

1 **Petrographical and geochemical criteria for a chronology of Roman mortars between**
2 **the 1st century BC and the 2nd century AD: the Curia of Pompey the Great**

3

4 Fabrizio Marra*¹, Ersilia D'Ambrosio², Mario Gaeta³, Antonio Monterroso-Checa⁴

5

6 ¹ Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia, Via di Vigna Murata 605, 00147 Rome, Italy

7 ² Direzione Musei Archeologici e Storico-Artistici, Sovrintendenza Capitolina ai Beni Culturali,
8 Via delle Tre Pile 1, 00186 Rome, Italy

9 ³ Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra, Sapienza Università di Roma, Piazzale Aldo Moro 5,
10 00185 rome, Italy

11 ⁴ Patricia Unit for R&D in Cultural Heritage (HUM 882 Research Group), Universidad de
12 Córdoba, Campus de Rabanales, Edificio C1, Carretera Nacional IV, km 396, 14014 Córdoba,
13 Spain

14

15 **Abstract**

16 Thirteen samples of mortar collected from different masonry structures of the Curia of
17 Pompey the Great and from three mixtilinear basins located within the Sacred Area of Largo
18 Argentina were studied.

19 Despite the use of the same volcanic deposit, known as "Pozzolane Rosse", to produce the fine
20 aggregate in all these mortars, it was possible to highlight some distinctive features through
21 the combination of geochemical analyses on selected trace elements and petrographic
22 analysis under an optical microscope, allowing us to distinguish among the three groups of
23 mortars.

24 These types of mortars reflect a perfect coincidence between the diversity of the volcanic
25 materials used and the different construction phases identified and documented by the
26 analysis of the stratigraphic units: a first construction phase of Pompeian age, a second one of
27 Augustan age and, finally, one of the medieval period. Furthermore, it was possible to
28 ascertain two phases of construction of the basins, the second coeval with the interventions of
29 the Augustan period.

30 Finally, this study increases the knowledge on the methods of exploitation and selection of
31 volcanic materials used to produce mortars in Roman times, identifying additional elements
32 useful to establish their origin and chronology of use.

33

34

35

1 **Keywords:** Roman mortars; "Pozzolane Rosse"; Petrography; Area Sacra di Largo Argentina;
2 Theater of Pompey.

3

4 **Introduction**

5 The identification of the volcanic materials used as fine aggregate in the mortars of the Roman
6 era and the criteria for their selection and use over the centuries have been addressed in
7 numerous studies and publications over the past 20 years (Jackson et al., 2007, 2009, 2010;
8 Marra and D'Ambrosio, 2013; Marra et al., 2013, 2015a, 2015b; D'Ambrosio et al., 2015; Secco
9 et al., 2019, 2020).

10 In particular, the petrographic analysis in thin section has been integrated with a geochemical
11 "fingerprinting" method based on the properties of trace elements (i.e., Zr, Y, Nb, Th, Ta, Ti)
12 insensitive to alteration processes. This allowed the identification of materials in very small,
13 weathered quantities, which would not have been possible to study with classical
14 petrographic methods (Marra et al., 2011). These studies permitted a reconstruction of a
15 chronology of use characterized by a first "experimental" phase, corresponding to the first
16 two centuries since the introduction of the concrete in Rome starting from the late 2nd
17 century BC (Mogetta, 2015; Marra et al., 2015a). During this first phase, heterogeneous
18 materials have been used, both of a volcanoclastic nature (sedimentary deposits containing
19 reworked volcanic materials), and purely volcanic, cropping(?) out near the construction sites
20 (Marra et al., 2015a).

21 The period following this initial phase, starting from the end of the 2nd century BC, was
22 characterized by the almost exclusive use of a specific volcanic deposit known by geologists as
23 "Pozzolane Rosse" (De Rita et al., 1988; Marra and Rosa, 1995) (red pozzolans), which were
24 systematically cultivated in dedicated tunnels: the "*arenari*" (Marra et al., al., 2015a).

25 The "Pozzolane Rosse" are a pyroclastic deposit (ignimbrite) erupted 456,000 years ago from
26 the volcanic district of Colli Albani (Karner et al., 2001). This super-eruption emplaced several
27 tens of km³ of magma in the form of pyroclastic flows (Freda et al., 2010). The deposit (locally
28 called "*pozzolana*") is a weakly coherent aggregate of ash, scoria and lapilli which is widely
29 used to produce mortar even today. The petrographic and chemical factors that give to the
30 "Pozzolane Rosse" ideal "pozzolanic" qualities were discussed in Jackson et al. (2010).

