

The Economic and Cognitive Impacts of Personal Benefaction in Hispania Tarraconensis

Rachel Meyers

Author ORCID id: orcid.org/0000-0003-0129-9668

Abstract: This chapter addresses the economic and cognitive roles of personal benefaction in Hispania Tarraconensis, a province of the Roman Empire encompassing a northeast region of modern Spain. During the Imperial period, in particular, individuals and families financed public works, buildings, statues, foundations, and various forms of entertainment such as games, banquets, and performances. As a way of assessing both the financial and cognitive impact of these benefactions over time, this paper analyzes a corpus of inscriptions from Hispania Tarraconensis dating from the Augustan period through the late second century. Assessing the financial impact of benefaction involves charting the cost outlays and whether the donation was a single or continuing occurrence, while analyzing the cognitive impact considers such factors as the function of the monument or activity funded and whether the benefaction might have encouraged competition among the wealthy to make even greater contributions.

[Testa]mento Cornelia[e P]roculae
ex rel[ic]tis HS(sestertium) N(ummis) XL et ad[ic]tis]
HS(sestertium) [N(ummis) V(milia)[C]CCCXCV [de suo
aedem] consum[m]avit - - l]ib[er]tus). (*IRC* III, 36)¹

This text informs us that in Emporiae in the first century, Cornelia Procula allocated 40,000 sesterces in her will for the construction of a temple, to which her freedman added 5,495

sesterces to complete the project. This inscription is an apt example to begin this chapter on civic munificence for it has several features shared with numerous other inscriptions. The text has been reconstructed from six disjointed fragments found through excavations carried out in the twentieth century, just as most inscriptions are fragmentary. It records the construction of a temple; architectural projects were one of the most common undertakings by benefactors. The benefaction was completed with funds bequeathed by the donor; posthumous donations are a small but significant number of the whole corpus of benefactions, which necessitate another individual—sometimes a family member or, as in this case, a freedperson—to bring the project to fruition. Finally, the plaque would have been mounted on the temple proclaiming in large letters the donor's name and her donation. The advertisement of one's generosity is paramount to the discussion of civic munificence in the Roman Empire.

This chapter addresses the economic and cognitive impacts of personal benefaction in Hispania Tarraconensis, a province of the Roman Empire encompassing the northeast region of modern Spain. Hispania Tarraconensis (also known as Hispania Citerior) was an important military, economic, and political center during Rome's wars against the Carthaginians in the late Republican period. Rich in natural resources and with quick accessibility by sea to Rome, it was one of the earliest Roman provinces and home to some of the earliest colonies, including Barcino, founded during the time of Augustus. Large-scale scientific excavations conducted since the 1980s have brought forth substantial remains of civic architecture, artworks, and inscriptions that permit scholars the opportunity to consider the nature of Roman society in these towns. Benefaction was practiced throughout the Roman empire in a variety of ways.

During the Imperial period, in particular, individuals and families financed public works, buildings, statues, foundations, and various forms of entertainment such as games, banquets, and performances. No other scholar has analyzed the broad impact of these donations on the towns in which they were bestowed. Evaluating the nuances of benefaction yields information about the cultural identity of a place. We can understand the demographic makeup of a town, what sorts of individuals or groups held authority and prestige, what kinds of buildings were desired, and what kinds of entertainment were enjoyed. The custom of benefaction tells us much more about society than a simple transaction. As a way of assessing both the financial and cognitive impacts of these benefactions over time, this chapter analyzes a selective corpus of inscriptions from Hispania Tarraconensis dating from the Augustan period through the late second century. After providing an overview of the evidence from the province, three towns will be examined in more detail with the aim of discerning the trends in actions of civic munificence over time.²

Methodology

The present study should be understood within the broader context of scholarly inquiries into the phenomenon of euergetism. The topic of euergetism—or, benefaction, as it is also called—has been the subject of numerous studies in the last forty years, but much of the scholarship has focused on the economic side of the practice.³ In fact, a starting point for understanding benefaction is R. P. Duncan-Jones's numerous works on the Roman economy. Duncan-Jones (1982) has compiled price lists for Italy and the African provinces, namely the epigraphic evidence stating the costs of buildings and infrastructure, various forms of spectacles, cash distributions, taxes, land valuations, the price of wine and wheat, and several other expenditures. These are essential comparanda for other areas of the Roman Empire where no such

comprehensive quantitative studies have yet been undertaken. My own corpus of benefactions from Hispania Tarraconensis, explained further below, is an initial effort for quantitative analysis in this province.

Leonard Curchin (1983) narrowed in on the epigraphic evidence from Spain, but his approach was to determine whether Spain's reputation for having some of the wealthiest cities in the empire held up to scrutiny. Therefore, he looked at the wealth of individuals by reviewing the monetary values recorded in inscriptions. He engages with Duncan-Jones's findings in Italy and North Africa, but he does not provide any in-depth analysis of any single benefaction or discern trends in place, time, or personal status of donations and donors. A few rich individuals in a variety of towns do not inform us about the overall livelihood of those towns.

Enrique Melchor Gil has done more than any scholar in focusing on euergetism in the Spanish provinces, especially in Baetica, where the most evidence has been recovered. He investigated the sources of wealth for some notable benefactors and found individuals and families involved in the silver mines, olive oil production, and the garum trade, among other pursuits (Melchor Gil 1993–1994). In his assessment of 641 benefactions in all of Spain, only 44 have the costs included in the inscribed text, amounting to only 6.9% (1993–1994: 346). Of those with a declared cost, 36.4% of them show that the donor(s) spent less than 10,000 sesterces. Since most projects undertaken by the benefactors were not that costly, Melchor Gil concludes that they would have not have been a hardship.⁴ However, a significant 20.4% of the texts describe projects involving more than 100,000 sesterces, indicating a substantial range in the amount gifted by donors.

In another study, Melchor Gil differentiated between donations given as part of what was required by local magistrates and what was given voluntarily (1994b). He also attempted to understand the motivations for euergetism in Spain and the reasons for the decrease in the practice in the third century (Melchor Gil 1994a). Finally, Emily Hemelrijk (2015) on female benefactors—as well as her previous studies—must be mentioned, for, though she encompasses the entire Roman West, her methodology provides a useful framework for my own investigation.⁵

Most studies, therefore, have aimed for broad overviews of the evidence, cataloging and categorizing inscriptions, with a particular eye towards expressions of costs in the texts. All this work has helped from an economic perspective, as far as our understanding of costs, trade, municipal management, and individual wealth. In building on these previous studies, I have different goals in mind. First, my approach combines the established categories of benefaction with considerations of geography, frequency, and chronology. Another way in which my approach differs is in moving beyond the strict economic impact to consider the cognitive impacts: how these benefactions were received by the towns and their residents in their daily lives. Both residents and potential future donors would have been affected. To investigate this sort of effect, I analyze the function(s) and placement of the physical structures that were donated and the value—broadly speaking—of goods, games, or other intangibles.

Thus, the original context of these acts of civic munificence—as far as they can be determined—cannot be excluded from study. The baths, roads, temples, and porticoes were not simple

financial transactions from donor to recipients. Considering only the financial resources required by any particular benefaction isolates the activity from its original setting. Buildings and monuments occupied physical space in and around towns for decades and even centuries. People used them and saw them on a regular basis and, undoubtedly, had opinions about them.

Spectacles, banquets, and goods filled other needs for those who received them. One might even say that those sorts of activities made life enjoyable. I do not deny that tracking the finances is worthwhile, but it is also essential to grasp the functions of those costed expenditures and to ask the basic questions: What did donors get out of making the gifts and what did the people get?

