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ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines the role of architectural patrons in North African cities during the Roman empire. Through a combination of epigraphic and archaeological evidence, I investigate how benefactors impacted the lived experience of inhabitants of Roman African cities. A three-fold theoretical rubric governs the interpretation, using agency theory, reception studies, and phenomenology to uncover the motives behind benefactors' choices and the visibility of their choices in urban life. Case studies of individual buildings at several cities in North Africa, and a diachronic examination of Thugga, offer glimpses into the nature of euergetism over a period of four centuries.

Architectural donors consciously sought to communicate messages of their own identity—based on gender, familial relationships, and political offices—through buildings. For example, in some cases buildings and their contents communicated information about their donors' gender identities, creating complex visual messages that placed donors in their social context on both local and regional levels. In other instances, the fragmentary archaeological record hinders our understanding of donors' gender identities, but topographic, archaeological, and epigraphic clues emphasize repeatedly the complex nature of civic identity in Roman North Africa.

This mixed civic identity can be most clearly seen at Thugga. In the first century C.E., donations in the city’s forum mimicked buildings being erected in Augustan Carthage. At Thugga, construction in the Julio-Claudian period looked both to the provincial capital and to its own pre-Roman history, focusing on the Numidian shrine of the deified king Massinissa as the centerpiece of the Roman civic space. Thugga’s African past contributed to the character of donations throughout the Roman period, particularly of temples. In the second and third centuries C.E., Carthage continued to be
an important source of architectural inspiration for Thugga’s benefactors, many of whom were citizens and public officials of the colonia Julia Concordia Karthago.

The role of these public officials at Thugga increased in importance over time. The earliest donors of the city presented themselves as benefactors eager to contribute to the development of the city’s urban landscape and to establish familial traditions of architectural patronage in the city. In the late first century, donations more explicitly connected to public office-holding replaced these traditions of benefaction based on civic duty and familial responsibility. In particular, priests of the imperial cult (flamines and flaminicae) were particularly active in the second and third centuries, and donations not linked directly to public office-holding apparently disappeared by the third century. In the Christian period, euergetism continued, but it was directed toward the Christian community rather than toward the civic life of the city.

Donors employed visual cues, like architectural styles; topographic cues, including proximity and orientation; and epigraphic cues, such as similar phrasing, to explicitly link their work with that of others. Additional response to benefactions came in the form of honorific statues and bases set up in public spaces. At Thugga these honors were reserved for donors whose work had the greatest impact on public life, emphasizing how visible architectural patronage was in the urban landscapes of North Africa.
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1. The Questions

In this dissertation, I examine questions of euergetism, gender, and urban development through an archaeological lens, seeking to answer questions about how individual donors expressed their identities and responded to the works of previous benefactors as they contributed to the development of their towns’ public spaces. The mechanisms or processes that I have identified here are certainly not new to scholars of the Classical world. What I propose to do here, however, connects all three questions in a way that is only beginning to be seen in Classical scholarship, by combining different types of research—archaeological, epigraphic, and theoretical—to consider the role of donors and their gifts in creating the urban landscape of the ancient city.

I incorporate several different types of data and research strategies in an effort to recover information about the contribution of individual donors to the communicative environment of the Roman city, a place where individuals constructed and proclaimed their social identities through the built landscape. This type of research has only recently come to the forefront in a discipline long dominated by studies on single categories of evidence, such as architecture, epigraphy, or social-history developments. But the Romans did not experience urban space as a series of disparate types of evidence: inscriptions were erected in particular spots in a landscape; different architectural types mingled together in diverse groups; social history took place within physical environments.

Studying inscriptions or buildings in typological groups, divorced from their physical context, provides valuable insights, but also disregards a crucial piece of evidence that was available to the ancient people who read or used them—the object’s
surroundings and the items that were associated with it. In order to develop a deeper understanding of the ways that ancient people lived, we must consider how the spaces that they moved in both created and constrained opportunities for civic and social life.

2. Geographical and Chronological Constraints

A study such as this one must necessarily be selective in its approach. The Roman empire was enormous in its geographic reach and tremendously long-lived, so a study encompassing all benefactions throughout Roman history would be the height of folly (not to mention never-ending). I have therefore chosen to focus, geographically, on the Roman provinces of central North Africa (fig. 1), particularly Africa proconsularis.

Though the actions and interactions of Roman agents and African cultural patterns are an important focus of this dissertation, North Africa’s history was characterized by frequent cultural interactions, both direct and indirect, between multiple groups for centuries even before the Roman period. The archaeological and historical sources indicate that the inhabitants of North Africa were long used to creating lives informed by many different cultural traditions.

Many different tribal units comprised the earliest inhabitants of North Africa, each with their own customs and territories.¹ In the late ninth century B.C.E., according to the ancient historians,² Phoenicians from the eastern Mediterranean established a colony at Carthage. In the centuries following Carthage’s establishment, other Punic (west Phoenician) cities also grew up along the North African coast, particularly at sites

¹ Herodotos (4.168-185) referred to them collectively as “Libyans,” but they probably went by many different names (Brett and Fentress 1996, 10-49).
² Gsell 1913-1928, vol. 1, 359-372, collected the ancient sources relating to Phoenician colonization in North Africa. Modern archaeological research (see Lancel 1995) indicates that Phoenician settlement appeared in the eighth century B.C.E., though there is isolated evidence for earlier occupation at Carthage in the ninth century B.C.E. (Sears 2011, 15).
with good natural harbors. One of these Punic *emporia* (trading cities) was Lepcis Magna in Tripolitania. In addition to Punic influence throughout the territory of North Africa, the pan-Mediterranean influence of Hellenistic Greek culture is also apparent in the archaeology of North Africa’s cities.

Ancient historians characterized Rome’s early involvement with North Africa as a struggle between empires, pitting Carthage’s economic and naval power against Rome’s expansion in the Italian peninsula and beyond. Indeed, the three Punic Wars that Rome fought against Carthage over the course of more than a century, between 264 and 146 B.C.E., provided Rome with some of its first overseas territories. The third Punic War ended in 146 B.C.E., with the destruction of Carthage by the Roman general Scipio Africanus. This victory left Rome in administrative control of parts of North Africa, which became the nucleus of the later province of Africa proconsularis. Further military actions between Rome and North Africa (the war with Jugurtha, king of the independent Numidian state, a one-time ally of Rome, 111-104 B.C.E., and the war with Tacfarinas, 15-24 C.E.) led to Rome’s administrative control over much of the area north of the Sahara.

The Roman administration of Africa took many forms. In some places, colonies were founded either *ex novo* or in pre-existing cities, sometimes with the addition of

---

3 Sears 2011, 16.
4 It was probably founded in the late seventh century B.C.E. (Ward-Perkins 1982, 29; Sallust, *BJ* 78).
5 In, e.g., the development of cities in the Numidian kingdom of Massinissa, in the third and early second centuries B.C.E. (Sears 2011, 21) and in the urban settlements of the Libyan oases in southern Tripolitania (Sears 2011, 22).
6 See Quinn 2010, 59-61, for the use of Hellenistic and local architectural models in Lepcis Magna of the first century C.E.
7 Gsell 1913-1928, vol. 3, collected the ancient references. The most important ancient sources for the Punic Wars are the works of Polybius, Livy, Diodorus Siculus, Appian, and Cassius Dio.
8 Detailed in Sallust’s *Bellium Jugurthinum*. See also Gsell 1913-1928, vol. 7, 123-265.
9 Tacitus’ *Annales*, books 2, 3, and 4, recount details of Tacfarinas’ revolt. See also Gsell 1913-1928, vol. 7, 229-230.
settlers from Italy or veterans from the Roman military. Other cities, particularly those that had supported the Romans during the Third Punic War, received the status of allies of Rome but remained formally independent of Roman administrative control. In all of the cities I discuss in this dissertation, however, whether allies or colonies or cities of other status, Roman cultural elements began to appear in the early first century B.C.E. These cultural elements included patterns of architecture and topography, the use of Latin language in public and private inscriptions, and cult activities for Roman-style deities and the imperial house.

Rome retained administrative control over the territory of North Africa (the provinces of Mauretania in the west, Numidia, and Africa proconsularis including Tripolitania) until the middle of the fifth century C.E., when the Vandals under Geiseric invaded Africa from Spain and conquered several of its major cities, including Carthage by 439 C.E. The Vandal kingdom of Africa existed for about a century; in 533-534 C.E. Justinian’s Byzantine army, led by the general Belisarius, defeated the Vandals and North Africa became once again the province of an imperial power, this time administered from Constantinople. Following the Arab conquest of Africa in the seventh century C.E., changes in settlement patterns meant that many Roman cities were abandoned in favor of new sites, offering archaeologists the chance to examine

10 Carthage was refounded as the colonia Julia Karthago, probably by Julius Caesar (Bullo 2002, 54-62 with ancient references); Simitthus, site of the Numidian marble quarries, was an Augustan colonial foundation (Bullo 2002, 141-146). Ammaedara was a new town built up from a military encampment (Benzina Ben Abdallah 1996).
11 For example, Quinn (2010, 52) recently summarized the history of Rome’s relationship with Lepcis Magna, which became a Roman ally at the time of the war with Jugurtha; later changed its allegiance during Rome’s civil war (when it back Pompey Magnus against Julius Caesar); and became an ally of the Romans again under Augustus.
12 Thugga was a Punico-Numidian town which, for the first two centuries C.E., was the site of a pagus (outpost) of colonists from Carthage. See ch. IV.1.a. Thugga in the Numidian and Julio-Claudian Periods, infra p. 129.
13 For a good recent summary of Roman cities of North Africa, see Sears 2011.
14 See now Cadotte 2007.
15 Cameron 2000, 553, with ancient references.
16 Procopius, De Bello Vandalico.
Roman-period settlements as they developed over a few hundred years, in many cases without the difficulties inherent in understanding urbanism in a living city such as Rome itself.\textsuperscript{17}

I focus my work especially during the Roman imperial period, from the first century C.E. to the first quarter of the fifth century, around 425 C.E. These dates reflect the most intense period of Roman activity in the region, up to the time of the Vandal conquest of North Africa. The date limits of this study reflect the availability of published data about inscriptions and buildings; but benefaction clearly continued after the Vandal and Byzantine conquests of the fifth and sixth centuries, at least in some areas and under some circumstances, as evidence from both religious and secular buildings makes clear.\textsuperscript{18} Archaeological and epigraphic interest in North Africa, however, focuses primarily on the earlier phases of habitation under the Romans, and this focus guides the present study. Future work should seek to incorporate additional material of later periods in order to consider the longue durée of Roman-style institutions of civic life, including euergetism.\textsuperscript{19}

Archaeological interest in North Africa’s Roman-period remains has a long pedigree, from the accounts of eighteenth-century travelers, to the massive clearances of colonial (mostly French) archaeologists in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, to the more focused salvage, conservation, and research work of modern archaeologists. This long history of excavation and publication is one reason that my

\textsuperscript{17} For a more detailed summary of Rome’s involvement in North Africa, the reader may refer to the synthetic works of, e.g., Raven (1993) and Le Bohec (2005) for more information. Gsell’s monumental survey of the history of North Africa (1921) is dated but provides a thorough overview of the ancient historical sources for the province from its Punic beginnings to the early imperial period.

\textsuperscript{18} Durliat (1981) catalogues donations of defensive works in Byzantine towns in North Africa; evidence from Thugga (see ch. VII.4.a. The Church of Victoria, infra p. 309) and other towns indicates that donations to Christian churches began some time in the fourth-fifth centuries.

\textsuperscript{19} This sort of study has become more common in recent years, though the slow pace of archaeological publication hinders the production of syntheses. Lepelley 1979 and 1981 are the standard works on “late antique” North Africa; Pentz 2002 and Leone 2007 are two recent additions to the scholarly field.
study can be successful, since many of the buildings I examine here have been excavated, studied, published, and restudied by numerous scholars. Epigraphic interest in North Africa is similarly long-lived. Despite the varying standards of excavation and publication, North Africa’s substantial archaeological and epigraphic record offers an opportunity to examine the institution of benefaction through a regional, diachronic lens.

3. Theoretical Underpinnings

The questions that I ask in this dissertation stem arise from the understanding that Roman euergetism reflected a donor’s conscious choice, informed by both individual desires and cultural imperatives.20 Furthermore, we can, with care, reconstruct the meaning behind these choices through our study of the epigraphic and material record. This stance corresponds, broadly, to the postprocessualist approach to archaeological interpretation, an approach which sees physical remains as one element or tool in the continuing dialogue between humans, environments, and cultures.

a. Agency Theory

My ideas in this dissertation are influenced by questions about the relationship between cultural structures and individual agents in antiquity. My interest lies in the degree to which we can see the actions and influences of individual benefactors in the archaeological remains of Roman cities, spaces created and used by entire communities as well as by individual donors and property holders. In this respect my work falls solidly into the theoretical framework known as agency theory.21

20 See this ch. I.4.a. Ancient Perspectives on Euergetism, infra p. 11.
21 Gardner 2008, 95; Johnson (2010, 224) identifies broad questions of agency in archaeology as one strand of what we might term the “post-postprocessualist” theoretical trend of recent years; Dobres and Robb (2000, 8-13) mention that archaeologists define and investigate agency in many different ways.
The concept of agency in archaeology originates from the sociological and anthropological theory works of Giddens\textsuperscript{22} and Bourdieu.\textsuperscript{23} Both scholars’ work moved beyond orthodox “structuralist” theory, with its classic binary oppositions between individual agents on one side and cultural structures on the other side. Instead, they examined relationships between individuals and societies as a complex and intertwined network of connections and influences, rather than a strict opposition. The dialogue between agent and structure creates the social milieu in which individual humans act, and these actions at the same time create, reinforce, and change the cultural structure.\textsuperscript{24} Physical objects—pottery, buildings, inscriptions, paintings, coins, and other archaeological material—are in some sense props in the human drama, created and used by agents, which then becomes part of the overall cultural structure. From this theoretical stance, archaeologists can seek to understand the cultural meanings embedded in the objects left behind. There is not, necessarily, one single meaning in physical objects since both agent and structure (individual and culture) contribute to an object’s meaning.\textsuperscript{25}

In answering my central question, considering questions of agency in benefactions in Roman North Africa means that we must investigate not only who built the buildings, but also what the benefactor’s original purpose was. As much as possible, we should also consider how the function and meaning of the building changed over time, or how different people or groups understood the building’s meaning, or how the building interpreted the dominant messages of Roman culture through connections

\textsuperscript{22} E.g., Giddens 1984.  
\textsuperscript{23} E.g., Bourdieu 1977.  
\textsuperscript{24} Gardner 2008, 98-99; Dobres and Robb 2000, 4-8.  
\textsuperscript{25} Cf. the work of Revell (2009) for an example of this type of analysis applied to Roman urban patterns and structures.
between disparate parts of its structure and decoration, or through connections between the building and other structures and landscapes around it.

b. Reception Theory

Reception theory, developed in theoretical studies of literature, considers the response of the reader to a work of literature or art rather than investigating its creator’s intentions. This theoretical viewpoint can also be applied to the study of archaeological monuments, and may provide some valuable insights in the current study, especially surrounding the question of later responses to and uses of the buildings donated by benefactors. Since, like literature, buildings and monuments endure long past their original creation, it behooves us to investigate not only the donors’ original intents and motives in erecting a public building, but also the responses of later inhabitants to the buildings as well, including reuses, renovations, or other changes.

In this sense, then, reception theory can shed light on the actions of later benefactors who, with their buildings, responded to or commented on earlier donated projects in crowded urban spaces (such as Thugga or any other Roman city in North Africa). We can also use reception theory, along with ideas drawn from agency theory,
to understand the ways in which other inhabitants of the cities might have understood the buildings’ messages. In long-inhabited towns, reception theory offers a way to investigate changing notions of civic space through the renovation or decay of specific buildings, the removal or relocation of honorific statues and inscriptions, and other actions; this information would be lost if studies focused solely on the original intent and effects of the donor alone.

c. Phenomenology

Phenomenology, too, informs this study, since it seeks to understand the lived experiences of ancient people.\textsuperscript{29} As Brück succinctly characterizes it, phenomenological research takes into account “the views from particular locations, the order in which different spaces within a monument are encountered, the way in which monuments may mimic elements of the physical landscape ...” and the physical experience of approaching a particular place.\textsuperscript{30} One underlying premise of phenomenological approaches is the essential connection between modern researchers and ancient people through the physical shape and abilities of the human body.\textsuperscript{31}

As a theoretical approach that seeks to interpret archaeological remains, phenomenology has been widely criticized on many counts, especially regarding the extent to which modern archaeologists can replicate the nature of ancient interactions with the landscape. Despite the similarities of our carnal bodies to those of our

\textsuperscript{29} See Tilley 1994 for the first major application of this theory in archaeological practice. Phenomenology springs from the philosophies of Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty (Tilley 1994, 12-14). See also Thomas (1996 and 2004) for other considerations concerning the use of these philosophies in archaeological research.

\textsuperscript{30} Brück 2005, 48.

\textsuperscript{31} Tilley 2004, 221: “Experience of the world is embodied and flows through the body. The body mediates our experience and such experience is always synaesthetic, involving all the senses. The phenomenal field is thus not an inner world, a mental fact, but the structure of lived material experience.”
historical subjects, culture plays a pervasive role in shaping humans’ experiences of the physical world. For example, the supposedly objective practice of seeing is culturally conditioned;\textsuperscript{32} emotions, and emotional responses, have both a biological and a cultural basis, so it is naïve to assume that ancient people would have experienced the same emotions that an archaeologist experiences in seeing a particular landscape.\textsuperscript{33} Furthermore, phenomenology’s emphasis on individual experience places individual and society in opposing spheres, but in this way it replicates a humanist, western perspective that ancient cultures may not have shared.\textsuperscript{34} Finally, phenomenological interpretation privileges the emotional and symbolic meaning of landscape over more holistic theories that also encompass the economic, ecological, or other “practical” meanings of place.\textsuperscript{35}

Phenomenological theory also is prevalent in architectural studies, where its practitioners seek an experiential understanding of space or place: how people define, understand, use, and experience architecture in its physical context and what meaning or message it sends.\textsuperscript{36} Like the archaeological application of this theory, its practice in architecture seems most fruitful when it is grounded in an emic (insider) perspective, rather than the etic, outsider role that most researchers and theoreticians take.\textsuperscript{37}

33 Tarlow 2000, 721-724.
35 Many of the criticisms are summarized by Brück 2005, 50-63; more recently, Bintliff (2009) decries the idea that space’s most important characteristic is its symbolic value and uses a case study from ancient Greece to point out that ancient people rarely divided the landscape and its uses into different categories of meaning or usefulness.
36 Norberg-Schultz 1980, esp. 5-23.
37 The etic perspective is extremely apparent in Norberg-Schultz’s analysis of Roman architectural space (1980, 138-166). Norberg-Schultz seeks to determine why Rome’s architecture gives it an “eternal” quality (138); he argues that the spirit of the place (genius loci) is evident in Roman architecture from the Hellenistic sanctuary of Palestrina (147-148) to the Via Sacra and the Colosseum (149) in Rome to the design of Michaelangelo’s Campidoglio and Bernini’s Piazza di San Pietro (151-152). By genius loci Norberg-Schulz appears to mean the importance of the contrasting topographical features around Rome: the deep valleys of Etruria, the campagna around Rome, and the Alban hills to the east. The examples he chooses, however, are so widely spaced chronologically and so selective that it is hard to
perspective allows us to analyze things that were genuinely important to the Romans, instead of our own experience. To that end, phenomenology is a useful method of gathering data, even if its interpretive approaches are problematic.

A research method informed by phenomenology, frequently involving the use of Geographic Information System (GIS) database analysis and/or physical inspection of standing archaeological remains, can help to identify patterns and connections between buildings or monuments, the physical landscape, and human experience. In that it allows us to identify patterns, practices, and connections that were important to the Romans, phenomenological research—with its emphasis on viewsheds and sightlines, moveable goods in architectural or archaeological context, and movement through space—can indeed help us to understand what the Romans experienced as they lived in their towns.38

4. Previous Research on the Questions

a. Ancient Perspectives on Euergetism

Ancient writers mentioned euergetism in many different contexts: letters and essays that detailed games and new buildings,39 denouncements of extravagance and

follow the pattern that Norberg-Schulz claims to observe, and difficult indeed to believe that Romans throughout time have always referred—however obliquely—to the physical and “emotional” elements of their surroundings. His thesis is particularly strained by any attempt to apply his model to “Roman” architecture in provincial settings, and I suspect that the architectural theorist Norberg-Schulz would hesitate—unlike many archaeologists—to define such buildings as Roman, since his understanding of “Roman” appears to be specific to the topography and genius of the city of Rome itself.

38 Examples of this sort of phenomenological method in archaeological research are Ellis 2008, Kaiser 2003, and Kaiser 2000. The legibility studies discussed above also draw implicitly on phenomenological theory and methodology to approach anthropological questions of how readers see and understand texts.

39 Cicero, Ep. ad fam. 7.1 for the games that accompanied the dedication of Pompey’s theater in Rome in 55 B.C.E.; Pliny the Elder, HN 36.24 for descriptions of some buildings built by wealthy men at Rome.
political pandering,⁴⁰ and lists of achievements⁴¹ among them. A number of authors⁴² wrote treatises that discuss the moral duty of the wealthy to provide services and benefactions to the community as well as to individuals of their acquaintance. These treatises focused more upon the correct attitude and motivation for giving a donation, rather than on the composition of the gift itself; the authors were concerned primarily with promoting honorable behavior among wealthy men.

Only two philosophical works on the subject have survived that date from the Roman period.⁴³ Both of these are Latin works by authors writing in the Stoic tradition: Cicero’s de Officiis, and Seneca’s de Beneficiis. Though the works are separated in time by nearly a century,⁴⁴ they share concerns such as how gifts (beneficia) should be given and received, and how generosity (liberalitas), a cornerstone of Roman society, fits into a wider system of moral obligation and behaviors.

Both Cicero and Seneca were concerned largely with the question of beneficia directed to individuals—to whom one should give such services, what the services should be, and how they should be received and repaid.⁴⁵ The authors said less about beneficia given to the community, the type of euergetism that I focus on in this study. Their works are instructive, however, in that they reveal the attitude toward donations that prevailed during the later Republic and early Empire—or at least the ideal to which some donors may have aspired.

---

⁴⁰ Juvenal (X.77-81) disparaged the Roman people for accepting the whims of a tyrannical ruler in exchange for “bread and circuses.”
⁴¹ Augustus, Res Gestae.
⁴² E.g. Aristotle’s views on friendship (especially Eudemian Ethics 7; Nichomachean Ethics 8-9). Inwood (1995, 241-243, with accompanying footnotes) discusses the Greek philosophical sources that informed Cicero and especially Seneca’s views on euergetism.
⁴³ Griffin 2003, 92.
⁴⁴ Cicero’s treatise was written around 44 B.C.E., addressed to his son Marcus who was studying at Athens, and based on the work of the Stoic philosopher Panaetius of Rhodes (Higginbotham 1967, 15-19). Seneca’s work, which also relied on the Stoic philosophers, dates to the later years of his career, ca. 56-64 C.E. and was addressed to his friend Aebutius Liberalis (Griffin 2003, 93).
First, the definition of *beneficium*.

According to Cicero, it was a critical component in maintaining society, and could be divided into active generosity—working directly on behalf of another—or passive generosity, for example supplying money to redress an unfortunate circumstance. Cicero viewed the active variety in a more favorable light, since it required more effort on the part of the donor. Seneca defined *beneficium* as a well-intentioned action toward others, that brings both doer and receiver pleasure. Griffin has pointed out that *beneficia* were part of the larger system of *amicitia*, which she defined as a reciprocal system of gift-exchange. For both authors, *beneficia* were intentional acts designed to improve the lives of the recipients, be they individuals or groups.

Both authors mentioned—at least briefly—what *beneficia* should consist of, and in such listings their focus on individual recipients is especially apparent: the best gifts are

---

46 In all Latin passages and quotations that follow, the translations are my own unless noted.
49 Sen. Ben. 1.6.1: Quid est ergo beneficium? Benevolis actio tribuens gaudium capiensque tribuendo in id, quod facit, prona et sponte sua parata. Iaque non, quid fiat aut quid detur, refert, sed qua mente, quia beneficium non in eo, quod fit aut datur, consistit, sed in ipso dantis aut facientis animo.
50 Griffin 2003, 95-102, contra Saller (1982) and other scholars who suggest that *amicitia* is more properly defined as part of the inequal system of personal patronage. For more on gift exchange and euergetism, see ch. I.4.b, Historical and Epigraphic Studies on Euergetism or Benefaction, infra p. 16.
those which directly benefit people in difficult circumstances, such as providing ransom for kidnap victims or augmenting the finances of friends in distress. Cicero listed the sorts of gifts that should be given to the community as a whole: useful things like docks and harbors and aqueducts. Both authors scorned gifts to the community that were ephemeral or that were designed to win glory for the giver: gifts like gladiatorial games, public banquets, and entertainments were to be avoided except when absolutely necessary. These sentiments of utility, personal interaction, and humility were philosophical ideals, however, that wealthy Romans did not always reach, as both literary evidence and the epigraphic corpus make clear.

Euergetism, liberalitas or series of beneficia, appear in several works, including Augustus’ Res Gestae and the letters of Pliny the Younger. In Augustus’ list of his achievements, he featured prominently the gifts he gave to individuals and towns in

\[...\]

51 Cic. Off. II.16.55: liberales autem, qui suis facultatibus aut captos a praedonibus redimunt aut aequi alienum suscipiunt amicorum aut in filiarum collocatione adiuvant aut opitulantur in re vel quaerenda vel augenda.

“The generous, on the other hand, are those who, with their own resources, redeem captives from pirates, or take up the debt of friends, or contribute to the dowry of daughters, or assist a man in acquiring or increasing a fortune.”


“It follows that we should discuss which benefits should be given and how. First let us give necessary benefits, then useful ones, then enjoyable ones, and in every case benefits that will endure.” Among Seneca’s necessary and useful benefits are: rescuing friends from enemies or from proscription, offering freedom to captives, and providing money to those in distress (1.11.2-3).

52 Cic. Off. II.17.60: Atque etiam illae impensae meliores, muri, navalia, portus, aquarum ductus omniaque, quae ad usum rei publicae pertinent. Quamquam, quod praesens tamquam in manum datur, iucundius est; tamen haec in posterum gratiora. Theatra, porticus, nova tempia verecundius reprehendo propter Pompeium, sed doctissimi non probant ...

“And also, those expenses are better which extend to the use of the state: walls, docks, ports, aqueducts, and all such things. Although, to be sure, an immediate benefit which is given into the hand is more pleasing, however these other things I’ve mentioned are more appreciated in the future. I refrain from speaking more disparagingly of theaters, porticoes, and new temples on account of Pompey, but the philosophers do not approve them …”

53 Cic. Off. II.16.55: Omnimodque eorum qui extendunt largorum, quorum alteri prodigi, alteri liberales: prodigi, qui epulis et vicerationibus et gladiatorium muneribus, ludorum venationumque apparatu pecunias profundunt in eas res, quorum memoria aut crevem aut nullam omnino sint relieturi ...

“And in every case there are two types of largess, of which some are wasteful, some generous: the wasteful ones, who pour out money on events with banquets and with food distributions and with provision of gladiatorial games, of theater shows, and of hunts, whose memory will endure either briefly or not at all.”


“First let us give necessary benefits, then useful ones, then enjoyable ones, and in every case benefits that will endure.”
cash,\textsuperscript{54} the buildings that he built or renovated in Rome,\textsuperscript{55} and entertainments that he offered at his own expense.\textsuperscript{56} Augustus considered these acts of euergetism so critical to his identity that he featured them on the inscription that graced his tomb. This fact indicates just how important public beneficia were in Roman society of the early imperial period, and how closely connected they were to the development of elite identities.

In his letters, the younger Pliny mentioned numerous donations that he made to individuals and to communities. He especially focused his generosity on his hometown, Comum in northern Italy, as well as to other towns for whom he served as a patron. These beneficia included: an endowment of land worth 500,000 sesterces, with an annual income of 30,000 sesterces, to support the maintenance of free-born children;\textsuperscript{57} the donation of a Corinthian bronze statue and inscribed base to a temple in Comum;\textsuperscript{58} a sum of money given to Comum to support the development of a school there;\textsuperscript{59} a temple, furnished with statues of the emperors, at Tifernum Tiberinum, along with a public feast to celebrate its dedication;\textsuperscript{60} and a refurbished Temple of Ceres with new porticoes on his own land.\textsuperscript{61} Like the donations that Augustus catalogued, Pliny’s community beneficia included both monetary gifts, buildings, and public entertainments.

Pliny the Younger echoed the ideals of Cicero and Seneca when he mentioned that a man who was truly generous should make donations to his country, his

\textsuperscript{54} Augustus, \textit{Res Gestae} 15-18.
\textsuperscript{55} Augustus, \textit{Res Gestae} 19-21.
\textsuperscript{56} Augustus, \textit{Res Gestae} 22-23.
\textsuperscript{57} Pliny the Younger, \textit{Ep.} 1.8 and 7.18.
\textsuperscript{58} Pliny the Younger, \textit{Ep.} 3.6.
\textsuperscript{59} Pliny the Younger, \textit{Ep.} 4.13.
\textsuperscript{60} Pliny the Younger, \textit{Ep.} 4.1 and 10.8.
\textsuperscript{61} Pliny the Younger, \textit{Ep.} 9.39.
neighbors, his relatives and his friends (especially his poor friends). He echoed the philosophers’ sentiments, too, when he noted that the endowment he made at Comum was better than paying for shows or gladiator bouts. As Griffin has noted, Pliny’s letters exemplify the correspondence between the philosophical works of Cicero and Seneca and the reality of high-society life. Philosophers’ ideals about euergetism reflected contemporary practice, and elites who participated in euergetism subscribed, at least partially, to the philosophical ideals.

These texts, both ideal philosophical discussions and real-world examples of donors and their works, demonstrate the important role euergetism had in Graeco-Roman society. As Cicero and Seneca claimed, beneficia or liberalitas helped to bind unequal social groups together: a wealthy man and his poor friends, or a patron and his city. Despite the philosophers’ exhortations to humility, moreover, the writings of Augustus and Pliny the Younger, among others, as well as the testimony of hundreds of inscriptions, show that recognition for euergetism was a major feature in creating a man’s legacy.

b. Historical and Epigraphic Studies on Euergetism or Benefaction

The phenomenon of euergetism, which the Romans usually called liberalitas or beneficentia or (especially in epigraphic texts) munificentia, has long been a subject of scholarly inquiry, because inscriptions that recorded these acts of generosity make up a

---

62 Pliny the Younger, Ep. 9.30: Volo enim eum, qui sit vere liberalis, tribuere patriae propinquis, affinibus amicis, sed amicis dico pauperibus, non ut isti qui iis potissimum donant, qui donare maxime possunt.

“I want a man, who would be truly generous, to contribute to his country and his neighbors, his relatives and friends, but I mean to his poor friends, that he not give to those who are wealthy, who are able to give the most (back).”

63 Pliny the Younger, Ep. 1.8.10: Accedebat his causis, quod non ludos aut gladiatores sed annuos sumptus in alimenta ingenuorum pollicebamur.

“It happened on these occasions, that we were not promising shows or gladiators but an annual stipend for raising children.”

64 Griffin 2003, 102-112.

65 The term “euergetism” was not used by the ancients themselves but was coined by French historians in the early twentieth century (Veyne 1990, 10, citing Boulanger 1923 and Marrou 1948).
large portion of the epigraphic corpus, and the subject also appears, as I have just outlined, in literary sources. One of the most common ways to study this practice of benefaction is by epigraphic means: reading inscriptions that mention donors and donations can shed light on the actors who participated in euergetism, the objects that they donated, and the economic, social, and political impacts of donations.\textsuperscript{66}

Scholars have suggested various motivations behind the ancient practice of euergetism. Zuiderhoek has recently explained benefactions as a way to legitimate powerholding by elite and wealthy members of society. In his view, benefactions provided a lubricant to prevent social friction from developing between elite and non-elite members of Roman society in the cities of Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{67} If these cities had been democratic, egalitarian \textit{poleis} before the Roman period, his thesis might have been tenable; but Meyer\textsuperscript{68} has pointed out that few cities in the ancient world operated on that principle. Even in the Classical period and certainly during the Hellenistic era wealth in Asia Minor’s cities had not been evenly distributed; changing economic patterns and the need to legitimize new structures of social power cannot therefore explain the rise of euergetism as a common social practice in the Roman period.\textsuperscript{69} In North Africa, moreover, it seems highly unlikely that legitimizing uneven distribution of wealth was the primary goal of euergetism. Some benefactions were extremely modest in scale, suggesting that even people who were not wealthy members of the elite could participate.\textsuperscript{70} If even those with limited means\textsuperscript{71} participated, there must have

\begin{itemize}
\item[] \textsuperscript{66} E.g., Jouffroy 1986.
\item[] \textsuperscript{67} E.g. Zuiderhoek 2009.
\item[] \textsuperscript{68} Meyer 2011.
\item[] \textsuperscript{69} Meyer 2001, 504-508.
\item[] \textsuperscript{70} Briand-Ponsart (1999) notes that even very modest sums sufficed to establish foundations that produced spectacles in some small towns in the Carthaginian hinterland.
\item[] \textsuperscript{71} Of course, I do not mean that every member of North African society could participate in euergetism; only those with income beyond their immediate needs would have been able to do so. I simply mean to point out that Zuiderhoek’s premise—that euergetism was a way for the social structure of Graeco-
been other motivations for making civic donations.

Another explanation for euergetism is as a way for citizens to obtain and hold political power, as Paul Veyne has suggested. He defined euergetism in two ways: on the one hand as spontaneous, voluntary acts, directed toward a community, provided for that community by its wealthy members. On the other hand, Veyne noted the close connections between euergetism and the pursuit of political power: for Veyne, euergetism *ob honorem* (as opposed to “true” voluntary euergetism) was essentially the “pay” part of “pay to play” politics. Veyne had a special interest in the patronage of the Emperor, especially toward the City of Rome, and spent very little energy investigating the work of local, smaller-scale benefactors during the high imperial period or later antiquity; but benefaction happened at all levels of Roman society, and to concentrate exclusively on the works of the Emperor misses a huge class of examples of benefaction that could shed light on how this mechanism worked in, and affected, Roman society at all levels. Veyne also excluded from his study any mention of women, since he focused so intently on how men used euergetism to get and keep political power. Veyne’s failure to consider women as benefactors ignored a small but significant population, and thus could not tell the whole story about how benefaction

---

72 Throughout this discussion, I shall refer primarily to the English translation (1990) of the abridged text, which, in its salient points, closely mirrors the French text; for a definition of ‘euergetism’, see Veyne 1990, 1 and 10.

73 Veyne 1990, 10-18. Andreau et al. (1978) have criticized Veyne’s work on many points, including his interest in portraying euergetism as a human behavior rather than as a culturally-conditioned activity; his distinctions between “political” and “non-political” euergetism, and other considerations. Garnsey 1991, 167 emphasizes the way in which Veyne explains euergetism in terms of social rather than political power.

74 Veyne’s chapter on the imperial period is named “The Emperor and his Capital,” and has an exclusive focus on that subject (1990, 292-482).

75 Indeed, the index of *Bread and Circuses* does not include an entry for “women” at all. Women who hold magistries and participate in euergetism are mentioned very briefly, in a note that also discusses the magistracies of children and dead men (Veyne 1990, 185, n. 208; see also Veyne 1976, 285 and 750, n. 261 (comparable contexts)).
worked in the ancient world. Euergetism could not have been simply a means to achieve political power, or the practice would have been limited to those who held (or were eligible to hold) political office—a segment of the population that would have largely excluded women.\(^76\)

Some scholars have preferred to see euergetism as a form of gift-exchange.\(^77\) In a recent interpretation of this theory, Zuiderhoek referred to the fundamental anthropological research of Mauss on gift exchange,\(^78\) and suggested that euergetism was an exchange of goods (public buildings, games, banquets, etc.) for public honors (statues, honorific inscriptions, public offices). Of course, Zuiderhoek acknowledged that the idea of gift exchange or reciprocity, derived from anthropological studies of practices like Native American potlach,\(^79\) is not entirely appropriate for studying the Greco-Roman world.\(^80\) Veyne, among others, had explicitly rejected potlach and similar gift exchanges as a comparative or explanatory model.\(^81\) The notion of gift-exchange is an interesting one (though not, to my mind, entirely convincing as an explanation for euergetism), but previous work in this trajectory has focused on the exchange, and in this work I intend to look more closely at the gift itself, a subject that has not been treated in as much detail.

Another theory of euergetism has interpreted the practice as a mechanism to redistribute wealth from the landed elite in ancient cities to the public treasury.\(^82\) This interpretation relies on analogy with the classical Greek practice of assigning

---

\(^76\) But see this ch., I.4.c. Gender and Social Identity in Euergetism, infra p. 22, for a more detailed discussion of women’s euergetism in antiquity.

\(^77\) E.g. Mauss 1990; Zuiderhoek 2009.

\(^78\) Mauss 1990.

\(^79\) Mauss (1990) examines potlach and related practices as well as the workings of gift exchange in Graeco-Roman antiquity.

\(^80\) Zuiderhoek 2009, 117-119.

\(^81\) Veyne 1976, 73-93.

\(^82\) Veyne 1976, 76-93, responds to (and rejects) principally the work of K. Polanyi.
compulsory liturgies to wealthy citizens, who supported activities of the state (equipping the military, conducting public sacred rituals) out of their own personal wealth.\textsuperscript{83} This practice continued, in some way at least, in the Roman period. Romans regularly contributed a \textit{summa honoraria}—essentially an entrance fee—to the public treasury in exchange for certain public offices; these funds supplemented cities' incomes from taxation.\textsuperscript{84} It is no doubt correct to discuss the importance of private wealth to public activity in the Roman world, but reliance on an economic model to explain euergetism again ignores the importance of the object that was given. If economic need were the only, or even the primary, reason for Roman euergetism, it seems likely that we would have fewer records of buildings built as payment of \textit{summae honorariae}, and more records of gifts of cash and property transferred into public treasuries. Gifts of buildings may well have met civic economic needs, sometimes; but they must at the same time have met other non-financial needs as well.

Other studies that are based on the epigraphic corpus explain some impacts that benefactions had on the civic world, such as the the relative frequency of various gifts, the types of buildings, or the commemoration of the benefactors.\textsuperscript{85} Wesch-Klein presented a short series of analytical essays based on the collected evidence, discussing types of benefactions (e.g. endowments, buildings, or annual events), the motivation and social standing of benefactors (including a few paragraphs on women), and the temporal distribution of benefactions.\textsuperscript{86} These analyses, however, did not focus on the

\textsuperscript{83} Lewis 1960, 181; Davies 1984, esp. 9-14 for the Archaic and Classical periods; Gauthier 1985 for the Classical and Hellenistic periods.
\textsuperscript{84} Duncan-Jones 1990, 177. Lewis (1963, 229-230) recognized that most secular Roman-period uses of the word \textit{leitourgia} continued to describe the compulsion of the wealthy to support activities of the city or state. For another perspective on how euergetism and patronage were connected to the economic life of the ancient Romans, see Wiedemann 2003.
\textsuperscript{85} E.g., Rockwell 1909, Jouffroy 1986. Wesch-Klein (1990, 10) cites a number of others in a similar vein; like Rockwell’s work, these all rely on epigraphic evidence.
\textsuperscript{86} Wesch-Klein 1990, 9-52.
most frequent type of donations—buildings—but talked extensively about the nature of endowed foundations, which, to judge from the epigraphic record, were comparatively rare gifts in the North African provinces. The work, therefore, shed little new light on the importance of benefaction to the cities of North Africa.\textsuperscript{87}

Such studies do present facts and theories that explain parts of the system of euergetism in the Roman world. By focusing solely on epigraphic and literary evidence, however, scholars have ignored an important source of evidence: the archaeological remains of the benefactions themselves, especially donated buildings. It is difficult to understand such buildings solely from their dedicatory inscriptions, as Wesch-Klein has noted, since building inscriptions rarely include information about the floor plan, decoration, or nature of the edifice, and building inscriptions are frequently divorced from their original archaeological context. Thus, much visual information that was available to ancient readers of the inscriptions has been lost to modern scholars.\textsuperscript{88} I argue through this dissertation that, although archaeological evidence may be difficult to interpret, it can shed critical light on the practice of euergetism and its importance in Roman society.

Both written and material evidence demonstrate that donors sought to create a physical manifestation of their social identities through their benefactions, and that their works underscored both the individual and communal nature of their identities through individual choices and also through connections with previous donors’ works. By considering the epigraphic evidence along with archaeological information, we gain a fuller picture of how benefactors used euergetism to create and express their social identities, and how such identities were created within a specific civic context.

\textsuperscript{87} Wesch-Klein 1990.
\textsuperscript{88} Wesch-Klein 1990, 23.
In North Africa, the institution of euergetism played a key role in the creation of urban spaces. Though benefactions of other types made important contributions to social activity in Roman towns who received them, buildings were among the most frequent and most costly of donations. Private funding and the decisions of the private individuals who provided the funds therefore had an immense impact on the shape and form of Roman towns in North Africa. From the remains of the buildings, we can hope to resurrect some of the motivations behind benefactors’ actions and also the way in which those actions impacted the lives of other citizens.

c. Gender and Social Identity in Euergetism

A question at the heart of this study concerns visibility and social identity. That is to say, I am interested in learning to what extent a donor’s social identity, including his or her gender, was evident in the buildings that she or he built, and the commemoration that each donor received. How did gender, or other factors, influence the messages that the donor chose to emphasize in his or her own work? How did later donors and visitors to the buildings respond to those messages?

Epigraphic studies of euergetism have long noted that women participated in this practice in antiquity, particularly in the Roman period.89 Other studies have shown that women regularly participated in various facets of public life.90 Such studies contradict the assertions of some ancient literary texts,91 which suggested that Roman women were rarely active in the public life of the city. In fact, one scholar concluded

89 Rockwell (1909) included women in his lists of benefactors; Wesch-Klein 1990 (46-47) discussed some of the common characteristics of women who served as benefactors to North African cities.
90 For example, Treggiari (1976) listed the sorts of jobs that Roman slave women could have held in high-status households, according to epigraphic texts; these ranged from hairdressers and masseuses to woolworkers and seamstresses. Women doctors and midwives are also attested. Some women were well-educated and may have taken on the roles of primary teachers or child-minders, as well as clerks or personal secretaries. See also Kampen (1981) on images of working women in Roman reliefs from Ostia.
91 E.g., Valerius Maximus (6.3.10), who recorded that in the second century B.C.E. Sulpicius Gallus divorced his wife because she had gone into public with her head uncovered (“…uxorem dimisit, quod eam capite aperto foris versatam cognouerat …”).
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that—at least in some parts of the Roman empire—“women as benefactors should be imagined playing their part personally and visibly, out in the open.”

Recent work on the expression of gender identity and euergetism emphasizes the need to study these questions in a local or regional perspective. Van Bremen concluded, from her study on women as office-holders and benefactors in Asia Minor, that women could and did participate in public life, both through benefactions and through public offices like priesthoods and civic magistracies. In nearly every case, however, the women who took on these public roles did so in the context of a male-defined sphere of influence, and as representatives of their families’ interests as well as of their gender. Boatwright’s study of the city gate built by Plancia Magna at Perge, on the other hand, suggested that women in eastern cities did sometimes express their own meanings in donated works, not just a message chosen by their families.

This pattern from Asia Minor apparently did not translate exactly to other areas of the Roman world, either. Briand-Ponsart has noted that in North Africa, especially in the second and third centuries, women tended to downplay their familial roles and private characteristics in public inscriptions, while emphasizing their public contributions. Women in North Africa rarely employed the dual representation of praising private virtues in public places that Van Bremen noted in the eastern provinces. In the western provinces, some women did hold official, or quasi-official, roles in municipal government, especially civic patronae, women whom the cities adopted in response to, or in expectation of, special favor and benefits. In most cases,
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92 MacMullen 1980, 212. For a general survey of the lives of Roman women, see, e.g., D’Ambra 2007.
94 Boatwright 1993.
95 Briand-Ponsart 2004.
such patronae held extremely high social status as well as possessing great wealth.\textsuperscript{96} Not all benefactresses, however, were patronae or other office-holders. Benefactresses generally gave specific items (buildings, foundations, monetary distributions, or similar) and received praise and honor for their specific gifts, while patronae in North Africa and other western provinces generally were praised because of their “merita,” “liberalitas,” or other general positive qualities.\textsuperscript{97} These differences underscore the importance of regional specificity in studying benefaction’s motives and its outcomes, a theme I shall return to throughout this dissertation. At the same time, a strict focus on women as official office-holders limits our understanding of how women as well as men could influence the physical shape of civic life in both formal and informal roles. In this work, therefore, I focus on the works of benefactors of both genders, whether or not they held civic offices.

d. How Buildings Communicated Meaning

If our object is to understand how donors communicated meaning through their building benefactions, an obvious question centers on the role of dedicatory inscriptions and architectural choices as a method of communication. The dedicatory inscriptions on which this study relies peaked in the late second and early third centuries, following the general pattern of Roman inscribed texts, the pattern that MacMullen has termed “the epigraphic habit.”\textsuperscript{98} Although benefactory inscriptions on buildings also declined in frequency in the later third and fourth centuries, as MacMullen’s general pattern does, the fact that some donation inscriptions appeared even in those later centuries suggests that the institution of euergetism continued to play an important role in civic life even as other practices and beliefs reshaped the way people lived in Roman cities.

\textsuperscript{96} Hemelrijk 2004a, 2004b.
\textsuperscript{97} Nicols 1989.
\textsuperscript{98} MacMullen 1982.
MacMullen has noted that inscriptions on stone, both public and private, suggested an expectation of long visibility.\textsuperscript{99} From this starting point—that Romans who created inscriptions expected them to be seen by others—Woolf has suggested that monumental writing (that is, public, lasting, intentional inscriptions) should be connected to the creation of personal identities by the writers, especially among those who experienced physical or social upheavals.\textsuperscript{100} This raises the question, though, of how many people who saw inscriptions could actually read them completely. Harris has shown how variable and restricted was literacy in the Roman world, though he notes that, using the frequency of inscribed texts as a measure of literacy, Africa proconsularis may have had a higher rate of public literacy than other western provinces.\textsuperscript{101} A related question is whether, indeed, reading the entire text was important for understanding its meaning.\textsuperscript{102} A number of studies have suggested that complete literacy was not required in order to understand and interpret ancient epigraphic texts.\textsuperscript{103} Inscriptions on public buildings were highly formulaic and even semi-literate viewers may have been able to pick out some features of such texts, features that were repeated over and over in multiple public venues.\textsuperscript{104} The ability of the

\textsuperscript{99} MacMullen 1982, 246.
\textsuperscript{100} Woolf 1996.
\textsuperscript{101} Harris (1989, 268) for the relative rates of literacy in Africa proconsularis and other western provinces; Harris (1989, 284-292) for variable levels of literacy in the Roman world according to social class and geographic location.
\textsuperscript{102} Lee (2003-2004), for example, has suggested that placing a Latin-only text (instead of a bilingual Latin - Neo-Punic text) on the exterior of the theater at Lepcis Magna communicated an important message about the donor’s social identity even though many viewers would not have been able to read the words. Graham (forthcoming) makes a similar argument based on her study of the Library of Celsus inscriptions at Ephesos, where the donor’s name and the name of the recipient of that monumental tomb structure were both placed prominently on the protruding portions of frieze of the aedicular façade.
\textsuperscript{103} e.g. Woolf 2009, who speaks of “literacies” rather than literacy, with earlier bibliography.
\textsuperscript{104} Saastamoinen 2010 is a useful study of the language of Latin building inscriptions in North Africa, especially with regard to the formulae and their variations as well as changes in such formulae over time.
literate or semi-literate to pick out important pieces of the text is what Susini referred to as the “colpo d’occhio, the comprehensive glance.”

