



HAL
open science

The Marble Hall of Furius Aptus: Phrygian Marble in Rome and Ephesus

Alfred Michael Hirt

► **To cite this version:**

Alfred Michael Hirt. The Marble Hall of Furius Aptus: Phrygian Marble in Rome and Ephesus. Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz, 2017, 28, pp.231-248. halshs-01907274

HAL Id: halshs-01907274

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01907274>

Submitted on 29 Oct 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

CAHIERS
DU CENTRE GUSTAVE
GLOTZ

XXVIII - 2017



ÉDITIONS DE BOCCARD



En couverture : deux des Tétrarques de Venise, en mémoire de William Seston.
Ils étaient sur la fusée de son épée d'académicien (dessin de Laetitia Darras, d'après la
photographie d'une sculpture de Robert Cami pour la maison Arthus Bertrand).

Cahiers du Centre Gustave-Glotz

publiés avec le concours
du Centre national de la recherche scientifique

XXVIII
2017

ÉDITIONS DE BOCCARD

Les Cahiers du Centre Gustave-Glotz
sont une des revues
de l'UMR 8210 ANHIMA (CNRS - Paris I - Paris VII - EHESS - EPHE)
2, rue Vivienne, 75002 Paris

COMITÉ SCIENTIFIQUE

Michael H. Crawford, Christian Le Roy

COMITÉ DE LECTURE

Jean Andreau, Clara Berrendonner, Jean-Marie Bertrand,
Olivier de Cazanove, François Chausson, Jean-Louis
Ferrary, Antony Hostein, Olivier Picard, Denis Rousset,
Ivana Savalli-Lestrade, John Scheid

RESPONSABLE D'ÉDITION

Nicolas Tran

DIFFUSION

Éditions de Boccard
4, rue de Lanneau,
75005 Paris
www.deboccard.com

Les articles proposés à la revue doivent être envoyés pour le 1^{er} juin.
La revue paraît durant le premier semestre de l'année civile.

Les tirages à part sont fournis aux auteurs sous format électronique
et sont uniquement destinés à une utilisation privée. Les Éditions de Boccard
conservent le copyright sur les articles, qui ne peuvent donc être mis en accès libre
sur quelque base de données ou par quelque portail que ce soit.

CAHIERS GLOTZ XXVIII 2017

SOMMAIRE

Violaine SEBILLOTTE CUCHET, <i>Gender studies</i> et domination masculine. Les citoyennes de l'Athènes classique, un défi pour l'historien des institutions	7
Francesco VERRICO, Le commissioni di redazione dei senatoconsulti (<i>qui scribundo adfuerunt</i>) : i segni della crisi e le riforme di Augusto	31
Anthony ÀLVAREZ MELERO, <i>Matronae stolatae</i> : titulature officielle ou prédicat honorifique ?	61
Moheddine CHAOUALI, Le culte de Neptune et des Nymphes dans la <i>ciuitas Thabbarensis (pertica Carthaginiensium)</i>	95
Michel CHRISTOL, Sous-procurateurs équestres : des auxiliaires de gouvernement	107
Alberto BOLAÑOS HERRERA, Concepción FERNÁNDEZ MARTÍNEZ, <i>CIL</i> II ² /5, 330 : [<i>Caru</i>] <i>s amicitii</i> s y [<i>lanifici</i>] <i>praeclara fides</i> , un posible modelo para <i>CIL</i> II ² /5,191	127
Ioan PISO, La signification du <i>dies Iouis</i> sur une inscription de Villadecanes (Espagne Tarraconaise)	135
Christian LAES, Multilingualism and Multilingual Encounters in Ammianus Marcellinus	151
<i>Du bon usage du patrimoine impérial</i> (sous la direction d'A. Dalla Rosa) ...	175
Davide FAORO, <i>Delatio</i> fiscale e proprietà imperiale nella <i>Tabula Clesiana</i> : una rilettura	177
Alberto DALLA ROSA, Les successeurs désignés du Prince et leur patrimoine. À propos de la délimitation d'Er-Rahel en Maurétanie Césarienne (<i>CIL</i> VIII 21663)	197
Hernán GONZÁLEZ BORDAS, Un nouveau regard sur le dossier des grandes inscriptions agraires d'Afrique contenant le <i>sermo procuratorum</i>	213
Alfred M. HIRT, The Marble Hall of Furius Aptus : Phrygian Marble in Rome and Ephesus	231

Marco MAIURO, Conclusions249

*Gens d'Afrique romaine et autorités romaines en Afrique du Nord :
approches prosopographiques et histoires provinciales (II)* (sous la
direction de Fr. Chausson, B. Rossignol et M. Sebaï)261

Pierre COSME, Qu'allait faire Caluia Crispinilla en Afrique?263

Michel CHRISTOL, Le légat et la légion à *Theveste* (Tebessa) sous Domitien . .271

Xavier DUPUIS, La Numidie de Septime Sévère à Gallien. Province ou
diocèse de l'Afrique proconsulaire?.....291

*Bulletin de liaison de la Société française d'études épigraphiques sur
Rome et le monde romain.* Année 2017309

Résumés/Abstracts313



ALFRED M. HIRT

THE MARBLE HALL OF FURIUS APTUS : PHRYGIAN MARBLE IN ROME AND EPHEBUS

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years scientific analysis has led to a better understanding of the distribution of white and coloured marbles; the circumstances by which these bulky items reached their destination and the archaeological and historical contexts of their use is still poorly understood. Ben Russell has offered a convincing model which explains the distribution patterns of stone observed throughout the Mediterranean and Temperate Europe as being defined by weight and shape.¹ The scattering of certain polychrome marbles, however, does not fit the model of free trade shaped by transport and transshipment costs. These specific stones (e.g. *giallo antico*, *pavonazzetto*, granodiorite, porphyry etc.) are thought to be the monopoly of the emperor, i.e. the respective quarries are run by imperial officials in order to feed the demand created by ever expanding imperial building projects in Rome and in important cities of the Roman Empire.² Even so, some of these stones have emerged in a private context, questioning these preconceptions.

The aim of this paper is to establish more clearly what the drive for the imperial monopoly of demand on certain polychrome marbles was, how this affected the organisation of quarries under imperial control and how the occurrence of these marbles in a private context, in the House of Furius Aptus in Ephesus, may reshape our understanding of the extent of this monopoly.

II. ROME

The emperor, as chief initiator and overseer of monumental building projects in Rome and in larger centres of the empire, dominated demand for specific polychrome marbles.³ His desire to directly control the extraction of these stones as

1. Russell 2009; Russell 2013, p. 141-200.

2. Fant 1993a, p. 157-167; Russell 2013, p. 184ff.; Hirt 2015, p. 290 ff.

3. Hirt 2015 with bibliography.

well is reflected in the supervision of quarry operations by his imperial officials. As Russell argues, this was done to 'prevent the exhaustion' of these marbles by private demand so that the emperor's demand for polychrome marble could be satisfied.⁴ But the focus on a purely economic causality for the establishment of this imperial monopoly falls short of providing an answer as to why the emperor demanded specific polychrome stones in the first place.