In order to answer these and other questions, I have assessed more than 31,000 inscriptions from the Spanish provinces, available via the Hispania Epigraphica Online Database, which is a growing electronic collection of published inscriptions found in Spain and Portugal. I determined whether inscriptions record benefactions if they included at least one of a number of expressions in the text, such as *de sua pecunia*, *donum dedit*, *faciendum curavit* (or similar variations), or other indications that an individual provided funds for a structure, goods, or other activity for the public benefit. If inscriptions were too fragmentary, they were discarded from study. My goal is not to be exhaustively comprehensive but to have a reasonably complete sample to examine in meaningful ways.

Therefore, I have sorted out and analyzed sixty-one inscriptions from the province of Hispania Tarraconensis for the purpose of this study. Many of the inscriptions record more than one benefaction, but the item mentioned first in the inscription is used as the primary gift for ease in analysis. The different types of benefactions are the following: architectural, whether new or

repairs; public works, such as roads, walls, bridges, aqueducts, baths, and other water features; spectacles, including all types of entertainment; one-time and foundational cash gifts; statues made with precious materials such as gold, silver, or gems; goods, namely public banquets; alimentary programs; and unspecified, in which cases the text is either in poor condition or omits any particular act of benefaction. In order to see the full range of benefactions in this province, a cross-section of the whole corpus is presented first, and then three towns are analyzed in further detail for the sake of space.

Overview of Benefactions in Hispania Tarraconensis

Of the 61 inscriptions, 25 record some kind of architectural structure, and that number also includes two instances of land being donated for the explicit purpose of building a temple. Financing of public works can be found in 18 of the inscriptions that mention roads, city walls, bridges, towers, baths, aqueducts, or other water features. In addition to financing baths with her own money on her own land in Tagili and giving a public feast and circus games to celebrate, Voconia Avita also left 200,000 sesterces for the future care of the bathing structure (*AE* 1979, 352; *IRAL* 48). This benefaction falls into a small group of enterprises that were not simply ephemeral transactions but were established with the intent of providing goods, entertainment, or repair costs for the future enjoyment of townspeople.

Two of the benefactions were established as foundations with an initial large quantity of cash invested so that the interest could be used for various gifts in the future. In these two cases, one foundation paid out a small cash gift to various individuals in the town (known as *sportulae*) (*CIL* II, 4511), and the other established annual games and oil to be used at the public baths (*CIL*

II, 4514). The final example in this type of endowment benefaction, which dates to the time of Augustus, is less clear whether the donor, Gaius Iulius Celsus, designated his financial gift to be used in a certain way. It appears that he bequeathed a sum of money to the town of Ercavica (in the region near Cuenca today), and the *decuriones* (members of the town council) decided to spend it, or a portion of it amounting to 100,000 sesterces, to build eight miles of roadway (*CIL* II, 3167).

Only one text records the financing of spectacles as the primary benefaction, though numerous other inscriptions include some kind of games along with the costlier gifts.⁶ For example, as seen above, Voconia Avita sponsored games to celebrate the opening of a bath complex she financed. Though most often statues are designated as honorary, since they were set up to recognize an individual, rather than to benefit the broader community, I do include five statues here under benefactions.⁷ These are not typical statuary dedications, as they were made from precious materials, which were much costlier than the common marble or bronze. Games or a cash distribution were given to mark the dedication of some statues. The final eight inscriptions in my corpus cannot be categorized because the text is too fragmentary or the wording too vague to ascertain the precise type of benefaction, but other language in the inscription makes clear that a donor is being recognized.

The amount given by this group of benefactors varies immensely. The most expensive donations are those that involve some kind of construction, whether a building or infrastructure, and these are the very donations that comprise the majority of my corpus to date. Ten inscriptions record the construction, renovation, or repair of temples, and eight record the same of nonreligious

structures, such as a council house, paving in the forum, and restoration of markets. Even within the category of construction, there is a range of cash outlay, depending upon the size, decoration, and types of materials used (among other factors). Though it is outside this study, the highest recorded price in sesterces for the construction of a single building in the Roman West comes from the province of Hispania Baetica, where an inscription records that Baebia Crinita bequeathed 200,000 sesterces for a temple in Arucci (*CIL* II, 964; *ILS* 5402; *ILER* 1760). However, the only inscription in my corpus from Hispania Tarraconensis that includes the cost outlay for any building is that recording the bequest of 40,000 sesterces by Cornelia Procula for a temple in Emporiae, as mentioned above (*IRC* III, 36). The silence on the exact expenses is in keeping with general trends, as the majority of inscriptions commemorating benefactions do not mention the amount of money spent (Curchin 1983: 229).

The second highest recorded cost for a privately funded construction project in the Spanish provinces is a bridge in the town of Oretum in Tarraconensis, financed by Publius Baebius Venustus in the time of Hadrian and dedicated to the divine imperial household, the *domus divina* (*CIL* II, 3221; Curchin, 1983: 229). He spent 80,000 sesterces on this project and gave circus games upon its dedication. In the text, Venustus gives the full names of his father and grandfather, rather than the more standard format with only his father's name. Perhaps Venustus wished to stress that his family had history in Oretum.⁸ If his family had established roots in the town—even though no offices or priesthoods are listed in the text—that might explain why he actually undertook this enterprise or why the *ordo* and people approached him with the request for a new bridge.⁹ The careful wording might also suggest that the construction of the bridge was something that was needed by the town and not a frivolous expenditure by a wealthy benefactor.

A further implication is that the town itself did not have the resources available to see to this infrastructure venture.

Aqueducts, another public works project, were among the costliest construction undertakings, costing millions of sesterces. In Gaul there is record of a 2,000,000 sesterces bequest for an aqueduct (Curchin, 1983: 229 n.16; *CIL* XIII, 596). Four inscriptions record the construction or repair of aqueducts in Tarraconensis, though unfortunately none include the amount expended. At the end of the first century or beginning of the second century in the town of Ilugo, Annia Victorina sponsored an aqueduct and bridges, dedicated with a banquet on account of the memory of her husband and son (*CIL* II, 3240). While this text does not specify the amount she donated for the endeavor, it does state that Annia Victorina took care of the costs on her own. If the aqueduct in Gaul is any indication, Annia Victorina allocated a very large amount of her resources for these undertakings, at least 2,000,000 sesterces.

In 40 of the 61 texts in my corpus, the gender and social rank of the donor can be determined with some degree of certainty. At times the personal status of the donor cannot be determined just from the name in the inscription, but often there are other clues if a certain office or priesthood is mentioned too. Established family names might help distinguish a senator from an equestrian, and the format of the name can sometimes identify a former slave. It is perhaps not surprising that most of the people responsible for financing the more expensive projects were members of the local decurial *ordo*. The architectural projects and public works, as has been established, are usually the costliest benefactions on record. Of the forty-three gifts in these categories, decurions were responsible for twelve, senators for two, and equestrians for two.

However, female donors undertook seven of these costly projects too, and freedpeople carried out five of them.¹⁰

Of the few examples of freedmen financing costlier donations, a freedman—a *sevir Augustalis* named Marcus Popilius Onyx—in Lucentum paid for the restorations of a temple. His former master's name is in the dative here, perhaps indicating that Onyx made the restoration on behalf of his patron. The female donors, constituting 14.7% (9 of 61 examples overall), are involved in the same kind of benefactions as the male donors in Tarraconensis. Claudia Persina granted land for a temple in Tarraco (*CIL* II, 4265; *RIT* 363). Sempronia Arganta's name appears inscribed on monumental blocks from Segobriga, indicating that she was responsible for a large architectural structure (*AE* 1999, 938; *HEp* 10, 2000, 291). Finally, Domitia Pressilla financed a bridge, which her freedmen oversaw (*CIL* II, 5690).

This overview of the practice of benefaction in the province of Tarraconensis has demonstrated the range of benefactions, the variety of people who engaged in the practice, and the incompleteness of the evidence.¹¹ By narrowing down the focus to a single town at a time, we can ask different questions of the evidence, leading us to a more nuanced view of munificent activities in a given locale. I have chosen to focus on Carthago Nova, Barcino, and Castulo, for they shared some traits—such as a change in their Roman civic status around the same time—yet also had different pre-Roman and early Roman existences. They have all been excavated to some degree and have multiple examples of benefaction for examination. These three were also prominent towns in their own regard in antiquity, whether serving as a port city or possessing natural resources.