31 The term *pozzolana*, probably used already in the late imperial age, derives from the city of
32 Pozzuoli (*Puteoli*), in the Campi Flegrei, where pyroclastic deposits were extensively
33 cultivated as aggregate for mortars in the *Pompeii* region since the 3rd century BC (Miriello et
34 al., 2010). Pliny the Elder (*Naturalis Historia* 16.202; 35.166), Strabo (*Geographia* 5.4.6) and

1 Seneca (Quaestiones Naturales 3.20.3) use the adjective puteolanus to indicate precisely those
2 Campania deposits that *Vitruvius* (*De Architectura*, 2.6.1) defines *pulvis* (see Jackson et al.,
3 2007; D'Ambrosio et al., 2015).

4 The "Pozzolane Rosse" have been the ubiquitous ingredient in the preparation of mortars
5 since the end of the 2nd century BC, testifying to a real "revolution" in the technique of
6 preparing concrete and in the methods of procuring the material used as the fine aggregate.
7 This revolution is closely linked to the intense public and utilitarian building activity
8 promoted by the members of the most influential families of the City to show their power and
9 political influence, exploiting the potential offered by the use of the new construction
10 technique represented by the concrete work (D'Alessio 2014; Davies, 2017).

11 The analyses carried out on samples of mortars collected from monuments of imperial age
12 show that the "Pozzolane Rosse" constituted the fundamental element of all the fine
13 aggregates of Roman mortars up to the 2nd century AD (Marra et al., 2015).

14 Starting from the 3rd century AD, the sporadic integration of a new, similar layer of
15 pozzolana, known as "Pozzolane Nere", stratigraphically above the previous one, is testified
16 by tunnel cultivation in the same areas where the *arenari* were located (Marra et al., 2015a).

17 At the passage between the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD, the first use of a third, stratigraphically
18 higher, layer of pozzolan (Pozzolanelle; Karner et al., 2001) is documented (Marra et al.,
19 2015). This deposit crops out extensively throughout the eastern suburbs of the City and was
20 therefore cultivated, unlike the older deposits, in the open air. The possible reasons for the
21 transition to the cultivation of "Pozzolanelle" and their more extensive use, likely linked to an
22 ever-greater need for supply, have been discussed in Marra et al. (2015a).

23 In this work, we test the possibility of distinguishing the mortars realized between the 1st
24 century BC and 2nd century AD by examining "Pozzolane Rosse" through petrographic and
25 geochemical characteristics of the aggregate. Such approach provides a further criterion for
26 distinguishing the chronology of use and therefore establishing an indirect dating method of
27 archaeological structures. We collected 10 samples of mortar from different walls of the Curia
28 of Pompey and 3 samples from 3 mixtilinear basins in the Sacred Area of Largo Argentina. We
29 also analyzed the composition of the aggregate, following the classification approach
30 developed in recent works (Marra et al., 2011; Marra and D'Ambrosio, 2013; Marra et al.,
31 2015a, 2015b; D'Ambrosio et al., 2015). The study was divided into two phases; the first one
32 sought to identify the origin of the volcanic aggregate by means of geochemical analyses.

33 Once the almost exclusive use of the pyroclastic deposit of "Pozzolane Rosse" was established,

1 the second phase attempted to further discriminate elements through the study of thin
2 sections under the optical microscope.

3

4 **The Curia of Pompey**

5 The Curia of Pompey is mentioned in ancient literary sources especially in relation to the
6 death of Gaius Julius Caesar who was assassinated in this very place on the Ides of March in 44
7 BC, during a meeting of the Senate. It was an almost square building (24 x 27 m) located
8 outside the eastern axis of the porticoes of the theater of Pompey (*Porticus Pompeiana*). The
9 large monumental complex was inaugurated in 55 BC by *Gneus Pompeus Magnus* (Pompey the
10 Great) and represented in the *Forma Urbis*, the marble plan of the city of Rome drawn up at
11 the time of the Severi (III AD) (Monterroso-Checa, 2010; Monterroso-Checa et al., 2017).

12 The building has been represented and interpreted in different ways, although the most
13 reliable historical plans are those developed by Marchetti-Longhi and Gatti (Marchetti Longhi,
14 1975). Recent studies have shown that the Curia of Pompey was not an exedra of the portico
15 of the Pompeian complex, but a standalone building that occupied the central part of the
16 eastern side of the arcades (Monterroso-Checa et al. 2017).

17 The remains of the Curia are still visible inside the Sacred Area of Largo Argentina, along its
18 western side (Figure 1). Recent research has made it possible to identify the different
19 construction phases and the original organization, from the Republican age (Phase I) to the
20 contemporary era (Phase IX). The construction phases I (61-55 BC), II (27-14 AD) and V
21 (medieval times) (Monterroso-Checa et al., 2017) are the subject of the present study.

