CHAPTER 000

ROMAN ARCHITECTS AND THE STRUGGLE FOR FAME IN AN UNEQUAL SOCIETY[1]

CHRISTOPHER SIWICKI

1. Introduction

Construction is an activity that encourages competition. Rivalries between individuals, communities, and states are made manifest in physical structures, as attempts at one-upmanship can lead to increasingly large, lavish, and innovative buildings. There is also competition between architects for commissions. Yet what this study explores is rivalry between people working on the same project—an area that is more commonly associated with cooperation than with competition. When it comes to accrediting titular authorship, architecture is quite an unusual field. In art, music, and literature the nominal credit for a piece of work is generally retained by the creator rather than the client: we refer to Michelangelo's rather than Pope Clement VII's *Last Judgement*, and Mozart's not Count Franz Walsegg-Stuppach's *Requiem in D minor*. In the realm of architecture, however, while there are many instances of buildings being inseparably connected to the names of their designers, the sponsor, too, is often given credit for the structure, officially and in popular opinion, by name.[2] This can result in a competitive situation where each party feels that its contribution, be it fiscal or intellectual, merits recognition.

Focusing on Italy during the late republican and early-imperial periods, and looking at public rather than domestic buildings, this chapter considers the relationship between patrons and architects in ancient

[1] I am grateful to Cynthia Damon, Christoph Pieper, and the anonymous reviewer, whose thoughtful comments have helped develop the arguments and focus of this chapter.

[2] A discussion of authorship and architecture in historical contexts and modern practice is provided in Anstey, Grillner, and Hughes 2007.

Roman society. Specifically, it looks at the evidence for anxiety about and rivalry over being celebrated as the creator of a building, as it is revealed in anecdotal stories (section 2), tomb monuments (section 3), and Vitruvius's *On Architecture* (section 4). As we will see, convention in Roman society directed that those who sponsored a monument were given credit for it, while those who actually built the structure were ignored. Yet this investigation shows how members of the latter group did not simply accept the status quo but instead sought to have their involvement publicly recognized. The way in which they did so is indicative of the possibilities and limitations of competition between people of different status. Further, by examining how certain architects strove to gain fame for their achievements, we learn something about both the concerns of these professionals and the environment in which they worked.

2. Being Written Out

The immense gulf in social status between the different actors makes this a particularly interesting subject for exploring notions of competition in antiquity. In the city of Rome the patrons of civic buildings were almost always members of the ruling elite: during the republic this meant senators; under Augustus and thereafter it was mostly members of the imperial family.[3] Architects, by contrast, were skilled workers and, while some were Roman citizens, many of those operating in Italy were foreigners and freedmen.[4] The label 'architect' is used throughout this study, although defining the ancient understanding of the responsibilities of an *architectus*/*arkhitektōn* and who might be classified as such requires more exposition than is possible here. I use the term 'architect' as an umbrella title that refers to professional builders more generally; in addition to *architetctus*, this includes the engineer (*machinator*), the contractor (*redemptor*), and the supervisor (*praefectus fabrum* and *magister*), but not craftsmen such as carpenters and masons.[5] For what is relevant to this present

[3] Eck 1984, 129-167; 2010, 89-110; Patterson 2015, 213-242.

[4] On the status of architects working in Roman Italy, see Gros 1983, 425-452; Anderson 1997, 15-67; Wilson Jones 2000, 26-30; Thomas 2007: 91; Cuomo 2007: 145-152; on Caesar's equestrian *praefectus fabrum*, Mamurra, see Palmer 1983, 343-361.

[5] On using "architect" as a blanket term, see Taylor 2003: 9-14. On the definition and varied duties of architects and these other professions in ancient Rome, see Donderer 1996, 15-23; Anderson 1997, 3-15; 95-118 and Delaine 1997: 66-68; 2000, 120-125; Cuomo 2007, 134-145. The social distinction between architects and craftsmen in antiquity is commented on at Thomas 2007: 91.

investigation is not the difference between specialist job titles but rather the broader distinction between professionals and patrons.

The construction of a building is a collaborative process. Even if the conception of a particular building is the brainchild of one person, many others contribute to its creation and completion. Yet this is not the impression given by ancient authors when they refer to the monuments of Rome. A huge number of buildings were constructed and restored in the city of Rome during the first two centuries CE, but ancient literature contains the names of just five architects that can be connected with these projects.[6] Even when an author acknowledges the role of a professional builder in the construction process, that individual often remains unnamed. For example, when Pliny the Elder disapprovingly details the creation of the remarkable yet dangerous revolving theatres in 52 BCE, he asks rhetorically who should be admonished for the invention, the patron or the designer (*HN* 36.118). While Pliny names the *auctor* of the project, the aedile Scribonius Curio, he is either unaware of, or uninterested in the identity of the architect, simply referring to him as an *artifex*.[7]

In Roman society buildings were first and foremost the *monumenta* of their patrons. It was their names that were inscribed on the façades and recorded in the annals: the inscriptions of the Pantheon claim that Marcus Agrippa 'made it' (*fecit*) and Septimius Severus and Caracalla 'restored it' (*restituerunt*);[8] in his *Res Gestae* Augustus takes personal credit for over one hundred structures;[9] authors of poetry and prose consistently refer to buildings in possessive terms such as Metellus's portico or Catulus's temple, and instinctively record that emperor *x* built structure *y*.[10] The architects, who were arguably of equal or greater importance in determining the actual appearance of the buildings, are in most cases written out of the story. It is probable that this imbalance was more a societal and literary convention than a conscious effort on the part of almost every patron or

[6] Severus and Celer (Tac. *Ann.* 15.42), Raberius (Mart. *Epigrams*. 7.56), Apollodorus (Cass. Dio. 69.4.2-5), Decranius (*SHA Hadr*. 19.12). For references to architects in literature working outside of Rome and this period, see Anderson 1997, 15-67.

[7] Other stories where the architect goes unnamed include those recorded by Varro (*Rust.* 3.17.9), Aulus Gellius (*NA* 19.10), and Macrobius (*Sat*. 2.5.9).

[8] *CIL* 6.896 = *ILS* 129.