Carthago Nova

Carthago Nova had a long history before the Romans established it as a Roman town. It was founded by the Carthaginian Hasdrubal, father of Hannibal ca. 229/228 BCE (Abascal Palazón and Ramallo Asensio, 1997: 11). It became a Roman *colonia* around the middle of the first century and was a significant port city in the Mediterranean, as well as being proximate to silver mines.¹² Excavation of the ancient town has been problematic due to the continued habitation at modern Cartagena. Excavations since the 1990s have been carried out at different places around the city, and they have begun to provide an overview of the urban framework (Ruiz Valderas and Martínez Andreu, 2017). One thing that is clear from the written sources is that Carthago Nova was known for its fortifications.

Sixteen of the benefactions in my corpus come from Carthago Nova, and they are some of the earliest datable texts as well. Of these sixteen, six were some kind of architectural structures, either new construction, renovation, or part of an existing structure. The other ten were public works, specifically sections of the city wall, gates, or towers. In fact, no other city has provided as many pieces of evidence for the construction of the city wall as Carthago Nova (Díaz Ariño 2008: 225; Abascal Palazón and Ramallo Asensio, 1997: 11). Marcus Calpurnius Bibulus and Gnaeus Cornelius Cinna were two of the men who each financed sections of the city wall. The inscription recording Cinna's donation reads:

Cn(aeus) Cornelius / L(uci) f(ilius) Gal(eria) Cinna / Ilvir / murum long(um)
 p(edes) CII / ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) f(aciendum) c(uravit) i(dem)q(ue)
 p(robavit). (*CIL* II, 3425; *ILS* 5332)¹³

The text specifies the length of wall (102 feet) and that Cinna took care of it according to a decree of the decurions. The inscription commemorating Bibulus' donation follows a similar format, though it is very fragmentary (*CIL* II, 3422).¹⁴ The other eight inscriptions that record construction of sections of the city wall, gates, and towers use the same formulaic language without providing too much detail about the donors themselves. They record sections of wall from 60 to almost 150 feet financed by each donor or group of donors. It is likely that all these infrastructure projects date to the very late first century BCE or early first century CE (Abascal, 2002: 35). Very few inscriptions from the Roman Empire that record gifts of a city wall and associated structures make any mention of the amount of money donated or required for such projects. The physician Crinas was said by Pliny to have spent 10,000,000 sesterces on the walls and other structures at Massilia (*HN* 29.9). Depending upon the amount of reconstruction or new construction, which is impossible to know without further excavations, the walls at Carthago Nova must have cost millions of sesterces as well, with each donor providing a portion.

Most of the architectural benefactions cannot be precisely dated. One inscription, dated to the Augustan period, records that a donor, whose name is missing but who is described as *duovir designatus*, paid for pavement and something else with his own money (*de sua pecunia*), though the location of this paving is unclear (*CIL* II, 5931). Another fragmentary inscription—known in

duplicate—records the testamentary gift for *hoc opus* (“this work”), which should indicate a civic structure of some sort, especially as it was found in the forum area (*CIL* II, 3423 + 3424); it is dated from the late first to the early second century CE. A third datable architectural project is a *sacellum* to Jupiter Stator, financed and dedicated by the freedperson Marcus Aquinius Andro in the second quarter of the first century BCE, according to the text set in small white tesserae in the floor of the structure (*HEp* 6, 1996, 655; *AE* 1996, 926). Though Republican in date, this shrine is included here as one of the earliest recorded benefactions in this region and is the only documented shrine to Jupiter Stator in the whole empire.¹⁵ Though unique from this perspective, it also fits into the pattern of architectural benefactions in the imperial period.

Two other architectural undertakings involve porticoes. In the last years of the first century BCE, two men financed a porticus (*CIL* II, 3430), and another man named Gaius Plotius Princeps paid for a crypt and porticus in the early first century CE (*CIL* II, 3428). The latter probably refers to the forum area, perhaps the Capitolium, as the inscribed stone was discovered next to the Plaza de San Francisco in Cartagena where the ancient forum is believed to have been situated (Abascal Palazón and Ramallo Asensio, 1997: 135).¹⁶ Three or possibly four men (the stone is very fragmentary) dedicated a column in commemoration of the *genius* of Carthago Nova and also funded a parade and games in the late Republic or early Augustan period (*CIL* II, 3408). The exact nature of this *columna* recorded in the text is unknown; most mentions of columns in inscriptions allude to the construction or repairs of public buildings where they form part of the structure or stand out because of an unusual characteristic (Abascal Palazón and Ramallo Asensio, 1997: 154).

Like most inscriptions that record benefactions, all but one of this group are silent about the costs of the project. The unspecified *hoc opus*, mentioned above, was financed by Lucius Aemilius Rectus, according to his will, with the amount of 250 pounds of silver, which his heir Lucius Aemilius Senex provided (*CIL* II, 3423 + 3424; Ramallo 1997: no. 59). Since there were silver mines not far from Carthago Nova, it is not uncommon to find cash amounts provided as bullion, though figuring out the value of the silver can be challenging. Curchin notes that the value of 250 pounds of silver would be 200,000 sesterces, using the model developed for figures in North Africa (1983: 229 n. 11). However, the proximity of the silver mines might have made the cost of silver less expensive in Spain. The inscription for the *sacellum* to Jupiter Stator does not list the amount given by Andro, and temple costs that are stated in inscriptions range from 3,000 in third century Sarra (in Africa Proconsularis) to 600,000 sesterces in late second-century Lambaesis for a temple to the *genius* of the town (Duncan-Jones, 1982: 90–91). The latter is certainly atypical, as most of the costs cluster around 20,000 to 60,000 sesterces.

According to the inscriptions, all sixteen of these donations were one-time projects with no funds allocated for future repairs or commemoration. Thus, while the most of these acts of civic munificence would have required a fair amount of cash to carry out, the donors were not required to contribute financing after they were finished. We will see examples of long-term investments in Barcino, but let us now consider the broader significance of these donations in Carthago Nova over the course of about two centuries.

The inscriptions make clear that in the second half of the first century BCE, there was a concerted effort at constructing new sections of wall and restoring parts of the older Carthaginian

Barquid fortifications as well. Strabo (*Geogr.* 3.4.6) comments on the impressive nature of the city walls of Carthago Nova, but in the late first century there was little reason for such a sturdy enclosure. In fact, the areas known for intense mining efforts became less densely populated, while in other areas new settlements developed (Orejas and Sánchez-Palencia, 2002: 587).

Rather than signaling a time of insecurity, the efforts directed at improvements for the city wall correspond to its change in civic status. Carthago Nova became a Roman *colonia* in the mid-first century BCE. Three of the named benefactors were among the earliest magistrates of the colony, while others lack any official offices and were presumably part of the wealthy elite. Residents and officials of the new colony pursued the sort of urban infrastructure they thought the new status required (Abascal, 2002: 35). A new cityscape was being formed in the first century BCE, as evidenced by a number of structures serving the religious, political, and entertainment needs of the city's populace (Ruiz Valderas and Martínez Andreu, 2017: 34–38).

Though a new city wall might have helped create the sort of urban look residents desired to go along with the new civic status of Carthago Nova, so many private benefactions for this sort of infrastructure are puzzling when weighed against other evidence. In the municipal charters from Urso, Malaga, and other cities in Spain, we learn that public funds may be used by the *duoviri* and other magistrates for the construction and maintenance of roads, city walls, sewers, and so on.¹⁷ Why are private individuals taking on this financial burden when the towns themselves were supposed to fund the sorts of construction that benefited the town as a whole? Was Carthago Nova a special example? Though ten recorded examples may seem insignificant when compared with the thousands of individuals who lived in Carthago Nova in the Augustan period, in no other city represented in my study are private benefactors responsible for so many projects

of civic infrastructure. Perhaps the importance of Carthago Nova during the Republican period inspired special pride in their fortifications.

