

Maria KANTIREA*

Non-elite Benefactors in the Roman East: Building Activity by Freedmen, Slaves, Craftsmen and Traders

Abstract: Building activity was undoubtedly the most visible way of self-celebration and of displaying financial power. Although that most monuments in the Roman East were constructed by the ruling elite, civic authorities and the emperor, under the Principate, leading members of the middle classes and professional associations, local craftsmen and artisans, traders and merchants, Roman *negotiatores*, well-to-do imperial freedmen and even slaves, in their attempt to imitate aristocratic practices of their time, undertook some building projects by supervising, commissioning and financing sacred, public and semi-private monuments. Certainly the cases of this non-elite building euergetism are not numerous, but, when seen in relation to other forms of social mobility, such as the entry of low-born persons and freedmen into the local councils, may indicate social changes. The aim of this paper is to gather the epigraphic testimonies and to interpret the building activities of these atypical benefactors in the context of urban development and daily life.

Keywords: Building activity; benefactors; local craftsmen; artisans; traders and merchants; *negotiatores*.

Most monuments in the Roman Empire were constructed by a small group of persons who made up the ruling class, that is, the emperor and senatorial, equestrian and local elites.¹ These sponsors conceived the form, structure and ornamentation of buildings that determined the architectural layout of cities. However, a few scattered pieces of epigraphic evidence from the Roman East make it clear that under the Empire, at least, Roman *negotiatores* and merchants, local craftsmen, artisans and traders, imperial freedmen and even slaves, financed the construction of some public, semi-public and sacred buildings. These cases are certainly not numerous and form an exception that constitutes yet another indication of the aristocratic nature of the building euergetism in ancient societies. The aim of this paper is to gather these testimonies, to examine the social profile of these non-elite benefactors and to interpret their building activities in the context of urban development and daily life. The inscriptions make up almost the only available source of information, as ancient authors paid scant attention to these non-elite groups.² The list I offer at the end should not be considered exhaustive, but I have tried to make it as representative as possible.

To identify members of the middle and lower classes who sponsored monuments is not an easy task. The absence of civic, religious or honorific titles in inscriptions is not a secure indication of status, given that notables and otherwise easily recognizable members of the ruling elite, magistrates and

* Dr. Maria Kantirea, University of Cyprus, Department of History and Archaeology, Nicosia CY-1678 Cyprus (kantirea@ucy.ac.cy).

This study derives from a project “Epigraphic Contribution to the Topography and Architecture of the Roman East”, which aims at collecting the *Testimonia* of the building programmes. A first shorter version of this paper, which dealt only with sacred matters and restricted itself to examining the social milieu of freedmen and slaves, was given at Berlin at the Sixteenth International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy (Kantirea 2014). I would like to thank Andrew Farrington for the proofreading of the paper and for his suggestions; I am responsible, of course, for any remaining errors.

¹ MacMullen 1959; Mitchell 1987; Mitchell 1993, 211–217.

² Cf. Joshel 1992, 63–69.

priests also occasionally omitted to mention them.³ On the other hand, not all the names of donors that appear in public subscriptions belong to persons of lower social strata. Léopold Migeotte argues that although in most cases the civic authorities addressed their requests to the whole of society, including aristocrats and foreign inhabitants, to contribute to some common project of general interest, the “citoyens plus humbles ne semblent jamais, sauf exception, avoir pris part en grand nombre aux souscriptions publiques”.⁴ Despite the collective character of such appeals, due to the high expenditure involved, building euergetism by subscription was sponsored almost exclusively by local notables, in particular during the Hellenistic and Roman periods.⁵

The criterion of our selection of persons is therefore the explicit mention of the social status of sponsors of monuments. These men did not form a homogeneous social group. They made up a great part of the population of the Roman Empire and ranged from the *plebs media* to the lower classes. They were free born persons, but also freedmen and slaves, who were involved with manual labour and commercial activities, either individually or as members of professional *collegia*.

Building projects of freedmen and slaves

The contribution of freedmen and slaves in the field of construction presents two particularities. Most of these men in question are imperial *liberti* and a large part of their investment involves religious building. The epigraphy of Asia Minor provides some typical examples of their contribution to the reshaping of the urban and rural landscape.⁶

The most famous case is undoubtedly the financial contribution of C. Iulius Zoilus, *libertus* of Caesar or Augustus, to construction work at Aphrodisias in the late first century BC.⁷ His social status, his special relationship to the emperor and his benefactions towards his town of origin are recorded in a notable spread of epigraphic documents and is illustrated in his funerary monument.⁸ An inscription probably part of the lintel of the western central door of the temple of Aphrodite suggests that Zoilus was involved in the first Roman building phase of the monument⁹ and possibly in the erection of the portico of the northern agora adjacent to the shrine of the goddess.¹⁰ He was also the main sponsor of the construction of the theatre, according to two almost identical inscriptions engraved on the architrave of the Doric stage-building (*logeion*) and of the two-storey facade of the Ionic *scaena frons* (*proskeneion*) above it (Fig. 1).¹¹ It seems that the monuments, that clearly determined the civic identity of a relatively new Roman town, were, in fact, founded by a freedman of the Julian family, whose devotion to the cult of Venus and love for his country went beyond the usual limits of piety and *philopatria*, and reflected the religious and political ideology of his patrons, the *Iulii*. Julius Caesar had already endowed the sanctuary with the right of *asylum*¹² and Augustus made Aphrodisias a *civitas libera*, as he boasted himself in a letter that he addressed to a certain Stephanos and in which he openly

³ Erkelenz 2003, 75–77.

⁴ Migeotte 1992, 357–376, in particular p. 366.

⁵ See e.g. ISmyrna 697; for other evidence, see Migeotte 1992, 364–368.

⁶ For slaves and freedmen in Asia Minor, see Golubcova 1992. For their legal status in sacred matters, see Schumacher 2006.

⁷ Reynolds 1982, 156–164.

⁸ Smith 1993.

⁹ IAph2007, 1.2.

¹⁰ IAph2007, 3.2.

¹¹ IAph2007, 8.1; 8.5. Theoderescu 1996.

¹² Tac. ann. 3,62,2. Rigsby 1996, 428–432 and 585.

expressed his special affection for Zoilus.¹³ It is therefore no surprise to find in this city an agent of the Iulii assuming the priesthoods of Aphrodite and of Freedom (*Eleutheria*), becoming *stephanephoros* for at least ten times and, in spite of his social status, receiving such prestigious titles from the *boule* and people as “saviour” and “benefactor”. The involvement of Zoilus in the transformation of a Carian town into a Roman city superimposed on the topography of Aphrodisias the political programme of Zoilus’ imperial patrons. The architecture and monumental iconography show that the citizens were conscious of and played a conscious role in this urbanization.¹⁴ Thus the construction of the wing of the temple of Aphrodite,¹⁵ the northern colonnade of the so-called “Portico of Tiberius” (or southern agora),¹⁶ the Sebasteion,¹⁷ various structures in the theatre¹⁸ and other buildings¹⁹ were financed by means of the private funds of numerous Aphrodisians over many generations.

About the same time, in Ephesus, two freedmen of Agrippa, Mazaeus and Mithridates, erected the southern gate of the commercial agora, otherwise known as the *Tetragonos*, in honour of the family of Augustus (Fig. 2).²⁰ Their benefaction becomes more significant, if it is viewed within the urban and social context of Ephesus under the early Empire. In fact, during the first century AD the city underwent considerable architectural development mainly thanks to men of non-Ephesian origin, who had established themselves in this harbour town for various economic and commercial reasons. Whilst native noble Ephesians are almost absent in building inscriptions at least up to the time of the Flavian emperors, new well-to-do inhabitants coming from outside Ephesus are clearly very active building *euergetes*.²¹ They include the two *liberti* of Agrippa, whose contribution to the embellishment of the market suggests that they were involved in trade and perhaps indicates an effort at least to increase their standing in Ephesian society, if not openly to challenge the local aristocracy in terms of economic prestige and power. Mazaeus and Mithridates enjoyed the protection of the son-in-law of Augustus and would certainly have been able to acquire the financial resources that formed the means for any attempt to engage in euergetism. The ostentatious position of the names of these low-born businessmen, without any mention of their civil status and prominently displayed immediately below the names of their patrons on a monumental gate in the capital of the province of Asia, certainly ignores matters of humble birth and lack of honour and stresses wealth and imperial patronage in a society that underwent constant change.²²

Under Domitian, at Laodicea ad Lycum, the imperial freedman Tib. Claudius Tryphon undertook the construction of the triple southern gate (also called the *Syriae pylai*)²³, where the road into the city from the south-east terminates. The architectural complex, which also includes towers and some other additions, was dedicated to Zeus Megistos Saviour and Domitian by the *proconsul* Sex(tus) Iulius Fron-

¹³ IAph2007, 8.29. The reason for these feelings on the part of Augustus is not known, but Smith 1993, 8–10, suggests that Zoilus was manumitted by Caesar or Augustus and became rich as a result of recognition of his military deeds.

¹⁴ Chaniotis 2009.

¹⁵ IAph2007, 1.4–8. Reynolds 1982, 78–81; Reynolds 1990.

¹⁶ IAph2007, 4.4; 4.19; cf. 11.407. Chaisemartin – Lemaire 1996.

¹⁷ IAph2007, 9.1; 9.25; 9.112.

¹⁸ Reynolds 1991.

¹⁹ IAph2007, 1.102; 6.2; 12.318; 12.407; 12.504–505; 12.1014; 13.503. For a general overview of the monuments of Aphrodisias, see Smith 1996; see also Chaniotis 2008.

²⁰ IEphesos 3006.

²¹ Halfmann 2001, 21–33; Halfmann 2003.

²² Joshel 1992, 76–122. Cf. also the case of C. Iulius Nicephorus, freedman of Augustus, who promised a *prytaneia* for life at Ephesus and gave money for the celebration of imperial sacrifices (IEphesos 859, 859A); cf. further IGRR IV 1347.