22 The original phase (Phase I - 61-55 BC) includes the concrete foundation made with
23 pozzolanic mortar and tuff stone (Tufo Lionato, Marra et al., 2017), above which there is a
24 concrete base bounded by three rows of Tufo Lionato blocks, and the internal walls in
25 reticulated work of pozzolanic mortar and Tufo Lionato caementa (Monterroso-Checa et al.,
26 2017).

27 In the Augustan age (Phase II, 27 BC - 14 AD), a concrete structure covered with reticulated
28 work was built in the center of the back wall of the building, where the *suggestus* that raised
29 the chair of the *princeps senatus*, the most important of the senators, was once located. This is
30 the very place where, according to ancient sources, Gaius Julius Caesar was assassinated. This
31 structure constitutes a block of 6.5 meters wide and at least 2 meters high that completely
32 occupies the central place of the Curia and leans against the back wall of the building
33 (Monterroso-Checa et al., 2017). Augustus, indeed, as the ancient historians testify (Cassius
34 Dio, 47, 19; Suet. *Aug.* 31.9; *Div. Iul.* 88), aimed to "cancel" forever the place of the

1 assassination of Caesar at the hands of the senators, and expiate for the guilt of the most
2 grievous murder in the history of Rome after that of the founder Romulus.

3

4 **Sacred Area of Largo Argentina - the mixtilinear basins**

5 Along the western side of the Sacred Area of Largo Argentina, between Temple B and the
6 remains of the Curia of Pompey, there are 2 basins of different sizes with a north-west/south-
7 east orientation (V2 and V3 in Figure 1). The basins are realized in concrete with leucitite
8 coarse aggregate and have inner coating of *signino*. They are about 75 cm deep, with walls
9 about 60 cm thick and have a rectangular plan which, at one of the long sides, to the north,
10 opens with a small semicircular apse.

11 A third basin (V1) with an east/west orientation and a more complex and articulated plan is
12 located between the northern side of Pompey's Curia and the northern *forica* (Marchetti
13 Longhi, 1975).

14 The basins were realized after the construction of Temple B (101 BC) and prior to the first
15 half of the 1st century AD, when they were obliterated by the rooms of a brick building that
16 occupies the area between Temple B and the back wall of the Curia of Pompey (Coarelli,
17 1981).

18

19 **Methods of analysis**

20 A large number of papers in the last fifteen years has shown the exceptional care by Roman
21 constructors in producing mortar and concrete (Jackson et al., 2006, 2007, 2009, 2010;
22 Bianchi et al., 2011). The analysis of over a hundred thin sections in these years has revealed
23 the extremely homogeneous features of the mortars descending from a strict selection of the
24 aggregates and their sieving, including the mixing of different aggregates to prepare
25 particular lightweight mortars for the vaulted structures (Lancaster et al., 2010; Marra et al.,
26 2013).

27 The high accuracy and reliability, as well as the limitations of using trace elements ratio
28 measures on very small samples of volcanic materials have been widely discussed in previous
29 literature (Marra and D'Ambrosio, 2013; Marra et al., 2013, 2015a, 2015b, 2016; D'Ambrosio
30 et al., 2015).

31 Bulk samples of the volcanic component separated from the mortar aggregates were analyzed
32 for trace element composition by Lithium Metaborate/Tetraborate Fusion ICP-MS at the
33 Activation Laboratories, Canada. Fused sample is diluted and analyzed by Perkin Elmer Sciex
34 ELAN 6000, 6100 or 9000 ICP/MS. Three blanks and five controls (three before sample group

1 and two after) are analyzed per group of samples. Wet chemical techniques were used to
2 measure the loss on ignition (LOI) at 900°C. International rock standards have been used for
3 calibration and the precision is better than 5% for Rb and Sr, 10% for Ni, Zr, Nb, Ba, Ce, and
4 La, and 15% for the other elements. Full analytical data are reported in Supplementary
5 Material #1.

6 7 **Results**

8 **Geochemical analyses**

9 Following separation by hydrochloric acid bathing, four samples (N1, N2, N3, N4), collected
10 from walls of the Curia referable to the first (N1), to the second (N2 N3) and to the fifth (N4)
11 construction phase, were preliminarily subjected to geochemical analysis.

12 All four separates were made up of red and black volcanic scoriae (Figure 2), showing the
13 characteristic appearance of "Pozzolane Rosse" (Jackson et al., 2010), which is the volcanic
14 deposit selectively exploited to produce mortars in Rome from the end of the second century
15 BC, and throughout the first century AD (Marra et al., 2015a).