The first glance or first impression of the reader governed the inscription’s layout, which was probably set out according to the eye of the carver rather than following any sort of strict geometric principles. The layout of the inscription helped the reader to grasp the most important elements in the text while allowing his eyes to pass quickly over the whole in the blink of an eye. Thus words, letter sizes, punctuation, images, abbreviations, and other elements were all carefully deployed to allow the reader the fullest understanding of the text in a single look. A reader with more interest or focus could glean additional information from more detailed attention after the first comprehensive glance.

Sartori has noted that the most important information in inscriptions was emphasized by its size or its position. Many inscriptions took the shape, figuratively-speaking, of an hourglass, with the most important information at the top and the bottom, and other details in the middle. For example, in a monumental inscription, the person’s nomen and tribe were usually placed at the beginning of the inscription, in large letters, while the cognomen was emphasized by being set off in a line by itself.
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105 Susini 1983 first introduced the term “colpo d’occhio, comprehensive glance,” exploring in finer detail questions he first raised in previous research (Susini 1973). He equated the comprehensive glance with remarks of Roman authors such as Horace (Sat. II, V. 559, “veloci percurrere oculo, to run over quickly with the eye”) and with inscriptions that invite the viewer to “sit and read,” acknowledging that most readers would not do so (Susini 1988, 120-122). See also Sartori 1995, 193.

106 Sartori 1995, 188.

107 Susini (1992, 195-197) imagined three different types of readers who might have learned different things from milestones or monumental inscriptions along a road: a reader who glances casually at a milestone and learns how far he has to travel to his destination; a reader who catches a few words or names of a monumental inscription and thinks—however briefly—about the political and historical events that created the monument; or a reader who stops his journey, gets up close to the text, and reads every word. These different types of readers are determined not only by their levels of literacy but also by their different tasks and purposes, and it is easy to imagine a situation in which one person might demonstrate all three levels of reading inscriptions in a single journey or day. This work (Susini 1992) is evocative and descriptive, not empirical, and as such is suggestive rather than conclusive. A systematic and large-scale study of the issues he raises would be a most welcome addition to the field.
surrounded by white space, or specially punctuated. Other important information, such as the person’s role (like *patronus* or similar) was often placed at the end of the inscription in another eye-catching position.\(^{108}\) Sartori’s argument is especially convincing for vertical inscriptions such as stelae, but his ideas about privileged positions in the inscription and letter size marking out the most important information in a text apply to horizontal texts—such as those on the entablature of a building—as well.

In addition to internal characteristics of the inscription—size, letter heights, layout, and similar factors—its external context and relationship with other nearby inscriptions played an important role in conveying meaning to a viewer or reader. In a forthcoming case study from Roman Ephesus, Graham argues for the importance of studying monumental inscriptions from ancient buildings in their architectural and topographic context. The donor of the library of Celsus at Ephesos used its design, with an aedicular façade, to emphasize his own name and that of his father, the dead man who was being commemorated with the building, on the protruding sections of the frieze, while less important information receded into the background.\(^{109}\) It is only through such contextual study that we can learn what Roman benefactors considered important in their donations of buildings.

Along with studying the context of single inscriptions, it is critical to understand the ways that urban spaces developed over time. To do this, we must place the inscriptions back into the landscape where they were first erected, rather than studying them divorced from their physical setting. Thus, for example, at Termessos in Asia Minor, van Nijf has identified a location in which a series of inscriptions and statues

\(^{108}\) Sartori 1995, 196-199.

\(^{109}\) Graham forthcoming. I am grateful to Dr. Graham for sharing her work with me in advance of its publication.
were grouped together to create a “lieu de mémoire” which reinforced the hierarchies of the town’s social and political structures. Whenever citizens or visitors passed by or among these groups of statues and inscriptions, they saw images of the elite and the powerful among their political, social, and familial peers, and mentally placed themselves in relation to both the honorees and the dedicators. Different viewers could interpret the social and political hierarchies in their own ways based on their positions relative to the statues and inscriptions, so the elite could see reinforcement of their powerful positions, while tradesmen could see themselves on an equal footing with some honorees because of patronage relationships.

This allowance for varying viewpoints makes the concept of civic memory a useful one for understanding the lived experience of the ancient city, since we can investigate not only the motivations of the initial dedicator, but also the experiences and motivations of those who came after. If the end goal of archaeology—including epigraphy—is a deeper understanding of the way Romans (or any ancient people) experienced their world, then studying inscriptions in this type of closely contextual approach is essential for understanding the ways in which people in cities experienced monumental buildings.

e. Archaeological Studies of Benefactors in the Roman World and Beyond

The question of how benefactors—and especially female benefactors—created meaning within the urban landscape has recently begun to occupy scholarly attentions, both in Classics and in other related fields such as art history, architecture, and anthropology. A number of these works provide useful models for the present study, as ways to analyze both individual buildings and the diachronic development of urban
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space. Regardless of their area of study, these works demonstrate that public benefactors have nearly always carefully considered the messages inherent in their buildings and how they should respond to the work of previous donors in the same area.

This type of contextual approach can be particularly illuminating in the case of sculptural displays studied in their architectural, topographic, and socio-historical landscapes. For instance, Boatwright\textsuperscript{112} has analyzed the second-century donation of a city gate at Perge in Asia Minor by Plancia Magna, a wealthy citizen of Perge and a holder of public office there. Boatwright integrated the study of Plancia Magna’s biography (gleaned from epigraphic evidence) with the archaeological evidence of her donation: the inscription erected on her gate, the statues that decorated it, and honorific statues erected for Plancia Magna elsewhere in the city. She concluded that the benefactress emphasized her own high status—not that of her father, husband, or other male relatives—in her building.\textsuperscript{113} This short study is illustrative of the deeper meanings that can nuance an inscription’s text when it is viewed in its original visual and architectural context. Boatwright used a traditional approach of “reading” the iconography of the building and the text of the building’s dedicatory inscription, and combines the two to demonstrate how each visual element reinforced and nuanced the message that the other conveyed.

Similar research on single buildings has regularly focused on the sculptural or epigraphic programs of Roman display buildings, such as monumental fountains and theater façades as well as gateways like Plancia Magna’s. For example, Lusnia has recently discussed Septimius Severus’ Septizodium in Rome, and the messages of

\textsuperscript{112} Boatwright 1993.
\textsuperscript{113} Boatwright 1993.
dynastic continuity that it communicated through the use of topographic connections, a
monumental inscription, and sculptural displays of the imperial family and selected
deities.\textsuperscript{114} Bol’s study of the nymphaeum of Herodes Atticus at Olympia similarly
considered the messages of self-representation communicated by the arrangement and
depiction of deities, members of the imperial family, and members of the donors’
family, on a monumental fountain façade,\textsuperscript{115} while Longfellow’s recent monograph has
surveyed the meanings of monumental nymphaea as an architectural type and a vehicle
for sculptural and epigraphic display.\textsuperscript{116} Sturgeon’s review of monumental tombs,
altnars, and theater facades in the Hellenistic and Roman east considered similar
themes.\textsuperscript{117} Graham’s study of the library of Celsus in Ephesos (discussed above)
examined similar themes of personal representation and monumental communication
through the medium of inscriptions rather than sculpture;\textsuperscript{118} Burrell argues that exotic—
and not so exotic—marble architectural elements could play a similar role in
communicating meaning.\textsuperscript{119} These studies of individual monuments and architectural
types demonstrate the variety of meanings that builders, emperors as well as local
patrons, could communicate, as well as the ways that various media could contribute to
the shape of the complete message.

Studies focusing on an urban region instead of a single building can provide a
different perspective on the question of meaning and communication in the civic
landscape. Favro’s study of Augustan Rome is one such work,\textsuperscript{120} which used models of
architectural and urban planning theory to study the way that ancient buildings, and

\textsuperscript{114} Lusnia 2004.
\textsuperscript{115} Bol 1984, esp. 91-96.
\textsuperscript{116} Longfellow 2011.
\textsuperscript{117} Sturgeon 2000.
\textsuperscript{118} Graham forthcoming.
\textsuperscript{119} Burrell forthcoming.
\textsuperscript{120} Favro 1996.
their benefactors’ meanings and motives (especially those of the imperial benefactor, Augustus) interacted to create an urban fabric that individual observers experienced “kinetically and haptically.”

Though Favro’s work has been criticized on many points, her analysis provides an interesting methodological alternative to the more traditional study of benefactions through epigraphic or iconographic remains. Her approach, combining “the soft data necessary for an experiential approach with the hard facts and time constraints essential to an urban biography,” offered a relatively new and welcome perspective on Roman urban studies, one that I seek to merge with the more traditional methodology and data set.

Woodhull’s dissertation followed the model established by Favro, but more successfully combined textual and iconographic evidence with topography and architecture. This study examined the work of six female benefactors: three Julio-Claudian women in Rome, and three elite women in some of Rome’s provinces, Italia and Istria (modern Croatia). By examining a variety of data types, Woodhull arrived at an understanding of the visual and ideological impact of the women’s buildings, as well as their impact on later builders in the same general area during the Julio-Claudian period. Burrell considered a single plaza in ancient Ephesos over a longer period of time, emphasizing the importance of diachronic change and the responses of later benefactors to existing buildings. This article employed a traditional descriptive approach along with an interest in the sensory experience of the ancient viewer and a
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121 Favro 1996, 10.
122 The criticisms of Favro’s work—both small scale (e.g. Simpson 1997, with his focus on her “apparent lack of elementary Latin; often barely comprehensible prose ...; a tendency to repeat; a deficient bibliography; sometimes ludicrous or unintelligible diagrams; and gross historical inaccuracies”) and large scale (Jaeger (1997) questions the identity of Favro’s oft-mentioned “urban observer” and also laments her failure to refer meaningfully to ancient texts)—are justified, but her specific failures do not, I think, entirely undermine the power of such an experientially-based analytical approach.
124 Woodhull 1999.
125 Burrell 2009.
consideration of the monuments’ reception in later periods, when further benefactors continued to focus on the plaza as a location for architectural donations.

Revell’s recent exploration of “Roman-ness” also employed a diachronic approach, drawing on agency theory to understand the minor narrative of how space was used on a daily basis, to create and perpetuate “Roman-ness” among inhabitants of Spain and Britain. To this end, Revell focused less on who built public buildings and more on who used them, on what and how the buildings contributed to the ideology of Roman identities, and how different people or groups experienced the urban landscape in different ways and developed their own understandings of what it meant to be a Roman citizen or subject. Revell has suggested that we should change the way we study Roman buildings, “from the building as architectural aesthetic to the building as social space.”¹²⁶ Revell’s work focuses on how people in the provinces controlled by Rome developed their concepts of “Roman-ness” and how public buildings shaped and mediated those identities. She questioned how gender, social status, economic class, and freedom contributed to various understandings of Roman identity, and found that there was not a single understanding of what it meant to be a Roman. Practically speaking, attempting such an analysis of “the building as social space” involves examining many distinct types of evidence—architecture, decorative programs, urban topography and context, inscriptions, reconstructions and later uses—in order to fully understand who used the building, how they interacted with the space, how the building organized their experiences and expectations. Revell’s work serves as a model for this study in its careful integration of multiple lines of evidence and its willingness to ask questions outside the traditional archaeological purview of architectural typology and chronology.

¹²⁶ Revell 2009, 19.
Scholars outside the field of Classics have also begun working in this vein, considering how people created communicative landscapes in many different cultures. Though the methodology changes somewhat depending on the scope of the work and the available forms of evidence, the conclusions show a certain level of consistency across disciplines. Proclaiming one’s own social identity appears to have been—and still to be—an important impetus for architectural patronage in many cultures.

Women’s donations have, interestingly, been studied more carefully in this vein than the benefactory works of men. This may derive from a practical consideration: since women in antiquity, in early modern Europe, and in Islamic cultures have generally controlled less wealth than their male counterparts, fewer of them made donations, and thus the dataset is more restricted and easier to subject to detailed analysis. For example, Valone drew parallels between the architectural patronage of women in early modern Italy and that of women in the ancient world, including pagan secular benefactresses and Christian patrons.\textsuperscript{127} With access to wealth through their land, these women were able to exercise influence over urban development through architectural patronage.\textsuperscript{128} In related work on women who patronized the Catholic church in early modern Italy, Valone combined textual, architectural/archaeological, and topographic evidence to consider the motives and messages that female patrons in early modern Rome broadcast through their donations. By focusing on the work of donors in a single neighborhood, Rome’s Quirinal Hill, Valone revealed the connections that existed between the patrons, their works, and their surroundings, including references to prominent Christian women in Rome of the fourth century C.E., to previous female patrons, and to the benefactions of other members of the their own

\textsuperscript{127} Valone 2001.
\textsuperscript{128} Valone 2001.
families. She has demonstrated that benefactors considered their place in an urban landscape and in a community of donors, and that they responded to both their buildings' urban contexts and the works of other women who shared their ideals.

This work underscores the importance of looking at benefactions through a wide lens, rather than focusing on a single monument or building; studying the development over time of an entire urban space—as far as possible given the limits of data—provides a richer and more complete understanding both of the benefactors’ actions and of the lived experience of the city’s inhabitants.

Donors, especially women and members of other marginalized groups, in other geographic and cultural circumstances also worked to express their own identities and political or religious messages through their donations. The Rani ki Vav, or Queen’s Stepwell, at Patan in the western Indian state of Gujarat, was built in the eleventh century C.E. by a Hindu queen, Udayamati, in part as an affirmation of Hindu religious practices in the wake of conflicts with neighboring Muslims. The sculptural decorations on the Queen’s Stepwell recall other cultural practices that may have held significance for the queen, such as Brahmin religious beliefs and ritual dancing. Similar patterns of self-identity—proclaiming the social roles of wife and mother, expressing the development of syncretized cultural practices, and establishing religious affiliation—can be seen among women’s donations in both Muslim and non-Muslim areas of medieval India.

Prominent women in medieval Islamic cultures worked to convey both appropriately modest social personae and messages of religious significance through

---

130 Valone 1994, 135, 140, 141.
131 Livingston 2002, 61-68.
132 Findly 2000.
their patronage, employing dedicatory inscriptions and architectural patterns to proclaim their identity as female members of important families.¹³³ Like women in such cultures, eunuch builders in Ottoman Istanbul also emphasized their identity and political power through acts of architectural patronage. Unlike the women, however, court eunuchs downplayed their familial origins and instead chose to display their court lineage—their linkages with other powerful eunuchs and sultans—through their buildings.¹³⁴ Though these studies mostly focus on women, I argue that male donors, couples, and even family groups felt the same concern with expressing their identities through donations, and similarly used dedicatory inscriptions, architectural plans and forms, and decorative elements to communicate those identities.

Diachronic studies of benefactors show repeatedly that they consider how their works participated in the larger dialogue of the communicative urban landscape. Valone and Dikici both showed this in their studies of Roman women’s and Ottoman eunuchs’ donations, tracing these developments both chronologically and in their local and regional contexts.¹³⁵ Lowry’s study of the Hamza Bey Mosque in Ottoman Thessaloniki also showed how important are later ideas about donated buildings: the mosque was actually financed by Hamza Bey’s daughter, but later donors responded to the building as if it had been built by Hamza himself.¹³⁶ On a more theoretical level, Bandmann has discussed the fact that architectural forms’ accrued meaning can affect donors’ choices for or against a particular form or building style. At the same time, Bandmann argued that the accrued meaning allows an architectural element to

¹³³ Tabbaa 2000; Wolper 2000; see also Thys-Şenocak 2006.
¹³⁴ Dikici 2009.
¹³⁵ Valone 1994; Dikici 2009.
¹³⁶ Lowry 2010.
communicate with viewers about the patron’s values.\textsuperscript{137} The communicative nature of architecture, and the importance of later interpretations in understanding buildings’ meanings, highlights the need for diachronic perspectives on donated buildings.

5. Methodology and Organization

In selecting the case studies for this dissertation, I began by sifting through the epigraphic corpora for North Africa,\textsuperscript{138} seeking out inscriptions relating to benefactions (usefully signalled by the Latin phrase “sua pecunia fecit, built it with (his/her) own money,” or its variants), and recording examples that preserved the donors’ names and at least some information about the donation. My search, though extensive, was by no means exhaustive, and I no doubt accidentally omitted epigraphic examples that could have usefully been included. I then searched for published excavation records relating to the towns and buildings mentioned in the epigraphic records, and have focused my subsequent attention on those inscriptions and buildings which have been excavated and been more-or-less completely published, since in a contextual study of the type I undertake here such records are a requirement.

This need for a solid archaeological record narrowed my dataset significantly, though North Africa’s long excavation history offered a number of suitable examples of individual buildings that have been studied and published. The topographic clearances of the early twentieth century revealed huge numbers of inscriptions and ancient buildings of the Roman period at many sites. Unfortunately, the excavators did not always publish a complete record of their works, and a large number of the sites that

\textsuperscript{137} Bandmann 2005.
\textsuperscript{138} \textit{CIL, ILAfr, ILTun}, Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss-Slaby; also smaller catalogues, including Wesch-Klein (1990), Saastamoinen (2010), and volumes publishing the corpus of inscriptions from Thugga, particularly \textit{DFH} and \textit{MAD}. 
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were exposed in those early research programs await further detailed study and publication. In most cases, I was able to find published archaeological data relating to a single building or monument, not in-depth publications of entire towns. Two chapters of this dissertation are devoted to these individual buildings from a number of towns.

As I examine each building, I consider—insofar as possible, given variations in the data—three essential questions:

1. How did donors express their identity in building works, and how did cultural conditions, especially gender roles, constrain that expression?

2. What impact did donated buildings have on future developments of urban space?

3. How did others, including civic authorities and later benefactors, respond to donors’ buildings?

These questions allow us to consider the choices that individual donors made; the ways that pre-existing buildings and prevailing cultural expressions shaped the buildings and the donors’ messages; and how later donors interpreted the messages in previous constructions.

In chapter two, I consider three religious buildings: temples to the gods built by individual patrons or couples. Some of these were free-standing buildings while others were portions of larger monument complexes. In each case, I discern motives for the donors’ gift and ways that they expressed social identity through textual and visual evidence, two lines of communication that sometimes appear to have been broadcasting different messages.

In the third chapter, I focus on civic and infrastructure buildings that were not explicitly designed for religious functions. In these instances, too, I find evidence of multiple forms of communication that sometimes implied different things about the
identities of the donors and their relative status. Since both chapters two and three are concerned with single buildings, I focus my energy on the first two questions: how donors expressed their identity, and how the existing civic landscape constrained their choices.

In the next four chapters, I take up the diachronic development of the town of Thugga (modern Dougga), a UNESCO World Heritage site in the Tunisian tell, about 125 km southwest of ancient Carthage. This site developed its particular character in large part due to numerous donations by ancient benefactors. Thugga also received substantial early interest from the French colonial excavators and epigraphers working in Tunisia, and it has remained at the center of archaeological interest and activity from the 1880s until the present day. Thugga’s early excavations are better-published than those from other sites in North Africa, and the site and its epigraphic remains have recently been the subject of a long-term program of restudy, conservation, and publication to modern standards.\(^{139}\) Only at Thugga have I been able to find the combination of epigraphic data, archaeological publications, and benefactors’ interest that allowed me to conduct a diachronic and topographic analysis of the impact of donors on the site’s development, where we can trace not only the donors’ original intentions but also how later donors used the earlier buildings to create additional levels of meaning in their own benefactions. So it is only at Thugga where I am able to consider all three questions, including the issue of later donors’ reception of earlier benefactions. Because the data from Thugga is so extensive, it is presented here in three chronological chapters, covering roughly the first, second, and third-fifth centuries

\(^{139}\) See, for example, Khanoussi and Maurin 1997; Khanoussi 1998; \textit{DFH}; \textit{MAD}; Khanoussi and Strocka 2002; Saint-Amans 2004; Golvin and Khanoussi 2005.
respectively. My analysis in each chapter is necessarily cumulative, because older buildings remained visible in the urban landscape in succeeding centuries.

Thus the organization of this study takes its structure from the vagaries of the archaeological data. It is to be hoped that further publication will allow for additional diachronic and topographic studies of whole towns or neighborhoods in future work. Although the study presented here relies on published data, travel in Tunisia in 2007 and 2008 allowed me to visit some of the buildings and city sites, most notably Thugga. In walking over the excavated areas of the cities, I undertook some phenomenological research, learning about the sites’ topography and the spatial relationships between buildings. I hope that future work on this project will enable me to collect geographic data at the sites, in order to incorporate Geographic Information Systems (GIS) analysis into the study of these buildings and their development over time.\textsuperscript{140}

\textsuperscript{140} GIS analysis on city viewsheds is promising, especially for cities with large quantities of standing remains; for an example of this sort of study, see Kaiser 2000.
CHAPTER TWO:
TEMPLES AND DONORS IN TRIPOLITANIA AND AFRICA PROCONSULARIS

1. Introduction

Temples were perhaps the single most common object of euergetism in ancient cities in North Africa, though of course they varied greatly in size, architectural form, and the deity to whom they were dedicated. Temples were an important object for donations because of the variety of social meanings that they communicated, through their architectural styles, their deities, their roles as public spaces and locations for civic activity. In this chapter I shall consider three temples, which differ in date, urban context, and the meaning that each donor wished to convey. I shall show that in some ways at least the buildings’ messages, and the donors’ social identities, paralleled each other. These examples suggest, however, that temples, as a class of building, may have had limited impact on the development of urban space over time.

2. Two Temples at Gighis, Tripolitania (Tunisia)

Gighis was a small city in western Tripolitania, on the coast of the Gulf of Bou Ghrara, with a harbor opposite the Roman town of Meninx on the island of Jerba. The coastal road from Lepcis Magna to Tacapae passed through the town.141 Punic tombs found in the area suggest that Gighis may have been founded as a Punic emporium around the third century B.C.E. Roman-period activity began by the Augustan period, when epigraphic and sculptural evidence indicate that the imperial cult was situated in the forum at the center of town; other first-century evidence has been noted at temples near the forum and at the Temple of Mercury southwest of the urban area.142 Epigraphic and archaeological evidence both indicate that Gighis prospered in the mid-second

141 Mattingly 1995, 60-62 (roads), 129 (harbor).
century, when the city received *municipium* status and *ius Latium maius* from the emperor Antoninus Pius.\(^{143}\) Monumental building in the second century CE focused on the forum and central areas of the town, with construction or renovation of temples, baths, and streets.\(^{144}\) The early excavators noted evidence of late antique occupation, and a fortress was constructed north of the city center in the Byzantine period; these traces await further study.\(^{145}\) The town is best known for its second-century flourishing, illustrated by substantial monumental remains in and around the forum, and by a long series of epigraphic texts that provide details of the city’s political history and its elite families. First-century evidence, however, demonstrates that elite families had long participated in euergetism and that the practice was crucial for the city’s urban development even before the second-century building boom.

a. The Temple of Mercury

The Temple of Mercury at Gigthis serves as an early example of the important role that euergetism played in expressing elite identity and in dictating the course of urban development. The donor’s construction of the temple at the edge of the urban space marked a boundary for the city’s development. The donor marked his own status through multiple inscriptions and through donations to several different deities; commemoration of his donation by his fellow citizens, however, nuanced the message of independent agency that he worked to communicate in his own choices for the building.

Located southwest of the city proper (fig. 3), in the suburban region, more than 300 m from the *macellum*, forum, and other public structures in the city, the Sanctuary of

\(^{143}\) Mattingly 1995, 128-131. The grant of *ius Latium maius* was mentioned in the honorific inscription of Servilius Draco: *CIL*, 22737.

\(^{144}\) Constans 1916.

\(^{145}\) Gauckler 1907, 286; Sjöström 1993, 133.
Mercury sat on a low hill and dominated the view from the town.\textsuperscript{146} The Sanctuary was a large colonnaded precinct which enclosed an open courtyard (fig. 4). Visitors to the sanctuary entered through one of two doors, the principal one on the west side of the courtyard and a smaller, less important door on the north side of the temple. Excavations at this subsidiary entryway revealed a 40-cm tall section of the lintel and cornice of the north (side) porch entrance, bearing the benefactor’s name in the first line, in letters 8 cm tall.

1. \[---]r C(aius) Servilius Quir(ina) Maurinus [---]\textsuperscript{147}

... Gaius Servilius Maurinus, of the Quirina tribe ...

No traces of an exterior inscription have been found at the main, west entry. The courtyard was surrounded on three sides (north, west, and south) by a roofed portico whose Ionic columns were made of yellow limestone.\textsuperscript{148} The temple building was positioned in the center of the courtyard, oriented east-west; it was a small square building on a podium, with a porch supported by two columns (distyle, prostyle). Ferchiou considered the building an intermediate example between Punic and Roman architectural types.\textsuperscript{149} The \textit{cella} is not well preserved, but it appears to have been built primarily of local materials, including white limestone and grey sandstone.\textsuperscript{150} Gauckler reported that the \textit{cella} employed polychromy in its

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{146} Constans 1916, 104.
\textsuperscript{147} \textit{CIL}, 22697b; Gauckler 1907, 9.
\textsuperscript{148} Tlatli 1971, 70-71; Constans 1916, 105. The site of the Sanctuary was identified in the early twentieth century (Gauckler 1907, 284; Constans 1916, 1); excavations by Gauckler and Sadoux cleared the area of the sanctuary, locating the remains of the cella and two additional small shrines in the precinct. More recently, research by N. Ferchiou (1988) into the architectural decoration of the temple, based on the preserved remains, has revised our understanding of the chronology from the conclusions put forth by Gauckler and Constans in their early reports. Recent excavations under the auspices of INP in Tunisia have not yet been published (A. Drine, pers. comm. 2008), but they will no doubt shed light on the chronology and phasing of the sanctuary as well as its functions.
\textsuperscript{149} Constans 1916, 106-107; Ferchiou 1988, 176.
\textsuperscript{150} Surveys conducted by Slim et al. (2004) along the coastline of the Petite Syrtes indicate that calcareous sandstone was mined in antiquity in the region of Gigthis, at Ersifet (Slim et al. 2004, 102, no. 22) and
\end{footnotesize}
decorative program, with the use of yellow and reddish limestone, and white, pink, and violet marbles. The sandstone blocks of the temple’s construction were stuccoed in white, the better to contrast with the other decorative stones. An inscribed grey marble plaque, discovered close to or inside the cella, bore the names of the donor and divinity. The text was written in three lines, with letters 12 cm tall in the first line, 11 cm tall in the second, and 8.5 cm tall in the third line.

2.  

\[
\]

Consecrated to August Mercury. Caius Servilius Maurinus [set this up] in honor of his perpetual flaminate and that of his wife Valeria Paulina, on the site given by the public.

A second inscription found in the same area may have belonged to the frieze of the temple’s façade; it was found at the door of the cella. The text was inscribed on a fragmentary grey marble plaque, at least 42 cm tall, 3 cm thick, and of unknown length. The text preserves at least 4 lines, written in letters “of a pretty late era” of decreasing size: 9.5 cm in the first two lines, 8 cm in the third, and 7 cm in the last.

3.  

\[
\text{Ol resti ---PLI---VI---IND--- et can del[ab]rum a[r]gen[teu]m [--- antiqua do}
\]

It is unclear where the polychrome marbles originated from; at Meninx, the polychrome marbles come from all over the Mediterranean (Morton 2009). Gigthis’ marbles may, too, have been imported, or they may have been local products from African quarries. Though the quarries of Simittus in Africa Proconsularis (modern Chimtou, Tunisia) were famed for their yellow, veined marble (the ancients called it \textit{marmor Numidicum}; modern scholars refer to it as \textit{giallo antico}), the stone from that site actually comes in a range of colors from white to pink to purple, and from yellow to orange to brown (Röder 1993, 18).

Gauckler 1902b, clxxxix; Ferchiou 1988, 180. Constans (1916, 8, n. 1) notes that the red and yellow limestone are locally available in the region of Gigthis—but he does not mention where they are found.

Benzina Ben Abdallah 1986, no. 4; \textit{CIL}, 22695; Constans 1915, no. 25; Gauckler 1907, 293, no. 5.

Gauckler 1907, 293 no. 6: “en lettres d’assez basse époque.”
... and the silver candelabrum ... antique gifts and the golden statue ... s/he dedicated all these things.

Behind the temple, the eastern end of the courtyard was occupied by a series of small rooms, some communicating only with the sanctuary precinct and some communicating only with the area outside the sanctuary. The rooms on either end of this range of rooms, on the north side and the south side, contained epigraphic and iconographic evidence to indicate that they were used as subsidiary chapels in the sanctuary. On the north side, the shrine was dedicated to Minerva, with an inscribed lintel in yellow limestone. The text was written in letters 5 cm tall in the first line and 4.5 cm in the second.

4. [Deae] Minerva[e] C(aius) Servilius
   [Maurinus flamen perp(etuus) v(otum) s(olvit)].

   To the goddess Minerva. Gaius Servilius Maurinus, perpetual flamen, completed his vow.

In the south side chapel, the tutelary deity remains unclear, though Constans suggests a female goddess, perhaps Fortuna. In addition, the northern wall of the south chapel included a built-in aedicule dedicated to Mercury, decorated with an inscribed monolithic pediment. The text was written in letters 4-4.5 cm tall.

5. Mercurio [s(acrum)]
   C(aius) Servilius Maurinus fl(amen) p(er)p(etuus).

   Consecrated to August Mercury. Gaius Servilius Maurinus, perpetual flamen, [set this up.]

Near the aedicule a sculpted head of the god Mercury, modeled in stucco, was discovered (fig. 5).

---

155 CIL, 22701; Gauckler 1907, 293, no. 6; Benzina Ben Abdallah 1986, no. 6.
156 Constans 1915, 109-110.
157 CIL, 22697; Gauckler 1907, 10; Constans 1915, no. 28.
158 CIL, 22696; Constans 1915, no. 28; Constans 1915, no. 30; Gauckler 1907, 294, no. 7.
The traditional date of the building relies heavily on indirect evidence from the inscriptions. Though the texts lack closely-datable imperial titulature or the name of a Roman official, Gauckler and Constans suggested that the sanctuary complex was constructed in the late second or early third century, at the latest under Caracalla.\(^{160}\)

Ferchiou, however, has proposed an earlier date for the sanctuary’s construction, perhaps mid-first century C.E., during the reign of Nero.\(^{161}\) She based this early date on prosopographic grounds as well as on detailed examination of the surviving architectural elements of the temple and the colonnade.\(^{162}\) The most fragmentary inscription (no. 3) appears to relate to a restoration or renovation of the sanctuary, with its mention of antique gifts, *antiqua dona*. Since that text does not preserve a donor’s name, it is not clear, however, whether inscription no. 3 referred to a restoration by Servilius Maurinus of an earlier Punic structure, or whether the text refers to a later restoration by an unknown donor of Maurinus’ first-century temple.\(^{163}\)

The text of the main dedicatory inscription, no. 2, which includes the phrase “... Maurinus pro flamo[nio] p(erpeto) suo …, Marinus [set this up] in honor of his perpetual flaminate,” offers an additional complication in regards to the temple’s date. If the text is correctly restored, it is a rare example of a first-century text to use the phrase “[...pro flamo[nio]

\(^{159}\) Constans 1916, 107-108; Gauckler et al. 1910, 71 no. 1163 and pl. xliii, 1.

\(^{160}\) Gauckler 1907, 288; Gauckler 1902b, clxxix; Constans (1915, 333-334, no. 25), justifies the date by noting that only one of the inscriptions includes the tribal affiliation of the benefactor, which he claims proves that the temple was built in the early third century, since it was under that emperor that the use of tribal affiliations in inscriptions seems to have ceased. It seems equally likely, however, that in the shorter inscriptions placed elsewhere in the Sanctuary complex, the tribal designation was dropped from the benefactor’s name in favor of including more important information; this also seems likely to be the reason that his first cognomen (Plautus) is found only on the main temple inscription and not on the subsidiary inscriptions.

\(^{161}\) Ferchiou 1988, 181-182.

\(^{162}\) Ferchiou 1988, 179; Constans and Gauckler placed the benefactor, Maurinus, in the Severan period, but Ferchiou placed him in the mid-first century, because his father M. Servilius Plautus has similar name to M. Servilius Nonianus who was consul in 38 and proconsul of Africa in 43 and 59; Constans based his third-century date for Maurinus on the presence of Q. Servilius Pudens as governor of Africa in the late second century.

\(^{163}\) Ferchiou 1988, 179.
though not a completely unique case.\textsuperscript{164} The balance of the evidence suggests strongly that the temple was constructed or extensively renovated in the first century C.E., at the expense of a generous local euergetes, Gaius Servilius Plautus Maurinus.

We know of Servilius Maurinus only from this Sanctuary, but he belongs to an important family of Gigthenses. Other Servilii were commemorated in the forum at Gigthis with honorific statues, erected in some cases by the public, and in other instances at private expense.\textsuperscript{165} The women and men so honored included a local patron, a decurion (member of the town council),\textsuperscript{166} and an ambassador to the emperor Antoninus Pius in the second century, who sought and received for Gigthis the right of \textit{Latium maius}, a legal status that granted Roman citizenship to the town’s civic office-holders.\textsuperscript{167} Constans and Gauckler dated these statue bases in the forum to the second or early third century.\textsuperscript{168} Perhaps G. Servilius Plautus Maurinus and his wife, Valeria Paulina, were the progenitors of a long line of civic-minded Servilii.

We can determine the motivation behind Maurinus’ generous benefaction to the city of Gigthis; he lists it in the temple’s primary inscription, no. 2: “... \textit{pro flamonio perpetuo suo et Valeriae Paulinae uxor}.” As Duncan-Jones has noted, the flaminate, priesthood of the imperial cult, was one of several civic priesthoods for which office-holders were expected to pay “\textit{summa honoraria},” set amounts of money specified by the civic authorities for certain offices.\textsuperscript{169} The flaminate was among the most prestigious of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{164} Saastamoinen 2010, 334-335.
\item \textsuperscript{165} Public: \textit{CIL}, 22737 and Gauckler 1907, no. 48; private: \textit{CIL}, 22741 and \textit{CIL}, 11033.
\item \textsuperscript{166} \textit{OCD}, s.v. “decuriones.”
\item \textsuperscript{167} Sherwin-White 1973, 255 and 414, with special reference to Servilius Draco’s embassy from Gigthis to Rome.
\item \textsuperscript{168} Gauckler 1907, 320, no. 49; Servilius Draco’s embassy is believed to have taken place in the reign of the emperor Antoninus Pius (Sherwin-White 1973, 255). See also Constans 1916, 16; Gauckler 1907, 318, no. 47.
\item \textsuperscript{169} Duncan-Jones 1982, 82.
\end{itemize}
civic priesthoods and as such it is likely that its *summa honoraria* was comparatively high.\(^{170}\) Maurinus’ primary inscription does not clarify whether his benefaction was the result of a *summa honoraria* or whether it was a voluntary donation instead of, or in addition to, such a *summa*.\(^{171}\) In a secondary inscription, no. 4, he mentioned that the small chapel’s dedication to Minerva was the fulfillment of a vow, suggesting that the building was constructed for personal reasons; in the same text, however, he identified himself as the *flamen perpetuus*, highlighting his social and political identity at the same time. Maurinus sought to commemorate both his own flaminate and that of his wife, Valeria Paulina, with his gift (inscription no. 2); the amount spent to build the Sanctuary to Mercury was probably substantial. The inscriptions suggest that Valeria Paulina did not contribute to the construction costs: her name appears only once in the building inscriptions, and then not as the subject of the text. The building inscriptions clearly assigned responsibility for the Sanctuary’s siting and form to her husband, the benefactor, and to the people of Gigthis who provided the land.

The texts of the subsidiary north entrance (no. 1), of the small chapels and the aedicule (nos. 4 and 5), and the main dedicatory inscription of the temple (no. 2) all proclaimed the donor’s social identity and his important role in constructing the sanctuary. Visitors first saw the donor’s name over the door as they entered;\(^{172}\) next, the lintel frieze of the temple (no. 3) and the dedicatory inscription of the temple (no. 2) would have been almost immediately visible to visitors, since the *cella* and the main (west) entry door are on the same axis. The dedicatory text of the *cella* celebrated the

---

\(^{170}\) Duncan-Jones 1990, 177. The evidence for relative expense of offices comes from a series of roughly contemporary inscriptions at Thubursicum Numidarum in the third c: 4,000 sesterces for *duovires*, decuriones, and perhaps also aediles, and 6,000 sesterces for *flamines*.

\(^{171}\) Duncan-Jones 1982, 65. Dated inscriptions including a specific price generally did not appear until the reign of Trajan, or later.

\(^{172}\) No evidence of an inscription over the main door has been recovered, but the presence of an inscribed text over the north door (inscription no. 1) suggests that a similar text might have been placed on the lintel of the primary entryway on the building’s west side.
god, Mercury, in the large letters, while the benefactor, Maurinus, and his ceremonial position were writ nearly as large; the specific nature of his position, and the fact that the donation was also in honor of his wife’s election to a comparable post, are relegated to the third line, in smaller letters. The size differential and layout of the text served to emphasize the role of the primary benefactor, Servilius Maurinus, placing his name in a prominent position at the beginning of a line, while burying the identity and role of his wife in the midst of smaller and more crowded text.

The citizens of Gigthis recognized Servilius Maurinus’ generosity, as additional epigraphic evidence demonstrates. Excavations revealed two similarly-sized statue bases, decorated with the same simple molding and written in the same lettering style. The base of Maurinus’ statue (no. 6) was found between the steps of the temple and the main altar, according to Gauckler and Constans; the preserved section is 58 cm tall and 42 cm wide. The letters of the text are 3.5 cm tall.

6. C(aio) Servilio Quir(ina) Maur[i]
noflamini perpetuo
M(arci) Servili Plauti flam(inis) per
petui filio senatus populus[que]
Gigthensium ob merit[a et]
munificentiam stat[uas duas?]
ipsi et Paulinae uxo[ri eius]
viritim aere col[lato --- po]
nendas censue[runt ---]
tani E F
Probi [---]
posu[it(?)]

To Gaius Servilius Plautus Maurinus, a member of the Quirina tribe, perpetual flam(en), son of Marcus Servilius Plautus, perpetual flam(en). The

174 Gauckler 1907, pl. 3, no. 50 (plan of the temple, on which the inscription’s findspot is marked north of the altar); Constans 1915, 334, no. 26.
175 CIL, 22739; Gauckler 1907, 321 no. 50; Constans 1915, no. 26. Constans (1915, 334, no. 26) reports that it was found in the esplanade of the temple precinct between the altar and the steps of the temple; he suggests that possibly it was set up in the west portico of the temple, flanking the main door (Constans 1916, 109). Gauckler’s plan (1907, pl. 3) indicates its findspot just north of the altar in the central courtyard.
senate and the people of Gigthis decided to set up these statues of himself and his wife Valeria Paulina, on account of his merits and his generosity, with money collected from each man …

A similar base bearing a fragmentary inscription (no. 7) that appears to refer to Valeria Paulina, the donor’s wife, was found in the western portico of the sanctuary precinct, near the main doorway, and may have been found in situ.\textsuperscript{176} Constans proposed that it was placed opposite the statue of Maurinus, with the two flanking either side of the entry door to the sanctuary’s portico.\textsuperscript{177} Like the statue base for Maurinus, the text is written in many short lines, in letters 4.5 cm tall.

\begin{verbatim}
7. op]timi munifi[centia]
    [marit C(ai) Servili M[auri
    [nus] flam(inis) perp(etui) p(ecuni) p(ublica) [p(osuit.)]
\end{verbatim}

...[To Valeria Paulina on account of the] generosities of her excellent husband, Gaius Servilius Maurinus, perpetual flamen, [the people of Gigthis] set it up with public money.

These are the only two municipal statue bases that have been found at the Temple of Mercury, and their uniqueness would have singled them out among the other divine representations in the sanctuary. These two life-sized (?) statues on half-meter-tall bases\textsuperscript{179} would have brought attention to the donor and his wife, reinforcing with their presence and words (for those visitors who could read them) the generosity of the temple’s benefactor, and his important role in its construction. The text of Valeria Paulina’s statue base (inscription no. 7) provides additional confirmation that she did not play an active role in the building’s construction, since the inscription specifically states that the statue was erected to honor her husband’s generosities (“\textit{op}timi

\textsuperscript{176} The plan in Gauckler, 1907, pl. 3, no. 51 indicates its findspot to the north of the main door.
\textsuperscript{177} Constans 1915, 336, no. 27.
\textsuperscript{178} \textit{CIL}, 22740; Constans 1915, 336, no. 27; Gauckler 1907, 322, no. 51. Constans (1915, 336, no. 27) supposes it was placed symmetrically with that of Maurinus on either side of the west entry door to the sanctuary’s portico.
\textsuperscript{179} Maurinus’ statue base is at least 58 cm tall; Valeria Paulina’s base is broken at the top, so its full height is not known, but the letter sizes are similar and presumably the bases were also similarly sized (Gauckler 1907, 320, no. 50).
munific[centia] [m]ariti C(ai) Servili M[auri]ni flam(inis) perp(etui)”). The presence of her statue in parallel with that of her husband, however, may have offered a slightly different view of the situation to visitors who could not or did not read the inscriptions. A matched pair of statues and statue bases, and the absence of other municipal statues in the area, may have communicated to those viewers that husband and wife shared equally in their contributions to the sanctuary’s establishment. The non-verbal elements of the building’s decoration thus nuanced the message that the texts communicated to viewers.

The Sanctuary of Mercury was one of the most visible buildings at Gigthis, and probably dominated the skyline of the city after its construction in the first century C.E. Situated on a rise well above the rest of the city, its presence advertised the generosity of the patron, Maurinus, and visibly glorified his election to the flaminate. The temple’s main façade, however, faced away from the city, toward the high road between Tacapa and Carthage (to the west and north) and Zitha and Lepcis Magna (to the east). Fentress has argued that this orientation away from the city center, as well as the temple’s location far southwest of most of the (excavated) public monuments and temples of Gigthis, was related to the building’s function: the temple probably served as the location of nundinae, periodic markets, and housed customs agents, who presumably operated out of the rooms behind the cella which do not communicate with

180 Even if the Sanctuary is actually Punic in origin, and Maurinus’ role at the Sanctuary was more in the nature of a reconstruction, this argument still holds. Punic sanctuaries were often precincts open to the sky (Pensabene 1989, 271-290), so the addition of an enclosed cella in the center would have significantly changed the character of the space. Placing his name and image, and that of the Roman gods he (re)dedicated the Sanctuary to, heightened Maurinus’ and Valeria Paulina’s visibility as donors and patrons and emphasized the importance of their role as Roman religious figures.

181 At 18 m above sea level, the temple was positioned on the highest promontory in the city, looming over the main street that leads toward the forum and the harbor (fig. 3).

182 Constans 1916, 20.
the rest of the precinct.\textsuperscript{183}

With its position and orientation, the temple advertised its patron’s generosity most strongly to those who approached it from the road, especially travelers and traders who made this their first stop in Gigthis. To rural people who visited the temple during these periodic markets, the size and decoration of the Sanctuary may have emphasized the niceties of urban living—moving among buildings that were decorated with expensive stones and sculptures of wealthy people.\textsuperscript{184} We can only guess at their reaction upon seeing such a grandiose building, but Maurinus’ intent was probably to aggrandize his position and that of the town, advertising the richness of the town to incoming travelers. Perhaps Maurinus also hoped to further his reputation and his civic or religious career by advertising himself to visiting provincial officials and influential visitors to the town.

\textbf{b. The Shrine of Concordia Panthea}

Around a century later, another prominent citizen of Gigthis donated another temple to the city. Unlike Servilius Maurinus’ Sanctuary of Mercury built southwest of the urban area, the Shrine of Concordia Panthea was a tiny structure nestled in a portico of the forum in the center of the city. Despite these differences, however, the two structures resembled one another in meaningful ways: both donors sought to emphasize their own political identities with their donations, and to connect their town to something larger. Servilius Maurinus’ Sanctuary of Mercury connected Gigthis with the economic activities of Tripolitania, serving as the location of periodic markets and as a customs post for traders traveling between Tacapae and Lepcis Magna. The Shrine of

\textsuperscript{183} Fentress 2007; Constans 1916, 109-110.
\textsuperscript{184} Fentress 2007, 132-135. She notes that the road which the Temple of Mercury faces was an important caravan route in antiquity.
Concordia Panthea, on the other hand, connected Gigthis with political activity of the empire and with the sanction of the goddess herself.

Located in the forum (fig. 3), the shrine was a small building that from the northern portico, just east of the northern entryway into the forum (figs. 6-7). A narrow pronaos opened off the portico. In the eastern section of the pronaos, a one m tall stele in grey limestone came to light before the forum’s systematic excavation. The text reads:

8. Aemilia[e Dona]
te ob m[eri]
ta ord[o sta]
tuam [---]D[---]
VI[---]M
[---]OV
[...]

To Aemilia Donata, on account of her meritorious actions the town [set up, or decreed] a statue ...

A central door led from the porch into a small, raised cella. At the door footing between the pronaos and the cella, fragments of a white marble plaque were found, which probably fell from the frieze above the entrance to the cella. Decorated with ivy leaves interspersed somewhat haphazardly between the words, the letters range from 9.5 cm tall in the first line to 4.5 cm tall in the remaining lines. The text can be reconstructed thus:

9. Concor[diae] Pantheae Aug(ustae) s[acrum]
M(arcus) Umm[i]d[iu]s Quir(ina) Sedatus a[e]dem qu[a]m
[pro [decu]rio[na]tu C(ai) U[m]mid[i] Q[uir(ina)] Sed[at]i fili(i)
su[i ex] VI m[ilibus] n(ummum) [pro]m[ils][er]lat inla[t]is r[ei publicae] le
[g(itimi)s [- m[ilibus]] n(ummum) [pro] de[c]urio[na]tu a[diectis ae]

185 Constans 1916, 50; Gauckler 1907, plate 1.
186 It was published, without comment as to its findspot, by Reinach and Babelon (1886), and twenty-one years later appeared marked on the plan of Gauckler (1907, pl. 1) in the pronaos of the shrine, again without comment.
187 CIL, 11036; Reinach and Babelon 1886, 51, no. 12, for text; Gauckler 1907, pl. 1, for findspot.
Consecrated to Concordia Panthea Augusta. Marcus Ummidius Sedatus of the Quirina tribe had promised a temple in honor of the decurionate of his son, Caius Ummidius Sedatus of the Quirina tribe, for the sum of 6000 sesterces. With the fees having been paid to the state, and with (additional thousands) having been added on the occasion of the decurionate, he built the shrine, with the statue of Concordia, from the ground up, and he built the porch and the arch, out of 21000 sesterces, and also dedicated it.

The cella’s well-preserved floor was decorated in a regular pattern with polychrome limestone and sandstone in yellow and red. Gauckler’s plan of the forum indicates that this shrine had a small apse at the back, flanked by a single column on either side, perhaps the arcum of the dedicatory inscription. In this apse, the excavators noted the discovery of a large aedicule and a large white marble statue of a draped female figure. The aedicule is architectural, with two spiral-fluted columns of limestone, topped with white marble composite capitals, supporting an inscribed frieze, a band decorated with a leaf-and-dart motif, and a triangular tympanum decorated with a single rosette. The inscription on the frieze, written in letters 8 cm tall, reads as follows:

10. Concordiae in Pa[ntheo sacrum]…

Consecrated to Concordia Panthea …

Gauckler reported that the statue was found in situ, surrounded by the pieces of the aedicule that originally framed it (fig. 8a). The statue itself, more than two m tall, is

---

188 CIL, 22693; Gauckler 1907, 290 no. 2 and pl. 1; Benzina Ben Abdallah 1986, no. 3.
189 Constans 1916, 48.
190 Gauckler 1907, 1.
191 Gauckler 1902b, cxxvi; Gauckler 1903, 462-463.
192 Gauckler 1907, 290, no. 1. Ferchiou (1989, 21) cited this small pediment as a parallel for one at Thuburbo Maius that dates, probably, to the mid-second century
193 CIL, 22692; Gauckler 1907, 290, no. 1; Benzina Ben Abdallah 1986, no. 2. Benzina Ben Abdallah (1986, 4, no. 2), indicates that “Concordia in Pantheo” should be taken as synonymous with the “Concordia Panthea” of the shrine’s dedicatory inscription.
194 Gauckler 1902a, 402.
made of fine-grained white marble (fig. 8b). It depicts a draped female figure, crowned and veiled, holding a cornucopia in her left hand; her right hand is lost. She stands frontal, with her weight on one leg. Her hair forms a halo around her head in heavy curling locks. Though sculpture from North African contexts has not been intensively studied, evidence from the neighboring region of Byzacena suggests that abstract deities (such as Concordia) may have been most commonly represented in sculpture in the second and early third centuries.