In the field of marble and quarry studies this imperial monopsony or monopoly of demand has certainly been recognised, but not fully understood. Previous observations only concerned the symbolism and the use of these materials in the visual discourse on Rome and its empire, but to my understanding do not fully identify the driving force for their almost exclusive use by the emperor. As shall be argued below, the impulse for the monopolisation of the demand for specific coloured stones by the emperor flows from the concentration of *imperium*, the magisterial power of command, in the hands of Augustus and his successors.⁵

In a recent contribution to an edited volume on the emperor and the city of Rome, Werner Eck reiterated the emergence of the emperor's dominion over the public space in the city of Rome. The military expansion of Rome beyond Italy and into the Greek East throughout the first half of the second century BC fuelled competition amongst the aristocratic elite not only by providing scions of dominant families with the opportunity to celebrate their military victories with a triumphal procession and to present themselves and their families to the people of Rome. The victories over external enemies also gave these individuals the legitimisation to firmly anchor their military accomplishment in the collective memory of the Romans by setting up victory monuments (e.g. *tropaea*), honorific statues, and by commissioning the construction of temples they vowed on campaign, ensuring their remembrance well beyond the fleeting moment of a triumphal procession. Many of the public buildings and temples of the Republican period owed their existence to successful military undertakings. What is more, triumphs could be commemorated on coins by family members and were revisited during *pompae funebres*. Some victors even received their own *fabulae praetextae*, plays based on a campaign of the general.⁶ The social impetus for the commemoration of military victors resulted in an increased competition for public space. In the Late Republic this commemorative practice became more and more focussed on the extraordinary men of the period: Pompeius celebrated his victory against the Cilician pirates and Mithridates not only by commissioning a temple for Minerva on the Campus Martius paid for from the spoils, but by constructing a gigantic monument to his victories in the shape of the Theatre of Pompeius.⁷ As for Caesar, the Forum Iulium and the Temple of Venus Genetrix were closely connected to his

4. Russell 2013, p. 194.

5. Hirt 2015, p. 290 ff. Monopolisation for prestige: Fant 1993a, p. 146, 154f.; 2008, p. 126-9; symbol of power and territorial reach of Rome: Peacock 1992, p. 27 f.; Bradley 2006, p. 1-3.

6. Eck 2010a, p. 89 f.; see also Itgenshorst 2005, p. 91-93, 101-105; on funeral processions: Walter 2004, p. 85-121; Hölkeskamp 2010, p. 112-115, with further references. On public building activity and military expansion in Rome: Kolb 1995, p. 175 ff.; Patterson 2000, p. 29 ff.;

7. Itgenshorst 2005, p. 357-361 (Katalog), with sources.

fourth triumph in 46 BC.⁸ These monuments clearly outcompeted those built to immortalise the military prowess of earlier members of the senatorial elite.

With the establishment of sole rule, Augustus changed the dynamics of elite competition for Rome's public space rather abruptly. By ensuring military command over unpacified provinces in 27 BC, by acquiring *imperium* over the soldiers garrisoned there, Augustus monopolised the celebration of triumphs. The *legati Augusti pro praetore* seconded to these provinces did not have their own *imperium* and could neither be acclaimed imperator nor celebrate a triumph. As Augustus held the *auspicia* as the official holder of all *imperium*, only he could receive imperial acclamations – a necessary precondition for a triumph.⁹ For those governors commanding troops in other provinces, the *provinciae populi Romani*, the right to celebrate a triumph could still be acquired in the early days of Augustus' reign, but in March 27, 19 BC, L. Cornelius Balbus was the last member of the senate to triumph who was not part of the imperial family.¹⁰ Furthermore, Agrippa (who also held *imperium*) seems to have set an example of modesty for the senatorial elite by renouncing the honour of a triumphal procession for his military successes (Dio 54.11.6) – an example the senators felt compelled to follow.¹¹

The focalisation of military success on the emperor deprived the senatorial elite not only of the opportunity to commemorate military achievement in the public sphere, but also of the means to pay for monuments from the spoils traditionally apportioned to the victorious general.¹² The *legati Augusti* handed the *manubiae* over to the emperor. Consequently, the *Theatrum Balbi*, built from the spoils Cornelius Balbus had acquired from the Garamantes, was the last public building in Rome commissioned by and displaying the name of a senator. From here on forward public buildings in the capital of the empire were either erected in the name of the senate and people of Rome or by the emperor and members of his family.¹³

The emergence and use of white and coloured marble in Rome seems to develop alongside, and is subjected to, this overarching socio-political trajectory. Marble arrived in Rome alongside the spoils of war from the Greek East. Livy and other authors put the capture of Syracuse in early 211 BC by M. Claudius Marcellus at the beginning of Rome's desire for Greek art.¹⁴ Greek sculpture, in white marble or bronze, was to become a regular part of plunder brought home by Roman generals from Greece and Asia Minor, the pillaging of Corinth by L. Mummius in 146 BC perhaps being the most memorable of despoliations.¹⁵ The Romans likely dismantled and removed architectural elements from Greece during this period, although their explicit mention as spoils of war is rare. The use of plundered marble to embellish manubial temples seems to have been an accepted practice, which is why Livy found the following episode extraordinary and therefore worth

8. Itgenshorst 2005, p. 372, with sources.

9. Eck 1999; Rüpke 1990, p. 44f. Hurler 2015, p. 293, with further bibliography.

10. Itgenshorst 2005, p. 427 f. Nr. 297.

11. Roddaz 1984, p. 209 f.; Itgenshorst 2005, p. 222; Eck 2010b, p. 20 f.

12. Pape 1975, p. 27-40, with earlier bibliography; Tarpin 2013; Coudry & Humm 2009.

13. Eck 2010c, p. 209.

14. Pape 1975, p. 6 f. Itgenshorst 2005, p. 140 ff., no. 158.

15. For Corinth cf. Pape 1975, p. 16-19; Pape 1975, p. 6-26 for literary references; Pensabene 2013, p. 24.

of mention : after his victory over the *Celtiberi* in Spain as praetor in 180 BC, the censor Q. Fulvius Flaccus dedicated the *aedes* of Fortuna Equestris in 174 BC during his censorship. In order to adorn the complex, the censor had marble tiles from the Temple of Iuno Lacinia at Croton in Bruttium removed – only to have them returned to the Crotonian allies on the orders of the Roman senate who did not approve of the sacrilegious act.¹⁶ The exceptionality of Flaccus' irreverent act arises from plundering a temple of the allies, not necessarily of a temple *per se*. If accurate, the despoilment and removal of tiles, columns, and capitals might well have been commonplace in the Middle Republic. Sulla, who celebrated a triumph in 81 BC for his victory over Mithridates VI of Pontus, had columns taken from the temple of Zeus Olympius in Athens in order to rebuild the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus which had been destroyed in 83 BC.¹⁷

During the Middle Republic the temples increasingly displayed imported white marble. Shortly after his triumph of 146 BC over Andriscus in Macedonia, Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus not only had statues he had looted on campaign set up in the *porticus Metelli*, he also commissioned the construction of the temple of Jupiter Stator in Greek marble.¹⁸ Even victorious generals not fighting in the Greek East built their temples vowed on campaign in white marble : D. Iunius Brutus Callaicus – having celebrated a triumph over Lusitanians and *Callaeci* in 133 (?) – dedicated a temple to Mars *in circo Flaminio* in 131 BC, which was built in Pentelic marble.¹⁹ Unless we want to see the use of Greek marble in temples solely as a cultural practice copied or adapted from Greece, we should consider the display of Pentelic or Hymettian marble as laden with symbolic meaning, as an integral part of the visual language deployed in promoting not only the triumphant individual and his *gens*, but the recognition of Rome's military might and of its subjection of others.²⁰

With the proliferation of white imported stones for use in private contexts in the first century BC, the capacity to convey Roman power and territorial dominance shifted to coloured stones.²¹ One of its earliest uses in the public sphere is exemplified by the victory monument commissioned by Bocchus I of Mauretania and set up in 91 BC on the Capitoline hill. According to Plutarch (*Mar.* 32 ; *Sull.* 6) the monument consisted of a group of golden statues which depicted the delivery of Jugurtha by Bocchus to Sulla a few years earlier. The sculpted stone base, which still survives today, was made of dark grey stone and likely derived from the town of Thala in Numidia, the stronghold of Jugurtha conquered by Q. Caecilius Metellus in 107 BC.²² Coloured marble was used in Pompeius' theatre (55 BC),

16. Itgenshorst 2005, p. 213 ff. Nr. 189, with sources. Perhaps the bronze Corinthian capitals used in the *porticus* of Cn. Octavius (cos. 165 BC) were brought to Rome from Greece as well, cf. Itgenshorst 2005, p. 236 f. Nr. 201. with sources.

