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Nemus et Templum. Exploring the sacred grove at the Temple of Venus in Pompeii

Maureen Carroll

In the Roman world, the provision of temple precincts with groves and gardens was probably fairly common practice, but sacred gardens seldom have been investigated archaeologically, and only a few are known anywhere.1 Even in Pompeii they remain rather elusive. Temple gardens or groves have been postulated here, but never corroborated archaeologically, at the temple of Isis and around the Doric temple in the Triangular Forum, as well as at the temple of Venus on the seafront at Herculaneum.2 The plantings around the suburban temple of Dionysos investigated in 1973 by Wilhelmina Jashemski remained the only archaeologically explored sacred grove of Roman date in Pompeii until excavations by the author at the temple of Apollo in 1998.3

At Pompeii in-depth exploration of accessible spaces such as atria and peristyles in Roman houses is clearly important for the information that can be gained on early Roman and pre-Roman occupation sequences and the processes of change, but the investigation of open areas around temples is also crucial, as it is here that we should expect to find the preserved remains of sacred groves and gardens. This most certainly applies to the sanctuary of Venus Pompeiana which was first cleared of ancient pumice and ash between 1898 and 1900.4 The primary focus of these and subsequent sporadic excavations in the twentieth century was to reveal the architectural remains of the temple and the colonnades around it.5 No effort had ever been made to explore the sub-soil in the area between the temple and the surrounding porticoes in search of evidence for a sacred grove, and, in fact, the existence of plantings on the site was questioned, if not denied, by modern scholars.6 Because much of the courtyard of the sanctuary was intact, and because Venus, as a goddess of fertility, could be expected to have had plantings associated with her cult, the site presented itself as an ideal location for an investigation into the existence and appearance of a sacred grove.7

A research project of excavation and survey was therefore designed to clarify the following:8 - the date of the earliest Roman temple garden and its relationship to the first Roman temple; - the nature and type of plantings in the temple garden; - changes in the design of the temple garden between the time of its establishment and the eruption of Vesuvius in A.D. 79; - the use of water in the sanctuary and the nature of dedicated votive offerings and monuments.

Seven trenches were opened on the west and east sides of the courtyard, avoiding the areas of nineteenth-century disturbance, the large basalt blocks strewn around the site, and the modern pathway that overlies the most westerly part of the courtyard and the foundations of the adjacent portico (Figs. 1-2). The following is a preliminary report on the fieldwork carried out in 1998, 2004 and 2006 by the University of Sheffield.

The location of this Roman sanctuary on the south-west edge of Pompeii’s lava plateau meant that it spectacularly overlooked the valley below and would have been visible for some distance by anyone approaching from this direction. The Pompeian sanctuary is related to a group of impressive terrace sanctuaries in central Italy built between the mid-second and the mid-first century B.C., such as, for example, the sanctuaries of Fortuna at Palestrina, of Jupiter or Venus at Terracina, of Hercules Victor at Tivoli, or of Diana Nemorensis at Nemi.9 As at these sites, the area chosen for the temple of Venus in Pompeii underwent substantial alterations to accommodate the new complex. In order to build on steeply

