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Abstract

_Locus Classicus: Origin Branding in Roman Luxury Markets, c. 100 BC - c. AD 130_

This thesis examines the social and economic context for so-called ‘origin brands’ (products referred to and associated with a particular town, region or country) in ancient Rome, and develops a hypothetical model of how a Roman brand’s reputation might grow. This thinking is illustrated by four detailed case studies of luxury brands.

Chapter 1 examines the role of brands in the Roman world in the light of modern thinking on the nature of brands and branding. I discuss the role of the consumer, in relation to brands, both modern and ancient, leading into an explanation of how brands are adopted by consumers, and how this might apply to a Roman luxury brand. Finally, I introduce and develop the concept of ‘origin brands’ in the Roman world, and relate the phenomenon of the origin brand to the consumer context.

Chapter 2 sets out the élite socio-economic context in which Roman brands developed. The last part of this chapter examines the potential role of literature and its performance in élite households in the communication of brand information.

Chapter 3 examines the nature of brand communication in the Roman world. In ancient Rome this was primarily word-of-mouth. This is analysed in a structured way to reflect the entire process from the production of a commodity to its ultimate purchase and consumption, leading to the formulation of a schematic model of the process.

The second half of the thesis consists of four extended case studies that narrate the history of selected luxury origin brands and how they achieved their success in the Roman élite marketplace. The four examples – Corinthian bronze, ivory, silk and fine wines – represent different competitive marketplaces, and differing ways in which the brands concerned developed.
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Introduction

‘Brand’ is not a word often found in the writings of ancient historians, except occasionally in the specific sense of branding animals or of branding criminals or runaway slaves as a punishment. I will argue that brands, in the modern sense of the word, were a common phenomenon in the Roman world, and that we can begin to discover not simply brand names but at least some brand reputations.

This thesis sets out, then, to examine aspects of the role of brands and branding in the late Roman Republic and early Empire. This is part of a field of study, that of consumer culture and behaviour, that is still under-explored in academic ancient history scholarship – the very idea of Romans as consumers is largely ignored. There is, as will be shown, ample evidence for the existence of brands in ancient Rome, and light can be thrown on the way in which Romans regarded them and used them by using some of the techniques and analytical approaches employed in the study of today’s vastly more crowded and active brand world. This analysis, in turn, will be seen to generate some new insights into relationships and the nature of interpersonal communication within Roman society.

1. Brands in Antiquity

Modern scholars have tended to view brands as a phenomenon of the recent past: an artefact of the mass-production enabled by the industrial revolution and promoted through advertising to become the focus of today’s global consumerism. Marxist analysis would point to branding as an essential element in commodification. This focus, however, obscures both the nature of branding and its pervasive antiquity. It is, in practice, only since the turn of the millennium that archaeologists and historians have begun to recognize that branding can be traced back almost to the very beginnings of writing, as a means of identifying a product or commodity and, hence, of providing some form of guarantee of its quality.

1 See Jones (1987).
2 There are scattered comments on Romans as consumers in general studies of Roman society, from Friedländer (1913) onwards. Books that arguably come closest to addressing the topic are Laurence (2003), Beard (2008).
3 See, e.g. Trentmann (2009), p.192.
The fact remains that the ancient world’s economy and markets operated at a more primitive and unsophisticated level than today’s hectically commercial global marketplace, and we cannot expect to find all the same mechanisms and institutions in operation. Any attempt to look at brands in the ancient world must, therefore, take due account of the very real differences between that world and our own.

The study of ancient brands is still in its infancy. The first academic article that openly discusses them was written by David Wengrow and published in 2008, though the thinking that led to this goes back at least to Karl Moore’s studies of early globalization dating from the late 1990s. These articles focus on very early sealing and labelling, from a variety of bronze age sites; and while this captures one essential element of branding, brand identity, the absence of any non-material evidence effectively precludes the consideration of the other key characteristic of brands, brand image or reputation. It is still true to say that the whole concept of brands and branding is largely absent from ancient-historical scholarship.

An essential next step, building on these small beginnings, is to look at brands from a more advanced pre-modern economy, where literary evidence can enable us to begin to understand the development of brand reputation, and the mechanisms whereby it was achieved. This study therefore focuses on the late Roman Republic and early Empire, and on luxury markets, for two key reasons. First, there is a critical mass of literary material, in which a variety of brands are referred to reasonably frequently, which allows us to develop a feel for these brands’ reputation or, at least, marketplace presence. Second, luxury brands were of sufficient interest to élite Roman society, and to the writers who were mostly also part of that élite, for there to be enough surviving discourse about some of these brands to enable serious

---

4 This is not, however, to accept the full-blooded ‘primitivist’ view of the ancient economy promulgated by Finley (1985); see the discussion in ch.2, pp. 60-63.
5 Wengrow (2008); Moore & Lewis (1996); Moore & Reid (2008). See also Wengrow (2012); Bevan (2012). There is a passing reference in Curtis (1984a), but this is not systematically followed through in his original article or subsequent publications (1984b, 1984-6, 1991).
6 It could, of course be argued that the simple act of branding a specific commodity represents at least some form of (reputational) guarantee. But see chapter 1, pp. 40-44.
analysis, which can be related to archaeological and epigraphic evidence to provide a reasonably rounded picture.

2. The Context and its Implications

In today’s world, brands are part of the background – and sometimes the foreground - to everyone’s lives. They are all around us; they influence and simplify the way in which we shop; and they help to shape the ways in which we present ourselves to our peers. In the very different economic and social world of ancient Rome, it is easy to imagine that brands had none of this power to influence people’s lives. Yet there are a surprising number of branded – or, at least, trademarked - goods in Rome: virtually every type of ceramic could, and often did, carry some kind of maker’s mark; to a lesser extent, the same was true of glass and at least some worked metal goods. In this, the Romans were merely carrying on practices that date back many centuries, in Greece, Egypt, Mesopotamia and even the Indus Valley. Those ceramics that contained foods or beverages often carried much more information, though much of this seems to have been essentially administrative in character.

Archaeologists have done much to trace the dispersion of some of these brands around the Roman Empire – and even beyond. But there is a large gap in our understanding of these brands, qua brands. To be sure, there are names or symbols that identify their producers, but we know next to nothing of how this brand information affected the people who bought and used the products concerned. In other words, we know a bit about brand identity, but nothing about brand image or reputation.

In the modern world, when marketers want to understand how a brand works in its marketplace, they carry out market research. This can consist of questionnaire-based surveys, increasingly implemented via the internet or the mobile phone; or of so-called

---

7 Evidence from Pompeii shows that loaves of bread, too, might carry a maker's stamp - see Frank (1918), pp. 228, 239; Beard (2008), p. 172.
8 See below, pp. 37-40.
9 See, e.g., Kiiskinen (2013); Will (1979).
qualitative research which may use focus groups, depth interviews or ethnographic observation to try to unravel the psychological underpinnings of individual brands: how they are perceived and valued by actual or potential customers. At the same time market researchers have discovered that there is a great deal of conversation about brands between people – or consumers, as they tend to be called. This informal discourse can now be tracked, to an extent, on social media like Twitter and Facebook, and can be traced, at least, by questionnaire. Meanwhile, of course, today’s marketers have the facility to attempt to influence perceptions of their brands through a diversity of tools of marketing communication: advertising in a range of media, public relations, promotions of all kinds, often at the point of sale, and so on.

In the Roman world, virtually none of this paraphernalia of modern marketing existed. There were no mass media, very limited point of sale opportunities, and very little consumer-oriented packaging that might carry a message to the buyer. We might, therefore, expect that such brands as existed might achieve familiarity, but that they would be unable to create any sort of brand image for themselves. There were certainly brands, but they had little or no obvious meaning beyond their identity as coming from the workshop of a named or symbolized producer, allied – of course – to whatever prior experience the user or buyer might have had of that particular brand.

The idea that these ancient brands might in fact carry some detailed meaning for their buyers has only recently been aired in academic archaeological or ancient-historical discourse; and there has been little discussion of the subject. While it has been recognized that ancient brand identifiers can play a dual role ‘as components of bureaucratic systems and as charismatic signifiers of product identity’, there seems to have been no attempt to date to examine the character or potential of these ‘charismatic signifiers’. This is hardly surprising, since, as already outlined, the way in which market researchers are accustomed to explore brand meaning involves questioning consumers. We cannot directly question consumers who lived 2000 years ago. But that does not mean we should not be looking for evidence.

11 For a description of Roman advertising possibilities see Curtis (1984-6).
We can make two useful preliminary assumptions, and these are the basis of this thesis. First, we can assume that the brand names and any other information that appear on artefacts produced by Roman manufacturers did in fact carry a relevant message to consumers. Obviously, the more information provided, potentially the more useful and influential the message conveyed. Second, we can assume that Romans, like today’s consumers, talked to their friends and families about at least some of the brands they purchased and used. If we could somehow access this brand discourse, we could learn something about how individual brands were perceived and valued in Roman society. How we might do this is central to the methodology of this study.

3. Methodology

My approach to the problem of accessing Roman brands and brand attitudes is based on a mix of disciplinary approaches. Underlying the thesis is the concept of consumer culture, which can be defined as the study of consumer choices from a social and cultural, as opposed to an economic, viewpoint. In the words of Arnould & Thompson,

Consumer culture theory focuses on the experiential and sociocultural dimensions of consumption that are not plainly accessible through experiments, surveys, or database modeling including such issues as product symbolism, ritual practices, the consumer stories in product and brand meanings, and the symbolic boundaries that structure personal and communal consumer identities.

While these theorists would resist the temptation to expect consumer culture researchers to use only qualitative methods, in practice it is clear that, contrary to the managerial focus and emphasis on quantification of most American market research, the use of group discussions, so-called depth interviews, semiotics and ethnographic methods are almost an essential part of their armoury, as they set out to investigate ‘the contextual, symbolic, and experiential aspects of consumption’.

Clearly, we cannot listen in to Roman citizens’ day-to-day brand conversations. What we could, however, hope to find is the reflection of at least some of this discourse in the

13 For a review of consumer culture theory, see Arnould & Thompson (2005).
14 ib. p. 870.
15 ib. p. 871.
literature that has survived from the period we are concerned with. Where we can find enough material about a given brand, we can use the techniques of modern qualitative research analysis to develop a picture of Roman consumers’ relationship with the brand. Given that the great majority of extant Latin and Graeco-Roman literature that survives dates from the first century BC onwards, with much of it coming from before AD 300; and given that Rome became much wealthier from the beginning of the second century BC onwards, it makes sense to concentrate within this period. In practice, the available evidence, as will become clear in the course of this thesis, applies chiefly to a period between about 100BC and the death of Hadrian in AD 138, with some leeway at both ends of this time-span. The central tool of analysis, then, is an examination of brand evidence in the literature of this period, supplemented by some later material that helps shed light on the subject. An overview of the sources, both ancient and modern, follows below.

As soon as we start to consider how to use the literary evidence, it becomes clear that more-or-less élite writers, writing for their peers or superiors, are unlikely to be much concerned with brands of Firmalampen, day-to-day tablewares, tiles or glassware. Where they discuss items of consumption, these are usually, though not always, in categories that could typically be described as luxuries. The exceptions tend to be foods or beverages, many of which would not have carried a brand name of any kind, since they were not packaged, and would usually have been purchased from a market stall or a specialised merchant. In other words, apart from some very high-status ‘art’ ceramics and costly metalwares, the main categories of articles carrying a brand identifier lie outside the scope of existing literature. The one obvious exception to this is fine wines, where there is evidence both from archaeology and literature of clear brand identification.

In fact, wines were generally identified not by a producer brand, though this was sometimes present on amphorae, but by their area of origin. This provides a key clue to the way in which we can begin to access at least some brand reputations. Origin, or ‘place name’ brands are not merely a common phenomenon in modern markets (think of Cheddar cheese, Champagne, Egyptian Cotton, Blue Mountain Coffee, or, more generically, of denim,

\[\text{footnote}{16}\text{For an academic discussion of qualitative research analysis, see Spiggle (1994); for a practitioner view, see Ereaut (2002).}\]
\[\text{footnote}{17}\text{See chapter 7, passim.}\]
damsons, calico), but were also widely found in ancient literature. Some of them, as we shall see, survive today.\(^\text{18}\) We can, as shown in Chapter 1, section 5 and Appendix 1.1, associate with specific geographical origins a surprisingly wide range of products and even what nowadays would be called services, some of which the Romans themselves were happy to rank in order of reputation. For at least some of these, there is enough material, in terms of product descriptions and the contexts in which these arise, to enable us to construct something approaching a brand image, much in the same way that a modern market researcher would use the analysis of qualitative research to build a profile of a modern brand. The four case studies in chapters 4-7 of this thesis show how this can be done, for a diverse group of products.

Literature is merely the medium by which we can access aspects of a wider dialogue. We have also to consider how the mechanics of word-of-mouth brand reputation development might have worked. Here, we have to rely on inference, and the model of communication that can be developed is essentially speculative and schematic. Using an analysis similar to Leroi-Gouhan’s *chaîne opératoire*, we can reconstruct the sort of conversations that might take a craft item from raw material, through the hands of merchants, craftsmen and salespeople to the ultimate user and beyond.\(^\text{19}\) We can identify the opportunities that existed for people to learn about brands of luxury goods, and to talk about them, subsequently, to their friends and acquaintances: gossip, it is clear from the literature, was a well-established Roman custom. Occasionally, very occasionally, we can see individual writers referencing such opportunities. But if we apply the insights of modern social psychology and sociology, it is possible to see how luxury brands – at least – became accepted in Roman society, and the sort of effects their usage (and, often, flaunting) had on observers in that society.

In addition to searching contemporary literature for brands and for evidence of their reputations, we can hope to find supporting evidence in epigraphy and more generally in archaeology to provide backing for the conclusions that may be drawn from our writers. For the most part, however, this evidence, such as it is, will be seen to be largely peripheral.

\(^{18}\) Some Roman origin brands survive, as such, today. Examples include: cherries, quinces, damsons, silk (from *serica*), topaz, indigo, parchment (from Pergamon).

\(^{19}\) Leroi-Gouhan (1943); Walsh (2014).
This brand-specific literature analysis needs to be underpinned by an understanding of how consumption fitted into the economy of the Roman world; and, more specifically, of the nature and social role of luxuries in Roman society. Inevitably, this dictates a focus on the élite, who could afford these luxuries. Similarly, because of the concentration of at least the surviving literature on writers who lived and worked in Rome, allied to the well-recognised economic and political dominance of the city of Rome within the Empire, the picture we can draw is bound to be essentially Rome-centred. We simply do not have enough evidence in our surviving literature to say very much about the character of consumer markets in provincial cities, let alone rural areas, though archaeology can fill some of the resulting void.

While the central focus of the analysis is on the Roman world of the period, I have aimed to use the insights of modern theory and experience of consumer culture to translate the data provided by the analysis into essentially modern terms. There is no reason to believe that human nature and its underlying psychology has changed radically over the last 2000 years, although modes of thinking, knowledge and ranges of experience have evolved as social and economic conditions have developed. *Mutatis mutandis,* we should be able to generalise about aspects of the way in which élite Romans approached the brands that they used in the light of modern understanding – so long as this is done with caution: today’s market analysts are reasonably adept at recognising and allowing for the differing attitudes and experiences of consumers in, say, California and Vietnam.

4. Ancient Sources

The thesis relies heavily on the extant literature from the period, primarily in Latin. While much of my analysis has relied on reading the literature, two key sources, the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (TLL) and the PHI *Latin Concordance* (PHI) have provided essential back-

---

20 Pompeii and Herculaneum represent an almost unique 'laboratory' for observing 'Roman' consumer life - but modern market research has long recognized the danger of drawing conclusions from a single, probably atypical, location.
In the Latin literature, Pliny the Elder’s *Natural History* is a key text, since he covers a vast range of subjects and includes many judgements as to the ‘best’ or the ‘top three’ sources – origins – of a variety of commodities. To a limited extent, similar judgements can be found in the agricultural textbooks written by Cato, Varro and Columella. Among other prose authors, Cicero, in particular in his Verrine orations and his letters, provides a range of useful material, and there are some interesting and relevant anecdotes in Suetonius. Other important prose sources include Seneca’s letters and the (later) works of Aulus Gellius and Macrobius.

Roman poetry is full of references that associate places of origin with particular commodities. More specifically, the satirists, Horace, Persius, Petronius, Martial and Juvenal, together with the surviving fragments of Lucilius and Varro, provide social commentary that often includes sharp critiques of commodities and their consumption. References in other poets are more scattered.

Contemporary Greek authors who provide useful material include Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, and Plutarch. Among later writers, there is useful material in Athenaeus and Galen, though much of Athenaeus consists of citations from Old and Middle Comedy, well before the period actually covered by this thesis.

In addition to literary sources, there is a substantial, and substantially under-analysed, range of epigraphic material that can provide evidence of branding and brand names; and which adds at least a degree of detail to our quite limited knowledge of the retail and wholesale distribution of consumer goods in the Roman world. Much of this can be found in the *Instrumentum Domesticum* sections of *CIL*.

---

21 The PHI Concordance can be accessed at [http://latin.packhum.org/concordance](http://latin.packhum.org/concordance)

22 Athenaeus serves to illustrate the way in which origin branding was as much a Greek as a Roman phenomenon.

23 *CIL* 6 (for Rome) and 15 (for *instrumentum domesticum*), and sections of other geographical volumes.
5. Modern Scholarship

A very wide range of modern scholarship has contributed to this thesis. This can be divided into two groups: sources concerned directly with ancient Rome; and the relevant modern theory of consumers, brands and brand communication. They fall into a number of categories, from which this summary selects the major sources used. The relevant volumes of CAH provide an invaluable summary of the historical background.

5.1.1 Analyses of Roman society

Friedlander (1913) provides the most detailed overview of Roman society, though this is, inevitably, dated. While no more recent author covers the ground so fully, there are important contributions from, especially, Laurence (2003), Wallace-Hadrill (2008) and Peachin (ed.) (2011).


Aspects of Roman élite consumption have attracted growing scholarly attention. The Roman discourse around luxury is still best served by Lintott (1972), and the related sumptuary legislation by Dari-Matiaucu & Plisecka (2010) and Zanda (2011). Wealth was most

24 CAH² vols IX-XI.
26 See also Duncan-Jones (1982); Silver (2007b).
27 On the latter, see also Slob (1986); Astin (1988); Dubois-Pelerin (2008).

In a study of communication among the Roman élite, the extent and range of literacy is important. Roman literacy is well covered by Harris (1989), Beard et al (eds.) (1991) and especially Johnson (2000, 2010); the reception of literature especially by Fantham (1996, 2013); and its circulation by Starr (1987). Word-of-mouth or gossip is perhaps the main form of communication, and is the subject of, particularly, Edwards (1993) and Hardie (2012).

5.1.2 The Roman Economy

The Roman economy has attracted a growing range of scholarship, in spite of the lack of real statistical data. Key general studies of the economy include The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World (CEH) and The Cambridge Companion to the Roman

28 See also Gowers (1993); Wilkins (2003).
29 And see Gazda (ed.) 1994; Mattusch (2005).
30 See also Laurence (1994); Greenwood (1998); Dufallo (2001).
Specific areas of the economy have been extensively analysed: banking and finance by Andreau (1999), Temin (2004), Howgego (1992) and Harris (2006); business structures and management by Aubert (1994) and Breoekaart (2012); and industry especially by Loane (1938) and Hawkins (2012). Retail and wholesale distribution have attracted little attention, before Holleran’s (2012) analysis, though aspects are covered by Kléberg (1957) and de Ligt (1993).

More generally, the development of consumer culture is the subject of a major article by Greene (2008), and other useful contributions here include Haug (2001), Hales & Hodos (eds.) (2010) and Walsh (2014). Finally, trade has been widely studied: in general, key contributions have been made by d’Arms (1980, 1981), Hopkins (1980) and, more recently, by Morley (2007, 2012) and Wilson (2009, 2011). Trade with the east, an important element in luxury imports, has seen intense study recently: work by Casson (1989), De Romanis & Tchernia (eds.) (1997), Parker (2002, 2008) and Seland (2010) stand out from a crowded field.

5.1.3 The Empire

The development of the Roman Empire and its nature, policies and administration are essential background to this thesis. From a vast literature, I have found particularly valuable discussions of the extent to which imperial policy involved and influenced trade. Here Woolf (1992), Sidebottom (2005), Speidel (2015) and Wilson (2015) are valuable. Another key focus is the relationship of Rome with its eastern neighbours, where Casson (1989), Millar

34 Also relevant here are Myres (1953), Rauh (1989), Ellis (2004), Walker (2004).

5.1.4 Individual Commodities

A growing range of monographs focus on individual products or commodities, chiefly from archaeological viewpoints. Among these I have found a number especially useful, either methodologically or simply as information.

*Amphorae*, as the main surviving ancient transport containers, have been widely studied. Modern commentaries start effectively with Calendar (1965). Other valuable contributions come from Paterson (1982); Will (1979, 1982, 1987), whose work on the Sestius amphorae is particularly useful; and, most recently, Williams (2010).

Among specific products, works by Fülle (1997) and Kiiskinen (2013) on *terra sigillata* are more consumer-oriented than most such monographs. The same applies to the studies of *garum* by Curtis (1984a, b, 1984-6, 1991) and Harris (1990b) on *Firmalampen*. In relation to the specific studies in this thesis, the growing body of work on ancient textiles depends greatly on Peter Wild (1970, 1984), and is updated and extended by Hildebrandt (2009) and Harlow & Nosch (eds) (2014). André Tchernia’s authoritative study of wine (1986/2016) dovetails with the amphora studies. Key works on ivory are those of Barnett (1948) and Krzyszowska (1990), which can be supplemented by Scullard’s definitive work on elephants.

5.1.5 Individual authors

Virtually all ancient writers have, by now, monographs by one or more authors, as well as editions with detailed commentaries. From the focus of this thesis, I have found a number

---

36 See also Etienne & Mayet (1998).
37 And see the papers in Fitton (ed.) (1992).
valuable, as they are more or less concerned with consumers and consumption and the ways in which society perceives these.

Susan Treggiari’s (1998, 1999) two papers on Cicero’s homes are joined by White (2010) on his connections as revealed by his letters. Horace as a drinker’s poet is discussed by Mackinlay (1946, 1947), Commager (1962) and Lill (2000). Petronius has attracted a growing literature, among which Veyne (1961) and Schmeling (1970) are representative. The elder Pliny’s encyclopedia has been approached in a wide variety of ways. Among these, I have found Healy (1999) and Wallace-Hadrill (1990) especially helpful. The letters of the younger Pliny are extensively analysed by Sherwin-White (1967), and commented on as an aspect of self-presentation by Henderson (2003).

Martial is studied for his view of Rome in Roman (2010), and as a source of understanding of Roman gossip in Greenwood (1998), within the wide-ranging collection of papers edited by Grewing (1998). The subject of his readership is addressed by Best (1969) and Larash (2004). Suetonius is subject of a detailed analysis by Wallace-Hadrill (1995). Finally, Athenaeus is the subject of a large edited volume by Braund & Wilkins (2000) and a valuable article by Jacob (2013).

5.1.6 Ancient brands

As noted, very few scholarly works are concerned with brands before the industrial revolution. Those that are are papers by Wengrow (2008) and Moore & Reid (2008), and Wengrow & Bevan’s (2010) edited collection, including an introduction by Wengrow and a paper by Bevan. Origin brands, though never directly described as such, are the focus of Dalby (2000b), and medieval brands are the subject of Richardson (2008).

38 Also Alexander & Danowski's (1990) rather limited network analysis on Cicero's letters; Stroup (2010) on Cicero's writings and their relationship with their dedicatees and Cicero's wider circle.
39 Also Paparazzo (2008).
5.2 Modern Sources on Brands and Branding

In addition, where relevant, modern analyses of consumers and brands have been used to suggest ways in which ancient branding may be compared with modern experience. In addition to my own experience as a brand strategist, researcher and consultant, which informs at least some of this thesis, these modern sources cover a range of aspects.

5.2.1 Anthropology and consumer culture

The basis of the study of consumer culture can be traced back to Marx, but in the modern era works by Douglas & Isherwood (1979), Bordieu (1984) and Appadurai (1986) have provided the theoretical groundwork for subsequent works by Belk (1988) and Gosden & Marshall (1999), while Arnould & Thompson (2005) is a valuable overview of consumer culture studies and approaches. A key to understanding brands in relation to consumers is semiotics, the subject of an overview by Ogilvie & Mizerski (2011).

5.2.2 Brands and branding

Both marketing academics and practitioners have produced a huge literature on brands and branding, and how brands develop. Among these, useful general work on brands includes books by Aaker (1991), Franzen & Bouwman (2001), Tybout & Calkins (eds) (2005), Dall’Olmo Riley (2009) and Earls & Bentley (2011). On brand communication, especially word-of-mouth, Katz & Lazarsfeld (1955) provided the original theoretical base, and more recent interpretations include Heath & Hyder (2005), Havli et al (2005), Ferguson (2008) and Fay & Thompson (2012). Brand diffusion theory is based on Rogers (1962), expanded

---

40 For the basis of semiotic theory see de Saussure (1961); Barthes (1964); Peirce & Welby (2001).
and refined by Bass (1969, 2004), with useful contributions by Earls & Bentley (2008) and Sharp (2010).\textsuperscript{41}

5.3.3 Conspicuous consumption, luxury and origin brands

Specifically in relation to this thesis, conspicuous consumption was first defined by Veblen (1899), and more recent contributions include those by Richins (1994), Charenroek & Thakor (2008) and Patsiaouras & Fitchett (2012).\textsuperscript{42} Luxury brands, as objects of conspicuous consumption, are an increasing focus of practitioner interest, but from a more theoretical point of view, Aiello \textit{et al} (2009) and Kapferer & Bastien (2009) are valuable. Origin brands, the key focus of this thesis, are the subject of papers by van der Lans \textit{et al} (2001), Thakor & Lavack (2003), Iversen & Hem (2008) and Pennington & Ball (2009).

5.3.4 Qualitative research

The methodology of the thesis’s use of surviving literature is essentially that of modern qualitative research, described from an academic perspective by Spiggle (1994), and a practitioner view by Ereaut (2002).

6. Structure of the Thesis

The thesis falls into two parts. The first three chapters examine the nature and role of brands and their place in Roman society and economy; and the role of brand communication in the development of these brands. This analysis is followed by four extended case studies of individual luxury brands, designed to illustrate in detail the practical workings of the theoretical material in chapters 1-3.

Chapter 1 examines the role of brands in the Roman world in the light of modern thinking on the nature of brands and branding. The first section of the chapter demonstrates the existence

\textsuperscript{41} The latter draws heavily on Ehrenberg's work, summarised in Ehrenberg \textit{et al} (1996).
\textsuperscript{42} Also Mason (2000); Trigg (2001).
of a wide range of producer brands in the Roman economy, and illustrates the extensive evidence from archaeology for these brands’ presence in the marketplace. I then go on to discuss how modern analysts look at brands, emphasizing the duality of the brand concept – the combination of brand identity, often referred to as, simply, ‘branding’, and brand reputation, which is the essential element in a brand’s success. Following this, I discuss the role of the consumer, in relation to brands, both modern and ancient, leading into an explanation of how brands are adopted by consumers, and how this might apply to a Roman luxury brand. Finally, I introduce and develop the concept of origin brands in the Roman world, and relate the phenomenon of the origin brand to the consumer context.

Chapter 2 examines the context in which Roman brands developed. The first section sets out a brief summary of the nature of the Roman economy. This is followed by a more detailed discussion of Roman élite society, placing the late Republican élite in their historical context, and demonstrating their significance in the economy. The élite were the primary consumers of luxury goods, and the next section examines the role of luxury in Roman society, the attempts made by first the censors and later the emperors to restrain luxury, and the critique of luxury put forward by Roman moralists. This leads into an analysis of the nature of luxury brands and an outline of their role in Roman trade and commerce. The last part of this chapter examines the potential role of literature in the communication of brand information, taking into account the extent of literacy, the circulation of works of literature, and the role of poets in the households of wealthy Romans as reflecting discourse about brands among their élite patrons.

Chapter 3 examines the nature of brand communication in the Roman world. For a brand to develop a reputation, some form of communication about it has to take place between its producers and its users. As is clear from chapter 1, in ancient Rome the primary form of communication about brands was word-of-mouth, and while there will, inevitably, have been sales pitches by merchants, auctioneers, etc, the main forum for these communications will have been represented by the many opportunities that a Roman’s day offered for, simply, gossip. These conversations can be analysed (hypothetically) in a structured way to reflect the entire process from the production of a commodity to its ultimate purchase and
consumption, leading to the formulation of a schematic model of the process. This can be worked through specific examples, and translated into a visual representation of the model.

The second half of the thesis consists of four extended case studies that narrate the history of selected luxury origin brands and how they achieved their success in the Roman élite marketplace. Each of the cases is designed to demonstrate the development of the reputation of the brand concerned, and to show the varied ways in which this reputation was achieved. The four cases – Corinthian bronze, ivory, silk and fine wines - represent different competitive marketplaces, and differing ways in which the brands concerned developed.
1. Brands and the Ancient Economy

Any examination of the role of brands in ancient Rome needs to be based in two key areas of understanding: a practical recognition of how the Roman economy actually worked; and a detailed analysis of brands and branding, and how the brand world can relate to the Roman world. It is easy to take the view that the Roman world and the modern consumerist ‘brandscape’ are so far apart that never the twain shall meet. As this thesis unfolds, it should become clear that, mutatis mutandis, the position of brands in the Roman world is quite similar to their modern situation. There are major differences in the context and environment in which they operate, but the similarities are evident, and it is possible to examine some Roman brands through the perspective of modern marketing theory.

Brands, such as Coca Cola, Ford, Chanel, Marks and Spencer, are a central feature of modern marketing and the lives of modern consumers. They are so much part of our mental furniture that it is tempting to try to apply brand-based thinking to social and economic analyses of other periods in world history. But any attempt to use brands and branding to understand aspects of the Roman world is inevitably complicated – though not totally undermined – by the very different nature both of the ancient economy and of ancient society, its workings and its attitudes from those of today. Nonetheless, it is a major premise of this thesis that by exploring the way in which some brands in the Roman world gained their reputation and developed (or lost) their strength, we can gather useful insights into the way in which communications about marketable products permeated and influenced at least a part of Roman society and the ways in which it used material objects. As will become clear, the typical modern brand, devised and actively promoted by an industrialist, hardly existed in the Roman world, though there are one or two exceptions: but there were plenty of manufacturers’ brands in existence. Moreover, there is no doubt that the way in which

---

43 Throughout this thesis, the focus will be primarily on the city of Rome and its immediate surroundings. This is the natural consequence of the metropolitan nature of the extant literature and the dominance of Rome itself in the historical record. While some at least of the narrative can be generalized to the rest of the empire, or at least to its major cities, the available evidence is too limited to enable this to be done systematically. See Kampen (1995), pp. 376-7.

44 ‘Brandscape’ seems to have been coined by John Sherry (1986).

45 For some key differences between the Roman economy and those of early modern Europe, see Scheidel & Friesen (2009), p. 64, and ch. 2.1, below.
Roman consumers approached a wide variety of products and commodities fits neatly into
the pattern of modern consumer-brand relationships.

In this thesis, I propose to examine the way in which certain Roman brands fit with modern
theories about branding, brands and their communication; and to use this analysis to shed
light on the development of material culture and the role of communications in that
development in the Roman world of the late republic and early empire, a period when
growing prosperity enabled and encouraged the growth of consumption on a substantial scale
- though this could not have approached that attained by early modern Western Europe.

1.1 Brands in Antiquity and Modern Historiography

Given the apparent absence of widely-promoted producers’ brands from ancient markets, it
is hardly surprising that historians have paid little attention to the idea of brands, qua brands,
in the ancient world. While archaeologists have been interested in exploring the diffusion of
the names found on anything from Attic decorative ceramics to everyday Roman	housewares and lead ingots, this process has taken place in what I would call a ‘brand desert’: the
significance of the names on these artefacts to the buyer or user (or, as we would say today,
consumer) has not, generally speaking, been considered in scholarly analysis, in spite of the
numerous examples of brand names (See plate 1.1 for some examples).

Understandably, given this lack of interest in brands, it is hard to find even the mention of
the word ‘brand’, except metaphorically or in the specific sense of branding slaves or
livestock, in articles or books about archaeology or ancient history, until very recently.

---

46 For a review of consumer-brand relationships, Fournier (1998) is fundamental: see especially
her table 1, p. 362.
47 Scheidel & Friesen (2009), p. 74, conclude that ‘Roman economic performance approached
the ceiling of what was feasible for ancient and medieval economies and their more recent
counterparts in the Third World but failed to anticipate even the early stages of the path toward
modern economic development.’
48 See, e.g. Boardman (1979) (Athenian pottery); Harris (1986) *Firmalampen*; Kiiiskinen (2013)
Plate 1.1
Producer brands

(Clockwise from top left)
1. Lead ingot
2. Sigillata
3. Firmalampen
4. Tile

[Details of sources of objects in illustrations are given, with credits, on pp. 333-6]
A wide-ranging search on JSTOR and similar sites produced only a single ancient-historical article before 1999 mentioning the word ‘brand’ in its market-related meaning, and only about 30 which use the term ‘trademark’ other than metaphorically – the majority of these referring to makers’ marks on ceramics of various kinds. Arguably, a further exception is Curtis (1984-6), where there is extensive discussion of the advertising tactics of Umbricius Scaurus and other producers of fish sauces, but the actual word ‘brand’ is not used. Searching for brand mentions in books is inevitably a more random process, but wide reading in likely publications has mainly drawn a blank. A notable exception is a single mention of brands, in a discussion of honey, in Loane (1938), but she misses numerous other opportunities to use the word.

In the same way, it is only relatively recently, for the most part, that scholars have interested themselves in the mechanics of consumer markets in the ancient world: how did physical distribution actually take place? Who were the wholesalers, brokers, retailers? Who actually bought from shops, markets, auctions – was it the principal, or one of his or her slaves or freedmen? What did ‘consumption’ mean in the ancient world? Again, a search of the literature produces a rather limited range and volume of discussion, with some notable high points – Bowen (1928), Loane (1938), Kléberg (1957), Curtis (1984b), Fülle (1997), Stern (1999), Ellis (2004), Pena & McCallum (2009), Holleran (2012), Kiiskinnen (2013), Walsh (2014).

50 Bennett (1953), p. 423, who uses ‘brand’ in close conjunction with ‘trademark’, of the seals on Mycenaean olive oil jars. But see n. 53, below.
51 Various ‘trade-mark’, trade-mark or trademark. Rodríguez-Almeida (1972); Will (1979, 1982); Anderson (1987); Fülle (1997); Gill (1998). Note that while it is easy to make the ‘brand’/‘trademark’ distinction in English, it is impossible in French, Italian, Spanish and German, where marque, marca, etc., carry both meanings, and it is only possible to decide which is meant through a close study of the context.
52 One of very few ancient historical articles to use the word ‘brand’ does so only in inverted commas, and does not define what is meant: Cartledge (2006). It is common to find articles describing trademarks with no mention of the concept of branding. A typical example is Grünbart (2006), p. 18, where a discussion of stamps on amphorae is followed immediately by a paragraph on branding irons used on horses, with no (overt) connection between the two being made. Mckinlay (1947) has an isolated early use of ‘brand’, referring to wine in Horace.
53 A keyword search of the Institute of Classical Studies library catalogue shows no instance of the word ‘brand’ in the sense required.
54 Loane (1938), p. 30 – contrast, for example, pp. 90-91, where she discusses Campanian silverware styles without using the word ‘brand’. The word is loosely used by Simon Loseby (2012), p. 338, to refer to African Red Slip wares (ARS), where ‘ARS’ is clearly an archaeologists’ brand name, not an ancient trademark.
However, while a number of studies analyse aspects of wholesale and retail distribution, there is remarkably little that focuses in any serious way on the ultimate buyer. There is enough anecdotal material scattered through classical literature to provide some relevant insights, but this does not seem to have been collected and analysed systematically, except within general overviews of Roman life. Arguably the best modern attempt to describe the Roman street scene, with at least some reference to the shopper, is by Dalby. Further, Greene has a good analysis of what it meant to become a consumer in the Roman world. A larger exception is the strand of anthropological analysis of consumer culture and commodification typified by Appadurai and Douglas & Isherwood, but these studies, again, are not concerned with brands and branding as such.

Marketing theorists typically regard brands as a construct of the industrial revolution, mass production, and the consequent mass marketing, beginning in earnest in the nineteenth century. In fact, if we step back from the modern brand-intensive marketplace, it is clear that brands preceded by far the growth of mass-production industries. While this has long been recognised in terms of, say, the last 500-600 years, the development of what Karl Moore calls ‘proto-brands’ in remote antiquity has only quite recently begun to be taken seriously, in articles by Moore, David Wengrow and others, and this interest has not been extended into the Graeco-Roman world. As a result, it is fair to say that the study and analysis of ancient brands is very much in its infancy, and the theoretical basis for it remains undeveloped.

As Moore points out, one of the first uses of writing was to list, classify and control commodities within a household (palace or temple) economy. Evidence for this can be found in the Indus valley, Mesopotamia, China, Egypt, and the archaic Aegean (Pylos, Crete, e.g.),

55 An interesting exception is Myres (1953), which is a re-working of a talk given as long ago as 1910, and provides a very modern-style overview of (mostly Greek) grocery markets – but does not mention the word ‘brand’.
56 E.g., Plaut. Cura 474ff.; Au. 280, 356, 374-5; Capt. 494, 846-62; etc.; Hor. Epist. 2.1.269ff.; Mart. 9.59; Juv. 6.153-7.
57 There is a certain amount in Carcopino (1940), pp. 175 ff., especially 178-183, but little in Friedländer (1913) (vol.1, pp. 147 ff., 314 ff.) and only sketchy information in Marquardt (1886), Balsdon (1969) or, more recently, in Toner (2009).
60 Appadurai (1986); Douglas & Isherwood (1979).
62 See, e.g., Maitte (2009) and n. 102 below. Cf. Sherry (2005), p. 44: ‘To a large extent, the brand has been the ritual substratum of consumer behaviour from time immemorial’.
to take the more obvious examples. We regularly find seals and labels attached to commodities, and clearly some of the information on these seals is concerned with what may be called brand identity: origin, specification and quantity. From this it is but a short step to the developing recognition by consumers (users, buyers) that one or other of the origins/brands so identified is in some sense better than the rest: a first, necessary step from mere brand identity, as exemplified by makers’ marks on tiles or terra sigillata, towards brand image.64

Both Moore and Wengrow are primarily talking about labels attached to volume production, where the idea of consistency or standardisation is immediately valid and readily recognisable. Indeed, Wengrow, following Fanselow, expresses the view that a ‘brand economy’ is in effect defined by volume, mass, standardised production. This seems, in the light of modern experience and practice, to be a rather limited and mechanistic view of branding. As Moore says (in passing), branding is, or can be, applied to people, countries, cities – a whole range of non-standardised ‘non-commodities’ - and there is a growing modern literature, both academic and practitioner, on how to develop brands of this kind.65 In other words, it is simply not true – or at least a considerable over-simplification, perhaps appropriate only to the Indian bazaars he is writing about - that, as Fanselow says, ‘Brands are therefore always associated with the pre-packaging and sealing of products’.66 The significance of this for the present thesis will become apparent when it is seen that of the four case histories that make up chapters 4-7, only one is concerned with a volume commodity of this type; but each of the other products can readily be recognised as, in a meaningful sense, a brand.

This ties in, again, with the importance of the role of consumers in the development of brand reputation and brand image. The in-built curiosity of people about the nature and origin of objects of consumption makes it inevitable that, faced with a new, unusual or striking object, questions are asked: what’s it called? Where does it come from? What’s it made of? Who made it? Out of these questions, brands begin to develop, even without any active effort by the original producer. Steps towards this can be seen in, for example, the labelling of wines found in Egyptian temple stores dating from the second millennium BC, where containers

64 From this it is a short further step to ‘advertising’. For a discussion of how this applied in the (pan-Mediterranean) market for garum, see Curtis (1984-6).
66 Moore (2003), p. 332; Anholt (2005); Ying (2006), e.g. This is noted as ‘post-modern’ in fig. 2 of Goodyear (1999), but the use of what we can recognize as brand imagery has applied to races, cities, countries from the birth of literature. Homer is full of it.
carried labels identifying region, estate, even the chief winemaker, as well as an indication of quality and the purpose for which the wine had been acquired.

There has been, then, an overall absence of debate and discussion about brands in an ancient-historical or archaeological context. David Wengrow’s analysis of the branding implications of seals from middle-eastern archaeological sites generated considerable interest in the wider world; but apart from the discussion in the issue of Current Anthropology that carried this original article, there appears to have been virtually no subsequent comment in the relevant academic literature, up until Wengrow’s book edited jointly with Andrew Bevan, which carries a good discursive overview of basically bronze age branding by Bevan. As already noted, archaeologists and ancient historians are happy to refer to some markings on artefacts and packaging as ‘trademarks’, and to pass on to other more pressing issues. ‘Trademarks’ are recognized as carrying information, though there is frequently dispute as to exactly what this information actually is. Bevan’s account has the great merit of recognizing that the information on bronze age sealings potentially carries brand imagery messages in addition: as he says, quoting Wengrow, seals are well-designed to play a dual role ‘as components of bureaucratic systems and as charismatic signifiers of product identity’. In the absence of appropriate contemporary literature, we cannot know for sure what inferences people who saw these seals drew from them, but many of the seals can certainly be read more as multidimensional signifiers than as mere statements of origin and standardization of quality or weight. This reflects an essential point made later in this chapter: that a brand needs more than a name to be a successful brand: it requires a reputation.

---

69 Wengrow (2010); cf. Wengrow (2008), Responses and Reply, pp. 21-27.  
70 Bevan (2010); Wengrow & Bevan (eds.) (2010). See Walsh (2014) for further discussion.  
71 See n. 52, above.  
72 See Callender (1965); Manacorda (1978). In particular, stamps on Italian amphorae seem to have generally been those of the maker of the amphora, rather than the producer or shipper of the contents. By contrast, the tituli picti from Monte Testaccio and other amphora dumps and from a variety of wrecked ships provide a good deal more information, though here again it is not entirely clear whether the names on the jars are those of the shipper or producer of the contents: see Rodriguez-Almeida (1972) and below. As with modern distributor brands, it is quite possible that the shipper’s name could be as valuable as a form of branding to the eventual buyer as that of the grower.  
As Wengrow and others have made clear, however, branding at its most basic is designed to provide information. Brand markings in the ancient world vary considerably in the extent to which they do this. At their simplest, they identify the maker of a product – in many cases merely the maker of a transport container. This may be done by a symbol, an abbreviated name, a full name or a longer statement of manufacture – ‘x made this’. Typically, this is what we find on a variety of ceramics, whether these are fine wares, coarse wares or transportation jars. The ‘x made this’ formula is mostly found on fine wares, though it does occur on coarser products. At the other end of the scale, transportation amphorae usually carry an abbreviated name and perhaps a symbol in addition stamped on the jar. Here, arguably the best-known examples are the Sestius amphorae, widely discussed since the discovery of the Grand Congloué shipwrecks (see plate 1.2).

The Sestius family, known especially from Cicero’s letters and his defence of Publius Sestius, had estates at Cosa in Tuscany, at which they clearly had a pottery-making operation (figlina) which produced large volumes of the type of amphorae known as Dressel 1, tablewares, tiles and bricks. There is little doubt that they also produced and sold wine, but amphorae marked with their stamps were certainly not used exclusively for their own wines. There are examples of stoppers on Sestius amphorae from the Grand Congloué wrecks carrying other names, notably that of T. Titius, who was a wine-maker or, more likely, a wine merchant. The Sestius operation seems to have produced amphorae both for their own wines and for those of the surrounding region. An intriguing question, from the trademark point of view, is the significance of the various symbols associated with the Sestius stamps. As Will points out, all unmutilated Sestius stamps include a pictogram or device, usually found after the abbreviated name Sestius. There are more than a dozen, including an anchor, trident, double axe, five-pointed star, etc. It is unclear what their significance is, though the most likely explanation seems to be that they are workmen’s

74 See n. 73, above.
75 E.g. Scottius fecit aretinum and Rutenos fec(it) aretinum on sigillata from Southern Gaul – see Kiiskinen (2013), p. 38.
76 It is reasonable to assume that at least some other goods – e.g. bales of cloth – carried perishable labels giving some relevant information.
77 See Moore & Reid (2008), pp. 427-8, and references there, for Athenian ceramics.
78 Benoit (1961). The literature is very extensive. See Will (1979), and references there, for what is still the most definitive analysis. Cf. Manacorda (1978); Long (1987); Will (1987).
79 E.g., Cic. Fam. 5.6, 13.8; Att. 13.2; 15.27; 16.4; Sest., espec. 3.6.
80 See Aubert (1994), p. 249 and references there.
1. Some of the different Sestius stamps

2. For an actual example, from the Grand Conglé wreck, see:


Plate 1.2 The Sestius Stamps
marks. As Jeremy Paterson has said, it is the simplest and most probable hypothesis that amphora stamps in general represent the owners of the *figlina* which made the amphorae and/or the slaves or freedmen who worked for them. As he points out, however, many amphorae carry no stamps at all.\textsuperscript{83}

As Paterson argues, based on evidence primarily from Cato’s *de Agricultura* and the jurists collected in the *Digest*,\textsuperscript{84} it seems that a common way in which wine was sold by the grower was direct to a wine merchant or *negotiator*, and the latter seems to have been expected to provide the amphorae into which the wine was drawn off from the *dolia* in which it had been made.\textsuperscript{85} While the amphorae might, in practice, come from the *figlina* on the estate of the wine producer and carry his stamp, any further labeling of the wine would be the responsibility of the *negotiator*. This would usually take the form of the painted-on details – *tituli picti* – which are found on amphorae used for wines, oil and fish products such as *garum*.

It is clear that the *tituli picti* on transport and retail amphorae could and presumably did perform a role similar to that of the seals found in middle-eastern archaeological sites and used as the basis for David Wengrow’s discussion of ancient branding.\textsuperscript{86} It is evident, however, from the literature surrounding amphorae and their *tituli* that modern historians have not been over-concerned with the idea of *tituli* as carrying brand names and, therefore, being part of a branding process.\textsuperscript{87} It seems to be generally accepted, for example, that the *tria nomina* characteristic of the elaborate *tituli* on Spanish oil amphorae embodied the name of the shipper or merchant, rather than the producer, and it is assumed – rightly or wrongly – that the function of these markings is purely administrative.\textsuperscript{88} Similarly, the *pozzolana*

\begin{footnotes}
\item[84] Paterson (1982), pp.154-6 and n. 64, with references. See also the catalogue of amphorae in Will (1987) and discussion there.
\item[85] Cato Ag. 146, 147, 148; Dig.8.3.6, 18.1.34.5, 19.1.6.4, etc.; cf. Plin. Ep.8.2.
\item[86] Sometimes, the wine would actually be made by the *negotiator* on the grower’s facilities. For more detailed discussion, see ch. 7.6.
\item[87] Wengrow (2008, 2010).
\item[88] Though, for example, Will (1979, 1982) refers to stamps on amphorae as ‘trademarks’; see below.
\item[89] See Zevi (1966); Curtis (1991), pp. 197-200; Rodriguez-Almeida (1972); Berdowski (2008). Given the widespread modern use of retailers’ and wholesalers’ own branding, this may be an
\end{footnotes}
stoppers common on wine amphorae carried limited inscribed information at best, and it is not entirely clear that any of the various ‘labels’ found on wine amphorae actually refer to the producer of the wine, on any regular basis, although a number of scholars do make this assumption (for this, see ch. 7, p. 234-5). Nonetheless, there was certainly at least an awareness among wine producers that their reputation mattered. We find this as early as the second century BC in Cato’s De Agricultura, where he twice emphasizes reputation in connection with wine.

In practice, tituli picti, or alternatively labels tied to the necks of the amphorae (pittacia), might provide a variety of information: for wines, the consular date both of the vintage and the ‘bottling’ of the wine, its region of origin and, possibly, the name of the producer. By contrast, garum containers routinely carried product descriptions that look quite like advertising puffery – gari flos, liquamen optimum, gar(um) prae(cellens), etc. They also identified the producer/marketer with phrases such as ex officina Scauri, and sometimes the region of origin - gar(um) Pompeian(um), hal(lex) Herc(u)lan(ensis), g(aram)... Antip(olitanum). As Richard Curtis observed in his study of the activity of Aulus Umbricius Scaurus, ‘modern labels hardly provide more information’. His view can be amplified by noting that the urcei in which garum seems to have been widely available at Pompeii are relatively small: the Pompeian favourite is the Schöne 6 type, which was almost certainly, from its size and capacity, a retail package (See plate 1.3). This is, I would suggest, one of the few opportunities offered by Roman packaging to talk to the ultimate

over-simplistic view. In addition, at least some tituli picti seem to have indicated re-use of a container, often for a different product from the original contents: see Peña (2007), pp. 61-62. See Manacorda (1978), p. 126; Paterson (1982), p. 157; Hesnard & Gianfrrotta (1989), espec. p. 400.

90 See, eg, Jashemski (1967); Berdowski (2008), pp. 261, 263; Williams (2010), p. 337.
91 Cato Ag. 3.2, 3.25.1, especially the latter: Quom vinum coctum erit et quom legetur, facito uti servetur familiae primum suisque, factoque studeas bene percoctum siccumque legere, ne vinum nomen perdat. For more extended discussion, see ch. 7.
92 For pittacia, see Petr. Sat. 34.6.
93 For Curtis (1984-6). CIL 4.5663 (gari flos); CIL 4. 5714 (liquamen optimum); CIL 4.10735 (garum prae cellens). For a complete list of these descriptions, see the appendix to Curtis, l.c.
94 For a variety of such identifications, see Curtis, (1984-6), pp. 224-226.
97 Of some 200 examples of Pompeian garum containers, 155 are urcei, and Scaurus’ identification was almost exclusively on these smaller jars. See Etienne & Mayet (1998), p. 202; Pena (2007), pp. 86-88.
A number of illustrations of these mosaics may be found at:

http://www.pompeiiinpictures.com/pompeiiinpictures/r7/7%2016%2015.htm

a section of this site devoted to A Umbricius Scurus’s dwelling.

Plate 1.3 Mosaics from the house of A. Umbricius Scaurus - advertisements for himself. These mosaics show typical Pompeian *urcei* with the type of inscription represented by the *tituli picti* on Scaurus’s retail pots.
consumer. These differentiate these *garum* retail *tituli* functionally from the labelling on Spanish oil jars, which were essentially wholesale packaging with no need to speak to the ultimate consumer, but every need for administrative clarity; and from the *tituli* on larger transport amphorae containing imported *garum*, which carried similar details.

It is clear, then, that many Roman commodities carried a form of brand identifier, even when this was not specifically designed to inform the ultimate consumer or user of the product. What is lacking from the analysis of artefacts is any evidence as to the consumer’s reaction to, or appreciation of, brands in the ancient world. It is this lack that can be at least partially filled by the consideration of origin brands, discussed in section 1.5, below.

1.2 The Nature and Role of Brands in the Modern World

To understand better the nature of Roman brands, it is necessary to see how brands have evolved in the modern world. It was not until the latter half of the twentieth century that both academics and marketing practitioners began to develop relatively complex theories about the nature of brands and branding and about how brands and their consumers interacted.\textsuperscript{99} Brands themselves are, however, much older than this.\textsuperscript{100}

Branding, it is assumed, developed as a means of distinguishing and differentiating the products of manufacturers, both as a form of identification and as a guarantee of (standardised) quality; and then, with the aid of advertising and other marketing communication techniques (brand identity, packaging, public relations, etc.), as a means of creating consumer needs, preferences and loyalties, thus ensuring regular repurchase and sustained market share in a competitive marketplace.\textsuperscript{101} As such, a key element in the

\textsuperscript{99} Etienne & Mayet (1998).
\textsuperscript{100} It is generally accepted that the earliest academic paper to address the issue at all is Gardner & Levy (1955) – see Dall’Olmo Riley (2009); but see also Hotchkiss & Franken (1923), Introduction.
\textsuperscript{101} The earliest surviving brand symbol or logo in Britain, the Bass ‘triangle’, dates from the early 18\textsuperscript{th} century. A Polish salt brand, Wielickza, claims to date from 1044, and two German breweries are virtually as old. Brands, in general, are much older still (see above).
\textsuperscript{102} See Dall’Olmo Riley (2009).
branding process is often considered to be the availability of mass media advertising, used by advertisers to launch their brands and then to ‘add value’ or to create ‘brand personality’. Inherent in this view is the notion that branding is, on the whole, something done to consumers by marketers: a process described as ‘product push’, in contrast to consumer-generated ‘demand pull’, with the underlying assumption that advertisers are able to manipulate consumers. This is implicit in the American Marketing Association’s definition of a brand: a brand is a name, term, design, symbol, or any other feature that identifies one seller’s good or service as distinct from those of other sellers.

As Francesca Dall’Olmo Riley has pointed out, however, while this is the AMA definition most often quoted, a subsequent formulation also available on the AMA website is more up-to-date and relevant:

a brand is a customer experience represented by a collection of images and ideas; often it refers to a symbol such as a name, logo, slogan and design scheme. Brand recognition and other reactions are created by the accumulation of experiences with the specific product or service, both directly relating to its use, and through the influence of advertising, design and media commentary.

---

103 It is usually assumed by commentators that advertising ‘creates’ demand for a product or category. The evidence for this is, in reality, extremely slender (see Broadbent et al (1998) for a detailed appraisal): what advertising does, primarily, is to influence brand preferences within a product category, and it does this in a quite low-key manner. See Ehrenberg et al (1996) for a brief summary of the most extensive research-based expression of this view, and now Sharp (2010), pp.134ff. Contra, Jones (1990; 2002, especially ch. 2), who believes that advertising can have, and should expect to have, a strong influence at the individual brand level.

104 A view first set out in popular terms by Packard (1957), and reflected vigorously some 45 years later by Klein (1999). The push v. pull distinction can be traced back as a concept at least to Theodore Levitt’s (1960) seminal paper, though it became articulated in these terms rather later: a good example can be found in Goodyear (1999).


106 There appears to be no legal definition of a brand, as such, on either side of the Atlantic. As Pickering (1998) says, ‘although the relationship between a trade mark and a brand lacks a legal definition, trade marks provide the principal legal foundation for brands.’ The 1946 US Lanham Act’s definition of a trademark is close to the first AMA definition of a brand: see Cohen (1986), p. 62.

As the latter definition indicates, a brand needs more than just the identity described in the first AMA definition. As a minimum, it requires two essential elements in order to be considered more than just a run-of-the-mill product: both a name, and a reputation – in the jargon, a brand image. In the modern world, too, brands have a wide range of additional communications and communication devices: a logotype or symbol, which may be simply a specialised typeface and colour scheme for the brand name, such as Marks and Spencer, or a symbolic device, such as the Nike ‘swoosh’; specialised packaging design and corporate colour schemes; advertising campaigns in a range of media; public relations programmes, websites, promotional campaigns, sponsorship, mobile phone ‘app’ (ication)s’, and so on. In the ancient world, a brand had to survive on the basics - its name and reputation, with at best very limited help from any other element of brand presentation. How its reputation might be achieved is a key focus of this thesis.

Relatively recently, it has been formally recognised that to be successful, brands have somehow to enter the minds of consumers – and from this it has been a short step to acknowledging that a successful brand, qua brand, exists primarily in the mind of the consumer: it is, in effect, a form of mental construct. What this means, in practice, is that the way in which consumers use brands is chiefly as a means of simplifying choices: over time, people buying within a given market develop a repertoire of brands that they have come to know, and this knowledge provides a useful shortcut to facilitate their purchasing choices. A chosen brand may be regarded as ‘the best’, or merely ‘the one I usually buy’, or, even, simply ‘one that I have heard of’. In fact, the basis of brand choice is often mere familiarity, and is likely to be emotional, depending on reputation, rather than the result of detailed, rational consideration. Indeed, decisions between brands are often made on the basis of simple heuristics – mental shortcuts. With the aid of analytical approaches such as

---

108 This is the most usual all-purpose term. Brands may also have ‘personality’, ‘character’, ‘essence’, ‘equity’, etc. The metaphorical resources of analysts and practitioners are extensive, but the underlying concepts are essentially the same (see Sherry (2005)). Goodyear (1999), fig.2, sets out the key distinctions between brand as naming and brand reputation. For the dualism inherent in brands, see (e.g.) Gardner & Levy (1955), p.34; Aaker (1991), p.7 (both quoted in Moore (2003), pp. 337-339).
110 See Bressette (2009); Heath & Hyder (2005) and references there. Kahneman (2011) sums up the distinction.
Semiotics, however, brands – especially successful brands - can be seen to be endowed with a rich texture of associations and meanings which are largely shared across the relevant public, and which influence consumer preferences. The richer this mixture, the stronger, generally, the brand.

Semiotics, of which there are two main ‘schools’, is the formal analysis of the meaning and significance of signs (words, pictures, symbols, etc) within a given cultural context. This enables the analyst to extract the meanings that various texts (of whatever kind) carry for that culture, and, where the data are available, to track changes in these meanings over time. In modern marketing research, this is a valuable interpretative adjunct to traditional market research techniques, and is also used to develop hypotheses before research is conducted. A brand’s semiotics are clearly of great importance when a buyer is faced by a new brand for the first time, but are also important as a contributor to the way in which a brand user may use the brand in the construction of his or her own identity.

The idea that brands can be used to construct personal identity and/or enhance self-image has been extensively discussed in the academic marketing literature, and is reflected in practitioners’ expressed desire to see consumers ‘living the brand’. The concept of self-image and its presentation derives ultimately from psychoanalytic thinking, and was analysed fully by Erving Goffmann. The performative emphasis found in Goffmann ties in

\[ \text{113 This shows Bevan's 'charismatic signifiers' at work (pp. 14, 34, above). Strength of associations is closely correlated with familiarity – a key thrust of Ehrenberg's (1996) analysis.} \]
\[ \text{114 The French, based on the work of the Swiss Fernand de Saussure (1916); and the American, derived from the voluminous writings of Charles Peirce (see especially Peirce (1977)). See Barthes (1964); Derrida (1974, ch. 2); Moore (2003); Manning (2010); Martin (2008), pp. 325-328.} \]
\[ \text{115 For an up-to-date example, see Ogilvie & Mizerski (2011), who have a wide-ranging set of references and background information; and for a succinct summary of the use of semiotics in market research see White, R. (2005). See also Crosswaite (2006); Lawes (2002), for clarity among a vast practitioner and academic literature.} \]
\[ \text{116 Belk (1988); Aaker (1997); Elliott & Wattanasuwan (1998); Fournier (1998); Berthon et al (2011), p. 188; Chaplin & John (2005).} \]
\[ \text{117 Goffmann (1959).} \]
well with aspects of élite Roman self-presentation.\textsuperscript{118} As David Mattingly has observed, artefacts can and do act as communicators and definers of social position.\textsuperscript{119}

Marketing thinking in the mid-to-late twentieth century often assumed that advertising was the primary means whereby a mental image of the brand was created, but the rise of digital media and the new thinking that has been built up around them in the last 15 years or so have led to the recognition that much brand communication is, in practice, between individuals: people talk to each other about brands.\textsuperscript{118} A key element in the evidence for this is that whenever market researchers set out to examine the apparent (acknowledged or reported) influences on brand choice among consumers, it becomes clear that the most trusted, and relied upon, source of information about brands is typically stated to be a consumer’s friends and acquaintances – or, indeed, other consumers generally, since online product reviews by people with whom the consumer is not acquainted are also given high credibility.\textsuperscript{118} In other words, mass media, and mass media advertising, are not essential for the development of brand identity and brand preferences, though of course they can have a key role in accelerating the process \textsuperscript{118} and it has to be recognised that respondents to market research surveys do not willingly acknowledge being influenced by advertising (or, perhaps, realise that they are so influenced).\textsuperscript{118}

It is, in fact, hardly surprising that personal communications should have such a key role in the development of a brand’s reputation. This must, after all, have been how brands developed their currency in the days before media advertising began to reach a wide

\textsuperscript{118} d’Arms (1999); Bartsch (1994). See pp. 82-3, below.
\textsuperscript{120} See Ferguson (2008); Liu (2006); Levy & Gvili (2015). Peres et al (2010), in an analysis of new product and brand diffusion processes, devote their entire paper to discussing, primarily, word-of-mouth (WOM) considerations. Keller & Fay (2009) adduce evidence, however, that a substantial proportion of WOM is influenced by advertising: cf. Fay and Thomson (2012). Findings about the influence of WOM are hardly new. The website of the Word of Mouth Marketing Association (WOMMA) carries a growing range of material on the subject–\url{http://womma.org}, accessed 05/11/2014. A recent presentation available on this website cites research on the subject going back at least to 1957 (Moore & Church (2014)), but it is worth noting that WOMMA itself was only set up in 2002.
\textsuperscript{121} Prendergast et al (2010); Taylor (2003).
\textsuperscript{122} A view rarely acknowledged, let alone accepted, by advertising’s more vocal critics.
\textsuperscript{123} See, e.g. Keller & Fay (2009); Keller & Libai (2009); Desor & Ellis (2012). The latter note this as being a consumer attitude, not necessarily a true report.
audience, and it is almost certainly the case for most origin brands (see section 1.5, below, and ch. 3, pp. 103-7), even today. Even when media advertising had extended to include TV, it was still not unusual for customers to ask the advice of the retailer before buying a new brand. Now that so much ofretailing in the industrial world is self-service, shoppers may ask complete strangers for advice on the choice of brand in the aisles of a supermarket (or, increasingly, ring a friend for advice on a mobile phone); similarly, consumer reviews are a key element in all kinds of online retailing, the most modern and technologically-advanced form of retail distribution.

1.3 Brands and Consumers: Modern and Ancient

Modern consumerism is to a substantial extent centred around brands. We buy brands rather than products, and use brands to help to create our personal identity, as we have seen, at least in terms of the face we show to the world. Much modern (or, indeed, post-modern) brand promotion is designed to help potential buyers recognise themselves as a Nike or Mastercard or Levis – for example - sort of person. While this is essentially a very modern development, consequent upon the economic prosperity of the postwar era, it can recognisably be related back to the psychology underlying Veblen’s theory of conspicuous consumption. Clearly, there is far more to personal identity than the brands someone buys or wears (something brand marketers and theorists are inclined to forget), but brands are recognisably one means of making a statement about the kind of person you are.

While the Roman Empire was not, overall, a consumption-focused society in the way modern industrial economies have become, there was an active market for luxuries among the élite, and it is clear that this was subject to many of the influences of fashion and inter-

125 Sutton (1964), who pointed out that by then – some 10 years after the introduction of commercial TV in the UK - this was becoming rarer.
126 Okazaki (2009), e.g.
127 See Robson et al (2013), and references there. Trip Advisor (www.tripadvisor.com) is a classic example, as are the customer reviews of books on www.amazon.com. There are numerous other examples.
128 Sherry (2005), pp. 43-47, and n. 114, above.
131 It is open to question who is saying what to whom when a wearer of an Abercrombie and Fitch polo meets a wearer of an Applecrumble and Fish t-shirt.
personal communication that exemplify modern consumerism.\textsuperscript{132} Understanding how these influences worked in the Roman world can shed light on modern views of how brand messages are communicated informally among consumers, while providing new insights into some of the interactions within Roman society and the ways in which the material culture of the Roman world developed.\textsuperscript{133} As will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter, the competitive nature of the Roman élite, and the close inter-connectedness of Roman society offered ample opportunities for the rapid adoption, and imitation, of new luxuries. This could, and did, spread through the élite in what looks almost like an orderly sequence: for example, Pliny’s account of the development of awnings to shade the theatre:

In more recent times linens alone have been employed for the purpose of affording shade in our theatres, Q. Catulus having been the first who applied them to this use, on the occasion of the dedication by him of the Capitol. At a later period, Lentulus Spinther, it is said, was the first to spread awnings of fine linen over the theatre, at the celebration of the Games in honour of Apollo. After this, Cæsar, when Dictator, covered with a linen awning the whole of the Roman Forum, as well as the Sacred Way, from his own house as far as the ascent to the Capitol, a sight, it is said, more wonderful even than the show of gladiators which he then exhibited. (Plin. \textit{NH}. 19.26, tr. Ramsey)

The Romans themselves, as we shall see (ch. 2, section 3), tended to refer the growth of (luxury) consumption to outside influences associated in particular with the conquest of the eastern Mediterranean. Diodorus Siculus has a great rant against the corruption of the young by the fruits of conquest; and, at a much simpler level, he describes a similar effect on Hannibal’s troops of a spell in Campania.\textsuperscript{134} Katherine Welch has argued that the rise of luxury was heavily influenced by the development of a booty mentality among Roman generals and their troops, starting effectively with Marcellus’s conquest of Syracuse in 211

\textsuperscript{132} See Greene (2008) and Walsh (2014) for the development of consumption and – even – consumerism in the Graeco-Roman world. Cf. Witt (2001), for a more general analysis. Pliny’s discussion of pearls in \textit{NH}. 9.106-123 provides an illuminating account of how one luxury category not only permeated Roman high society, but eventually trickled down to distinctly lower levels. Cf. \textit{NH}. 33.139, on fashions in silver plate.

\textsuperscript{133} For discussion of the ‘material turn’ in archaeological thinking, see Versluys (2014) and the responses to that article.

\textsuperscript{134} Diod.Sic. 37.3-6 (Roman youth); 26.11 (Hannibal); cf. Livy 23.18; Val Max 9.1 ext.1.
BC, though it is clear, as Eric Gruen has pointed out, that artistic and luxurious booty was coming into Rome from conquest much earlier than this.\textsuperscript{135}

The analytical approach of this thesis is based firmly in the modern perception (already noted) of brands as mental constructs in the minds of consumers; and of brand communications as being to a large extent mediated by consumers themselves, rather than being the exclusive subject of manipulation by the brand owners.\textsuperscript{136} The logical consequence of this, of course, is that a product or commodity can become recognisably a brand in the eyes of consumers as a result of their own usage, and without any very active intention on the part of the producer.\textsuperscript{137} To be sure, the majority of modern brands are created and actively promoted by their marketers, as the original AMA definition quoted above makes clear; but this tends not to be true of long-established origin brands, nor of more abstract ‘brands’ such as those of cities, regions and countries: indeed, it is only in the last twenty years or so that the latter have become an active focus for promotion (or study) on any scale.\textsuperscript{138}

1.4 Theories of Brand Adoption and Diffusion

The adoption and diffusion of brands has been the subject of study by marketers and academics for many years. The basic modern theoretical model of how new ideas percolate through a population (either society at large or a relevant subset of it) is derived from Everett Rogers, whose \textit{Diffusion of Innovations} (1962), based substantially on earlier research among farmers by Ryan and Gross (1943), remains the key text describing how the process occurs.\textsuperscript{139} Rogers postulates the development of the acceptance of new ideas broadly following the statistical normal curve: a small group of ‘innovators’ adopts an idea, a brand


\textsuperscript{136} Barnham (2012); Christodoulides & de Chernatony (2010); Bressette (2009); du Plessis (2005); Franzen & Bouwman (2003); Fournier (1998), etc.

\textsuperscript{137} See, e.g., Arndt (1967).

\textsuperscript{138} See Krebs (2012); Gertner (2011); Johnson (2011); Anholt (2001, 2005, 2009); Olins (2004).

\textsuperscript{139} For more recent and extensive analysis see Bass (1969, 2004), with references in the latter paper, and the review by Peres \textit{et al} (2010).
or a product; here, we are talking of only perhaps 2-3% of the relevant population. These are followed by a somewhat larger group of ‘early adopters’. By this time the idea may have been accepted by perhaps 15-20% of the population. Successful innovations then get accepted by the much larger ‘early majority’, which takes penetration up over 50%, to be followed over time by the ‘late majority’ and, perhaps, even the ‘laggards’. Unsuccessful ideas fail to penetrate enough of either the innovator or the early adopter group, and fizzle out. Or, alternatively, as Oded Shenkar has argued, they get overtaken by better-designed or cheaper innovators who have built successfully on the original idea – much as, as is shown in chapter 6, Coan wild silk (Coae vestes) was superseded in the market by Chinese cultivated silk (serica), which offered superior performance; and the Coan brand probably, also, was eventually replaced by cheaper and more abundant wild silks (bombycina) from other sources.

A corollary of the diffusion model is the idea of the ‘opinion leader’. This concept is derived from the work of Paul Lazarsfeld and Elihu Katz, whose two-step model of communication postulated the idea that new ideas, or new products, were fostered by a small group of ‘leaders’ who were well-connected, knowledgeable and authoritative within their social milieu. More recently marketing practitioners have attempted to develop this general concept, with Ed Keller’s theory of so-called ‘influentials’. This theory is based on market research findings that around 10% of the (American) population appear to be key influencers on the consumption (and voting) behaviour of the other 90%. Both versions of the theory suffer from the criticism that it is highly unlikely that the same group will be credible role models, and hence influencers or leaders, in every field. Further, as Duncan Watts has demonstrated, the presence of influentials is not essential to the diffusion of new ideas. Mark Earls has taken this further by emphasising the importance of imitation in human behaviour. The shape of the diffusion curve for innovations, however, as Watts points out,
is common to all current models of the process, regardless of whether they involve influentials or opinion leaders, or not."

If we apply Rogers’s model to the luxury markets of Rome, it would clearly require no more than about a dozen prominent senators to start a trend among the small senatorial class (only 600 families, under the Augustan settlement)." With the help of comments from their patronage networks, including – possibly – a good poet or two, the recognition of a new brand could rapidly become widespread within the senatorial class. Thence, it would quickly overlap into other wealthy groups - the equestrians and, especially, well-off freedmen, who seem to have been inveterate imitators of their social betters, if Petronius’s parodic Trimalchio has anything more than purely comic value.« We can see the process of the diffusion of valued brands among the élite at work through the writings of members of the actual élite themselves, where these survive. There are clues (at least) in Cicero’s letters, as in those of the younger Pliny more than a century later; and Petronius remains a classic source book for ostentatious living, through the admittedly preposterous figure of Trimalchio.« We can admire, too, the inherent hypocrisy in the attitudes expressed by the exceedingly wealthy younger Seneca, whose philosophy seems often to be at odds with his lifestyle – however much the latter may have been exaggerated by hostile commentators.»

Exactly what market penetration any given luxury might have achieved at a given time is hard to establish. One possible indicator is the passing (or proposing) of sumptuary laws.» By the time a product or practice was being castigated by the sterner moralists in the senate, it would probably be well on the way to becoming firmly established. Indeed, the history of

146 See Talbert (1984), pp. 131-134.
148 It is reasonable to assume that Petronius, in his role as arbiter elegantiae, would himself have filled a real-life role perhaps similar to that of today’s editors of Vogue, Wallpaper or GQ. See (e.g.) Cic. Att 1.9 (marble Hermae); 2.1 (Corinthian bronze); 4.10 Laconicum; Plin. NH 33.139 (fashions in silver plate); Plin Ep. 1.15 (shopping for fine foods); 2.6 (fine wines); 2.17 (Laurentian villa); 3.6 (Corinthian bronze); 4.7 (Regulus’s activities); 5.6 (Tuscan villa).
149 As a specific example, we find Seneca, who reputedly owned ‘500’ ivory-legged and presumably citronwood tables (Dio C. 61.10.3), saying that he thinks little of the more decorative citronwood effects – De Tranq. An. 1.7.
150 Gellius, N.A. ii. 24, and Macrobius, Sat. iii. 17. Sumptuary laws are discussed in more detail in the following chapter (pp. 75-6).
the (non-) observance of sumptuary laws under both the republic and the early principate strongly suggests that their main purpose was more to limit the spread of new luxury ideas beyond the senatorial class itself, by signalling deterrence to the lower echelons of society, than to stamp the luxuries out altogether. This was merely the élite retaining its privileges for itself."

1.5 Origin Branding

Where producers are making little or no effort to brand their products, in the sense of building a positive reputation for them, there is little to guide a buyer in making a choice in the marketplace. Certainly, for familiar fresh fruit or vegetables, a consumer can usually rely on the feel, smell and appearance of the product – though even here it may be useful to know which particular variety is being offered. But for more complex or unfamiliar articles, the buyer is very much in the hands of what the seller chooses to communicate. There is a lack of information on which to base a decision to buy.\footnote{152} In the Graeco-Roman world, markets were relatively under-developed, and the vast majority of people bought only basic household articles and textiles, and such food as they had not grown for themselves. The small but wealthy élite, by contrast, had the resources and the knowledge to buy a far wider range of goods, and the opportunity to use consumption to present a self-image of power and wealth to the outside world.\footnote{153} This gave rise over time to what Andrew Dalby (to whom this section owes a considerable debt) has called a ‘geography of luxury’: geographical adjectives were used to create impressionistic images of the experience of using a particular commodity from a particular town or region or country.\footnote{154} These geographical adjectives exemplify the origin brands of the Roman world.

Origin branding, or place branding, as one or two modern analysts have called it, arises when consumers of a commodity feel the need to establish a basis for discrimination between

\footnote{152} See Richardson (2008), p. 1. Richardson’s analysis of branding in the medieval economy shows some clear similarities with ancient Rome.
\footnote{153} See ch.2, especially pp. 74, 82.
different sources of the commodity. Origin brands are brands that link specific commodities to their place of origin: Champagne, Cheddar cheese, Blue Mountain coffee, Egyptian cotton, Toledo steel, to illustrate from modern equivalents. These brands are often ‘created’ by consumers themselves: there is an almost inevitable interest in where a high-quality product comes from, so that further supplies from the same source can be sought out in future. The consumer’s interest is to eliminate uncertainty, to be as sure as is possible of obtaining an authentic product of reliable good quality (or better). This, Pennington & Ball argue, presupposes a marketplace where a range of sources is available, and the quality of product is, or is seen as, variable. In the ancient world, I would suggest, this picture is not so clear-cut. There are, certainly, at least a few origin brands that are genuinely *sui generis*: unique products that are specifically and regularly associated with their place of origin. *Serica*, silk produced by the Seres of China and, arguably, Tyrian purple are obvious examples. (The latter, of course, did compete, eventually, with other purple dyes and was, also, produced elsewhere in factories established by Phoenicians from Tyre, but its original fame was unique).

The principles of attribution and classification that characterise early branding (above, pp. 33-35) underpin origin branding: the designation of varieties of a commodity by a specific geographical origin, which may, in time, become protected by some such system as the French *appellation contrôlée* for wines or, more widely, the EU’s PDO/PGI/TSG scheme for agricultural products. Many of these (modern) origin designations are very long-established, some indeed Roman in origin: in textiles, for example, damask (from Damascus) and denim (Nimes); a host of cheeses; honey from Hymettus, which was famous in classical times and still has its own cachet today; currants (from Corinth) and damsons (originally also from Damascus); and so on. In the same way, even the Romans were happy to talk in this
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156 Pennington & Ball (2009), p.458.
157 For *Serica*, see ch. 6, below. Tyre: Jensen (1963); Reese (2010); Marzano (2013), pp. 145-160.
159 They have often, like most of these examples, lost their geographic connotation and become generic: this is true even of some cheeses, like Cheddar, where the producers have failed to take steps to protect the name. Examples of Roman origin brands still current include cherries, damsons, quinces; pheasants; indigo; fenugreek; topaz; Bactrian camels; larch; copper; Parian marble; magnets; asphalt; parchment; silk.
way about non-material ‘brands’, for example, *Atellanae fabulae* (Atellan farce, from Atella in Campania), parodied by Cicero as *Osci ludi* (Oscan jokes) with reference to local politics in Campanian Pompeii; or ‘Samnite’ and ‘Thracian’ gladiators."

In the literature, especially the poetry, of the late Roman Republic and early Empire we regularly find that when a town or region is mentioned, it is accompanied by a comment to the effect that it is well-known, or famous, for some commodity or other. Similarly, where a commodity is mentioned, it may well be associated with a particular town, region or country of origin. Andrew Dalby has collected a large number of these references, primarily for Italy, but also more widely across the Roman Empire as a whole and its trading partners. This use of product attributions is, it could be argued, a development of the practice established in early epic poetry of using conventional epithets as – almost – punctuation; but the way in which these associations are used does not have the same metronomic consistency that we find in Homer: this is not simply the use of the geographically-descriptive adjective as mnemonic or punctuation. It is also, like so many characteristics of Latin literature, not a Roman invention: to take a much-quoted example, it permeates the fragmentary surviving work of the fourth-century BC Western Greek gourmet poet Archestratos."

What is rather less common (though far from infrequent) than mere association or attribution, is the claim for a particular town or region or province that its wool or cheese or honey or pearls (to take a few random examples) are ‘the best’, though the implication is often there even when not made explicit. That great list-maker Pliny the Elder, however, does aim to identify the best (or sometimes the ‘top three’) extensively throughout the pages of the *Natural History*, often with quoted authorities to support his classification. These rankings, we find, are sometimes present in earlier extant authors, such as Varro, Cato and Naevius; and are reflected more formally, in the *Edict* of Diocletian, more than three
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160 *Cic. Fam.* 7.1.3.
161 First found in Lucil. 149-152M.
162 Dalby (2000b), *passim*. For an extended list, see Appendix 1.1.
164 Varro *LL*.5.111 (Faliscan sausages); Varro *RR*. 2.4.11 (Lucanian sausages): Cato *Origines* 2.9 (Gaulish ham); Naevius *Ariolus*, II.25-6 (Praenestine nuts and Lanuvian stuffed wombs). *Athenaeus’s Deipnosophistae* brings together a vast range of earlier, mostly Hellenistic, origin brands in quotations from Greek literature, together with at least some contemporary (late 2nd century AD) comments. Some of these coincide with later Roman listings.
centuries later. In the Edict, the top-quality origins for many commodities are allowed higher maximum prices than more run-of-the-mill products. It is clear that the Edict’s degrees of discrimination varied widely between commodities: it tends to be much more fine-tuned in textiles, for example, than most other sectors. Less common, still, is the association within the Edict of a particular commodity with a single town or region.

An important caveat needs to be entered here. When the products referred to are sufficiently exotic, Roman authors – especially the poets – are often far from accurate. Thus we find Juvenal suggesting that elephants might be Nabataean, Pliny believing that cinnamon came from Ethiopia, and a mention of turifer Indus when the only sources of frankincense were Southern Arabia and Somalia. This does not necessarily undermine the thrust of this thesis – indeed, it can be read as a form of support for the idea that the ‘brand image’ of the commodity concerned embodied the sort of associations that its wrongly-attributed (usually exotic) origin conveyed. It is worth noting, in this context, that present-day survey research shows that today’s allegedly sophisticated consumers can be wildly wrong about the geographic origins of products and brands that they buy; and that these misconceptions may significantly affect their attitudes to such a misattributed brand.

It is fair to point out, too, that not all unique products were necessarily labeled – or, more precisely, talked about - with a designation of origin. Although it was recognized that frankincense came mainly (if not, perhaps, exclusively – Roman writers seem to have been uncertain) from Arabia Felix, it is far from consistently labeled as Arabian (or Sabaean) in
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165 e.g. Ch. 2 (wines); Lucanicae (4.14); olivae Tarsicae (6.89); Ch. 8 (hides). In textiles, ch. 49 includes a range of origins, especially for items 41-51 (byrrhus), 52-70 (various items, all but one with an origin designation): Ch. 55 (wool) has Mutinense listed as the most costly, followed by a selection of other origins. Similarly the very long Ch. 56 (linens) lists the same 5 different origins for a range of different garments and qualities.

166 Juv. 11.126-7.

167 Plin. NH 12.86. In Andrew Dalby's (2000a) interpretation, Pliny knows perfectly well that cinnamon comes out of India, but is suffering from the Roman tendency to conflate India with East Africa. For a questionable explanation based on trade routes, see Miller (1969) pp. 153-172, with comments in Haw (2017), who argues that cinnamomum was not today's cinnamon.

168 Ovid Fast. 3.720. Some of Athenaeus's citations attribute myrrh and frankincense to Syria: 1.27F (Hermippus); 3.101C (Archestratos); 4.131D (Anaxandrides).

169 There is a very extensive academic literature about Country-of-origin (COO) and its meaning for, and effect on consumers. E.g.: Verlegh & Steenkamp (1999); Baker & Ballington (2002); Tregear (2004); Donvio et al (2009).
classical literature." Nor is amber, the vast majority of which came to the Roman world from the Baltic, given a geographical adjective (partly, perhaps, because of a degree of uncertainty as to its precise origin); though in fact, the Romans named the Baltic island which they identified as a main source *Glaesaria* after a German word for amber, *glaesum*. Just as classical literature provides us with plenty of origin brands, it is also prolific with what may be termed ‘branded origins’: the river Pactolus has golden waves or sands, and similarly the Hermus is *auru turbidus*; hills are rich in vines, countrysides swathed in olive trees. Sometimes, too, these designations are essentially fanciful, and can be dismissed as poetic ornamentation: *turifer Indus* is a prime example – though of course some of these ‘mistakes’ may be the result of sheer geographical ignorance or poetic licence. An interesting example of differing perspectives on origin/brand, leading to what could be described as ‘instability’ of origin, from nearer (the Roman) home discussed by Dalby is that of the excellent wool from Apulia. This was especially associated with Tarentum, rated by several authors as either the best or one of the top three origins. Outside Italy, this wool was, Dalby says, quoting Pliny, simply described as ‘Italian’.