[9] *RG* 19-21.1.

[10] A similar point is made at Wiseman 2014, 44-45.

chronicler to suppress the role of the architect. Yet there are a number of stories about emperors being envious of architects' abilities.

Dio recounts the incident of an architect who devised a novel solution for righting a supposedly irreparable portico in Rome.[11] He claims that he cannot tell his readers the man's name because the emperor Tiberius, impressed at, but also envious of the architect's skill refused to allow it to be recorded and exiled him from the city. When the architect attempted to win favour again by demonstrating a type of unbreakable glass to Tiberius, he was executed. Versions of this last element of the story are also told by Petronius and Pliny the Elder, although they do not identify the anonymous individual as an architect.[12] The differing details, the implausibility of unbreakable glass, and the lack of specifics in the alternative accounts suggest that the incident has been distorted and is quite likely to be entirely apocryphal.[13] For the tale conforms to the theme of skilled practitioners being punished by petty rulers.[14]

The incident also has similarities to the relationship that Dio suggests existed between the emperor Hadrian and the architect Apollodorus of Damascus, who rose to prominence working under Trajan.[15] Supposedly, when Trajan was still alive and Hadrian attempted to interject in a conversation, Apollodorus insulted Hadrian by telling him to 'go away and draw your gourds.' Later, when Hadrian was emperor and sent Apollodorus the plans for the temple of Venus and Roma he was building, the critical response of the architect enraged the emperor, who on realising that Apollodorus was right, was forced to recognize his own shortcomings and invidiously put Apollodorus to death. Pointing to inconsistencies in the account and the existence of a wider hostile tradition to Hadrian, scholars have cast doubt the veracity of the incident.[16] Even if Apollodorus was executed, it seems unlikely that this was known to have been motivated by Hadrian's envy of his skill. These

[11] Cass. Dio. 57.21.5-7.

[12] Petron. *Sat*. 51; Plin. *NH* 36.195.

[13] David Scourfield argues persuasively in a forthcoming paper that it has the characteristics of an urban legend. I am grateful to the author for sharing his paper prior to publication.

[14] For example, on Nero, see Suet. *Ner*. 23.2-3; 24.1; Cass. Dio. 62.29; on Hadrian, see Cass. Dio. 69.3.4-4.1; cf. Swain 1989, 150-158.

[15] Cass. Dio 69.4.2-5.

[16] Paribeni 1943, 124-130; Millar 1964, 60-72 esp. 65-66; Ridley 1989, 551-565; Swain 1989, 150-158; Bowie 1997, 1-15.

stories, which highlight character faults of Tiberius and Hadrian, do not seem to me to indicate that emperors felt threatened by the recognition an architect might achieve: the gap in social status was too great for patrons to worry about being eclipsed. Nevertheless, they do indicate that in popular thought, at least, rivalry between emperors and architects was conceivable. Indeed, the alleged envy on the part of the emperors accords with the negative part of Cicero's definition of *aemulatio*.[17]

But what about those on the opposite side—were architects concerned about their fame, which was far less assured? [18] Even if convention directed that patrons received credit for the construction of public buildings, the desire of architects to be associated with the structures they built is indicated in the epigraphic record. Several inscriptions belonging to late-republican and early-imperial public buildings from southern Italy mention the architects responsible for their construction, including the theatres at Pompeii and Herculaneum and temple of Augustus at Pozzuoli.[19] Similarly, there are buildings on which an architect has signed his work less formally, as in a late second century BCE nymphaeum at Segni, where Quintus Mutius's name is written in pebble mosaic.[20]

However, the names of architects are never given equal prominence to those of the patrons: the text of their inscriptions is often smaller and placed in a less conspicuous location.[21] Indeed, in the nymphaeum at Segni Mutius's name would have been largely obscured by the falling water that fed the pool. The scarcity of building inscriptions that actually name the architect is most apparent in Rome, where none from this period seem to have survived.

There is a scarcity of building inscriptions that actually name the architect, especially in Rome, where apparently none from this period have survived. While this might be due to the random preservation of material,

---

[17] Cic. *Tusc*. 4.8.17; 4.26.56: *est aemulatio aegritudo, si eo quod concupierit alius potiatur, ipse careat*; 4.56: *illa vitiosa aemulatione, quae rivalitati similis est*. See also the Introduction to this volume.

[18] Thomas (2007: 91-103) explores a similar question in relation to Greek East in the Antonine period.

[19] *CIL* 10.841 = *ILS* 5638a; *CIL* 10.1443; *CIL* 10.1614. A catalogue of Roman-era inscriptions that refer to architects is provided by Donderer 1996.

[20] Cifarelli 1995, 159-188. I am grateful to Stephen Kay for bringing this example to my attention. On architects signing work, see Donderer 1996, 34-39.

[21] Donderer 1996, 27-34; Taylor 2003, 9-10; Thomas 2007, 91-92; Hurwit 2015, 28-29.

it also seems indicative of the rarity with which architects had their names inscribed on structures (Donderer 1996, 27-39). Certainly, their relative lack of visibility in the epigraphic record corresponds with the already noted dearth of references to named architects in literature.[22]

Frequently denied formal acknowledgement for their part in the construction of buildings, whether by patrons or writers, some architects took matters into their own hands and employed alternative strategies to achieve recognition. But to what end? Revealingly, the strategies they employed indicate that their anxieties over reputation go beyond concerns about immediate distinction or securing further work. In the same way that patrons understood and utilized public buildings as *monumenta* to ensure fame beyond their lifetime, so, too, we find architects striving for this goal.[23] Unlike poets though, where a successful work is anticipated as bringing fame to both the dedicatee and the author, for architects the patron was a potential rival.

3. Writing Yourself In

Pliny the Elder, in his account of architectural marvels in *Natural History* 36, gives a brief description of the famous light at Alexandria (36.83):

> The tower is said to have cost 800 talents. We should not fail to mention the generous spirit shown by King Ptolemy, whereby he allowed the name of the architect , Sostratus of Cnidos, to be inscribed on the very fabric of the building.[24]

> …quam (*sc.* turrem) constitisse DCCC talentis tradunt, magno animo, ne quid omittamus Ptolemaei regis, quo in ea permiserit Sostrati Cnidi architecti structura ipsa nomen inscribi.