Another consideration behind the number of sections of wall financed by private individuals is competition. All of the extant texts recording the donations for sections of the city wall, towers, and gates date to about the same time period. There might have been a coordinated effort by multiple donors to take on responsibility for parts of the whole construction project, especially if the city did not possess the funds for such a massive undertaking. However, the donors might have been driven by a sense of competition after one or two individuals allocated funds for the structures. A donor inserts himself into the town fabric through his or her donation and the subsequent commemoration of that gift. Donors broadcast their own wealth and social status by engaging in such a public activity as benefaction. Everyone coming and going through the city gates would have seen the plaques commemorating the donors' generosity. A certain degree of jealousy might prompt others to make similar or even larger donations to receive the same kind of recognition given to earlier benefactors. The desire to contribute to the wall, in particular, might have been increased due to the recent designation of Carthago Nova as a Roman *colonia* and the significance of city walls as an emblem of that status. This sense of competition is naturally difficult to find among the fragmented stones bearing the records of donations, yet it is entirely plausible based upon the short time period in which the city wall was reconstructed.

The benefactions for buildings in Carthago Nova would have allowed donors the same privilege of marking their identity into the fabric of the city. Although we do not know for certain where the structures were located, with the exception of the *sacellum* to Jupiter Stator (Sánchez et al.,

1995), they were probably within the city center and therefore visible to passersby on a daily basis. Through the monuments and the monumental writing inscribed on commemorative plaques, individuals incorporate themselves into the larger whole. A “primary function of monuments in the early Empire was as devices with which to assert the place of individuals within society” (Woolf, 1996: 29). Buildings endured for generations; thus, generations of people saw the donor’s name affixed to a temple, porticus, or other civic building. Furthermore, the arrangement of buildings dictates how people approach them and how people experience their city. As Valone puts it, “buildings mold the physical and cultural environment of a place” (2001: 317). The donors received prestige for their donations while also impacting the daily lives of thousands of people as they negotiated their way through their city. From the type of benefactions undertaken—mostly architecture and infrastructure—it is clear that at least a small group of families in Carthago Nova had substantial wealth and used it as a way of asserting their own roles within the city.

Barcino

Barcino was established as a Roman *colonia* in the last part of the first century BCE and known officially as *colonia Iulia Augusta Paterna Faventia Barcino*. It occupied a strategic position on the coast, while also having communication with the interior of the province via the Rubricatus river (Mar, Garrido, and Beltrán-Caballero, 2012). It experienced steady development as a Roman town over the course of the first and second centuries, and many of its residents pursued careers in imperial administration.

While in Carthago Nova, the private benefactions were divided between architectural and public works, in Barcino there is more variety in the types of gifts provided by benefactors. Indeed, there is a notable lack of any type of architectural donation, and just one donor financed a portion of city wall. Two donors gave statues, one pair jointly financed the construction of baths, and two set up recurring gift. Thus, the six benefactions in Barcino represent a range of types. Of the four that can be dated, three were made during the second century.

A concise inscription, dated to the Augustan era, commemorates the financing of walls, towers, and gates by a Gaius Coelius (*IRC IV, 57; AE 1978, 441*).¹⁸ The text simply states: *C(aius) Coelius Atisi f(ilius) / Ilvir quin(quennalis) mur(os) / turres portas / fac(iendas) coer(avit)*. This reconstruction—or construction *ab initio*—coincides with the period in which Barcino became a Roman colony. A recent analysis of the remains of the Roman city walls visible in Barcelona concludes that the first wall, constructed at the end of the first century BCE, was made with local sandstone, had a perimeter of 1,315 meters, a height of eight meters, and was two meters thick (Corso, Casals, and Garcia Almirall 2017). Four gates allowed traffic in and out of the town. Since there is no indication of the length of wall or how many towers or gates were financed by Gaius Coelius, a cost estimate is impossible. Certainly the cost of the walls, towers, and gates at Barcino must have extended into the millions, based upon the sparse evidence we have. Just like at Carthago Nova, here at Barcino the elevation to the status of *colonia* seems to be the impetus for improving the city walls.

When he died in the Antonine period, Lucius Minicius Natalis Quadronius Verus left 100,000 sesterces so that the income from interest on the gift could finance *sportulae* annually on his

birthday for the *seviri Augustales* and the *decuriones* (*CIL* II, 4511). The rates are missing due to the fragmentary nature of the inscribed stone, but Duncan-Jones (1964: 205) suggests that, in comparison with other known rates, the conjecture of three denarii per *sevir Augustalis* and five denarii per decurion is highly plausible. Therefore, 100 decurions would benefit and 250 Augustales. During his lifetime, Quadronius and his father financed baths with porticoes and water channels on their own land (*CIL* II, 4509). The gift of the baths is overshadowed by the long list of offices, priesthoods, and titles for both men, occupying the majority of the inscribed stone slab.¹⁹

Lucius Caecilius Optatus had a military career as a legionary centurion and was honorably discharged under the emperors Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus before serving as *duovir* and *flamen Romae divorum et Augustorum* in Barcino. He bequeathed 7,500 sesterces to the town of Barcino such that a portion based on 6% of the annual interest was to be used annually on June 10 (probably his birthday) for boxing matches and to provide oil for bathers at the public baths (*CIL* II, 4514). Specifically, 250 denarii could be spent on boxing matches, and 20 denarii should be used for the distribution of oil. Optatus further specified that this bequest was accompanied with a condition: that unless his freedmen and freedwomen were spared taking up the office of the sevirate, the whole sum of money would be transferred to the city of Tarraco, which would be obliged to carry out the same distributions. This is the only such stipulation in a donation in this province and carries with it an element of distrust. Perhaps the donor worried about the handling of his gift to Barcino. From the inscription, Optatus has no apparent connection with the colony of Tarraco, so his reason for establishing it as the alternate beneficiary remains unclear.

While statues of individuals do not necessarily fall into the purview of civic munificence, statues of gods or emperors, and any statue made from precious metals or decorated with jewels could, indeed, be considered a gift for the public good. There are two statue dedications from Barcino, neither of which can be dated specifically, that are included in the present corpus. One inscription, recording a statue dedicated to Aequitas Augusta by Lucius Minicius Myron (*IRC IV*, 1; *AE* 1962, 395), explicitly states the reason for the gift: *ob honorem VVirat(us)* (*on account of the honor of the sevirate*). The other inscription is very fragmentary, though it can be discerned that a Marcus Porcius Martialis dedicated a statue of Venus Augusta (*CIL II*, 4500). This statue might have also been dedicated *ob honorem VViratus*, but the stone is too fragmentary to be certain. While some scholars have previously considered that dedications made *ob honorem* were closely connected to the contribution required of local offices and priesthoods, Duncan-Jones (1974: 86–87) asserts that this type of donation is, indeed, a form of euergetism. Melchor Gil (1994: 203–205) has compiled a study with 57 donations made *ob honorem* in the Spanish provinces, not all of which were statues. Neither of these inscriptions mention the type of material used or any special decorations. It is, therefore, likely that they were marble statues, which could cost anywhere from a few thousand sesterces to over 20,000 (Duncan-Jones 1962: 83–88).

With this range of civic munificence in Barcino, the economic impact of all the gifts varies considerably from just a couple thousand sesterces to hundreds of thousands and millions. The costliest project presumably was the undertaking of walls, towers, and gates. Even without knowing whether this gift included the whole circuit of the wall or repairs to existing structures,

this undertaking would have easily totaled millions of sesterces. Bathing complexes were also costly, especially when one considers water conduits, holding tanks, and even the land on which the structures were built. The data from Africa yield the range of 100,000 to 400,000 sesterces for the construction of a thermal complex (Duncan-Jones, 1982: 91). Apart from the architectural benefactions, we also see the establishment of recurring gifts of games, goods, and a cash distribution. While Optatus left behind the moderate amount of 7,500 sesterces for annual distributions, Quadronius Verus bequeathed 100,000, which would have provided gifts for many more years. *Sportulae* had both an economic and a cognitive impact.