The epigraphic evidence does not provide a firm date for the construction of this small shrine. Clues in the prosopographic record and the archaeological remains of the building’s fixtures, however, suggest that it belongs to the second century; Constans proposed a dedication date during the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161-180). Syme outlined the prosopographic argument:

Whatever the [legal] status of Gigthis, it is reasonable to assume that these Ummidii [of Gigthis] got civitas and name from a proconsul. Hence support for a conjecture: C. Ummidius Quadratus (suff. 118) held the post [of proconsul of Africa] in 133/4. Syme’s conjecture suggests that the year 133/4, when C. Ummidius Quadratus held the proconsulship of Africa and gave his name to the Ummidii of Gigthis, is a terminus post quem for the establishment of the shrine, since before their elevation to Roman citizenship the Ummidii would, presumably, have gone by another (African) name.

---

195 Gauckler reported her height as 2.40 m (1902b, cxxvi), while Constans (1916, 49) listed it as 2.25 m; L. Poinssot (in Gauckler et al. 1910, 58, no. 1030) stated that she is 2.5 m tall. This discrepancy does not obscure the fact that the statue is monumental in scale.

196 Her hairstyle seems to be intermediate between Sabina and Faustina the Younger’s parted, wavy hairstyles and the heavily drilled locks of Julia Domna. (Sabina, veiled: Kleiner 1992, 242 fig. 206 [Terme Museum, Rome]; Faustina the Younger: Kleiner 1992, 280 fig. 247 [Museo Capitolio, Rome]; Julia Domna, as Ceres: Kleiner 1992, 328 fig. 291 [Ostia, dated ca. 203 C.E.]).

197 De Chaisemartin 1987, 153-154. I am grateful to Dr. Lea Stirling for her assistance with questions about the sculpture.

198 Tlatli 1971, 68.

199 Syme 1968, 92.

We know of at least three generations of Ummidii at Gigthis, presumably active mostly during the second century C.E.\textsuperscript{201}

The benefactor, Marcus Ummidius Sedatus, is known primarily from his activity related to this building. We do not know of any other building activity by the Ummidii, though he was called “ornator patriae, improver of his fatherland,” in an honorific inscription (no. 11). That phrase was used in Tripolitania as an honorific title for citizens who made large or extensive gifts to their cities.\textsuperscript{202} Its use to describe Ummidius Sedatus, then, suggests that either he made other benefactions at Gigthis (for which no archaeological or epigraphic evidence remains), or that the shrine of Concordia Panthea was lavish enough on its own to win him the honorific title. Ummidius Sedatus’s provision of the entire temple and its fittings, as the main building inscription (no. 9) declared, demonstrated a substantial level of generosity toward the citizens of Gigthis. And the building inscription left no doubt as to the reason for his munificence: he chose to erect the shrine of Concordia Panthea in thanks for the election to the decurionate of his son Caius (“a[e]dem qu[a]m [p]ro [decu]rio[n]a]tu C(ai) U[m]mid[i] Q[uir(ina) Sedat]i fil[i(i)] su[i]… [p]rom[i]s[er]at”). But the total cost of the shrine, preserved in the

\textsuperscript{201} The stemma of this family appears debatable. Syme (1968, 92) proposes that the “inscriptions … at Gigthis … commemorate in various ways the honors and public services of a single prominent family, viz. C. Ummidius Sedatus, his sons C. Ummidius Haterianus, L. Ummidius Pacatus, M. Ummidius Sedatus, his grandson C. Ummidius Sedatus.” Constans (1916, 50), however, proposed a different stemma, where Marcus Ummidius Sedatus was the first generation, Caius Ummidius Sedatus was the second generation, and Lucius Ummidius Pacatus, Caius Ummidius Haterianus, and Marcus Ummidius Sedatus were the third. Both scholars placed Marcus Ummidius Sedatus in the mid-second century, Syme on perhaps slightly more authority than Constans. Other scholars have followed Constans (e.g. Benzina Ben Abdallah 1986, 5, no. 3) and in fact the language of inscription no. 12 seems to require that C. Ummidius Sedatus was the middle generation between two men named Marcus, his father and his son. I therefore follow Constans’ stemma: Marcus Ummidius Sedatus (benefactor) \(\rightarrow\) Caius Ummidius Sedatus (decurion) \(\rightarrow\) Lucius Ummidius Pacatus, Caius Ummidius Haterianus, and Marcus Ummidius Sedatus (donor of statue no. 12).

\textsuperscript{202} TLL, “ornator” (vol. IX, 2). Others known to have received the title “ornator patriae” in Tripolitania include Annobal Rufus of Lepcis Magna, who donated to that city both its macellum and its theater (see ch. III.2. A Theater-Temple Complex at Lepcis Magna, infra p. 75, for Annobal Rufus and the theater of Lepcis Magna).
inscription, was 21,000 sesterces, a very large amount indeed.\textsuperscript{203} This was not an excessively large sum for temples in African provinces, which in the Antonine period had stated costs up to 70,000 sesterces. It is the only priced temple inscription from Gigthis, so it is difficult to determine whether it was more or less costly than other buildings in the town. A comparably-sized building, the Temple of Pietas at Thugga\textsuperscript{204} cost 30,000 HS to construct in the Hadrianic (?) period. Furthermore, the inscription from the Shrine of Concordia Panthea recorded that the initial promise of money to build the shrine was only 6,000 sesterces, less than a third of the eventual outlay. We might imagine that Ummidius Sedatus promised the smaller figure, 6,000 sesterces, as a \textit{summa honoraria} for his son Caius’ office.\textsuperscript{205} His later costs, an additional 15,000 sesterces, were given in order to complete the shrine and outfit it in a splendid fashion.

Ummidius Sedatus may have decided to spend such a large amount of his money on the shrine in part because other citizens and provincial officials were also making similar benefactions to the city. The forum underwent substantial renovations in the second century C.E., including the construction of the large main temple that dominated the forum space from the west side. Other monuments such as a sanctuary of Apollo were dedicated along the northern side of the forum at about the same time.\textsuperscript{206} By contributing to the renovations of the forum and dedicating a shrine himself, Ummidius Sedatus placed himself and his family among their political superiors,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{203} Based on price lists in Duncan-Jones 1982, 90-91.
\item \textsuperscript{204} See ch. VI.2.b. The Temple of Augustan Pietas, infra p. 186.
\item \textsuperscript{205} Duncan-Jones (1990, 177) notes that in Thubursicum Numidiae (in Numidia) in the third century, \textit{summa honoraria} for decurions averaged about 4000 sesterces.
\item \textsuperscript{206} The sanctuary of Apollo was dedicated by a provincial official, M. Ummidius Annianus Quadratianus, in 162 C.E., according to the inscription’s imperial titulature (\textit{CIL} 22691; Constans 1916, 53). The large temple on the western side, Temple A, the so-called Serapeum (which is more likely a Capitolium), also belongs to the Antonine period according the style of the sculptural fragments associated with the building (Constans 1916, 33). Epigraphic evidence suggests that statue bases to \textit{divi} Nerva and Trajan and to Hadrian as Augustus (Constans 1916, 30-33), and the small temple, C, east of the shrine of Concordia (Constans 1916, 48) date to the Hadrianic period. Ferchiou (1984, 67) pointed out that first-century column bases in the forum’s portico were partially paved over by later renovations.
\end{itemize}
including provincial officials. The connections between the Ummidii of Gigthis and other political actors supported Caius Ummidius Sedatus’ election to the decurionate.

Ummidius Sedatus chose the goddess Concordia as the dedicatee of his shrine in order to further underscore the importance of his son’s new office as decurion. The goddess Concordia had long-standing associations with politics and with the imperial family. Concordia figured in imperial propaganda as a way to emphasize dynastic harmony, and she became particularly prominent under the co-emperors Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus in the mid-second century. In choosing Concordia, Ummidius Sedatus connected his son, the newly-elected decurion, with harmonious political activity. The choice of the goddess expressed Caius’ identity as a wise political councillor whose decisions received divine sanction.

The citizens of Gigthis celebrated Ummidius Sedatus’s generosity with an honorary inscription and statue, probably erected in the forum near the shrine itself. The inscribed statue base, made of red limestone in the shape of an altar, was found reused as building material about 18 m from the shrine, in the northeast corner of the forum. Standing about one m tall, with letters 2.5-5.5 cm tall, the stone has been associated with the shrine of Concordia based on the name of the honoree.

11. M(arco) Ummidi[o] Quir(ina) Sedat[o] ornator patriae expostulante populo con sensu decurio num ordo sta

---

207 Hölscher (1990, esp. 493-496) has noted the connections between political activity and depictions of the goddess Concordia, which began in the Republican period when the censor G. Cassius Longinus suggested that a statue of the goddess should be erected in the Curia to oversee the deliberations of the Senate (Cic., Dom. 130, 136).

208 Hölscher 1990. At Gigthis Constans (1916, 51) interpreted this shrine as the town’s Curia based in part on the dedication to Concordia.

209 CIL, 11042; according to the plan in Gauckler 1907, pl. 1, marking the findspots of inscriptions.

210 Gauckler 1907, 322, no. 51.
To Marcus Ummidius Sedatus, of the Quirina tribe, the improver of his fatherland, after the people requested it and the decurions gave their consent, the town ordered a statue at public expense; contented by that honor, Marcus Ummidius Sedatus set it up and dedicated it at his own expense.

The text records a further act of generosity on the part of the benefactor: he paid for his own statue. The formulaic language of the inscription claims that he was “content with the honor” of the statue and did not make the town pay for the commemoration of his building activity. Since the inscription was found reused in a later structure, it is unclear where it was originally set up. On analogy with the honorific statues of the Temple of Mercury at Gigthis, we might expect his statue to have been erected near or inside the building he donated. The findspots of other, related honorific inscriptions (see below, no. 12) suggest that we could restore the donor’s statue on the eastern side of the shrine’s doorway, where Gauckler’s plan indicated an empty plinth. The presence of another honorific inscription in the pronaos, the statue base of Aemilia Donata (no. 8), offers another possibility: perhaps, like the statue bases of Servilius Maurinus and Valeria Paulina, the statues of a man and a woman (his wife, the mother of the decurion Caius?) were set up on opposite sides of the doorway inside the pronaos. The materials of the inscribed bases would tend to refute this possibility, though. The statue bases in the Temple of Mercury were nearly identical in material, decoration, and letter forms. The bases supporting the statues of

---

211 *CIL*, 22743; Constans 1915, 27; Gauckler 1907, 322, no. 52.
212 *TLL* (”honor,” VI.3, 2927 l. 80ff) records many instances of the phrase “honore contentus.” These occur frequently in the *CIL* and Pliny the Younger, himself a benefactor, also used the phrase in his letters.
213 A similar pattern is evident in the erection of honorific statues at both religious and secular buildings at Thugga; see, e.g., ch. VI.2. The *Templa* of Concordia, Frugifer, Liber Pater, and Neptune, infra p. 190.
214 Gauckler 1907, pl. 1.
Aemilia Donata (no. 8) and Marcus Ummidius Sedatus (no. 11) do not resemble one another, with one made of grey and the other of red limestone. They were probably not placed in the pronaos of the shrine as part of the same decorative program, as were the statues of Servilius Maurinus and Valeria Paulina.

Perhaps the most likely original location for the statue of Ummidius Sedatus was in the open space of the forum. Constans and Gauckler both noted the presence of statue bases in front of most of the columns of the porticoes on all three sides of the forum, and Constans mentioned that these bases were, without exception, made of red limestone.\textsuperscript{215} Since the statue was not found in its original context we cannot be certain, but we can perhaps imagine that the benefactor’s statue was erected in the forum proper, alongside the statues of other local notables, in prominent view of citizens who crossed the open space of the forum. This location echoed Ummidius Sedatus’ own efforts to place himself among the highest echelons of the families of Gigthis through his generous donation of the shrine.

Another publicly-decreed honorific statue base was found on the western side of the entryway into the shrine from the portico.\textsuperscript{216} The 1-m tall statue base commemorated the benefactor’s son, Caius Ummidius Sedatus, with a text written in letters 6 cm high; the last two lines were carved in smaller letters, 3 cm tall.\textsuperscript{217}

\begin{verbatim}
12. C(aio) Ummidio
Quir(ina) M(arci) f(ilio)
Sedato
cum ordo
statuam
decrevisset
M(arcus) Ummid[ius]
Sedatus p[atri]
honore cont[entus]
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{215} Constans 1916, 25-26 and pl. 2; Gauckler 1907, pl. 1.
\textsuperscript{216} Gauckler 1907, pl. 1
\textsuperscript{217} Letter heights reported in \textit{CIL}, 11042.
sua pecunia [posuit].

To Caius Ummidius Sedatus, of the Quirina tribe, son of Marcus; when the town had ordered a statue, Marcus Ummidius Sedatus [his son], contented by the honor to his father, set it up with his own money.

A final statue base, erected in honor of the same man, the benefactor’s son Caius, was found in a reused position outside the northeast corner of the forum portico, in the courtyard of the adjacent Temple B. That statue base was larger than the other: 1.2 m tall, written in letters 5 cm tall except for the first line, 7 cm tall:

13. C(aio) Ummidio
   Quiri(na)
   Sedato
   C(aius) Ummidius
   Haterianus
   L(ucius) Ummidius
   Pacatus
   M(arcus) Ummidius
   Sedatus
   patri
   indulgen
tissimo
   s(ua) p(ecunia) p(osuerunt).

To Caius Ummidius Sedatus, of the Quirina tribe. Caius Ummidius Haterianus, Lucius Ummidius Pacatus, and Marcus Ummidius Sedatus set this statue up, at their own expense, to a most gracious father.

The findspot of Caius’ publicly-decreed statue, no. 12, just outside the door to the shrine, in the portico of the forum, recalls the placement of the statue of Valeria Paulina in the Temple of Mercury at Gigthis. Their analogous positions suggest that Caius’ statue base may have been found in situ, where the statue’s donor, his son Marcus, and the town council (who voted the statue) placed it. Like Valeria Paulina’s statue, the presence of a life-sized statue at the entryway to the shrine of Concordia Panthea

---

218 CIL, 11042.
219 Gauckler 1907, pl. 1.
220 Base size and letter heights according to CIL, 11043.
221 CIL, 11043; location according to Gauckler 1907, pl. 1.
emphasized Caius’ connection with the building, even though the building’s dedicatory text (no. 9) made clear that his father Marcus was in fact the donor. Placing his publicly-decreed statue in front of the shrine built on the occasion of his assuming public office emphasized the connections between his public service to the city of Gigthis, his father’s position among the town’s elite, and his honor of a public statue.

The other statue base (no. 13), erected in honor of Caius by his three sons, Marcus, Lucius, and Caius, spoke to different, but related, virtues. Found in a reused context, and associated with other public statues that were erected with private funds, this statue appears to have been placed originally in a gallery of honor, either in the courtyard of Temple B or in the northeast corner of the forum’s portico. The inscription’s language and position emphasized Caius’ private virtues, instead of his public role: whereas no. 12, found in front of the shrine itself, connected Caius with the political activity of Concordia and of the decurionate, the text of the second statue, no. 13, focused on his familial values, calling him “patri indulgentissimo, a most gracious father.” The other statue bases that derived from the gallery of honor shared the same superlative, intimate language; this secondary gallery of (deceased?) members of prominent families from Gigthis echoed the more visible gallery of emperors and magistrates in the open area of the forum.

Caius’ second statue base (no. 13) communicated a consistent message to perceptive viewers, since Concordia was associated not only with political decision-making, but also with dynastic stability. The visible presence of three generations of Ummidii in the forum, in words and images, reinforced their position among the elite

---

222 Cf. the similar gallery of honor at Termessos (van Nijf 2000).
224 Hölscher 1990.
and the politically-connected of Gigthis and underscored the divine sanction of Concordia, the goddess they honored with their temple.

The last honorific statue base found in the temple, the inscription to Aemelia Donata (no. 8), is problematic: its extant text is not in doubt, but its presence in the shrine of Concordia Panthea raises questions that, unfortunately, our current state of knowledge cannot answer. The inscription itself, too, is frustratingly incomplete. For what merits (ob merita) did Aemelia Donata receive her statue? Was she related to the Ummidii who built this shrine? Her statue appears not to have been associated with other statues of the Ummidii by its material, decoration, or lettering style, so if she were a member of the family it would seem that her commemorative statue was not planned and executed at the same time as the others of the family. If we accept that Aemilia Donata married into the Ummidii and became the mother of Caius, she was far more visible in the iconographic program of the shrine’s decoration than in the epigraphic program, since she was never mentioned in the inscriptions of the shrine of Concordia Panthea at all (like Valeria Paulina’s presence in the Temple of Mercury, but to an even greater degree). Her statue, not far from the main building frieze, stood in mute but eloquent testimony to her role in providing the town of Gigthis with its newest decurion.

Or perhaps Aemilia Donata was a citizen of Gigthis from a later period, honored with a public statue “ob merita, on account of her worthiness” for service to the town. Although we lack good data for this suggestion, too, this solution is, perhaps, simpler

---

225 The initial publication of the text contained no information about the statue’s context (Reinach and Babelon 1886), and Gauckler merely noted, without comment, its findspot on his plan of the forum (Gauckler 1907, pl. 1). The archaeological record can offer no more information: no publication mentioned the discovery of this statue base and it is unclear whether it was found in situ or reused in some fashion.

226 I know of no published photograph of this inscription, so it is impossible to date the statue base based on paleographic evidence. Since the archaeological literature is entirely silent on the discovery of this
than the first. In this second scenario we can imagine Aemilia Donata as a third- or even fourth-century citizen of Gigthis, honored for some service to the town with a public statue. We can go further and speculate that her statue was set up in the shrine of Concordia because her service related to that goddess in some way: she renovated or repaired the shrine, perhaps; or maybe her *merita* included some informal diplomacy on behalf of or among Gigthis’ magistrates and town councillors, and she was honored in Concordia’s sanctuary because she, too, represented the harmonious political decision-making of Concordia and had received divine sanction.

If this second scenario is true, then when Aemilia Donata’s statue was erected, it changed the relationship between the shrine and the town. When the shrine was first built and Ummidius Sedatus and Caius received their publicly-decreed statues (nos. 11 and 12), the shrine was closely connected with a single family—the Ummidii of Gigthis. Their name appeared in several places in the immediate vicinity of the building, including above the doorway from the pronaos into the *cella*, and in front of the door leading from the forum portico into the shrine’s pronaos on Caius’ statue base. Ummidius Sedatus’s name appeared on his own statue base which was probably erected in the open area of the forum near the shrine. Perhaps the name Ummidius appeared again in the *cella* of the shrine, on the aedicule that housed the statue of Concordia herself (the second half of the aedicule’s inscription [no. 10] is lost, but the benefactor’s name could have appeared there, like it does on the aedicule inscription in the Temple of Mercury [no. 5]). With the later addition of a publicly-decreed statue to Aemelia Donata, the town changed the emphasis of the shrine’s decorative program:

---

*base, we cannot make any definite determination of the statue’s date based on stratigraphic or associative evidence, either.*
instead of glorifying the Ummidii, it highlighted the importance of the goddess Concordia to all citizens of Gigthis, not just a single family.

3. An Extramural Sanctuary at Ammaedara (Tunisia)

Located near the border between Africa Proconsularis and Numidia (modern Tunisia and Algeria), Ammaedara was established as a camp for the *legio III Augusta* in the early years of the first century C.E. The city sat at an intersection of several major roads, connecting it to Theveste, Lambaesis, and Cirta in Numidia and Carthage and Hadrumentum in Africa Proconsularis. Located in an area controlled by the Musulames, a native tribe, Ammaedara was a city created *ex novo* and its urban plan reflects its origins as a military settlement (fig. 9). Though the legion moved from the city in 75-76 C.E., Ammaedara’s growth continued with its promotion to the status of *colonia*; early excavations at the site revealed numerous public buildings including a forum with temples, a *macellum*, a judicial basilica (probably), baths, and a theater.\(^{227}\) In later periods Ammaedara continued to thrive; more recent scientific excavations have revealed evidence of an active community with several large Christian churches, and the town was fortified during the Byzantine period.\(^{228}\)

\hspace{1em} a. The Temple of Saturn

The Temple of Saturn at Ammaedara contrasts sharply with the two temples from Gigthis. Located more than a kilometer outside the central area of the town, the Temple stands on the eastern side of a low hill well east of the town’s center (figs. 9-10).\(^{229}\) The temple’s rural location underscores the importance of donation in many

\(^{227}\) Benzina Ben Abdallah 1996, 68-82.
\(^{228}\) Duval 1982, 651-661; Benzina Ben Abdallah 1996, 67-68.
\(^{229}\) Baratte et al. 2000, 54, say that the temple is approximately 2 kilometers from the forum; Baratte and Benzina Ben Abdallah 2001, 74, placed it around 1500 m to the east of the city; LeGlay 1961, 323,
different landscapes, not just central urban and suburban contexts. Finds from the site suggest that the sanctuary had been in use long before the period when named donors contributed to it, offering a glimpse of how benefactors responded to pre-existing structures.

The Temple of Saturn is less well-known than some other religious structures at Ammaedara. Little remains today of the building’s architecture, which was exposed in early excavations but never published.\textsuperscript{230} The physical remains of the temple indicate that it was a sanctuary built on three different levels (figs. 10-11). The lowest level, at the east, comprised the entryway into the precinct and a narrow forecourt (fig. 11: A). In the middle level stood a courtyard, partially open to the sky and with, apparently, porticoed corridors on either long side of the sanctuary (fig. 11: B-C). Remains of a monumental built altar (fig. 11: D) stand slightly off-center in the open courtyard, to the south of the sanctuary’s long central axis. Finally, the cellae were located on a podium raised above the courtyard and reached by six central steps (fig. 11: E). Three cellae rested side-by-side, approximately identical in size and all with vaulted roofs. In front of the central cella, a columned tetrastyle porch covered part of the walkway along the front of the podium, from which each cella could be accessed. Under the southern-most cella, a small room served as a favissa (fig. 11: F), or a depository for outdated votive

\textsuperscript{230}The temple was excavated around 1930 by Dr. Dolcemascolo, a medical doctor in a nearby mining town and dilettante archaeologist who undertook much of the early excavation at Ammaedara. The work was nominally supervised by L. Poinsot but no excavation reports nor even brief notices were published (LeGlay 1961, 323). LeGlay’s survey mentioned that a publication of the temple by MM. L. and C. Poinsot was in preparation, but no such publication has ever appeared (Baratte et al. 2000, 54). The architectural remains have since been left open and subject to severe erosion; some of the finds were transported to the Bardo Museum in Tunis, while others were stored in the depot at Ammaedara (modern Haidra) (Baratte et al. 2000, 54.). Recent research by the French-Tunisian mission at Ammaedara has turned some attention to the finds from the Temple of Saturn (e.g., Baratte and Benzina Ben Abdallah, 2001; Baratte et al., 2000). But still the architecture remains unpublished, and no accurate, measured plan of the building or its exact location exists (see plates 9 and 11 for the building’s approximate location and a sketch plan).
objects, many of which were found either in the favissa or in the confines of the sanctuary more generally.\footnote{LeGlay 1961, 323-331. The finds from the favissa include several inscribed quadrangular altars and stelae showing the enthroned god Saturn. The poor state of the publication of this monument, and presumably the poor standards of record-keeping during the doctor’s excavations, preclude more specific comments about the context of the finds. The statuettes that have been published recently have only the general context “from the temple” (Baratte et al. 2000, 57).}

Epigraphic evidence from this temple itself is slight, though a number of votive objects with inscriptions have been found here. Only one inscription relates directly to the building:\footnote{This architectural fragment was found not in the excavations of the temple itself, but in a secondary context, reused in a later construction in a nearby village (LeGlay 1961, 326, no. 6; Piganiol and Laurent-Vibert 1912, 209-211, no. 189). It has been associated with the temple based on the text’s dedication to Saturn.} a text inscribed on a section of temple entablature (50 cm tall; 120 cm long), with letters 6 cm tall in the first line and 3.5 cm tall in the remaining lines.\footnote{Only its size, the letter heights, and the text are published (ILAf 182; Piganiol and Laurent-Vibert 1912, 209-211, no. 189; LeGlay 1961, 326, no. 6); LeGlay (1961, 209) refers to it as a piece of architrave, but there is no information about the type of stone the block is made from, or whether other architectural elements are preserved on the same block.}

14. \textit{Saturno et Opi [sacrum} \\
\textit{pro salute Imp(eratorum) Caesarum L(ucii) Septimi(i) Seve[ri Pii - et] M(arci) Aureli Antonini Aug(usti) Pii [[[et L(ucii) Septimi(i) Getae nob(ilissimi)]]} \\
totius(ue) diviniae domus victoriaq(ue) eorum ... [L. Baebius Secundus] et Iulia Victorina uxor Secundi mater ... \footnote{ILAfr 182; Piganiol and Laurent-Vibert 1912, 209-211, no. 189; LeGlay 1961, 326, no. 6. The 1912 edition of the inscription indicates clearly that the block preserves only half of the text. The words “\textit{Saturno et Opi}” are centered at the top of the block; the missing block could easily have contained a third name as well as the dedicatory word “\textit{sacrum}.”}

Consecrated to Saturn and to Ops [and to ?] … for the well-being of the Emperor Caesar Lucius Septimius Severus Pius … and of the Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Augustus Pius, and of Geta, the most noble Caesar … and of the whole divine household and for their victory. … Lucius Baebius Secundus and his wife, Iulia Victorina, mother of …

Based on the precise, though fragmentary, imperial titulature included in the text, it is possible to date this inscription and this construction activity financed by Baebius Secundus and Iulia Victorina to the period 198-208.\footnote{Kienast 1996, 162-165. Geta did not become Augustus until the year 209, so this inscription falls between the elevation of Caracalla to Augustus in 198 and 208, the final year in which Geta was Caesar.} It is clear, however, that
this inscription referred not to the period of the temple’s initial establishment, but to a later renovation or improvement of the Sanctuary. The tripartite cella behind an open courtyard space was a typically Punic feature; other elements of the space—including the side porticoes, the low podium, and the architectural elaboration of the central cella—borrow characteristics from Roman tripartite temples. The presence of the favissa suggests, also, that this sanctuary was used over a long period of time, since a favissa was typically used to store older votive items. Most of the published finds from the sanctuary, however, date to the Severan period, or more generally to the late second and early third centuries, indicating the frequency with which this sanctuary was visited during that period.

We have comparatively little information about the benefactors of the building. Only the name of the second benefactor, Iulia Victorina, is preserved in the text. The name of the other benefactor, her husband L. Baebius Secundus, has been restored in the Saturn inscription based on another text from Ammaedara that was recently published. In an ex-voto dedication to Hygeia, the names of both husband and wife appeared. The text of the inscription, though fragmentary, hints that the couple made
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236 Pensabene 1989; LeGlay 1966, 275-283. The tripartite cella opening into porticoed courtyard was a feature of numerous Punic and Phoenecian temples, but those earlier examples are less regular and symmetrical in plan than Roman-period ones.
237 LeGlay 1961, 324; Baratte and Duval 1974, 68-69. “Roman” characteristics of the sanctuary included the use of a high podium for the cellae and the strongly axial nature of the sanctuary’s plan.
238 E.g., at the Temple of Saturn at Thugga, where first century material has been found in the favissae of a building that was in use through the third century C.E. (Pensabene 1989, 255; see ch. VII.2.a. The Temple of Saturn, infra p. 263).
239 Baratte et al. 2000, 64-72. Few of the newly-published stelae are dated, but those that are belong to the Severan period or early third century (e.g. Baratte et al. 2000, 68, no. 5, and 72, no. 14).
Consecrated to Hygeia Augusta. For the health and the victories of the Emperor Caesar Lucius Septimius Severus Pius Pertinax Augustus and Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Pius Felix Augustus [and Lucius Septimius Geta, most noble Caesar] and Julia Domna Augusta mother
their dedication jointly: unlike the inscription of the Temple of Mercury at Gigthis, where Caius Servilius Maurinus’ name is the only one in the nominative (and therefore the only person doing the action in the sentence), in this dedication from Ammaedara, the names of both husband and wife are in the nominative, actor case. They both, together, acted to make their dedication.

Another interesting aspect of the inscription of Baebius Secundus and Iulia Victorina is the description of Iulia Victorina not only as wife of Secundus (\textit{uxor Secundi}), but also as mother [of children] (“\textit{mater …”}). The inscription breaks off at that point, so we can only guess the content of the rest of the inscription. The children’s names were probably mentioned (in the genitive case), and we might suppose that the dedication was also made on their behalf. With its stronger emphasis on the activity and existence of multiple members of the family, therefore, this inscription—and probably the purpose of the benefactors in erecting it—displays a distinctly different focus from the dedication of the temple of Mercury at Gigthis. Emphasizing the presence of multiple generations and the participation of Iulia Victorina in making the dedication to Saturn and Ops might have signalled their intention to continue making gifts to the gods (and to the people of Ammaedara) as a familial policy.\footnote{Their joint dedication to Hygeia did not include mention of Iulia Victorina’s role of mother, or the names of the couple’s children. The inscription to Hygeia is dated, like the Saturn and Ops inscription, to 198-208 (Benza Ben Abdallah 1999, 13, no. 7). Perhaps this Hygeia inscription is earlier, referring to a vow undertaken before any children had been born, and the Saturn/Ops dedication was made later. Or perhaps it reflects a different attitude toward the two cults, in which Saturn and Ops became the focus of familial piety and other deities were honored in a less systematic way.}

It is important to note that this inscription, and my interpretation of it, somewhat nuances Nicols’ argument that women in third-century Africa downplayed their roles as wives and mothers in their public inscriptions.\footnote{Nicols 1989.} This inscription used Iulia Victorina’s status as a mother to
emphasize her family’s generosity and to express their intention to continue their program of benefaction into the next generation.

We have little information about how these benefactors, Lucius Baebius Secundus and Iulia Victorina, were celebrated for their generosity. Their names were inscribed on an architectural fragment of the sanctuary’s superstructure (no. 14). But the inscribed text would have been difficult to read when the inscription was in situ, because the letters were quite small (only 3.5 cm tall). Building inscription texts were often written in larger letters (for example, those of the Temple of Mercury were up to 12 cm tall [nos. 1 and 2] and those of the shrine of Concordia Panthea were up to 9.5 cm in their largest lines [nos. 9 and 10]). It is tempting to suppose that the donors’ names or images appeared elsewhere in the sanctuary to underscore their generosity. Perhaps the pair were honored with statues, as were Servilius Maurinus and Valeria Paulina at Gigthis’ Temple of Mercury; several togate statues were found in the temple of Saturn at Ammaedara. Since these have never been published, it is difficult to determine whether they belong to the same phase of the Temple’s use as the donation of Lucius Baebius Secundus and Iulia Victorina. The limestone togati could have been additional dedications to the gods of the temple, but they are more likely to have been commemorative of human worshippers rather than votive gifts to a deity. If these statues did honor benefactors such as Baebius Secundus and Iulia Victorina, their generosity was emphasized inside the sanctuary, but the visibility of their benefaction was limited to the sight of worshippers who visited the Sanctuary.

243 These letter heights are similar to those on the statue bases of the temple of Mercury at Gigthis (nos. 6 and 7).
244 Saastamoinen (2010, 36–37) excluded inscriptions from his survey of building texts if their letter height was less than 11 cm, unless they were carved on identifiable architectural elements.
245 Baratte and Duval 1974, 69.
246 Dedication to the gods of the temple tended to take different forms in Saturn’s cult at Ammaedara: votives included plaques, terracottas, and stone statues of the god in both local and Roman artistic traditions (LeGlay 1961, 324; Baratte et al. 2000; Baratte and Benzina Ben Abdallah 2001).
The Temple of Saturn may have had a long history before Baebius Secundus and Iulia Victorina made their donations. Several lines of evidence suggest this: the dedication of the space to Saturn and Ops (popular deities in Roman Africa, syncretized with Punic Baal and Tanit-Caelestis); the Punic antecedents of the sanctuary’s physical form; and the variety of votive objects found there, in both local style and standard Roman style. Taken together, these factors indicate that the site was in use well before the Severan period when the named donors improved the space in some way. Their work may not, therefore, have been a new construction, but rather a renovation or an improvement to what was already there. Architectural elaboration changed the space, while at the same time continuing to emphasize its connections with long-standing traditions through another dedication to Saturn and Ops.

The Temple of Saturn at Ammaedara was located far east of the center of the ancient city, and across the river from most of the urban space (figs. 9-10). Access to the temple may have been cumbersome for city-dwellers who lived in the urban core, and at times of flood urban citizens of Ammaedara might have found it impossible to reach the Sanctuary. Built into the east side of a hill, and with its entryway apparently facing toward the east, this temple was perhaps largely invisible to those acting out their lives in the center of Ammaedara. The façade and flank of the building may have been visible from a distance to travelers on the main road between Carthage and Theveste, but travelers wishing to visit the temple they had glimpsed from afar would have been obliged to travel nearly to the center of town before they reached a bridge to
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249 The third deity’s name does not appear in the surviving portion of the inscription, but LeGlay noted a statuette of Aesclepius and a statuette of Mars among the finds from the sanctuary (LeGlay 1961, 324; see also LeGlay 1966, 237-239 and 245-246).
250 Baratte et al. 2000, 55.
251 Baratte et al. 2000, 54.
cross to the south bank of the river; there seems to have been no bridge further east to
allow direct access from the high road to the sanctuary of Saturn. Other scholars have
posited that this sanctuary appears to have been primarily rural in its orientation,
intended for the citizens of Ammaedara who did not live in the urban area of the city.

The gift of Lucius Baebius Secundus and Iulia Victorina was, therefore, probably
most visible to the rural visitors to the sanctuary; any architectural donation impacted
the rural landscape of the eastern part of Ammaedara’s territory far more than it
impacted the townscape, where view of this sanctuary was obstructed by the hillside.
The inscription, even if placed at the entrance to the sanctuary and not inside the
precinct, was probably only visible to those who approached it up close; its small-sized
text certainly could not have been read from the high road hundreds of meters away.
The sanctuary’s rural location and the limited visual impact of the donation inscription
may both have limited the visibility of the donors in the urban landscape of
Ammaedara. But their contribution to a long-lived sanctuary site that was frequently
visited by worshippers likely made them prominent among members of that
community.

4. Concluding Thoughts

In this chapter, I have considered the ways in which donors sought to create their
own identities and to connect themselves to some larger cultural element through their
building works. Servilius Maurinus, donor of the temple of Mercury at Gigthis,
emphasized his political identity as flamen and his individual responsibility for the
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252 See fig. 9 for bridges over the Oued Haïdra from the central city to the southern necropoleis and the
temple; though there was a bridge east of the city center, it was still a considerable distance from the
Sanctuary of Saturn.

253 Baratte and Benzina Ben Abdallah 2001, 74; Baratte et al. 2000, 55. Rural should not, however, be read
as a synonym for “unimportant;” the substantial votive deposits from the site testify to its importance
in the life of citizens of Ammaedara.
work of the Temple through repeated inscriptions. His temple’s location at the edge of town and its roles as customs house and rural marketplace connected Gigthis and Maurinus himself to the patterns of economic activity of the province. Ummidius Sedatus, donor of the Shrine of Concordia Panthea, connected himself and his decurion son to the political life of Gigthis and of the empire through their dedication to Concordia and the shrine’s location in the forum, the center of political activity and commemoration. And Baebius Secundus and Iulia Victorina sought to emphasize their connections with the long-established tradition of worship of Saturn and other native deities, reinforcing their identity as true residents of the city of Ammaedara. In each case, the donors made a strong effort to connect consciously with the wider community even as they proclaimed their own identities as individuals or families making particular choices.

In some cases, though, other parties changed the ways that donors expressed their identities through further additions to the space. In both examples from Gigthis, the addition of commemorative statues of the donors nuanced the messages conveyed by the inscriptive and architectural evidence. Servilius Maurinus’ inscriptions make it clear that he was the primary donor of the Temple of Mercury, but the publicly-funded statues of Maurinus and Valeria Paulina brought her to greater prominence in the visual program of the sanctuary. A similar effect occurred at the shrine of Concordia Panthea where Caius Ummidius, the decurion and donor’s son, eventually received two honorific statues, making him more visible than his father, the primary donor. It is unclear whether a similar pattern existed at Ammaedara, since certain evidence of the donors’ commemoration is lacking. It is clear, however, that commemorative statues at the sanctuary of Saturn would have been placed among many other votive objects and

-72-
might not have been prominently featured, just as the donors’ names were not especially prominent in the epigraphic text that recorded their donation.

The three temples considered here had varying impacts on the later development of urban space, and I think this relates to their chronology as well as to their location in physical space. Maurinus’ temple of Mercury, built at an edge of the urban area on a site owned by the town, marked the furthest edge of the built up urban space and delimited Gighis’ territory along the main road. Since it was built at an early date and on a high hill, the temple of Mercury must have become a landmark, along with the main road, that demarcated the urban space. Later activity seems to have focused on the areas further north and east of the Temple of Mercury, which marked the transition between urban space and rural landscape. The later temples in this chapter did not have such a great impact on the future developments in the areas where they were placed. The shrine of Concordia Panthea was placed into a pre-existing area, the forum, and while it was part of renovations that embellished that area of the city, it probably did not drastically reshape either the forum’s physical footprint or how people used the space. Likewise, the Sanctuary of Saturn at Ammaedara was a sacred area of long standing, improved by Severan-period donors but already a presence in the rural landscape. Its isolated location, far separated from Ammaedara’s urban core, may have meant not only that the donors did not need to pay much attention to other buildings in the area as they considered their improvements to the space, but also that benefactors interested in displaying themselves in the urban area might not have considered the messages conveyed by the Temple of Saturn.

Donors of temples were concerned with conveying their political and social identity and with establishing their position in relation to other family members’ identities. Temples were slotted into the landscape wherever they fit, and wherever
their meaning could be accentuated by their local context (Mercury = commerce = on the main road; Concordia = politics = in the forum; Saturn and Ops = the pre-Roman tradition of life = rural space outside the city). But in these cases their impact—and the visibility and messages of the donors who built them—was limited to their immediate surroundings and did not significantly change the character of the areas in which they were built.
CHAPTER THREE:
CIVIC BUILDINGS

1. Introduction

Civic buildings—those with a primarily non-religious function—made up an important part of every ancient city’s public space. Buildings for hygiene and health, entertainment and recreation, and business and commercial activity, provided opportunities for citizens to interact and for business to take place. Though religion was an ever-present part of daily life in Roman cities, these spaces served primarily to house other aspects of daily activity. Donations of civic buildings appear frequently to have come to the cities from their wealthiest and most prominent residents, male and female alike. Both the cost and the impact of the structures appear to have been substantial, and this group of buildings provides clear evidence that benefactors of civic buildings could and regularly did change the urban landscape—sometimes for generations to come—with their donations, far more so than did the donors of temples. Each benefactor was able to promote his own ideas about the direction that the city should take and emphasize his or her familial connections with the practice of benefaction and the city in which he resided.

2. A Theater-Temple Complex at Lepcis Magna

An important port city, Lepcis Magna lay along the coast of central Tripolitania, in modern-day Libya (fig. 2). Archaeological evidence suggests that a Punic town may have been established on the site as early as the seventh century B.C.E. The city thrived
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254 See, e.g., Barton 1995.
255 For baths, see Nielsen 1993; Thébert 2003.
256 For theaters, see Sear 2006; for circuses, see Humphrey 1986.
257 For markets, see de Ruyt 1983.
258 See ch. II, Chapter Two: Temples and Donors in Tripolitania and Africa Proconsularis, supra p. 40.
during its Punic period and some of its urban remains (especially the layout and some buildings of the Forum) may date to the second-first century B.C.E. By the late first century B.C.E., however, Lepcis Magna was in Rome’s ambit. During the reign of Augustus the city expanded in size with new insulae laid out in a regular grid west of the forum (fig. 12). The early Julio-Claudian period saw major changes to the city’s urban landscape. A temple to Rome and Augustus joined other temples in the forum during Tiberius’ rule, and numerous other important public structures were built in the early first century C.E., including the theater-temple complex discussed below.

Through the first and second centuries the town continued to grow. In the year 106 C.E. Lepcis Magna received the status of a Roman colonia, which meant that its all citizens gained citizenship, which had previously been restricted to the town’s elites. Lepcis Magna’s most famous son was the emperor Septimius Severus, who showered the town with new monuments and privileges after his ascension in 193 C.E. The most substantial of those buildings was a new forum and basilica built away from the “old” forum at the coast. In the late third-sixth centuries Lepcis served as capital of the province of Tripolitania. Excavations, which began in the early twentieth century, focused on the city’s monumental centers, and many of the public buildings have been cleared and restored.

The large theater complex at Lepcis Magna was a prominent landmark in the northwest quadrant of the city, built in a neighborhood that also housed other public
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259 See Quinn 2010 for a survey of the growing presence of Roman-style structures in first century Lepcis Magna.

260 The Temple of Rome and Augustus was dedicated during the reign of Tiberius with a Neo-Punic inscription (Levi della Vida and Amadasi Guzzo 1987, 53-57 no. 22; its sculptural decoration apparently dates to the period 14-19 C.E. (Ward-Perkins 1982, 31). Changes to the forum appear to have begun somewhat earlier than that, probably in the later years of Augustus’ reign (Mattingly 1995, 118).

261 Mattingly 1995, 116-122, with additional references.


buildings. The theater complex, which included the theater itself, a Temple of Ceres, a quadriporticus and second Temple, lay adjacent to the Chalcidicum, another public structure, and less than 60 m from the macellum of the city. Like the theater at Thugga, it was built as a benefaction by a group of private citizens. Situated in an area of mixed public and private buildings, the theater-temple complex impacted strongly the development of a neighborhood in transition. Its donors, members of a single extended family, sought with their donation to emphasize their position as the first family of Lepcis Magna and to connect themselves with the political process in Rome.

a. The Theater Building

As restored, the theater building stands nearly 20 m high, its massive bulk directed the course of streets and dominated nearby structures. Built in local travertine limestone, the theater’s drum was sparsely decorated with engaged pilasters standing on a molded socle, reaching from the first story nearly to the top of the drum. The lower level of the theater’s drum was pierced by fifteen archways leading to rooms, passageways into the theater’s orchestra, or staircases into the cavea seating areas. A large inscribed lintel (4.64 m long and 1.03 m tall) of grey limestone originally belonged over the eastern exterior entryway (see fig. 13). It was found reused in the portico along the street east of the theater. In the course of the building’s restoration in the early twentieth century, this lintel was reinstalled above the doorway leading from the street.

264 It seems likely that the entire theater complex, including the Temple of Ceres and the Quadriporticus with temple to Dei Augusti, may have been planned at the same time.
265 Recent excavations in the northwest sector of the city have found mixed uses in the neighborhood in the later Roman period (fourth-fifth century), and preliminary interpretations suggest that the multifunctional character of the neighborhood begins as early as the first century (Walda 1996, 127).
266 This supposition that Suphunibal was part of the same family is strengthened by the fact that two members of the same extended family, the Tapapi, built the theater and the temple behind it (IRT 321, 322; IRT, 273).
267 According to elevation drawings and sections in Caputo 1987, esp. pl. II and IX.
268 Caputo 1987, 22.
269 Caputo 1987, 32. The plain pilasters’ bottom portions are clearly visible in Caputo’s photographs of the building’s exterior, e.g. pl. 21 no 1, pl. 133.
270 Caputo 1987, 28-32
on eastern side of the theater into the orchestra. The text is written in letters 15 cm tall in the first line and 12 cm tall in the remaining lines.\textsuperscript{271}

\begin{verbatim}
15. Imperatore Caesare Diui filio Aug(usto) pont(ifice) max(imo) tr(ibunicia) pot(estate) XXIV
col(n)s(ule) XIII patre patr(iae)
Annobal ornator patriae amator concordiae flamen
sufes praef(ectus) sacr(orum) Himilchonis Tapapi [f(ilius)] Rufu[s] d(e) s(ua)
\textit{p(ecunia) fac(iendum) coer(auit) idemq(ue) dedicauit}.\textsuperscript{272}
\end{verbatim}

When Emperor Caesar Augustus, son of deified Caesar, was chief priest, holder of tribunician power for the twenty-fourth time, consul for the thirteenth time, father of his country, Annobal Rufus, son of Himilcho Tapapius, improver of his fatherland, lover of harmony, flamen, local magistrate, and prefect in charge of sacred things, organized the construction at his own expense and also dedicated it.

Clearing inside the theater building revealed numerous additional inscriptions, including two bilingual Latin and Neo-Punic texts that originally surmounted the \textit{aditus maximi} leading into the orchestra from the exterior of the building. The eastern \textit{aditus} text, inscribed on a lintel smaller than that of the exterior text (exterior text: no. 15; this stone was 3.17 m long x 0.97 m. tall), was found at the base of the eastern tribunal inside the theater, and restored above the eastern doorway from the orchestra to the exterior of the building.\textsuperscript{273} The letters range in size from 9 cm to 6.5 cm tall. In the center of the second line (between \textit{patre} and \textit{patriae}), two disembodied right hands, carved in relief, are clasped in the traditional sign of harmony (sometimes labelled “\textit{dextrarum iunctio,”} not an ancient phrase).\textsuperscript{274} The Latin text is identical with that of the exterior inscription (no. 15), and two lines of Neo-Punic (in the smaller letters), after the Latin text, translate the inscription’s content.\textsuperscript{275}

\textsuperscript{271} IRT, 323; cf. Caputo 1987, pl. 146 no. 1, where this inscription is shown but mistakenly labelled “IRT 322” rather than 323.
\textsuperscript{272} IRT 323.
\textsuperscript{273} IRT, 322; cf. Caputo 1987, pl. 147, nos 2-3.
\textsuperscript{274} Hamberg 1945, 24; Davies 1985, 637.
\textsuperscript{275} Levi Della Vida and Amadasi Guzzo 1987, 59-60, no. 24 (b); Jongeling and Kerr 2005, 19, no. 16a.
When Emperor Caesar Augustus, son of deified Caesar, was chief priest, holder of tribunician power for the twenty-fourth time, consul for the thirteenth time, father of his country, Annobal Rufus, son of Himilcho Tapapius, improver of his fatherland, lover of harmony, flamen, local magistrate, and prefect in charge of sacred things, organized the construction at his own expense and also dedicated it. Annobal, who adorns his country, who loves the complete knowledge, sacrificer, sufet, lord of the ‘zrm-sacrifices, son of Imilco Tapapi Rufus made it according to plan at his own expense and consecrated it.277

The western aditus text, a grey limestone lintel, (3.16 m wide x 0.82 m tall), was found in situ above the western door leading from the orchestra to the street.278 The text is written in letters 8 cm tall. Like the other aditus inscription (no. 16), this lintel carries two lines in Neo-Punic after the Latin, which closely echo the Latin text. The western text, however, lacks the clasped hands carved in relief among the imperial titles.279

IRT 322; Levi Della Vida and Amadasi Guzzo 1987, 59-60, no. 24 (b); Jongeling and Kerr 2005, 19, no. 16a.

IRT, 321; Caputo and Levi Della Vida 1935, 96-97 and fig. 8; see also Caputo 1987, 24 and pl. 147, no. 1.

IRT 321; Levi Della Vida and Amadasi Guzzo 1987, 59-60, no. 24 (a); Jongeling and Kerr 2005, 19, no. 16b.
When Emperor Augustus, son of deified Caesar, was chief priest, holder of tribunician power for the twenty-fourth time, consul for the thirteenth time, the father of his country, Annobal Rufus, improver of his fatherland, lover of harmony, flamen, local magistrate, prefect in charge of sacred things, son of Himilcho Tapapius, organized the construction at his own expense, and dedicated it. Annobal, who adorns his country, who loves the complete knowledge, sacrificer, sufet, lord of the ʿzrm-sacrifices, son of Imilco Tapapi Rufus made it according to plan at his own expense and consecrated it.  