An additional important element in the attribution of a commodity to its place of origin could be, at least in some cases, the attributes of the origin itself. This is a phenomenon that has been widely recognized in modern marketing theory, where the influence of country-of-origin (COO) has been extensively analysed by many researchers.
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171 Plin. NH. 37.42: Certum est gigni in insulis septentrionalis oceani et ab Germanis appellari glaesum, itaque et ab nostris ob id unam insularum Glaesariam appellatam, Germanico Caesare res ibi gerente classibus, Austeravia a barbaris dictam. Cf. Diod. Sic. 5.23.1; Tac. Ger. 45.4 ff. The identity of *Glaesaria/Austeravia* has not been established. For amber, see Kolendo (2007) and references there; cf. Bluijene (2011), ch. 3.
172 Varr. Men. Sat. 234.1 [M]; Verg. Aen. 10.142; Propert. 3.18.28; Juv. 14.299 (Pactolus); Verg. Geo. 2.138 (Hermus): Plin. NH. 3.60; Sil. Pun. 4.347, 10.34 (*vitifer*); Ovid Fast. 3.151; Stat. Theb. 4.50; Mart. 12.98.1 (*olivifer*); Ovid Fast. 3.720 (Indus).
174 E.g. Verg. Geo. 2.195-9; Hor. Od. 2.6.10; Colum. 7.2.3; 7.4.1; Plin. NH. 8.190, etc. By Diocletian’s time, Po valley wool, from Mutina, was more costly (*Ed. Dio. 55.1*).
175 Plin. NH. 8.190.
today’s consumer markets, German products are expected to be well-made, reliable; Italian products to be stylish, well-designed but liable to break down; and so on.178 In the ancient world, too, this seems to have applied, at least to an extent, especially where the products of distant countries are concerned. For example, I argue in chapter 5 that ‘Indian’ had a particular resonance for a Roman audience, as Grant Parker has shown.179

What seems clear from both modern experience and what we can observe or deduce of its equivalent in the ancient world, is that it is a natural instinct on the part of buyers to look for reassurance that what they are buying will be the genuine article and that it will deliver whatever specific utility or performance they may want from it; and that part of this reassurance will lie in its ‘correct’ origin. We see this very clearly spelled out as early as Cato’s de Agricultura, where he lists in considerable detail (22.3, 135) the best sources for a range of equipment for his model farm, mostly in terms of market towns (up to and including Rome), but also including some specific individual suppliers. He casts his net anywhere between Rome and Campania; while his farm is situated between Suessa and Pompeii, though nearer to the former. Cato’s criteria, more or less explicitly, are a very modern-sounding combination of quality, price and convenience – the latter being closely related to transport costs for larger pieces of equipment, in a world where land transport was both slow and costly.180

We know very little of the mindset of the Roman buyer, except from a small number of anecdotes scattered through a surviving literature that is little concerned with mundane, day-to-day purchasing. Importantly, however, we do know, mainly from a number of examples in Pliny’s Natural History, that unscrupulous merchants were perfectly capable of a variety of frauds designed to pass off adulterated goods as something better and more expensive. For example, he says that the expensive long pepper is easily adulterated with Alexandrian mustard, or with juniper berries; frankincense can be adulterated with white resin, but this is easily detected; myrrh can be cut with mastic or other gums, and with the inferior Indian myrrh; ammoniacum is adulterated with sand; balsam (balm of Gilead) can be adulterated in

178 See, e.g., Iversen & Hem (2008).
179 Parker (2002), especially p. 55, pp. 78-84.
a whole series of ways; wine with aloes. Similarly, you can make fake terebinth by boiling
walnut or wild pear in a colouring liquid; or dilute the inferior silphium of Mesopotamia with
gum, beans or sacopenium; while ‘nothing is adulterated as much as saffron’. Counterfeiting is an ancient practice, and it is no accident that caveat emptor is a Latin tag, though it has no extant classical source. We can readily imagine that the alert Roman buyer would be concerned both with the specific origin and the authenticity of many of his or her purchases, especially of more exotic luxury items.

It is against this sort of background that we should consider the status of the rankings of the origins of different products that have been collected and reflected in Pliny. At its simplest, it is easy to see a buyer at the weekly nundinae asking a stallholder who has produced the grapes or cabbages or sausages; which variety they are; and whether they are from a local producer, a known source or the town or region that is famous for them. This may be why, for example, we find a dipinto on a garum jar from Herculaneum that proclaims its origin in the town. In the same way, if word has got about that the three or four best sources of wool are Apulia, Mutina, Baetica and Miletus, it will be reassuring to a buyer to be told that a new cloak or toga is assuredly made of wool from one of these places – a fact that might be confirmed by a characteristic colour or weave.

To take a final example, covered in more detail in chapter 7, a buyer of fine wine would be well aware of the reputations of the main brands, especially from Campania and, very probably, Greece; possibly also from Spain or Gaul, though these mostly seem to have been

181 Plin. NH. 12.28.7 (mustard); 12.29.10 (juniper); 12.65.6 (frankincense); 12.71 (myrrh); 12.107; (ammoniacum), 12.119-123; (balsam); 14.67 (wine). For a detailed discussion of adulteration in Roman food and related markets, see Bush (2002). Cf. Parker (2002), p. 45.
182 Pliny NH. 16.205 (terebinth); 19.40 (silphium); 21.31 (saffron – adulteratur nihil aequo). Cf. aloes 27.16; bulls-glue 28.231; saltpeter (nitrum) 31.114: cinnabar 33.117; ‘flowers’ of copper 34.107; verdigris 34.112; atramentum 35.41; bitumen 35.180; alum 35.184; opal 37.83.
183 The principle of caveat emptor is believed to originate in Roman law: see Buckland & McNair (1965), p. 210, though Hamilton (1931), pp. 1156-8, points out the lack of a precise source.
184 For example, see the younger Pliny’s uncertainty about his purchase of a Corinthian bronze statuette – Plin. Ep. 3.6, and p. 132, below.
185 CIL 4.5720.
186 For the ranking of the best wool, see Plin. NH. 8.190. For a range of origins and types of garment see Mart. 14.133, 155, 157, 158. For the wool trade, see Frayn (1984), especially pp. 164ff. Cf. Richardson (2008), pp. 4, 17-18 for medieval textile-makers’ practices designed to protect their origins (a reference I owe to Justin Walsh).
more ‘mass-market’ than the best Roman or Greek brands. What is a lot less clear is whether it was possible, or meaningful, to distinguish between different individual producers of a given wine origin. Certainly, one could tell from the label the date of the wine being drawn off into the amphora, and possibly, too, the year of its actual making, but information about the maker, as opposed to the merchant, seems to have been at best sketchily available, and we do not hear in contemporary literature of specific producers of any major brand of wine – the only remotely relevant anecdotes concern wine yields, rather than quality.

The scope of origin branding in the Roman world is very widespread. As Dalby says, the evidence is primarily literary, and especially from Latin literature, since Latin poetry in particular is characterized by an extremely wide geographical consciousness and reference. It is, in fact, a characteristic of much classical poetry that the mention of a place seems to trigger a reference to a product or commodity for which it is well-known or famous. Correspondingly, the mention of a commodity, especially a rare or luxurious one, is likely to call up a geographical association, as noted above. The conventions of most poetic genres in effect fuel this process, which goes right back to Homer (and presumably beyond). As Luke Roman has pointed out, Martial’s epigrams, in particular his two early volumes of Saturnalia gifts, the Xenia (book 13) and Apophoreta (book 14) carry an extremely high proportion of geographical identifications, and Roman goes so far as to suggest that ‘denominazione d’origine controllata was very much part of the idiom of the urban consumer in ancient Rome’.

188 See Plin. NH. 14.49-52 for the achievements of Acilius Sthenelus. Cf. Varro RR 1.2.7, Colum. 3.2-3. Wine producers’ names do appear on some tituli picti, but the practice seems the exception rather than the rule. See n. 73 above.
189 Dalby (2000b), p. 3ff. Cf. Thomas (1982) for discussion of how at least some poets’ knowledge and practice was rooted in an ethnographic tradition traceable back to Herodotus and Hecataeus.
190 As Pliny (NH. 13.4) points out, perfumes, for example, are frequently named by their country of origin – see Parker (2002), p. 41.
191 Parker (2002), p. 89, stresses the evident Roman desire to identify the origin of commodities, especially those that are rare, valuable or exotic.
192 Roman (2010), p. 95. Note that, strictly speaking, the DOC applies specifically to wine: the general term, equivalent to English PDO, is Denominazione d’origine protetta, DOP. For the relevance of PDO in modern markets see van der Lans et al. (2001).
Origin brands infiltrate almost everything that a Roman could conceivably buy: a whole range of food and drink; everyday and special utensils and tableware; textiles and garments of all kinds; metals; stone and building materials; animals and livestock; plants; game birds, and so on. Beyond this, it could be applied to different types of gladiator, theatrical genres and even styles of divination. By extension, it could even be said to be reflected in a variety of national stereotypes: soft, luxury-loving, untrustworthy Greeks, fat Etruscans, blue-eyed, uncouth Germans, swarthy Egyptians, etc. Arguably, the most firmly-established origin brands are those where Roman authors routinely use the origin or its adjectival form as a shorthand for the object itself. Good examples of this include *Corinthia* (bronze), *Numidicae* (guinea-fowl), *Serica* (silk), *Cydonia* (quinces), *Persica* (peaches), most wines, Tyrian (purple dye), *Lucanica* (sausages), *Atellana* (plays), *Milesii* (tales).

Appendix 1.1 lists some 700 product categories, from around 450 different origins (listed in Appendix 1.2) – there are more categories than origins because products in several categories may be associated with the same place. This does not include the more than 200 wine origins that occur in the literature, and which are listed separately, in Appendix 7.3. Some of these origin brands are referenced a considerable number of times in the extant literature: see Appendix 1.3 for the leading brands in these terms.

1.6 Conclusions

In this chapter, I have outlined the key elements of brands and branding in relation to the historical context of the Roman world. There is no doubt that there were a large number of producer-branded items available on the market, chiefly in ceramics, but we can get little or no idea of the reputation of the vast majority of these. Quite simply, the available sources do not give us any usable information. At the same time, however, there was also a wide range of origin brands, whose existence we can establish from primarily literary sources, and in at least some cases, as we shall see later, we can begin to describe their brand images. More widely, there are many commodities for which we know which origins were regarded as particularly good or, in some cases, ‘the best’. In effect, while Roman manufacturers
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193 See Appendix 1.1 for an extended list.
194 Gladiators: Sen. Controv. 3 pr.16.3; (Thraex); 9.40; Varro LL. 5.142 (Samnites); Comedy: Livy 7.2.12.3; Suet Ner. 39.3 (Atellana); Divination: Cíc de Div. 2.28.12 (Etrusci, Elii, Aegyptii, Poeni).
195 Verg. Geo. 2.193 (pinguis Etruscus); Mart. 1.49.33 (horridus Liburnus); Hor. Ep. 2.1.33 (Achivi uncti); Juv. 3.73-78 (Graeculus esuriens); Hor.” Epod.16.7 (fera caerulea...Germania pube); Prop. 2.33a.15 (fuscis Aegyptus alumni).
trademarked their products, there is very little evidence to suggest that they branded them effectively in any way we could recognise today. Rather, those brands that did achieve a recognisable reputation were origin brands, branded by consumers.

Most importantly, the role of brands within society, as a means both of the construction of one’s own identity and of signalling to others, has been clearly identified. This use of brands is well-established in modern, brand-saturated society, and we have already identified some of the ways in which it may be paralleled in the very different élite culture of ancient Rome. As will be seen in the next chapter, analysing the role of individual brands in their Roman context is most readily done for luxury brands, since these are most likely to be the subject of discussion or description in a literature written for an élite audience by writers who were themselves mostly members of the élite.

What is clear from the analysis so far is that we can recognise an origin brand when we meet it in the Roman world:

1. It will be a commodity or product that is regularly – systematically, even – associated with a particular town, region or country of origin;
2. The particular origin may well be described in some sources as being ‘the best’ – often in comparison with other known origins;
3. Descriptions and associations with the brand will combine to create a consistent impression – ‘brand image’.

In the next chapter, I will examine in more detail the key features of élite Roman society that enabled the successful promulgation and development of luxury brands, and the economic basis of the long-distance trade that enabled Romans to indulge their enthusiasm for prestige luxury brands. The chapter includes a discussion of Roman attitudes to luxury, and an analysis of the nature of luxury brands, based on modern experience as well as Latin and Greek literature.
2. Economy and Society: the Context of Roman Brands

To understand the nature, role and experience of brands in the Roman world, we need a clear picture of the economic, cultural and societal context within which these brands were bought, sold and used. As commentators have regularly argued, the context of consumption is a critical element in understanding consumer culture. Similarly, it is not enough to observe the mere existence of an artefact or brand to describe a consumer culture: to paraphrase Mattingly’s formulation, artefact+praxis= culture: how the brand is used (and, ideally, regarded or spoken about) helps define the nature of the culture.

In this chapter, I aim to locate the Roman élite within the society and economy of the Roman world and illustrate how its members used consumption and luxury brands, among other resources, to maintain and demonstrate their élite status. To show how this process operated, I go on to examine the nature of the Roman luxury marketplace and the attitudes that relate to it; and the character and scale of commerce that provided the necessary supply of luxuries and access to them. Finally, I discuss the role of literature and literacy in the communication of luxury brands and the development of their reputation.

2.1 The Roman Economy

It is hazardous to compare the modern brand environment with that of ancient Rome – just as in today’s world no sophisticated international marketer would approach the market in Papua New Guinea in precisely the same way as she would that in California. The difference between ancient economies and today’s industrial world has been a topic for argument since at least the end of the nineteenth century. This is not the place for a detailed analysis of the


Mattingly (2010), p. 287. Arguably, the reverse is also true: the culture defines how the brand is used and perceived.
arguments, which continue to be vigorous, and by no means concluded by the publication of the *Cambridge Economic History of the Ancient World* (*CEH*).

The position taken in the present study is close to that of Harris in *CEH*: that the Roman world had a well-developed and quite sophisticated financial system underpinning an economy that, while it lacked many of the core characteristics of modern capitalism, was by no means ‘irrational’ in Weberian terms. It was different in many respects from a modern economy, but it relied to a substantial extent on markets and trading systems that behaved in many ways similarly to today’s markets; and it is not unreasonable to examine economic processes within it with reference to modern conditions, while recognising that they may not work in exactly the same way. Critically, however, in spite of some heroic attempts to make up for the lack of data, we have no very good means of attempting the kinds of quantitative analysis that are the meat and drink of modern economics, though a growing number of efforts to fill the gap are being made.

What this means, in terms of how we should approach any analysis of economic phenomena in the Roman world, is that we should be sensitive both to similarities and differences, and that we must be cautious in any attempt to attribute specific economic effects to particular actions in any but more or less broad terms. In practice, given the lack of adequate quantitative data, this does not create a major handicap – so long as we do not attempt to push an analysis too far. We are, obviously, not dealing with a full-blooded, integrated
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199 Harris (2007). This view is considerably more ‘modernist’ than that of Finley (1985), which has been highly influential in the debates on the nature of ancient economies, but which is now generally regarded as taking too narrow a view of the character of the Roman economy in particular. The literature on the subject is vast, and shows little sign of coming to a clear consensus, but the extreme ‘primitivist’ position set out by Finley is clearly too limited. Conversely, the latest analysis by Temin (2013) is arguably too willing to attribute ‘modernity’ to the economy of the Roman world (see Bransbourg (2012) for counter-arguments based on earlier papers by Temin). For a range of views, see (e.g.) Lo Cascio & Malanima (2011); Monteix & Tran (2011) pp. 3-5; Silver (2007a, 2009a); Bang (2008); Temin (2004, 2006); Butcher (2003) p. 181-7; Jongman (2002); Andreau (1999); Pleket (1990); Davies (1998); Millar (1984).
201 Scheidel & Friesen (2009) and references there; Scheidel (2010); Lo Cascio & Malanima (2011).
modern economic system, in which essentially global phenomena have global effects that can – at least in theory – be predicted almost in real time. Equally, however, in the light of the economic experience of the world since 2008, we should be careful about attributing rationality, let alone superiority, to today’s clearly flawed economic system. It is easy to dismiss the past as unsophisticated, non-rational and underdeveloped, without being altogether clear about the criteria by which sophistication, rationality and development might rightly be judged. Weber’s criteria were of his time.

It is, I would argue, perfectly possible, so long as the process is conducted with due care, to examine the evidence for ‘modern’ economic phenomena within the Roman economy on the basis that they can be expected to operate in at least something approaching the ways that modern analysts have identified. It is by taking this view that the analysis of brands in the Roman world can be undertaken.

For this analysis, a key issue is the scale and character of trade and commerce in the relevant period. It is clear that the Roman world, especially its cities, operated a system of markets and wholesale and retail outlets that would be broadly recognisable today, though parts of the (substantial) rural economy may have been effectively non-monetised. Similarly, trade, in a variety of more or less staple commodities and products, clearly operated all round the Mediterranean by sea; and even land-based trade, though less evident in the archaeological record, and much more costly, seems to have been widespread, especially at a local level.

202 But see Geraghty (2007) who argues, on the basis of admittedly highly simplified assumptions, that the Roman economy as a whole was in fact recognisably integrated, and n. 200 above.
204 See e.g. Greene (2000), p.32; Love (1991), espec. pp. 93-4. Weber (1976) provides a considerably more nuanced overview of the Roman economy and society than is implied by some of the criticism of his views.
205 See, especially, Howgego (1992) pp. 16-22; Dominguez (2010), p. 170; Bang (2012), p. 299. On markets, see de Ligt (1993); on retailing, see Holleran (2012); also Kléberg (1957), and section 2.5, pp. 82-5, below.
This trade was, almost certainly, predominantly ‘exchange’, in the terms used by Polanyi and his colleagues (1957), though substantial ‘redistribution’ was involved in the operation of the annona and of military provisioning. The trade in luxuries, however these are defined (see sections 2.3 and 2.4 below), appears by this time to have been essentially additional to trade in more everyday products, though this is arguably less true of long-distance trade with places outside the Roman empire itself.

2.2 Roman Elite Society: Wealth, Status and Competition

2.2.1 The Historical Background

By the time the Roman republic had reached full maturity, towards the end of the third century BC, it was an aristocratic society based on wealth held in land, within an agricultural economy which provided an essentially subsistence existence for the great majority of the population. The political system, centred on the Senate and annual magistrates, had achieved a degree of stability, although a continuing under-current of resistance to the power of the aristocrats is evidenced by the reforms of the Gracchi and the importance of the populares in the late Republic. By its nature, the aristocracy was an élite group, though it is possible to argue about the precise definition of ‘élite’.

In the face of competitive pressures from neighbouring cities and societies, Rome had long been geared to regular warfare in defence of its interests. This almost inevitably turned towards more aggressive expansionary policies designed to ensure the integrity of the the extent of integration in Roman trade (mostly, in his analysis regional, rather than empire-wide) based on archaeological evidence.


208 Seland (2010); Scheidel (2009); Oka & Kusimba (2008), pp. 347, 352; Morley (2007), especially pp. 72 ff.; Butcher (2003), pp. 181-7; Horden & Purcell (2000), pp. 53-81. Cf. Ael. Arist. 27.11: so many merchant ships arrive here conveying every kind of goods from every people every hour, every day, so that the city is like a marketplace common to the whole earth.’ [tr. In Morley, (2007)]. It is likely that long-distance trade originally focused on 'luxuries' as much for gift exchange as for trade-for-profit (Sherratt & Sherratt (1991), pp. 373-5; Adams (1974)); but by the period under review this was no longer the case.


210 See Gelzer (1975); Alföldy (1985), espec. p. 146; Wallace-Hadrill (2008), p. 12; Dench (2005), p. 106 and refs there; Winterling (2009), pp. 28-29. Cf. Andreau (2005), especially p. 65. As Holland (2005) shows, the result of the skirmishes between patricians and plebeians in (mainly) the 5-4th centuries BC was the development of a 'patrician-plebeian aristocracy', in which plebeians who had successfully exploited the opportunity to achieve elective office became 'aristocrats'.
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homeland and to head off potential threats. Roman expansion beyond the Italian peninsula, primarily in the second and first centuries BC, seems to have developed initially as a response to military threats rather than to any specific territorial or power-seeking policy on the part of the ruling classes: the conquest of Sicily, starting in the mid-third century, resulted from a conflict over spheres of influence with Carthage, for example. However, by the time (146 BC) Rome had defeated Macedon, the Seleucids, and finally Carthage, the city effectively controlled the whole Mediterranean, apart from Egypt, and had eliminated the major, immediate threats. By now, conquest had become almost a way of life and, in particular, a source of prestige and finance for the city’s politicians and officer class (essentially the same people); and, just over 100 years later, the imperialist rhetoric of the Augustan poets embodies a clear expectation of the continued expansion of the empire.

By the beginning of the first century BC, traditional patterns had begun to change radically, as a result of the conquests of the previous hundred years. Rome was consolidating its position in the eastern Mediterranean, and had started to acquire the whole Iberian peninsula and Gaul. The most obvious result of this was a massive influx of wealth, both in bullion and in artworks and furnishings, and with it an enormous import of slaves that would underpin the domestic economy for many years to come. This process continued through the first century BC, in spite of the progressively tangled internal political state of Rome: the reforms of the Gracchi, through the Social War and the Sullan dictatorship, to the triumvirates and the final civil war that culminated in the principate of Augustus. Despite all this, Rome conquered Gaul and Spain, acquired the legacy of Attalus and the riches from the defeat of Mithridates, and ultimately, the biggest prize of all, the wealth and trade networks of Ptolemaic Egypt; while Pompey’s destruction of the menace from pirates was a key factor in

212 This brief summary avoids entering the substantial scholarly debate about the degree of aggression inherent in Rome’s expansion. For a balanced analysis, see Smith & Yarrow (2012), Introduction. For Roman conceptions of imperium as ‘empire’ see Richardson (1991). The Romans were adept at positioning their wars as essentially others’ faults: Cic. Rep. 3.34 ff.; Off. 1.35; Potter (2011), p. 520; cf. Veyne, 1975, passim; but modern historians, following Harris (1979), generally regard the expansion of the late republic as driven by senatorial competition for military glory and, hence, political power, together with the opportunity to gain ‘windfall wealth’ from booty. See Welch (2006a), with Sidebottom (2005), espec. pp. 315–320.
213 See, e.g., Verg. Aen. 1. 272 ff; Ovid Ars Am. 1.171 ff; Hor. Od. 4.14.41 ff; 4.15.23 ff.
214 These changes, of course, started earlier – see White (2014), pp. 96-7.
215 In a vast academic literature, see especially Shtaerman & Trofimova (1975); Bradley (1994); Scheidel (1997, 2005). It is arguable to what extent the wars of the second and first centuries were motivated by the quest for slaves: I do not believe this could have been a major motivation, though it may have had some subsidiary influence.
216 See Ando (2011) for an insightful overview of this period, together with Brunt (1988a), ch. 1.
the subsequent development of pan-Mediterranean trade. Almost the only setback was Crassus’s defeat by the Parthians at Carrhae. In addition to the direct spoils of war, the system of provincial governance allowed senior politicians and their companions to extract wealth and possessions from their provinces. As Catullus grumbled, this was expected, even if expectations might be dashed. As Cicero’s Verrine orations show, the process could easily become sheer brigandage.

2.2.2 The Elites

Roman republican society had traditionally been aristocratic, with a small cluster of noble families managing government through the senate and the magistracies, and, together with the broader group of equites (from which all senators were drawn) controlling access to political power, through provision of the ‘pool’ of candidates for magistracies. This broader élite, and its core, the Senate, were both ‘managed’ by the censors, who could exclude or expel anyone whose conduct or background failed to meet their criteria. The existence of elections provided an element of democracy and a limited restraint on the ruling class. Military prowess, present or past, was a key element in the success and status of most individuals. Initially, at least, the senate was a subset of the equestrian order, with access to it dependent on being elected to one of a limited number of offices. As Andreau points out, the two orders were essentially homogeneous, albeit with some differences between them.

218 Catull. 10, cf. 28; cf. Cic. Att. 7.1. For the role of booty, and discussion of how it arrived in private hands, see Dillon & Welch (eds.) (2006), especially ch. 1 and 2; Coudry & Humm (eds.) (2009), especially ch. 1.
219 See especially Verr. 2.4, passim.
220 See Astin (1988); Cram (1940); Slob (1986).
221 The degree to which later Republican politics were remotely democratic is hotly disputed among modern scholars. In spite of Millar's arguments (1984, 1986, 1998, etc.), supported by Yakobsen (1992,1995), republican Rome never really approached being a democracy – see Mouritsen (2001); Ward (2004); Burkhardt (2006); Winterling (2009); Ando (2011). Clearly the lex Gabinia (139 BC), which made ballots secret, changed the situation to some extent – Wiseman (1971), p. 4. See now Mouritsen (2017).
222 Harris (1979); Peachin (2011), p. 22; Holscher (2006), p. 35. Cicero is an interesting exception, though even he hoped for a triumph for his military operations as a provincial governor: Cic. Fam. 2.10; 8.5; Att. 6.8; 7.2; 7.4; 7.7
The Roman élite as a whole was based on heredity, and the right to stand for public office was restricted to those in the top census category. By the time of Augustus, who formally divided what had been a single census class, senators had to be able to show a certain level of wealth, _equites_ a rather lower amount, plus citizen descent: senators (limited by Augustus to 600, after having expanded to over 1,000 during the triumvirate) had to have at least HS 1 million, _equites_ HS 400,000. Unlike Greek cities, the Romans were generous with their citizenship, both through including conquered groups and through the manumission of slaves; and this became more pronounced over time, especially within Italy, as Rome consolidated its dominance over the various peoples with which it found itself in competition and conflict and finally, at the end of the Social War, extended full citizenship throughout Italy. By the end of the republic, the children of freedmen (such as Horace) could easily become _equites_, and provincials could aspire to be senators. Even so, _novi homines_, such as Cicero, could still find themselves regarded as upstarts by members of established noble families.

Status (_dignitas, existimatio_) was key to an individual’s (or a family’s) position in society, and the political clout (_auctoritas_) he might bring to bear. Status depended on heredity, primarily, and, closely linked to this, on wealth, but it could be substantially enhanced by achievement. Social mobility was not impossible. As might be expected, established and successful senatorial families were repositories of enormous wealth, primarily invested in landholdings. The potential power that this wealth enabled needed to be exploited if it was to be effective. The senatorial class was highly competitive. Individuals expected to compete for magisterial offices and military position, the two being closely linked, in a city which

---

224 Dio Cass. 52.42; 54.14.1.
225 See Dio Cass. 54.17.3; 54.26.3-5. For discussion of the equestrian and senatorial census in the late republic and early principate, see Nicolet (1976), _passim_.
226 In a rather similar way, on the fringes of the Empire, notably in the east, Rome was usually content to maintain its power through the sponsorship and protection of local kings or princes who acknowledged Rome’s suzerainty. See for example, the situation in Syria, described by Sartre (2014). This inclusiveness was distinctly unusual in the ancient world.
228 _Dignitas, existimatio_ and _auctoritas_ together add up to something very close to Bourdieu’s (1984) ‘symbolic capital’.
was rarely not involved in actual or potential conflict, whether with local rivals within Italy or, increasingly, with international opponents from around the Mediterranean or beyond.\textsuperscript{230}

Success in this competition for position brought with it the trappings of power: in Roman society, this is most distinctively reflected in the system of clientela.\textsuperscript{231} The magnates of Rome kept more or less open house both to their equals and to a corps of hangers-on; the latter were expected to serve attendance on their patrons and to provide a range of services, especially in terms of political support at election times,\textsuperscript{232} in return for a small retainer – the sportula – and an occasional dinner. The clients would appear at their patron’s house in the morning for the salutatio, and would then be expected to accompany him to the courts or the senate house.\textsuperscript{233} A big man’s\textsuperscript{234} daily progress to the forum or the senate could be assessed by interested bystanders through the number of followers in his train:\textsuperscript{235} the space taken up by an individual’s entourage was an index of his political power – reflected in formal custom by the consuls’ and praetors’ lictors.\textsuperscript{236}

As Peter White has shown, the way in which this set of relationships functioned can best be summed up in the Roman concept of amicitia.\textsuperscript{237} Amici, in practice, covered a wide spectrum, from intimate, close friends and collaborators to mere hangers-on. Amici were expected to operate a reciprocal relationship, in which services and favours would be repaid appropriately (gratia): most such relationships were in some sense unequal, and the nature of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{232} See the Commentariolum Petitionis, passim.
\item \textsuperscript{233} On salutatio, see Goldeck (2010).
\item \textsuperscript{234} For the anthropological concept of the Big Man, see Sahlin (1963). There is an excellent description of the lifestyle of a modern big man, from Ghana in the early 1960s, on p. 50 of Angelou (1987).
\item \textsuperscript{235} See Cic. Att. 1.18.1 and comments in Winterling (2009), pp. 47-8, for an insight into the different levels of amicitia that could be involved.
\item \textsuperscript{236} For a detailed discussion of how this worked in practice, see Morstein-Marx's (1998) analysis of the Commentariolum Petitionis.
\item \textsuperscript{237} White (1978).
\end{itemize}
the officium owed by the reciprocator was adjusted accordingly.\textsuperscript{238} The ways in which these obligations worked are analysed at length in Cicero’s \textit{de Amicitia} and \textit{de Officiis}, and reflected later in Seneca’s \textit{de Beneficiis} and in his \textit{Epistles}. Cicero demonstrates that the objective of a powerful Roman was, effectively, to put himself in the position of providing \textit{beneficia}, rather than of owing \textit{officia}.\textsuperscript{239} How these relationships affected the position of poets who attached themselves to wealthy patrons’ households is discussed in section 2.8, below.

2.2.3 Élite Society and the Economy

The élite who reaped the main benefits of the burgeoning prosperity of the late Republic were quite few in number. The senatorial and equestrian families may have accounted for little more than some 2-3\% of the population of Rome at the outside, but they controlled the vast majority of both the monetary wealth of the city and of its landholdings.\textsuperscript{240} Also, less obviously, perhaps, they controlled the city’s commerce. While land provided the basis of Roman wealth, there was plenty of money to be made by commerce, especially as the empire’s geographical reach extended. Senators were expected not to engage in trade, which was considered to be below their dignity, and there were laws restricting the scale of shipping senators were allowed to own.\textsuperscript{241} There were no such restrictions on the \textit{equites}, who were, for example, major players in the \textit{societates} that farmed taxes around the empire.\textsuperscript{242}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[238] See Cic. \textit{Am., passim}; Saller (1982, 1989); Verboven (2002, 2011); Nauta (2002). See also Konstan (1995), who argues persuasively for a distinction between \textit{amicus} and \textit{cliens}, while allowing that an individual could be both.
\item[239] For an extended view of the issues this raises, see Griffin (2003), especially pp. 95 ff., where she discusses the nature of the patron-client relationship in the light of a range of recent scholarship.
\item[240] See Scheidel & Friessen (2009) and references there, both for share of population and of wealth. Estimates of both remain controversial, but the difficulties involved in their calculation are unlikely to be resolved in the absence of meaningful quantitative data.
\item[241] d’Arms (1980, 1981); Shatzman (1975); Broekaert (2012). The \textit{Lex Claudia} of 218 BC barred senators from owning any ship with a capacity of more than 300 amphorae (about 7 tonnes), and theoretically prevented senators from having direct involvement in overseas trade. For a good overview of the continuing debate on how far senators were in fact actively engaged in non-agricultural commercial activity, see Andreau (2005).
\item[242] See Badian (1972); Broekaert (2012). Cf. equestrian bankers such as Atticus (Welch (1996)).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Nonetheless, it is clear that senators who wished to become involved in commerce had little difficulty in doing so: much as sumptuary laws were widely ignored, those that aimed to restrict senatorial commerce seem to have been at most loosely applied, though direct evidence is not easy to find. In spite of the initially limited recognition of agency in Roman law, it was common practice for rich men to set up freedmen or even slaves in business, or to employ them to manage commercial enterprises which fed directly into the family coffers.

To take just one example of élite involvement in commercial activity, one consequence of the influx of wealth into Rome was the interest in wine-making that evidently lies behind the agricultural treatises of Cato, Varro and, especially, Columella. Wealth was seeking an outlet, in the form of productive investment – even if, as has been argued, the Romans lacked adequate accounting methods to be sure just how profitable such ventures actually were. In practice, however, as Andreau argues, it seems most likely that the main area of involvement of the élite in commerce was as the providers of finance.

A key characteristic of the social lives of the élite, in relation to this thesis, is the extent to which their lives were lived in public. Rich and powerful Romans’ houses were designed to be very largely open to the ‘public’, in the form of their owners’ clientela and a whole range of other friends, supplicants and seekers after favours. The front section of a typical town house consisted in effect of public reception rooms where the owner held court for the morning salutatio and the conduct of business, which also might be confined, for more private affairs, to the tablinum, or even the paterfamilias’s cubiculum. Further back, the triclinium provided the setting for elaborate dinner parties, which might include a variety of

243 Shatzman (1975); Rauh (1986); Andreau (2005); Tchernia (2011). For a major figure’s commercial capabilities, see Plut. Crass. 2, which emphasizes Crassus’s large corps of highly-trained slaves; cf. Plut. Cato Mai. 21.5-7 on Cato’s (financial) involvement in shipping ventures.

244 See d’Arms (1980); Aubert (1994); Andreau (1999, 2005); Verboven (2002); Broekaert (2012). A combination of mandatum, procuratio and the setting up of slaves in businesses based on their own peculium provided a range of options – see especially Verboven (2002), pp. 227 ff.

245 See Rathbone (1991) pp. 385-6, and Stringer (2012), who, with Love (1991) pp. 65-68, argues that rationes were a great deal more sophisticated than is usually believed, even if, as Finley (1973) rightly pointed out, double-entry book-keeping had not yet been invented.

246 Andreau (2005), p. 74. There is ample literary evidence of money-lending, even though, for example, Cato (de Ag., praef.) despised it, unlike commerce, where he merely noted the risks. Crassus loaned money freely at no interest, but expected prompt repayment, which proved embarrassing to many creditors (Plut. Crass. 3). On loans, see, e.g., Frederiksen (1966); Verboven (2003); Harris (2006), Tchernia (2011), pp. 48 -53. For the legal background to agency, see Aubert (1994), passim, together with Verboven (2002).

entertainments, ranging from erotic dancing to serious recitals of new or classic poetry and other literature. Villas in the country offered the same opportunities for entertaining: even if the idea of the villa was to provide the busy magnate with *otium* – ideally, to be used in intellectual pursuits, at least according to both Cicero and Pliny - travelling friends and colleagues were liable to appear, complete with their entourage of slaves and hangers-on, and expect to be entertained.

Although much of the direct evidence comes from the satirists Horace, Martial and Juvenal, it is clear that dining with friends and contacts was a regular and expected part of at least urban life, and a core element in the intercommunication of the rich and powerful. There are also numerous references to dining out scattered through the letters of Cicero and Pliny, not to mention the critiques to be found in Seneca’s *Epistles*. Plutarch wrote six books of discussion of what might go on at a (literary-intellectual) dinner party, while Athenaeus’s entire *Deipnosophistae* is devoted to a marathon version of an intellectual word-feast. The extent to which the élite were interconnected is clear from this social activity, and may be further illustrated by the fact that on one occasion Cicero wrote letters to every member of the senate, bar one.

The triumph of Octavian in the civil war and his creation of the principate led to significant, if gradual, changes in the position and character of the élite. The *princeps* monopolised *imperium* and hence the possibility of military glory and a triumph; and Augustus’s

---

249 e.g. Cic. *Or.* 3.15.57; Off. 3.1; Brut. 7-9; *Tusc.* 1.5; Plin. *Ep.* 1.22; 9.3. See Treggiari (1998) for an insightful analysis of the tension between private and public evident in Cicero’s writings.
250 Columella (1.5.7) suggests that it is unwise to locate a *villa rustica* too close to a main road because the owner will never be free of visitors.
251 Wilkins (2003), pp. 359ff.; Slater (1991); Shero (1923). For the role of Atticus's dinner parties in the dissemination of Cicero’s writings, see Murphy (1998). For dining alone as a sign of social failure: Horace, Sat. 2.7.29-32; Mart. 5.47; 11.24.15.
252 Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* Good examples of such accounts include Cic. *Fam.* 9.16; *Att.* 13.52; *Verr.* 2.2.3.68; Plin *Ep.* 1.15; 2.6; 5.3; 9.17; 9.36; Sen. *Ep.*16.9, 90; 78.23-4; 114.10; 122.5.
254 Though triumphal *ornamenta* continued to be awarded. The last known triumph awarded to a non-member of the imperial family was won by Cornelius Balbus in 19 BC (Plin. *NH.* 5.5.36), and the first *ornamenta* under the principate to Agrippa in 14 BC. See Maxfield (1981), pp.101-109, with references there.
principate effectively saw the end of the opportunity for competitive euergetism in the capital - after 27 BC there seems to have been no significant public building in Rome by any individual senator: all public building was by either the emperor or the emperor and the senate together. Similarly, the gradual seeping away of real political power from the senate reduced some of the incentive to seek political office; while the fact that consulships became in effect the emperor’s gift, rather than the result of an election by the citizen body, must have reduced the importance of a large element of the patronage system and moved its focus to the emperor, while forcing the élite to behave like clients. Cicero would have been appalled. Élite competition shifted, to an extent, from politics to the law courts, though the magistracies of the cursus honorum continued to be competed for and filled. Competitive dining, already becoming established in the late Republic, seems to have become more prevalent as a means of – at least – working off the competitive urge that was increasingly hard to assuage by public means.

During the first century, too, the destruction of old senatorial families by the actions of suspicious emperors and then the civil wars of 68-69 led to a fundamental change in the make-up of the senate, with an influx of provincial senators. Meanwhile the accumulation of wealth and power by the freedmen of the familia Caesaris changed the balance of both influence and ostentation. Nonetheless, the first century AD saw continued lavish spending on luxuries by the élite, to the extent that, as Tacitus observed, much of the traditional wealth of the senatorial families had been eroded by the end of the century.

255 Ando (2011), pp.52-3. For euergetism, see Veyne (1990), ch. 1, pp. 5 ff.
256 For an analysis of this see Tacitus Dial. 7. Quintilian (Inst.1. pr. 22) clearly locates the role of the orator in the law courts – cf. Inst. 4.1.6 ff, where the entire focus of the discussion (and of the following two books) is on forensic speeches. For elections, see Plin. Ep. 3.20; and for electoral misconduct, Plin. Ep. 4.25. On the continuation of competition in the cursus honorum, see Strunk (2013).
257 For this furor convivarium, see Sen Brev. Vit. 12.5. Augier-Grimaud (2012) sees the Cena Trimalchionis as the satirist’s reaction to the rise of ‘dinner theatre’ (Jones (1991)), and describes dining under the early empire as ‘une sorte de cursus elegantiarum’ (p. 1).
258 Tac. Ann. 3.55.
2.3 The Role of Luxury

This section focuses on the role of luxury in Roman society, and how élite Romans made use of luxuries as social signaling. In the following section, there is a brief summary of modern analyses of luxury in relation to brands, and a discussion of how luxury brands can be recognised. As will become clear from that section, the definition of luxury, and its value as a concept in social or economic analyses, are a subject of some debate. It is equally clear, however, that the Romans themselves had no doubt about what constituted luxury, and criticized it accordingly.

Roman writers of the late republic and early empire were very ready to recount and deplore the development of luxuria, and to attribute it to specific incidents in the city’s history. As Lintott (1972) has made clear, this became a topos in Roman historians’ analyses, and is a recurring theme in Pliny’s Natural History. Luxuria is variously defined, but can be interpreted in modern terms as something closely akin to Veblen’s conspicuous consumption. For the moralizing Roman writer, it involved ostentatious and exaggerated private expenditure, on anything from buildings to exotic foods; the importation of strange and rare (mostly oriental) products, whether as architectural features, artworks, furnishings, items of clothing or, especially, foods; the adoption of foreign (Greek, oriental) habits of clothing and leisure; and so on. Expensive and rare materials, foreign practices and religious observations, unusual and exotic foods, unconventional clothing, strange sexual practices, even the acquisition of a specialist cook, are all criticized and stigmatized by moralists – and

259 For a more detailed discussion, see White (2014).
260 See p. 79 below.
261 See n. 292 below. Lintott (1972), p. 629, n. 18 suggests that victorious Roman generals were corrupted by visions of wealth at least as early as the First Punic war (M. Valerius Messalla and C. Duilius), though Roman authors tend to date the first signs later – without agreeing on the precise ‘culprit’. Pliny uses the word luxuria at least 60 times – e.g., NH 9.67-68; 9.117-123; 12.83; 13.20; 33.148-150; 36.109, 113-115; 37.12-14, 18-22. See Wallace-Hadrill (1990), p. 86; Bounia (2004), pp. 178 ff.; Dubois (2008), pp. 23-24, 41; White (2014), espec. pp. 118, 133; etc.
262 Veblen (1899); cf. Liebenstein (1950). Trigg (2001, with references) rejects recent critiques and enlists the support of Bourdieu (1984) to restate Veblen’s position. For an overview of the modern development of the phenomenon, see Patsiaouras & Fitchett (2012) and references there.
brought up as objects of abuse in politics and the law courts. And, of course, widely adopted within the élite groups and their imitators.

Luxuries, of various kinds, became an essential part of the demonstration of status by the Roman élite. Being a member of the élite required wealth. Being a competitive member of the élite required ostentatious expenditure of that wealth. How the individual chose to achieve this demonstration of his wealth and power might vary widely. The traditional form, which long remained widespread and respected, especially in the provinces, was the endowment of public works, from the building of public offices or temples to the presentation of decorative artworks to the city and putting on games or theatrical performances. By the first century BC, however, the rich and powerful at Rome were embellishing their own ever-more-portentous residences with imported marbles and collections of Greek sculptures and paintings. Where the second century’s triumphatores had presented most of their spoils of statuary, jewels and treasure to the city’s temples, by the first century far more of the booty went into their own palatial residences, both in the city and in country villas.

As far as moralist writers were concerned, this burgeoning luxury was the cause of a perceived decline in Roman morals and, indeed, national morale: the source, in effect, of decadence, and a reason for the political dissolution that destroyed the Republic and

---

263 See Edwards (1993); there are ample examples in Cicero's speeches, notably the *Philippics, Verrines* (especially *Verr. 2.4*), *In Pisonem* and *Pro Sestio*.

264 Euergetism of almost any kind, was seen as both desirable and acceptable, but after the Civil War private euergetism, at least in public building, seems to have been largely excluded from Rome itself, though remaining common in Italy and the provinces. (cf. n. 256 above)

265 For marbles, see Plin. *NH*. 37. For a detailed discussion of houses as 'social structures' see Wallace-Hadrill (1988); cf. Zanker (1979). For collecting, see Bounia (2004). For the houses themselves, see Cic. *Off*. 1.138-9; *Leg*. 2.2. Cf. Vitruv. *6.5.2*: nobilibus vero qui honores magistratusque praedem praestare debent officia civibus, facienda sunt vestibula regalia alta, atria et peristyila amplissima, silvae ambulationesque laxiores ad decorum maiestatis perfectae - 'But for nobles, who in bearing honours, and discharging the duties of the magistracy, must have much intercourse with the citizens, princely vestibules must be provided, lofty atria, and spacious peristyila, groves, and extensive walks, finished in a magnificent style' (tr. Joseph Gwilt).

266 It is worth noting that the root *praed-* covers both 'booty' and 'estate' – *sic* Lewis & Short: the *OLD* does not offer this equivalence. For booty, see Dillon & Welch (2006), ch. 1-3; Gruen (1992) p. 85-6; Bloy (1998-9), pp. 56-60; Churchill (1999); Coudry & Humm (eds.) (2009). The idea of war as (primarily) a source of booty goes back to Plato (*Phaed. 66c*) and Aristotle (*Pol*. 1256b23). For villas as media for luxury display, see Zarmakoupi (2014).
continued to undermine society under the early principate. Romans tended to make a distinction, which goes back at least to Cato at the beginning of the second century, between public and private display. The former, as Cicero makes clear, was regarded with favour, but the latter was – at least – suspicious. Given the essentially public nature of the élite Roman’s house, it was easy enough to see what anyone had on display in their residence.

The Roman élite were well aware that their society was changing under the influence of wider outside contacts and the increase both in wealth and in the diversity of the city’s population. The idea that any Roman should indulge in displays of ostentatious luxury was frowned on at the height of the republic, to the extent that as early as the first quarter of the third century a consular senator was expelled from the senate by the censors, who regularly attempted to curb excess luxury, for having an excessive amount of silver tableware. At the end of this century, too, the first explicit sumptuary legislation was enacted, albeit as an emergency measure in the course of the Second Punic War. This was the lex Oppia, which restricted the jewellery and rich clothing of women, and limited their use of carriages. Its proposed repeal was the subject of a fulminating opposing speech by Cato, as consul in 195 BC, which failed, we are told, in the face of considerable pressure from the wealthy matrons of Rome. Subsequent laws in this field were directed primarily at food, or more precisely at the expense and character of banquets and dinner parties. Between 182 and 18 BC, there were no less than nine such laws and sundry decrees of the senate or censors, starting with the lex Orchia de cenis. For the most part, these laws limited the amount that might be spent

267 A view traceable back to Polybius (31.25.4-8), but perhaps most strongly identified with Sallust, e.g. Cat. 10-12; 13.1-2; 20.11 and repeated in (among others) Livy (e.g. 39.6.7-9; 25.40.1), both Senecas and, especially, Pliny (notably NH. 36.113-158) See Sen. Controv. 2.1.11-13; Sen. Ep. 86.6; 89.201; 95.8-9; 122.5-8. Virtually every prose writer extant, and several poets, too, followed this line. The voice of luxury-lovers is mostly silent, though there are tentative examples in Horace (Sat. 2.4) and Ovid (Ars Am. 3.121-28), while Statius (Silv. 1.3; 2.2; 4.6) was more openly admiring.


269 Gazda (1994); Treggiari (1999), etc.

270 P. Cornelius Rufinus, in 275 BC. He had, allegedly, 10 lbs. of silver tableware: Liv. per.14; Gell. NA. 4.8.7; Val. Max. 2.9.4. By contrast, the silverware found in the cellar of the House of the Menander at Pompeii consisted of 107 items, weighing in total 84 kg. (Source: National Archaeological Museum, Naples). By the early Principate, a slave of Claudius reportedly had a single plate weighing 500 lbs, together with eight side plates each of 250 lbs. (Plin. NH. 33.145). For the censors' attempts to suppress luxury in general, see Slob (1986); Astin (1988) and refs there, and Astin (1985) for a discussion of Gcero's analysis of the censorship. It is clear that the censors' action on luxury was more widespread in their treatment of individual senators and equites than in laying down general rules.

271 Liv. 34.1.8; Val. Max. 9.1.3.
on a banquet, and sometimes detailed the allowable cost or character of the wines that might be served."

*Luxus mensae* in general attracted both criticism from moralists and these legal interventions. The idea of serving exotic and sought-after ingredients at dinners can be traced to Greek society, and was becoming familiar to the Romans as early as the time of the first significant Latin poet, Ennius, who used the ideas of Archestratus in his *Hedypagetica*, the only extant fragment of which discusses where best around the Mediterranean to acquire a variety of different fish. By the beginning of the first century BC, the initiative of Sergius Orata, one of the circle of the exceedingly wealthy Lucullus, led to the first commercial oyster farming on the bay of Naples. Pliny, and before him, slightly improbably, the poet Ovid, deplored the interest of wealthy Romans in eating fish. By contrast, Juvenal had a field day in his fourth *Satire* recounting the appearance at the imperial court of Domitian of a giant turbot and the excitement and sycophantic manoeuvrings that followed. From all this, it is clear that the fashion for serving expensive and exotic fish, in particular, had developed into something approaching a competitive game between Roman gourmets, complete with aggressive bidding in the markets. What started as simple emulation had become, for some, vicious rivalry.

272 Gell. NA. 2.24; Macrob. Sat. 3.17. The best-documented censorial programme is that of Cato in the early 2nd century BC, which led to taxation of jewellery and furnishings over a value of 1500 HS (Plut. Cat. mai.18). In the 1st century, the censors banned the sale of ‘exotic unguents’, and attempted to cap the price of fine wines – see Slob (1986). Under Tiberius, the wearing of silk by men and the use of gold tableware were banned, but more ambitious proposals were rejected by the senate, and Tiberius himself refused to be drawn into new areas of sumptuary regulation: see Tac. Ann. 3.52-5. On sumptuary legislation, the most valuable recent sources are Coudry (2004); Dari-Matiau & Plisecka (2010); Zanda (2011).

273 For an overview of dining, see Gowers (1993). For some criticisms of *luxus mensae*, see Diod. Sic. 37.3-6; Sen. Ep. 47.5; 70.23-4; Plin. NH. 19.52-54; Clem. Alex. Paed. 2.1; Gell. NA. 15.8.2.


279 For some detail of *luxus mensae*, see d’Arms (2004); and for dining alone as a sign of social failure: Hor. *Sat.* 2.7.29-32; Mart. 5.47, 11.24.15. ‘Competitive entertaining was a crucial part of the social and indeed political life of the Roman elite’ – Edwards (1993), p. 202.
The eastern conquests in the second century BC led to the import of a mass of artworks of all kinds, some of them looted from temple treasuries, and this stimulated the development of art collections. Initially, as has been noted, triumphing generals deposited their loot – or most of it – in temples. But as both the supply of artworks and knowledge about them increased, the Roman élite began to use them to decorate their own homes and, to a greater or lesser extent, to form collections, especially of sculpture, but also of a variety of other artworks and artefacts. While most of the evidence for this comes from archaeology, a few key texts (notably books 34-36 of Pliny’s *Natural History*) shed some light – at least – on the intention behind these collections. The evidence for collecting and collectors is exhaustively set out and analysed by Alexandra Bounia. It is clear from her analysis that a key aim of many collectors was to present an appropriate impression to visitors to the house or villa. We see the concept at work in the well-known correspondence between Cicero and Atticus about the sculptures Cicero required to create the right atmosphere in the study areas of his villa at Tusculum. As Jerome Pollitt points out, however, Augustus appears to have set out to ‘deprivatise’ collections of Greek art. As a result of this, for example, Asinius Pollio’s extensive collection was installed in his (public) library. This policy was soon reversed, at least for the princeps, by the collecting zeal of first Tiberius and then Caligula and Nero.

The availability of a substantial supply of art treasures, plus the ready willingness of Roman buyers to acquire copies of well-known sculptures, meant that it was easy for the rich and powerful to compete in the display of often eclectic collections of sculpture and other works of art. In parallel, the later 1st century BC and much of the 1st century AD saw a competitive process of ostentatious housebuilding, albeit one that was trumped by the building activities of the emperors, principally Nero and Domitian, though the process started with Augustus,

---

281 For Cicero’s correspondence on sculptures for the villa, see *Att*. 1.7; 2.2; 4.2; 5.2; 6.3; 6.4; 7.3; 9.3; 10.5; *Fam*. 7.23, with Bounia (2004), pp. 290-292. Cf. Plin. *NH*. 35.2.
284 Plin. *NH*. 34.62; 35.70 (Tiberius); Suet. Cal. 22.2; Dio Cass. 59.28.3-5 (Caligula); Plin. *NH*. 34.84 (Nero). See Laurence (2003), pp. 140-147.
286 Plin. *NH*. 17.2-6; 36.6-8; *Cic. Off*. 1.140.
who could say with some justification that he had found the city of brick and left it as marble.

At the same time, on a day-to-day basis, ambitious politicians competed, too, in entertainment, both domestic and public. Tacitus, viewing this with a jaundiced eye from the beginning of the following century, clearly took some pleasure in describing the way in which the great families who had survived the end of the Republic had achieved competitive impoverishment under the early principate.

2.4 Luxury brands

If we attempt to study ancient brands and the attitudes to them of ancient consumers, we are inevitably constrained by the nature of the surviving evidence. This consists primarily of literary references to individual brands, supplemented to a limited extent by evidence from archaeology. Roman literature from the first centuries either side of the Christian era is the richest Latin literature we possess (together with some valuable contemporary material in Greek), but it represents only a fraction of all that was written in the period; and virtually all the authors and poets involved were, inevitably, members of a quite small aristocracy of wealth and/or education. Crucially, too, they owed their reputation and, indeed, literary survival to their ability to maintain contacts among the élite, since these were the people who could provide them with patronage and wider contacts.

While we can supplement the written word with the documents of archaeology, whether epigraphic or simply material, we are inevitably thrown back on the written word and – of course – the substantial volume of scholarship that has gone into understanding Roman

\[287\] Suet. Aug. 28.3. (Although Augustus’s Palatine residence was deliberately unostentatious – Suet. Aug. 72)
\[288\] Tac. Ann. 3.55.
\[289\] Salles (1992), p. 44, points out that of 206 writers known from the first century AD, we have material at all from only 26, a mere 12% of the writers, and then only part – at most – of their output. (Cited in de la Durantaye (2007), p. 1, n. 2).
\[290\] Obvious exceptions are Epictetus and Statius, though the latter certainly had the entrée to a significant sector of élite society.
society and the social and economic context in which brands might be written and spoken about. The fact remains that we have limited knowledge about how these communications were actually received by those who read or heard them; but it is these texts, and the underlying discourse that they represent, that provide the basis for examining the social life of brands in the period. This subject is discussed in detail in the section on literacy (2.6).

The constraints outlined also dictate the sort of brands that it makes sense to examine in detail in this way. While luxury products of all kinds appealed, as the preceding section has shown, to a narrow market within the Roman Empire, the people who used them controlled the vast majority of the Empire’s wealth, as well as representing the primary ‘consumers’ of Latin (and Greek) literature. It is very clear that the Romans themselves recognised the existence of a dynamic market in a wide variety of luxuries, which, as we have seen, moralising writers were quick to criticise and identify as the symptom (or even cause) of the alleged decadence of Roman society from the principled morality claimed for the early Republic. 292

It is fair to say that modern writers have questioned the value of ‘luxury’ as a category, especially in the context of understanding ancient trade. 293 It has, reasonably, been pointed out that luxury is both a relative and a labile term: yesterday’s luxury, as its use becomes more widespread, turns into today’s everyday product. 294 At the same time, commentators from Friedländer onwards have observed that the luxury attributed to the Romans tends to pale before the well-documented excesses of eighteenth and nineteenth-century princelings. 295

Nevertheless, modern marketing theory has identified a category of ‘luxury’ brands that have quite clearly defined characteristics and relationships with the marketplace and consumers. 296 They are, by definition, relatively highly priced and bought by a more or less exclusive

292 Lintott (1972) is still the best succinct analysis of Roman ‘moral decline’. For a general discussion of Roman luxury, see White (2014). See nn. 265, 267 and 270 above.
295 Friedländer (1913) (vol. 2), passim.
296 For an overview and literature review, see Brun & Castelli (2013). Detailed analyses are best found in Kapferer & Bastien (2011) and Vigneron & Johnson (1999).
cliente of well-off buyers. In economists’ terms, luxury brands are those that successfully command a price premium, and may be surprisingly price-inelastic: indeed, they may actually become more demanded if their price is increased, and risk falling out of favour if they become too ‘affordable’. Like diamonds, for example, they are actually demanded because they are costly.²²⁷ Once hoi polloi are seen buying them, the true connoisseur will move on to something more exclusive; and a discounted luxury is a luxury on the slide.²²⁸ Classically, too, luxuries are ‘positional’ goods.²²⁹ These are products that enable their owner or user to make a clear statement about his or her position in society.

The key characteristics of luxury brands are quite straightforward; see fig. 2.1, distilled primarily from analyses I have been involved in, working for international advertising agencies, on brands such as De Beers, Rolex and Salvatore Ferragamo:

![Fig.2.1. Key characteristics of luxury markets and brands](image)

- High quality, well-designed and crafted by experts. Both well-made and aesthetically pleasing
- Rare, special, unusual, exotic: possibly obtained only by great or risky effort
- Reflecting authentic heritage or history: ideally with a good, credible and even slightly ‘magical’ background story
- Highly-priced – too expensive for most people, but not for the rich or the true connoisseur – hence, exclusive
- Recognisably used by high-status/wealthy people: seen in the ‘right’ places.
- Indulgent – to be experienced and enjoyed with enthusiasm


²²⁸ A good example is provided by Plin. NH. 9.106ff., describing how pearls had come to be worn by even the poor – pauperes. The rich would wear only the very best pearls, usually in quantity. Cf. a similar account of the development of fashions in purple dye in NH. 9.63.
²²⁹ See Hirsch (1977). Bourdieu (1984) has much to say on the subject: positional goods have an important contribution to make to his ‘symbolic capital’.
This list is in essence common to all analyses of luxury brands, and is reflected in the ways in which modern brands such as Louis Vuitton, De Beers, Armani, Patek Philippe, Mandarin Oriental and so on are presented and marketed. For the luxury buyer, the precise brand, and the precise representation of the brand, is an essential element in choice. Quite apart from the public display involved in the use of the brand, there is the personal satisfaction of having made an informed, connoisseur’s choice. This type of attitude can happily embrace commodities from shellfish to fine art.

From the list of characteristics, we can see how products or commodities in the luxury field can become brands, especially in a pre-mass-media world. Take ivory as an example: a merchant might offer a craftsman a tusk or part of a tusk. The craftsman will want to be sure what he is buying. The merchant will assure him that it is the tusk of an Indian elephant – as opposed to either an African elephant’s tusk, or the horn of a narwhal, or a hippopotamus tooth, or even a piece of bone – with the specific qualities of whiteness and density that characterise Indian ivory. The craftsman, in turn, will make the ivory into a finished product, most probably to order, and to reassure his customer he may well name the brand – in this case, *Indian* ivory (see ch. 5).

Brands of this type – origin brands - in the Roman world can be readily identified, as we have seen, and provide the main raw material for this study, as set out in the case studies (chapters 4-7). The choice of luxury brands rests on the fact that these are the sorts of commodities that are sufficiently widely discussed or referenced in the extant classical literature to provide a substantial body of material for analysis. They were products for the wealthy élite, and a subject for comment by authors and poets who were themselves part of, or patronised by, that élite. Without the resulting discourse, we would have rather little to analyse. Classical literature is largely silent about *garum*, *Firmalampen* and *terra sigillata* - though the archaeological record has plenty to reveal about all three, and they are certainly branded commodities, to a greater or lesser extent. What we do not know, which is critical

300 See, eg, Kapferer & Bastien (2009); Walley et al (2013); Charoenroek & Thakor (2008), in a very extensive and growing literature.

for the present analysis, is virtually anything about these brands’ reputations among their buyers and users.

Within the highly competitive upper reaches of Roman society, status, closely linked to wealth, though not entirely dependent on it, was critical for personal satisfaction – and for political advancement. As the Roman world grew wealthier, especially as a result of the conquests of the second and early first centuries BC, the small senatorial and equestrian élite both discovered the appeal of luxury goods of all kinds and acquired the means to buy and flaunt them. The luxuries of the east (mostly), in the form of artworks, gold and silver plate, expensive and luxurious furniture, exotic foods, plants and animals, were displayed, together with throngs of captives, soon to be slaves or slaughtered, in the triumphal processions of a succession of generals. Some, at least of the loot then appeared in the increasingly luxurious town houses and villas of the rich and famous. In societal terms, this kind of display of wealth was a valuable – though not absolutely essential – element in the aspiring politician’s self-presentation: shows of wealth demonstrated substance and breeding or success (or both), not to mention the possibility that some of it might rub off on others in return for political support. Ostentation and power went hand-in-hand.

Subsequent commentators, often writing from a jaundiced nostalgia for a simpler, possibly golden age, noted who was first to decorate a public building, and then his own house, with marble columns; who introduced the idea of fish farms to provide oysters or prize mullets; who was honoured with an ivory statue or carried on a funeral couch inlaid with gold and ivory. At the same time, crusty politicians, concerned at what they had started, vainly introduced a series of sumptuary laws – most of which were quickly ignored or treated with

---

302 Literary references go back at least to Plautus. On triumphal displays see Hölscher (2006), and for the degree to which accounts of triumphs actually described reality, see Beard (2007), pp. 37 ff. For an outsider's view of what constituted luxuries in Roman trade, see Revelation 18. 11-13 (n. 316, below).

303 It is fair to point out that at least in the early stages of this process, most of the booty was given to the State, and the generals concerned were more likely to dedicate a new and splendid temple or a public theatre than to build themselves an ostentatious mansion. But this spirit of euergetism, though it never actually died out, especially in the provinces, became gradually a less important channel for newly acquired wealth (see p. 72, above).

304 Marble columns: Plin. NH. 36.7 (L. Crassus); fish farming: Pliny NH. 9. 168 (Sergius Orata); ivory statue, funeral couch: Suet. D. J. 76, 84 (Julius Caesar).
contempt. While it would be a mistake to take the political rhetoric and personal attacks of first-century-BCE Roman politics at their full face value, it is possible to trace through the historical and other literary evidence of the period the development of lifestyles that favoured extravagance, display and also, at the extremes, an associated rowdyism and contempt for the rest of society.

2.5 Trade and Commerce

Most luxury items were imported, often from far-distant sources – pearls, spices and ivory from India, amber from the Baltic, incense from southern Arabia and east Africa, silk from China (mostly via India – see ch. 6). Indeed, there has long been a theory that long-distance trade was originally developed for, and depended on, luxury commodities. Pompey’s defeat of the pirates made the Mediterranean relatively safe for sailors, and this is at least partly reflected in the apparent increase in trading voyages in the late 1st century BC and the two subsequent centuries. It is clear that within the Mediterranean there was a regular volume of seaborne trade at least during the 8-9 months of favourable weather, and that this trade was essentially commercial and everyday. In character, it ranged from the regular cargoes of grain from North Africa and Egypt that supplied Rome with its basic foodstuff under a system of government-organised contracts to the coastal cabotage that we can see in, for example, the Acts of the Apostles, which also provide an excellent description of why the winter months were mostly to be avoided for sailing.

305 E.g. Tac. Ann 3.55; Gell. NA. 2.24; Macrobr. Sat. 3.17 ff; Griffin (1985) pp. 100-1; Rosivach (2006); Dari-Matiacu & Plisecka (2010). And see above, n. 272.
307 E.g. Clodius – see Cic. Fam. 1.13, 1.14, etc.; Sen. Ep.51.4 (drunken conduct at Baiae); Juv. 3. 288-301 (muggings at night); and Plaut. Most. 20-24 for an early view (see Quinn (1982)).
310 De Souza (1999). The direct evidence for increased voyages, the precise interpretation of which is disputed, was collected by Parker (1992). For up-to-date overview and critique see Wilson (2009, 2011).
311 See Rickman (1980).
312 Acts 20.13-16, 21.1-4 (cabotage); 27 (perils of winter sailing). Cf. Horden & Purcell (2000), pp. 144-150, who emphasise the overall importance for Mediterranean trade of cabotage. Contra Arnaud (2011), esp. pp. 61-63, who argues that pure cabotage was rare; coastal traders were more usually collecting cargoes from regular emporia on planned voyages. Arnaud provides an excellent overview of the institutions underlying trade in the Mediterranean.
There was, very clearly, a substantial trade in basic commodities: wine, olive oil, grains, fish and fish products, together with a variety of ceramics. On top of this, as an addition to the value, and hence the profit, for any given voyage, a shipper or entrepreneur might acquire more valuable and exotic cargo. The first-century BC wreck discovered in 1907 off the Tunisian town of Mahdia, for example, was carrying a selection of sculptures, presumably mostly from a Greek workshop, which might have decorated a rich Roman’s villa, as well as more mundane items. Long-distance trade relied to a greater extent on luxuries, as the diatribes of Pliny the Elder against the expenditure of Romans on a range of expensive commodities from Arabia, India and beyond make clear. The products of these distant lands outside the empire’s boundaries needed to be valuable and prestigious, like pearls, ivory and silk, or highly demanded (like pepper and frankincense) to justify the cost and risk of the voyages needed to bring them into the empire.

Rome had no natural seaport to receive the imports that it needed to sustain its growing population. For some time, imported bulk commodities were mostly landed at Puteoli, some 250 km away, on the Bay of Naples. Later, Ostia and then Portus at the mouth of the Tiber became the main import channels for goods from the western Mediterranean. Ostia was substantially expanded under Tiberius. Portus was founded by Claudius, and further developed by Trajan to provide the essential docks and warehouses that enabled the goods of the empire and beyond to be transhipped for the journey on barges up the Tiber to the quays.

313 The scale of trade in the Roman world is a focal point of the long-running debate about the nature of the ancient economy (see ch. 1). For a recent overview of the issues, see Bang (2007). For the importance of trade in ‘basics’ see Horden & Purcell (2000); Tchernia (2011); Bowman & Wilson (2013). Ceramics seem usually to have been a secondary element of cargoes – Tchernia (2011), pp. 111-112; Leitch (2011), pp. 177-181.
315 For the alleged global cost of the far eastern trade see Plin. NH. 5.12, 6.101, 12.84, with comments by Parker (2002) and references there. For detailed analysis of two key commodities, see the chapters on Ivory and Silk below (ch. 5 and 6). See P. Vindob G 40822 for the very high value of a single cargo from Muziris in India, and the comments of Casson (1990) and Rathbone (2000) on this much-cited fragment of evidence. For an outsider’s view of the scope of Roman luxury trade, see Revelation 18. 11-13, on the expected consequences of the fall of ‘Babylon the great’: ‘And the merchants of the earth shall weep and mourn over her; for no man buyeth their merchandise any more: the merchandise of gold and silver and precious stones, and of pearls, and fine linen, and purple, and scarlet, and all thine wood, and all manner vessels of ivory, and all manner vessels of most precious wood, and of brass, and iron, and marble, and cinnamon, and odours, and ointments, and frankincense and wine and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, and chariots, and slaves and souls of men.’ (AV).
and warehouses of Rome itself. These ports were highly-developed and diversified commercial facilities on a par with many medieval ports, providing a range of services and specialised professions to deal with the commodities imported into Rome and the labour and administration of handling them. Portus seems to have taken over some of Puteoli’s eastern-Mediterranean traffic, though Puteoli was still a prosperous port well into the second century.\(^{317}\)

Once imported luxury products had arrived within the Empire, they naturally gravitated to the richest and largest market – Rome itself. First however, raw materials had to be turned into suitable finished products. Much of this work, for goods from the far eastern markets, was carried out either in Alexandria, which was not merely a hub for trade,\(^{318}\) but also a great centre for craft workmanship, or in the other major centres of the near east – Antioch, Damascus, Berytus. Thus, for example, much ivory carving clearly took place in Alexandria, which was a major source of luxury furniture manufacture; while silks were woven – and in some cases re-woven – and dyed in the workshops of the near east, especially in Berytus.\(^{319}\)

We know little in detail about the wholesale and retail distribution of luxury goods in Rome and the other major cities of the empire. Claire Holleran has set out to analyse how Romans shopped, and her recent book, the first to attempt an overview of the subject, collects a wide but scattered range of evidence that required imagination and persistence to be turned into a coherent picture.\(^{320}\) What follows inevitably draws heavily on her work.

Rome’s luxury buyers represented an exceedingly wealthy and attractive market for purveyors of the rare, exotic and valuable. But this market ranged from fancy foodstuffs to precious stones, rare marble to exotic unguents. By their very nature, these various products required different forms of transportation, storage (warehousing – the numerous specialised horrea in Rome) and retail facilities. Chiefly from Martial, we know that in 1st century AD

\(^{317}\) The case for the continuing importance of Puteoli is set out in d’Arms (1975).

\(^{318}\) Alexandria: ‘the greatest emporium in the inhabited world’: Strab. 17.1.13; Dio C. 32.35.

\(^{319}\) Frazer (1972); Rodziewicz (2007); Takacs (1995) (Alexandria); Rey-Coquais (2002) (Syria); Downey (1961) (Antioch); Hall (2004); Lauffray (1978) (Berytus); Burns (2005) (Damascus).

\(^{320}\) Holleran (2012).
Rome luxury goods of various kinds could be found especially in the Via Sacra, the Vicus Tuscus and at the Saepta Julia. Buying goods in the ‘right’ places seems to have been important in Rome, just as it is in some circles today, and storeholders in these élite shopping areas will have been happy to tell their customers what they ought to be buying. Auction sales, too, were evidently widely used to sell a variety of goods, especially high-cost items such as property and slaves, but also works of art. This would provide anyone interested with very public evidence of what was in demand among the wealthy and famous.

At the same time, the élite ideal of self-sufficiency undoubtedly meant that much produce was supplied from a magnate’s country estates – as Petronius’s parodic Trimalchio illustrates. It is likely that most meat, game and especially fish bought on the retail market would have been purchased from the Macellum, a permanent building that seems to have operated as both a wholesale and a retail market. There were macella in cities all over the empire: Rome seems to have had several, the first established by M. Fulvius Nobilior as censor in 179 BC.

Furnishings and household items in general seem to have been produced in craft workshops that doubled as retail outlets, and no doubt wealthy buyers could and did have their furniture and items such as tableware made to order. These workshops are not easy to identify in the archaeological record, but there seems little doubt that the tabernae that proliferated in Ostia and Pompeii, and which can be widely identified on the surviving fragments of the various contemporary ‘maps’ of Rome, catered for a range of activities from straightforward retailing to manufacturing with a retail ‘front’.

321 See Ovid Am. 1.8.97; Prop. 2.24.14; (Via Sacra - see Papi (2002)); Hor. Sat. 2.3.242-6; Ep. 2.1.269-70; Mart. 11.27.11 (Vicus Tuscus); Mart. 9.59; 10.80 (Saepta).
323 Holleran (2012), p. 254. Some of Pliny’s quoted prices evidently derive from auction sales – e.g. NH. 34.11-12. On auctions and auctioneers, see Rauh (1989).
325 Livy 40.51.5. See Walker (2004).
326 Holleran (2012), ch. 3.
It seems, too, that the art market worked rather differently: this is an area Holleran does not really cover. Again, the evidence is scattered and fragmentary, but we know, for example, that Cicero used the services of Atticus and a variety of intermediaries to acquire the statuary for his Tusculan villa. In his day, prices for these articles seem to have been set by private negotiation, though at least some artworks would have been sold at the many auctions that took place at different locations around Rome. As Cicero observed in one of his speeches against Verres, artworks are worth what someone is prepared to pay for them.

2.6 Literacy, Education and Access to Literature

It has already been suggested that one way in which new luxury products might achieve currency within the Roman élite was through mentions in literature, especially poetry. To do this, of course, the poetry that talks about these commodities and brands would have to be read or repeated reasonably widely, at least within the élite circles with the purchasing power to buy them. Here, it is necessary to consider how far the works of a Horace or Propertius, a Statius or a Martial actually found an audience on any scale. While it is safe to assume, with William Harris, that the population of the Roman empire as a whole was probably 90% illiterate, this would not apply within the élite: Harris reckons that at least the males of the senatorial class were virtually all literate in the classical period, and his view has become widely accepted, but it is less clear how far literacy reached down the socio-economic scale.

327 Cic. Att. 1.3; 1.6; 1.8; 1.9; 1.10; 1.11.
328 Cic. Verr. 2.4.14: *qui modus est in his rebus cupiditatis idem est aestimationis*. Pliny has a number of anecdotes about sales of works of art: Plin. NH 34.11-12; 35.24; 35.26; 35.70; 35.88; 35.125; 35.127; 35.136; 35.156.
330 There are also plenty of examples of educated élite women: see Hemelrijk (1999). What was true of senators was probably broadly true of *equites*, too. Much of Roman education was actually Greek: ‘In the time of Cicero’s youth, any Roman with cultural pretensions would have a mind filled with Greek learning’ – Fantham (2013) p. 57: cf. p. 150 for the early empire – and Greek education was more formally organized (Morgan (1998)).
331 For a detailed view of the possibilities, see Horsfall (1996), who argues for an extensive informal culture in which the theatre, in particular, influenced the currency of a range of literature and sub-literature.
We know less than we would hope about Roman schooling, especially at the elementary level. It seems that the children of senatorial families, at least, would mostly learn their letters at home, from tutors rather than their fathers, though there were, certainly, elementary schools available.332 There was, however, no formal, official provision for education in Rome under the Republic, and the situation must have varied widely between different cities and even within a major centre of population such as Rome or Alexandria.333 At a slightly higher level, the first century BC saw a rapid development in the presence in Rome of grammatici, ‘secondary’ teachers who also frequently acted as literary critics, as we can see from the pages of Suetonius’s account of the lives of a selected group. He says that there were at least 20 schools run by these mostly Greek experts in Rome by the time of Augustus.334 The grammatici seem to have both created and made considerable use of the canon of literature that has come down to us from Quintilian,335 in the form of passages to memorise and recite; and this serves to remind us of the extent to which Greek and Roman societies were accustomed to rely on memorisation and oral interaction.336 It was not necessary to have access to a written work of literature to have at least some knowledge of its contents; and, by inference, the ‘circulation’ of at least the more accessible works of literature, especially poetry, will have been some way wider than the physical circulation of the actual books in which the text was recorded.

As Emily Hemelrijk makes clear, it is impossible to reconstruct Roman reading habits: there is an almost total lack of evidence for the nature and size of the ‘reading public’, though this has not discouraged ample scholarly speculation.337 Given the essentially primitive nature of ‘publishing’ in ancient Rome, any given work’s circulation must have been quite limited. As Raymond Starr demonstrated, most works were distributed through private copying, initially

332 Suet. Gram.17, cf. Plin. Ep.3.3.3; Quint. Inst. 1.2. There was a clear obligation on the wealthy to educate their sons – and even their daughters. See Harris (1989), pp. 233 ff., and references there; Bonner (1977); Morgan (1998).
333 Greek education was somewhat more formally organized, at least from Hellenistic times. See Morgan (1998).
335 Inst. 10.12 ff.
336 For an example, see Sen. Cont. 10. pr. 7-8, where Cassius Severus is reported to have said when T. Labienus’s entire works were sentenced to be burned that they would have to burn him, too, since he had learned them all by heart. The role of memory cannot be ignored in pre- or semi-literate societies. On the benefits of memorising, see Quint. Inst. 2.7. 2-3. See Gowing (2005); Farrell (1997); Akinnaso (1992).
337 Hemelrijk (1999), pp. 48-49.
within a very small circle of the author’s friends. Most copies were made from friends’
texts, though increasingly in the first century AD booksellers seem to have played a bigger
role."

2.7 The Circulation of Literature

How widely any new literary work in Rome might be circulated in the period under review is
far from certain. The idea of ‘publication’ should not be taken in its modern sense: methods
to produce quickly thousands of copies of a book – almost however short – did not exist.\textsuperscript{338} It
seems reasonably clear, although the precise details are much disputed, and changes over
time are equally difficult to trace, that most literary works were initially produced with at
most a few presentation copies for the writer’s friends, patrons and dedicatees.\textsuperscript{339} For poets,
certainly, and even for many prose authors, the main ‘medium’ of initial publication was the
recitation. From Martial, we get the sequence:

1. recitation
2. revision, in the light of friends’ suggested amendments
3. preliminary private copies for selected individuals
4. copies for public distribution and sale.\textsuperscript{340}

An obvious exception to this was private correspondence, and here the body of letters that
has come down to us (notably those of Cicero and the younger Pliny) as a result of
subsequent publication had clearly been selected and revised ahead of publication, much as
happened with the written versions of speeches.\textsuperscript{341}

\textsuperscript{338} Starr (1987), especially p. 215 ff.
\textsuperscript{340} See especially Sommer (1926); van Gronigen (1963). Pliny's story (Ep. 4.2.) of Regulus
   circulating a thousand copies of a eulogy for his dead son was clearly held up as an example of
   something quite unusual – and, possibly, in bad taste.
\textsuperscript{341} The practice of dedicating writings goes back at least to the early 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC: see the
   commentary of Stroup (2010), pp. 11 ff.
\textsuperscript{342} Martial 14.186; see Fantham (1996), p. 16. Pliny’s letters suggest a similar pattern: e.g. Ep.
   3.7.5; 5.3.8; 5.12.1; 7.17.7; 8.21.4. See Iddeng (2006); Parker (2009), pp. 205-212. Historians,
too, seem to have expected to give public readings as a way of ensuring their reputation. See
Recitations, the first stage of the launch of a new work, were usually to a select group of friends, often over dinner.\textsuperscript{344} Though public recitations were reputedly instituted by Asinius Pollio (cos. 40 BC),\textsuperscript{345} it is by no means clear whether these were primarily for new work or for recognised ‘classics’.\textsuperscript{346} It is the case, however, as Kenneth Quinn demonstrates, that in the late Republic literature was largely ‘performed’, usually to quite a limited audience. In the first century AD, recitatio became what Quinn calls ‘the single undisputed forum’ for introducing writings to an invited but sometimes wider audience, depending on the status and ambitions of the writer. As the nobility increasingly came to dabble in writing, especially poetry, recitations became something of a drug on the market, as both Juvenal and Pliny tell us,\textsuperscript{347} and it could be argued, as Quinn has suggested, that by the end of the century recitations were almost purely social events.\textsuperscript{348} However, as he says, “So long as a stable cultural elite existed, it was worth writing for; indeed, it was the only audience worth writing for; as it was small it could be reached by verbal performance….\textsuperscript{349}” In practice, by the end of the first century, the audience for serious literature had become larger, more geographically scattered, and more diverse. Of extant authors, only Martial seems to have recognised (or at least talked about) the need to publish widely to reach it.\textsuperscript{350}

A successful recitation of a new work might lead to the production of a larger number of copies. As Nepos recounted, Atticus had a household of slaves who might not be particularly good-looking, but all of whom had been taught to write and copy, and these could be used to act as a sort of ‘publishing house’.\textsuperscript{351} Rather earlier, Crassus had famously educated slaves to read, write and copy, as a means of raising their value:\textsuperscript{352} the demand for literate slaves

\textsuperscript{344} Atticus was known to launch works by recitations at dinner (Cic. Arch. 28; Nepos Att. 14). Cf. Plin. Ep. 3. 5.12; Sen. Ep. 64. 1-2. See Dupont (1997) on more-public recitations.
\textsuperscript{345} Sen. Contr. 4, praef. 2 – see Quinn (1982), p. 159.
\textsuperscript{346} On Pollio, see (e.g.) Dalzell (1955); Morgan (2000), pp. 65 ff. For the importance of recitations as a source of public recognition for literature, see Quinn (1982), pp. 83 ff, and pp.145 ff.
\textsuperscript{347} Juv. Sat. 1; Plin. Ep. 1.13.
\textsuperscript{348} Quinn (1982), p. 163.
\textsuperscript{349} Quinn (1982) p. 164. Pliny (Ep.1.13.5) claimed to know virtually every serious writer in Rome: Peter White has identified some 50 poets among his acquaintance (White (1975), pp. 299-300).
\textsuperscript{351} Nepos, Att. 13.3 – but this was not an example of ‘mass-production scriptorid, pace Skeat (1956), p. 189: see Starr (1987), pp. 219-220, n. 54.
\textsuperscript{352} Plut. Crass. 2.
existed, though it would usually be more for commercial purposes than for publishing literary material."

The process of publication was limited by the nature of available materials, as much as by the absence of printing technology. Until at least the end of the first century AD, books consisted of rolls of papyrus, which were both expensive and awkward to read. It is not until Martial that we first hear of book-like codices, and the codex did not come into its own until the fourth century."

We know little of the mechanics of Roman publishing. Cicero’s letters were ‘published’ by Atticus; Vergil’s Aeneid was posthumously edited and published by Varius and Tucca (against the poet’s wishes, but with Augustus’s encouragement); the bookselling Sosii acted, in some sense, as Horace’s (and therefore possibly Maecenas’s) publishers."