²³ Philostr. *soph.* 1, 25 (543).

tinus.²⁴ The erection of the monumental *tripylon* was apparently part of a vast reconstruction programme that the city had begun after the earthquake of AD 60 and to which many individuals contributed financially.²⁵ From this point of view, a benefaction made by a well-to-do imperial freedman becomes extremely important,²⁶ because it was part of a building operation which drew together many Laodiceans, in a similar way to what had happened at nearby Aphrodisias some decades earlier, when many citizens had contributed financially to the completion of the temple of Venus and the erection of other monuments.

Despite of its lacunose state of preservation, epigraphic material from Corinth and Patras in Greece suggests the involvement of freedmen in the reconstruction of these two Roman colonies, especially during the first century AD. The *Colonia Laus Iulia Corinthiensis* was founded by Julius Caesar in 45/44 BC, a century after the destruction of the Greek city by the army of L. Mummius (146 BC) during the Achaean War. According to Strabo, those dispatched to the newly resettled colony were “people that belonged for the most part to the freedmen class”.²⁷ They must have been organized in a *collegium libertorum*, mention of which appears on the cornice of a building near the forum which was probably erected out of contributions made by them.²⁸ Prosopographic considerations suggest that under the Julio-Claudians at least an unidentified Ionic building,²⁹ perhaps the restored Asclepieion³⁰ and the so-called Babbius’ monument dedicated to Neptune³¹ would have been constructed and dedicated by freedmen.³² However, their social status is hardly recognizable in other epigraphic documents, except for the *augustales* who offered votive offerings and other *sacra* to the emperor.³³ The only surviving piece of evidence from the colony of Patras, founded by Augustus through the agency of Agrippa, attests that the son of an *augustalis*, C. Varronius Verus, erected at his own expense and probably in his capacity of *aedilis*, thirty-four marble columns together with their ornamentation.³⁴ The monument has not yet been identified and may be a basilica or a portico surrounding an imperial temple.

The contribution of imperial freedmen to the construction of monuments housing the imperial cult in the Greek East is apparently more important than is usually thought. At Sidyma in Lycia, a *libertus* doctor of Claudius, Tib. Claudius Epagathus, together with Tib. Claudius Livianus, apparently an ex-

²⁴ IGRR IV 847; ILaod.Lyk. 24a–b.

²⁵ According to Tac. ann. 14, 27, “in the same year (AD 60), Laodicea, one of the famous Asiatic cities, was laid in ruins by an earthquake, but recovered by its own resources, without assistance from ourselves” (translation by J. Jackson, Loeb). Financial support by citizens is attested in the construction of the stadium-amphitheatre (ILaod.Lyk. 15), of the baths (ILaod.Lyk. 13) and of a cistern (ILaod.Lyk. 12). Barresi 2003, 328–333.

²⁶ Barresi (2003, 328) believes that, two centuries later, another imperial *libertus*, Aurelius Heliodorus, contributed to the construction of the temple of the *neokoria* granted to the city by Caracalla (for a suggestion as to the location of this monument, see Sperti 2000, 91–92). However, the evidence of Aurelius Heliodorus’ involvement in this building project is suggestive but not conclusive. It derives mostly by the inscription on the funerary monument that Heliodorus bought and restored for himself, his wife, his daughter (who donated to the council of Laodicea one thousand *denarii* to be used to crown her every year on a particular day) as well as for his own freedmen (MAMA VI 18; ILaod.Lyk. 85).

²⁷ Strab. 8,6,23 (381; translation by H. L. Jones, Loeb).

²⁸ Corinth VIII.2 121.

²⁹ Corinth VIII.3 316. Cf. Rizakis et al. 2001, COR 316.

³⁰ Corinth VIII.3 3, 311; Corinth XIV, p. 39. Cf. Rizakis et al. 2001, COR 65.

³¹ Corinth VIII.2 2–3, 132; Corinth VIII.3 155. The name of the donor, Cn. Babbius Philinus, appears in other architectural fragments (Rizakis et al. 2001, COR 111). He became *aedilis*, *duovir* and *pontifex*, since in colonies founded by Caesar, freedmen were allowed to hold local magistracies and priesthoods (Treggiari 2003, 63; Mouritsen 2011, 73–75).

³² Cf. the list of donors in Corinth VIII.3, p. 21, although it is not easy to establish firmly the origins and social profile of all of these men. See further Hautcourt 2001.

³³ Corinth VIII.2 77; Corinth VIII.3 52–53. For the *augustales*, see Duthoy 1978; Ostrow 1990.

³⁴ IPatras 49.

slave of Livia,³⁵ constructed and consecrated (*[kathie]rosan*) a portico and set up a statue of the emperor.³⁶ The *consecratio* of a *stoa* is to be explained, if this portico formed part of some sacred monument.³⁷ This may have been the prostyle temple, erected on a *podium* and to which belonged an inscribed architrave bearing a dedication to the gods *Augusti* saviours but making no mention of any dedicators.³⁸ Helpfully, this last inscription dates the construction of the building in question by reference to the *legatus propraetore* Quintus Veranius, who was the first governor (AD 43/44–47/48) of the province of Lycia that Claudius created in AD 43.³⁹ Here the involvement of the Claudian *liberti* in the erection of a statue of the emperor and of a portico appears alongside the presence of the first governor of Lycia in the dedication of an imperial temple which makes no mention of any local factors, such as the city, the council, civic officials or priests. The juxtaposition of imperial freedmen with provincial governor indicates how Roman representatives of various social statuses help co-ordinate the integration of the emperor into the urban landscape of Sidyma in the political context of the recent absorption of Lycia into the Roman empire. The construction, but apparently not the architectural layout, of the sacred complex at Sidyma was probably inspired by a foundation of Claudius at nearby sanctuary of Leto at Xanthos sometime between January and May AD 43. Here the emperor seems to be involved in the introduction of the imperial cult, in that he dedicates a rectangular hall in the northern portico, which has been identified as the “national” (*ethnikon*) *Caesareum* of the province.⁴⁰ In the hitherto scarcely urbanized parts of Asia Minor, such as Mysia, Phrygia and Galatia, where there were no independent civic traditions, the cooperation of imperial freedmen and Roman magistrates in the erection of imperial temples gave these regions their first taste of urban building in the Greco-Roman tradition.⁴¹ The presence of imperial *servi* and *liberti* in these rural areas is not surprising, given that the emperors possessed there agricultural properties and other natural resources, especially in the post-Hadrianic period.⁴²

In north-western Galatia, Eutyches, an *oikonomos* (*curator*) of imperial territories, with his two slave-born sons, Faustinus and Nicerotianus, erected a temple and statues of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus, whilst the *epitropos* (*procurator*) Claudius Valerianus consecrated the monument.⁴³ Property belonging to the Antonines comprised a group of seven villages named *choria* (*praedia*) *Considiana*, from the name of the previous owner, which must have been located between the rivers Sangarius and Tembris, near Pessinus.⁴⁴ The imperial *patrimonium* in the fertile central plateau of Anatolia consisted mainly of territories of local or Italian notables, which, from the reign of Hadrian onwards (as the epigraphic presence of *liberti* bearing the name of Publii Aelii confirms) were gradually made over to, bought or simply confiscated by the emperor.⁴⁵ The collaboration between an imperial freedman

³⁵ Livianus probably entered the house of the Claudii through the will of Livia. For able and gifted Greeks as freedmen doctors during the Republic and in early Empire, see Treggiari 2003, 129–132.

³⁶ Respectively TAM II 178 and 184.

³⁷ Barresi 2003, 510.

³⁸ TAM II 177. Dardaine – Frézouls 1985, 214–215.

³⁹ Rémy 1989, 279–281 no. 229.

⁴⁰ For a discussion of the evidence, see FXanthos VII, pp. 25–28 no. 11. Mitchell 1993, 102, remarks that “not only the early date but also the active role played by the emperor in erecting the cult building are worth emphasis”.

⁴¹ For the imperial cult in these areas see Mitchell 1993, 100–117.

⁴² Mitchell 1993, 143–164; for further evidence of slavery in Asia Minor under Roman rule, see Bussi 2001, 99–111.

⁴³ RECAM II 34. A fragment of an inscribed architrave carrying a Latin dedication to Marcus Aurelius and Commodus (AD 177–180) very probably belonged to this temple (RECAM II 36; Mitchell 1993, 114; Barresi 2003, 568). Cf. Weaver 1972, 267–281.

⁴⁴ Both inscriptions were found at Yukarı İğde Ağaç near the modern town Sivrihisar (Anderson 1937).

⁴⁵ On chronological ground, Mitchell (1993, 153) excludes the possibility that the previous owner was either the knight Considius Aequus, who was punished by decree of the senate in AD 21 (Tac. ann. 3,37; PIR² C 1279) or the

(Eutyches), assisted by his slave sons and a Roman knight (Claudius Valerianus), both responsible for the administration of the imperial estate in Galatia,⁴⁶ in the erection of a temple and statues of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus provided peasants who were working in the Antonines' territories and lived scattered between seven villages as well as other rural inhabitants with a common cult place. Such monuments that emphasized the presence of the emperor, for all their isolated location, may have formed a religious nucleus of the Roman urbanization in the Eastern countryside.

Further west, in Mysia, this process apparently started somewhat earlier. In the late first century AD, the family of Tib. Claudius Halys, *liberti* of Claudius or Nero, consecrated to Artemis Sebaste Baieane a temple and another structure, probably baths, in the area of the future town Hadrianeia.⁴⁷ The identity of the divinity is intriguing. Paolo Barresi suggests that she was a Greek-Persian goddess,⁴⁸ while Anne-Valerie Pont thinks, perhaps rightly, that this Artemis, who bore the epithet *Baieane*, is to be identified with Diana of Baiae, the well known resort near Puteoli, on the shores of Campania.⁴⁹ This town was dominated by villas belonging to the emperor and his family, whilst the density of the evidence for the presence of imperial freedmen and slaves suggests that vast imperial holdings extended all over the region around the bay of Naples.⁵⁰ If Artemis (and not Cybele),⁵¹ who appears in the consecration from Mysia and is explicitly named *Augusta*, is the same as Diana of Campania, then we have a case of the transfer of a cult of an Italian divinity into a rural region in north-western Asia Minor. Another element that strengthens this hypothesis is the construction of a second building mentioned in a lacuna of the inscription, which is thought to be a bath by the editors. Although the restoration of this word is based on the fact that the inscription had been reused in the floor of a nineteenth century hamam at the village Benjuk Tepekevi (today Tepeköy, close to Dursunbey),⁵² it must be correct as it alludes to the natural and architectural environment of Baiae, especially the thermo-mineral water installations and bathing complexes.⁵³ The transfer of an Italian cult and its integration into the landscape of Asia Minor was carried out by imperial freedmen, who were perhaps returning home or had simply been sent to the area to take up some post in the service of the emperor and therefore they had emerged as leaders of their village communities. Thus it is possible that the temple (and the baths) constructed by imperial agents became the centrepiece of the imperial estate⁵⁴ and so prepared the ground for the impending architectural transformation of the area, before Hadrian decided to found there the cities bearing his name,⁵⁵ that is Hadrianeia (from the region of which our inscription comes), Hadrianoi and Hadrianutherai, thus accelerating the urban development of Mysia as a whole.