The Minicii family, of which Quadronius Verus was a member, was one of the most well-known in the province, for a father and son both had extensive careers in imperial administration and are known from multiple inscriptions, not only in their hometown Barcino, but also in other towns in Spain and even in North Africa, where they were stationed (Pintado and Ferré, 2006; Eck, 2009: 82–83). As Eck points out, these men were well-known in Barcino; the inscriptions recording their civic munificence did not need to include all their offices and titles, as they would have been identifiable simply by their names alone (Eck, 2009: 82). However, by memorializing their careers, the men demonstrate their connections to the emperors Trajan and Hadrian, and tout their lifetime accomplishments. The large cash gift left by the younger Minicius exhibits clear signs of self-promotion. The recurring cash distribution would have lasted quite a few years, benefitting 350 people (and their families) each year. The amount given to each individual was not substantial, and the recipients would have been some of the wealthiest residents of the town anyway. *Sportulae* did not function as charity; rather, they were a means by which a donor could be recognized for his goodwill, and, in this case, that recognition continued for a number of

years. While not tangible in the sense of a building in the middle of the forum, a recurring gift would have given the donor another sort of lasting fame after his death. The townspeople would continue to know the impact of the Minicii family for decades, which would benefit the rising generations of the family in the public sphere of Barcino.

Castulo

Castulo became a Roman *municipium* in the late Republic. It had been part of the province Baetica but was transferred into the province Tarraconensis through the territorial reforms by Augustus (Arboledas Martinez, 2008: 83). Tarraconensis was an imperial province, while Baetica was under senatorial authority. Several productive silver mines were located near Castulo, which might have been one motivation for the city's rezoning.

Just five benefactions are known from Castulo, and they are distributed from the mid-first to mid-second centuries. There is a mix of benefaction types as well. The earliest recorded act of civic munificence is unique in my corpus, as it names an emperor along with the other benefactors:

[Ti(berius) Claudius Caesar Aug(ustus)] Germanicus p(ater) p(atriae) e[t/
P(ublius) Cornelius P(ubli) f(ilius) Gal(eria) Taurus et Valeria P(ubli) f(ilia)
V]jerecunda uxor d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(ecerunt) / [P(ublius) Cornelius P(ubli)
f(ilius) Gal(eria) Taurus f(ilius) ludis impensa] sua factis dedicavit. (*CIL* II,
3269c)²⁰

While emperors are known to have funded public works and architectural projects in Rome and around the empire, this is the only example in Tarraconensis that shows a (presumably) local couple in coordination with the emperor.²¹ The inscription is known in triplicate from fragments of three stone slabs, which would have been mounted on the structure. Though unnamed in the text, the building has been identified as the amphitheater of Castulo (Gómez-Pantoja and Garrido, 2009). Due to the high construction costs of such a building, the emperor might have contributed funds from the imperial treasury. In fact, none of the amphitheaters in Spain were known to have been funded solely by private funds.²² Since the text lacks any description of Taurus's career, the connection between him (or his wife) and emperor Claudius cannot be determined.

A benefaction dated to the Flavian period provided for a water conduit, tanks, and pipes (*CIL* II, 3280). The donor's name does not survive, but the gift came at the same time that a large thermal complex was constructed in Castulo (Pavía Page, 2016: 89). No donor can be matched with the costly undertaking of the bath structure itself. However, there might have been a number of private individuals who funded various aspects of this project, evidence for which has been recovered elsewhere in the empire.²³

One benefaction from Castulo records the deeds of a Cornelia Marullina, who had financed silver statues (of whom, it is unknown), a public feast, and circus games in the first half of the second century (*CIL* III, 101; *AE* 1958, 4). When the city wished to erect statues of her and her son Lucius Cornelius Marullus to show its gratitude, she paid for the expense herself. It was a common practice for someone receiving an honorary statue to cover the costs associated with the

statue—a sort of benefaction in its own right—signaled in the texts with expressions such as *honore accepto de pecunia sua* (“with the honor accepted, [she paid] from her own money”) or *sua impensa* (“at her/his own expense”). Her heir Gaius Cornelius Bellicus dedicated those statues of Marullina, and her son and provided additional circus games to celebrate. The full text of the base for the statue of Cornelius Marullus reads:

L(ucio) Corn(elio) Marullo / quod ordo Castulon(ensium) / pro liberalitate
 Cor(neliae) / Marullinae matris / eius quod civitatem / Castulonensium sta/tuis
 argenteis et epu/lo et circensib(us) decora/set statuam ei et filio su/o positeram se
 decre/verat Cor(nelia) Marulli/[n]a honore accepto / d[e] pec(unia) sua poni iussit
 / [h]oc donum illius / C(aius) Co[r(nelius)] Bellicus heres eius / d(edit) d(edicavit)
 edi[tis] circensib(us). (*CIL*A III, 101; *AE* 1958, 4)²⁴

There is nothing else known about Marullus; no titles, offices, or priesthood are recorded in this inscription. He was the intended recipient of the town’s praise, as he was listed first in the text, yet it was his mother’s liberality that apparently provided the impetus for the council of Castulo to move that statues of them both be set up. Unfortunately, we know little else about Marullina either.²⁵ She was likely a widow by the time of the honor was conferred, since no husband or father was referenced in the inscription, as would have been customary. Certainly she had acquired substantial financial resources to make costly benefactions in her town, and perhaps she was trying to use her wealth to pave the way for her son’s political career.²⁶ Her heir carried out the dedication of the statue so she must have died between the decreeing of the honorary statue and its actual installation.

In an eloquent, though unfortunately fragmentary, inscription, it is recorded that Lucius Licinius Abscantio gave theatrical shows and gladiatorial contests lasting multiple days for residents and citizens of Castulo, and dedicated a statue to the reigning emperor Antoninus Pius in 154 CE (*AE* 1976, 351; Ceballos Hornero 2004: 227–229). He undertook these dedications after his time as *sevir* in Castulo, perhaps as a way of commemorating his own civic service. The base for the statue of the emperor was found in an area thought to have been part of the baths in Castulo (Mariner Bigorra, 1979: 407). While this text does not provide details for an entirely remarkable benefaction, it is significant for other reasons. This is the only base for a statue of any of the members of the Antonine family in Castulo, and Abscantio is the first *sevir* known from the town (Mariner Bigorra, 1979: 407).

Last but certainly not least, the costliest of all benefactions in Castulo was financed by Quintus Thorius Culleo at some point in the mid-first to mid-second century. He was a procurator of Baetica but was probably from Castulo, as deduced from the scale of the projects he undertook there. According to the inscription on a statue base set up by the town in his honor, he repaired the city wall, paved a road after heavy rains damaged it, gave land for a bath complex, paid for statues of Venus Genetrix and Cupid for the theater, forgave a debt of 10,000,000 sesterces owed to him by the town, and provided circus games on top of everything else (*CIL* II, 3270). Taken together, this is the largest set of donations by a private individual to any town in the Western Roman Empire (Duncan-Jones, 1974: 80). In Italy, where comparative material is available, each mile of paved road could cost 100,000 sesterces (Duncan-Jones, 1982: 124–25, 152–53). The road connected Castulo to Sisapo, about 90 miles to the northwest. There has not been a

complete excavation in this area, which passes through quite rocky terrain in parts, but the estimate of 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 sesterces seems reasonable (Duncan-Jones, 1974: 81).