The three dedicatory inscriptions from the theater are nearly identical to one another. The imperial titulature indicates that the theater was dedicated in the year 1-2 C.E. by a prominent local citizen, Annobal Tapapius Rufus. Most of the more than ninety inscriptions found in the theater do not relate directly to the building’s construction; many of them are statue bases, and most were erected much later than the building itself, suggesting that the theater became a veritable lieu de mémoire for commemoration of important people and events in Lepcis Magna after its construction. Some inscriptions relate to later renovations, improvements, or additions to the theater building.

b. The Temple of Ceres

The physical remains of the temple of Ceres are located at the top of the cavea of the theater building. The temple’s remains are modest: a wide façade (12-14 m) fronting a shallow porch and cella (together, about nine m deep), fitted inside the curve of the
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282 Kienast 1996, 64-66. See also IRT 323, note 1. The use of Neo-Punic on the theater inscriptions offers another indication of the building’s early date, since bilingual Latin and Neo-Punic public texts from Lepcis Magna disappear by the later first century C.E. (Millar 1968, 131-133).
284 Cf. Termessos, where a similar gallery developed in a main street: van Nijf 2000.
summa cavea of the theater (fig. 14). Facing northeast, the temple looked out over the theater and toward the coast and the sea. Stairways gave access to the temple from either the back of the auditorium or the inside of the cavea, so that it was possible to visit the temple without passing through the seating of the theater. Excavations revealed evidence of eight column drums and several other architectural elements belonging to the entablature of the temple. The columns were probably about six m tall, and thus dominated the roofline of the portico at the summa cavea. The most likely reconstruction is a hexastyle temple, with six columns supporting a shallow porch. Two additional columns likely formed a doorway from the porch into the cella. The extant cipollino and granite columns apparently replaced the original limestone columns when the Temple was renovated in the Severan period. One inscription belongs to this small temple. Found scattered on the steps of the cavea, it is monumental in size, nearly 12 m long. The text was clearly legible from a great distance, with large letters of 20 cm tall in the first line, and 18 cm tall in the second line. It is in an excellent state of preservation, and only a few letters must be restored:

18. Cereri Augustae sacrum
C(aius) Rubellius Blandus co(n)s(ul) pont(ifex) proco(n)s(ul) dedic(auit)
Suphunibal ornatrix pa(f[r]iae) Annobalis Rusonis d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(acienda) c(urauit).

Consecrated to August Ceres. Caius Rubellius Blandus, consul, priest, proconsul, dedicated this. Suphunibal, the improver of her fatherland, daughter of Annobal Ruso, organized the construction from her own
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285 Caputo 1987, 61 and pl. 152. The columns excavated were of cipollino marble and grey granite, but these likely belong to a Severan restoration of the building; the original columns were probably limestone like the rest of the structure.
286 Hanson 1959, 60; Caputo 1987, 62: the two sets of columns (for the porch and the doorway) were 6.36 m and 5.80 m tall, respectively, with their column capitals. The columns of the portico were around 2.25 m tall (Caputo 1987, 115).
287 Caputo 1987, 62 and pl. 152.
288 Caputo 1987, 57 and pl. 4 no. 3
289 IRT 269; Wesch-Klein 1990, 112, no. 3.
290 IRT2009 does not supply [fiilia] d[e]l in the damaged portion of the stone, and makes Suphunibal, therefore, the wife of Annobal Ruso. Other editions, including AÉpig 1951, 84, however, supply
funds.

In addition to the epigraphic and architectural remains, excavations revealed a colossal sculpture of a female deity, identified as Ceres-Fortuna based on the building inscription (no. 18) and her iconographic features (fig. 15). Made in white Pentelic marble, and standing on a short plinth of fine grey limestone (0.14 m tall), the statue’s total height reaches 3.10 m. The goddess’ body is well-preserved; her left arm and right hand with their attributes are missing, and her nose and crown are broken. The deity stands with her weight on the right leg, and wears traditional Greek garb including a peplos, chiton, and mantle. Her head turns to the right, with a serene expression on the face with its wide-set eyes, broad cheekbones, and small mouth. Her hair, parted in the middle, is styled with a bun in the back and deeply-drilled curls, which probably extended down the back of her neck as well. On her head the goddess wears a mural crown and a wreath with leaves, ears of grain, and poppy flowers tied together with ribbons. The features of her face and hairstyle identify the figure as Livia, wife of Augustus and mother of Tiberius, and this statue has been widely recognized as an early example of Livia portrayed with divine attributes.

The text of the inscription (no. 18) furnishes a secure date for the temple’s construction: 35-36 C.E., the year in which C. Rubellius Blandus, who dedicated the

\[\text{[filia]}, \text{“daughter” and this reading seems to me preferable, since the stone preserves an interpunct after a wide space (suitable for missing letters) between “Rusonis” and “S P F C.”}\]

Caputo and Traversari 1976, 76-79, no. 58. The head was discovered during excavations of the theater’s cavea, on the axis of the Temple; the body was excavated from the street behind the theater, where it had fallen.

Caputo 1987, 64 and pl. 1.; Caputo and Traversari 1976, 76-77, no. 58 and pl. 54-55. See also Bartman (1999, 179-180 cat. 74), who accepts the Tiberian date. Bartman (1990, 106-107) also notes that the associations between Ceres and Livia emphasize the latter’s role as nourishing mother of the imperial family. Alexandridis (2004, 130-131, cat. no. 37) similarly identifies this as a portrait of Livia, dating to the late Tiberian or early Claudian period, though she seems skeptical that the statue is necessarily from the Temple.

building, held the proconsulate of Africa, during the reign of the emperor Tiberius.\footnote{Caputo 1987, 62; IRT 269; New Pauly, s.v. “Rubellius (3): C.R. Blandus.”} This secure date—and the temple’s position on top of the theater’s cavea—indicates that the temple’s construction and dedication significantly post-date that of the theater building itself.\footnote{The imperial titulature of the theater inscriptions (nos. 15, 16, 17, whose texts are nearly identical), which mention Augustus Caesar, dates that building’s dedication to 1-2 C.E.}

c. The Quadriporticus and Temple

Behind the theater’s scaenae frons, to the north, lay an irregularly-shaped quadriporticus, in the middle of which a small tetrastyle prostyle temple stood. The temple was built on the central axis of the theater building, aligned with the Temple of Ceres at the top of the summa cavea. The small quadriporticus temple sat on a low podium, reached by two shallow stairs at the porch. The excavators report that they found remains of three statue bases inside the temple.\footnote{Caputo 1950, 167. In the final publication (Caputo 1987) I can find no mention of these three statue bases, nor any photographs to show their location. Presumably they were uninscribed and fragmentary.} They also found a dedicatory inscription for the quadriporticus temple, on blocks of grey limestone, measuring together 9.56 m wide x 0.52 m tall, with lettering 13 cm tall in the first line, 12 cm tall in the second line, and 8 cm tall in the third line.

19. Dis Augustis
   Q( uintus) Marcii C(aii) f(ilius) Barea co(n)s(ul) XVvir s(acris) f(aciundis) fetialis proco(n)s(ul) II patronus dedicavit.
   Iddibal Magonis f(ilius) Tapapius Lepcitanus de sua pecunia fecit.\footnote{IRT 273.}

To the Augustan gods. Quintus Marcius Barea, son of Caius, consul, member of the committee of fifteen for sacred rites, ferial priest, proconsul for the second time, patron, dedicated this. Iddibal Tapapius, son of Mago, a citizen of Lepcis Magna, built it at his own expense.

The name of the proconsul who dedicated the small quadriporticus temple furnishes a date for that building: 42-43 C.E.\footnote{It is not clear whether the quadriporticus
is contemporary with the temple, or if the temple was added to an existing building. The excavator maintains that both structures were built at the same time, in 42-43 C.E.\textsuperscript{299} But there is evidence that suggests the quadriporticus is earlier than the temple, and that the temple’s donor added his building to the middle of an extant square. Caputo has noted physical connections between the porticus behind the theater and the \textit{scaenae frons} of the theater (such as staircases between the two, and the repeated use of grey limestone).\textsuperscript{300} Amucano has demonstrated that the theater and the quadriporticus share the same proportional model.\textsuperscript{301} These connections, along with the evidence that the Temple of Ceres was also planned into the theater, suggest to me that the trapezoidal quadriporticus formed an integral element of the building complex, and was not added on four decades later.

d. The Theater-Temple Complex

The donor of the theater building, Annobal Tapapius Rufus, was a generous and extremely wealthy Lepcitanian citizen of the late first century B.C.E. and the first century C.E. In addition to the theater building, we know of him as well from his

\textsuperscript{298} IRT 273 note 1.
\textsuperscript{299} Caputo’s reports lack stratigraphic details to confirm whether the theater and quadriporticus are contemporary, but some architectural considerations make it likely that the quadriporticus was planned and built at roughly the same time as the theater building itself. These architectural details include stairways connecting the \textit{scaena} with the quadriporticus and identical materials used in both structures (Caputo 1987, 51-54 and pl. VII; see fig. 13). Caputo’s discussion of the theater complex’s phasing mentioned that the quadriporticus, which already existed informally as an open trapezoidal area, was formalized at the same time as the temple was constructed. In doing so, the builders made changes to the theater’s design, incorporating the original western hall into the expanded quadriporticus (Caputo 1987, 133-134). The original western hall (“salone occidentale originario”) is not, however, indicated on any plans of the building’s phases, and Caputo did not discuss how the quadriporticus was integrated into the theater complex, though the presence on his plans of several staircases linking the theater’s \textit{scaenae frons} and its western \textit{aditus} with the quadriporticus make it clear that the quadriporticus was intimately connected with the rest of the theater complex. I am reluctant to accept Caputo’s premise that the quadriporticus and temple were formalized at the same time. I suspect that part of his reasoning for this phasing lay in the availability of a historical date for the temple’s construction, and a desire to associate all portions of the building with epigraphic dates.

\textsuperscript{300} Caputo 1987, 51-54.
\textsuperscript{301} Amucano 1994, 701-702.
construction of the market building, built east of the theater in 9-8 B.C.E. The inscription from the quadriporticus temple indicates that Iddibal Tapapius, son of Mago, the temple’s benefactor, was part of the same wealthy clan as Annobal Tapapius Rufus; we know of him, however, only from this work.

Suphunibal, the benefactor of the temple building, is also known only from her activity in the construction of this temple. Her exact family connections are, unfortunately, not entirely transparent. But she belonged (by birth or marriage) to a family in which the cognomen “Annobal” was common. Few men named “Annobal” are known epigraphically from the region; the index of IRT lists only two others. One Annobal is mentioned in the dedication of a temple of Magna Mater in the Forum Vetus at Lepcis Magna; the other is Annobal Tapapius Rufus, son of Himilcho, donor of the theater and *macellum*. We know of a few other Tapapii in Lepcis Magna; one of these is Iddibal, son of Mago, who built the quadriporticus temple. These pieces of information form, at best, circumstantial evidence for Suphunibal’s family tree.

Taken together, all the circumstantial evidence—that few people in the epigraphic record are known by the cognomen Annobal; that one the three Annobals known from Lepcis Magna also built the theater, and another of the three is mentioned in the theater-temple’s inscription; that two members of the same extended family, the Tapapii, built both of the other parts of the theater-quadriporticus-temple complex; that Suphunibal herself has a neo-Punic name, like others in the family (Annobal, Iddibal,  

---

302 IRT, 319a: dated by imperial titulature of Augustus.
303 See discussion of the missing “[*filia*]” in the dedicatory inscription (no. 18); regardless of whether Suphunibal was Ruso’s daughter (as I maintain) or his wife, the general outlines of the following discussion hold true.
304 IRT 300: *Imp(erator) Caesare Vespasiano [Aug(usto) pont(ifice)] m(ax(imo) trib(unicia) potest(ate) III imp(eratore) X co(n)s(ule) IIII des[ig(nato) V p(atre) p(atriae)] Q(uintus) Manlius Ancharius Tarq(uitius Saturni)us proco(n)s(ul) patronus [d]edicauit | Volumnius Memor Felix [legatus] pro pr(aetore) | Iddibal Balsillie[ci]s [filiius Annobalis n(epos) Asmunis pro[nepos] tem[plum Matris Magnae] | et exor[nauti elx (sestertii) CC m(ilibus) n(ummum) d(eci) s(ua) p(ecunia) d(edit) [· · ·]; dated to 72 C.E. based on imperial titulature.
Mago, Himilcho)—points to a single conclusion: that Suphunibal and her father, Annobal Ruso, belonged to this same generous family, the Tapapii. The construction of the theater complex, therefore, was a family affair, undertaken by several wealthy, related donors.

Though epigraphic evidence indicates that three separate donors paid for individual elements of the buildings, architectural and topographic evidence suggests that the theater-temple complex was planned as a single unit. The Temple of Ceres was not dedicated until 34 years after the theater, but architectural accomodations for such a structure were built into the fabric of the theater from the beginning. These accommodations included staircases to access the Temple from the outside of the theater, and an open space in the center of the portico at the top of the cavea. I have argued that the quadriporticus behind the theater was probably also an original feature of the complex. Moreover, the plan of the complex clearly indicates that the quadriporticus temple was installed on the same axis as the Temple of Ceres (see fig. 13). Both temples share the same central axis as the scaenae frons, despite the irregularity of the portico’s exterior shape. Even though the quadriporticus temple was dedicated four decades after the theater, the construction of that temple carefully followed the established plan of the complex and may have been a planned component of the structure from the start.

IRT 319, n. 8, does not include Suphunibal in the list of Tapapii known from Latin and Neo-Punic inscriptions, but the circumstantial evidence suggests that we should include her. In fact, I am not entirely convinced that Annobal Rufus and Annobal Ruso were not the same person with two different Latinized cognomina, thus making Suphunibal the daughter of the builder of the theater. But one might expect consistent orthography of the name in the same monumental complex, since Rufus’ name appeared throughout the theater in both Latin and Neo-Punic.

Caputo 1987, 62-63 and pl. XXXIII; see also Bianchi Bandinelli et al. 1966, 81-83.

See this ch. III.2.c. The Quadriporticus and Temple, supra p. 83.

Bianchi Bandinelli et al. 1966, 81 and pl. 72, 75.

Even if the quadriporticus temple was not originally planned as part of the building complex, it complemented the rest of the structure and fitted quite neatly into the existing plan, without need for additional architectural accomodations.
We might consider Annobal Rufus, whose inscriptions (nos. 15, 16, and 17) are earliest in the complex and who already had a history of generous benefaction, to have been the instigator of the theater’s construction.\textsuperscript{310} He probably requested or required other family members’ participation because the construction of the theater was so costly.\textsuperscript{311} Suphunibal may have played a role in the complex’s construction because she was the only available representative of her branch of the family; perhaps her father wished to bring her to greater prominence for another reason. Iddibal’s reasons for participating in the project are similarly obscure. Regardless of their motivations, Suphunibal and Iddibal clearly agreed to fund portions of the building complex, and to communicate a consistent message with their donations. Numerous scholars have pointed out the messages of “Romanization” that this theater complex communicated,\textsuperscript{312} but I think the connections here are more personal and more programmatic than simply a message that Lepcis Magna was becoming a Roman town. The donors communicated connections between themselves and the imperial family, drawing an analogy between the first family of Rome and themselves as the first family of Lepcis Magna. The funds apparently came from three separate sources: each contributor noted that his part was erected at his (and her) own expense.\textsuperscript{313} The overall meanings of the complex, however, were consistent across the buildings, even though each donor put his or her individual stamp on those messages.

\textsuperscript{310} The other two benefactors, Suphunibal and Iddibal, are known only from their activity in this monument, and their contributions are significantly later than that of Annobal Rufus.

\textsuperscript{311} Sear (2006, 21) has estimated that the cost of building the theater building at Lepcis Magna may have reached nearly 8,000,000 HS, and this estimate appears not to include the cost of the two related temples.

\textsuperscript{312} E.g., MacMullen 2000, 37-39.

\textsuperscript{313} It is also possible that the other members of the family, Suphunibal and Iddibal Tapapius, contributed to the project’s completion because Annobal Rufus himself had died before the construction could be completed. Although this situation is not mentioned in either of the later building inscriptions, Saastamoinen (2010, 347) has noted that specific statements of inheritance of building projects did not appear in building inscriptions before the second and third centuries C.E.
The builders made clear the connections between Lepcis Magna and Rome and themselves with the imperial family of Augustus in several ways. First, Annobal Rufus used only Latin in his exterior building inscription above the theater’s entrance. This monolingual inscription contrasted sharply—and tellingly—with his other inscriptions, inside the theater, which included both Latin and Neo-Punic texts. As Lee has pointed out, this arrangement is actually a bit backwards: we might reasonably have expected that the most accessible inscription—the one with two languages—would have been set on the exterior of the building, where the highest number of people would have been able to see it. Putting an inscription written only in Latin on the outside of the building suggested that this inscription, at least, “was meant to be more symbolic and monumental than informative.” What is more, its symbolism overtly connected Annobal Rufus, the benefactor, to Rome, by the use of the Roman language in place of the more familiar and more traditional Neo-Punic.

The connections to Rome in this building, though, went even deeper: a theater-temple complex was a Roman building, without obvious Punic precedents. Its erection called to mind the building activity of Augustus’ family in building and rebuilding the theater-temple-portico complexes in Rome itself, construction projects that had recently been completed in the imperial capital as the theater of Lepcis Magna was being built. The Latin inscriptions in the theater underlined this link to Rome and

---

314 Lee 2003-2004, 120.
315 Quinn (2010, 63-64) has, however, pointed out the relative novelty at Lepcis Magna of inscribing any texts on stone; she convincingly interpreted the choice to use both Neo-Punic and Latin (as opposed to Libyan) as a positive and deliberate decision to emphasize certain elements of Annobal Rufus’ identity and his connections with the elite of Lepcis Magna’s society.
316 Hanson (1959, 29-39) noted the Italic nature of the Roman-style built theater, with reference to both Hellenistic Italian sanctuaries (Gabii, Praeneste) and to political arenas such as those at Cosa. Quinn (2010) has more recently emphasized the importance of Hellenistic models from Alexandria and Utica as possible precedents for this building.
317 Augustus (or members of his family) reconstructed the Theater of Pompey in 32 B.C.E. (Gros 2000, 36); he dedicated the Theater of Marcellus by 11 B.C.E. (Ciancio Rossetto 2000, 32). The Theater of Balbus was also erected at about the same time in Rome, ca. 13 B.C.E. (Manacorda 2000, 30-31).
empire with their use of Augustus’ full imperial titulature to date the building’s construction; the Neo-Punic texts, on the other hand, omitted that dating formula.\(^{318}\) The two languages served to connect the donor both to Rome and to his hometown.

Finally, Annobal Rufus’ civic positions and honorific titles echoed the titulature of Augustus himself, two lines earlier: Rufus was “adornor of his country” and “lover of harmony” while Augustus was “father of his country” (inscription no. 15). Each man was a priest (\textit{pontifex; flamen, praefectus sacrorum}) and magistrate (\textit{consul and tribunicia potestate; sufes = local chief magistrate})\(^{319}\). The connections between the two men were consciously emphasized in the inscriptions which recorded Annobal Rufus’ donation to Lepcis Magna. Indeed, even the design of a theater-temple-portico complex connected Lepcis Magna to Rome, where Pompey’s portico, theater, and temple to Venus Victrix, or the Augustan Theater of Marcellus, may have provided the model for Annobal Rufus’ building project.\(^{320}\)

Similar connections existed in Suphunibal’s Temple of Ceres, between the donor Suphunibal and Augustus’ wife Livia. The monumental statue of the goddess Ceres-Fortuna was depicted with the face of the empress Livia Augusta; its date during the reign of Tiberius made this one of the earliest examples in which Livia was depicted with the attributes of a goddess, well before her deification.\(^{321}\) The choice to use Livia Augusta’s features in the portrait of the goddess was a meaningful one, dictated by the

---

\(^{318}\) Levi Della Vida and Amadas Guzzo (1987, 59-60, nos. 24a-b) read \textit{bn’rm} in the Neo-Punic text, and suggested that the Neo-Punic texts on the theater included the donor’s grandfather’s name: “Annobal, ... son of Himilcho, son of Arim,” but Jongeling and Kerr (2005, no. 16a-b) and Jongeling (2008) follow Fevrier (1954) in disputing both the reading and the supposition that the Neo-Punic inscription contained additional information not included in the Latin. They argue that the Neo-Punic is a close translation of the Latin.

\(^{319}\) \textit{OLD} (s.v. sufes, -etis) defines this Punic loan-word as “An annual chief magistrate at Carthage and in other Phoenician cities.”

\(^{320}\) Hanson 1959, 59.

\(^{321}\) Wood 1999, 121. Livia, known as Iulia Augusta after the death of her husband Augustus in 14 C.E., died in 29 C.E. and was deified by the emperor Claudius in 42 C.E. (\textit{New Pauly}, s.v. “Livia (2): L. Drusilla = Iulia Augusta”).
building’s benefactor, Suphunibal. The Temple of Ceres was an integral part of the theater complex at Lepcis Magna, as I have discussed; the designers of the complex planned its presence at the top of the summa cavea from the outset. It is not clear whether the deity to whom the temple would be dedicated was also settled early in the planning process: none of the earlier inscriptions from the theater mentioned the goddess Ceres. Suphunibal, who oversaw the temple’s construction, probably decided which deity to honor and how to depict the goddess. Using Livia’s portrait on a statue of the goddess Ceres transformed this from an ordinary temple to an important deity322 into a temple to the nascent Imperial cult. Suphunibal’s shrine to Ceres-Livia made an even more overt connection between the family of the Tapapii and the imperial family of Rome than Annobal Rufus’ theater building had done. In the Temple of Ceres, the goddess’s face was a portrait of the leading lady of the empire, wife of a divus and herself a divine being.

An imperial focus for the shrine made sense in the context of the theater complex’s overall building program; but the question remains why Suphunibal chose to depict Livia with the attributes of Ceres and Fortuna, rather than dedicating a statue of divus Augustus or divus Caesar, or dedicating the temple to Venus or Apollo.323 Suphunibal’s choice of Ceres-Livia bore more meaning than a simple desire to connect her family to the imperial family and cult. Livia Augusta provided Suphunibal with a

322 Cadotte (2007, 343-360) considered the cult of Ceres to be a quintessential example of syncretism in African religion. Adopted from Greek cult practice, Ceres and Tellus (Kore and Demeter, in the Greek pantheon) were quickly integrated into the Punico-African pantheon in the fourth century B.C.E. The popularity of the goddess(es) only increased in the Roman period. This dedication from Lepcis Magna is one of many that date from the first century C.E.

323 Venus, Mars, and Apollo figured prominently in Augustus’ reconstruction and restoration of the city of Rome in the long years of his rule. See Zanker 1988, esp. 85-86, 108, 193-201; see also Augustus, RG 19 (Temple of Apollo), RG 20 (theater of Pompey), 21 (Temple of Mars Ultor and Theater of Apollo (i.e. Theater of Marcellus)). Either Venus or Apollo would have been ideal deities to whom to dedicate a theater temple to, because of their close associations with imperial Roman theaters (the theater of Pompey, and the theater of Marcellus, respectively: Hanson 1959, 43-55).
model for how elite Roman women could act in public life, influencing public discussion and shaping the urban landscape around her through benefactions. Woodhull has detailed the important role that Livia took in Augustus’ program to remake the city of Rome, especially with her construction of the Porticus Liviae and its accompanying Temple of Concordia, through which she underscored Augustus’ new moral program and brought to the forefront the concerns and cults of women.\textsuperscript{324} Woodhull concluded that Livia (along with her counterpart, Octavia) “set a standard for other women in the western empire to follow” in their participation in public architectural patronage, a role previously reserved for men.\textsuperscript{325}

Such a model would have benefitted Suphunibal herself in her quest to become a prominent figure in Lepcis Magna, where civic patronage was alive and well, but where women had rarely participated in that form of urban development.\textsuperscript{326} Her choice to depict Livia in the goddess’s face served as a clear message to her fellow citizens: Suphunibal honored the Augusta and in doing so equated her own behavior with that of Livia, a civic patroness and upstanding Roman matron.\textsuperscript{327} As a member of one of the wealthiest and most generous families in Lepcis Magna, Suphunibal designed the statue in order to emphasize her similar role as “first lady” of her city, just as Livia was a leading figure in the wealthiest and most generous patron family in Rome itself.\textsuperscript{328}

\begin{flushright}
326 In this regard, Suphunibal was one of a number of women in provincial towns across the empire who looked to Livia as a model for how to take leading roles in their own cities. Eumachia, a priestess who built a colonnaded building off Pompeii’s forum, may also have used Livia’s model in order to advance her own local identity (Woodhull 1999, 140-142).
327 Livia’s image would have been quite familiar to Lepcitanian citizens, since she had received several monumental statues in public venues around the city, and had also appeared on the city’s coinage during the age of Tiberius, under the legend “mater patriae” (Bartmann 1999, 178-180). Portraits of Livia with the attributes of Ceres also appeared in other North African cities during the Julio-Claudian period (for an example from Thysdrus in Africa proconsularis, see Stirling, forthcoming).
328 By the mid-30s C.E. Livia was regularly equated with the goddesses Ceres and Tyche in private and provincial art, provincial coinage, and inscriptions; this equation emphasized the fertility and prosperity of the Roman empire under Augustus and his successor, Livia’s son Tiberius; Spaeth (1996,}
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Furthermore, the depiction of Livia as Ceres emphasized her position as *materfamilias* and *mater patriae* as counterpart to her husband Augustus.\textsuperscript{329} Suphunibal’s choice to depict Livia equated Suphunibal herself as *mater patriae* of Lepcis Magna, an idea quietly reinforced by her inscription.

The inscription on the Temple of Ceres (no. 18) named Suphunibal "*ornatrix patriae,*" an honorific title particularly prevalent in inscriptions from Roman Tripolitania.\textsuperscript{330} The language of the honorific recalled the phrase "*mater patriae*" used in connection with Livia. It also echoed the inscriptions in the theater,\textsuperscript{331} where Annobal Rufus was called "*ornator patriae, amator concordiae,* improver of his fatherland, lover of harmony" and where emperor Augustus was named along with his honorific title "*pater patriae.*" These phrases continued the associations between the imperial family and the Tapapi, and between the construction projects the imperial family carried out in remaking Rome and those the Tapapii undertook in improving Lepcis Magna, namely the massive theater complex. The title "*ornator/-trix patriae*" is a particularly Tripolitanian phrase that translates a Neo-Punic title, connecting Suphunibal (and Annobal Rufus, too) at once to both Rome, Lepcis Magna’s future, and to its long Punic past.

A few years later, the final part of the building complex, the temple in the quadriporticus dedicated to the Dei Augusti (inscription no. 19), emphasized yet again the esteem in which the Tapapii held the imperial family. Saastamoinen has suggested,

---

\textsuperscript{169-173} lists 26 representative examples of Livia as Ceres on cameos, provincial coinage and inscriptions (during her lifetime), statues, and official state coinage (after her deification); see also Zanker 1988, 234. Christof (2001, 227 and f.n. 3) cites this particular statue, however, in noting that not every woman wearing a mural crown should be identified as a representation of a city or a city protectress.

\textsuperscript{329} Spaeth (1996, 119-123) noted that the Senate recommended that Livia receive the honorific title "*mater patriae*" after Augustus’ death, though Tiberius declined the honor on her behalf; Woodhull 1999, 78.

\textsuperscript{330} *TLL,* s.v. "*ornator.*"

\textsuperscript{331} e.g. *IRT* 321, *Imperator* *Caesar* *Divi* *filio* *Aug(ustus) pont(ifice) max(imus) tri(ibunicia) pot(estatus) XXIV co(n)s(ul)e XIII pa(trae) *Annobal* *Rufus ornator patriae amator concordiae …*
following Fishwick, that this temple was dedicated to “anonymous gods protecting the imperial family.”³³² It is more likely, however, to have been a temple associated with the imperial cult, including in its cella three cult statues to the three divi of the imperial family, as Gradel has argued convincingly that divi and dii were usually synonymous in the early years of the imperial cult.³³³ The overt links to the imperial family elsewhere in the complex, moreover, preclude a dedication to “anonymous gods protecting the imperial family”:³³⁴ in the Temple of Ceres, and in the inscriptions of the theater’s dedication, the connection with the divine imperial family was both explicit and repeated in words, images, and architectural patterns. This temple to the imperial cult equated Iddibal Tapapius, the last of the builders, with the heirs of Augustus, just like the other parts of the complex associated Annobal with Augustus and Suphunibal with Livia. The links between the Tapapii in Lepcis Magna and the Julio-Claudian rulers in Rome emphasized the dynastic nature of the benefaction, incorporating several members or perhaps even generations of a single family, and equating their impact on Lepcis Magna’s urban development with the impact of the imperial family on the changing shape of the city of Rome. This building complex showed that Annobal Rufus

³³² Saastamoinen 2010, 78 and note 344. See Beard et al. (1998, 351-352) for a different interpretation that connects the use of the term “Augustus” with imperial cult activity, even if not directly.

³³³ Gradel 2004, 67. Caputo (1987, 58) has identified the three gods in question as Caesar, Augustus, and the newly-deified Livia and dismisses the suggestion that Tiberius might have been included in the lineup of gods here. In my opinion, which three divi are included is a non-essential question, as long as the temple is assigned to the imperial cult. See also Caputo 1950, 167, with more details on the statue bases and his reading of the inscription, which requires that dis = divis.

³³⁴ Fishwick 1991, 450-452. He suggests that this inscription, which is unique in being dedicated only to Di Augusti, must refer not to imperial ruler cult but instead to “anonymous Augustan gods, the gods in general who collectively operate within the sphere of the Imperial family” (451). In support of this he cites inscriptions that include the phrases Di Augusti and pro salute formulas referring to a sitting emperor (CIL, 11193; CIL, 25934), but the inscriptions he cites are more than a century later than this inscription (Antonine and Severan, respectively), and do not necessarily indicate that the ideas about imperial divinity in force in the second and third centuries were also operating in the first. I suspect that Fishwick’s assertion that “August” became a mechanical addition to divine titulature is correct for later dedications but might be overstating the case for such a rote process in the early to mid-first century C.E., only a few decades after the deification of Caesar and of Augustus, and only a year after Livia’s elevation to divine status.
and the members of his family were remaking Lepcis Magna in the same way that Augustus’ family was remaking Rome.

Unlike the two temples at Gigthis, where the donors were honored with statues and inscribed bases placed in or near their buildings, no commemorative statues for the donors of the theater-temple complex have been found. This lack can be interpreted in two ways. Perhaps we are simply missing the statue bases or honorific plaques that the grateful citizens of Lepcis Magna dedicated to the benefactors. It is entirely possible that such evidence has been lost to the vagaries of time or not yet recovered from the vast archaeological landscape of Lepcis Magna. But later donors did receive such commemoration, as the number of statue bases and portraits of benefactors found in the theater testifies. As a major public monument, the theater attracted later, smaller donations by other donors (such as an altar and a balteus or parapet donated by Ti. Claudius Sestinus in the late first century C.E.). The theater became a “lieu de mémoire” for honorific statues of local notables after its construction, but its donors themselves received no such recognition. I suggest that the monumental inscriptions themselves served as the benefactors’ honorific monuments.

The texts of Annobal Rufus’ dedicatory inscriptions (nos. 15, 16, and 17) and that of Suphunibal’s inscription (no. 18) include honorific titles bestowed on the donors. The

---

335 See ch. II.2. Two Temples at Gigthis, Tripolitania (Tunisia), supra p. 40.
336 Caputo and Traversari (1979) catalogued 133 sculptures from the excavations of the theater, in varying states of preservation and of varying dates.
337 Octagonal altar, inscribed in Latin and Neo-Punic = IRT 318: face a) [---] | [Augu]sto | [sac]rum | Aspr[e]nas | proco(n)s(ul) | dedicavit. Face b) [---] | ornator pa[triae] | amator concor|diae cui primo | ordo et populus | ob merita mai|orum eius et ipsis | lato clauo sem|per uti concessit | aram et podi(um) | d(e) s(u) | p(ecunia) | f(acienda) c(uravit). Face c) = Neo-Punic text.
338 Balteus = IRT 347: Imper[atore] Caesare diui Vespasiani | [filio] Domitianus Augustus Germanico | I | pontif(ice) maximo | trib(unicia) potest(ate) | XXI co(n)s(ul) | censore | [perpetu]lo | patre patriae | | Ti(berius) Claudius Quir(ina) (tribu) | Sestius Ti(berius) Claudi Sesti | praefectus sacrorum | flamen | diui Vespasiani | sues | flamen | perpetuus | amator | patriae | amator | ciuium | ornator | patriae | amator | concordiae | cui primo | ordo et populus | ob merita | maiorum eius et ipsis | lato clauo | semper | uti | concessit | Podi(um) | et | aram | d(e) | su(u) | p(ecunia) | f(acienda) c(uravit).
phrase “ornator patriae” was a traditional Punic honorific title translated into Latin. Annobal Rufus received two such honors: “ornator patriae” and “amator concordiae” which both were prominently featured in his building inscriptions for this building. The text of the exterior inscription (no. 15), for example, placed those two honorific titles immediately after Annobal’s praenomen, before any of his other titles or his filiation or cognomen, marking the titles’ importance. The titles occupied a similarly prominent position in the interior inscriptions (nos. 16 and 17). Neither honorific title appeared in Rufus’ earlier building inscriptions, marking his construction of the macellum in 8 B.C.E. It seems likely, therefore, that he received these honorific titles—or at least “ornator patriae” (which was more closely connected to building activity)—as a result of his building activity after the construction of the macellum, in response to his undertaking of the theater’s construction.

Suphunibal, too, was designated “ornatrix patriae” in her dedicatory inscription of the Temple of Ceres (no. 18). Since we know of no other building activity by Suphunibal in Lepcis Magna, I suggest that she, like Annobal Rufus, received this honorific title in response to her dedication of this building complex, before the temple’s inscription was set up. To the best of our knowledge, she received no honorific

339 IRT 80, citing Caputo and Levi Della Vida 1935.
342 As evidenced by its more frequent presence in Tripolitanian building inscriptions: IRT’s index IX indicates that amator concordiae appears in 5 inscriptions of two people (including Annobal Rufus), while ornator patriae (or its feminine variant, ornatrix) appears in 7 inscriptions of 4 people (including Rufus and Suphunibal). IRT’s index incorrectly ascribes the Neo-Punic phrase “meshqal eres” in Neo-Punic 32 to inscription 319, the macellum inscription of Annobal Rufus; IRT’s Neo-Punic 32 (=Levi Della Vida and Amadasi Guzzo 1987, no. 27) actually corresponds to IRT 318, the altar inscription of Ti. Claudius Sestius, who also holds the honorific title.
statue, but even without a statue, Suphunibal’s name and her work were highly visible for all to see.

By contrast, the quadriporticus temple’s inscription (no. 19) did not include any honorific titles for Iddibal Tapapius, marking him solely as a private benefactor with its phrase “de sua pecunia fecit.” This lack of an honorific title suggests to me that his contribution—while important to the overall message of the complex, with its overt imperial ideology—was not considered critically important to the shape of the town. Iddibal’s smaller contribution received only the “normal” recognition, his name in the dedicatory inscription of the building, rather than the extraordinary honor of a new official title like “ornator patriae.”

The theater-temple-quadriporticus complex was an important landmark in a newly developing quarter of the city in the Augustan era. Excavations below the level of the theater revealed earlier, Punic tombs, which indicate that the area around the theater was outside the city limits in Lepcis Magna’s earlier phases. By Augustus’ 13th consulship, however, the building complex formed part of a growing Augustan-era civic center, along with the macellum already built by Annobal Rufus in 9-8 B.C.E. The building inscriptions of the theater (nos. 15, 16, and 17) and the macellum give no indication of who chose the placement of the two buildings constructed by Annobal Rufus, whether they were on private land (solo suo or similar) or on land controlled by the community (solo publico). The proximity of his two donations may suggest that Annobal Rufus (or his family, the Tapapii) controlled some or all of the land in the

---

343 Caputo 1987, 18-19.
344 IRT 319: [Imp(erator) Caesar Diui f(ilius) Augustus] co(n)s(ul) XI imp(erator) XIII trib(unicia) pot(estate) XV pont(ifex) m(aximus) | M(arco) Licinio M(arci) f(ilio) Crasso Frugi co(n)s(ul) augure proco(n)s(ule) patrono flaminib(us) Aug(ust)i Caesaris Iddib[a]le Arinis f(ilio) [ ... ]one [et - · - · ]nnobalis [f(ilio) - - - ]on[ - - - ] [su]fetib(us) M(uttun Annonis f(ilio) - ? - · ] Annobal «Himilcho» f(ilius) Tapapius Rufus su[efes flamen praefectus sacrorum] de sua pequ[nia faciunt dum coe[r][uit] idem[que] de[d][icauit].
345 Saastamoinen (2010, 180 and note 956) noted that these ownership phrases are found only in a small subset of datable building inscriptions, three of which date to the first century C.E.
Augustan new town, and thus controlled its development. The layout of the theater and the quadriporticus reflect the topographic adjustments that connected the new area under development into the heart of the old Punic town at the Old Forum: the streets leading out from the forum curved to accommodate the \textit{macellum} and the theater. The curve in the street leading into the plaza in turn dictated the odd trapezoidal shape of the quadriporticus. In addition, the two buildings of Rufus, the \textit{macellum} and the theater, each have a slightly different orientation. The later Chalcidicum aligns exactly with the theater and not with its other near neighbor, the \textit{macellum}, underlining the important role that the theater, as a dominant visual landmark in the city, played in later urban development.

The theater-temple complex was one of the most prominent landmarks in the city, and dominated the area where it stood, offering views toward the forum and the sea.\textsuperscript{346} Measurements of the restored theater building put its height, with the columns of the portico at the \textit{summa cavea}, at nearly 20 m.\textsuperscript{347} At the top of that massive building, the columns of the Temple of Ceres were more than twice as large as those of the portico, making the temple by far the tallest and most visible part of the building. The colossal scale of the statue of Ceres-Livia accorded well with such a tall and prominent building. The goddess’ statue would have been visible to most people who entered the theater or approached the temple,\textsuperscript{348} and perhaps to those who strolled in the quadriporticus behind the theater as well.\textsuperscript{349} The visibility of this image of the goddess Ceres who blessed their city, and who was depicted with the features of Livia, an imperial

\textsuperscript{346} Caputo 1987, 19.
\textsuperscript{347} According to elevation drawings and sections in Caputo 1987, esp. pl. II and IX.
\textsuperscript{348} Excavations revealed no trace of door fittings, suggesting that the temple was always open and that the goddess’ statue was always visible to theater-goers.
\textsuperscript{349} Caputo (1987, 101-105) notes that the \textit{scaenae frons} was three stories, but his chronology of the \textit{scaena} is problematic, and it is not clear whether the Augustan \textit{scaenae frons} influenced the dimensions of the Antonine renovation of that structure (see also Sear 1990, 379-380 and 2006, 281-282).
patroness and active builder, called to mind the analogous benefactress of Lepcis Magna, Suphunibal herself.

Suphunibal’s name was visible in the large, clear letters of the simple inscription on the temple’s façade. The letters were easy to read, and visible from a long way away. The Latin inscription might have been inscrutable to some first-century Tripolitanian citizens who could only read Neo-Punic (or who could not read at all). But the inscription was formulaic, and it shared phrases and abbreviations with the bilingual Latin and Neo-Punic inscriptions of Annobal Rufus placed around the theater. Familiarity with the content of those bilingual inscriptions would have assisted those who wished to understand Supuhinbal’s role in the development of the temple of Ceres and the honor that she received for building this sanctuary for her city. Even to those who could not read the words, the large inscription towering over the tallest monument in the city spoke clearly about the prominence of Suphunibal as a Roman African woman and architectural patron.

Long after its construction, the theater continued to impact life in Lepcis Magna, as the large number of later inscriptions found in the theater and quadriporticus testifies. As a busy civic nexus, the theater complex was an ideal focus for later benefactions and for honorific statues and other memorials. Later benefactions in the complex include the tribunal inscription of the proconsul L. Caninius Gallus dedicating an area of important seating;\(^{350}\) the altar and balteus inscription of Ti. Claudius Sestius;\(^{351}\) and renovations of the complex.\(^{352}\) Dedications to the Severan emperors found in the quadriporticus testify to the continuing influence of the building as a major center

\(^{350}\) IRT 521, approximately contemporary with the theater building itself.
\(^{351}\) IRT 318, with Neo-Punic text (Levi Della Vida and Amadasi Guzzo 1987, 65-70, no. 27 [= IRT’s Neo-Punic 32]); IRT 347; both of these are later first century C.E.
\(^{352}\) e.g. IRT 534, the scaenae frons, and IRT 533, a fountain added to the quadriporticus, both Antonine in date.
for civic activity.\textsuperscript{353} Annobal Rufus’ initial dedication, therefore, of the theater and quadriporticus created long-lasting influences in the urban life of Lepcis Magna. Iddibal Tapapius and Suphunibal both contributed to the majesty of the complex with the construction of their temples, but neither addition to the building caused such a significant change to the way urban space was used, since both were incorporated into the theater complex and worshippers had to enter into the theater complex to visit their temple buildings. The original design of Annobal Rufus’ building complex had the greatest impact on Lepcis Magna’s urban plan, but the buildings constructed by Suphunibal and Iddibal emphasized the role of wealthy architectural patrons in civic life.

3. An Infrastructure Project at Sabratha

Like Lepcis Magna, Sabratha (figs. 2 and 16) apparently began as a Punic town around a small natural harbor. Punic remains at the site include tombs and some evidence of domestic activity. In the Roman period, Sabratha, like Lepcis Magna, received monumental public buildings in the Roman style, including Forum and temples, a theater, baths and fountains. Like Lepcis, the city developed on several different orthogonal grids, with major public monuments such as the forum and the theater serving as anchors for those areas. The forum area, which began to develop in the early first century C.E., underwent major renovations in the Antonine period. The theater was apparently constructed in the later second century C.E., probably at about the same time as the new \textit{insulae} were laid out in the adjacent areas. Evidence for

\textsuperscript{353} e.g. \textit{IRT} 424, a dedication to Caracalla.
additional public building in the third and fourth centuries is scarce, though the city continued to exist through the Byzantine period.³⁵⁴

a. The Aqueduct and Fountains of Flavius Tullus

The donation of Flavius Tullus to the city of Sabratha underscores several major themes that I have already mentioned in this study, but the benefaction itself was unique: an infrastructure project designed to improve the overall life of the community. Construction of aqueducts and other major infrastructure elements was more frequently undertaken at public expense, or at the expense of the emperor, but this example from Sabratha indicates that individual citizens could and did contribute such systems. Despite its unique character, Flavius Tullus’ water-supply project highlights the prevalence of familial traditions of euergetism and the tremendous impact that such private donations could have had on urban development. The evidence for this benefaction comes from both the epigraphic record and excavated remains. The material evidence has not been studied in an integrated manner, and the epigraphic remains come from secondary contexts. These factors complicate the process of interpretation, but integrating the physical and epigraphic evidence provides a deeper understanding of how important benefactions of all types were to the cities that received them.

Two sets of epigraphic evidence, mostly from secondary redeposition contexts, shed light on the donation of the water system and its place in Sabratha’s urban development. The primary document that mentions the water supply system was found in a favissa beneath the Capitolium, at the western end of the forum, in a secondary deposition context probably dating to the fourth century C.E. The marble plaque is 3.16

m long and 0.70 m tall. The text’s first line is 6.5 cm tall, and the remaining lines are 4.5-5 cm tall.  

20. C(aio) Flauio Q(uinti) fil(io) Pap(ricia tribu) Pudenti flam(ini) Liberi Patris Iluiro flam(ini) perpetuo cius pater Fl(auius) Tullus post multas liberalitates per quas patriam suam exornauit aquam priuata pecunia induxit item lacus n(umero) XII exstru-xit eosdemque crustis et statuis marmoreis excoluit praeterea (sestertios) CC mil(ia) num(mum) ad tutelam eiusdem aquae rei publ(icae) promisit et intulit quod ipse quoque Pudens super numerosam munificentiam quam in ciues suos contulit eiam muneris gladiatori spectaculum primus in patria sua per dies quinq(ue) splendidissimum ediderit ordo Sabrathensium populo postulante quadrigam ei de publico ponend(am) censuit Fl(auius) Pudens honore contentus sua pecunia posuit.  

To Caius Flavius Pudens, son of Quintus, of the Papiria voting tribe, a flamen of Liber Pater, a duumvir, a perpetual flamen, whose father, Flavius Tullus, after many generosities through which he adorned his city, brought in a water supply at private expense, and also constructed twelve pools and decorated them with revetment and marble statues; moreover, he promised to the city 200,000 sesterces for the maintenance of these waters and paid the money. And because Pudens himself, besides the numerous generosities which he gave to the citizens, also produced as a donation the first, most marvelous spectacle of gladiators in his hometown over five days. The town of Sabratha decided, with the acclamation of the people, to set up a quadriga to him, at public expense. Flavius Pudens, content with the honor, erected it with his own money.  

Another inscription, also found in the same favissa of the Capitolium, was inscribed on a fragmentary marble panel, 39 cm wide x 21 cm tall. The text, which apparently

---

355 IRT 117; Bartoccini 1964, 22.  
356 IRT 117.  
357 I think that this word must refer to the open tank or pool at the base of a fountain, though Shaw (1984, 135 n. 48 and 1991, 69) considers that the aqueduct opened into a reservoir with 12 basins rather than 12 individual fountains. Frontinus used the word “lacus” to describe simple fountains or basins in the public domain (Aq. I, 23: ...quantum extra urbem, quantum in urbe, et ex eo quantum lacibus, quantum muneribus, quantum operibus publicis, quantum nomine Caesaris, quantum privatis usibus erogetur, “[it is appropriate that a single person decide] how much should be distributed outside the city, how much inside the city, and out of that amount [distributed in the city] how much to the basins, how much to the display fountains, how much to public buildings, how much in the name of Caesar, how much for private uses.”) See also Longfellow (2011, 19), who translates lacus as “water basin.”  
358 IRT, 117. Three other fragmentary inscriptions from the excavations at Sabratha (IRT 143, 144, 145) represent at least two additional copies of this text. One (IRT 143) was found, along with the complete panel (IRT 117; our no. 20), in the favissa of the Capitolium; one (IRT 144) came to light in excavations of the theater; the third (IRT 145) has no specific provenance.
duplicated that of inscription no. 20, is 4.5 cm tall in the first preserved line, 4 cm-3 cm in the remaining lines.\textsuperscript{359}

21. \textit{[·· ? ···]s [·· ? ···]  \\
[·· ? ···] aquae ductu[·· ? ···]  \\
[·· ? ···] q\textit{uae (sestertiis) CC m(ilibus) n(ummum) a[diectis ·· ? ··]  \\
decretam [·· ? ···]}\textsuperscript{360}

Because the detailed inscription celebrating Flavius Tullus’ benefaction was found in a secondary context, destined for reuse,\textsuperscript{361} it is not possible to guarantee that the physical evidence of Sabratha’s public water supply results from Tullus’ donation. Most scholars assume that the inscription refers to the fountain(s), aqueduct channel, and other water-supply evidence found in the excavations of Sabratha. I, too, associate the physical with the epigraphic remains in this discussion of the Flavius benefaction, though I acknowledge that in some cases the relationship is somewhat speculative.

