more than one position, I list them in chronological order insofar as is possible, with the earliest position first. I note problems in titlature and chronology only when they have a bearing on the argument of this paper.

<sup>c</sup> For Pompeius Macer see White 214–15: Macer set up and organized the Apollo library, rather than being director of it, and we should not identify him (as earlier scholars did) with the Pompeius, proconsul of Asia, known from Strabo 13.2.3 (618). We thus know nothing else of his career.

<sup>d</sup> For this title see Stein in *PIR*<sup>2</sup> D 103 and cf. Pflaum 1960–61.

<sup>e</sup> I include Sextus for the sake of completeness. There are many uncertainties. He is usually taken as a freedman (so, e.g., Howell 80, Sullivan 163), but the praenomen Sextus virtually rules out the possibility of his belonging to the *familia Caesaris*. Thus I list him here as freeborn, though hesitantly. Sextus has been taken as an *a studiis* (e.g., by Mommsen, cited by Hirschfeld 304–5 n. 5), or as *a studiis* and *a bibliothecis* simultaneously (Friedländer *ad Mart.* 5.5). He clearly had some responsibility for one or more book collections, since Martial thinks of him as accepting and organizing books, and so he deserves a place in our list. There are too many problems, however, for him to be used as evidence.

<sup>f</sup> The plurals in *Graecarum et Latinarum* come from *IGRR* 3.1077.

<sup>g</sup> Volusius is the single certain example of a man who was *a studiis* and *procurator bibliothecarum* simultaneously. Given the date of his prefecture in Egypt, we can probably date his library post in the 140s or 150s.

TABLE 4. (CONTINUED)

<i>Name and References</i>	<i>Title and Selected Administrative Positions</i>	<i>Comment</i>
36. L. Baebius L.f. Gal(eria tribu) Aurelius Iuncinus <i>CIL</i> 10.7580; Pflaum no. 251	proc(urator) b[ib][i]othec(ae or –arum) ad HS [L]X	Late second century. After the library position, his first, he held five further posts, most or all of them financial.
37. T. Aelius T.f. Largus <i>CIL</i> 14.2916; Pflaum p. 1023	proc(urator) Aug(usti) bybliothecaru[m]	Uncertain, but probably late second or early third century. <sup>b</sup> Aelius' inscription calls him also <i>iuris publici privati [peritis-sinus?]</i> .
38. Sex. Iulius Africanus Afric. <i>Cest.</i> 18 ( <i>P. Oxy.</i> 3.412=Vieillefond 290–91)		220s. Title unknown. Designed, built, or administered library in <i>Pantheo</i> .
39. Q. Veturius Callistratus v(ir) e(gregius) <i>CIL</i> 6.2132 (Rome); Pflaum p. 1023	proc(urator) rat(ionum) summ(arum) privatarum bibliothecarum Augusti n(ostri)	Roughly 240s. The implications of his title are discussed below.

<sup>b</sup> Largus' date depends upon the use of the abbreviation *Eq. R.* on his inscription. Cf. Hirschfeld 303 n. 6 ("probably after Antoninus") and Pflaum (third century). I have not found any clear examples of *Eq. R.* before A.D. 100 in the inscriptions of *CIL* 6 or *AE*.

Tiberius' advisers. It is entirely possible that from Tiberius to Domitian the emperors called upon members of the Greco-Oriental intellectual community to oversee their book collections, much as Cicero had called upon Tyrannio, and made available to them domestic slaves as staff, as Cicero had done.

But in the early second century, or perhaps even under Domitian, there was a significant change, and we begin to find equestrians as library commissioners. Did these men continue to have a staff consisting of domestic slaves? Or were they provided with a more standard administrative staff, including accountants and secretaries?<sup>54</sup> As we have seen, no trace of such an administrative staff survives, making this a difficult (but not impossible) thesis to maintain, and the lone second-century slave *a bybliotheca* known to us, [Eutyc?]hes (no. 24), has a title<sup>55</sup> that is identical with that of staff known from the Julio-Claudian period. Given the paucity of evidence, certainty is beyond our grasp, but it may be that the answer to this question lies primarily in the nature of the commissioner's position itself.

The shift from men such as Pappus and Dionysius to equestrian procurators can be best understood within the context of the more general change from freedman to equestrian administrators that took place under Trajan and Hadrian. In several cases, equestrians were put at the head of new or expanded imperial services,<sup>56</sup> and in others they were made superior to freedmen in established administrative units, the freedmen being retained as subordinates. This has been observed and commented on many times, especially in regard to the great secretariats, the *a rationibus*, the *ab epistulis*, and the *a patrimonio* (Boulvert 271). In the case of the secretariats, as Fergus Millar pointed out, the change is not so much a shift from *liberti* to equestrians as it is one from Greek to Roman intellectuals (Millar 89). While Millar was not himself concerned with the library post, his formulation almost exactly fits the change in the libraries so far as we can observe it: in the first century, we have Pappus and Dionysius, Greek intellectuals, as library commissioners (though not, it is true, freedmen), while in the second century the known commissioners are

<sup>54</sup> It is worth recalling at this point what we noted above when we first considered the distinction between domestic and administrative staff: the distinction is a modern one, and the borders between the groups were not absolutely clear. Romans may not have felt the administrative anomaly that we think we observe.