17. Plut. *Publ.* 15, with Richardson 1992, p. 222f. ; Val. Max 9.3.8 ; Tac. *hist.* 3.72.

18. Bradley 2006, p. 2 ; see also Itgenshorst 2005, p. 251 with sources ; Albers 2013, p. 80 f.

19. Itgenshorst 2005, p. 271 f. with sources ; Bernard 2010, p. 36 ; Albers 2013, p. 76 f. ; for Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus' *aedes Neptunis* also built in Pentelic marble : Itgenshorst 2005, p. 289 f. no 222 with sources ; Bernard 2010, p. 38 f. ; Albers 2013, p. 76 f. ; Pensabene 2013, p. 26 ;

20. Schneider 1986, p. 149-152 ; Bradley 2006, p. 2 ; Ostenberg 2009, p. 272 ff.

21. Cf. Mahdia shipwreck with Cic *Att.* 12.19.1 and Pliny *ep.* 9.39.4, Hesberg 1994, p. 179, 182 ; Hesberg 2005, p. 35f.

22. Schäfer 1979, p. 243-250 ; Schneider 1982, p. 145f.

too, a building linked to his triumph of 61 BC : a large column of *africano* (from Teos) with a lead token marked *Cn. Pompei* was still visible in the Via dei Chiavari in Rome in c. 1740.²³ The column set up on the spot of Caesar's funerary pyre in March 44 BC by the people of Rome was made of *marmor Numidicum* (Suet. *Iul.* 85); J. Clayton Fant reads the choice of material, a stone possibly associated with Numidian kings, as a reference to the recapture of the *provincia Africa* after the battle of Thapsus in 46 BC in the civil war.²⁴ The appropriation of wealth from the people and territories conquered by Rome was not only made manifest by the spoils and treasure presented in a triumph; now, raw military power and imperial dominance could be more lastingly evoked by exhibiting distinctive polychrome marble as architectural elements in public buildings.

In Late Republican Rome the connotation of these marbles with conquest, victory, and triumph is tangible, even in a domestic context. Pliny the Elder notes that 'public spaces' of senatorial houses had become an extended part of the Forum.²⁵ Spoils acquired by the triumphant commander in the theatre of war were presented in the *atrium* – together with the ancestor masks.²⁶ The use and display of white and, at a later stage, coloured marble columns and veneer clearly takes place in this very specific, symbolically loaded context of the *atrium* in which the sociopolitical 'capital' of the senator is presented to the public.²⁷ Initially, erecting marble columns in the 'privacy' of one's house, even if in the *atrium*, went against the accepted convention of this material being used only for public buildings. L. Licinius Crassus (cos. 95 BC) reportedly set up six columns of white Hymettian marble in his private house on the Palatine and he was accused by his fellow censor, Gn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, of *luxuria*.²⁸ Crassus' unconventional action, however, might be explained by a triumph agreed on by the senate commission for his victorious engagement of the enemy in Cisalpine Gaul but vetoed by his co-consul at the time. The denied commemoration of his victory in the public space may have prompted its celebration in the 'privacy' of his own home.²⁹

By the mid first century BC the use of imported marble in a domestic context was well accepted – provided one was of the right social standing, that is, if one had *dignitas*.³⁰ The lack of *dignitas* (the reputation/prestige acquired through services to the Roman state) thus explains the animosity with which the use of marble by disreputable characters is met by literate circles of the Late Republic and the

23. Pensabene 2013, p. 36; lead token : Bruzza 1870, p. 184 no.187; Dubois 1908, p. 149 no. 480. On the triumph of Pompeius : Itgenshorst 2005, p. 357 ff. no. 258.

24. Fant 1995, p. 278 f., for a different view : Schneider 1982, p. 146 f.

25. Pliny *n.h.* 34.17; Hesberg 2005, p. 39.

26. Wiseman 1987, p. 394; Flower 1996, p. 189-222; Polito 1998, p. 26; Flaig 2003, p. 49 f.; Hesberg 2005, p. 33 f.; Stein-Hölkeskamp 2006, p. 307-309; Ostenberg 2009, p. 20-22.

27. Flaig 2003, p. 49 f.; Hölkeskamp 2010, p. 107 ff.

28. Plin. *n.h.* 17.6; Hesberg 1994, p. 178 f.; Hesberg 2005, p. 40; cf. Wallace-Hadrill 1988, p. 64-66.

29. Cic. *Inv.* 2.111; Cic. *Pis.* 62 with Ascon. 15 C.; Val. Max. 9.1.4; Plin. *n.h.* 36.7. On Crassus, cf. Schultze 2011.

30. On private use : Hesberg 1994, p. 180 with n. 45, contra Baltrusch 1989, p. 105. On houses and *dignitas* cf. Cicero *off.* 1.138 f., Pliny *n.h.* 36.7. Cf. Wiseman 1987, p. 393; Wallace-Hadrill 1988, p. 45; Hesberg 2005, p. 33 f.; Hölkeskamp 1993, p. 31 f.; Hölkeskamp 2005, p. 258 f.; Hölkeskamp 2010, p. 50 f.

Principate. M. Aemilius Scaurus is named and shamed by Pliny the Elder (36.5-6) – not only for the 360 columns of Lucullean and Hymettian marble, statues, and marble blocks or veneer he uses for the temporary theatre set up during his aedileship in 58 BC, but also for the largest columns of *marmor Luculleum* he uses in his house. It is his limited *dignitas*, the absence of (military?) achievements for the Roman state, which is not commensurate with the display of marble in a domestic setting. Other *exempla* noted by Pliny such as M. Aemilius Lepidus (cos. 78 BC; *n.b.* 36.49) or the equestrian Mamurra (*n.b.* 36.48) fit the same mould.³¹ In the absence of *dignitas* the display of foreign marble in the ‘public’ spaces of a house offended elite sensibilities, even more so in the case of coloured stones which reflected the territorial reach of empire and therefore conquest, and military achievement.³²

The use and display of imported white and polychrome stones was integral to the self-presentation of a respected senator who had achieved high standing in Roman society through his and his ancestor’s services to Rome. The intense competition amongst the aristocratic elite paired with the benefits of military victories in terms of wealth and symbolic capital fuelled the population of public spaces with monuments to these achievements. Manubial temples, triumphal arches, tropaea, honorific statues, together with the display of spoils propagated the military exploits and celebrated the *triumphatores* beyond the fleeting moment of the *pompa triumphalis*. White and coloured marble were very much part of the visual language through which these accomplishments were conveyed to the people of Rome. Perhaps initially hauled to Rome as spoils from the Greek East, specific imported mono- and polychrome marbles may have retained a certain nimbus of a prize gained through war. The misappropriation of such symbolically charged marbles i.e. their acquisition and display by people not of the ‘right’ standing could raise eyebrows; the negative *exempla* Pliny lists are testament to this.

With the focalisation of military success on the emperor the senatorial elite was not only deprived of claiming military victory but of celebrating and commemorating military achievement in the public sphere as well. Large scale projects such as manubial temples, permanent theatres, and other representative public buildings (theatres, amphitheatres, baths, *fora*), if not initiated by the people and senate of Rome, were now commissioned by the emperor. The *theatrum Balbi* was the last to be built on the expenses of a senator; it displayed four columns of onyx marble (Plin. *n.b.* 36.60).³³ Despite Augustus’ call for the embellishment of the city (Suet. *Aug.* 29), there is no indication that the *ordo senatorius* followed suit. In fact, any form of self-presentation by the senatorial elite disappeared from public spaces in Rome and was reduced to honorific monuments set up in the private confines of their homes or *villae*; the few senators honoured by the emperor with the *ornamenta triumphalia* for their military achievements as his legates could be

31. On Mamurra: McDermott 1983. Pape 1975, p. 51 f. with sources; Steinby 2012, p. 72. See also Cic. *Rosc.* 133 on L. Cornelius Chrysogonus, a freedman of Sulla: Hesberg 2005, p. 31. Lucullus’ use of black veneer (*africano*) might be the notable exception here: Plin. 36.49 f.; Fant 1989b, p. 20 (Teos); Itgenshorst 2005, p. 352 ff., no. 256.