The donation of the land for the thermal structure indicates that Culleo owned substantial property in Castulo, as a bath complex necessitated a large expanse of flat land. This was apparently the second bath structure in Castulo, the first having been built in the Flavian period, to which the anonymous donor of *CIL* II, 3280 might have contributed with the financing of water conduits. The statues of Venus and Cupid were probably made from silver, which is a very common material for statues of deities in this area, given the proximity of the silver mines. Though details are not provided as to the length of the road paved or whether the whole circuit of the wall was reconstructed, Duncan-Jones (1974) has estimated the total financial outlay of certainly more than 10,000,000 and up to 20,000,000 sesterces.²⁷

While there are not many benefactions known from the small *municipium* of Castulo, those that were given were rather costly. To review, they comprise an amphitheater, water features probably connected to a bath structure, feasts and circus games, several days of gladiatorial and theatrical shows, costly statues, and all the projects financed by Culleo. Certainly the extravagant gifts by Culleo tip the scales. But what might have been the cognitive impact of this array of benefactions as well as the others? Given that the donations were spread over at least a century, there does not seem to be a pattern of competitive giving by the wealthy elite. Returning to the earliest benefaction, the amphitheater, funded by Publius Cornelius Taurus and his wife Valeria Verecunda, along with the patronage of the emperor Claudius, would have played a significant role in the society of Castulo. Having a venue for gladiatorial combats and other shows would set

the town apart from others. Thousands of residents and visitors from the region would have enjoyed the entertainment for decades to come. Indeed, the gladiatorial shows sponsored by Abscantio in 154 CE must have taken place in this very amphitheater constructed a century earlier. An amphitheater was not a place where people visited daily or even weekly, yet when they did come, they would have seen the donors' names in large letters next to Claudius's name. Though we do not know the nature of the connection between Taurus and his wife Verecunda and the emperor, the fact of having their names on the same structure bearing the emperor's name is of an inestimable magnitude. The association must have lent respect to Taurus and his family. Such an immense physical structure also created a long-lasting memory of its donors, keeping the family name in the town's collective consciousness.

All of the gifts provided by Culleo were certainly important individually. Having a strong city wall was a characteristic of Roman towns, even when there was not any imminent danger of attack.²⁸ Repaving a road would have facilitated travel and commerce, and was especially crucial for mining operations in the area. According to the town charters of Irni and Urso, the construction and maintenance of roadways was under the direction of the *duoviri* or *aediles*. The fact that Culleo, who served in neither position in Castulo (according to the text of the dedication), spent such a large sum of his own money on such operations was remarkable. That said, the road in question served as an important route in mining operations, which could have benefited Culleo himself, his friends, or at least others in the town, since the silver mines nearby were an integral part of the local economy. Thus, while the undertaking of caring for the road was beyond what most private benefactors financed, it might not have been entirely selfless.

The two bathing facilities in Castulo would have been received enthusiastically, given the importance of such buildings in Roman society. Baths were places for so much more than simply bathing. People met up with friends, had a bit to eat and a drink, got a massage or other specialized services, and engaged in athletic activities. The grounds were landscaped with fountains, plants, and trees, and the interiors were decorated with statuary, mosaic, and marble revetment.²⁹ The baths were central to the lives of the Romans, and everyone entering or even walking by would have seen the names of the donors who made them possible.

Conclusions

Throughout this chapter, both the economic and cognitive impacts of benefactions in Hispania Tarraconensis have been highlighted. In terms of the economic impact on the donors, the benefactions run the gamut from inexpensive to very costly. Most would not have affected the finances of the donors to a great extent, nor would those such as *sportulae* have had much of an impact on the recipients. Another aspect of the economic impact relates to the broader market economy. A very large labor force was required for each of the construction projects under discussion. Materials and supplies had to be sourced and transported, whether from close in the vicinity or across the empire. The public banquets provided by some donors necessitated a great quantity of foodstuffs as well as workers to prepare the feast. All of these benefactions, therefore, created a large effect not just on those immediately involved but in the broader economy as well (Hoyer, 2013).³⁰ The structures funded by donors comprised only a fraction of all buildings and monuments in a given town. Public funds, the resources derived from taxes, the obligatory fees assessed from local officials (*summae honorariae*), and other income would have funded the majority of buildings and public works. The intangible impression of privately funded works is

much harder to assess but undoubtedly more significant. Both recipients and donors benefited in ways that are hard to quantify.

Donors received acknowledgment for their munificent acts in a variety of ways. First and foremost is the inscribed plaque commemorating their gifts. Additionally, many donors were honored with statues erected in public, further thanking the donor for their generosity. The donation itself and the acknowledgement of the donation helped to seal the memory of the donor into the fabric of the city. A portico or the commemoration of a public banquet endured for decades or generations, making it possible for people to remember the benefactor. The desire for this type of lasting recognition certainly motivated some men and women to sponsor benefactions.

Ng has recently argued that spectacles were valued more highly than buildings for their ability to keep a donor's memory alive since, in certain instances, even when an endowment for games had been exhausted, cities provided funds to continue them (2015: 11). According to her reasoning, buildings might fall into disrepair and unintentionally serve to tarnish the memory of the donor. However, Ng's conclusions, supported by the writings of jurists, philosophers, and a few epigraphical examples from the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire, do not correspond to my own findings in *Tarraconensis* where spectacles make up a small number of benefactions.

Furthermore, a sense of competition might have motivated donors to give ever more elaborate gifts, thus increasing the recognition they received as well.³¹ In analyzing the effect of benefactions on other residents in a given town, I have focused on the physicality of architectural

structures and also the enjoyment derived both from the amenities or activities offered in these buildings, as well as the entertainment provided by shows or public banquets. Having an organized town replete with richly decorated buildings and beautiful statuary can also bring a sense of joy to people's lives.

Not all donors were clearly motivated by the same circumstances. A number of people financed large building projects or other donations during their lifetimes, but some of the more expensive and more ostentatious gifts were made posthumously. That is, the gifts intended to bring more personal recognition to their donor were given through testamentary bequest. At first glance, the practice seems contradictory. Why wait until after death to give a large gift that could be received with thanks, an honorary statue, and inestimable personal capital? Perhaps, contrary to my arguments regarding a sense of competition among the elite and the desire for great recognition, there was a sense of modesty in some donors. Over the course of two hundred years, men like Cicero, Seneca, and the emperors Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius cautioned people against lavish gifts, especially for ephemeral pleasures such as banquets and games and the construction of entirely new structures. Seneca advises: "Let us give what is necessary first, then what is useful, then what is pleasurable, particularly things that will endure. But we should begin with necessities; for that which supports life impresses the mind in one way, that which adorns or equips life, in quite another" (*De beneficiis* I.x 5–xi.4). Both Antonine emperors encouraged potential donors to see to more useful endeavors, such as the repairs of old structures rather than financing new buildings.³² The contradictory nature of the evidence cautions us from making broad generalizations about all benefactors in the Roman Empire, or even in one province.

This analysis of inscriptions from Hispania Tarraconensis that record benefactions is one step in a larger study of assessing the nature of civic munificence in the Spanish provinces. Analyzing the expenditures made by donors is limited due to the fragmentary nature of many inscribed texts or the simple omission of these figures in the inscriptions. The fact that the majority of inscriptions are silent on the costs of benefactions should itself cause us to wonder if the amount of money mattered as much as other factors for the benefactors or those in the town. Clearly other elements such as the functions of a building or activity sponsored by donors were also significant.

Bibliography

- Abascal Palazón Juan Manuel. “La fecha de la promoción colonial de Carthago Nova y sus repercusiones edilicias.” *Mastia* 1 (2002): 21–44.
- . “Epigrafía y numismática de Carthago Nova.” Pages 117–128 in *Cartagena: Colonia Urbs Julia Nova Carthago*. Edited by E. Conde Guerri, J.M. Abascal Palazón, et al. Roma: L’Erma di Bretschneider, 2017.
- Abascal Palazón and Ramallo Asensio. *La ciudad de Carthago Nova: la documentación epigráfica*. Cartagena: Universidad de Murcia, 1997.
- Arboledas Martínez, Luis. “Aspectos sociales y fiscales en las minas romanas del Alto Guadalquivir.” *Pyrenae* 39 (2008): 71–99.
- Ceballos Hornero, A. *Los espectáculos en la Hispania Romana: la documentación epigráfica*. Cuadernos Emeritenses 26. Mérida: Museo Nacional de Arte Romano, 2004.