The physical remains of Sabratha’s public water supply lie in at least two, or perhaps three, different parts, the most visible of which is a fountain just south of the forum and the East Forum Temple, adjacent to the Antonine temple, in an open square (figs. 16-17). Only one small public fountain is known; the other eleven were presumably placed around the city, but physical evidence for their network is not yet known. The fountain was excavated in the 1920s and 1930s during investigation of the Antonine temple.\textsuperscript{362} Built of local limestone, the fountain took the shape of a large square approximately five m on each side (fig. 17). At the top of the fountain, which was built in four courses of large, dressed stones, a square platform at each of the

\textsuperscript{359}IRT 143; Bartoccini 1964, 23.
\textsuperscript{360}IRT 143.
\textsuperscript{361}Bartoccini 1927, 48 (favissa with redeposited inscriptions, architectural fragments, and other remains under the Capitolium); Bartoccini 1950, 33-35 detailed the fourth-century destructions, and proposed that they were carried out by mauroading Austuriani in ca. 365 C.E.; Kenrick 1986, 114 and 315 has followed Di Vita who posited that an earthquake was responsible for the mid-fourth century destruction, not an otherwise-unattested raid by the Austuriani.
\textsuperscript{362}Bartoccini 1964.
fountain’s four corners served as the base for a statue or inscribed cippus. One headless togate statue has been re-erected on the south-east corner of the fountain.\textsuperscript{363} A tank or trough, around one m tall, lay in front of the fountain on the south side, extending the fountain’s south façade about one m on each side.\textsuperscript{364} Two further plinths for statues or inscriptions stood in the tank, flanking the main bulk of the fountain. Both tank and trough were originally plastered and whitewashed on their exteriors, as was the normal practice with the friable local sandstone. In the course of excavation, a cippus of limestone was found on the right-hand plinth in the fountain tank, measuring 0.9 m tall and 0.5 m wide, with an inscribed text enclosed in a simple carved frame. The letters are 6 cm tall in the first line and 3.5 cm tall in the remaining lines.

\textbf{22.} C(aio) Fl(auiio) Q(uinti) fil(io) \\
Pap(ricia tribu) Puden-
ti flam(ini) per \\
pet(uo) Curia Io \\
ui(ob) merita.\textsuperscript{365}

To Caius Flavius Pudens, son of Quintus, of the Papiria tribe, perpetual \textit{flamen}. The Curia of Jupiter (set this up) on account of his merits.

Additional physical evidence that might relate to Tullus’ donation of fountains and an aqueduct is scanty. In excavations of the 1950s, archaeologists traced part of the channel route of an underground aqueduct found to the south of the ancient city (fig. 18a), which was apparently fed by wells or cisterns. Later explorations followed the course of the aqueduct into the city (fig. 18b), to the eastern quarter near the theater,

\textsuperscript{363} Bartoccini 1964, pl. 8a; see plate 17. The statue is shown in all published images of the fountain but is not mentioned in any published text. Presumably it was found either fallen inside the fountain or outside the fountain nearby.

\textsuperscript{364} Measurements for the trough are not given in Bartoccini’s excavation report; I have taken them from the plan and section of the fountain given in Bartoccini 1964, pl. xxvi.

\textsuperscript{365} \textit{IRT} 122. This inscription is one of a series of eight virtually identical texts found around the forum (\textit{IRT} 118-125), all dedicated to Caius Flavius Pudens by different \textit{curiae} of the city. All take the form of a simple limestone cippus approximately 1 m in height (except for two which are broken and whose total height cannot be determined), and the wording is identical except for the names of the various \textit{curiae} (Bartoccini 1950, 47).
where it probably ended in a water tower, from which the water was distributed.\textsuperscript{366} Though oral tradition held that the aqueduct found its primary source in the mountains far south of the city,\textsuperscript{367} the excavated aqueduct channel is much shorter, apparently deriving from large cisterns and wells about 3-5 km south of the ancient city; at least two sources of water for the aqueduct were located.\textsuperscript{368} The channel was approximately 1.75 m tall on the exterior and 0.75 m wide, and built of brickwork with a vaulted ceiling. The second exploration of the aqueduct’s course discovered that it apparently delivered its output to a water tower near the theater in the eastern part of the town; further information about the intra-urban distribution network was not discovered.\textsuperscript{369} None of the excavators published a map of this ancient aqueduct’s exact location or course toward the city, and only circumstantial evidence connects the remains of this aqueduct to the one built by Flavius Tullus, but the two are likely related, since we have no other archaeological evidence of a second aqueduct, and no epigraphic evidence suggesting that the city may have had another public water supply.

Though we do not know where all of Flavius Tullus’ fountains were located, I propose that another public lacus must have been located near the theater, in the newly-developing eastern quarter (figs. 16 and 19). Several pieces of circumstantial evidence point to this conclusion. First, the channel of the aqueduct apparently ended in a water tower near the eastern side of the theater.\textsuperscript{370} Without complete publication of the findings, it is impossible to tell how the water was distributed from that point, but

\textsuperscript{366} The later explorations are reported by di Vita 1985, 453, who publishes also a photograph of the channel (454, fig. 10). No plan of the aqueduct’s course or of the supposed water tower is given, however.

\textsuperscript{367} Bartoccini 1964, 23.

\textsuperscript{368} Wells in the low hills about 5 km outside the city; wells and pools around 2 km closer to the urban area, where a noria (water wheel) apparently raised the water to the level of the aqueduct channel.

\textsuperscript{369} Bartoccini 1964, 23 and pl. VIIIc, Xa; di Vita 1985, 453. Ward (1970, 47-48) offers the intriguing information that the channel may have continued on past the supposed water tower at the theater and back toward the forum area, but cites no specific evidence that this was, in fact, the case.

\textsuperscript{370} di Vita 1985, 453.
presumably water passed from a water tower (*castellum*) into smaller, local distribution channels leading to the various fountains around the city. Second, a fragmentary copy of the long inscription listing the benefactions of Tullus and of Pudens (no. 20) was found during excavations of the theater. This small fragment, found in the theater road, derived from the right side of a marble plaque or panel 16 cm wide and 19 cm tall; it preserves at least three lines of text, in letters 4 cm tall.

23. [---]
   [·· ? ··]s quas
   [·· ? ··] aquae duct((?)-
   [·· ? ··] pec]unia
   [---]371

It is tempting to assume that the plaque was erected in or near the theater because it was near another of Tullus’ fountains, close to that large public building. The theater at Sabratha probably dates to the reign of Commodus, at the end of the second century,372 approximately the same time period to which the excavators assign the Flavius Tullus inscription.

Excavations of the theater revealed a number of features which might have been related to the water system; none of them can be definitively assigned to this project through close stratigraphic association. In addition to the fragmentary inscription, clearance in the *porticus post scaenam* revealed structures that were identified as a “pozzo, well,” and “vasca, tank,” in the southwest corner of the porticoed space, and an additional “pozzo” in the southeast corner (figs. 19-20).373 Unfortunately, the excavation report mentioned these items only in passing, in discussion of the porticus behind the theater. Caputo suggested that this space was a “viridarium,” a garden-space similar,

---

371 *IRT* 144. Another fragmentary inscription, *IRT* 145, apparently also relates to the donation of Flavius Tullus; the preserved text reads “[·· ? ··]RO[·· ? ··] | I·· ? ··]XII lac[us ·· ? ··].” This example also derives from a marble panel or plaque but has no recorded provenance.

372 Kenrick 1986, 315; Caputo 1959, 29.

373 Caputo 1959, 28-29 and pl. 60; see plate 19.
perhaps, to that in the porticus of Pompey at Rome. Of the wells and tank, he wrote that
the water structures were apparently located below the ancient ground-level of the
garden. According to the plans and photographs given (figs. 19-20), the shape of the
pozzo and vasca in the southwest corner of the porticus appears quite similar to that of
the fountain of Tullus south of the Forum: a rectangular structure, built of multiple
courses of limestone blocks, with a wider tank on its south side. Investigation of this
structure appears to have been extremely cursory, but I propose to identify it as
another fountain paid for by Flavius Tullus, based on its apparent structural similarities
with the fountain near the forum. I suggest that this fountain pre-dates the construction
of the theater and its porticus post scaenam; when that large building complex was
constructed, a second well could have been added to the garden in order to incorporate
the existing structure into the design of the theater complex. This earlier date could
account for the fountain tank’s odd location butted against the south and west walls of
the porticus, and for its level below the ground of the porticus. The presence of a small
public fountain in this area indicates that the vicinity of the theater was already used (or
intended for use) as public space.

The main inscription for the benefaction mentioned an aqueduct and twelve
pools or fountains; it made no mention of other water infrastructure like drains or an
intra-urban distribution network of smaller aqueduct channels, pipes, or aqueduct-
supplied cisterns. It is plausible to suppose, however, that Flavius Tullus’ aqueduct

---

374 Caputo 1959, 29.
375 Caputo's (1959, pl. 17, fig. 32) photograph shows two courses of limestone blocks, and a mortared tank
attached to the blocks (see plate 20).
376 Those excavations were also destructive; later state plans indicate that the tank was removed as
excavations progressed: see Caputo 1959, pl. 62.
377 Such a multi-faceted system was in use at Carthage in the imperial period prior to the construction of
the long Carthage-Zaghouan aqueduct (Wilson 1998), and a similar system of storage and distribution
might have been in place at Sabratha, where many households employed cisterns as well as the public
fountains installed by Flavius Tullus. Kenrick (1986, fig. 66) shows numerous cisterns in the houses of
project also included some municipal plumbing work, as Kenrick has suggested.\textsuperscript{378} Drains in the central area around the forum were apparently laid in the middle or later second century, when the streets and the forum area were paved (fig. 21). A large drain running N-S across the eastern edge of the forum apparently passed close by, or perhaps intersected, the structure of the fountain just south of the Forum. Excavations did not clear this drain’s channel or clarify its declination, but Kenrick theorized that it ran northward under the Forum, picking up other drains’ outputs as it went.\textsuperscript{379} Though the precise connection between the drainage system in the forum and the fountain to the south has not been investigated, it is tempting to connect both projects to the same period of infrastructure investment: the two projects appear to be broadly contemporary (see below), and the path of the drain could run alongside the fountain’s western edge. Flavius Tullus may not have paid for the drains as well as the aqueduct; another civic-minded donor, or the municipal treasury, could have financed the drainage project while Flavius Tullus paid for the aqueduct and fountains. It is tempting to associate the two projects, however, since Tullus’ project would have involved major infrastructure work to bring the aqueduct into the city and deliver it to his twelve fountains.\textsuperscript{380}

---

\textsuperscript{378} Kenrick 1986, 25-28.

\textsuperscript{379} Kenrick 1986, 315.

\textsuperscript{380} If the underground aqueduct channel found by Bartoccini (1964, 23) was the source for Tullus’ fountains, it must have brought water into the city at a relatively low level, necessitating construction
It is difficult to determine the date at which Tullus gave his benefaction to the city of Sabratha, since the complete inscription (no. 20) does not include any specific dating formulae. In fact, the text of the inscription, which mentions gifts from two generations of donors from the Flavius family, dates to a later period than the initial benefaction by Flavius Tullus, since both Flavius Tullus and his son Flavius Pudens had completed substantial donations to the city before the plaque was inscribed. Based on its letter forms, the editors of *IRT* dated the inscription to the later second or early third century. The fountain and aqueduct were not stratigraphically dated at the time of their excavation, but the fountain’s orientation at an angle to both the Antonine temple to its east and the East Forum Temple to its north suggests that the fountain was built at a different time than either of the two temples. The fountain probably pre-dated the temples’ construction: if it had been built after the temple we might reasonably expect the builders to have taken their orientation cues from the buildings around them.

Since the Antonine temple was dedicated in 166-169, we can posit a *terminus ante quem* for the fountain’s construction in the mid-second century. This supposed date would correspond well with the other available evidence, especially that related to the construction of the theater and the drains in the forum. Evidence for the theater’s date comes primarily from its architectural details, which point to the Antonine (or perhaps Severan) period, late second or early third century. Stratigraphic dating of the drains’ construction assigns them to the late Antonine period, or the second half of the second century inside the city of channels at or below street-level. Constructing drains along with the underground channel would therefore have been a relatively uncomplicated task.

---

381 *IRT* 117, inscription no. 20.
382 Compare this to the case of the *macellum* and theater at Lepcis Magna, where the larger building, the theater, dictated the orientation of other public buildings and also neighboring *insulae* (see ch. III.2.d. The Theater-Temple Complex, supra p. 84).
383 Bartoccini 1964, 27, based on a fragmentary inscription from the temple’s frieze, including the names of both Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus; the temple’s dedicatory inscription must therefore date before Verus’ death in 169.
century, during a phase of major renovations to the Forum area. All this evidence—the letter-forms of the later second or third century, the orientation of the forum fountain itself, and the contemporary construction of the large drains in the forum—suggests strongly that Flavius Tullus gave his substantial donation of aqueducts and fountains to the city in the middle of the second century, during a period of major civic improvement.

Flavius Tullus was clearly a wealthy citizen of Sabratha, but we know of him only through his donation of the fountains and aqueduct and the endowment for maintaining those structures. His son, Flavius Pudens, was also a benefactor to the city, as we learn from both the long inscription listing his generosity and the series of inscribed cippi that the citizens erected around the forum in his honor “ob merita, on account of his merits.” It is clear that the family were important members of the local elites in imperial-period Sabratha who made a habit of benefaction: the inscription cites Tullus’ “multas liberalitates per quas patriam suam exoranavit, the many generosities with which he adorned his city” and Pudens’ “numerosam munificentiam quam in ciues suos contulit, numerous donations which he conferred on his fellow citizens” in addition to their specific works, the aqueduct and the gladiatorial games.

Tullus’ donation was spectacularly generous; he paid for both the initial construction of the aqueduct and fountains, and for their continued maintenance. Pudens took the additional generous step of paying for his own honorific statue group. Their family’s donations to the town of Sabratha were obviously something of a familiar pattern, perhaps one that extended even further than the two recorded generations.

---

385 Kenrick 1986, 25-28: dating evidence include ceramics (ARS forms, dating to the second half of the second century) and coins (Hadrianic date). The renovations to the forum during this period included paving the open space at a high level (0.65 m higher than the previous floor level, which allowed for relatively deep drains to be set below the paving), constructing porticoes along its north and south sides, and—in the same general period, at least—the construction of the Antonine temple and the South forum temple outside the area of the forum proper.
The motivation behind the Flavius family’s generous donations is not entirely clear from the inscription. Flavius Pudens held several municipal offices, so he could have produced the gladiatorial games and offered additional donations as part of his official actions (i.e. as a *summa honoraria* for one or more of his offices). The inscription does not give any indication of Flavius Tullus’ career, but the high cost of his donation falls significantly above the usual cost of African *summa honoraria*.386 The water supply project must have been extremely costly,387 and it is therefore unlikely to have been promised to the city as a result of Tullus holding a municipal office. Instead, his donation may have been offered—or solicited—to support the large-scale renovation of the central city that took place in the Antonine era. Possibly (though we have no certain epigraphic evidence for this) Tullus’ benefaction was one of many that supported the monumentalization of the forum and other public areas of the city, including the theater district to the east.

If the marble plaque honoring Pudens and Tullus is really later than the original donation, it seems surprising that no earlier inscriptions honoring Flavius Tullus’ benefaction have come to light. The togate statue found in the fountain may well represent the man himself, but without an inscribed base it is impossible to say for certain that the statue was erected in his honor on the site of his donation. We can

---

386 Duncan-Jones (1982, 82-85 and 109, nos. 360-361) notes that the highest recorded payment of a *summa honoraria* was found in Carthage, where a second-century magistrate paid 38,000 HS for holding the quinquennalitas; at other large cities in the African provinces, high offices required a payment of around 20,000 HS, or one-tenth of the size of Tullus’ foundation for his water system’s maintenance.

387 Scholars have regularly noted the incredible expense associated with aqueduct construction: Shaw (1991) reminds us that their costs must have been “formidable” and that donations of this sort were restricted to the wealthiest and most generous of benefactors. Aqueduct construction could easily run into millions of sesterces, as we learn from ancient literary sources (Shaw 1991, 68-69). In his encyclopedia, Pliny the Elder notes that the massive Aqua Claudia at Rome cost 350,000,000 HS (*HN* 36.24.122-123). More modest provincial water projects were also extremely costly; Duncan-Jones (1982, 91-92, nos. 37b, 54) lists several examples of water projects in Africa, whose costs ranged from 30,000-600,000 sesterces, and none of them included construction of an aqueduct. At standard interest rates of 4-6%, Flavius Tullus’ 200,000 HS-endowment would have provided about 10,000 HS annually just for the maintenance of the water installations that he had constructed, and their initial construction must have cost many times that amount (Duncan-Jones 1982, 80-81).
suppose that this is the case, and that perhaps each of the fountains bore a similar honorific statue of their donor. The other plaques (including nos. 21 and 23) may also have been placed in locations near the fountains. The complete plaque found in the favissa of the Capitolium (no. 20) was clearly destined for reuse, and its original provenance is unknown. It seems likely, however, that the plaque was displayed near the fountain just to the south of the forum. Additional honorific texts for the son, Pudens, were found at the forum fountain and in the forum, though it is unclear whether the inscribed cippi (e.g. no. 22) were found in situ.

A second area of commemoration for these two benefactors was located in the public space at the site of the theater, where at least one additional inscribed plaque (no. 23) was discovered. I have suggested above that we should recognize a second of Tullus’ fountains in a structure that was later built into the theater’s porticus post scaenam; finding a commemorative inscription nearby follows the pattern of the forum fountain. Tullus may have even set up a fountain in this region in order to emphasize his own family’s efforts on behalf of the city of Sabratha, and to associate himself with ancestors who built structures in that part of the city.³⁸⁸ By placing his fountain near an earlier building also constructed by a member of the Flavius family, Flavius Tullus multiplied the impact of his family name, allowing his own plaque to form a sort of

³⁸⁸ I base this suggestion on the discovery of a fragmentary monumental inscription, IRT-S 1 (Reynolds 1955, 125, no. S1), in the porticus post scaenam. The stuccoed limestone inscription, whose letters are 13-14 cm tall lapidary capitals, reads ….Flavi[us? … | …]um mun[…. Stuccoed limestone was an early material for inscriptions at Sabratha, and combined with the paleographic evidence of large lapidary capitals, the material indicates a relatively early date for this inscription, later first or early second century (Reynolds 1955, 125, no. S1; IRT, 25: stuccoed limestone was the normal material for inscriptions at Sabratha until the reign of Hadrian). The first line of this fragmentary inscription could refer equally well to an ancestor of Flavius Tullus or the first-century imperial family. The interpretation of the second line is more doubtful: Caputo restored it as “portic[um munificentia],” and suggested that it named a first century portico, later incorporated into the structure of the triporticus behind the theater (Caputo 1959, 28). Reynolds (1955, 125, no. S1) offered a different reconstruction of the text in line 2, “patron[um municipi]” which she suggested related to the redevelopment of Sabratha’s constitution in the late first century C.E. I find Caputo’s reconstruction to be the more convincing, since the letter size and style seem more appropriate to a building dedication than to a municipal legal text, statue base, or commemorative plaque.
visual echo of the earlier building dedication and perhaps even creating the impression that the entire area was given over to public use through the generosity of the Flavii. Though many specific details of their commemoration remains unknown, the epigraphic evidence gives an impression that Flavius Tullus’ name and likeness, and those of his son Flavius Pudens, were regularly visible in many public spaces around Sabratha.

Tullus’ twelve fountains were located throughout the city, so his donation caused a great impact not only on the urban plan of Sabratha, but also on the lives of its inhabitants. Many of the private dwellings in the town were equipped with wells and cisterns, but Tullus’ provision of twelve new *lacus* must have benefitted residents of the town who had limited access to fresh drinking water. The new fountains, constructed in public spaces, created or enlivened public gathering areas with the water supply at their center, where people regularly stopped to draw water for personal or domestic use. It is possible that the construction of these fountains had the greatest impact on the lower-status residents, those without access to private supplies of water in their own homes.

In addition to creating informal gathering spaces around the urban area of Sabratha, Flavius Tullus’ construction of the water supply in turn created opportunities for other benefactors to give additional donations. There is, indeed, some evidence that new bathing facilities were constructed in the second half of the second century. The organized development of the eastern quarter of the city, too, was approximately concurrent with the construction of the water supply, and we should perhaps see in this

---

389 Mattingly 1995, 127. Other scholars who mention the regular presence of wells and cisterns include Sandoz 2006, 403; Kenrick 1986, 141-166 (with special reference to the construction of cisterns in the “Casa Brogan” near the forum); Bartoccini 1927, 19.

390 One example of such structures is the “Office Baths” at the southwestern edge of the ancient city: Brecciaroli Taborelli 1974-1975, 144; the baths had their own reservoir, but there is no mention of how that cistern was filled (Brecciaroli Taborelli 1974-1975, 123).
parallel development a successful integration of public construction projects and the private implementation of a civic water supply, which allowed for even greater development in that area in its wake. The augmented water supply thus directly created even more opportunities for public interaction by making additional construction projects of public and private space possible.

We might speculate that the second part of Flavius Tullus’ donation, the endowed maintenance fund, was part of an effort to solicit further donations to the town. Endowed funds earmarked for maintenance of the water supply system removed that fiscal burden from the town’s coffers, and freed civic funds for other uses.³⁹¹ This greater financial flexibility might have allowed the municipal leaders to repair or refurbish older buildings, or to promise other prospective donors maintenance of their buildings at civic expense. Flavius Tullus’ donation spurred additional development and signified to Sabratha’s low- and high-status residents alike that their city was worthy of further financial and social investment. In this way, Tullus donated not just a water supply but also a new civic attitude to his fellow citizens.

4. A Bath Building at Bulla Regia

Located in northern Africa Proconsularis, Bulla Regia (figs. 2 and 22) lay on the road between two important cities, Carthage and Hippo Regius. Originally perhaps a Numidian settlement, Bulla Regia came under Punic influence in the third century B.C.E.; after the second Punic War, the Numidian king Massinissa made it a royal city. After 146 B.C.E. the city was incorporated into the Roman province of Africa and its inhabitants came increasingly under Roman influence. The city became a municipium in

³⁹¹ Duncan-Jones (1982, 137) noted that similar endowments were set up at several cities in Italy to maintain the public baths, or, in one case, to provide fuel to heat the bath-water.
the first century and a *colonia* under Hadrian, which status granted Roman citizenship to all its inhabitants. The rich agricultural land around Bulla Regia made its citizens quite wealthy, and this wealth is reflected in the city’s material remains. The archaeological record shows a fascinating mixture between “native” adaptations, most famously the subterranean levels of the domestic structures, designed perhaps to mitigate the heat of African summers—and typically “Roman” elements, including public buildings like a theater, baths, temples, a forum, and courtyard houses with polychrome mosaics. Early excavations cleared some of the domestic areas and most of the public buildings, including the large bath complex of Julia Memmia. Located in the southern part of the town, they were slightly removed from the town’s center and its major public buildings, though the bath complex was built on a busy street that lead to the theater and the forum.

**a. The Baths of Julia Memmia**

The Baths of Julia Memmia were a prominent part of the landscape of the Roman town of Bulla Regia in Africa Proconsularis. Named for their benefactress, they are one of the foremost examples of women’s benefactions in North Africa. Like Flavius Tullus’ donation of a water supply at Sabratha, the Memmian baths constituted one element of a larger, long-term redevelopment in their neighborhood. Like the theater complex at Lepcis Magna, the Memmian baths became an anchor for that neighborhood and influenced its future developments. And as we have seen with other benefactors, Julia

---

392 Beschauoch et al. 1977, 1-17. The baths of Julia Memmia were excavated in the late 19th-early 20th centuries, especially during the period 1909-1924, by a French expedition under the direction of L. Carton (Broise and Thébert 1993, 10-11). Carton and his colleagues published several brief preliminary notes at the time of their excavation, but the complex was not completely published until a Franco-Tunisian archaeological mission to Bulla Regia undertook a large-scale study of the bath building and its surroundings in the 1980s and 1990s. This study comprised an architectural study of the standing remains of the bath, and some excavation in nearby areas to determine the character and history of the neighborhood (Broise and Thébert 1993, 15).

393 Broise and Thébert 1993, 1-3.
Memmia’s familial connections to Bulla Regia played a role in her decision to make a donation to the town, but likely did not dictate that donation’s form.

The Baths of Julia Memmia were impressive in their scale. A portico along the street, approached by shallow steps, led into the entry hall at street level (fig. 23). No dedicatory inscription has come to light, though we might reasonably expect such a text to have been placed above the columns of the portico, lining the street.\textsuperscript{394} Two symmetrically-placed staircases led down from the entryway into the main block of the complex, which was built nearly three m below street level.\textsuperscript{395} The baths are named based on an inscribed limestone statue base (1.8 m tall x 0.6 m wide x 0.47 m deep) discovered at the base of the eastern staircase. The base was inscribed on two faces; the first inscription is written in 13 lines, with letters 0.04 m tall in the first line and 3.5 cm tall in the remaining lines\textsuperscript{396}

\begin{verbatim}
24. [Iul]iae Me[m]mia[e] 
[---]cae Rut[ae] Aemi 
[liana]e Fidia[nae] claris 
[simae et nobilis][simae feminae 
[C(ai) Memmi I]ul(i) Albi consularis 
[viri patr]oni et alumi fil(iae) ob 
[praecipu]am operis sui thermaum 
[magnifi]centiam qua et patriam 
[suam e]xornavit et saluti civium 
[---]ico consulere 
[---]ignata] est …
\end{verbatim}

To Julia Memmia Prisca Rufa Aemelia Fidiana, most excellent and noble woman, daughter of Caius Memmius Iulius Alb(i)us, a man of consular rank, patron and hometown boy, on account of the exceptional magnificence of her own works, the baths, by which she both adorned her fatherland and [improved, vel sim.] the health of the citizens … she was

\textsuperscript{394} Broise and Thébert 1993, 17-26 and 347-355. Cf., for example, the inscription of the Temple of Mercury at Thugga (see ch. VI.3.e. The East Forum Area, the Macellum, and the Temple of Mercury, infra p. 241, no. 64) where the inscription ran the length of the porch fronting the sanctuary.

\textsuperscript{395} Bulla Regia is unique in the Roman world for its partially subterranean buildings, including both private villas and houses and public structures. A number of the buildings had both above- and below-ground spaces, as do the Memmian Baths.

\textsuperscript{396} Carton 1920, 323.

\textsuperscript{397} ILAfr 454.
worthy [of …]

A second inscription, on the right side of the base from the previous text, records the text of a letter to the citizens of Bulla Regia concerning the construction of the baths themselves. The text was inscribed in letters 1.5 cm tall, and is in such poor condition that it cannot be fully translated:398

25. [---] bene et eius
   [--- pa]tronae et [ // ]
   NV[---]M
   OBT[---]NIAE[---]ORI[---]IS
   domini patri[s ---]
   [---] aedili[---]rio etia[m ---]
   A oreque[---]EVMDOCTNV[---]
   TVA[---]ITI[---]VLMVMCV[---]IS [---]
   VOS PER[---]ISSEI[---] h[or]tatur ad rem[uneran]
   da vestr[a] OI[---]VIA ita enim et singulis [---]
   liu[m] VER[----------] pu[b]lici ad promerendos EI[---]
   esti[-]mer[-] semper C() C() item CI[---]AlAIO[---]
   vos condigncr[---] dari posset VCII[---]
   mihi QVET [v]estris [u]tilitatabus esset V[---]
   NIVSNIVO[-]E[---] fortuna [h]omini NOV[---]
   [---]arunt [---]TVNMV SO[---]
   [---]B[---]VMDO[-]SEI[---]mate lavac[---]
   in[---]suos nunc ita [--- m]inima ad [---]
   qu(e) [---]ae SV[---]EDI[---]vae iussit [---]
   AM[---]NRV[---]IIAE[---]itis ex sestert
   iiis M [tr]ibus num[m]um de meo vobis fa[---]L[---]ta
   O[---]onem SVI[---]AS [---]
   [---]NASII[---]VMA[---]VI[---]
   [---]itiate OP[---]
   [--- i]n epistulis quae IV
   A[---]ve therma [---]
   [---]al|ere [---]V[-]ani …399

A second limestone statue base, recut and reused, was found in an antechamber to the caldarium; perhaps originally of the same dimensions as Julia Memmia’s statue base (nos. 24 and 25), ca. 1.8 m tall, the excavators have proposed that it originally stood in

399 ILÄfr 454.
the western stairwell of the baths, in a position parallel to the statue and statue base of Julia Memmia (fig. 23).  

26. C(aio) Memmio C(ai) fil(io) Quir(ina)  
Fido Iulio Albio c(larissimae?) m(emoriae?) v(iro?)  
OV[---]TP C[---]PIR[...  

To Caius Memmius Fidus Iulius Albius, son of Caius, of the Quirina tribe,  
(a man of greatest memory?) …

The staircases led into a long vestibule, from which visitors could have accessed either of the symmetrically-placed basilicate halls or the centrally-located frigidarium. The symmetrical arrangement of rooms did not extend to the heated rooms used for bathing, which were instead arranged in a counter-clockwise ring leading from the frigidarium through the various warm rooms and finally into the hot caldarium. 

Remains of mosaic paving, frescoes, marble revetments and opus sectile, sculpted stone, and statue bases testify to the lavish appointment of the baths’ interior spaces, but little of their overall decorative program can be confidently restored. The size, layout, and decorative program of the baths testified to the generosity of the benefactor, since these baths were built on the same scale as other (perhaps imperially-funded) bath complexes in other mid-sized cities in Africa.

The date of this building is not precisely known from either the inscriptions or the archaeological record of the baths themselves. Excavation of the baths and their surroundings indicate that they are probably somewhat later than their terminus post

---

401 Broise and Thébert 1993, 351.
402 Architectural historians class the Memmian baths as a “half-axial ring-type thermae” complex (Nielsen 1993, 1:90 and 2:26 no. C.207; Yegül 2010, 144).
404 According to the comparative plans shown in Broise and Thébert (1993, fig. 385), the Memmian baths are similar in size to the large bathing complexes at Thysdrus, Thugga (the Antoninian baths, which may have been an imperial benefaction: see ch. VII.3. The Third and Fourth Centuries, infra p. 300), Gigthis, and Lambaesis, among others.
quem; Broise and Thébert propose a date of ca. 220-240 C.E. based on stratigraphic evidence and biographical information of the Memmius family gleaned from the inscriptions.  

The inscriptions, along with two others from Africa Proconsularis, indicate that the builder was the daughter of a consular office-holder; the other inscriptions give further details about Memmius Fidus’ career and allow us to date his consulate to the year 191-192, giving a \textit{terminus post quem} for the baths’ construction. We can safely say that the baths were built after his consulship, since otherwise the inscriptions of Memmia and Memmius in the baths would not have mentioned his consular rank.

Additional construction around 360 C.E. added a large cryptoporticus to the west of the main bath building, in an open area that may have served as the building’s palaestra prior to the renovation. No epigraphic evidence connects the fourth-century renovation of the baths and the construction of the cryptoporticus with a particular donor.

Julia Memmia is known only from her activity in constructing this bath on behalf of the citizens of Bulla Regia. Her father, C. Julius Memmius Fidus, may well have been a patron and benefactor in his own right to the town of Bulla Regia. But as the

\footnotesize{405} Broise and Thébert 1993, 105.
\footnotesize{406} \textit{CIL} 12442 and 11928; both were found in other parts of Africa proconsularis, and neither mentions other members of the family of Memmius.
\footnotesize{407} Broise and Thébert 1993, 350.
\footnotesize{408} Cryptoporticus date: Broise and Thébert 1993, 155-157; use of space as palaestra prior to cryptoporticus’ construction: Broise and Thébert 1993, 350.
\footnotesize{409} Inscription no. 25 includes the word “\textit{patronae}” in a feminine form, which suggests that Julia Memmia might have also been a formal patron of the city, but the fragmentary nature of the text makes this an uncertain reading.
\footnotesize{410} Cagnat (1920, 327-329) suggested that Memmius was both patron and donor to the city of Bulla Regia, and then connected his name with an extremely fragmentary inscription from the Temple of Apollo in the town. The implication of Cagnat’s reconstructed text is that Memmius may have given a donation to renovate the Temple of Apollo, but nowhere does Cagnat explicitly state this, and to my knowledge this building in the forum has not been scientifically excavated or published (Beschaouch et al. 1977, 86, no. 33).}
inscription on her statue base makes clear, the building work of the baths was her own, “operis sui, thermarum,” and not the work of multiple members of her family.

The inscriptions on Julia Memmia’s statue base also provide us with at least limited insight into her purpose in erecting the large bath complex. The legible section of the text includes the phrases “et patriam suam exornavit et saluti civium ... , both adorned her fatherland and [improved, vel sim] the health of its citizens.” Since this is an honorific inscription and the text of these phrases is written in the past tense, we should understand that these improvements to the town and its citizens were a result of Memmia’s benefaction, but it seems likely that these results were part of Memmia’s purpose in erecting her building. It remains to ask, however, why the citizens’ health needed a benefactor’s attention: perhaps Bulla Regia had previously lacked a large public bathing facility, or perhaps the public facility was in poor repair or too small for the town’s population. The current state of our knowledge about the urban development of Bulla Regia does not permit us to do more than speculate on the date of other bath complexes in the town (fig. 22).411 This text could also have exaggerated the baths’ effect on both the city and its residents in order to glorify the benefactor. No

411 Bulla Regia is not, however, a town lacking in bathing facilities, from an archaeological perspective. In fact, Beschaouch et al. identify and describe no fewer than six baths in the city (1977, 13, fig. 3; 23-32; 77-79; 93-95; 100-101; 114-115). Probably four of these should be classed—based on their relative sizes in plan—as small (and perhaps private or semi-private?) balnea rather than larger thermae; the baths of Julia Memmia and the Large Southern Baths are probably to be understood as public bath complexes. It is unclear whether any or all of the bath buildings—especially the Memmian baths and its near neighbor, the Large Southern Baths—were in use during the same periods of time. Unfortunately only two of these bath buildings, besides the baths of Julia Memmia, have been published to modern standards (the baths to the northwest of the theater: see Hanoune, et al. 1983, and the baths of the “grand ensemble séverien” to the southeast of the theater: Hanoune 2005 and 2006). For the baths northwest of the theater, even this modern report relies on data from the early excavations of the city and as such does not contain much information that modern scholars consider essential, such as ceramic and stratigraphic analyses. The authors suggest (1983, 90) that the architecture of the baths northwest of the theater resembles that of large, late imperial baths in Rome such as those of Diocletian and Constantine, implying perhaps a late(ish) date for this particular small bath complex. For the baths of the “grand ensemble séverien” southeast of the theater, modern investigation of the complex confirms a Severan period date—that is, late second or early third century—and the bath building’s orientation suggests its public character (Hanoune 2005, 281).
doubt the now-fragmentary inscription no. 25 would have offered additional
information about the reason for and practicalities of the baths’ construction.

The inscribed statue base which furnishes our primary textual evidence for the
baths is also the only indication that we have of the commemoration which Julia
Memmia received for her donation of this large and opulent building. The statue base is
nearly 2 m tall, and was probably found in situ; its height, combined with a postulated
life-sized or slightly over-life-sized statue, would have made the image of the building’s
donor visible from the top of the eastern stairwell. After descending down the stairs, a
visitor would have been able to read the name of the donor (inscribed prominently at
the top of the base and in larger letters than the rest of the text), and—if interest or time
permitted—the text of the letter from the donor to the citizens of Bulla Regia inscribed
on the side of the base. A matching statue and base (inscription no. 26) in the western
stairwell landing honored C. Iulius Memmius Fidus, the father of Julia Memmia.412 In
the absence of further evidence, therefore, we can assume that the statues of the
benefactor and her father were placed prominently inside the building, but that they
received no other public recognition of their good works on behalf of the town.

Although the portraits of the benefactor and her father were placed inside the
bath building, its expansive size and its construction in a largely domestic quarter of the
city made the building itself quite prominent.413 The street-level entry into the baths
resembled a 45-m long colonnade, rising perhaps as much as 8 m above the level of the
street onto which it opened.414 This façade and the domed roof of the entry hall (room 5)
behind it would likely have towered over neighboring buildings (fig. 24). The well-
preserved subterranean levels of several of the houses at Bulla Regia provide an

412 Broise and Thébert 1993, 351; Carton 1920, 323.
413 Broise and Thébert 1993, 3 and 356-365.
414 Broise and Thébert 1993, 17-22 and fig. 27.
analogy for the height of above-ground domestic buildings; these houses preserve lower stories 3-5 m tall, and we can perhaps assume that ground-level stories might have had similar dimensions. In a few cases houses may have had upper stories over all or part of the ground level, but such multi-story above-ground dwellings do not appear to have been the norm at Bulla Regia. The new Baths constructed by Julia Memmia probably dwarfed many of the nearby structures and created a formal colonnade along the south side of a busy thoroughfare.

The neighborhood in which Julia Memmia built her bath complex had seen many improvements in the decades preceding the baths’ construction. The street off of which the baths opened was widened and paved around 190-200 C.E., before the baths were built; perhaps a bit earlier than that, a large open space adjacent to the site of the baths was developed into a religious complex with the erection of at least two small temples. After the road was paved, the construction of a portico on its northern side (across the street from the site of the baths) enhanced the formality of the paved street. When Julia Memmia constructed the baths—apparently demolishing some private dwellings in order to obtain the space necessary for the large complex—she contributed a major public structure to a sector of the city that was becoming increasingly monumentalized. The portico fronting the baths on the south side of the street matched that already in existence on the north and created a more formal aspect to the street.

Thébert (1972) discussed houses with underground levels, of which at least 8 are now known at Bulla Regia. In several of his plans he included multiple staircases, suggesting that at least some of these houses had upper as well as lower levels (e.g., Maison d’Amphitrite, Maison no. 1). Maison no. 1’s ground floor appears to have been built on several levels which were mediated by a few stairs (Thébert 1972, 23) but Thébert mentioned no evidence from that building for a true upper story. Lower stories in the fancy houses with underground rooms ranged from 3 meters tall (Maison du Paon) to 5.15 m (Maison de la Chasse) (Thébert 1972, 20-25).

The new bath building, with its semi-symmetrical plan and large scale, was certainly designed to draw in large numbers of people to bathe and socialize. Its placement away from the other major public buildings of Bulla Regia made it—and perhaps its neighborhood—a particular destination outside the civic center and the entertainment district of the city. Locating the baths in a domestic quarter may have been a way to offer convenient bathing facilities to area residents, or it could have been intended to create additional traffic through the neighborhood and to increase the area’s civic visibility. A few instances of decoration inside the baths suggests that they were associated in some way with the *sodalitates*, private associations in the city which may have had both religious and civic functions. Thébert posited that the baths might have been made available to members of several different *sodalitates* on certain occasions, and that Julia Memmia may have been in some way associated with one or more of these groups, though as a woman she was probably not a full member of the organizations.

It is interesting to consider whether the baths’ location might have been chosen based on the needs of the *sodalitates*: were they placed in the neighborhood where members of these groups lived or congregated? And would the association with certain groups have drawn citizens to visit the baths who might otherwise have patronized establishments in other parts of the city? Regardless of the association with the *sodalitates*, however, it is clear that the construction of the large and imposing bathing
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417 Broise and Thébert (1993, fig. 385) have demonstrated that the Baths of Julia Memmia were fairly large for privately-built bath complexes in North Africa, though the large imperial bath complex at Carthage (built in the second century) dwarfs this building (and most others in the region).

418 Several different symbols associated with different *sodalitates* were lightly inscribed on the surfaces of keystones in the niches of the frigidarium, and a sculpted figure on the keystone of a window in the caldarium might also be associated with these groups or their functions. The decoration would not have been particularly visible, however, and Thébert has suggested that the symbols were used to mark the construction in some way, but would have been covered by plaster or marble revetment when the baths were in use (Thébert 1991, 195-203 and fig. 2, fig. 4 for images of the symbols used in the baths’ decoration). Salommonson (1960) connected these groups and their decorative symbols in North African contexts with the *venationes* that were popular objects of euergetism; Thébert (1991) also underlined their possible religious connections with the cult of Dionysos/Bacchus.

419 Thébert 1991, 195-203.
complex in a primarily domestic neighborhood may have raised the profile of this quarter of the city and changed the area’s character to a more public type of space.

In the baths’ original form, visitors may have been able to access the building through multiple entryways, either from the front portico, through the main entrance hall and then down into the baths, or from several doorways in the western wing, accessed from a side street between the baths and their informal palaestra to the west. The building’s permeability suggests that the baths were designed to be openly accessible to the public, especially perhaps those residents who were familiar with the neighborhood and knew about the side entrances from the public space to the west of the building (fig. 25).

More than a century after their initial construction, the addition of a cryptoporticus and associated rooms to the western side of the building expanded the baths’ interior space. At the same time, this renovation restricted access to the building by blocking the side-street entrances (three previous entry-ways on the western façade of the building were reduced to one entryway, marked by a compact set of stairs), and probably removed the palaestra-ground from use. The shift in accessibility and from exterior to interior space may indicate that the character of the baths changed during the later fourth century (ca. 360, when these changes to the building were made). Perhaps a new, unknown benefactor decided to renovate the building for the use of a particular group, and made changes to the building to restrict access to the group’s members and to more easily accommodate their activities. Or perhaps further construction in the city (for example, of a new, larger set of baths such as the Grand
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420 Broise and Thébert 1993, 204-209 and 215-16.
421 One of the sodalitates is a convenient object, but there is no solid evidence to connect the decorative symbols of these groups with the fourth-century renovation of the baths rather than their third-century construction, so at best this suggestion is only supposition.
Southern Baths) rendered the Baths of Julia Memmia less important as a public space, and the changes made to the building in the fourth century reflected the new, more local character of the structure in the wake of further public building.

5. Concluding Thoughts

I have shown in this chapter that civic (as opposed to religious) benefactions by individual donors were extremely important to urban development in Roman cities in North Africa. Civic donations were generally more grandiose, on a larger scale, and had greater impact on the physical development of space and the character of social interaction. The three examples studied in this chapter suggest that gender did not play a role in either the type of donation or its impact; the donor’s family background, however, did play a role in these civic benefactions.

All three of the benefactions in this chapter were enormous in size. The theater complex at Lepcis Magna occupied the space of approximately four *insulae*, while the baths of Julia Memmia took up the space of at least one large *insula*. The water supply system of Flavius Tullus at Sabratha may have occupied less concentrated space, but its network extended over much of the ancient town and around 5 km to the south, as well. Each of these benefactions is noteworthy for the amount of space it occupied and the impact that its bulk or extent had on the urban space around it.

The effects on urban space are surprisingly similar for all three projects: each project opened new space to public use or changed the character of the region in which it was erected. The theater complex, which is built on a different axis to the insulae to its northeast, apparently opened a new area of land for development in Lepcis Magna, and became the focus for a new civic area outside the Forum, an area in which additional public structures were eventually built (arch of Tiberius north of the portico;
chalcidicum). The streets and buildings south and east of the theater clearly take their orientation from that structure, rather than from streets and buildings closer to the coast and the older part of town. When Annobal Rufus constructed the theater at an angle to the existing structures, he influenced the future development of Lepcis Magna for generations: even nearly 300 years later, the quadrifrons arch of Septimius Severus was built on the same orientation as that of the theater and its neighboring insulae. Flavius Tullus impacted Sabratha’s urban development in another way, by building a series of informal public gathering spaces at his twelve fountains; since his network extended throughout the urban area of the city, his impact was equally extensive. Like Annobal Rufus’ theater-complex, Flavius Tullus’ water supply impacted future development: by ensuring a constant water supply he opened the way for other types of buildings, especially baths, and by providing for its maintenance he encouraged other donors to also contribute to the city’s development. Julia Memmia’s baths also had an impact on the development of the city of Bulla Regia; the construction of her large and imposing baths contributed to changing the character of the neighborhood in which they were placed. The area in which Julia Memmia built her baths was already occupied by domestic structures, which had to be demolished to make way for the large public building which she planned. It dwarfed other structures in the neighborhood, standing out as a visible landmark, inviting all and sundry to enter, and connecting this formerly domestic quarter to the more monumental public areas of the city at the other end of the street. It is unclear whether Julia Memmia’s baths became a focus for later public development, as the theater and the water supply system did; their continued importance to the town’s public life is attested, however, in the fourth-century renovations that updated and restored the building. Each benefactor had great impact in the future development of a neighborhood or even an entire city.
The benefactor’s specific identity appears not to have played a strong role in their choices of buildings. In these civic buildings, the needs of the community must have had greater influence on the decision than the benefactor’s own personal opinions. Annobal Rufus had already built the *macellum*, a building with a commercial purpose; his theater had a wildly different function. Rufus and his family must have been the most important or wealthiest benefactors in first-century Lepcis Magna, and their donations must have been predicated at least partially on the city’s desires; if a theater was necessary to impress visiting dignitaries, a bath building or fountain would not do. Similarly, Flavius Tullus must have been one of few citizens in Sabratha wealthy enough to fund the creation of a city-wide water supply. The inscription’s language masks the dynamics of his donation: it is impossible to tell (as it usually is) whether Tullus offered the donation spontaneously or whether such a generous gift to the city was solicited by local magistrates who were beginning a grand campaign of renovations and new construction. Likewise, Julia Memmia was a well-to-do and well-connected citizen who had the financial ability to fund a major project. The baths appear to have been built as a one-off donation, rather than as part of a complex or a city- or regio-wide development project. This might suggest that Julia Memmia was more of an outsider than the other donors I have discussed, but her family connections make it clear that was probably not the case. Julia Memmia was the daughter of a consular patron of Bulla Regia, a man who must have done many favors, both tangible and intangible, for the city, and with whom the city leaders must have had close contacts. Julia Memmia continued to act as an informal patron of the city in building a lavish public structure, designed to benefit the health of the citizens. The Flavius Tullus inscription makes it clear that, for at least two generations, the Flavius family were major benefactors at Sabratha, and it seems likely that Pudens was spurred to additional donations in his
own name in order to preserve a family tradition of major benefactions to the citizens of Sabratha. His donations were of a substantially different nature than those of his father, but they kept the Flavius name and image in the minds of their fellow-citizens. Annobal Rufus was a member of a distinguished and generous family as well, and probably started the tradition in his family of offering donations to his city: there are a number of Tapapii who appear in benefactory inscriptions of first-century Lepcis Magna, offering the town various amenities to make it a major, monumental center. For these massive, expensive, civic donations, it seems clear that cities relied on donors who had strong family connections to the town and to the tradition of benefaction, as well as enormous (inherited) wealth.

In light of the benefactors’ major contributions to the urban development of their towns, it seems surprising that—at first glance, at least—their commemoration was so comparatively modest. Our archaeological record is incomplete, of course, and so perhaps we are simply missing the many honorific statues and inscriptions that celebrated the benefactors and displayed their images all over each town. Annobal Rufus and Iddibal Tapapius apparently did not receive statues in or near the theater itself; either their theater complex with its large dedicatory inscriptions served as the commemoration as well as the object of benefaction, or their statues were placed elsewhere in Lepcis Magna in a gallery of honor.422 Flavius Tullus’ commemoration may have been extensive—if his portrait was displayed at or near each of his twelve fountains, along with an inscribed plaque—but it was delayed by perhaps as much as an entire generation, since the inscribed plaques that celebrate his donation also (and in fact especially) honored the many generosities of his adult son Flavius Pudens. The
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422 Cf. Termessos: van Nijf 2000. I do not know of any evidence for such a gallery in the excavated areas at Lepcis Magna, however.
layout of the inscribed plaques places Flavius Pudens’ name in both of the most prominent positions, at the top left of the inscription and in the last line with wide and emphatic spacing, while Flavius Tullus’ name is written only once, in an abbreviated form, at the right end of the first line. Tullus is honored, but his name is not displayed as prominently as we might expect. Julia Memmia did receive a commemorative statue, but it was apparently placed indoors, visible only to members of the public who visited her bath building. If her name was displayed on the exterior of the building, no evidence of this inscription has survived. And the visual impact of the large statue of Julia Memmia was probably muted by the presence of a similar statue of her father in a symmetrical position opposite her own. These commemorative works honoring the benefactors were designed to praise the familial tradition of donations as much as the specific actions of individual donors. Perhaps this was a way for the cities to encourage future generations of benefactors and to solidify the relationship between donor families and the municipal government.

---

423 Sartori 1995, 196-199.
CHAPTER FOUR:
PROLEGOMENON TO THE STUDY OF BENEFACTORS AT THUGGA

1. The Site of Thugga in Africa Proconsularis

a. Thugga in the Numidian and Julio-Claudian Periods

Thugga was, in many ways, a recognizably Roman town in Northern Africa proconsularis, in the Carthaginian hinterland (fig. 2). Built in an area of fertile land, the city was relatively small but prosperous. Thugga was originally a Numidian settlement. During the third century B.C.E. it came under Punic influence from the Carthaginian empire; after the second Punic War the city became a royal residence of the Numidian king Massinissa.\(^\text{424}\) Incorporated into Rome’s empire in the first century B.C.E., when the province that would eventually be known as Africa proconsularis expanded, Thugga became, administratively, a double city with a pagus of Roman citizens connected to Carthage living alongside the civitas of the indigenous inhabitants of Thugga.\(^\text{425}\) Beginning in the first century C.E., Thugga gradually received numerous amenities associated with Roman cultural activity, including temples, a forum, a market building, and spaces for civic government (figs. 26-27). The town’s layout depended on its early origin; Thugga was perched on a steep slope, and its plan did not follow a strict grid, unlike other Roman cities in North Africa including Carthage and Lepcis Magna.\(^\text{426}\)

Thugga’s epigraphic record attests that benefactors played a crucial role in its transformation into a recognizably Roman city. A long case study, in four parts, on this city’s benefactors and their role in creating its urban space will compose the remainder

---

\(^{424}\) See Khanoussi 2003.