32. Schneider 1986, p. 152; Carey 2003, p. 91 f.; Bradley 2006, p. 1-3.

33. Eck 2010a, p. 92; Pensabene 2013, p. 40.

honoured with a statue in public; the initiative to do so and the choice of place lay entirely with the emperor.³⁴ The public sphere of Rome was now dominated by the monuments and images of the *princeps*, and it was he who had the standing to employ coloured marble for its symbolic value.

The connotation of specific marble stones with victory, triumph, and conquest is strongly emphasized under Augustus. Nowhere is this demonstrated more clearly than with the obelisks made of red Aswan granite imported from Egypt. One obelisk was imported to function as gigantic arm of the sundial inaugurated on the Field of Mars in 9 BC, another set up in the Circus Maximus; both were inscribed with the phrase *Aegypto in potestatem populi Romani redacta* 'once Egypt had been reduced to the power of the Roman people' (*ILS* 91a+b).³⁵ These genuine spoils brought to Rome commemorated the Roman subjection of Egypt after the defeat of Cleopatra in 30 BC. Numidian and Phrygian marble both adorned key buildings commissioned by Augustus, of which the Forum of Augustus and the Temple of Concordia were paid for *de manubiis*.³⁶ Columns and floor slabs of Numidian and Phrygian marble, together with *cipollino*, *africano*, and other marble stones, were used in the Forum Augustum.³⁷ The temple of Concordia displayed Phrygian marble; the Basilica Aemilia on the Forum Romanum, refurbished by Augustus after a fire in 13 BC, was adorned with slabs of Numidian stone covering the floor and with statues in the shape of Phrygians. Given 'Phrygians' usually represent people from the East, the statues likely alluded to the Augustan success in 'compelling' the Parthians to return the legionary standards in 20 BC. Fragments of some twenty standing statues of barbarians made of *pavonazzetto* were found during excavations of the Basilica Aemilia in the late 19th century.³⁸ These symbolically charged polychrome stones (e.g. *m. Numidicum*, *m. Phrygium*) could only really be deployed in public and private building projects in Rome by the sole holders of *imperium* and military victories, by Augustus and his successors. For senators, who were implicitly barred from self-presentation in the public sphere in Rome, the utilisation of these marbles on a grand scale in the public space of Rome or in the semi-public *atrium* of their house could only be seen as a challenge to the emperor. As a consequence, the *princeps* emerges as the sole individual to demand coloured and white marble for display in Rome; this monopsony necessitated direct control over the sites where these stones were quarried.³⁹

When and how the emperor took control of the sites supplying the required stones is unclear: the quarries for *marmor Numidicum* at Simitthus (modern Chemtou in Tunisia), for instance, were already producing blocks and columns which arrived in Rome in the Late Republic (see above); Friedrich Rakob argued for an imperial takeover of the Simitthus quarries in 28 BC, perhaps with the involvement of M. Vipsanius Agrippa.⁴⁰ When the quarries of Phrygian marble

34. Eck 2010a, p. 93-96.

35. Schneider 1986, p. 150 f.; Fant 1993a, p. 148 f.; Albers 2013, p. 112 f.

36. *RGDA* 21; Suet. *Tib.* 20.

37. Zanker 1968, p. 10; Schneider 1986, p. 148 with fn. 1119; Ungaro 2002.

38. Schneider 1986, p. 115-125, 148 with fn. 1118, 200; Fant 1995, p. 278.

39. Hirt 2015, p. 314.

40. Quarry labels refer to an *officina Agrippae*, Hirt 2010, nos. 822, 824, 825; cf. also Lassère 1980, p. 41; Fant 1993b, p. 75 with fn. 8; Rakob 1993, p. 7 fn. 29.

near Docimium had come under imperial control is, once more, unknown, but the Augustan period seems likely.⁴¹ In Egypt, further quarries were newly opened under Augustus and Tiberius, as Pliny indicates (36.55); the inscribed stele of C. Cominius Leugas at Mons Porphyrites, who 'discovered' the porphyrite deposits there (*SEG* 45 : 2097), and the names of the quarries of Tiberiane or Mons Claudianus may well reflect an imperial drive to secure new sources of coloured and distinctive marbles for large scale construction projects in Rome.⁴²

Why emperors like Augustus, Tiberius, or Claudius continued to import, even expand a variety of coloured marbles to Rome is, again, not part of Roman literary discourse. The senate and people of Rome aside, the only person commissioning buildings in the public sphere was the emperor, which would have allowed him to cease the import of these 'luxuries'. Yet, by the early days of the Principate the people of Rome had long become accustomed to *magnificentia publica* (Vell. 2.1.1f.) and public buildings were expected to have lavishly decorated interiors and exteriors. Even though no senatorial elite challenged the emperor's visual dominance of the memorial landscape that was Rome, each and every building set up by a Roman emperor stood in competition with existing monuments and monumental buildings not only of his predecessors in office, but with the Republican past as well.⁴³ It is this continued competition, the requirement to outdo those who went before, and the expectation of *liberalitas* from the emperor, which drove imperial building activity in Rome in general, and the imperial demand for specific polychrome stones of symbolic value in particular. One therefore might expect that the sole purpose of quarries under imperial control was to supply construction projects in Rome and chosen cities receiving columns as imperial gifts.⁴⁴ In short, quarries under imperial control were not run for profit, but in order to ensure the supply of (coloured) marble to Rome in continuance of Republican traditions now centred on the emperor.

III. EPHEBUS

A recent discovery may provide a slight corrective to this picture. In 2014, the published excavation report of House 6 in 'Hanghaus 2' provided a full account of the spectacular marble decorations found in this private house at Ephesus. The 'Hanghaus 2', the *insula* on the northern slope of the Bülbüldağ was divided into three terraces; the topmost terrace included the Houses 1 and 2, the middle terrace the Houses 3, 4, and 5, and the lowest terrace the Houses 6 and 7. Immediately adjacent to the north and looking onto the 'Street of the Kuretes' were market stalls and workshops.⁴⁵ In the 2nd century, entry to 'House 6' was gained via a

41. Strabo 12.8.14; Tibullus 3.3.13-14; Fant 1989a, p. 7; Pensabene 2010, p. 78; Dalla Rosa 2016, p. 317 f. n. 54.

42. Hirt 2010, p. 338 f.

43. On the real and perceived threat to Augustus' position by the senatorial elite, cf. Hurllet 2012.

44. Athens: Pausanias 1.18.8-9; Millar 1992, p. 184, 420f.; Fant 1993a, p. 148 with n. 23, 156 with n. 73. Smyrna; *IK Smyrna* 697+II 2 pp. 375f., ll. 40-2. Philostr. *VS* 1.25.530-44. Fant 1993a, p. 155f.; Barresi 2003, p. 446; Pensabene 2010, p. 85; Hirt 2015, p. 291.

45. Thür & Rathmayr 2014, p. 3.

staircase leading on to a vestibule; from this room one stepped into a peristyle court with twelve columns. This splendidly decorated room sported a fountain and revealed the owner of the house, whose portrait bust was presented on a pilaster. From this central room the visitor could either enter the built-in baths along the eastern wall of the court, the latrines, and the reception and banquet rooms. Water was provided by a well and a conduit, allowing the installation of the bath and fountains during extensive refurbishments of 'House 6' in the mid 2nd century AD.⁴⁶ The ornamentation of these rooms in this period represented a significant departure from the earlier wall paintings and mosaics; most notably the 'marble court' (31) and the peristyle court (31a) saw marble floors and wall panels being fitted, and many of the rooms on the ground floor were embellished with marble decoration. The 'Marmorsaal' (31) stood up to 8.6 m high with its floor and walls being covered in marble panels made of white marble of local provenience, in *verde antico*, *cipollino verde*, *rosso brecciato*, *bigio antico*, etc.⁴⁷ Most notable is the use of white and violet *pavonazzetto* panels, a white marble with grey to violet veins hailing from the Bacakale quarries near Docimium (modern Isechisar in Asia Minor). The back of some of these panels display engraved notes, which were read by the editor Hans Taeuber as follows :

Hadriano III co(n)s(ule) dex(---) LI[---].