1 Jashemski 1979a; Carroll 2003, pp. 60-71 (on the archaeology of sacred gardens in antiquity in general); Carroll forthcoming (on Roman temple groves).
2 Jashemski 1979a, pp. 155-157, 158-160 (referred to as the Sacred Area).
3 Jashemski 1979a, pp. 157-158, fig. 244; Jashemski 1993, pp. 253-254; Carroll and Godden 2000.
4 Sogliano 1899; Sogliano 1900; Miulli 1900.
5 Snod 1910; Miulli 1960, pp. 173-176. More recently excavations have been conducted by E. Curti to explore the pre-Roman remains on the site and the relationship between this quarter of the town and the harbour: Curti 2005, and see this volume.
7 Venus, like Aphrodite, is most often connected with plants and growing things, so, for example, by Lucretius, de rerum natura 1.1, who refers to the earth spreading flowers under her feet. For the connection between Aphrodite and gardens, see Pindar, Pythian Odes 5.24; Hesiod, Theogony 11.194-195; Strabo, Geography 8.3.12, 14.6.3; Pliny, Historia Naturalis 36.4.16; Pausanias, Description of Greece 1.19.2, 1.27.3. See also Monte 1973, pp. 121-137; Carroll-Spillecke 1989, p. 24, fig. 7. Venus at Pompeii also had the epithet ‘Fisica’. In this guise, she may not have been primarily fertility related, as she appears also to have had celestial and marine connections, and she acted as a goddess of mediation. Carayll 2002, pp. 88-89, aligns her with the great Near Eastern goddesses, but one of these goddesses, Astarte, and her eastern Greek counterpart, Aphrodite, were definitely also fertility deities. On the cult of Astarte/Aphrodite with physical evidence for a sacred grove at Kourkla (Paphos) and Kition (Larnaca) in Cyprus, see Herodotus History 1.105; Kappenberg and Carroll-Spillecke 1998, pp. 142-146. On depictions of Venus at Pompeii, see Schnider 1923; Schilling 1954, pp. 285-289, pls. XIV, XV, XVII, Appendix 1; Jashemski 1979a, pp. 124-131.
8 Funding and support for the 1998 fieldwork were provided by Earthwatch and the University of Sheffield. Fieldwork in 2004 was enabled by funds from the University of Sheffield and the Stanley Smith Horticultural Trust. The British Academy funded the 2006 season.
9 On central Italian terrace sanctuaries, see Carayll 1987.
sloping land, masses of building debris, stone, rubble and soil were brought in and deposited here to create a level building site for the new temple and its surrounding porticoes. We excavated this deposit in several places to a depth of over a metre (Fig. 3). The finds extracted from this material in the temple terrace date, in the main, to the second century and first half of the first century B.C., suggesting that the temple of Venus Pompeiana, the protector of Roman Pompeii, dates to the time after the establishment of the Roman colony in 80 B.C. Lead sling shot found mixed in with the building rubble in the temple terrace may point to the Sullan siege in 89 B.C. and the subsequent demolition of buildings damaged in this incident. Some of the ceramics in these deposits date as late as the mid-first century B.C., suggesting that the building project may have taken some time after the deduction of the colony to be completed.

The sacred precinct of Venus was inserted into the existing urban fabric of Pompeii, and it became the principal and largest sanctuary of the Roman city. The temple was built on the terrace created for it, and our excavations clearly showed how the porticoes were built on and inserted into the levelling deposits. Parallel to the porticoes on all sides of the sanctuary was a shallow water channel made of tufa for run-off from the portico roof. One source of water for the sanctuary was a large cistern built under the floor of the eastern portico. Contemporaneous with the building of the temple and its porticoes was the landscaping and planting of the open courtyard as a sacred grove, the main floor of the courtyard being beaten earth. Our excavations uncovered planting pits for trees with a maximum depth of 50-60 cm below the tufa water channels on the edges of the courtyard. The arrangement of the pits indicates that the temple grove consisted...
of a row of trees planted parallel to the colonnades on the north, west and east sides of the sanctuary (Fig. 4). In several of the pits were the buried and complete (but broken) terracotta pots, still in situ, in which young plants once had been started (Fig. 5-6). They are of the type with four holes in the lower walls and bottom of the vessel (Type A, 14-16.5 cm in height) or with one hole in the bottom (Type B, 19 cm in height), and they are related to the ancient practice of propagating and air-layering trees and shrubs in containers and transporting young plants in them to their destination (Fig. 7). The larger vessels from the sanctuary of Venus may well have been too big and heavy to be suspended from the branches of a parent tree for the process of air-layering, but they would be well suited as portable containers for shoots or saplings of trees.

Evidence, such as planting pits that inter-cut each other, clearly indicates that some trees had to be replaced from time to time when they died or failed to flourish, and the remains of wooden stakes driven into the ground or through the buried plant pot reveal that temple garden-

---

11 Lead sling shot also has been found in the destruction horizon of the Sullan siege at the Casa delle Vestali in Insula VI: Jones and Robinson 2005, and see also http://www.archaeology.org/interactive/pompeii/field/5.html.
12 Carroll 2003, p. 89, fig. 70.
13 Catu, De agricultura 52; Pliny, Historia Naturalis 12.7. On excavated plant pots, see Josemski 1979a, pp. 238-240; Josemski 1993; Meschiardi 1993; Desbat 1997; Baret and Moret 1999; Macaulay Lewis 2006.
ers propped up the trees or bushes if extra support was needed (Fig. 8). Traces of this kind of gardening activity are extremely rare anywhere. Furthermore, the plant pots testify to the existence of plant nurseries supplying a cult organisation with the desired vegetation in containers for the landscaping of a sanctuary. Analysis of the soil in the containers also points to the practice of soil

enrichment in the nursery in which these plants were grown before being transferred to the temple of Venus. The analysed planting soil in the pots was fertilised with shells, fish vertebrae and the bones of juvenile pigs.14