In contrast to what occurred in rural Anatolia, building activity on the part of imperial freedmen in cities concerns monuments that formed part of urban life and civilization. Thus, at Nysa, under Antoninus Pius, the *technitai* of Dionysos honoured T. Aelius Alcibiades, *libertus a cubiculo* of Hadrian, or his homonymous son, for his benefactions towards the city, which included the donation of books to

praetorian *senator* Considius Proculus, who was indicted for treason and executed in AD 33 (Tac. ann. 6,18; PIR² C 1281).

⁴⁶ See n. 60.

⁴⁷ IGRR IV 288 (the inscription has been found at the modern village Tepeköy, previously Benjuk Tepekevi).

⁴⁸ Barresi 2003, 480.

⁴⁹ Pont 2010, 50.

⁵⁰ Camodeca 2007; Maiuro 2012, 278–284.

⁵¹ A sanctuary of Mysian Cybele was found in nearby modern village Aşağı Acaalan (IHadrian., Taf. 35–36). For rural Mysia, see Mitchell 1993, 165–166.

⁵² It was not possible for us to localise this building again.

⁵³ Yegül 1996.

⁵⁴ Cf. Mitchell 1993, 113–114 and 184–185.

⁵⁵ IHadrian., pp. 156–160.

the library.⁵⁶ According to the honorary inscription, this edifice was situated in the sanctuary of the *technitai* of Dionysos, in connexion to the *temenos* of Roma (*epi Rhomes temenos*). Although it is not explicitly attested, it is possible that the donor, who is praised for his high level of cultural attainment by the followers of Bacchus, contributed also to the construction of the library, whilst his son, Aelius Alcibiades Neoterus restored the neighbouring theatre,⁵⁷ a symbolic monument of the professional activity of the *technitai*.

At Tralleis, (Ulpius) Chresimus, *Aug(usti) libertus*, having embellished the *caldarium* of the gymnasium with coloured marble from Docimeium, dedicated it to Nerva.⁵⁸ Epigraphic documents from Tralleis, Mylasa, Ephesus and Miletus attest that the sponsor was a well-known *procurator lapicidinarum* (*epitropos latomeion* or *procurator a marmoribus*), whose occupation was closely linked to marble quarrying and trade in the Maeander valley under the emperors Domitian and Nerva.⁵⁹ The inscription from the gymnasium of Tralleis in particular implies that such an imperial *procurator* in charge of marble quarries enjoyed a certain decree of freedom, if he was able to contribute to the architectural remodelling of a building and to immortalize his own name, in addition to that of his patron, on a public monument of a great city of Asia Minor.⁶⁰

The donation of building material by imperial agents is also attested at a lower level. For example, a slave named Docimus belonging to the empress Domitia, Domitian's wife, made a perhaps somewhat modest offering consisted of ten tiles and twelve *denarii* for the gilding of a coffered ceiling in a building in the sanctuary of Apollo Lairmenos at Dionysopolis (or Motella) in Phrygia.⁶¹ Despite the isolated location of this cult site and presumably the unpretentiousness of the followers of the local god, the imperial slave attempted to imitate, on a smaller scale, the love for ornamentation displayed by free-born benefactors or imperial freedmen in more frequented places. This evidence offers yet another typical example of the way in which persons belonging to the *familia Augusta* display their piety towards local divinities and promote the imperial presence in remote regions of Asia Minor.⁶²

Freedmen of eminent families in the Roman East also expressed their devotion to their masters, both gods and men. Thus, under Trajan, a certain Diadoumenos constructed and adorned a temple of Asclepius Saviour and of another god apparently to commemorate the recovery of his master, the senator (Caius Antius) A(ulus) Iulius Quadratus of Pergamum.⁶³ The affluent aristocrat, who was a personal friend (*amicus clarrissimus*) of Trajan and served as consul twice (AD 94 and 105) and as *proconsul* of Asia (AD 109–110), restored temple and lands to Dionysos, obtained for Pergamum its first neocorate, funding the construction of the *Traianeum* on the acropolis and founding the *Traianeia Diphilia* festivals, and also maintained the cult of Asclepius, the tutelary god of the Attalid city.⁶⁴ If the

⁵⁶ IEphesos 22 ll. 8–18. Barresi 2003, 428.

⁵⁷ Barresi 2003, 429–430.

⁵⁸ ITralleis 148.

⁵⁹ Herrmann 1988, and Hirt 2010, 115–117, present the evidence and discuss the exact nature of the post of Chresimus.

⁶⁰ For the post of financial and patrimonial procurators involved in the supervision of the emperor's estates, see Eck 1997, 67–106.

⁶¹ MAMA IV 293.

⁶² Pont 2010, 42. See also Mitchell 1993, 158–162.

⁶³ IPergamon VIII.2 290; IGRR IV 277. It must have been rather a small monument (the inscribed marble architrave is about one meter in length, while its original length is estimated to have been about 1,62 m) and remains unidentified; Barresi 2003, 459, supposes that the temple was situated *infra muros*. For the involvement of senatorial freedmen in economic and commercial transactions, see Schleich 1984, 61–70. Cf. a contemporary evidence of monumental statuary dedications by freedmen at Ephesus (IEphesos 857–858).

⁶⁴ PIR² I 507. Price 1984, 252 no 20; Virgilio 1993, 104–108; Halfmann 2001, 45–55; Pohl 2002, 212; Witulski 2007, 78–89.

dedication by Diadoumenos was intended to imitate the benefactions and building activities of his patron, it is possible that the second divinity in the Diadoumenos' temple was Trajan Zeus *Philios*.

In AD 89, L. Sergius Corinthus, freedman of the Sergii Paulli, the well-known family of Italian veterans, who had settled as colonists in Asia Minor under Augustus,⁶⁵ constructed at his own expense and dedicated a temple and adjoining buildings to the god Men (his epithet is almost lost).⁶⁶ The monument was situated at a considerable distance from the main residence of the Sergii Paulli in Pisidian Antioch, within or next their private estate in the region of Vetissus (near Bulduk) in Galatia.⁶⁷ Presumably the aim of the Sergii Paulli in allowing their freedman to make a consecration to one of the most popular deities among the rural populations of central Anatolia was probably to win them over, to create links between these local inhabitants and the colony of Antioch and, consequently, to reinforce the hold of the senatorial family over their remote estates, which in fact gradually passed into imperial hands during the second century AD.⁶⁸

The next two cases set the dependence of slaves on the civic authorities in the context of the urban landscape. Under Antoninus Pius at Balbura in Lycia, the public slave Onesimos constructed a temple containing a cult-image of Nemesis and an adjacent *exedra*, where he erected statues of his masters, referred to as *despotai* in the inscription, that is, the *Boule* and the *Demos*.⁶⁹ The whole dedication is an unusual, if not unique, example of building euergetism by a public slave in his capacity as civic official responsible for the state granaries and the grain-market in a relatively small Lycian town. Onesimos must have been popular in that he implemented official decisions concerning the annual distribution among magistrates and citizens of a corn-dole of three hundred fifty-two *modii* (that is, more than three tonnes).⁷⁰ The presentation of Nemesis, who is to be identified with the city's Tyche-Fortuna,⁷¹ and of the personification of local assemblies in the *agora* makes manifest in the topography of the Lycian town the particular association of Onesimos with an important civic institution of Roman Balbura.

Another temple probably dating also to the reign of Antoninus Pius and containing a cult statue personifying the city, *Agathe* Tyche or Bona Fortuna, was erected at Miletropolis in Mysia. According to the inscription engraved in three adjoining fragments (one is lost) of the marble architrave of the building, the temple was paid for by Euschemon, a purple-seller, probably a slave, as is implied by his name, which lacks a patronymic.⁷² The representations of Tyche on local coins dating between the time of Marcus Aurelius and the third century AD⁷³ indicate the importance of the cult of Fortuna as protectress of Miletropolis, but it is unlikely that this numismatic evidence is to be linked with the building erected by Euschemon. However, the dedication of a sacred monument to the patron goddess by a *servus* is clearly intended to imitate the pious attitude of a citizen. The ability of a slave involved in the

⁶⁵ Levick 1967; Christol – Drew-Bear 2002.

⁶⁶ MAMA VII 486 (the inscription was discovered at Beşkavak). Bussi 2001, 105.

⁶⁷ On basis of the epigraphic presence of Sergii Paulli, Mitchell (1980, 1073), suggests that the centre of the property was located at the modern village of Sinanlı. This land had been acquired under the Julio-Claudian period, when wealthy colonists from Antioch were looking outside the city territory for ways of adding to their original allotment of land (Mitchell 1993, 151–152).

⁶⁸ Mitchell 1993, 156–158.

⁶⁹ Coulton et al. 1988; Hornum 1993, 286.

⁷⁰ For the institution of grain distribution in second-century AD Lycian cities, see FXanthos VII, pp. 214–219.

⁷¹ Coulton et al. 1988, 130–131; Hornum 1993, 41–42; Barresi 2003, 496.

⁷² IKyzikos (II Miletropolis) 35. Barresi 2003, 494.