[22] For a comparison with the far greater number of artists who are mentioned in literature, see Vollkommer 2014, appendix 5.1.

[23] For examples of close interaction between architects and patrons see Cic. *Fam.* 3.1; *Att*. 2.3; Plin. *Ep*. 9.39; Dio 69.4.2-5. On the Roman understanding of *monumenta*, see Thomas 2007. 2 and 165-170.

[24] Plin. *NH*. 36.83. Translation by Eichholz 1962.

The accuracy of Pliny's explanation for the presence of Sostratus's name has been justifiably questioned.[25] Indeed, rather than revealing the state of patron-architect relationships in third-century BCE Alexandria, the comment is arguably more indicative of the situation familiar to Pliny in first-century CE Rome. The very fact that he considers it a magnanimous, noteworthy, and therefore presumably rare act for a patron to permit an architect to have his name inscribed on a structure corresponds to the general attitude we have already seen in Roman society.

Writing two generations later, Lucian presents a somewhat different story about the inscription in *How to Write History* (62):

> 'Do you know what the Cnidian architect (*ἀρχιτέκτονα*) did? He built the tower on Pharos […]. After he built the edifice, he inscribed his own name on the stones, then, smearing over a layer of plaster to cover it up, he inscribed over it the name of the man who was then king, knowing full well that in a very short while the legend would fall off along with the plaster to reveal the words: "Sostratus of Cnidos, son of Dexiphanes, to the saviour gods on behalf of all those who sail." And this is indeed what happened. So we can see that he had a view not to that particular moment in time or to the rest of the short life-span he had left, but to this day and for all time, for so long as the tower which he built stands and his art (*τέχνη*) endures.'[26]

Again, it is highly likely that the explanation is apocryphal and perhaps even invented by Lucian himself; regardless, the details are significant to this investigation for a number of reasons.[27] First, it is an example of how a professional, through his ingenuity, could be imagined as prevailing over a king. It also highlights the idea of rivalry between a patron and an architect over who receives credit for the construction of a monument. The temporal location of Sostratus's ambition is particularly interesting. As Karen ní Mheallaigh (2014, 179) has shown, the story has a wider purpose in Lucian's text as an injunction to prospective historians (for whom

[25] McKenzie 2007, 41-42; Hurwit 2015, 53-55.

[26] Translation by ní-Mheallaigh 2014.

[27] On this story in Lucian, see Ni-Mheallaigh 2014, 178-179.

the piece was ostensibly written) to create a work 'which will win enduring value for its author rather than ephemeral celebrity in the present'.[28] Given this context, one wonders whether Lucian has deliberately omitted Ptolemy's name, instead referring non-specifically to the 'the man who was then king', in order to make the point that prominence or status will not save you from obscurity. Within Lucian's account there is an assumption that the builder of a monument would want recognition for his work and an expectation that under normal circumstances and in the immediate term he could not have it, but that if his focus was longer-term he might succeed. It may well be that the story as told by Lucian is fictitious, but the issues expressed in it appear to reflect actual concerns of architects operating in the Roman world.[29]

What was an architect to do? In the crypt of the seventeenth century Cathedral of St. Paul's in London is the modest tomb of its architect Christopher Wren. On the wall above the simple grave a Latin inscription reads:

> 'Buried below is the founder of this church and city, Christopher Wren, who lived for over ninety years, not for himself but for the public good. Reader, if you seek his monument, look around you.'

Written by Wren's son, the epitaph is an evocative reminder of the man responsible for the magnificent edifice in which the visitor is standing and an example of how the tombs of architects can be employed to promote messages of association with, even ownership of, the buildings they designed.[30] In Roman society, too, funerary monuments were utilized as vehicles for public promotion and self-image. In some instances the deceased's line

[28] Ni-Mheallaigh 2014, 179.

[29] Thomas (2007, 92) notes that a similar idea is present in another story—also of doubtful veracity—of Pliny's (*HN* 36.42), which concerns two Greek builders, Sauras and Batrachus, who are not allowed to put their names on the temple they constructed in Rome: they carve a lizard and a frog into one of the columns as emblematic of their names in order to preserve the memory of their involvement.

[30] Elmes (1852, 814) suggests that the inscription was originally intended to be placed inside the Cathedral itself.

of work is highlighted: the tools of craftsman and builders are depicted on stele, for example.[31] But certain individuals went beyond simply noting their profession. As with Wren's grave, the tombs of some Roman architects were also used to stake a claim on the buildings they constructed.

An inscription belonging to a large circular tomb on the Via Praenestina outside of Rome told passers-by about the career of its occupant (*CIL* 1(2).2961):

> 'Lucius Cornelius, son of Lucius, of the Voturia tribe was works supervisor (*praefectus fabrum*) of Quintus Catulus when consul, and his architect (*architectus*) when censor.'[32]
>
> L• CORNELIVS• L• E• VOT
> Q CATVLI• COS• PRAEF• FABR
> CENSORIS• ARCHITECTVS

Quintus Lutatius Catulus, consul in 78 and censor in 65 BCE, was a leading late-republican politician who completed the rebuilding of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, the *tabularium*, and the monumental substructures that front the eastern flank of the Capitoline Hill. Together, these constituted the largest and most prestigious public works that were undertaken in Rome in the first half of the first century BCE.[33] Catulus took over responsibility for building the temple of Jupiter following the death of Sulla in 78 BCE–when, according to the inscription, Cornelius was his *prafectus fabrum*–and building work continued into the 60s BCE–when Cornelius was employed as his architect.[34] This makes it very likely that Cornelius was heavily involved with, perhaps even the main person responsible for, the actual construction of these projects.[35]

---

[31] Zimmer 1982; George 2006, 19-29. On architects specifically, see Wilson Jones 2000, 27; Cuomo 2007, 77-102. On freedmen, see Leach 2006, 1-18.

[32] On this inscription and Cornelius see Molisani 1971, 1-10. *Praefectus fabrum* could be both a civil and a military post.