<sup>55</sup> *Vilicus a bybliotheca*. At least this is probably his title. The inscription is fragmentary.

<sup>56</sup> Trajan built a new aqueduct and added an equestrian procurator to the staff of the *aquae*, supplementing the existing *curator* and freedmen; he appointed an equestrian *procurator ad Miniciam* in the grain supply; and he built a new port and created a sexagenarian post, the *procurator annonae Ostis*, subordinate to the existing *praefectus annonae*.

all Roman equestrians. They continue, however—and this is an important point—to be scholarly men.

Leaving aside the freedman Scirtus (no. 14), at least five of the six library commissioners known to us, from both the first and the second century, were scholars. Dionysius (no. 29) was a *grammaticus*, active in the Museum at Alexandria, before coming to Rome (*Suda* s.v. Dionysius 1173 Adler). Suetonius (no. 31) was, of course, the biographer of the Caesars and author of numerous scholarly works (Sallmann 16–49). Lucius Iulius Vestinus (no. 32) had been *procurator Musei* at Alexandria, and so presumably active as a scholar, before his appointment in Rome.<sup>57</sup> [Valerius Euda]emon (no. 33) was *ab epistulis Graecis* after his library post, and Pflaum noted that this post, usually given to literary men, is a strong indication that Eudaemon belonged to the Greco-Oriental intellectual community. While not a member of this intellectual group, Volusius Maecianus (no. 35) was one of the great jurists and legal writers of the second century (Sallmann 131–33). Pappus, although not specifically attested as a scholar, also fits comfortably within this group, given his background (Panciera 113).

In addition, the commissioners of the libraries in both the first and the second century seem to have been close to, or advisers of, the emperors. We have considered Pappus and Dionysius earlier. Suetonius (no. 31) was an *a studiis* before and *ab epistulis* after his library post,<sup>58</sup> and, if we can trust the anecdote in the *Historia Augusta* (*Hadr.* 11.3), all too familiar with life at court. Iulius Vestinus (no. 32), too, was both *a studiis* and *ab epistulis*, and a certain Eudaemon, probably identical with our [Valerius Euda]emon (no. 33), could be said by Hadrian's biographer to have been *consciis imperii* (sc. *Hadriani*), implying a close relationship between him and the emperor (*HA Hadr.* 15.3). L. Volusius Maecianus (no. 35) was *a libellis* of Antoninus Pius even before Pius became emperor, and then held a long series of appointments, including the post *a studiis*, which he combined with his library procuratorship.

That is, the library commissioners were consistently, through both the first and the second century, scholarly advisors, and we might infer that the first responsibility of the library commissioner was not administration,<sup>59</sup> but

---

For references see Boulvert 262–67. The process of shifting to equestrians had already begun under Domitian, when we see slaves being replaced by freedmen and freedmen being made subordinate to equestrians: Boulvert 239, 252.

<sup>57</sup> For Vestinus' philological work see Schmid and Stählin 2: 873.

<sup>58</sup> For the responsibilities of the *a studiis* and the *ab epistulis*, and the contact they had with the emperor, see Wallace-Hadrill 83–88.

<sup>59</sup> I would not argue that the commissioners had no administrative responsibilities. At least three of them, after all, had extended administrative careers, and none of them

rather to assist the emperor or his staff on questions to which the answers could be found in books, matters touching on literature, history, science, or technology, for example, as well as questions that could be answered by consulting archival materials.<sup>60</sup> And if that is so—if the commissioner was expected to work primarily as a scholar, advising the emperor—he might well have needed at all times not administrative staff, but slaves who knew their way around the library and its materials and could assist him precisely because of that knowledge. Perhaps, then, the shift to equestrian procurators as library commissioners in the early second century did not require or entail a corresponding shift from domestic to administrative staff. It is possible that the procurators in the second century continued to employ the slaves *a bybliotheca* not as an executive would his administrative staff, but as any user would employ, or rely upon, the slaves who worked in a friend's library.<sup>61</sup>