16 N1 differs from N2, N3 and N4 for a more heterogeneous particle size and a more abundant
17 fine fraction. It also contains only light-colored red scoriae. Among the others, N2 and N3 are
18 identical in morphometric characteristics and proportion of red and black scoriae. N4 is
19 distinguished by a slightly finer particle size and a different proportion between aggregate
20 and matrix, with the latter more abundant than N2 and N3.

21 The results of the geochemical analyses were used to identify the nature of the aggregates by
22 means of two classification diagrams that make use of the ratios of some "immobile" chemical
23 elements, characteristic of the original magmas and which are little affected by the alteration
24 processes of the rocks: the Zr/TiO₂ vs. Nb/TiO₂ diagram, and the Zr/Y vs. Nb/Y diagram
25 (Figure 3a, b). The diagram with the abundances of the "rare earths" was also used (Figure
26 3d) as a further element of comparison between the analyzed samples.

27 The Zr / TiO₂ vs. Nb / TiO₂ of Figure 3a shows how the four aggregates have extremely
28 similar compositions that fall within the "Pozzolane Rosse" compositional field. Three of the
29 analyzed samples (N2, N3, N4) show a linear distribution corresponding to that of the
30 composition of the "Pozzolane Rosse" also found in the second diagram in Figure 3b. Sample
31 N1, on the other hand, is clearly displaced towards higher Nb/Y values. Similarly, sample N1
32 displays an offset plot also in the Th/Ta vs. Nb/Zr diagram of Figure 3c. Such offsets, caused
33 by Y and Ta depletion, have been shown to depend, with the same original composition, on a
34 more severe degree of geochemical alteration and weathering (Marra et al., 2011). Since all

1 the samples analyzed underwent the same acid treatment, the different degree of alteration in
2 N1 is undoubtedly attributable to its original conditions, suggesting an origin from an area
3 where the volcanic deposit has undergone particular post-depositional processes in
4 environmental conditions different from those common to all the other samples. This
5 deduction is further supported by the diagram in Figure 3d, where samples N2, N3 and N4
6 have compositional characters identical to each other and clearly distinct from those of N1.
7 Therefore, the first three aggregates most likely come from the same extraction sector, as also
8 suggested by red and black centimeter-sized scoriae in their macroscopic appearance. N1
9 certainly comes from a different area. Its macroscopic characters --reddish scoriae and
10 abundant fine fraction--are similar to those of the Republican-age mortars, such as those of
11 the Temple B of Largo Argentina (late 2nd and first half of the 1st century BC) (Marra et al.,
12 2015a). These mortars were extracted in tunnels (*arenari*) in the urban sector of Rome and
13 generally have a greater degree of alteration than those of the imperial age. They were
14 probably extracted from deposits located in the area south of the city which are characterized
15 by greater thicknesses (Figure 4).

16

17 **Petrographic analyses**

18 The analysis in thin section under the optical microscope of six mortar samples collected from
19 the walls of the Curia di Pompeo (CP6, CP7, CP8, CP9, CP10, CP12) and of three samples
20 collected from the adjacent basins (V1, V2, V3), confirmed the extensive use of "Pozzolane
21 Rosse" in the aggregate. The mortars of the basins are also characterized by the presence of
22 brick fragments that have been mixed with the evident intention of making these mortars
23 more waterproof, adopting a composition close to that of "cocciopesto" or "signino". In the
24 case of the basins studied, however, the proportion of " Pozzolane Rosse" volcanic scoriae is
25 much greater than brick fragments, compared to the classic cocciopesto.

26 Due to the compositional uniformity of the aggregates the analysis of macroscopic characters
27 was also used in order to classify them, similarly to what has already been done in the case of
28 the four previously studied samples (N1, N2, N3, N4).

29 The observations under the optical microscope, however, have highlighted some peculiar
30 elements of the volcanic scoriae, which allowed the use of further discriminating elements
31 (Fig.5 and Fig. 6). Unlike what has been observed so far in other Roman mortar samples
32 (Marra et al., 2015a; 2015b), the thin sections of the samples studied showed that various
33 scoria clasts had primary calcite crystals and a smaller portion had volcanic glass (for the
34 origin and petrological implications of calcite see Gozzi et al., 2011).

1 While the observation of calcite, as also suggested by its presence in mortars of different
2 epochs (see Table 1), is not considered a very discriminating element and is essentially linked
3 to the good workmanship of the thin sections, the presence of volcanic glass, which is rare in
4 the Colli Albani pyroclastic rocks (Gaeta et al., 2021), constitutes a strongly discriminating
5 element on the origin of the aggregate. Actually, the presence of volcanic glass indicates
6 peculiar zone of the Pozzolane Rosse deposit characterized by high cooling rate (Gaeta et al.,
7 2021). Considering the presence or absence of glassy scoria clasts and the macroscopic
8 characters related to their size (granulometry) and color (proportion between red and black
9 scoria), the aggregates of the analyzed mortars were classified and grouped by homogeneous
10 phases, as described below and summarized in Table 1.