\(^{425}\) Numerous scholars, among them Gascou (1982, 140), espoused the traditional view, first put forward by L. Poinssot (1919), that the pagus-civitas division at Thugga was territorial as well as administrative. More recent scholarship has demonstrated, however, that no “ethnic” divisions can be found in the urban landscape of the city (e.g. Khanoussi 2003, Khanoussi 1993).

of this dissertation. Excavations and research at the site began in earnest in the late nineteenth century, though travelers and amateur archaeologists had expressed interest in the well-preserved visible ruins long before that time. The early excavations were extensive rather than intensive, clearing vast swathes of the city, particularly its public buildings. More recently, modern stratigraphic excavations have been carried out on a smaller scale, both in previously unexcavated areas, and at sites that had already been excavated and published to some degree. Thugga’s excellent state of preservation, its long history of excavation, and its comparatively robust publication record allow us a glimpse into the ways in which architectural benefactors truly shaped a city with their gifts, and were at the same time influenced by both the city itself and by the other donors who supported its development.

In chapter five, I trace the development of urban space at the hands of benefactors from the reign of Tiberius to the Hadrianic period. I argue that donors at Thugga did not work within a vacuum, but instead used their construction projects to respond to the pre-existing civic landscape, in particular the shrine of Massinissa in the area of the forum. Those early donors sought to communicate numerous messages with their buildings: the role of familial tradition in euergetism; the importance of Thugga’s early history; the city’s connections with first-century Carthage; and their own identities as members of the civic elite.

b. Excursus on the Shrine of Massinissa in the Numidian and Julio-Claudian Periods

One of the major features of Thugga’s pre-Roman urban plan was the shrine or temple of Massinissa, known from a bilingual Libyan-Punic inscription found during
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428 E.g. Raming and Ritter 2002.
excavations north of the Temple of Mercury, in the Roman civic center.\textsuperscript{429} That inscription indicates that Thugga erected a shrine at public expense to deified Massinissa in the tenth year of the reign of his son, Micpisa, that is in 138 B.C.E.\textsuperscript{430} Though L. Poinssot suggested, based on the inscription’s findspot, that the shrine of Massinissa was located north of the later Roman forum,\textsuperscript{431} Khanoussi has more recently proposed\textsuperscript{432} to identify the shrine with a series of poorly-preserved foundations in the northwest corner of the later Roman forum.\textsuperscript{433} Other scholars accept Khanoussi’s identification,\textsuperscript{434} and some recent excavation data\textsuperscript{435} confirms that the foundations in the corner of the forum were built in the Hellenistic period. Those excavations recovered Numidian and Italian ceramics characteristic of the second-century B.C.E., associated with the foundation levels of the forum structure.\textsuperscript{436} The date of the associated ceramics, and the form of the building’s foundations (which are similar to another, better-known Numidian shrine of Massinissa at the site of Simitthus\textsuperscript{437}), tend to support the building’s identification as the shrine of Massinissa.

A more difficult issue is whether the shrine was still visible in the first century C.E. The fragmentary archaeological record of the building does not permit a definite answer, but I would argue that it remained standing in the corner of the forum through the early Julio-Claudian period, if not until the Antonine era. The stratigraphy of the area is particularly challenging, and so bears a brief review here.

\textsuperscript{429} Gauckler 1905, clxxii.
\textsuperscript{430} \textit{RIL} 2-3.
\textsuperscript{431} L. Poinssot 1919, 170-171.
\textsuperscript{433} The foundations were excavated by L. Poinssot, with brief summaries published in Merlin 1908 and Poinssot 1909a.
\textsuperscript{434} E.g., Saint-Amans 2004, 46.
\textsuperscript{435} A summary of the Freiburg excavations appeared in Hiesel and Strocka 2002, 73-74.
\textsuperscript{436} Hiesel and Strocka 2002, 73.
\textsuperscript{437} Rakob 1994.
Archaeological evidence indicates two things about the building’s relationship with later structures in the forum. First, a platform was eventually built over the southern part of the monument’s foundation, at a time when the shrine was no longer in use; L. Poinssot dated this later platform to the Severan or Tetrarchic periods (third century C.E.) based on the finds of epigraphic material nearby. Second, the pavement of the forum abutted, or perhaps even covered, the molded socle of the Hellenistic platform’s foundation, but this pavement has never been stratigraphically dated. Epigraphic evidence indicates that the forum was first paved in the Julio-Claudian era, but it is not clear whether the forum was repaved in later renovations. Furthermore, there is no reason to suppose that installing a pavement up to the structure’s foundation would place the shrine out of use. Rather, such a pavement may have raised the floor level of the forum up to the level of the shrine, which had previously loomed over the open space.

Comparative evidence from other African cities indicates that Numidain and Punic monuments were sometimes destroyed in the early Roman period, but this was not universally the case. At Carthage, the citadel and elite domestic structures on the Byrsa Hill were systematically levelled and replaced with the large platforms that housed public buildings of the Roman civic center. At Chumtou, two Numidian-period tumuli were apparently razed to make way for the construction of the Roman forum. In both cases the construction of new civic centers deliberately destroyed
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438 Poinssot 1909a, ccxii; Poinssot 1919, 186.
439 Poinssot (1909a, ccxii) suggested that the pavement was laid in the late third century, during the period of the Tetrarchy, based on epigraphic finds nearby and the high level of the pavement.
441 The recent excavations at the foundation of the structure indicate that it was erected on high ground; sloping layers led from its base down toward the open space of the forum (Hiesel and Strocka 2002, 73).
442 Gros 1990.
443 Rakob 1993, 4-5.
evidence for the earlier period. But a Numidian shrine at Simitthus, built in honor of the deified Massinissa in the year 139 B.C.E., remained an important feature in the landscape and a site of cult activity for centuries. Unlike Carthage and Simitthus, which were both colonies in the Julio-Claudian period, with significant military and administrative populations, Thugga was a pagus community, subordinate to Carthage. Its separate administrative status, and possibly the use of the shrine for cult activity for multiple deities as was the case at Simitthus, may help to explain why the shrine of Massinissa at Thugga remained standing in the early Roman period when tombs and civic buildings at some other sites were deliberately destroyed.

c. Thugga in the Second Century

Thugga’s double administrative status, with a civitas governed by local officials and a pagus administered from Carthage, continued until 205 C.E., when the city achieved the status of municipium. Throughout the second century, benefactors continued to contribute to the development of urban space with the construction of new temples, renovated public spaces, and entertainment complexes. This process was particularly prominent during the second half of the second century, as multiple benefactors participated in the practice of euergetism. Among the benefactors who contributed to the development of Thugga’s urban space are a considerable number of people whose inscriptions indicate that they held the office of flamen or flaminica. We have already seen, in the case of the Temple of Mercury at Gigthis, that holders of that office could use the position as an occasion for euergetism. This was particularly the case at Thugga beginning in the second century, as chapters six and seven will demonstrate.

Rakob 1994. It eventually became the site of a Byzantine Christian church, testifying to the enduring influence of sacred spaces in the landscape.
d. Excursus on the Office of Flamen or Flaminica

The office of flamen or flaminica was a civic priesthood. Its holders were charged with celebrating the imperial cult, both in general and in relation to specific emperors (flamines of Augustus, Vespasian, Titus, Nerva, Antoninus Pius, and Septimius Severus are also recorded in epigraphic texts related to the city of Carthage).\footnote{Rives 1995, 58. See also Bassignano 1974, 109-122 for flamines of Carthage. A flamen of Tiberius is attested at Lepcis Magna, suggesting that not only official divi received cult attention (IRT 596=Bassignano 1974, 26, inscription no. 7). Evidence from Thugga corroborates this supposition (see ch. V.2.d. infra p. 151). Compare Fishwick 1987, 269-281, for the case of flamines of multiple imperial family members in Hispania and Baetica.} The office of flamen existed on both the local/municipal and provincial levels, though the municipal flaminate was established earlier than the provincial priesthood.\footnote{Fishwick 2002a, 130: dating evidence in the provincial flaminate inscriptions (inscriptions in which a priest is identified as flamen provinciae Africai) indicate that the official provincial imperial cult was established around 70 C.E. under Vespasian. Carthage certainly had a local priesthood to celebrate the imperial cult, however: an inscription from Thugga named a flamen Augusti coloniae Iulii Carthaginis in ca. 54 C.E. under Claudius (see ch. V.3.a. Licinius Rufus' Macellum, infra p. 160, inscription no. 30 = DFH 26). Inscriptions from Thugga indicate that the town had its own imperial cult priesthood by about the same period (see ch. V.3.b. Licinia Priska's Temple of Venus Concordia, infra p. 162 inscription no. 31 = DFH 69, in which Licinia Priska was named flaminica [perpetua?]). Other epigraphic evidence from Thugga suggests, however, that the imperial cult may have been established as early as the reign of Tiberius (see ch. V.2.a. Postumius Chius, infra p. 144, inscription no. 27 = DFH 23, which mentions both a Temple of Caesar and an altar of Augustus).} It is not clear whether an office of the provincial flaminica existed along with the provincial flamen in Africa proconsularis, but it probably did.\footnote{Fishwick’s examples (2002b, 200-204) from Proconsularis include only men, but the 15 known examples of provincial imperial priests from Africa must be but a small sample of the membership of the priesthood over several centuries. In the provinces of Mauretania, flaminicae provinciae are attested in several examples (Fishwick 2002b, 206 and 209).} On the municipal level, however, we know of both flamines and flaminicae from many African towns and cities. Though often a husband and wife held the positions concurrently (as in the case of Servilius Maurinus and Valeria Paulina, who built the Temple of Mercury at Gigthis), the positions could be held independently; thus elite women could take the office of flaminica if their husbands did not hold the position of flamen, and vice versa.\footnote{Fishwick 2002b, 206-209.} In some cases the priests are called flamen perpetuus or flaminica perpetua. What, precisely, the adjective implied...
has been debated: it may have been a purely honorary title bestowed at the end of the priest’s tenure;\(^\text{449}\) it could have meant that the *flamen* was obliged to continue carrying out some religious duties;\(^\text{450}\) or even that the *flamen*, having finished his priestly tenure, was then eligible for election to the provincial assembly.\(^\text{451}\) Regardless of whether it was a perpetual position, the flaminate was an office of high status at both the municipal and provincial levels.

The flaminate apparently stood outside the municipal *cursus honorum* for many office holders, meaning that they held it in no particular sequence with other offices.\(^\text{452}\)

The provincial flaminate of Africa proconsularis held a similar position outside the *cursus*, though its holders were generally of at least equestrian rank, and frequently had held municipal offices prior to the provincial flaminate.\(^\text{453}\) But at both the municipal and provincial level, the flaminate was an office of high status,\(^\text{454}\) and its members often participated in the euergetism that was an expected element of many such official positions.\(^\text{455}\)

e. Thugga in the Third – Fifth Centuries

The end of the Severan period witnessed a slowdown in the frenetic pace of public euergetism at Thugga, but the practice did not stop completely.\(^\text{456}\) The elevation

\(^{449}\) Rives 1995, 58 (though he cites no other scholarship to support this possibility). Fishwick 2002b, 192 says the honorary nature of the adjective is “the usual interpretation” (also without a footnote).

\(^{450}\) Jarrett 1971, 526.

\(^{451}\) Pflaum 1976, 156; see also Fishwick 2002b, 192, who follows Pflaum by saying that the honorary title of *flamen perpetuus* was “a distinction that must have strengthened his claims to be chosen for service on the provincial assembly."

\(^{452}\) This was the case for the provincial-level flaminate: Fishwick 2002b, 191-198; it was also true of municipal *flamines* at Timгад in Numidia: Pavis d’Escurac 1980, 192.

\(^{453}\) Fishwick 2002b, 191-198.

\(^{454}\) Jarrett 1971, 526-527; Rives 1995, 58-60.

\(^{455}\) Gordon (1990) linked the municipal priesthood’s euergetism toward their municipalities with the benefactions of the *princeps* toward Rome. Pavis d’Escurac (1980, 187-190) has noted the impact of *flamines’* euergetism on the urban landscape of Roman Timгад.

\(^{456}\) The study of architectural patronage in the third and fourth centuries C.E. is complicated by the decline in the “epigraphic habit” that MacMullen identified. In fact, architectural patronage may have
of Thugga to the status of colonia in 261 C.E. was the occasion of additional public building funded by a private citizen, and other donations also appeared during the third and fourth centuries. As I shall show in chapter seven, the third- and fourth-century donors continued a process of creating and expressing their own identities through public benefactions. In the early fifth century, benefactors turned their attention to Christian structures instead of pagan temples and civic monuments, but even in that new context euergetism was an important way for members of the elite to communicate their identities to their fellow citizens—and to God.

After the early fifth century, benefaction apparently ceased at Thugga, though habitation at the site may have continued during the Vandal period (ca. 439-533 C.E.) The town was (re-?)occupied and fortified during the Byzantine era.457 Following the Arab conquest, habitation continued at the town until the early twentieth century, when concerns about preservation of the archaeological material prompted the resettlement of the villagers in the nearby village of “Nouvelle Dougga” established to the southwest of the ancient site.458

In all periods, benefactors apparently took into account multiple factors as they planned and built their donated buildings: the needs of the town, their own wishes and intended messages, and the messages and meanings of earlier benefactors in their own buildings. In this way, they created a complex urban space filled with messages that echoed long after their buildings were initially constructed, and influenced the future development of the town.
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457 Pringle 1981, 244-245. See also de Vos 2004 for evidence that sites in the countryside near Thugga were continually occupied from the second to the seventh centuries C.E.
458 Poinssot 1958, 9-17.
2. Spoliation and the Challenges of the Archaeological Record

One significant problem that archaeologists and historians face in the study of material from Thugga is the site’s long history of occupation. Over the centuries, much building and rebuilding took place in the town’s central spaces. The Byzantine fortress (figs. 27 and 30), built around the Roman forum and incorporating some public buildings, including the ancient Capitolium, remains the most prominent example of this type of activity, but later occupants also built houses, public buildings (like baths), and a mosque in, on top of, or around earlier buildings.\textsuperscript{459} In the process of such construction, Byzantine and Arab builders used surrounding structures as sources for ready-made building materials, or \textit{spolia}.

The process of spoliation has been studied in other parts of the late Antique and Byzantine world.\textsuperscript{460} In many cases, builders used \textit{spolia} intentionally; for example, in Ravenna, Italy, columns were usually reused in matched pairs.\textsuperscript{461} Byzantine reuse of architectural elements from old buildings created a “memory landscape” that conveyed meaning through connections with older cultural practices.\textsuperscript{462} But such intentional use seems not to have been the pattern in spoliation at Thugga.

Documentary evidence from Ravenna indicates that sometimes \textit{spolia} were transported great distances for use in particular building projects.\textsuperscript{463} The construction of the sixth-century Byzantine fortress at Thugga, however, required not finely-carved architectural elements, but regularly-sized blocks that could be used for the walls’

\textsuperscript{459} Khanoussi 1998: 49 (Dar Lacchab); 33 (Aghlabid hammam of the ninth century C.E.); 24 (small mosque). See also early excavation reports (e.g. Poinsot 1906, 1916) for findspots of inscribed texts in the walls or furnishings of private houses of the Arab period.

\textsuperscript{460} E.g. Deichmann 1975, on \textit{spolia} use in the Late Antique capital of Ravenna; Ward-Perkins 1984 on Rome and northern Italy; Papalexandrou 2003 for Greece.

\textsuperscript{461} Ward-Perkins 1984, 214; Deichmann 1975, 91-101.

\textsuperscript{462} Papalexandrou 2003.

\textsuperscript{463} Ward-Perkins 1984, 217-218: Theodoric ordered spoliated architectural elements from Rome for use in his building projects in Ravenna.
ashlar construction.\textsuperscript{464} At least one building, the \textit{macellum}, was completely demolished to provide construction material for the fortress; its site was almost directly adjacent to that of the fortress (see plan, fig. 27).\textsuperscript{465} Other buildings that lay along the outskirts of the fortress site—that is, the Roman forum—were incorporated into the structure, including the Capitolium and, apparently, the forum’s porticoes as well. Though Byzantine- (and Arab-) period activities at the site are not well-documented by scientific excavation, a pattern of minimal expenditure of construction effort emerges from the available evidence. The buildings nearest to, but outside, the fortress appear to have been quarried most extensively for reuse in that structure. Specifically, at Thugga \textit{most materials used in the fortress’s construction appear to have been transported from no more than 30 m away from it}. After building materials had been cleared away for reuse, new buildings were sometimes erected on the now-available sites; during the Arab period, for example, a small mosque was constructed on top of an ancient podium just east of the forum, a site that (given its proximity to the fortress) might well have been mostly cleared of its earlier architecture by Byzantine builders.\textsuperscript{466}

The basic problem that this reuse of material poses is one of uncertainty. Many architectural fragments and inscriptions have been found in reused contexts, so it is impossible to say definitively whether they derive from a particular structure of Roman Thugga. This is true not only of blocks that were built into the fortress, but also of pieces that were used in construction during the Arab period; some of them may have moved multiple times from their original spot; e.g., a particular stone might have been reused

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{464} Pringle 1981, 244-245 for ashlar masonry construction of the fortress, the normal sixth-century style.

\textsuperscript{465} DeRuyt 1983, 218.

\textsuperscript{466} The structure on top of the podium was almost completely demolished. The inscription of the Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury was built into the east wall of the fortress, and that text has been assigned—not without considerable controversy—to the podium where the mosque now sits. For detailed discussion on the identification of that structure, see VI.2.a, “The Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury.”

\end{footnotesize}
first into the fortress, then removed from the fortress into another structure at a later date. This reuse—and the early excavation practices that did not value and systematically document such activity as parts of the archaeological record—make studying the public buildings of the central part of Thugga particularly challenging.

Of course, I am not the first scholar to wrestle with this problem. In the absence of more specific concrete evidence (such as the presence of inscriptions still in situ on a building), L. Poinssot assumed that the blocks—most of which are quite large—did not move far from their original contexts, because later builders tended to minimize their efforts. Thus, for example, he assigned a four-meter-long inscribed lintel\(^{467}\) built into the southern exterior wall of the fortress to an arch built along the southern side of the Roman forum. Of this inscription, Poinssot wrote:

Le texte appartenait, selon toute apparence, à la porte monumentale qui y est mentionnée. Comme il est encastré dans la partie Sud-Ouest du réduit byzantin, il est naturel de chercher l’emplacement de l’arc de Tibère dans le voisinage; or c’est précisément en cet endroit que débouchaient la rue et l’escalier qui donnaient accès au forum.\(^{468}\)

The text belongs, to all appearances, to the monumental gateway which is mentioned in it. Since it was built into the south-west section of the Byzantine fortress, it is natural to look for the location of the arch of Tiberius in that neighborhood; more precisely, in that area where the road and staircase open out, giving access to the forum [i.e. in almost the exact place where it was immured].

Though some of Poinssot’s interpretations have been challenged,\(^ {469}\) for the most part scholars accept his identifications of inscriptions and buildings based on this model of least expended effort.\(^ {470}\) In nearly every case, I, too, have relied on this model and on

---

\(^ {467}\) See inscription no. 27 below (= \textit{DFH} 23; \textit{ILAfr} 558; Poinssot 1913-1916, no. 33), infra p. 144.

\(^ {468}\) Poinssot 1919, 177.

\(^ {469}\) E.g., his suggestion that the Roman forum lay separate from the Numidian civic space: Poinssot 1919, 175; \textit{contra}, Khanoussi 2003; the identification of “Temple B”: Raming and Ritter 2002.

\(^ {470}\) E.g. Saint-Amans 2004, who has followed Poinssot’s interpretations of the locations of particular cults in the landscape, unless direct evidence has come to light since his day to contradict those interpretations and offer an alternative site (see, for example, her rejection of Raming and Ritter
the interpretations of L. Poinssot, and on the identifications of other, more recent, epigraphers and archaeologists including Khanoussi, Maurin, and Saint-Amans. I differ with them in a few instances, especially when inscribed texts have no recorded findspots, or the evidence of their findspots is contradictory, but in the absence of any scientific research on how later builders used “regular” building material (not fine architectural elements such as columns, capitals, and statuary) I, too, will follow the model of least expended effort, and assume that at Thugga inscriptions and other blocks were generally reused within about 30 m of their original contexts.

CHAPTER FIVE: DONATIONS IN THE CENTRAL AREA OF THUGGA, FIRST AND EARLY SECOND CENTURIES C.E.

1. Introduction

Thugga’s earliest remains testify to its long history of settlement. A Numidian cemetery with tombs in the form of dolmens; a Punic-style mausoleum; a shrine to the deified Numidian king Massinissa; and pre-Roman housing all indicate that the town thrived in the centuries before the Roman period (fig. 28). In the early Roman period, however, the development of the Latin epigraphic habit at Thugga allows us a glimpse into a rapidly changing urban and social environment. Benefactors played a critical role in the transformation of Thugga’s urban center into a space that became recognizably Roman despite its earlier origins. Yet with this chapter I argue that benefactors of first-century Thugga did not set out to make Thugga into a Roman town. Instead, they sought to communicate messages with their fellow-citizens: messages about their own identity as members of Thugga’s elite; messages of connection to the new Roman colonia at Carthage. They also responded to their physical context with donations, marking the importance of Thugga’s pre-existing civic structures. Responses to buildings built by previous donors reinforced or nuanced the messages in both buildings, creating an urban landscape that communicated to viewers through both text and architecture.

The vast majority of this early public building for which we have solid epigraphic and archaeological evidence was concentrated on the southern edge of the acropolis (see fig. 26). The area was already the site of at least one public building, the

---

471 To use the phrase of MacMullen 1982; note that pre-Roman Libyan and Neo-Punic inscribed texts have also been discovered at Thugga, but it was in the early first century C.E.—and in the Latin language—that the epigraphic habit became widespread there. This contrasts with the situation at Lepcis Magna, where bilingual and Neo-Punic inscriptions were regularly used during the Julio-Claudian period (Quinn 2010).
In the Julio-Claudian period, benefactors concentrated their efforts on this area in an attempt to connect themselves not only to Thugga’s present and future but also to its past. Donors of the Flavian and Trajanic periods, by contrast, turned their attention to the southern reaches of the urban space, seeking to define and delimit the city’s public area with additional monuments.

2. The First Benefactions in the Forum

The first area that received attention from Roman benefactors was the forum. The area that became the Roman forum probably had been a civic gathering space even before Thugga came under Roman control.\(^{473}\) In the northwestern corner of the space, the city built a temple or large shrine to Massinissa (fig. 29), the second-century B.C.E. Numidian king and Roman ally who had controlled much of the Maghreb, including the territory around Thugga.\(^{474}\) Given that the space apparently already was used as a public area, and had both civic and religious functions, it is not surprising that Roman residents of Thugga focused their early benefactions on this important public space. Later activity, including construction of a Byzantine fortress (figs. 26-27 and 30), has obscured much of the physical evidence of these early benefactions, but epigraphic remains testify to their existence, and recent archaeological research has brought new physical evidence to light. Even in these earliest benefactions, it is clear that the benefactors considered their impact on the urban space and their relationship with the existing buildings in offering their donations. It is also clear that all the benefactors

\(^{472}\) See ch. IV.1.b. Excursus on the Shrine of Massinissa in the Numidian and Julio-Claudian Periods, supra p. 130.

\(^{473}\) Khanoussi (2003, 146) and others have discredited L. Poinssot’s theory (1919, 175) that the forum was not occupied by the pre-Roman inhabitants of Thugga (the cibitas).

\(^{474}\) New Pauly, s.v. “Massinissa”; for the temple or built shrine to this figure in the northwest corner of the forum, Saint-Amans 2004, 77. The temple was built at public expense in the pre-Roman period at the middle of the second century B.C.E. (RIL 2).
shared certain aims: creating a familial tradition of benefaction, developing the central area as a focus of civic activity, and defining both Thugga’s new allegiance to Rome and the importance of the city’s past in its physical make-up.

There are at least three early benefactions in the forum for which we have epigraphic evidence. All of the inscriptions were discovered in reused contexts, in the

475 In fact, there is tentative evidence for two additional dedications in the forum, but the evidence associating them with particular sites is extremely tentative. The first is an inscription naming L. Iulius Crassus as dedicator and C. Pomponius Restitutus as donor (DFH 68; CIL 26475; ILTun 1393):

...[sacrum] Lucius Iulius L(uci) f(ilius) Cor(nelia) Crassus aed(iliciis) orn(amentis) tr(ibunus) mil(itum) leg(ionis) XXI Rapacis in Germania praef(ectus) fabr(um) Ilviri aug(ur) Ilviri quin(s)uennalis des(ignatus) pat(ronus) pagi ded(icavit) C(aius) Pomponius L(uci) f(ilius) Restitutus d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(aciendum) c(uravit).

Consecrated to ?. Lucius Iulius Crassus, son of Lucius, in the Cornelia tribe, decorated as an aedile, military tribune of the legio XXI Rapacis in Germany, leader of the craftsmen, duumvir, augur, quinquennal duumvir designate, patron of the pagus, dedicated this. Caius Pomponius Restitutus, son of Lucius, organized its construction out of his own funds.

This inscription, which was reused in the north wall of the Byzantine fortress, is highly fragmentary and its original location is unclear, though we might assign it to the region around the forum, or in the forum itself, based on its reused context. Poinsot (1909, 84-86) read a dedication to Jupiter Optimus Maximus in the first line, but that reading cannot be substantiated on the stone (DFH, 180; Saint-Amans 2004, 374-375, no. 117). Prosopographic study of the men mentioned in the text dates it to the year 54 C.E.

The other text that has sometimes been assigned to the forum is an inscription marking the dedication of an altar of the imperial cult (DFH 46; CIL 26517; Beniza Ben Abdallah 1986, 87-88, no. 224):

...[sacrum] Tiberio Claudio Caesar Augusto Aug(usto) Germanico pont(ifici) max(imo) trib(unicia) pot(estate) VIII imp(eratori) XVI co(n)s(uli) IIIIII pl(at(i)ariae) cens(ori) C(aius) Artorius Bassus pontifex aed(iliciis) duumvir cur(ator) lucustae patronus pagi ded(icavit) Julius Venustus Thinoba filius honoribis peractis flamen divi Aug(usti) et Gabinia Felicula uxor et Faustus f(ilius) eius huic senatus et plebs ob merita patriis omnium portarum sentent(i)s ornam(enta) suetis gratia decrevit suo et Fausti Thinobae patris honoribis peractis flam(inis) divi Aug(usti) et Firmi qui civitas ornamenta suetis ob merita sua decrevit et Saturi suetis ii <c=Q>ui a civitate et plebe suffragio creatus est et Institoris honoribus peractis flamen divi Aug(usti) fratrum suorum nomine sua pecuniae fecerunt] curatore Iulio Filio filio.

Consecrated to Divine Augustus and to Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus, the pontifex maximus, with tribunician power for the eighth time, imperator for the sixteenth time, consul for the fourth time, father of the fatherland, censor. Caius Artorius Bassus, priest, aedile, duumvir, curator of the locusts, patron of the pagus, dedicated it. Julius Venustus, son of Thinoba, having completed his duties, flamen of divine Augustus and Gabinia Felicula his wife and Faustus his son built this out of their own funds. To Venustus, the senate and the people, on account of the merits of his father, with the assent of all the portae, decreed the decoration of a suetena, free of charge. He took them up in his own name, on behalf of his father Faustus Thinoba, who completed all the duties of the flamen of divine Augustus, and on behalf of his brothers: Firmus, to whom the civitas had granted the decoration of a suetena on his own merits; Satusris, who was elected suetena for the second time by the civitas and the people; and Institor, who completed his duties as flamen of divine Augustus. Julius Firmus served as curator.

This second text is inscribed on a small altar, which was built into the Byzantine fortress, not far from the Capitolium. Based on my criterion of least expended effort, it seems likely that this text was originally set up in the forum. But there is no indication whether it was connected with a building or was set up independently. Perhaps this altar was associated with the donations of Postumius Chius and Licinius Tyrannus, who also built structures associated with imperial cult. The text is dated by imperial
immediate area of the Byzantine fortress, and all can be assigned—with varying degrees of certainty—to archaeological evidence dating from the first century C.E.

a. Postumius Chius

The first epigraphic source, whose physical context is most secure, is a limestone lintel, 0.48 m tall and 3.97 m long, reused in the southern exterior wall of the Byzantine fortress (fig. 31). The text is written in letters that vary from 10.5 cm tall (in the first and third lines) to 8 cm tall (in the second and fourth lines).476

27. *Imp(eratori) Ti(berio) Caesari divi Aug(usti) f(ilio) Aug(ustus) pontif(ici) maximo tribunic(ia) potest(ate) XXXVIII co(n)s(uli) V L(ucius) Manilius L(uci) f(ilius) Arn(ensi) Bucco I(IIvir) dedicavit L(ucius) Postumius C(ai) f(ilius) Arn(ensi) Chius patron(us) pag(i) nomine suo et Firmi et Rufi filiorum forum et aream ante templum Caesaris stravit aram Aug(usti) aedem Saturn(i) arcum d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) faciendum c(uravit).477

To Emperor Tiberius Caesar Augustus, son of deified Augustus, pontifex maximus, with tribunician power for the 38th time, consul for the fifth time, Lucius Manilius Bucco, son of Lucius, in the voting tribe Arnensis, duumvir, dedicated this. Lucius Postumius Chius, son of Caius, of the voting tribe Arnensis, a patron of the pagus [Roman citizens], in his own name and that of his sons Firmus and Rufus, paved the forum and the space in front of Caesar’s temple, and organized the construction of the altar of Augustus, the shrine of Saturn, and the arch out of his own funds.

The work of L. Postumius Chius took place in 36-37 C.E., the last year of the reign of Tiberius, according to the imperial titulature that heads his inscription.478 His donation was enormous in scale, including four named projects: paving the forum and the “area, courtyard” of the Temple of Caesar and erecting an altar of Augustus, a shrine to Saturn, and an arch, apparently all in the immediate region of the forum. Little

476 *DFH*, 59-62, no. 23.
477 *DFH* 23; *ILAfr* 558; *AÉpig* 1914, 172; Poinssot 1913-1916 no. 33.
478 Kienast 1996, 78.
archaeological evidence sheds additional light on the location and organization of these spaces, but the entire inscription, though broken into two pieces, was built into the south wall of the Byzantine fortress (figs. 31-32). The balance of scholarly opinion holds that this particular inscription probably did not move far from its original location, since it is so large.\textsuperscript{479} Thus, we should consider that the arch—on which the inscription probably was carved—may have been located on the south or west side of the forum, and probably served as a monumental entryway into that civic space.\textsuperscript{480} Paving the open forum area would have improved the function of the space and may have involved additional infrastructure work such as drainage or leveling the floor; this pavement may have been at a relatively low level.\textsuperscript{481}

The \textit{aedem Saturni, shrine of Saturn} is difficult to locate exactly; incomplete publication adds to the confusion created by later renovation of the space. The shrine may have been located at the western side of the forum (fig. 32). Two rooms, now incorporated into the western side of the Byzantine fortress, could be candidates for the shrine of Saturn. Poinssot suggested that the central room of the western portico was the Temple of Saturn, and Khanoussi and Maurin have followed this view in suggesting that the room was originally a temple.\textsuperscript{482} Hiesel and Strocka, who have recently

\textsuperscript{479} DFH, 61, no. 23, with earlier bibliography, especially Poinssot 1913-1916, 42-43 and Poinssot 1919, 177.
\textsuperscript{480} Maurin (in DFH, 64) prefers it as the western gateway, while Poinssot (1919, 177) places it in the southwest corner, where stairs still lead from the street into the forum area.
\textsuperscript{481} Excavations to date the paving in the forum stratigraphically found that the visible paving probably dates at least to the second century C.E. or later (Hiesel and Strocka 2002, 74), so first-century paving must be at a lower level. Similar activities at Sabratha might serve as a guide; the second century paving in that city’s forum raised the ground level by more than half a meter (Kenrick 1986, 25-28).
\textsuperscript{482} DFH, 61, no. 23 and 252-253, no. 126; Poinssot 1913-1916, 30, based on the findspot (in a modern house built in the western portico of the forum) of a second century dedication recording the repair, at public expense, of a \textit{templum} of Saturn, damaged by age. A plan of the central area (Institut National du Patrimoine 2008c) indicates a hexastyle, prostyle building on a high podium (approached from the front by 10 steps) and an associated altar, built onto the central room of the western portico. Khanoussi (2003, 145 fig. 7) named the central room the Temple of Tiberius. Balty (1991, 97-99 and fig. 65) identified the central room as Thugga’s Curia based on its floor paving and post-holes that would have supported wooden benches on three sides of the room, and Balty’s identification seems to have the best evidence supporting it.
excavated in this area, propose instead to identify the southernmost room in the fortress’ western wall as the Temple of Saturn, whose south wall was integrated into the Byzantine fortress; their evidence indicates that the structure pre-dates the Roman period, and that a podium was added to the building’s front side. Hiesel and Strocka (2002, 73-74) Parts of the superstructure of the Claudian-period temple (that is, presumably, the reconstructed temple built by M. Licinius Tyrannus) can be seen in the retaining wall of the Byzantine fortress. They identify the central room off the western portico as the city’s Curia. As Saint-Amans has noted, this southwest room seems a reasonable candidate for the “aedes Saturni,” since it may have been a shrine dedicated to Baal in its pre-Roman phase, renovated with the addition of a porch and rededicated to Baal in his Roman guise as Saturn. Hiesel and Strocka (2002, 74). Hiesel and Strocka did not publish a plan, section, restoration drawing, or extensive photographic evidence of their excavations of the aedes Saturni. It is difficult to pinpoint exactly, from their text summary, precisely where their evidence comes from. Saint-Amans (2004, 74) follows their suggestions and those of Balty (1991), placing the Curia in the central room and the Shrine of Saturn in the southernmost room.

The archaeological evidence for the “aram Augusti, altar of Augustus” that Postumius Chius listed in his inscription is elusive. The recent plan of Thugga’s forum by the Tunisian Institut Nationale du Patrimoine locates an altar northeast of the podium temple in the western portico, and standard Roman practice would have placed an outdoor altar near a temple, but I know of no other published evidence that documents an altar there. The physical evidence of Postumius Chius’ donation is therefore somewhat obscure, but it is clear that his benefaction was an important element in formalizing the central gathering space of the city, and one of the first steps to creating a monumental forum.

484 Hiesel and Strocka 2002, 74. Hiesel and Strocka did not publish a plan, section, restoration drawing, or extensive photographic evidence of their excavations of the aedes Saturni. It is difficult to pinpoint exactly, from their text summary, precisely where their evidence comes from. Saint-Amans (2004, 74) follows their suggestions and those of Balty (1991), placing the Curia in the central room and the Shrine of Saturn in the southernmost room.
485 Institut National du Patrimoine 2008c. See note 482 above, however, for my concerns about this plan.
b. Caesetius Perpetuus

Three fragments of another dedicatory inscription, erected by a second benefactor, came to light in excavations of the northwestern part of the forum, in a later house; a fourth fragment was found in the hemicyle of the *macellum* (fig. 33). The fragments have a maximum height of 0.58 m, and the total length of the lintel can be estimated at 2.07 m or longer, based on surviving fragments. Letter heights range from 7 cm for the first line to 4-5 cm for letters of the lower lines. The first two lines were carved over an erased field, indicating that the inscription was partially recarved in order to rededicate the building to a new recipient.\(^{486}\)

28. *Imp(eratori) Ti(berio) Cl[audio Caesari Au(gusto) Germanico patri patriae pontifici] maximo tribunicia potestate co(n)s(uli) ii[ller(um)] co(n)s(uli)*

design(nato) III

*L(ucius) Iulius Crassus* *aedilicii* *ornament(um)*

*tribunus* *m(ilitum) leg(ionis) XXI* *Rapacis in Germania*

*praef(ectus) fab[r(um)] I* *Ivir augur I* *Ivir quinquen(nalis)]* *patronus pagi dedicavit*

*C(aius) Caesetius[s] C(ai) fилиus) Arn(ensi) Perpetuus sacerd(os) Cer(erum) anni LXXIX aedilis praef(ectus) iur(e) dic(undo) c(oloniae) C(oncordiae) I(ulieae) K(arthaginis)*

*patronus pagi Thuggensis nom(i)ne suo et filiorum H(onatus) et Perpetui arcum et gradus d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) [f(aciendum) c(uravit)].*\(^{487}\)

To the Emperor Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus, father of the fatherland, pontifex maximus, with tribunician power, consul for the second time and consul designate for the third time, Lucius Iulius Crassus, son of Lucius, of the voting tribe Cornelia, with the honors of an aedile, military tribune of the Legio 21 Rapax in Germany, prefect of the craftsmen, duumvir, augur, duumvir of the quinquennalia, patron of the *pagus*, dedicated this. Caius Caesetius Pepetuus, son of Caius, of the voting tribe Arnensis, priest of Ceres in the year 68 [=23 C.E.], aedile, judicial prefect of the Colonia Concordia Julia Karthago, patron of the *pagus*, in his own name and that of his sons Honoratus and Perpetuus, organized the construction of the arch and the steps out of his own funds.

\(^{486}\) *DFH* 62-64, no. 24.

\(^{487}\) *DFH* 24; *CIL* 26519; *ILAfr* 520; *ILTun* 1496; *AÉpig* 1914, 173; Poinssot 1913-1916 no. 35; Poinssot 1919 no. 8.
The first two lines of this text, which detail the imperial titulature, have been recarved in order to change the emperor’s name and titles to those of Claudius, in the third year of his reign. This recarving suggests that the arch and steps were originally built in the reign of the emperor Gaius, 37-41 C.E.; the recarving occurred in 42-43 C.E. Again, the archaeological evidence for this benefaction has been obscured by later building, but the inscription’s findspot—mostly in the western portion of the forum—suggests that it, too, belongs in the forum; this arch might have formed a second monumental gateway into the civic space. Which gateway it was, however, remains unclear (fig. 33). L. Poinssot posited it as the western gateway, based on the inscription’s findspot; Kallala and Maurin have suggested that it was an eastern entryway with steps leading from the (later) area ante Capitolium into the forum proper. I prefer the suggestion of L. Poinssot that this was the western gateway, since the bulk of the fragments were found in that area. But since Thugga’s forum was built into the hillside, steps would probably have been required to approach it from any direction, and the archway could have been placed over one of several roads that may have intersected with the forum space.

c. Licinius Tyrannus

Epigraphic evidence for the third donation was dispersed over much of the central area of the city from the forum to the plaza in front of the macellum and even further east, but several fragments of the limestone lintel were found in a single secondary context, in the northern wall of the Byzantine fortress that surrounded the forum area (fig. 34). As reconstructed, the lintel may have been as much as 3.20 m long; its letters

---

489 Poinssot 1919, 179; Kallala and Maurin in *DFH*, 64.
range from 9 cm tall in the first line, 7 cm tall in the second line, to 5.5 cm tall in the third line and 3 cm tall in the last line.  

curatore L(ucio) Vergilio P(ublii) f(ilii) Ru[fo ---]G dato Viriae  
P(ublii) f(iliae) Rusticae aviae M(arci) Licini [Rufi flam(inis) perp(etui) Aug(usti)  
coloniae) C(oncordiae)] I(uliae) K(arthaginis)  
M(arcus) Licinius M(arci) libertus) Tyrannus patronus pa[gi --- ign]e  
consumptas  
restituit aedem et statu[a]s corruptas exornavit opus intestinu[m refecit curatore  
M(arco) Licinio P]riscillo f(ilio).  

Dedicated to the Emperor Tiberius Caesar Augustus, with Lucius  
Vergilius Rufus, son of Publius, of the voting tribe Arnensis as a curator …  
G ...., having been given by Viria Rustica, daughter of Publius,  
grandmother of Marcus Licinius Rufus, perpetual flamen of Augustus of  
the Colonia Concordia Iulia of Carthage. Marcus Licinius Tyrannus,  
freedman of Marcus, patron of the pagus restored [these (feminine, plural)  
structures], after they were consumed by fire; he beautified the shrine and  
the damaged statues; he restored the wooden furnishings and fixtures,  
with his son Marcus Licinius Priscillo as curator.  

This benefaction, too, cannot be located with certainty due to later obscuring  
activity in the forum. The inscription was built into the northwest corner of the  
Byzantine fortress, and this findspot suggests that the building it decorated may have  
been located in that area of the forum. The inscription itself—and the precise identity  
of the building—are problematic, since the inscription refers to “… ign[e consumptas,  
several (feminine) items that had been consumed by fire.” Poinssot and other scholars  
after him have assumed that this inscription refers to a temple (or temples?), and  
several suggest that it could be the templum Caesaris mentioned in the earlier inscription  
of L. Postumius Chius, since this restoration work was also dedicated to the emperor  

---

490 DFH, 65-67, no. 25.  
491 DFH 25; CIL 26518; ILAfr 519; ILTun 1402; AÉpig 1969-1970, 651; Poinssot 1904 no. 2; Poinssot 1906 no. 63; Poinssot 1913-1916 no. 118.  
492 Saint-Amans (2004, 77-78) suggests that we should locate the building in the same area as the Temple of Massinissa, considering that the earlier shrine may have been appropriated or augmented during the early imperial period.
Tiberius.\textsuperscript{493} If the \textit{Templum Caesaris} was located in the same space as the shrine of Massinissa, we might be able to explain the plural construction of the inscription by reference to the multiple objects of cult practice located in the same place. Another alternative might be to assign this restoration to the shrine of Saturn (?) located in the southwest corner of the forum, where excavations revealed evidence of a relatively early (pre-Antonine?) burnt structure.\textsuperscript{494} Clearly, more complete publication of excavation data will be necessary to shed light on the identity of the temple in the southwest corner of the forum and its post-construction history.

The date of the building’s restoration is somewhat clearer than its object: imperial titulature in the surviving sections of the inscription (re)dedicated the building to Tiberius Caesar. The donor, M. Licinius Tyrannus, and his patron M. Licinius Rufus, are known from other datable inscriptions at Thugga, which indicate that both men were active in the community especially during the reign of Claudius (41-54 C.E.)\textsuperscript{495} So we can date the restoration of the building to the mid-first century CE, around a generation (or two?) after the first Roman activity in the space.

\textsuperscript{493} Poinssot 1913-1916, 42-43; Poinssot 1919, 178; \textit{DFH}, 66-67.

\textsuperscript{494} Hiesel and Strocka 2002, 74. The description of this burnt structure and its precise location is extremely cursory, and no stratigraphic dates are given, but the authors seem to suggest that this structure might have been related to an early (pre-Antonine) retaining wall built in that area of the forum. The burnt structure’s association with the Temple (of Saturn)/Curia building is unclear from the written description.

\textsuperscript{495} See this ch. V.3. The Licinii in the Area East of the Forum, infra p. 159, and inscription no. 30 (=\textit{DFH}, 65). I would date the reconstruction of the forum temple more broadly, from about the reign of Claudius to the reign of Vespasian, perhaps, because we have no clear indication that Licinius Rufus, the datable patron, was necessarily alive at the time of the restoration. A date in the middle of the first century seems almost certain, unless the involvement of the son indicates a posthumous completion of the building; Saastamoinen (2010, 347), however, points out that texts mentioning such testamentary donations are not datable before the second century. But a date “at the end of the reign of Claudius” seems unnecessarily narrow to me, given the paucity of the evidence. Note, however, that the excavators, Hiesel and Strocka (2002, 74), have proposed that the burnt structure in the southwest corner showed evidence of building activity during the Claudian period.
d. The Creation of Thugga’s Forum

All three benefactors gave their gifts as part of a family group: L. Postumius Chius donated in his name and that of his two sons, as did C. Caesetius Perpetuus. M. Licinius Tyrannus restored a shrine in his own name, but with the official participation of his son as well.496 All three of these benefactors apparently either were following a familial tradition of euergetism (for which, however, we currently have very little evidence) or were attempting to create such a tradition by including multiple generations of their families in the projects. Indeed, M. Licinius Tyrannus cited the role of the grandmother of his own patron, M. Licinius Priscus, in his dedicatory inscription, in addition to the name of his son; he took care to indicate in this way the precedents in his familia for his participation in civic-minded benefactions.

Of these three early benefactors, the best known is Licinius Tyrannus, who also made other benefactions in nearby areas of the city.497 The other two benefactors, L. Caesetius Perpetuus and L. Postumius Chius, are known only from their activities in the forum. The inscriptions indicate that all three men were Roman citizens (who were enrolled in a voting tribe, the Arnensis), connected thereby with the large city of Carthage, where their citizenship was based and where Caesetius Perpetuus, at least, had held official posts (inscription no. 28). The freedman M. Licinius Tyrannus had connections to the Roman citizenry at Carthage through his familia and his patron. All three of these men managed to emphasize their status as Roman through their building projects in and around the forum.

496 If we accept the restoration of [curatore …]; Saastamoinen (2010, 292 n. 1731) suggests that it might be possible to restore the text to read [cum M. Licinio P]risculo f. instead, which would negate the elaborate need to explain the role of two curators for the project, and indicate that Licinius Priscus and his son jointly undertook the restoration project.
497 See this ch. V.3. The Licinii in the Area East of the Forum, infra p. 159.
The text of the first inscription (no. 27), that of L. Postumius Chius, makes it clear that some civic building had already taken place, since the city had a “*templum Caesaris*, Temple of Caesar,” at the time of Postumius Chius’ project either already standing or in progress. The nature of this temple is unclear and much discussed, but current scholarly opinion holds that it was a temple to the living Tiberius (thus “*templum Caesaris*” rather than “*templum divi Tiberii Augusti*” or similar) located in the forum. Its original builder is unknown, but we might assume that this was another donation from a private citizen.

Each benefactor was careful to delineate in his inscription the extent of his generosity, but none gave specific indication of their motivation for making such donations. This follows the pattern at Lepcis Magna’s first-century theater, where the dedicatory inscriptions of various parts of the complex simply name the donors, Annobal, Suphunibal, and Iddibal, with their positions, but contrasts with the practice in other first-century instances, such as the Temple of Mercury at Gigthis, where Servilius Maurinus noted that he gave the building in response to his election to the post of *flamen*.

The language of Thugga’s inscriptions, however, provides us with some hints as to the benefactors’ motives. First, as I have mentioned briefly above, each donor took care to include his sons’ names in the inscriptions, even though their participation in the

---

499 Fishwick (1991, 439) notes the interesting juxtaposition of addressing the emperor in his worldly titles (*imperator*, *consul*, etc.) while also using the word *sacrum*, a term which generally denotes a divine role. However, he also notes that in Africa proconsularis, as in other western provinces, the imperial cult almost certainly included worship of living as well as divine emperors (Fishwick 2002a, 131).
500 Perhaps it was the work of C. Pomponius Restitutus, whose building project Saint-Amans has placed in the forum area (Saint-Amans 2004, 62 and 374-375, no. 117; see also footnote 475, above). The Licinii had been involved in the original project in some fashion, however, as Tyrannus’ restoration inscription (no. 29) mentioned the name of Viria Rustica, the grandmother of Licinus Rufus.
actual project was fairly minimal: all three inscriptions use the singular form of the verbs, which indicates that only the main donor took the action (L. Postumius Chius ... stravit ... curavit; C. Caesetius Perpetuus ... curavit; M. Licinius Tyrannus ... restituit ... exornavit ... refecit). This inclusion suggests that each donor was attempting to establish a tradition of benefactions that would extend into a second generation, and thereby both glorify his family name and place the people of Thugga in his family’s debt. This attempt was apparently unsuccessful; we have no evidence that demonstrates that the second generation of any of these three families participated in architectural patronage at Thugga. (The only evidence for a second generation of these families comes in the form of a tombstone of the son? of Caesetius Perpetuus, Caesetius Honoratus, (CIL, 26757; MAD, no. 166)).