[33] On the *tabularium*, the substructures, and their attendant problems, see Coarelli 2010: 107-132; Tucci 2013/2014: 43-123.

[34] The temple was dedicated in 69 BCE but work continued into the late 60s BCE, Cass. Dio 37.44.1-2.

[35] Molisani 1971, 1-10; Anderson 1997, 26-32.

We know that Catulus' name appeared on the façade of the temple of Jupiter, and Cicero, Valerius Maximus, and Tacitus explicitly refer to the building as Catulus' *monumentum*.[36] In all of these cases though, Cornelius goes unmentioned. Similarly, a now lost inscription exclusively names and credits Catulus with the other components of the building programme: the *substructio* and the *tabularium*.[37] Otherwise invisible, Cornelius is nevertheless able to draw attention to his central role in the construction of these buildings through his funerary monument, by highlighting his connection to the man who was formally recognized as being responsible for them.

Something similar might be seen in a sculpted relief panel discovered at the coastal town of Terracina around fifty miles south of Rome. The piece was found out of context and suggestions as to its date vary from the late first century BCE to the early second century AD.[38] Measuring only twenty-four centimetres in height and fifty-four in length, the fragment was once part of a larger monument and the frieze appears to continue beyond the breaks at either end.[39]

The part which survives depicts a construction scene. On the far left a person is quarrying rock with a pick, in the centre two more figures shape the stones with smaller tools, and behind them another workman, with the assistance of a crane, positions a block onto a partially finished tower-like structure of squared masonry. On the right of the scene, a magistrate in military dress and seated on a curule chair atop a *suggestum* is represented as directing operations, his presence indicating the public nature of the work being undertaken. Of particular interest are the three cloaked figures clutching what appear to be scrolls (labelled 'A' on Figure 2). Although the heads are too damaged to know if they were portraits, based on similarities in attire and stance, these are usually interpreted as being the same man overseeing different stages of the building process, which coupled with the inclusion of the scrolls, suggests he is the architect.[40] The seated magistrate, on account of his relative size is a

[36] Cic. *Verr*. 2.4.69-70; 2.4.82; Val. Max 4.9.5; Tac. *Hist.* 3.72. For Catulus' name on the façade, see Tac. *Hist.* 3.72; Cass. Dio. 37.44.1-2; 43.14.6.

[37] *CIL* 6.1314 = *ILS* 35

[38] Coarelli 1996, 444-446; Romeo 1998, 143-144.

[39] Coarelli 1996, 434-438.

[40] Coarelli 1996, 446; Wilson Jones 2000, 28.

dominating figure, but the repetition of the architect, his facing the viewer, and positioning in the foreground implies that the scene is actually about him.

Filippo Coarelli, pointing to what he suggests is the front of a rostrum of a ship in the bottom right corner and a Pharos being raised in the centre, connects the scene to the general find-spot and argues that it shows the port of Terracina being built.[41] But the absence of further details means that any such identification remains conjectural. The object that this relief comes from is also unknown. Coarelli argues it was part of a monumental arch at Terrracina, but such a building has yet to be found and construction scenes do not typically feature in the iconography associated with this type of architecture.[42] Also, the high level of exposure afforded to a private individual (the architect) in the scene suggests that it was not from a public building. Ilaria Romeo argues that it is part of a sarcophagus; but the panel is too short to have been the front of the body and personalized work scenes are not commonly found on sarcophagus lids of the first or early second centuries AD.[43] Also, the presence of what appears to be a dowel hole in the back of the slab indicates that it was once fixed to another piece of stone or brick masonry, and the notion that the panel thus faced an actual structure is appealing.[44]

Staying with the idea of a funerary context, an alternative proposal is that the fragment is from a tomb. Running friezes that depict work scenes relating to the profession of the deceased are not uncommon on tombs in central Italy, such as that of the first century BCE baker Eurysaces, which shows a workforce engaged in the different stages of making bread.[45] Although it is not clear if the Terracina relief formed part of a much longer frieze or was a relatively short stele, tomb reliefs with comparable dimensions are known.[46] Read in this way, we find another instance of an architect adopting an alternative approach to promote their involvement with a public building project.[47]

---

[41] Coarelli 1996, 434-454; cf. Giardina 2010, 101; *contra* Romeo 1998, 143-148.

[42] Coarelli 1996, 448.

[43] Romeo 1998, 146-147.

[44] See Figure 204, Romeo 1998, 147.

[45] On Eurysaces tomb, see Petersen 2003, 230-57, esp. 232-233; 244-245.

[46] For example, a bakery scene located in Trastevere measures 19.5 cm in height, see Wilson and Schörle 2009, 101-103.

[47] On the meaningfulness of individuals including work scenes on tombs, see Cuomo 2011, 77-84.

A final example is the early second century AD tomb of the Haterii, located on the via Labicana about three miles from Rome. An early example of the so-called 'temple' tomb, the exterior of the rectangular structure was richly ornamented with busts, architectural decorations, and marble panels showing gods and figural scenes.[48] The inscription on the tomb does not state the profession of Haterius, however, a persuasive case has been made that he should be associated with Q. Haterius Tychicus, known from another inscription to be a *redemptor* (building contractor) operating in Rome.[49] The argument that the Haterius inside the tomb was involved in the building industry is strengthened by one of the decorative panels, which shows a highly detailed, quasi-fantastical construction scene involving a large treadwheel crane, and is usually understood as a reference to the deceased's profession. Another frieze depicts five of Rome's monuments side by side: an arch connected to Isis; an amphitheatre (possibly the Colosseum); an unknown quadrafrons; another arch, which is labelled as being at the top of the via Sacra and thought by some to be the still standing one dedicated to Titus; and a temple to Jupiter.[50] So far as they can be plausibly identified, the buildings can be dated to the Flavian period or as being restored around that time. Following the argument that Haterius was a builder, their presence on his tomb is interpreted as being structures that he worked on in life, a sort of iconographic *res gestae*.[51]

Like Lucius Cornelius and the architect at Terracina, Haterius uses his tomb to associate himself with monuments that it is unlikely his name was formally attached to. Neither the Terracina example nor Cornelius' tomb points to an adversarial rivalry between the patron and the architect. Indeed, for Cornelius the presence of Catulus' name in the inscription is integral to his own self-promotion, and the inclusion of the magistrate in the Terracina relief adds to the prestige of the architect by association. Interestingly, so far as can be determined, Haterius chose not to include any reference to the patron(s) of the buildings shown on his tomb. This could have been done by inscribing the relevant emperor's name in the architrave of the different depictions, as was a known

[48] Jensen 1978; Sinn and Freyberger 1996.