#### VETURIUS CALLISTRATUS

In addition to the *procuratores bibliothecarum*, we know of one man whose responsibility included all of the City's libraries. This was Veturius Callistratus (no. 39), who in the third century was *proc(urator) rat(ionum) summ(arum) privatarum bibliothecarum Augusti n(ostri)*. While there are some uncertainties in the interpretation of this title, its basic import is reasonably clear: Callistratus was the financial official (*procurator*) in charge of that branch of the emperor's personal funds (*ratio privata*) that was responsible for the li-

---

was a scholar of the sort that had headed up the Alexandrian library, a man like Eratosthenes. As administrators, though, we might imagine them dealing not with day-to-day problems, which could be left to the *vilici* or to the functionaries in the *cura operum publicorum* or the *ratio castrensis*. Instead, the library commissioners might have dealt primarily with policy. There were decisions to be made. If a man died and left a large collection of books to the emperor, should those books be assigned to an existing library, and if so which one? Would a new library be needed? The procurator might need to decide. When a library was destroyed by fire, the procurator could advise the emperor on the question of rebuilding and restocking. There might be personnel matters, too: which staff members should be assigned to each library?

<sup>60</sup> In these activities, the *a bibliotheca* might closely resemble the *a studiis*, and it is probably no accident that three of the four known second-century library commissioners served also as *a studiis*. Note also Sextus (no. 30).

<sup>61</sup> This does not rule out another likely development. In the course of the first century, as the emperor's book collection grew and his libraries became more numerous and visible (with the addition of libraries in the Templum Novum Divi Augusti, the Templum Pacis, and perhaps on the Palatine), the libraries may well have come to be regarded less as the emperor's own collections and more and more as public services.

braries.<sup>62</sup> The important point for us is that Veturius was not a financial official within the library administration, but rather an official in the *ratio privata*, charged with handling the funding of the libraries. He was not, for example, an *a rationibus* (or *rationalis*) *bibliothecarum*. This is at least consistent with what we inferred from the titles of our slaves *a bybliothecca* of one and two centuries earlier: library bills may well have been paid not by a library administration, but by the *ratio castrensis*.

#### OTHER UPPER-LEVEL ADMINISTRATORS

The remaining six men in Table 4 held positions which, with one exception, are unclear or disputed or both. We will consider each in turn.<sup>63</sup>

*Pompeius Macer* (no. 27). Macer set up and organized the Apollo library at the request of Augustus. Suetonius (*Jul.* 56.7) informs us that Augustus told Macer not to make certain writings of Julius Caesar available to the public, and from this we can infer that one of Macer's tasks was to decide which books should enter the library and which should not. We do not know whether he stayed on as director once he organized the library.

*Sextus* (no. 30). We do not know what Sextus' position or title was. Martial 5.5 depicts him as accepting and arranging books, and that might suggest that, like Pompeius Macer, Sextus was in charge of setting up a new library.<sup>64</sup> But he also might have been director of an existing library, since Martial's hope of finding a home for his new book recalls that of Ovid at *Tr.* 3.1.59–72, and Ovid is thinking of libraries long since established.<sup>65</sup> It is also possible that Sextus was *a studiis* and not a librarian at all.<sup>66</sup>

<sup>62</sup> The placement of *Augusti n(ostr)i* leaves its point of reference unclear: should we take it as *procurator Augusti nostri*? Or as *bibliothecarum Augusti nostri*, which might imply that Callistratus was responsible for the libraries in the imperial villas, as well as those in Rome. I take the *Augusti n.* with *procurator* (and thus with the entire title). For discussions of the plural *summ(arum)* in this inscription see Mommsen ad *CIL* 6.2132 and Hirschfeld 20, and for the *ratio privata* in general see Hirschfeld 20 or Nesselhauf.

<sup>63</sup> Again I will not be concerned with all aspects of the careers of these men, only with matters that touch upon the libraries. Full discussions of the men will be found in Pflaum or other prosopographical works cited in Table 4.

<sup>64</sup> Martial's poem was written ca. 89, a time when we know of no new libraries coming into existence. That being the case, it is conceivable that Sextus was involved in the rebuilding and restocking of one or more of the libraries that had been destroyed by fire, and that Domitian rebuilt (*Suet. Dom.* 20.1).

<sup>65</sup> The similarity in the procedures followed by Ovid and Martial was noted by Dix 1994: 289.