Nonetheless, enough literary works were physically available for the Romans to follow the example of Alexandria and Pergamon and establish public libraries: Julius Caesar planned a major library for Rome, to be developed and stocked by Varro—, but it was left to Augustus to create not one but two in the city,— on the Palatine and in the Campus Martius; while wealthy citizens might endow them elsewhere, notably the younger Pliny’s expensive gift to Comum.— There were, too, private libraries at Rome, going back at least to Aemilius Paullus, who acquired the royal Macedonian library through the defeat of King Perseus in 168 BC.— In the same way, Lucullus established a magnificent library in his villa at Tusculum,— a library consulted by Cicero and Cato, among others.— Lucullus used this as the basis for an

353 See Booth (1979).
355 Suet. Vit. Verg. 39 (Varius); Hor. Ars. 345; Ep. 1.20.2 (Sosii). For the very real limitations of ‘publishing’ as a concept applied to the Roman world, see Starr (1987); van Groningen (1963); Sommer (1926), etc. For a recent overview, see Iddeng (2006).
356 This implies the possibility of buying copies of key works on the open market, at a time when we have little literary evidence for the existence of booksellers, though Cicero has much to say on the difficulties of obtaining good copies of works he is looking for— see Marshall (1976), pp. 253-54; Iddeng (2006), p. 67.
357 Asinius Pollio placed a library in the Atrium Libertatis in 39 BC – Plin. NH. 7.115; 35.10.
359 Plut. Aem. 28.
360 Plut. Luc. 42. (the source of this library is uncertain: it seems to have been mostly purchased, though Isidore of Seville says it was looted from Pontus. See Fantham (2013), p. 65).
361 Cic. De Fin. 3.2.7-8; Plut. Luc. 42.
extensive network of patronage of scholars and writers. Similarly, Sulla imported Aristotle’s library after the sack of Athens in 86 BC, and this appears to have been acquired by Cicero from the dictator’s son Faustus. Cicero himself had three libraries in his country villas (Arpinum, Antium and Tusculum), as well as an apparently smaller one in his house in Rome, but he also regularly used Atticus as a source of books from Atticus’s own or his contacts’ libraries — and we hear of a number of other private libraries through the early Principate. The public libraries seem to have been, on the model of Alexandria, places of study, rather than lending libraries, though Augustus did not endow scholarship in the same way as the Ptolemies had, and he seems to have used his libraries as a vehicle of patronage, and even perhaps a form of censorship. There are, however, examples of individuals lending (or borrowing) books between themselves, and, sometimes, making copies.

It is not until Martial — again — that we learn much about booksellers, who were found in Rome primarily in the Argiletum and the Vicus Tuscus, but Catullus had mentioned, more than 100 years earlier, that there were none in Verona. It is hard to tell how much stock, and of what nature, they might have carried, though we hear of them in a variety of locations, from Lugdunum to Brundisium, and Aulus Gellius makes it clear that there was some sort of market in second-hand and rare books in his day. It is evident, however, that at least some booksellers acted effectively as publishers: they held a master copy, and if a customer wished to buy, they would have a copy made — a distant foreshadowing of today’s print-to-order publishing.

362 Cic. Acad. Prior. 2.2.4; Arch. 6, 8, 11, etc.
363 See Marshall (1976), p. 259 and n. 44.
364 Cic. Att. 2.4.1; 2.20.6; 8.11.7; 13.8; 13.31.2; 13.32.2; 13.33.2 (etc).
365 Eg Persius’s 700 volumes - Suet. Vit. Pers.6.
367 See e.g. Marshall (1976); Starr (1987) on Cicero and Atticus’s loans.
368 For booksellers in general, see Kléberg (1967); Starr (1987); Holleran (2012), pp. 246-7.
369 Catull. 68.36 – therefore acknowledging the existence of booksellers at that time.
370 Plin. Ep. 9.11.2 (Lugdunum); Aul. Gell. N.A. 19.11.1 (Brundisium). For the used book market, see Aul. Gell. N.A. 2.3.5; 5.4.1; 16.8.2; 19.1.11; Lucian, Adv. Indoct. 102. Entrepreneurs such as Atticus offered whole libraries for sale: Cic. Att. 1.4.3; 1.7; 1.10.4; 1.11.3.
371 This is the implication both of Horace’s mentions of the Sosii (see p.91) and of Martial’s references to different booksellers. (1.2.8; 1.113; 1.117; 4.7.2; 13.3.2).
What is uncertain in all of this is how many copies might be available even of a wildly popular or well-regarded book – say Vergil’s *Aeneid*, which rapidly became a standard school text, apart from being a challenging model for all subsequent poets with epic ambitions. Quinn (1982) produced a theoretical model of the copying process that could explain a circulation of perhaps 2000 copies quite shortly after the *Aeneid* was finally published, but we have really no way of telling how this relates to reality, nor any indication as to how often copies of copies may have been made, whether privately or by booksellers. Certainly, we find poets from Horace to Martial complaining that while their works are widely read, they get not a penny from this.

Undoubtedly, Roman intellectuals and professional writers could and did obtain access to the works they needed to consult in order to write. Unless, of course, they found themselves exiled, like Ovid, to the furthest corners of the Empire, and cut off from anything that looked like a decent library, as Ovid complains. Even the (*soi-disant*) impecunious poet Martial had 120 rolls of papyrus on his shelves. A serious researcher such as Pliny could claim to have consulted some 2000 books in compiling the *Natural History*, and this does not seem at all exaggerated if we consider the scale of the Piso-Philodemus library from the Villa of the Papyri at Herculaneum, which contained 1,785 rolls. (It seems, from what Pliny says and the range of authorities he cites, that he is talking of 2000 complete works, rather than the smaller total that would be represented by 2000 rolls, given that Livy’s history, for example, ran to 142 rolls.)

What is clear is that among those who took any serious interest in literature – Martial’s *studiosi lectores* – there was relatively easy access to, and considerable familiarity with, at

---

372 See Starr (1987) for the relationship between authors and booksellers. Copyright did not exist, and we know of no mechanism for poets to get a return from books sold by booksellers, though Ball (1907) and Sage (1916) interpret some of Martial’s references to buying his works from individual booksellers to be, in effect, paid-for advertisements. It seems likely, too, that some specific poems were paid for by recipients who had commissioned them. See Fitzgerald (2007), pp. 29-30; Clarke (1978); Williams (1982), pp. 8-9; Zetzel (1982), p. 92.

373 Tristia 3.14.37: *Non hic librorum per quos inviter alarque/ copia* . . . For a view of a scholar’s use of public libraries, see the analysis of Galen’s *Peri alupias* in Nicholls (2011).

374 Mart. 14.190.


376 *HN. Praef.* 17. As Conte (1994), p. 69, points out, Pliny includes the only extant Roman bibliography.
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least the main authors in the ‘canon’. And it is equally clear that many of the élite, from emperors downwards, took an active if dilettante interest in writing poetry, even if this was confined to epigrams. We find Martial distinguishing different categories of reader, from the busy magnates who might have time merely to scan a short epigram dedicated to them to the diligent reader who might work his or her way through a whole book or more.”

Quintillian’s ‘canon’ of literature that the educated would-be orator should be acquainted with (and, by implication, be able to quote from appositely if the need arose) is extensive. It can presumably be taken to represent the broad syllabus of the equivalent of advanced secondary education, and it indicates the extent to which at least successful writers could expect to have their works – or the best known of them – widely circulated in educated circles. Beyond this, of course, the genuinely docti et studiosi could be expected to be far more widely read, both in Latin and Greek. As Andrew Wallace-Hadrill has shown, Suetonius meets this specification, in his own individual way, which is different from, but similar to, that of the elder Pliny.

One indication of the extent of Roman readers’ literary knowledge is hinted at by the quantity of allusion and quotation to be found in most Latin literature, especially poetry. Arguably the extreme case of this is Persius, whose satires are full of material from other writers: the amount of intertextuality involved appears excessive, and in many cases the references are by now totally obscure. What we cannot know is how far they were equally opaque to their audience at the time. It is reasonably clear, however, that, for example, theatre audiences (who were by no means limited to the literate élite) were well able to pick up quotations and allusions, quite apart from their sensitivity to lines that might refer to contemporary events and public figures. Certainly, it is easy to agree with Sander Goldberg

378 Quint. Inst. 10.1.120 ff. - conspicuously different from the reading list for the 'lighter' sort of reader in Ovid Ars Am. 3.392 ff (see Hemelrijk (1999), pp. 48-52).
381 See, e.g. Cic. Att. 2.19, Fam. 7.1, Sest. 50-59; Suet. DJ. 84; Tib. 61. Beacham (1991), pp. 139 ff.
that allusion is pointless if its audience cannot recognize it. However, as Caroline Vout puts it:

This is Rome as it approaches the end of the Julio-Claudian dynasty, a place in which reproduction no longer suffices; where the script is so well known as to encourage the trafficking of oblique reference, half-lines, refraction, and bricolage.

What this means, in the context of a study of brands, is that, if a poet should discuss a brand of wine, or go on about ladies in diaphanous Coan dresses, this would quite quickly gain a reasonably wide currency among the Roman élite. There is little doubt that educated Romans were well able to memorise substantial parts of what they heard.

An indication of the possibly far wider knowledge of at least some very familiar parts of the canon is to be found in the many literary allusions among Pompeian graffiti – a large proportion of which are, however, quoting Virgil Aeneid 1, line 1.

2.8 The Connected Poet

The inter-connectedness of élite Roman society has already been discussed above, together with the importance of patronage and clientela. Most Roman poets known to us, and virtually all whose work has survived, were members of the élite – either equites or, even, senators. They were, however, mostly from outside Rome, with very few exceptions, and by no means all of them were strikingly well off. The poor poet struggling to make ends meet is an ancient topos, deployed by, among others, Horace, Martial and Juvenal, the last of whom took an opportunity to snipe at Statius for being in the same category. It is clear, however, that most poets had patrons, whom they were expected to ‘immortalise’ in return for favours of one kind or another.

383 Vout (2009), p. 107. A comment which surely refers to the élite, and perhaps among them only to the studiosi.
385 See Milnor (2014).
386 E.g. Plautus (from Sarsina); Vergil (Mantua); Horace (Venusia); Ovid (Sulmo); Persius (Volaterra); Statius (Naples); Martial (Bilibilis); Juvenal (Aquinum).
387 Juv. 7.85-7. For the topos generally, see (e.g.) Clarke 1978. White (1982) argues that most poets did not need to make money from writing.
Poets earned no regular income from poetry: booksellers paid them nothing, as Martial frequently complains. Latin poets seem never to have established a regular practice of getting paid for commissioned verses, unlike Greek epigrammatists (who seem to have continued the practice at Rome); and until festivals were established by Nero and then Domitian, there were no prize-offering competitions for Latin poetry comparable to the circuit of Greek festivals successfully entered by Statius’s father.

The practice of wealthy nobles welcoming poets (and philosophers and even historians) into their houses as part of the household goes back at least to the end of the 3rd century BC. Ennius (Fulvius Nobilior, Scipio Africanus), Terence (Terentius Lucanus, P. Scipio) and Polybius (Aemilius Paullus, Scipio Aemilianus) all had the benefit of powerful patrons. After this, our literary records are sketchier, but examples include the poets Hostius, Accius, Archias and (possibly) Lucretius, together with the historian Theophanes and the philosophers Diodotus and Philodemus.

The high point of literary patronage dates from the end of the republic and the start of the Principate. Three major figures, the consuls Asinius Pollio and Messalla Corvinus and the rich eques Maecenas, each gathered a coterie of literary figures, mostly poets, around them. These groups show a number of overlaps, which suggests that the idea of tightly-binding patronage and clientship did not apply, at least to these relationships. All three patrons were widely and well connected, and their poetic protégés must have had the entrée to most of Roman élite society. Interestingly, we know more detail about the connections of at least two

388 But see articles by Ball (1907) and Sage (1916) cited in n. 372 above.
391 Cic. Arch. 22.1 (Ennius); Suet. Poet. 11.1-10 (Terence); Polyb. 31.23; Plin. NH. 8.47 (Polybius).
392 See Clarke (1978) (Hostius and Sempronius Tuditanus); Cic. Brut. 107; Kuttner (1995), p. 162 (Accius and Decimus Junius Brutus Callaicus); Cic. Arch. 6.19,21; Att. 1.16.15 (Archias and Lucullus, Marius, Metellus, Catulus); Serv. ad Geo.1. pr. 29 (Lucretius and Memmius); Cic. Brut. 309 (Diodotus and Cicero); Cic. Arch. 10; Plut. Pomp. 37 (etc) (Pompey and Theophanes); Cic. Pis. 68-72 (Philodemus and Piso).
of the poets, Horace and Ovid, than those of the patrons. Both poets addressed a range of people in their poems, as well as providing biographical material that extends the range of their connections still further.

What we lack is enough detailed knowledge of the poets’ and patrons’ connections to develop a coherent network analysis of the whole. We can be reasonably sure that complex interconnections exist. Through these, quotations and whole works of the poets might be communicated across contemporary society and through time. One potent instrument was undoubtedly the use of Latin poetry, especially works of Vergil and Horace, as the core of school curricula, under the stimulating influence of the grammatici who acted both as critics and as promoters of the works of major writers. Educated Romans – which should mean, in effect, most of the élite (see above) – will have learned much verse by heart, and been exposed to a whole range of literature, even if not to the full canon set out by Quintilian.

There is clear enough evidence that the major poets of the 1st century AD used allusions and intertexts referencing the Augustan poets as well as a variety of earlier Latin and Greek writers. It seems reasonably certain that this practice would have been imitated, more or less successfully, by the numerous dilettante poets among the élite. We know, just from Tacitus, of a range of distinguished Romans of the Julio-Claudian era who wrote carmina. It is easy to imagine how, in the context of a convivium, verses about luxury brands by distinguished poets might become material for nugae (humorous bons mots) that were extemporized around the triclinium. In this way, key phrases describing a brand could be refreshed and

---

393 Pollio and Messalla both had conspicuous roles in politics and the armies of the Civil Wars, while Maecenas was closely linked to Augustus from at least 40BC until his fall from favour in 22BC. See Williams (1982), pp.17-18.
394 See in particular Hor. Sat.1.5, 1.6 (see Gowers (2003)); Ovid Trist. 4.10.41 ff.
395 See Suet. Gramm. for brief biographies of the key figures, and discussion in Fantham (1996), pp. 27 ff. On Roman education in general, see Marrou (1948); Bonner (1977); Morgan (1998); Horster (2011).
396 Inst. 10.12 ff.
given new circulation. We can reasonably assume, too, that the poets’ language around brands would have reflected that used by their aristocratic sponsors.

The continuing reputation of a brand over time requires that communication about it is maintained and replenished. It would be convenient to be able to trace the process through verses and versifiers through time. But just as we cannot create a meaningful and effective network analysis of poets and the élite in the Augustan period, still less can we do so over an extended period. The only way in which we can infer the transmission of brand knowledge is through observing the language used about a brand over a period of time in the literature. Where this is consistent, it is a reasonable assumption both that literary references to the brand have been communicated to successive generations and that other forms of discourse about the brand have maintained the same forms of language.

As will be shown in the case study chapters (4 to 7) there is considerable evidence of consistency over time in the way that individual brands are described in the literature. This is most clearly the case with leading wine brands (ch. 7), which are among the most referenced brands in surviving Latin literature. We need to remember, however, that although these literary sources are the most visible available evidence for the discourse around Roman brands, they were certainly not the only way in which brands were talked about.

2.9 Conclusions

Roman élite society provided an environment in which luxury brands achieved ready circulation, as a form of support for their competitive users’ perceived status. The open nature of the élite household encouraged relative outsiders to observe the luxury furnishings and artworks, and to share in (or jealously observe) the rich and rare food and drink, and these would readily become fuel for the gossip that pervaded city life. Within this, the practice of patronage enabled poets to become the eulogists of their patrons’ display, and the circulation of poetry among the élite represented a potentially powerful medium of communication about luxury brands, both to contemporary audiences and to posterity.
As we shall see in the following chapter, it is easy to exaggerate the role of poets in brand communications. As so often in ancient history, our view of things is liable to be distorted by the limitations of the available evidence. Word-of-mouth communication about brands was in fact multi-faceted, as the Cena Trimalchionis serves to remind us.
3. Brand Communications in Ancient Rome

As was made clear in chapter 1, brands in the full modern sense with which we are familiar today barely existed in the Graeco-Roman world. This is not to say there were no branded items. Where it was possible, as we have seen, producers regularly put their names on a variety of manufactured objects: *Firmalampen, terra sigillata*, and much other day-to-day pottery, including transport amphorae; together with various building products such as bricks, tiles and pipes, which were often subject to official scrutiny and were stamped with a proprietary name, as were metal ingots. There are, too, examples of glassware. However, in relation to the argument about the true nature of brands set out in chapter 1, there is very little evidence for producers attempting to build the reputation of their brand - with the notable and virtually unparalleled exception, at least in the literary and archaeological record, of the Pompeian *garum* producer Aulus Umbricius Scaurus, whose dwelling included a handsome set of mosaic advertisements for his product and whose retail packaging carries a variety of commercial messages.

What we do find, however, as shown in section 5 of chapter 1, are *origin* brands, for at least some of which we can begin to delineate a brand image or reputation, as will be illustrated in detail in the case studies in chapters 4-7. The discussion of origin branding leads naturally into the consideration in this chapter of how knowledge of these brands might have been communicated in the Roman world. In the absence of today’s rich media environment, the role of word of mouth (WOM) becomes, clearly, central, although there were other, limited forms of communication available to Roman retailers (and, indeed, manufacturers). Gossip (as a general descriptive term for WOM) is a vital element in Roman brand communication, and I examine the evidence for this. Finally, I set out a schematic model of how the reputation of an ancient brand might have developed.

---


400 For two early articles that suggest that producers (or retailers) paid poets such as Martial to mention them, see Sage (1916) and Ball (1907). Neither writer seems to me to have made the case. However, Dalby (2000), p. 199 describes Martial’s naming of aromatics dealer Cosmus as recurring ‘like commercial breaks’ – cf. Roman (2010).

401 Given the basis of this thesis in literature, and the nature of the surviving literature, written by members of the élite for the élite, the focus is, inevitably on products that are, more or less, luxuries.

402 See below, pp. 103-4.
As was shown in chapter 1, there was clearly quite enough of a motive, from the Roman consumer’s point of view, for origin brands to become relevant and desirable across a wide range of commodities, as a way of discriminating between products; and there is abundant and diverse evidence for their existence. What is less easy to identify, in any formal way, is how people came to know about the relative qualities of different origin brands. In the absence of mass communication media, just how did consumers discover which brands were worth buying or persevering with? The process by which these various origin brands could become recognized and commonplace is not at all obvious from our literary sources. While we can identify relevant references, and – just occasionally – see how intertextual references crop up in later authors, the way in which a commodity from a particular place becomes a frequently-referred-to brand is something that no Latin writer was interested in. So the process has to be inferred from what we know about modern consumers’ behaviour, and then from a series of assumptions about how this can legitimately be compared with the behaviour of consumers in the Roman world. What we are looking at, evidently, is a more or less informal process of cultural communication. While this is likely to have varied in character in different levels of society and between different commodities or categories of commodity, I believe we can use a combination of intelligent speculation and the insights of modern market research to create a crude but credible model of the process by which an origin brand might develop its reputation.

It is – inevitably – easier to define the model, and to illustrate at least some of its workings, in markets which involve élite consumers directly and which are referred to, even in passing, in the essentially élite literature that has come down to us. It will become apparent, too, that where limited epigraphic evidence is available, this tends to support the underlying concept of the model. Even here, most of the commodities concerned are primarily for the élite; it is this focus on the élite that has dictated the concentration of this thesis, and especially of the case studies in chapters 4-7, on luxury markets. Quite simply, we know more about them.

---

403 There is a single comment in Quintilian that specifically recognises the use of an origin name as a shorthand for the object concerned (Inst. 8.2.8); but there is nothing explicit in what has survived of Varro’s de lingua Latina, where it could perhaps have been expected.

404 See Philipsen (2003).

405 For the well-recognised hazards implicit in this kind of procedure, see most recently Walsh (2014), pp. 82 ff.

406 Ivory, silk, fine wines, Corinthian bronze.
3.1 The Communication of Luxury Brands

In chapter 1, section 2, the importance of word-of-mouth (WOM), even in the modern world of mass communications, was emphasised. In the Graeco-Roman world, where there were no mass media, opportunities for advertising were very limited and very local, and literacy was far from universal, WOM must have been essential for any brand to gain currency and reputation. Because the sources that we have are essentially literary, it is easy to over-emphasise their importance in the circulation of brand information. We can be reasonably sure that literature, especially poetry, contributed to brand awareness and reputation, and we can use linguistic analysis to find evidence for both. It is far less easy to assess the importance of informal conversation in the brand process, but it is a reasonable hypothesis that it was a substantial influence – and almost certainly the major one. We can hypothesise, at least, that brand references in poetry reflect the language and tenor of day-to-day conversation.

In addition, of course, there was the commercially-engaged discourse of salesmen, hawkers and auctioneers; and some limited availability of point-of-sale signs and symbols, but the latter were, inevitably, small-scale and local in character, and the evidence for them is largely, though not exclusively, confined to the well-preserved sites of Pompeii and Herculaneum. Examples include point-of-sale (POS) messages: Seneca talks of shop window displays, and Pompeian bars offer examples of POS messages, ranging from the simple injunction to drink in the bar Palmyra (CIL 4.8475) via an illustration of a drinker demanding a glass of Setine wine (CIL 4.1291) to the well-known price list from the bar Hedone featuring Falernian wine. Other examples of local advertisements from Pompeii, which may or may not have featured actual brands – except in so far as a politician is, in a sense, a brand – are the numerous political dipinti and ads for gladiatorial games. The in-home ads of Umbricius Scaurus and his use of retail packaging messages have been

407 Of course, literary mentions can simply reflect the existence of awareness of a brand, and act as evidence for the brand’s existence for the historian. Arguably, the key factor for brand development via literature will have been the extent to which the work that mentioned a brand achieved wide circulation and familiarity. The frequency with which Falernian wine appears in widely-read Latin poetry must have had some significant bearing on the wine’s reputation, for example. See ch.7. More generally, see Hardie’s (2012, p.324) comment on Martial: ‘Gossip in poetry, poetry as gossip, is no surprise in a culture where poetry is as embedded in social practice as it was in antiquity’.

408 This is likely to be particularly true of satirical verse.

409 Sen. Ep. 33.3.

410 CIL 4.1679 – see ch. 7, p. 238.

411 CIL 4. 1147, 3775, 7868, etc. (political); CIL 4.3884, etc. (gladiators).
discussed in chapter 1; and rather similar is the elaborately clever ‘advertisement’ on the 
residence of the fuller M. Fabius Ululitremulus, with its Virgilian quotation and pun on the 
owner’s name. Seneca, too, talks of the raucous row made by street criers promoting a 
variety of merchandise and services. Inns proclaimed their presence by inn signs, and the 
itineraries sometimes identify them by these – ad Torres, e.g., near Rome, on the Tabula 
Peutingeriana.

3.2 Word of Mouth and Gossip

The active social intercourse of élite Roman society has been discussed in ch. 2. The formal 
context of the dinner party was, arguably, the hub around which much élite interpersonal 
communication took place. But it was supplemented, in terms of social communication, by 
less formal contacts and conversations. The morning salutatio provided the opportunity for a 
throng of clients and contacts to observe an important Roman’s house. The crowd will have 
been able to see exactly how the big man’s house was furnished and decorated – the 
paintings, sculptures, mosaics, hangings and furniture of the public rooms and courtyards – 
and no doubt anything of interest, or evidence of excess, would be eagerly commented on, 
and discussed elsewhere in the course of the day.

Gossip (fama, rumor, etc) was, as Juvenal and others make clear, the fuel of much of 
society, and circulated freely, especially among those who frequented the baths. What is 
certain is that this sort of gossip did in fact occur. Later Roman commentators, often writing 
from a jaundiced nostalgia for a simpler, possibly golden age, reported who first decorated a 
public building, and then his own house, with marble columns; who introduced the idea of 
fish farms to provide oysters or prize mullets; who was honoured with an ivory statue or 
carried on a funeral couch inlaid with gold and ivory. These examples (and there are many 
more) surely circulated as gossip long before Pliny or Suetonius or Plutarch relayed them in 
literature. They are an essentially negative form of the Roman love of exempla: famous 
incidents in which the behaviours of well-known figures from the past are held up as models

412 See pp. 32, 39, 101 and Plate 1.3.
413 CIL 4.9131: Fullones ululamque cano, non arma virumq[ue].
415 TPV 2m: see E. Weber (1976). The complete map can be found online at 
416 Goldeck (2010).
417 For a fuller Latin vocabulary of gossip see Greenwood (1998), and below.
418 See, e.g., Ovid. Am. 3.1.15-22; Sen. Ep. 43.1; Mart. 2.72; Juv. 6.403 ff, 11.3-4.
419 Marble columns: Plin. NH. 36.7 (Licinius Crassus); fish farming: Plin. NH. 9.168 (Sergius Orata); 
ivory statue, funeral couch: Suet. DJ. 76. 84 (Julius Caesar).
to current citizens. (Negative, because they are, usually, part of a critique of luxuria). The surviving work of Valerius Maximus consists entirely of exempla, and we find them throughout the works of Cicero, Seneca and Pliny. There seems to be little doubt that knowledge of these exempla was circulated and amplified by gossip, far more widely than books could reach.

Ancient Rome was, in fact, a rumour-mill. Roman society was driven – or sometimes riven – by gossip and tittle-tattle. Much of this was about what today we’d call celebrities. In the absence of Hello! magazine, gossip provided the essential fuel for the Roman passion for exempla. Roman society was largely non-literate, and mass media were non-existent, so people talked. They talked on street corners, at the baths, at the barber’s, the perfumer’s, in the forum, the theatre, the temples, the lawcourts, the markets. They relayed the latest information from the morning salutatio, when they visited their patrons and gawped at the latest furnishings of luxury urban villas. They gossiped furiously over dinner, if lucky enough to be invited, though Horace piously says that instead of idle gossip, his dinner partners liked to talk of serious matters. In fact, Rome seems to have been so full of gossip that Latin has no single word for it: apart from fama (mostly positive), rumor (more likely to have negative connotations) and sermo, there are a series of verbs ranging from the simple aiunt, dicitur or dicunt to jactare, vulgare and pervulgare, all of which can be about gossip, though none of them designates gossip exclusively. Several Roman authors use the phrase in circulis et in conviviis – ‘at social gatherings and dinner parties’ – generally to describe more political chatter. Martial lists where these conversations might occur (he is actually talking about people reciting his epigrams, but the point can safely be generalised): te convivia, te forum sonabit/ aedes, compita, porticus, tabernae – only the baths and theatre

---

420 See Val. Max. passim, Cic. Or. and Tusc Disp. and Plin. NH. 7.88 ff. are particularly rich sources. There are examples scattered through Seneca’s Epistles, eg 24.4-6; 27.5-8; 40.11-12; 71 passim; 77.5-9; 86 passim; 87.9-10; etc. For a comprehensive analysis of the status of exempla through until late antiquity, see Lichfield (1914).


422 See ch. 2, section 6.

423 See, e.g. Hor. Sat. 2.6.50-3; Sen. Ep. 43.1; Mart. 2.82; 5.20; Juv. 6.403-412; 9.102-123; 11.3- 4 (See Colton (1991), pp. 388-9).

424 Hor. Sat. 2.6.70-73.

425 See OLD s.v.v and Greenwood (1998). As Hardie (2012, p. 361) points out, too, fabula is a standard term for the talk of the town – e.g. Prop. 2.24.1-10; Hor. Epod. 11, 7-10; Ovid. Am 3.1.15-22.

426 Livy 44.22.8; Cic. Att. 2.18.2; Balb. 57; Tac. Ann. 3.54.1, cf. Tac. Agric. 43.1 (per fora et circulos).
are left out.\textsuperscript{427} More generally, for example, a search shows that even historians are great users of the word \textit{rumor}: out of 464 instances listed in \textit{PHI}, 156 (33\%) are cited from historians.\textsuperscript{428} That hearsay and gossip were important factors in Roman life is shown by its evident role in politics and in the law courts, where countering \textit{fama et rumores} is an essential element of the legal orator’s practice.\textsuperscript{429}

The odd thing about Roman gossip is that scholars have taken little interest in it as a topic in its own right – a point made by Basil Dufallo. Until very recently, the weightiest article on the subject was Greenwood’s analysis of Martial’s extensive vocabulary of gossip, already cited; Ray Laurence wrote a piece on gossip in politics; Amy Richlin included a short section on gossip in Cicero’s letters in her book on Roman humour; Basil Dufallo uses Cicero’s \textit{Pro Caelio} for an account of some legal ramifications of Roman gossip; and perhaps most illuminating, there is Israel Shatzman’s article on Tacitean rumours, which points out the critical overlap between \textit{rumor}, \textit{fama} and everyday conversation, \textit{sermo}.\textsuperscript{430} Most recently, Philip Hardie has published a magisterial study of \textit{fama}, focused primarily on (good) reputation, but including some rich material on gossip as an element in the development of renown.\textsuperscript{431}

The Romans themselves were well aware of the power of gossip. Quintilian’s thesis on training lawyers emphasizes how the advocate must be able to exploit or discredit \textit{fama et rumores}.\textsuperscript{432} These are, however, merely one category in a range of types of argument that Quintilian lists in Book 5 of the \textit{Institutio}. But if you read Cicero’s speeches, which were nearly always for the defence, you realize how important gossip was in lawyers’ attempts to destroy the character of a defendant.\textsuperscript{433} Catullus’s \textit{rumores senum severiorum} were less easy to ignore when they appeared in a court of law.\textsuperscript{434} Similarly, Cicero’s letters are a wonderfully rich source of mostly political tittle-tattle.\textsuperscript{435} Finally, in this vein, Suetonius’s \textit{Lives of the

\textsuperscript{428} \url{http://latin.packhum.org/concordance}, accessed 12/8/2015. As Hardie (2012), p. 228 and n.3, points out, \textit{rumor} is more significant in Roman than Greek historiography, especially in Livy and Tacitus.
\textsuperscript{429} For politics, see Laurence (1994); for the law courts see Quint. \textit{Inst.} 5.3.1. Richlin (1992), pp. 83-6, has a good discussion of gossip in Cicero’s letters.
\textsuperscript{430} Greenwood, (1998) (Martial); Laurence (1994) (politics); Richlin, (1992) (Cicero); Dufallo (2001); Shatzman (1974), (Tacitus). Archard (1991) is disappointingly focused on what he sees as the dominance of the written word in the late Republic and early Empire, though there is some discussion of gossip, especially in pp. 77-78 and 227-238. See now Guastella (2017).
\textsuperscript{431} Hardie (2012). He is careful to distinguish \textit{fama}-as-reputation from \textit{fama}-as-gossip (p. 8).
\textsuperscript{432} Quint. \textit{Inst.} 5.3, cf. \textit{Rhet Her.} 2.5.2.12.
\textsuperscript{433} See, in particular, \textit{Pro Caelio}, with Dufallo (2001), n. 29.
\textsuperscript{434} Catull. 5.
Caesars is substantially gossip, in spite of the author’s privileged access, as an Imperial secretary, to official correspondence. More widely, Catherine Edwards has used her excellent analysis of Roman moral and sexual abuse to show how gossip permeated the day-to-day politics of the city. Hardie suggests that Tacitus’s evidence, in particular, shows how, under the principate, gossip became even more significant:

‘... and with a persisting doubt as to the legitimacy of de facto rule by one man, fama as the unattributable and irresponsible circulation of rumour and gossip within the Roman people becomes ever more powerful.’

3.3 Brand Communication Analysed

In the absence of media of mass communication, it is inevitable that consumer information – especially knowledge or opinion about brands - depends overwhelmingly on word of mouth (WOM): people talking to each other about what they have bought, what they have eaten or served to their guests at dinner, their experience in the market, their knowledge (or belief) about how and where a commodity is produced, and how to judge a good or bad example of a particular product. It should go without saying that there is at least potentially a wider field for such discussions among those who can afford a relatively high standard of living, and whose purchases extend beyond mere subsistence. Nonetheless, given that much day-to-day marketing in the Roman world was presumably done by slaves on behalf of their

---

435 Gossip in Cicero’s letters and their subjects: some examples: Att. 1 18.3 (Memmius); Att. 2.24.3 (Caesar); Att. 5.21.9 (Pomptinus); Att. 6.1.25 (Vedius); Att. 11.23.3; 12.52.2; 13.7; (Metella); Fam. 2.15.5; 8.7.2; (news from Caelius); Att. 10.10.5; 10.16.5; (Antony & Cytheris); Att. 1.12.3; 1.13.3; 1.18.2-3; 2.4.2 (Clodius/bona dea); Att. 2.9.1; 2.12.2; 2.14.1; 2.22.5 (Clodia); Att. 2.1.5; 4.11.2 (Clodius); Att. 1.14.5 (Curio); Att. 2.3.1 (Pompey); Fam. 8.12.3; 8.14.4 (Caelius). Source: derived from Richlin, (1992), p. 86.
439 See, e.g. White (1993), p. 41: ‘In a fashion-sensitive society with few facilities for mass communication, word of mouth was one of the most effective means of generating fame, and the leaders of society controlled the networks through which word of mouth was spread.’ For modern views, see, e.g., Prendergast et al. (2010); Ferguson (2008).
440 For a detailed discussion of the development of consumption and consumerism in the Roman world see Greene (2008).
441 In its traditional sense of ‘shopping’.
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well-off masters or mistresses, there must have been scope for dialogue about commodities purchased to circulate well down the social scale. At the same time, there was much door-to-door selling to élite homes, which could involve various members of the household. Manufactured goods, too, were made by craftsmen, artisans or slaves who would have to know how to identify the right materials and tools for the job.

I have outlined in chapter 1 (pp. 47-49) modern theory on how new ideas are diffused through a relevant population, in statistical terms; and also discussed the possible role of influential people – ‘opinion leaders’ - in the way in which new ideas take root; and in chapter 2 (pp. 65-67), I have described the way in which Roman élite society was tightly inter-connected. The importance of WOM has been stressed earlier, too, but what is needed as the basis for a model of the process of communication is an integration of these elements with both a deeper understanding of the mechanics of WOM in Roman society and the recognition of the links in the marketing chain between the producer of the original commodity and its ultimate buyers and users. While an agricultural commodity typically passes through relatively few hands from field to consumer, things are very different for manufactures, whether these are produced artisanally or in a modern industrial factory. It is important to recognize that there is very little contemporary, Roman evidence for much of the scenario described below.

Let us consider as an example Corinthian bronze, the high-status antique tableware that is the subject of the case study in chapter 4. The raw materials – copper, tin, silver, gold - were mined in various locations around the Mediterranean.

---

442 We find indications of this in Plautus, especially in his Aulularia: Aul. 280, 356, for examples of a slave’s master apparently shopping for provisions and wine; Aul. 374-5, where a (poor) citizen goes to the market and finds everything too dear. Elsewhere in Plautus, shopping usually seems to be done by slaves: e.g. Cap. 846-852; Men. 209; 219; Stich. 440.
443 Plautus lists a range of traders calling on élite homes – Aul. 505-22; Epid. 229-34; cf. Ovid Ars Am. 1.421-4; Hor. Od. 3.6.30; Sat. 2.3.226-30. See Holleran (2012), p. 244.
444 Cato’s recommendations, aimed presumably at the owners of farms, rather than their vilici, have been noted above (ch. 1, p. 56 and n. 181) – see especially De Ag. 135.
445 Ch.1.2, pp. 44-5.
446 For the life–history of artefacts as a subject for archaeological and anthropological analysis, conceptualized as a ‘behavioural chain’, see Walker & Schiffer (2006), pp. 71-3, and references there. Cf. Walsh (2014), pp. 88-9, on Leroi-Gourhan’s (1943) concept of the chaîne opératoire.
447 Given that for Romans Corinthian bronze was an antique, and manufactured elsewhere, the ‘production’ end of this scenario is entirely hypothetical, though I would argue that it would have been realistic for a Corinthian, mutatis mutandis.
448 See Appendix 1.1.9.
manufacture), and purchased from a merchant by the craftsman who would first make the bronze and then work it into a finished product. The craftsman (or men) would have to have a technical knowledge of the raw materials, considerable metallurgical expertise to create the material, and expertise in casting and finishing the final product—a typically highly decorated tableware, which might be embossed or chased, as well as assuming any of a variety of shapes. The combined efforts of—presumably—a number of different craftsmen created a ‘bank’ of products which were originally purchased by local buyers or exported around the Greek world. When the Romans sacked Corinth in 146 BC, Mummius and his army looted the city and a substantial—but finite—quantity of already ‘antique’ Corinthian bronze was carried off to Rome, where it found its way onto the market and thence to the tables of the wealthy. Helped—it appears—by the publicity given to it in Cicero’s Verrine speeches, it became an object of vogue among the élite of the late Republic, up to and including the emperor Augustus and beyond.

Schematically, we can chart the process of production and selling, and the nature of the information involved at each stage, as follows:

**Fig.3.1. Schematic summary of market process for Corinthian bronze**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>INTERMEDIARY</th>
<th>PURCHASER/USER</th>
<th>INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw materials</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Craftsman</td>
<td>Identity/purity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material (alloy)</td>
<td>Craftsman(smelting)*</td>
<td>Craftsman</td>
<td>Quality of molten mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finished Product</td>
<td>Craftsman (cast/worked)</td>
<td>Merchant/end-user</td>
<td>Authenticity, fitness for purpose, aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finished Product (1)</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>End-user</td>
<td>Authenticity/fitness for purpose/value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finished Product (2)</td>
<td>Dealer/retailer, Auction (e.g.)</td>
<td>End-user (collector)</td>
<td>Authenticity, pedigree, rarity, aesthetics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*assumes different craftsmen creating the material and the artefact.

(1) The original purchase. (2) Subsequent purchase(s).

449 See ch. 4, p. 133.
450 There is no doubt that ancient craftsmen had developed considerable practical knowledge of metallurgy. See Healy (1999), especially pp. 290-293, 307-314. More generally, see Tylecote (1987); Maryon (1949).
451 See, e.g. Petr. Sat. 31.9: a figure of an ass carrying saddlebags, which were filled with olives.
452 It is clear that Verres’s enthusiasm for Corinthian bronze must have been part of an already-present liking for the material among some of the élite (indeed, Pliny NH. 37.12 attributes it directly to Mummius); but Cicero seems to have given the process a considerable boost—see below, ch. 4, pp. 135-8; 142. For Augustus, see Suet. Aug. 70.5.
If we view this schema, the missing element is how information is actually transmitted at each stage in the life of the product. Further, as laid out, the schema implies a simple, one-way process from raw material, to product, to market. There is no allowance for any feedback loops, or, in economists’ language, for demand, as opposed to supply. To begin to understand the information flow, we need to consider not just what information might be conveyed, but how it might be conveyed, and by whom, to whom; and how this information might be understood by the various parties.

At the raw material stage, the buyer needs to be reassured as to the quality of the material being purchased. This will largely depend, in the buyer’s eyes, on the quality and the precise origin of the material: from which country? Which mine? Which shipper? What identification is provided with the goods? (e.g., if metal is in ingot form, what stamp does it carry? Are there any signs of official checks for weight or purity?). To win the confidence of the craftsman, the merchant would have to be able to answer these sorts of questions.

At the material stage, in the case of metals, the craftsman who will work the metal will probably, from what we know of the organization of ancient metal-working, have been involved in producing the metal in the form in which it is to be worked, so there will be no need for much information to be exchanged. The craftsman will need to be satisfied that, for example, an alloy has been made in the right proportions, and treated so that it will be stable and consistent. His knowledge will have been derived primarily from the craftsman with whom he underwent his apprenticeship, supplemented – no doubt - from conversations with other craftsmen in his neighbourhood (probably not difficult, since in Graeco-Roman cities, as in medieval times, crafts tended to congregate in a single street or groups of streets).

Once the craftsman is producing, or has produced, the product, a buyer comes into the picture. This will be either a merchant buying to sell on to a customer; or an actual customer,

---

453 It is safe to assume that the craftsman would, for these raw materials at least, have a very good idea of how to evaluate the information given him by his supplier. For other types of commodity, the risk of adulteration could be high – see ch. 1, pp. 56-7, with n. 182.
454 In Rome, at least, there were in fact a variety of specialized craftsmen who might be involved in making a piece of metal tableware – see the summary in Hawkins (2012), pp. 178-9, based on Strong (1966), p. 179.
455 This is characteristic of medieval European cities, but controversial in most other contexts. It is clear that there is considerable variability from city to city and between different cultures. For a summary of the evidence see Smith (2010), espec. p. 150. Loane (1938), p. 64, n. 17, lists several streets in ancient Rome named after the crafts clustered therein. See Holleran (2012), pp. 52-58; Hawkins (2012), p. 180; Smith (2010).
who may have commissioned the piece or who is sufficiently interested to wish to buy direct from the craftsman.« This, presumably, would have frequently been the case with many works of art.» In either case, the buyer will want to be reassured about what is being bought: the merchant, so that he will have a good story to use to sell to a customer; the end-user, to reassure himself that he is buying a genuine article that he can feel both satisfied and proud to own. If the end-user is buying a luxury, as we have already seen, it will be part of his self-presentation, so he will need to be able to talk it up to his friends and acquaintances.«

Sometimes – and we really do not know how often this will have been the case – luxury goods, including antiques such as works of Corinthian bronze, will have been sold at auction.« Here, the buyer would be very much at the mercy of the praeco – auctioneers were regarded with considerable suspicion» and would need to be well advised on any technical questions. Which is why, for example, we find the younger Pliny being rather diffident about buying what appears to be a Corinthian bronze statue, and his uncle claiming that candelabra sold as Corinthian were not genuine Corinthian bronze.«

We can now begin to refine the underlying question: how did ordinary members of the Roman élite acquire awareness of, and knowledge about, the luxuries they seem to have been so eager to purchase and display? The focus of luxury consumption had shifted in the late republic from public works – such as Caesar’s awnings shading the Forum or the marble columns that originally adorned Scaurus’s temporary theatre before being incorporated into his mansion» - to more domestic display; and the principate saw the effective demise of the private provision of public buildings such as temples, at least in Rome itself.» As a result, the source of news and information about luxury goods became, increasingly, the houses of the rich, viewed as we have seen above (p. 68) at the salutatio or at dinner, supported (no doubt) by the warehouses and shops of dealers in rare and valuable items.

457 In the case of jewellery, Loane (1938), p. 88 says that customers would often have supplied a jeweller with their own precious stones.
458 For extended discussion of the role of artworks in the Roman world see Haug (2001); Bounia (2004).
459 Examples of this can be found at Cic. Rosc. Am. 133.3-7; Plin. NH. 34.11-12; cf. Cic. Verr. 2.2.46.15-20; 2.4.14.2. As Holleran (2012), pp. 252-5, points out, auctions make fashions in consumption immediately evident.
460 See, e.g. Cato. Ag. 106; Cic. Planc. 33.20; Juv.7.6, with Rauh (1989).
461 Plin. Ep. 3.6; Plin. NH. 34.12.
462 Plin. NH. 19.23 (awnings); 36.5 (columns).
Particularly as regards *luxus mensae*, regular dinner parties provided ample exposure of new delicacies and fine wines, as well as another opportunity to observe furnishings, tableware, objets d’art, luxurious textiles, and the latest fashions in casual dress. The presence at these meals of both the host’s peers and at least some of his diverse *clientela* would have created the opportunity for talk about what had been on show and consumed to be communicated across a range of at least the upper strata of society. This could build on hosts’ tendency, parodied by the satirists, to talk up their fine vintages and the exotic provenance of the foods they served. This table talk could be amplified by the presence of the host’s ‘house poet’ (see ch. 2, pp. 96-7), who might incorporate into a poem praise of the vintages served, or even of a new piece of decoration on the table. The basic ‘tool’ of communication, which ties all this together, was, I believe, that fundamental human medium – gossip - as described above. While the subject-matter of Roman gossip was, clearly very diverse, I think we can safely infer that at least some of it, as illustrated by the literary table-talk of Athenaeus (in particular) or Aulus Gellius, will have focused on commodities of various kinds.

Among the élite, too, there was also a considerable circulation of reading matter, though this may well have consisted mainly of serious works of philosophy or practical, technical treatises. Many books, as the discussion of origin branding in ch. 1 showed, contained information of a sort about commodities. We know very little in detail of the reading habits of the Romans. We do know that it was not unusual to have readings over dinner, or as part

---

464 Both Horace and Martial point to dining alone as a sign of social inadequacy: Hor. *Sat.* 2.7.29-32; Mart. 5.47, 11.24.15. cf. Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 7 praef.
465 As Quintus Cicero (probably) put it in the *Commentariolum Petitionis*, a guide to getting elected to office in the late Republic, *nam fere omnis sermo ad forensem famam a domesticus emanat auctoribus* (*Com. Pet.* 17.4). Though he is stressing the need to get the candidate’s message across to a wide range of categories of people, including his freedmen and even slaves, the point can safely be generalised. In the same way, modern luxury brands are often advertised in mass media, so that their prestige can be communicated both to future potential buyers and to envious onlookers.
466 Petronius’s Trimalchio (*Sat.* 23 ff.) is the obvious reference, but also Nasidienus (Hor. *Sat.* 2.8, especially 2.8.92-3: *suavis res, si non causas narraret earum et/naturas dominus*) and Virro (*Juven.* 5). See Gowers (1993), pp. 135-161, for Nasidienus, pp. 213-219 for Virro. The classic poetic *recusatio* explaining why his patron or friend is invited to a very modest meal (Hor. *Od.* 1.20, e.g.) is an inversion of this.
467 For example, poems by both Statius (*Silv.* 4.6) and Martial (9.43 and 9.44) on a statuette owned by their patron Novius Vindex: these may have been recited (or in Martial’s case, even written) at a dinner given by the owner. For wines, the examples of Nasidienus and Trimalchio (*Sat.* 34.6-7), while clearly poking fun, must reflect a more general reality.
468 On Athenaeus, see Braund and Wilkins (2000); Jacob (2013). On Gellius, see Holford-Strevens (2003).
469 See pp. 51-59 and the detail in Appendices 1.1 and 7.3, on origin brands and wines.
of the after-dinner entertainment, and this might include recitations of new work by a poet.\footnote{References to recitations at dinner include, for example Suet. Poet. 11.27; Plin. Ep. 8.21. On recitations, see pp. 89-91.} At the same time, it is clear that Roman education involved a great deal of memorisation of verses, with parts of Vergil in particular being extremely familiar to virtually all educated Romans; while would-be orators memorised famous speeches, especially those of Cicero.\footnote{See Quint. Inst. 10.1.22 ff, and the detailed analysis in Morgan (1998), espec. pp. 74-83 and ch. 7.} From this material the élite Roman could pick up ideas of luxury products that might be desirable – though this particular channel of communication would hardly be conducive to the development or adoption of short-lived fashions.

### 3.4 A Communication Model

Clearly, the process by which a commodity acquired origin-brand status involved a mix of influences and a number of stages. The fine detail of the process for any given brand will be subtly different, and influenced by both the character and nature of the commodity concerned and by its place of production. The process is clearly more complex, too, in the case of products imported from far-off and even unknown places, since the degree of intermediation involved is greater.

At its simplest, we can posit a formula:

\[
\text{Product} + \text{Origin} = \text{Potential origin brand. [1]}
\]

As has been argued earlier, simply giving a product a label or tag does not make it a real brand.\footnote{Chapter 1, pp. 41-3.} For this, we need:

\[
\text{Product} + \text{Origin} + \text{Reputation} = \text{Origin Brand. [2]}
\]

In other words, in some way the product needs to acquire a complex of imagery and associations, whatever jargon we might use to describe it, that is coherent, consistent (both in itself and over a period of time) and appealing to potential buyers.\footnote{The language of brand image and brand associations has become complex and unnecessarily obscure in modern analysis, as illustrated by the following pair of quotations: ‘...brand image – defined as “...that cluster of attributes and associations that consumers connect to the brand name”’ (Biel, 1993); ‘Several aspects of consumers’ reactions to brands that may contribute to brand equity have been identified, including brand image, brand personality, brand affinity,}
for an origin brand (and, in modern times for any brand that has a recognised region of origin, such as Volkswagen or Sony) from the associations attached to its town, region or country of origin. In other words, we can refine [2], as follows:

(Product + reputation) + (Origin +reputation) = Origin brand [3],

where ‘reputation’ comprises a combination of objective information about both the product and its place of origin – ‘facts’ – and subjective, emotional associations linked to them. This means there are, particularly for brands imported from faraway places, two distinct but interlinked strands of information: information about the product itself, which can consist both of factual information about how the original material is grown or mined and harvested and of more or less ‘fabulous’ information relating to the product’s source or use; and similar information about the place of origin. As Grant Parker has shown, the Romans were keen to identify the origins of commodities and especially susceptible to the allure of the exotic, where myth and travellers’ tales could add their own magic to a luxury item.

How then did reputation develop and become communicated? Clearly the producer and/or the merchant who sold a brand would have had something – perhaps a lot – to say about the product, probably starting with its origin but including whatever information might aid a sale. The buyer, or potential buyer, could evaluate this information according to whatever knowledge he or she might have both about the category of products concerned and about the country or region it was reported to come from. In the case of the country of origin, especially for exotic luxury products, first-hand knowledge would be rare – on both sides.

Sources of information can be many and varied, and may influence the brand’s reputation at each stage in the marketing chain, as outlined above for Corinthian bronze. This means that formula [3] must be rewritten to include a range of information sources and elements of reputation:

{Product + (information,... + reputation,...)} + {Origin + (information,...
+ reputation,...)} = Origin brand [4],

brand relationships, brand charisma, brand attitude, and the like, but there is no generally accepted model relating these constructs to purchase processes. Thakor & Kohli (1996), p. 27.  
475 For the distinction, see, e.g., Richardson (2008), p.1, n.1; Iversen & Hem (2008), p. 607.  
477 Parker (2002).
where \(a, b, c \ldots n\) represent sources of information, broadly defined, and \(1, 2, 3 \ldots n\) represent the various steps in the marketing and communication chain. The word ‘communication’ has been added here to emphasise the fact that the brand’s reputation is a property that reaches beyond just the buyers and sellers of the brand, and can, equally, be influenced by people who are not the brand’s users. The key to how this can work is the availability of a range of ‘media’ of communication – using media in the widest possible sense. To put flesh on the crude model just outlined, we need to examine these media or, more precisely, social interactions, since they involve a mix of people and situations, more closely.

3.5 How Brand Communication Might Work

For Romans faced with a luxury product, the sources of information available were, as we have seen, predominantly word of mouth (WOM). In some cases, this will have been from an identifiable source – a producer or craftsman, a merchant or retailer. But in many cases it will have been the result of conversations or comments in the course of normal day-to-day life: the stuff of normal social intercourse (a.k.a. gossip, or, especially, *sermo*), which leaves few records, but often provides the information that people have to rely on to manage their lives.

If we take our formula [4] from the preceding section, and plot the elements of the left-hand side of the equation against a version of the market process schema set out in fig. 3.1 above, we can produce a hypothetical chart of the sorts of product attributes and origin characteristics that might go to build up the identity and image of a luxury origin brand. In fig. 3.2 below, the attributes listed are intended to be generalisable to most luxury brands, and are primarily derived from the characteristics of luxury brands set out in fig. 2.1 (p. 80), based on a range of modern analyses of luxury markets. There is no reason to believe that there should be any major difference between modern and ancient views of luxuries, at least at this level of generalisation, as has been made clear in earlier chapters.

The first three rows of the table in fig. 3.2 refer to the actual transaction, and focus on the product; the last two to subsequent communications, which are more concerned with the brand’s reputation:
### Fig. 3.2 Generalised luxury brand communication schema

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Product characteristics/attributes</th>
<th>Ascribed origin characteristics/attributes</th>
<th>Information source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Producer/manufacturer</td>
<td>Ingredients/material Craftsmanship Quality</td>
<td>Authenticity Type-town (eg)*</td>
<td>Local Word of mouth Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant/ seller</td>
<td>Quality Material Craftsmanship Fitness for purpose Prestige</td>
<td>Authenticity Exoticness Superiority</td>
<td>Seller/merchant Travellers’ tales Word of mouth Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyer/user</td>
<td>Rarity/specialness Showiness Prestige Costliness</td>
<td>Authenticity Exoticness Magic</td>
<td>Seller User Word of mouth Literature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guests/clients/contacts/peers

- Costliness Rarity Prestige
- Exoticness Magic
- User
  - Word of mouth Literature

Poets/other writers

- Prestige Quality Context
- Exoticness Magic Distance
- Literature User
  - Word of mouth

* Town, country, region, etc.

As can be seen from fig. 3.2, there is likely to be a fair degree of consistency in what the various actors in the brand communication process are looking for, though there will be differences of emphasis: functional product characteristics are generally more important at the level where actual transactions take place – the top three steps in the process. The first step combines the first three elements of fig. 3.1, since there is unlikely to be any significant

---

478 This allows for the likelihood of a chain of merchants, etc., between the producer and the ultimate buyer, especially for products traded over long distances.

479 The relatively rare instances where a brand carries an origin-identifying label or inscription, are subsumed under ‘seller’.

480 The user's contacts will either have been told about the brand by the user, or have observed it in his/her house.
difference between the three; while two additional groups have been added below the buyer/user, to reflect the third-party communication that would, inevitably, occur for any brand that gained genuine currency among the (élite) public. The buyer/user’s contacts, in general, will have visited his house for business reasons or for the salutatio, taking the opportunity to note and subsequently comment on any luxurious novelty, and at least some of them will have been invited to dinner, to be exposed again to furnishings and décor, and to share – or at least observe – fine food and wines and expensive tableware. At the same time, the buyer may well have boasted about his latest acquisition or gourmet discovery to his peers. Among the clients and guests might well be a poet: if the host is his patron, the chances are that the poet will find the opportunity to make a comment, whether general or specific, on a luxury seen or consumed at the patron’s house. If the poet is a good one – and good poets were the exception among an élite that frequently dabbled in writing poetry – his verses might become widely known, especially if they became part of the educational canon.⁴⁸¹

Other writers, too could influence brand perceptions. These include Pliny and his many sources, and a variety of other technical writers, such as the agriculturalists and medical writers. There are, in addition, references scattered throughout histories, geographies, speeches, letters and so on – Cicero’s descriptions of Verres’s enthusiasm for Corinthian bronze are a particularly vivid example,⁴⁸² and there is a considerable amount of passing comment on wines in the pages of Strabo. Alongside material from the medical writers, we should recognize, too, the influence of doctors, especially on the choice of fine wines: a doctor could clearly be a powerful influence, especially if he happened to be advising an emperor;⁴⁸³ and this influence would extend, too, to the use of a range of medicinal ingredients and items of diet.

The complete process can be mapped, schematically, to show the flow of information leading to the development of a product from a given favoured origin into a more or less fully-fledged brand – identity plus reputation, as described in ch. 1 above. The process is illustrated in fig. 3.3, below. This is, inevitably, an oversimplification, especially as the potentially very complex feedback possibilities have been omitted for clarity’s sake. It has, also omitted – but allows for – many of the full range of possible interactions, including the

---

⁴⁸¹ The emphasis on poets should not be taken to exclude other writers. Poets are simply the most likely group, as a whole, to use origin descriptors.
⁴⁸² See ch. 4.
⁴⁸³ See ch. 7, pp. 218, 220, 226, 232, 236.
likely presence of a number of distributors – wholesalers, retailers, travelling salesmen, auctioneers – who might come between the producer and the buyer.

Fig. 3.3: Schematic model of origin brand communication and development

It is fair to say that not every ancient origin brand will have had the benefit of the complete process as illustrated. Most day-to-day products will not have been the subject of such extensive and intensive scrutiny and comment. But luxury, positional products will have had every chance to be talked and gossiped about widely, once they had appeared in the houses or at the tables of the notables who bought, used and displayed them. After all, if a piece of consumption is ‘conspicuous’, the temptation to brag about it, or to comment on it, is almost irresistible. In an ideal world, it would be possible to assign quantitative values to each of the categories of communication link, but this normally requires *ad hoc* market research, which is clearly impossible retrospectively at a distance of 2000 years.\footnote{A relatively recent example of how this can be done in today’s markets can be found in Tillson & Passikoff (2009).} It should be noted, too, that
while the majority of the communication would be more or less synchronous, a strong brand is diachronic, and literary communication in particular can help to sustain the image of a brand over time, both through the transmission of poems and other texts and through intertextual use or quotation of a poet’s work by later writers. Finally, the balance of the elements within the model will, certainly, have varied between different brands. This will become clear in the course of the case studies that follow in the succeeding chapters.

3.6 Conclusions

From this and the two preceding chapters, it is clear that origin brands were widely prevalent in the Roman world, and perhaps especially so in luxury markets; though we should recognize that these were the most likely to attract literary comment, and Appendix 1.1 illustrates the very extensive range of origin branding across widely differing types of commodity. In practice, although our evidence for these brands consists primarily in literary texts, the realities of life in the Roman world strongly suggest that word of mouth, in a variety of locations and situations, was the main method by which brand awareness and knowledge developed. By considering the possible elements in the life-chain of a hypothetical commodity, we can see how these origin brands could acquire the reputation and imagery that would make them true brands in the modern sense, and we can at least schematically model the process.

In practice, modern research suggests that the branding process will not have been as ‘tidy’ as the model illustrated in fig. 3.3 might imply. The relative importance of the different influences will almost certainly have varied between different brands and different broad categories of product. In the total absence of the market research that would be used in modern markets to measure this importance, attempts to assess these differences must inevitably be speculative. In the following chapters, I go on to examine in depth four very different luxury brand markets (n. 406, above), in order to understand in greater depth how specific luxury brands acquired their cachet in the Roman world, and in order to illustrate the process described by the model; and to begin to indicate the way in which the various influences might have differing importance for different kinds of commodity.

485 A good example is Seneca’s direct quotation in Ep. 87.20 of Vergil’s Nonne vides croceos ut Tmolus odores/ India mittit ebur? (Geo. 1.57), echoed by Claudian, Pan.Hon. 210, Dabit….India ebur, over 300 years after Seneca. (Cf. Ovid Med Fac.1.10: India praebet ebur).
Introduction to part 2 – case studies

As we have seen, there were numerous origin brands in ancient Rome, covering a wide range of commodities, from day-to-day staples to expensive, esoteric luxuries. I have argued earlier that the nature of the available (literary) evidence means that the focus of this thesis has to be on luxury items, and on origin brands, as opposed to producers’ brands. Producers’ brands for which we have archaeological evidence are almost exclusively found in commodities that the literary world did not find it interesting to talk about. As a result, we have no contemporary access to any aspect of their reputation as brands.

The aim of these case studies is to demonstrate the genuine brand nature of at least some of the many origin brands, on the basis of contemporary evidence. In the absence of any available ‘formula’ for this exercise, I propose to approach this by looking in detail at a small group of brands that meet two basic criteria:

1. A reasonably substantial number of citations, spread across several authors from within the broad period,
2. A range of context, description and attributes that could be regarded as comparable to the material that might be obtained from at least a small-scale modern qualitative research study.

In addition, as this is an essentially exploratory exercise, it makes sense to look at a reasonable variety of market situations, ranging from single, unique products to products within a brand-competitive marketplace.

There are a number of candidate commodities for closer examination, and any choice has to be essentially arbitrary. The four case studies that follow cover a selection of competitive market situations:
- a unique – antique – brand (Corinthian bronze)
- a two-brand market (ivory)
- a complex market originally pioneered by one type and origin of product but developed by a different type and origin of product (silk)
- a genuinely multi-brand market (fine wines).

This is, clearly, a personal choice from among many possible candidates, bearing in mind the need to have sufficient citations to enable a reasonable view to be developed of the nature of the reputation of the brands concerned.

Other possible candidates, drawn from Appendix 1.1, on the basis of a significant number of citations for at least the leading origin, might include:

- cherries – Cerasus (lots of citations but little imagery)
- damsons – Damascus (ditto)
- eels – Copais/Boeotia (most citations from Athenaeus)
- fenugreek – *faenum Graecum* (most citations medical)
- guineafowl – Numidica (little description)
- hazelnuts – Pontus (little imagery)
- honey – Hybla and Hymettus (wide range of citations but limited imagery)
- olive oil – Venafrum (simply, and frequently, described as ‘the best’ – among lots of competitors)
- oysters – Lucrine (many citations – and lots of competition)
- peaches – *persica* (little imagery)
- pheasant – Colchis/phasianae (little imagery)
- saffron – Cilicia/Corycium (little imagery)
- wool – competitive market with several highly-rated origins
- purple – Tyre plus a number of competitors. Often used to symbolize luxury
- balsam – Judaea (exclusive source)
- frankincense – Arabia/Saba/Panchaea (almost a standard commodity, with little imagery)
- mastic – Chios (little imagery, mostly medical)
- nard – India plus competitors (little imagery)
- silphium - Cyrene (little imagery)
- pearls – India, Red Sea (interesting luxury market)
- hounds – Molossus, Sparta and several others (limited imagery)
- citronwood – Mauretania/Africa (the luxury decorative timber, widely cited)
- ebony – India, Ethiopia (little imagery)
- gold – Pactolus, plus numerous other origins (little specific imagery)
- marble – very complex market in which Paros stands out in terms of citations (limited imagery, related to specific end uses)
- pitch – Bruttium (limited imagery, very functional product)
- minium – R. Minius (Spain) (limited imagery)
- plays – Atellani (limited imagery)
- papyrus – Egypt (some imagery, and a type classification)
- galleys – Liburnian (little imagery)
- slingers – Balearic (little imagery).

In other words, there are quite a number of brands for which there are a sufficient number of citations, but the context or the way in which they are described does not always lend itself to the type of analysis set out in the chapters that follow. This does not, however, diminish their status as origin brands: it merely means that, in the literature that we have, there is usually insufficient qualitative comment to enable us to develop a clear understanding of the nature of the brands’ reputation, beyond the implied or stated fact that they are seen as ‘the best’ or among the best in their product category.

The significance of these limitations will become apparent on reading the following chapters, where the richness of at least some of the data can be appreciated. It is probably fair to say that, of the 30-odd categories listed above, there are only half a dozen, beyond the chosen four, that could generate this kind of richness: purple, honey, wool, frankincense, citronwood, pearls and possibly also marble and papyrus.
4. Corinthian Bronze: A Collector’s Dream

The conquest and sack of Corinth by Lucius Mummius in 146 BC is one of the many occasions cited by Roman moralists as a seed of the decline of Rome into luxury and decadence. While Mummius himself seems to have been something of a paragon of virtue, distributing his booty, mostly in the form of statues, as largesse to numerous towns all over Italy, the rest of the loot included a class of luxury goods that was to enthuse individual wealthy Romans and their emulators for the next 150 years: Corinthian bronze.

A note on the specialist sources can be found at appendix 4.1

‘Bronze’ and ‘brass’ are two words for alloys of copper that have tended to be used loosely and even interchangeably over the centuries, so that it is necessary to be careful to be sure what is referred to in literary sources, especially in translation. The situation is complicated by the fact that the Greeks and Romans, similarly, used the words chalkos and aes equally loosely, for either copper or bronze, so that it is not always clear in classical sources exactly what material is being referred to. Modern usage defines bronze as an alloy of copper with the addition of tin as the main secondary metal; brass as copper with zinc as the main secondary. Ancient bronzes often included small quantities of other metals – lead, antimony, bismuth, gold, silver, etc. – sometimes by design, sometimes by accident, or as a result of impurities in the original ore remaining after smelting, or because of the use by the smith of scrap bronze. Zinc does not appear to have been systematically used in the Graeco-Roman world at least until the first century BC, where it becomes common in Roman coins, but at least some copper alloys with a significant proportion of zinc - ie ‘brass’ - are found earlier

486 See ch. 2.3, pp. 73-6, especially nn. 262, 268.
488 No specific mention of bronzes in Dio’s account of the sack (Dio Cass. 21), but Vitruvius 5.5.8 says Mummius dedicated bronzes from Corinth in the temple of Luna, without being explicit about their precise nature - see Murphy O’Connor (1983).

125
than this, and there are apparent literary references back to the sixth century BC. Before about the first century BC, brass (*oreichalcos*) was clearly seen by the Greeks as rare and expensive.

What is clear from the growing number of modern analyses of ancient bronzes, in particular the major project reported by Paul Craddock (n. 491), is that metallurgical practice tended to change over time. The earliest ‘bronzes’ were mostly arsenical copper, with at least some tin; this, in turn, was superseded by alloys in which tin was the major secondary ingredient, while later still lead became an important additional metal in the alloy, though it had also appeared in some early pieces. What also emerges from these analyses is that the make-up of the alloy might be varied according to the artefact being made, and the technique (e.g. casting, hammering, etc.) being used for its manufacture: in some cases, it seems that the balance of the alloy was regarded as functionally critical, but for others the mixture did not appear to matter so much.

What is clear, however, is that among the pieces analysed, whether by Craddock or by other scholars, there are no examples that satisfactorily meet the specification implied by Pliny the Elder – our only contemporary source – for *aes Corinthium*. No examples of this material, a tin bronze alloy containing a proportion of gold and/or silver, and presenting a shining gold or silver appearance, have been identified.

### 4.1 Aes Corinthium: the Material

Pliny the Elder devotes the first dozen chapters of book 34 of his *Natural History* almost entirely to Corinthian bronze, together with a limited amount about other types of bronze; and the rest of book 34, much of which is about sculptors and sculpture, has several references to the material. There are also a small number of other references to Corinthian 

---

491 It is by no means certain that *oreichalcos* can be assumed to mean brass before Strabo (c. AD 40-90) – see Craddock (1978), p. 6; Caley (1964).
493 Plin. *NH* 34.95 discusses the addition of lead to copper to make a bronze.
494 e.g., Craddock (1977) found more lead in Archaic and Classical Greek statuettes than in other artefacts, while vessels were usually unleaded (pp. 105-6).
bronze scattered through the *Natural History*. Unfortunately, as so often with Pliny, he is not always clear, and his knowledge of metallurgy is certainly sketchy.\textsuperscript{496} This has led to a great deal of scholarly debate about both the nature of the material and, indeed, about the correct interpretation of some of the detail of what Pliny has to say. In the absence of any other classical source, this has meant that scholars have had to turn to considerably later sources, and comparisons with metallurgy from other cultures, for any further enlightenment.\textsuperscript{497}

The origin and nature of *aes Corinthium*, Corinthian bronze, are, indeed, something of a mystery. As to its origin, Pliny retails a highly unlikely story that the unusual nature of the material was an accident, arising from copper being exposed, together with gold and silver, to fire during the sack of Corinth.\textsuperscript{498} This story, which seems to have been quite widely current in Rome, is nicely parodied by Petronius,\textsuperscript{499} when Trimalchio recounts how the material originated in the burning of Troy (by Hannibal!); and it is repeated by Plutarch (who also has another, rather different and equally improbable tale) and Florus, and later by Orosius and finally Isidore of Seville, who references part of Trimalchio’s account by attributing the sack of Corinth to Hannibal.\textsuperscript{500} Pliny has in fact said, only a sentence or so earlier, that making this special bronze is a lost art that could not possibly be discovered by chance;\textsuperscript{501} and his story of its origin is such an obvious nonsense that it is slightly surprising to find even him giving it credence. Clearly, the ‘accidental’ origin of Corinthian bronze must be taken with a large pinch of salt – though it is just conceivable that it has some kind of basis in reality, even if attributing it to the sack of 146 BC is clearly apocryphal: Pliny also goes on to say that the most artistic creators of Corinthian bronze pre-date the sack of Corinth by many years.\textsuperscript{502}

\textsuperscript{496} See Caley (1926) p. 1165: Maryon (1949); Paparazzo (2008); Contra Craddock and Giulumia-Mair (1993, pp. 110-111), who claim that Pliny’s language describing the process of making Corinthian bronze is used with great precision (see below, with the comments of Jacobson & Weitzman (1995)).

\textsuperscript{497} In particular, reference is made to the fifth century Leyden Papyrus X (for details and a translation, see Caley (1926)), which appears to draw on sources going back at least to the first or second century AD; and to Japanese and pre-Columbian American metallurgies. See, e.g., Oguchi (1983); Lechtman et al (1983); Schorsch (1998); Cockrell (2009).

\textsuperscript{498} NH. 34.6.

\textsuperscript{499} Sat.50.

\textsuperscript{500} Plut. Mor. 395C; Flor. 1.32: Oros. 5.3; Isid. Orig. 20.4.

\textsuperscript{501} NH. 34.5.

\textsuperscript{502} NH. 34.7.
Pliny’s account of the material itself is not detailed enough to make it absolutely certain what Corinthian bronze actually looked like, or was made of, nor how this effect was achieved. He tells us that it was an alloy of *aes* (which probably means tin bronze, but could mean simply copper) with silver and gold, and came in two main forms: one in which the bronze was alloyed chiefly with silver, and developed a silver sheen; the other where the main addition to the alloy was gold, and the resulting effect golden [*candidum argento nitore quam proxime accedens, in quo illa mixtura praevaluit: alterum in quo auri fulva natura*].

Both forms were highly valued, more than silver, and almost as much as gold. A third form had both gold and silver in equal proportions [*tertium, in quo aequalis omnium temperies fuit*], but Pliny gives us no description of its appearance. There was, too, a fourth, darker kind of bronze, for which Pliny did not know – or did not bother to reveal – the ‘recipe’, and which was described as ‘liverish’ (*hepatizon*), an adjective found in the technical writers Dioscorides and Theophrastus, and there apparently meaning black or dark purple. According to Pliny, this was ‘far inferior’ to Corinthian bronze, but superior to bronze from other renowned sources – Aeginetan or Delian – and especially appropriate for statuary. Thus, although Pliny introduces *hepatizon* in the context of Corinthian bronze, it seems reasonably clear that he does not consider it to be in any sense the same material – a view accepted by Mau, but ignored by some more recent scholars.

There have been various attempts to argue that *aes Corinthium* simply refers to *any* bronze made in Corinth, which certainly had both a reputation for craftsmanship and a significant bronze industry, making everything from armour to statues of the gods. D. M. Emanuele discounts the possibility that Corinthian bronze was genuinely a bronze/gold/silver alloy, which he describes as merely a ‘popular misconception’, and suggests it is purely a high-tin bronze alloy, which is less vulnerable than standard alloys to corrosion. Engels takes a broadly similar view. He argues that the key characteristics of Corinthian bronze derive from corrosion or patina: the local groundwater at Corinth turns bronze reddish, and all that was

---

503 *NH*. 34.3ff.
504 *NH*. 34.8.
505 *NH*. 34.8.
506 *NH*. 34.8; Mau, *RE* 4.1, 1233-4 says firmly that *hepatizon* was not *aes Corinthium*.
508 *RE* 4.1, cols. 1233-4.
509 e.g. Murphy-O’Connor (1983); Emanuele (1989); Engels (1990).
510 e.g. Hdt. 4.180; Strab. 8.6.23.
511 Mattusch (2003), and references there.
needed for this effect was to have a high proportion of tin (15%+) in the alloy.\textsuperscript{513} This, he considers, accounts for the otherwise obscure story in Pausanias that the bronze needed to be quenched (\textit{baptethai}) in the Peirene spring’s waters.\textsuperscript{514} This whole argument seems unlikely, and relies heavily on the conviction that Pliny did not know what he was talking about when he said that Corinthian bronze was an alloy of bronze with silver and gold. The story is further complicated by an account in Plutarch of bronze statues at Delphi, some of which came from Corinth, and had a blueish (\textit{kyanos}) patina.\textsuperscript{515}

So, what was Corinthian bronze? The most convincing explanation seems to be that advanced by David Jacobson and M.P. Weitzman, who describe, and have imitated in the laboratory, a process called depletion gilding, whereby a bronze-silver-gold alloy is treated by heating and the application of certain acids, so that the precious metal becomes, in effect, the surface of the metal, the copper and silver having been leached out, leaving a shining yellow-gold appearance.\textsuperscript{516} A similar process can be used for silvering, and Roman coinage seems to have used this technique in the early years of the Christian era.\textsuperscript{517} This process is paralleled by similar work (\textit{tumbaga}) produced by pre-Columbian metallurgists from the Moche culture of South America.\textsuperscript{518}

An alternative and vigorously pursued suggestion may serve to explain Pliny’s ‘liverish’ finish (\textit{hepatizon}), but, as Jacobson points out, does considerable damage to the interpretation of Pliny’s text if it is to account for the ‘standard’ silver and gold versions. This is that of Paul Craddock and colleagues.\textsuperscript{519} He describes a Japanese technique (\textit{shakudo}, a specific form of \textit{irogane}) which produces a darkened, near-black bronze, usually inlaid with gold or silver.\textsuperscript{520} While Craddock is able to point to a significant number of examples of Egyptian, Mycenean and classical artefacts that appear to have been treated in this way, there

\textsuperscript{513} Emanuele (1989); Engels (1990).
\textsuperscript{514} Paus.2.3.3. \textit{Bapto} is interpreted by Craddock (1982b, p. 71) to mean to ‘colour’.
\textsuperscript{515} Plut. \textit{Mor.} 395D = de Pyth. Or. 2.2.
\textsuperscript{517} Jacobson & Weitzman (1992) p. 245. For ancient gilding techniques see Lins & Oddy (1975); Oddy (1993); Bray (1993); La Niece (1995).
\textsuperscript{518} Jacobson & Weitzman (1992), p. 243, and references there.
\textsuperscript{520} Oguchi (1983); cf. Cooney (1966, 1968); Cockrell (2009).
seem to be serious difficulties with this approach. First, although his examples certainly involve copper alloys that include silver and gold, their appearance best fits Pliny’s description of *hepatizon* (which, as we have seen, is almost certainly not *aes Corinthium* at all), and does not seem to allow for the burnished gold or silver appearance attributed to ‘true’ *aes Corinthium* by Pliny. Second, there is not a single example in this style of the sort of artefacts that Pliny asserts were the stock-in-trade of Corinthian bronzesmiths (see below). Further, it is difficult to interpret Pliny, as Craddock and others wish to, to mean ‘inlay’ as opposed to ‘alloy’ when he talks of *mixtura*. In spite of Craddock’s arguments to the contrary, it is very difficult to find much support for this interpretation of *mixtura* in either the *OLD* or the *TLL*, though Engels clearly thinks there is sufficient evidence for it. There are in fact a number of Latin words that can be translated as ‘inlaid’, and one would have expected Pliny to have used a form of one of these if that was what he meant. The argument seems, too, to ignore the rest of Pliny’s language in describing *aes Corinthium*. For example, *aes confusum auro argentoque miscebatur* (*NH* 34.5) seems clearly to refer to an alloy, and *temperies*, too, is difficult to reconcile with inlays. Craddock and Giumlia-Mair do try to find a way around this, but the linguistic arguments do not look very convincing, and their additional citations from Athenaeus, Plutarch and Pausanias do not add anything significant. Difficult as Pliny’s Latin can be, it seems to be stretching the imagination to believe that almost every key word he uses in describing Corinthian bronze metallurgy carries an obscure or unusual connotation, and is used ‘with great precision’ to do so.

The fact remains that Craddock and his associates can point to actual examples of the type of material they are promoting as Corinthian bronze. The central problem, though, is that it really does not fit the descriptions given in ancient literature. As Jacobson and Weitzman conclude, Pliny’s account, together with those from other classical sources, includes a number of clear pointers to the character of Corinthian bronze as a material, whatever it actually was, and any solution to the problems posed by its precise identity needs to take all these factors into account: Corinthian bronze was a bronze [or copper] alloy containing silver or gold or both; it was more valuable than silver and almost as valuable as gold; it was hard and best fashioned by casting; it had a lustrous surface that in one form shone with a

---

524 For the detail, see Craddock & Giumlia-Mair (1993), pp. 10-11.
yellowish, gold-like hue; its lustre was produced by a process that included burnishing; it resisted tarnishing; and its production involved one or more heat treatments and quenching stages. One can add to this list that its main – almost exclusive - use is for tableware; that it is usually, or at least frequently, elaborately decorative (caelatus – which can mean, according to the OLD, anything from ‘engraved’ to ‘repoussé’; the Greek equivalent is toreutos); and that as an alternative to the yellowish, golden hue, there was a shining white, silvery version.

The issue of the precise nature of Corinthian bronze must remain open – far more open than Craddock and his colleagues claim. Certainly, the sophisticated metallurgy of several areas and cultures of the eastern Mediterranean produced a range of bronze artefacts that are both beautiful and technically advanced. But that does not necessarily make them ‘Corinthian’.

4.2 Corinthian Bronze Artefacts

It is clear from references to Corinthian bronze in classical literature that it was used primarily for vessels – display tableware (suppellex or vasa), which was highly decorative (caelatus) - and also (probably) for small statuettes. As Elizabeth Pemberton says, it seems that Corinthian bronzesmiths focused on utilitarian products, rather than the purely decorative. Here, Pliny’s testimony is borne out both by Petronius, who describes a range of Trimalchio’s tableware, including a statuette of an ass, and by Cicero, who typically talks of vasa Corinthia. Pliny is quite explicit about this primary use (which he considered somehow inappropriate for such a highly-valued material). As tableware, Corinthian bronze would have competed with the silverware (See Plate 4) that had provided the utensils of choice for the tables of the wealthy since at least the early third century BC, when we hear of the censors penalising a senator for owning too much silver tableware. In the context of formal dining, Corinthian ware would have made a strong statement to the owner’s most important guests that he was wealthy and powerful, with the taste of a connoisseur.

526 Caelare: adorn a surface with work embossed or engraved in relief, emboss, engrave, chase – OLD.
528 Petr. Sat. 50 – see Baldwin (1973).
529 E.g. Rosc. Am. 133; Verr. 2.2.46; 2.2.176; 2.4.1; 2.4.50; 2.4.98; 2.4.131; NH. 34.7.
530 The consular grandee P. Cornelius Rufinus was attacked for this by Fabricius Luscinus (censor 275BC). See Val. Max. 2.9.4. For changing fashions in Roman silverware see Oliver (2004).
1. Silver tableware from the House of the Menander, Pompeii

2. Several images of a painting of tableware from the tomb of C Vestorius Priscus at the Ports Vesuvio, Pompeii may be found at

http://www.pompeiiinpictures.com/pompeiiinpictures/Tombs/tombs%20porta%20ve
suvio%20vgj%20p2.html

Plate 4.1 Tableware competitive with Corinthian bronze
In addition to tableware, there are mentions in both Josephus and Martial of candelabra of Corinthian bronze, and Pliny himself has an anecdote on the subject, but he regards Corinthian candelabra as clearly fakes. It is possible, too, to infer from a passage in Cicero’s *Verrines* that armour was also made of this material, but it seems more likely that this particular example is purely one of ‘bronze from Corinth’, as there is no question that Corinth produced bronze armour in ‘orthodox’ bronze. The example in the *Verrines*, however, could conceivably have been ‘parade’ armour, as it had been dedicated in a temple, and was, therefore, something special.

While Pliny argues that the owners of statues that are claimed to be made of Corinthian bronze are usually deluding themselves, he himself talks of several examples, notably a sphinx that Hortensius had been given by Verres, and a statuette in the possession of Nero. His nephew the younger Pliny proudly reports in one of his letters that he has purchased such a statue, which has a suitably antique appearance, and which he is convinced, clearly, is the genuine article, apparently largely on the strength of its patination. It has been suggested that this ‘statue’ was in fact a relatively small statuette, possibly originally part of a large vase such as the Derveni krater, or the Vix krater, which was conceivably made in Corinth. It was, clearly, expensive, and Pliny says he intends to put it up in the Temple of Jupiter at Comum, rather than keep it at home - *emi autem non ut haberem domi (neque enim ullam adhuc Corinthium domi habeo)*. Corinthian statuettes appear, too, in Martial’s *apophoreta*. Another relatively late mention of a Corinthian statue is the *imago Corinthea* of the emperor

---

532 Jos. Vit. 13; cf. Mart.14.43. *Contra*, Plin. *NH*. 34.12: *cum esse nulla candelabra Corinthia constet* – ‘it is well-known that there is no such thing as Corinthian candelabra’.


534 *NH*. 34.48. Hortensius’s sphinx is also referred to by Quintilian (*Inst*. 6.3.98). Pliny, *NH*. 9.139, indicates the likelihood of Corinthian bronze being faked.


536 See Barr-Sharrar (2008), on the Derveni krater. Pemberton (1981) points to the analogy of the Vix krater, on which see Godje sen (1963), who argued strongly for a Corinthian origin for this piece, on art historical grounds. Current opinion, however, places its origin in southern Italy, and a technical analysis shows that, whatever its origin, the alloys used do not fit Pliny’s specification for Corinthian bronze – see Bourgarit & Mille (2003).

537 Mart. 14.172; 14.177.
Trajan referred to on a Roman inscription, which implies, rather improbably, that the technique of its production was still known in Flavian times."

The only other application for Corinthian bronze that we know of is that the material appears to have been used to adorn Nicanor’s Gate to Herod’s temple at Jerusalem, a gate that may be represented in a fresco from the synagogue at Dura Europos. From references in Josephus and the fact that Nicanor was a prominent citizen there, it seems that this bronze was made in Alexandria: it looks as if the technology, at least, had been transferred from Corinth. Assuming these gates were indeed of Corinthian bronze, they are much the largest use of the material of which we have any record. I return to Nicanor’s Gate below.

### 4.3 Corinthian Bronze in Literary Sources

For this study, the interest in Corinthian bronze lies especially in the way in which it clearly became highly desirable and avidly sought after in the upper echelons of wealthy Roman society, as that society absorbed the wealth and culture of its eastern Mediterranean conquests.