This sacred grove of Venus was very much an ‘architectural’ one in which trees were planted parallel to the

14 Faunal remains analysis conducted by Sarah Viner, University of Sheffield.
water channel in front of the columns of the colonnades on three sides of the courtyard (Fig. 9). The rows of trees on the two long sides of the courtyard did not continue to the southern limit of the sanctuary, but they did flank the temple itself. A visitor approaching from the south, where there was no portico, would have seen the temple framed and highlighted by this grove. The trees were planted at fairly regular intervals of approximately .90-1.00 m (from the centre of the planting pit to the centre of the next pit), and it is to be expected that they echoed the rhythms of the columns of the porticoes in some way. Although the columns of the porticoes will not have been spaced as closely as the plantings, perhaps there was one tree in front of each column and one in between, giving us a colonnade with columns at intervals of roughly 2 m. This juxtaposition of vegetation and portico columns is evident in other architectural contexts, as, for example, in the peristyle garden at the so-called villa of Poppaea at Oplontis, where there is a planting about every 1.80 m in front of each column, and in the courtyard of the Palestra Grande in Pompeii, where there are plane trees at intervals of about 9 m, that is one tree in front of every fourth column. It is suggested here that the plantings at the temple of Venus constituted what Latin texts refer to as a *nemus*, a grove created or manipulated by man and furnished with sacred buildings and images. Unfortunately, due to later alterations and rebuilding of the sanctuary, it is entirely unclear what images and votives may have stood in the precinct at this time.

The plantings in the sanctuary of Venus are as yet of botanically undetermined types, as no organic remains had survived. Analysis of the flotation residues may yet reveal surviving phytoliths that can shed light on the vegetation in these planting pits. Jashemski’s excavations at many sites in Campania have demonstrated that the size of Roman planting pots need not mean that only small trees and shrubs were able to grow in them. Trees with the potential to grow quite large and have an extensive root system, such as lemons or citrons, were started in ceramic pots 14 cm in height, for example, at the so-called Garden of Hercules in Pompeii. The ancient written sources do not help much either in determining what grew at the temple of Venus, because they say that the vine, the fig, the olive, the pomegranate, quinces, every variety of the apple, the laurel, the plum, the myrtle, the hazelnut, and the plane are capable of being propagated by layers using pots or baskets, although we can probably rule out the existence of fruit trees in the sanctuary. At any rate, the evidence uncovered in the sacred grove of Venus indicates a regular pattern of alternating planting pits containing one of the two types of pot and planting pits with no pot in them: a type A pot, a pit with no pot, a type B pot, a pit with no pot, a type A pot, and so on (Fig. 10). This may suggest tall vegetation alternating with shorter vegetation, or slender plants alternating with bushier, or it may simply imply a sequence of trees and shrubs that required propagation in ceramic pots and those that did not need this treatment. Candidates for the plantings are laurel, as has been suggested for the peristyle garden at Oplontis (now replanted with laurel), or citrons and oleander, as suggested at Livia’s Villa at Oplontis. A visitor approaching from the south, where there was no portico, would have seen the temple framed and highlighted by this grove. The trees were planted at fairly regular intervals of approximately .90-1.00 m (from the centre of the planting pit to the centre of the next pit), and it is to be expected that they echoed the rhythms of the columns of the porticoes in some way. Although the columns of the porticoes will not have been spaced as closely as the plantings, perhaps there was one tree in front of each column and one in between, giving us a colonnade with columns at intervals of roughly 2 m. This juxtaposition of vegetation and portico columns is evident in other architectural contexts, as, for example, in the peristyle garden at the so-called villa of Poppaea at Oplontis, where there is a planting about every 1.80 m in front of each column, and in the courtyard of the Palestra Grande in Pompeii, where there are plane trees at intervals of about 9 m, that is one tree in front of every fourth column. It is suggested here that the plantings at the temple of Venus constituted what Latin texts refer to as a *nemus*, a grove created or manipulated by man and furnished with sacred buildings and images. Unfortunately, due to later alterations and rebuilding of the sanctuary, it is entirely unclear what images and votives may have stood in the precinct at this time.