<sup>66</sup> That Sextus was *a studiis* is supported by several items in Martial's poem. Sextus was *facundus*, and he apparently worked closely with the emperor, since he knew the

*C. Annius Postumus* (no. 34). Two inscriptions give us Postumus' career, and the library post is given differently on the two different stones. On *CIL* 8.20684, from Saldae in Mauretania, Postumus is said to have been [*p*]roc(urator) Aug(usti) a bybliotheceis, which should mean he was commissioner of all the libraries. The inscription from Ostia, however (*CIL* 14.5352), gives his title as proc(urator) bibliothecarum Divi Traiani, and that ought to mean that he was procurator of just the Trajan Library.<sup>67</sup> Pflaum, noting that this procuratorship was Postumus' first post, argued that he could not have been procurator of all the libraries, since that was ordinarily a senior post, and he therefore took Postumus as director of just the Trajan Library (Pflaum 1960–61: 317). Despite some problems with this interpretation, I am inclined to accept it.<sup>68</sup>

*Baebius Aurelius Iuncinus* (no. 36) and *T. Aelius Largus* (no. 37). Although these two men are both called *procurator bibliothecarum*, they are clearly distinct from the ducenarian procurators, for Iuncinus is specifically stated to have been a sexagenarian procurator, and Largus' library procuratorship seems to have been his very first position, meaning that he, too, was probably a sexagenarian procurator. There are at least three possible ways to interpret this evidence for a sexagenarian procuratorship. (a) These men each directed a single library. This seems unlikely especially in Iuncinus' case, since no library is mentioned on this inscription, which in other respects is detailed and explicit. (b) Hirschfeld 303–4 suggested that at some point in the late second century the ducenarian library procuratorship ceased to exist, being replaced by a sexagenarian procurator in charge of non-scholarly affairs in all the libraries plus several scholars, each of whom was in charge of a single library.<sup>69</sup>

---

emperor's *curae* and *secreta*, plausibly taken by Howell 81 to mean Domitian's own literary efforts. See further n. e in Table 4.

<sup>67</sup> The plural *bibliothecarum* will in this case refer to the Greek and Latin libraries, which were in separate buildings.

<sup>68</sup> The arguments against Pflaum are cogently put by Wallace-Hadrill 82–83 n. 16. Pflaum was not the first to take Postumus as director of a single library: see, e.g., Hirschfeld 303–4 n. 5. Since Pflaum wrote, an additional item has been discovered that lends support to his thesis. We now know that Postumus was *idios logos* in Egypt, attested in A.D. 157–59 (see Daris). If we take Postumus as procurator of all the libraries, we must take the *Divi Traiani* on the Ostian inscription as meaning that he was procurator during the principate of Trajan. That would mean that his career spanned at least the years A.D. 117–59, not impossible but highly unlikely.

<sup>69</sup> Hirschfeld did not elaborate on what he took to be the responsibilities of the scholarly and non-scholarly directors, but I assume that he thought of the former as working directly with the book collections, while the latter would tend to such matters as accounts, maintenance, and personnel.

Baebius Iuncinus, on this reading, would be an example of the administrative procurator,<sup>70</sup> and Aelius Largus, who seems to have been a jurist, would be an example of the scholarly director of an individual library. (c) It is also possible that the ducenarian procuratorship continued to exist and was given a sexagenarian assistant.<sup>71</sup> In that case, both Baebius Iuncinus and Aelius Largus might have served as such assistants. In the present state of our knowledge, we cannot be sure which of these explanations, if any, is correct.<sup>72</sup>

*Sextus Iulius Africanus* (no. 38). In his *Cestoi*, Iulius Africanus tells us that he designed, built, or directed the “beautiful library in the Pantheon near the Baths of Alexander at Rome” (*P. Oxy.* 3.412, lines 63–68). The verb Africanus uses of his activity is *architektoneô*, which has several possible meanings. It can mean that he built the physical structure, or that he designed the library, or that he was a director of the library. Scholars have generally taken Africanus to mean that he designed the library,<sup>73</sup> which makes sense: while a man of broad interests, he was more a literary person than a builder;<sup>74</sup> and if he was director we might have expected him to use some such verb as *proistêmi* (the verb used in the *Suda* lexicon of Dionysius, no. 29) or *epistateô*, something, that is, closer to the Latin *praesum*, which is the verb Suetonius uses of our one certain library director, Hyginus (*Suet. Gram.* 20). Even so we cannot rule out the other possibilities.

In sum, then, below the level of the ducenarian *procurator bibliothecarum* it is difficult to identify clear patterns in the library administration. We know that there was at least one man who directed an individual library. This was Hyginus (no. 1), who directed the Apollo Library under Augustus and so before there were commissioners of all the libraries. Others may also have

<sup>70</sup> Pflaum 1960–61: 679 agreed with Hirschfeld that Baebius Iuncinus’ post must have been limited to administrative matters.

<sup>71</sup> So van’t Dack 179–80. Such duplication of positions—with the assistants usually called *subprocurator*, but sometimes *procurator*—are known from the time of Vespasian on. See Pflaum 1950: 79 for a list of nineteen posts created “en vertu du principe de la dualité des fonctionnaires à la tête des offices.”