11 Samples CP6 and CP8 have macroscopically and microscopically identical characters. Among
12 the mortars of the masonry, the scoriae present in the aggregate are the only ones
13 characterized by the presence of glassy, scarcely vesiculated scoria clasts with euhedral
14 leucite (Fig. 5a and 5b). Furthermore, the macroscopic characters are substantially the same
15 as those observed in the aggregate of samples N2 and N3. However, they are clearly
16 distinguished from those related to sample CP10. This last sample, as well as the sample
17 CP12, are characterized by the presence of fine- to medium-grained, leucite-bearing granular
18 rocks, enclosed in the Pozzolane Rosse scoria clasts (i.e. Fig. 5c e 5d). Moreover, the sample
19 CP10 has a fine particle size and light red scoriae, in a very similar way to what was observed
20 in sample N1. This differs from N2 and N3 for some additional compositional characteristics
21 relating to the trace elements, highlighted by the geochemical analyses carried out on the first
22 set of samples.

23 It can therefore be established with sufficient certainty that CP10, CP12 and N1 belong to the
24 first Pompeian phase, while CP6, CP8, N2 and N3 belong to the second Augustan phase. The
25 CP7 sample, taken from masonry referable to the fifth construction phase, has intermediate
26 characteristics between these two groups of mortars, showing a slightly finer grain size than
27 CP6 and CP8, but with the presence of both red and black scoriae in a similar proportion. It is
28 also distinguished by the presence of large leucite (up to 5 mm in diameter), quartz
29 characterized by subgrains (Fig. 6a), and euhedral sanidine (Fig. 6b) and by the absence of
30 glass. These macroscopic and microscopic characteristics make it identical to the N4 sample
31 which among those previously studied, is the only one on which the thin section has been
32 made. Remarkably, both these samples are collected in the walls of the fifth construction
33 phase.

1 The CP9 sample, taken from the same masonry from which N4 was taken, and referable to the
2 fifth construction phase, is the only one in which elements other than the "Pozzolane Rosse"
3 appear in the aggregate. In fact, a clast characterized by an oxidized hematite core,
4 surrounded by crystals of sanidine and quartz, was observed, indicating an inclusion of
5 sedimentary rock, deriving from the reuse of previous materials. This suggests a "late"
6 character of the mortar. Although clasts of this sort are probably an occasional presence, the
7 overall characteristics of the aggregate are similar to those of the CP7 and N4 samples,
8 forming a group of mortars with characteristics different from those of the first and second
9 phase.

10 In particular, samples CP6, CP8, N2 and N3 show a good sorting of the aggregate which
11 indicates a probable sieving and particular care in the preparation of the mortar. CP10, CP12
12 and N1, on the other hand, have a finer and more heterogeneous particle size, but they lack
13 large scoriae, suggesting a selection of the aggregate also in this case. The mortars of the third
14 group, on the other hand, are poorly classified and heterogeneous, and are on the whole,
15 distinguished by the lesser care in their preparation.

16 In regards to the mortars of the basins, a substantial uniformity is observed in the
17 compositional characteristics, with the presence of "Pozzolane Rosse" aggregate and a small
18 fraction of brick fragments. In the macroscopic compositions, only the aggregate of the
19 sample V3 is slightly finer than the other two. However, comparison with the macroscopic
20 characteristics of the mortars of the masonry is not possible given the different specificities of
21 these mortars and of the concrete realized for the basins, which is made with lava *ceamenta*.
22 On the other hand, the presence of volcanic glass in the scoriae of sample V1 is extremely
23 significant (Fig. 6c) and discriminating, which suggests that the origin of this aggregate is the
24 same as that used in samples CP6 and CP8 of the masonry of phase 2. It is therefore possible
25 to think that basin 1 was built later than basins 2 and 3 but simultaneously with the
26 interventions of the second phase. This hypothesis is supported by the presence of leucite-
27 bearing, granular lithic clast enclosed in the Pozzolane Rosse scoria clasts in V2 and V3
28 samples (Fig. 6d).