The plantings in the sanctuary of Venus are as yet of botanically undetermined types, as no organic remains had survived. Analysis of the flotation residues may yet reveal surviving phytoliths that can shed light on the vegetation in these planting pits. Jashemski’s excavations at many sites in Campania have demonstrated that the size of Roman planting pots need not mean that only small trees and shrubs were able to grow in them. Trees with the potential to grow quite large and have an extensive root system, such as lemons or citrons, were started in ceramic pots 14 cm in height, for example, at the so-called Garden of Hercules in Pompeii. The ancient written sources do not help much either in determining what grew at the temple of Venus, because they say that the vine, the fig, the olive, the pomegranate, quinces, every variety of the apple, the laurel, the plum, the myrtle, the hazelnut, and the plane are capable of being propagated by layers using pots or baskets, although we can probably rule out the existence of fruit trees in the sanctuary.

At any rate, the evidence uncovered in the sacred grove of Venus indicates a regular pattern of alternating planting pits containing one of the two types of pot and planting pits with no pot in them: a type A pot, a pit with no pot, a type B pot, a pit with no pot, a type A pot, and so on (Fig. 10). This may suggest tall vegetation alternating with shorter vegetation, or slender plants alternating with bushier, or it may simply imply a sequence of trees and shrubs that required propagation in ceramic pots and those that did not need this treatment. Candidates for the plantings are laurel, as has been suggested for the peristyle garden at Oplontis (now replanted with laurel), or citrons and oleander, as suggested at Livia’s Villa at Oplontis. A visitor approaching from the south, where there was no portico, would have seen the temple framed and highlighted by this grove. The trees were planted at fairly regular intervals of approximately .90-1.00 m (from the centre of the planting pit to the centre of the next pit), and it is to be expected that they echoed the rhythms of the columns of the porticoes in some way. Although the columns of the porticoes will not have been spaced as closely as the plantings, perhaps there was one tree in front of each column and one in between, giving us a colonnade with columns at intervals of roughly 2 m. This juxtaposition of vegetation and portico columns is evident in other architectural contexts, as, for example, in the peristyle garden at the so-called villa of Poppaea at Oplontis, where there is a planting about every 1.80 m in front of each column, and in the courtyard of the Palestra Grande in Pompeii, where there are plane trees at intervals of about 9 m, that is one tree in front of every fourth column. It is suggested here that the plantings at the temple of Venus constituted what Latin texts refer to as a *nemus*, a grove created or manipulated by man and furnished with sacred buildings and images. Unfortunately, due to later alterations and rebuilding of the sanctuary, it is entirely unclear what images and votives may have stood in the precinct at this time.

The plantings in the sanctuary of Venus are as yet of botanically undetermined types, as no organic remains had survived. Analysis of the flotation residues may yet reveal surviving phytoliths that can shed light on the vegetation in these planting pits. Jashemski’s excavations at many sites in Campania have demonstrated that the size of Roman planting pots need not mean that only small trees and shrubs were able to grow in them. Trees with the potential to grow quite large and have an extensive root system, such as lemons or citrons, were started in ceramic pots 14 cm in height, for example, at the so-called Garden of Hercules in Pompeii. The ancient written sources do not help much either in determining what grew at the temple of Venus, because they say that the vine, the fig, the olive, the pomegranate, quinces, every variety of the apple, the laurel, the plum, the myrtle, the hazelnut, and the plane are capable of being propagated by layers using pots or baskets, although we can probably rule out the existence of fruit trees in the sanctuary.

At any rate, the evidence uncovered in the sacred grove of Venus indicates a regular pattern of alternating planting pits containing one of the two types of pot and planting pits with no pot in them: a type A pot, a pit with no pot, a type B pot, a pit with no pot, a type A pot, and so on (Fig. 10). This may suggest tall vegetation alternating with shorter vegetation, or slender plants alternating with bushier, or it may simply imply a sequence of trees and shrubs that required propagation in ceramic pots and those that did not need this treatment. Candidates for the plantings are laurel, as has been suggested for the peristyle garden at Oplontis (now replanted with laurel), or citrons and oleander, as suggested at Livia’s Villa at Oplontis.