<sup>72</sup> Other factors now difficult to recover might have led to changes in the library administration. Fires in the second century perhaps eliminated some libraries (cf. Daguet-Gagey 57–58), and the proliferation of Palatine advisory positions over time (Pflaum 1950: 90–91) may have resulted in a reduced rôle for the *procurator bibliothecarum*.

<sup>73</sup> So Vieillefond 290 (“j’ai établi les plans”). Rampaldi 78 took Africanus as designing and building the library. Callmer 165 took Africanus as the builder, Blanck 165 as setting it up: “Africanus . . . dieser . . . eingerichtet hat.”

<sup>74</sup> Africanus wrote a *Chronography* (used by Eusebius), and his *Cestoi* included sections on natural history, medicine, war, and magic. See Schmid and Stählin 1346–48. Africanus was also interested in surveying (Lewis 56, 78, 286–88), but so far as we know not in the kind of surveying needed to construct a building.



directed individual libraries: Annius Postumus (no. 34) probably directed the Trajan library, and Aelius Largus (no. 37) too may have been a library director.<sup>75</sup> And some men, very likely equestrians, may have been appointed to special posts when a new library was being organized (so Pompeius Macer, no. 27, and Iulius Africanus, no. 38) or when there were special needs.

There is, however, good reason to doubt that libraries regularly had equestrian directors. There were from five to a dozen libraries in existence over a period of two or more centuries, and if there were equestrian directors of each library, with an average term of, say, five years, there ought to have been at least two hundred, and perhaps as many as five hundred, such directors. Yet we cannot name a single certain example of an equestrian library director. Nor can this be ascribed to our ignorance of equestrian careers: we have extensive knowledge of some 350 of them (Pflaum lists 357 not counting his *bis* numbers), as well as many partial careers. Even the one likely instance of such a director, Annius Postumus (no. 34), may have been a special case, appointed early in the history of the Trajan Library to help organize its collection, or because the Trajan Library, as the largest and most elegant in Rome, was thought to need an equestrian director.<sup>76</sup>

It is also not obvious what eight or ten equestrian procurators might have found to do to keep themselves busy, each in his own library.<sup>77</sup> Hyginus (no. 1), Augustus' freedman, had time to spare for teaching while he directed the Apollo Library, suggesting that his administrative responsibilities were not onerous (Kaster 211), and it is not easy to think of administrative tasks in a library of one or two rooms and, say, forty thousand volumes, that would in ordinary times justify an equestrian procurator, even a sexagenarian one.<sup>78</sup>

<sup>75</sup> Other candidates as directors of individual libraries are Scirtus (no. 14), Sextus (no. 30), Baebius Iuncinus (no. 36), and Iulius Africanus (no. 38).

<sup>76</sup> We do not actually know that the Trajan Library was the largest in Rome, but it included two large buildings and (for what it is worth) is treated by the *Historia Augusta* as the most important of Rome's libraries. See Bruce 1981: 559–63 for the relevant passages in the *HA*, and a discussion.

<sup>77</sup> The late regional catalogues claim that there were 28 or 29 public libraries in Rome, and scholars often accept these figures. For the text see Nordh 97; the *Curiosum* gives 28, the *Notitia* 29. I doubt that these figures are correct, at least if we take public libraries as state-supported repositories that included at least some literature. Perhaps the number included semi-public libraries, such as those of *collegia*, or records and archives offices. If there were 28 libraries, though, and an equestrian procurator for each, it would be astonishing not to have any record of such procurators in the inscriptions that survive.

<sup>78</sup> Equestrian procurators of individual libraries might be scholars, of course, as we have seen the procurators of all the libraries were, but except for Aelius Largus (no. 37) none of the attested junior procurators is known to have been a scholar, and even Aelius Largus' status as a jurist depends upon a supplement to his fragmentary inscription.

Especially in the first century, when there were few equestrian procurators of any sort in Rome, it seems unlikely that the emperors would be willing to assign from five to seven young men to these libraries.<sup>79</sup>

I would not argue that there were never equestrian procurators of individual libraries. From time to time, in response to emergencies or to changing circumstances and needs, the emperor might want to appoint an equestrian procurator.<sup>80</sup> Perhaps one or more libraries, such as the Trajan Library, always had an equestrian director. The point I want to make is simply this: there is nothing to suggest that all libraries had equestrian directors at all times, and thus nothing to suggest that there was an administrative hierarchy in each library.<sup>81</sup> That is consistent with what we have observed previously: none of our lower-level staff—slaves *a bybliotheca* and *vilici*—seems to be suitable for the kind of administrative structure that might be expected if we had an equestrian procurator in each library, and the tasks such an administration might have performed could readily be handled by other offices.