[49] *CIL* 6.607; Coarelli 1979, 266-268; Reitz 2013, 36 with fn. 68. On *redemptores*, Anderson 1997, 95-113.

[50] These identifications have been challenged by Freyberger and Zitzl (2016), who propose a new interpretation of the buildings depicted and their connection to Haterius. Also, Pieter Broucke (2009:28) has alternatively suggested that the temple to Jupiter is actually the Domitianic Pantheon.

[51] Castagnoli 1941, 59-69; Coarelli 1979, 255-269; Anderson 1997, 111-112

technique for labelling buildings in iconography.[52] That Haterius instead decided to use topographical references in the legends (ARCUS AD ISIS; ARCUS IN SACRA VIA SUMMA) is unusual. There are a range of possibilities as to why this might have been preferred, but a noticeable consequence of the patron's absence is that for the viewer of the tomb the buildings are left to be associated with Haterius alone.

All three tombs indicate a desire for the architects to be directly connected with specific building projects and demonstrate an inventive strategy through which this might be achieved. The fact that tombs were the chosen vehicle of these attempts is particularly significant, for by their very definition the structures were *monumenta* intended to project messages about the deceased to the future.[53] It is an indicator that the interest of these architects was on securing recognition for posterity, an idea we also find in Vitruvius' ten book treatise *On Architecture*.

4. *The architect as author*

The premise that the written word is a more lasting *monumentum* than stone structures was familiar to writers in the Augustan age. Vitruvius' contemporary Propertius claims that his verses will outlast the temple of Zeus at Olympia, the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, and the Pyramids at Giza.[54] Although an evidently self-serving claim when made by writers, that they might actually have been right is suggested by the posthumous reputation of Vitruvius. Since the Renaissance he has been the most famous architect of antiquity and one of the greatest influences in the development of Western architecture, yet not a single building of Vitruvius' survives and his fame is due entirely to his literary output. Given the often arbitrariness with which texts have come down to us from the classical world, this situation is fortunate for Vitruvius, but it is not an accident. Vitruvius articulates the view of how writing can act as a living memorial of an author and, as is made apparent in the preface to Book Six, he conceived of *On Architecture* as a legacy designed to perpetuate his own memory:

---

[52] For example, a triple-bay Augustan arch (*RIC* I second edition Augustus 359), a single-bay Augustan arch (*RIC* I second edition Augustus 267), the Domitian temple of Jupiter Capitolinus (*RIC* II^2 second edition Domitian 815).

[53] Thomas 2007: 168.

[54] Prop. 3.2.17-29. On this theme, also see Hor. *Carm.* 3.30.1-9; Ov. *Pont.* 4.8.31; *Am.* 1.15.7; *Met.* 15.235; *Fast*. 2.55; Fowler 2000: 193-217.

> ‘And so, many people, striving to that end [making money], apply bold methods and along with wealth, they have achieved celebrity (*notitiam*) too. But I, Caesar, never devoted my efforts to making money by my skill (*arte*), but rather thought that I should pursue modest means and a good reputation (*fama*)–not wealth and infamy (*infamia*). Thus up to this point little celebrity (*notities parum*) has followed, yet I hope that once these volumes are published I will be known to future generations (*etiam posteris ero notus*).’[55]

Like Sostratus, the recognition that Vitruvius seeks is not immediate and ephemeral celebrity, but lasting fame.[56] It is a further indication that this was a concern of certain architects and was the ambition of Vitruvius’ fellow practitioners in the design of their tombs.

By writing *On Architecture* it is possible that Vitruvius not only sought to achieve recognition for the text itself, but through it to lay claim also to an actual building he designed, a basilica at the Augustan colony of Julia Fanestris (Fano) in northern Italy. Vitruvius introduces his readers to the basilica in Book five, claiming to have both built and arranged (*conlocavi curavique faciendam*) for the construction of an edifice of the highest dignity and grace (*summam dignitatem et venustatem*).[57] In an account too lengthy to reproduce here (by some way it is the most detailed description of a building in the text, a fact which is further suggestive of its significance), Vitruvius demonstrates the basilica to be an innovative piece of architecture that he characterizes as possessing *magnificentia* and *auctoritas*. On the basilica itself, in line with standard practice, we might assume that the patron or dedicatee’s name (either the local magistrate or Augustus) was the most prominent, carved in a dedicatory inscription.[58] Whether Vitruvius’ name was present or not on the actual building is unknown, but

[55] Vitr. 6. Praef. 4-5. Translation adapted from Rowland and Howe 1999.

[56] On the idea of texts as a living memory: Vit. 9.praef.1-3; 16-17.

[57] Vitr. 5.1.6-10. Palmer (1983, 252) argues that *conlocavi* indicates Vitruvius let the contracts and so should be considered a major magistrate at the colony. Yet even if Vitruvius was responsible for organising the contracts, this does not mean he was a public official. Certainly, the notion that he was a town magistrate does not accord with the other biographical information he provides, including that he lived off a pension from Octavia.

[58] As on the near contemporary basilica Aemilia in Rome: *CIL* 6.3737; 6.36908.

through explaining his involvement in *On Architecture*, Vitruvius is able to situate the basilica as his achievement. As is increasingly realized, far from being a 'handbook' on construction, *On Architecture* is sophisticated piece of literature through which Vitruvius carefully constructs both his own image and that of his profession.[59] The protracted account of the basilica undoubtedly serves a didactic, architectural purpose, but as the text as a whole is intended to ensure the future fame of its author, the description can also be seen to function as a means of Vitruvius creating lasting recognition of his part in the project.