⁷³ IKyzikos (II Miletropolis), pp. 82–86, nos. 38, 48, 51–52, 61, 63, 66–67, 72, 74.

lucrative purple trade to construct such a building also indicates that he had at his disposal a considerable *peculium*, capable of funding such small constructions.⁷⁴

Roman law allowed slaves active as managers in commercial concerns, such as shop keeping, trading and even banking, a certain amount of independence. Evidence from two harbour cities in Caria, Iasos and Halicarnassos, exemplifies the application of the relevant clauses in the *Digest*⁷⁵ to matters connected with construction. At Iasos, a person named Potens is honoured in two *stelai* set up by the local *strategoï* in front of two heavily-frequented public buildings, the baths and the *Caesareum* (Fig. 3). The only surviving inscription from the two summarizes the decree voted by the council and the people, and commemorates the benefactions of the honorand and his children on behalf of the city.⁷⁶ Potens acted as superintendent of works (*ergepistates*), together with two free-born persons, and paid in advance one hundred thousand *denarii* for the construction of a building which must be the public baths.⁷⁷ In addition to this expensive project, he promised to dedicate a *phiale* to Serapis and Isis (which costs ninety *denarii*) and apparently a cult statue of the emperor, which was to be erected in the *Caesareum*. He also announced that he would donate the interest on one thousand two hundred *denarii* to the ferry-men of Iasos, whilst on the occasion of the festivities for the birthday of Tiberius, he promised to offer gifts of money to the members of the local council, with sums of twenty-five *denarii* to be distributed among the participants of each *triclinium*. The official character of the document issued by the local *strategoï*, in accord with the decision of the council and the people of Iasos, provides some clues as to the social status and consequently the civic identity of the benefactor. While the names of the president of the *strategoï* and of the two building co-supervisors mentioned in the inscription that probably refers to the bath⁷⁸ are typically Greek, with the patronymic in the genitive, the absence of any patronymic for Potens probably indicates his servile origin. He must therefore have been a slave who was acting as an agent for some company of *publicani* with a branch at Iasos or who was managing the business of a *socius portuum* or even of an aristocrat. However, the buildings were apparently financed by Potens himself, rather than by his wealthy owner, who is nowhere mentioned. The appearance of the name of a *servus* in dedicatory inscriptions indicates the way in which Potens chose to identify himself in terms of economic activities, to counterbalance his social marginality.⁷⁹ On the other hand, the citizens of Iasos apparently accepted the consequences of the social upheavals of the early Empire, in that they decided to honour a man of humble birth with the title of *euergetes*, which was normally reserved for free-born benefactors. This is not only a turning point in the evolution of aristocratic values of the Greco-Roman society. It also attests the degree of dependence of a harbour town of Caria on commercial and maritime activities.

The benefaction made by two slaves, Kalokairos and Eutychos, in their capacity as *pragmateutai* (*servi vectigalis*) of an *archones* of the fourty ports of Asia (*promagister quadragesimae portuum Asiae*) in nearby Halicarnassos had a different purpose.⁸⁰ In this case, the construction from the foundations up of a customs house, which included a portico and sheltered a gilded statue of Aphrodite, concerned city

⁷⁴ This sum of money obviously always belonged to the master and could be recalled at any time (Bradley 1994, 27). The juridical framework of the *peculium* is provided by Digest. 14.4 and 15.1–4. The site where purple dye was produced must have been somewhere on the shores of Lake Miletopolitis (Strab.12,8,10 [575]) or in nearby Cyzicus.

⁷⁵ This pattern is clearly shown by a section of the Digest. 14.3, that deals with the contractual liability of persons who appointed agents to undertake business for them; see also Plut. De liberis educandis, 7. Bradley 1994, 75–76; see also Buckland 1970, 187–206; Mouritsen 2011, 109–118 and 228–247.

⁷⁶ Pugliese Carratelli 1993, 261–265 (SEG XLIII 717). Barresi 2003, 352.

⁷⁷ This last benefaction is very probably recorded also in Iasos 253.

⁷⁸ Iasos 253.

⁷⁹ Joshel 1992, 76–85; cf. Tran 2006.

⁸⁰ ILS 8858. Barresi 2003, 335. See further Bradley 1994, 75–76; Bussi 2001, 111–113; Schumacher 2010, 31–47.

interests only indirectly.⁸¹ It catered mainly administration of taxation of the ports of Asia that was conducted by the owner of these two slaves, the imperial *procurator* under Commodus, M. Aurelius Mindius Matidianus Pollio, whose name and prestigious posts of *Bythiniarch* and *Asiarch* appear on the dedicatory inscription.⁸²

Building activities of professional associations and individual members

In addition to *servi* and *liberti*, two other groups employed building activities and dedications to the *Augusti* to advertise love for the urban way of life and their loyalty to the principles of the Empire. These were middle-class businessmen, such as members of professional *collegia* and Roman *negotiatores*, who acted either at an individual level or within their *conventus civium Romanorum* and often in collaboration with the city.⁸³ Some of the monuments built by them directly celebrated imperial glory. Such is the case with a votive altar for the victory of Domitian and for the salvation of the Roman people, of the local people and of the *negotiatores* of the city, which was funded and dedicated by an Italian trader, M. Athalius Longinus, at Sebaste in Phrygia.⁸⁴ In other cases, the *conventus* of Roman *negotiatores* combines forces with the city and its magistrates to contribute to the costs of imperial monuments. An interesting Latin document from Cyzicus apparently commemorates the construction of a triumphal arch to celebrate the British victory of Claudius.⁸⁵ The dedicators were the *cives Romani qui Cyzici [constitunt]* and the *Cyzi[ceni]*, most of whom would also have been Romans established in this Augustan colony. The supervision of the works was entrusted to a *curator*. The meaning of the inscription is not clear, because the right side of the stone is damaged, but if the restorations proposed by the editors of *CIL* are to be accepted, the dedicators must have been aware of imperial ideology regarding the conquest of Britain.

The epigraphic evidence from Blaundus is more explicit. In the second half of the first century AD, this Lydian town situated on the frontier with Phrygia witnessed an important architectural development, thanks to the financial contribution of at least two Italian businessmen. The recent publication of the archaeological and epigraphic evidence from Blaundus by Axel Filges shows that C. Octavius and C. Mummius Macer sponsored the construction of two temples, of porticoes including workshops, and of gates, while the role of local officials, Tib. Claudius Menecrates to be specific, was limited to the supervision of some of these works. The first temple built by C. Octavius was dedicated to Ceres-Demeter and maybe to the *Dom[us Augusta]* (rather than to Domitia), according to a bilingual inscription engraved on the frieze (Latin) and on the architrave (Greek) of the monument. Here the foreign benefactor declares his particular devotion to the gods and proudly records the amount offered by his lavish generosity towards his adoptive city, that is one hundred thousand drachmas.⁸⁶ The monument has been identified with a tetrastyle temple (7,6 x 14,2 m) of the Ionic order built on a *podium*, while the *propylon* and the *stoas* mentioned in the document must therefore be the Doric porticoes to the south of the temple (Fig. 4).⁸⁷ The second temple financed by C. Octavius, for which Ti. Claudius Menecrates was again superintendent, was dedicated to Vespasian and Titus (Fig. 5). It is situated in the north of the city and was apparently surrounded by porticoes that housed workshops, while access was given by means of a monumental gate.⁸⁸ These buildings are to be identified with the

⁸¹ For the Roman customs system and the administration of the *XXXX portus Asiae*, see Dreher 1997; Merola 2001, 109–113, 199–231.

⁸² PIR² A 1559.

⁸³ Hatzfeld 1919, 309–315; van Nijf 1997, 73–128.

⁸⁴ IGRR IV 684. Barresi 2003, 318.

⁸⁵ CIL III 7061.

⁸⁶ Filges 2006, 323–324, restores *Cereri et Dom[itia]e Aug[ustae]*; we propose *Cereri et Dom[o Augusta]*.

⁸⁷ Filges 2000, in particular p. 600; Barresi 2003, 450.

⁸⁸ Filges 2006, 324–326.

propylon and the *ergasteria* financed by the other Italian *negotiator*, C. Mummius Macer.⁸⁹ The whole complex, to which some Latin fragmentary inscriptions that preserve the name of Macer probably belonged, was dedicated, like the above-mentioned temple of C. Octavius, to the Flavian emperors and to the local people.⁹⁰ The financial contribution of Italian merchants to sacred and commercial construction is the manifestation in the civic landscape of Blaundus of the integration of such foreign businessmen in the society of their new country. Some fragmentary evidence for this process of integration is given by an interesting, albeit unfortunately very lacunose, inscription. The document seems to imply that C. Mummius Macer gave the local *gerousia* a territory whose income was to be employed for the provision of oil for use in the gymnasium and, in return, the donor became gymnasiarch and a member of the Elders' assembly.⁹¹

However, the most representative benefaction of the social status of Macer is the building of porticoes and workshops, which betrays the habit of Italian and local traders and craftsmen to dedicate to the emperor utilitarian buildings that catered for their own professional activities. Their attitude is perfectly understandable, as economic enterprises were always of concern of businessmen, in addition to the love of honours (*philotimia*) that also preoccupied them. The shipowners of Nicomedia built and dedicated to Vespasian their own club-house (*oikos nauklerikos*) and a sanctuary in AD 71.⁹² In another important harbour city, Ephesus, the fishermen and fishmongers dedicated a toll house for fishing products to Nero, his mother Agrippina Minor and his wife Octavia (AD 54–59).⁹³ The building was constructed on a public land that the city granted them for this reason and the association started a fund for contributions from its members. This subscription preserves a long list of names of about one hundred individuals, frequently with their parents, wives and children, who contributed through donations of money or building materials.

Free-born and slave craftsmen and traders made up a large part of the urban populations and many of them were members of professional associations, which were important factors in the maintenance of middle- and lower-class sociability and social mobility. The evidence from Thyatira in Lydia illustrates some interesting aspects of non-occupational activities, including building projects, of professional *collegia*,⁹⁴ although precise information on the economic motives behind this activity, such as, for example, the securing of tax exemption, is lacking.⁹⁵ Thus, the *pragmateuomenoi* and the city dedicated to the *divi Augusti* a structure composed of a *tripylon* and porticoes with workshops, warehouses and adjoining buildings that catered to professional needs of tailors (Fig. 6).⁹⁶ The funds came respectively from the surplus in the coffers of a person named Pamphilos, who was perhaps the president of the association of Lydian traders, and of an outgoing civic *strategos*, Apollodotos son of Menodotos, who also appears as superintendent of the construction.⁹⁷ A fragmentary architrave inscription presumably from the region of Philadephia attests that the association involved in spinning cotton or wool into fine threads (*symbiosis psilagnaphon*) built with its own funds a workroom or shop (*exedra*) within a portico

⁸⁹ Cf. Barresi 2003, 451.