The inscription on this particular revetment panel is dated by consular date, when Hadrian was consul for the third time, so the year AD 119.⁴⁸ Given similar inscriptions found on blocks in the quarries of Bacakale, we are more likely to read *Hadriano III co(n)s(ule) de XLI[---]*.⁴⁹ The back of another *pavonazzetto* panel provides a further consular date, this time of AD 121 when Cn. Arrius Augur held the post :

*Augur(e) co(n)s(ule) L S[---].*⁵⁰

The consular date also provides us with the *terminus post quem* for the extensive refurbishment and aggrandizement of 'House 6'. Other *pavonazzetto*(?) panels showed the abbreviation for the quarry section: *b(racchio) quart(o)*.⁵¹ Furthermore, a lead seal was found inserted in a cavity of a further *pavonazzetto* revetment panel. Taeuber deciphered LIBE / AR / ES, but other readings remain possible.⁵²

All inscriptions noted so far were carved into the stone; one graffito on the back of a *pavonazzetto* panel, however, had been applied in red paint and reads *Furi Apti*, 'of Furius Aptus'.⁵³ According to the excavators, a C. Flavius Furius

46. Thür & Rathmayr 2014, p. 856 f.

47. K. Koller, in Thür & Rathmayer 2014, p. 227-254.

48. H. Taeuber, in Thür & Rathmayer 2014, p. 338 GR 255; with Thür & Rathmayer 2014, p. 14.

49. Fant 1989a, nos. 59, 60 = Hirt 2010, App. nos. 103, 104.

50. H. Taeuber, in Thür & Rathmayer 2014, p. 339 GR 284.

51. H. Taeuber, in Thür & Rathmayer 2014, p. 339 GR 285, GR 286.

52. H. Taeuber, in Thür & Rathmayer 2014, p. 339 GR 282

53. H. Taeuber, in Thür & Rathmayer 2014, p. 339 GR 283.

Aptus is likely to be the owner of unit 6, whose full name is inscribed pediment on a fountain pilaster in peristyle court 31a. This *Furius Aptus* is likely to be the instigator of the significant refurbishment in 'House 6'.⁵⁴

The find of *pavonazzetto* panels inscribed with quarry markings in a private context in Ephesus raises two important questions. How did *Furius Aptus* gain access to or acquire these specific marbles? And how does the ostentatious display of *pavonazzetto* by a wealthy provincial square with the notion of *marmor Phrygium* and other coloured marbles being exclusive to the emperor? Eck observed that during the Principate the restrictions to self-presentation by means of honorific statues and buildings by the aristocratic elite in public spaces, which are evident in the city of Rome, did not apply in Italy or the provinces. In Rome, senators who accepted honorific monuments from clients and provincial communities were limited to the domestic sphere and their private gardens when displaying these honours.⁵⁵ In the public places of Italian and provincial towns senators, equestrians, and local elites funded honorific statues and public buildings, often in direct competition with 'imperial' buildings and statues. The most notable example in Italy is *M. Nonius Balbus*, whose statues are omnipresent throughout Herculaneum. Even more conspicuous are provincial forms of self-presentation where senators have themselves monumentalised riding horses or driving chariots (*biga, quadriga*): at *Thamugadi* senators, amongst them two *legati* of *legio III Augusta*, received chariot monuments (*biga, quadriga*) which were similar in style and size as the monuments honouring the Antonines.⁵⁶

Similar observations apply to Ephesus: *Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus* from *Sardis* (*cos. suff.* AD 92), had a gigantic library built, outmatching the neighbouring *agora*, a honorific monument to *Augustus* and *Agrippa*; the *Celsus Library* sported *pavonazzetto* columns which *Ti. Iulius Aquila* (*cos. suff.* AD 110) had secured for his father's library/tomb.⁵⁷ *Phrygian marble* was on public display elsewhere in Ephesus: the 'Marble Hall' of the *Vedius Gymnasium* inaugurated between AD 147-149 – a benefaction of *M. Claudius P. Vedius Antoninus Phaedrus Sabinianus*, senator and Ephesian ambassador to Rome – was also equipped with *pavonazzetto* columns.⁵⁸ His daughter *Vedia Phaedrina*, who was married to the sophist *T. Flavius Damianus*, added a banqueting hall to the *Artemis temple*, which was adorned with *Phrygian stone* (*Philostr. Soph.* 2.25.605).⁵⁹ *Patrizio Pensabene* argued that the aristocratic elites of Ephesus and elsewhere in Asia acquired *pavonazzetto* from the emperor for public and even private use; this required not only wealth but also good connections to the emperor, which men like *Celsus*, *Vedius*, and *Damianus*

54. Rathmayr 2016, p. 5; K. Koller, in Rathmayr 2016, p. 259 ff.

55. Eck 2010a, p. 96-98.

56. Balbus, cf. Pappalardo 2005. *Africa*: Zimmer 1989, p. 70-78; Eck 2010a, p. 99, 101.

57. *PIR*² J 260; Halfmann 1979, p. 111f.; Fant 1993a, p. 156; Scherrer 1996, p. 12f.; Barresi 2003, p. 377-380; Eck 2010a, p. 99 f.; Pensabene 2010, p. 83-85.

58. Steksal & La Torre 2008, p. 21, 64 with *Kat. Nr. A 101* and *Taf. 80.1-3* [wrongly identified as *cipollino*], 303-308; Fant 1989a, p. 217; Fant 1993a, p. 154; Halfmann 1982, p. 628; Thomas 2007, p. 133-135.

59. *T. Flavius Damianus*: *PIR*² F 253; Halfmann 1982, p. 629; Quass 1993, p. 166, 218 with n. 780; Fant 1993a, p. 156 n. 73. *Harbour Gymnasium*: Barresi 2003, p. 374; Pensabene 2010, p. 84f.; Schneider 2002, p. 99.

certainly had. Little demonstrated proximity to the emperor and imperial patronage more than using 'his' marble in a public context.⁶⁰

But does this apply to other members of the Ephesian elite? In around AD 130 we learn from an inscription that a Dionysios, son of Nikephoros, *prytanis*, chief magistrate in Ephesus, provided the missing columns of 'Docimian marble' of 25 ½ feet (7.5m) in length for the *Sebaston gymnasion*. He appears to have paid for the missing columns himself.⁶¹ So far, there is no clear evidence for Dionysios having made the acquaintance of Hadrian or another emperor which allowed him to secure access to Phrygian marble. We are equally in the dark about potential imperial connections of Furius Aptus, who displays *pavonazzetto* in the context of his house 6 but not in a private context, strictly spoken. After all, the Peristyle Court and the Marble Hall were very much the 'public' part of this residence. As far as we can tell Aptus was a member of a wealthy and influential family in Ephesus whose members had been *asiarchs* and *gymnasiarchs*. His father, T. Flavius Aristobulus, had been *grammateus* and *prytanis* in Ephesus, his uncle even *archiereus Asiae*, chief-priest of the province of Asia; both achieved these high offices in the later years of Trajan and the early years of Hadrian. Furius Aptus possibly attained civic offices under Antoninus Pius and became *alylarch*, chief of police, under Marcus Aurelius. Given that Aptus' son, T. Flavius Lollianus Aristobulus, was the first of his family to become member of the senatorial order (probably under Marcus Aurelius), Aptus was likely of equestrian rank.⁶² In short, Furius Aptus belonged not only to the local elite, but by the mid-second century AD had established himself in the higher echelons of provincial society.