This impression is furthered if we consider that the patron's name does not feature at all in the discussion of the basilica. Just as authors in other genres typically give no indication of a building being a collaborative endeavour, Vitruvius acknowledges the involvement of no one but himself, the difference being that it is the patron not the architect who goes unmentioned. The highly detailed description of the basilica, which includes information on structural particulars, the thought processes behind decisions, and explanations of how challenges were overcome, displays an intimate level of knowledge that only the designer could possess. The reader is left in little doubt about who was behind the creation of the building and the impression that it is Vitruvius' *monumentum* is reinforced. The method is different to that adopted by Sostratus, but it arguably has the same purpose and result. With his eye on the future, Vitruvius is competing to be recognized as the author of a building, his writing provides the opportunity to present himself as such, and his silence about the patron, while not an overtly aggressive act, removes a potential rival from the picture.

Vitruvius' emphasis on ensuring recognition of the architect's connection to the buildings they design goes beyond the personally relevant example of the basilica at Fanum. As already mentioned, it was commonplace for Roman authors across literary genres to name the patron of a building and make no mention of its architect; however, throughout *On Architecture* we find the opposite. For example, Velleius Paterculus tells us that the senator Quintus Metellus built the temple of Jupiter Stator in the Campus Martius after his victory against the Macedonians, but Vitruvius states it was constructed by the architect Hermodoros of Salamis and does not mention the magistrate's name.[60] This is far from an isolated instance: in Book Three alone, Vitruvius

[59] For example, see the collected essay in Cuomo and Formisano 2016.

[60] Vell. Pat. 1.11.3; Vitr. 3.2.5.

refers to the temple of Honos and Virtus in Rome by Mucius; the temple of Diana in Magnesia by Hermogenes; the temple of Apollo at Alabanda by Menesthenes, and the temple of Diana at Ephesus by Chersiphon–in all these cases the named individuals are the designers not the sponsors.[61] Later, in Book Seven, Vitruvius does acknowledge that Gaius Marius sponsored the temple of Honos and Virtus, but this is one of only four occasions in the entire text that he directly attributes a building to a Roman patron.[62] Where Vitruvius does not record the architect involved then he tends not to give any name. Even Augustus, the dedicatee of *On Architecture*, is not mentioned in connection with his temples of Palatine Apollo, Defied Julius, or Quirinus.[63] In this way, Vitruvius' presentation of buildings can be seen to downplay the importance of patrons and increase that of architects. Although, given the subject matter of his work it might be expected that Vitruvius would include more names of architects than other authors tend to, the almost total preference for describing a building by reference to the patron not the professional elsewhere in Latin literature suggests that Vitruvius' choice to frequently invert this convention is conscious and meaningful. A notable outcome of focusing on the designers is that various structures are redefined as the architects' monuments: for Vitruvius' readers at least, Metellus' temple of Jupiter Stator becomes Hermodoros'.

This emphasis is consistent with how Vitruvius can be seen as attempting to raise both the status of architecture as a discipline in Roman society as well as the prominence of architects as individuals, who are given centre stage throughout the treatise.[64] A notable instance comes in the second half of the final book, which deals with war machines and details a number of historical sieges.[65] In Vitruvius' account of the different battles, the kings and generals are relegated to passive observers while the architects are presented as the heroes who secure victory through *sollertia*.[66] This relates to Vitruvius' broader message to his readers and Augustus–for whose benefit he professes to be writing–that architects are indispensable to rulers.

---

[61] Vitr. 3.2.5-7

[62] Vitr. 7.1.17 (*aedes Honoris et Virtutis Marianae*); 3.2.5 (*porticu Metelli*); 3.3.5 (*Herculis Pompeiani*); 5.9.1 (*porticus Pompeianae*).

[63] Vitr. 3.3.5; 3.3.2; 3.2.7

[64] On Vitruvius' aims, see Romano 1987; McEwen 2003; Gros 2006; Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 145-210.

[65] Vitr. 10. 10.

[66] As argued by König 2009, 47-52; on Vitruvius Book ten, also see Cuomo 2011, 309-332.

The final example Vitruvius includes is a siege of Massilia, where the defenders are described as outwitting and repulsing the efforts of the attackers. Although Vitruvius refrains from mention the protagonists by name, his readers would likely have been aware that the 49 BCE siege of Massilia was conducted by Julius Caesar during the civil war against Pompey.[67] As Alice König has highlighted, in light of who Caesar's adopted son was this is an provocative incident for Vitruvius to have included, especially as in his retelling (unlike the version in *The Gallic War*) it ends with Caesar's forces being defeated.[68] König sees this example as part of a wider tension in Vitruvius' relationship to Augustus, and persuasively argues that far from *On Architecture* being a text which merely celebrates the Principate, it presents 'an exploration, perhaps even an interrogation, of the emperor's newly claimed authority.'[69] While overtly subservient to Augustus, König shows how at various points in the work Vitruvius also places himself in the role of the emperor's instructor in architectural matters.[70] This is expressed directly at the end of the preface to Book One when Vitruvius explains part of his purpose in writing the treatise:

> 'I have set down these instructions, complete with technical terms, so that by observing them you could teach yourself how to evaluate the works already brought into being and those yet to be.'[71]

Vitruvius implies that in the field of architecture he is more knowledgeable and accomplished than the emperor, a realistic but nevertheless rather striking and ambitious assertion. In part, Vitruvius is attempting to establish his relationship to Augustus and we not necessarily read any intended antagonism into his pretension. Still, if Vitruvius' forthrightness is indicative of other architects' attitudes, then it might help explain why they are the subject of the anecdotal stories about practitioners' skills provoking the envy and hostility of Tiberius and Hadrian. What Vitruvius is also doing both here and throughout the text is underscoring the importance and

---

[67] Vitr. 10.16.11.

[68] König 2009, 49-52; Cuomo (2011, 321-324) presents an enlightening examination of this episode in both Vitruvius and Caesar's *Gallic War*.

[69] König 2009, 35; contra McEwen 2003.

[70] On Vitruvius and Augustus as instructor and apprentice, see König 2009, 42-43.