⁹⁰ Filges 2006, 321–322 and 326–327.

⁹¹ Filges 2006, 335–336; cf. Quaß 1993, 382–394.

⁹² TAM IV 22. Mitchell 1993, 212.

⁹³ IEphesos 20. See further Dreher 1997; Rodhe 2012, 308–312; Dittmann-Schöne 2010, 149–154.

⁹⁴ For the multiple functions of craft-guilds in the Roman East, see van Nijf 1997.

⁹⁵ See van Nijf 1997, 12–18, especially for the economic activities of *collegia* and guilds.

⁹⁶ IGRR IV 1209; TAM V 862; IGRR IV 1189; TAM V 861.

⁹⁷ Barresi 2003, 474–475, suggests that the name of Apollodotos is to be restored also in the blank at the end of the first inscription set up by the *pragmateuomenoi* (IGRR IV 1209; TAM V 862).

(?), which probably served as a manufacturing and commercial centre also for other *collegia* (2nd–3rd c. AD).⁹⁸

From the late Hellenistic period onwards and particularly under the Empire, to undertake a building project became an important element in the self-celebration both of the elite and of non-elite groups, who thereby imitated aristocratic attitudes.⁹⁹ Under Hadrian, the dyers of Thyatira honoured their patron, Marcus son of Meandros, a civic official, who supervised the construction or the restoration of the headquarters of their *collegium*.¹⁰⁰ His benefactions in terms of building projects also included the supervision of the erection of twenty-five statues of Eros along the porticoed main street of the city (the so-called *Hekatontastylon*), the construction of the *oikobasilikon* in the edifice of the *gerousia*,¹⁰¹ and the building of protective walls and channels on the banks of the river Lycum.¹⁰² These walls and channels were built apparently with the intention of catering the particular needs of the dyers, whose industry required large amounts of water. Patrons were expected to supply their clients with the professional accommodation and infrastructures required and then to maintain them. Some of these structures included workshops, warehouses, harbour buildings and toll houses, were also of use to the rest of society.¹⁰³ The club-house of such associations (*oikos*, *ergon*, *station*, etc. in the east, *aedes* and *schola* in the west) especially must have been a high priority in the building projects of these benefactors.¹⁰⁴ In addition to Marcus, another *strategos* of Thyatira, Aurelius Artemagoros, was honoured with an *andrias* in recognition of his activities as superintendent of the headquarters of the dyers (*epistesamenon to ergon ton vapheon*).¹⁰⁵ Textile *collegia*, which were composed of free-born craftsmen, freedmen and slaves, were numerous and enjoyed a certain prestige in Mysian, Lydian and Phrygian cities, such as Thyatira, Saittai and Hierapolis, that were centres for the production and manufacture of wool and linen of at least regional importance.¹⁰⁶

Despite the fact that the local career of Marcus is fully described on the statue base,¹⁰⁷ this document, which summarizes the decree that his clients voted in his honour, does not reveal if the benefactor was a local notable with particular economic or commercial interests in the dyeing business, or whether he himself was a leading member of the *collegium*, who succeeded in being accepted into the ruling class of Thyatira.¹⁰⁸ His name, Marcus son of Meandros, which perhaps betrays a concealed attempt by a Greek to adopt Roman onomastic habits, may allude to a person of middling social status. The inte-

⁹⁸ Dittmann-Schöne 2010, 214.

⁹⁹ This is particularly visible in the epigraphic habits of funerary inscriptions of the professional associations (van Nijf 1997, 31–69).

¹⁰⁰ TAM V 991. van Nijf 1997, 88–89; Dittmann-Schöne 2010, 187.

¹⁰¹ The *oikobasilikon*, which is also attested in another inscription from Thyatira as part of the Hadrianeion (IGRR IV 1290; TAM V 982 ll. 17–22 [after A.D. 170]) and from Sardeis (IGRR IV 1528; Sardis VII 63b, ll. 15–18 [after AD 212]), must have been a Roman basilica housing meetings especially in Lydian cities.

¹⁰² Barresi 2003, 475.

¹⁰³ Waltzing 1968, vol. 4, 567–568; van Nijf 1997, 82–95.

¹⁰⁴ van Nijf 1997, 107–109; Dittmann-Schöne 2010, 42–49.

¹⁰⁵ TAM V 945. van Nijf 1997, 104–106; Dittmann-Schöne 2010, 177.

¹⁰⁶ Pleket 1984, 24–31; Ritti 2007, 426 n. 41; Ruffing 2008, 256–265; Huttner 2009; Dittmann-Schöne 2010, 180–188, 195–202, 231–243.

¹⁰⁷ Marcus successfully undertook many municipal tasks: he was *strategos*, *agoranomos*, responsible for the food supply (*sitones*), secretary of the council and the people, keeper of the public archives (*grammatophylax*), *dekaprotos* by his own choice, sponsor (*choregos*) for oil supplying to the gymnasium (if not gymnasiarch), supervisor of sacred embassies (*epimeletes theorion*) and twice vice-archon of the council and the people (TAM V 991).

¹⁰⁸ For a discussion of the patronage relations between aristocrats and professional *collegia*, see van Nijf 1997, 73–128; Dittmann-Schöne 2010, 52–62. A representative case is the benefactions of M. Fulvius Publicianus Nicephorus at Ephesos (van Nijf 1997, 83–85).

gration of people of the *plebs media* into councils and, consequently, the holding of lesser public offices is a typical mechanism of social mobility under Roman rule.¹⁰⁹ Strabo describes the amazing political, social and economic rise of two low-born men from Mylasa in the late first century BC,¹¹⁰ while Cicero criticizes assemblies of some cities in the province of Asia for being meeting places of “cobblers and belt-makers” (*sutores et zonarii*), “craftsmen, shopkeepers and all the dregs of a city” (*opifices et tabernarios atque illam omnem faecem civitatum*).¹¹¹ However, a century and half later, in AD 128/129, Hadrian was of quite a different opinion, when he requested the councillors of Ephesus to accept the shipowner (*naukleros*) L. Erastus among their ranks.¹¹²

Statistical analysis has shown that generally only a small number of patrons of *collegia* did not belong to the civic aristocracy.¹¹³ Nevertheless, epigraphic evidence from Thyatira supports the view that, under the Empire, the urban elite especially of this city also included wealthy craftsmen and traders.¹¹⁴ The benefactors *strategoï*, Marcus son of Menandros and Aurelius Artemagoros son of Glykon (this last, at least, owed his Roman citizenship only to the universal grant of the *Constitutio Antoniniana* and is praised for being the sixth hereditary president of the guild) must have belonged to families of dyers engaged in the business for several generations. Likewise, the slave-trader Alexandros became *agoranomos* for four months in Thyatira and was honoured by the association of the dealers and agents in the slave-market in recognition of his activities during the short term of his public function and his lavish donations during the celebration of imperial festivals.¹¹⁵

This last example proves that, in contrast to the usual desire on the part of new members of the elite to hide their previous lowly social status, some benefactors wished to be identified in terms of occupational activities. At Koptos in Upper Egypt, an important trans-shipment and trading centre on the Nile and the closest entrepot of the port of Leukos Limen, the Palmyran wool-traders (*eriemporoi*) honoured a shipowner (*naukleros*) from the Red Sea, the “saintly and just” Zabdalas son of Salmanos, because he completely rebuilt a commercial complex at his own expense. This building consisted of three *stoai* housing shops and other space for the conducting of trade. A monumental *propylon* introduced the *stoai*, whilst the *thyromata* (gates or doors) may have given access to the inner courtyard through the porticoes.¹¹⁶ M. Aurelius Alexander Moschion, from Hierapolis, who must have derived his wealth from the luxury clothing industry, ostentatiously juxtaposes his occupation as purple-seller and his function as councilor (*porphyropoles bouleutes*) in the same inscription.¹¹⁷ Given the great amount of investment that the production and commerce of luxury goods required, this trade was normally in the hands of well-to-do merchants and wealthy *collegia*, and consequently offered more chances for upward social mobility.¹¹⁸ An interesting piece of epigraphic evidence from Hierapolis shows that some of the wealth that came from the purple dyeing industry funded extremely high-profile public monuments. The association of purple-dyers contributed a probable sum of one thousand

¹⁰⁹ Syme 1979; Quaß 1993, 355–365 and 382–394; Ruffing 2004.

¹¹⁰ Strab. 14,2,24 (659–660).

¹¹¹ Cic. Flacc. 17–19 (translation by C. Macdonald, Loeb). Quaß 1993, 357–358. For the western societies, see Tran 2006, 65–88.

¹¹² IEphesos 1487. See further Pleket 1984, 10–17.

¹¹³ van Nijf 1997, 73–128; Sommer 2006, 121–126, in particular p. 125; Dittmann-Schöne 2010, 52–62.

¹¹⁴ Cf. also the rich evidence of honorific practices of other professional *collegia* at Thyatira (IGRR IV 1205, 1231, 1216, 1226, 1239, 1242, 1244, 1250, 1252).

¹¹⁵ TAM V 932. van Nijf 1997, 102; Ruffing 2004, 91–92; Dittmann-Schöne 2010, 193.

¹¹⁶ SEG 34 1593. van Nijf 1997, 87, 102–103. Hadrian granted to Palmyrians the right to make trade in the Red Sea (Drexhage 1982, 32–33). For the commercial role of Koptos, see Ruffing 1995.

¹¹⁷ Pleket 1983, 141–142. At Ephesos, Aurelius son of Menodotos, secretary of an unknown *synergasia*, was boasted to be an offspring of local councilors (IEphesos 679).