As for the *pavonazzetto* Aptus used in his refurbished 'terraced' house (possibly delivered to him in the shape of two blocks weighing some 2077 kg, and 829 kg respectively) – the inscriptions on the back of the revetments only indicate the year when the blocks were quarried (AD 119, AD 121), not when they were acquired by Aptus.⁶³ Neither do we learn anything about the circumstances of their acquisition: whether young Aptus had made the acquaintance of Hadrian, when the emperor visited Asia and Ephesus in AD 124 and 129, or whether he befriended Antoninus Pius in AD 135 when the latter resided at Ephesus as governor remains unknown.⁶⁴

Without clear evidence of imperial patronage we must also entertain the possibility that Aptus acquired the *pavonazzetto* blocks on the private market either from a contractor at Bacakale or perhaps at Ephesus itself; we know that marble was stapled in the harbour area (at least temporarily). We learn from an edict of AD 146/7, emitted by the proconsul of Asia L. Antonius Albus that, in order to protect the harbour of Ephesus from damage, merchants were prohibited to staple wood and cut stones they imported (*I. Eph* I a 23). A year later, still under the governorship of Albus in Asia, the gymnasium of Vedius, was completed, suggesting that perhaps some of the marble mentioned in the previous edict might have been

60. Pensabene 2010, p. 83-85. For the gift of columns to Smyrna by Hadrian, cf. Birley 1997, p. 159 ff.; Hirt 2015, p. 291.

61. On Dionysios: *I. Eph.* 666, 1034; Barresi 2003, p. 418-20; Quass 1993, p. 217f., n. 777.

62. Rathmayr 2009, p. 307-310; Thür & Rathmayr 2014, p. 846-848.

63. S. İlhan, in Thür & Rathmayr 2014, p. 818 f.

64. Halfmann 1986, p. 192-194; Birley 1997, p. 172, 221 f.

stapled in the harbour to supply the construction project. Perhaps Aptus redirected two blocks of *marmor Phrygium* from this stock to his house.

IV. BACAKALE

Aptus may also have bought these blocks off the quarrymen at Bacakale. If so, we must reconsider the basis upon which the imperial quarries there were run. This is not the place to reiterate the organisational pattern revealed by quarry labels on *pavonazzetto* blocks and architectural elements in detail; a brief summary must suffice. What is clear from the evidence, though, is that the quarries were under the oversight of imperial officials.⁶⁵

The inscriptions on Aptus' *pavonazzetto* panels are typical of the brief notes applied to quarried items at the imperial quarries of Bacakale from the earliest days of imperial control to the twilight years of Hadrian's rule: these brief notes mention consular dates, a location where the stone was cut, serial numbers, together with undecipherable abbreviations. In the late years of Hadrian's reign these notes are replaced with more informative quarry labels which allow us to gain better insight into the organization of these quarries. Besides date of production, provenance within the quarries, and serial numbers, these new labels allow us to differentiate responsibilities and determine work processes more clearly, e.g.

Hirt 2010 App. 222 (AD 157)

a) *loco IIII b(racchio) III | Barbaro et Regulo co(n)s(ulibus) ex off(icina) Pela(goni) | ex cae(sura) Zosi(mi)*

b) *PAL*

The key terms are *caesura* and *officina*. At *officinae*, 'workshops', blocks and columns were dressed and different construction elements (capitals, column shafts, etc.) were roughed out. A *caesura* identified an area of responsibility within a quarrying district. In the bureaucratic language at Bacakale the term is accompanied by a name in the genitive clause (e.g. *Zosimi*). The name has been understood to refer to the person responsible for a quarry section; the onomastic material suggests these to be mostly free men (and imperial freedmen) taking on such responsibilities.⁶⁶ In other words, the operation of *caesurae* could be contracted out to private individuals.

How these contracts with private partners worked is not clear from the usual labels found on the quarried items. Owing to three rather ambiguous labels, though, we can glimpse internal accounting procedures in relation to a *caesura*. These allow us to reconstruct the contractual basis for the involvement of private individuals in imperial quarrying operations at Bacakale.

65. Hirt 2010, p. 113 f.

66. For a detailed discussion, cf. Hirt 2010, p. 293-297 (*caesura*), 297-299 (*officina*). Pensabene 2010, p. 97-99; Hirt 2015, p. 299 f.

Hirt 2010 App. no. 295 (no. 296 is similar)

Commodo dom(ino) n(ostro) II et Martio | Vero II co(n)s(ulibus) (AD 179) recepti a Tito | nomene (!) ZNT IOVI[.] | [...] b(racchio) quar(to)

‘received from Titus, in the name of ... (?)’.

Hirt 2010 App. no.300

Commodo dom(ino) n(ostro) II et [Martio Vero co(n)s(ulibus) II (AD 179)]recepti ex officina Prusaen[si ---]/in loc{q}um lapidum quoꝛ receperat promutuo Titus ex caesura Veteris,

‘(stones) received from the *officina* of Prusa [---] in place of the stones which Titus received as a loan (*promutuo*) from the *caesura* of Vetuſ.’

These inscriptions seem to indicate that stones were delivered from an *officina Prusaensis* to an unknown location as a substitute for a delivery of stones from the *caesura* of Vetuſ. The *caesura*-holder Vetuſ had given quarried blocks “as a loan” (*promutuo*) to Titus, who had not returned the loan in time, that is, the equivalent amount or blocks. The transfer of stones between the holders of a *caesura* and the option of receiving quarried stones ‘on loan’ suggests that the administration expected a fixed number of items to be produced, prompting the holder of a *caesura* (such as Titus) to loan stones from the *caesura* of Vetuſ to meet the set target. The consular date and serial number could indicate that a fixed amount was expected per annum. We may presume that a set amount of marble elements for specific imperial building projects was requested from Bacakale, which the imperial officials translated into fixed numbers of blocks, capitals, and column shafts demanded from individual contractors of *caesurae*.⁶⁷

The use of the term *promutuo*, ‘loan’, in relation to quarried items may indicate that *caesura*-holders could acquire private property of (some of the) blocks they cut and dress within the imperial district at Bacakale. If this is so, then *caesurae* were perhaps contracted out on the basis of a *locatio conductio rei*, which would see the contractor lease a quarry section and pay rent to the imperial officials for doing so. Given that there seems to be no real free market distribution of quarried items, a *locatio conductio rei* is less likely.⁶⁸ If so, a *locatio conductio operis faciendi* seems more plausible: the contractor receives a fixed payment from the imperial administration in return for a set amount of quarried blocks made of *pavonaz-zetto* to be delivered within a set period of time (perhaps within a year, hence the consular dates noted on labels); those running the *caesura* may have been allowed to keep and sell any additional Phrygian marble quarried during the agreed period.⁶⁹ Therefore, one could argue that stones received on ‘loan’ may indicate private

67. Hirt 2010, p. 296 f. with cat. nos. 295, 296, and 300; Hirt 2015, p. 300.

68. On *locatio conductio rei*, cf. Kaser & Knüttel 2005, p. 220 ff.; Russell (2013, p. 194-196) assumes that private customers could acquire stones from imperial quarries, but his evidence is of the late 3rd c. AD (*TM* 22980 [AD 267/8]; *TM* 22987 [AD 267/8]; Diocletian’s Prices Edict, cf. Corcoran & De Laine 1994).

69. For similar arrangements, cf. *P. Oxy.* 3595-3597; Strobel 1987; Aubert 1994, p. 232f.; Hirt 2010, p. 297, 319f. On *locatio conductio operis*, cf. Kaser & Knüttel 2005, p. 225f.

property of (some of the) blocks quarried by private contractors at Bacakale. This would have meant that at least some blocks became available on the free market.

In short, given our current knowledge of the distribution of *pavonazetto* in Asia Minor a real free market for *pavonazetto* did not exist, but the private contractors at Bacakale quarrying this stone probably might have been allowed to sell off any excess material to customers on their own. And it is perhaps in this manner that *Furius Aptus* acquired the *pavonazetto* panels for his home.