## SCENARIO

We are now in a position to put together a conjectural picture of the public libraries of Rome. Let me emphasize that this is conjectural; while I hope it is essentially correct, it is dependent upon the evidence and arguments presented above, and thus subject to revision as more evidence becomes available.

The libraries were the emperor's, a central fact: the collections were his, part of the Palatine property even when housed off that hill. And at least during the first century the emperor provided staff from his household as personnel for the libraries, controlling access to the libraries through that staff.<sup>82</sup> The

<sup>79</sup> Pflaum in his indices (Pflaum 1960–61: 1019–35) lists no equestrian procurators in the city at the lowest (sexagenarian) level before A.D. 96, and only one prefect, Turranius Proculus Gellianus.

<sup>80</sup> We know of equestrian procurators in charge of individual projects in other contexts. Titus appointed a number of equestrians to special posts to help after the fire of A.D. 80 (Suet. *Tit.* 8.4 *praeposuit complures ex equestri ordine*). For other officials appointed to special projects see Bruun 203–4.

<sup>81</sup> Equestrian directors might have been especially awkward in the first century A.D., when the procurators of all the libraries included two orientals, Iulius Pappus (no. 28) and Dionysius (no. 29) and perhaps a freedman, Scirtus (no. 14). It would be surprising if these men ranked above equestrian library directors. (I assume here that the procurator of all the libraries would in some sense be the superior of the individual library directors.)

<sup>82</sup> We can now see that “public” libraries in Rome are distinct from modern libraries in an important way. They were open to the public, but in a very real sense they were not public property, but the emperor's; and the public who used them may have been re-

staff we hear of in the early Empire was not essentially administrative, intended to provide a service to the people of the Empire, but domestic, their first function being to manage the emperor's properties (in this case the book collections). Expenses in the libraries seem to have been handled through the emperor's Palatine staff generally, not by the individual libraries. Whereas in the Republic Cicero himself made decisions regarding his library, the emperor left such policy matters to others: to scholars who organized the library, to his commissioners, and perhaps on occasion to other equestrian officials. So far as we know, there was no significant central library administration,<sup>83</sup> and we might imagine the library commissioner working in the first instance (as scholar) with the emperor or his staff, and in the second instance (as administrator) with the slave *vilici* who managed the individual libraries. The *vilici* in turn probably organized the day-to-day work of the slaves *a bybliotheca*.

Books accrued to the emperor over time, through purchase, gift, inheritance, conquest, and the like. Presumably they were kept for a period of years in storage, more or less available; some of the emperor's slaves must have kept track of them, and we might choose to assume that it was the slaves *a bybliotheca* who did this. When, for whatever reason, an emperor chose to create a new library, he could appoint a scholar or administrator to work with his slaves in organizing such books as had accumulated.<sup>84</sup> On other occasions, too, for example after fires, special arrangements might be called for. Early in the second century, there may well have been a shift from Greek to Roman scholars as library commissioners, and a regularizing of that position, but we do not know whether that had any impact upon the occupational titles of the staff or the functioning of the libraries. In the late second century there may well have been adjustments in the upper levels of the administration, but at all times, I would suggest, the upper-level commissioners were concerned first with scholarly questions—the emperor's and their own—and secondarily with

---

stricted, perhaps even to a circle of scholars and friends parallel to the users of the great private libraries of the Republic. But in this matter of users we cannot be at all certain.

<sup>83</sup> With few exceptions, the titles of all personnel below the equestrian level indicate that they worked not in a central libraries office, but in specific individual libraries. The exceptions are Apollonius (no. 9), [*a?*] *bybl[iotheca]*, which could be *bybl[iothecis]*; Charops (no. 10), *ad byblio(thecam or -thecas)*; Scirtus (no. 14), *proc(urator) bybl(iothecae or -arum)*; and the *incertus* (no. 19) *a byblio(theca or -heci)*. Given that we have no certain examples of men assigned to an office *a bybliothecis*, and fifteen inscriptions in which the staff member is clearly assigned to one library, it seems best to take the uncertain examples as also of men assigned to one library.

<sup>84</sup> Because enough books had gathered, for example, or to celebrate an occasion such as victory in the Dacian Wars.

administrative policy, while the physical work, especially assisting patrons by locating and bringing out volumes, but also maintaining the book collection through copying, repairs, and cleaning, could be left to men drawn from the emperor's household, the slaves *a bybliothecca* and the *vilici*.<sup>85</sup>