¹¹⁸ Pleket 1983.

and five hundred *denarii*¹¹⁹ to the restoration of the *scaena frons* of the theatre, under the supervision of local and Roman magistrates (Fig. 7). The rebuilt monument was dedicated to Apollo Archegetes, to the gods of fatherland (*patrooi*) and to the Severans (Septimius Severus, Caracalla, Geta and Iulia Domna) in AD 206/207.¹²⁰ The decoration consisted mainly of the revetment of the first and second storey of the stage-building, which was executed in marble from Docimeium and covered six hundred fifty-three square feet. The recent restoration of the theatre of Hierapolis has revealed the impact of the generous contribution of the association. In the view of the Italian archaeologists, three different types of marble were used in the front-stage of the theatre. The rather cheap and mediocre local marble seems to have been used mostly in the arcading, marble from Aphrodisias was employed particularly for the capitals, while the more expensive and prime quality marble from Docimeium (the so-called *pavonazetto*) was used in the central columns and, according to the inscription of purple-dyers, in the architraves and in the revetment of the walls of the second and third storey of the *scaena frons*.¹²¹ When set against the Ephesian fishermen's toll-house, the dyers' club-house and porticoes at Thyatira or the wool-trade centre at Koptos, the luxurious donation of the purple-dyers of Hierapolis comes close to euergetism in its purest Greco-Roman form, that is a benefaction intended for the benefit of society as a whole. Furthermore, the fact that the dyers' *collegium* at Hierapolis chose to beautify a major civic building and the point that their benefaction recorded in monumental form the financial power of a guild may mean that this type of building euergetism became an important means of self-identification and self-projection, and of socializing for professionals at least in some Phrygian and Lydian cities under the Empire.

Two main tendencies are to be observed in building activities undertaken by businessmen and Roman *negotiatores*. They contributed mostly to the construction of utilitarian buildings of use to their craft and trade, such as shops, workshops and warehouses. These were frequently surrounded by porticoes and often formed larger architectural complexes around an open courtyard which was often entered by a monumental gate. In accord with ancient consecratory habits, these monuments were dedicated to local gods and frequently also to the *Augusti*.¹²² Dedications to the emperors in particular, rather than being an indication of any special relationship to the *domus Augusta*, were demonstrations of the loyalty of these men to an absolute monarch, whose policy, wars, decisions and acts were expected to guarantee the smooth functioning of commerce all over the Empire. Roman *negotiatores* paid also for temples that housed cult statues of gods and emperors. Businessmen followed in this sense the example of the city and its elite, and thus helped integrate the imperial presence in the public and religious fabric. Roman rule marked a turning point in the building practices of traders. This stands in contrast to what happened during the Hellenistic period, when foreign merchants established in international commercial centres acted as isolated groups and centred their identity around the cult and the shrine of a specific protector divinity.¹²³

Building activity was undoubtedly the most visible way of self-celebration and of displaying financial power. Well-to-do freedmen and leading members of the middle classes, in their attempt to imitate aristocratic practices of their time, undertook long-term projects by supervising, commissioning and financing sacred, public and semi-private monuments.¹²⁴ This new aspect of "popular" or "ordinary" euergetism, when seen in relation to other forms of social mobility, such as the entry of plebians and

¹¹⁹ The estimation of the financial contribution belongs to Barresi 2003, 325–327, in particular p. 327.

¹²⁰ Ritti 1985, 108; Ritti 2007, 399–409; Dittmann-Schöne 2010, 237–238.

¹²¹ Attanasio – Pensabene 2002, in particular pp. 72–76; Masino – Sobrà 2012, in particular pp. 213–221, for the *scaena frons*.

¹²² Cf. van Nijf 1997, 74–75, who argues that quite a few honorary inscriptions were addressed to an emperor or to a member of his immediate entourage.

¹²³ van Nijf 1997, 8.

¹²⁴ van Nijf 1997, 66.

freedmen into the local councils,¹²⁵ indicates important social changes. However any generalizing conclusions may be misleading. Every case is individual and should therefore be studied in its specific local context. The only obviously true statement is that this rare evidence for the financing of buildings on the part of these non-elite groups does not significantly change our understanding of the social profile of the traditional Greco-Roman benefactor. Epigraphic monuments in the Roman East confirm once more that the most important factors in the urbanization and its associated architectural development were the emperor, the city and the local aristocracy, whose members usually performed acts of euergetism in their capacity as holders of public office.

APPENDIX

MONUMENTS DEDICATED BY FREEDMEN, SLAVES, ROMAN *NEGOTIATORES* AND *COLLEGIA* OF CRAFTSMEN AND TRADERS

FREEDMEN AND SLAVES

CITY	DATE	DEDICATORS	MONUMENT	REFERENCE
Aphrodisias (Caria)	Late Rep. -Early Emp.	C. Iulius Zoilus, freedman of Caesar/ Augustus	Temple of Aphrodite, portico of the N agora, theatre: stage building	IAph2007, 1.2 IAph2007, 3.2 IAph2007, 8.1, 8.5
Corinth (Achaea)	Late Rep.-Early Emp.	Freedmen	Ionic building	Corinth VIII.2 121
Corinth (Achaea)	Late Rep.-Early Emp.	Freedmen	Ionic building	Corinth VIII.3 316
Corinth (Achaea)	Augustan	Cn. Babbius Philinus, freedman (?)	Round monument in the forum dedicated to Nep- tune	Corinth VIII.2 132 Corinth VIII.3 155 Cf. Corinth VIII.2 2–3
Ephesus (Ionia)	Augustan	Mazaeus & Mithri- dates, freedmen of Agrippa	S gate of the commercial agora (<i>Tetragonos</i>)	IEphesos 3006
Sidyra (Lycia)	Claudian	Tib. Claudius Ep- agathus, freedman & doctor of Claudius, & Tib. Claudius Livianus (his son or relative ?)	Portico dedicated to Clau- dius, (imperial cult?) statue & (imperial temple?)	TAM II 178 TAM II 184 Cf. TAM II 177
Iasos (Caria)	First half of the 1 st c. AD	Potens, slave agent of <i>asocius portuum</i> <i>Asiae</i> (?)	Baths, sacred objects & donation of money	IIasos 253 SEG 43 717
Laodicea ad Lycum (Phrygia)	AD 84-85	Tib. Claudius Tryphon, imperial freedman	S city gate, towers & ad- joining buildings dedicated to Zeus Megistos Saviour & to Domitian	ILaod.Lyk. 24a-b
Near Vetissus (Beşkavak, Galatia)	AD 89	L. Sergius Corinthus, freedman of the Sergii Paulli	Temple of Men [---]pycenos	MAMA VII 486
Dionysopolis (Phrygia)	c. AD 90	Dokimos, slave of Domitia Aug.	Sanctuary of Apollo Lairmenos: 10 tiles & 12	MAMA IV 293

¹²⁵ Quaß 1993, 391–392 (freedmen); van Nijf 1997, 18–23 (craftsmen and traders).

Region of Hadrianeia (Tepeköy, Mysia)	Flavian	Tib. Claudius Halys, imperial freedman, & his family (under the supervision of Ti. Flavius Aug. I.)	<i>denarii</i> for a gilt ceiling Temple of Artemis Sebaste Baieane & baths (?)	IGRR IV 228
Tralleis (Ionia)	AD 96-98	(Ulpius) Chresimus, imperial freedman, <i>proc. lapicidinarum / a marmoribus</i>	Gymnasium: marble revetment of the <i>caldarium</i> dedicated to Nerva	ITralleis 148
Patras (Achaea)	1 st c. AD	C. Varronius Quir. Verus, son of an <i>augustalis</i>	34 marble columns with ornamentation	IPatras 49
Pergamum (Mysia)	Trajanic	Diadoumenos, freedman of A. Iulius Quadratus	Temple of Asclepius Saviour & [---]	IPergamon VIII.2 290 (IGRR IV 277).
Nysa (Ionia)	Under Hadrian or Antoninus Pius	T. Aelius Alcibiades, Hadrian's freedman <i>a cubiculo</i>	Books & the library(?) in the sanctuary of the <i>technitai</i> of Dionysos (in connexion stoa <i>temenos</i> of Roma)	IEphesos, 22, ll. 16-18
Balboura (Lycia)	Under Antoninus Pius	Onesimos, public slave	Temple of Nemesis & statues of the <i>Boule</i> and the <i>Demos</i>	Coulton et al. 1988, 130, cf. p. 136
Miletopolis (Mysia)	Under Antoninus Pius	Euschemon, slave purple-seller	Temple & statue of Tyche	IKyzikos (II Miletupolis) 35
Near Pessinus (Sivrihisar, NW Galatia)	AD 177-180	Eutyches, <i>oikonomos</i> of the imperial territories, & his two slave-born sons	Imperial temple & statues of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus	RECAM II 36 RECAM II 34
Halicarnassos (Caria)	Under Commodus	Two slaves agents of a <i>promagister XXXX portuum Asiae</i>	Customs house, portico & a gold gilt statue of Aphrodite	ILS 8858

ROMAN *NEGOTIATORES* AND *COLLEGIA* OF CRAFTSMEN AND TRADERS

CITY	DATE	DEDICATORS	MONUMENT	REFERENCE
Ephesus (Ionia)	AD 54-59	Fishermen & fishmongers by subscription	Toll house for fishing products dedicated to Nero's family	IEphesos 20
Cyzicus (Mysia)	Claudian	R. <i>negotiatores</i> & the people of Cyzicus	Arch (? for the <i>victoria britannica</i> ?) dedicated to Claudius	CIL III 7061
Nicomedia (Bithynia)	AD 71	Shipowners	Sanctuary and club-house dedicated to Vespasian	TAM IV.1 22
Blaundus (Lydia)	Flavian or Late Julio-Claudian (?)	C. Octavius, R. <i>negotiator</i>	Temple of Ceres, porticoes & <i>propylon</i> dedicated to Ceres & to <i>Dom[us Augusta]</i> (?rather than to Dom[itia])	Filges 2006, 323-324
Blaundus	Flavian	C. Octavius,	Temple of Cybele (?),	Filges 2006, 324-326