There are no certain references to Corinthian bronze, as such, before the first century BC, though Murphy O’Connor and others cite several quotations in Athenaeus from earlier Greek writers that clearly refer to bronze from Corinth and all of which could, possibly, be interpreted as referring to the specific material. A reference to a ‘Corinthian’ helmet in Herodotus gives no clue as to whether the author is talking about the helmet’s origin, style or material. Livy (34.4) puts a mention of *ornamenta Corinthia* into the mouth of Cato in his speech against the repeal of the *Lex Oppia*, but this is likely to be an anachronism.

---

538 CIL 6.8686.

539 See Renov (1970) for the identification, and for the doubts expressed by the editor of IEJ at the end of that article.

540 For the most up-to-date detailed discussion, see Schwarz (2003). What is believed to be Nicanor's tomb was discovered in Jerusalem in 1902, and his ossuary is now in the British Museum, but the identification is controversial – see Schwartz (2003) and p. 138 below.

541 Pliny, in fact, mentions in *NH*. 34.13 the bronze capitals of Gnaeus Octavius's double portico to the Flaminian Circus being described as 'Corinthian', but clearly considers them not to be *aes Corinthium*, along with the gates of the Temple of Vesta and the capitals of the Pantheon, which he describes as being of 'Syracusan' bronze.

542 Ath. 4.128D (Theophrastus of Eresus); 5.199E (Callixeinus of Rhodes); 6.236B (Diphilus); 11.488C-D (Asclepiades of Myrlea). See Murphy O’Connor (1983); Giuliia-Mair & Craddock (1993).

543 Hdt. 4.180. Corinthian helmets are one of a range of types of ancient helmet – see Snodgrass (1964) for classification and comparison with other types.
The earliest literary mention in Latin is in Cicero’s *Pro Roscio Amerino*, dating from 79 BC, and his Verrine orations, a few years later, are full of it. From Cicero, it is clear that Corinthian bronzes, along with ivory, were among Verres’s prime targets for expropriation from his Sicilian victims. Evidently, by this time, collectors were already well aware of Corinthian bronze, and eager to obtain it, in some of the provinces just as much as in Rome itself; and Verres, who is portrayed by Cicero as a voracious connoisseur and seeker-out of desirable luxury objects, could not keep his hands off it. Pliny tells us that Verres (and also, apparently, Cicero, at least on the obvious interpretation of Pliny’s text) was later proscribed by Antony because he would not surrender his Corinthian bronzes. The first actual mention of *aes Corinthium*, as such, occurs in a letter of Cicero to Atticus dated to 60 BC. Generally, Cicero refers to *vasa Corinthia*, though sometimes simply to *Corinthia*. Not long after this, Augustus was described as being a great admirer of Corinthian bronzes; and by the time of Tiberius we find a (fruitless) attempt to restrain the price of the material. The whole phenomenon was aptly, if crabbily, summed up by Seneca as *aes paucorum insania pretiosum*.

The collecting of antiques and works of art became increasingly popular among wealthy Romans towards the end of the second century BC, helped by the flow of artefacts from Greece and Asia Minor that followed the conquest of Macedon, the defeat of the Seleucids, the subsequent conquest of all of mainland Greece and the legacy of Attalus of Pergamum in 133 BC. This series of events and the triumphs associated with them both exposed the Roman public to wholly new artistic (and luxurious) influences and encouraged rich Romans to a frenzy of refurbishment and rebuilding of increasingly spacious and richly furnished houses – and the country villas that enabled them to enjoy their estates. The process was reinforced in the first half of the first century BC by the conquests of Sulla and Pompey. On

---

544 Cic. *Rosc Am.* 133, 136; Verr. 2.2.46, 83, 176; 2.4.1, 50, 51, 83, 96, 98, 131.
545 *NH.* 34.6.
546 Cic. *Att.* 2.1.11.
547 Verr. 2.4.51; *Fin.* 2.3.14; Tusc. 2.32; *Parad.* 1.13; 5.3; Mur. 31.9.
548 Suet. *Aug.* 70.2: *Notatus est et ut pretiosae supellectilis Corinthiorumque prae cupidus et aleae indulgens: nam et proscriptionis tempore ad statuam eius ascriptum est: *Pater argentarius, ego Corinthiarius,* cum existimaretur quosdam propter vasa Corinthia inter proscriptos curasse referendos.*
549 Suet. *Tib.* 34.1: *Corinthiorum vasorum pretia in immensum exarsisse....
551 Bounia (2004); Rosenmeyer (2007); Morcillo (2010).
the whole, wealthy Romans preferred antiques to contemporary work, however costly and artistic, and if they could not get originals they were happy with copies."

It is very clear from Cicero, and also from Seneca,\(^\text{553}\) both Plinys and Suetonius, not to mention Petronius, that the collecting and display of Corinthian bronze was one of the features of wealthy Roman society, through most of the period from 100 BC to AD 100. Strabo gives an interesting account of the ransacking of tombs at Corinth when the city was recolonised by Julius Caesar in 44 BC:

\[\text{And when these were removing the ruins and at the same time digging open the graves, they found numbers of terra-cotta reliefs, and also many bronze vessels. And since they admired the workmanship they left no grave unransacked; so that, well supplied with such things and disposing of them at a high price, they filled Rome with Corinthian "mortuaries," for thus they called the things taken from the graves...}^\text{554}\]

Unlike ivory (see ch. 5) and silk (ch. 6), Corinthian bronze is relatively sparsely referred to in poetry, but there are scattered references in Ovid, Vergil, Horace and Propertius among the Augustans - though none of the Horace citations usually quoted by scholars discussing the material actually puts the words \textit{aes} and \textit{Corinthium} together. All of these in context refer loosely, at least, to luxury.\(^\text{555}\) Similarly, Corinthian bronze re-surfaces in poetry in the late first century, in Statius’s account of Pollius Felix’s luxurious villa at Sorrento; \(^\text{556}\) and in Martial, who suggests that connoisseurs can distinguish Corinthian bronze by its smell (an idea also found in Petronius, perhaps equally satirically).\(^\text{557}\) This Martial context is rich in other luxury items – statuettes, fine crystal, \textit{myrrhina} - and Martial’s \textit{apophoreta} in book 14

\(^{552}\) See Bieber (1977), especially pp.182 ff; Mattusch (2002).
\(^{553}\) Sen. Brev. Vit. 12.2; Tranq. 9.6; Helv. 11.3.
\(^{554}\) Strab. 8.6.23, tr. Hamilton & Falconer (Loeb Classical Library). For these necrocorinthia, see Payne (1931).
\(^{555}\) Verg. Geo. 2.464; Prop. 3.5.6; Hor. Sat. 1.4.28; Ep. 1.6.17; 2.1.193; Ov. Met. 6.146. As is clear from Cicero’s practice, \textit{Corinthia} clearly came to mean \textit{vasa Corinthia} in general usage – see n. 559 below.
\(^{556}\) Silv. 2.2.68.
\(^{557}\) Mart. 9.59.11; Petr. Sat. 50. Brass (copper plus zinc) \textit{is} reported to produce a distinctive odour when associated with food (see Craddock (1978)) but the idea that bronze might do so has been dismissed out-of-hand by scholars – perhaps too eagerly, given the lack of any
include Corinthian candelabra (14.43) and two statuettes (14.172, 177) among his ‘expensive’ presents.

What is clear from the literature, as Quintilian points out in a passage where he is talking about the use of particular words that automatically conjure up specific associations, is that the very word *Corinthium* was automatically associated with *aes.* The strength of this association can still be seen in Sidonius Apollinaris in the latter half of the fifth century, over three hundred years later: his *Carmen 5*, a panegyric to Marjorian, lists (5.40 ff.) ‘the fruits of each province’, most of them luxuries, and ending (47–48): *(fert)... Aurum Lydus, Arabs guttam, Panchaia myrrham/ Pontus castorea, blattam Tyrus, aera Corinthus.*

It is this familiarity that lies behind the graffito about Augustus, and the throw-away joke in Cicero’s letter to Atticus, to the effect that he was more involved in *aes alienum* than *aes Corinthium.* While they might not wish to emulate the ostentation of those who regularly put Corinthian broneware on their dining tables, it is quite clear that every wealthy Roman was well aware of its collectability – and quite a few were equally aware of the possibility of being offered a fake. The defensiveness of Pliny the younger over his purchase and the way in which Trimalchio proclaims his Corinthian wares’ alleged ‘provenance’ both testify to a recognition of the risk of fraud.

Corinthian bronze is mentioned as a luxury item in a surprisingly wide range of classical authors: it clearly had a wide currency among the élite, both those who could afford to buy it and those who merely observed. A possible way in which it could have been communicated around the élite and the craftsmen who supplied them has been used as a model for the communication of origin brands in chapter 3. It seems clear from the literary evidence that it would have been a ready subject for the gossip that was an essential part of

---

558 *Inst. B.2.8: Item quod commune est et aliiis nomen intellectu aliqui rei peculiariter tribuitur, ut "urbe" Romam accipimus et "venales" novicios et "Corinthia" aera, cum sint urbes aliae quoque et vetalia multa et tam aurum et argentum quam aes Corinthium.*

559 Altogether, this passage, from line 42 onwards, is a fine list of origin brands.

560 *Cic. Att. 2.11.*

561 See Appendix 4.2 for a list of citations.
the brand communication process, with Cicero’s *Verrines* as a particularly high-profile literary stimulus. Suetonius and Petronius are eloquent witnesses to the brand’s potency as gossip-fodder, as, in its way, is Seneca’s outburst against it.

4.4 Beyond Rome

Unlike some other luxury products’, the fame of Corinthian bronze was not purely a Roman phenomenon (in a literary context, at least). Mentions of the material in Josephus have already been noted, and this seems to reflect a genuine interest in Corinthian bronze in the eastern part of the empire. In particular, Corinthian bronze seems to have appealed to the Jews, who recognised it as something special. Josephus describes one of the gates of Herod’s temple as follows:

> Now nine of these gates were on every side covered over with gold and silver, as were the jambs of their doors and their lintels; but there was one gate that was without the [inward court of the] holy house, which was of Corinthian brass, and greatly excelled those that were only covered over with silver and gold.'

This was the Nicanor Gate, which is usually identified with the ‘beautiful gate’ of Acts 3.2, and which is frequently referred to in Jewish writings. Nicanor was a wealthy citizen of Alexandria, who, according to the Jewish literature, transported the gates from Alexandria by sea to Joppa, and miraculously preserved the gates, and his own life, in a storm. Whatever the truth of this piece of mythology, the discovery on the Mount of Olives of an ossuary (now in the British Museum) which refers (rather ungrammatically, in Greek) to one Nicanor as ‘the maker of the gates’, and links him with Alexandria, seems highly convincing.

---

562 *Bj.* 5. 201 (tr. W. Whiston).
563 For numerous references, see Weisenberg (1953), p. 15, n. 2.
564 *Yoma* ii.4; iii.41a. For the full story – and some rejected alternatives - see Weisenberg (1953) pp. 15-16.
565 Clermont-Ganneau (1903); Dickson (1903); Weisenberg (1953), pp. 28-9; Bammel (1956); Schwartz (2003).
What seems clear from this story is that ‘Corinthian bronze’ was being manufactured in Alexandria sometime in the first century AD, and exported to Palestine. Equally, it is clear from Josephus that it was regarded as a very special material, even in a context where the notably wealthy Tiberius Alexander had supplied copious quantities of gold for the Temple’s other gates.

It is clear, certainly, that Jewish writers had developed an interest in Corinthian bronze, around the turn of the Christian era. Earlier Jewish (Hebrew) literature refers to ‘burnished brass’ or ‘shining copper’; but in the Syriac translation of the Old Testament, the Peshitta, which probably dates from sometime between the first and third centuries AD, the language refers explicitly to Corinthian bronze, in three separate instances. It is at least possible that by this time the fame of Corinthian bronze had circulated around the Roman Empire to the extent that any highly-polished bronze with a golden sheen, however arrived at, came to be called Corinthian. Either explanation, however, testifies to the strength of the Corinthian brand, and may, too, reflect a serious business of imitation, or perhaps counterfeiting, in at least one major manufacturing centre in the empire.

In a world where the concept of intellectual property had not been developed, we have no definite knowledge of actual counterfeiting of Corinthian bronze, though, as we have seen, there are undoubtedly hints in our literary sources, and there is little doubt that more mundane products, like flour, were subject to more or less routine dilution by cheaper and nastier substitute ingredients. Both Petronius and, more seriously, Pliny indicate that the identification of Corinthian bronze was not entirely straightforward – and the younger Pliny’s purchase, referred to earlier, clearly had a few questions attached to it, as far as the

566 Contra Murphy O’Connor (1983), who believes that the material could only be manufactured in Corinth, in which case Nicanor merely finished his gates in Alexandria. As Jacobson & Wetzman (1992) point out, this seems unlikely. But this looks like another instance of post-146 BC manufacture – cf. p. 132.
567 Ezra 8:27; 1 Kings 7:45; 1 Chronicles 29.7. For the interchangeable use of ‘brass’, ‘bronze’ and ‘copper’ in both English and ancient languages, see Rickard (1932). For the precise texts of the biblical original and Peshitta citations, see Jacobson & Wetzman (1992), p. 241.
569 NH 34. 6-7: ac mihi maior pars eorum simulare eam scientiam videtur ad segregandos sese a ceteris magis quam intellegere aliquid ibi subtilius ... sunt ergo vasa tantum Corinthia, quae isti elegantiores modo ad esculenta trans ferunt, modo in lucernas aut trulleos nullo munditiam dispectu. See Baldwin (1973).
buyer was concerned. Certainly, the copying of artistic originals was a standard and recognised practice in the Hellenistic and Roman world. Whatever the precise nature of Nicanor’s bronze, what we have in Corinthian bronze, clearly, is a rare example of a brand highly regarded in Roman élite circles that is definitely recorded in non-Roman sources and outside Rome.

4.5 Other Evidence

Beyond the literary record, there are a small number of inscriptions that refer to Corinthiarii or a Corinthis. Both designations seem to refer to servants or slaves with the job of looking after the Corinthian bronze in rich, especially imperial, houses. The datable inscriptions are all from before the end of the first century AD, and come from either Rome or Campania, mostly from imperial or very rich families’ columbaria.

But, as discussed earlier, that is as far as the archaeological record seems to take us. As Paul Craddock, among others, has pointed out, we have no positively-identified example of a bronze artefact that fits the orthodox interpretation of Pliny – a vase or vessel made of copper or bronze alloyed with a proportion of gold and silver. What we do have, as Craddock and Giumlia-Mair have amply demonstrated, is a number of items, from Egypt, Mycenae and classical Rome, that appear to exemplify a shakudo-type technique - and which, I believe, far more nearly match Pliny’s brief description of hepatizon than his description of Corinthian bronze.

Similarly, we have no meaningful idea of the prices paid for Corinthian bronze by Roman connoisseurs: merely that prices were high, and sometimes ridiculously high, as under Tiberius, according to Suetonius; while Dio Chrysostom introduces Corinthian bronze early in his discourse On Wealth, clearly as an outstanding example of a luxury material. In fact,
the only price mentioned in any of our literature is the 50,000 sesterces paid by a lady called Gegania for a candelabrum which, Pliny implies, was most unlikely to be Corinthian, though it may well have been presented as such. Unfortunately, we have little way of finding a context of comparison, beyond noting that it is a substantial sum, equivalent to 5% of a senatorial census qualification. All we have is Pliny’s statement that *aes Corinthium* was more valuable than silver, and close to the price of gold.

**4.6 Conclusion**

Whatever its precise nature, Corinthian bronze enjoyed a period of intense demand as a luxury brand of antique among the Roman élite – and, it seems, especially at the very top end of this élite, who were, perhaps, the only people who could afford to buy it, or had the power to divert it into their possession. Interestingly, however, we do not hear of any emperor after Augustus pursuing Corinthian bronze. Possibly, by the time he had finished collecting, the imperial household had sufficient. Like many classes of antique, it was subject to the whims of fashion, just as we can see crazes for Art Deco or Adam or Arts & Crafts in today’s antique markets. It is easy to assume that the fashion simply died out, though the scattering of references to Corinthian bronze among post-classical authors shows that awareness of the material had not died, even though we hear nothing more of it as a demanded consumer product after Martial. There are no mentions of it in, for example, Juvenal, Apuleius, Aulus Gellius or Macrobius. Isidore of Seville certainly implies that Corinthian bronze was being made in his day (seventh century AD), though it is by no means clear whether this was ‘real’ or ‘fake’.

A search on the internet shows that ‘Corinthian bronze’ is still being made and sold to this day.

Perhaps, like ‘brown furniture’ in the UK today, Corinthian bronze became something that merely lingered on in the possession of the Roman families that had acquired it in earlier years. Or, more likely, as it went out of fashion it was melted down and turned into anything from coins to mirrors. As it went out of fashion, valuations like ‘more valuable than silver and close to gold’ would have disappeared, and the outmoded dishes would have become merely fodder for the bronzesmith, silversmith and goldsmith.

---

573 Plin. *NH*. 34.11. The purchase came with a dwarf slave as a 'bonus'.
574 Isid. *Orig.* 20.4.
In this instance, it is tempting to attribute much of Corinthian bronze’s currency to the emphasis placed on it by Cicero in his prosecution of Verres. This is the one existing source where it appears again and again. This would, however, be to ignore the obvious fact that, in order for the attack on Verres to have its maximum effect, it must already have been well recognised, at least among the cognoscenti, that Corinthian bronzes were desirable, high-value status symbols. Rather than giving the credit to Cicero, we should probably blame Mummius, who may well have had no idea what he was starting, since his reputation (possibly undeserved) is of an artistic know-nothing. 

Quite simply, we do not have any meaningful evidence between 146 BC and Cicero’s Pro Roscio Amerino in 79 BC.

As the discussion of the communication model in chapter 3 shows, it is quite easy to hypothesise the role of a wide variety of word-of-mouth communication about the Corinthian bronze brand, and the literary evidence readily supports the view that the brand was widely recognised and talked about. Unlike Indian ivory, the focus of the next chapter, there was no doubt about the origin of the brand – so long as it was genuine.

---

576 Yarrow (2002) – Pliny, NH. 37.12 attributes the introduction of Corinthia and paintings to Rome to him, as do Livy (Per. 53.168), Vitruvius (5.5.8) and Velleius (1.1.3.4).
5. Indian Ivory – an Imperial Fantasy Brand?

Ivory is the archetypical luxury product. It is exotic, expensive, rare; it is sensually attractive and aesthetically beautiful; and when worked it asks for – and gets - exquisite craftsmanship. For the craftsman, it is durable and easy to work. As a luxury, it has a long history of use in religious, royal and aristocratic contexts, appearing as, or as part of, a wide range of artefacts. However, ivory tends to become fragile and to discolour with age and maltreatment and most ivory artefacts are quite small (there is a limit to the size of a tusk, let alone the portions suitable for carving), so that relatively few pieces survive from antiquity in good condition.

For the student of brands in the Roman world, ivory raises an intriguing question. Why is it frequently (though not exclusively) associated with India, rather than Africa, in our literary sources from our period, when its original main origin for the Romans was, almost certainly, Africa, and Africa undoubtedly remained a significant source of the material throughout the period? What is it about ivory, or India, that creates this strong and frequent association between commodity and origin? When and where was the connection established, and how was it promulgated in Roman society? The resulting ‘brand’ – Indian ivory – is a consistently strong one from the mid-first century BC right through to the third century AD and beyond.

In this chapter, I examine the history of ivory carving, and go on to discuss the Roman experience of ivory and the imagery which they attached to it. This imagery early became closely entwined with Roman perceptions of India, and this relationship reflects – to an

578 O’Connor (1987); Penniman (1952).
extent - the way in which trade in ivory developed in the period under discussion. An account of the main specialist sources is given in Appendix 5.1.

5.1 Ivory: the Back Story

As R.D. Barnett put it, ‘For five millennia ivory has exerted an extraordinary – almost mysterious – fascination over men’s minds in three continents’. 579

By the time the Romans became fully aware of it, ivory had a long record of craftsmanship and circulation around the Mediterranean, especially in Egypt (where its historical Western use apparently originated) and the Near East, 580 extending into both island and mainland Greece in Minoan and Mycenean times. 581 Small ivory objects from Egyptian tombs are dated to well before 3000 BC, 582 and the first pyramid, that of Cheops (c.2500 BC), contained ivory figurines. 583

The Egyptians seem to have used elephant and hippopotamus ivory more or less interchangeably, 584 though the two materials have different physical characteristics, 585 quite apart from the fact that elephant tusks provide a larger individual surface. By the time ivory can be identified in the archaeological record in the Near East, it seems that most of the raw material came via Egypt, at least initially (but see Hayward (1990)), and that both hippopotamus and elephant ivory were traded: the fourteenth century BC shipwreck of Ulu-Burun carried both types among its cargo. 586 At the same time, there was a near-eastern population of elephants, the so-called Syrian elephant, 587 which supplied some ivory for local

580 Wills (1968), pp. 15ff.
582 Including the earliest Egyptian writing known – on hippopotamus ivory. See Dreyer (1998).
585 Hippopotamus ivory is much harder – see Krzyszkowska (1990), p. 2.
587 Scullard (1974), pp. 29ff; Miller (1986); Dodge (1955). Contro, Collon (1977), who argues that the Syrian population always consisted of imported animals from India – but disregards
craftsmen, and these elephants were still being hunted by Assyrian kings in the ninth century, though they seem to have died out soon after.

Ivory-working developed in numerous middle eastern centres during the second millennium BC, with workshops and local styles in (primarily) Ugarit, Byblos, Phoenicia and several sites in Anatolia. Much of our knowledge of early ivory artefacts derives from the enthusiastic looting of conquered cities by the Assyrian kings of the early first millennium, leading to substantial finds of ivories at Nimrud. The Assyrians and later the Persians recorded tribute in elephant tusks from various sources: clearly they, too, established local craftsmanship, and Barnett suggests that the Assyrians’ insatiable demand for ivory had the effect of damaging the Phoenician ivory industry.

From the Levant, ivory carving spread to Cyprus and Crete at least before 1500 BC, and soon afterwards it appears in mainland Greece, where the House of Shields and the House of Sphinxes at Mycenae have produced a huge range of pieces. Other early centres of ivory-working in mainland Greece include Thebes and Attica, while the largest catalogue of archaic Greek ivory comes from Sparta, where its use appears to have died out around the end of the seventh century, for reasons which remain uncertain. The earliest Greek literary

numerous reports of elephant hunting in the wild by both Egyptian and Assyrian monarchs down to at least the end of the ninth century. The issue is raised again in Caubet & Poplin (2010), essentially as an argument ex silentio.
589 Barnett (1939). Thereafter, the only ‘Syrian’ elephants were those that the Seleucids had obtained from India, which overcame the African elephants of Ptolemy II at the battle of Raphia: Polyb. 5.84.5-6; Gowers (1948). Cfr. Livy 37.19; Plin. NH. 8.27.
590 For a detailed overview, see Barnett (1982).
596 Hdt. 3.97.
references to ivory are in Homer, and the first Greek account of an elephant appears in Herodotus. By the fifth century, Phidias was producing masterpieces of chryselephantine sculpture at Athens, Olympia and elsewhere, developing on a grand scale techniques used a thousand years before in Crete.

In Italy, ivory has been found in Etruscan tombs, notably the late seventh century Barberini and Bernardini Tombs at Praeneste, and as late as the third century; and it seems highly likely that the Roman victors obtained some ivory objects as they gradually conquered their Italian near-neighbours. What is certain is that the Roman magistrates’ chair, the *sella curulis*, was inlaid with ivory, and the magistrates had ivory staffs; and though there is no record of when this practice started, the Romans themselves regarded the chair as Etruscan.

Etruscan tomb pieces reflect Phoenician influences, though it is uncertain whether individual pieces were imported from Phoenician traders or crafted locally by travelling craftsmen trained in Phoenicia (It is generally accepted that in the late bronze age, ivory carvers were mobile, and became established either in temples or the palaces of wealthy patrons as ‘house carvers’).

While there is little surviving Hellenistic ivory from mainland Greece, much of what there is consists of furniture inlays: Letta catalogued 184 ivory and bone inlaid couches from across the Graeco-Roman world dated between 400 and 100 BC. As St Clair points out, the majority of these are bone, which is cheaper, more readily available and hard to distinguish from ivory, especially when damaged by age. It was, too, used in the same workshops by the

---

602 e.g. *ll. 4.101; 4.141; 5.583; Od. 4.73; 11.404; 18.196; 19.56, 563-4; 21.7; 23. 200.
603 Hdt. 4.191.
607 Livy states that the form of chair came from Etruria: Livy 1.8; cf. Diod. Sic. 5.40.1; Sil. 8.485-7 - see Schäfer (1989). Livy recounts gifts of curule magistrates’ insignia to two African kings during the 2nd Punic War (27.4; 30.15), describing the chairs as ‘ivory’, but whether he is being anachronistic, we cannot know. Cf. Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 3.6.1; 5.35.1 and, under Tiberius, Tac. *Ann.* 4.26.
609 Letta (1984); Greifenhagen (1930).
610 St Clair (2003), p. 31.
same craftsmen.\textsuperscript{611} In Athens in the fourth century BC, Demosthenes’ father’s two factories each needed 2 minae of ivory a month for uses including sword hilts and scabbards and furniture inlays.\textsuperscript{611} The Macedonian royal tombs at Vergina have produced a wide range of figures, furniture inlays and portrait heads.\textsuperscript{611}

Taking a broad overview of ivory’s role in Greek society, it appears that the largest volume use was in votive offerings at many temples – the Artemision at Ephesus, the Heraion at Samos, Apollo’s shrine at Delphi, Olympian Zeus, and so on. It is fair to say, however, that the collection of offerings at religious sites makes it easier for archaeologists to locate and record these than more widely-diffused objects. These offerings might be carved figurines and other artefacts or whole tusks, while temple doors were often inlaid with ivory.\textsuperscript{611} Indeed, it could be claimed that ivory before the Hellenistic period was primarily controlled by priests: as Barnett says, the employment of ivory carvers in the fifth century BC was mainly in priestly hands in Greece - though, given the wealthy, part-time status of most priests, this did not preclude a taste for ivory pieces among the wealthy, or the opportunity to obtain them.\textsuperscript{615}

Clearly ivory was prized by kings and aristocrats: as Archer St Clair says, the association of ivory, particularly ivory-veneered furniture, with royalty is well illustrated by the Vergina tombs and confirmed by finds of tusks and finished objects from Hellenistic and early Roman sites.\textsuperscript{616}

\textsuperscript{611} See also Nicholls (1979): the elegant couch in the Fitzwilliam Museum uses bone, carved to a very high standard.
\textsuperscript{612} Dem. 33. 9-10; 30-33. A mina is equivalent to c.430 gms – see D&S, sv talent.
\textsuperscript{613} Andronikos (1984).
\textsuperscript{614} Oliver (1992); IG 4.4.1 - see Meiggs (1982) appendix 4, pp. 423-5, with details of the accounts from the temple at Epidaurus – see Appendix 5.3.
\textsuperscript{615} Barnett (1982), pp. 63-4.
\textsuperscript{616} St Clair (2003), p. 30.
The inlaid couches which provided a showcase for much ancient ivory carving were used especially for funerary purposes, and this practice was followed down into Roman times: Suetonius tells us that Julius Caesar’s funeral couch was inlaid with ivory, as was that of Augustus. In addition to inlays, at least some couches had ivory fulcra, carved in the round. In contrast to these major pieces, however, it is clear that there was also widespread use among wealthy women of ivory for small items – combs, pins, cosmetic containers, etc – which have survived, at best, patchily from classical Roman times; while knife handles, plectra for playing stringed instruments and sword hilts seem to have been common, judging from literary mentions. And, as Pliny tells us, ingenious craftsmen made miniature carvings of great delicacy out of ivory.

5.2 Rome, the Elephant and Ivory

The Romans, whatever their experience of ivory, had never seen an elephant until the war with Pyrrhus of Epirus (280 BC), and there is no evidence to show when or how they made the connection between ivory and its source. The fact that the war with Pyrrhus was initially fought in Lucania led to the first Latin term for an elephant – Luca bos. By the time they encountered Carthaginian war elephants, this transmogrified into Libyssa belua, just as, in turn, Ovid was to refer to Inda belua. As is clear from Livy, by the time of the Second Punic war and the subsequent wars against Philip V of Macedon and Antiochus IV, the Romans obtained fighting elephants both by capturing them in battle and through gifts from

617 As Andrianou (2006) says, there is far more surviving Greek furniture from funerary than domestic contexts: for a list of examples, see her pp. 245-8 and references there. And see Ransom (1905).
618 Hill (1963); Suet. Df. 84.1 (Julius Caesar); Dio Cass. 56.34 (Augustus). The fact that these were singled out for comment reflects ivory’s special character.
620 Verg. Aen. 6.647; Tib. 3.4.39; Prop. 2.1.9; 3.3.25; Laus. Pis. 166; Mart. 14.167 (plectrum); Verg. Aen. 11.11; Ov. Met 7.422; Plin. NH. 33.152 (hilt); Juv. 11.132 (knife handles).
621 NH. 7.85: Callicraetes ex ebore formicas et alia tam parva fecit animalia, ut partes eorum a ceteris cerni non possent. Myrmecides quidem in eodem genere inclaurit quadriga ex eadem materia, quam musca integeret alis, fabricata et nave, quam apicula pinnis absconderet. On Myrmecides, see also Varro LL. 7.1; Cic. Ac. Quaest. 4.120.
622 Plaut. Cas. 845-6, cf. Varro LL. 7.39 (quoting Naevius); Plin. NH. 8.16. Pyrrhus’s elephants were Indian, captured from the Seleucids (Paus. 1.12.2-4).
623 Sil. 3.459 (written in the first century AD).
624 Ov. Trist. 4.6.7-8. Juvenal (10.158) refers to Gaetula belua.
625 Plin. NH. 8.16; Livy 23.46.4; 24.42.8; 25.41.7; 27.42.7; 30.6.9, etc.
their African ally Massinissa, though captured elephants found their way, at least initially, into the arena. According to Pliny, the first time elephants were seen in harness at Rome was at the triumph of Pompey over Africa.

Subsequently, the Romans seem to have been able to maintain at least a small supply of elephants, primarily for slaughter in the arena. Whence these elephants came is not known, but Claudius appears to have had an elephant ‘farm’ at Laurentum, and Columella speaks of elephants born in Rome. Similarly, they must from time to time have been imported: Pliny tells of the problems of disembarking elephants at Puteoli, and the celebrated ‘Great Hunt’ mosaic at Piazza Armerina (fourth century) shows elephants being captured and shipped (See Plate 5.1).

The first Latin mentions of ivory, *ebur*, occur in the earliest surviving Latin literature, in Ennius, from the early second century BC, and Plautus, and can be associated with the appearance of ivory-decorated booty displayed in the triumphs of generals victorious over eastern opponents, such as Vulso, whose triumph over the Galatians took place in 186 BC. These early references link to wealth and display. L Cornelius Scipio brought back 1231 tusks from Syria for his triumph in 188 BC – the precise number illustrates the importance attached to tusks and to ivory. (In both cases, the elephants would have been Indian elephants – as were those of Pyrrhus, but not the Carthaginians’). Unlike Greek, in which *elephas* does duty both for the animal and its tusks, Latin acquired its own specific word, *ebur*, for ivory, while adopting the Greek *elepha(n)s*, or *elephantus*, for the beast itself.

---

626 Livy 32.27.2 (e.g.). As Ptolemy II had discovered at Raphia (see Gowers (1948)), the Romans found that their African forest elephants were smaller than Antiochus’s Indian elephants, and overawed by them in battle (Livy 37.39. cf. Curt. 9.17; Plin. NH. 8.9).
627 Plin. NH. 8.16 (Metellus); Cic. Fam. 7.1.3 (Pompey), Vell. Pat. 2.56.1 (Caesar).
628 Plin. NH. 8.2.
630 Plin. NH. 8.3.6; (Plaza Armerina) see http://www.bluffton.edu/~sullivanm/armerina/elephant.jpg For loading onto ships, there is also a 3rd-4th cent. mosaic from Veii in the Badisches Landesmuseum Karlsruhe, see https://www.flickr.com/photos/carolemage/18025661724 (both accessed 16/11/2015).
632 Livy 39.6-7.
633 Livy 37.59. – Blümner sv *Elfenbein* in *RE* sV, col. 2356 ff. On triumphs, see Itgenshorst (2006); Beard (2007).
634 Vergil three times uses *elephantus* to refer to ivory – *Geo.* 3.26; *Aen.* 3.464; 6.895.
1. Mosaic from Veii – 3\textsuperscript{rd}/4\textsuperscript{th} century AD

2. Mosaic from the Great Hunt, Piazza Armerina – 4\textsuperscript{th} century AD

Plate 5.1. Elephant transportation
Ebur, too, has its own derivatives – eboratus, e boreus, eburnus, eburneus, eburneolus - together with the epigraphic term for ivory-workers, eborarius. By the first century BC, even poets knew what ivory was: the teeth – dentes – of the elephant.

At first, ivory objects and tusks acquired by conquest (then the main source of supply) seem to have been deposited in Roman temples in the context of triumphs as part of general booty; but it was only a matter of time before ivory found its way into private hands: a speech of Cato, dated to 152 BC speaks of houses ‘embellished with citrus wood and ivory and Punic pavements’, but before the first century AD, we hear little of personal possessions of ivory. However, Cicero’s Verrine speeches contain many examples of the pillage of ivory for Verres’s personal collection, including tusks stolen from a temple on Malta, which had earlier been looted by a lieutenant of king Massinissa, but restored by him when he discovered their provenance. The triumphal nature of ivory is reflected in the honours decreed to Caesar in 45 BC, as described by Dio:

And they decreed at this time that an ivory statue of him, and later that a whole chariot, should appear in the procession at the games in the Circus, together with the statues of the gods.

The literary evidence for specific artefacts in private possession is rather thin before the end of the first century AD, though one of the younger Pliny’s letters talks about an ivory portrait sculpture; but the poet Martial, for whom life’s little luxuries clearly had a fascination, records a whole variety of small ivory objects, most of them in his list of apophoreta in Book 14: birdcages, writing tablets, cash boxes, medicine chests, backscratchers, and so on.

---

635 CIL VI.7655; 7885; 9375; 9379; 33423; 33885; 37374; 37793. Two of these refer specifically to politor eborarius. Eborarius is not found in literature, though Horace has eboris faber (Ep. 2, 196).
636 e.g. Catull. 64.68 Indo dente poli tum; cf. Ov. Met. 8.288; Mart. 2.43; 10.98 – though Pliny (NH. 8.7) points out that Juba, one of his key sources, had got it wrong. Pausanias, too, argues vigorously that tusks are horns (5.12.1-3).
637 Griffin (1976), p. 91; see ch. 2.3, p. 74.
638 ORF 8.185: aedes…exploitae maximo opera citro atque ebore atque pavimentis Poenicis.
639 Cic. Verr. 2.2.21; 2.2.72; 2.4.1; 2.4.56. Curiously, ivory does not appear in any other of Cicero’s speeches, possibly because he usually spoke for the defence.
640 Cic. Verr. 2.4.56.
641 Dio Cass. 43.45.2 (tr. Cary) – an honour later conferred on Germanicus (Tac. Ann. 2.80).
642 Plin. Ep. 4.7. His uncle says surprisingly little about ivory personal artefacts.
A good photo of the Marsyas from Pompeii can be found at
https://www.flickr.com/photos/antiquitiesproject/12238809144

Plate 5.2 ivory items
Clockwise from top:
1. Plaque showing Trajan and soldiers
2. Doll from C1 AD tomb
3. Marsyas from Pompeii
4. Chest with toilette articles
Nonetheless, it is evident from pieces that have survived that a considerable range of items might be found in wealthy households. While the poets tend to talk about ivory ceilings and doors, the wives of the rich had *pyxides* for cosmetics, jewellery boxes, combs, bracelets, pins and – even – a rather complicated apparatus for unrolling papyri for easier reading; and their daughters had ivory dolls, which have survived in tombs. More mundanely, offcuts were used for dice and other gaming pieces, though these were more often bone. Men are more usually associated in poetry with ivory sword sheaths or handles and musical instruments – lyre, flute and plectra for the former (For a small selection of surviving artefacts, see Plate 5.2).

The problems of looking for ivory from a specific period in the archaeological record are well illustrated by Dimitra Andrianou, who points out that ivory is among the category of objects found during excavations that are usually reported as ‘minor objects’ with little or no detail of stratification or dating. They are generally small, valuable and transportable, so that it is rarely easy to be certain of the provenance of a given piece, while much surviving ivory consists merely of fragments of inlays from furniture.

As far as is known, most Roman ivory artefacts were carved within the Roman empire, from imported tusks, though archaeological evidence for ivory workshops of this period is limited: we know of workshops (using both ivory and bone) on the Palatine in Rome, and

---

646 For a precise description of the issues see Andrianou (2006), pp. 223-4.
647 This applies even to large assemblies of material, such as the Fitzwilliam couch, which ‘appeared on the London market’ in 1973 (Nicholls (1979), p. 1) – and turned out to be bone.
648 Both the ‘Alexandrian tariff’, a rescript of M. Aurelius and Commodus (*Dig*. 39.4.16.7), and Diocletian’s *Edict* (43.1) clearly consider only raw ivory as a commodity. The Muziris papyrus (*P. Vindob.* G 40822 – see p. 84 and n. 682 below) has tusks and talks also of *schidai*, which de Romanis (2014) identifies, following Rathbone (2000), as cheaper offcuts of tusks, which are a necessary by-product of using elephants for any kind of work. This is clearly right: via my parents, I possess some from timber-working in Burma in the 1920s.
649 Hostetter & Brandt (1999); St Clair (1996); (2003), pp. 41-44.
there is epigraphic evidence of *eborarii* in Rome, but no other Latin epigraphic evidence of *eborarii* from elsewhere – nor, indeed any Greek epigraphic evidence. It is well-known, however, that there was ivory working on an industrial scale in Alexandria, both in Hellenistic times and on into the Byzantine era, and it seems highly unlikely that the craft died out in the major cities of the Levant. While there is substantial evidence for the working of ivory and bone from excavations at Alexandria, there is little material that can be positively identified as being both Alexandrian and from our period, either from Alexandria or elsewhere. It seems likely, however, that much of the Roman world’s inlaid furniture originated in that city. Slightly surprisingly, there is no evidence of any sort of guild of ivory carvers earlier than the time of Hadrian, and then it was a joint guild, in Rome, with the *citronarii* – workers in citronwood, emphasising the importance of the conjunction of ivory and fine furniture.

While we would expect Rome to have imported carved ivory artefacts from the near east (where Barnett and others observed ivory carving still going on in Syrian workshops in the mid-twentieth century) and Alexandria, we have no hard evidence of this. We simply do not know where surviving ivories may have been carved, though examples of ivory artefacts are found all over the Roman Empire. The only known import of a carved piece from outside the Empire is the solitary Indian figurine from Pompeii, possibly of the goddess Lakshmi, which appears to have been a table leg, now in the Naples Museum (see Plate 5.3). Pompeii, indeed, is one of few places where a significant volume of Roman ivory from our period, mostly now in the museum at Naples, has been found in situ. The sheer size

---

651 There is one reference to an Athenian *elephantourgos* in a second century BC papyrus – see Barnett (1948), p. 2, n. 5 (Petropoulos (1939), no. 64).
652 Rodziewicz (2007), *passim*; Kollwitz (1963); Barnett (1982), p. 69 suggests that this may not have been true of the Roman era, with a shortage of ivory leading to considerable use of bone for mass-produced carvings.
656 e.g. Bianchi (2000); Greep (1987); Nielsen & Phillips (1983); Rodziewicz (2007); Schneider (1990); Stern & Thimme (2007).
657 Maiuri (1939); Levi D’Ancona (1950). Table leg: During Caspers (1981), pp. 350-354; Parker (2002). The identification with Lakshmi is much disputed, but the origin of the piece is certain, as its resemblance in many respects to pieces in the hoard from Begram in Afghanistan attests. (See [http://ecai.org/begramweb/](http://ecai.org/begramweb/), last accessed 23/01/2017, for an extensive description and analysis of this material).
Plate 5.3 Indian ivory figurine from Pompeii, probably a table leg
of this collection suggests how much greater the ownership of ivory articles must have been in Rome itself, where the contemporary archaeological record is far more patchy.

We do know from Pliny that demand for ivory during the first century AD had become voracious, and that traditional sources were becoming exhausted – Stanley Burstein, indeed, argues that this was already happening in the second century BC.\(^658\) Pliny says, in effect, that by his time furniture without ivory inlays was considered naked, leading some carvers to try to use elephant bone in the absence of a sufficient supply of ivory.\(^659\)

In fact, we hear little of private ownership of ivory in the first century AD, apart from Seneca’s notorious ‘500’ ivory-legged tables\(^660\) and the various ivory pieces owned by Statius’s connoisseur friend Vindex.\(^661\) The things we mostly hear about are imperial, and usually referenced by disapproving authors: Caligula’s ivory manger for his horse Incitatus;\(^662\) decorations on the ships of Nero’s sea-borne banquet; the toy chariots he played with and the ceilings of his Golden House;\(^663\) etc. We know, too, that elephants were kept on a Laurentine ranch under Claudius – presumably for the circus.\(^664\)

The poetic *recusatio* of ivory ceilings and other trappings of luxury occurs as early as Propertius and Horace, and reappears in Juvenal, who says that his knives had bone handles, not ivory. This seems just part of the continuing strand of literary Roman suspicion and criticism of luxury and nostalgia for an older, simpler world.\(^665\) As such, it is one more piece of evidence for ivory’s currency and popularity among the rich and powerful. As if there were a need in Rome to look beyond the census as an indicator of wealth, it is undoubtedly true, as St Clair says, that

> The ownership of ivory, in whatever form, remained one way of defining the wealthy citizen of the Greek and Roman worlds.\(^666\)

In a world of conspicuous consumption, ivory held a special place.

---

660 Dio Cass. 61.10.3.
661 Silv. 4.6.20, 26-28.
662 Suet. *Calig*. 55.3.
663 Tac. *Ann*. 15.37 (ships); Suet *Ner*. 22 (chariots); 31 (ceilings); Ward-Perkins (1956), p. 215-6.
664 n. 630 above.
665 Hor. *Od*. 2.18; Prop. 3.2.11-14; Juv. 11.131-4. Cf. ch. 2.3, above.
5.3 ‘Indian’ Ivory

As E H Warmington observed, it was around the end of the Republic that Roman poetry began consistently to label ivory ‘Indian’, even though it is reasonably clear that most of the ivory circulating in the Roman world at this time would have been of African origin - though it might have been crafted in the Levant, by Phoenician or Syrian craftsmen, or in Alexandria. Anthony Cutler (1985) takes a sceptical view, suggesting that the only reason poets described ivory as Indian was because the word scanned, and that there was no good reason for them to be concerned with where the product came from. This seems, at the very least, to ignore the common Roman practice of attaching an adjective of origin to all sorts of commodities, and the availability of ample metrical alternatives for both ‘Indian’ and ‘African’.

It is with the Augustan poets that India begins to be linked explicitly and consistently with ivory. Earlier examples are moderately rare: but Plautus’s Miles claimed to have had his leg broken by an Indian elephant; the sole mention of an elephant or ivory in Terence is of Indian elephants; and Lucretius talks of Indian elephants in De Rerum Natura, which cannot be dated later than 53 BC. We find the link explicitly, however, in Vergil, Ovid, Horace and, slightly earlier, Catullus, and it is reasonably clear, too, that Ovid’s ‘Assyrian’ ivory would have been Indian (see below).

By contrast, ivory is rarely associated with Africa at this time, though there are examples in Propertius (a specific reference to Augustus’s newly-built temple of Apollo, where the origin of the ivory used may have been well-known); and in Ovid, who is much the most prolific source of poetic ivory quotes. It is fair to say, nonetheless, that less than 20% of poetic

\[668\] Cutler (1983/5), p. 22: ‘In all probability, classical writers were no more interested in the origins of the ivory that they praised than are modern workers in the material. Only traders, such as those described in the Periplus ... distinguished between the different grades and origins of ivory’.
\[669\] See ch. 1.5, pp. 51-59.
\[670\] Plaut. Mil. 25 – here the writer is presumably reflecting a Greek original, and for Greeks, elephants were always Indian after Alexander.
\[671\] Ter. Eun. 413.
\[672\] Lucr. 2.538.
\[673\] Especially Verg. Geo. 1.57 Nonne vides...India mittit ebur? For a list of poetic citations see Appendix 5.2.
\[674\] Maeonis Assyrium femina tinxit ebur, Ov. Am. 2.5.40.
\[675\] See Parker (2002), passim.
\[676\] Prop. 2.31.1-16.
\[677\] Pont. 4.9.28: Numidi sculptile dentis.
references to ivory come with a geographical (or any other) adjective attached – these are not Homeric conventional epithets, but are used from time to time, as appropriate: there is no very obvious pattern of specific contexts in which the poets felt it necessary to call their ivory (or their elephants) Indian.\(^678\)

Between Ennius and Juvenal, there are 173 extant mentions of ivory or elephants in the poetry that has come down to us.\(^679\) Of these, 32 (19\%) have a geographical adjective attached to them. 23 of the 32 (63\%) are various forms of ‘Indian’, including one ‘Assyrian’, which effectively refers to Indian ivory (see below). Specifically among the Augustan poets (Tibullus, Horace, Propertius, Vergil, Ovid), there are 75 individual mentions of ivory or elephants, and of these 10 (13.3\%) have a geographical identifier. 80\% of these are Indian. The data are summarised in the table below.

**Fig. 5.4. Latin Poetry 200BC - AD120. Mentions of elephants or ivory and geographical identifiers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>All Mentions (n)</th>
<th>No. with identifier</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No. ‘India’</th>
<th>No. ‘Other’</th>
<th>India % of identifiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Augustan</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustan</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Augustan</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* Appendix 5.2

\(^{678}\) Geographical adjectives applied to ivory are much rarer in Latin prose.

\(^{679}\) This includes fragments of (eg) Ennius and Varro’s Menippean Satires, but not all fragments of Latin poetry, nor *carmina epigraphica.*
As can be seen from the table, while ‘Indian’ is the preferred adjective overall, the Augustans are much more likely than later poets to make this connection explicit. Reasons for the Augustan poets’ concentration on ‘Indian’ as the default adjective to apply to ivory are analysed in more detail below.

Africa is much less widely named as a source of rare or luxury materials in general than is India, in spite of Pliny’s ex Africa semper aliquid novi:460 ‘The most valuable products of Africa that were available for display in wealthy Roman households were citronwood and marble.’460 Africa was closer to Italy, and the Romans had fought over much of North Africa by the middle of the first century BC; but the idea of Africa was a complex one – especially since Egypt was seen as separate from ‘Africa’ – whether we are talking specifically of the province or of the wider continent. Africa could be divided into Libya, Mauretania, Aethiopia, and so on, so that its identity was far from clear. Aethiopia, too, as we shall see below, could easily be attached to Asia and confused or conflated with India.

Apart from the poets, other authors, either Greek or Latin, who mostly have different agenda, tend not to attribute ivory to any particular origin. Geographers such as Strabo, and tour guides like Pausanias, do have something to say on the subject,682 but it is only in Pliny the Elder’s Natural History that the issue of provenance is raised as a question of interest. From him we learn that by his time the demand for ivory was such that traditional sources in Africa were insufficient, and ivory was increasingly sought from India.683

The Principate of Augustus marked a significant change in the pattern of trade between the Mediterranean and India. As Strabo tells us, before this time perhaps 20 ships a year set out

---

680 NH. 8.42.
682 Pausanias says, for example, that ivory for Phideas’s chryselephantine Zeus was sought from both Africa and India (Paus. 5. 12.3); Strabo discusses the difference between Indian and Libyan elephants (Strab. 15.43), and gives plentiful details of the Ptolemies’ elephant hunting grounds on the Red Sea coast in Book 16.
683 Plin. NH. 8.7: etenim rara amplitudo iam dentium praeterquam ex India reperitur; cetera in nostro orbe cessere luxuriae.
for India from Myos Hormos on the Red Sea coast; in his day, this had risen to 120. As Lionel Casson has pointed out, these would have been large, sea-going ships, capable of coping with monsoon winds, and of carrying large cargoes. The significance of this can be seen in a second-century papyrus which deals with financing just part of a cargo from Muziris on the west coast of India: as Casson shows, the quantity of ivory involved would fit in a corner of a typical Roman merchant ship, but was still worth over 1000 talents. If anything, the sheer scale of this one cargo (worth over HS 7m.) tends to support Pliny’s well-known observations about the amount of money pouring out of Rome to India and other eastern markets – even if the suspicious roundness of his numbers raises questions as to their likely accuracy.

It is important to recognise that for the Romans trade that entered Egypt through the Red Sea ports of Berenice and Myos Hormos would tend to be assumed to be ‘Indian’, although we know from the *Periplus Maris Erythraei* that a significant volume of ivory (and the best, at that, according to the author) was shipped through Adulis, from Ethiopia, and a substantial volume, too, from Rhapta (possibly Dar es Salaam) further down the African coast. Similarly, goods that reached the Mediterranean via the Persian Gulf might be called Syrian or Assyrian, the latter, as we have seen, an adjective applied by Ovid to ivory. We simply do not know, in the absence of any definitive scientific test to discriminate between the two species of elephants’ ivory, where a given piece of ancient ivory actually originated.

The Red Sea route was not, of course, the only way by which Indian goods in general could reach the Roman world. The Persian Gulf had been a trade route into Mesopotamia from about 3000 BC, and the overland route across the Hindu Kush and through Persia is also ancient – and reflected in Isidore of Charax’s *Parthian Stations*, apparently written around the turn of the era and perhaps based on a Parthian survey of around 100 BC. W. W. Tarn pointed out that the prosperity of Seleucia in the third and second centuries must have been

---

684 Strab. 2.5.12.
685 Casson (1980).
687 Plin. *NH*. 6.101; 12.84. Widely discussed: see e.g. Parker (2002), pp. 73-4, and below.
688 Hilton (1993), p. 4; Chami (2007), p. 6; Peppard (2009), p. 194: the precise location remains a matter for conjecture, but the Rufiji delta, 200km south of Dar es Salaam, now seems the most probable of several alternatives.
690 nn. 671, 672, p. 157.
693 Kramer (2003).
based on trade with India; and Seleucus’s elephants came from India, almost certainly overland.\textsuperscript{694} The very substantial quantity of ivory in Antiochus IV’s triumph at Daphne must, surely, have come from Indian elephants, and certainly not by the Red Sea route, though at least some of it may have come up the Persian Gulf, or have been derived from the Seleucids’ elephant ranch.\textsuperscript{695}

5.4 Actual Sources of Ivory

The Egyptians had obtained their ivory from Africa – essentially, Nubia and Ethiopia – and from Syria. Phoenician, Syrian and Anatolian ivory workers seem to have obtained their supplies initially from the local Syrian herd or via Egypt; and it is not until local herds started to disappear that they began to look for other sources of supply. It is this that – presumably – led Solomon and Hiram of Tyre to trade with Ophir (most probably India)\textsuperscript{696} around 1000 BC; while Darius of Persia, some 500 years later, recorded in an inscription at his palace at Susa that he obtained ivory from Ethiopia, India and Afghanistan (Arachosia).\textsuperscript{697}

When the Greeks found supplies from Phoenicia cut off at the end of the seventh century, they seem to have turned to North Africa\textsuperscript{698} and Africa appears to have been their main source through to Hellenistic times, although Pausanias, writing much later, says (without quoting a source) that the Greeks brought ivory from both Ethiopia and India to Olympia for Phidias’s chryselephantine statue of Zeus.\textsuperscript{699}

Under the Ptolemies, several ports were established down the Red Sea coast for obtaining elephants for military purposes,\textsuperscript{700} and these provided the infrastructure for imports of ivory into Egypt for crafting in Alexandria, or export to destinations around the Mediterranean. Tarn, basing his argument on inscriptions from Delos, says that Ptolemy II put so much African ivory on the market between 269 and 250 BC that the price collapsed, to the extent

\textsuperscript{694} Tarn (1930). Seleucus had a stable of ‘500’ elephants kept at Apamea: Strab. 16.2.10.
\textsuperscript{695} Tarn (1952), pp. 361-2.
\textsuperscript{696} 1 Kings 10.22. More broadly, see Barnett (1948), n. 4; Hornell (1947).
\textsuperscript{697} Scheil (1929).
\textsuperscript{698} Hermippus in Ath. 1.27F.
\textsuperscript{699} Paus. 5.12.3: Gill (1992).
\textsuperscript{700} Agatharchides fr.1; fr.8; fr.9.54-56; Plin. NH. 6.171; Tarn (1930), p. 212; Casson (1993); MacGregor (1985), p. 38.
that Indian ivory (imported mainly via Syria, and a Seleucid monopoly) lost its market. His view is that the decline of the Mauryas in India and the exploitation of Ethiopian ivory by the Ptolemy’s meant that African ivory became dominant, a process reflected in the Ptolemy’s later handsome gift of tusks to Didyma. He also, however, talks elsewhere of the ‘enormous quantities of Indian ivory… exhibited by Antiochus IV in his triumph at Daphne in 166’, though this was 100 years later. As he says, this looks like Antiochus’s way of matching the glory of Ptolemy II’s earlier Procession, with its 600 tusks.

By the mid-first century AD, Pliny commented that African ivory was becoming hard to come by, so that craftsmen were trying to work elephant bone, suggesting that India had indeed become the major source of the commodity. The implication, clearly, is that in the recent past Africa had been the primary, possibly even the only, source of raw ivory recognized by the Romans. The shift to ‘India’ as a source, in turn, is liable to be misread: it is clear both from the (mid-first-century AD) Periplus and from Pliny that a major source of ivory (pluralium ebur – Pliny) was the port of Adulis, at the south end of the Red Sea, which acted as the clearing-house for ivory traded by or through the increasingly influential kingdom of Aksum – broadly present-day Ethiopia. As far as metropolitan Romans – even well-informed ones – might be concerned, ivory shipped up the Red Sea and transported to Alexandria for processing or onward shipment to Rome was following a trade route from India, and could be taken as ‘Indian’.

Schneider compiled a substantial book on the subject of confusion and conflation between, specifically, Ethiopia and India in classical literature. Much of this goes back to Herodotus, and Alexander certainly expected to find a physical connection between the Indus and the Nile; but although there is an overlap between the often-mythical fauna and flora of the two in authors of our period, there is little sign by this time of real confusion between them.

---

701 Tarn (1930), p. 226. See also Burstein (1996); and Appendix 5.3.
702 OGIS 93.
704 Ath. S.201A; Rice (1983).
705 N.H. 8.7: quamquam nuper ossa etiam in laminas secari coepere paenuria.
706 The statio of Sabrata at Ostia carried a mosaic of an elephant (Meiggs (1973), p. 283). See also Aurigemma (1940).
707 PME. 4; Plin. NH. 6.173.
We know from the *Periplus* that several Indian trading stations, notably Barygaza and Muziris/Nelkynda on the west coast, and as far east as Desarene (Orissa), were recognized sources of ivory\(^{710}\), and Strabo tells us that Taprobane supplied a large volume of ivory to the Indian market,\(^{711}\) from which – presumably – it might be exported to Rome, probably via Muziris. The *Periplus*, which mentions Taprobane almost in passing, does not include ivory in its products, and does not, either, suggest that ivory could be obtained at Poduke (Arikamedu), the obvious point for transshipment from Taprobane.\(^{712}\) Pliny mentions Taprobane only as a source of large and warlike elephants.\(^{713}\) The *Periplus* expresses the view that ivory from Adulis is better quality than the Indian - and superior, too, to ivory from Rhapta, further down the coast of Africa.\(^{714}\) Interestingly, this judgment broadly matches the modern ivory carvers’ view that African ivory, and especially that from the Eastern, bush elephant, is a better material to work with than Indian elephant ivory.\(^{715}\)

By about the third century AD, the emphasis of supply had apparently shifted back to Africa, and supplies were becoming more abundant – or demand was less buoyant – since a comparison of the few early price references to ivory with Diocletian’s *Edict* shows that the price of ivory in silver equivalent had dropped very considerably.\(^{716}\)

By the 7th century, however, Isidore of Seville says in his *Origines* that elephants were no longer found in Africa (by which, presumably, he meant North Africa), only in India.\(^{717}\)

### 5.5 The Image of Ivory

The semiotics of ivory in the ancient world are clear, with the help of a rich corpus of poetry. From the earliest Latin mentions of ivory, in Ennius and Plautus, the material’s associations with wealth, prestige, power and triumphal processions are explicit. Tusks were carried in triumphs, and Rome’s senior magistrates had ivory-inlaid chairs and ivory staffs. Religious
connections are there, too:” quite apart from the practice – at least before the turn of the first century BC – of depositing rich booty such as ivory in temples within the triumphal format, and the widespread use of both tusks and artefacts as votive offerings to temples, ivory is identifiably one of the attributes of gods. Zeus has an ivory sceptre, for example, and the gods’ dwellings have ivory ceilings and doors,” while the chryselephantine statues of major gods became famous across the Greek world before being imitated by the Romans, for statues both of their gods and, a little later, of their deified leaders – starting with Julius Caesar.” Temples throughout the Mediterranean world had ‘ivory’ doors – inlaid, at least, with plaques of ivory.” Arguably, the association with the gods served to enhance the image of those rich and powerful mortals who could afford to display ivory, especially in public. Less attractively, perhaps, ivory-inlaid funeral couches became and remained fashionable for the rich and famous.” Historically, ivory belongs in palaces, and on the accoutrements – sword hilts, shields, for example” - of very wealthy and powerful people. No doubt the ivory-handled daggers found in large numbers in Nubia had their Greek and Roman equivalents – perhaps simply the table-knife handles spurned by Juvenal.”

We hear relatively little in Latin literature of the ‘female’ side of ivory: the cosmetic containers, combs, hairpins, bangles, that clearly could be found in any rich lady’s boudoir. While these were, arguably, the most day-to-day ivory objects available, they do not impinge on the literary record – at least not until Martial, right at the end of our period. He takes it even further into the day-to-day, by several times mentioning its use for false teeth.”

718 Barnett (1948) p. 2: ‘In spite of the feeling that there was something uncanny about ivory, objects made from it were highly valued gifts to the gods,’ and his n. 7.
719 Ov. Met. 1.177: The *Metamorphoses* are full of ivory associated with gods or mythical figures: the roof of the Sun’s palace (2.3-4), the ivory doors behind which Venus and Mars made love (4.169 ff.), Theseus’s sword-hilt (7.420), Atalanta’s quiver (8.318), Apollo’s lyre (11.168) – plus, of course, Pygmalion’s statue (10.243-297) and Pelops’s shoulder (6.401 ff.).
721 Prop. 2.31.1-16; and n. 614 above.
722 Nicholls (1979); Hill (1963); Andrianou (2006): ‘Like statuary, furniture was publicly displayed in temples and in triumphal and funerary processions, bringing it before a wide audience and stimulating the fashion for imitations.’ (St Clair (2003), p. 10).
723 E.g. Verg. Aen. 9.305;11.11; Sil. 16.207. See also Gilliam (1981).
725 Mart. 2.43.9-10; 6.13.1-4; 14.91.
But ivory does have a human side. One of the older myths relates how the injured Pelops had his shoulder replaced by Hephaestus with ivory when he had been reassembled with a part missing, because one of the gods had absent-mindedly chewed it, after he had been dismembered for his father Tantalus’s gruesome feast. More attractive is the story of Pygmalion, who (in Ovid’s version of the tale) created a sensationaly desirable statue of a woman out of ivory, with which he then fell in love. Patricia Salzman-Mitchell’s sensitive analysis shows how pervasive the association of ivory with beautiful human flesh is in Ovid’s poetry, especially in Metamorphoses:

It is worth pointing out that throughout Metamorphoses and much of Latin poetry, ivory is used as a metaphor for the dazzling whiteness of the body, and of specific body parts in particular. In Book 3, Narcissus’s neck is ivory-like (eburnea colla, Met. 3.22). Hermaphroditus’s neck is also ivory (eburnea colla, Met. 4.335), the color of his blush is like painted ivory (ebori tincto, Met. 4.332), and even his whole figure later resembles an ivory figure incased in glass (Met. 4.354). Pelops has a shoulder of ivory (Met. 6.405) from when, they say, the gods pieced him back together again (membra ferunt iunxisse deos, Met. 6.408). Naked Atalanta has an ivory back (terga eburnea, Met. 10.592).

Ivory, then, is beautiful, white, warm and soft to the touch, as well as being rare, exotic and costly. In many literary contexts it is linked with gold, as a reflection of its status and value, as well as with other luxury decorative commodities – tortoiseshell, terebinth, purple. It is, also, liable to be coloured. As far back as Plautus, we find a suggestion of turning ivory black, but more commonly the allusions are to the common practice of painting the faces of ivory statues with ‘cosmetics’, a concept which clearly had considerable appeal to the Romans. A more sinister side of ivory exists, however. Ivory is one of the two gates of dreams, the other being made of horn. But ivory is the gate that deceives. The idea goes back
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726 Hom. Od. 11.567; Pind. Ol. 1; Eur. Or. 12-16; Apollod. Epit. 2.1-9; Ov. Met. 6.213; 458; etc.
729 E.g. Plaut. St. 377; Au. 168; Cic. Leg. agr. 2.38; Hor. Od. 1.31.6; Verg. Aen. 3.463-5; 9.303-5; Tac. Ann. 15.37; Stat. Silv. 16.175; Mart. 8.50.5; etc.
730 (tortoiseshell) Ov. Met. 2.737; Mart. 9.59.8-9. (terebinth) Ov. Pont. 3.398; Verg. Aen. 10.136-7. (purple) Varro Quinq. Fr. iii; Catul. 64.45-49
731 Plaut. Most. 259-260.
732 Ov. Met. 4.2.25 ff; Am. 2.5.40; Verg. Aen. 12.67-9; Stat. Ach. 1.307-9.
to Homer, but reappears in Horace and Vergil, and again in Statius. Finally, throughout the late Republic and early Empire, as we have seen above, ivory is ‘Indian’.

5.6 The Semiotics of India

The Romans ‘knew’ about India, from a variety of mainly Greek sources. At the time of Augustus, they did not, it seems, know a great deal, and much of what they thought they knew was either speculative or inaccurate or simply marvelous. Strabo prefers the witness of some highly dubious tales (in addition to some good geography) by ‘respectable’ authors to what he might have learned if he had been prepared to listen to the traders he met who had actually been there on business – idiotai, just ordinary people, who in his eyes carried no authority as a source. Pliny, too, succumbs to a variety of accounts of monsters and marvels, though his knowledge of geographical details is superior to Strabo’s in many ways. But it seems that it was not until Ptolemy, in the second century, that some of the traders’ up-to-date knowledge filters into the literary record - the Periplus, which is now firmly dated to the mid-first century AD, does not qualify as literature in this sense. In fact, as Tarn showed long ago, Strabo’s sources are almost exclusively Hellenistic – indeed, there’s little sign of any source for India in Strabo later than the third century BC, as Dihle (1964) confirms.

Above all, India was bound up with the already semi-mythical figure of Alexander the Great. Alexander had been to India and conquered, and much of the reports of the sub-continent relied on either the accounts of his generals and staff or on the romances that had grown up
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733 Hom. Od. 19.503; Hor. Od. 3.27.41; Verg. Aen. 6. 895; Stat. Silv. 5.2.289.
734 Strab. 15.1.4.
736 Tarn (1952).
737 ‘We may conclude that – according to the standards of literary tradition in the time of the Roman empire – India was to all intents and purposes the country Alexander subjugated and Megasthenes lived in, and nothing else…… India’s literary dignity entirely depended on Alexander and his campaign’ - Dihle (1964), p. 20.
around him. In the context of the late first century BC, this resonates powerfully with the poetic concept of Augustus as a new Alexander.

For the Romans, India was at the virtual end of their world horizons, and it seems clear that the Romans had an understandable human tendency to be fascinated by, and to value, the distant and exotic; but India was, also, sufficiently visible to acquire a range of attributes, characteristics and imagery, which attached themselves not just to the country but to its produce – some of which was highly desired and valued by wealthy Romans.

India was a hot, rich, teeming country, a place of abundance, full of big cities and large rivers – Indus, Ganges and Hydaspes all recur in Latin poetry. It is the source of spices (especially pepper), and spices were the basis not just of culinary expertise but of perfumes, medicines and cosmetics, too. Its people were dark-skinned – burnt by the sun – but included weird philosophers on the one hand and mighty warriors on the other (though the latter had, of course, succumbed to the might of Alexander). The best pearls were Indian and, famously, the fabulous gold of India was mined by ants – a story as old as Herodotus that recurs in Propertius and that Pliny repeats, with at least a degree of scepticism. And, as Parker (2002) points out, in the menagerie of real and mythical beasts that the Romans associated with India, the most distinctive animal is the elephant.

India was not only rich, it also absorbed a lot of Roman gold, as Pliny made clear (n. 687, above). In two of his (many) moral diatribes directed against luxury and indulgence, he says

738 Parker (2002), pp. 80-81: ‘The figure of Alexander is crucial...as a lens by which India exists in Roman minds’. See Parker (2008), especially pp. 33-60.
739 For the connection between Alexander and Augustus, see Kleiner (1988) pp. 354 ff. and references there.
740 Parker (2002), passim, especially p. 55: ‘this survey has consistently pointed to the power of rare commodities to connote distance.... Indian origins of any particular item, whether real or imagined, added value to it in Roman eyes’.
741 Hdt. 3.102-5; Prop. 3.13.5. cf. Mela 3.62.
742 NH. 11.36; Whitaker 1998, p. 6. Pliny is not always sceptical: NH. 7.21-30 contains a whole catalogue of Indian ‘marvels’: he was deeply interested in India, to the extent that entries from Pliny take up over 40 pages of André & Filozat's (1986) collection of Latin texts on the country.
that India absorbed 50 million sesterces annually, and that India, China and Arabia together took no less than 100 million sesterces. Neither number has great credibility, but it is clear that during the 1st century AD there was a thriving trade between India and the Roman world; that this resulted in very considerable quantities of Roman coinage arriving in India; and that individual cargoes returning from India might be astonishingly valuable, and a 25% tax on imports entering the Empire made the Indian trade a valuable source of revenue. 744 While it can be questioned whether Pliny had specific knowledge of the scale of this traffic, he was sufficiently highly placed, as one of Vespasian’s advisers, to have at least an idea of what was going on. It is much less clear that the Romans had any sort of grasp of modern concepts such as trade balance, by which they might formulate some sort of commercial policy to cope with the situation. 745

When Octavian conquered ‘the East’ by defeating Antony and Cleopatra’s basically Egyptian forces at Actium, the Roman world greeted this as a far wider-reaching triumph than the facts justified. The rhetoric of the times, reflected in the poetry of Vergil, Horace, Propertius and others, and presumably orchestrated – at least to an extent - by Augustus’s friend and advisor Maecenas, saw Rome’s dominion stretching to the extremes of the known world. Even the more sober, if undoubtedly propagandistic, content of Augustus’s Res Gestae manages to claim sway over peoples who would not have readily recognized Roman rule, and specifically mentions ‘frequent’ embassies from India. 746 Certainly, early in Augustus’s Principate, expeditions were undertaken to probe the boundaries of the newly-acquired Egyptian sphere of influence and – Strabo suggests – to try to grab for the Empire some of the fiscal benefits of the Indian trade then transshipped by the Arabians. 747 Neither the efforts of Aelius Gallus in Arabia, nor those of Petronius against Meroe, seem to have led to any significant extension of Roman imperium.

746 Res Gest. 31.1. See Dio Cass. 54.9.8 for an account of an Indian embassy.
747 Res Gest. 18-23; Strab. 16.780-3.
This is not what might be believed from the poets, whose encomia of Augustus attribute to him triumphs, or power, or both, over a wide range of races – not just the Indians, but also the Seres, Scythians, Garamantes, and so on, none of whom were ever defeated by, or in any way subject to, Rome. As Nicolet (1991) shows, the idea of Romans as lords of the world – in Plutarch’s words, in the context of Tiberius Gracchus in 133 BC, kyrioi tes oikoumenes – is almost a cliché from the late second century BC onwards. A wide range of texts amplifies this vision, and it may, indeed, have reflected Augustus’s ambitions at, at least, the start of his Principate, though by his death Roman policy had become much more conservative and defensive.

As Whittaker points out, the Augustan poets were not actually an imperial propaganda department, but represented a specific network of discourse within Augustus’s new regime, and reflected the attitudes of those westerners who had any contact with India. He goes on to say that, together with other ‘fringe’ peoples, such as the Germans, the Indians were in effect an imaginary construct, composed through the ‘rhetoric of identity and the rhetoric of alterity’.

The idea that Rome held some kind of suzerainty over India, or at least that she should go out and conquer the Indians, persisted through the first century. Seneca’s lost geography of India may reflect an ambition of Nero in that direction, and Domitian, too, may have intended an expedition. Trajan was visited by Indian delegations and said in his old age that he regretted not being able to make an expedition in the steps of Alexander. Trajan, of course, actually journeyed as far as the head of the Persian Gulf, where he would
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749 See Meyer (1961), with the detailed critique in the review by Brunt (1963), who includes the main references, typified by Verg. Geo. 2. 170-172: et te, maxime Caesar/qui nunc extremis Asiae iam victor in oris/inbellem avertis Romanis arcibus Indum.
751 Dio Cass. Epit. 68.15 (embassies); 68.29 (expedition).
undoubtedly have met with merchants who used this long-established trade route from India.\footnote{Millar (1993) p. 101. Trajan also seems to have taken serious steps to consolidate Rome’s hold on trade routes to the east, See Fitzpatrick (2011), Wilson (2015).}

This kind of wishful thinking about India carried through even to the early fourth century, where it is reflected in the epitaph of Aurelius Gaius, a soldier who includes ‘India’ in a comprehensive list of postings that had taken him from his native Phrygia all round the Roman Empire.\footnote{AE 1981, p. 777. See Sartre (1983).}

### 5.7 ‘Brand Development’: the First Century AD

The Indianness of ivory was, then, largely a construct of the late first century BC, in which the Augustan poets, primarily, built on both legend and the heritage of Greek literature, and fostered the imperial ambitions of the new principate by firmly attributing one of the more potent and attractive symbols of wealth, power and religious awe to its more distant point of origin.

In the years that followed, nothing seems to have changed this. Indeed, given the story set out by Pliny, it would be surprising if it had changed. It is certainly no surprise to find Seneca (who wrote a lost geography of India) quoting Vergil’s *India mittit ebur*.\footnote{Sen. Ep. 87.20. (The line is reflected in Claudian, in the late fourth century: 7.211 – *dabit Indus ebur* – and Sidonius Apollinaris *Carm. 5.43*, a hundred years later).} As Strabo makes clear, the turn of the Era saw a dramatic increase in trade between Rome (or more specifically Egypt) and India, with greatly increased volumes of traffic down the Red Sea, and rich cargoes carried from Berenice and Myos Hormos across the desert to Koptos and thence down the Nile to Alexandria and beyond - all to the profit of the imperial *fiscus*, which took a cool 25% of each cargo’s value as customs duty.
Ivory remained – to the often cynical observers of the Roman scene – associated with wealth and ostentation, sometimes to a ludicrous extent. Seneca’s alleged 500 ivory-legged tables are perhaps unusual in being adduced as evidence of *private* wealth, as opposed to the imperial extravagance of Caligula’s ivory manger.

Pliny, as we have seen, happily accepts the idea of ivory coming predominantly from India, though he recognizes that Africa has been the main source of ivory in the past, and remains a significant one.

By the time we get to Martial, in the early years of the second century, ivory still tends to be Indian, though he does once suggest (14.5) that, had they not been cut up into small pieces, his citronwood writing tablets might have been tabletops resting on *Libycae dentes*. Juvenal, meanwhile, succeeds in suggesting that elephants might be found in a variety of locations, including – rather improbably – among the Nabataeans, as well as India and Mauretania.755

### 5.8 Conclusions

In spite of over 100 years of fighting the African elephants of Carthage, the Romans inherited from the Greeks the idea of ivory and (perhaps more especially) elephants as Indian. With the victory of Augustus a new eastward focus of military and political interest stimulated a far more vigorous discourse about things Indian, in which ivory’s symbolic values of wealth, luxury and exoticness came to play a natural role. It is with the Augustan poets that we find the development of a strong identification of ivory with India. India had, after all, a whole range of valuable associations which fitted with the luxury status of ivory. And, to put the finishing touch, it was the farthest-off country that Rome aspired (at least) to rule over.756 The fact that knowledge of India was at best sketchy was no barrier – indeed, it may have actually helped.

756 If we exclude the Seres, who do occur in the Augustan poets, but are a far more shadowy presence in this period (See ch. 6.4, pp. 197-9).
The identification of ivory with India ran counter to the dominance of Africa in sourcing of the raw material up to this time, and indeed it seems clear that much ‘Indian’ ivory will in fact have come into the empire from Africa, but via the ‘Indian’ trade route up the Red Sea to Berenice or Myos Hormos. Nonetheless, the first century AD clearly saw a significant shift in the ivory trade to a reliance on India, so that the poets’ branding of the material turned out to be prophetic. For Pliny, by his time, a couple of generations after Augustus, it looked, at least, as if the majority of ivory imported into Rome was indeed from India.

What the Augustan poets had done, in fact, was to attach ivory symbolically to a strand of imperialist wishful thinking that had its origins before their time in the idea of Rome’s destiny as ruler of the known world, and which was to continue at least through the first century AD.

As a material, ivory was superbly well placed to fulfil this role – as a sort of proxy for a conquered India. It offered beauty and accessibility – but with it a potent range of historical and mythological associations, to go with the exotic appeal of a product of a far country. Both for individuals in their private lives and for emperors in public places, ivory carried an aura of exotic luxury, wealth and power. That it came available only on the death of a mighty elephant might be deplored by Pliny, but could only add to its appeal – and as far as the Romans knew, Indian elephants were more powerful than African, which served to reinforce the power of the connection with India.

The imperial fantasy of conquest of India could thus be played out through the medium of an accessible, beautiful material which, indeed, could often be found in the form of what were in effect playthings. This, certainly, is the message of Martial’s *apophoreta*.

---

After this time, ivory does seem to have lost its cachet, to an extent, judging, at least, from the relatively low price for the material in Diocletian’s Edict; but artistically it then saw a new flowering in late antiquity, with the development of the consular diptychs as a standard-bearer for its old prestige.

\[758\text{ On these see Delbrück (1929).}\]

Anyone who reads the Augustan poets, especially Propertius and Tibullus, will be struck by the vision of desirable women (who may be of doubtful moral character) swanning around in diaphanous dresses described as *Coae vestes*. What were these ‘Coan dresses’? What did they have to do with Cos? And why did they achieve only the short-lived fame which, as this chapter will show, was their fate? After the late first century AD, they effectively disappear from our literary sources.

Aristotle tells us, in an obscure passage, how silk is produced on the island of Cos, and how this process was discovered:

> From a certain large *scolex*, which has things like horns, and differs from the others, there is produced by transformation of the *scolex* a caterpillar, then a cocoon, and from this a *necydalus*; and it transforms through all these forms in six months. And some of the women unravel the cocoons of this animal by combing them out, and then spin them; and they say that Pamphile the daughter of Plateus in Cos was the first to weave [the resulting fiber]. (tr. W. Forbes).

After this one mention in Greek sources, the story goes quiet until the first century BC. There is then a brief outbreak of mainly poetic comment and enthusiasm in Latin, followed by diatribes from moralists such as Seneca and the elder Pliny; and within about 100 years, *Coae vestes* vanish from literary view - apart from a *reprise* of Aristotle in Athenaeus, and Isidore of Seville’s summary of Pliny’s more detailed version (see below, p. 178).

In this chapter, I examine the relationship between the Romans and various forms of silk, as evidenced almost exclusively in literature. While the story starts with the Coan brand, this is a market where a form of brand competition arose, with two different forms of silk competing for the space originally occupied by Coan silk.

759 Arist. Hist. An. 19.551b10 (=Ath. 352E). cf. Clem. Al. Paed. 2.11. This puts Coan silk at least in the fourth century BC, but the legendary character of ‘Pamphile’ suggests a significantly older pedigree. For a detailed analysis of this passage, see Forbes (1930).

760 An oblique reference in a fragment of Callimachus likens poetry to the weaving of a Coan fabric (fr. 532).

The study of silk in the Roman world has to address several issues which have given rise to scholarly disputes. First, there is a general lack of surviving silk textiles in the archaeological record, though there are exceptions, and the numbers are growing, but they are mostly from a limited geographical area, and later than our period. Second, there are at least two, and perhaps as many as four varieties of silk referred to in classical literature: at least, we must recognize cultivated silk and so-called ‘wild’ silk, from different geographic origins. There is a limited number and range of references to silk in this literature, with little evidence of real understanding of how silk is produced until the sixth century AD, which is beyond the historical horizon of this thesis. Finally, there are considerable uncertainties, and academic arguments, about details of trade, production and consumption of silk, especially in our period.

A note on the sources is in Appendix 6.1.

6.1 Silk and its Varieties

It is clear from the poets’ descriptions of Coae vestes that they are talking about some form of silk: the robes are diaphanous, shiny and luxurious. So it is the history of silk and its varieties in the Greco-Roman world that we should consider to evaluate the Cos brand and its role in the marketplace.

6.1.1. The true silkworm, bombyx mori, was cultivated in China from at least the third millennium BC, but did not reach the Graeco-Roman world until the time of Justinian (c. AD 550), though it had moved westwards as far as central Asia (Khotan) some time earlier, and had probably also reached India, though the timing of this is even less certain.

762 See Wild (1984); Good (1995); Zuchowska (2013), and p. 186 below.
763 The fabric woven from cocoons spun by silkworm larvae. No-one has seriously disputed this, though the description of the garments could conceivably apply to very fine linens or muslin. See Spantidaki (2014), on Amorgina.
*Bombyx mori* feeds on the leaves of white mulberry trees: the caterpillars produce a filament to create a cocoon; and the silk production process involves killing the larvae while in the cocoons, usually by dipping them in boiling water, thus enabling the entire silk filament to be degummed (a critical element in the technology) and unwound, providing a strong thread up to 1000m long.\(^{765}\)

6.1.2. In addition, numerous other moths, mostly among the *Saturnidae*, produce silken cocoons, and although their caterpillars cannot be cultivated like true silkworms, their cocoons can be collected and processed to produce so-called *wild silk* or *tussah* (tussore).\(^{766}\) However, because the cocoons can only be harvested in the wild, they are gathered after the insect has escaped from the cocoon, so the threads are broken, and discarded cocoons have to be, sometimes, literally scraped off the trees. Thus, while wild silk is very strong, it requires more elaborate processing (cultivated silk can be wound directly onto a reel, but wild silk must be cleaned, drawn out and spun); and it cannot produce the smooth texture provided by cultivated silk, because the profile of the threads is flat, rather than round, and they tend to be thicker. While cultivated silk threads may average around 10-15µ in thickness, wild silks go up to 40µ or more.\(^{767}\) Further, while cultivated silk is pale-coloured or even white, wild silk comes in a range of browns and yellows, and is harder to dye.

From Aristotle's description, repeated in a slightly different – and differently garbled – form by Pliny,\(^{768}\) it is clear that what was being produced on Cos was wild silk, and the presence in the eastern Mediterranean of two candidate moths (*Saturnia pyri* and *Pachypasa otus* Drury) explains how this was possible. There is argument among experts as to which is the stronger possibility: Pfister argues that *Pachypasa otus* is rare, and therefore unlikely, but this presupposes (as he admits) that its prevalence remains as it was in the first (or fourth) century BC, which seems sufficiently improbable for the argument to have little force.\(^{769}\)

---

765 Barber (1991), p. 31. Boulnois (1966), p. 22, quoting a 13th century Chinese source: 'When the caterpillars are about to start spinning, they are taken and placed on trays of rice straw and kept in a gentle heat which will stimulate the formation of the cocoon and produce a silk more easy to boil. The formation of the cocoon is closely observed, and when it is almost complete it is thrown into boiling water to dissolve the gum. The boiling water is then gently beaten with branches; the cocoons are caught by the twigs, and all that remains is to unravel them with great care and join the threads of several cocoons into a single strand. The result is raw silk which has then to be prepared for dyeing and weaving.'

766 The name is derived from one of the Indian moths that produce wild silk, the tussah moth (*antheraea mylitta* Drury). Wild silk was being produced by the Indus civilization as early as around 2000 BC (Good et al (2009)).

767 Pfister (1934), p. 50.

768 NH. 11.76-78. See below.

More cogently, it is argued that Aristotle’s description, and especially that of Pliny, who lists feedplants appropriate for both species, are a conflation of the characteristics of the two moths, suggesting that the Coans were using cocoons from both. Aristotle does not say that the caterpillars actually grow on Cos: from his account they might be imported. Pliny, by contrast, talks about growing the cocoons on Cos.