V. CONCLUSION

The display of marble revetments in the house of G. Flavius *Furius Aptus* at Ephesus in the mid second century AD has forced us to reconsider some of the organizational patterns in the imperial district of Bacakale. The limited use of *marmor Phrygium* beyond imperial building projects and the distribution patterns distinct from those observed of other marbles indicate a significant distortion of the market for Phrygian marble by the imperial monopsony. This limited the ways by which *Aptus* acquired *pavonazetto* : although the *princeps*' patronage remains a possible option, the private acquisition of Phrygian marble could explain how two blocks, later cut into panels and hung in the 'Marmorsaal', arrived at House 6. Given the imperial monopoly on the large scale display of certain marbles in the public space that is Rome, accessibility to these marbles was strongly restricted – a consequence of the usurpation by Augustus and his successors of Republican traditions closely linked to the commemoration of military victors (*triumphatores*) and underpinned by a moral code professed by Cicero and Pliny and centred on the concept of *dignitas*. Even so, these ideas seem not to have played in Italy or the provinces : financially potent provincials in Ephesus and elsewhere throughout the province of Asia may well have spent their cash on acquiring Phrygian and other marbles for building venues they either funded as public benefactors or as private house owners. And *Aptus* was wily enough to accumulate the funds to acquire a small 'scrap' of imperial marble for his pleasure.

Alfred M. HIRT
University of Liverpool

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albers 2013 : J. Albers, *Campus Martius. Die urbane Entwicklung des Marsfeldes von der Republik bis zur mittleren Kaiserzeit*, Wiesbaden, 2013.
- Aubert 1994 : J.-J. Aubert, *Business Managers in Ancient Rome. A Social and Economic Study of Institores, 200 BC - AD 250*, Leiden, 1994.
- Baltrusch 1989 : E. Baltrusch, *Regimen morum. Die Reglementierung des Privatlebens der Senatoren und Ritter in der römischen Republik und der frühen Kaiserzeit*, München, 1989.
- Barresi 2003 : P. Barresi, *Province dell'Asia Minore. Costo dei marmi architettura pubblica e committenza*, Roma, 2003.
- Bernard 2010 : S.G. Bernard, "Pentelic marble in architecture at Rome and the Republican marble trade", *JRA*, 23, 2010, p. 35-54.

- Birley 1997 : A.R. Birley, *Hadrian the Restless Emperor*, London – New York, 1997.
- Bradley 2006 : M. Bradley, “Colour and marble in Early Imperial Rome”, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 52, 2006, p. 1-22.
- Bruzza 1870 : L. Bruzza, “Iscrizioni dei marmi grezzi”, *Annali dell’ Istituto di Corrispondenza Archaeologica*, 42, 1870, p. 106-204.
- Carey 2003 : S. Carey, *Pliny’s Catalogue of Culture. Art and Empire in the Natural History*, Oxford, 2003.
- Corcoran & DeLaine 1994 : S. Corcoran, J. DeLaine, “The Unit of Measurement of Marble in Diocletian’s Prices Edict”, *JRA*, 7, 1994, p. 263-267.
- Coudry & Humm 2009 : M. Coudry, M. Humm, *Praeda. Butin de guerre et société dans la Rome républicaine / Kriegsbeute und Gesellschaft im republikanischen Rom*, Stuttgart, 2009.
- Dalla Rosa 2016 : A. Dalla Rosa, “From Exploitation to Integration. Imperial Quarries. Estates and Freedmen, and the Integration of Rural Phrygia”, *Studi Ellenistici*, 30, 2016, p. 305-330.
- Dickmann 1999 : J.-A. Dickmann, *Domus frequentata. Anspruchsvolles Wohnen im pompejanischen Stadthaus*, München, 2009.
- Dubois 1908 : C. Dubois, *Étude sur l’administration et l’exploitation des carrières marbres, porphyre, granit, etc. dans le monde romain*, Paris, 1908.
- Eck 1999 : W. Eck, „Kaiserliche Imperatorenakklamation und ornamenta triumphalia“, *ZPE*, 124, 1999, p. 223-227.
- Eck 2010a : W. Eck, “Emperor and senatorial aristocracy in competition for public space”, in B.C. Ewald, C. F. Noreña (ed.), *The Emperor and Rome. Space, Representation, and Ritual*, Cambridge, 2010, p. 89-110.
- Eck 2010b : W. Eck, „Senatorische Selbstdarstellung und kaiserzeitliche Epigraphik“, in W. Ameling, J. Heinrichs (ed.), *Monument und Inschrift. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur senatorische Repräsentation in der Kaiserzeit*, Berlin, 2010, p.1-43
- Eck 2010c : W. Eck, „Cum dignitate otium. Senatorische Häuser im kaiserzeitlichen Rom“, in W. Ameling, J. Heinrichs (ed.), *Monument und Inschrift. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur senatorische Repräsentation in der Kaiserzeit*, Berlin, 2010, p. 207-240.
- Fant 1989a : J.C. Fant, *Cavum Antrum Phrygiae. The Organization and Operations of the Roman Imperial Marble Quarries in Phrygia*, Oxford, 1989.
- Fant 1989b : J.C. Fant, “Poikiloi lithoi. The anomalous economics of the Roman imperial marble quarry at Teos”, in *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire*, London, 1993, p. 206-218.
- Fant 1993a : J.C. Fant, “Ideology, Gift, and Trade. A Distribution Model for the Roman Imperial Marbles”, in W.V. Harris (ed.), *The Inscribed Economy. Production and Distribution in the Roman Empire in the Light of Instrumentum Domesticum*, Ann Arbor, 1993, 145-170.
- Fant 1993b : J.C. Fant, “The Roman imperial marble trade. A distribution model”, in R. Francovich (ed.), *Archeologia delle attività estrattive e metallurgiche*, Firenze, 1993, p. 71-96.
- Fant 1995 : J.C. Fant, “Augustus and the City of Marble”, in M. Schvoerer (ed.), *Archéomatériaux. Marbres et autres roches. ASMOSIA IV*, Bordeaux, 1995, p. 277-280.
- Fant 2008 : J.C. Fant, “Chap. 5. Quarrying and Stoneworking”, in J.P. Oleson (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Engineering and Technology in the Classical World*, Oxford, 2008, p. 121-135.

- Flaig 2003 : E. Flaig, *Ritualisierte Politik. Zeichen, Gesten und Herrschaft im Alten Rom*, Göttingen, 2003.
- Flower 1996 : H.I. Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, Oxford, 1996.
- Halfmann 1979 : H. Halfmann, *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.*, Göttingen, 1979.
- Halfmann 1982 : H. Halfmann, „Die Senatoren aus den Kleinasiatischen Provinzen des römischen Reiches“, in S. Panciera (ed.), *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio*, Roma, 1982, II, p. 603-650.
- Halfmann 1986 : H. Halfmann, *Itinera principum. Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im Römischen Reich*, Wiesbaden, 1986.
- Hesberg 1994 : H. von Hesberg, „Die Architekturteile“, in G. Hellenkemper Salies et al. (ed.), *Das Wrack. Der antike Schiffsfund von Mahdia*, I, Bonn, 1994, p. 175-194.
- Hesberg 2005 : H. von Hesberg, „Die Häuser der Senatoren in Rom. Gesellschaftliche und politische Funktion“, in W. Eck, M. Heil (ed.), *Senatores populi Romani. Realität und mediale Präsentation einer Führungsschicht*, Stuttgart, 2005, p. 19-52.
- Hirt 2010 : A.M. Hirt, *Imperial Mines and Quarries in The Roman World. Organizational Aspects 27 BC – AD 235*, Oxford, 2010.
- Hirt 2015 : A.M. Hirt, „Centurions, Quarries, and the Emperor“, in P. Erdkamp, K. Verboven, A. Zuiderhoek (ed.), *Ownership and Exploitation of Land and Natural Resources in the Roman World*, Oxford, 2015, p. 289-314.
- Hölkeskamp 1993 : K.-J. Hölkeskamp, „Conquest, Competition and Consensus. Roman Expansion in Italy and the Rise of ‘Nobilitas’“, *Historia*, 42, 1993, p. 12-39.
- Hölkeskamp 2005 : K.-J. Hölkeskamp, „Images of Power. Memory, Myth and Monuments in the Roman Republic“, *Scripta Classica Israelica*, 24, 2005, p. 249-271.
- Hölkeskamp 2010 : K.-J. Hölkeskamp, *Reconstructing the Roman Republic. An Ancient Political Culture and Modern Research*, Princeton – Oxford, 2010.
- Hurlet 2012 : F. Hurlet, « Concurrence gentilice et arbitrage impérial. Les pratiques politiques de l'aristocratie augustéenne », *Politica Antica*, 2, 2012, p. 33-54.
- Hurlet 2015 : F. Hurlet, « La suprématie auspicielle du prince en question(s). Une nouvelle hiérarchie des auspices », *CCG*, 26, 2015, p. 289-305.
- Igenshorst 2005 : T. Igenshorst, *Tota illa pompa. Der Triumph in der römischen Republik*, 2 vol., Göttingen, 2005.
- Kaser & Knüttel 2005 : M. Kaser, R. Knüttel, *Römisches Privatrecht*, München¹⁸, 2005.
- Lassère 1980 : J.-M. Lassère, « Le peuplement de la colonia Iulia Augusta Numidica Simitthus », *AntAfr*, 16, 1980, p. 27-44.
- Mc Dermott 1983 : W.C. McDermott, „Mamura, eques Formianus“, *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 126, 1983, p. 292-307.
- Millar 1992 : F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World*, London², 1992.
- Ostenberg 2009 : I. Ostenberg, *Staging the World. Spoils, Captives, and Representations in the Roman Triumphal Procession*, Oxford, 2009.
- Pape 1975 : M. Pape, *Griechische Kunstwerke aus Kriegsbeute und ihre öffentliche Aufstellung in Rom. Von der Eroberung von Syrakus bis in augusteische Zeit*, Hamburg, 1975.
- Pappalardo 2005 : U. Pappalardo, „Marcus Nonius Balbus. Der patronus von Herculaneum“, in J. Mühlbrock, D. Richter (ed.), *Verschüttet vom Vesuv. Die letzten Stunden von Herculaneum*, Mainz, 2005, p. 171-181.