Corso Sarmiento, Juan Manuel, Jordi Casals Fernandez, and M. Pilar Garcia-Almirall.

“Restitution of Barcelona at the end of the third century: models and diffusion of the Colonia Iulia Augusta Faventia Paterna Barcino.” Pages 1–10 in *World heritage and disaster: knowledge, culture and representation: Le Vie dei Mercanti_XV International Forum*. Edited by Ciro Ferrandes. Naples: La scuola di Pitagora, 2017.

Curchin, Leonard A. “Personal Wealth in Roman Spain.” *Historia* 32 (1983): 227–244.

Díaz Ariño, B. “Las murallas romanas de Cartagena en la segunda mitad del siglo I A.E.” *Zephyrus* 61 (2008): 225–234.

Duncan-Jones, R.P. “Costs, Outlays, and *Summa Honorariae* from Roman Africa.” *PBSR* 30 (1962): 47–115.

———. *The Economy of the Roman Empire*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

———. “Human Numbers in Towns and Town-Organizations of the Roman Empire: The Evidence from Gifts.” *Historia* 13 (1964): 199–208.

———. “The Procurator as Civic benefactor.” *JRS* 64 (1974): 79–85.

Eck, W. “There are No cursus ‘honorum’ Inscriptions: The Function of the ‘cursus honorum’ in Epigraphic Communication.” *Scripta classica israelica* 28 (2009): 79–92.

Eck, W. and F. Navarro. “Das Ehrenmonument der Colonia Carthago für L. Minicius Natalis Quadronius Verus in seiner Heimatstadt Barcino.” *ZPE* 123 (1998): 237–248.

Fagan, G.G. *Bathing in Public in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.

Hemelrijk, Emily. *Hidden Lives, Public Personae. Women and Civic Life in the Roman West*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Liu, Jinyu. *Collegia Centonariorum: The Guilds of Textile Dealers in the Roman West*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Mariner Bigorra, S. “Basa de una estatua de Antonino Pío, dedicada en Cástulo el 154 d. C.” Pages 407–415 in *Cástulo II*. Edited by J.M. Blázquez. Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Cultura 1979.

Mar, Ricardo, Ana Garrido, and José Alejandro Beltrán-Caballero. “Barcino y el urbanismo provincial romano.” *Barcelona Quaderns d’Història* 18 (2012): 63–112.

Gómez-Pantoja, Joaquin and Javier Garrido. *Epigrafia anfiteatral de l’Occidente Romano, VII. Baetica, Tarraconensis, Lusitania*. Roma: Quasar, 2009.

Gómez-Pantoja, Joaquin and Mariano Rodríguez Ceballos. “¡Fiesta! Una nota sobre los festivales y espectáculos ciudadanos de Hispania.” Pages 359–384 in *Poder central y autonomía municipal: La proyección pública de la élites romanas de Occidente*. Edited by J.F. Rodríguez Neila and E. Melchor Gil. Córdoba: Universidad de Córdoba, 2006.

Hispania Epigraphica Online Database: Roman Inscriptions from the Iberian Peninsula.
<http://eda-bea.es/>.

Hoyer, Daniel. “Public feasting, elite competition, and the market economy of Roman North Africa.” *Journal of North African Studies* 18 (2013): 574–591.

Melchor Gil, Enrique. *El patronato cívico en la Hispania Romana*. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 2018.

———. “Consideraciones acerca del origen, motivación, y evolución de las conductas evergéticas en Hispania Romana.” *Studia Historica. Historia Antigua* 12 (1994): 61–81.

———. “Construcciones cívicas y evergetismo en Hispania romana.” *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma, Serie II, Historia Antigua* 6 (1993): 443–466.

- . “Las élites municipales de Hispania en el alto imperio: un intent de aproximación a sus fuentes de riqueza.” *Florentia Iliberritana*. 4–5 (1993–1994): 335–348.
- . “*Summae Honorariae* y donaciones *ob honorem* en la Hispania Romana.” *Habis* 25 (1994): 193–212.
- Orejas, Almudena and F. Javier Sánchez-Palencia. “Mines, Territorial Organization, and Social Structures in Roman Iberia: Carthago Noua and the Peninsular Northwest.” *American Journal of Archaeology* 106 (2002): 581–599.
- Palmer, R.E.A. “Customs on Market Goods Imported into the City of Rome.” *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 36 (1980): 217–233.
- Pavía Page, Marta. “Termas Públicas del Conventus Carthaginensis: Primera Aproximación a su catalogació y studio.” *Cuadernos de Arquelogíá* 24 (2016): 81–101.
- Pintado, Javier Andreu and Oscar Curulla Ferré. “Un Nuevo document sobre los Minicii de Tarraco.” *Butlleti Arqueològic* 28 (2006): 199–210.
- Puig i Verdaguer, F. and I. Rodà de Llanza. “Las murallas de Barcino. Nuevas aportaciones al conocimiento de la evolución de sus sistemas de fortificación.” Pages 597–632 in *Murallas de ciudades romanas en el occidente del imperio. Lucus Augusti como paradigma*. (Actas del Congreso Internacional celebrado en Lugo, (26–29, XI, 2005). Edited by A. Rodríguez Colmenero and I. Rodà de Llanza. Lugo: Publicaciones de la Diputación Provincial de Lugo.
- Ramallo Asensio, S. *La Ciudad Romana de Carthago Nova: La documentación arqueológica*. Cartagena: Universidad de Murcia, 1989.
- Ravotto, A. “La simbiosi entre muralla i ciutat de Barcino.” *Auriga: revista de divulgació i debat del món clàssic* 87 (2017) 10–15.

- Rodà de Llanza, I. “Le iscrizioni in onore di Lucius Minicius Natalis Quadronius Verus.” *Dacia* 12 (1978): 219–223.
- . “Consideraciones sobre el sevirate en Hispania. Las dedicaciones ‘ob honorem seviratus’ en el ‘conventus Tarraconensis.’” Pages 399–404 in *Religio deorum: actas del coloquio internacional de epigrafía. Culto y Sociedad en Occidente*. Edited by M. Mayer and J. Gómez Pallarés. Sabadell: AUSA, 1994.
- Ruiz Valderas, E. and M. Martínez Andreu. “Topografía y evolución urbana.” Pages 25–38 in *Cartagena: Colonia Urbs Julia Nova Carthago*. Edited by E. Conde Guerri, J.M. Abascal Palazón, et al. Roma: L’Erma di Bretschneider, 2017.
- Sánchez, Manuel Amante, Miguel Martín Camino, M^a Ángeles Pérez Bonet, Rafael González Fernández, and M^a Ángeles Martínez Villa. “El *Sacellum* dedicado a Iuppiter Stator en Cartagena. *Lengua e historia* XII (1995): 533–562.
- Sánchez López, Elena. “Nuevo fragment perteneciente a la inscripción *CIL* II, 3269.” *Sylloge Epigraphica Barcinonensis* 13 (2015): 45–54.
- Valone, Carolyn. “Matrons and Motives: Why Women Built in Early Modern Rome.” Pages 317–330 in *Beyond Isabella. Secular Women Patrons of Art in Renaissance Italy*. Edited by Sheryl E. Reiss and David G. Wilkings. Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2001.
- Woolf, G. “Monumental Writing and the Expansion of Roman Society.” *JRS* 86 (1996): 22–39.
- Yegül, F. *Bathing in the Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

¹ “According to the will of Cornelia Procula, with the amount of 40,000 sesterces, her freedman completed the temple with an additional 5,495 sesterces of his own money.” All translations by the author.