In his discussion of insects in Book 11, Pliny talks about Coan silk. While it is clear what he is talking about (and the location of the textile’s origin is clearly stated), the story gets distinctly garbled. It owes a large debt to Aristotle, but includes material derived from some other, unknown source:

There is another class of these insects produced in a different manner. These spring from a grub of larger size, with two horns of very peculiar appearance. The larva becomes a caterpillar, after which it assumes the state known as bombylis, then that called necydalus, and after that, in six months, it becomes a silk-worm. These insects weave webs like those of the spider, which are used for making costly and luxurious women’s garments, known as ‘bombycina’. Pamphile of Cos, daughter of Plateas, discovered how to unravel these webs and weave them; she should not be deprived of the glory of working out how to clothe a woman and leave her naked.

The silk-worm, too, is said to be a native of the isle of Cos, where the vapours of the earth give life to the flowers of cypress, terebinth, ash, and oak which have been beaten down by the showers. At first they look like small butterflies with naked bodies, but soon, unable to endure the cold, they throw out bristly hairs, and assume a thick coat against the winter, by rubbing off the down that covers the leaves with their rough feet. They compress it into balls by carding trees, making it fine by combing it out: finally, they take and roll it round their body, forming a nest in which they are enveloped. It is in this state that they are taken; after which they are placed in earthen vessels in a warm place, and fed on bran. A peculiar sort of down grows upon the body, and, clothed with this, they are put to another task. Once the cocoons are taken, they are rendered soft with water, and then drawn out into threads with a spindle of reed. Nor, in fact, have even men felt ashamed to use garments of this material, because of their extreme lightness in summer: for, so greatly have manners degenerated, that, far from wearing a breastplate, even a garment is too heavy. The produce of the Assyrian silkworm, however, we have till now left to the women. (tr.W.Forbes).

We are left with the question as to what the final sentence of Pliny’s account actually means: are the ‘Assyrian’ cocoons somehow different? We do not know, but there may be a vague reference to wild silk production within the Parthian empire, or even to imports of Chinese

---

770 e.g. Forbes (1930); Forbes (1956).
6.1.3. A complication comes from Aristophanes. In *Lysistrata*, he talks about *amorgina*, and clearly, from the context, describes a diaphanous material worn by his rebellious ladies. No-one knows what this is, but art historians relate it to the clinging light robes that appeared on some Greek sculptures towards the end of the fifth century. For some time, it was argued by scholars that this fabric, also mentioned in one of Plato’s letters and a fragment of Kratinus (who died c.420 B.C.), was a fine linen; but Gisela Richter pointed out that the name should derive from Amorgos, a small, rocky island in the Cyclades (as is Ceos), which is an inappropriate place to grow flax, and she argued that what was meant was silk. No-one, however, has found any suggestion of a silk industry on Amorgos, though the island is on a natural trading route between the textile industries of the near east and mainland Greece; so if there was a trade in wild silk (or cocoons) about which we know nothing, Amorgos could have had its name attached to the textiles concerned, on the familiar basis that this was ‘where it came from’. Peter Wild, however, does not accept *amorgina* as silk, and suggests that it might have been a bast fibre, probably from mallow (*malva*).
Whatever amorgina were, they disappear from our surviving literature after the fourth century BC, leaving no later trace, except among the Aristophanic scholiasts and one mention in Athenaeus, which might be an antiquarian flight of fancy. There are, however, a number of donations of amorgina, by Athenians, in the inventories of the temple of Artemis Brauronia, dating from the mid fourth century BC. Clearly, whatever amorgina were, they were not only sexy, as is clear from Aristophanes, but valuable, too, and appreciated by the citizens of the richest, most sophisticated city of mainland Greece.

6.1.4. Finally, there is the unnecessarily controversial question of ‘sea silk’, a material whose existence has been denied by some scholars, but which clearly does exist, and for which there is archaeological evidence from late classical times. It comes from the silky beard of molluscs of the genus Pinnidae, and was still used in parts of the Mediterranean as a textile at least until the late nineteenth century. For classical scholars, the material’s identity is complicated by the fact that its common name is byssus, a term also applied both to linen and, particularly, cotton. The earliest firm mention in classical literature is in Tertullian, and there is no certainty that earlier mentions of byssus refer to this textile. It has been suggested that the ‘marine wool’ of Diocletian’s Edict may be this material, in parallel with Chinese accounts of ‘sea silk’ from a slightly later date. The fifth century AD

---

777 Wild (1970) p. 12, n. 3. Wild does not give detailed reasons, but his authority in this field must be respected. Liddell & Scott consider amorgis to be mallow, but give no convincing citation or etymology, presumably relying on Hesychius sv, which merely says that amorgis is ‘a certain stalk, of which clothing is made’ – see Richter (1929), p. 28, n. 1. That amorgis is mallow was the interpretation of Yates in his pioneering 1843 work, Textrinum Antiquorum. Taillardat (1962, p. 132) argues that amorgina were linen, since linen had been produced around the Aegean at least since the end of the second millennium BC: this view is widely accepted by French scholars (see Labarre & Le Dinahet (1996)). Certainly, either linen or silk, both respected materials, seem better candidates than mallow, which is nowhere used for luxury textiles. For an account of mallow, primarily a source of a textile dye, molochinon, see Leon (1953).

778 For other contemporary references see n. 775 above; also Ath. 6.255E; while the late glossaries attempt definitions – Hesych. sv amorgis; Pollux (7.74); Suda (sv), etc.

779 Linders (1972): there are numerous mentions of chitons (specifically) of amorgina in IG II² 1514–1530, all dated between 350 and 335 BC.

780 E.g. the contemptuous dismissal by Raschke (1978), p. 854, n. 849): ‘this particular fable, whose acceptance by modern scholars demonstrates an almost absurd naivety, continues to flourish (e.g. J Ferguson, ANRW II.9.2, p. 590)’.


782 nec fuit satis tunicam pangere et serere, ni etiam piscari uestitum contigisset; nam et de mari uellera, qua muscosae lanostatis lautiores conchae comant - nor was it enough to plant and sow your tunic, unless it had likewise fallen to your lot to fish for raiment. for the sea withal yields fleeces, in as much as the more brilliant shells of a mossy wooliness furnish a hairy stuff’. De Pal. 3.6, tr. Laufer (1915). There is a later description in Procop. Aed. 3.1.

“Hou Hanshu” is dismissive, saying that the material is probably wild silk, though this is regarded by John Hill as a fifth century addition to an earlier account.  

Silk was sufficiently exotic and rare that the classical Greeks did not have a word for it; nor did the Romans, before the first century BC. The first mention of ‘serica’ in surviving Greek literature was attributed in the past to Nearchos, who wrote his *Indike* sometime after 323 BC, and is quoted by Strabo, but this is now regarded as Strabo’s own addition to Nearchos. What is unknown is how the word, derived by most etymologists from the Chinese for silk – ‘ssu’ – reached the Greeks and Romans: presumably it came from their Indian contacts; and the Chinese became the Seres – the silk people – to the Graeco-Roman world in consequence (the true identity of the Seres is discussed further, below).

### 6.2 Silk in Roman Literature

An extended list of textiles and articles of fashionable women’s clothing in Plautus contains no hint of silk. The earliest mention of silk in Latin is in Lucretius, writing before 55 BC, where Cos seems to be confused with Ceos; around the middle of the century, too, Dio records that Caesar provided silken awnings in the theatre; and Lucan, also writing after the event, talks of silk woven in the near east on Cleopatra’s barge. By the end of the Civil Wars, the Augustan poets, Horace, Propertius, Tibullus and Ovid all show their enthusiasm for Coan silk garments.

---

784 Hill (2009), p. 469.
785 Strab. 15. 693. - see Brill’s New Pauly (sv). There is also a reference from Artemidorus in Strab. 11.11.1 = FGHI 779 F7a, but this would be considerably later – c 100 BC. Ctesias fr. 86M, sometimes quoted as an early Greek source (c. 400 B.C.), is also considered an interpolation.
786 Plaut. *Epi.* 229-233 (c. 200 BC).
787 Lucr. 4.1130. The OLD points to other examples of Cos/Ceos confusion. (The text of Lucretius is uncertain here – see Brown (1987), p. 262).
788 Lucr. 4.1130; Dio Cass. 43.24.2, presumably reflecting a contemporary source; Luc. 10.141.
789 Tib. 2.3.53; 2.4.29; Prop. 1.2.1; 2.1.5; 4.2.23; 4.5.21; 4.5.57; Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.101; *Od.* 4.13.13; *Ov.* AA. 2.298; *Pont.* 4.1.29.
It is not clear why no extant source mentions Coan silk between Aristotle and the first century BC. Susan Sherwin-White suggested that the Hellenistic writers who have come down to us simply did not share the Roman predilection for moralising. Equally, there seems to have been no significant Roman presence on Cos before the early first century B.C., judging from the absence of relevant inscriptions. There was a Roman community there by 88 B.C., however, because, as Tacitus tells us, the Coans admitted resident Roman citizens into the sanctuary of the temple of Aesculapius to escape the massacre by Mithridates in that year. This Roman presence must have been part of the general increase in Roman activity in the Aegean in the late second and early first centuries, following the conquest of Greece, the defeat of Macedon and the Seleucids and increased political involvement across Asia Minor.

The question remains why, if Roman traders had been on Cos since the early first century BC, it took so long for Coan silk to acquire poetic recognition. The explanation could be that it was not until Augustus had completed his conquest of the ‘east’ that silk {from any origin) began to reach Rome in sufficient quantities to become fashionable in any sector of society. As the Romans had no word for silk, they looked to the most immediate source of silk that they knew about, which was Cos, so that silken garments, of whatever character, became ‘Coae vestes’. Certainly, ‘Coan’ is mainly (but by no means exclusively) what we hear silk described as for the next 50 years or so.

Once the Romans became exposed to Coan silk, its attraction presumably grew as an aspect of the oriental luxury that increasing wealth permitted to the Roman élite during the first half of the century, and which Roman moralists enthusiastically deplored. It is clear from Propertius and his contemporaries that ‘Coan’ garments were diaphanous robes worn by women. Sometimes they were died purple, or interwoven with gold thread. More than that, we do not know, though the consistent use of the noun chiton with amorginon in the Artemis Brauronia inscriptions suggests that we should be thinking in terms of tunics or dresses. Luce Boulois thinks that the Romans merely produced decorative panels or embroidery

---

790 But see n. 761.
793 Tac. Ann. iv.14: ‘Cos could boast equal antiquity [with Samos], and it had an additional claim connected with the place. Roman citizens had been admitted to the temple of Aesculapius, when king Mithridates ordered a general massacre of them throughout all the islands and cities of Asia’. (tr. Church and Brodribb).
794 See Hatzfeld (1919), ch. 1-3. Cos’s status in this period is uncertain. It was formally made a free city (immunis) by Claudius in AD 53 (Tac. Ann. 12.61). It seems likely it was left libera by Pompey after his campaign against the pirates. See Paton & Hicks (1891).
795 Tib. 2.4.29. For gold textiles, see Gleba (2008).
from silk, to enhance more mundane textiles, but this does not square with the poets’ (and the moralists’) descriptions, which speak of clinging, figure-revealing garments.

The mid-first century BC was also the time that Chinese silk began to become noticed by the Romans. According to Florus the first time that Romans were seriously impressed by ‘serica’ (presumably specifically Chinese silk) was when the Parthians unfurled their shining silken and gold banners at Carrhae (53 BC). Although Florus is writing well after the event (second century AD), he is summarizing Livy, and this story clearly made an impression on the Romans, to be handed down. The earliest references to Chinese silk (serica) appear in Horace and Propertius, though Vergil talks about textiles that the Seres comb off trees, the three creating a tantalizing cluster of virtually contemporaneous references, all around 30 BC.

It is unclear when the Romans distinguished wild from cultivated silk, and how this distinction emerged. The lack of knowledge of how cultivated silk is produced led to the confusion in Vergil and Pliny noted earlier. There are clues, however, in the language: a distinction between serica and bombycina appears during the first century AD, and is more marked later. Ulpian (c. AD 200) clearly distinguished the two: vestimentorum sunt omnia lanae lineaque vel serica vel bombycina. For the first mention of bombyx in a silken context, we can go back to Propertius: nec si qua Arabio lucet bombyce puella, which raises the question of precisely what he was talking about, since the one place no-one sees as a possible source of silk is Arabia. Presumably this is yet another imprecise geographical

---

796 Boulnois (1966), pp. 40-42. Tib. 2. 3.53 illa gerat uestes tenues, quas femina Coa texuit; Hor. Sat. 1.2.101: Cois tibi paene videre est/ut nudam; Plin. NH. 11.76, ut denudet feminas vestis. (cf. NH. 6.20).
797 Flor. Epit. 3.11.8 Itaque vis dum venerat Carrhas, cum undique praefecti regis Silaces et Surenas ostendere signa auro sericisque vexillis vibrantia. In contrast to wild silk, cultivated silk is especially shiny. This detail is not in Plutarch’s Crassus. Florus also refers to serica on a much earlier occasion, during the war with Antiochus III in 192-191 BC, when he talks of tents of silk and cloth of gold (Epit. 2.8.9). Both references perhaps tie in with the descriptions in Greek writers of Persians wearing what is presumed to be silk - Herodotus’s ‘Median robes’ - of which educated Romans would have been aware.
798 Hor. Epod. 8.15: quid? quod libelli Stoici inter Sericos/ iacere pulvillo amant. Written c. 30 B.C., closely contemporary with Vergil’s Georgics (29 BC); and Propertius (1.14.22), before October 28 BC.
799 Geo. 2.121: quid nemora Aethiopum molli canentia lana, / uelleraque ut folis depectant tenuia Seres? A story repeated by Silius Italicus (Pan. 6.4; 17.595) and Petronius (Sat. 119). It occurs also in the ‘Nearchos’ passage quoted by Strabo (15.693) (see p. 177), and is, as Richter (1929) points out, a reasonable description of how wild silk is harvested.
800 Dig. 34.2.23.1.
801 Prop. 2.3.15.
descriptor, related to a trade route, being used to signify ‘eastern’, ‘exotic’, or both. ‘Arabian’ is often used to describe goods arriving in Egypt through the Red Sea.

By the time of Pliny, the picture is little clearer. If we compare his account of the Seres as a source of silk in Book 6 with his description of Coan silkworms in Book 11, there is no obvious sign that he recognizes the close similarity between Coan silk and serica – except in their delivery of transparent female clothing. In Book 6.20, he talks about the Seres as follows:

\[\text{primi sunt hominum qui noscantur Seres, lanicio silvarum nobles, perfusam aqua depectentes frondium canitiem, unde geminus feminis nostris labor redordiendi fila rursusque texendi: tam multiplici opere, tam longinquo orbe petitur ut in publico matrona traluceat.}\]

Here we have, again, the story of silk growing on trees, still repeated by Ammianus Marcellinus 300 years later. It has been suggested that Pliny is talking about not silk, but cotton; but this seems unlikely, given the clear identification of the Seres with silk throughout classical literature, and the giveaway verb traluceat. We get confirmation that Pliny believed serica to grow on trees from NH. 37.204, where silk ranks jointly with nard as the most expensive vegetable commodity. In fact, Pliny’s description fits wild silk gathering reasonably well, and given Roman ignorance of silk production, a confusion between wild and cultivated silk seems the most likely explanation. Actually, if we look at the quotation by Boulnois in n. 766 (p.177), this could, in a confused third-party report, lead to a description of cultivated silk production quite like Pliny’s.

All this suggests that the Romans’ first acquaintance with silk as a consumer commodity came from the wild silk of Cos; but almost simultaneously, as contacts with the Parthians increased and the trade routes to India became more active, both wild silk from more exotic origins and cultivated silk from China started to become available, in significant quantities.

---

803 It could, conceivably, be a hint of trade in cocoons.
804 See e.g. Parker (2004), pp. 29-31.
805 ‘The first people known here are the Seres, famous for the wool found in their forests. After steeping it in water, they comb off the down that clings to the leaves. Our women then have the dual task of unraveling the threads and weaving them. Out of this multiple labour, over such a great distance, we arrange for women to reveal themselves in public.’ (tr. Ramsay).
806 Amm. Marc. 23.67.
Thus, the Augustan poets were able, in a flush of erotic excitement, to sing the praises of 
*Coae vestes*, while they were also beginning to gain awareness of a similar material coming
from the distant *Seres*, of whom they knew next to nothing.

Certainly, during the early years of the first century AD, enough silk reached the Roman
market for adventurous Roman men to experiment with wearing silk robes, leading Tiberius
to ban its use by men in AD 16, a ban which may not have lasted long, as we find Caligula
wearing silk only a few years later. The ban may, of course, have served merely to
stimulate interest in silk. As Horden and Purcell point out, silk fitted into a widespread
pattern of luxury textile use:

> The spending of very large sums of money on textiles was a perennial aspect of
ancient elite behaviour, and the accumulation of fine textiles has, in much of
Mediterranean history, been integral to maintaining a high social standing – a
spectacular, easily quantifiable, and pleasing form of real estate.

Raschke suggests that the reason *Coae Vestes* disappear from literature in the first century
AD is that they were assimilated into the new generic word for silk – *serica*. It seems more
likely that, as implied long ago by Doremberg & Saglio (*sv. bombycina*), wild silk came to
be recognised as different from cultivated silk, and, from what was known of its production
on Cos, became the generic brand *bombycina*. Either way, the Cos brand, as such,
disappeared after a brief flowering, never to be resurrected, and records of the wild silk
industry of Cos have, similarly, vanished. *Serica* became the origin brand for silk.

Less certain is whether Coan silk was actually driven out of the market. Several scholars
have argued that it disappeared from the literary record because it was displaced by the
superior Chinese product. While this is possible, the continuing references to *bombycina*
provide proof of the presence of wild silk – from whatever origin – in the market, and of the

---

807 Tac. *Ann.* 2.33; Dio Cass. 57.15.
811 Pliny’s descriptions seem to be the last time Coan silk, as such, is mentioned for certain in
extant literature. A Juvenal reference (8. 98 ff.) cited by Sherwin-White (1978) may only refer to
conchylia Coa – i.e. purple dyestuff.
recognition, albeit imperfect, of a distinction between cultivated and wild silk. By the second century, Apuleius makes it clear that bombycina is cheaper than serica. We know from surviving textiles from Palmyra that wealthy Palmyrenes were using both types of silk in the second and third centuries. Some of their wild silk has been positively identified as Indian, and it seems likely that the greater volume, and possibly superior quality, of Indian production enabled these imports to drive out the Coan product. Also, the growing demand for silk may have meant that Coan producers were incapable of supplying sufficient quantities, thus opening the market for other sources of silk; so perhaps it was only when these other sources opened up to Roman trade that enough silk reached the market for the material to gain its initial cachet, though for a time ‘Coan’ remained the key generic descriptor. Exactly how this happened, we shall never know. It is, however, valid to raise the argument ex silentio that there is no identifiable mention of Indian wild silk, specifically (as opposed to the generic serica, whether as cloth or thread), in the mid-first-century AD Periplus, which lists plenty of other Indian textiles, chiefly linens, cottons and muslins, so that it seems likely that the process of displacement was gradual.

6.3 The Silk Trade

True, cultivated silk had become almost an industrial product in China by the early first millennium BC, and developed into a regular ‘export’ to the nomads on their north-western borders during the first half of the millennium, whether as booty or as bribes to discourage raiding – an early form of ‘Danegeld’.

It seems, too, that much silk was passed on as a prestige gift between princes, and there is a record of the First Emperor (221-210 BC) trading silk for horses with the Yuezhi.

Silks have been found in many tombs of different tribes and cultures across southern Siberia and central Asia from the seventh century BC.
onwards." (The provenance of a silk thread wound into the hair of a woman in an Egyptian burial of the late second millennium is unknown)." 

Wild silk, as identified, is more elusive, but a cocoon found on Thera suggests that its use in the Aegean area goes back at least to the end of the second millennium, while recent discoveries in the Indus valley take the use of wild silk there back into the third millennium BC." 

H-J Hundt, who published an apparently silk-embroidered textile from the fifth-century Grave VI at Hochmichele in Baden-Württemberg, and another from Hochdorf, argued that the Hallstatt Celts had imported this (Chinese) silk from the Greeks of Massilia, with whom they regularly traded: there were, too, reported silks in a late fifth-century grave in the Kerameikos at Athens, which suggested that the Athenians might have been importing – and perhaps re-exporting – small quantities of Chinese silk, presumably via Persia. This grave (identified as HTR 73) was from the family of Alcibiades, whose international connections could have provided the necessary contacts. Hundt also suggested that cultivated silk found its way to Greece in the wake of Alexander’s conquests, which is not unlikely, but there is no evidence, literary or archaeological, to support this. Recent analyses have questioned Hundt’s thesis. Research by Banck-Burgess, Spantidaki and Margariti et al seems to show that none of these textiles are actually silk. However, it seems possible from some of Good’s data that at least some of the material from all three sources includes silk. See Jorgensen for a summary of recent research." 

It is probable, nonetheless, that the Greeks had early encountered silk in a Persian context: this seems to be far the most likely identity of the ‘Median robes’ (medika estheta) mentioned by Herodotus and Xenophon. Whether the Persians were using silk imported from further east, or producing their own textiles from local wild moths, is unknown. Given

824 Banck-Burgess (1999); Spantidaki (2004); Margariti et al (2011); Good (2010); Jorgensen (2013). See now Margariti & Kinti (2014), who confirm the negative findings for Kerameikos.
825 Hdt. 1.135; 2.84; 7.116; Xen. Cyrop. 7.40: cf. Nep. Paus. 3.1; Tert. de Pall. 4; Procop. Bell. Hist. 70.9-12.
that their empire extended into northern India, it seems quite likely that their source was Indian wild silks.

It was not until the Han dynasty, which came to power in China at the end of the third century BC, that Chinese silk seems to have become a systematic element in the fraught relationship between the Chinese and their nomad Xiongnu neighbours. Chinese records show very substantial volumes of bales of silk and of silk floss exported to the nomads in the course of the first century BC, and Chinese embassies carrying gifts of silk as far west as Parthia as early as BC 127.\footnote{Raschke (1978), pp. 615-618; Zuchowska (2013). For the Xiongnu, see Psarras (2003), (2004).}

Ever since Baron von Richthofen coined the term ‘Silk Road’, or more precisely, ‘Silk Roads’ – \textit{Seidenstrassen} – in the 1870s, people have imagined caravans of camels bringing loads of valuable luxuries all the way from China across central Asia to the Near East, in a continuous stream of traffic.\footnote{Ferguson (1978) says that from the end of the second century BC ‘five to ten’ caravans, each with up to 100 people, set out from China every year (p. 587). He does not quote a source, but it seems to be based on a misunderstanding of a passage in \textit{Shiji} 123, which talks about official \textit{ambassadors}, bearing gifts, to various western states, including Parthia. This is clear from the translations of Hirth (1885) and Watson (1993), quoted in Hill (2009), p. 64, cf. pp. 456-457. Raschke (1978) says the first authenticated caravan dates from the eighth century AD (p. 638, n. 620). See Wang & Zhao (2012), p. 17. For a critique of the whole Silk Road concept, see Rezakhani (2010).} The available evidence shows that, far from Chinese merchants accompanying their caravans across Asia, silk and other goods were sold on at a number of staging points to new sets of caravanners.\footnote{Brice (1954), Boulnois (1966), p. 63.} The term ‘silk roads’ is shorthand for trade routes that have crossed central Asia from time immemorial, taking precious stones and minerals, in particular, to both east and west.\footnote{Hill (2009), pp. 324-329; Christian (2000).} Silk became just one of the commodities to circulate within this system of routes, but it was not until towards the end of the second century B.C. that the Chinese began to approach the export of silk more systematically. The Han emperor Wudi (140-87 B.C.) was responsible for a considerable increase in the attention paid to relationships between his empire and their neighbours to the west, starting with the 10-year mission of Zhang Qien which took him as far as Bactria. The primary
motive for this seems to have been to obtain horses from the nomads of the steppes, in particular the renowned horses of Ferghana, and silk was used to pay for this trade.  

Apart from being a massive over-simplification of a diversity of routes, concentration on land routes ignores the sea-going traffic in silk between the far east and the Mediterranean: the route from China to north-west India, from whence the goods travelled on by sea up Persian Gulf or the Red Sea.  

The Periplus of the Erythrean Sea (understandably) emphasises the route from China to India via Afghanistan, with possibly a lesser contribution from an eastern route down the Brahmaputra valley.  

From India, silk could then take two courses: the ‘old’ route from the mouth of the Indus to the head of the Persian Gulf and on into Mesopotamia, a route which, increasingly, took in Spasinou Charax and Palmyra; and the ‘new’ route opened up by the Graeco-Romans’ ‘discovery’ of the monsoons, which took India’s exports up the Red Sea and on to Alexandria from Berenice or Myos Hormos. (It is not surprising that extensive excavations at these sites have produced no silk fragments among the textiles discovered: textiles found here will have been those worn day-to-day, not the objects of trade passing through).

This does not mean that no silk reached the Mediterranean world in the early Empire by what later became the classic ‘silk routes’ across Iran and Mesopotamia, via the key centre of Seleucia/CTesiphon, to Antioch and Damascus. There is, understandably, considerable scholarly dispute as to the role of the Parthians in the silk trade. We will never know in any detail how this trade divided up quantitatively between the available routes, let alone ‘northern’ routes that avoided Parthia by skirting the Caspian Sea and then through to Colchis and the Crimea, or on through Armenia. Chinese sources suggest that the Parthians both wished to trade in silk and to discourage direct contact between the Chinese and the ultimate major customers, the Romans: the only possible interpretation is that the Parthians
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830 Hill (2009), pp. 167-170. There is plenty of room for argument as to how far, if at all, the Chinese had a ‘trade policy’. Cf. n. 836 below.
832 The value of the Periplus is limited by its scope. It does not pretend to cover land routes, nor does it say anything in detail about the route up the Persian Gulf. For this eastern route see Colless (1980), pp. 159-160; Liščak (2000), pp. 120-1.
833 See Gawlikowski (1994) for Palmyra’s role, connections and trade routes.
834 See Tomber (2008), p. 84.
835 Pompey’s expedition in 65 BC has been interpreted as an attempt to access trade routes linking Armenia with the Oxus basin, reflecting the existence of an established route to the far east. According to Varro, his motive was to find a route from India (Plin. NH. 6.52). That such a route existed and was used has been inferred from a comment in Strabo (11.5.8) that such a route ‘could’ be used (Tarn (1952) p. 140), and supported by recent archaeological discoveries – see Yang (2009), p. 17. See Hill (2009) p. 451 for the northern route, and Gleba & Krupa (2012), pp. 407, 414, for silk finds from Ukraine which presumably came this way.
wished to take a healthy profit as the silk crossed their territory.\textsuperscript{836} There is conflicting evidence that this happened on a significant scale. Raschke (1978) argues in detail that the real middlemen on the various silk routes were the Sogdians\textsuperscript{837} and, above all, the Kushans (in both cases the people the Chinese called the Yuezhi, who were divided into five different ‘tribes’ in the Chinese view);\textsuperscript{838} and that this trade would mostly have headed for north-west India, through Afghanistan, effectively skirting the Parthian domains, because the Parthian tariffs were too high.\textsuperscript{839}

There is enough material in Chinese chronicles, however, to show that the Chinese were well aware of the demand for silk in the west, and that they obtained a variety of goods from ‘Rome’ in return, via the Parthians.\textsuperscript{840} Certainly, Chinese knowledge of the west was not merely patchy, but effectively stopped at the borders of Parthia, at least in our period.\textsuperscript{841} It is possible to use these Chinese sources\textsuperscript{842} and argue, with Colledge and Thorley, that the wealth of the Parthians was substantially due to their ability to profit from the China trade – in either direction.\textsuperscript{843} It seems clear that, whatever the fine detail, there was no Parthian monopoly of the trade in the classical era, nor were ‘Roman’ or Palmyrene traders routinely excluded from the boundaries of the Parthian empire.

\textsuperscript{836} Hou Han-shu 118.5. It must be recognized that by the time the trade reached a significant volume, the Parthians controlled much of what is now Pakistan, as the Periplus (38,1-3; 47, 3-6) makes clear, so that goods travelling to the coast of India would go through Parthian territory. See Hill (2009), pp. 244, 483.


\textsuperscript{838} See Liu (2001) for a detailed account of the Yuezhi.


\textsuperscript{840} Raschke (1978), p. 619-622 and n. 219, argues that there is no evidence that the Chinese had any positive policy of developing exports to the west, but it is certainly possible to interpret the main Chinese sources as indicating a serious interest in trade with the west.

\textsuperscript{841} The journey of Gan Ying in AD 97 led him as far as the shores of the Persian Gulf (though some Chinese scholars (e.g. Wang & Zhao (2012)) believe it was the Caspian). Here, his Parthian advisers told him he would have to take ship to reach Da Qin (Rome), and it might take him three years. Clearly, the Parthians were trying to discourage direct contact between the Roman Empire and China – which might have been for political or commercial reasons (or both). Nonetheless, Gan gleaned considerable information, some of it true, about Da Qin. Boulnois (1966), pp. 68-9; Hill (2009), pp. 481-483.

\textsuperscript{842} Especially Hou Han Shu 118.5.

\textsuperscript{843} Colledge (1967), pp. 81-3; Thorley (1971) suggests, specifically, that between about A.D. 60 and sometime in the second century, direct trade between China and Parthia, and thence on to the Roman Empire, was a routine affair. Raschke (1978) attributes Parthian wealth primarily to agriculture.
Plate 6.1 Schematic map of the silk roads – first century AD
For much of this time Parthia was so riven by internal conflicts and squabbles that, in spite of the Parthians’ ability to combine to repel the Romans when necessary, a strong commercial policy seems likely to have been beyond them. This view is supported by the fact that a variety of commercial traffic seems to have had no difficulty in crossing the Parthian frontiers from and to the west, with the (apparently unique) expedition sent by Maes Titianus to the Stone Tower, probably around A.D. 100, reported by Marinus of Tyre and used by Ptolemy in his Geography, as a particularly spectacular example. More mundane and perhaps better evidence of day-to-day reality are the numerous contacts of the Jewish diaspora referred to by Josephus, and established Palmyran links with Vologesias and Spasinou Charax. The Parthian frontiers were, it appears, extremely porous.

What is certain is that the idea of a caravan originating in China and travelling through to the Mediterranean is an illusion. Goods were sold on and exchanged at several points on the route, and the Palmyrans, about whom we do know plenty, were sponsors and escorts of their own caravans that plied between Palmyra and cities within the Parthian territories – Hatra, Vologesias, Babylon, Seleucia and so on – in addition to the semi-independent mini-states at the head of the Gulf, to complete the journey into the Roman empire. Nonetheless it is tempting to agree with Boulnois’s view that ‘at the end of the first century [AD] the majority of silk imported into the Mediterranean countries had been transported by the maritime route and not the overland route which crossed Persia.’ It was not until much later, when the Sassanians had replaced the Parthians with a far more disciplined and cohesive empire, which had control over the silk route into India, and of the Indian Ocean.

845 Ptol. Geo. 6.11.7, see Cary (1956). The Stone Tower could have been one of several Tashkurgans dotted across Central Asia. The best bet appears to be on the edge of the Pamirs, at the head of the Yarkand river (Boulnois (1966), p. 62-3), but see Dean (2015) for an alternative. Cary (1956) argues a case for an Augustan date for Maes’s expedition. The issue remains open. Marinus must have been writing before Hadrian’s reign, but under Trajan. See now Heil & Schulz (2015).
847 Gawlikowski (1994), p. 29 – though Vologesias was barely within the boundaries of Parthia, and Spasinou Charax belonged to the independent but satellite kingdom of Mesene. Raschke (1978), p. 643, also mentions Palmyrene enclaves at Kharg and Susa.
848 Brice (1954); Will (1957); Rose (2010).
849 See especially Richmond (1963); Will (1957). Charax seems to have been the main link (Gawlikowski (1994), pp. 30-31).
that the Roman Empire faced a real crisis of silk supply, which led eventually to the drastic measures of Justinian, described by Procopius.**

### 6.4 The Seres

A question that has troubled scholars is the identity of the Seres. Pliny describes them, quoting an ambassador from Taprobane (not, perhaps, the most promising source), as tall, blue-eyed and red-haired, which hardly squares with the Han Chinese; while the location of the land of the Seres is, in all classical geographers’ references, somewhat vague. The problem the geographers faced was, simply, that no Greek or Roman had been there, so they had to rely on second-hand reports, from non-Greeks, and to fit these into their preconceptions about the shape of the land mass to the east and the seas that might surround it. As a result, while the land of the Seres was believed to be on the farthest end of the continent, and roughly north and/or east of India, any details are rather fanciful. Pliny names three major rivers flowing through ‘China’, Ptolemy two; and the names are different. By the early fifth century, Ammianus Marcellinus talks of the country being surrounded by a high wall, which might be a reference to the Great Wall. One over-logical French scholar takes the view that this cannot be, because the Great Wall does not ‘surround’ China.**

Related to this is the question of the derivation of the name Seres. As noted above, it has usually been attributed to the Chinese (and Mongolian) ssu = silk. But several attempts have been made to link it to geographical names nearer the Graeco-Roman world. These are summarised by Jean-Noel Robert, who nearly – but not quite – comes down in favour of a theory that the Seres were the (distinctly Caucasian) inhabitants of Kashmir; that serica might include cashmere; and that the name derives from Srinagar, the region’s major city. He manages to do this, however, without taking account of the other version of China found

---

**NH. 6.88.

**NH. 6.20; Ptol. Geog. 6.11. By Ptolemy’s time, it was recognized that there was a country called Sina or Thina, in addition to the land of the Seres. See Sergent (1998); Lieberman (1957); Liu (2001), p. 270, for diverse views: however, it seems to be increasingly believed that the red-haired, blue-eyed Seres were the ‘Tocharians’, known to the Chinese as the Yuezhi.

**Amm. Marc. 23.6; Robert (1997), p. 87.

**A view that goes back at least to Pausanias (6.26).

in the *Periplus* which talks of silk originating from ‘a very great inland city called *Thina*’ in the land of *This*, which is beyond the furthest land to the east in the bay of Bengal, called *Chryse*. (By Ptolemy’s time, *Chryse* had clearly been identified as the Malayan peninsula, and he talks about *Sina*). It is clear from the *Periplus* that *Thina* is seen as the home of the *Seres*, since the author tells us that it is from here that silk (serica) is exported through Bactria to Barygaza, and via the Ganges to Damarica (Lymirike on the Malabar Coast).

As far as we know, the first Romans to reach China arrived in AD 166, where they presented themselves at court as an embassy from ‘An Tun’, the Roman emperor (Antoninus, generally assumed to be Marcus Aurelius). They had reached China via Vietnam, presumably having rounded the Malay peninsula by ship. History does not record whether they ever returned home. But their voyage shows how the sea routes of the Indian Ocean were beginning to develop at this early date, and the knowledge of this or similar voyages fed into Ptolemy’s geography. Subsequent, similar visits are recorded in AD 226 and 284 in the Chinese records.

Nonetheless, the main conclusion to be reached about the Romans’ knowledge of the *Seres* is of vagueness and desperate reliance on whatever scraps of information, true or false, could be gleaned from any source, including some powerful imagination. Like silk itself, its producers were an unknown quantity. The one ancient author before the sixth century who seems to have had a fairly clear idea about silk is Pausanias. In one of his characteristic digressions he gives an approximate description – unsourced - of how silk is produced, and includes the derivation of *serike* from *ser*.

---

857 *PME* 63-4 (tr. Casson).
858 Or, possibly, having crossed the Bay of Bengal and made the land crossing to the Gulf of Thailand.
860 Paus. 6.26.6: There is in the land of the Seres an insect which the Greeks call *ser*, though the Seres themselves give it another name. [7] Its size is twice that of the largest beetle, but in other respects it is like the spiders that spin under trees, and furthermore it has, like the spider, eight feet. These creatures are reared by the Seres, who build them houses adapted for winter and for summer. The product of the creatures, a clue of fine thread, is found rolled round their feet. [8] They keep them for four years, feeding them on millet, but in the fifth year, knowing that they have no longer to live, they give them green reed to eat. This of all foods the creature likes best;
an interpolation, but no recent editor of Pausanias gives this view credence, and it is very much in Pausanias’s style.\[861\]

6.5 Roman Demand for Silk

Over the first two centuries of the present era, and the last century before it, the Roman Empire developed a considerable appetite for silk, as the taste for luxuries, especially those of the east, was fed by growing wealth and the leisure to spend it, stimulated by the conquests that gave Rome its provinces of Asia and Syria, and brought the Romans into contact and conflict with the Parthians.

We know little about how this desire for silk came about. It seems probable that the military exploits of first Pompey (up to 64 B.C.) and then Antony (from 41 B.C. onwards) in the near east meant that the Romans encountered silk, whether as garments or decorations, in enough quantities to excite their interest. Caesar’s awnings would have helped. Certainly, eastern wars helped to stimulate the general enthusiasm for oriental luxuries. It is possible that there was already an embryo silk ‘industry’ in Syria, beside the wild silk production on Cos, though there is no hard evidence for this.\[861\] We can see, however, that the Augustan poets clearly fed the desire, and successfully romanticised it, some twenty years or more after Crassus’s troops trembled before the shining Parthian banners, or Caesar used silk hangings; and for want of better information they identified the material with Cos.

After this, the floodgates opened, presumably through the further opening up of the middle east (and beyond) in the wake of the battle of Actium, but we have no way of knowing what volumes of silk may have been involved. We have to assume that for every Cynthia or Delia or Chloe who flaunted her silk shift to a lovelorn poet, there must have been many others who looked at the material, felt it, admired its shimmer and lightness, and coveted their own. We have no way of tracking female gossip, but the poets evidently fuelled interest in the material and promulgated its acceptance. So that by the early first century AD, men too

so it stuffs itself with the reed till it bursts with surfeit, and after it has thus died they find inside it the greater part of the thread.’ (Tr. Jones and Ormerod).

\[861\] Forbes (1930) p. 22, n. 3; Forbes (1956), p. 52.

\[862\] See pp. 178-9 above.
recognised that silk was cooler and lighter in the hot Roman summer than the by now going-out-of-fashion woollen toga. Even if Tiberius stopped the rot – and Roman sumptuary laws were mostly more honoured in the breach – his imperial successors, led by Caligula, set a renewed example, and an imperial lead was usually followed, as occurred, too, with fashions in wine. By the time Tiberius acted, the word had, clearly, got around that silk was both highly fashionable and a highly desirable material, for either sex.

So the moralising strictures of the Senecas or Pliny, writing in the middle of the century or a little later, must reflect a substantial and growing market for silk. They reflect, too, the tensions involved in the emergence of a new textile status symbol in a society in which clothing carried symbolic messages related both to historical values – the mos maiorum – and to social structure. Augustus’s emphasis on the traditional woollen toga and the corresponding matron’s outfit of stola, palla, etc. seems to have been an attempt to reinforce these traditional forms of dress against the creeping new influences of luxury and the orient. Demand for silk was met by the burgeoning Indian trade reflected in the Periplus: four major trading stations – Barbaricum, Barygaza, Nelkynda/ Muziris and the mouth of the Ganges – are identified as sources of silk, in various forms, cloth, thread or floss. Not, it should be noted, as finished garments: as Wild has observed, textile trade in the Roman world was basically in raw materials or weaves, not finished articles.

By the time of Martial and Juvenal, there is – perhaps surprisingly – little sign of the moral strictures that might have been expected from them, while it is significant that Quintilian says that a lawyer should not appear in court in a silk toga, which implies, at least, that such

863 See pp. 50-1 and ch.2.3, pp. 75-6.
864 See chapter 7, pp. 223, 232.
865 Sen. Controv. 2.13.7; 2.15.4; Ben. 7.9.5; Ep. 90.2; Plin. NH. 6.54; 11.76-8. Their critiques focused, naturally, on women, though Pliny, as we have seen, also criticised male wearing of silk. (NH. 11.78).
866 See Horden & Purcell, quoted above, p. 189.
a garment was far from unusual, even though – presumably – regarded as too informal for the courts."

6.6 Silk Production and Distribution

We know little about the production of silk garments in the Roman Empire in classical times. Aristotle talks about the cocoons of the silk moths being processed by ‘certain women’ – gynaiikes tines – a phrase which usually refers to freeborn women, as opposed to the slaves who might be expected to carry on a semi-industrial process. However, Sherwin-White cites a Coan inscription which suggests that, somewhat later than Aristotle, there were slaves at work, possibly on textiles."

By the time the Roman world was importing silk thread and cloth from India and elsewhere it is probable that silk processing was centred in the Near East, but as Jones points out, virtually all the literary evidence for near-eastern silk processing comes from late sources."

Certainly by the Byzantine period the region was the focus of production, but there is earlier evidence in Josephus (in particular) of substantial Jewish interest in silk, both in trade and production, especially in Berytus and Tyre, but also elsewhere. There seems little doubt – though little evidence – that Alexandria was another major manufacturing centre for silk, as it was one of the most important textile centres in the Roman world. However, as Wipszycka has made clear, there is hardly any information on silk in Roman Egypt: it is not found in any papyri, and almost the only Egypt-related literary mention is Lucan’s description of Cleopatra. Similarly, while there is a considerable body of Egyptian textiles

869 Quint. Inst. 12.10.47.
871 Jones (1960), pp. 191-2. Pliny’s mentions of ‘Assyria’, noted earlier, may reflect awareness of this near eastern industry; and Lucan’s Cleopatra’s silk had been worked by ‘Sidonians’ (B.C. 10.141-3).
872 Procop. Anec. 25. 14ff.
873 See Heichelheim (1938). For a detailed analysis of the epigraphic evidence from Syria, see Rey-Coquais (2002). Ruffing (2014) seems to add little to this.
available from archaeological sources, it has proved difficult to identify specifically Roman materials. Most of what has been found is post-Justinian, and little is entirely silk.

It is clear, however, that by the third century there was a wide range of textiles being produced in the Roman Empire, primarily in Syria, that blended silk with other textiles: we hear of *holoserica* and *subserica*, with the implication that *holoserica* garments were the exception: according to the *SHA*, Elagabalus (naturally) was the first (emperor?) to wear *holoserica*. While *holoserica* clearly means ‘completely silk’, we don’t know precisely what this means in practice: possibly we are talking about the typical Han heavy brocade (see below). Similarly, *subserica* is usually taken to mean a textile in which silk is blended with other textile fibres, but it could mean something else. Going back to the Augustans, Tibullus refers both to silk woven with gold thread and to purple-dyed silks, indicating the luxuriousness of the fabric: All this is reflected in Diocletian’s *Edict*, which provides prices for a range of silk fabrics, including purple silk – *metaxablatta* and *sericoblatta* - and also for the wages of a variety of silk craftspeople.

More controversial is the view that the Romans imported heavy Chinese brocade-style silks, as that was what Han Chinese production chiefly comprised; but since this was not to the Roman taste, these cloths were unraveled in Near Eastern workshops and re-woven into the fine, light, diaphanous textiles that the market wanted – either of pure silk or with an admixture of linen or wool. This process is clearly referred to by Lucan, and by Pliny, and confirmed from the Chinese side by the third-century *Weilue*: We know from the textiles
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875 Wipszycka (1965), p. 39 and references there; Adams (2002).
876 *SHA* Elagab. 26.1. Elagabalus was Syrian. It has been suggested that almost all Roman silk garments were, in fact blended fabrics, of silk and linen or wool, i.e. *subserica*, but this does not seem to square with what Pliny, in particular, says about it. See Matthews (1970), p. 3.
878 *metaxa*, meaning raw silk, and the modern Greek word for silk, is not found before the fourth century AD. See Pastor de Arozena (1994).
879 The *Edict*’s silk references cluster in chapters 49, 50, 52, 53, and 54 of the new Latin edition (see Appendix 6.3).
880 Luc. BC.10.141: *candida Sidonio perlucent pectora filo,/ quod Nilotis acus compressum pectine Serum/ soluit et extenso laxuit stamina uelo*. Plin. *NH* 6.20: *Seris, lancicio silvarum nobiles, perfusam agua depectentes frondium canitiem, unde geminus feminis nostris labor redordiendi fila rursumque texendi*. Ferguson (1978), p. 589; Thorley (1971), pp. 77-78. For the *Weilue*, see Hill (2009), p. 280. The story has been questioned by such authorities as Mommsen, Blummer and Pfister, who prefer Yates’s (1843) suggestion that this is a reference to unreeling cocoons, but the Chinese confirmation seems compelling. Wipszycka (1965) lists the earlier authorities backing the competing views. There seems no reason to invent the re-weaving story, if all that
from Palmyra that at least some silk clothing was woven ‘locally’ – i.e. in Syria – presumably from imported thread (the *Periplus’s serica nymata*).\(^881\) The humorous part of this is that the ‘Roman’ silk was exported via Parthia to China, and the Chinese believed that the Romans possessed silkworms and their silk was of a higher quality.\(^882\)

As far as the retail textile trade is concerned, we are left with very little information – something that applies equally to other textiles. We know from Martial that silk could be bought in Rome in the Vicus Tuscus, though the context implies that this was where prostitutes and other low life would go to buy, as Plautus had indicated nearly 300 years earlier.\(^883\)

Epigraphic evidence tells us of *sericarii* - presumably silk sellers or dealers rather than silk manufacturers, though there’s no clear evidence either way – from a number of locations around the Empire, with a distinct clustering in Rome.\(^884\) Our evidence for the location of silk manufacture is mostly late, coming primarily from Procopius (*Anec. 25.14 ff.*), who locates the industry in Berytus and Tyre, where merchants (*emporoi*), overseers (*epidemiourgoi*) and craftsmen (*technitai*) made up the industry.\(^885\) There were, too, other merchants in Byzantium, who bought direct from the Persians. As Jones says, Procopius appears somewhat confused about the details of the market. The presence of the industry in Syria is confirmed by a limited range of inscriptions from Tyre and Berytus which mention *serikarioi* and also *metaxarioi*. These inscriptions are, however, late, dating from the fourth century or later.\(^886\) Outside Syria, a detailed overview of inscriptions relating to the textile trades across Asia
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881 *PME 39*; Pfister (1934), pp. 56-8; (1940), S6; Schmidt-Colinet et al (2000).
882 Thorley (1971).
883 Mart. 11.27.11; Pl. Curc. 482.
884 Ferguson (1978), p. 588, again without quoting sources, says that there were silk dealers in the main centres of Rome, Naples and Tibur, presumably on the basis of epigraphic evidence – e.g. Rome *CIL* 6. 9678, 9890-93; Tibur *CIL* 14. 3711-2; Neapolis *IG* 14. 785 (*σιρκοποιος*).
Minor shows no specific mention of silk in this area, in spite of an active and diverse textile industry."

Silk was costly stuff. Pliny, as we have seen, rated it the most valuable ‘plant’ product, along with nard.\textsuperscript{887} The \textit{SHA} tell us that it cost its weight in gold, though Diocletian’s Edict makes it rather cheaper than that.\textsuperscript{888}

\textbf{6.7 Conclusions}

The history of silk in the Roman Empire is a tangled one, shot through with uncertainties. There is no doubt that the Cos brand was, for quite a short time, the embodiment of rather louche female luxury, and that its currency derived largely from the Augustan poets – with, unlike the case of ivory, virtually no prior history that we can trace in extant literature (apart from the original description in Aristotle). \textit{Coae vestes} are a typical example of origin branding. They also seem to be a typical of the way in which an innovative brand can be quite quickly supplanted in the market by either a superior alternative – \textit{serica} (another origin brand, of course) – or a cheaper, higher-volume generic, which is what seems to be represented by \textit{bombycina}.

As such, the Cos brand of silk represents an early example of the type of fashion brand that achieves a \textit{succès fou} but then rapidly loses momentum as more accessible and/or technically superior alternatives become available.\textsuperscript{889} After the early first century AD, silk remained a luxury, and was still highly desirable, but never seems to have achieved quite the same beguiling notoriety as we find in the Augustan poets. It was, however, widely adopted by the Imperial household,\textsuperscript{890} and it eventually evolved into an imperial monopoly that helped to structure the Byzantine Empire’s hierarchy of fashion.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{887} Labarre \& Le Dinahet (1996).
\item \textsuperscript{888} NH. 37. 204.
\item \textsuperscript{889} See Appendix 6.3. ‘White’ (\textit{alba}) silk is priced at 12,000 \textit{denarii} per pound, gold at 72,000 – \textit{Ed. Dio.} 53 (silk), 59 (gold).
\item \textsuperscript{890} See, eg, Schneider \& Hall (2011); Kapferer (2014), p. 115: ‘the flip side of fashionability is going out of fashion’.
\item \textsuperscript{891} Matthews (1970) \textit{passim}.
\end{itemize}
All the evidence we have indicates that silk was, and remained, a luxury material for the wealthy classes, though Josephus tells us that Vespasian’s troops wore silk at his triumph over the Jews. Once the first flurry of interest roused by the Augustan poets had died down, it never attained quite the same exotic appeal, but this seems to have been sufficient to kick-start an appreciation of the material, and Tiberius’s ban may well have stimulated further interest; recognition of silk as a desirable luxury carried right through into late antiquity and beyond. The poets’ decorative and underclothed objects of desire may not have been able to keep the Coan brand afloat, but they successfully launched a luxury commodity on a long career.

Jos. JA. 7.5.4.
7. Fine Wine: a Multi-brand Marketplace

Wine is a different type of commodity from my other case studies. It is a differentiated multi-brand market, in which consumption in the Roman world was widespread, regular and by no means confined to the élite. Even if we disregard the nastier forms of ‘sub-wine’, posca and lora, which were drunk by slaves and the lower ranks in the army, wine drinking, by the end of the republic, had clearly become nearly universal, at least in Rome itself, and substantial, in terms of per capita annual consumption. What is more, wine was – or became – a market in which trade was on a large scale, both within the Empire and outside it. Peter Temin has argued that wine provides some of the best evidence for something approaching a true market economy in the Roman Empire. In modern economic jargon, wine was a fast-moving consumer good. More specifically, in relation to branding as we know it today, the amphorae in which wine was mostly transported and sold in the period covered by this research were stamped, sealed or inscribed with a variety of marks: these would usually include that of the pot-maker, but also quite possibly those of the wine producer and/or the shipper, as well as a mark of origin and, even, the (consular) date of the vintage and of the wine being drawn off into amphorae.

A note on the specialised sources is given in Appendix 7.1, but any account of Roman wines must acknowledge a major debt to Alain Tchernia’s (1986/2016) monograph.

7.1 Wine and the Romans

In a close parallel to today’s wine markets, the Romans recognised a wide range of grape varieties and numerous geographical origins, both within Italy and from elsewhere,

---

893 Roughly equivalent to today's piquette. Posca is sour wine – nearly vinegar - mixed with water and flavouring herbs; lora is the result of a third pressing of grapes already pressed for wine (Varro RR 1.54.3). See Tchernia (1986), pp. 10-20 for detailed discussion.
894 As Tchernia (1986), pp. 20-21, makes clear, rural consumption depended, as now, on whether wine was produced in the area. In urban centres, especially Rome, per capita consumption was substantial, though the evidence is limited and the subject of much dispute. For discussion, see Tchernia (1986), pp. 23-7.
895 Temin (2001), passim.
especially (at least in the late republic) from Greece. It is tempting, and many scholars succumb to the temptation, to map onto Roman wines the French 19th-century adoption of vineyard rankings, and talk about ‘grands crus’, second and third growths, etc. This ignores the fact that Roman (Italian) wine regions, though clearly identified, were analogous not to the Bordeaux châteaux where the classification of growths originated, but to the regions defined in France by the appellation d’origine contrôlée (AOC). Although it looks as if one particularly famous wine – Caecuban – may have been produced by a single proprietor, it is clear that the vast majority of Roman wine origins involved production by a number of wine growers, who ranged from the peasant to the rich and famous.

As might be expected of a commodity which was so widely available and widely consumed, and which lubricated the key social medium of the dinner party, there are numerous literary references to wine, wine drinking and wine origins, and sometimes to individual grape varieties. From this, it is reasonably clear which origins/brands were the most highly regarded at different times (sometimes for medicinal reasons rather than through connoisseurship).

The top brands are the primary focus of this case study. These are those which modern scholars tend to describe as grands crus, but which I prefer to call ‘fine wines’, in accordance with a more appropriate modern practice. Analysis is helped by the fact that there was, clearly, a tradition of ‘ranking’ wines and fine foods, such as oysters, according to their origin: this is explicit in Pliny, who lists over a hundred wines which he regards as ‘worthy of note’; two-thirds of them from Italy; and the general practice goes back at least to Archestratus in the fourth century BC. Other origins may be mentioned in passing, but our chief concern is with the best dozen or so fine wines and what we can learn about how and
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897 See p. 228, below.
898 There is no discussion in the literary sources of differences in the style or quality of production from different estates within a region. Epigraphy, however, shows that amphorae sometimes carried what appears to be a producer’s brand. See references in ch. 1, n. 92.
899 For discussion of the medical sources, see pp. 214, 218-222, 224, 227, 237.
900 Pliny comments (NH. 14. 95) that others may include wines he has omitted: people have different tastes, and local loyalties, but those he lists, he considers, meet with widespread approval.
why they achieved (or lost) their reputation and status. For example, while Falernian maintained its fame throughout our period, by the end of the period it was perhaps marginally less likely to be seen as the very best wine, though its reputation endured at least into the sixth century. The top brands were subject to changes in fashion and changes in quality - which may have been due to neglect by the growers and winemakers or to other extraneous factors, though evidence for this is hard to find. It is clear, especially from Columella and Pliny, that there was a constant trade-off among wine producers between quantity and quality; and Roman experience, like today’s, was that it is rarely possible to achieve both.\

The detailed early history of Roman wine-making is obscure. The Greek colonists of southern Italy and Sicily certainly took vines and wine-making with them to Italy, but there were probably also indigenous Italian grape varieties: the Greeks called Italy Oenotria – ‘wineland’, an interesting precursor of the Vikings’ Vinland. But it is by no means certain how far the Romans – specifically - were active wine makers before about the end of the third century BC, though the Etruscans had a well-developed wine-making tradition far earlier than this: it appears that viticulture was established in central Italy by the eighth century BC. The development of an active interest in wine-making among élite Romans was aided by the translation of the Carthaginian agriculturalist Mago’s massive ‘textbook’ by order of the Senate soon after the sack of Carthage in 146 BC, which influenced Varro,
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901 Columella (3.2.31) seeks to combine quality with high yield, which Tchemia (1986, pp. 200-201) describes as a false trail. It seems that in the first century AD there was a shift in Italian viticulture to higher-yielding varieties of grape, of which two, biturica and balisca, were of reasonable quality. Columella is loyal to the aminean grape, which seems to have become progressively lower-yielding (Tchernia (1986) p. 187). It seems likely that the producers of Faustinianum in the ager Falernus damaged their quality by going for volume – see Plin. NH. 14.62. Conison (2012) argues unconvincingly that the Romans had no concept of wine quality.

902 There was, however, a tribe in South Italy called the Oenotrii (Strab. 6.3. 254), which seems to have become progressively lower-yielding (Tchernia (1986) p. 187). It seems likely that the producers of Faustinianum in the ager Falernus damaged their quality by going for volume – see Plin. NH. 14.62. Conison (2012) argues unconvincingly that the Romans had no concept of wine quality.

903 There was, however, a tribe in South Italy called the Oenotrii (Strab. 6.3. 254), which seems to have become progressively lower-yielding (Tchernia (1986) p. 187). It seems likely that the producers of Faustinianum in the ager Falernus damaged their quality by going for volume – see Plin. NH. 14.62. Conison (2012) argues unconvincingly that the Romans had no concept of wine quality.
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Pliny and Columella, though Cato’s *De Agri Cultura* was written before Mago’s work became available in Latin.\(^904\)

It is frequently suggested that Roman consumers’ interest in wines was stimulated by the wonderful Opimian vintage of 121 BC.\(^904\) Certainly, it is only from about this time that specific Italian wine origins began to be talked about, but there is also an even earlier fine vintage mentioned by Cicero as proverbial,\(^906\) the Anician vintage of 160 BC; and the enthusiasm shown by Cato for viticulture seems clear evidence of increasing interest in wine-growing in the early second century. Cato, indeed, says that a wine grower should be careful to look after his brand’s reputation.\(^907\)

The history of Roman viticulture and trade in wine raises several still unanswered questions. It seems probable that wine growing by Roman interests only really took off in the second century: Cato was something of a pioneer. Locally-produced fine wines began to compete with the high-quality Greek wines that were imported for the élite, and which, as Pliny tells us, ‘formerly’ held the leading reputation.\(^908\) The first century saw considerable growth in production, especially in Campania,\(^909\) and the rise in competitive terms of the original ‘big three’ of the Italian wine business – Falernian, Caecuban and (closer to the capital) Alban. This growth coincides with, and seems related to, the rapid development of the villa culture, especially on the coast of Campania, but also in the *ager Cosanus*, north of Rome.\(^910\) At the same time, wine was spreading down the social scale, creating a volume demand that local producers could not meet, leading to imports from Spain and Gallia Narbonensis, while Italian wines were being exported both to Gaul and Greece.\(^911\) The early first century AD deposit of amphorae of La Longarina at Ostia shows clearly the volume significance of


\(^905\) See Baldwin (1967).

\(^906\) *Cic. Brut.* 83. The earliest archaeological (or other) reference to a named Italian origin (Falernian) dates from 102 BC (*CIL* 15. 4554 – FAL MAS): the first Latin literary reference is in Catul. 27.1, more than 30 years later. Before this, the only wine brand references in Latin literature are to Greek origins – e.g. Plaut. *Poen.* 697; *Curc.* 79; Cato *De Ag.* 105; 112 – apart from a possible reference to Massic wines in Plaut. *Pseud.* 1303.

\(^907\) *De Ag.* 25 – specifically in the context of careful handling of the newly-picked grapes.


\(^909\) See Frederiksen (1984).

\(^910\) See Manacorda (1978); Will (1979); Purcell (1988). Wines from Cosa, however, seem never to have attained a high reputation in Rome, judging from Pliny's silence.

\(^911\) For Italian exports to Gaul, see Bats (1986). Imports from Spain and Gaul seem to have been mostly of everyday wines, apart from one or two exceptional origins, such as Vienne (Plin. *NH*. 14.57; Mart. 13.107).
Spanish imports by this time. Meanwhile, the more prestigious Greek brands continued to be imported; while there is little doubt that demand for everyday wines was at least partially satisfied by local production which has left no direct archaeological traces, and little in the literature.

The eruption of Vesuvius in AD 79 led to substantial destruction of vineyards that had traditionally provided Romans with several of their better wines and a significant volume trade, as is clear from the make-up of amphora finds at Ostia and in Rome itself, and from shipwrecks around the (mostly western) Mediterranean coasts. The destruction seems to have stimulated the growth of imports and encouraged the development of new vineyards in Italy – a process which must have been helped by Columella’s vigorous championing of vineyards as a source of profit. Exactly how this process fed into Domitian’s attempt in AD 94 or 95 to limit the extension of Italian vineyards is a subject of dispute. It seems likely that Domitian’s action reflected a combination of a particularly productive wine-growing season and a temporary crisis in grain production.

7.2 Roman Wines

Our knowledge of the precise nature of Roman wines is limited. They were mostly white wines, though the Roman vocabulary for colour does not help much here. From what we know about Falernian wine, for example, it was a white wine, though Pliny tells us it came in three forms - *austerum, dulce,* and *tenue* - and Martial several times describes it as *nigrum,* or *fuscum,* which, if it was a modern wine, would presumably mean red wine; but the Latin of the time seems to have meant, simply, ‘dark’, which was a sign of age and/or madeirisation. Many Roman wines, and most of the best-regarded, were sweet, closer perhaps to Sauternes or the wines of the Jura than to today’s dry whites. Red wines were rarer, and less highly-rated, for we hear little about them. The best wines were expected to be
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912 See Hesnard (1980).
913 Much of this would have travelled in wineskins or, later, barrels. See Marlière (2000).
914 See, e.g., Purcell (1985); Arthur (1982).
915 Suet. Dom. 7.2; Stat. Silv. 4.3.11-12. See Tchernia (1986), pp. 217-230 for a detailed discussion, and arguments for a later date than AD 92, which is the date given by Eusebius (Chron. Hier. Olymp. 217).
916 Bradley (2009), passim, especially the discussion of *fulvus* in ch. 1; Tchernia & Brun (1999), p. 111; Tchernia (1986), pp. 108-110, and see below.
917 NH. 14.63.
918 Madeirisation: a form of oxidization caused especially by heating, and characteristic of Madeira wines, which are deliberately heated. It is nowadays considered a fault in a wine, but was clearly admired by the Romans. Tchernia (1986) p. 202; Tchernia & Brun 1999, p. 43: ‘so-called ‘black’ wines were madeirised’.
kept for a considerable time before drinking – Falernian was reckoned to be at its best after ten years and better after 15-20, and both sorts of Alban after 15. Galen says that Surrentinum is immature until it is twenty years old, and Athenaeus that it needs 25 years. Age was clearly a key marker of a superior wine, to be served on special occasions, to élite diners – as is still, up to a point, true today.

The Romans had only a sketchy understanding of the detailed chemistry of wine-making, though their vinification was based on a mass of practical experience and experiment, as well as on Greek and Punic texts. For example, the accounts in Cato, Varro and Columella and also in Pliny describe a variety of explicit attempts to ensure that the wine is free from taints and does not turn to vinegar (‘its natural destination’), but some of which modern winemakers would find wrong-headed or even absurd. The legal issues concerning wine buying and selling discussed in the Digest focus to a considerable extent on the uncertainties of keeping wine in good condition. It is clear that most ordinary wines had a life of less than a year at best.

Two aspects of classical wine-making worthy of specific mention are the addition of salt, in the form of seawater, to the must; and the use of pitch or resin either to flavour the wine or, or more generally, to line and sterilise the casks. This last was standard practice, and applied to both dolia and amphorae: indeed, a pitch lining to an amphora is regarded by archaeologists as diagnostic of the contents being wine. Many wines must have been similar to modern retsina, and the characteristic profile of (usually) terebinth resin is regularly found in archaeo-chemical analyses of ancient wine residues. Salty wines were characteristic of several Greek origins, notably Cos, Halicarnassus and Rhodes, and as early
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921 See Wilson (2003), ch. 5, pp. 168 ff. Leary (1999), in an article that otherwise well describes Martial’s knowledge of wines, suggests that the Romans had few aged wines. This seems to misunderstand the market, and the fact that well-made sweet white wines are among the longest-lasting wines, even today.
923 See, eg, Dig. 19.1.25, and the contracts in Cato De Agr. 147-8. For example, wine was often sold ‘on the bush’, in which case the responsibility for vinification and storage lay with the buyer.
924 Wilson (2003), ch. 5.
927 Ath.1.33B; Col. RR. 12.37; Dioscor. 5.19.1.
as Cato we find recipes for making ‘Coan’ wine. As Salt was added to some French wines as late as the end of the 19th century, as it improved clarity and keeping qualities. Resinated wines – vina picata – were especially found in Gaul, where the wines of Vienne were very resinated and extremely expensive; while those of Massilia were smoky and resinated - and roundly abused by Martial among others. ‘Smoking’ wines was another way in which the Romans tried both to improve keeping qualities and to age wines more rapidly: the fumarius seems to have been a standard feature of wine-growing estates.

A Roman wine was considered ‘aged’ a year after its vintage, but most of the finest wines were judged to be much better when kept for five years or more, while some seem to have retained their quality for far longer. Pliny reports that it was still possible to find Opimian wine in his day, almost 200 years after the famous vintage, though he says that it had become a sort of thick syrup, and could only be used to blend and improve other wines. Given that Martial, writing at least 20 years later, several times talks about Opimian wines, it seems that by his time ‘Opimian’ had become a shorthand for ‘top quality and very old’, rather than referring to an actual wine of Opimius’s date.

The best Roman wines were the result of the first pressing of the grapes, which might be trodden or, in larger enterprises, run through a press; subsequent pressings produced posca or lora. The must (mustum) was then put into large containers (dolia) to ferment; here it might be kept for some time, with various treatments applied to it – the addition of powdered marble or chalk, as finings; the removal of the lees, or alternatively, for white wines, fermentation sur lie; the addition of a proportion of boiled-down must, defrutum, which would aid keeping qualities, and would have an effect similar to today’s chaptalisation of raising the alcohol content of the finished wine; some wines were flavoured with herbs.
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928 Cato de Agr. 105, 112.
929 See Turié (1894).
930 (Vienne) Plin. NH. 14.57, (Massilia) Mart. 10.36.1 – Pliny (NH. 14.68) says that Massilian wines are the best in Narbonensis, but the context suggests this is damning with faint praise.
931 Col. RR. 3.21.6; 1.6.20. See also Galen (14.19 Kuhn) for the open-air equivalent.
932 Varro RR. 1.65.
934 Wilson (2003), pp. 182-3, citing Mart. 1.26; 3.82; 9.87; 10.49.
935 There was no standard size for a dolium. A common measure seems to have been 50 amphorae: an amphora contained some 26 litres.
rather like today’s vermouths; *et cetera.* However, Pliny says firmly that the best wines should need no additives, as does Columella.

After fermentation, wine for keeping was usually transferred into amphorae—holding, typically, 26 litres— which were then sealed either with earthenware covers or, more usually, corks coated with a form of mortar – *pozzuolana.* Traded wines were normally shipped in amphorae, or occasionally in *dolia,* though the vogue for the latter appears to have been a short-lived one, judging from the evidence of shipwrecks. Local traffic in wines, and presumably the carrying of *vin ordinaire* over short distances, was typically in wineskins, which leave no archaeological traces beyond a few illustrations in carvings, mosaics or wall-paintings (see Plate 7.1). The use of wooden barrels was prevalent in Gaul and to an extent in northern Italy, and became widespread later (perhaps from the 2nd century onwards), but the vast majority of trade – or more precisely of the surviving evidence for trade – in our period was of wine in amphorae.

The technology of amphora production changed over time, apparently in response to market fashions and to the practical need to get a better balance between the weight of the pot and its ingredients, for shipping purposes. In the first century BC, both Italian and other producers moved away from the ponderous Dressel 1 and Graeco-Italian amphorae which had been standard in the western Mediterranean for some time to Dressel 2-4, which were substantially lighter. While this was by no means the only style of amphora used for traded wines, it came to dominate in the western Mediterranean, until the development of the flat-bottomed gaulish amphorae that date from the late first century onwards, while Greek designs remained the major factor in the east.
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937 Plin. *NH.* 23.45: Quaecomique vini nota sine condimento valet perennari, optimam esse eam censemus, nec omnino quidquam permiscendum, quo naturalis sapor eius infuscetur; *Col. RR.* 12.19.2.
938 This fitted with the practice whereby buyers had to remove the wine from the *dolia* before the next vintage; though there is at least one amphora label that indicates a wine kept in the *dolum* for some 41/2 years (*CIL* XV 4539= *ILS* 8580: Ti Claudio P Quintilio cos ad. XIII k. Iun. Vinum diffusum quod natum est duobus Lentulis cos - Made BC 18, drawn off BC 13, May 20th.).
939 Roman measures used for wine: 1 amphora = 3 modii = 48 sextarii. A culleus, used as a measure of the yield of a vineyard, was 20 amphorae. The 26-litre amphora seems to have become a trading standard, early in the market’s development.
941 For the use of barrels and wineskins, see Marlèvre (2000).
942 Dressel 1 and Dressel 2-4 are characteristic of western Italy and the western Mediterranean. Adriatic Italy used a different style of amphora (Lamboglia 2). So did Greek producers. See Tchernia (1986), pp.156ff. There is a vast and growing literature on amphorae, and while much of our knowledge of the development and character of the wine trade depends on analysis of...
Plate 7.1 Forms of wine transport
From top left: 1. Amphorae from Grand Congloué wreck; 2. wineskin on coin of 86 BC; 3, barrels on ship, from Gaul
7.3 Wine drinking

The Romans drank fine wines – the brands we are primarily considering – with their evening meal, especially on social occasions, though Plutarch notes a fashion for drinking aperitifs, so that people arrived at table already drunk. More modest wines, and even some better products, were available in a variety of bars and eating places – a Pompeian bar’s price list has Falernian listed, at four times the price of the cheapest vin ordinaire, though one can question the likelihood of this being the real stuff. Interestingly, as Tchernia points out, Diocletian’s Price Edict, two centuries later, has the same ratio between cheapest and best quality.

In addition, wine was provided at public banquets, which were, in the latter days of the republic, a means of gaining or cementing political influence. As a result, various sumptuary laws attempted to control the level of extravagance, either in terms of quality or quantity, by limiting the expenditure allowed on wines on these occasions (see Ch.2, pp. 75-6) Specifically, in 89 BC a censors’ edict fixed maximum prices for Greek wines. Julius Caesar is reported to have raised the ‘tariff’ in public banquet wine-giving by being the first to serve four different wines – two Greek (Chian and Lesbian), Mamertinum from Sicily, and Falernian.

Wine was routinely mixed with water, usually in the ratio 1:2, wine:water, though the proportions might vary. Athenaeus has a lengthy discussion on the subject, which explores almost every possible way of drinking wine. According to Pliny (NH. 14.53) Maronean wine, described as the ‘best’ in Homer, was diluted 1:20. Drinking wine unmixed was

evidence from amphorae, it is of limited relevance to the topic of this thesis. Tchernia (1986) draws heavily on the author's extensive researches into amphorae; and the subject continues to develop, as evidenced by active websites such as the Archaeology Data Service, run by the University of Southampton, which includes a 'digital resource on Roman amphorae', http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/amphora_ahrb_2005/index.cfm?CFID=1215&CFTOKEN=E4172A6F-FA6A-453E-9B04FEDFDF4EAF63 (accessed 24/1/2012 and subsequently).

943 Plut. Mor. 734A. The practice appears to have developed as early as the principate of Tiberius, see Plin. NH. 14.143; Sen. Ep. 122.6.
945 Plin. NH. 14.95.
946 Plin. NH. 14.97.
947 Ath. 10.426B-427C. As Dunbabin (1993) points out, this discussion takes place in relation to the Greek practice of mixing wine for all drinkers at a symposium in a single krater. All our evidence suggests that Roman drinkers had their wine mixed individually.
regarded by both Greeks and Romans as an uncivilised, characteristic of barbarian peoples such as the Scythians or Gauls. For the Romans, it was a recipe for almost instant drunkenness, though there are enough poetic references to merum to suggest that the occasional unmixed cup was a feature of many festive occasions. Libations poured to the gods were of unmixed wine.

By the end of the Republic, wine was part of the everyday diet of – at least – the majority of citizens of Rome itself, and we find unrest among them when wine supplies partially dried up under Augustus. As Tchernia points out, one stimulus for this development, alongside the generally increased standards of living in the Rome of the first century BC, was the introduction by Clodius in 58 BC of the free distribution of bread, which released extra purchasing power for bread’s natural dietary companion, wine.

While drunkenness was a constant in the opprobrium poured on political opponents in Roman public discourse, it seems clear that there was a great deal of excessive consumption of wine among the élite, and probably also among the general mass of the urban population, when they could afford it. The poets seem, however, to have used ebrius more as a term for ‘happy’ than as a criticism, in many cases, going back at least to Catullus’s Minister vetuli puer Falerni…”

7.4 Wine Brands

Several Roman authors suggest lists of the ‘best’ wine origins, and these let us plot changes in popularity or ranking over time. This process is hardly transparent, since we can never be sure of the precise date reference for comments relating to the past (several in the important case of Pliny, and most confusingly in Athenaeus); nor is it clear what criteria are being used, nor what in-built biases may lie behind an author’s judgements. In modern terms, one could describe the available data as being equivalent to that from a rather ill-conducted piece of qualitative research.
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949 Bemejo Barrera (1987) p. 124. ‘Drinking wine undiluted was a sign of barbarism’.
951 Suet. Aug. 42. Augustus pointed out that Agrippa had provided the city with ample water supplies.
954 Lucr. 3.476-482; Cic. Verr. 2.5.94; Red. Sen. 13.1; Har. Resp. 55.17; Phil. 2.67.7; 5.24.7; Sen. Ep. 122.6; Mart. 1.26. See Villard (1988).
955 Catul. 27.
7.4.1 The Quantitative Picture

That said, we can combine the material provided by writers who aim to provide brand rankings – notably Pliny, but also Columella and others - with evidence from other literary sources, and begin to establish some sort of quantitative picture. Frequency of mentions of a particular brand in a favourable context can be taken as evidence of the brand’s currency and quality, where currency means its familiarity in the élite circles represented by Roman authors, and quality reflects the judgements of both the writer and the circles in which he is accustomed to move. It is also possible to use our literary sources to identify at least some of the forces behind a given brand’s changing reputation over time.

As part of this research project, a database of over 1150 literary references was compiled, covering a period from Plautus, around 200 BC, to Athenaeus and Aelian at the beginning of the third century AD, with a few later citations (see Appendix 7.2, 7.3). In addition, the CIL lists over 130 stamps and dipinti on amphorae (Appendix 7.4). An obvious feature of this long list of citations is the importance in the total of medical authors: Galen in particular, but also Aretaeus, Celsus, Dioscorides, Scribonius Largus, and Soranus (represented by the translation of Caelius Aurelianus). Galen alone accounts for over 200 citations, and the medical group as a whole for just over 25% of the total. Just over 60% of citations are from authors actually writing within the precise period covered by this research (100BC – 130 AD). A substantial proportion of the many citations from Athenaeus, who accounts for just over 15% of the total, are quotations from earlier (usually much earlier) writers.

The database was developed initially from Appendix 1 of Tchernia (1986), but that is confined to wines from Italy, and the coverage of authors, while it includes all the major volume sources of citations, is somewhat incomplete. For this thesis, a number of authors have been added to the overall coverage, and an attempt has been made to include a reasonably extensive listing of non-Italian brands, the vast majority of which are from Greece or Asia Minor. A conclusion that can be drawn from this is that wines from Gaul, Spain and North Africa were mostly targeted to the mass market, rather than the élites who
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956 For an overview of wine in Greek medicine see Jouanna (1996), an analysis focused primarily on Hippocrates, from whom Galen derived most of his view of medicinal uses of wine.
957 Most of Athenaeus's wine citations are from middle or old Comedy, though the epitome in Bk. 1.27ff. attributes much to Galen.
958 There are rather more references in the new second edition (2016).
are best represented in the literary record. Indeed, with very few exceptions, when wines from these countries are mentioned, they are roundly abused.

While our literary sources list various wines as being at or near the top rank at various periods, the quantitative picture provided by the literature demonstrates the overwhelming dominance of Falernian, at least in the literary consciousness. It has all the characteristics of a classic brand leader – indeed, in today’s jargon, a Superbrand.\footnote{See \url{www.superbrands.com} accessed 24/12/2012.} Mentions of Falernian (181) account for over 15% of the total; it is frequently used as a standard of comparison; and no other brand (of any kind) comes close in number of references. The next most frequently-cited brands are both Greek – Chian/Ariusian (63, of which Ariusian, often described as the ‘best’ Chian, 15), and Lesbian (58). Both owe much of their strength, however, to Galen and Athenaeus, with Lesbian, in particular, little mentioned in classical Latin authors. The strongest Italian brands after Falernian are Surrentinum (37), Caecubum (34) and Albanum (31). Falernian, Caecuban and Alban are the ‘big three’ cited both by Pliny and Columella. Looking at the picture provided by the full database of 1176 references, the top 21 brands, each receiving 10 or more citations, account for 669 references, or some 59%. Given the fragmented nature of the market, with Pliny alone listing 127 brands, it is hardly surprising that there should be a substantial ‘long tail’ of wines.\footnote{Given the focus of this case study on fine wines, I have excluded from the statistical data Pliny’s listings of flavoured and herbal wines, raisin wines (passum), etc. in \textit{NH.} 14.98-115, as does Tchernia.} As Pliny says, he mentions only the ones that have some currency, while there are no doubt others that have some local fame, and there are plenty in the database that he does not name (virtually all non-Italian): the total number of brands in the database is more than 240.

Before around 30 BC, when Horace’s second book of Satires appeared,\footnote{Sat. 1 contains only two brand references, one Greek, both in the same line (1.10.2).} mentions of any wine by name are sparse indeed in Latin literature. Including several early citations of Greek brands, Latin writings before 30 BC account for only 38 branded references – a mere 3% of the total - with 13 of these being of Falernian. If, as Pliny believed, Italian wines began to be called by their origin names around the time of the Opimian vintage in 120BC, and, as Tchernia and Brun argue, the practice of wine connoisseurship developed in the circle of
L. Licinius Crassus in the early years of the first century, wine branding seems to been quite slow to take root. As Tchernia points out, it takes time for both the required level of connoisseurship and interest in wines to develop, and for individual brands to acquire currency and reputation. Varro, writing *de Re Rustica* around 35 BC, is not a prolific dropper of brand names (or even of the names of grape varieties), unlike Columella some 100 years later. It is clear, though, from later references that there was a growing awareness of the differences between wine brands, and the fact of Julius Caesar’s provision of four different brands for a triumphal feast is surely indicative of the importance of wine choice being established by mid-century.

An examination of the literary references to wine brands over time can only be regarded as indicative: the numbers of references in any given time period are not large, and references to individual brands tend to be correspondingly few. Choice of period affects the picture, and it only makes much sense if we exclude Galen (late, specialist and often comparing Italian and Greek brands) and Athenaeus (late, and mostly quoting from early Greek sources) from any time series analysis. At the same time, of course, only a small part of the possible literature has survived. However, the picture given by Figure 7.2 below, which takes a broad view, does suggest some patterns. *Falernum* clearly remains the dominant brand over time, with no other brand coming close. *Albanum* retains its reputation over time, while *Caecubum* loses ground – hardly surprising, since the vineyard was at least partly destroyed by Nero’s canal works. *Massicum* seems to have lost its standing by the end of the first century AD, while *Surrentinum* gained ground, and *Setinum* prospered in the first century, presumably because of its imperial patronage. In the Latin world, the leading Greek wines took a lesser place after the end of the first century BC. There seems to have been a change in the character of *Sabinum*, perhaps in the second century, since it is highly rated by Galen, but insignificant earlier. *Gauranum* is one of few ‘new’ brands, though others such as *Hadrianum* and *Neopolitanum* also begin to become more widely mentioned in later literature; correspondingly, some wines praised by the earlier writers, such as *Raeticum*, *Statanum* and *Calenum*, drop out of sight.

964 See above, p. 78, n. 290.
Table 7.2. Literary references to main wine brands: $n+$ (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>To BC</th>
<th>AD 1-100</th>
<th>AD100-175</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Galen(c.AD 180)</th>
<th>Athenaeus (c.AD200)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>39 (29%)</td>
<td>77 (15%)</td>
<td>12 (19%)</td>
<td>181 (15%)</td>
<td>33 (15%)</td>
<td>7 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chium*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbium</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thasium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massicum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setinum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabinum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmolites</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signinum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raeticum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauranum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (15)</td>
<td>97(71%)</td>
<td>247(49%)</td>
<td>53(83%)</td>
<td>602(53%)</td>
<td>107(49%)</td>
<td>74(40%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Ariusium

Source: Database – see appendix 7.3

An issue that emerges from looking at the quantitative data is that we might expect different authors to have differing purposes in citing specific brands, and that this would result in differential patterns of citation. Pliny, clearly, is involved in a systematic listing of wine...
brands, and we would expect a relatively large number of brands, each mentioned relatively infrequently. Galen, at the other end of the scale, is providing his fellow doctors with guidance as to which readily-obtainable and widely-acceptable wine might fit a particular therapeutic need. We could expect him to cite a smallish range of wines frequently – though his habit of providing both Italian and Greek examples might dilute this effect. However, of the other medical sources, only Scribonius Largo shows this sort of pattern, on an admittedly small sample of citations.

Table 7.3. Citations per brand by main sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>Citations(n)</th>
<th>Brands cited</th>
<th>Citations per brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galen*</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caelius Aurelianus*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silius Italicus</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varro</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columella</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenal</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribonius Largo*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vergil</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statius</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Medical</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-medical</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Medical sources

Source: Database – appendix 7.3
As for the poets, the picture is quite mixed. We could expect some ‘conventional’ use of brands as illustrations of a specific context, and something like this seems to have occurred in practice, especially in Martial, and to a degree in Horace, but not so much in Juvenal, Silius, Statius or Vergil. The data are summarised for the main source authors, accounting for over 85% of all citations, in Table 7.3, above.

### 7.4.2 A Qualitative View

In evaluating what the literary sources tell us about the individual brands, we need to distinguish several strands of writing, which have different agenda and, to an extent, criteria of judgement. In particular, during the later years of the Republic the medical profession (mostly Greeks, or Greek-educated) began to rely heavily on wine’s medicinal value, and the particular virtues of specific brands and types of wine. This clearly influenced élite Roman tastes in wine and promoted some particular brands, leading eventually to a shift in the character of the brands regarded as best. By contrast, in the poets, wines seem to be judged primarily on their sympotic virtues, and individual brands emphasised are either those excellent brands routinely preferred (or at least served) by their élite patrons or inferior brands that are cited (usually) to demonstrate a satirised target’s lack of taste, or contempt for inferior guests.