20 Jordan 1979a, p. 295, although she does not rule out citrons; Kynne and Lijenstrøm 2000a, 233; Kynne and Lijenstrøm 2000b, p. 125.
21 Pliny, Natural History 12.2.
22 The planting pots from Pompeii tend to range from between 12 and 15.5 cm, and many of them, but perhaps not the smallest ones, definitely were used for trees.
23 Kynne 1997-1998, fig. 8. According to A. Klynne, investigations in 2006 at Prima Porta uncovered clusters of six vessels of only 9-10 cm in height, and he interprets these as containers for flowers, not trees (pers. comm.).
24 Thompson 1937. The cuttings for plantings at the temple of Hephaistos are the same distance apart as the columns of the temple so that the columns and the trees mirror each other’s rhythm; Thompson 1937, p. 405, fig. 6. The cuttings have sides of up to 90 cm in length and were up to 65-90 cm deep. This almost certainly has to do with the fact that they are cut into the bedrock, making a large cutting that could accommodate the necessary amount of soil for proper tree growth necessary.
25 Lutter 1968-1969; Coarelli 1993, pp. 48-52, figs. 1-2. As at the Athenian temple of Hephaistos, the cuttings at Gabii are hewn out of the bedrock, so their large size is also explained by the need for an adequate amount of fertile soil. The biggest cuttings there measure 1.50 by 1.60 m, and are 1.20-1.50 m deep, the smaller ones are 1.20 x 1.30 m in size and 0.60-0.80 m deep. Coarelli 1993, p. 50, suggests the latter might have been for myrtles.
26 Giani forthcoming, and see Giani 1993 for recent excavations at Nemi.
28 Kynne 2005.

Prima Porta, although we have no mention of oleander at any temple garden in Greece or Italy.20 The myrtle, with its dark berries and white blossoms, was particularly sacred to Venus and also remains a good possibility.21 Most of the planting pots from the temple of Venus are bigger than examples found in private and commercial contexts in Pompeii, and since, as we have seen, a pot 14 cm in size could accommodate a citron with large roots, we can be confident that the plant pots in the sacred grove were for trees of non-dwarf varieties.22 When less substantial plants such as small bushes or flowers were grown in ceramic containers, these tended to be much smaller.23

It remains to explore how the grove in this sacred complex in Pompeii was related to other Roman sanctuaries of the late Republic and early Empire. The arrangement of temple and plantings resembles that in the sanctuary of Hephaistos in Athens, a grove laid out probably in the third century B.C. and replanted thereafter in the late first century B.C., possibly just after the damage caused by Sulla in his attack on Athens in 86.24 A grove laid out somewhat earlier than that in Pompeii, but in a similar manner surrounding three sides of the temple, is that of Juno at Gabii.25 This grove dates to the mid-second century B.C. and was replanted in the early first century B.C. Of the late Republican terrace temples named earlier, certainly the sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis had a grove of trees planted in pits along the porticoes, as recent preliminary geophysics and excavation have suggested.26 These date to the first centuries B.C. and A.D. Perhaps all the other grand central Italian terrace sanctuaries were also planted with a grove, although this has yet to be confirmed by archaeological investigation.

The idea of a planted porticus triplex was taken up later for landscape planning in the context of Augustan religious architecture. The courtyard of the victory monument of Augustus, built between 29 and 27 B.C., at Nikopolis, was planted, as ceramic plant pots indicate. Like the earlier terrace sanctuaries in Italy, this colonnaded monument was located in a dramatic setting on a hill sacred to Apollo with a view to the sea below where the battle of Actium was decided in Augustus’ favour.27 Allan Klynne recently has investigated another porticus triplex, built possibly in the 20s B.C., on Prima Porta hill to the east of the Villa of Livia with the open side of the complex overlooking the Tiber valley.28 As terracotta planting pots excavated here reveal, this porticus triplex was planted, very possibly with the laurels from which Augustus and later Julio-Claudian emperors cut branches for their triumphal wreaths. The porticus and laurel grove may have been designed intentionally to reflect the layout of a sacred precinct planted with trees and to therefore act as a manifestation of the divine sanction of the gens Julia.