(Lydia)		R. <i>negotiator</i>	porticoes & [<i>propylon</i> ?] dedicated to Vespasian & Titus		
Blaundus (Lydia)	Flavian(?)	C. Mummius Macer, R. <i>negotiator</i>	Propylon (in front of the previous temple) & work- shops dedicated to the em- peror & to the people	Filges 2006, 321–322	326–327,
Thyatira (Lydia)	Hadrianic	Marcus son of Menandros, patron of the dyers’ <i>collegium</i> & civic official	<i>Collegium</i> ’s club-house (su- pervision), walls & channels on the banks of the river Lycum, <i>oikobasilikon</i> in the <i>gerousia</i> ’s house, 25 statues of Eros along a collonaded street	TAM V.2 991	
Thyatira (Lydia)	1 st -2 nd c. AD	Tailors (?) & the city	Tripylon, porticoes & work- shops dedicated to the <i>Augusti</i>	TAM V.2 862 TAM V.2 861	
Region of Philadelphia (?)	2 nd -3 rd c. AD	Association of spinning cotton/wool workers	<i>Exedra</i> & portico	Dittmann-Schöne 214	2010,
Hierapolis (Phrygia)	AD 206-207	Association of the purple-dyers (in collaboration with the city)	Theatre: marble revetement of the <i>scaena frons</i> dedicated to Apollo <i>Archegetes</i> , to the gods of fatherland & to the Severans	Ritti 1985, 108	
Thyatira (Lydia)	3 rd c. AD	Aurelius Artemagoros son of Glykon, patron of the dyers’ <i>collegium</i> & civic official	<i>Collegium</i> ’s club-house (supervision)	TAM V.2 932	
Koptos (Egypt)	3 rd c. AD	Zabdalas son of Salmanos, shipowner (<i>naukleros</i>)	<i>Propylon</i> , 3 colonnades & gates (for the wool-traders of Palmyra)	SEG 34 1593	

Abbreviated Literature

- Anderson 1937 J. G. C. Anderson, An Imperial Estate in Galatia, *JRS* 27, 1937, 18–21.
- Attanasio – Pensabene 2002 D. Attanasio – P. Pensabene, I marmi del teatro di Hierapolis, in: D. De Bernardi Ferrero (a cura di), *Hierapolis Scavi e Ricerche IV. Saggi in onore di Paolo Verzone*, Roma 2002, 69–85.
- Barresi 2003 P. Barresi, *Province dell’Asia Minore. Costo dei marmi, architettura pubblica e committenza*, Roma 2003.
- Bradley 1994 K. Bradley, *Slavery and Society at Rome*, Cambridge 1994.
- Buckland 1970 W. W. Buckland, *The Roman Law of Slavery*, Cambridge 1970.
- Bussi 2001 S. Bussi, *Economia e demografia della schiavitù in Asia Minore ellenistico-romana*, Milano 2001.
- Camodeca 2007 G. Camodeca, Sulle proprietà imperiali in Campania, in: D. Pupillo (a cura di), *Le proprietà imperiali nell’Italia romana. Economia, produzione, amministrazione. Atti del Convegno Ferrara-Voghiera, 3–4 giugno 2005*, Firenze 2007, 143–167.
- Chaisemartin – Lemaire 1996 N. de Chaisemartin – A. Lemaire, Le Portique de Tibère: recherches sur son architecture et sa fonction, in: Ch. Roueché – R. R. R. Smith (edd.), *Aphrodisias Papers 3. The setting and quarries, mythological and other sculptural*

- decoration, architectural development, Portico of Tiberius, and Tetracylon, *Ann Arbor* 1996, 149–172 (JRA Suppl. 20).
- Chaniotis 2008 A. Chaniotis, Twelve buildings in search of locations: known and unknown buildings in the inscriptions of Aphrodisias, in: Chr. Ratté – R. R. R. Smith (edd.), *Aphrodisias Papers 4. New research on the city and its monuments*, *Ann Arbor* 2008, 61–78 (JRA Suppl. 70).
- Chaniotis 2009 A. Chaniotis, Myths and Contexts in Aphrodisias, in: U. Dill – Ch. Walde (edd.), *Antike Mythen. Medien, Transformationen und Konstruktionen*, Berlin/New York 2009, 313–338.
- Christol – Drew-Bear 2002 M. Christol – Th. Drew-Bear, Les Sergii Paullii et Antioche, in: Th. Drew-Bear – M. Taslialan – Ch. M. Thomas, (edd.), *Actes du I^{er} Congrès International pour Antioche de Pisidie*, Lyon 2002, 177–191.
- Coulton et al. 1988 J. J. Coulton – N. P. Milner – A. T. Reyes, Balboura survey: Onesimos and Meleager, *Anatolian Studies* 38, 1988, 121–145.
- Dardaine – Frézouls 1985 S. Dardaine – E. Frézouls, Sidyma: étude topographique, *Ktéma* 10, 1985, 211–217.
- Dittmann-Schöne 2010 I. Dittmann-Schöne, *Die Berufsvereine in den Städten des kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien*, Regensburg 2010.
- Dreher 1997 M. Dreher, Das Monumentum Ephesenum und das römische Zollwesen, *Münstersche Beiträge z. antiken Handelsgeschichte* 16.2, 1997, 79–96.
- Drexhage 1982 R. Drexhage, Der Handel Palmyras in römischer Zeit, *Münstersche Beiträge z. antiken Handelsgeschichte* 1.1, 1982, 17–34.
- Duthoy 1978 R. Duthoy, *Les Augustales*, ANRW II, 16.2, 1978, 1245–1309.
- Eck 1997 W. Eck, *Die Verwaltung des Römischen Reiches in der Hohen Kaiserzeit. Ausgewählte und erweiterte Beiträge*, 2. Band, Basel - Berlin 1997.
- Erkelenz 2003 D. Erkelenz, *Optimo praesidi. Untersuchungen zu den Ehrenmonumenten für Amtsträger der römischen Provinzen in Republik und Kaiserzeit*, Bonn 2003.
- Filges 2000 A. Filges, in *Jahresbericht 1999 des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts: Abteilung Istanbul*, AA 2000, 591–604.
- Filges 2006 A. Filges, *Blaundos. Berichte zur Erforschung einer Kleinstadt im lydisch-phrygischen Grenzgebiet*, Tübingen 2006 (DAI, *Istanbuler Forschungen* 48).
- Golubcova 1992 E. S. Golubcova, Sklaverei- und Abhängigkeitsformen in Kleinasien, in: L. P. Marinovič et al. (edd.), *Die Sklaverei in den östlichen Provinzen des römischen Reiches im 1.-3. Jahrhundert* (Übersetzung von J. Kriz), Stuttgart 1992, 77–138.
- Halfmann 2001 H. Halfmann, Städtebau und Bauherren im römischen Kleinasien. Ein Vergleich zwischen Pergamon und Ephesos, Tübingen 2001 (MDAI(I) Beiheft 43).
- Halfmann 2003 H. Halfmann, Stadttypologien im römischen Kleinasien: Pergamon und Ephesos als Modell, in: E. Schwertheim – E. Winter (edd.), *Stadt und Stadtentwicklung in Kleinasien*, Bonn 2003, 111–126 (*Asia Minor Studien* 50).
- Hatzfeld 1919 J. Hatzfeld, *Les Trafiquants Italiens dans l'Orient Hellénique*, Paris 1919.
- Hautcourt 2001 A. d'Hautcourt, *Corinthe: financement d'une colonisation et d'une reconstruction*, in: J. -Y. Marc – J. C. Moretti (edd.), *Constructions publiques et Programmes éditaires en Grèce entre le II^e siècle av. J.-C. et le I^{er} siècle ap. J.-C.* Actes du Colloque organisé par l'EFA et le CNRS (Athènes 14–17 mai 1995), BCH Suppl. 39, 2001, 427–438.
- Herrmann 1988 P. Herrmann, Chresimus, procurator lapidinarum. Zur Verwaltung der kaiserlichen Steinbrüche in der Provinz Asia, *Tyche* 3, 1988, 119–128.
- Hirt 2010 A. M. Hirt, *Imperial Mines and Quarries in the Roman World. Organizational Aspects 27 BC – AD 235*, Oxford 2010.
- Hornum 1993 M. B. Hornum, *Nemesis, the Roman State, and the Games*, Leiden – New

- York – Köln 1993.
- Huttner 2009 U. Huttner, Die Färber von Laodikeia und Hierapolis. Eine Nachricht aus dem Corpus der Alchemisten, *Marburger Beiträge zur antiken Handels-, Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte* 26, 2009, 139–157.
- Joshel 1992 S. R. Joshel, *Work, Identity, and legal Status at Rome. A Study of the Occupational Inscriptions*, Norman - London 1992.
- Kantirea 2014 M. Kantirea, *Constructions sacrées des affranchise et esclaves en Asie Mineure sous l'Empire*, in: W. Eck, P. Funke et al. (ed.), *Öffentlichkeit-Monument-Text. XIV Congressus Internationalis Epigraphiae Graecae et Latinae (27.–31. Augusti MMXII)*, Berlin 2014, 624–626.
- Levick 1967 B. Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, Oxford 1967.
- MacMullen 1959 R. MacMullen, *Roman Imperial Building in the Provinces*, *HSCPh* 64, 1959, 207–235.
- Maiuro 2012 M. Maiuro, *Res Caesaris. Ricerche sulla proprietà imperiale nel Principato*, Bari 2012.
- Masino – Sobrà 2012 F. Masino – G. Sobrà, *Ricerche e interventi nel Teatro*, in: F. d'Andia – M. P. Caggia – T. Ismaelli (a cura di), *Hierapolis di Frigia V. Le attività delle campagne di scavo e restauro 2004–2006*, Istanbul 2012, 207–233.
- Merola 2001 G. D. Merola, *Autonomia locale, governo imperiale. Fiscalità e amministrazione nelle province asiatiche*, Bari 2001.
- Migeotte 1992 L. Migeotte, *Les souscriptions publiques dans les cités grecques*, Genève/Quebec 1992.
- Mitchell 1980 S. Mitchell, *Population and the Land in Roman Galatia*, *ANRW II*, 7.2, 1980, 1053–1081.
- Mitchell 1987 S. Mitchell, *Imperial Building in the Eastern Roman Provinces*, *HSCPh* 91, 1987, 333–365.
- Mitchell 1993 S. Mitchell, *Anatolia. Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor. Vol. 1, The Celts in Anatolia and the Impact of Roman Rule*, Oxford 1993.
- Mouritsen 2011 H. Mouritsen, *The freedman in the Roman world*, Cambridge 2011.
- Ostrow 1990 S. E. Ostrow, *The Augustales in the Augustan Scheme*, in: K. A. Raafaub – M. Toher (edd.), *Between Republic and Empire. Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate*, Berkeley - Los Angeles - Oxford 1990, 364–379.
- Pleket 1983 H. W. Pleket, *Urban elites and business in the Greek part of the Roman Empire*, in: P. Garnsey – K. Hopkins – C. R. Whittaker (edd.), *Trade in the Ancient Economy*, London 1983, 131–144.
- Pleket 1984 H. W. Pleket, *Urban Elites and the Economy in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire*, *Münstersche Beiträge z. antiken Handelsgeschichte* 3.1, 1984, 3–35.
- Pohl 2002 D. Pohl, *Kaiserzeitliche Tempel in Kleinasien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der hellenistischen Vorläufer*, Bonn 2002 (*Asia Minor Studien* 43).
- Pont 2010 A.-V. Pont, *Orner la cité. Enjeux culturels et politiques du paysage urbain dans l'Asie gréco-romaine*, Bordeaux 2010 (*Ausonius Scripta Antiqua* 24).
- Price 1984 S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge 1984.
- Pugliese Carratelli 1993 G. Pugliese Carratelli, *Epigrafi onorarie di Iasos in Caria*, *Rend.Acc.Linc.* 4, 1993, 261–269.
- Quaß 1993 F. Quaß, *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens. Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Entwicklung in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*, Stuttgart 1993.
- Rémy 1989 B. Rémy, *Les carrières sénatoriales dans les provinces romaines d'Anatolie au Haut-Empire (31 av. J.-C.-284 ap. J.-C.): Pont-Bithynie, Galatie, Cappadoce, Lycie-Pamphylie et Cilicie*, Istanbul - Paris 1989.