To an extent, therefore, we can find both wines that are highly regarded and popular in élite circles and brands that are clearly of low quality and associated with lack of savoir faire or, even, sheer meanness. It is clear that, as today, tastes in wine are individual, and we find, for example, that the up-and-coming *Surrentinum* brand is criticised by both Tiberius and Caligula as being little better than vinegar; while Strabo, writing around the time it began to gain popularity, notes that it had only recently been discovered that this wine could be

---

967 Asclepiades, to whom Pliny (*NH*. 23.32) attributes the introduction to Rome of wine as a form of medicine, is dated by Rawson (1982), pp. 360-1, to before 91 BC. See Jouanna (1996) for a wide-ranging discussion of wine in Greek medicine.
968 Wine was widely used across the ancient world as both a medicament and as an antiseptic – see McGovern (2005), pp. 305 ff; Jouanna (1996).
969 As Pliny readily admits (*NH*. 14.59).
successfully aged – an essential factor in its acceptance.”. The criticism may have been justified: _Surrentinum_ was promoted by doctors as being light and good for the digestion.” As such, it ran counter to the established Roman tradition of rich, sweet, heavy, full-bodied wines typified by _Caecuban_ and _Falernian_, the brands that had been the absolute leaders in quality in the late Republic, and which maintained their reputation in the early years of the principate. One of Athenaeus’s wise diners sums up _Surrentinum_ with the remark that it is liked by those who drink it regularly.

The most detailed descriptions of individual wines appear in Galen, writing towards the end of the second century AD. He was knowledgeable about wines and an inquiring and enthusiastic wine taster. There is, however, a problem in using Galen as a guide to the wines of the end of the Republic (for example), in that it seems that wines from certain origins changed their character over the 200-odd years involved, and tastes in wine also evolved-as, indeed, did the relative standing of different fine wines. In the same way, Galen’s focus of interest, as a doctor, is primarily on the therapeutic value of different wines, or wine types, so that his evident connoisseurship is in a sense incidental to his text.

At the end of the Republic, the trio of Falernian, Caecuban and Alban had established themselves as the top Italian brands, and the leading Greek brands, Chian and Lesbian, which, as Pliny tells us, had ‘formerly’ had the leading reputation (_auctoritas_), were less widely in demand, at least in élite circles in Rome.” The numerous sources quoted by Athenaeus, mostly from before our period, indicate that to Chios and Lesbos can be added Thasian; and perhaps also Pramnian, which seems to have been more a type of wine than a specific origin.” All these wines are categorised by Galen as falling into the general category of rich, strong and sweet. Falernian is described by Pliny as having three varieties, _austerum, dulce_, and _tenue_, and several sub-regions, _Falernum, Faustinianum_ and _Caucinum._ To these might be added _Massicum_, though this is really a neighbouring origin, except for the

---

970 Strab. 5.4.3; (Tiberius: _generosum acetum_; Caligula: _nobilem vappam_; Plin. _NH._ 14.64).
971 Cael. _Aur._ Ac.2.212; Plin. _NH._ 23.33, 35; Gal. 10.831.
972 Ath.1.26D.
973 _Plin._NH.14.56.
974 Various sources talk of Pramnian wines from Icaria (Ath. 1.30c–Eparchides), Ephesus (Ath. 1.30e–Alciphron) and Smyrna (Plin. _NH._ 14.54–see André (1958) _ad loc._).
975 _NH._ 14.62-3
apparently unarguable evidence of the label on *CIL* 15.1554 - FAL MAS. Pliny says that *Faustinianum* used to be the best, but had degenerated by his day; Galen calls it the sweetest variety of Falernian.

The strength of the Falernian brand is amply demonstrated by the number of literary citations in the database. This is confirmed by the comments made about it, which are full of praise and extremely short of criticism, while the brand is routinely used as a standard against which other wines may be measured."

Praise for wines falls into a number of different categories." These can be summarised as follows (these are the main elements: it is not intended as an exhaustive list):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.4. Characteristics of good wines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical characteristics</strong>: sweet, mellow, smooth (<em>suavis</em>), strong (<em>severus</em>), warming (<em>ardens, calidus</em>), full-bodied, fragrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attributes</strong>: noble, generous, authorititative, expensive, exclusive, luxurious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong>: served at the dinner tables of the rich and famous, connoisseurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong>: aged, from ancient cellars, long-kept, Opimian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Divinity</strong>: loved by/planted by/cherished by/ fit for Bacchus/Liber/Lyaeus; like nectar, ambrosia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong>: no headaches, easy on the stomach, nourishing, fortifying, healthy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Colour**: this is more equivocal. Dark (*niger*) seems to be favourable in Martial, but tawny (*flavus*, Greek *kirros*) seems more generally appreciated."

*Source: Database keywords; literary sources.*

For the medical writers, different types of wine have value for different kinds of patient and condition. There is a cluster of conditions which require wines to be relatively thin or light, dry and astringent, and a corresponding cluster of wine brands that meet this specification."" They are not mostly, however, the wines that are generally well-regarded by wine drinkers,

---

977 References for these characteristics will be found as they occur in the discussion of individual wines.
978 Though not in Aulus Gellius (*AN.* 13.31.14ff) where tawny wines are described as a dog's dinner (*caninum prandium*).
979 Gastric problems, headaches, etc.-for examples see n.982 below.
at least in the late Republic and the early principate. Still less well-regarded are those that Galen classifies as weak, thin, watery, and recommends for certain medical conditions.

Corresponding to the favourable characteristics listed above, there is a range of abusive descriptions of inferior wines. For wine drinkers, as opposed to the medical profession, these are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.5 Characteristics of inferior wines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical characteristics:</strong> dry, harsh (<em>austeros, ferox</em>, Greek <em>skleros</em>), thin, watery, vinegary, bitter, dregs (<em>faex</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attributes:</strong> lowly (<em>vilis</em>), inferior, miserly, cheap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context:</strong> served to inferiors by rich/arrogant hosts, low taverns, poor/miserly houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong> young, too old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health:</strong> causes hangovers, laxative, astringent, causes headaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colour:</strong> white tends to be regarded as a sign of a thin, watery, diuretic wine.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Database keywords; literary sources.*

With these profiles of good and bad wines in mind, we can look at some of the leading brands in detail.

### 7.4.2.1 Italian Brands

**Falernum**

‘Falernian’ appears to have been used rather loosely at times to describe all the wines of the *ager Falernus*, including Mt Massicus, so that as well as Pliny’s three varieties of *Falernum*,

---

980 Gal. 6.807 (Kuhn); 11.87; 14.16; 15.468.
981 Eg Gal. 6.337 (diuretic); 10.834 (for the stomach); 10.836 (for circulation); 11.604 (for the heart); 13.513 (for a poultice); 14.29 (as an antidote); Cael. Aur. *Chr.* 2.104 (for catarrh); *Ac.* 3.43 (for choking); 5.121 (for an abscess); Scrib. Larg. *Comp.* 36 (for ulcers of the eyes); 93 (for coughs); 115 (for the bowels).
982 See Beta (1999).
Faustinianum and Caecinium, it sometimes includes the well-regarded Massicum (see below). Pliny also talks of Falernian as having three varieties – *austerum, dulce, tenue.* Galen is less specific, but seems to talk only of a sweeter, amber-coloured wine and a drier, whiter one.

As we have seen, Falernian is clear brand leader throughout our period and beyond – in spite of Pliny’s assertion that Caecubum was formerly the leader, with Falernian second - and Falernian is clearly the standard of comparison for most comments about wines. As such, it ticks all the relevant quality boxes listed above. The most common descriptors fall into the ‘excellent’, ‘best’, ‘superior’ area, and this is closely associated with comments about age, which, as we have seen, was expected of the best Roman wines. It is rare, costly, and regularly associated with the gods and with fine, luxurious dining. It is strong, sweet, fragrant, and of a good colour – especially for Martial, who talks of *nigrum* (or *fuscum*) *Falernum* in no less than six different places. While for Horace the wine is merely *ardens,* Pliny (*NH.* 14.61) says that it is the only wine that can actually flame (*solo vinorum flamma accenditur*) – a phenomenon explained by Tchernia (1986), following Weber (1855), p.54, as meaning that the wine flares when poured over a flame. Falernian even has a ‘founding myth’, recounted, and apparently invented, by Silius Italicus: a folk tale about an old farmer visited by a disguised Bacchus.

---

983 See André (1959), p.100; Tchernia (1986), Appendix 3.
985 *Glukos/kirrhos* – Gal. 6.801 (Kuhn); *austeros/kirrhos-leukos* – Gal. 6.275; 11.87 (Kuhn).
986 Plin. *NH.* 14.61-2. Purcell (1985), p.16 says that Pliny puts Alban above Falernian, but it is not easy to see how he arrives at this view. He appears to have misread Pliny’s remarks specifically about Faustinianum, as Pliny says clearly that at present no wine ranks higher than Falernian: *nec uli nunc vino maior auctoritas* (*NH.* 14.62).
987 Varro *Ant. Rom.* 11.1; Hor.*Sat.* 2.8.16; 10.1.20.10; Tib. 3.6.6; Plin. *NH.* 14.62, etc.
988 Catull. 27.3; Mart. 1.10.1 (vetulus); Tib. 2.1.27 (vetus); Mart. 9.93 (immortalis); Mart. 6.27.5 (annosus); Petr. *Sat.* 34.6 (Opinionum); Pers. 3.3; Luc. *BC.* 10.163 (indomitum); Hor. *Od.* 2.3.8 (interiore nota); etc.
989 Prop. 4.6.72; Hor. *Od.* 2.3.8; Petr. *Sat.* 34; Mart. 1.71.3; 3.77.8; 11.36.5; Juv. 4.138, etc.
990 Cael.Aur. *Ac.* 2; Hor. *Sat.* 2.4.24; *Od.* 1.27.10; Plin. *NH.* 15.53.
991 Phaed. *Fab.* 3.1.2; Juv. 6.303; Gal. 12.728.
992 Mart. 2.40.6; 8.55.14; 8.77.5.; 11.8.7; 11.49.7, etc.; Gal. 6.801; 12.728.
993 Hor. *Od.* 2.11.19; Juv. 4.138; Mart. 9.73.5; 14.113.
994 *NH.* 14.61.
Falernian can be drunk in quantity. You can get drunk on it, and the vocabulary used reflects this, from *ebriosus/ebrius* to the frequent use of the verb *madere* or *madidus*; Petronius’s ‘drowning in it’ (*inundamur*), and the verbs *spumare* or *despumare* – ‘foaming’, implying overflowing, abundant, as well as, perhaps, lively.\(^{996}\)

Galen, who is a firm fan of Falernian, though not recommending it for those with headaches or suffering from biliousness, comments that this is a wine from a small region, but is exported all over the empire, ‘so people skilled in this kind of thing doctor other wines to produce fake Falernian’.\(^{1000}\)

### Caecubum

Pliny states explicitly that Caecuban once held the number one position, ahead of Falernian.\(^{1001}\) But he goes on to say that by his time it had been destroyed by the neglect of the grower (singular) and its limited area, but mostly because of the canal dug by Nero in his attempt to link Baiae and Ostia.\(^{1002}\) Nonetheless, it is still mentioned by Martial, several times, and also by Galen, who appears to use it as a sort of generic description for a type of tawny wine that goes fiery with ageing through madeirisation. Its survival as an actual wine origin is more cogently attested, however, by a Hadrianic amphora.\(^{1003}\)

---

\(^{996}\) Catul. 27.3; Mart. 12.17.5.

\(^{997}\) Prop. 2.33.39; Tib. 2.1.27ff.3.6.5 (*madere*); Mart.9.73.5 (*madidus*).

\(^{998}\) Petr. *Sat.* 21.6.

\(^{999}\) Prop. 2.33.45; Petr. *Sat.* 28.3.

\(^{1000}\) Gal. 10.835 (headaches); 6.803 (biliousness); 14.77 (Kuhn) (fakes), my translation. For exports, see the comments of Hesnard *et al* (1989).


\(^{1002}\) *ib*: *quod iam intercidit incuria coloni locique angustia, magis tamen fossa Neronis, quam a Baiano lacu Ostiam usque navigabilem incohaverat.* Note the singular *coloni*: this implies a single property, unlike most Roman wine origins, but may merely refer to the main grower of the brand.

\(^{1003}\) ‘The famous Caecuban wine of Caecubum all came from a single vineyard which could be destroyed in the Neronian period by planning blight and one man’s incompetence (Pliny, *HN.* 14, 61)’, Purcell (1985), p. 7. But see, eg, Mart. 2.40.5; 3.26.3; 3.58.7; etc – eight references in all. It is also mentioned by Galen, much later (6.805, 809; 10.834 Kuhn). For the Hadriatic inscription, *CIL VI* 9797, see André (1958), p. 100. Tchernia (1986), pp. 207-8 argues, rather unconvincingly, that post-Neronian mentions of Caecuban refer merely to a type of wine, and one Galen reference can be adduced to support this (10.834 Kuhn). Part of the vineyard – or the wine-producing area – seems to have survived. A clue may be found in Vitruvius (8.3.12), who
Caecuban had an excellent reputation in the early Principate – the first literary reference to it is in Horace’s second book of *Satires*, and Horace, Strabo and Dioscorides all give it high praise, while Columella puts it in his top four wines. Caecuban is a wine to be preserved and watched over: it comes *cellis atavis*; it is *servatum centum clavibus*. It is brought out as an almost sacred offering on feast days and great celebrations. It is both *superbus* and *generosus*. Even Strabo, who rarely does much more than note the presence or abundance of wine and vines in a particular area, calls Caecuban excellent or ‘best’ in two different references. For Martial, Caecuban is clearly a luxury wine, often of great age, and to be cut with snow, rather than mere water.

This is a more exclusive image than Falernian’s: Caecuban is a true connoisseur’s wine, to be savoured on great occasions: it’s not something to get drunk on – which Falernian might be. In modern terms, this is Pétrus, rather than Mouton Rothschild: a wine so exclusive that it is very highly regarded, but not widely drunk, which its relatively low production would not have allowed.

**Albanum**

Unlike most other top Roman wines, which used the aminean grape, Alban was made from the *eugenia* grape – allegedly imported from Sicily, and well adapted to the local *terroir*: it did not do well elsewhere in Italy, in spite of the promise of its name.

---

says that Caecuban was produced both in Fundi and Terracina, implying at least two different vineyards.

1004 Hor. *Sat.* 2.8.15.
1005 Col. *RR* 3.8.5.
1006 Hor. *Od.* 1.37.5; 2.14.25-6; *Epod.* 9.1.
1008 Strab. 5.3.5; 5.3.6.
1009 Mart. 2.40.5; 3.26.3 (*Opimian’); 6.27.9; 12.17.6 (snow).
1010 Col. *RR* 3.2.16.
While Alban wine was highly ranked by both Columella (‘one of the top four ‘) and Pliny, who places it third, behind Caecuban and Falernian, by Galen’s time it seems to have deteriorated: he puts it in the second rank, together with Sabinum and Hadrianum, neither of which ranks highly with Pliny.

In literature, we get a mixed picture of Albanum. While it is clearly a luxury wine, expensive, suitable for Maecenas’s banquets, sweet and like honey and well-aged, there are hints of roughness – austeritas. The later medical writers describe it as thin – aquosa – and Galen says it should be drunk young, and that it easily turns to vinegar; while Athenaeus says that aged Alban is a stupefying drug. It looks as if the standards of Alban winemakers deteriorated over the course of the second century – perhaps because they were looking for volume rather than quality for a vintage produced close to the metropolitan market.

**Surrentinum**

Sorrentine wine enjoyed a vogue in the first century AD, due to imperial patronage. Horace, who only mentions it once, was sceptical, suggesting it needed to be mixed with the lees of Falernian to be drinkable; and a clue to its subsequent development may be found in Strabo, who says that it rivaled Falernian once it had been found that the wine could be aged.

Columella considered it one of the top four wines, but Pliny gives it faint praise, and says that Tiberius and Caligula both called it expensive vinegar. An indication of its ambiguous status is that both Pliny and Martial talk of it being presented in its native earthenware. By

---

1011 Top rank: Col. RR.3.8.5; Plin. NH. 14.64. Second rank: Gal. 6.275 (Kuhn), cf. 6.334.
1012 (Feasts) Hor. Sat. 2.8.16, Od. 4.11.2; Juv. 5.33; (Sweet) Dion Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.66.3; Discor. 5.10.2; Plin. NH. 14.64; (Aged) Hor. Od. 4.11.2; Juv. 5.33; 13.214; (Aquosa) Gal. 10.833; 14.15; (Stupefying) Ath. 1.33A; (austeritas) Plin. NH.14.64;23.36.
1013 Hor. Sat. 2.4.55; Strab. 5.4.3.
1014 Col. 3.8.5; Plin. NH. 14.64, cf. 23.35, 36.
1015 Plin. NH. 14.34; Mart. 13.110.
contrast, Statius praises it lavishly, rating it higher than Falernian, though the context is a giveaway – he is lauding a patron’s Sorrentine villa.\footnote{Stat. Silv. 2.2.1-5; cf. 2.2.98; 3.5.102.}

The medical authors, Caelius Aurelianus and Galen, seem to be talking about two different wines: the former describes it as clear, sharp, lacking in body and very astringent; the latter calls it warming and good for the heart, robust, and sweet – though also austerum and (once) astringent. Galen reckons it needs 20 years’ ageing. The final word must go to Athenaeus, who agrees about the need for ageing, but says that this is a wine that appeals only to its fans.\footnote{Cael. Aur. Ac. 2.211-2; Chr. 4.71; Gal. 6.334; 10.831; 11.604; 11.648; 14.15; Ath. 1.26D.}

Massicum

Grown on the mountain overlooking the Ager Falernus, Massic wine is often linked to, or regarded as a variety of, Falernian, as we have seen. It was, however, sufficiently distinct to be mentioned in its own right by a range of writers from Vergil to Fronto, and Columella has it among his top four wines (in the strange absence from his list of Falernian).\footnote{Col. RR 3.8.5.} Pliny puts it on a par with Alban and Sorrentine, in third place behind Falernian and Caecuban.

Apart from Silius Italicus’s fable about Falernus, who ploughed Mt Massicus with Bacchus’s aid, Massicum is mostly referred to either as a very superior, connoisseur’s wine or as an example of successful viticulture. It is talked about as aged, carefully preserved, and generally excellent. The fact that it was grown on the mountain gave it a kind of sacred aura, and the association with Bacchus is found in Vergil – three times in different places - as well as in Silius.\footnote{(Old) Hor. Od.1.1.19; 3.21.5; Mart. 13.111; (quality) Hor. Od.3.21.5; Mart. 1.26.8; 3.49; 4.69.1; Fronto Ep. ad M. Caes. 4.4.2; (Bacchus) Verg. Geo.2.143; 3.526; Aen.7.725; Sil. Pun. 7.199; 4.346.}
Setinum

Setine wine enjoyed a vogue in the first century, having been a chosen wine of Augustus, because it was regarded as *digestif.* We find enthusiastic mentions from Strabo (the earliest citations we have) through to Martial and Juvenal, but there is nothing later than Soranus, as translated by Caelius Aurelianus, probably originally written around AD 125, though the brand does recur (as *Saiti*) in Diocletian’s *Edict.*

The vocabulary around *Setinum* is quite limited. It is described as excellent, widely famed and costly by Strabo. Pliny says little about it, though he describes it as being strong and harsh, in a medical context. Martial is the main source, and his comments revolve around quality, age, mentions of Bacchus, and of mixing it with snow, which was an ostentatiously luxurious practice, only otherwise found in connection with Caecuban. In both Martial and Juvenal, the context is convivial and luxurious. In their day, *Setinum* was clearly still a wine to be seen with.

Sabinum

We first meet Sabine wine in Horace’s odes. Horace was proud of his Sabine farm, and also of the wine that was produced locally: commentators who have taken his description of it as *vile Sabinum* as derogatory have ignored the *re cusatio* context: this is merely the poet himself being ‘humble’. After Horace, however, and passing references in Pliny, who was interested in a unique local grape variety, and an unfavourable mention in Martial, *Sabinum* does not really re-surface until Galen. Galen gives the brand almost as much coverage as any of the leading brands, and rates it as a good second rank wine at the lighter end of the scale: it is mildly astringent, but light, thin and watery. This last judgement fits with the description in Athenaeus as ‘very light’.

---

1021 *Ed. Dio.* 2.5 – the reading could conceivably refer to an Egyptian, Saiite wine.
1022 Strab. 5.3.6, 10; Plin. *NH.* 14.61, 23.36; Mart. (age) 13.112; (quality) 13.124; 4.69.1; 8.51.19; (Bacchus) Mart. 13.20.1, cf. Sil. *Pun* 8.376; (snow) Mart. 6.86.1; 14.103.
1023 Hor. *Od.* 1.20.1. More credible is *Od* 1.9.7, where a four-year-old wine is described as *benignum,* and capable, as a ‘winter warmer* of being drunk neat (*merum*).
1024 Plin. *NH.* 14.28, 38; Mart. 10.59.3.
1025 (Quality) Gal. 6.275, 334; (thin, watery, etc) Gal. 6.807, 10.483-5, 11.87, 15.648.
1026 Ath. 1.27B.
Others

There is a wide range of other Italian wines mentioned in the literature, though none of them attracts as much attention as those picked out in the preceding pages. Some are quite well thought of:

_Gauranum_, not mentioned before Pliny, is highly rated, but considered watery, by Galen.\(^\text{1027}\)

_Hadrianum_ is merely mentioned by Pliny, but Galen puts it up alongside Alban and Sabine in the second rank.\(^\text{1028}\)

_Calenum_ was highly regarded by Horace, but Pliny implies that it had declined by his day, and apart from one mention in Athenaeus we do not hear of it after Juvenal.\(^\text{1029}\)

_Statanum_ is well regarded by Strabo, and Pliny says that it used to be excellent. It does not occur later than Pliny, and as a near-neighbour of Falernian, it may well have been ‘co-opted’ into the Falernian brand.\(^\text{1030}\)

_Trebellicum (Neapolitanum):_ Trebellicum, referred to by Pliny as up-and-coming, is stated by Tchernia to be ‘undoubtedly’ the same as Galen’s Neapolitan aminean, highly rated by the latter as a good light wine to drink relatively young.\(^\text{1031}\)

Others are less well spoken of:

_Nomentanum_ is both a grape variety and an origin, famous for providing enormous volume yields – but not really for quality.\(^\text{1032}\)

---

\(^\text{1027}\) Plin. _NH._ 14.38; 14.65; Gal. 10.833; 14.16.

\(^\text{1028}\) Plin. _NH._ 14.67; Gal. 6.275.

\(^\text{1029}\) Hor. _Od._ 1.20.9; 1.31.9; 4.12; Plin. _NH._ 14.65; Juv. 1.69; Ath. 1.27A.

\(^\text{1030}\) Strab. 5.3.6; Plin. _NH._ 14.65.

\(^\text{1031}\) Plin. _NH._ 14.69; Gal. 6.806.

\(^\text{1032}\) Col. _RR._ 3.2.14; Plin. _NH._ 14.23. Columella had a Nomentan vineyard, but Nomentum was chiefly famous for the high yields achieved by a grower, Acilius Sthenelus, who helped a proprietor called Palaemon achieve a massive profit on a hitherto neglected vineyard which he sold to the younger Seneca: see Col. _RR._ 3.3.3; Plin. _NH._ 14.5. It is described by Balsdon (1969, p. 43) as a leading wine, but he seems to have misread the sources.
Ravenna grew vines on its marshes, but Martial reckoned that buying water in a tavern was better value.

Signinum was highly regarded by the medical profession as a powerfully astringent means of constricting the bowels, but no-one seems to have much time for it as a drink.

Marsicum, mentioned several times by Galen, appears even more astringent and medicinal.

Martial, who seems to have been a connoisseur of inferior beverages, has no good words for Spoletinum (‘piss’), Vaticanum (‘poison’, ‘vinegar’), or Veientanum (‘dregs’), all wines barely mentioned elsewhere.

Interestingly, the wines of Southern Italy – Magna Graecia – which represent the first flowering of Italian wine-making, are of little account in our period. One or two brands get a few mentions, but none is very high-profile, even when their quality is acknowledged. As far as Rome and its metropolitan drinkers and writers were concerned, the wines that get noticed are mostly those that have reasonably easy access to the city’s market, whether by sea or river. Thus, although the wines of Thurii, its neighbour Lagaria and Tarentum all get one or two favourable mentions, none of them is remotely as famous or highly-rated as their competitors from Campania and Latium. Similarly, though Pliny mentions the wines of Luna as being the best from Etruria, Tuscan wines get little attention before Galen.

7.4.2.2 Other Western Mediterranean Brands

Although we know that Rome imported increasing volumes of wine from Spain and Gaul, and that some of her earliest imports came from Sicily, few of these wines managed to make a great impression on the more serious Roman wine drinker, as reflected in the literature.

1033 Mart.3,57.1.
1034 Strab. 5.3.10; Diosc. 5.11.5; Plin. NH. 23.36; Mart. 13.116; Cael. Aur. Chr. 4.71; Gal. 13.659.
1035 Gal. 10.831; 10.832; 11.441.
1036 Mart. 6.89.3 (Spoletinum); 1.18.2; 6.92.3; 10.45.5; 12.48.14 (Vaticanum); 1.103.9; 2.53.4 (Veientanum – cf Hor. Sat. 2.3.143; Pers. 5.147).
1037 For detailed discussion of these wines and of what little is known about them, see Vandermeersch (1994).
1038 Plin. NH.14.68; Gal. 6.335; 6.806; 10.833.
Sicily gave the Romans, as we have seen, the eugenian grape, and the wines of Messena (Mamertinum) and Taormina (Tauromenitanum) were respected (Pliny tells us that the latter was liable to be passed off as the former).\textsuperscript{1039}

Cisalpine Gaul was not distinguished for its wines, apart from the Raeticum produced around Verona, which was patriotically praised by Vergil, and reputedly favoured by Augustus.\textsuperscript{1040} Ligurian wines were harsh and resinated, according to Strabo, who said that the locals imported wines from Italy.\textsuperscript{1041}

While Gallia Narbonensis became a major volume supplier to Roman markets, its wines were not highly regarded. Both Pliny and Martial say that the local winemakers added a whole variety of herbs and flavourings to their wine; while the best-known, Massiliot, wines, though the best from the region according to Pliny, are described by Martial as heavily smoked, to the extent of being ‘vicious’ and ‘toxic’.\textsuperscript{1042} The other Gaulish wine of note is the resinated (picata) wine from Vienna (Vienne), which was both highly regarded and very highly priced.\textsuperscript{1043}

We know that Spanish wines were being imported into Rome by the early first century AD, and Pliny mentions several brands – Laietanum, Lauronense, Tarraconense. He is quite favourable to Laietanum, calling it nobile, but Martial is abusive, calling it faex in one spot and sapa (basically = decoctum) in another.\textsuperscript{1044} Strabo talks of large quantities of wine being exported from Turdetania (Baetica), and says that the region’s exports went entirely to Italy and Rome because of favourable sailing conditions.\textsuperscript{1045}

7.4.2.3 Greece and the East

As Pliny tells us, the first wines of repute in Rome were Greek, and their prestige continued well into the first century BC, as evidenced by Caesar’s quartet of wines for his celebratory

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1039} Plin. NH. 14.66. \\
\textsuperscript{1040} Verg. Geo. 2.95 (‘good, but not equal to Falernian’); Suet. Aug. 77. \\
\textsuperscript{1041} Strab. 4.6.2. \\
\textsuperscript{1042} Plin. NH. 14.68; Mart. 10.36.1, etc. \\
\textsuperscript{1043} Plin. NH. 14.17, 57; Mart. 13.107. \\
\textsuperscript{1044} Plin. NH. 14.71; Mart. 1.26.9 (faex); 7.54.6 (sapa). \\
\textsuperscript{1045} Strab. 3.2.6. It is difficult to use this text to conclude, as does Tchernia (1986, p. 144-5), that this trade dates back to the time of Posidonius (pre-70 BC); there is no obvious logical connection between the anecdote about Posidonius in Strab. 3.2.5 and the discussion of Turdetania’s exports in Strab. 3.2.6-7. However, Ovid, writing at the turn of the era, talks of getting a doorkeeper drunk on cheap Spanish plonk, Ars Am. 3.645-6, so these wines had by then achieved some mass-market currency.
\end{flushright}
banquet (see above), and a continuing smattering of mentions throughout our period, until the two major later (Greek) writers, Galen and Athenaeus, provide us with a greatly enhanced view of the repertoire of wines from the eastern Mediterranean.

Mainland Greece was not, on the whole, a well-regarded source of wine, but the islands produced the best Greek wines, while Asia Minor and the near east was wine’s original heartland, and good vintages could be listed from the Black Sea to Upper Egypt.

Late Republican and early Imperial Rome’s acquaintance with wines from this broad region was quite selective. Before the turn of the era, the repertoire of citations of Greek and eastern wines was confined largely to the ‘big three’ – Chian, Lesbian and Thasian – all of which occur in Plautus. To these can be added Coan, for which Cato provided two recipes, and which Horace clearly regarded as cooking wine; Tmolites, cited by both Vergil and Vitruvius; and single mentions of Rhodian, Naxian, Catecaumenitan, Syrian and Mareotic.

**Chian**

Chian wines were generally highly regarded, with Ariusian seen as the best. From Galen, who never talks of generic Chian, we learn that Ariusian was the sweetest of the Greek wines, along with Lesbian: it was warming and easily absorbed; it was yellow/tawny and fragrant. From Horace and Tibullus we find Chian wine associated with feasting and celebration. It is smooth (*suavis*), and, as Pliny tells us, the great orator Hortensius had a cellar full of it.

**Lesbian**

Like Chian, Lesbian wines are most prominent in Galen and Athenaeus, though they pick up a few mentions in earlier authors – going back to Plautus. The best Lesbian wine, according

---

1046 E.g. *Poen.* 697, which also mentions Leucadian, otherwise only found in Athenaeus.
1048 *Hor. Od.* 3.19.5; *Tib.* 2.1.27; *Plin. NH.* 14.96. Galen, who refers only to Ariusian, is full of praise for it, e.g. 6.335; 10.832; 11.604; 13.659.
to Galen, came from Eressus, and other specific varieties came from Methymna and Mitylene.\footnote{1049}

Although very sweet, like Ariusian, Lesbian wines were relatively light – Horace, in one of his pastoral odes, describes them as *innocens*.\footnote{1050} They were, however, tawny and fragrant, and Galen regarded them as warming, easily absorbed and good for the heart – but not for the head. There is a relatively limited vocabulary used to describe Lesbian wines, but both their context and their history makes it clear that they were highly regarded, over a period of at least 800 years, and exported all round the Mediterranean – Sappho’s brother exported Lesbian wines to Naucratis.\footnote{1051}

**Thasian**

The final member of the ‘big three’ Greek wines was Thasian. This was also a sweet, fragrant wine, and seems to have been well thought of, but the Latin sources do not describe it at all, beyond discussion of its native grape, though Pliny allows it *auctoritas*, along with Chian and Lesbian, before the wines of Italy had asserted themselves.\footnote{1052} A variety of mostly Hellenistic sources quoted in Athenaeus clearly saw it as one of the best.\footnote{1053} Interestingly, it is totally ignored by Galen.

**Tmolian**

Tmolian wine or *Tmolites*, from Mt Tmolus in Lydia, is mentioned by a variety of Roman writers, from Vergil to Silius, though most of its citations come from Galen: in contrast to Thasian, Tmolian has no mentions in Athenaeus. This was another sweet wine – Pliny says ‘very sweet’ – tawny, fragrant and warming. Galen puts it in the same category as Lesbian, Ariusian and Falernian.\footnote{1054}

**The Tethalassomenoi – salted wines**

Salted wines were characteristic of several Ionian Greek brands, notably Coan and Rhodian, which were widely exported, though not especially highly thought of. Despite this, as we have seen, Cato thought it worth providing recipes for making ‘Coan’ wine by adding

---

\footnote{1049}{Gal. 14.28 [Kuhn].}
\footnote{1050}{Hor. *Od.* 1.17.21.}
\footnote{1051}{Strab. 17.1.33.}
\footnote{1052}{Plin. *NH.* 14.95.}
\footnote{1053}{Espec. Ath. 1.28E.}
seawater to wine, as Pliny noted.\footnote{For the *tethalassomenoi* in general, see Ath. 1.32F; Plin. *NH*. 14.79.} *Salage* was practised in some French vineyards until it was banned at the end of the 19th century.\footnote{See Turié (1894).}

**Other Sources**

There is a sprinkling of references to wines from more exotic sources, mostly as more or less passing mentions – Strabo is full of them, and Pliny’s liking for lists encourages him to look everywhere, even though his expressed intention is to talk only about those that have a ‘general reputation’. None of these wines gets any serious analysis, but it is worth mentioning the wines of Byblos in Phoenicia and the Mareotic lake in Egypt.\footnote{Byblos: Ath. 1.31A; *Mareoticum*: Hor. *Od*. 1.37.14; Strab. 17.1.14; Plin. *NH*. 14.39; Stat. *Silv.* 3.2.24.} The mentions of the latter are almost the only reminder in Latin literature of a long tradition of Egyptian winemaking, which had reached a high degree of sophistication and organisation as early as the mid second millennium BC.\footnote{See McGovern (1997) for a detailed account.}

7.4.2.4 Conclusions: the Qualitative View

The Roman (written) world’s view of fine wines became increasingly centred on the best Italian wines, as viticulture developed and thrived in the first century BC. By the time of the second sophistic at the end of the second century AD, Greek writers, even those whose experience and focus was essentially from the eastern Mediterranean, were having to relate their own native preferences to those of the metropolis. Among Italian wines, those of Campania and Latium not only enjoyed advantages of proximity to Rome, but also seem likely to have been the focus of the efforts of the most advanced viticulturalists. The best wines seem to have been able to achieve high quality and consistency. Among the top wines, Falernian achieved brand leadership early, and the momentum it gained in the minds (and on the tables) of the élite enabled it to build and maintain a clear leadership over all challengers.

7.5 Brand Communication

7.5.1 Brand Identification

Trimalchio’s banquet is noteworthy for the host producing glass amphorae - *amphorae vitreae*, into which, presumably, the wine had been decanted from pottery storage amphorae
- or even from wineskins, if Trimalchio was sufficiently cynical - of ‘Opimian’ Falernian wine, carefully sealed with gypsum, complete with a label \((\text{pittacium})\) saying that the wine was 100 years old – clearly a nonsense in every respect. \(^{1059}\)

Amphorae were, however, often stamped, then labelled and inscribed with \textit{tituli picti}, providing a range of information – not all of which can be successfully interpreted.\(^{1060}\) The range of information this labelling \textit{could} provide includes the following: the producer of the amphora; the contents (brand); the producer of the contents; its weight; the consignee; the consular year of production; the name of the ship carrying the cargo.\(^{1061}\) In at least one instance we have the date of the wine being made \textit{and} the date on which it was transferred from the \textit{dolia} to the amphora.\(^{1062}\)

The name of the specific wine contained in amphorae which have been found is not always apparent, though there are plenty of examples, many of which are listed in Appendix 7.4. Many amphorae have no product description at all, and it must be assumed that they had a label attached to them, or a \textit{dipinto} that has been lost. Similarly, there are a variety of abbreviations and ligatures for which the correct interpretation is uncertain, for example \textit{VIR}, found on some Pompeian amphorae, which \textit{may} stand for \textit{vi(num) r(ubrum)} – red wine.\(^{1063}\) Usually, however, these abbreviations seem to refer to the wine’s (or the amphora’s) producer – \textit{SEST} (Sestius), \textit{CLOD} (Clodianum), \textit{FAB} (Fabianum), etc.\(^{1064}\)

Correspondingly, at least some of the wines for which we have this kind of identification also carry – usually as \textit{tituli picti} – the name of what must be assumed to be the producer. We know of a number of names, not least from the \textit{ager Falernus}; while one of the most widely distributed stamps on amphorae identifies the estates of Sestius, who appears to have been proprietor of a large villa at Cosa in southern Etruria.\(^{1065}\) As was made clear in chapter 1 (p. 38), the stamps on amphorae are thought to relate to the producer of the amphora, and not


\(^{1064}\) Purcell (1985) p. 8 and nn. 33-5.

\(^{1065}\) Will (1979) (Sestius); cf. Jashemski (1967) p. 197-8. It should be noted that the idea of labeling with the name of the producer estate goes back at least to second millennium Egypt – see McGovern (2005), p. 30.
the producer of the wine (though they could be the same person). The wine producer would normally be identified (if at all) in a dipinto or an attached label.

7.5.2 Brand Communications

Fine wine brands lend themselves to word-of-mouth communication. As one of the key elements of any dinner party, they offer the host the opportunity to demonstrate both wealth and connoisseurship, and the guests the opportunity to discuss the wines provided. Two (satirical) examples can illustrate this. The first is Trimalchio’s absurd elogia of his ‘Opimian’ Falernian, with its obviously spurious label: The second is the eagerness of Nasidienus in Horace’s satire to demonstrate the riches of his cellar by offering Maecenas a choice of four top brands, whichever he might prefer.

Where, as clearly happened quite often, the host gives his main guests a superior wine and the remainder an inferior one, this is cause for griping: A host could, too, use the occasion to boost wine from his own vineyard – or, as Horace does, to modestly offer his own vile Sabinum: ‘humble’, rather than ‘nasty’.

In general, the wealthy seem to have served well-known, well-regarded and costly wines, preferably well aged. These are the wines that are most frequently mentioned by the leading poets, and there seems little doubt that this could help to give a brand a wide currency. While the circulation of books was certainly limited, the practice of recitations meant that a significant audience could hear a poet praising a particular vintage; and in a society where people were accustomed to memorise striking comments, with an education system that fed off leading poets and rote-learning, praise of Falernian or Caecuban or Sorrentine wine could travel far and wide through time. Particular phrases might also be repeated in new work: intertextuality is endemic in classical literature. We can be reasonably sure, too, that the poets’ language would reflect what their patrons and élite contacts were saying about individual wines.

---

1066 Petr. Sat. 34.
1067 Hor. Sat. 2.8. 13-17 (Alban, Caecuban, Chian, Falernian).
1068 Plin. NH. 14.91; Plin. Ep. 2.6; Mart. 3.49; 6.11.2-3; 10.49; Juv. 5.1-34. ‘Pliny the younger is the first Roman since Cato to pride himself in drinking the same wine as his inferiors’ – Tchernia (1995), p. 302.
1069 Od. 1.20 – see Tchernia (1986), p. 32.
Doctors, also, helped suggest which wines to drink – or avoid – and they could influence important people, as we have seen. This influence, according to Pliny, goes back, at Rome, to Asclepiades in the early 1st century BC, and clearly continued through to Galen and beyond. Pliny notes several medical influences under the early principate.~

All of this would have been amplified by gossip, as shown in chapter 3, with the ‘inferior’ diners perhaps liable to talk more about the poor wines they had been served than about the excellent vintages being drunk at the top table.

7.6 The Wine Trade

As Tchernia has shown,~ wine could be consumed or marketed at three distinct levels:

- purely domestic products for consumption day-to-day on the producer’s estate or as a local everyday wine sold within a confined radius from the vineyard, in which case it would typically be transported in wineskins, either by humans, donkeys or bullock-carts:
- widely-distributed more or less fine wines, transported and sold for the most part in amphorae in the period under review:~
- mass-market wines which were either transported short distances from the hinterland of a city or imported in bulk from low-cost producers in, especially, Spain.~

Fine wines will have been transported from the grower’s estate both for consumption in the producer’s home or homes and for sale. We have no way of separating the two channels, but it is clear from Columella, in particular, but also Varro and Cato that there is every expectation that the vineyard’s produce will be sold for profit.~ There is no sign in these authors that the bulk of production was reserved for the producer’s own use. We know, too, from numerous literary sources that élite wine drinkers were accustomed to stock their...

1070 Plin. NH. 14.61 Setinum (Augustus and later emperors); 14.64 Surrentinum (described as a doctors’ conspiracy by Tiberius); 14.69 Lagarinum (Messalla); 14.96 Chium (C.Sentius); Suet. Aug.77 Raeticum (Augustus).
1072 In most of the Empire, wooden barrels do not seem to have been used before the third century, though they were current in Gaul and possibly other parts of central Europe earlier than this. See Tchernia (1986) pp. 285 ff; Marlière (2000).
1074 See, especially, Col. RR. 3.3.9 ff.
cellars with a range of wines from different origins, and it is most unlikely that all the required range could be supplied from a magnate’s own production, even though it was common to own villas or estates in several different places. Transport was undoubtedly both easier and cheaper by sea (or even river) than by land, and the evidence of amphorae found at both Ostia and Rome shows that the capital was mostly supplied with fine wines through the ports – a situation which favoured nearby Italian origins, especially in Latium and Campania, and the easy sea routes from Gaul and Spain (the latter sources mainly providing volume wines for the mass market). The fact that there was a small but steady supply of Greek wines, which also appear at Pompeii, both shows that they retained their prestige and suggests that at least some of the grain traders from Egypt were not above picking up a bit of extra marketable cargo in the Greek islands on their way to Puteoli or Ostia.

Wine was sold to merchants – negotiatores or mercatores, specifically, vinarii – who in turn either shipped the wine for export or sold it to wineshops (cauponae, popinae, tabernae, thermopola) or to the great houses of the wealthy élite. We know of many vinarii from inscriptions, but, as Wilhelmina Jashemski has made clear, the inscriptive evidence is singularly uninformative about their activities, and the literary evidence almost non-existent. We know of a Portus Vinarius, attested in AD 68, and a Forum Vinarium (or possibly two of them) at Rome, and, by analogy, this seems to have been a wholesale market. There is also evidence of wine cellars (cellae) which seem to have been wholesale establishments, outside the city walls of Rome. There was a Hadrianic Forum Vinarium at Ostia with at least two guilds of wine merchants.

We know that merchants bought from wine growers at various stages in the production process. It was perfectly possible – and perhaps not uncommon – to buy the crop on the vine, in which case the merchant was then responsible for both vinification and packaging. A purchase might take place at any stage in the production process, with appropriate arrangements built into the contract. As the Digest makes clear, the ultimate key issue in all this was whether the wine was properly made and capable of keeping. Tasting, by an

1075 E.g. Hor. Sat. 2.8.13-19.
1076 See, e.g., Varro RR. 2.6.5, who talks of merchants carrying wineskins on donkeys, in Apulia.
1077 Jashemski (1967) p. 196. For an up-to-date, if somewhat speculative, view suggesting a degree of vertical integration in the Roman wine trade, see Broekaart (2012b), pp. 112-4.
1080 See Meiggs (1973), p. 283 and p. 317; CIL XIV. 318, 376, 409, 430. It seems unlikely, on the basis of epigraphic silence, that there were collegiae of vinarii, still less of cauponarii or popinarii before the second century AD (Kléberg (1957), pp. 85-6).
independent third party, was a standard feature of contracts. Of course, the earlier in the process that the merchant bought, the greater the risk he laid himself open to. The letters of the younger Pliny, who grew wine both in the region of Como and near Tibur, illustrate how purchase ‘on the vine’ carried a risk of the crop failing or the wine being inferior. Pliny makes much of his generosity, beyond the terms of the contract, in providing merchants who had pre-bought a failed vintage with a degree (at least) of financial compensation.

We know very little of the further detail of the wine market. A variety of sculptures and mosaics show scenes of wine shops and the transportation of wine, but these give no detailed texture to the process, beyond the (fairly obvious) practice of pouring wine from amphorae into smaller jugs for retail sale, or, for ‘local’ wines, decanting wine from large wineskins into amphorae for retail stocking (see Plate 7.2). Archaeological studies of Pompeii and Ostia provide evidence of a large number of retail sellers of wine – more than 160 of them at Pompeii. It is generally assumed that catering establishments were for the benefit of the lower classes, rather than the élite, though the price list at Pompeii’s Bar Hedone lists Falernian among its offerings. Certainly, as Ellis (2004) makes clear, Pompeii’s bars were sited to meet the maximum pedestrian traffic, and the same applies at Ostia, suggesting that their main customers were the urban mass market.

The most detailed available analysis of the spectrum of Roman drinking places is that of Kléberg (1957), who collected a wide range of data from literary, epigraphic and archaeological sources, primarily in Italy, but also to an extent from the provinces. From this it is clear that the Roman catering industry had a number of sub-categories, though we cannot with any certainty identify them in the archaeological record – or, indeed, be absolutely sure what the differences between them were, apart from the provision of accommodation. *Hospitium, caupona, deversorium* and *stabulum* all, according to Kléberg, involve the provision of accommodation; *popina, ganea, gurgustio*, etc, do not. The case of *taberna* is less clear, not least because the word seems to have moved from its original general meaning of ‘shop’ to the more specific ‘wine shop’ (*taberna vinaria*), with the

---

1082 The main references are in *Dig.* 18, especially Title 6. See Conison (2012), pp.105ff. for extended discussion.
1083 Plin. *Ep.* 8.2
1084 Ellis (2004), *passim*.
1085 See n. 943.
'shop' meaning dominant before about the turn of the Christian era, after which it gradually came to mean specifically a wine shop.\textsuperscript{1087}

As Kléberg shows, the presence of a variety of eating and lodging places is evident in the archaeological record in places such as Pompeii, Herculaneum and Ostia. Ellis (2004) for Pompeii and Hermansen (1981) for Ostia have analysed the location of bars and cafes, and produced results that point to bars being concentrated in high-traffic areas, especially at road intersections.\textsuperscript{1088} Similarly, literary and epigraphic records point to a variety of types and styles of hostelry along the major roads of Italy. Sources range from Horace to the Tabula Peutingeriana.\textsuperscript{1089} In Rome itself, the archaeological evidence is scanty, but there are frequent literary references to bars of various types. The classic text is Martial’s account of Domitian’s action in driving tabernae back from encroaching on the streets into their own premises - \textit{Nunc Roma est nuper magna taberna fuit}.\textsuperscript{1090}

For the most part, these outlets tended to be relatively down-market,\textsuperscript{1091} and it is a topos of political and moralistic discourse that their frequenters are unsavoury, if not criminal, so that political opponents or disguised emperors who visited them were demonstrating their moral turpitude. An early notable example comes from Cicero’s \textit{in Pisonem}.\textsuperscript{1092} Cicero’s Philippics, too, frequently accuse Antony of drunkenness, but only once with visiting low taverns.\textsuperscript{1093} In Suetonius, we find stories about Caligula, Claudius and Nero drinking in public bars, and though we can treat these as the retailing of scandalous gossip, they serve to illustrate the prevailing attitude.\textsuperscript{1094} Kléberg (pp. 93-5) lists a string of later emperors – Commodus,
Elagabalus, Gallienus, Aurelian – who are cited in the SHA as bar-flies. (Hadrian, by contrast, made clear to Florus that he, unlike Florus, did not frequent bars). In much the same way, the well-known story of how M. Antonius was discovered by his enemies during the Social War illustrates how the élite (or their minions) were not expected to buy in ordinary wine shops.

As to the barkeepers themselves, their reputation was also suspect. The idea of the perfidus caupo appears as early as Horace’s first Satire (Sat. 1.1.29), and the charge of falsifying or over-watering wine goes back at least to Varro and recurs in Plutarch. As Kléberg observes, this seems to have been a comic stereotype. For a vignette of bar life, we need look no further than the Copa Syrisca, part of the Appendix Virgiliana, and identified by Wilamowitz as an advertisement for a bar.

*7.7 Prices*

Just as today, fine wines that had been stored and aged acquired value in ancient Rome. Aged wines carried their own prestige, and the fact that most of the better wines actually needed as much as 20 years to come to their best meant that their value (and, of course, the underlying cost) reflected this. The classic text on the subject is Pliny’s slightly rambling account of Opimian wine:

Let us suppose, according to the estimated value of these wines in those days, that the original price of them was one hundred sesterces per amphora: if we add to this six per cent per annum, a legal and moderate interest, we shall then be able to ascertain what was the exact price of the twelfth part of an amphora at the beginning of the reign of Caius Cæsar, the son of Germanicus, one hundred and sixty years after that consulship. In relation to this fact, we have a remarkable instance, when we call to mind the life of Pomponius Secundus, the poet, and the banquet which he gave to that prince — so enormous is the capital that lies buried in our cellars of wine! Indeed, there is no one thing, the value of which more sensibly increases up to the twentieth year,

---

1095 Ego nolo Florus esse, / ambulare per tabernas/ latitare per popinas, / culices pati rotundas – SHA Had. 16.4.
1096 Plut. Marius 44.
1097 Hor. Sat. 1.1.29.
1. The reconstructed shop from Herculaneum can best be found at [http://www.romanhomes.com/your roman vacation/quarters/pompeii-herculaneum.htm](http://www.romanhomes.com/your roman vacation/quarters/pompeii-herculaneum.htm)

2. Bar, from Ostia


4. There are several versions of the price list from the bar Ad Cucumas to be found at [http://herculaneum.uk/Ins%206/Herculaneum%206%2014.htm](http://herculaneum.uk/Ins%206/Herculaneum%206%2014.htm)

Plate 7.6 Wine ‘Distribution’: Clockwise from top left: 1. Shop (Herculaneum); 2. Bar (Ostia); 3. Cupids dispensing wine (Pompeii); fresco 4. ‘Price list’
or which decreases with greater rapidity after that period, supposing that the value of it
is not by that time greatly enhanced. (tr. Bostock & Riley) 

It is not exactly clear precisely how Pliny intends his calculation to work, but it should mean,
assuming that Pliny’s interest is simple, not compound, that an amphora of the Opimian
vintage had risen in value by 960% over 160 years. The threat, to the owner of ageing
wine, lies in Pliny’s observation that once wine has gone over the top, it loses value very
fast. The temptation for the wine grower, or his merchant, lay in the fact that, as Columella
says, even second-rank wines gained value if they were aged more than a year.

What we do not know, of course, is how accurate Pliny’s estimate of the value of an
amphora of fine wine in 120 BC might be. We have little in the way of price information
from any point in our period from which we might draw any conclusions. Typically, where
we have the cost of wine for sale, or purchased, there is no quantity attached. It seems likely
that wine was retailed primarily by the sextarius, equivalent to 0.546 litres, and 1/48 of an
amphora. On this basis, the AD 79 Pompeian bar Hedone’s price of 4 asses (= 1 sestertius)
for ‘Falernian’ would be equivalent to 48 HS for an amphora. This is a good deal less than
Pliny’s price for Opimian, and one might expect inflation to have had some effect; but
Opimian was, of course the vintage of all time, and the bar’s Falernian is, arguably, highly
suspect. The bar’s base price of one as for wine is paralleled in a dialogue between tavern
and customer on an inscription from Aesernia in Samnium, which is possibly of a similar
date. We have, too, what looks like a shopping list from Pompeii, where the quantities are
not explicit, but the amount paid for wine is, again, small.

1100 NH. 14.56-7: quod ut eius temporis aestimatione in singulas amphoras centeni nummi
statuuntur; ex his tantum usura multiplicata semissibus, quae civilis ac modica est, in C. Caesaris
Germanici fili principatu anno CLX singulas uncias vini costitisse, nobili exemplo docuimus
referentes vitam Pomponii Secundi vatis cenamque quam principi illi dedit. tantum pecuniarum
detinent apothecae! Nec alia res malus incrementum sentit ad vicesimum annum maulse ab eo
dispensandum, non proficiente pretio; raro quipped adhuc fuere, nec nisi in nepotatu, singulistestis
milia numnum.
1101 singulas uncias, translated by Bostock and Riley as one-twelfth of an amphora, ought strictly
to be 1/960th of an amphora, since an amphora was equivalent to 80 librae by weight, according
to Smith (1875), who bases this on Festus (sv publica pondera). It remains unclear precisely
1102 Colum. RR. 3.21.6: 10 – he actually says that every wine has the property of acquiring value
with age.
1103 CIL 9.2689: Copo, computemus. – Habes vini sextarium unum, panem, assem unum.
Palmentar(ium), asses duos. – convenit. – Puell(amat), asses octo. – et hoc convenit. – Faenum mulo,
asses duos. – Iste mulus me factum dabit. See Kléberg (1957), pp.118-120. It looks as if, in this
When the censors of 89 BC decided that Greek wines should cost no more than 8 asses, if we assume – in the absence of any evidence – that this was the price per sextarius, this would make these prestige imports worth 96 HS per amphora at that date, which is in the same broad price bracket as Pliny’s estimate for the Opimian vintage.

By the time of Diocletian’s Edict, inflation (and debasement of the currency) had completely changed the scale of Roman prices. Here, the best wines have their prices fixed at 30 denarii per sextarius: 120 HS, equivalent to 5,760 HS per amphora. Diocletian’s list of fine wines includes some which were merely second-rank wines (or worse) in Pliny’s time. As a result, as Pliny says, there was a huge amount of money stored in the cellars of the rich.

From what little we can glean of actual prices for wine, day-to-day wine was evidently cheap, and affordable even for the urban poor, but fine wines could range from expensive to very expensive – a situation much like that in today’s wine markets. The élite could and did pay high prices for prestige wines, because it was an essential part of the Roman magnate’s bella figura to be seen to be serving the best possible wines to at least his most distinguished guests. As a result, as Pliny says, there was a huge amount of money stored in the cellars of the rich.

### 7.8 Conclusions

Wine was an integral part of Roman life, both as refreshment and as medicine. But it was, also, a key element in the self-presentation of the élite. As landowners, they might take the ownership of a vineyard more or less seriously, as did the younger Pliny and the younger Seneca, and it seems clear that most proprietors of vineyards would have aimed to supply most of their own day-to-day needs for wine from their own production.

But the style of Roman dining and banqueting provided the élite with the opportunity to use the best brands of fine wine to make an ostentatious statement of their power and prestige. Thus, they could not only serve old vintages of the best brands to their equals at the top dialogue, bread and wine together are charged at 1 as, which would make the deal similar to that found in Polyb. 2.15.5.

106 Ed. Dio., ch. 2. The listed brands at 30 denarii are: Picenum, Tiburtinum, Sabinum, Setinum (Saitium), Surrentinum, Falernum (Falerinum), together with ammineum, which is a (top) grape variety. Other fine wines – vini vetera primi gustus – are priced at 24, and second rank wines at 16. Vins de pays – vina rustica – are priced at 8 denarii.

107 La Penna (1999), p. 171.
table, but they could use a choice of wines to ensure that their less powerful and important guests were kept in their place by being served less high-quality wines. It seems to have been a rare senior patron who served the same wine to all the guests at a dinner party, and the recognition of this fact by the satirists serves to demonstrate how effective a currency wine brands, as signifiers, had become by the end of the first century AD.

The Roman wine market had thus acquired many of the characteristics of today’s complex international wine market. A considerable range of brands, from a variety of different regions and countries, backed by a substantial degree of connoisseurship, at least at the level of the followers of Robert Parker – the knowledge that a given brand has been given the *imprimatur* of an expert, or, ideally, of the emperor.
8. General Conclusions

The extent and scope of brand presence in the Roman world is surprisingly widespread, and this has so far been very little acknowledged by ancient historians. ‘Brand’ is not a word that comes readily into this arena, and this reflects the rather limited interest that has been shown by historians in the Romans as consumers, at least until very recently. It is, however, perfectly possible to identify Roman brands in large numbers; and in a quite limited number of cases we can begin to examine their brand images and how they were arrived at, and so to understand how these brands were perceived and used by their consumers.

8.1 Roman Brands

As I have shown in this thesis, two different types of brand can be identified in the Roman world. First, there are plenty of what today we would recognise as ‘manufacturers’ brands’: products that carry their producers’ identities, in some form or another, as a sign of their provenance and authenticity. As we have seen, this can, up to a point, represent on its own a form of guarantee of genuineness and quality to the products’ user or purchaser, or even convey what David Wengrow calls ‘charismatic signifiers of product identity’. We know about these products because they can be found in archaeological assemblages from all over the Roman world, and in many cases they appear in the Instrumentum Domesticum section of CIL and its updates and the pages of L’Année Epigraphique, though there must be many that remain unpublished. They are, however, very rarely mentioned in the surviving literature. Second, there is a very wide range of products that are associated with their place of origin, and can be described as ‘origin’ brands. The concept is a familiar one in the modern world, in spite of the dominance of manufacturer brands, and appears to be extremely widespread in the ancient world, where manufacturer brands are less obviously prevalent. We can identify origin brands in the Roman world almost solely by their occurrence in the surviving literature, though some are still current today, demonstrating the great longevity of the phenomenon. As shown in chapter 1, origin branding pervades

1107 They are effectively confined to a limited range of product types – ceramics, metalwork and glass.
1109 Examples of Roman origin brands still current include cherries, damsons, quinces; pheasants; indigo; fenugreek; topaz; Bactrian camels; larch; copper; Parian marble; magnets;
Roman literature, and covers an extremely wide range of commodities – and even some of what today we would call services.

As the discussion of brands in chapter 1.2 showed, a successful brand has a dual character: it has an identity; and it has a reputation or, in the jargon, a brand image. For Roman manufacturers’ brands, while we can to an extent infer their success by studying their distribution across the Roman world or their apparent density within a given area, we have virtually no information about how they were perceived by their users. Our surviving literature does not discuss the merits of Fortis lamps or *terra sigillata* from the *figlinae* of Gnaeus Ateius\(^{1110}\). And because of the limitations of much past archaeological data collection and reporting\(^{1111}\) it is unlikely to be possible to say – for example – that brand X of *terra sigillata* is mostly found in relatively up-market homes, while brand Y is mostly found in down-market, poorer homes.\(^{1112}\) We can infer that the most widely and densely found brands were – for whatever reason – the most popular, at least in a given area. But we cannot go beyond that, and the inference may be misleading because of the quirks of archaeological coverage or practice.

The situation is different for origin brands. With the partial exception of wines, virtually the only real sources we have for origin brands and their reputations are references in literature, both from within our period and from later (or earlier) writers. We can, as has been shown in chapter 1, identify a very large number of different origin brands, in many commodity categories. It is true that for most of these there will be little more than the information that (e.g.) place A is ‘famous for’ product B, or perhaps that the ‘best’ commodity B comes from place A; but there are a significant number of these brands for which we can glean enough information from literary references to develop at least an outline understanding of the detail of their reputation or brand image.

\(^{1112}\) I am not aware of anyone who has tried to do this. Kiiskinen (2013), the most thorough discussion of *sigillata*’s distribution, does not have anything to say on the subject. This is not to dismiss the (common) observation that the *quality* of pottery varies with the socio-economic status of the housing in which it is found. A good example of what has been done so far in the analysis of archaeological data to identify types of home is in Thomas (2012).
8.2 Understanding Roman Brand Communication

This currency in the literature reflects, I have argued, an on-going discourse among Roman élite (especially, but probably not exclusively) consumers. That the brands about which it is easiest to develop the kind of brand image material that I have been looking for are luxury brands is no accident. As the description of Roman élite society in chapter 2 has made clear, this was a society in which the rich and famous, or rich and would-be famous, were accustomed to using luxury products of all kinds as ‘positional goods’, to demonstrate their wealth and importance to others. Inevitably, this led to comment, whether by admiring or envious contemporaries or by captious moralists – the latter often with a political agenda - or in the course of litigation, where, as is shown by Cicero’s speeches and by Quintilian’s guide for orators, criticism of luxuria, complete with lurid details, was rampant. This discourse is what survives in the literature – again, with all the limitations created by the chance of survival and the social range of Roman writers.

These comments provide the basis for our understanding of the process by which origin brands became recognised and acquired meaning for Roman consumers. Word-of-mouth – in other words, mostly gossip – was in effect the only way in which Romans could exchange brand information; and it is still surprisingly important in today’s brand world, where there are a host of marketing communications in all kinds of media vying for primacy of communication. As shown in chapter 3, the opportunities for gossip were many in a society in which there were plenty of occasions during the day when people would get together and – we can assume – talk. Some of this talk will, undoubtedly, have been about what they had seen at the morning’s salutatio at their patron’s palatial mansion; and some of it about the fare at the preceding evening’s dinner party, whatever their position at table. Some of it, even, may have been about their shopping experience in the local market.

At the same time, of course, every product has its own chaîne opératoire. At each stage of this, there will have been conversations between suppliers or salesmen and their customers. We have few examples in classical literature of this, at any stage of a product’s life before it reaches consumption, but it is possible to hypothesise the sort of communication that might

---

1113 For many of the élite, shopping was done by their slaves. But there would have been exceptions, particularly where some really special item was involved, for all but the most lofty patrician.

1114 Leroi-Gourhan (1943).
occur at each stage, as illustrated in chapter 3 (pp. 107-117). These conversations could be expected to be focused on the product itself, and practical detail about it, and within this a key piece of information – for both buyer and seller – would be the product’s place of origin: in effect, its branding.

As my analysis of luxury brands in chapter 2, based on today’s luxuries, shows, a true luxury carries a story, based on its history, its provenance, the craftsmanship it embodies, and the company it keeps. A high price, rarity, a distant point of origin, and mythical or magical associations can all contribute to a luxury brand’s reputation and, hence, desirability. The four case studies in chapters 4-7 have taken a deliberately detailed view of the history of the products concerned, in order to show how their reputations could have developed over time in the Roman market, and the factors that combined to create their appeal. It is arguably no accident that there are elements of mythology in the stories about all of these products; and it is probably no accident that three of the four case studies concern products still available, and highly regarded, today. The best luxuries are – as their modern advertising is inclined to say – timeless.

8.3 Comparisons with Today’s Brands

The modern brandscape is crowded – overcrowded – with competing brands, in a way that was certainly not the case in most product markets in the Roman world. Modern brands use a variety of forms of communication in an attempt to differentiate themselves from their competitors, in ways that will heighten their appeal to their target market. Modern brands, too, are often more or less global, though all the talk of global brands is in practice profoundly exaggerated: very few brands are truly global, even to the extent of having a significant presence on all five continents.

Most Roman brands, by contrast, will have been essentially local in character, though their successful presence in Rome itself would have the effect of exaggerating their reach across the empire. It is in practice quite surprising how many origin brands from either the Aegean or the western Mediterranean are given mindspace by writers based in Rome: wool from
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1115 Indications in Cato’s and Columella’s agricultural texts suggest some of the considerations that would be discussed when buying livestock or selecting varieties of vine to plant.
1116 Wines, as a whole, have strong connections to the gods; and the wines of the ager Falernus actually had a founding myth created for them by Silius Italicus (see ch. 7, p. 227).
1117 And the fourth, Corinthian bronze, has a modern equivalent – see p. 141, n. 575.
1118 A classic example is the on-going campaign for Louis Philippe watches.
1119 For a recent analysis by expert market researchers see Griffiths & Landell-Mills (2015).
Miletus or Baetica; wines from the Greek islands, Spain or Gaul; seafood from all round the
Mediterranean and, even, as far away as Britain; exotic timbers from north Africa and
Lebanon; a wide range of textile products from Gaul to Babylon and beyond; and a host of
exotica from the middle east and further along the trade routes into Asia.

It is important to see these brands in perspective. These were products catering to the richest
segment of the population of the richest and most cosmopolitan city in the then known (to
Europeans) world. Their buyers could afford to be discriminating, and desired to be
recognised both as wealthy and as connoisseurs. There is little evidence for internationally-
marketed brands that catered for a more general public. A possible exception might be the
Spanish garum sociorum, which seems to have been widely available, at least in the western
Mediterranean; and some of the leading ceramic brands are widely distributed – this is true
both of terra sigillata and of Firmalampen.

8.4 Traded Brands

It is also noticeable that, in general, luxury brands were imports into Rome, as illustrated in
the case studies: we see less obvious evidence of exports from Rome, whatever that can be
seen to mean: Rome itself was not obviously a city of production, and certainly not
production for export. Rome’s exports were, using a modern analogy which should not be
pushed too far, mostly financial services: the financial wealth of Rome financed trade,
supported public works in cities around the empire, and earned money for Roman’s wealthy
élite, in a variety of ways. However, Romans would arguably, following the laudes Italiae
that permeate Vergil and Pliny, Varro and Columella, claim most Italian exports as ‘Roman’.

Given the sheer scale of the Roman Empire, too, it is difficult to identify many exports from
‘Rome’ to the rest of the world in any meaningful way. Almost the only literary information
we have on these exports comes from the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea, which identifies
potential export markets on the route from Berenice or Myos Hormos to the Indian coast, but
talks almost exclusively in terms of commodities, not brands. The Tamil poems widely
quoted as evidence for trade with the ‘Yavanas’ talk of wine, but not of origins. The Chinese
sources, while they attribute various articles of trade to ‘Da Qin’, received these goods after

\(^{1120}\) It is referred to by Seneca, who thought it over-priced (Ep. 95.25), Pliny (NH. 31.94), and
Martial (13.102), and as late as Ausonius (Ep. 21). An amphora from Pompeii – CIL 4.5659 –
carries the brand name: see Étienne (1970).

\(^{1121}\) See Kiiskinen (2013) (sigillata); Harris (1980) (Firmalampen). Arretium as a source of
pottery is mentioned in both Pliny (NH. 35.160) and Martial (1.53; 14.98).
they had passed through many hands along the Silk Roads, and their actual origin may have been anywhere from Rome to Samarkand or beyond. Scattered archaeological finds – such as Roman glass in China – have not, to my knowledge, been systematically studied from a global, as opposed to local, perspective.

What is clear, however, is that there was active regional and inter-regional trade within the Empire itself. Brands that were imported into Rome were also sold to people in Carthage, Athens, Berytus and the frontier stations of the northern *limes*. Of the brands discussed in chapters 4-7, we can only track – or at least identify – some wines. As Alain Tchernia has noted, it is the best wines that appear to travel furthest:

*Trouvées au Maroc, au Portugal, en Bretagne, en Angleterre vers le couchant, dans les eaux de Thasos et à Alexandrie vers le levant, les amphores à vin couvrent, au delà des limites des armes romaines, un territoire bien plus vaste que la céramique campanienne…. Alors que la règle générale est que seuls les grands vins navigaient au loin.*

Galen’s comment on the export sale of Falernian, quoted earlier, is relevant here, with its reference to potential fraud. As ever, trade depends on trust, and at the outer extremes of Roman commerce, there must have been an acute risk of a transaction turning sour unless the parties had previous knowledge of each other. The institutions that enabled this sort of trust became quite sophisticated in the late Republic and early Empire, as shown most recently by Wim Broekaert.

8.5 Directions for Further Brand Studies

In this thesis I have demonstrated the possibility of studying at least some Roman brands in depth, as a means of understanding how they were regarded, and hence how they fitted into the élite section of Roman society within which they mostly circulated. In this, I have suggested the mechanism, and developed a crude model, to show how these brands built and

---


*1123* See p.228.

promulgated their reputations. The concept of a brand image, and the means whereby it could be created, clearly has some relevance in the Roman world. There are, certainly, other brands that could be treated in the same way, though they may not be many, in view of the various constraints of available information noted earlier.

There is, too, room for a better understanding of the nature of Roman discourse about consumption and consumer goods. Much of this, as we have seen, comes under the general heading of gossip – *fama et rumores* – and this is in itself still a rather under-studied field. Philip Hardie has done a massive job on the role of *fama*-as-reputation, but he would, I think, acknowledge that there is work to be done, above and beyond what he has included in his book, on the nature of *fama*-as-gossip.\(^{1125}\) Here, the available sources are extensive and varied. Hardie built his book around the great poetic metaphors of *Fama* in Vergil and Ovid. Various scholars have looked at aspects of gossip in specific authors – Cicero, Martial, even Tacitus – but there is a far wider field to be examined.\(^{1126}\) From a brand viewpoint, this study could be focused on consumer behaviour and how it is reflected in literary gossip: there are numerous references scattered through the surviving literature, from Plautus through Cicero, Horace, Seneca and Pliny to Juvenal and beyond. There are, of course, hazards to be met with in analysing this material, especially when we arrive at Athenaeus, where there is plenty of material about both brands and shopping, but most (though not all) of it is drawn from Middle and New Comedy and dating from before 300 BC.

### 8.6 Lessons for the moderns

From the viewpoint of the modern marketing analyst, the main value of this study is arguably the confirmation of the existence of branding in depth long before the industrial revolution, which tends to be taken as its effective point of origin. This is not a new idea: it was expressed some years ago by John Sherry:

> To a large extent, the brand has been the ritual substratum of consumer behaviour from time immemorial. Insofar as culture is reproduced in and through material objects, branding has always been a vehicle of human agency.\(^{1127}\)

Nonetheless, it would be news to many of today’s marketing practitioners and, even, academics. While not of any immediate value of itself, it could encourage more thinking on the lines implicit in Sherry’s comment: that brands and branding can be approached through

---

\(^{1125}\) See Hardie (2012), and my comments on pp. 104-7, and see now Guastella (2017).

\(^{1126}\) See ch. 3.2.

\(^{1127}\) Sherry (2005), p. 44.
the disciplines of anthropology and psychology just as much as through economic analysis, and that this offers a better chance of accessing those essentially unchanging aspects of human nature that fundamentally influence brand choices.

Beyond this, what my thesis has done, I hope, is to confirm the richness of word-of-mouth in the propagation and development of brands and brand images in a world deprived of the benefits of mass media. The current fragmentation of media and the resulting difficulty that marketers find in reaching diverse and kaleidoscopic audiences should encourage further analysis of the processes by which consumer word-of-mouth contributes to brand success (or failure). The primitive model developed in chapter 3 is not a million miles away from a modern picture – if today’s social media were fed into the mix.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX 1.1
Brand Origins in Latin (primarily) Literature: Introductory Note

While this list is extensive, it does not pretend to be comprehensive – something that is probably impossible. It is based on a combination of data extracted from Dalby (2000), extensive reading of texts, and searches in thesauri and concordances, primarily the online Packard Humanities Concordance: http://latin.packhum.org/concordance. The citations are most widely from Latin, as opposed to Greek, literature, and Pliny the Elder’s Natural History is, inevitably a dominating source. The major Greek exception is Athenaeus, whose citations are mostly from Middle or New Comedy, but serve to show the prevalence of origin branding in Greek culture as well as Roman, and in many cases to demonstrate the long-standing nature of successful origin brands. Where Athenaeus quotes a source, these are shown in brackets after the reference.

As will be seen, the precise origin of some products – eg cinnamon – is distinctly moot. In many cases where there are multiple references from Pliny the Elder, the major single source, he ranks the various sources in order. In general, here, the most common item(s) are put first, the rest in alphabetical order. In some cases, where Pliny (in particular) lists multiple sources full references for the ‘also rans’ are not given.

Citations for each item are listed in approximate chronological order by author.

Items marked with an * are usually referred to simply by the geographical adjective, the noun being omitted.

Wines are covered separately, as Appendix 7.3.

The remaining categories are listed as follows:

1.1 Food
1.2 Flowers
1.3 Cosmetics, unguents, spices, etc.
1.4 Textiles, clothing, dyes
1.5 Furniture, furnishings, etc.
1.6 Precious stones, etc.
1.7 Animals
1.8 Trees/timber
1.9 Metals
1.10 Building materials
   1.10.1 Marble
   1.10.2 Other stones
   1.10.3 Sand, cement, etc.
1.11 Pigments & related substances
1.12 Paper
1.13 Entertainment, etc.
1.14 Military/naval

A list of all locations named is in appendix 1.2
1.1 Food

Paphlagonia: Ath. 1.28A (Hermippus)

Alexanders: Crete; Ath. 9.371C (Nicander)

Alba: Plin. *NH*. 15.90
Cyprus: Ath. 2.52C, 2.54B
Naxos: Ath. 2.52B, C, D (Eupolis, Phrynichus)
Paphlagonia: Ath. 1.28A (Hermippus)
Tarentum: Plin. *NH*. 15.90
Thasos: Ath. 2.54B


Apples: Abella: Verg. *Aen.* 7.740
Corinth (Sidus): Ath. 3.82A (Antigonus, Archytas, Nicander)
Delphi: Ath. 3.80D, 3.80E (Mnesitheus)
Euboea: Ath. 1.27F (Hermippus)
Laconia: Ath. 3.82C (Androtion)
Mordium (Apollonia): Ath. 2.81A
Paphlagonia (Gangra): Ath. 2.81C

Asparagus: Gaetulia: Ath.2.62E

Barley: Galatia: Col. *RR*. 2.9.8; 2.9.16
Lesbos: Ath. 3.111F (Archestratus)
Thasos: Ath. 3.112A (Archestratus)
Thebes: Ath. 3.112A (Archestratus)

Barley cakes: Aegina: Ath. 6.265A(Cratinus)
Eretria: Ath. 4.160A (Sopater)
Teos: Ath. 4.160A (Timon)

Beans: Egypt: Ath. 3.91A

Bay: Cnidos: Ath. 2.66D

Boar: Lucania: *Ed. Dio.* 4.16
Thessaly: Ath.1.27E (Hermippus)

Beet: Ascra: Clem. Alex. *Paed.* 2.1; Ath.1.4D
Nursia: Plin. *NH*. 18.130

Boar: Laurentine: Hor. *Sat.* 2.4.42; Verg. *Aen.* 10.709
Lucania: Hor. *Sat.* 2.8.6
Marsia: Hor. *Od.*1.1.28
Tuscany: Mart. 7.27; Stat. *Silv.* 4.6.10
Bonito: Bosphorus: Ath. 7.319B (Sophocles)
Byzantium: Ath. 7.278CA (Archestratus)
Borers (mollusks): Cephalenia: Ath. 3.91B (Archippus)
Bouglossos (fish): Chalcis: Ath. 7.288B (Archestratus)
Bread: Athens: Ath. 3.112B (Archestratus); 3.112C-D (Antiphanes); 4.134E (Matron)
Cappadocia: Ath. 3.113C; 4.129E (Hippolochus);
Cilician: Ath. 3.110D (Plato)
Corinth: Ath. 3.112B (Archestratus)
Cyprus: Ath. 3.112E-F (Eubulus)
Magnesia: Ath. 1.29F
Bream: Delos: Ath. 7.328B (Archestratus)
Eretria: Ath. 7.298E (Antiphanes); 7.328B (Archestratus)
Bulbus (grape hyacinth): Megara: Cato Ag. 7; Petr. Sat. 130; Plin. NH. 19.93;
Plin. Ep.1.15.1-4; Galen 8.15; Ath. 2.64D (Nicander), 12.583F
Africa: Ed. Dio. 6.41
India: Ath. 2.64E (Phaenias)
Cumae: Plin. NH. 19.140
Cnidus: Ath. 9.369F (Eudemus)
Cyme: Ath. 9.369F (Diphilus, Eudemus)
Ephesus: Ath. 9.369F (Eudemus)
Eretria: Ath. 9.369F (Eudemus)
Megara: Ath. 3.281A (Apollodorus)
Pompeii: Plin. NH. 19.140 (also Brutitian, Sabine)
Caraway: Caria: Plin. NH. 19.164 (also Phrygia)
Catfish: Egypt: Plin. NH. 32.125, 131 (Africa)
Cheese: Bithynia: Plin. NH. 11.241
Cebanus: Plin. NH. 11.241
Centronian: Plin. NH. 11.241
Chersonese: Ath. 2.65C; 9.370D (Ephippus)
Dodeleian: Plin. NH.11.241
Luna: Plin. NH. 11.241; Mart. 13.30
Nemausus: Plin. NH. 11.241
Phrygia: Ath. 12.516D (Hegesippus)
Salonian: Strab. 12.4.8
Sassanitus: Plin. NH. 11.241
Sicily: Ath. 1.27E, F (Antiphanes, Hermippus); Ath. 14.658A (Philemon)
Tolosatis: Mart. 12.32.18
Trebulus: Mart.13.33
Tromilican: Ath. 14.658 B-C (Simonides)
Vestinus: Plin. NH.11.241; Mart.13.31
Velabrum: Plin. NH.11.240-2; Mart. 11.52
Cheesecakes: Attica: Ath 3.101D (Archestratus); 4.130D (Hippolochus); 14.647B (Lynceus)
Cos: Ath. 645F (Cratinus)
Crete: Ath. 4.130D (Hippolochus); 14.644D (Seleucus); 647F (Chrysippus)
Parium: Ath. 14.644B
Rhodes: Ath.14.647B (Lynceus)
Sabine: Ath.14.647F (Chrysippus)
Samos: Ath. 4.130D (Hippolochus); 14.644C (Sopater)
Sicily: Ath. 14.645F (Cratinus); 14.647A (Heracleides)

Cherries*: Cerasus (Pontus): Col. R.R. 11.2.13, 11.2.96; Plin. NH. 12.14; 13.67, 105; 15.57, 101-102, 109, 111; 16.74, 104, 124-6, 138, 183, 219; 17.88, 234,260; 23.141; 37.42; Apic. Coq. 1.20.1.2; Ath. 2.50F-51A

Miletus: Ath. 2.51B (Diphilus)

Chestnuts: Euboea: Ath. 2.54B (Mnesitheus, Nicander)

Neapolis: Plin. NH. 15.94

Chickens: Delos: Varro RR. 3.9.2; Col. RR. 2.2.4; Petr. Sat. 22

Persia: Ath. 9.374D (Cratinus)

Chickpeas: Miletus: Ath. 3.55B (Diocles)

Chromis (fish): Ambracia: Ath. 7.328A (Archestratus)
Pella: Ath. 7.328A (Archestratus)

Coquilles (pecten): Mytilene: Enn. Var.36; Plin. NH. 32.150; Apul. Apol. 39.11

Tarentum: Hor. Sat. 2.4.34; Ath. 3.90F (Diphilus)

Cockles Ephesus: Ath. 3.92D (Archestratus)

Linusa: Strabo 13.