The ceramic evidence retrieved in our excavations indicates that at the end of the first century B.C. or in the early first century A.D., the temple of Venus and its porticoes were refurbished with marble, a material that was increasingly being employed for public and sacred buildings in Pompeii and elsewhere in the Augustan period. This is further supported by the analysis and dating of
surviving architectural elements by L. Jacobelli and P. Pensabene. More recently M. Wolf, in an architectural study of the sanctuary of Venus, has suggested that the temple and its colonnades were rebuilt in marble and completed before A.D. 30 on exactly the same alignment and on the same scale as the earlier buildings constructed of tufa. Our excavations clearly show that at the time the temple was rebuilt, the grove was destroyed or intentionally abandoned, and the planting pits and pots were covered by a deposit of soil containing pieces of wall plaster, tile and pottery, as well as off-cuts and chips of white marble (possibly Luna) that may have been left from the Augustan building work on site (Fig. 4). On top of this deposit, the courtyard was now paved with a layer of white mortar, and in places this mortar was applied in more than one layer, possibly as a measure to repair minor wear or damage to the pavement (Fig. 11). The sanctuary may not have had a grove in this phase, but the remains of lead water pipes, masonry water tanks abutting the tufa water channels on the edges of the courtyard, and the bases of monuments and statues (some connected to a water source) indicate that the courtyard clearly was a focus of religious veneration and social activity. Yet, quite how the trees could be disposed of, although they belonged to Venus and were therefore of religious significance, remains unclarified.

Years later, in A.D. 62, most public and private buildings in Pompeii, including the temple of Venus, were destroyed or ruined by the earthquake. In the following years, the site was cleared for the reconstruction of the sanctuary and building work on the new temple foundations began. The excavations uncovered rare evidence for the work done in this final phase and for the appearance of a Roman construction site, complete with heaps of stone chips and architectural debris from the cutting of basalt foundation blocks and the carving of columns, architectural decoration and votive monuments of white and coloured marbles imported from the eastern Mediterranean. The temple was to be the biggest and finest yet on that site, and the builders had dug a broad and deep foundation trench around the old temple and were in the process of erecting courses of large basalt blocks against the original building for the new structure (Fig. 12). The precinct itself was enlarged over the slope to the south and out into the street to the north. The sanctuary, however, was never finished, nor was its sacred grove replanted, because Vesuvius erupted before this could happen.

Sacred groves in Roman sanctuaries rarely have been the focus of any controlled archaeological excavation. The results of our investigations, therefore, have validity not only for Pompeii, but also for an understanding of and insight into the physical appearance and workings of Roman sanctuaries in general, especially those in the late Republic. If our interpretation of the evidence is correct, the establishment of an impressive new landscaped sanctuary in an existing settlement...
casts light on the ways in which a community used sacred space to express changing political circumstances and social relations. Should an older indigenous sanctuary (of the Samnite goddess Mefitis perhaps?) have been replaced by the Roman sanctuary of Venus Pompeiana, the significance of the appropriation of this space becomes clear, especially if this occurred on the initiative of the Roman colonists. By the same token, a real change in the social identity of the community is also evident if the Roman temple replaced other structures such as private houses of Pompeii’s indigenous population. In either case, the establishment of the Roman temple of Venus with its sacred grove played a formative role in the political, religious and social transformation of Pompeii from a Hellenistic town to a Roman colony.

### Abbreviazioni bibliografiche

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
riconstruzione del santuario, in Rivista di Studi Pompeiani, 7, 1995-1996, pp. 45-76.

JASHEMSKI 1979a and 1993

JASHEMSKI 1979b

JASHEMSKI 1981

JASHEMSKI 1992

JASHEMSKI 1995

JONES and ROBINSON 2005

KARAGEORGHIS and CORRILL-SPIELERIEKE 1998

KENNE 2005

KENNE and LIJENSTORPE 1997-1998

KENNE and LIJENSTORPE 2000a

KENNE and LIJENSTORPE 2000b

LATTER 1968-1969

LLOYD 1982

MACAULAY LEWIS 2006

ROSTER 1900
A. ROSTER, Der Tempel der Venus Pompeiana, in Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, 15, 1900, pp. 270-308.

ROSTER 1908

MAURI 1942
A. MAURI, L’ultima fase edilizia di Pompei, Rome 1942.

MAURI 1960

MESSINGER 1993
G. MESSINGER, Ollae Perforatae, in Xenia, 9, 1993, pp. 65-82.

MOTTE 1973

REDD 2000

SCHEID 1993

SCHILLING 1954

SCHILLING 1989

SCHILLING 1990
A. SCHILLING, Pompei. Relazione degli scavi fatti durante il mese di gennaio 1900, in Scavi, 1900, pp. 27-31.

SCHILLING 1993

SPINO 1910
G. SPINO, Pompei, in Scavi, 1910, pp. 270-271.

SQUILLER 1983

THOMPSON 1937

WOLF 2004

VILLERHEU 1992

VILLERHEU 2001

ZACHOS 2003