All three benefactors took care to note their connections with the pagus of Thugga—that is, with the Romans who resided or held land in the town and were citizens of the Roman colony at Carthage—by naming themselves as “patronus pagi, patron of the citizen-community.” And all three men also emphasized their connections to Carthage itself in various other ways. L. Postumius Chius advertised his own status as a Roman citizen of the colony by including his voting tribe affiliation, the Arnensis of Carthage, in the inscription, as did C. Caesetius Perpetuus. Caesetius Perpetuus also took pains to indicate that he himself was an office-holder of Carthage (priest of Ceres in the year 23 C.E., aedile, judicial prefect). M. Licinius Tyrannus spent no little space in his inscription noting his connection to his patron Licinius Rufus, and his patron’s position(s) in the Roman colony at Carthage. All three inscriptions also include the names and positions of a curator or dedicator, another citizen (and magistrate) from Carthage, whose name appeared above that of the benefactor in the

---

502 This attempt was apparently unsuccessful; we have no evidence that demonstrates that the second generation of any of these three families participated in architectural patronage at Thugga. (The only evidence for a second generation of these families comes in the form of a tombstone of the son? of Caesetius Perpetuus, Caesetius Honoratus, (CIL, 26757; MAD, no. 166)).

503 Saint-Amans 2004, 60-68, states that Carthaginian magistrates were involved in the building donations at Thugga because of Thugga’s legal and political relationship as a subsidiary of Carthage, and I do not mean to downplay this practical reason for their presence; Rives (1995, 105-110) has also discussed the legal status of the cults established by private benefactors at Thugga as private cults, not public ones. But I suspect that the legal relationship between the two cities does not tell us the whole story about the benefactions that the smaller one received. See also DFH, 310.

504 Arnensis was the voting tribe for citizens of Carthage (Warmington 1954, 40, note 9).
In these ways, the benefactors emphasized their connections both with the Roman community of Thugga (the *pagus*) and with the larger Roman society found in Carthage itself.

The imperial titulature of the inscriptions, probably along with the architecture of these early buildings, created connections between Thugga and Rome; a temple of Caesar, an altar of Augustus, and building dedications to the reigning emperors all signified that Thugga, like Lepcis Magna in the first century, was part of the empire. No single benefactor at Thugga in this early period was able—as far as we can tell from the available evidence—to make the same far-reaching connections between himself and the imperial family that Annobal Tapapius Rufus made in his theater complex at Lepcis Magna. Though L. Postumius Chius' donated complex was certainly extensive and probably costly, the language of his inscription—even with its imperial dedication—lacks the many connections between emperor and donor that linked Annobal Tapapius Rufus with Augustus. Indeed, Postumius Chius' inscription emphasized instead his connections with the elite of Carthage, not the rulers of Rome. The inscriptions of Caesetius Perpetuus and Licinius Tyrannus follow a similar pattern, connecting their actions at Thugga with the elite and the ruling class at Carthage. Of course, since our physical evidence for these three donations is so limited, we might simply be missing the information, from architecture and iconography, that would allow us to understand the deeper nuances of these inscriptions. But I suspect that in fact these Roman benefactors were attempting to create Thugga into the image not of Rome, but of

---

505 This mimics a usual pattern at other sites in North Africa, especially in the first century C.E., when buildings were regularly dedicated by provincial magistrates, rather than the donors, as was the case in Suphunibal’s Temple of Ceres in Lepcis Magna, dedicated by the proconsul Rubellius Blandus (see ch. III.2.b. The Temple of Ceres, supra p. 80, inscription no. 18).

506 At the Temple of Ceres in Lepcis Magna, for example, we would miss critical information about the connections between Suphunibal and Livia were the statue of Ceres-Livia not preserved, since the inscription of that temple dedicates the building only to Ceres and not to the recently-deceased empress (see ch. III.2. A Theater-Temple Complex at Lepcis Magna, supra p. 75).
Roman Carthage, and that both their inscriptions and their architectural offerings reflected a desire to equate their small city with the large metropolitan capital, rather than the imperial city that was so distant (physically and metaphorically) from Thugga itself. The practice of creating Thugga in Carthage’s image played a critical role in the city’s development even into the third century C.E. or later, as the remainder of this case study will indicate.

Finally, each of these benefactors made a donation that responded to previous building activity and to the builders (fig. 35). Given the scarce archaeological evidence, these connections are clearest in the epigraphic record—but I have no doubt that they would have been communicated by other means, including iconographic elements and architectural forms. The earliest benefaction in Thugga’s forum, the work of Postumius Chius, was itself a response to urban patterns that had already taken shape. He noted (in inscription no. 27) that “forum et aream ante templum Caesaris stravit, he paved the forum and the courtyard in front of the Temple of Caesar.” These areas already existed

---

507 Evidence for the first century forum at Carthage is scarce, as at Thugga, due to later construction. Gros (1990) summarizes the archaeological evidence for Carthage, especially with reference to the French Byrsa excavations of the 1970s; he notes that the main platform on the Byrsa hill, where the Romans placed their forum after the destruction of the Punic citadel there, occupies an area of more than 13,000 m², and the total area apparently used for public activities (including both the main and subsidiary terraces on the hill) was more than 30,000 m² (Gros 1990, 553). This space dwarfed the fora and associated public spaces of Thugga, whose central complex (forum, Capitolium, and macellum complexes: see ch. VI.3. The Apex of Public Building During the Antonine Era, infra p. 205) occupied a space of around 5000 m² at their largest extent. Despite this difference in scale, however, the forum at Carthage probably had at least one triumphal-style arch in the Augustan period (Gros 1990, 554) and may have had other structures with Roman architectural features (Gros 1990, 554-555). The precise nature of the buildings remains hypothetical; the basilica of Antonine date on the eastern side of the forum may have had an Augustan predecessor, along with the north and south porticoes, and a (tripartite Capitoline?) temple may have stood on the western side. The forum was paved in limestone at an early date and not altered in the second century (Gros 1990, 555-556). On the southern part of the platform, Gros (1990, 560-561) suggests a similar monumental complex, a forum adiectum or an Augusteum or Caesareum, with the basic form of a quadriporticus. The forum apparently also served as a locus of imperial cult activity; statues of the imperial family (including Gaius Caesar and a Julia) may have been housed in the early judicial basilica, in a sacellum, or even in a porticoed gallery like that of the forum of Augustus in Rome (Gros 1990, 561-564). The southern area of the Byrsa hill was gradually built up with additional temples of the imperial cult (Gros 1990, 564). The most striking thing about the forum at Carthage—in stark contrast to the situation at Thugga—is its evidence for long-term planning: the platforms were generously-sized to house monuments, even those that had not yet been concretely planned (Gros 1990, 565). See also Deneauve 1990.
and were in use, and Postumius Chius used his benefaction to improve them. Of course, there is much we do not yet know about these earlier buildings: who built the Temple of Caesar: another private citizen, or the municipality? Was the temple already standing when Chius paved its courtyard, or was it being built at the same time? Had the forum previously been paved, or was this a new form for the space? Even with these questions, however, it is clear that the shape of the existing urban core provided a framework on which Chius could expand through his own donations. Khanoussi says that this act of paving the forum “*marque en fait la naissance du forum en tant que centre civique*, marks, in fact, the birth of the forum as the civic center” of Roman Thugga.

The component parts of Chius’ benefaction indicate that the forum was already important as a civic space; its importance as a central area of the town made its monumentalization desirable, rather than monumentalizing a space so that it would become a civic center. Thus Chius not only paved the open space, but added a monumental arched gateway to usher people into the space.

Creating such an entryway continued the process of monumentalization, which had already been begun already in the pre-Roman period, and which continued with the construction of the Temple of Caesar. Chius also built “*aram Augusti*, an altar of Augustus,” which must have served as an adjunct focus of imperial cult activity, even if it was not located in the same place as the Temple of Caesar.

---

508 The mention of Viria Rustica, the grandmother of Tyrannus’ patron Licinius Rufus, suggests that she may have been involved in the Temple’s initial construction (see inscription no. 29). According to Duncan-Jones (1990, 178-182) many of the buildings at Thugga were paid for by private citizens; in contrast, at Timgad most structures were built using public funds. And at Lepcis Magna, the buildings in the theater complex that related to the imperial cult were, of course, privately-funded (see ch. III.2. A Theater-Temple Complex at Lepcis Magna, supra p. 75). The funding supplement is lost in the dedicatory inscription from the Temple of Roma and Augustus in Lepcis Magna’s forum (Levi della Vida and Amadası Guzzo 1987, 53-57, no. 22).

509 Khanoussi 2003, 146.

510 Fishwick (1991, 518-519) notes that altars could serve as the focus for imperial cult activity, especially in the Augustan period; temples were not required, and even in places where temples were erected, normal practice would have located the messy business of sacrifice at an altar outside the temple.
Saturn—if it was indeed built on the western edge of the forum—mixed a recognizably Roman-style architecture, a temple on a high podium, with a porch and steps on the building’s front, with a Punic-style divinity.\textsuperscript{511} Chius thus declared his allegiance, it seems, with both Rome and Carthage, with the pagus of Thugga and with the city’s long pre-Roman history.

The next donation in the forum area, that of Caesetius Perpetuus (inscription no. 28), involved a similar effort to further monumentalize the space, and a clear response to Postumius Chius’ earlier donation. The language of the inscriptions is similar, and seeks to emphasize Caestius Perpeutuus’ higher status and greater connections: whereas Chius identified himself as a citizen of Carthage, Perpetuus’ inscription identified him as both a citizen and a magistrate; Chius’ donation was dedicated by a Carthaginian magistrate, but Perpetuus’ was dedicated by a more accomplished, higher-placed official of the colony.\textsuperscript{512} The social competition evident in the inscription and the donation’s form contrasted with the rather more limited nature of Perpetuus’ donation; whereas Chius made multiple—and presumably costly—improvements to the forum space, Perpetuus donated only a single gateway and a set of stairs. Physically, however, the two gateways may have been closely linked by visual cues. Though such clues are now unrecoverable from the archaeological record, they may have included similar architectural decorations, heights, and building materials. The archways must have been intervisible from the forum’s central area, and they may have even stood directly opposite to one another. The two structures, together with the paved surface, framed and defined the civic space of the forum. By constructing a

\textsuperscript{511} LeGlay 1966, 62-67: Saturn was an especially popular divinity in Roman North Africa because he was syncretized with the Punic Baâl-Hammon. See also Cadotte 2007, 25-63, who has recently reiterated that Saturn remained at heart a Punico-African divinity despite his Roman name.

\textsuperscript{512} DFH, 64, no. 24.
structure similar in form to the pre-existing gate, Caesetius Perpetuus was able to link his own, rather modest, benefaction with the larger, more generous program paid for by Postumius Chius, and thereby, perhaps, gain additional kudos.

The final early donation to the forum, by M. Licinius Tyrannus (inscription no. 29), was a direct response to earlier building activity in the forum, since he renovated a pre-existing structure that had been damaged by fire or some other catastrophe. Tyrannus’ inscription emphasized that his benefaction in the forum was a direct result of the previous involvement of his familia in that area; Tyrannus rebuilt the temple(?) because M. Licinius Rufus’ grandmother had built there, and not (necessarily) because he wished to compete with the area’s previous donors, Chius and Perpetuus. In fact, Tyrannus’ other activity in Thugga[513] makes it clear that he based the location of his building projects on the location of other projects built by his patron, and had little personal interest in the forum space, outside of its connection with his familia.

Thus already in early first-century Thugga, we see the ways in which urban space developed through the action of benefactors, and how urban space contributed to the forms those benefactions took. No single Roman-period benefaction took place in a vacuum; even the initial construction of the Temple of Caesar may have responded to the earlier presence of a royal cult for Massinissa in the same area. The work of each of these three benefactors created both connections and contrasts between them. Their donations also developed and reaffirmed in physical form new connections with Roman Carthage and connections with Thugga’s early history.

3. The Licinii in the Area East of the Forum

At about the same time as Licinius Tyrannus was reconstructing a temple in the forum, other members of his familia were giving donations in the area nearby (fig. 36). The east forum, the area adjacent to the forum proper, which lies at an elevation several meters above the level of the forum proper, became the site of the town’s macellum; northeast of the shrine of Massinissa, another member of the familia built a small temple; and three members jointly erected another, probably larger, temple. The benefactors’ motives and the buildings’ impacts were closely connected with those found in the forum proper. The epigraphic and archaeological evidence demonstrates that these benefactors also were concerned with the creation of monumental space, with familial traditions of benefaction, and with connections to Carthage and to Thugga’s past.

One of the three buildings, the Temple of Ceres, is known solely through fragmentary epigraphic evidence: two inscriptions have been found that relate to it. The first\(^{514}\) was found in fragments in the area of the forum, probably in a secondary context. The second\(^{515}\) was found in fragments in the cavea of the Antonine theater. Together, the texts indicate that Marcus Licinius Rufus, his freedman Marcus Licinius Tyrannus, and Tyrannus’ wife, Licinia Prisca were all jointly involved in a project to build a Temple of Ceres. The inscriptions cannot be associated with any excavated architectural remains,

---

\[\text{[Cereri Aug(ustae) s[acrum]} | \text{M(arcus) Licinius Rufus} | \text{praef(ectus) alae Bosphoranae exercitus qui est in Syria]} | \text{[flam(en) pre]p(tem)ius Aug(usti) coloniae Concordiae} l(uliae) [Kart(haginis)] || \text{patronus pagi et civitatis Th[ugg(ensis) ded]it idem]ue] dedicavit]} | \text{[M(arcus) Licinius M(arci)] l(ibertus) Tyrannus[s et Licinia Prisca]} [de sua pecunia fecerunt].
Consecrated to Ceres Augusta. Marcus Licinius Rufus, prefect of the Bosphoran wing of the army, which is in Syria, perpetual flamen of Augustus of Carthage, patron of the pagus and civitas of Thugga, gave this building and also dedicated it. Marcus Licinius Tyrannus, freedman of Marcus, and Licinia Prisca built it from their own funds.

\(^{515}\) Saint-Amans 2004, 286-287 no. 13; CIL 26464; AEpig 1969-1970, 648:
\[\text{Cereri [Aug(ustae) sacrum]} | \text{M(arcus) Licinius M(arci) l(ibertus)} | \text{Tyrannus[s et Licinia M(arci) l(iberta) Prisca]} | \text{voto susc[ep]to pro s[alute M(arci) Licini Rufi patroni] cellam cum p[orticibus] des posuerunt].
Consecrated to Ceres Augusta. Marcus Licinius Tyrannus, freedman of Marcus, and Licinia Prisca, freedman of Marcus, having taken a vow for the help of their patron Marcus Licinius Rufus, set up this cella with its porticoes and its goddesses.
so we will not discuss them extensively here. The texts’ findspots in the forum and theater suggest that the Temple of Ceres was probably in the central area of the city, perhaps east of the forum proper. The mention of “deas, goddesses” in the plural suggests a further connection with Carthage, where the cult of the Cereres was an important element of the civic religion.516

a. Licinius Rufus’ Macellum

Like the buildings of the early forum, the macellum is not well preserved in its earliest form because of later activity at its site, including later renovations,517 and, eventually, complete destruction of the structure to serve as a quarry for the Byzantine fortress.518 Early excavations at the site cleared the space and established its basic plan, while more recent stratigraphic investigations have helped to clarify its phasing and offered insight into the site’s earlier history, before the construction of the macellum. Built on a rocky platform at the southern edge of the space east of the forum (fig. 37), the first-century macellum was rectangular in plan (fig. 38). It was a comparatively large space (35.5 m x 28 m in its second phase) and probably rather loomed over the buildings to its south. The interior of the building had porticos on three sides; cuttings in the floor paving indicate that impermanent stalls were erected under the porticoes.519 Access to the building was from the south via two staircases that communicated with a street or plaza at a lower level on that side of the building; the building may not have been accessible from the plaza on the north side.520 The central courtyard was paved in

---

516 On this priesthood, see Fishwick and Shaw 1978; Gascou 1987; Fishwick 1996. Rives (1995, 157-160) ignored the plural “deas” in this text and preferred to interpret the cult at Thugga as that of Roman Ceres (singular); in this he followed Gascou’s interpretation.

517 See ch. VI.3.e. The East Forum Area, the Macellum, and the Temple of Mercury, infra p. 241.

518 See ch. IV.2. Spoliation and the Challenges of the Archaeological Record, supra p. 137.

519 De Ruyt 1983, 213.

520 De Ruyt 1983, 215-216. Later construction on the north façade of the building has rather obscured the earlier phases, and suggests that changes were made to the building’s structure on that side in the second century renovations (Hiesel and Strocka 2002, 72).
white marble.\textsuperscript{521} The building had a lower level on its south side, whose rooms were probably used for storage.\textsuperscript{522} Epigraphic evidence for this phase of the building exists in a single limestone lintel, incomplete in two or three non-joining fragments. It was found during early excavations, reused in paving of a later drain, at the edge of this building.\textsuperscript{523} The surviving pieces have a maximum height of 37 cm, and their combined length is 83 cm; the original size of the text was probably at least twice as long (to accommodate the restored text at the left side) and at least 6 cm taller (to accommodate an additional line of lettering above the surviving text). The letters range from 6-4.5 cm.\textsuperscript{524} The text is restored based on other inscriptions that mention the same individual, including that of Licinius Tyrannus’ restoration in the forum (no. 29).\textsuperscript{525}

30. \textit{[Ti(berio) Claudio Caesari Aug(usto) Germanico p(atri) p(atriae) p(aetane)}
\begin{flushleft}
\hspace{0.5cm} pontifici maximo \textit{trib(unicia) p(otestate) \textit{XIII co(n)s(ulis) V}}
\hspace{0.5cm} \textit{M(arcus) Licinius Rufus praef(ectus) alae} I Bosphoran\textit{(ae) flam(en) Aug(usti)}
\hspace{0.5cm} \textit{C(oncoliae) C(oncordiae) I(uliae) K(arthaginis) patro(nus pagi et civitatis Thugg(ensis)}
\hspace{0.5cm} \textit{p(lego) dedit itemque dedicavit}
\hspace{0.5cm} \textit{ma(cellum) sua pec(unia) fec(it)}
\hspace{0.5cm} \textit{---lo P(ubli) f(ilio) Qui(rina) Ge---lio M(arci) f(ilio) Arn(ensi) Sever[o].}\textsuperscript{526}
\end{flushleft}

When Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus, the father of his country, the chief priest, held tribunician power for the 14\textsuperscript{th} time and was consul for the fifth time, Marcus Licinius Rufus, prefect of the first Bosphoran unit,\textsuperscript{527} flamen of Augustus in the colony Concordia Julia Karthago, patron of the pagus and of the civitas of Thugga, gave (this building) to the pagus and also dedicated it. He built the macellum from his own funds, with (...) as curators.

\textsuperscript{521} Poinssot 1958, 33; Hiesel and Strocka 2002, 72.
\textsuperscript{522} De Ruyt 1983, 216.
\textsuperscript{523} Poinssot 1919, 157-159, no. 9 and n. 2.
\textsuperscript{524} Interestingly, the smallest line, the next-to-last one, with letters 4.5 cm, also has the most generous and eye-catching spacing, which was clearly designed to call attention to the words in the line: \textit{ma(cellum) sua pec(unia) fec(it)}---the object of the dedication, and the source of the funds for the project. The text of the last line was apparently larger (5 cm), but more closely spaced.
\textsuperscript{525} \textit{DFH,} 181-182 no. 69.
\textsuperscript{526} \textit{DFH} 69; \textit{ILAfr} 559; \textit{ILTun} 1499; \textit{AÉpig} 1969-1970, 652; Poinssot 1919, no. 9; Poinssot 1969, 222-223, text E.
\textsuperscript{527} Poinssot 1969, 228: Rufus was an equestrian-ranked commander of an allied cavalry wing of the Roman army, which was raised in the Bosphorus and served in Syria.
The imperial titulature in the first two lines of the text provides a dedication date for the building: the 14th year of Claudius’ reign, 54 C.E.\(^{528}\) This text’s imperial titulature has been used to date other structures that mention Licinius Rufus or his freedmen (e.g. inscription no. 29, 31, and the construction of the Temple of Ceres [CIL 26603, 26464]).

b. Licinia Prisca’s Temple of Venus Concordia

The second building of the Licinii in this area was probably constructed at about the same time. Its inscription, which was discovered northeast of the forum in excavations of 1960, is a limestone lintel, incomplete in two joining fragments. The surviving portion of the original stone is 0.46 m tall, and 2.40 m long. The letters, 9.5-7 cm high, are centered around the vertical axis of the stone, and written in clear lapidary capitals.

31. [V]eneri Concordiae sacrum
   [Licinia] M(arci) l(iberta) Prisca Licini Tyranni uxor flaminica perpetua?
   [templum(?)] s(ua) p(ecunia) f(aciendum) c(uravit) idemque dedicavit.\(^{529}\)

Consecrated to Venus Concordia. Licinia Prisca, freedman of Marcus, wife of Licinius Tyrannis, perpetual flaminica, organized the construction of the temple out of her own funds, and she also dedicated it.

This temple’s precise location has been debated, but I place it near the inscription’s findspot, about 30 m northeast of the forum, in the structure Khanoussi named as “Anonymous Temple 4” (fig. 39-40). The temple, now in a poor state of repair, faced toward the west; it was a prostyle building with a shallow porch and square cella, built on a tall podium and approached by eight steps.\(^{530}\) Other scholars\(^{531}\) have placed the temple instead on the podium at the northeastern corner of the macellum, the site of the

---

\(^{528}\) Kienast 1996, 91.
\(^{530}\) Khanoussi 1998, 64 no. 45 and plan général no. 45; Saint-Amans (in DFH, 68, no. 26) mentioned recent work by Khanoussi at this alternate site, but I cannot find any publication of such study. Saint-Amans herself (2004, 315) has more recently accepted Louis Poinssot’s hypothesis that the temple was, in fact, constructed in the east forum complex.
later mosque. This was the site proposed for a Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury by Louis Poinssot, who found an inscription for that building—constructed in the Hadrianic period—built into the eastern exterior wall of the Byzantine fortress. With the later discovery of the inscription of Licina Prisca (no. 31), Claude Poinssot noted similarities between the two inscriptions; scholarly opinion holds that they referred to the same building, built in the first instance by Licinia Prisca and refurbished and expanded later. It seems more likely to me, however, that the small temple adjacent to the inscription’s findspot is the earlier structure, and that additional construction during the Hadrianic period added a new building whose dedication overlapped with that of Licinia Prisca’s temple. Further publication of recent research at the site of Anonymous Temple 4 will no doubt shed new light onto the structure’s history and role in the development of Thugga’s urban core.

Licinia Prisca’s inscription (no. 31), which names both her husband Licinius Tyrannus and her patron Licinius Rufus, is broadly contemporary with Rufus’ construction of the *macellum*, dedicated in 54 C.E. according to his inscription’s imperial titulature (no. 30). We know that Rufus, Tyrannus, and Prisca were all active at approximately the same time since they dedicated the (unlocated) Temple of Ceres jointly. We need not assign Licinia Prisca’s construction of the Temple of Venus Concordia to precisely the same year as Licinius Rufus’ construction of the *macellum*. Her temple was apparently built after the Temple of Ceres, since in the Temple of Venus Concordia’s inscription Licinia Prisca listed her position as *flaminica* (priestess of

---

532 Poinssot 1919, 182.
534 In fact, Poinssot (1919, 182) identified it as the temple of Venus and Concord, but more recent research has indicated that the two goddesses were syncretized in African towns, including Carthage, Sicca Veneria (modern Le Kef), and probably Thugga as well (Saint-Amans 2004, 155-156).
the imperial cult), a title that she did not carry in the inscriptions of the Temple of Ceres.\footnote{Saint-Amans in *DFH*, 68 (no. 26).}

c. The Role of the Licinii

Both Licinius Rufus and Licinia Prisca came from a family group that had already played a role in Thugga’s urban development. Rufus’ grandmother, Viria Rustica, had given something to assist in constructing the temple of Caesar—perhaps the land on which it stood, or money to finance the project—and Licinius Tyrannus, Rufus’ freedman, used this familial connection to justify his participation in reconstructing the temple after it was damaged (inscription no. 29). The inscriptions that mention Licinius Rufus allow us to reconstruct his career as a military prefect in Syria and then as *flamen perpetuus* of Augustus in Carthage; he was enrolled as a citizen at Carthage, and became patron of the *pagus*, the Roman citizens at Thugga; most unusually in this early period, he also became patron of the *civitas*, the non-citizens of the city.\footnote{See Poinssot 1969. Rufus is the only known double patron of this early date; most other patrons of *pagus et civitas* date to the second century or later (Poinssot 1969, 230-233).} His household was apparently based at Thugga, as a number of tombstones of his slaves and freedmen have come to light.\footnote{The slaves include Telete and Prote; in addition, one more freedwoman, Licinia Secundina, may have been part of this *familia* (MAD, 77 and nos. 1188, 1011, 679).} Licinia Prisca, a member of the *familia* that was so active in construction projects around the city, also came to hold a prominent position: she became priestess of the imperial cult at Thugga, apparently on her own.\footnote{There is no epigraphic indication that her husband Tryannus held the position of *flamen* himself at Thugga. Licinius Rufus held a municipal flaminate (of Augustus), but held it in the more prestigious capital, Carthage, rather than at Thugga (Saint-Amans 2004, 157-158).}

The inscriptions themselves shed little light on the motivations for Rufus and Prisca to contribute to the development of the area east of the forum. Saint-Amans has suggested that Licinia Prisca might have given her temple as a *summa honoraria*...
building, in response to her flaminate.\textsuperscript{540} Rufus’ motives for building the macellum are ambiguous: his inscription suggests that he gave the macellum to the pagus only, but though this idea has exercised scholars to a considerable degree,\textsuperscript{541} recent research has thoroughly discredited the idea that Thugga’s public buildings might have been built exclusively for the use of the Roman citizens and prohibited to the non-citizen inhabitants.\textsuperscript{542} The enigmatic phrase “plago dedit itemque dedicavit, he gave it to the pagus and also dedicated it” is based partly on a reconstruction, and might not be the text’s original wording. If the reconstruction is correct, however, I would interpret the phrase as Rufus’ effort to glorify the pagus and to make the urban appearance of Thugga more like that of Carthage, which almost certainly had a commercial center by the early first century C.E.\textsuperscript{543} The building itself, and its inscription, thus proclaimed its donor’s identity as a citizen of Carthage and a high-status member of the citizen community at Thugga. Perhaps the commercial function of the building hinted at Licinius Rufus’ own activities in the town. Certainly the inscription sought to bring the function of the building to the viewer’s attention: the fifth line of the inscription, “mac[ellum] sua pec(unia) fec(it), he built the macellum with his own funds,” marked the building’s name with a decorative ivy-leaf and wider spacing than any other words of the text.\textsuperscript{544}

Licinia Prisca’s temple also sought to enhance the generous reputation of her familia. By including the name of her husband and a reference to her patron in her dedicatory inscription, she underscored her relationship with both men, who were already benefactors of the city in their own right. But her dedication, made in her own

\textsuperscript{541}E.g. Poinssot 1919, 191; Khanoussi 2003, 148; Khanoussi 1993, 602.
\textsuperscript{542}Khanoussi 2003, 146, contra Poinssot 1919, 175-176.
\textsuperscript{543}It is not clear whether the commercial center was located on the platforms at the top of the Byrsa hill, or whether it was near the port. The region around the port and the Ilôt de l’Amirauté probably served as a center for trade by the mid-second century C.E. (Hurst 2010, 55; Hurst 1994, 114-115).
\textsuperscript{544}Poinssot (1969, 222 inscription E) shows the layout and spacing of the text. The fragment, which preserves the letters MAC and the first letters of the last line, only has an ivy leaf in front of macellum.
name, also pointed to her rising influence in the town: holder of a prestigious priesthood, the flaminate, and someone who dedicated buildings. Following Sartori’s principles of alignment, we see that the fact that Licinia Prisca paid for the structure was not as important as the fact that she dedicated it herself, a fact recorded at the very end of the inscription’s final line. In contrast to the financing statement, which was highly abbreviated with only four letters, “S(ua) P(ecunia) F(aciendu) C(uravit),” the dedication statement was fully written out, “idemque dedicavit.” The action of dedicating the building herself aligned Licinia Prisca closely with her patron, Licinius Rufus, who dedicated his own building, the macellum (no. 30), in contrast to the practice followed in other first-century benefactions in the forum, where a Carthaginian magistrate made the formal dedication (nos. 27, 28, 29).

The imperial connections between Venus Concordia and Rome have been enumerated already: Saint-Amans notes that the goddess Venus had a strong association with the Julio-Claudian imperial family, and her aspect as Concordia also referred to the Augustan political program, Concordia also invoked a close connection with Carthage, the Colonia Concordia Julia Karthago. Such imperial-style ideology is reasonable, given Licinia Prisca’s position as flaminica, priestess of the imperial cult. But her building was constructed outside the forum itself, where the official buildings of that cult (the Templum Caesaris [inscriptions no. 27, 29], and altars to Augustus and Tiberius [inscription no. 27 and DFH 46]) were constructed. Licinia Prisca’s goddess was a step removed from the imperial cult itself, just as the physical location of her temple was slightly removed from the central area of the forum and the locus of the imperial cult. This situation contrasts with the circumstances at Gigthis.

545 Saint-Amans 2004, 156
546 See ch. II.2.b. The Shrine of Concordia Panthea, supra p. 51.
where the second-century Shrine of Concordia Panthea was placed in the forum proper, in the same area as imperial cult activity. Perhaps the marginal location of Licinia Prisca’s Temple of Venus Concordia reflected her more marginal status: as a freedwoman—even a wealthy one in an official ritual position—she occupied a different place in the hierarchy than did a decurion-elect, exercising less political influence than did the Ummidii who built the Shrine of Concordia Panthea at Gigthis. Although the dedication of the building to a Roman-style goddess, and Licinia Prisca’s position as flaminica, both pointed to her connections with Rome and with Carthage, the temple’s orientation and position nuanced those messages. The west-facing structure, built with a podium and porch in the Italic style, looked toward the forum, and toward the pre-Roman shrine of Massinissa there, which, as I have argued above, also formed a focal point for other early imperial structures in the forum. Even in a marginal location—it is not clear from the present state of evidence whether other buildings would have blocked the line of sight between Licinia Prisca’s Temple of Concordia and the Shrine of Massinissa—the building sought to emphasize the connections that other donors had made between Thugga’s past and its future.

The macellum’s impact on Thugga’s urban development was far-reaching; like the theater complex at Lepcis Magna, or the Baths of Julia Memmia at Bulla Regia, its construction changed the character of the neighborhood. Though L. Poinssot suggested that the macellum was built on land held by the pagus, recent research has demonstrated that the land was occupied in the pre-Roman period by Numidian buildings. Construction of the macellum in the space created a monumental aspect in

---

547 See this ch. V.2.d. The Creation of Thugga’s Forum, supra p. 151.
548 Poinssot 1919, 176.
549 Khanoussi 2003, 146. The sondages reported by Hiesel and Strocka (2002, 74) discovered pre-Roman ceramic material at the base of the macellum’s second-century apse, suggesting that the area was
the area, since the two-level building loomed over structures to its south, down the hill. This new monumental aspect in turn invited additional construction of monumental structures nearby: the first architectural elaboration of the Temple of Tellus and later construction around the east forum area and further to the south and east in the Hadrianic period and later.

The existing shape and associations in the urban space almost certainly played a role in Rufus’ decision to site the *macellum* in the area immediately east of the forum. His family had played a role in early construction near or in the forum (inscription no. 29) and his freedmen, Tyrannus and Prisca, were actively involved in building projects in the same vicinity at approximately the same time as his construction of the *macellum*. Visual connections between the buildings may have enhanced the visibility of the *familia* and compounded their reputation for public generosity, creating an impression that the Licinii were active on every side of the city’s public spaces and even beyond. Seen in this light, the site of Licinia Prisca’s temple, northeast of and marginal to both the forum and the *macellum*, in a neighborhood perhaps largely given to domestic space, would have heightened the family’s urban presence, much like the diffuse commemorative statues and inscriptions of Flavius Tullus, donor of the water supply at Sabratha.

The commemorative program for these donors, like those of the early forum, is obscure. Licinius Rufus did receive a statue, at public expense, but this was not erected until the later second century. It seems likely that, just as was the case at the theater of Lepcis Magna, the buildings themselves served as the commemorative monuments for

---

550 See this ch. V.4.a. The Temple of Tellus, infra p. 170.
552 See ch. III.3.a. The Aqueduct and Fountains of Flavius Tullus, supra p. 100.
553 See ch. VI.3.e. The East Forum Area, the *Macellum*, and the Temple of Mercury, infra p. 241.
the donors. The inscribed texts placed the names of Licinius Rufus and Licinia Prisca in prominent locations on their buildings. The size of the *macellum*, at least, would have made Licinius Rufus’ contribution visible for many of the city’s residents. Licinia Prisca’s visibility may have been more limited, just as her building’s impact may have been.

4. Other Early Donations at Thugga

In sharp contrast to the evidence from the first half of the first century C.E., the Flavian and Trajanic periods at Thugga were a quiet period for private donations to the city’s urban space. Archaeological and epigraphic evidence offer only three examples of benefactions that date to the late first and early second centuries C.E., and only two of those inscriptions have an archaeological provenance. Of course, this apparent dearth of public building in the later first and early second centuries could be based on incomplete evidence; perhaps public benefactors focused their efforts on an area of the city that has not yet been studied.

It is quite clear, however, from the surviving epigraphic evidence that donors of this period did not focus on the forum and its immediate surroundings, as they did during the Julio-Claudian period. Indeed, the two donations that can be located within the urban area during the Flavian and Trajanic periods were both outside the immediate central area, south of the civic center in the forum (fig. 41). But their donors followed some of the same patterns as the earlier donors in responding to the urban layout with their constructions. I have emphasized in the preceeding sections how

---

554 The third Flavian-period dedication, Benzina Ben Abdallah 1986, 89, no. 226, is known only from a fragmentary inscription that is said to come from Thugga. The nature of this benefaction is disputed: Khanoussi (1997, 123) suggests it perhaps derives from a temple, while Christol (1991, 614) suggests that its inscribed form is similar to inscriptions of statue groups. Since the white marble plaque has no specific context information it is not included in this discussion.
much importance the early donors placed on the appearance of generational continuity in euergetism—that is, how hard they worked to signal their willingness to participate in euergetism as a continuing pattern, by naming sons and other members of their familia. This was only an appearance of willingness; as I have shown above, the generosities of those early donors did not extend beyond a single generation, despite their concern to emphasize the importance of familial tradition in their inscriptions. In the Flavian and Trajanic periods, the meager evidence suggests that benefactors may have given up this appearance of continuity in favor of self-promotion; in the later periods, as we shall discuss in chapters six and seven, the two goals of self-promotion and familial positioning became more closely linked. As in other cases, limited study and lack of publication curtail our understanding of the buildings and their donors’ messages, but even incomplete evidence shows that these donors, too, responded to, and influenced in their turn, the shape and meaning of the urban environment.

a. The Temple of Tellus

The Temple of Tellus, built south and west of the macellum, on the same level as the macellum’s lower story (fig. 41), developed in the late first century, if not in the Numidian period. Few of the building’s remains derive from its first-century phase; it was apparently extensively rebuilt in the third century (fig. 42). The first-century phase is signalled by two things: the building’s plan and an inscribed door lintel dated on paleographic grounds to the later first or early second century. The third-century Temple of Tellus was comprised of a colonnaded courtyard and three cellae set behind the courtyard, a plan which had antecedents in Punic architecture. It differed from the

555 Saint-Amans (2004, 108) suggests that cult locations were so long-lived that there might well have been an earlier Numidian-period sanctuary on the site, probably also dedicated to Tellus or her pre-Roman equivalent.

556 For third-century activity at the site, see ch. VII.3.a. The Renovated Temple of Tellus, infra p. 301.
traditional Roman tripartite temple in the positioning of the *cellae*: they were not placed inside a courtyard, on a high podium approached by many steps, but outside of the courtyard, and on its same level.⁵⁵⁷ Such a plan would be unexpectedly archaizing in a new construction of the third century;⁵⁵⁸ other third-century buildings at Thugga follow a more “Italian” plan, with temple inside of, rather than behind, the courtyard.⁵⁵⁹ The third-century Temple of Tellus apparently preserved the older, first-century plan.

The other first-century evidence from this building was found inside the courtyard when it was cleared: an inscribed door lintel, 1.40 m long and 0.45 m tall. This limestone inscription may have been placed over the main doorway leading from the street into the sanctuary’s courtyard.⁵⁶⁰ The text was inscribed in first- or early second-century lapidary capitals, 12.5 cm tall; the lintel’s decorative elements also have parallels in the later first century.⁵⁶¹ The text, which is fragmentary, reads:

32. *Telluri Aug(ustae) [sac(rum) …*⁵⁶²

Consecrated to Tellus Augusta …

Finds from the building, including statuary and figural mosaics, indicate that it was probably dedicated to Ceres and Pluto along with Tellus; the three gods were popular in African religious practice.⁵⁶³

We know so little about this building’s early phase (and its anonymous donor⁵⁶⁴) that it is difficult to assess its impact and meanings. The building’s orientation, east-

---

⁵⁵⁷ Pensabene 1989.
⁵⁵⁹ See e.g. ch. VII.2. e. The Sanctuary of Caelestis, infra p. 290.
⁵⁶³ Saint-Amans 2004, 107; see also Cadotte 2007.
⁵⁶⁴ It is possible, of course, that the building was originally funded by the city rather than an individual donor, but the patterns of evidence at Thugga make this possibility seem unlikely. In the third-century reconstruction, a named donor took responsibility for the site, and that does not seem to be the usual pattern for civic-funded structures at Thugga. Indeed, the reverse was more usually the case: the city took over responsibility for maintenance of some private structures—if no donor stepped forward.
southeast, does not follow the orientation of either the earlier buildings in the forum or of the *macellum*. Saint-Amans has suggested that the Temple of Tellus could have had pre-Roman antecedents, which might explain its unusual orientation, though currently our evidence dates only to the Flavian period.\(^{565}\) When the sanctuary was constructed, it may have taken over space that had previously been used for domestic activity;\(^{566}\) this change from domestic to ritual space may have signalled a further change in the neighborhood’s character, following in the wake of the *macellum*. A similar pattern is evident at Bulla Regia (though in a later period), where the construction of Julia Memmia’s baths moved land from domestic to public use and helped to monumentalize the neighborhood.\(^{567}\) This process had already begun, however, with the construction of the *macellum*; the Temple of Tellus added additional public character to an area that had been shifted to public use by Licinius Rufus’ donation, much as the Baths of Julia Memmia at Bulla Regia and the temples of the theater-temple complex at Lepcis Magna\(^{568}\) contributed more momentum to a process of monumentalization that was already underway.

b. The Temple of Minerva I

A second building that was built in the late first or early second century CE is the Temple of Minerva I, south of, and down the hill from, the forum (fig. 41). Unlike the Temple of Tellus, which contributed to an increasingly monumentalized area southeast of the forum, the Temple of Minerva was apparently built well away from other public structures. Its location suggests that the donor(s) sought to define Thugga’s urban

---

568 See ch. III.2.d. The Theater-Temple Complex, supra p. 84.
image along a route where travelers entered the city, as did Servilius Maurinus in the Temple of Mercury at Gigthis.\footnote{569}

Excavated and identified in 1959-1961 (but never fully published),\footnote{570} the archaeological remains of this temple (fig. 43) include a courtyard, with porticoes on its long sides and an apse at the western end, oriented toward the (south) east along one of the east-west roads. In the apse, an inscribed statue base, apparently in situ, identified the temple and (one of) its donor(s).\footnote{571} The low base, 0.27 m tall, 1.375 m wide, and 1.14 m deep, was made of white limestone. Its text was carved in letters decreasing gradually in size from 9.5 cm in the first line to 4 cm in the final line.\footnote{572}

33. *Minervae Aug(ustae) sacr(um)*

*ex testmento Q(uinti) Vinnici Q(uinti) fil(i) Arn(ensi) Genialis sacerdotis Ceres anni CXXVII quaestoris praefecti iuris dic(undi) Ilvir(i) c(oloniae) C(oncordiae) I(ulii) K(arthaginis) patroni civitatis Thuggensis ex HS X mil(ibus) XX(icesima) pop(uli) R(omani) minus civitati donum dedit curatore C(aio) Mario Per petuo patrono civitatis.*\footnote{573}

Consecrated to Minerva Augusta, from the will of Quintus Vinnicius Genialis, son of Quintus, of the Arnensis tribe, priest of Ceres in the year 127, quaestor, judicial prefect, duumvir of the colony Concordia Julia Karthago, patron of the *civitas* of Thugga, from 10,000 sesterces (less 1/20 as a tax of the Roman people), he gave as a gift to the *civitas*, with Caius Marius Perpetuus, patron of the *civitas*, as curator.

The base likely held an over-life-sized statue of the goddess Minerva, almost certainly the cult statue. The inscription relates, however, to the donation of the statue itself and not to the construction of the Temple. The total donation was around 9500 sesterces, and Kalalla points out that this was quite costly for a statue but not a large

\footnote{569}{See ch. II.2.a, “The Temple of Mercury, Gigthis, Tipolitania.”}
\footnote{570}{Khanoussi 1997, 121.}
\footnote{571}{Khanoussi 1998, 47 no. 27; Saint-Amans 2004, 338.}
\footnote{572}{Kalalla 1997, 154.}
\footnote{573}{Kalalla 1997, 154 no. 2; AEpig 1997, 1655.}
enough donation to have funded an entire temple. Vinnicius Genialis may have donated both the statue and the building (as was the case, for example, at Gigthis’ Temple of Mercury where the donor inscribed his name on both the building and the statues). But without more evidence for the structure of the building and its epigraphic program, we cannot be certain that this was the case.

Quintus Vinnicius Genialis, who is otherwise unknown at Thugga, can be reasonably closely dated by his provincial priesthood of the Cereres, which he held at Carthage. “Anni CXXVII, cult year 127,” corresponds to a date in the 80s C.E. (specifically, 83-89), since the cult of the Cereres at Carthage was established at the latest by 39 B.C.E., or as early as 44 B.C.E. Since Vinnicius Genialis held other offices as well, and he gave this donation postumously, Kallalla posited that the temple was probably built near the end of the first century or the beginning of the second, probably ca. 96-105 C.E. This inscription is our only evidence of the man, and we have no indications that he had given any other benefactions to the city of Thugga during his lifetime.

Vinnicius Genialis’ inscription emphasized the role of the donor himself, without reference to other members of his family; his donation was posthumous, inspired by his position as “patronus civitatis, patron of the civitas,” and the fact that his heirs were not mentioned in the execution of the bequest signalled that this generosity was a single occurrence, not a promise of more to come. This represented a change from previous practice, since earlier donors had regularly mentioned their children in benefactions (see inscriptions no. 27, 28, 29) or their positions as members of a generous familia.

---

574 Kalalla (1997, 157), cites Duncan-Jones’ median prices for a statue around 4000-6000 sesterces, compared to a median cost of 43,500 sesterces for a temple (Duncan-Jones 1982, 75).
575 On the establishment date of this cult, see Gascou 1987; Fishwick and Shaw 1978; Fishwick 1996.
576 Kallala 1997, 155.
(inscriptions no. 29, 30, 31), but had not always held positions as patrons of parts of the city.

The language of the inscription makes it clear that, despite his position as patron of the *civitas* of Thugga, Vinnicius Genialis was eager to associate himself with the Roman citizens of Carthage. His inscription detailed his many connections with Carthage, including several magistracies and the high-status position in a provincial-level cult. A dedication to the goddess Minerva, favored by both Domitian and Trajan, underscored Vinnicius Genialis’ identity as a Roman with connections to the imperial cult. Like Licinia Prisca, Vinnicius Genialis’ dedication of a temple to a goddess with imperial connections identified him as a man of importance, though the connections in the inscription were indirect. Without the statue itself, it is difficult to determine whether these indirect imperial connections might have been made more explicit through visual means, as was the case in Suphunibal’s Temple of Ceres—with its cult statue bearing a portrait head of Livia—at Lepcis Magna, where she made herself into the city’s first lady through direct reference to the empress.

The temple’s location suggests that Vinnicius Genialis wished to convey different messages than did Licinia Prisca, who sought to emphasize her rising status in Thugga’s urban life. Instead of placing this temple in the central area of the city, he located it well outside the central public space, in a neighborhood that appears to have been primarily domestic. In later periods, it seems that the presence of this temple provided a basis for change in the neighborhood’s character as additional structures

---

577 As Kalalla points out (1997, 156-157) both Domitian and Trajan promoted their connections with the goddess Minerva, and other African examples of temples to this goddess in fact date largely to the Trajanic period.

578 See ch. III.2.d. The Theater-Temple Complex, supra p. 84.

579 We know little about this particular area because large sections of the space are unstudied. But several large houses rise on the same street, further to the east (toward the gate/triumphal arch), while other structures to the west and north also appear to have had domestic characters.
such as a large nymphaeum were built nearby. The temple faced onto a road that ran east-west across the hill, and may have been a thoroughfare for people entering the town through the south-east gate. The location of this temple not far from Punic and Roman period necropoleis on the southern edge of the urban area suggests that its construction may have marked a boundary of the urban core. Its position on a major street in the southern part of the town allowed Vinnicius Genialis (or the other donors who contributed to the temple’s construction) to set the tone for those entering the city, just as Servilius Maurinus’ Temple of Mercury did at Gigthis.

5. Concluding Thoughts

In the first and early second centuries, Thugga’s urban area took on a more monumental appearance, especially in the forum, where two monumental arches helped to formalize and define the space (nos. 27 and 28). As the site of pre-Roman ruler cult activity at the Shrine of Massinissa, first-century buildings in the forum area shifted smoothly to a focus on the Roman imperial cult, with the construction of a Temple of Caesar and multiple altars to divine emperors (nos. 27 and 29; DFH 46). At the same time, the donors’ buildings marked the continued importance of the pre-Roman traditions through improvements to the Temple of Saturn in the forum (no. 27), as well as through their orientation toward the Shrine of Massinissa, which played a central role in the development of the early forum. Even religious structures outside the forum itself, such as Licinia Prisca’s Temple of Venus Concordia (no. 31), appear to have taken their orientation cues from that building. The construction of the Temple of Tellus (no. 580)

This monumental nymphaeum (Khanoussi 1998, 75 no. 56) is associated with the cisterns of Ain-al-Hammam (Khanoussi 1998, 76 no. 57) in the southern portion of the site, but I can find no indication of the date of either structure.

581 A triumphal arch of Septimius Severus was built at the southeastern edge of the site in 205 C.E., probably marking an entry point into the city from the main road linking Carthage with Theveste (Khanoussi 1998, 70-71 no. 50).
(32) also recalled Thugga’s earlier history with its dedication to a popular African trinity and its tripartite, African-style plan.

At the same time that their works emphasized their connection to Thugga’s pre-Roman past, however, the donors also sought to strengthen the city’s—and their own—ties to the new Roman colony at Carthage. Buildings that mimicked those in Carthage’s civic center on the Byrsa, including arched gateways, temples, and altars for the celebration of imperial cult, helped to recreate Thugga as an urban center in Carthage’s image. With these buildings, the donors emphasized as well their own status as members of the community of Carthage’s Roman citizens, elite residents of the *pagus* of Thugga. These connections extended beyond the forum itself to encompass nearly every donated building in first-century Thugga, as temples to other deities with imperial connections, Venus Concordia (no. 31) and Minerva (no. 33), make clear.