Methymna: Clem. Alex. Paed.2.1

Sicily: Varro Men. Sat. 403, ap. Gell. NA. 1.9.7; Ath.1.4D (Pelorus)

Codfish: Antheodon: Ath. 7.316A (Archestratus)
Pessinus: Varro Men. Sat. 403, ap. Gell. NA. 1.9.7

Cockney: Sicyon: Ath. 7.288C (Eudoxus, Philemon); 7.293E (Archestratus)

Sinope: Ath. 8.338F (Antiphanes)

Coracinus (tilapia): Nile: Ath. 7.309A (Amphis)

Cow-tongue (fish): Chalcis: Ath.7.330B (Archestratus)

Crabs: Alexandria: Ath.1.7B

Parium: Ath. 3.92D (Archestratus)

Scyros: Ath. 7.295D (Antiphanes)


Crawfish: Minturnae: Ath. 1.7B

Scyros: Ath. 295D (Antiphanes)

Smyrna: Ath. 1.7B

Crayfish: Lipara: Ath. 105A (Archestratus)

Sigeium: Ath. 3.105D (Aristotle)

Cress: Media: Ath. 2.66E (Nicander)

Miletus: Ath. 1.28D (Antiphanes)

Cucumber: Moesia: Plin. NH. 19.65;

Africa: Plin. NH. 19.65

Antioch: Ath. 2.59B (Diocles)

Boeotia: Ath. 3.74B (Theophrastus)

Lacedaemon: Ath. 3.74B (Theophrastus)

Cummin: Carpetania (Spain) Plin. NH.19.161 (also Africa)

Ethiopia: Plin. NH.19.161; 20.161-2; Ath. 2.68B

Cuttlefish: Abdera: Ath. 7.324B (Archestratus)

Maroneia: Ath. 7.324B (Archestratus)

Damsons*: Damascena: Col. RR. 10.404; Plin. NH. 13.51; 13.54. 15.43; Stat. Silv. 1.6.14; Mart. 5.18; 13.29; Apic. Coq. 4.5.5.16 (etc.); Ath. 2.49D-E; Ed. Dio. 6.86

Syriaca pruna: Petr. Sat. 31

Dates Syrian (caryoti): Strab. 17.1.51; Diod. Sic. 2.53.5; Petr. Sat. 40.3; Paus. 9.19.8; Ath. 14. 652A (Melanippides);
Thebaic/Egypt: Varro Men Sat. 403, ap. Gell. NA. 1.9.7; Strab. 17.1.51; Petr. Sat. 40.3

Dentex (sinodon): Sicily: Ath. 7.322C (Archestratus)

Dogfish: Rhodes: Ath. 7.294D (Archestratus)

Dolphinfish (Coryphaena): Carystus: Ath. 7.304D (Archestratus)

Ducks:
- Boeotia/L. Copais: Ath. 1.27E (Antiphanes); 2.71C (Aristarchus); 135D (Matron); Ath. 7.295C (Antiphanes); 7.297C (Agatharchides, Dorion); 7.298F (Archestratus); 7.299B (Aristophanes); 7.300C; 7.297D (Dorion); 7.298E (Archestratus); 7.302C (Aristophanes); 7.304A (Antiphanes); 7.327E (Strattis); 8.359B (Ephippus); 14.622E (Antiphanes)
- Berenice (Libya): Ath. 2.71C (Aristarchus)
- Eulus R.: Ath. 7.300D (Antimachus)

Eels:
- Boeotia/L. Copais: Ath. 1.27E (Antiphanes); 2.71C (Aristarchus); 135D (Matron); Ath. 7.295C (Antiphanes); 7.297C (Agatharchides, Dorion); 7.298F (Archestratus); 7.299B (Aristophanes); 7.300C; 7.297D (Dorion); 7.298E (Archestratus)
- Lake Cephisus: Paus. 9.24.2
- Macedonia: Ath. 2.71C (Aristarchus); 7.298B (Hicesius)
- Maeander: Clem. Alex. Paed. 2.1; Ath. 7.299C (Simonides)
- Messene: Ath. 7.298E (Archestratus)
- Strymon: Ath. 7.298F (Archestratus); 7.300D (Antiphanes)

Elops (fish):
- Crete: Ath. 7.300E (Archestratus)
- Rhodes: Varro Men. Sat. 403, ap. Gell. NA. 1.9.7; Colum. RR. 8.16; Plin. NH. 9.169; Aelian 7.28
- Syracuse: Ath. 7.300D (Archestratus)

Fenugreek:
- Greek (faenum Graecum): Cels. Med. 1.1221; 4.65.6; 5.812.2; 6.18.67; 7.27.62; Col. RR. 2.7.1; 2.10.24, 33; 12.20.2; 12.28.1; Plin. NH. 13.10; 13.13; 23.123; 24.184; 27.29; Larg. Comp. 269.5; Ed. Dio. 1.18; Apic. Coq. 5.7.1.1

Figs:
- Chios: Varro RR. 1.41.6; Cal. Sic. 2.81; Col. RR. 5.11.1; Plin. NH. 15.69; Mart. 7.31; Ath. 3.75E (Herodotus); 380C
- Attica: Ath. 3.74E (Antiphanes, Isistrus); 3.75E (Lyceus); 13.608C (Macho); 14.652C-E (Dinon, Alex, Lyceus, Philemon)
- Antiocheia: Strab. 13.630
- Caria: Ath. 3.76A (Parmenon); Ed. Dio. 6.84-5
- Chalcidice: Varro RR. 1.41.6; Col. RR.5.11.1; Plin. NH.15.69; Ath. 3.75E (Herodotus)
- Cimolos: Ath. 1.30B (Amphis)
- Egyptian: Plin. NH. 13.56; 15.68 (also Cyprus, Mt Ida, etc)
- Laconia: Ath. 3.75A (Aristophanes); 3.75D (Androton)
- Megara: Ath. 3.75D (Androton)
- Lydia: Ath. 3.76B
- Paros: Ath. 3.76B (Archilochus)
- Phrygian: Ath. 2.55B (Alexis); 3.75B (Alexis)
- Rhodes (dried): Ath. 1.27F (Hermippus); 3.75E (Lyceus); 3.80C
- Rome: Ath. 3.75E
- Sabine: Varro RR. 1.67
- Tithrasian: Ath. 14.652F (Theopompus)
- Tralles: Ath. 3.80C

Fish:
- Sicily: Ath. 1.27D (Antiphanes)
- Flat-cakes: Athens: Ath. 3.101E (Archestratus)
- Flounder: Chalcis: Ath. 7.330A (Archestratus)
- Eleusis: Ath. 7.285E, 7.330A (Lyceus)

Garum: Antipolis: Plin. NH. 31.94; Mart. 4.88; 13.102 (muria)
Carthago Spartaria (Spain): Plin. NH. 31.94
Clazomenae: Plin. NH. 31.94
Leptis: Plin. NH. 31.94
Pompeii: Plin. NH. 31.94
Pontus: Ath. 9.366C
Spain: Hor. Sat. 2.8.46
Thurii: Plin. NH. 31.94

Gilthead bream: Ephesus: Ath. 7.328B (Archestratus)

Ginger:
Arabia: Diosc. Mat. Med. 2.160; Plin. NH. 12.28

Gobies:
Phalerum: Ath. 7.309E (Antiphanes)

Goose:
Maeander: Ath. 2.57E (Simonides)
Nile: Ath. 9.395D (Alexander)

Gourds:
India: Ath. 2.58F-59A (Euthydemus, Menodorus)
Magnesia: Ath. 2.59B (Diocles)

Grapes:
Attica: Ath. 14.654A (Lynceus)
Cydonia: Col. RR. 3.2.1
Libyan: Col. RR. 3.2.1
Nomentan: Col. RR. 3.2.14, Plin. NH 14.23
Rhodian: Col. RR. 3.2.1; Ath. 14.654A (Lynceus)

Grayling:
Megara: Ath. 11.462A (Antiphanes, Archestratus)

Grey mullet (glauclus): Megara: Ath. 7.295C (Archestratus, Antiphanes)
Olynthos: Ath. 7.295C (Archestratus)

Groats:
Egyptian: Ath. 4.131D (Anaxandrides)

Guinea Fowl*:
Numidia: Hor. Epod. 2.53 (Afra); Col. RR. 8.2.2, 8.12.1; Petr. Sat. 55.93; Plin. NH. 10.132; 19.52; Stat. Silv. 1.6.78; Mart. 3.58; 13.45; Suet. Col. 22.3; Apic. Coq. 6.8.4.2

Hake:
Anthedon: Ath. 7.315F (Archestratus)

Ham
Cantabria: Strab. 3.4.11; Ath. 14.657F (Strabo)
Gaul: Ath. 14.657A
Libya: Ath. 14.657D (Strabo)

Menapia: Ed. Dio. 4.8

Hazelnuts:
Pontus: Cato. Ag. 8.2.5, 133.2; Col. RR. 5.10.4; Plin. NH. 12.32, 100; 15.58, 90; 16.69, 121; 17.96,136; 22.152; 23.145, 150; 25.138, 148; 29.44, 30.87,105; 37.81; Stat. Silv. 1.6.12; Priap. 51.12; Ath. 14.647F (Chrysippus)
Abella: Ed. Dio. 6.53
Praeneste: Naev. Ariol. 2.25; Cato Ag. 8.25, 133.1; Plin. NH. 15.90; 17.96

Thasos: Ath. 14.647F (Chrysippus)

Herbs:

Honey:
Hybla: Verg. Ecl. 7.37 Ovid AA. 2.517; Pont. 4.15.100; 5.13.22; Strab. 6.2.2; Luc. BC. 9.291; Plin. NH. 11.32; Sil. Pun. 14.199; Mart. 2.46.1-2; 5.39.3; 7.88.8; 9.11.3; 9.26; 11.8; 11.42; 13.105; Stat. Silv. 2.1.48; 3.2.118

Hymettus/Attic: Varro RR. 3.16.26; Cic. Fin. 2.112.7; Hor. Od. 2.6.14; Strab. 9.1.23; Val. Max. 1.6(ext); Col. RR. 10.386; Petr. Sat. 38; Sil. Pun. 2.218; 14.200; Plin. NH. 11.32, 39; 20.68, 85; 21.57; 22.113; 23.131; 24.34; 26.33; 28.88, 94; 32.70; 37.12; Mart. 5.37; 6.34; 7.88.8; 11.42.3; 13.108; 14.127; Paus.1.32.1; Macrobr. Sat. 7.12.19; Ath. 3.101E (Archestratus); 13.582D (Machon)

Brundisium: Strab. 6.3.6
Calymnos: Strab. 10.5.19; Ovid Met. 8.222; Plin. NH. 11.32
Corsica: Plin. NH. 30.28; 37.195

**Horsetail** (*hippouros*): Carystus: Ath. 7.304D (Archestratus)
Kale: Carthage: Ath. 1.28D (Antiphanes)
      Melos: Clem. Alex. Paed. 2.1; Ath. 1.4D
Lamprey: Sicily: Clem. Alex. Paed. 2.1; Ath. 1.4D; Ath. 7.312F (Archestratus)
      Tartessus: Varro Men. Sat. 403, ap. Gell. NA. 1.9.7

**Latus** (Bream): Messene: Ath. 7.311F (Archestratus)
      Nile: Ath. 7.311F

**Lebias** (toothcarp): Delos: Ath. 7.301D (Archestratus)
      Tenos: Ath. 7.301D (Archestratus)

Leeks:
      Aricia: Plin. NH.19.110
      Egyptian: Plin. NH. 10 110
      Ostian: Plin. NH.19.110

Lentils:
      Egyptian: Gell. NA 17.8
      Gela: Ath.1.30B (Amphis); 2.67B (Amphis)

Lettuce:
      Cappadocia*: Plin. NH.19.126; Mart. 5.78
      Cilicia: Plin. NH.19.128
      Galatia: Ath. 2.59B (Diocles)
      Laconian: Plin. NH.9.125; Ath. 2.69B (Theophrastus)
      Smyrna: Ath. 2.59B (Diocles)

**Little bustard** (*tetrax*): Moesia: Ath. 9.398E

Lobster:
      Alexandria: Ath. 1.7B
      Hellespont: Plin. NH. 9.97-8; Ath. 3.105A (Archestratus)
      Lipari Is.: Ath. 3.105A (Archestratus)
      Thasos: Ath. 3.105D (Aristotle)

Lovage:
      Liguria: Plin. NH. 19.165; 20.168

Mackerel:
      Byzantium: Ath. 1.27E (Hermippus); 3.116C (Euthydemus)
      Eleusis: Ath. 7.285E (Lyceus)
      Spain: Ath. 3.121A (Diphilus)

**Maiotae** (fish): L. Maeotis: Ath. 312A
      Nile: Ath. 312A

Marjoram:
      Cos: Ath. 15.689E (Apollonius)
      Phrygia: Ath. 15.679D (Theophrastus)
      Tenedos: Ath. 1.28D (Antiphanes)

Meat:
      Marsia: Ed. Dio. 4.9

Medlars:
      Chios: Ath. 650D (Aristaeus)

Monkfish (*rhine*): Smyrna: Ath. 7 319D (Dorion)

Mulberry:
      Ostia: Plin. NH.15.97
      Tusculum: Plin. NH.15.97

Mullets:
      Abdera: Ath. 3.118C (Dorion); 7.307B (Archestratus)
      Aegina: Ath. 7.307D (Archestratus)
      Aexona: Ath. 7.326A (Cratinus, Nausicrates)
      Erythrae: Ath. 7.325E (Archestratus)
      Miletus: Ath. 7.311A, 7.320B, 7.325D 7.325D (Archestratus)
      Sicily: Clem. Alex. Paed. 2.1:
      Sinope: 3.118C (Dorion); 7.307B (Archestratus)
      Thasos: Ath. 7.325D (Archestratus)

Murena:
      Sicily: Plin. NH. 9.169; Ath. 7.313A (Archestratus)

Mussels:
      Aenus: Ath. 3.92D (Archestratus)
      Ephesus: Ath. 3.87C (Hicesius), 90D
      Pontus: Ath. 7.295C (Antiphanes)
Mustard: Cyprus: Ath. 1.28D (Antiphanes)
Egypt: Plin. NH. 12.28 (Alexandria); 19.171

Nuts: Praeneste: Naev. Ariol.2

Octopus: Caria: Ath. 7.318F (Archestratus)
Corcyra: Ath. 7.318F (Archestratus)
Thasos: Ath. 7.318F (Archestratus)

Olivines: Picenum: Plin. NH. 15.16; Mart. 1.43.8; 5.78.20; 11.52.11
Libya: Stat. Silv. 4.9.12
Sidicinum: Plin. NH. 15.16; 31.9
Tarsus: Ed. Dio. 6.89

Olive Oil: Venafrum: Cato Ag. 146; Varro RR1.2.6; Hor. Sat. 2.4.69; 2.8.45; Od.2.6;
Strab. 5.3.10; Plin. NH.15.8; 17.31; Mart. 12.63; 13.101; Juv. 5.86; Scrib. Larg. Comp.269.2
Attica: Paus. 10.32.19
Baetica: Plin. NH. 15.9, 17.31; Paus. 10.32.19 (Iberia)
Caria: Ath. 2.67A (Ophelion)
Istria: Plin. NH. 15.9; Paus. 10.32.19
Samos: Ath. 2.66F (Antiphanes/Alexis)
Sicyon: Paus. 10.32.19
Thurii: Ath. 1.30B (Amphis); 2.67B (Amphis)
Tithorea: Paus. 10.32.19
Turdetania (Spain): Strab. 3.2.6

Onions: Askalon: Strab. 16.2.29; Plin. NH. 19.101 (also Cyprus, Cnidos, Sardis,
Crete, Issus, Africa, Gaul)
Amiternum: Plin. NH. 19.105-6
Samothrace: Plin. NH. 19.101; Ath. 1.28D (Antiphanes)
Tusculum: Plin. NH. 19.102, 105

Orcunus (Horse mackerel): Cadiz: Ath. 7.315D (Dorion)
Sicily: Ath. 7.315D (Dorion)

Oregano: Crete: Plin. NH. 20.177 (also Smyrna)

Oysters: Lucrine: Varro Men. 501.2; Hor. Epod. 2.49; Sat. 2.4.32: Sen. Ep.
78.23; Petr. Sat.119.1.34; Mucian. Hist. 29.1 (ap. Plin. NH. 32.62);
Plin. NH.9.169; 32.62; Mart. 3.60.3; 5.37.3; 6.11.5; 13.82.1; 13.90.2;
Juv. 4.141, 11.48 (Baiae)
Abydos: Enn. Hed. 39.2 (ap. Apul. Apol. 39.2); Ath. 3.92D (Archestratus);
Verg. Geo. 1.207; Clem. Alex. Paed. 21.1
Britain (Rutupiae): Plin. NH. 9.169; 32.62; Juv. 4.141
Brundisium: Plin. NH. 9.169; 32.62; Ath. 3.92E (Archestratus)
Circeian: Hor. Sat. 2.4.33; Plin. NH. 32.62
Coryphas: Plin. NH. 32.62
Cyzicus: Plin. NH. 32.62
Ephesus: Plin. NH. 32.62
Lucus: Plin. NH. 32.62
Medulae (Bordeaux): Plin. NH. 32.62
Tarentum: Varro Men. Sat. 403, ap. Gell. NA. 1.9.7

Parrotfish: Byzantium: Ath. 7.320B (Archestratus)
Chalcidon: Ath. 7.320B (Archestratus)
Ephesus: Ath. 7.320B (Archestratus)

Partridges: Attica: Ath. 9.390B (Theophrastus)
Boeotia: Ath. 9.390C
Italy: Ath. 9.390B
Paphlagonia Ath. 9.390C (Theophrastus)
Skiathos: Ath. 9.390C (Theophrastus)
Peaches*: *Peach* is Opp. Agr.2.1; Cal. Sic. 2.43; Col. RR. 5.10.20; 9.4.3; 10.405; 10. 410; Plin. NH.12.14;15.39, 42, 109-114; 16.138; 23.132; Mart. 13.46; Galen 12.76; Ath. 2.82F (Theophrastus, Diphilus, Philotimus)

Arabia: Ath. 14.654A (Posidonius)
Syria: Ath. 14.654A (Posidonius)

Pears:

Arabia: Ath. 14.654A (Posidonius)
Syria: Ath. 14.654A (Posidonius)

Peacocks: Peacock
Media: Clem. Alex. Paed. 2.1

Pears:

Crustumium: Verg. Geo. 2.88; Cels. Med. 2.24.2; Col. RR. 5.10.18;
12.10.4; Plin. NH. 15.53; 23.115; Scrib. Larg. Comp. 104.18
Ceos: Ath. 650D (Aeschylides)
Euboea: Ath. 1.27F (Hermippus)
Falernum: Plin. NH. 15.53
Signium: Plin. NH. 15.55; Juv. 11.73
Syria: Verg. Geo. 2.88; Col. RR. 5.10.18; Plin. NH. 15.53; Mart. 5.78.13; Juv.11.73

Pepper:

India: PME. 56; Plin. NH. 12.26; 12.30; 19.58; Apul. Flor. 6.7; Cosmas. 11.441
Libya: Ath. 2.66D (Ophelion)
Pheasant:

Colchis (Phasianae*): Petr. Sat. 93.2; Plin. NH.10.132, 114; 11.114, 121, 194; 19.52; Mart. 3.58; 13.45; 13.72; Stat. Silv.1.6.77; 4.6.8; Juv. 11.140
(Mysian); Suet. Cal. 22.3; Vit. 13.2; Clem. Alex. Paed. 2.1; Ath. 5.201B (Callicheinus): 9.369A; 9.386E; 9.386F, 387A (Aristophanes); 9.387B
(Mnesimachus, Theophrastus); 9.387C (Agatharchides, Aristotile, Speusippus); 9.387D (Callicheinus, Epainetus); 9.398D (Epicharmonus); 14.654C (Ptolemy XII); 14.654D (Theophrastus); Dig. 32.1.66 pr.1

Pigeons:

Sicily: Ath. 9.395B-C (Alexis, Nicander)

Pigfish (hyes); Aenus: Ath. 7.326F (Archestratus)
Pontus: Ath. 7.326F (Archestratus)

Pigs:

Ephesus: Ath. 9.375A (Hipponax)
Syracuse: Ath. 1.27F (Hermippus)

Pike

Miletus: Ath. 7.289C (Aristophanes); 7.289E (Archippus, Eubulus)
Pistacchios;

Arabia: Ath. 14.649D (Posidonius)

Plaice:

Chalcis: Ath. 7.330B (Archestratus)

Plum:

Armenia: Plin. NH. 15.41

Pomegranates: *Punica mala*: Petr. Sat. 31; Suet. Dom. 1.1; Plin. NH. 13.112 (also Samos, Egypt); 23.106; 27.44

Prawns:

Libya: Ath. 1.7B

Minturnae: Ath. 1.7B-C
Smyrna: Ath. 1.7B

Prickly pear (kaktos): Sicily: Ath. 2.70D

Puddings:

Megara: Ath. 3.127A-B (Antiphanes)
Thessaly: Ath. 1.27E (Hermippus); 3.127A-B (Antiphanes); 3.127C (Alexis)

Quail:

Delos: Ath. 9.392D (Phanodemus)

Quince:

Cydonia*: Prop. 3.13.27; Ovid AA. 3.705; Cal. Sic. 2.91; Petr. Sat. 69.7; Dioscor. 5.20; Plin. NH. 15.37; Apic. Coq. 1.ca.1.12; 1.19.11; 4.237.1; 10.2.12.2; Ath. 3.81C-E (Stesichorus, Cantharus, Philemon, Hermon); 13.601B (Ibycus); Ed. Dio. 6.73
Sicilian: Plin. NH. 23.103

Radish:

Algidan: Plin. NH. 19.81
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Boeotia: Ath. 2.56F (Theophrastus)
Corinth: Ath. 2.56F (Theophrastus)
Megara: Ath. 7. 289A (Apollodorus)
Syrian: Plin. NH. 19.81
Thasos: Ath. 2.56F

Raisins: Rhodes: Ath. 1.27F (Hermippus)
Rape: Thebes: Ath. 1.4D
Rays: Miletus: Ath. 7.329E
Red mullet: Aexone: Ath. 7. 325E-F (Cratinus, Nausicrates)
Teichioessa: Ath. 7.320A, 7.325E (Archestratus)
Thasos: Ath. 7.325E (Archestratus)
Ribbonfish: Canopus: Ath. 7.326A
Rue: Myra: Ath. 2.59B (Diocles)
Saffron: Corycium (Cilicia): Pl. Cuc.102; Prop. 4.6.74; Hor. Sat. 2.4.69; Strab. 14.5.5; Ovid Fast. 1.76; Cels. Med. 6.6.33.2; Col. RR. 3.8.4; 9.4.A; Ciris 317; Luc. BC. 9.809; Plin. NH. 13.5; 13.9; 21.31-3; Mart. Spec. 3.8; Ep. 3.65.2; Ath. 14.688E (Apolonius); 14.689D (Theophrastus); Ed. Dio. 68.15
Tmolus (Cilicia): Verg. Geo. 1.56; Col. RR. 3.8.4
Olympus (Phrygia): Plin. NH. 21.31 (also Centuripa (Sicily), Phlegraea)
Aegina: Ath. 14.689E (Theophrastus)
Africa: Ed. Dio. 68.16
Arabia: Ed. Dio. 68.14
Rhodes: Ath. 14.689E (Apollonius)
Sicily: Strab. 6.2.7; Stat. Silv. 2.4.36

Salpe (cow bream): Mitylene: Ath. 7.321E (Archestratus)
Salt: Salamis (Cyprus): Plin. NH. 31.79, 84 (and many others)
Borysthenes. Hdt 4.53; Dio Cass. 36.3
Megara: Plin. NH. 31.79
Sicilian: Plin. NH. 31.79, 85, 86
Tarentum: Plin. NH. 31.84-6
Tatta (Phrygia): Plin. NH. 31.84, 99

Salt fish (tariche): Bosphorus: Ath. 1.27E (Hermippus); 7.284E (Archestratus)
Phaselis: Ath. 7.302A (Heropythus)
Pontus: Ath. 3.119C (Cratinus); Ath. 6.275A (Polybius)
Sexitania (Spain): Strab. 3.156 ('Exitania'); Ath. 3.121A (Strabo)
Sicily: Ath. 5.209A

Sand shark (carcharias): Torone: Ath. 7.310C (Archestratus)

Sardines: Cyzicus: Ath. 7.328D (Euthydemus)
Gades: Galen 6.747

Sausages: Falisca*: Varro. LL. 5.111.2; Mart. 4.46.8; Stat. Silv. 4.9.35
Lucanica*: Varro RR. 5.111.2; Cic. Fam. 9.16.8; Mart. 4.46.8; 13.35;
Apic.Cq. 2.ca12; 2.4.1.1; 2.4.1.2; 5.3.2.6; 5.3.2.12; 5.3.8.2; 5.4.2.2;
5.4.6.4; 8.7.14.4; Ed. Dio.4.14, 15

Scallops: Alexandria: Plin. NH. 32.150
Altinum: Plin. NH. 32.150
Ambracia: Ath. 3.92D (Archestratus)
Chios: Plin. NH. 32.150
Methymna: Ath. 3.92E (Philyllius)
Mitylene: Plin. NH. 32.150; Ath. 3.86E (Philyllius); 3.92D (Archestratus)
Salonae: Plin. NH. 32.150
Tyndaris: Plin. NH. 32.150

Scorpion (fish): Thasos: Ath. 7.321A (Archestratus)
Sea Bass: Miletus: Ath. 7.311A-D (Archestratus, Aristophanes)
   Ambracia: Ath. 7.311A (Archestratus)
   Calydon: Ath. 7.311A (Archestratus)
   Lake Bolbe: Ath. 7.311A (Archestratus)
Sea Bream (*phagros*): Delos: Ath. 7.327D (Archestratus)
   Eretria: Ath. 7.295D (Antiphanes); 7.327D 9Archestratus
Sea Squirts: Calchedon: Ath. 7.319D (Archestratus)
Sea Urchins: Misenum: Prop.1.114; Hor. Sat. 2.4.42
Selachia: Miletus: Ath. 7.319D (Archestratus)
   Smyrna: Ath. 7.319D (Dorion)
   Cilicia: Col. *RR*. 11.2.56
   Pamphylia: Col. *RR*. 11.2.56
Shabar (fish): Maeotis: Ath. 3.118C (Dorion)
Sheatfish: Danube: Ath. 7.311F
Sharks (*selache*): Miletus: Ath. 7.319E (Archestratus)
   54, 96, 97
   Pelorus: Ath.1.4D
Shrimp: Ambracia: Ath. 3.105E (Archestratus)
   Caria: Ath. 3.105E (Archestratus)
   Carystus: Ath. 7.320D (Antiphanes)
   Macedonia: Ath.3.105E (Archestratus)
Skirret: Gelduba (Germany): Plin. *NH*. 19.90
Snails: *Asterpaeae*: Plin. *NH*. 30.32, 45, 126 (also Balearic, Sicilian (Aetna), Capri)
Snipe: Egypt: Clem. Alex. *Paed*. 2.1
Spelt (*far*): Campania: Varro *RR*. 1.3.6; Plin. *NH*. 3.60
Sprats: Carystus: Ath. 7.295C (Antiphanes)
   Nile: Ath. 7.309A; 311F
   Lipara: Clem. Alex. *Paed*. 2.1; Ath. 1.4D
   Phalerum: Ath. 6. 257D (Macho)
Squid (*teuthis*): Ambracia: Ath. 7.326D (Archestratus)
   Dium: Ath. 7.326D (Archestratus)
   Crete: Plin. *NH*. 18.77
   Egypt: Plin. *NH*. 18.77
Stuffed wombs: Lanuvium: Naev. Ariol. 2.26
Sturgeon: Bosporus: Ath. 3.116B
   Danube: Ath. 3.119A (Sopater)
   India: Plin. *NH*. 12.32
Swordfish: Byzantium: Ath. 3.116C (Euthydemus); Ath.7.314E (Archestratus)
   Cape Pelorus: Ath. 7.314F (Archestratus)
Thresher shark: Rhodes: Ath. 7.286A, 7.294E-295A (Archestratus)
Thrushes: Daphnis: Clem. Alex. *Paed*. 2.1
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Thyme: Attica (Cecropian/Hymettus): Verg. Geo. 4.270; Plin. NH.19.172,21.56-7; Mart. 11.42.4; Quint. Inst. 12.10.25.3; Ath. 1.28D (Antiphanes); 15.681F (Theophrastus) 
Hybla/Sicily: Verg. Ecl. 7.37; Ovid Trist. 5.13.22; Pont. 2.7.26; Mart. 5.39.3; Ath.15.681F Theophrastus) 

Tunny: Byzantium: Hor. Sat. 2.4.66; Plin. NH. 9.50; Stat. Silv. 4.9.12: Ath. 2.45D Hermippus); 3.116C (Euthydemos); 3.116E (Hicesius); 3.117A (Archestratus); 3.118D (Antiphanes); 3.118E (Nicostratus); 3.120F (Diphilus); 7.302A (Archestratus); 7.303E (Archestratus); 7.304E (Archestratus) 7.304F (Antiphanes) 
Cadiz: Ath. 3.118D (Antiphanes) 
Carystus: Ath. 7.302A (archestratus) 
Hipponium: Ath. 7302A (archestratus) 
Megara: Ath. 7.295C (Antiphanes) 
Pachynum: Ath.1.4C 
Samos: Ath. 7.301F (Archestratus) 
Sardinia: Ath. 3.121A (Diphilus) 
Sicily: Ath. 7.302A (Archestratus); 3.116F (Archestratus); 9.399D (Theopompus) 
Cape Tyndaris: Ath. 7.302A (Archestratus) 

Truffles: Africa: Plin. NH. 19.34 
Cyrene: Ath. 2.62A (Theophrastus) 
Elis: Ath. 2.62B 
Lampsacus: Plin. NH. 19.37, Ath. 2.62B 
Mytilene: Ath. 2.62B 

Turbot: Attica: Clem. Alex. Paed. 2.1 
Ravenna: Plin. NH. 9.169 

Turnip: Corinth: Plin. NH. 19.75-6 (also Cleonasian, Liothasan/Thracian, Boeotian) 
Amternum: Plin. NH. 18.131; 19.77 (also Nursia) 
Cephisus: Ath. 9.369C (Cratis) 
Mantinea: Ath. 1.4D 

Vinegar: Cleonae: Ath. 2.67D (Aristophanes, Diphilus) 
Decelae: Ath. 2.67E (Alexis) 
Egyptian: Ath. 2.67C (Chrysippus) 
Methymna (Lesbos): Hor. Sat. 2.8.51 
Sphettium: Ath. 2.67D (Aristophanes, Didymus) 
Thasos: Plin. NH.34.114 

Walnuts: Carystus: Ath. 1.52B (Eubulus) 
Persia: Ath. 1.53D; 1.54C (Mnesitheus); 67A(Amyntas); Ath. 3.82E (Theophrastus) 
Pontus: Ath.1.53F; 1.54A; 

Wheat: Africa: Plin. NH. 18.63 
Boeotia: Plin. NH. 18.63: Ath. 3.112B (Tegea) (Archestratus) 
Phoenicia: Ath. 1.28A (Hermippus); 3.127B (Antiphanes) 
Sicily: Plin. NH. 18.63 

Whelks: Messene: Ath. 3.92D (Archestratus) 

Whitebait (aphues/gonos): Athens/Phalerum: Ath.7.285B (Archestratus); 7.285E (Lynkeus) 
Rhodes: Ath.7.285C (Archestratus, Chrysippus); 7.285E (Lynkeus); 7.293E (Sotades); 8.360D; 11.469B; 14.647A-B (Lynkeus) 

Winkles: Mitylene: Ath. 3.92E (Archestratus) 

Wines: see Appendix 7.3 for a comprehensive listing

1.2 Flowers
Media: Col. *RR.* 2.9.24; 2.9.25; Plin. *NH.* 18.44
Garlands: Caria: Ath. 15.672-3C (Nicaenetus); 15.675F-676C (Polycharmus)
Etruria: Plin. *NH.* 21.6
Naurcatris: Ath.15.671E ((Anacreon); 15.676B-D (Epicharmus)
Iris: Selge (Pisidia): Strab. 12.7.4; Plin. *NH.* 12.4; 15.7; 21.41
Illyria: Plin. *NH.* 21.40-41; Larg. *Comp.* 269.5; Ath. 14. 681F (Theophrastus); Ath. 15.682A (Theophrastus)
Ivy: Three: Ath. 14.683C (Nicander)
Lychnis: Cyprus: Ath. 15. 681F (Posidonius); Ath. 15.682A (Amerias)
Lemnos: Ath. 15. 681F (Posidonius); Ath. 15.682A (Amerias)
Lotus: Alexandria: Ath. 15.677D
Mycene: Egypt: Ath.15.675D (Theophrastus)
Philadelphus: Parthia: Ath. 15.682C (Timachides); 15.682D (Apollodorus)
Roses: Paestum: Verg. *Geo.* 4.119; Prop. 4.5.61; Ovid *Met.* 15.708; *Pont.* 2.4.28;
Col. *RR.* 10.37; Mart. 5.37; 6.80; 9.60; 12.31; (Campania) Plin. *NH.* 21.16
Capua: Ath. 15.689E (Apollonius)
Emathia: Ath. 15.683A (Nicander)
Phaselis: Ath. 15.683C (Nicander); 14.688E (Apollonius)
Praeneste: Plin. *NH.* 21.16; Mart. 9.60
Miletus: Plin. *NH.* 21.16; Ath. 15.683B (Nicander)
(Many others listed in Plin. *NH.* 21.16-19.)
Cyrene: Ath.15.682B (Theophrastus)
Violets: Tusculum: Plin. *NH.* 21.27 (also Calatian)

1.3 Cosmetics, fragrance, unguents, spices, herbs, etc.
Ammi: Egypt: Diosc. 3.68; Plin. *NH.* 19.162
Amomum: India: Plin. *NH.* 12. 48 (also Armenia, Media, Pontus)
Armenia: Diosc. *Mat. Med.*1.14 (also Media, Pontus)
Pontus: Pl. *Truc.*540
Syria: *Ciris* 512
Aristolochia: Pontus: Plin. *NH.*25.97
Asafoetida (*laserpitium*): Parthia: Plin. *NH.* 19.40; Apic. *Coq.*1.30.1.1; 3.13.1.2; 7.1.3.1
Asarum: Illyria: Diosc. Mat. Med. 1.9; Plin. NH 12.47
Phrygia: Diosc. Mat. Med. 1.9; Plin. NH 12.47
Pontus: Diosc. Mat. Med. 1.9; Plin. NH 12.47

Balsam: Alexandria: Ed. Dio. 68.69
Arabia/Nabataea: Strab. 16.2.41 (Jericho); Diod. Sic. 2.48.6; 3.46.2, 19.
Judaea: Col. RR. 3.8.4; Jos. Ant. Jud. 8.6.5; 14.4.1; Bl. 6.6; 18.5;
Diosc. Mat. Med. 1.18; Plin. NH 12.111, 113, 118; 16.135; Ed. Dio. 68.70

Bdellium: India (Bactria): Plin. NH. 12.35 (Also Arabia, Babylon, Media); PME. 37

Ben oil (myrobalan): Egypt: Plin. NH. 12.100, 15.28

Calamus: India: Diosc. Mat. Med. 1.17
Syria: Plin. NH. 12.104 (also Arabia, India); 13.18

Concamum (gum benjamin): Nabataea (via Trogodytae): PME. 8; Plin. NH. 12.98

Cardamom: India: Plin. NH. 12.50
Arabia: Plin. NH. 12.50
Comagene: Diosc. Mat. Med. 1.5 (also India, Arabia)
Media: Athen 3.104F (Nicander)
Miletus: Athen 2.45C (Eubulus)

Cassia (Chinese cinnamon): Arabia: Diosc. Mat. Med. 1.13
Aethiopia: Plin. NH. 12.95
Syria: Ath. 9.403D (Mnesimachus)

Castorea: Africa: Plin. NH. 32.27
Dalmatia: Ed. Dio. 68.78
Galatia: Plin. NH. 32.27
Pontus: Verg. Geo. 1.58; Strab. 3.14.5; Plin. NH. 32.27; Scrib. Larg. Comp. 175.1; Ed. Dio. 68.77

Centaury: Arcadia: Plin. NH. 25.67 (also Elis, Messenia, etc.)

Cimolian earth: Cimolos: Ovid Met. 7.463; Col. RR. 6.17.4; Plin. NH. 20.212; 21.138; 26.121; 28.110, 163; 29.111; 31.118; 34.155; 35.36, 194, 195-6, 198

Cinnamon: Aethiopia: Strab. 16.4.19, 25; Plin. NH. 12.86; Stat. Silv. 5.3.43
Assyria: Stat. Theb. 6.61
Commagene: Plin. NH. 29.55
India: Strab. 15.1 22
Panchaea: Ov. Met. 10.308-9
Saba (Arabia): Diod. Sic. 2.49.3; 3.46.3; Mela Chor. 3.79.2; Sen. Oed. 117;
Plin. NH. 10.97, 12.82, 85, 99; Stat. Silv. 4.5.32
Trogodytae: Plin. NH. 6.174, 12.86, 12.98

Cloves (caryophyllon): India: Plin. NH. 12.30
Convolvulus juice: Cyprus: Ath. 1.28D Antiphanes)
Cosmetics: Sardis; Ath. 15.690 (Ion)

Costum (Putchuk): Arabia: Diod. Sic. 2.49; Diosc. Mat. Med. 1.15
Persia (Achaemenium): Hor. Od. 3.1.44
Syria: Diosc. Mat. Med. 1.15

Cyperus (galingale): India: Plin. NH. 21.17
Hammon: Plin. NH. 21.60; 21.117
Rhodes: Plin. NH. 21.60, 21.117
Thera: Plin. NH. 21.117
Egypt: Plin. NH. 21.117; Ath. 15 665E (Apollonius)

Cyperis (Turmeric): India: Diosc. Mat. Med. 1.5; Plin. NH. 21.117
Dittany: Crete: Plin. NH. 25.92
Elaterium: Arabia: Plin. NH. 20.7 (also Arcadia, Cyrene)
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Fish glue: Pontus: Plin. NH. 32.73
Frankincense: Arabia/Saba; Pl. Truc. 540; Verg. Geo.1.57, 2.117; Ov. Fast. 4.569; Strab. 16.4.19; Manil. 4.654-5; Grat. Cyn.132; Diod. Sic. 2.49.2; 3.42.5; 3.46.3; 5.41.4; 19.94.5; Col. RR. 10.262; Diosc. Mat. Med.1.81; Plin. NH. 6.154; 12.51.2; Arr. Alex. 8.41; Claud. Stil. Cos. 1.57
Euphrates: Ov. Fast. 1.341
Panchaea: Verg. Geo. 2.139, 4.379; Culex 87; Lucret. 2.417; Tib. 2.23; Apul. de Mund. 35.28;
Galbanum: Syria: Plin. NH. 12.126
Gentian: Illyria: Plin. NH. 25.71
Ginger: Arabia: Diosc. Mat. Med. 2.160; Plin. NH.12.28
Trogodytica: Diosc. Mat. Med. 2.160; Plin. NH.12.28
Hairpieces: Germania: Ov. Am. 1.14.45-6, Mart. 5.37.8, 5.68, 14.26, Juv. 13.165
Hellebore: Anticyra: Hor. Sat. 2.3.82-3; Ars 300; Ov. ex Pont. 4.3.54; Plin. NH. 25.52.5; Gell. NA. 17.15.6
Thasos: Plin. NH.14.110.4
Hemlock: Susa: Plin. NH. 25.154 (also Laconia, Crete, etc)
Henna: Cyprus: Ath. 14.688F (Apollonius)
Phoenicia (Sidon): Ath. 14.688F (Apollonius)
Hyssop: Cilicia: Plin. NH. 14.109; 25.136 (Mt Taurus) (also Pamphylia, Smyrna)
Iris: Selge (Pisidia) Strab. 12.7.4 Plin. NH 12.4; 15.7; 21.41
Corinth: Plin. NH.13.5
Cyzicus: Plin. NH.13.5; Pausan. 4.35.8; Ath. 14.688E (Apollonius)
Illyria: Cels. Med. 5.18.3.3; Diosc. Mat. Med.1.1 (also Macedonia); Plin. NH. 13.14, 18; Larg. Comp. 269.5
Ladanum: Arabia: Diosc. Mat. Med.1.128 (also Libya); Plin. NH. 12.73; 26.47 (also Cyprus, Syria, Africa)
Laurel: Delphi: Plin. NH. 23.157 (also Alexandria/Ida)
Liquorice: Cilicia: Plin. NH. 22.24
Pontus: Plin. NH. 22.24
Scythia: Plin. NH. 26.28, 146; 27.2
Mace (macir): India: Plin. NH. 12.32
Malabathrum (cinnamon leaf): India: Diosc. Mat. Med. 1.11; PME.65; Plin. NH. 12.129 (also Syria, Egypt); Apic. Coq. 1.30.22
Cirrhadia: Ptol. 7.2.15-16
Marjoram: Cos: Ath. 15.688E (Apollonius)
Cyzicus: Plin. NH. 13.14
Mastic: Chios: Diosc. Mat. Med. 11.42; 1.70; 1.90; Plin. NH.12.72, 14.128; 24.43, 12137.51; Mart. 14.22; Galen 10.322,499; Apic. 1.1, 1.3; Ed. Dio. 68.17
India: Plin. NH.12.72
Pontus: Plin. NH.12.72, 14.128
Myrobalanum: Syria: Plin. NH. 12.101
Myrrh: Arabia: Diod. Sic. 2.49.2; 3.46.3; 5.41.4;19.94.5; Diosc. Mat. Med. 1.78; Plin. NH. 12.51.4; 12.81
Achaia: Col. RR. 10.173
Gedrosia: Strab. 15.2.3
India: Plin. NH. 12.71.4
Panchaea: Ov. Met. 10.310
Syria (Orontea): Prop. 1.2.3; Ath. 3.101C (Archestratus); 4.131D (Anaxandrides)
Trogodytica: PME. 7; Ed. Dio. 68.58

**Narcraphton:** India: Diosc. Mat. Med. 1.22
Nard:
Assyria: Hor. Epod. 13.8-9; Od. 2.11.16.4.12.13 (‘Achaemenid’)
Celtic/Gallic: Cels. Med. 5.23.1b.3; 5.23.3a.5; 5.25.6.1; Scrib. Larg. Comp. 177.6; Col. RR. 12.20.5; Diosc. Mat. Med. 1.7; Plin. NH. 12.44-7; 13.18; 14.106-7; 15.30; 21.135; 27.48-50
Crete: Plin. NH. 12.45; 21.115.6
Gedrosia: Strab. 15.2.3
India: Cels. Med. 5.23.2.5; 6.6.6.2; 6.6.9a.1; Grat. Cyn. 314; Strab. 15.1.22; PME. 48, 49, 56, 63; Plin. NH. 12.42; 13.16; 62; Scrib. Larg. Comp. 120.5; 144.8; 177.6; Diosc. Mat. Med. 1.6; Sen. Phaed. 387-91; Plin. NH. 12.44; 14.107; Scrib. Larg. Comp. 70.17: 110.5; 113.2; 173.1; 176.5; 271.17; Ath. 15.689E (‘Tarsus’)

**Nasturtium: Babylonia:** Plin. NH. 20.130
**Nutmeg (comacum): Syria:** Plin. NH. 12.135
**Nymphaea:** Orchomenus: Plin. NH. 25.75 (also Marathon, Peneus)
Oenanthe:
Adramyttium: Ath. 15.688E (Apollonius); Ath. 15.689A (Apollonius)
Cyprus: Plin. NH. 13.5; Ath. 15.688E (Apollonius)
Syria: Plin. NH. 23.8
Opium:
**Cyrene: Ed. Dio. 68.105**
Thebes: Ed. Dio. 68.104
Perfumes:
Athens (panathenaicon): Plin. NH. 13.6; Ath. 1.27E (Antiphanes); 15.665B (Plato); Ath. 15.688F (Apollonius)
Delos: Plin. NH. 13.4
Egypt: Plin. NH. 13.4, 5, 8, 17 (Mendes); Ath. 2.66D; 3.124B (Dexcricrates); Ath. 15.688F (Apollonius); Ath. 15.689B (Anaxandrides); 15.690E (Eubulus)
Syria: Ath. 6 258B (Clearchus); Ath. 15.689B (Apollonius)
Quince-perfume: Cos: Ath. 15.688E (Apollonius)
Resin:
Arabia: Plin. NH. 14.122 (also Syria, Cyprus, Colophon)
Rue:
Macedonia: Plin. NH. 20.131 (also Galatia)
Seaweed:
Crete: Plin. NH. 32.66
Silver sage:
Aethiopia: Plin. NH. 27.11-12 (also Mt Ida, Messenia)
Scammony:
Colophon: Plin. NH. 26.59 (also Mysia, Priene)
Silphium:
Cyrene: Strab. 17.2.22, 23; Vitruv. 8.3.13; Plin. NH. 5.33; 15.15; 19.38, 50; 22.100-6; Larg. Comp. 67.3; 175.6; 177.7; Paus. 3.16.3; Ath. 1.27E (Hermippus); 3.100F (Antiphanes); 14.623B (Antiphanes) (Libyan)
Bactria: Strab. 15.2 10
Hymettus: Ath. 1.28D (Antiphanes)
Soap (spuma):
Batava/ Chattica: Ov. AA. 3.163, Plin. NH. 28.191; Mart. 8.33.20, 14.26, 14.27
Spleenwort:
Crete; Plin. NH. 27.34
Sponges:
Africa: Plin. NH. 31.130-1
Lycia: Plin. NH. 9.149
Rhodes: Plin. NH. 31.131
Stonecrop:
Crete: Plin. NH. 27.99
Sulphur:
Melos: Plin. NH. 35.174 (also Aeolian Is., Campania
Styrax:
Cilicia: Diosc. Mat. Med. 1.179; Plin. NH. 12.125; Ed. Dio. 68.11
Selge (Pisidia): Strab. 12.7.3; Diosc. Mat. Med. 1.179; Plin. NH. 12.125

Sweet Rush: Nabatea: Plin. NH. 12.104 (also India, Syria); 21.120
Babylon: Plin. NH. 21.120
Africa: Plin. NH. 21.120

Wax: Cyprus: Plin. NH. 24.23; 36.133
Punic: Vitruv. 7.9.3, 4; Plin. NH. 21.49 (also Pontus, Corsica)

Wormwood: Pontus: Plin. NH. 14.109; 26.91; 27.45; Ed. Dio. 68.19

1.4 Textiles, clothing and dyes

Asbestos; Carystus: Strab. 10.1.6
India: Plin. NH. 19.19

Ganges: PME. 62
Tylos (Bahrain): Plin. NH. 12.38-9
Spain: Strab. 3.4.9; Plin. NH. 11.18; 37.203; Gell. NA. 17.3.2-5; Ath. 5.206E (Moschion)

Flax: Carpasos: Paus. 1.26.7
Elis: Paus. 5.5.2; 6.26.6; 7.21.14
India: Curt. Ruf. Hist. 8.9.15
Gaul: Bituriges, Caurci, Caleti, Morini, Ruteni – Plin. NH. 19.9

Iberia: Ath. 5.206F (Moschion)
Mylae: Plin. NH.19.174

Hides: Babylon: Ed. Dio. 8.1; Dig.39A.16.7.5
Cyrene: Ath. 1.27E (Hermippus)
Phoenicia: Ed. Dio. 8.3
Sparta (Lacaena): Ed. Dio. 8.4
Tarrles: Ed. Dio.8.2

Colchis: Strab. 11.2.
India: Curt. Ruf. Hist. 8.9 15; 8.921; Arr. Alex.8.16
Laodicea: Ed. Dio. 56.20, 26, 32, 46 52, 58, 64, 70, 76, 99, 105, 111, 125, 131, 137, 151, 157, 163, 177, 183,189, 202, 208, 214, 227, 234, 240,250, 266,272, 278, 288
Malta: Diod. Sic. 5.12.2
Tyre: Mart. 4.19
Silk: Arabia (*bombyx*): Prop. 2.3.15
Assyria (*bombyx*): Plin. *NH*. 11.75.1, 77.8
Cos: Arist *Anim.* 55.1b13; Prop. 1.2.2; 4.2.33; Pers. 5.135;
Plin. *NH*.11.75-6; Mart. 8.33; 8.68; 14.24; Juv. 6.626; Apul. *Met*. 8.27
Cos (*bombyx*): Plin. *NH*. 11.76.5, 77.1
Wool: Altinum: Col. *RR*.7.2.3; Plin. *NH*. 8.190; Mart. 14.155; *Ed. Dio*. 51.2; 55.4
Apulia/Tarentum: Varro *RR*.3.18; Hor. *Ep*. 1.17.30; *Od*. 2.6.10; Strab. 6.3.6, 9; Petr. *Sat*. 38; Calp. Sic. 2.69; Colum. *RR*. 7.2.3; Plin. *NH*. 8.190-1;
29.33; Mart. 5.37; 8.28; 12.63; 14.155; *Ed. Dio*. 51.2; 55.5
Attica: Varro *RR*.3.18; Plin. *NH*.29.33; Ath. 5.219A
Baetica: Strab. 3.2.6; Col. *RR*. 7.2.4; Plin. *NH*. 8.191; Mart. 1.96.5; 5.37;
8.28; 9.61; 12.65; 12.98; 14.133; Juv. 12.40: *Ed. Dio*. 55.7 (Asturia)
6.150; Suet. *Ner*. 30
Galaesus (Sparta): Stat. *Silv*. 3.3.93
Galatia: Plin. *NH*. 29.33
Laodicea: Strab. 12.8.16; *Ed. Dio*. 49.25-27; 51.2; 55.6
12.519B (Athenodorus)
Mutina: Strab. 5.1.12; Col. *RR*. 7.2.3. Mart.3.59; *Ed. Dio*. 49. 13, 21, 23-26;
51.1; 55.1
Parma: Col. *RR*. 7.2.3; Mart. 2.43; 5.13; 14.155
Pollentia: Strab. 4.6.2; 5.1.12; Sil. *Pun*. 8.597; Col. *RR*. 7.2.4; Plin. *NH*.
8.191; Mart. 14.157, 158
Bedding/cushions: Tralles: *Ed. Dio*. 8.3; 56.299
Antinoe: *Ed. Dio*.56.299
Cyprus: *Ed. Dio*.56.300
Damascus: *Ed. Dio*.56.300
Corinth:(blankets) Ath. 1.27D
Boots: Varda (Dalmatia): Mart. 4.4; Juv.16.13
Carpets: Africa: *Ed. Dio*.49.35
Britannia: *Ed. Dio*. 49.28
Cappadocia: *Ed. Dio*.49.30
Carthage: Ath. 1.28A (Hermippus)
Egypt: *Ed. Dio*. 49.32
Persia: Ath. 5.197B (Callixeinus)
Pontus: Ed. Dio. 49.30
Sardis: Ath. 6.253C (Clearchus); 12.532C (Heraclides)

Cloaks, etc.

Corinth: Ath. 13.582A (Machon)

Banatus: Gaul: Ed. Dio. 49.53
- Noricum: Ed. Dio. 49.52
Bedox: Gaul: Ed. Dio. 49.55
- Noricum: Ed. Dio. 49.54

Byrrus: Ed. Dio. 49. 37ff: 17 origins: Laodicea, Nervii, Taugastrum, Ripensis (Dacia), Noricum, Britain, Meditomagus (Egypt), Canusium, Numidia, Argolid, Achaea (or Phrygia'), Africa: cf. 52.21-26
- Canusium: Plin. NH. 8.190; Mart. 9.22.9; 14.127; 14.129; Juv. 6.150; Suet. Ner. 30.3

Cuculli: 'Gaulish':
- Leuconian: Mart. 11.21; 14.159
- Liburnian: Plin. NH. 8.191; Mart. 14.140
- Lingonian: Mart. 1.53
- Santonian: Mart. 14.128; Juv. 8.145
- Venetian: Juv. 3.170

Dalmaticomafortium: Mutina: Ed. Dio. 49.513

Fibulatorium: Africa: Ed. Dio. 49.65
- Laodicea: Ed. Dio. 49.25,27; 52.19
- Mutina: Ed. Dio. 49.24; 52.18
- Petovium: Ed. Dio. 49.64
- Rhaetia: Ed. Dio. 49.62
- Treveri: Ed. Dio. 49.63

Paenula: Laodicea: Ed. Dio. 49.60
- Balesium: Ed. Dio. 49.61

Rachana: Arabia: Ed. Dio. 49.6
- Damascus: Ed. Dio. 49.6

Sagum: Africa: Ed. Dio. 49.69
- Ambianum: Ed. Dio. 49.70
- Gaul: Ed. Dio. 49.70 ('or Biturigan')
- Liguria: Strab. 4.6.2

Singellio: Frugiacum (Brittany) Ed. Dio. 49.59 ('or Bessian')
- Gaul: Ed. Dio. 49.57
- Noricum: Ed. Dio. 49.56
- Numidia: Ed. Dio. 49.58

Cushions:
Carthage: Ath. 1.28A (Hermippus)
Doric: Ath. 6.253 (Clearchus)
Sicily: Ath. 2.47F (Eubulus)

Drapes/cloths: Attalicae (Pergamon): Cic. Verr. 2.4.27; Prop. 2.32.11-12; 3.18.19; (peristromata): 4.5.24; Val. Max. 9.1.5; Plin. NH. 7.196; 8.196; 33.63; 36.115; 37.12
- Babylonian: Plaut. Stich. 379
- Campanian: Plaut. Pseud. 146

Embroidery: Babylonian: Plin. NH. 8.196
Fabrics: Salacia: Strab. 3.2.6; Plin. NH. 8.7

Handtowels/Knapkins: Gaul: Ed. Dio. 56.326
Robes:
Media: Ath. 12.518A (Xenophon)
Persia: Ath. 11.484D (Menander); 12.522C (Timaeus): 12.525B-C; 12.521E (Epiphonus)
Sicily: Ath. 14.658B (Philemon)
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Tarentum: Ath. 14.622B (Serenus)

Rugs (hair):
Cilicia: Cic. Verr. 2.1.95; Sis. Fr. 107.2; Varro RR. 2.11.12: Plin. NH. 5.145; Suet. Aug. 75.1; Dig. 19.1.17.4;

Shawls:
Laconia: Ath. 5.198F (Callixeinus)

Slippers:
Babylon: Ed. Dio. 14.1 (calcei); 15.4 (socci)

Gaul:
Cic. Phil. 2.76; Gell. NA. 13.22; Ed. Dio. 13.1-3

Phoenicia:
Suet. Aug. 75.1; Dig. 19.1.17.4;

Shawls:
Laconia: Ath. 5.195C (Posidonius); 11.484B (Critias)

Tunics (chlamys/tunicus):
Dardanus: Ed. Dio. 49.66-

Purple:
Tyre: Cat. 61.108.165; Verg. Geo. 2.506; 3.17; 3.307; Prop. 3.137;

Tib. 1.2.77; Ov. A.A. 2.297; 3.172; Med. Fac. 1.9; Met. 6.222; Trist. 2.534;

Strab. 16.2.23; Manil. 5.258; Sen. Thy. 955; Oed. 413; Petr. Sat. 30; Luc. BC. 3.217; Plin. NH. 5.76; 9.127, 135, 137; 21.45; Stat. Silv. 3.2.139

Mart. 1.53.5; 2.29.3; 6.11.7; 8.10.2; 14.156; Quint. Inst. 12.10.75; Juv. 7.134; Suet. Nero. 32.3; Paus. 5.12.4 (Phoenician);

Africa/Punic/Gaetulia: Strab. 17.3.18; Hor. Epist. 2.2.181; Od. 2.16.35; Tib. 2.3.58; Ov. Fast. 2.3.19; Sil. Pun. 436; Plin. NH. 9.127 (Meninx, Gaetulia)

Ancona: Sil. Pun. 8.437

Laconia: Hor. Od. 2.18.1-5; Plin. NH. 9.125-8; 21.45; Mart. 14.156; Paus. 3.21.6

Miletus: Ed. Dio. 54.6,7

Nicaea: Ed. Dio. 54.8

Sidon: Verg. Aen. 4.137; Hor. Epist. 1.10.26; Tib. 3.3.18; Prop. 2.16.55; Ov. Met. 10.267; Luc. BC. 3.217; Sil. Pun. 8.436; Stat. Silv. 3.2.140; 5.1.1225; Mart. 2.16.3; 14.154

Tarentum: Hor. Epist. 1.10.26; Plin. NH. 9.137

1.5 Furniture, furnishings, etc.

Amphorae: Chios: Plin. NH. 36.59

Beds: Delos: Plin. NH. 33.144

Chios/Miletus: Ath. 1.28B; 11.486E

Corinth: Ath. 1.27D (Antiphanes)

Bronze statuettes: Tuscanica*: Plin. NH. 34.34

Bronze ware: Etruria: Ath. 1.28C (Critias)

Calices: Placentia: Cic. Pis. 67

Casks: Megara: Ath. 1.28D (Eubulus)

Cauldrons: Argos: Ath. 1.27E (Antiphanes)

Couches: Chios: Ath. 1.28C (Critias)

Delos: Plin. NH. 33.144

Miletus: Ath. 1.28C (Critias)

Punic: Plin. NH. 33.144

Sicily: Ath. 2.47F (Eubulus)

Cups: Etruria: Ath. 1.28 (Critias)

Lesbos: Ath. 11.486A

(skyphoi) Boeotia: Ath. 11.500A-B (Bacchylides)

Rhodes: Ath. 11.500B

Syracuse: Ath. 11.500B

Door joinery styles: Greek: Plin. NH. 16.225 (also Campanian, Sicilian)
Glass: Phoenicia [Sidon]: Strab. 16.2.25; Plin. *NH*. 36.190
Alexandria: *Ed. Dio.* 41.1,3
Campania (Volturnus): Plin. *NH*. 36.194 (also Gaul, Spain)
India: Plin. *NH*. 36.192
Judaea: *Ed. Dio.* 41.2
Sidon: Luc. *Am*. 26

Gold cups: Etruria: Ath. 1.28C (Critias)
Keys: Sparta: Ath. 7.303B (Aristophanes)
Lampstand (*lychnia*): Etruria: Ath. 15.700C (Pherecrates)
Myrrhine: Carmania: Plin. *NH*. 37.21
Pans: Sicily: Ath. 1.28D (Eubulus)
Tableware/pottery: Samian: Tib. 2.3.47-8 (Cumae); Plin. *NH*. 35.160, 165 (also Surrentine, Asta, Pollentia, Saguntum, Pergamum, Tralles, Erythrae, Cos, Adria, Mutina); Gell. *NA*. 17.8.5
Campania: Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.144, Mart. 14.114
Arretium: Plin. *NH*. 35.160; Mart. 1.53.6,14.98
Cnidos: Ath. 1.28D (Eubulus)
Rhosis: Ath. 6. 230A

Thrones: Thessaly: Ath. 1.28B (Critias)
Tripods: Delphi: Ath. 5.198C-D (Callixeinus)
Writing stylus: Alexandria: *Ed. Dio.* 48.2
Wooden vessels: Nuceria: Strab. 5.2.10

1.6 Precious Stones, etc
Agate: Crete: Plin. *NH*. 37.139
Cyprus: Plin. *NH*. 37.141 (also Trachinia, Parnassus, Lesbos, Messene, Rhodes)
Egypt (Thebes): Plin. *NH*. 37.141
Phrygia: Plin. *NH*. 37.141
Sicily: Plin. *NH*. 37.139
Amber: Glaesaria: Plin. *NH*. 4.97, 103; 37.42-6; Tac. *Ger.* 45.4
Linguria: Strab. 4.5.3; 4.6.2
India: Plin. *NH*. 37.46
Eridanus (Po): Paus. 5.12.7 (see Plin. *NH*. 4.97)
Amethyst: India: Plin. *NH*. 37.91, 121, 122
Arabia: Plin. *NH*. 37.121,122
Armenia: Plin. *NH*. 37.121
Egypt: Plin. *NH*. 37.121 (also Cyprus, Thasos)
Beryl: India: Plin. *NH*. 37.78
Pontus: Plin. *NH*. 37.79
Africa: Plin. *NH*.37.165
Cyprus: Plin. *NH*.37.165
Carbuncle: India: Ath.12.523C
Assos: Plin. *NH*. 37.105
India: Plin. *NH*. 37.105
Paros: Plin. *NH*. 37.105 (also Arabia, Egypt, Epirus)
Coral: Aeolian Is: Plin. NH. 32.21
Gravisca: Plin. NH. 32.21
Malta: Grat. Cyn. 404
Neapolis: Plin. NH. 32.21
Sicily: Diosc. Mat. Med. 5.138
Stoechades (Hyère): Plin. NH. 32.21

Crystal:
India: Plin. NH. 37.23
Alps: Plin. NH. 37.23
Asia: Plin. NH. 37.23, 25
Cyprus: Plin. NH. 37.23, 25
Lusitania: Plin. NH. 37.24

Diamond: Ethiopia: Plin. NH. 37.55
India: Plin. NH. 37.56
Arabia: Plin. NH. 37.56

Emerald: Aethiopia: Plin. NH. 37.69
Bactria: Plin. NH. 37.65
Cyprus: Plin. NH. 37.66, 67
India: Prop. 3.18.19; Plin. NH. 37.115
Scythia: Plin. NH. 37.64, 65, 67; Mart. 4.28; 14.109
Egypt: Plin. NH. 37.64, 65 (also Attica, Media)

Garnet (carbunculus): India: Plin. NH. 37.92, 94, 96
Carchedonia: Plin. NH. 37.92, 95-6
Alabanda: Plin. NH. 37.92, 96
Aethiopia: Plin. NH. 37.92, 94, (also Orchomenos, Chios, Troezen, Corinth)

Hyacinthos: Ethiopia: Plin. NH. 37.126

Ivory:
India: Ter. Eun. 413; Cat. 61.109; Lucr. 2.538; Diod. Sic. 2.35.3, 2.42.1; 19.15.5; Verg. Geo. 1.58; Hor. Od. 1.31.6; Ovid. Med. Fac. 1.10; Petr. Sat. 135; Plin. NH. 8.7, 27; 35.42-3; Mart. 1.72, 2.43.9, 5.37.5, 10.98.6, 14.5, 14.12, 14.14, 14.77, 14.78; Stat. Silv. 3.3.87; Dio. Chrys. 79.4
Aethiopia: Diod. Sic. 1.55.1: 2.16.4; 3.26; Plin. NH. 6.173; 8.31; Juv. 11.124
Africa/Libya/Numidia/Mauretania: Diod. Sic. 2.16.4, 2.51.4; Plin. NH. 8.27; Juv. 11.125; Ath. 1.27F (Hermippus); 6.236B (Achaeus)
Dosarene (India): PME. 62

Jasper (carchedonia): Nasamones: Plin. NH. 37.104
Egypt: Plin. NH. 37.104

Jasper (iaspis): Cyprus: Plin. NH. 37.115
India: Plin. NH. 37.115
Persia: Plin. NH. 37.115 (also Amisos, Caspian, Cappadocia, Chalcedon, Phrygia, Thermodon)

Lapis lazuli (cyanos): Scythia: Plin. NH. 37.119
Cyprus: Plin. NH. 37.119
Egypt: Plin. NH. 37.119

(sapphiros): Media: Plin. NH. 37.120

Malachite: Arabia: Plin. NH. 37.114

Murrhine (fluorite): Carmania: Plin. NH. 37.20
Diospolis (Thebes): PME. 6
Parthia: Prop. 4.5.26; Plin. NH. 37.20

Onyx:
Arabia: Plin. NH. 36.59; 37.90
Carmania: Plin. NH. 36.59
India: Plin. NH. 37.90, 91

Opal:
India: Plin. NH. 37.80, 130
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Egypt: Plin. *NH.* 37.84, 130
Arabia: Plin. *NH.* 37.84, 130
Pontus: Plin. *NH.* 37.84, 130 (also Galatia, Thasos, Cyprus)

**Pearls:**
- Erythraea: Tib. 2.430 (*concha e rubro mare*); Plin. *NH.* 9.106, 113 (*in rubro mari*); 12.2; 37.62 (Arabia); Mart. 5.37.4; 9.2.9; 9.12.5; 10.17; Stat. *Silv.* 4.6.18; Ath. 3.92E (Isidore)
- India: Prop. 1.8.39 (*Indis conchis*); 3.4.2; Hor. *Epist.* 1.6.5; Strabo 15.1.67; Petr. *Sat.* 55.6.9; Curt. *Ruf. Hist.* 8.9.19; Plin. *NH.* 9.106, 113; 37.62; *PME.* 59; Mart. 5.37; 7.30; 10.17; 10.38.5; Arr. *Alex.* 8.8; Ath. 3.93A-D (Androsthenes, Chares, Theophrastus)

**Sandastros:**
- India: Plin. *NH.* 37.100-1
- Arabia: Plin. *NH.* 37.100-1

**Sapphire (asteria):** Carmania: Plin. *NH.* 37.131
- India: Plin. *NH.* 37.131

**Sardonyx:**
- India: Plin. *NH.* 37.87.89, 90, 91, 105; Mart. 4.28
- Arabia: Plin. *NH.* 37.87.88
- Armenia: Plin. *NH.* 37.89


**Tourmaline (lychnis):** Caria: Plin. *NH.* 37.103
- India: Plin. *NH.* 37.103

**Tortoiseshell:** Chryse (Malaysia?): *PME.* 63
- Taprobane: *PME.* 61

**Turquoise (callaina):** Carmania: Plin. *NH.* 37.110,

### 1.7 Animals

**Asses:**
- (wild)

**Bison:**
- Paeonia: Plin. *NH.* 8.40; Paus. 10.13.1

**Camels:**
- Bactria: Plin. *NH.* 8.67; Ath. 5.219A
- India: Paus. 9.21.2

**Cattle:**
- Ethiopia: Ath. 5.201C (*Callixeinus*)
- Falerii: *Ov. Fast.* 1.83-4; *ex Pont.* 4.4.32; Plin. *NH.* 2.230
- India: Ath. 5.201 C (*Callixeinus*)
- Liguria: Col. *RR.* 3.8.3
Mevania: Col. RR 3.8.3

Crocodiles:
Nile/Egypt: Cic. ND. 1.82.4; Diod. Sic. 2.51.4; Vitruv. 8.2.7; Curt. Ruf. Hist. 8.9.9 Plin. NH. 8.89; 28.31; Paus. 4.34.3
India: Curt. Ruf. Hist. 8.9.9; Paus. 4.34.3
Libya: Paus. 2.28.1

Elephants:
Africa/Libya/Aethiopia: Lucret. 6.1114, Diod. Sic.1.55; 2.51.4; 3.26; Curt. Ruf. Hist. 8.9.17; Luc. BC, 6.208; Sil. Pun. 3.459; Plin. NH. 5.18, 8.27; 8.32; Manil. 4.666; Juv. 10.150, 11.124-5
India/Indicus: Plaut. Mil. 25, Ter. Eun. 413, Lucret. 2.537; Curt. Ruf. Hist. 8.9.9; Paus. 2.28.1
Libya: Paus. 2.28.1

Ferrets:
Libya: Strab. 3.2.6

Fighting Cocks:
Chalcis: Plin. NH. 10.48
Melos: Plin. NH. 10.48
Rhodes: Plin. NH.10.48
Tanagra: Plin. NH. 10.48

Goats:
Brattia (Illyricum): Plin. NH. 3.152
Scyros: Strab. 9.5.16; Ath.1.28A(Pindar); 12.536A (Alexis)

Hippopotamus:
Nile: Diod. Sic. 2.51.4; Plin. NH.8.95; Paus. 4.34.3

Hogs:
Syracuse: Ath. 1.27E (Hermippus)

Horses:
Apulia: Strab. 6.3.9
Arcadia: Strab. 8.8.1
Argolid: Strab. 8.8.1
Campania: Lucil. 506M; Liv. 8.11.5; 26.4.3; Val. Max. 2.3.3
Cappadocia: Nemes. Cyn. 240-50,
Celtiberia: Strab. 3.4.15 (Poseidonius)
Cyrene: Athen. 3.100F (Antiphanes)
Epidaurus: Verg. Geo. 3.44-5; Strab. 8.8.1
Epirus: Verg. Geo 1.59
Italy: Grat. Cyn. 539-40; Plin. NH. 37.202
Macedonia: Grat. Cyn. 532
Nesaea (Media): Strab. 11.13.7, 11.14.10
Numidia: Grat. Cyn. 518
Parthia: Strab. 3.4.15 (Poseidonius); Grat. Cyn. 508
Sicily (Acragas): Grat. Cyn. 526
Spain: Grat. Cyn. 514-5; (Asturco) Petr. Sat. 86.6; Plin. NH. 8.166; Mart. 14.199; Suet. Nero 46
Thessaly: Grat. Cyn. 228, 503; Petr. Sat. 89; Apul. Met.1.2; Ath. 7.278E (Archestratus)

Thrace: Grat. Cyn.524

Hounds:
Aelian: Arist. Nat. Anim. 3.2
Aetolia: Grat. Cyn.187
Britain: Strab. 4.5.2; Grat. Cyn.175-9
Caria: Dio Chrys. 15.30
Crete: Lucret. 4.441; Grat. Cyn. 212; Sen. Phaedr. 34; Mart. 11.69; Arrian Cyn. 3;
Hyrcania: Grat. Cyn.161; Ath. 5.201B (Callixeinus)
India: Ath. 5.201B (Callixeinus)
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Maltese: Ath. 12.519D (Athenodorus Timon)

Media: Grat. Cyn. 155

Molossus: Virg. Geo. 3.405; Hor. Epod. 6.5; Grat. Cyn 181, Luc. BC. 4.440; Nemes. Cyn. 107; Ath. 5.201B (Callixeinus); 7.308D; 12.540d-541A; 12 542A; Culex 331

Sparta/Taygetus: Virg. Geo. 3.44; 339-47; 405; Prop. 3.14.12; Hor. Epod. 6.5; Grat. Cyn. 212; Petr. Sat. 40; Nemes. Cyn. 107 (= Amyclean); Dio Chrys.8.11;15.30; Ath. 1.28A (Pindar); 5.201D (Callixeinus)


Leopards: Libya: Ed. Dio. 63.5-6

Lions: Libya: Ov. AA. 2.183 (Numidia); Manil. 4.666; Ed. Dio. 63.1-4

Mauretania: Ath. 5.201C (Callixeinus)

Mules: Reate: Strab. 5.3.1

Ostrich: Arabia: Ath. 4.145E (Heracleides)

Oxen: Epirus: Plin. NH. 8.176

Parrots: India: Ov. Am. 2.6.1; Plin. NH. 10.117; Apul. Fl. 12.1; Paus. 2.28.1

Rhinoceros: Ethiopia: Paus. 9.21.2; Ath. 5.201C (Callixeinus)

Sheep. Aethiopia: Ath. 5.201C (Callixeinus)

Zebus Aethiopia: Ath. 5.201C (Callixeinus)

1.8 Trees/Timber

Ash: Macedonia: ('humelia') Plin. NH. 16.63

Box: Corsica: Plin. NH 16.71, Diod.Sic.5.14.3

Cyperus: Cyl. 4.13; Verg. Geo. 2.437; Strab. 12.3.10, Theoph. Hist. Plant 3.15.5; Plin. NH. 16.71

Phrygia: Varro Men. Sat. 131B; Virg. Aen. 9.619 (Berecyntia); Plin. NH. 16.71

Cedar: Cilicia: Strab. 14.5.4

Lycia, Phrygia: Plin. NH. 16.137; 31.197

Syria: Plin. NH. 1.13a.20; 16.52.4,

Citronwood: Africa: Petr. Sat. 119.27ff; (Libyca citrea) Mart. 2.43.9; Luc. BC.10.144-6 (Cynere)

Mauretania: Cic. Verr 4.37; Strab. 17.2.5; Vell. Pat 2.56.2; Mela Chor. 104.1; Luc. BC. 9.426-430; Sen. Ben. 7.9.2; Plin NH. 1.13a.48; 5.12.10; 13.91; 94-5; 96-7; 33.146; Stat. Silv 1.3.35; 3.3.90 (Massylia = Numidia); Mart 9.59.7; 10.80; 12.66
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Cornel: Thrace: Grat. Cyn. 127
Cypress: Crete: Plin. NH. 16.141; Ath. 1.27F (Hermippus)
Lebanon: Diod. Sic. 19.58.4; Plin. NH. 24.32 (Syria. Also Asia)
Miletus: Ath. 5.205B (Callixeinus)

Ebony: India: Virg. Geo. 2.116-7; Strab. 15.1.37; Plin. NH. 1. 12a.15; 12.17; 19.6;
PME. 36;
Aethiopia: Diosc. Mat. Med. 1.129; Plin. NH. 6.197;
Paus. 1.42.5
Mareoticum: Luc. BC. 10.117
Meroe: Diod. Sic. 1.33.3; Luc. BC. 10.302-6;

Elm: Gaul: Plin. NH. 16.72
Italy: Plin. NH. 16.72

Larch: Larignum*: Vitruv. 2.9.14-16

Laurel: Cyprus: Cato. RR. 133; Plin. NH. 15.127
Delphi: Cato. RR. 133; Plin. NH. 15.127

Maple: Gaul: Plin. NH. 16.66
Sinope: Strab. 12.3

Oak: Arcadia: Paus. 8.12.1

Poplar: Libya: Plin. NH. 16.85
Crete: Plin. NH. 24.47

Terebinth: Arabia: Diod. Sic. 2.49.
Chios: Ed. Dio. 68.100
Cyprus: Plin. NH. 24.34

Willow: America: Cato Ag. 11; Verg. Geo. 1.265; Plin. NH. 24.58

1.9 Metals
Bronze: Corinthian*: Cic. Rosc. Am. 46.133; Verr. 2.2.46; 2.2.83; 2.2.176; 2.4.1;
2.4.50; 2.4.51; 2.4.96; 2.4.97; 2.4.98; 2.4.131; Par. Stoic. 1.135.5; 5.36.9;
5.38.6; Plin. 2.3.14; 2.23.22; Tusc. Disp. 2.32.7; 4.14; 4.32.2; Att. 2.11.1;
Verg. Geo. 2.464 (Ephyraeae); Prop. 3.5.6; Liv. 34.4.4.3; Tib. 34.1.4; Hor. Epist. 1.6.17; 2.1.193; Sat. 1.4.28; 2.3.21; Vitruv. 5.5.8; 8.4.1; Strab. 6.23;
Liv. 34.4; per. 53.168; Vell. Pat. 1.1.3.4; Petr. Sat. 31.9.2; 50.21; 119.1;
Dio Chrys. Or. 79.2; Sen. Brev. Vit. 12.2; Helv. 11.3; Med. 796; Dial. 9.9.6;
10.12.2; Tranj. An. 9.6; Plin. NH. 9.139; 33.144; 34.1; 34.3; 34.5; 34.6-14;
34.48; 37.12; 37.49; 37.148; Sil. Ital. Pun. 14.656 (Ephyraeae); Plin. Ep. 3.1.9;
3.6.1; 3.6.4; Jos. Bfl. 5.201; Vit. 13.68; Stat. Silv. 2.2.68; Mart. 9.57.2;
9.59; 14.43; 14.172; 14.177; Quint. Inst. 6.3.96; 8.28; Flor. Epit. 1.32.21;
Suet. Aug. 70.2.6-10; Tib. 34.1; Paus. 2.3.3; Front. Diff. 519.5; Plut. Mor. 395B-C; 395D; Porph. in Hor. Sat. 1.4.28.2; 2.3.21.3; Epist. 2.1.193.2;
Serv. in Verg. Aen. 3.466.2; 6.848.2; Geo. 4.264; Dig. 32.1.100; Ath. 4.128D (Hippolochus); 5.199E (Callixeinus); 6.236B (Diphilus); 9.387E (Epicharmus); 11. 486D (Asclepiades); Sid. Apoll. Car. 5.48; Oros. 5.3;
Isid. Orig. 20.4
Delian: Cic. Rosc. Am. 133.4; Verr. 2.2.83; 2.2.176; 2.4.1, Plin. NH. 33.144;
34.8; 34.9; 34.10
Aeginetan: Plin. NH. 34.8; 34.10; 34.11; 34.75

Calamine (cadmea) Cyprus: Plin. NH. 34.103

Copper: Cyprus*: Vitruv. 7.11.1; Plin. NH. 20.131; 23.74; 28.95; 33.90; 33. 131;
34.2; 34.4; 34.94; 34.98; 34.106; 34.109; 34.115; 34.172; 36.193
Bergamo: Plin. NH. 34.2
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Campania: Plin. NH. 34.95
Copper slag (scoria): Cyprus: Plin. NH. 34.107
Copper pyrites (chalcitis): Cyprus: Plin. NH. 34.126
Copper residue (spodos): Cyprus: Plin. NH. 34.130
Copperas (misy): Cyprus: Plin. NH. 34.121
Ferrous sulphate (sory): Egypt: Plin. NH. 34.120 (also Cyprus, Spain, Africa)

Gold:
- Asturia (Spain): Plin. NH. 33.78
- Dalmatia: Stat. Silv. 4.7.14-15; Mart. 10.78
- Etruria: Plin. NH. 33.10-11; Juv. 5.164
- Gallaica: Plin. NH. 33.78; Mart. 4.39: 10.17; 14.95; Sil. Ital. Pun. 2.602
- Ganges: Plin. NH. 33.66
- Hermus: Virg. Geo. 2.138; Plin. NH.33.66; Mart. 8.78 5-6; Ampel. Lib. Mem. 6.9.3
- Lusitania: Plin. NH. 33.78
- Lydia: Stat. Silv. 2.2.121
- Nile: Ath. 5.203C (Callixeinus)
- Pactolus: Varro Men. Sat. 97; 234; Verg. Aen. 10.142; Prop. 3.18.28;
- Strab. 13.592; 13.626; Grat. Cyn. 315-6; Manil. 5.530; Plin. NH. 5.110; 33.66; Sen. Phoen. 604; Ampel Lib. Mem. 6.9.3; Juv. 14.299; Dio Chrys 33.23; 77.31; Ath. 5.203C (Callixeinus); 13.603A (Hermesianax)
- Padus: Plin. NH. 33.66
- Spain: Plin. NH. 33.67
- Tagus: Cat. 29.19; Plin. NH. 33.66; Mart. 1.49.15

Gold leaf:
- Praeneste: Plin. NH. 33.61

Lead oxide (litharge): Attica: Plin. NH. 33.106
- Spain: Plin. NH. 33.106

Orichalcum:
- Gaul: Plin. NH. 34.3
- Corduba: Plin. NH. 34.4

Iron:
- Bilbilis: Plin. NH. 34.144
- Cappadocia: Plin. NH. 34.144
- Elba: Plin. NH. 34.12
- Noricum: Plin. NH. 34.145
- Parthian: Plin. NH. 34.145
- Sericum: Plin. NH. 34.145
- Toledo: Grat. Cyn. 341

Lead:
- Britain: Plin. NH. 34.164
- Cantabria: Plin. NH. 34.158

Sandarac (arsenic sulphide): Pontus: Vitruv. 7.7.5

Silver:
- Illyricum: Liv. 45.43.6.1

Silver ‘spodos’: Laurium: Plin. NH. 34.132

Tin:
- Britannia/Cassiterides: Mela 3.48; Plin. NH. 7.197
- Galicia: Plin. NH. 34.156
- Lusitania: Plin. NH. 34.156

Verdigris:
- Cyprus: Plin. NH.34
- Rhodes: Vitruv. 7.11.12; Plin. NH. 34.112; 34.14

White lead (cerusa): Rhodes: Vitruv. 7.11.12; Plin. NH. 34.175

1.10 Building Materials
1.10.1 Marble

Paros: Vitruv. 10.2.15; Strab. 10.5.7; Plin. NH. 4.67; 36.62; 36.14; 36.86; 36.132; 36.135; 36.158; Mart. 1.88.3; Paus. 1.14.7; 1.33.2; 1.43.5; 2.2.8; 2.13.4; 2.29.1;
2.35.3; 4.31.11; 5.11.10; 5.12.6; 8.25.6; 9.20.4; Ath. 205E (Callixeinus); 13.582; 13.584; 14.622 (Alexis)
Luna: Strab. 5.2.5; Plin. NH. 36.14, 48, 135; Stat. Silv. 4.3.99 ('Ligurian'); 4.4.23-4; Suet. Nero 50; ILS 8379
Alexandria: Sen. Ep. 86.6
Carystus: Tib. 3.3.14; Sen. Tro. 836; Plin. NH. 4.64; 36.48, 36.49; Plin. Ep. 5.6; Stat. Silv. 1.5.34; Mart. 9.75.7; Dio Cass. 79.2
Chios: Plin. NH. 36.46; 36.132
Cyzicus: Plin. NH. 36.151
Hymettus: Hor. Od. 2.18.3, Val. Max. 9.1.4; Plin. NH. 17.6.4; 36.7.4; 36.114.6
India: Ath. 5.205E (Callixeinus)
Lesbos: Plin. NH. 36.44; Ed. Dio. 62.16
Memphis: Plin. NH. 36.56
Numidia (Nomadum), Hor. Od 2.18.1-5 (Africa) Epist. 1.10.19 (Libycis lapillis);
Sen. Ep. 86.6.3; Plin. NH. 5.22.10; 35.3; 36.49; Stat. Silv. 1.5.36 (Nomadum); Mart. 6.42 (Libya); 8.53.8 (Nomas); Suet. Jul. 85; Ed. Dio. 62.3
Pentelic: Cic. Att. 1.8.2, Strab. 9.1.23; Paus. 1.19.6; 5.10.3; 7.23.6; 7.25.9; 7.26.4; 8.28.1; 9.2.7; 9.4.1.9.11.6; 9.25.3; 9.27.3; 10.4.4: 10.33.4; 10.35.10
Phrygia: Hor. Od. 3.1.41; Strab. 12.8.14; Plin. NH. 35.3; 36.102; 36.146-7; Mart. 6.42.11; 9.75.9; Stat. Silv. 1.5.37, 2.2.85-9; Paus.1.18.9; 2.3.5 (Croceae);
Ath.13.602A
Proconnesus: Vitruv. 2.7.10; 10.2.15; Strab. 13.589; Plin. NH. 5.151; 36.47; 37.185; Ed. Dio. 62.18
Rhodes: Plin. NH.37.172
Sicyos: Strab. 9.5.16; Ed. Dio. 62.14
Sparta (Taygetus/Taenarum): Strab. 8.5.7, Plin. NH. 36.55; Stat. Silv. 1.5.40 (Eurotas); Mart. 1.55.5; 6.42.11, 9.75.9; Juv. 11.175; Paus. 2.3.5; Ed. Dio. 62.2
Synnada: Strab. 12.8.15; Plin. NH. 35.3
Tauromenium: Ath. 5.207F (moschion)
Teos: Dio Cass. 79.2
Thasos: Vitruv. 10.2.15; Plin. NH. 36.44; Suet. Nero 50; Stat. Silv. 1.5.34; Ed. Dio. 62.17
Traguria (Dalmatia): Plin. NH.3.141