- Reynolds 1982 J. M. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome. Documents from the excavation of the theatre at Aphrodisias conducted by Professor Kenan T. Erim, together with some related texts*, London 1982 (JRS Monographs 1).
- Reynolds 1990 J. M. Reynolds, *Inscriptions and the building of the Temple of Aphrodite*, in: Ch. Roueché – K. T. Erim (edd.), *Aphrodisias Papers 1. Recent work on architecture and sculpture*, Ann Arbor 1990, 37–40.
- Reynolds 1991 J. M. Reynolds, *Epigraphic evidence for the construction of the theatre: 1st c. B.C. to mid 3rd c. A.D.*, in: R. R. R. Smith – K. T. Erim (edd.), *Aphrodisias Papers 2. The theatre, a sculptor's workshop, philosophers, and coin-types*, Ann Arbor 1991, 15–28 (JRA Suppl. 2).
- Rigsby 1996 K. J. Rigsby, *Asyilia. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley 1996.
- Ritti 1985 T. Ritti, *Hierapolis Scavi e Ricerche I. Fonti letterarie ed epigrafiche*, Roma 1985.
- Ritti 2007 T. Ritti, *Iscrizioni pertinenti all'edificio teatrale di Hierapolis*, in: D. De Bernardi Ferrero – G. Ciotta – P. Pensabene (a cura di), *Il teatro di Hierapolis di Frigia. Restauro, architettura ed epigrafia*, Genova 2007, 389–427.
- Rizakis et al. 2001 A. Rizakis – S. Zoumbaki – M. Kantirea, *Roman Peloponnese I. Roman Personal Names in their Social Context*, Athens 2001 (Meletimata 31).
- Rodhe 2012 D. Rodhe, *Zwischen Individuum und Stadtgemeinde. Die Integration von collegia in Hafenstädten*, Mainz 2012.
- Ruffing 1995 K. Ruffing, *Einige Überlegungen zu Koptos: Ein Handelsplatz Oberägyptens in römischer Zeit*, *Münstersche Beiträge z. antiken Handelsgeschichte* 14.1, 1995, 17–42.
- Ruffing 2004 K. Ruffing, *Die Selbstdarstellung von Händlern und Handwerkern in den griechischen Inschriften*, *Münstersche Beiträge z. antiken Handelsgeschichte* 23.2, 2004, 85–102.
- Ruffing 2008 K. Ruffing, *Die berufliche Spezialisierung in Handel und Handwerk. Untersuchungen zur ihrer Entwicklung und zu ihren Bedingungen in der römischen Kaiserzeit im östlichen Mittelmeerraum auf der Grundlag griechischer Inschriften und Papyri*, Rahden/Westf. 2008.
- Schleich 1984 Th. Schleich, *Überlegungen zum Problem senatorischer Handelsaktivitäten*, *Münstersche Beiträge z. antiken Handelsgeschichte* 3.1, 1984, 37–76.
- Schumacher 2006 L. Schumacher, *Stellung des Sklaven im Sakralrecht*, in: T. J. Chiusi et al. (edd.), *Corpus der römischen Rechtsquellen zur antiken Sklaverei (CRRS) VI*, Stuttgart 2006.
- Schumacher 2010 L. Schumacher, *On the status of private actores, dispensatores and vilici*, in: U. Roth (ed.), *By the sweat of your brow. Roman slavery in its socio-economic setting*, London 2010, 31–47.
- Smith 1993 R. R. R. Smith, *Aphrodisias I. The Monument of C. Julius Zoilos*, Mainz am Rhein 1993.
- Smith 1996 R. R. R. Smith, *Archaeological research at Aphrodisias, 1989–1992*, in: Ch. Roueché – R. R. R. Smith (edd.), *Aphrodisias Papers 3. The setting and quarries, mythological and other sculptural decoration, architectural development, Portico of Tiberius, and Tetracylon*, Ann Arbor 1996, 10–72 (JRA Suppl. 20).
- Sommer 2006 S. Sommer, *Rom und die Vereinigungen im südwestlichen Kleinasien (133 v. Chr. – 284 n. Chr.)*, Hefen 2006.
- Sperti 2000 L. Sperti, *Ricognizione archeologica a Laodicea di Frigia: 1993–1998*, in: G. Traversari (a cura di), *Laodicea di Frigia I*, Rome 2000, 29–103.
- Syme 1979 R. Syme, *Sabinus the Muleteer*, *Roman Papers I* (ed. E. Badian), Oxford 1979, 393–399 (= *Latomus* 17, 1958, 73–80).
- Theoderescu 1996 D. Theoderescu, *La frons scaenae du Théâtre: innovations et particularités à*

- l'époque de Zoilos, in : Ch. Roueché – R. R. R. Smith (edd.), *Aphrodisias Papers* 3. The setting and quarries, mythological and other sculptural decoration, architectural development, Portico of Tiberius, and Tetracylon, Ann Arbor 1996, 127–148 (JRA Suppl. 20).
- Tran 2006 N. Tran, *Les membres des associations romaines. Le rang social des collegiati en Italie et en Gaules, sous le Haut-Empire*, Rome 2006 (EFR 367).
- Treggiari 2003 S. Treggiari, *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic*, Oxford 2003 (reprinted).
- van Nijf 1997 O. M. Van Nijf, *The civic world of professional associations in the Roman East*, Amsterdam 1997.
- Virgilio 1993 B. Virgilio, *Gli Attalidi di Pergamo. Fama, Eredità, Memoria*, Pisa 1993 (Studi ellenistici 5).
- Waltzing 1968 J.-P. Waltzing, *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Empire d'Occident*, Roma 1968, vols. 4 (reprinted Louvain 1895–1900).
- Weaver 1972 P. R. C. Weaver, *Familia Caesaris. A social study of the Emperor's freedmen and slaves*, Cambridge 1972.
- Witulski 2007 Th. Witulski, *Kaiserkult in Kleinasien. Die Entwicklung der kultisch-religiösen Kaiserverehrung*, Göttingen/Fribourg 2007 (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 63).
- Yegül 1996 F. K. Yegül, *The Thermo-Mineral Complex at Baiae and De Balneis Puteolanis*, *The Art Bulletin* 78, 1996, 137–161.

Özet

Doğu Roma İmparatorluğunda Elit Tabakasından olmayan Hayırhahlar: Azatlı, Köle, Esnaf ve Zanaatkarlar ile Tüccarların İmar Faaliyetleri

Yazar makalesinde Roma İmparatorluk Dönemi'nden günümüze kadar gelen yapıların inşasında, alışlageldiği gibi kentin yerel seçkinlerinin ve Romalı yöneticilerin değil, bilakis kent katmanlaşmasının diğer basamaklarında yer alan; orta sınıftan önde gelenler, dernekler, esnaf ve zanaatkarlar, tüccarlar, Romalı *negotiatorlar*, varlıklı imparatorluk azatlıları ve hatta kölelerin oynadığı rolü Asia Minor kentlerinden elde edilen epigrafik veriler ışığında örneklendirmektedir. Örneklendirmelerini kent ve kırsal, Asia Minor'un iç bölgeleri ve batı bölgeleri şeklinde gruplandıran yazar, imparatorluk azatlıları ve kölelerinin kentlerdeki bu faaliyetlerinin kent gelişimi açısından değerlendirildiğinde tahmin edilenden daha önemli bir rol oynadığını vurgulamaktadır. Kentin ticari hayatına yön veren tüccarlar, esnaf ve zanaatkarlar, Romalı *negotiatorların*, kentin ticari yaşamına fayda sağlayacak dükkanlar, atölyeler, depolar gibi çeşitli yapılar yaptırduklarına da değinmektedir. Şüphesiz bu tarz yapı faaliyetleri, kendi mali gücünü gösterebilmenin en iyi yollarından biriydi. Bu örnekler, son olarak, makalede yukarıda bahsedilen gruplandırmalar dahilinde tablolarla açıklanmıştır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: İmar Faaliyetleri; hayırhahlar; esnaf ve zanaatkarlar; tüccarlar; *negotiatores*.



Fig. 1. Aphrodisias: theatre's stage building



Fig. 3. Iasos: Caesareum



Fig. 2. Ephesus: gate of Mazaeus and Mithridates



Fig. 4. Blaundus: temple of Ceres



Fig. 5. Blaundus: Flavian temple



Fig. 6. Thyatira: shopping arcade



Fig. 7. Hierapolis: theatre's stage building