29

30 **Conclusions**

31 The analyses conducted on the mortars of the Curia walls highlight a perfect coincidence
32 between the diversity of the compositions, the origin of the volcanic materials used, and the
33 different building phases identified and documented by the analysis of the stratigraphic units.
34 In fact, there is a clear distinction in the composition of the samples collected from masonry

1 referable to the first construction phase of the Pompeian age, to that of the Augustan age and,
2 finally, to that of the medieval period. All the available archaeometric and archaeological data
3 derived from the stratigraphic reconstruction, agree in defining three construction phases:
4 the original by Pompey; the "structural closure" of the central wall of the Curia, site of the
5 assassination of Caesar committed by Augustus; and, the final post-ancient phase. The latter is
6 marked by a reuse of the materials of the Curia that had lost its original function.
7 The data deriving from the analysis of the mortars taken from the mixtilinear basins are also
8 of considerable interest. It demonstrates two different construction phases with an
9 intervention during the Augustan era, hitherto never hypothesized by scholars. In fact, the
10 construction of the counter-podium of temple B dates back to this period (Caprioli, 2011). The
11 new data therefore indicates that the intervention involved the construction of a third basin
12 (V1), for the arrangement of the area north of the Curia's back wall.
13 From a methodological point of view, this study confirms the potential for ICP trace-element
14 analysis as a fast tool to identify the origin of the volcanic aggregate employed in Roman
15 mortars. By plotting the data in simple classification diagrams published in the literature, this
16 methodology can be applied by non-specialized scholars and is particularly useful when
17 dealing with small amount of deeply weathered materials, due to the small amount necessary
18 (≥ 5 g) and to the insensibility of the immobile elements (Nb, Zr, Y) to the chemical alteration
19 processes.
20 However, this study also highlights the indispensable role of petrographic analysis in thin
21 section to achieve detailed information that enables the investigators to recognize the
22 provenance from specific exploitation areas as a function of the petro-chemical compositional
23 features of the aggregate. The latter may vary in function of the timing and the modality of
24 emplacement of the pyroclastic deposits, which account for progressively different magma
25 composition during the eruption, as well as for different environmental conditions
26 superintending to the post-depositional geochemical processes.

27

28 **Acknowledgments**

29 We would like to thank the Sovrintendenza Capitolina ai Beni Culturali, in particular former
30 Superintendent prof. Claudio Parisi Presicce, Dr. Marina Mattei, Director of the excavations of
31 the Sacred Area of Largo Argentina, and arch. Maurizio Anastasi, in charge of the Procedure,
32 for making possible the sampling and the carrying out of the scientific project.

1 Geochemical analyses and archaeological documentation campaigns presented in this paper
2 have been funded within the I&D National Research Projects Ref. HAR 2011 25705 and Ref.
3 HAR 2013 41818P of MINECO/AEI – Gov. of Spain.

4 We are grateful to Giuliana Motta for editing the English of the text.

5

6

7 **Data availability statement**

8 The data that supports the findings of this study are available in the supplementary material
9 of this article

10

11

1 REFERNCES

2

3 Caprioli, F. 2011. Forma architettonica, linguaggio decorativo e committenza della prima fase
4 del tempio B di Largo Argentina, D'Alessio, A., La Rocca, E., Tradizione e innovazione.
5 L'elaborazione del linguaggio ellenistico nell'architettura romana e italica di età tardo
6 repubblicana, Studi Miscellanei 35, 89-107. Doi: 10.1400/258601

7

8 Coarelli, F. 1981. L'Area Sacra di Largo Argentina: Topografia e Storia. Coarelli, F., Kajanto, I.,
9 Nyberg, U., Steinby, M., L'Area Sacra di Largo Argentina. Roma 1981, 11-51.

10

11 D'Alessio, A. 2014. *L'edificio in opus incertum del Testaccio a Roma. Status quaestionis e*
12 *prospettive di ricerca*, Atlante Tematico di Topografia Antica, 24, 7-23.

13

14 D'Ambrosio, E., Marra, F., Cavallo, A., Gaeta, M., Ventura, G., 2015. Provenance materials for
15 Vitruvius' harenae fossiciae and pulvis puteolanis: geochemical signature and historical-
16 archaeological implications. Journal of Archaeological Science Reports.

17

18 Davies, P. J. E., 2017. Architecture and Politics in Republican Rome. Cambridge: Cambridge
19 University Press, 366 pp. ISBN 978-1-107-09431-4.

20

21 De Rita, D., Funicello, R., Parotto, M., 1988. Geological map of the Colli Albani volcanic
22 complex. 1:50000 scale. C.N.R., Roma.

23

24 Freda, C., Gaeta, M., Giaccio, B., Marra, F., Palladino, D.M., Scarlato, P., Sottili, G., 2010. CO2-
25 driven large mafic explosive eruptions: the Pozzolane Rosse case study from the Colli Albani
26 Volcanic District (Italy), Bull Volc, **73**, pages241–256. DOI:10.1007/s00445-010-0406-3

27

28 Gaeta M., Bonechi B., Marra F., Perinelli C., 2021. Uncommon K-foiditic magmas: The case study
29 of Tufo del Palatino (Colli Albani Volcanic District, Italy). Lithos 396–397, 106239.
30 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lithos.2021.106239>

31

32 Gozzi, F., Gaeta, M., Freda, C., Mollo, S. Di Rocco, T., Marra, F., Dallai, L., Pack, A. (2013)
33 Primary magmatic calcite reveals origin from crustal carbonate, Lithos, 190-191, 191-203.