1.10.2 Other stones
Alabandine: Alabanda: Plin. NH. 36.62
Miletus: Plin. NH. 36.62
Alabaster: Carmania: Plin. NH. 36.61
Egypt: Plin. NH. 36.158
India: Plin. NH. 36. 61 (also Asia, Cappadocia, Syria)
Arabian: Plin. NH. 36.142
Basanites: Aethiopia: Plin. NH. 36.58
Gypsum: Cyprus: Plin. NH. 36.182
Syria: Plin. NH. 36.182
Thurii: Plin. NH. 36.182
Thessaly (Perrhaebia, Tymphae): Plin. NH. 36.182
Jet (gagates): Gages (Lycia): Plin. NH. 36.141
Lodestone (magnes*): Magnesia – Lucret. 6.906-1089; Plin. NH. 36.128
Aethiopia: Plin. NH. 36.128
Boeotia: Plin. NH. 36.128
Cantabria: Plin. NH. 34. 148
Troas: Plin. NH. 36.128
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Millstones: Volsinii: Plin. NH. 36.135
'Mussel stone': Megara: Paus. 1.44.6
Obsidian: Ethiopia: Plin. NH. 36.196 (also India, Spain, Samnium)
Porphyry: Egypt: Sen. Ep. 115.8; Plin. NH. 36.55, 57; Suet. Nero 50
Pumice: Pompeii: Vitruv. 2.6.2
Aeolian Is: Plin. NH. 36.153
Melos: Plin. NH. 36.153
Nisyros: Plin. NH. 36.153
Samian: Plin. NH. 36.152
Cyprus: Plin. NH. 36.160
Cappadocia: Plin. NH. 36.160
Sicily: Plin. NH. 36.160
Serpentine: Thebes: Luc. BC. 9.714; Plin. NH. 36.55; 36.63; 36.158; Stat. Silv. 1.5.35; Mart. 6.42; Juv. 15.2; Apul. Apol. 8.17
Silica (silex): Tarquinia: Plin. NH. 36.168
Statonia: Plin. NH. 36.16
Soapstone: Comum: Plin. NH. 36.159
Siphnos: Plin. NH. 36.159
Taenarum: Plin. NH. 36.135, 158
Thebaic stone: Plin. NH. 34.106; 34.157; (cf 33.21, 36.53).
Touchstone (coticula): Tmolus/Lydia: Plin. NH. 33.126
Armenia: Plin. NH. 36.52
Naxos (Cyrus): Plin. NH. 36.52
Tufa: Gabii: Strab. 5.3.10, 11; Tac. Ann. 15.43.4
Alban: Vitruv. 2.7.3; Plin. NH. 36.166; Tac. Ann. 15.43.4; Suet. Aug. 72
Tiburtine: Strab. 5.3.11; Vitruv. 2.7.1-2; Plin. NH. 36.46
Carthage: Plin. NH. 36.166
Whetstones: Crete: Plin. NH. 36.164
Laconia: Plin. NH. 36.164
Naxos: Plin. NH. 36.164
Cilicia: Plin. NH. 36.164
Armenia: Plin. NH. 36.164

1.10.3 Sand, cement, etc
Bitumen: Agrigento: Plin. NH. 35.179
Apollonia: Plin. NH. 35.178
Babylonia: Diod. Sic. 2.12; Vitruv. 8.3.8; Plin. NH. 35.178; 35.180; 35.182
Asphaltites (Dead Sea) Plin. NH. 5.72; 7.65; 28.80; 35.178
Zacynthus: Plin. NH. 35.178
Bricks: Lydia: Plin. NH. 35.171
Cement: Puteoli (puteolanum pulvis): Vitruv. 5.12.2; Sen. Quaest. Nat. 3.20; Plin. NH. 16.202, 35.165; 35.166
Cumae: Plin. NH. 35.166
Columns: Corinthian: Plin. NH. 36.178; Ath. 5.205C (Callixeinus)
Doric: Plin. NH. 36.178
Ionic: Plin. NH. 36.178
Tuscan: Plin. NH. 36.178
Attic: Plin. NH. 36.179
Ladders: Greek: Gell. NA. 10.15.29
Pitch: Bruttium: Dion. Hal. 20.15.2; Cic. Brut. 85 (forest of Sila); Verg. Geo. 2.438 (Locrian); Grat. Cym. 416; Strab. 6.1.9; Cal. Sic. 5.80-1, Col. RR. 12.18.7; 12.22.2; Plin. NH. 14.127, 14.135; 15.31; 16.53; 24.37; 24.39
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Rhone: Ath. 5.206f (Moschion)
       India: Plin. *NH*. 36.52 (also Egyptian, Naxian)

1.11 Pigments and related substances

Alum: Egypt: Plin. *NH*. 35.184  (also Armenia, Spain, Macedonia, Pontus, Sardinia, Aeolian Is.)
       Cyprus: Plin. *NH*. 35.183
       Melos: Plin. *NH*. 35.184; 35.188; 35.190
Armenium*: Armenia: Varro *RR*. 3.2.4; Vitruv. 7.5.8, 7.9.6; Plin. *NH*. 35.30
Brown ochre (*sil*): Attica: Vitruv. 7.7.1; 7.14.1; Plin. *NH*. 33.159-60 (also Scyros, Achaia, Gaul); 35.50
Caeruleum: Egypt: Vitruv. 7.1.1 (Alexandria); Plin. *NH*. 33.161
       Scythia: Plin. *NH*. 33.161
       Cyprus: Plin. *NH*. 33.161 (also Spain, Puteoli)
Chalk (*Creta*): Chios: Plin. *NH*. 35.194
       Cimolos: See *Cimolian earth, under cosmetics, etc, above*
       Eretria: Vitruv. 7.14.1; Plin. *NH*. 35.21; 35.192; 35.194,
       Lycia: Plin. *NH*. 35.196
       Samos: Plin. *NH*. 35.191, 194
       Sardinia: Plin. *NH*. 35.196, 198
Selinus: Vitruv. 7.14.2; Plin. *NH*. 35.46, 194
       Thessaly: Plin. *NH*. 35.196
       Umbria: Plin. *NH*. 35.196
Chrysocolla: Macedonia: Vitruv 7.9.6; Plin. *NH*. 33.89
       Armenia: Plin. *NH*. 33. 89
       Cyprus: Plin. *NH*. 33. 89
       Spain: Plin. *NH*. 33. 89
Cinnabar: Spain: Strab. 3.2.6; Paus. 8.39.6
       India: Plin. *NH*. 29.25
Green chalk: Smyrna: Vitruv. 7.7.
Indigo*: India: Vitruv. 7.9.6; 7.14.2; Plin. *NH*.33.163; 35.30; 35.43; 35.46; 35.49
Minium*: R. *Minius* (Spain): Varro *RR*. 3.2.4; Vitruv. 7.5.8; 7.9.6; Plin. *NH*. 29.25; 33.112;
       34.106; 35.3; 35.33; 35.38; Cel. *Med*. 4.22.5; 5.20.3; 6.6.19
Sinope: Cel. *Med*. 5.6.1
Orpiment: Pontus: Vitruv. 7.7.2
Purpurissum: Puteoli: Plin. *NH*. 35.45 (also Tyre, Gaetulia, Laconia)
Red lead: Pontus: Vitruv. 7.7.2
       Ephesus: Vitruv. 7.7.2
       Magnesia: Vitruv. 7.7.2
Red: Sardis: Ath. 2.47B (Plato)
Red ochre (*rubrica*): Sinope (Pontus): Strab. 3.2.6; 12.2.11, Vitruv. 7.7.2; Plin. *NH*.35.30;
       35.31; 35.36; 35.50
       Egypt: Vitruv. 7.7.2 (*Paraetonium*); Plin. *NH*.35.31; 35.35
       Africa: Plin. *NH*.35.31; 35.35
       Balearics: Vitruv. 7.7.2; Plin. *NH*. 35.33
       Cappadocia: Plin. *NH*. 35.31
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Lemnos: Vitruv. 7.7.2; Plin. NH 35.31; 35.33
Melos: Vitruv. 7.7.2
Shoeblack (*calcanthum*): Plin. NH. 34.123
Ultramarine (*Armenium*): Vitruv. 7.5.8; Varro RR. 3.2.4; Plin. NH. 35.30; 35.47; 37.81
Usta (purple): Asia: Plin. NH. 35.3
Vermilion (*anthrax*): Ephesus: Vitruv. 7.8.1
Spain: Vitruv. 7.9.4
White: Paraetonium: Egypt: Vitruv. 7.7.2; Plin. NH. 33.90-91; 35.30; 35.36
Crete: Plin. NH. 35.36
Cyrene: Plin. NH. 35.36
Melinum*: Melos; Vitruv. 7.7.2; Plin. NH. 35.30; 35.36-7; 35.49-50;
Samos: Plin. NH. 35.37
Woad: Britain: Plin. NH. 22.2
Gaul: Plin. NH. 22.2

1.12 Paper
Papyrus: Nilus: Ovid Met. 15.753; Plin. NH. 5.44; 7.206
- Egypt: Strabo 17.1.15; Plin. NH. 13.68; 13.71-3; 16.157; 24.88; 33.94; Mart. 13.1.3; Apul. Met. 1.1.3; Ath. 1.27F (Hermippus) [sub-brands: Plin. NH. 13.74-77, 8]
Saitic: Plin. NH. 13.76, 78
Taeneotic: Plin. NH 13.76
Parchment: Pergamum: Plin. NH. 13.70

1.13 Entertainment, etc.
Cooks: Chios: Ath. 1.25F (Timocles)
Elis: Ath. 1.27D (Antiphanes)
Sicily: Ath. 15.661E (Crinus); 15 661F (Antiphanes)
Cottabos: Sicily: Ath. 1.28B (Critias); 15.666B (Critias); 15.666C; 15.668C (Callimachus); 15.668E
Dancers: Gades: Plin. Ep. 1.15; Stat. Silv 1.6.71; Mart. 1.41.10; 3.63.5-6; 5.78.26-8; 6.71; Juv. 11.162-8
Crete: Ath. 5.181A-D (Pindar)
Doric: Ath. 14.617E (Pratinas)
Ionia: Hor. Od. 3.6.21; Ath. 1.22B (also Sparta, Troezen, Mantinea, Crete, Epizephyros); Ath. 14.629E
Molossus: Ath. 14.629D
Persia: Ath. 14.629D
Phrygia: Ath. 14.629D
Thracia: Ath. 14.629D
Etruria: Liv. 7.2.4
Flute: Lesbos: Ath. 5. 180 (Archilochus)
Libya: Ath. 14 625D (Duris)
Lydia: Ath.14.628C (Ion)\nFlute girls: Aegion: Ath. 1.27D(Antiphanes)
Gladiators: Samnium: Varro LL. 5.142; Hor. Epod. 2.2.98; Plin. NH. 7.81
Thracia: Hor. Epist. 1.18.36, Sat. 2.6.44; Petr. Sat. 45; Plin. NH. 11.245; 33.129;
Suet. Cal. 55.2; Tit. 8.2; Dom. 10.1
Doria: Paus.9.12.5; Ath. 14.624D; 14.625A (Heraclides); 14.635D (Posidonius); 14.637D
Ionia: Ath. 14.624D-625D (Heraclides, Pratinas); 15.665D (Plato)
Locris: Ath. 14.625E (Heraclides); 14.639A (Cratinus); 15.677B
Lydia: Paus.9.12.5; Ath. 14.624C (Heraclides); 14.625F; 14.626A (Telestes); 14.635D (Posidonius); 14.637D (Cratinus)
Phrygia: Paus.9.12.5; Ath. 14.624B (Theophrastus); 14.625F; 14.626A (Telestes); 14.635D (Posidonius); 14.637D; 14.638F (Cratinus)
Nablia (harp): Phoenicia: Ath. 4.175D-E
Pipes: Libya: Ath. 14.618B (Duris); 14.634C (Ion); 14.635C (Sophocles)
Phrygia: Ath. 4.177A (Juba)
Plays: Atellani*: Cic. Div. 2.25.9; ad Fam. 9.16.7; Varro LL. 7.28; Bassus Poet Spec. 9, Liv. 7.2.12.1, 3; Sen. Contr. 7.3.9.3; Val. Max. 2.4.4.26; Petr. Sat. 68.5.3; Juv. 6.71; Suet. Tib. 45.1; Cal. 27.4; Nero 39.3; Gal. 13.1; Gell. NA. 10.24.4, 12.10.7, 16.6.7, 17.2.8; 18.6.6
Oscan: Cic. ad Fam. 7.1; Val. Max. 2.4.4.26; Tac. Ann. 4.14
Sambuca players: Rhodes: Ath. 4.129A (Hippolochus)
Tales: Miletus: Quint. Inst. 8.4.11.3; Apul. Met. 1.1, 4.32
Triangle: Phrygia: Ath. 4.183E (Sophocles); Ath. 14.625A (Sophocles)
Syria: Ath. 4.175D (Juba)

1.14 Military/naval/judicial
Belts: Babylon: Ed. Dio.17.1 (zona); 17.3 (subalare)
Bow: Scythia: Ath. 7.290A "(Pythermus)
Carts: Sicily: Ath.1.28B (Pindar, Critias)
Chariots: Thebes: Ath. 1.28B (Pindar); 1.28C (Critias)
Galleys: Liburnia*: Hor. Epod. 1.1; Prop. 3.11.4; Luc. BC. 3.534; 4.530; Plin. NH. 9.13; 9.88; 16.39; Front. Strat. 2.5.43; Suet. Cal. 37.2; Hist. 80.1; Tac. Ann.16.14; Hist. 2.35; 3.12; 3.43: 3.48; 3.77; Plin. Ep. 6.16.7; Arrian Bell. Illyr. 3; Plut. Ant. 67.2; App. BC. 5.99; 5.111: Gell. NA. 17.3.4
Mercenaries: Arcadia: Ath. 1.27F (Hermippus)
Quiver (pharetra): Lycia: Grat. Cyn. 124: Verg. Aen. 7.816; 8.166; Geo.3.345 (Cressan); Quint. Inst.9.3.51 (Cressan)
Media: Hor. Od. 2.16.6
Sail rigging: Egypt: Ath. 1.27F (Hermippus)
Scourgers: Bruttium: Cato 58.3, ap. Gell. NA. 10.3.18
Slingers: Balearic: Caes. BG. 2.7.2.1; Diod. Sic. 5.18.3-4; Sall. BJ. 105.2.2; Verg. Geo. 1.309; Ovid Met. 2.727; 4.710; Liv. 21.21.12.2, 27.2.6.3, 38.29.5.2; Luc. BC. 3.711; Plin. NH. 3.77
Cretan: Liv.37.41.9.4, 38.21.2.4
Swords: Chalcis: Ath.14.627B (Alcaeus)
### Appendix 1.2: Locations Named in Appendix 1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdera</td>
<td>Askalon</td>
<td>Carthago Spartaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abella</td>
<td>Asphaltites</td>
<td>Carystus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abydos</td>
<td>Assos</td>
<td>Cebanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acanthus</td>
<td>Assyria</td>
<td>Celtiberia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acarnania</td>
<td>Asta</td>
<td>Centuripa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achaea</td>
<td>Asturco</td>
<td>Centronia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acone</td>
<td>Asturia</td>
<td>Cephallenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adria</td>
<td>Astypalaeae</td>
<td>Cephisus (L.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegina</td>
<td>Atella</td>
<td>Cerasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aenus</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Chalcedon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeolian Is.</td>
<td>Attica</td>
<td>Chalcidice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeolis</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Calchis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aenos</td>
<td>Bactria</td>
<td>Chersonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aethiopia</td>
<td>Baetica</td>
<td>Chios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aetolia</td>
<td>Balearic Is.</td>
<td>Chryse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aexona</td>
<td>Balesium</td>
<td>Cilicia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Batavia</td>
<td>Cimolos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrigentum</td>
<td>Berenice</td>
<td>Circeii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabanda</td>
<td>Bergamo</td>
<td>Cirrhadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alba</td>
<td>Berytus</td>
<td>Clazomenae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Bilbilis</td>
<td>Cleoneae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algidus</td>
<td>Bithynia</td>
<td>Clitumnus (R.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliana</td>
<td>Bituriges</td>
<td>Cnidos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpes</td>
<td>Boeotia</td>
<td>Colchis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altinum</td>
<td>Borysthenes</td>
<td>Colophon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambianum</td>
<td>Bosphorus</td>
<td>Comagene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambracia</td>
<td>Brattia</td>
<td>Comum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ameria</td>
<td>Britannia</td>
<td>Copais (L.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amisos</td>
<td>Brundisium</td>
<td>Corcyra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiternum</td>
<td>Bruttium</td>
<td>Corduba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancona</td>
<td>Byblos</td>
<td>Corinth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticyra</td>
<td>Byzantium</td>
<td>Corsica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antinoe</td>
<td>Calymnos</td>
<td>Corycium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>Campania</td>
<td>Coryphas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antipolis</td>
<td>Canopus</td>
<td>Cos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td>Cantabria</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apulia</td>
<td>Canusium</td>
<td>Crustiumium (R.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabia</td>
<td>Cappadocia</td>
<td>Cumaee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>Cydonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argolis</td>
<td>Carchedonia</td>
<td>Cyme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos</td>
<td>Caria</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aricia</td>
<td>Carmania</td>
<td>Cyrene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Carpasus</td>
<td>Cytorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascræa</td>
<td>Carpentania</td>
<td>Cyzicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Carthage</td>
<td>Dalmatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Damascus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphnis</td>
<td>Hermes (R.)</td>
<td>Magnesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dardanus</td>
<td>Hipponium</td>
<td>Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceleia</td>
<td>Hybla</td>
<td>Mantinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delos</td>
<td>Hymettus</td>
<td>Mareotis (L.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>Hyrcania</td>
<td>Marsia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diospolis</td>
<td>Iberia</td>
<td>Massilia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dium</td>
<td>Ida (M.) (Crete)</td>
<td>Massylia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doclea</td>
<td>Ida (M.) (Asia)</td>
<td>Mauretania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris</td>
<td>Illyria</td>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Meditomagus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elba</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
<td>Megara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elis</td>
<td>Issa</td>
<td>Melos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleutherus (R.)</td>
<td>Ister (R.)</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emathia</td>
<td>Istria</td>
<td>Menapia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerita</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Mendes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesus</td>
<td>Judaea</td>
<td>Meroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidaurus</td>
<td>Laconia</td>
<td>Messene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epirus</td>
<td>Lampsacus</td>
<td>Messenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epizephyros</td>
<td>Laodicea</td>
<td>Methymna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eretria</td>
<td>Larignum</td>
<td>Molossus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eridanus (R.)</td>
<td>Laurentum</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythraea</td>
<td>Laurium</td>
<td>Minos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etruria</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Minius (R.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euboe</td>
<td>Lemnos</td>
<td>Minturnae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphates (R.)</td>
<td>Leptis</td>
<td>Misenum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falerium</td>
<td>Lesbos</td>
<td>Moesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>Leuconia</td>
<td>Mordium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faventia</td>
<td>Liburnia</td>
<td>Mutina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frugiacum</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Mylae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabii</td>
<td>Liguria</td>
<td>Myndos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gades</td>
<td>Lingones</td>
<td>Myra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaetulia</td>
<td>Linguria</td>
<td>Mytilene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gages</td>
<td>Linus</td>
<td>Nabataea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galaesus</td>
<td>Lipara</td>
<td>Narbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatia</td>
<td>Liris (R.)</td>
<td>Narycia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallaica</td>
<td>Locris</td>
<td>Nasamones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galicia</td>
<td>Lodicea</td>
<td>Naxos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganges (R.)</td>
<td>Lucania</td>
<td>Naxos (Cyprus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaul</td>
<td>Lucrinum (L.)</td>
<td>Neapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedrosia</td>
<td>lucus</td>
<td>Nemausus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Luna</td>
<td>Nesaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelduba</td>
<td>Lusitania</td>
<td>Nesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaesaria</td>
<td>Lycia</td>
<td>Nicaea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravisca</td>
<td>Lyconia</td>
<td>Nile (R.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>Nisyros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halicarnassus</td>
<td>Macedonla</td>
<td>Nomentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammon</td>
<td>Maeander (R.)</td>
<td>Noricum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellespont</td>
<td>Maeotis (L.)</td>
<td>Nuceria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Rhodanus (R.)</td>
<td>Susa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numidia</td>
<td>Rhodes</td>
<td>Synnada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursia</td>
<td>Ripae</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympus (Phrygia)</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchomenus</td>
<td>Rutupiae</td>
<td>Taenarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oricum</td>
<td>Saba</td>
<td>Tagus (R.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>Sabinum</td>
<td>Tanagra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pactolus (R.)</td>
<td>Saetabis</td>
<td>Taphrobanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padus (R.)</td>
<td>Saguntum</td>
<td>Tarraco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paeonia</td>
<td>Sais</td>
<td>Tarentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paestum</td>
<td>Taeneotis</td>
<td>Tarquinius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallene</td>
<td>Salacia</td>
<td>Tarsus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamphylia</td>
<td>Salaminum</td>
<td>Tartessus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pannonia</td>
<td>Salaminae</td>
<td>Tatta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paphlagonia</td>
<td>Salamis</td>
<td>Tauragstrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>Tauromenium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paros</td>
<td>Samothrace</td>
<td>Tygetus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parthia</td>
<td>Santones</td>
<td>Tenedos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patavia</td>
<td>Sardinia</td>
<td>Tenos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelavia</td>
<td>Sardis</td>
<td>Teos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelusium</td>
<td>Sciahtos</td>
<td>Thasos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelusium</td>
<td>Scythia</td>
<td>Thebe (Greece)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peparethus</td>
<td>Scythopolis</td>
<td>Thebe (Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamum</td>
<td>Scyros</td>
<td>Thera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perrhaebia</td>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>Thermodion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>Seleuceia</td>
<td>Thessaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perusina</td>
<td>Selge</td>
<td>Thrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petovium</td>
<td>Sequania</td>
<td>Thurii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra</td>
<td>Serica</td>
<td>Tibur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalerum</td>
<td>Sextiania</td>
<td>Tithorea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaselis</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Tithrasia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlegraea</td>
<td>Sicyon</td>
<td>Tmolu (M.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenicia</td>
<td>Sidicinum</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrygia</td>
<td>Sidon</td>
<td>Tolosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picenum</td>
<td>Sigeium</td>
<td>Topazos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisidia</td>
<td>Signium</td>
<td>Torre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Sinope</td>
<td>Traguria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollentia</td>
<td>Siphnos</td>
<td>Tralles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompeii</td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>Trebulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontus</td>
<td>Solitania</td>
<td>Tripolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praeneste</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Troas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proconnesus</td>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>Troezen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puteoli</td>
<td>Sphettium</td>
<td>Trogodytica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>Spoleium</td>
<td>Tromilica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reate</td>
<td>Statonia</td>
<td>Turdetania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retovium</td>
<td>Stoechades Is.</td>
<td>Tuscany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhaetia</td>
<td>Strymon (R.)</td>
<td>Tusculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhegium</td>
<td>Surrentum</td>
<td>Tymphae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyndaris</td>
<td>Vestinus</td>
<td>Volsinii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tylos</td>
<td>Velabrum</td>
<td>Voltumnus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tyre</td>
<td>Venafrum</td>
<td>Zacynthos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbria</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Zoela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varda</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1.3 Leading Origin Brands, by Number of Mentions in Extant Literature (all with 20+ citations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wine – Falernian</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze – Corinth</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine– Chian</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk – Serica</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine– Lesbian</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine – Sorrentine</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple – Tyre</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey – Hymettus</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine – Caecuban</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine - Thasian</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherries - Cerasus</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine – Alban</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory – India</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine – Massic</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marble – Paros</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine – Setine</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants – Phasis</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine- Sabine</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelnuts – Pontus</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine –Tmolus</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool – Apulia</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galleys – Liburnia</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine – Signia</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephants – India</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citronwood – Mauretania</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk – Coan</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Appendix 1.1; Appendix 7.3*
Appendix 4.1 Sources for Corinthian Bronze

The Ancient Sources

The key classical source for Corinthian bronze is Pliny’s *Natural History*, Book 34, which carries considerable, but slightly inadequate, information about the material. The other main source is Cicero, primarily his *Verrine* orations, but there are also mentions in his letters. A surprisingly wide range of authors mention the material, though none later than Martial in our period (see Appendix 4.2). Josephus should be noted as a non-metropolitan who mentions it several times.

The importance of *aes Corinthium* in the households of the rich is indicated by inscriptions referring to *Corinthiarii* or *a Corinthiis*. (see p.138 for references).

Modern Scholarship


Beyond these, Mau’s *RE* article (1900) is still a useful compendium of references. Murphy O’Connor (1983) provides an interesting counterblast to over-detailed analysis. Paparazzo (2008) has a modern overview of Pliny’s metallurgy. Weisenberg (1997), Bammel (1956), Renov (1970) and Schwartz (1991) together cover the Nicanor gate, the most significant known example of Corinthian bronze outside Rome’s immediate sphere of influence or interest.
Appendix 4.2 Corinthian Bronze: Citations

Athenaeus. 4.128D (Theophrastus)  Horace. Ep. 1.6.17
   5.199E (Callixeinus)          Ep. 2.1.193
   6.236B (Diphilus)             Sat.1.4.28
   9.387E (Epicharmus)           Sat. 2.3.21
   11.486D (Asclepiades)         Isidore. Orig. 20.4

Cicero. Att. 2.1.11  Josephus. BJ. 5.201
   Fin. 2.3.14              Livy        34.4
   Fin. 2.23.22             Per. 53.168
   Parad. 1.13              Martial. 9.57.2
   Parad. 5.36               9.59.11
   Rosc.Am. 46              14.43
   Rosc.Am.133.4            14.172
   Tusc. 2.32.7              14.177
   Tusc. 4.14
   Tusc. 4.32.2
   Verr. 2.2.46             Ovid. Met. 6.146
   Verr. 2.2.83              Pausanias. 2.3.3
   Verr.2.2.176             Petronius. Sat. 31.9
   Verr. 2.4.1               Sat.50
   Verr. 2.4.50              Sat. 119.1
   Verr. 2.4.51
   Verr.2.4.83              Pliny. NH.9.139
   Verr. 2.4.96              NH 33.144
   Verr.2.4.97              NH. 34.1
   Verr. 2.4.98              NH.34.3ff.
   Verr. 2.4.131             NH. 34.5
   CIL 6.4455                NH.34.6
   6.5847                   NH. 34.7
   6.5900                   NH. 34.8
   6.8756                   NH.34.11
   6.8757                   NH. 34.12
   6.33768D                 NH. 34.13
   6.8686                   NH. 34.48
   10.692                   NH. 37.12
   10.6638                  NH.37.49
   Digest. 32.1.100.3       Pliny. Ep.3.1.9
   Dio Chrysostom. Or. 79.2  Ep. 3.6.1
   Florus. Epit.1.32        Ep. 3.6.4
   [Fronto]. Diff. 519.15    Plutarch. Mor.395 B-C
Mor. 395D
Propertius. 3.5.6
Quintilian. Inst. 6.3.98
Inst. 8.2.8
Seneca. Brev. Vit. 12.2
Helv. 11.3
Med. 796
Phil. Dial. 9.9.6.2
Phil. Dial. 10.12.2.5
Tranq. 9.6
Sidonius Apollinaris. Car. 5. 48
Silius Italicus: Pun. 14.656
Statius. Silv. 2.2.68
Strabo. 6.23
Suetonius. Aug. 70.2.6
Aug. 70.2.9
Aug. 70.2.10
Tib. 34.1
Velleius Paterculus. 1.1.3.4
Vergil. Geo 2.464
Vitruvius. 5.5.8
8.4.1

**Plus:** Porphyry on Horace *Satires*
1.4.28.2; 2.3.21.3, *Epistles* 2.1.193.2
Servius on Vergil *Aeneid* 3.466, 6.848; *Georgic* 2.464.
Appendix 5.1 Sources for ivory

The case study is anchored by the references to ivory and elephants in Roman literature of the period covered, especially poetry, since it is here that geographical adjectives are most freely used. Elephants are discussed with a wealth of detail by Pliny (NH. 8) and recur in their military role throughout Livy; while key modern views of elephants in antiquity are provided by Kunz (1916) and Scullard (1974).

Archaeological evidence

Archaeological and art historical scholarship on ivory in antiquity has two main temporal foci: on the Middle East and the Aegean in the Bronze Age; and on the flowering of ivory carving in late antiquity. The former has generated a very considerable literature in which works by R.D. Barnett (1948, 1982) and the articles collected by Lesley Fitton (1992) stand out, together with the essential technical account by Olga Krzyskowska (1990). For late antiquity, Anthony Cutler (1985, 1998) is a valuable guide.

This leaves a substantial gap, of over 1000 years, into which our period falls. No significant overview of ivory carving and artefacts for any part of this period has been published, reflecting a relative shortage of surviving material, a phenomenon reflected in the overviews provided by museums and art historians. There are, however, some valuable monographs. Kenneth Lapatin (1997, 2001) has written in depth about chryselephantine statuary; and Alexandra Croom (2007) and Gisela Richter (1926, 1966) on furniture. Ivory has its place, too, in a wide range of archaeological reports, but, as Dimitra Andrianou (2006) points out, ivory is usually relegated to a miscellaneous category of ‘minor objects’ which have tended in the past to be less carefully recorded than major finds. The most substantial account of ivory from our period is Archer St Clair’s (1996, 2003), although much of her work is concerned with objects of bone, and the material from the Palatine East excavations which she describes is chiefly from a rather later period.

Because ivory artefacts are mostly small, valuable and fragile, their survival is always chancy. While our period provides a range of surviving pieces, these are scattered across Europe’s and America’s museums, and much of what survives is fragmentary. The one really significant collection in volume terms from the period is that from Pompeii and Herculaneum in the Naples Museum, which
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includes the one known artefact imported into the Roman Empire from elsewhere, an Indian figurine, discussed in several articles, notably that by Mirella Levi d’Ancona (1950) (see Plate 5.3).

**Epigraphic and related sources**

Evidence of ivory carving and trade from epigraphic sources is very limited: there are a few inscriptions, all from Rome, in *CIL VI*, referring to *eborarii*, including one with details of a guild of *eborarii* and *citronarii*, dating from the time of Hadrian, which shows how closely ivory was tied to the furniture business. A key papyrus, *P. Vindob. G 40822*, published by Harrauer and Sijpestein (1985) and widely discussed, provides details of a (second century) shipment from Muziris (Malabar Coast) to Egypt, that included ivory, both whole tusks and fragments (*schidai*) (see De Romanis (2014)) among other valuable cargo.

There are a few mosaic representations of elephants, including one in the ‘Great Hunt’ at Piazza Armerina in Sicily, showing an elephant being taken on board ship. Among the great number of mosaics surviving in Tunisia, it is notable that there are considerably more tigers to be seen than elephants, which in classical times could still be found in north Africa.

**Trade**

Trade in ivory during the period increasingly involved India, as is clear from Strabo, Pliny, and the *Periplus Maris Erythraei*, which confirms that much ivory actually reached Alexandria from the east coast of Africa, down to what is now Tanzania. The India trade has stimulated a wealth of modern scholarship, notably the work of Gary Young (2001), Lionel Casson (1980, 1989), Steven Sidebotham (1986), Francesco de Romanis (2010, 2014), and E.H. Warmington (1928/1974).

**India**

Roman policy towards, and perceptions of, India are an important element in understanding the ivory brand. Here, important modern analyses include those by H.D. Meyer (1961), M. G. Raschke (1978), Steven Sidebotham (1986) and Lionel Casson (1989); while Roman perceptions of India and attitudes towards it are discussed in detail by Grant Parker (2002, 2008) and C.R. Whittaker (1998); and illuminated further by P. Schneider (2004) and the collection of Latin citations of India by J. André and J. Filliozat (1986).
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Appendix 5.2 Elephants and ivory: Poetic Citations, by period

* = 'Indian' ** = 'other' (mostly African)  

Epist. 1.6.54  
2.1.96  
2.1.193  

'Pre-Augustan'

Ennius  
Ann. 232  
Ann. 607  
Scen. Fr. 1  

Plautus  
Mil. 25*  
Mil. 235  
Stich. 168  
Stich. 377  
Curc. 424  
Most. 259-60  
Au. 168  
Cas. 845-6**  
Caec. fr. 1  

Terence  
Eun. 413*  

Lucretius  
2.537-8*  
5.1228  

Varro  
Men. Sat. 378  
Men. Sat. 447.1  
Prometh. Lib. fr. xii  
Quinq. fr. iii  

Catullus  
1.2*  
61.111*  
64.45-9*  

'Augustan'

Tibullus  
1.4.63  
1.7.8  
3.4.39  

Propertius  
2.1.9  
2.13a.17  
2.24b.13  
2.31.12**  
3.2.12  
3.3.25  
3.9.15  
3.21.30  
3.2.5  
4.6.8  
4.7.82  

Horace  
Od. 1.31.6*  
2.11.22  
2.18.1  
3.27.4  

Ep. ex Pont. 3.3.98  
Rem. Am. 10*  
Ars Am. 2.203  
Trist. 2.386  
4.2.63  
4.6.7-8*  
4.9.28**  
5.51  
3.7.7  
10.244  
10.255  
10.275  
10.283  
10.592  
11.167*  
15.792  
10.540a  
4.131  
4.105  
4.5.18  
4.9.28**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vergil</td>
<td>Geo.</td>
<td>1.58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aen.</td>
<td>1.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Verg.Aen)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.68*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Eleg Maec.]</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Post-Augustan’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calpurnius Siculus</td>
<td>Ecl. 7.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucan</td>
<td>Phars.</td>
<td>2.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.208**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca</td>
<td>Phaedr.</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thy.</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thy.</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silius Italicus</td>
<td>Pun. 3.495**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.582**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius Flaccus</td>
<td>2.465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manilius</td>
<td>Astr.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.666**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statius</td>
<td>Theb.</td>
<td>1.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achil.</td>
<td>1.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silv.</td>
<td>1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.94-5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martian</td>
<td>de Spect.</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ep.</td>
<td>1.72.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.43.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.73.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.28.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.22.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Post-Augustan’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calpurnius Siculus</td>
<td>Ecl. 7.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Post-Augustan’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calpurnius Siculus</td>
<td>Ecl. 7.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucan</td>
<td>Phars.</td>
<td>2.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.208**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca</td>
<td>Phaedr.</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thy.</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thy.</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silius Italicus</td>
<td>Pun. 3.495**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.582**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius Flaccus</td>
<td>2.465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manilius</td>
<td>Astr.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.666**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statius</td>
<td>Theb.</td>
<td>1.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achil.</td>
<td>1.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silv.</td>
<td>1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.94-5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 5.3 Ivory prices

We have very little data available on the price of ivory, and none at all for the precise period covered by this study.

There is some limited data from Greek temple accounts from the fourth and third centuries, though in several cases either the quantity or the value of ivory used is quoted, but not both:

1. *IG*² VI 1.102. Ivory for the doors of the Epidaurus Asklepion (c.370 BC): ‘Sotairos took the contract to provide ivory for the door for 3150 drachmae’. We have no indication of the amount of ivory supplied. The door was then constructed by ThrasyMedes and Kaphisas. ThrasyMedes also made the statue of Asklepios in the temple, according to Pausanias (2.27.1). (See Meiggs (1982) appendix 4, pp. 423-5).

2. The doors of the temple of Athena Parthenos cost 2 talents, 743 drachmae. Again, we have no indication of the quantity involved. This expenditure appears in year 9 of the project (439/8 BC), see *IG*² 1347. (The full Parthenon accounts, which are considerably more fragmentary than scholars would wish, are at *IG*² 1. 339ff. See W Dinsmoor, ‘Attic building accounts I’, *AJA* 17, 1913, pp. 53-80; ‘Attic building accounts V: supplementary notes’, *AJA* 25, 1921, pp.233-247).

3. At Delphi, in the fourth century, tusks were recorded at a cost of 24.5 drachmae per mina. At this time, this was ¼ of the price of silver. (E Bouguet: *Epigraphie: les comptes du IVe siècle (Fouilles de Delphes III,5)* Paris 1932, no. 25, col. IIa 5-130).


6. *IG*² XI 287 A 1,118. The doorframe of the temple of Apollo at Delos (269-250BC) required 10 minae of ivory, worth 35 drachmae = 3.5 dr/mina.

The last three of these pieces of evidence are the basis for Tarn’s view that the price of ivory was forced down by new supplies coming from the Ptolemies’ elephant hunting. (See Tarn (1930), p.226.)

After this, apart from Pliny’s listing of ivory as the most valuable animal product on the market, we have no meaningful data until the second century AD papyrus P. Vindob. G 80422, where the price of the ivory cargo is put for tax purposes – and therefore presumably realistically – at 100 silver drachmae per mina. Assuming the Attic standard of 4.3 grams of silver per drachma, this would imply virtual equivalence in value of ivory and silver, since a mina – on the Attic standard, again - was c.430g. (See Harrauer & Sijpestein (1985), Casson (1990)).

Finally, Diocletian’s *Edict* (ch. 43) of AD 301 has a price for ivory of 150 denarii per *libra*, compared with a price for silver (ch.59) of 6,000 denarii per *pondum*. 
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This means that ivory is a mere 1/40\textsuperscript{th} of the silver price, suggesting a drastic collapse in the price since the time of the Vienna papyrus.

Clearly, the price of ivory was capable of violent fluctuations, and this is not totally incredible for a luxury commodity for which the supply chain was both geographically extended and subject to the chances of uncertain sea voyages. If what we have learnt from Pliny is right, the first century AD saw a boom in demand for ivory, and this will have led to an increase in price, especially as the supply shifted from Africa to more distant and erratic sources in (or at least on the way to) India. Then, by the time of Diocletian, supply seems to have moved back to Africa, and this, together with a decline in the overall level of individual wealth and luxurious living among the \textit{élite}, could well have led to the sort of decline in ivory's value that Diocletian's \textit{Edict} suggests.
Appendix 6.1 Sources for Silk in the Roman World

Ancient Sources

The Latin sources fall into three primary groups: the Augustan poets (Horace, Ovid, Propertius and Tibullus, together with Vergil); first century AD moralists (Seneca and Pliny, with the latter also providing a lot of detailed background); and the Flavian satirists (Martial and Juvenal). Outside this list, there are comments in Suetonius and Tacitus, and a little in later historians referring to our period.

Modern Scholarship

Modern material divides into three main groups: analyses of ancient textiles and clothing; historical analyses of aspects of production and trade; and a very extensive range of studies of the so-called Silk Roads.


On the Silk Roads and Rome’s eastern trade generally, M.G. Raschke’s (1978) magisterial study of the sources remains a standard against which to judge others; while John Hill’s (2009) translation and commentary on the Hou Han Shu’s ‘Chronicle of the Western Regions’ provides a wealth of extracts from and comment upon a variety of papers and books that examine the Chinese tradition, going back to Hirth (1885). Luce Boulnois (1976) and J.-N. Robert (1997) provide contrasting views of the ancient trade routes, but the range of publications on the Silk Roads is enormous and steadily growing. Important recent additions to this list include Liu (2010), Rezakhani (2010) and Hansen (2012).

**Chinese Sources**

Several Chinese annalists provide information relating to contacts with the Roman world of our period. Chinese annals frequently repeat information from earlier annals. The earliest history is the *Shiji*, written by Sima Qian in 93 BC, and covering a period up to 96 BC. Chapter 123 contains some information about China’s relationships with the ‘Western Regions’ (*Xiyou*), which chiefly in this period meant east central Asia and the Yuezhi, Wusun and Xiongu people. A translation can be found in Watson (1961), vol. II, pp. 264-289.

There is more detail in the *Hanshu* (Chronicles of the Han), written by Ban Gu in AD 83 and covering the period from 210-23BC. Chapter 69 is devoted to the Western Regions, and includes details of the expedition of Zhang Qian. A translation with detailed notes is in Hulsewé & Loewe (1979).

The *Weilue* (Brief account of the Wei Dynasty) written by Yu Huan, covers the period from AD 220 to 265, and was written about AD 289. The work as a whole is lost, but the section on the Western Regions is reproduced as chapter 30 of the later *Sanguozhi*, dating from 429. The *Weilue* carries details of the report by Ban Yong to the emperor in AD125, based largely on the expedition to the west of Gan Ying. There is an up-to-date (though ‘draft’) translation by John Hill available online (Hill 2004) (accessed 12/07/2015).

The *Houhanshou* (Chronicles of the later Han), written by Fan Ye before his death in AD 445, covers the period from 23 BC to AD 220. Chapters 86 and 88 cover the Western Regions. The *Houhanshou* contains much of the material from the *Weilue*, but with some additional information. A translation with detailed commentary and references to a wide range of historical material can be found in Hill (2009).

All of these, and some later, sources are discussed relatively briefly and usefully by David Sevillano-López (2015) (In Spanish), and by Kolb & Speidel (2015), pp. 133-140.
Appendix 6.2 Silk Citations, by category of silk

Cos/Coae Vestes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aristotle H.A.</td>
<td>5.19.551b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callimachus</td>
<td>fr. 532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucretius R.N.</td>
<td>4.1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibullus</td>
<td>2.3.53, 2.4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propertius</td>
<td>1.2.1, 2.1.5, 4.2.23, 4.5.21, 4.5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace Od.</td>
<td>4.13.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat.</td>
<td>1.2.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid AA.</td>
<td>2.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pont.</td>
<td>4.1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persius</td>
<td>5.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny N.H.</td>
<td>11.76-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenal</td>
<td>8.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>8.352F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isidore Et.</td>
<td>19.22.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statius Silv.</td>
<td>3.4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quint. Inst.</td>
<td>12.10.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Ep.</td>
<td>3.82.7, 9.37.3, 11.8.5, 11.27.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacitus Ann.</td>
<td>2.33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suetonius Cal.</td>
<td>52.1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florus Epit.</td>
<td>1.24.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fronto Ep.Aur.</td>
<td>1.9.3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apuleius Met.</td>
<td>4.8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plutarch Mor.</td>
<td>396B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pausanias</td>
<td>6.26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anth.Lat.</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHA Car.</td>
<td>19.3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ant. Phil</td>
<td>17.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ant.Hel.</td>
<td>29.6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex.Sev.</td>
<td>33.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurel.</td>
<td>40.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm.</td>
<td>13.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gall.</td>
<td>8.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pert.</td>
<td>8.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassius Dio</td>
<td>43.24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.12.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.17.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.26.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.17.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Dio.</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ammianus Marcellinus 23.6
Digest
  21.2.37.1
  34.2.23pr.
  39.4.16.7
  39.16.6.1

Holoserica, subserica

SHA  Ant.Hel.  26.1.1
       26.1.2
       26.1
       26.2
       49.9
       49.10
       49.12
       49.13
       49.14
       49.15
       49.16
       49.17
       49.18
       49.19
       50.1
       50.2
       50.7
       50.8
       50.9
       50.10
       50.11
       52.8-15
       53.1
       53.2
       54.1
       54.13-15

Aurel.  15.4.4
        45.4.1

Claud.  14.8.2
        17.6.3

Quad.Tyr.  15.8.2

Tac.  10.4.1

Ed. Dio.*  7.50
          7.51
          26.1
          26.2
          49.9
          49.10
          49.12
          49.13
          49.14
          49.15
          49.16
          49.17
          49.18
          49.19
          50.1
          50.2
          50.7
          50.8
          50.9
          50.10
          50.11
          52.8-15
          53.1
          53.2
          54.1
          54.13-15

* Chapter numbers from Latin version
  (Smith et al, forthcoming)

Bombyx/bombycina

Propertius  2.3.15
Pliny N.H.  5.14
           11.76-8
           19.14
           24.108

Martial Ep.  8.33.15
            8.68.7
            11.49.5
            14.24

Juvenal Sat.  6.260
Apuleius Met.  8.27.4
            10.31.5

Clement of Alexandria Paed. 2.11
Digest  34.23.pr

‘Median Garments’

Herodotus  1.135
           2.84
           7.116
Xenophon Cyrop.  7.40
Nepos Vit. Paus.  3.1
Tertullian Pall.  4
Procopius Hist. Bell.  1.20.10
           1.70.9-12
APPENDIX 6.3 Silk and silk-related prices
from Diocletian’s Edict of Maximum Prices (A.D. 301) – from the new ‘complete’
Latin version (Crawford et al, forthcoming)

Ch.7 (Extract)
demercidibus operarior[um] et artificium

........

49. sarcinatori in veste suptile replicaturae  d sex
50. eidem aperturæ cum subsutura holosericae  d quinquaginta
51. eidem aperturæ cum subsutura subsericae  d triginta

ch.26 (Extract)
detelis

1. tela holosericis vestis scutlatae  d septingentis quinquaginta
vac cum omni instrumento ex lingo
2. tela subsericae vestis cum omni instrument ex ligno [d??]

Ch 49 (extract)
devestamentis

........

9. dalmatica virilis subserica clabans ypoblatÆæ uncias(???)  d ??
(tunic)
10. strictoria subserica clabansuncias ypoblatæ tres  d ??
(long-sleeved shirt)
11. strictoria asema [clabans uncias ypoblatae ???]  d s]ex milibus
12. dalmaticom[afor]tium subsericum aluum clavans
purpu[rae hy]poblatææ l[ifib.] unam  d quadraginta
qu[attu]or milibus
13. dalmaticoma[fortium Mu]tinense subsericæ clauans
[pur]purae hypoblatt[æ lib. u]nam  d quadragina sex
[milibus]
14. dalmaticom [fortium marinum subsericum ut supra  d qu[adra]ginta octo
mi[libus]
15. dalmatica holoserica virilise clavans purpuræ blattæ
selib  d quinqua[ginta milibus]
16. [dalmatic]comafortium holosericum alvum clau[ans??]æ lib. duas
    d centum triginta quinque milibus
17 [??] infectis eadem h[olo]seric[a] habita ratione
tincturæ sic[distrahi debe]t
18. strictoria holoserica clauans purp[ræ uncias se]x
    [d qu]adrag[ilnta ?? milibus]
19. [a]se[h]oloserica  d qu[adraginta quinque milibus]
Ch.50 (Extract)
de mercedibus plumariorum et sericariorum

1. *plumario in strictoria subserica pro uncial una d ducentos*
2. *in strictoria holoserica per singulas uncias d trecentos*

......

7. *barbaricario in holoserica in uncial una d quingentos*
8. *operis secondi in uncial una d quadrtringentos*
9. *sericario in subserica pasto diurnos d viginti quinque*
10. *in holoserica pura pasto diurnos d viginti quinque*
11. *in holoserica scutlata d quadraginta*

Ch.52 (Extract)
de fullonibus

...... (fulloni)

8. *in dalmatica virile subserica rude d ducentos*
9. *in strictoria subserica rude d centum septuaginta quinque*
10. *in asema subserica rude d centum viginti quinque*
11. *indalmaticom[fortio] subserico muliebri <rudi> d trecentos*
12. *in dalmatica holoserica virile rude d quadrtringentos*
13. *in dalmaticomafortio oloserico rude d sescentos*
14. *in strictoria oloserica clauata d ducentos quinquaginta*
15. *in asema holoserica rude d ducentos*

Ch.53
de pretiis serici

1. *serici albi 3 cm. vacat libra una d duodecim milibus*
2. *sericum solventibus cum <pu>rputa in uncia d sexaginta quattuor*

Ch.54 (Extract)
[de purpura]

1. [*purpurae metaxablattae libra una d centum quinquaginta milibus*]

........
13] metaxablattan sive in coloribus infectum solventibus in libra una d <tria milia>
14, [purpuram ad holosericum tingentibus in uncial una d centum sedecim]
15, [purpuram ad subsericum tingentibus in uncial una d sexaginta]
Appendix 7.1. Sources for Roman wines

Ancient Sources

Pliny the Elder is a key guide: Book 14 of the Natural History devotes a substantial amount of space to the vine, as does Book 23, and there are scattered references elsewhere. With wines, however, we also have the benefit of material from all three extant agricultural texts of the period, by Cato, Varro and Columella, each of whom takes a rather different approach to the subject, though each recognises the potential for profit from a well-run vineyard. Unsurprisingly, too, there is ample discussion of and allusion to wine in all its aspects in poetry, where Horace in particular has a justified reputation as a drinking man’s writer. There is much on drinking and drunkenness in Petronius and Martial, but rather less in Juvenal, and the expected stern critique in the younger Seneca’s letters. But there are few Latin authors who do not have something to say about wine; and among Greek writers of or near our period, Galen, who was an expert on wines, has a great deal to tell us about both wine-tasting and the medicinal virtues (or demerits) of different wines, and sheds interesting light on the way in which health-driven wine fashions developed among the élite; while Athenaeus and Plutarch are full of wine lore, much of it ancient or abstruse (The bulk of Athenaeus’s wine references are from old or Middle Comedy, and thus focused on Greek origins, and some 5-600 years before his time).

The medical sources are something of a special case. Apart from Galen, the remainder, including the medical books of Pliny, are effectively books of recipes for remedies, though they provide some material on the perceived merits or demerits of specific wines for particular conditions. Their wine repertoires are confined to a few leading brands.

Modern Scholarship

The key modern source is André Tchernia’s Le vin de l’Italie romaine (1986, 2nd ed. 2016), which is an authoritative and detailed monograph drawing on the author’s knowledge of both amphorae and of viticulture. This is an indispensible guide, to which this case study inevitably owes a great deal, though his treatment of non-Italian wines is quite cursory, so he does not give a fully-rounded view of the broader wine market of our period. It is usefully supplemented by Le vin romain antique, by Tchernia and Jean-Pierre Brun (1999), which recounts, as one of its main themes, an attempt to reproduce Roman wine-making and a Roman wine. The older text of Billiard (1913) remains valuable, though he tends to ignore Galen among the key ancient texts; while Christian Vandermeersch (1994) provides a readily accessible overview of the contribution of

---

1131 A view vigorously disputed by Rosenstein (2008), though he admits that his model is essentially schematic. He argues that the profitability of wine-growing was, at least, seriously over-sold.
1132 See, eg, Lill (2000); McKinlay (1946, 1947); Commager (1957). As these and other writers make clear, it is naïve to take much of what Horace says about the pleasures of drinking entirely at face value: he was not a drunken poet. Lill, in particular, argues that Horace uses different wines in carefully chosen contexts to tie in with particular emotions.
1133 Aristaeus, Dioscorides, Scribonius Largo, Celsus, Caelius Aurelius, Pliny NH. 23-32.
amphorae to our understanding of trade in wines, in a field where new analyses proliferate, though his focus is on an earlier, less well-charted period.


The economics of the Roman wine trade are a subject of dispute, though Varro and Columella, especially the latter, clearly saw vineyards as an important source of profit. Modern treatments include Purcell (1985), Tchernia (1989, 2006), Temin (2001), Rosenstein (2008), Broekaart (2012 a, b). There are useful analyses of Roman bars by Kléberg (1957) and Ellis (2004), while Jashemski (1967) and Rowland (1969) provide much of what little we know about Roman wine retailers. The archaeology of Ostia, Pompeii and Herculaneum provides many examples of bars and some winesellers, though the precise function of many ‘tabernae’ remains open to doubt.

Roman dining and drinking habits are well covered by the collections of Murray & Tecusan (1995), Slater (1991) and Donahue (2003).

Several articles address at least some of the language used about individual wines, among which Beta (1999), Bettini (1995) and La Penna (1999) are more or less general, while Commager (1962), Lill (2000), McKinlay (1946, 1947) and Murray (1985) focus specifically on Horace.
Appendix 7.2 Wine citations: summary data from the database
- see Appendix 7.3 for full details

1. Citations by author
(those with 10+ citations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>No. of citations</th>
<th>No. of brands named</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galen</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny the Elder</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caelius Aurelius</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silius Italicus</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varro</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columella</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenal</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribonius Largo</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vergil</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statius</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 authors = 999 citations = 87.8% of total (n=1137).
291 citations (25.6%) are from medical writers (not including Pliny’s medical books).
2. Main brands (10+ citations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>No. of citations</th>
<th>Of which, medical (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>54 (29.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chium*</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27 (42.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbium</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18 (31.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18 (48.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6 (17.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thasium</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7 (20.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13 (41.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massicum</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setinum</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3 (12.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabinum</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15 (62.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmolites</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14 (63.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signinum</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13 (65.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coum</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5 (26.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raeticum</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsicum</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8 (66.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibertinum</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pramnium</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranum</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caenum</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadrianum</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6 (60.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massilitanum</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* inc. Ariusium (15)

21 brands = 669 = 58.8%. o/w medical author citations = 200 = 29.9
APPENDIX 7.3 Citations of Roman and Greek Wines, by Brand and Author

The list that follows is taken from the database compiled for this thesis. The data are based originally on Appendix II of Tchernia (1986), supplemented by a wider coverage of Greek and Eastern Mediterranean wines. The full database, which is available online with this thesis, as an Excel file, includes the following fields:

- Author
- Citation reference
- Wine brand
- Context – eg wine growing, entertaining, banquet, celebration
- Keyword or words
- Approximate date of ‘publication’

The data can be manipulated to provide analysis by author, brand and date. For simplicity of presentation the data that follow are confined to the first three fields – author, reference and wine brand.

In the primary table, wines are listed alphabetically, and where they are cited by more than one author, the authors are also ordered alphabetically.
## Appendix 7.3. Wine Brand Citations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Wine</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Wine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>17.1.42</td>
<td>Abydos</td>
<td>Galen</td>
<td>(ed 14.15</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1,30E</td>
<td>Acanthium</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>Sat 2.8.16</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>5.10.3</td>
<td>Adrianum</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>Sat2.4.72</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed</td>
<td>6.337</td>
<td>Aegeates</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>4.11.2</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed</td>
<td>6.600</td>
<td>Aegeates</td>
<td>Juvenal</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed</td>
<td>6.600</td>
<td>Aegeates</td>
<td>Juvenal</td>
<td>6.365.015</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed</td>
<td>10.833</td>
<td>Aegeates</td>
<td>Juvenal</td>
<td>13.214</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>17.208</td>
<td>Aemilia</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>Aenatium</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.64</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.27B</td>
<td>Aequanum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>Africanum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columella</td>
<td>3.3.2</td>
<td>Ager Gallicus</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>23.36</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varro</td>
<td>RR1.2.7</td>
<td>Ager Gallicus</td>
<td>Statius</td>
<td>Silv. 4.8.39</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>Alba Pompeia</td>
<td>Galen (ed</td>
<td>6.800</td>
<td>Albates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.33A</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>Galen (ed</td>
<td>10.833</td>
<td>Albates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.26D</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>Galen (ed</td>
<td>11.648</td>
<td>Albates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cael Aurel</td>
<td>Ac2.211</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>Silius Ital</td>
<td>12.526</td>
<td>Allifanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columella</td>
<td>3.2.16</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>Celsus</td>
<td>4.12.7</td>
<td>Allobrog-icum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columella</td>
<td>3.8.5</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>Columella</td>
<td>3.2.16</td>
<td>Allobrog-icum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columella</td>
<td>3.9.2</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>12.7.2</td>
<td>Amblada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion Hal</td>
<td>1.37.2</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>Ambraciotum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion Hal</td>
<td>1.66.3</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>Amertinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>14.8(12)</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>Silius Ital</td>
<td>12.526</td>
<td>Allifanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>5.6.6</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>Celsus</td>
<td>4.12.7</td>
<td>Allobrog-icum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed</td>
<td>5.10.2</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>Columella</td>
<td>3.2.16</td>
<td>Allobrog-icum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed</td>
<td>6.275</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>12.7.2</td>
<td>Amblada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed</td>
<td>10.485</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>Ambraciotum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed</td>
<td>6.334</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>Silius Ital</td>
<td>12.526</td>
<td>Allifanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed</td>
<td>6.806</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>Celsus</td>
<td>4.12.7</td>
<td>Allobrog-icum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed</td>
<td>10.833</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.33F</td>
<td>Antyllum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed</td>
<td>10.835</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>Apamenum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed</td>
<td>13.659</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>Galen (ed</td>
<td>10.835</td>
<td>Aphrodisiense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed</td>
<td>13.659</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>Galen (ed</td>
<td>13.659</td>
<td>Aphrodisiense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>10.98.1</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>10.1.6</td>
<td>Carystium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>11.56.11</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>13.4.11</td>
<td>Catacecaum enites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>12.17.6</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>Catacecaum enites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>12.60.9</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>Catacecaum enites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>13.115</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>16.173</td>
<td>Vitruvius 8.3.12.7 Catacecaum enites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>13.4.11</td>
<td>Catacecaum enites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>14.1.15</td>
<td>Catacecaum enites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.61</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>Vitruvius</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>Caulinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>1.27C</td>
<td>Caecina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>16.173</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>Aelian</td>
<td>VH13.6</td>
<td>Cerynia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>12.8D</td>
<td>Chalybonium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>5.4.8</td>
<td>Catania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>5.3.5</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>6.2.3</td>
<td>Catania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>5.3.6</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.27B</td>
<td>Caecina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitruvius</td>
<td>8.3.12</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>Caulinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columella</td>
<td>3.9.6</td>
<td>Caeretanum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>Caulinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>6.73.3</td>
<td>Caeretanum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.28D</td>
<td>Chalybonium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>13.124</td>
<td>Caeretanum</td>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>15.3.22</td>
<td>Chalybonium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>Caesena-</td>
<td>Aelian</td>
<td>VH12.31</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.27A</td>
<td>Calenum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.3F</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>Od 1.20.9</td>
<td>Calenum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.26B</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>Od1.31.9</td>
<td>Calenum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.28E</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>Od1.31.9</td>
<td>Calenum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.28F</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>Od4.12.14</td>
<td>Calenum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.29A</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenal</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>Calenum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.31B</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>3.60.1</td>
<td>Calenum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.32F</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>Calenum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.33C</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>5.4.3</td>
<td>Calenum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>4.167E</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius</td>
<td>1.8.18</td>
<td>Calenum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>9.375E</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>11.473A</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>13.118</td>
<td>Campania</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>11.484F</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>Campania</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>11.498C</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>18.336</td>
<td>Campania</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>12.565B</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>Campania</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>13.579F</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>30.146</td>
<td>Campania</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.29E</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>5.4.3</td>
<td>Campania</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>12.567A</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>Cantharite</td>
<td>Chrysostom</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.31D</td>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>Diod</td>
<td>5.11.7</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polybius</td>
<td>34.7.1</td>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columella</td>
<td>3.9.2</td>
<td>Carseola-</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>37.9.4</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>17.213</td>
<td>Carseola-</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>37.9.4</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>17.213</td>
<td>Carseola-</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>37.9.4</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen</td>
<td>6.801</td>
<td>Caryinum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>37.9.4</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>37.9.4</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen</td>
<td>8.774</td>
<td>Caryinum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>37.9.4</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>37.9.4</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.31D</td>
<td>Carynium</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>37.9.4</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>37.9.4</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plautus</td>
<td>Curc.79</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrib. Larg.</td>
<td>Comp.27.1</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.29.15</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.2.19</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.1.15</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.2.19</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.3.19</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibullus</td>
<td>2.1.27</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varro</td>
<td>Men Sat 104</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varro</td>
<td>LI.9.67</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varro</td>
<td>VPR 125.5</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varro</td>
<td>RR 2 pr.4</td>
<td>Chium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>5.10.5</td>
<td>Cilician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.33B</td>
<td>Cilicium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>Cilicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>5.1.12</td>
<td>Cispadana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>Clazomenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>5.10.10</td>
<td>Clazomenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>Clusium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.32F</td>
<td>Cnidium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cael Aurel</td>
<td>Ac 3.43</td>
<td>Cnidium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>Cnidium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>14.1.15</td>
<td>Cnidium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>Cnidium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>Consentium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.33F</td>
<td>Corecyrean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.30F</td>
<td>Corinthium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>9.2.6</td>
<td>Corsum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelian</td>
<td>VH 12.31</td>
<td>Courn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.32E</td>
<td>Courn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.33B</td>
<td>Courn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cato</td>
<td>De Ag 105</td>
<td>Courn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cato</td>
<td>De Ag 112</td>
<td>Courn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>5.10.10</td>
<td>Courn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>Sat 2.8.9</td>
<td>Courn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>Sat 2.4.29</td>
<td>Courn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persius</td>
<td>5.135</td>
<td>Courn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>Courn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>Courn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>15.66</td>
<td>Courn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>23.19</td>
<td>Courn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>27.44</td>
<td>Courn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>Courn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>14.1.15</td>
<td>Courn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.2.19</td>
<td>Counm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varro</td>
<td>RR 2 pr.4</td>
<td>Counm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cael Aurel</td>
<td>Chr 2.104</td>
<td>Creticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.26F</td>
<td>Cumaean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>Cumaean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.31D</td>
<td>Cumaean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>Cyprum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen</td>
<td>(ed) 8.775</td>
<td>Creticum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>5.10.7</td>
<td>Ephesiam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>5.11.7</td>
<td>Ephesiam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>Ephesiam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.27C</td>
<td>Erbulanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.32B</td>
<td>Erythraeum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion Hal</td>
<td>1.37.2</td>
<td>Etruria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.30F</td>
<td>Euboeum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>128.14</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.26C</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.26D</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.26.E</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.26F</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.27A</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.27C</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.33A</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aukus Gellius</td>
<td>NA 6.20.6</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cael Aurel</td>
<td>Ac 2.211</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cael Aurel</td>
<td>Ac 2.212</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catullus</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td>Or 2.242.11</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td>Brutus 287</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td>in Mac 2.3.2</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columella</td>
<td>10.431</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dig</td>
<td>33.1.17.1</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diod Sic</td>
<td>37.3.3</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion Hal</td>
<td>1.37.2</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion Hal</td>
<td>1.66.3</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion Hal</td>
<td>14.8(12)</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>5.10.1</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>5.11.5</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florus</td>
<td>1.11.5</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fronto</td>
<td>De El. 1.4.9</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fronto</td>
<td>De Fer Als</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Ep</td>
<td>Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fronto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>6.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>6.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>6.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>6.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>6.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>6.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>6.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>8.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>10.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>10.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>10.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>10.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>11.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>11.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>12.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>12.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>12.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>13.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>13.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>13.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>13.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>13.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>14.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>14.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>14.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>14.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>14.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>14.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>14.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>15.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>15.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>15.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>15.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>15.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>15.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>15.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>15.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
<td>15.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>1.106.3</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>2.40.6</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>3.77.8</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>5.64.1</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>6.27.5</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>7.27.8</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>8.55.14</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>8.77.5</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>9.22.8</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>9.73.5</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>9.93.1</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>10.36.5</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>10.66.6</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>11.8.7</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>11.26.3</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>11.36.5</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>11.49.7</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>12.17.5</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>12.57.22</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>12.70.5</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>13.120</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid</td>
<td>Ep P. 4.2.9</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persius</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petronius</td>
<td>Sat 21</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petronius</td>
<td>Sat 28</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petronius</td>
<td>Sat 34</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petronius</td>
<td>Sat55</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaedrus</td>
<td>Fab.3.1.2</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philodemus</td>
<td>11.1.25</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>1.23a.30</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.38</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.62.1</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.62.3</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.6.3</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.97.4</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.97.5</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>22.87</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>23.34</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>23.36</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>37.47</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propertius</td>
<td>2.33A.40</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propertius</td>
<td>4.6.72</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrib.Larg</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrib.Larg</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrib.Larg</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

319
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.27A</td>
<td>Fundanum</td>
<td>Galen (ed)</td>
<td>6.334</td>
<td>Hadrianum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>13.113</td>
<td>Fundanum</td>
<td>Galen (ed)</td>
<td>6.806</td>
<td>Gauranum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>Fundanum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.30B</td>
<td>Icarius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>5.3.6</td>
<td>Fundanum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.30C</td>
<td>Icarius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitruvius</td>
<td>8.3.12.8</td>
<td>Fundanum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.30D</td>
<td>Icarius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed) Kuhn)</td>
<td>6.334</td>
<td>Gabianum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.30F</td>
<td>Ismarium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>5.34.2</td>
<td>Gallia Cisalpina</td>
<td>Philippus</td>
<td>AP 9.232</td>
<td>Hadrianiacetum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.124</td>
<td>Gallia Cisalpina</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>Halicarnassius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>Gallia Cisalpina</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.32B</td>
<td>Halicarnassius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>17.49</td>
<td>Gallia Cisalpina</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.32E</td>
<td>Heracleotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>17.208</td>
<td>Gallia Cisalpina</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>Heracliaen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plutarch</td>
<td>Mor 676B</td>
<td>Gallia Cisalpina</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.31F</td>
<td>Heracliaen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polybius</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Gallia Cisalpina</td>
<td>Aelian</td>
<td>VH 13.6</td>
<td>Hippodamantium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>5.1.12</td>
<td>Gallia Cisalpina</td>
<td>Galen (ed) Kuhn)</td>
<td>6.801</td>
<td>Hippodamantium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.26F</td>
<td>Gauranum</td>
<td>Galen (ed) Kuhn)</td>
<td>10.836</td>
<td>Hippodamantium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florus</td>
<td>1.11.5</td>
<td>Gauranum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>Hippodamantium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fronto</td>
<td>Ep.ad M. Caes 4.4.2</td>
<td>Gauranum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>Hippodamantium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed) Kuhn)</td>
<td>6.806</td>
<td>Gauranum</td>
<td>Petronius</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Hispanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed) Kuhn)</td>
<td>10.833</td>
<td>Gauranum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.30C</td>
<td>Icarius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed) Kuhn)</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>Gauranum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.30D</td>
<td>Icarius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenal</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>Gauranum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.28D</td>
<td>Issa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>Gauranum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.31C</td>
<td>Laconian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.38</td>
<td>Gauranum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.31C</td>
<td>Laconian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>Gauranum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>Lagarinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statius</td>
<td>Silv.2.1. 147</td>
<td>Gauranum</td>
<td>Cassiodorus Var.12.22</td>
<td>Istricum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statius</td>
<td>Silv.3.5.99</td>
<td>Gauranum</td>
<td>Cassiodorus Var.12.23</td>
<td>Istricum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmachus</td>
<td>Ep.1.8</td>
<td>Gauranum</td>
<td>Cassiodorus Var.12.24</td>
<td>Istricum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>Genua</td>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>5.10.5</td>
<td>Istricum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>Graviscanum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.26E</td>
<td>Labicanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiphilus</td>
<td>AP 6.257</td>
<td>Hadrianum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.31C</td>
<td>Laconian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.33A</td>
<td>Hadrianum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>Lagarinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>5.6.7</td>
<td>Hadrianum</td>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>6.1.14</td>
<td>Lagarinae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed) Kuhn)</td>
<td>6.275</td>
<td>Hadrianum</td>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>1.26.9</td>
<td>Laetanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed) Kuhn)</td>
<td>6.334</td>
<td>Hadrianum</td>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>7.54.6</td>
<td>Laetanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed) Kuhn)</td>
<td>6.806</td>
<td>Gauranum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>Laetanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed) Kuhn)</td>
<td>6.806</td>
<td>Gauranum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.29F</td>
<td>Lampscacum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed) Kuhn)</td>
<td>6.334</td>
<td>Hadrianum</td>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>16.2.9</td>
<td>Laodicium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed) Kuhn)</td>
<td>6.334</td>
<td>Hadrianum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>Latiniense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed) Kuhn)</td>
<td>6.334</td>
<td>Hadrianum</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.38</td>
<td>Laurentium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
<th>Place(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>5.10.3</td>
<td>Mamertium</td>
<td>Grattius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>5.11.6</td>
<td>Mamertium</td>
<td>Horace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>13.117</td>
<td>Mamertium</td>
<td>Horace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>Mamertium</td>
<td>Horace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>Mamertium</td>
<td>Martial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>6.2.3</td>
<td>Mamertium</td>
<td>Martial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitruvius</td>
<td>8.3.12</td>
<td>Mamertium</td>
<td>Plautus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.33D</td>
<td>Mareotium</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.33D</td>
<td>Mareotium</td>
<td>Pliny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grattius</td>
<td>Cyn. 314</td>
<td>Mareotium</td>
<td>Silius Ital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>Od 1.37.14</td>
<td>Mareotium</td>
<td>Silius Ital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>Mareotium</td>
<td>Silius Ital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statius</td>
<td>Silv.3.2.24</td>
<td>Mareotium</td>
<td>Statius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>17.1.14</td>
<td>Mareotium</td>
<td>Virgil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgil</td>
<td>Geo.2.91</td>
<td>Mareotium</td>
<td>Virgil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>Mareotium</td>
<td>Virgil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.26F</td>
<td>Marsicum</td>
<td>Virgil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cael Aurelius</td>
<td>Chr. 4.71</td>
<td>Marsicum</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>6.337</td>
<td>Marsicum</td>
<td>Galen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>10.831</td>
<td>Marsicum</td>
<td>(ed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>10.832</td>
<td>Marsicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>11.441</td>
<td>Marsicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>13.659</td>
<td>Marsicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Kuhn</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>Marsicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>13.121</td>
<td>Marsicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>14.116</td>
<td>Marsicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>17.171</td>
<td>Marsicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrib. Larg</td>
<td>3.8.5</td>
<td>Marsicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columella</td>
<td>1.11.5</td>
<td>Massicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florus</td>
<td>Ep.ad M.</td>
<td>Massicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varro</td>
<td>1.3.3</td>
<td>Massilia-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.29D</td>
<td>Mendeum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.29E</td>
<td>Mendeum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.29F</td>
<td>Mendeum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>4.129D</td>
<td>Mendeum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>4.146E</td>
<td>Mendeum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Athenaeus 8.335A Mendeum Martial 1.105.1 Nomentanum
Athenaeus 11.484C Mendeum Martial 10.48.19 Nomentanum
Athenaeus 1.31A Mendeum Pliny 14.48 Nomentanum
Strabo 14.1.15 Mesogian Pliny 14.23 Nomentanum
Strabo 14.1.47 Mesogites Pliny 14.48 Nomentanum
Pliny 14.75 Mesogiticum Pliny 14.48 Nomentanum
Silius Ital 7.210-11 Methymna Pliny 14.49 Nomentanum
Strabo 14.1.47 Metropoli Pliny 14.48 Nomentanum
Pliny 14.37 Mevania Pliny 17.212 Novaria
Athenaeus 1.30B Mitylene Pliny 14.76 Oeneates
Mysiana Pliny 14.76 Oreticum
Pliny 14.35 Mutina Pliny 14.76 Oreticum
Pliny 14.75 Myconia Pliny 14.76 Oreticum
Ath. 1.32E Myndium Pliny 14.76 Oreticum
Athenaeus 1.32E Myndium Athenaeus 1.29A Peparthium
Athenaeus 1.33B Myndium Athenaeus 1.29A Peparthium
Galen (ed) 6.334 Mysium Pliny 14.76 Peparthium
Kuhn) Galen (ed) 10.833 Mysium Pliny 14.76 Peparthium
Kuhn) Galen (ed) 6.335 Mysium Galen (ed) 6.337 Perperi
tum Kuhn)
Kuhn) Galen (ed) 13.659 Mysium Galen (ed) 6.800 Perperi
tum Kuhn)
Pliny 14.75 Mysticum Galen (ed) 6.800 Perperi
tum Kuhn)
Pliny 14.76 Naspercen- Galen (ed) 6.805 Perperi
tites Kuhn)
Athenaeus 1.30F Naxium Galen (ed) 10.833 Perperi
tum Kuhn)
Athenaeus 2.52D Naxium Galen (ed) 10.833 Perperi
tum Kuhn)
Propertius 3.17.27 Naxium Pliny 14.75 Petritanum
Galen (ed) 6.334-5 Neapolita- Varro 1.27 Phrygium
num Galen (ed) 6.806 Phanaroea
Kuhn) Galen (ed) 12.3.30 Pliny 3.127 Picenum
Kuhn) Galen (ed) Athenaeus 1.27D Pliny 3.127 Picenum
Kuhn) Galen (ed) Athenaeus 1.29D Pliny 14.39 Picenum
Kuhn) Galen (ed) Athenaeus 2.57E Pliny 14.60.1 Picenum
Kuhn) Galen (ed) Pliny 14.79 Picenum
Kuhn) Galen (ed) Pliny 14.79 Picenum
Kuhn) Galen (ed) Pliny 14.79 Picenum
Kuhn) Athenaeus 1.27B Pliny 14.35 Pisanum
Columella 3.2.14-15 Nomentanum Pollia
Columella 3.3.3 Nomentanum Pompeia
num
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>5,3,6</td>
<td>Statanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>5.4.3</td>
<td>Persius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>Statanum in Statius Silmonense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>17.250</td>
<td>Pliny in Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aretaeus (ed Hude)</td>
<td>128.13</td>
<td>Pliny in Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.26D</td>
<td>Pliny in Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.26E</td>
<td>Pliny in Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.27B</td>
<td>Pliny in Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cael Aurel</td>
<td>Ac.2.211</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cael Aurel</td>
<td>Ac.2.212</td>
<td>Pliny in Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cael Aurel</td>
<td>Chr.4.71</td>
<td>Pliny in Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columella</td>
<td>3.2.10</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columella</td>
<td>3.8.5</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digest</td>
<td>33.6.16</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>5.10.3</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>5.11.5</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed Kuhn)</td>
<td>6.275</td>
<td>Pliny in Surrentinum in Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed Kuhn)</td>
<td>6.334</td>
<td>Pliny in Surrentinum in Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed Kuhn)</td>
<td>6.335</td>
<td>Pliny in Surrentinum in Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed Kuhn)</td>
<td>10.831</td>
<td>Pliny in Surrentinum in Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed Kuhn)</td>
<td>11.604</td>
<td>Pliny in Surrentinum in Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed Kuhn)</td>
<td>11.648</td>
<td>Pliny in Surrentinum in Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed Kuhn)</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>Pliny in Surrentinum in Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>Sat.2.4.55</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenal</td>
<td>6.365.</td>
<td>Pliny in Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(O15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>13.110</td>
<td>Pliny in Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>14.102</td>
<td>Pliny in Surrentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>Tarraco-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silius Ital</td>
<td>3.369</td>
<td>ense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silius Ital</td>
<td>15.177</td>
<td>Tarraco-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>Tauromenitum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>Tauromenitum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>Telmesi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>Tempsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelian</td>
<td>VH12.31</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silius Ital</td>
<td>15.177</td>
<td>Tarraco-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>Tarraco-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelian</td>
<td>VH13.6</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apuleius</td>
<td>apol 24.11</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.28E</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.28E</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.29A</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.29E</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.31A</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.31F</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.32A</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>2.47C</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>4.129F</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>4.146E</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>10.432B</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>10.455B</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>10.460C</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>11.478E</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>13.579B</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>14.601F</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td>Or 2.242</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dio</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysostom</td>
<td>66.26</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plautus</td>
<td>Poen.697</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.117</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgil</td>
<td>Geo.2.91</td>
<td>Thasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.33F</td>
<td>Thebaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.337</td>
<td>Theriaeum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.801</td>
<td>Theriaeum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.804</td>
<td>Theriaeum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 10.833</td>
<td>Theriaeum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 11.649</td>
<td>Theriaeum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.338</td>
<td>Therenum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.801</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.804</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 10.833</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 11.649</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.338</td>
<td>Therenum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.801</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.804</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 10.833</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 11.649</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.338</td>
<td>Therenum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.801</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.804</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 10.833</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 11.649</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.338</td>
<td>Therenum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.801</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.804</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 10.833</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 11.649</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.338</td>
<td>Therenum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.801</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.804</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 10.833</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 11.649</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.338</td>
<td>Therenum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.801</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.804</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 10.833</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 11.649</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.338</td>
<td>Therenum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.801</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.804</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 10.833</td>
<td>Therinum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 11.649</td>
<td>Therenume</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.338</td>
<td>Therenum</td>
<td>Kuhn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.806)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Titacazen-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 10.485)</td>
<td></td>
<td>num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 10.833)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Titacazen-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 14.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td>num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 15.648)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Titacazen-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides 5.10.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.335)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.802)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 6.803)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 10.835)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 10.836)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 10.836)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 11.604)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 12.728)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 13.513)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 13.659)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 14.28)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed 14.29)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid Fast.2.313</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid Met. 6.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny 14.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca Phoen. 602</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silius Ital 7.210-11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo 14.1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgil Geo.2.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tmolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitruvius 8.3.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transpad-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florus 1.38.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>ana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny 14.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transpad-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny 17.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transpad-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny 17.201</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transpad-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Page Reference</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varro</td>
<td>RR 1.8.6</td>
<td>Uria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>1.18.2</td>
<td>Vaticanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>6.92.3</td>
<td>Vaticanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>10.45.5</td>
<td>Vaticanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>12.48.14</td>
<td>Vaticanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.27C</td>
<td>Veafranum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>Sat 2.3.143</td>
<td>Veientanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>1.103.9</td>
<td>Veientanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>2.53.4</td>
<td>Veientanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>3.49.1</td>
<td>Veientanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persius</td>
<td>5.147</td>
<td>Veientanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.27A</td>
<td>Veliternum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>Veliternum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.27C</td>
<td>Venafran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florus</td>
<td>1.38.13</td>
<td>Venetia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>17.49</td>
<td>Venetia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>17.201</td>
<td>Venetia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>Verona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columella</td>
<td>3.2.10</td>
<td>Vesuvium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dio Cassius</td>
<td>66.21.3</td>
<td>Vesuvium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florus</td>
<td>1.11.5</td>
<td>Vesuvium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florus</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Vesuvium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (ed Kuhn)</td>
<td>10.364</td>
<td>Vesuvium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>4.44.1</td>
<td>Vesuvium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>Vesuvium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>5.4.8</td>
<td>Vesuvium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>13.107</td>
<td>Viennense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>Viennense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>14.57</td>
<td>Viennense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>1.33B</td>
<td>Zacynthium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 7.4  
**EPIGRAPHIC BRANDING**  
Identifiable brands from CIL and other sources

#### Italian Wines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>CIL</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>CIL</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.4531</td>
<td>Albanum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.5511</td>
<td>Gauranum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1101</td>
<td>Ariminum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>1.233</td>
<td>Hadrianum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4554</td>
<td>Beneventanum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>15.4573</td>
<td>Hadrianum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9797</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>15.1554</td>
<td>Massicum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4545</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>10.114</td>
<td>Petelinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4546</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>Ed. Dio.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Picenum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4547</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.55597</td>
<td>Pompeianum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4550</td>
<td>Caecubum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>15.4590</td>
<td>Rheginum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.45327</td>
<td>Campania</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>6.5511</td>
<td>Sabinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2564</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.1292</td>
<td>Setinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2565</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>6.9797</td>
<td>Setinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2566</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>8.22640</td>
<td>Setinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5554</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>Ed. Dio.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Setinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6896</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>15.4740?</td>
<td>Signinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9313</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>Delatre (1906)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Statanum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10723</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.2555</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10724</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.2556</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9797</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.25617</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.22640</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.5514</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.919</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.5521</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4532</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.5522</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4552</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.5525</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4553</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.5560</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4554</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.5561</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4555</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.5562</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4556</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.9515</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4557</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.9328</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4558</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.9329</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4559</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>11.4592</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4560</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>Ed. Dio.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Surrentinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4561</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>Ed. Dio.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Tiburtinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4562</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.5518</td>
<td>Trifolinium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4563</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>15.4546</td>
<td>Tudor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4564</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>15.4595</td>
<td>Veientanum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4565</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.2257</td>
<td>Vesuvium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4566</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.2258</td>
<td>Vesuvium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4567</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.2259</td>
<td>Vesuvium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4568</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>8.22640</td>
<td>Vesuvium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other Origins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.4569</td>
<td>Fundanum</td>
<td>4.10721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4567</td>
<td>Fundanum</td>
<td>4.1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4566</td>
<td>Fundanum</td>
<td>4.1321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4565</td>
<td>Fundanum</td>
<td>4.2565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.5536</td>
<td>Coum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.5537</td>
<td>Coum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.5538</td>
<td>Coum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.5539</td>
<td>Coum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.5540</td>
<td>Coum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.5541</td>
<td>Coum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.9320</td>
<td>Coum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.9321</td>
<td>Coum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.10722</td>
<td>Coum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.5535</td>
<td>Cnidium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.5526</td>
<td>Creticum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.5558</td>
<td>Lauronese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.2654</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.6298</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.6299</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.6300</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.6301</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.6302</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.6469</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.6471</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.6472</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.6473</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.6474</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.6475</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.6476</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.6477</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.6478</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.6483</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.7004</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.9485</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.9787</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.9789</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.9790</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.9791</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.10285a</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.10285b</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.10452</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.10453</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.10454</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.10455</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.10456</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.1046</td>
<td>Luttios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.2602</td>
<td>Mesopotamiumum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>4.2603</td>
<td>Mesopotamiumum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 7.5
Wine Prices from Diocletian’s Edict on Maximum Prices (AD 301)

Chapter 2 *item de vinis*

1. Piceni  
   *ital.st*  
   *d triginta*

2. Tiburtini  
   *ital.st*  
   *d triginta*

3. Sabini  
   *ital.st*  
   *d triginta*

4. Aminnei  
   *ital.st*  
   *d triginta*

5. Saiti **  
   *ital.st*  
   *d triginta*

6. Surrentini  
   *ital.st*  
   *d triginta*

7. Falerini  
   *ital.st*  
   *d triginta*

8. *item vini veteris primi gustus*  
   *ital.st*  
   *d viginti quattuor*

9. *vini veteris sequentis gustus*  
   *ital.st*  
   *d sedecim*

10. *vini rustici*  
    *ital.st*  
    *d octo*

* st. = sextarius, or one-sixth of a congius. A congius was 3.27 litres, so a sextarius was 0.546 of a litre.
** Probably = Setini: wine of Setinum, rather than wine of the Saite nome in Egypt, not otherwise known.

*Source:* Crawford *et al* (forthcoming)

The seven fine wines – nos. 1-7 - are virtually 8 times the price of the cheapest *vini rustici*
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