² This chapter does not address the topic of civic patronage or the patron-client relationship, which, though they may encompass some of the same motivating factors, are quite different from the sort of civic munificence under discussion. For a detailed overview of civic patronage in Spain, see Melchor Gil 2018.

³ A full overview of the practice of benefaction is beyond the scope of this chapter. The beginnings of this line of inquiry, particularly as it relates to the Classical and Hellenistic periods, can be traced back to Veyne 1976, Gauthier 1985, and Quass 1993. Rogers 1991 argues for a new approach to euergetism in the context of the Greek East during the Roman period. A growing body of scholarship, as cited throughout the chapter, has considered elements of benefaction in particular places and time periods in the Roman Empire.

⁴ Melchor-Gil, 1993–1994: 346, states that the entry into the decurionate in most large cities was 100,000 sesterces, while in smaller cities the amount was around 20,000.

⁵ For benefactions by women in the East, as well as their public roles in general, see van Bremen 1996.

⁶ For a full study on the range of games in Roman Hispania, see Ceballos Hornero 2004.

⁷ Andreu Pintado 2004 also includes statues to individuals, emperors, and divinities as examples of euergetism since they add to the overall ornamentation of the city and provide public benefit.

⁸ Thank you to Arjan Zuiderhoek for this suggestion.

⁹ The phrase *petente ordine et populo* indicates that the town council and people sought out the donation.

¹⁰ If a man is designated as *sevir* or *sevir Augustalis*, I consider him a freedman since they tended to fill this priesthood most commonly, though some freeborn men known in this role. The *sevirate* was a priesthood whose members had duties in the imperial cult, among other things. However, I am hesitant to make assumptions solely based upon the name of an individual since a Greek cognomen does not always indicate freedperson status, especially later in the imperial period (cf. Liu, 2009: 172–73). On the *sevirate* in the Spanish provinces, see Rodà de Llanza 1993.

¹¹ The range of benefactions, status of donors, and the chronological framework are all similar to the findings of Andreu Pintado 2004 in the province of Lusitania.

¹² Abascal 2002 revises the date for the founding of the colony Carthago Nova from 45 BCE under Julius Caesar to 54 BCE during the governorship of Pompey based on numismatic evidence for the existence of *duoviri quinquennales*.

¹³ “Gnaeus Cornelius Cinna, son of Lucius, of the Galeria tribe, duovir, undertook the construction of (a section of) the wall 102 feet long, according to the approval of the town councilors.” For more on the possible family connections of this Cinna, see Abascal Palazón and Ramallo Asensio, 1997: 90–92.

¹⁴ This is not necessarily the same Bibulus who was consul in 59 BCE. See Abascal Palazón 2017: 120.

¹⁵ The *gens* to which this freedman belonged is known to have been involved in mining in the area near Carthago Nova starting in the mid-second century BCE. See Orejas and Sánchez-Palencia 2002 for discussion of mining activity and social structure in Roman Spain. For more on the discovery of the *sacellum*, see Sánchez et al., 1995.

¹⁶ Ceballos Hornero 2004, 622 suggests that this inscription refers to the theater, which was located at some distance from the forum. The theater was built during the time of Augustus, the same time when G. Plotius Princeps financed this construction project. There is no overwhelming proof for this suggestion, though inscriptions were commonly transported from the areas in which they were originally installed.

¹⁷ For example, see the *Lex coloniae genitivae Iuliae Ursonensis*, chapter 77, recorded on multiple bronze tablets (*CIL* II Suppl. 5439; *ILS* 6007; *CIL* II², 594), which is a copy of the founding law of the colony of Urso, made during the Flavian era.

¹⁸ For more on the walls of Barcino, see Puig i Verdaguer and Rodà de Llanza 2007 and Ravotto 2017.

¹⁹ On the careers of the two men, see *PIR*² M 619, 620; E. Groag, s.v. *Minicius* RE XV₂ n. 19, cols. 1836–1842. Lucius Minicius Natalis Quadronius Verus is known from at least twenty inscriptions from around the empire, mostly coinciding with the military and political positions he held. Also see Eck and Navarro 1998 and Rodà 1978.

²⁰ “The emperor Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus, father of his country, and Publius Cornelius Taurus, son of Publius, Galeria tribe, and Valeria Verecunda, daughter of Publius, his wife, made [this] with their own money. His son Publius Cornelius Taurus, son of Publius, Galeria tribe, dedicated [it] and gave games at his own expense.”

²¹ Sánchez López 2015 suggests a reading of *eius iussu* in place of *et* at the end of the first line of the inscription. With that reading, the emperor would not have provided finances for the construction of the building. Instead, he would have given the order or suggestion that the local couple carried out. While the inscription is very fragmentary and does not rule out this reconstruction, it seems tenuous. Sánchez López provides no other inscriptions or references to the use of the phrase *eius iussu* in other situations. The expression is not commonly used at all in

inscriptions, nor are there documented examples in which individuals pay for the construction of a building at the behest of the emperor. See Ceballos Hornero 2004, 203 for further bibliography on this set of inscriptions.

²² A fragmentary inscription with large letters found in the amphitheater of the ancient town of Segobriga provides the partial name Lucius Iulius and the word *testamento*, suggesting that this man bequeathed funds for the structure in his will (*HEp* 2, 1990, 384). The amphitheater at Tarraco was probably also financed, at least partly, by a private individual (*HEp* 4, 1994, 841; *AE* 1997, 882).

²³ See Pliny, *Ep.* 10.39.3: *huic teatro ex privatorum pollicitationibus multa debenter, ut basilicae circa, ut porticus supra caveam* (referring to theatre at Nicaea). Duncan-Jones (1982: 224 no. 443) records other examples of shared benefactions, one of which was for the bath complex built at Corfinium in Italy through funds by at least three men as well as with public money.

²⁴ “To Lucius Cornelius Marullus, because the *ordo Castulonensis* due to the generosity of his mother Cornelia Marullina, who had adorned the city of Castulo with silver statues and had given a banquet and circus games, had decreed a statue for herself and her son be erected, Cornelia Marullina, with the honor accepted, ordered this gift to be placed with her own money. Gaius Cornelius Bellicus, her heir, gave and dedicated (it) and gave circus games.”

²⁵ Another inscription (*CIL* II, 3265) records that she dedicated an altar to *Pietas Augusta* in memory of her son.

²⁶ Eumachia might have been attempting the same as her son was included in the dedication (*CIL* X, 808 + 809) she made of a building on the forum of Pompeii. Gómez Pantoja 2006: 356 suggests that Marullina’s son might have already been deceased at the time the statue was dedicated since he does not possess any of the titles a man of his position normally would have acquired.

²⁷ Duncan-Jones reasons that the mention of the ten million sesterces owed by the city might not be an additional expense but, rather, refer to the cost of repaving the road that led to Sisapo through the *Castulonensis* pass. There is a dearth of evidence in Spain for other private individuals undertaking road-building (1974: 82). This is the type of project that municipalities were generally responsible for. Since the town council erected the statue for Culleo and presumably decided on the language of the text, the inclusion of this act of munificence might signal the immense gratitude the council felt for Culleo and his contributions.

²⁸ See Palmer 1980 for the use of city walls and gates as stations for the collection of customs and taxes on goods.

²⁹ For more on baths in the Roman world, see Fagan 1999 and Yegül 2010.

³⁰ Hoyer 2013 proposes some scenarios in which the local economy of Africa Proconsularis might have developed, especially in relation to benefactions such as banquets. This is one case study that pulls together archaeological and epigraphical evidence to reveal the possible impacts of benefaction on the wider economy. He does not consider non-market channels, such as the goods and services provided from the donors' own estates. The honorary texts themselves, however, are silent on such issues, complicating our own understanding of the nuanced effects of large benefactions of the local economy.

³¹ In a future publication, I will consider the impact of competition as a motivating force behind benefaction in Hispania.

³² *Digest* 50.10.7. Rescripts from Marcus Aurelius and Commodus in 177 CE put caps on how much could be spent for gladiatorial contests.