[71] Vitr. 1.praef.3.

relevance of architects by emphasising that it is they who possess the requisite *ars*. Therefore, in various ways, Vitruvius can be seen as attempting to raise the prominence of architects in relation both to the patrons they worked for and the works they created; outside of *On Architecture*, it is an ambition that seems to have been largely unsuccessful.

5. *Conclusion*

Rabun Taylor, in his book *Roman Builders*, asks why given that nobody would claim Augustus was the author of the *Aeneid*, do we allow the assertion that the emperor was the *constructeur* of the Forum of Augustus?[72] The tendency that Taylor identifies, of not acknowledging the role of professional architects in the construction of Roman monuments, is common in modern scholarship but has its roots in antiquity. As detailed above, building inscriptions and literature leave little doubt that in Roman society buildings were categorized as the *monumenta* of their sponsors. Nevertheless, as this paper has aimed to show, it is apparent that certain architects also desired to claim a level of authorship on the structures that they helped to build.

We are therefore confronted by a competitive situation in which the professional has to struggle against social convention in order to try to achieve a greater degree of recognition, which as is indicated by Vitruvius' attempts to raise the profile architects, some thought they deserved. Both the patron and the architect had the same goal of being remembered through their *monumentum*, but it is not a straightforward form of competition. Firstly, the architects' rivalry with the patrons is indirect; indeed, it is possible that the latter were largely oblivious of their employees' aspirations. The various anecdotal stories that describe tense relationships between emperors and architects are arguably indicative of reality, or at least show that such frictions could be popularly imaged as existing, but beyond this it is difficult to find evidence of animosity. Part of the reason that there is not direct conflict between the two parties is because of the temporal focus of the architects' ambitions. A common theme in all of the examples discussed, anecdotal and actual, is that they involve the architect trying to commemorate his accomplishment to a future audience. Although the funerary monuments might have been designed and erected in during a person's lifetime, and Vitruvius' text was intended to have an immediate impact,

[72] Taylor 2003, 11.

the works are also about ensuring posthumous fame–the central idea behind Sostratus' deception too. While this deferred field for competition is the choice of the architects, it is also possibly out of necessity that they have to restrict their ambitions to the hope of delayed recognition, for their social status, relative to that of the patron, prohibited any immediate challenge. Similarly, with traditional channels of propagating one's association with a building–such as dedicatory inscriptions–largely closed off, the resort to alternative media–tombs and literature–was inventive but required.

Irrespective of the difficulties architects faced or their potentially limited successes (we do after all know the names of very few), that they were anxious about achieving posthumous fame for their creations reveals a concern that has been more commonly associated with Roman politicians and poets than builders. Further, while it might be possible to read some of the examples discussed within the context of other sub-elite groups, for example workers or freedmen, what is noticeable is the emphasis on the specific activity carried out by the individual.[73] The funerary monuments do not simply highlight the occupation of the person, depict tools associated with it, or show a generic scene of work, but rather they promote associations with particular projects. Haterius, Cornelius, the man on the Terracina relief, as well as Vitruvius do not see themselves as indistinct artisans, but as the creators of individual works–to draw an analogy, they present themselves not as scribes but as authors.

This being said, we should not assume that all architects had such lofty ambitions. Part of the context for Virtuvius' insistence in the preface to Book Six that he does not seek short-term celebrity is the complaint that this is precisely what many of his fellow practitioners avariciously pursue. Vitruvius offers a disparaging assessment of a particular type of architect, claiming that the profession is 'arrogated by the ignorant and inexperienced,' and he explicitly sets himself apart from those 'who make the rounds and ask openly to work.' [74] Not only does Vitruvius present us with an alternative type of reputation certain other architects valued, but his attack also raises the issue of rivalry and competition between those working in the same field; it is a topic that merits further study.

[73] Leach (2006, 1-18) discusses the tomb of the Haterii in the context of the freedmen art.

[74] Vitr. 6.praef. 5-7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, J., *Roman Architecture and Society*. Baltimore, 1997.

Anstey, T., Grillner, K., and Hughes, R., *Architecture and Authorship*. London, 2007.

Bowie, E., 'Hadrian, Favorinus, and Plutarch', in: J. Mossman (ed.), *Plutarch and his Intellectual World*. London, 1997, 1-15.

Broucke, P., 'The First Pantheon: Architecture and Meaning', in: G. Grasshoff, M. Heinzelmann, and M. Wäfler (eds.), *The Pantheon in Rome: Contributions to the Conference, Bern, November 9-12, 2006*. Bern, 2009, 27-28.

Castagnoli, F., 'Gli edifice rappresentati in un relieve del sepolcro degli Haterii,' *Bullettino della Commissione archeologica comunale in Roma* 69 (1941), 59-69.

Cifarelli, F., 'Un ninfeo repubblicano a Segni con la firma di *Q. Mutius* architetto', *Tra Lazio e Campania* 16 (1995), 159-188.

Coarelli, F., 'La riscoperta del sepolcro degli Haterii: una base con dedica a Silvano', in: Kopcke and M. Moore (eds.), *Studies in Classical Art and Archaeology: A Tribute to Peter Heinrich von Blanckenhagen*. New York, 1979, 255-269.

Coarelli, F., 'La costruzione del porto di Terracina in un rilievo storico tardo-repubblicano', in: F. Coarelli (ed.), *Revixit ars. Arte e ideologia a Roma.* Rome, 1996, 434-454.

Coarelli, F., 'Substructio et Tabularium', *Papers of the British School at Rome* 78 (2010), 107-132.

Cuomo, S., *Technology and Culture in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Cambridge, 2007.

Cuomo, S., 'Skills and Virtues in Vitruvius Book 10', in: M. Formisano and H. Böhme (eds.), *War in Words. Transformations of War from Antiquity to Clausewitz*. Berlin, 2011, 309-332.

Cuomo, S., and Formisano, M., 'Vitruvius: Text, Architecture, Reception', *Arethusa* 49.2 (2016), 121-391.

Donderer, M., *Architekten der spaten romischen Republik und der Kaiserzeit: epigraphische Zeugnisse*. Erlangen, 1996.