34

35 Jackson M.D., Marra, F., Deocampo, D., Vella, A., Kosso, C., Hay, R. L. (2007) - Geological
36 Observations of Excavated Sand (*harena fossiciae*) used as Fine Aggregate in Ancient Roman
37 Pozzolan Mortars, Journal of Roman Archaeology, 20, 1-30.

38

39 Jackson M., Logan J. M., Scheetz B., Deocampo D., Cawood C. G., Marra F., Vitti M., Ungaro L.,
40 2009. Assessment of material characteristics of ancient concretes, Grande Aula, Markets of Trajan,
41 Rome, Journal of Archaeological Science, 36, 2481-2492. DOI:10.1016/j.jas.2009.07.011.

42

43 Jackson M., Deocampo D., Marra F., Scheetz B., 2010. Mid-Pleistocene volcanic ash in ancient
44 Roman concretes, Geoarchaeology, 25/1, 36-74, 2010. dOI:10.1002/gea.20295.

45

- 1 Karner, D.B., Marra, F., Renne, P., 2001. The History of the Monti Sabatini and Alban Hills
2 Volcanoes: Groundwork for Assessing Volcanic-Tectonic Hazards for Rome, *Journ. of Volc. and*
3 *Geoth. Res.*, 107, 185-219.
- 4
- 5 Marchetti Longhi, G. 1975. Gli scavi dell'Area Sacra del largo Argentina. Evoluzione e
6 trasformazione dell'area dei templi dall'età imperiale all'inizio del Medioevo, *Bullettino della*
7 *Commissione Archeologica Comunale* 82, 7-62.
- 8
- 9 Marra, F., Rosa, C., 1995. Stratigrafia e assetto geologico dell'area romana. In: Funicello, R.
10 (Ed.), *La Geologia di Roma. Il Centro Storico. Memorie Descrittive della Carta Geologica d'Italia*
11 50, pp. 49-118.
- 12
- 13 Marra, F., Deocampo, D., Jackson, M.D., and Ventura, G., 2011. The Alban Hills and Monti
14 Sabatini volcanic products used in ancient Roman masonry (Italy): an integrated
15 stratigraphic, archeological, environmental and geochemical approach, *Earth-Science*
16 *Reviews*, 108, 115-136. doi:10.1016/j.earscirev.2011.06.005
- 17
- 18 Marra, F., D'Ambrosio, E., 2013. Trace-element classification diagrams of pyroclastic rocks
19 from the volcanic districts of Central Italy: the case study of the ancient Roman ships of Pisa,
20 *Archaeometry*, 55, 6 (2013), 993-1019. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-4754.2012.00725.x
- 21
- 22 Marra, F., D'Ambrosio, E., Sottili, G., Ventura, G., 2013. Geochemical fingerprints of volcanic
23 materials: Identification of a pumice trade route from Pompeii to Rome, *GSA Bulletin*, 125, 3-
24 4, 556-57. doi: 10.1130/B30709.1
- 25
- 26 Marra, F., D'Ambrosio, E., Gaeta, M., Mattei, M., 2015a. Petro-chemical identification and
27 insights on chronological employment of the volcanic aggregates used in ancient Roman
28 mortars, *Archaeometry* 58 (2), 177-200. doi: 10.1111/arcm.12154.
- 29
- 30 Marra, F., Danti, a., Gaeta, M., 2015b. The volcanic aggregate of ancient Roman mortars from
31 the Capitoline Hill: petrographic criteria for identification of rome's "pozzolans" and historical
32 implications. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 308, 113-126.
33 doi:10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2015.10.007.
- 34
- 35 Marra, F., D'Ambrosio, E., Gaeta, M., Mattei, M., 2017. Geochemical fingerprint of Tufo Lionato
36 blocks from the *Area Sacra di Largo Argentina*: implications for the chronology of volcanic
37 building stones in ancient Rome. *Archaeometry*. DOI:10.1111/arcm.12343
- 38
- 39 Miriello, D., Barca, D., Bloise, A., Ciarallo, A., Crisci, G.M., De Rose, F., Gattuso, C., Gazineo, F.,
40 La Russa, M.F., 2010. Characterisation of archaeological mortars from Pompeii (Campania,
41 Italy) and identification of construction phases by compositional data analysis.
42 *J. Archaeol. Sci.* 37, 2207-2223.
- 43
- 44 Mogetta, M., 2015. A New Date for Concrete in Rome. *Journal of Roman Studies*, Available on