- Peacock 1992 : D.P.S. Peacock, *Rome in the Desert. A Symbol of Power*, Southampton, 1992.
- Pensabene 2010 : P. Pensabene, "Cave di marmo bianco e pavonazetto in Frigia. Sulla produzione e sui dati epigrafici", *Marmora*, 6, 2010, p. 71-134.
- Pensabene 2013 : P. Pensabene, *I marmi nella Roma antica*, Roma, 2013.
- Polito 1998 : E. Polito, *Fulgentibus armis. Introduzione allo studio dei fregi d'armi antichi*, Roma, 1998.
- Quass 1993 : F. Quass, *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens. Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Entwicklung in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*, Stuttgart, 1993.
- Rakob 1993 : F. Rakob (1993), „I. Zur Siedlungstopographie von Chemtou/Simitthus“, in F. Rakob (ed.), *Simitthus I. Die Steinbrüche und die antike Stadt*, Mainz, 1993, p. 1-16.
- Rathmayr 2009 : E. Rathmayr, „Das Haus des Ritters C. Flavius Furius Aptus. Beobachtungen zur Einflussnahme von Hausbesitzern an Architektur und Ausstattungen in der Wohneinheit 6 des Hanghauses 2 in Ephesos“, *Istanbuler Mitteilungen*, 59, 2009, p. 307-336.
- Rathmayr 2016 : E. Rathmayr (ed.), *Hanghaus 2 in Ephesos. Die Wohneinheit 7. Baubefund, Ausstattung, Funde*, Wien, 2016.
- Richardson 1992 : L. Richardson (ed.), *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, Baltimore – London, 1992.
- Roddaz 1984 : J.-M. Roddaz, *Marcus Agrippa*, Rome, 1984.
- Russel 2009 : B. Russell, "The dynamics of stone transport between the Roman Mediterranean and its hinterland", *Facta*, 2, 2009, p. 107-126.
- Russel 2013 : B. Russell, *The Economics of the Roman Stone Trade*, Oxford, 2013.
- Rüpke 1990 : J. Rüpke, *Domi Militiae. Die religiöse Konstruktion des Krieges in Rom*, Stuttgart, 1990.
- Schäfer 1979 : Th. Schäfer, „Das Siegesdenkmal vom Kapitol“, in H. G. Horn, Chr. B. Rüger (ed.), *Die Numider. Reiter und Könige nördlich der Sahara*, Bonn, 1979, p. 243-250.
- Scherrer 1996 : P. Scherrer, "The City of Ephesos. From the Roman Period to Late Antiquity", in H. Koester (ed.), *Ephesos Metropolis of Asia. An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion, and Culture*, Valley Forge, 1996, p. 1-25.
- Schneider 1986 : R.M. Schneider, *Bunte Barbaren. Orientalenstatuen aus farbigem Marmor in der römischen Repräsentationskunst*, Worms, 1986.
- Schneider 2002 : R.M. Schneider, "Nuove immagini del potere romano. Sculture in marmo colorato nell'impero romano", in M. De Nuccio, L. Ungaro (ed.), *I marmi colorati della Roma imperiale*, Venezia, 2002, p. 8-105.
- Schultze 2011 : C. Schultze, "Encyclopaedic exemplarity in Pliny the Elder", in R.K. Gibson, R. Morello (ed.), *Pliny the Elder. Themes and Contexts*, Leiden – Boston, 2011, p.167-186.
- Stein-Hölkeskamp 2006 : E. Stein-Hölkeskamp, „Das römische Haus – die memoria der Mauern“, in E. Stein-Hölkeskamp, K.-J. Hölkeskamp (ed.), *Erinnerungsorte der Antike. Die römische Welt*, München, 2006, p. 300-320.
- Steinby 2012 : E. M. Steinby, *Edilizia pubblica e potere politico nella Roma repubblicana*, Roma, 2012.
- Steksal & La Torre 2008 : M. Steksal, M. La Torre, *Das Vediusgymnasium in Ephesos. Archäologie und Baubefund*, Graz, 2008.

- Strobel 1987 : K. Strobel, „Einige Bemerkungen zu den historisch-archäologischen Grundlagen einer Neuformulierung der Sigillatenchronologie für Germanien und Rätien und zu wirtschaftsgeschichtlichen Aspekten der römischen Keramikindustrie“, *MBAH*, 6/2, 1987, p. 75-115.
- Tarpin 2013 : M. Tarpin, « Devenir riche par le butin. Données quantitatives dans l'empire romain », in C. Baroin, C. Michel (ed.), *Richesses et Sociétés*, Paris, 2013, p. 69-80.
- Thomas 2007 : E. Thomas, *Monumentality and the Roman Empire. Architecture in the Antonine Age*, Oxford, 2007.
- Thür & Rathmayr 2014 : H. Thür, E. Rathmayr (ed.), *Hanghaus 2 in Ephesos. Die Wohninheit 6. Baubefund, Ausstattung, Funde*, Wien, 2014.
- Ungaro 2002 : L. Ungaro, “Il foro di Augusto”, in M. De Nuccio, L. Ungaro (ed.), *I marmi colorati della Roma imperiale*, Roma, 2002, p. 109-121.
- Waelkens 2002 : M. Waelkens *et al.*, “Marble and the marble trade at Sagalassos (Turkey)”, in J. J. Herrmann Jr, N. Herz, R. Newman (ed.), *ASMOSIA 5. Interdisciplinary Studies on Ancient Stones*, London, 2002, p. 370-380.
- Wallace-Hadrill 1988 : A. Wallace-Hadrill, “The Social Structure of the Roman House”, *PBSR*, 56, 1988, p. 43-97.
- Wiseman 1987 : T.P. Wiseman, « *Conspicui postes tectaque digna deo*. The public image of aristocratic and imperial houses in the Late Republic and early empire”, in *L'urbis. Espace urbain et histoire (I^{er} siècle av. J.-C. - III^e siècle ap. J.-C.)*, Rome, 1987, p. 393-412.
- Zanker 1968 : P. Zanker, *Forum Augustum*, Tübingen, 1968.
- Zimmer 1989 : G. Zimmer, *Locus datus decreto decurionum. Zur Statuenaufstellung zweier Forumsanlagen im römischen Afrika*, München, 1989.