Eck, W., ‘Senatorial Self-Representation: Developments in the Augustan Period’, in: F. Millar and E. Segal (eds.), *Caesar Augustus, Seven Aspects*. Oxford, 1984, 129-167.

Eck, W., ‘The Emperor and Senatorial Aristocracy in Competition for Public Space,’ in: B. Ewald and C. Noreña (eds.), *The Emperor and Rome: Space, Representation, and Ritual*. Cambridge, 2010, 89-110.

Eichholz, D., *Pliny. Natural History: Volume X. Books 36-37*. Cambridge MA., 1962.

Elmes, J., *Sir Christopher Wren and his Times*. London, 1852.

Fowler, D., ‘The Ruins of Time: Monuments and Survival at Rome’, in: D. Fowler (ed.), *Roman Constructions: Readings and Postmodern Latin*. Oxford, 2000, 193-217.

Freyberger, S., and Zitzl, C., ‘Das Bautenrelief aus dem Hateriergrab in Rom: Eine neue Deutung’. *Kölner Jahrbuch* 49 (2016), 367-389.

Hurwit, J., *Artists and Signatures in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge, 2015.

George, M., ‘Social Identity and the Dignity of Work in Freedmen’s Reliefs’, in: E. D’Ambra and G. Métraux (eds.), *The Art of Citizens, Soldiers and Freedmen in the Roman World*. Oxford, 2006, 19-29.

Geertman, H., and de Jong, J., *Munus non ingratum: Proceedings of the International Symposium on Vitruvius’ De architctura and the Hellentistic and Republican Architecture*. Leiden, 1989.

Giardina, B., *Navigare necesse est: Lighthouses from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*. Hockley, 2010.

Gros, P., ‘Statu Social et Rôle Culturel des Architectes (Période Hellénistique et Augustéene)’, in: P. Gros (ed.), *Architecture et Société, de l’Archaisme Grec à la Fin de la République Romaine*: Paris, 1983, 425-452.

Gros, P., *Vitruve et la Tradition des Traités d’Architecture: Fabrica et Ratiocinatio. Recueil d’Etudes*. Rome, 2006.

Jensen, W., *The Sculptures from the Tomb of the Haterii*. Ann Arbor, 1978.

König, A., ‘From architect to *imperator*: Vitruvius and his addressee in the *De Architectura*’, in: L. Taub and A. Doody (eds.), *Authorial Voices in Greco-Roman Technical Writing*. Trier, 2009, 31-52.

Leach, E., ‘Freedmen and Immortality in the Tomb of the Haterii’, in: E. D’Ambra and G. Métraux (eds.), *The Art of Citizens, Soldiers and Freedmen in the Roman World*. Oxford, 2006, 1-18.

McEwen, I., *Vitruvius: Writing the Body of Architecture*. Cambridge MA, 2003.

McKenzie, J., *The Architecture of Alexandria and Egypt, C. 300 B.C. to A.D. 700*. New Haven, 2010.

Millar, F., *A Study of Cassius Dio*. Oxford, 1964.

Molisani, G. 'Lucius Cornelius Quinti Catuli architectus', *Atti dell' accademia nazionale dei Lincei Rendiconti* 26 (1971), 1-10.

Ni-Mheallaigh, K., *Reading Fiction with Lucian: Fakes, Freaks and Hyperreality*. Cambridge, 2014.

Palmer, R., 'On the Track of the Ignoble', *Athenaeum* 61 (1983), 343-361.

Paribeni, R., 'Apollodoro di Damasco', *Atti della reale academia d'Italia Rendiconti* 7.4 (1943), 124-30.

Patterson, J., 'Imperial Rome and the Demise of the Republican Nobility', in: G. Morcillo, J. Richardson and F. Santangelo (eds.), *Ruin or Renewal: Places and the Transformation of Memory in the City of Rome*. Rome, 2015, 213-242.

Petersen, L., 'The Baker, His Tomb, and Her Breadbasket: The Monument of Eurysaces in Rome', *The Art Bulletin* 85.2 (2003), 230-257.

Reitz, B., *Building in Words: Representations of the Process of Construction in Latin Literature*. Leiden (thesis), 2013.

Ridley, R., 'The Fate of an Architect: Apollodoros of Damascus', *Athenaeum* 67 (1989), 551-565.

Romano, E., *La capanna e il tempio: Vitruvio o dell'architettura*. Palermo, 1987.

Romeo, I., *Ingenuus leo: l'immagine di Agrippa*. Rome, 1998.

Sinn, F. and Freyberger, K. *Katalog der Skulpturen. Vatikanische Museen. Museo Gregoriano Profano ex Lateranense. Die Grabdenkmäler 2. Die Ausstattung des Hateriergrabes.* Mainz, 1996.

Rowland, I. and Howe, T., *Vitruvius Ten Books on Architecture*. Cambridge, 1999.

Scourfield, D., 'Petronius and the poodle in the microwave'. Forthcoming.

Swain, S., 'Favorinus and Hadrian', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 79 (1989), 150-158.

Taylor, R., *Roman Builders: A Study in Architectural Process*. Cambridge 2003.

Tucci. P., 'A New Look at the Tabularium and the Capitoline Hill', *Rendiconti della pontificia academia Romana di archeologia* 86 (2013/14), 43-123.

Thomas, E. *Monumentality and the Roman Empire*. Oxford, 2007.

Vollkommer, R., ‘Greek and Roman Artists’, in: C. Marconi (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Art and Architecture*. 2014, 107-135.

Wallace-Hadrill, A., *Rome’s Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge, 2008.

Wilson, A. and Schörle, K., ‘A baker’s funerary relief from Rome’, *Papers of the British School at Rome* 77 (2009), 101-123.

Wilson Jones, M., *Principles of Roman Architecture*. New Haven, 2000.

Wiseman, T.P., ‘Popular Memory’, in: K. Galinsky (ed.), *Memoria Romana: Memory in Rome and Rome in Memory*. Ann Arbor), 2014, 43-62.

Zimmer, G., *Römische Berufsdarstellungen*, Archäologische Forschungen 12. Berlin, 1982.