#### WORKS CITED

- Blanck, H. 1992. *Das Buch in der Antike*. Munich.
- Boulvert, G. 1970. *Esclaves et affranchis impériaux sous le haut-empire romain: Rôle politique et administratif*. Naples.
- Bruce, L. 1981. "A Reappraisal of Libraries in the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*." *Journal of Library History* 16: 551–73.
- . 1983. "The *Procurator Bibliothecarum* at Rome." *Journal of Library History* 18: 143–62.
- Bruun, C. 1991. *The Water Supply of Ancient Rome: A Study of Roman Imperial Administration*. *Commentationes Humanarum Literarum* 93. Helsinki.
- Buonocore, M. 1982. "Materiali per lo studio del colombario dei liberti e schiavi dei Volusii sulla Via Appia." In *I Volusii Saturnini: Una famiglia romana della prima età imperiale*. Bari. 17–35.
- Callmer, C. 1944. "Antike Bibliotheken." *OpArch* 3: 145–93.
- Carlsen, J. 1995. *Vilici and Roman Estate Managers until A.D. 284*. *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici Suppl.* 24. Rome.
- Casson, L. 2001. *Libraries in the Ancient World*. New Haven.
- Chantraine, H. 1967. *Freigelassene und Sklaven im Dienst der römischen Kaiser: Studien zu ihrer Nomenklatur*. Wiesbaden.
- Churchill, J. B. 1999. "Ex qua quod vellent facerent: Roman Magistrates' Authority over *Praeda* and *Manubiae*." *TAPA* 129: 85–116.
- Coarelli, F. 1982. *Lazio*. Rome and Bari.
- Dack, E. van't. 1963. "A studiis, a bybliotheccis." *Historia* 12: 177–84.
- Daguet-Gagey, A. 1997. *Les opera publica à Rome (180–305 ap. J.-C.)*. Paris.
- Daris, S. 1983. "Ricerche di papirologia documentaria." *Aegyptus* 63: 117–22.
- Degrassi, A. 1963. *Inscriptiones Italiae: Volumen XIII*. 2 vols. Rome.
- Dix, T. K. 1986. "Private and Public Libraries at Rome in the First Century B.C.: A Preliminary Study in the History of Roman Libraries." Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan.
- . 1994. "'Public Libraries' in Ancient Rome: Ideology and Reality." *Libraries & Culture* 29: 282–96.
- Dix, T. K., and G. W. Houston. 1995. "Libraries in Roman Baths?" *Balnearia* 4: 2–4.

<sup>85</sup> I am most indebted to Paul Weaver, Keith Dix, and Jerzy Linderski, all of whom read earlier versions of this article and gave me much useful advice, and to the referees for *TAPA*, who gave me many excellent suggestions. Such faults as remain are of course my responsibility.

- Eder, W. 1980. *Servitus publica: Untersuchungen zur Entstehung, Entwicklung und Funktion der öffentlichen Sklaverei in Rom*. Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei 13. Wiesbaden.
- Fanizza, L. 1982. *Giuristi, crimini, leggi nell'età degli Antonini*. Naples.
- Fedeli, P. 1989. "Biblioteche private e pubbliche a Roma e nel mondo romano." In G. Cavallo, ed., *Le biblioteche nel mondo antico e medievale*. 2nd ed. Bari. 31–64.
- Fehrle, R. 1986. *Das Bibliothekswesen im alten Rom: Voraussetzungen, Bedingungen, Anfänge*. Freiburg.
- Gummerus, H. 1932. *Der Ärztestand im römischen Reiche nach den Inschriften*. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 3.6. Helsinki.
- Halkin, L. 1965 (original publication 1897). *Les esclaves publics chez les romains*. Rome.
- Hanslik, R. 1948. "Valerius Eudaemon." *RE* 7A col. 2496.
- Hesberg, H. von. 1987. "Planung und Ausgestaltung der Nekropolen Roms im 2. Jh. n. Chr." In H. von Hesberg and P. Zanker, eds., *Römische Gräberstrassen: Selbstdarstellung, Status, Standard*. Munich. 43–60.
- Hirschfeld, O. 1963 (original publication 1905). *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*. 2nd ed. Berlin.
- Horsfall, N. 1989. *Cornelius Nepos: A Selection, Including the Lives of Cato and Atticus*. Oxford.
- Houston, G. W. 1996. "Onesimus the Librarian." *ZPE* 114: 205–8.
- Howell, P., ed. 1995. *Martial Epigrams* V. Warminster.
- Kaster, R. A., ed. 1995. *C. Suetonius Tranquillus. De grammaticis et rhetoribus*. Oxford.
- Kolb, A. 1993. *Die kaiserliche Bauverwaltung in der Stadt Rom: Geschichte und Aufbau der cura operum publicorum unter dem Prinzipat*. Stuttgart.
- Kuebler, B. 1895 "Bibliotheca." In E. de Ruggiero, ed., *Dizionario Epigrafico di antichità romane*. 5 vols. Rome. 1: 1003–5.
- Langie, A. 1908. *Les bibliothèques publiques dans l'ancienne Rome et dans l'empire romain*. Fribourg.
- Lewis, M. J. T. 2001. *Surveying Instruments of Greece and Rome*. Cambridge.
- Lo Cascio, E. 1991. "Le tecniche dell'amministrazione." In A. Schiavone, ed., *Storia di Roma* II.2. Turin. 118–91.
- Magie, D. 1905. *De romanorum iuris publici sacrique vocabulis sollemnibus in graecum sermonem conversis*. Leipzig.
- Manacorda, D. 1999. "Per l'edizione del secondo colombario Codini: Il problema epigrafico nel contesto archeologico." In *Atti del XI Congresso Internazionale di Epigrafia Greca e Latina. Roma, 18–24 settembre 1997*. Rome. 251–60.
- Marshall, A. J. 1976. "Library Resources and Creative Writing at Rome." *Phoenix* 30: 252–64.
- Millar, F. 1977. *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 B.C.–A.D. 337)*. Ithaca.
- Mols, S. T. A. M. 1999. *Wooden Furniture in Herculaneum: Form, Technique and Function*. Amsterdam.
- Mommsen, T. 1952 (original publication 1887–88). *Römisches Staatsrecht*. 3 vols. in 5. 3rd ed. Graz.
- Nesselhauf, H. 1966. "Patrimonium und res privata des römischen Kaisers." In *Historia Augusta Colloquium, Bonn 1963*. Bonn. 73–93.
- Nordh, A. 1949. *Libellus de regionibus urbis Romae*. Skrifter utgivna av Svenska institutet i Rom 3. Lund.