1 CJO 2015 doi:10.1017/S007543581500043X
2
3 Monterroso-Checa, A. 2010. *Theatrum Pompei*: forma y arquitectura de la génesis del modelo
4 teatral de Roma, Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Escuela Española de
5 Historia y Arqueología en Roma.
6
7 Monterroso-Checa, A., Martín, R., Murillo J. I., Utrero M. d. l. A., 2017. *Curia Pompeia*. Secuencia
8 edilicia desde la Arqueología de la Arquitectura. *Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica*
9 *Comunale di Roma*, 118, 55-84.
10
11 Secco, M., Previato, C., Addis, A., Zago, G., Kamsteeg, A., Dilaria, S., Canovaro, C., Artioli, G.,
12 Bonetto, J., 2019. Mineralogical clustering of the structural mortars from the Sarno Baths,
13 Pompeii: A tool to interpret construction techniques and relative chronologies. *Journal of*
14 *Cultural Heritage* 40, 265-273.
15
16 Secco, M., Dilaria, S., Bonetto, J., Addis, A., Tamburini, S., Preto N., Ricci, G., Artioli, G., 2020.
17 Technological transfers in the Mediterranean on the verge of Romanization: Insights from the
18 waterproofing renders of Nora (Sardinia, Italy). *Journal of Cultural Heritage* 44, 63-82.
19
20
21

1 FIGURE CAPTIONS

2
3

4 Figure 1 - Plan of the Sacred Area of Largo Argentina showing the archaeological survey of the
5 Curia of Pompey (drawing by R. Martín-Talaverano and J.I. Murillo-Fragero) and of three
6 basins. The main construction phases and the position of the mortar samples collected for
7 geochemical and petrographic analyses are shown (see text for explanation).

8

9 Figure 2 - Aggregates of mortars after separation from lime through hydrochloric acid bath.

10

11 Figure 3 - Geochemical classification diagrams. a) Zr/TiO₂ vs. Nb/TiO₂ diagram showing the
12 close clustering of the analyzed samples, including one reference outcrop samples PR-C,
13 within the previously defined compositional field of Pozzolane Rosse (Marra et al., 2015).
14 b) Zr/Y vs. Nb/Y and (c) Th/Ta vs. Nb/Zr diagrams showing the outlier composition of sample
15 N1; according to Marra et al. (2011) such anomalous compositions are due to Ta and Y
16 depletion, as a consequence of strong weathering processes.

17

18 Figure 4 - a) Geologic map of the area of Rome showing the outcrops of the "Pozzolane Rosse"
19 pyroclastic-flow deposits and the sectors dedicated to their exploitation. Areal trend of the
20 estimated thickness of the deposit (isopach lines) is also shown. A: area of the earliest tunnel
21 exploitation; B possible area of later tunnel exploitation, C: area of later open-air
22 exploitation; b) longitudinal section showing the grainsize variation and the alteration zone
23 at the interface with the exogenous agents of a pyroclastic-flow deposit (see text for
24 comments).

25

26 **Figure 5** Photomicrographs at the optical microscope (plane-polarized light) of the CP6, , CP8,
27 CP10, CP12 sample. Glassy, scarcely vesiculated scoria clast in the CP8 sample (a).
28 Magnification of the glassy scoria clast occurring in the CP6 sample (b). Leucite-bearing
29 granular rock in the CP10 sample(c). Fine-grained, leucite-bearing granular rock in the CP10
30 sample (d).

31

32 **Figure 6** Photomicrographs at the optical microscope (a and b crossed nicols; c and d plane-
33 polarized light) of the CP7, CP9, V1 and V2 sample. Quartz characterized by subgrains in the
34 CP7 sample (a). Euhedral sanidine in the CP9 sample (b). Glassy scoria clast in the V1 sample

1 (c). Fine-grained, leucite-bearing granular rock enclosed in the V2 sample. The Pozzolane
2 Rosse scoria clast including the leucite-bearing granular rock is characterized by the typical
3 star-like leucite (d).

4
5
6

7 TABLE 1 - Mortars of the Curia of Pompey. For the N1, N2, N3 samples no thin sections were
8 made, therefore the observation is based only on the macroscopic characters of the aggregate
9 whose composition was determined by analysis on trace elements. Legend: PR: Pozzolane
10 Rosse; AR: sandstone; LA: brick; C: coarse; M: medium; F: fine; R + B: red and black scoriae; R:
11 red scoriae; LBGR: Lct-bearing granular; rocks; GSC: glassy scoria clast; QTZ: quartz; SAN:
12 sanidine.

13
14
15
16
17