- Oldfather, W. A. 1938. "The Maintenance of Ancient Greek Public Libraries." *Library Quarterly* 8: 287–88.
- Packer, J. E. 1997. *The Forum of Trajan in Rome: A Study of the Monuments*. 2 vols. Berkeley.
- Panciera, S. 1969. "Miscellanea Epigrafica IV." *Epigraphica* 31: 104–20.
- Pesando, F. 1994. *Libri e biblioteche*. Vita e costumi dei Romani antichi 17. Rome.
- Pflaum, H.-G. 1950. *Les procurateurs équestres sous le haut-empire romain*. Paris.
- . 1960–61. *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le haut-empire romain*. 4 vols. Paris.
- Rowland, R. J., Jr. 1977. "Some New *Medici* in the Roman Empire." *Epigraphica* 39: 174–79.
- Ruggiero, E. de. 1900. "Commentarii." In E. de Ruggiero, ed., *Dizionario Epigrafico di antichità romane*. 5 vols. Rome. 2.1: 532–46.
- Sallmann, K. 1997. *Die Literatur des Umbruchs: Von der römischen zur christlichen Literatur, 117 bis 284 n. Chr.* Munich.
- Schmid, W., and O. Stählin. 1961 (original publication 1929). *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*. 2 vols. Munich.
- Schuster, M. 1958. "Vestricius Spurinna." *RE* 8A cols. 1791–98.
- Shear, T. L. 1936. "The Campaign of 1935." *Hesperia* 5: 1–42.
- Solin, H. 1982. *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom: Ein Namenbuch*. 3 vols. Berlin.
- Steinby, E. M., ed. 1993–2000. *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae*. 6 vols. Rome.
- Sullivan, J. P. 1991. *Martial, The Unexpected Classic: A Literary and Historical Study*. Cambridge.
- Thompson, D. L. 1981. "The Meetings of the Roman Senate on the Palatine." *AJA* 85: 335–39.
- Tønsberg, J. 1976. *Offentlige biblioteker i Romerriget*. Copenhagen.
- Treggiari, S. 1969. *Roman Freedmen During the Late Republic*. Oxford.
- . 1975. "Jobs in the Household of Livia." *PBSR* 43: 48–77.
- Turner, E. G. 1983. "Sniffing Glue." *CronErc* 13: 7–14.
- Väänänen, V. 1973. *Le iscrizioni della necropoli dell'autoparco vaticano*. Rome.
- Vacher, M.-C., ed. 1993. *Suétone*. Grammairiens et rhéteurs. Paris.
- Vieillefond, J.-R. 1970. *Les "Cestes" de Julius Africanus: Étude sur l'ensemble des fragments avec édition, traduction et commentaires*. Paris.
- Vulić, N. 1910. "Dispensator." In E. de Ruggiero, ed., *Dizionario Epigrafico di antichità romane*. 5 vols. Rome. 2.2: 1920–23.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1983. *Suetonius: The Scholar and His Caesars*. New Haven.
- Weaver, P. R. C. 1972. *Familia Caesaris: A Social Study of the Emperor's Freedmen and Slaves*. Cambridge.
- White, P. 1992. "'Pompeius Macer' and Ovid." *CQ* 42: 210–18.