Connections with Carthage, and concurrent political status, were only one element of donors’ identities that they expressed through their benefactions. Inscriptions, architecture, and topographic relationships between the buildings all communicated meaning to viewers. Familial relationships were of great importance to two donors, Licinius Tyrannus and Licinia Prisca, who made connections with their patron and his *familia* not only by mentioning him in their building inscriptions, but also by building the Temple of Venus Concordia near his own structure, the *macellum*, and by taking responsibility for maintenance of a building that Licinius Rufus’ grandmother Viria Rustica had previously constructed, the Templum Caesaris in the forum. Other donors also stressed the importance of familial relationships in the building inscriptions, naming their sons as co-benefactors with them (e.g. inscriptions no. 27, 28). The implication of including the names of sons in benefactory inscriptions was that the sons would continue a program of euergetism toward Thugga, that the
first donors were establishing patterns that would create long-term benefits for the city. But the epigraphic record includes no evidence that those traditions took root. The city’s political leaders may have sought to strengthen their ties to such families through the appointment of their members to the position of *patronus*—certainly, the donors Postumius Chius, Caesetius Perpetuus, Licinius Rufus, and Licinius Tyrannus took on such roles, but even this official title did not succeed in creating a long-lasting tradition of euergetism on the part of Thugga’s wealthy early first-century families. In the later first century we see the participation not of familiar families, but of a new donor, Vinnicius Genialis, whose relationship to the town was formalized through his patronage of the *civitas*, and whose generosity may have been limited to a single statue.

This change in emphasis from the appearance of long tradition to a single donor reflected a reality of life in a small city in the first century. Thugga’s elite apparently focused on connecting themselves to Carthage, and in so doing they may have increasingly lost sight of the local community’s needs. Once Thugga had the basic elements of a Roman civic and religious architecture, it seems that its wealthy residents may have been reluctant to donate additional buildings to the city. Their reluctance to commit to generations-long programs of euergetism could account for the increasing prominence of *patroni* and other officials, rather than family groups, beginning with the donation of Vinnicius Genialis and extending into the second and third centuries.

Donated buildings played an important role in shaping Thugga’s urban landscape, and their impact multiplied as additional privately-funded buildings were constructed. The cases of the forum and the *macellum* demonstrate that benefactors often chose to place their donations in the same area as other donors had done. The arch of

---

582 Poinssot 1969, 230-231; see also ch. V.2. The First Benefactions in the Forum, supra p. 142, inscriptions no. 27, 28, 29, 30.
Caesetius Perpetuus (no. 28) added another monumental structure to the forum, which had already received donations of an arch and paved flooring. I argue that Caesetius Perpetuus’ donation of an arch responded to—and mimicked—the earlier arch, in an attempt to connect himself with the far more extensive program of euergetism given by his predecessor, Postumius Chius (inscription 27). In the same way, the construction of the Temple of Tellus (no. 32) followed, and enhanced, the initial monumentalization of space southeast of the forum that had been begun by construction of the macellum (no. 30). This process, too, continued and accelerated in the second century, and was even evident in later periods of Thugga’s urban life.
CHAPTER SIX:
The Zenith of Public Euergetism at Thugga, Second Century C.E.

1. Introduction

As discussed in chapter five, Thugga’s urban area had experienced a renaissance in the first half of the first century at the hands of multiple benefactors, but in the late first century only a few donors contributed to the city’s continuing development. I suggested in chapter five that the comparative dearth of benefactors in the Flavian and Trajanic periods necessitated a shift on the part of the city’s officials. They were unable to rely on the generosity of elite families to develop the urban center, as promised traditions of euergetism failed, for the most part, to continue beyond a single generation. Instead, the city turned to a more reliable source for new constructions: public officials. Already in the first century “official” construction by flamines and patroni had played a role in many of the public structures that were built at Thugga by private benefactors. The role of official construction became more pronounced through the second century, providing Thugga with many additional public buildings, of both civic and religious character.

Many of the patterns that appeared in first century donations continued to be present in the second century. Donors expressed their political and social identities through the buildings and their locations as well as through their inscriptions. Earlier donations figured prominently in donors’ choice of locations, so that benefactions increasingly clustered together into zones of monumentalized public space. And donated public buildings filled one of two goals, either monumentalizing the city, in imitation of Carthage, or helping to define its boundaries. These processes did not change dramatically over the second century, but the pace of euergetism and public
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building intensified and heightened the effects of the processes that had begun in the early first century.

2. Developments East of the Forum in the Hadrianic Period

The area east of the forum had already begun to be monumentalized in the first century, with the construction of Licinus Rufus’ macellum,\textsuperscript{583} the Temple of Venus Concordia to the north,\textsuperscript{584} and the Temple of Tellus to the south.\textsuperscript{585} Beginning in the Hadrianic period, (118-135 C.E.), this area experienced extensive new construction at the hands of three different families of private benefactors (fig. 44). All of those new buildings responded to the structures and the identities of the previous donors, focusing on a space that allowed them to echo and amplify earlier messages.

a. The Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury

One donation of Hadrianic date was built east of the forum, adjacent to the macellum of Licinius Rufus and southeast of the Temple of Venus Concordia built by Licinia Prisca.\textsuperscript{586} This location was not arbitrary, but full of meaning. The building’s dedication, location, and probably also its architecture created connections between its donors and the Licinii, and by doing so enhanced the reputations of its donors.

The primary epigraphic evidence for the temple comes from a fragmentary limestone lintel found in reuse contexts. One of the fragments was built into an Arab-period house, immediately east of the Capitolium;\textsuperscript{587} two other fragments were found during clearance of the northern section of the area macelli.\textsuperscript{588} The lintel, which is nearly

\textsuperscript{583} See ch. V.3.a. Licinius Rufus’ Macellum, supra p. 160, inscription no. 30.
\textsuperscript{584} See ch. V.3.b. Licinia Prisca’s Temple of Venus Concordia, supra p. 162, inscription no. 31.
\textsuperscript{585} See ch. V.4.a. The Temple of Tellus, supra p. 170.
\textsuperscript{586} See ch. V.3.b. Licinia Prisca’s Temple of Venus Concordia, supra p. 162.
\textsuperscript{587} Merlin 1903 no. 8.
\textsuperscript{588} Poinssot 1906 no. 21.
complete, is estimated to have been originally about 4.6 m long, and 55 cm tall. The letters are 10 cm in the first line, 7 cm in the second line, and 5 cm in the last two lines.\textsuperscript{589}

34. *Fortunae Augustae* Veneri Concordiae Mercurio Augusto sacrum pro salute Imperatoris Caesaris Traiani Hadrian Augusto pontificio maximo tribuniciae potestate co(n)s(ulis) III p(atriae) p(atriae)

Q(uintus) Maedius Severus patronus pagi et civitatis nomine suo et M]aediae Lentulae filiae suae flaminiciae perpetuae templum quod ex HS LXX m(ilibus) n(ummum) fa]cturum se promiserat ampliata pecunia a fundamentis exstruxit --- opere exornavit idemque dedicavit cura[tore] [M]agnio Primo Seiano.\textsuperscript{590}

Consecrated to Fortuna Augusta, Venus Concordia, and Mercury Augustus, for the health of Emperor Caesar Trajan Hadrian Augustus, pontifex maximus, holder of tribunician power, consul for the third time, father of his country. Quintus Maedius Severus, patron of the pagus and the civitas, in his own name and that of his daughter Maedia Lentula, perpetual flaminica, constructed from its foundations the temple which he had promised to build with 70,000 sesterces, with additional funds added to the total; he ornamented the building and also dedicated it, with Magnius Primus Sejanus as curator.

A second, much later inscription, in three fragments, also mentions this building. Like the earlier text, no. 34, its fragments were found in reused contexts. Two of the fragments were built into the eastern side of the Byzantine wall; a third was found in excavations southeast of the *macellum*.\textsuperscript{591}

35. *Pro salute Imperatoris C(aesarei) divi Septimi Severi Pii nepotis, divi [Magni Antonini Pii filii], [Marci Aureli Severi Alexandri Pii Felicis Augusti,] et [Iulii M]amaeae Augustae, matris Augusti[,] et [Iulii Maesa Augustae, aviae Augustae], totiusque divinae domus eorum, opus templi

Fortunae [quod Q(uintus) Maedius Severus patr]iae suae extruxerat vetus[tate consumptum, respublica munici]p[ii Septimii Aureli Liberi Thuggensis restituit].\textsuperscript{592}

For the health of Emperor Caesar, grandson of deified Septimius Severus Pius, son of deified and great Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander Pius Felix Augustus, and of Julia Mamaea Augusta, the mother of Augustus, and Julia Maesa Augusta, grandmother of Augustus, and of

\textsuperscript{589} DFH, 265.
\textsuperscript{590} DFH 136; CIL, 26471; ILTun 1392; AÉpig 1904, 116; Poinssot 1906 no. 21.
\textsuperscript{591} Saint-Amans 2004, 318 no. 49.
\textsuperscript{592} Saint-Amans 2004, 318 no. 49; CIL, 26547; ILAfr, 528; ILTun, 1411.
their whole divine family. The city of municipium Septimius Aurelius Liber Thugga restored the work of the Temple of Fortune that Quintus Maedius Severus had constructed for his own homeland, which had been destroyed by age.

L. Poinssot suggested that the inscription of Maedius Severus and Maedia Lentula should be connected with a large structure adjacent to the *macellum*, on which the mosque now stands (figs. 44-45a), based on the proximity of the reused inscriptions to the podium, and later researchers have tentatively accepted this identification. Excavation in the area has been limited to clearing the podium’s edges and investigating its stratigraphic relationship to the building immediately to the north. The podium, more than 17 m wide along its western face, supported remains of masonry courses which probably represent the walls of the temple. A black-and-white geometric mosaic visible on the surface of the podium, near the mosque (fig. 45b), dates stylistically to the first half of the second century, and column drums are among the elements reused in the mosque’s construction. The inscription, which dedicated the temple to three separate deities, suggests a tripartite temple in the African style, with three *cellae* approached from a common courtyard, but no remains of any structures above the podium can confirm this hypothesis.

The first inscription, no. 34, indicates that the building was constructed early in Hadrian’s reign, perhaps 117-119 C.E., though the imperial titulature is somewhat confusing. According to inscription no. 35, the structure was apparently reconstructed

---

593 Poinssot 1906, 136; Poinssot 1919 (182-183) reiterated this view; Khanoussi (1998, 24 no. 8) notes that the structure is “usually identified (généralement identifié)” with the Temple; Saint-Amans (2004, 315) accepts the identification with reservations.
594 Merlin 1903, 24-25.
595 Khanoussi 1998, 24 no. 8; Saint-Amans 2004, 315-316 fig. 39a-b.
596 Kienast 1996, 129-130; DFH, 265 no. 136: though Hadrian did not officially receive the title *pater patriae* until 128 C.E., provincial inscriptions included this in his titulature from early in his reign. The combination of the third consulate with the first *TP* is incorrect (if, indeed, this is an enumeration and not just a simple notice that the emperor was endowed with tribunician power). Saint-Amans
in the reign of Alexander Severus, in the early third century, at public expense, at which time it may have been rededicated to the goddess Fortuna alone.\footnote{DFH, 266, following Poinssot 1919, 145.}

The primary benefactor of this temple was Quintus Maedius Severus, who gave the building in his own name and on behalf of his daughter, Maedia Lentula. Maedius Severus was patron of both the \textit{pagus} and the \textit{civitas}, and from the other benefactors whose works we have already examined it seems clear that building donations were an important responsibility of the citizens who became patrons of either or both groups. Maedius Severus had already promised a large sum of money for the building in advance of its construction, as the pluperfect tense in the inscription (no. 34) makes clear (\textit{``templum quod ex sestertium LXX milibus facturum se promiserat}, the temple which he had promised he would build for 70,000 sesterces\textquoteright\textquoteright). What had prompted the promise of such a temple is, however, not entirely clear: he might have promised a temple in response to being named patron of the \textit{pagus} and the \textit{civitas}, or in order to receive that honor. Saint-Amans has suggested, probably correctly, that he promised the building in response to his daughter\textquotesingle s election to the perpetual flaminate, and that is why Maedius Severus includes Maedia Lentula\textquotesingle s name in the dedicatory inscription.\footnote{Saint-Amans 2004, 122; according to Saastamoinen (2010, 337), many of these donations that were given with additional funds were the result of office holding, or benefactions \textit{ob honorem}.}

Maedia Lentula\textquotesingle s position as \textit{flaminica perpetua} probably explains both the building\textquotesingle s construction and its dedication to Fortuna Augusta, Venus Concordia, and Mercury Augustus. This building was constructed as a response to the earlier temple of Venus Concordia, built by another flaminica, Licinia Prisca. Saint-Amans has already noted the connection between the official priesthood held by the two women and their
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dedication of temples to the same deity.\textsuperscript{599} Numerous scholars have suggested that the Maedii reconstructed Licinia Prisca’s earlier temple to Venus Concordia, interpreting the phrase in Maedius Severus’ text “\textit{a fundamentis}, from its foundations” as an indication of extensive reconstruction work.\textsuperscript{600} I prefer to interpret the phrase literally: the Maedii built an entirely new temple in the area east of the forum, consciously echoing the work of the earlier \textit{flaminica} and building off of her reputation to enhance their own. The obvious parallel between the two dedications to Venus Concordia invited a connection between the two donors’ families, so that Maedius Severus and his daughter Maedia Lentula looked like the successors to the first-century Licinii. The inscription’s layout emphasised Maedius Severus’ name, placing it at the beginning of a line, and his generosity in funding the temple, more than his daughter’s name and position: the important actor for this building was Maedius Severus, not his daughter. The building’s inscription and its location, adjacent to the \textit{macellum}, connected Maedius Severus, \textit{patronus pagi et civitatis}, with the similar \textit{patronus} Licinius Rufus, constructor of the \textit{macellum} itself.

Facing toward the shrine of Massinissa, like the buildings of the forum, this temple may have served to extend the area of the forum’s public activity. Its orientation toward the shrine and the forum’s buildings created visual connections between them, just as the earlier forum buildings had done. The building’s location near the \textit{macellum} of Licinius Rufus, and the epigraphic parallels between the two donors, reinforced the impression that the Maedii were continuing the efforts of the Licinii to enhance Thugga’s urban space. This temple celebrated imperial virtues at one remove, just as Licinia Prisca’s temple of Venus Concordia had done. Its orientation toward the shrine

\textsuperscript{599} Saint-Amans 2004, 156.
\textsuperscript{600} E.g. Saint-Amans 2004, 315; Poinssot 1969, 218-219, inscription C.
of Massinissa and its possible tripartite African-style plan, acknowledged the central role of the past in Thugga’s urban shape even as it celebrated the imperial virtues favored by the present. By including Mercury, a Roman god of commerce, in the dedication, this temple brought the *macellum* more fully into the workings of the east forum, even though that building’s entrance was on the south side, facing away from the central civic space. The physical and religious connections between the *macellum*, the Temple of Fortuna Augusta, Venus Concordia, and Mercury Augustus, and the Temple of Venus Concordia tied the three buildings together, and also tied together the two families who built the buildings, making the Hadrianic Maedii seem like the logical successors of the first-century Licinii and completing the efforts of the Licinii to create the east forum into an extension of the public space.

b. The Temple of Augustan Pietas

The Temple of Augustan Pietas, located northeast of the *macellum* and at the western corner of the Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury (fig. 46), is in some ways highly problematic because its history is not well understood. Its *terminus ante quem* dates to the Hadrianic period; though other scholars have dated it far later, I date it to the Hadrianic period based on archaeological evidence and on the the message it conveyed to viewers and the connections it made between other buildings in this area. The donor of this building sought to incorporate his own modest donation into the larger familial program of building developed by the Licinii and continued by the
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601 As I have noted above, the dedication to three divinities makes it possible that the *cellae* followed an African-style plan, like that of the Temple of Tellus (see ch. V.4.a. The Temple of Tellus, supra p. 170).
602 Cadotte (2007, 113-164) has hypothesized that in Africa Mercury was syncretised with Baal Addir, an agricultural deity. In this case, however, the dedication to Mercury Augustus suggests that the Roman god was the intended recipient.
603 Saint-Amans 2004, 346-348, no. 84, dates it to the reigns of Commodus or Septimus Severus; Saint-Amans and Maurin in *DFH* 80-86, no. 30 note that the building is earlier, stratigraphically, than the Hadrianic (?) podium adjacent to it, but prefer to consider it an “archaizing” building. By constrast, Khanoussi 1997, 123 places it at the end of the first century or beginning of the second century, in about the same time period as the Temple of Minerva discussed above.
Maedii, and thereby to participate in their tradition and to aggrandize himself and his contribution by association.

The archaeological remains of this temple consist of a small, semi-circular podium at the northeastern corner of the east forum area, facing northwest (fig. 46). Its façade fronts along the road leading into the plaza, and a small porch, supported by two limestone columns, leads into the cella (fig. 47). The podium is built on a slight slope and its height ranges from around 1 m on the northwest to around 1.5 m on the southeast; a staircase of seven steps gives access to the podium at the southern corner, nearest the other east forum buildings. The epigraphic evidence from this building derives from a single inscription, originally installed above the columns of the porch. The limestone lintel, composed of three separate blocks, originally sat probably along the entire length of the small temple’s façade; it was found lying in fragments around the structure, and one piece was built into the wall that surrounded the mosque. The three inscribed blocks measure, in total, 4.35 m long and 0.60 m tall. The text is written in clear lapidary capitals, with letters 13 cm tall in the first line, and 11.5 cm tall in the last two lines. It reads:

36. Pietati Aug(ustae) sacrum
[--- Pompeius] Rogatus testamento C(ai) Pompei Nahani fratri sui ex HS XXX m(ilibus) n(ummum) sol(ilo s)uo
[exstruxit itemque] dedicavit curatoribus M(arco) Morasio Donato C(aio) Pompeio Cossu[to] …

Consecrated to Pietas Augusta. Pompeius Rogatus erected this on his own land with funds of 30,000 sesterces from the will of his brother Caius Pompeius Nahaniu, and he also dedicated it, with Marcus Morasius Donatus and Caius Pompeius Cossutus as curators.

As I have mentioned already, it is difficult to date the temple precisely. The text provides no certain dates based on imperial titulature or dateable individuals, and the
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604 DFH, 81.
605 DFH 30; CIL 26493; AÉpig 1904, 120; Poinssot 1906 no. 40; Merlin 1903 no. 17.
archaeological stratigraphy is equally complex. The temple’s podium is built out over the street that leads toward the forum from the northeast, and the building thus must post-date the road. Investigations at the steps of the temple, on its southern edge, have suggested that this building was built before the podium immediately to its south (fig. 47), the probable location of Maedius Severus’ and Maedia Lentula’s Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury, a building dated by imperial titulature to the early Hadrianic period (no. 34; as I have noted, that inscription derives from a secondary context), which was apparently restored in the third century (no. 35). Ferchiou, however, has dated the decorative scheme of the column capitals of this Temple of Augustan Pietas to the late Hadrianic period. The paleography of the inscribed letters in the dedicatory text (no. 36), lapidary capitals with some “mannered” letters, suggests a second- or third-century date. The text of the inscription includes the names of two curators, a position which appears only in early inscriptions at Thugga. The inscription also mentions that the building was erected as a posthumous benefaction, a type of inscribed detail that Saastamoinen has shown does not appear before the second century in African building inscriptions.

Maurin and Saint-Amans have proposed that these many elements indicate an “archaizing” architectural style and date the Temple of Augustan Pietas to the Severan period, based especially on the paleography of the inscription. The balance of evidence suggests that it was constructed earlier than that. The Hadrianic or even the Trajanic

---

606 See this ch. VI.2.a. The Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury, supra p. 181.
607 Maurin and Saint-Amans in DFH, 85-86.
608 Maurin and Saint-Amans in DFH, 81.
609 Maurin and Saint-Amans in DFH, 84; Saastamoinen (2010, 292) notes that the ablative absolute phrase lacking a participle used in this inscription (“curatoribus Marco Morasio Donato, Caio Pompeio Cossu ...”) falls into the earlier group of inscriptions mentioning a curator, all of them first or second century in date. Compare inscriptions in ch.V.2. The First Benefactions in the Forum, supra p. 142 and ch. V.3. The Licinii in the Area East of the Forum, supra p. 159.
610 Saastamoinen 2010, 352, n. 2088 and n. 2090.
periods seem likely: the mention of curators precludes an Antonine date, but the detail about the donation’s posthumous nature places it in the second century C.E.; the architectural decoration points to the Hadrianic period. We could easily envision a situation in which the temple’s construction began before the construction of the neighboring temple podium in the early Hadrianic period, but its completion was delayed so that the architectural decorations, such as the column capitals, were not erected until later in the 130s C.E. (Alternatively, the podium could have been enlarged during the third-century renovations of the Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury, removing the difficulty with dating the entire structure of the Temple of Augustan Pietas to the later Hadrianic period.)

We know little about the benefactor himself or his particular motives, though the inscription mentions that the money for the temple building came from the will of his deceased brother. Thus, we must consider that this small temple, like other donations that we have seen, represents not the interest of a single benefactor but those of a family; the language of the inscription underscores this by recording that Pompeius Rogatus gave the land (“solo suo”) while his deceased brother Pompeius Nahanius gave the money (“testamento Caii Pompei Nahani ex HS XXX milibus”). Both brothers were involved in the decision to build a temple in this particular location, in the area adjacent to the forum.

The brothers Pompeius made a conscious effort to connect this small temple with the earlier temple of Venus Concordia erected by Licinia Prisca. The dedication of the building, to Pietas Augusta, celebrated an imperial virtue, pietas, just as Licinia Prisca’s Temple of Venus Concordia, and the Temple of Fortuna Augusta, Venus Concordia,
and Mercury built by the Maedii, celebrated the virtues of *fortuna* and *concordia*. It faced north, toward Licinia Prisca’s Temple of Venus Concordia; the small structure was adjacent to the large podium of the Temple of Fortuna Augusta, Venus Concordia, and Mercury, and visitors walking along the road would have had to pass by the Temple of Pietas in order to access or even see that larger temple in the east forum area, reinforcing the connections between the virtues of piety, concord, and good fortune. Connecting the two buildings through their shared imperial links indirectly connected their donors, Licinia Prisca, Maedius Severus, and Pompeius Rogatus and his brother Nahanius. The large scale of the donations of the Maedii and the Licinii lent additional glory to the relatively small donation of the brothers Pompeius, and magnified the message of their small temple, making them, along with the Maedii, successors of a grand tradition of benefaction established by the Licinii.

c. The *Templa* of Concordia, Frugifer, Liber Pater, and Neptune

One final Hadrianic-period building has been identified in the epigraphic and archaeological record, though once again the epigraphic and archaeological data is somewhat confusing. This religious complex was the first donation of a family whose members became highly active benefactors in Thugga during the second and third centuries C.E. It responded to earlier benefactions as a dedication to multiple deities, like that temple of the Maedii in the area east of the forum, and was located in the same section of the town, contributing to the further development of that neighborhood.

---

611 It is difficult to determine precisely what “Pietati Aug Sacrum” signifies. The abbreviation could be expanded as “Pietati Aug(usti) sacram, Consecrated to the Pietas of (the) Augustus,” or as “Pietati Aug(ustae) sacram, [as supra, no. 36] Consecrated to Pietas Augusta” but regardless of the exact interpretation the dedication had imperial overtones: Maurin and Saint-Amans in *DFH*, 86.

612 See this ch. VI.2.a. The Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury, supra p. 181.
Epigraphic evidence for this building complex is extensive; at least five inscriptions mentioning this temple and its builders have come to light. Their findspots were widely scattered, though many were concentrated in or near the complex known as “Temple B” (figs. 48-49). Though all are fragmentary, together they offer a picture of a large and rather sumptuous building complex given by an extremely wealthy family. The fragments of the main text were found in the area southeast of the building complex, mostly near the Licinian baths to the building’s west. The text was inscribed on a large limestone lintel, 49 cm tall, approximately 5.5 m. long, broken into 6 fragments (of which 5 are extant).\footnote{These are the measurements estimated by Saint-Amans 2004, 293 no. 15. DFH, 69 no. 27 estimates the total length at 4.5 m.} Letter heights are 8 cm in the first line, 7.3 cm in the second, and 6.7 in the remaining three lines.\footnote{DFH, 69 no. 27.}

\begin{verbatim}
patronus pagi et civitatis M(arcus) Gabinius Quir(ina) Bassus flam(en)
A[ug(usti) ---] patronus pagi
et civitatis templum Concordiae Frugiferi Liberi Patris c[ofilis]m reliquis templis et
xystis
solo suo a fundamentis sua pecunia struxerunt in qu[od opus cum HS] L(milia)
promisissent
multiplicata pec(unia) consummaverunt itemq(ue) ded(icaverunt) cura[toribus
Fortunato L(ucio) Instani[o]
Fortunato M(arco) Vibio Gemello M[...]
\end{verbatim}

For the health of the emperor Caesar Trajan Hadrian Augustus. Aulus Gabinius Datus, of the Quirina tribe, patron of the pagus and the civitas, and Marcus Gabinius Bassus of the Quirina tribe, perpetual flamen of Augustus, patron of the pagus and the civitas, have built with their own money the temples of Concord, Frugifer, Liber Pater, with the other temples and the xysti, on their own land, from the ground up. On this project, although they had promised 50,000 sesterces, they spent additional monies. They also dedicated this building. The curators were … Fortunatus, Lucius Instantius Fortunatus, Marcus Vibius Gemellus, and Marcus …

\footnote{DFH 27; CIL 26467, 26469a, 26469b; ILTun 1389; ILAfr 515; Poinssot 1913-1916 no. 9; Brouquier-Reddé and Saint-Amans 1997, 190-191 no. 1.}
A second fragmentary limestone lintel was found east and northeast of the temple complex, near anonymous Temple A. The lintel is the same height (49 cm) and depth (50 cm) as the inscription no. 37 above, and is estimated to have had the same length, ca. 5.50 m, as well.  

The letters are 11 cm tall in the first line(s?); the smallest text in the last line is 7.5 cm tall.  

The text is restored based on the text of the better-preserved inscription 37.

38. A(ulus) Gabinius [Quir(ina) Datus patronus pagi et civitatis Thuggennsis]  
M(arcus) Gabinius [Quir(ina) Bassus patronus] pagi et civitatis  
templa Concordiae Frugiferi Liberi Patris cum reliquis templis et xystis  
solo suo a fundamentis sua pecunia struxerunt in quod opus cum HS L(milia)  
promis  
sissen[t(!)] multiplicata pecunia consummaverunt itemq(ue)] dedic(averunt).  

Aulus Gabinius Datus, of the Quirina tribe, patron of the pagus and the civitas, and Marcus Gabinius Bassus of the Quirina tribe, perpetual flamen of Augustus, patron of the pagus and the civitas, have built with their own money the temples of Concord, Frugifer, Liber Pater, with the other temples and the xysti, on their own land, from the ground up. On this project, although they had promised 50,000 sesterces, they spent additional monies. They also dedicated this building.

The third inscription has no specific known findspot; it may have been discovered west of the Temple B complex, based on its current location in the street near the “Dar Lacchab” monument. The limestone lintel is inscribed on both long faces. It was probably originally 46 cm tall, 4.1 m long, and 50 cm deep.

Like those of inscription 38, the letters of inscription 39 decrease in size from 11-7.5 cm.

39. A(ulus) Gabinius, Quir(ina), Da[tus, pat]ro[nus] pagi et civitatis  
Thuggen[sis] M(arcus) Gabinius, Quir(ina), Bassus, [flamen] aug(usti)  
perp(etuus,) patronus pagi et civ[i]tatis,  
templa Concordiae Frugi[feri Liber]i Patris cum reliquis templis et [xystis]

---

616 As estimated by Saint-Amans 2004, 294 no. 16.  
617 Saint-Amans (2004, 294 no. 16) does not provide letter heights for all lines but only the maximum and minimum heights.  
618 Saint-Amans 2004 no. 16; CIL 26468; Brouquier-Reddé and Saint-Amans 1997, 191 no. 2.  
solo suo a fundamentis s(ua) p(ecunia) struxerunt in quod opus cum HS L m(ilia)
n(ummum) promississent, multip[lil(cata) pec(unia) consum(maverunt.)]621

Aulus Gabinius Datus, of the Quirina tribe, patron of the pagus and the civitas of Thugga, and Marcus Gabinius Bassus, of the Quirina tribe, perpetual flamen of Augustus, patron of the pagus and the civitas, have built with their own money the temples of Concord, Frugifer, Liber Pater, with the other temples and the xysti, on their own land, from the ground up. On this project, although they had promised 50,000 sesterces, they spent additional monies.

The second text, on the other side of the lintel, is carved in smaller size letters, 7.5-6.5 cm tall.

40. A(ulus) Gab[i]nius, Quir(ina), Datus, patronus p[agi] et civitatis
M(arcus) Gab[i]nius, Quir(ina), Bassus, flamen aug(usti) p[erpetuus]
nomine [su]o et A(uli) Gabini(i) Dati fil(ii), in quinque decuriis ab imp(erator)
Caes(are)
Traiano [H]adriano Aug(usto) adlecto, patro[no p]agi et civitatis, templa solo
suo [a] fun[da]mentis s(ua)
pecunia struxerunt i[temque dedicave(runt).]622

Aulus Gabinius Datus, of the Quirina tribe, patron of the pagus and civitas of Thugga, and Marcus Gabinius Bassus, of the Quirina tribe, perpetual flamen of Augustus, patron of the pagus and the civitas, in his own name and that of his son Aulus Gabinius Datus, elected to the board of five by the emperor Caesar Trajan Hadrian Augustus, patron of the pagus and the civitas, built the temples, from their foundations, on their own land, with their own money, and dedicated them.

A fourth inscription, apparently derived from this building, was built into the northern wall of the Byzantine fortress, west of the later Capitolium. The shallow limestone statue base, which is only 27 cm deep, has a preserved height of 62 cm and an estimated total length of 2.2-2.4 m; the preserved fragment is ca. 83 cm long. The text is written in African capitals which contrast strongly with the lettering style of the lintel inscriptions.

---

The letters are 5 cm tall in the second line, 4.5 cm in the third, and 4 cm in the fourth; the first line of the text is badly damaged.

41. [Pro salute] Imp(eratoris) [Caes(aris) Traiani Hadriani Aug(usti)]
M(arcus) Gabinius Quir(ina) Bassus flam(en) Aug(usti) perp(etuus) patron[us pagi et civitatis A(ulus) Gabinius Arn(ensi) Datus patronus pagi et civitatis]
[flamen(?)] divi Titii aedilis augur (coloniae) I(uliae) K(arthaginis) equo publico in quinque decurias

[tem]pla Concordiae Frugiferi Liberi Patris Neptuni

Q(uinto) Iulio Fausto [...]

For the health of emperor Caesar Trajan Hadrian Augustus. Marcus Gabinius Bassus of the Quirina tribe, perpetual flamen of Augustus, patron of the pagus and the civitas of Thugga, and Aulus Gabinius Datus of the Arnensis tribe, patron of the pagus and the civitas, flamen of Divine Titus, aedile, augur of the Colonia Iulia Carthage, equestrian, elected to the council of five, [erected] the temples of Concordia, Frugifer, Liber Pater, Neptune [and ?], with their marble fittings and statues and ornaments with their own money. Quintus Iulius Faustus [and ? served as curator.]

Identification of the precise location of the templare is challenging; the epigraphic evidence derives largely from secondary contexts; some was found in the area east and south of the macellum, and suggesting that the templare should be sought in that area. In that region, three temples were built in close proximity to one another. Scholarly opinion has placed the templare of the Gabinii in that complex of temples, though precisely where has long been a subject of debate.

---

623 DFH 28; Saint-Amans 2004, 196 no. 19; CIL 26470; Poinssot 1909b no. 9; Brouquier-Reddé and Saint-Amans 1997, 192-193 no. 3.

624 Carton (1893a, 24), mentioned a Temple of Concord in the area, and marked it on the plan of the site, but referred to it as a vaulted structure; he may have meant the structure now known to be imperial baths, as did Poinssot (1919, 141-144). In Carton’s second guidebook, (1922, 46) he described two adjoining temples, noted the presence of a statue of Pluto in a niche, and assigned to the second temple, lying southeast of the first, the inscription of the Gabinii (no. 37) found nearby. C. Poinssot (1961, 257-260) published an updated plan and description of the complex that identified three temples in the space, with Temple A as that of Concord, Temple B as Liber Pater, and Temple C as Frugifer. Research by Brouquier-Reddé and Saint-Amans (1997, 185-188) noted the stratigraphic relationships between the three structures: Temple B is apparently the earliest; later, Temple A was added to the complex; Temple C, between Temple B and the Licinian baths, was built much later, and its walls lean on both neighboring structures. Brouquier-Reddé and Saint-Amans (1997, 188) identified Temple B as the templare of the Gabinii; Raming and Ritter (2002) have rejected this identification.
Built on the slope of the hill southeast of the macellum, the complex includes a porticoed courtyard with five rooms or cellae arranged on its northern side (fig. 49). The central cella is the largest, with an apse at its north end and an exedra on each side. The other four cellae are basically rectangular in plan, and each is furnished with a separate entrance. At the south side of the courtyard, a large gateway leads into an attached odeum or auditorium with theatrical seating and a colonnaded orchestral area (fig. 50a). Clearance in the courtyard of Temple B recovered six Attic column bases and large fragments of a monolithic column in red-grey-white marble (fig. 50b). In room one, the cella at the northwest corner, a column base and a fragmentary capital were found, though it is not certain whether the capital belongs to columns of the porticus or to the entry to room 1 itself. Evidence of marble wall cladding was noted in room 5, the easternmost cella; fragments of marble in white, dark green, and dark red suggest the decorative scheme. These few pieces of evidence indicate that Temple B must have been luxuriously appointed when it was built.

Additional epigraphic evidence, in the form of statue bases to members of the Gabinius family, has also come to light in the area (see figures 48-49). Their findspots were more closely linked to the area around Temples A and B, lending weight to the identification of Temple B as the templo constructed by the Gabinii. Of the first inscription, one fragment of the limestone statue base was found near the sanctuary of Aesculapius, in a reuse context; the provenance of the other is unknown. Together,

---

625 Raming and Ritter 2002, 94, 92 fig. 7, and pl. 15a, 16a. The excavators did not provide color photographs of the marble, nor did they indicate its source; the description of the color, however, suggests that it might be portasanta marble from Chios (Hirt 2010, 312-313; Lazzarini 2002, 262-265 and 264, map no. 21) or africano marble from Teos (Hirt 2010, 311; Lazzarini 2002, 250-251 and 264, map no. 19). For an overview of the use of these stones in Roman architecture, see Pensabene 2002. I am grateful to Barbara Burrell for sharing with me her knowledge of ancient marble trade and use.

626 Raming and Ritter 2002, 90 and pl. 13c, 17b.

627 Raming and Ritter 2002, 92 and pl. 14d.

628 Saint-Amans 2004, 297-298, no. 21 and fig. 19.
they are around 55 cm tall and perhaps 43 cm wide and 17 cm deep. The letters are 5 cm tall in the first line, 4 cm in the second line, and 2.5 cm high in the remaining lines. The text is too fragmentary to be completely reconstructed or translated, but the general sense of the inscription is clear.

42. [M(arco) Gabini]o Qui(rina) [B]asso
    [flamini Aug(usti) p]erpetuo [patro]no pagi et
    [civitatis Thugg(ensis) ob exi]miam [ei]us mun]ificienti
    [am ---in c]ivita[tem ---] Thugg(ensem) quod
    [--- Frugi]feri et Lib[e]ri Patris qui(m) quina mil(ia)
    [---] n(ummum) sacra o[---] numinum
    [---] reditu quod
    [--- qu]od is utram
    [que --- i]n veterem
    [---]q[ue eis et
    [---]m aux[e]---]
    [---]o[---]des[ ...

To Marcus Gabinius Bassus of the Quirina tribe, perpetual flamen of Augustus, patron of the pagus and the civitas of Thugga, on account of his exceptional generosity ... toward the people of Thugga, because [he gave] statues? of ... Frugifer and Liber Pater valued at 5000 HS [each?] ...

Two limestone statue bases were found reused in a late antique wall north of Temple B. The first, no. 43, is 1.3 m tall, 64 cm wide, 55 cm deep. The text is written in letters decreasing in size: 7.5 cm in the first line, 6.5 in lines 2-3, 5.5 in lines 4-5, 4.5 cm in line 6.

43. A(ulo) Gabinio Quir(ina) Dato p(atri)
    flam(ini) Aug(usti) perp(etuo) patrono
    pagi et civitatis Thuggen(sis)
    conductores praediorum
    regionis Thuggensis ob me(rita)
    curatore M(arco) G(abinio) Basso f(ilio).

To Aulus Gabinius Datus of the Quirina tribe, perpetual flamen of Augustus, patron of the pagus and the civitas of Thugga, the conductores of the estates in the region of Thugga (set this up) on account of his merits, with Marcus Gabinius Bassus his son as the curator.

The second limestone statue base found in the late antique wall was slightly larger than

---

629 DFH 137; CIL 1496; Saint-Amans 2004, no. 21.
630 DFH 59; ILAfr 568; AÉpig 1922, 114.
no. 43: at least 1.37 m tall, 72 cm wide, and 60 cm deep. It was written in smaller lettering, 4.5 cm tall in the first four lines, 4 cm in line 5, 3.5 cm in the last two lines.631

44. [A(ulo)] Gabinio
   Dato filio
   flamin(i) divi
   Titi aug(uri) pa
   trono pagi
   et civitatis pa
   gus et civit(atis) Thu[gg(ensis)].632

   To Aulus Gabinius Datus the son, flamen of divine Titus, augur, patron of the pagus and the civitas, the pagus and the civitas of Thugga (erected this).

Three additional statue bases were found during surface survey of the area between the templum and the houses to the south, in 1924.633 The first, no. 45, was made of limestone and measured 45 cm tall, 48 wide, with letters of a uniform 5 cm

45. A(ulo) Gabinio A(uli) f(ilio) Arnensis(i) Da[to]
   patrono pagi et civitatis Th[ugg(ensis)]
   flamin(i) divi Titi aedil(i) augur[i]
   c(oloniae) C(oncordiae) I(uliae) K(arthaginis) equo publico in quinque
decuris ab Imp(erator) Caesare Traiano Hadriano Aug(usto) [adlecto].634

   To Aulus Gabinius Datus, son of Aulus, of the Arnensis tribe, patron of the pagus and the civitas of Thugga, flamen of divine Titus, aedile, augur of colonia Julia Concordia Carthage, equestrian elected to the council of five by emperor Caesar Trajan Hadrian Augustus.

The second statue base, no. 46, found in the surface survey measured at least 1.13 m tall, 65 cm wide and 60 cm deep. Its text is not quite as uniform as that of no. 45; the letters are 7.5 cm tall in the first two lines, 6.7 cm tall in the next four lines, and 7.5 cm in the last line.

46. Gabiniae Beatae coniu
   gi A(uli) Gabini Dati flamin(is) Aug(usti)
   perp(etui) patroni pagi et civit(atis)

---

631 DFH, 196-198.
632 DFH 77; ILAfr 569; AÉpig 1921, 25.
633 Poinssot and Lantier 1925b, xxxiii.
634 ILTun 1513; AÉpig 1924, 30; Poinssot and Lantier 1925b, xxxiii-c.
Q(uintus) Marius Rufinus nepos aviae piissimae ob merit(a) curatoribus Gabinis Prisco et Honorato.635

To Gabinia Beata, wife of Aulus Gabinius Datus, perpetual flamen of Augustus, patron of the pagus and the civitas. Quintus Marius Rufinus, her grandson, (erected this) to a most pious grandmother on account of her merits, with Gabinius Priscus and Gabinius Honoratus as curators.

The final statue base, at least 1.2 m tall, 55 cm wide, and 50 cm deep, was also found in surface survey of 1924, in the area south of Temple B.636

47. M(arco) Gabinio Quir(ina) Basso flam(ini) Aug(usti) perp(etuo) patrono pagi et civitat(is) Thugg(ensis) pag(us) et civit(as) Thugg(ensis).637

To Marcus Gabinius Bassus of the Quirina tribe, perpetual flamen of Augustus, patron of the pagus and the civitas of Thugga, the pagus and the civitas of Thugga (erected this).

Recent archaeological investigation by the Tunisian-German team at Thugga638 has cast doubt on the identification of this Temple B as the templum of the Gabinii. These doubts hinge upon a stratigraphic pottery sequence from the northwest corner of the courtyard, the material from which dates no earlier than the second half of the second century C.E.639 They suggest that a later-second-century date is inconsistent with the epigraphic data, which date the building to the reign of Hadrian (or later) through their use of imperial titulature.640 They doubt the relationship between Temple B and the

---

635 DFH 75; ILTun 1511; AÉpig 1924, 29; Poinssot and Lantier 1925b, xxxii-b.
636 Poinssot and Lantier 1925b, xxii; Poinssot and Lantier 1925c, 263-264.
637 ILTun 1512, DFH 195-196 no. 76; Poinssot and Lantier 1925b, xxxii-a.
638 Raming and Ritter 2002.
auditorium to its southeast;\textsuperscript{641} they suggest that the sum of 50,000 sesterces, listed in several of the building inscriptions (nos. 37, 38, 39), would hardly be enough to pay for such a large building complex, and thus the inscriptions must refer to a smaller temple.\textsuperscript{642} The excavators therefore reject the identification of Temple B as the \textit{templa} of the Gabinii, but they neither offer an alternative identification for Temple B nor propose an alternative location for the \textit{templa} complex.

Brouquier-Reddé and Saint-Amans, however, have come to different conclusions about the identity of Temple B.\textsuperscript{643} The findspots of the building inscriptions (nos. 37-41), which were widely scattered, suggest that the building was located somewhere south of the forum; the five honorific statue bases for members of the Gabinius family were discovered in the immediate surroundings of this building.\textsuperscript{644} In addition, the architecture of Temple B, with its courtyard, multiple \textit{cellae}, and theatrical area, seems to accord well with the epigraphic evidence. As we have already seen with other buildings at Thugga, a preference for multiple \textit{cellae} in buildings dedicated to multiple divinities appears to have been the normal practice there.\textsuperscript{645} Since at least four deities were named in the epigraphic texts for the \textit{templa} (Concordia, Frugifer, Liber Pater,[inscriptions no. 37, 38, 39] and Neptune [text no. 41]) we should look for a structure with multiple \textit{cellae}. The mention of the \textit{xysti} of the building (in text nos. 37, 38, 39) also points to the architecture of the Temple B complex, since in African usage it apparently denoted a

\textsuperscript{641} Raming and Ritter (2002, 104) prefer to see this theatrical area as a bouleuterion. Saint-Amans (2004, 290) notes that the buildings are not precisely symmetrical, but that this mis-alignment is likely a result of topographic concerns.

\textsuperscript{642} Raming and Ritter 2002, 104.

\textsuperscript{643} Brouquier-Reddé and Saint-Amans 1997; see also Saint-Amans 2004, 287-298.

\textsuperscript{644} Brouquier-Reddé and Saint-Amans 1997, 178; Poinssot and Lantier 1925b, xxxii-xxxiii; Poinssot 1920, ccxi.

\textsuperscript{645} See ch. V.4.a. The Temple of Tellus, supra p. 170 and this ch. VI.2.a. The Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury, supra p. 181.
portion of a theater. As for the costs associated with the building, the sum of money listed in the texts (50,000 sesterces: nos. 37, 38, 39) probably precluded the construction of multiple buildings, but the phrase “multiplicata pecunia” in those same texts indicated that the donors made additional, unspecified outlays in constructing the templae, and this might have involved a considerable sum. The findspots of the honorific texts (nos. 42-47), and these correspondences between the architecture of Temple B and the epigraphic descriptions of the structure, point to Temple B as the most likely site as the Templae of the Gabinii.

The benefactors, Aulus Gabinius Datus, Marcus Gabinius Bassus, and Aulus Gabinius Datus filius, were members of the first—or perhaps only—family at Thugga to successfully establish a generations-long tradition of euergetism toward the city. The inscriptions of this building complex suggest that they approached the tradition in a different fashion than did earlier donors: the construction of the templae involved multiple members of the family as active benefactors, rather than a sole active benefactor who donated in the name of his heirs. The epigraphic corpus provides information on the relationships between these donors: Aulus Gabinius Datus was the father of Marcus Gabinius Bassus (no. 43: A(ulo) Gabinio Quir(ina) Dato p(atr) … curatore M(arco) G(abiniio) Basso f(ilio)); he was also the father of the younger Aulus filius (no. 45: A(ulo) Gabinio A(uli) f(ilio) Arnens(i) Da[to] …) Each man held a high status as patron of both the pagus and the civitas of Thugga (e.g. Aulus pater: no. 43; Gabinius Bassus: no. 42; Aulus filius: nos. 44-45), and Gabinius Bassus additionally held a post of perpetual

647 Saint-Amans 2004, 290 notes that at Thugga this additional sum could be as much as double the original promised amount.
648 I have mentioned previously (see ch. V.3. The Licinii in the Area East of the Forum, supra p. 159) that the Licinii participated in a familial tradition of benefaction, since Viria Rustica, Licinius Rufus’ grandmother, had apparently given some building in the forum (see inscription no. 29). The Gabinii participated in Thugga’s urban life as benefactors for generations.
649 See ch. V.2. The First Benefactions in the Forum, supra p. 142.
flamen of Augustus at Thugga (no. 42). The second son, Aulus filius, held Roman citizenship through Carthage (in the tribe Arnensis), and also held several offices and magistracies in Carthage (no. 45). The careers of these three men indicate that the Gabinii were active in municipal life of the city and actively sought social advancement, which they achieved with Aulus Gabinius Datus filius' elevation to equestrian status and office-holding in Carthage.

From the numerous mentions of their political and religious offices, it seems that the construction of the templum was one more step in their efforts; the language of the inscriptions makes it clear that the complex was constructed as summa honoraria for one or more offices (perhaps the flaminates of Aulus pater or Gabinius Bassus). A pattern of promising a set amount of funding, and then increasing it, was a hallmark of such “euergetism ob honorem,” as many scholars have pointed out, and the shrine of Concordia Panthea in the forum at Gigthis followed a similar pattern. Including the name and titles of the younger son, Aulus filius, even though he likely did not actively participate in the construction or its financing (like the sons of the early donors in Thugga’s forum), indicated the family’s rising social and political status. Their dedication to Concordia underscored their links with Carthage and Rome, as well as with other benefactors of Thugga’s urban space, Licinia Prisca and the Maedii. As other donors had done before them, however, the Gabinii carefully balanced their Roman political identities with references to Thugga’s past in the donation to three deities (Frugifer, Liber Pater, and Neptune) with African aspects and roots, and built a structure that is a variation on an African-style temple.

---

650 E.g. Veyne 1990, 10-18; Saastamoinen 2010, 326-327 and 337-347.
651 See ch. V.2.d. The Creation of Thugga’s Forum, supra p. 151.
The *templa* were a large space (28.2 m x 35.88 m),\(^{654}\) and the addition of the theatrical area to the south more than doubled their footprint. At the time of its construction, it may well have been the largest building in the city, and its construction cost was no doubt extremely high. The decorative elements found inside the *cellae* and courtyard indicate that the building was lavishly ornamented with imported marbles (not the yellowish red of Chimtou, but dark red with white veins, and dark green) and monolithic marble columns (fig. 50b).\(^{655}\) These fittings—which may have been somewhat unusual in Thugga at this time, as few other examples of marble inscriptions or decorative elements have been found in excavation of donated public buildings—probably contributed to the impression of the Gabinius family’s generosity in constructing a lavish and important new building.

The Gabinii built their *templa* on their own land, “*solo suo*,” as the texts (nos. 37-40) make clear. This was not an unusual practice; the small Temple of Pietas was constructed at about the same time on land belonging to its donor Pompeius Rogatus, and I suggested earlier that the Licinii may have also built some or all of their public buildings on privately-held land.\(^{656}\) Like the earlier Temple of Tellus,\(^{657}\) Temple B was built near the *macellum*; the *templa* also based their location, in part, on the presence of that large public building in the area. The space was well-suited to the unique architectural requirements of the *templa*: the courtyard and *cellae* were constructed on the same topographic level as the *macellum*, while the auditorium was built into the

---

\(^{654}\) Raming and Ritter 2002, 87.

\(^{655}\) Chimtou marbles range from yellow to orange, pink, brown, and purple; no dark green or red-and-white marble comes from those quarries (Röder 1993, 18). Monolithic columns and colored marble were regular features of Hadrian’s architectural endeavors in Rome and in other cities in the provinces, and he regularly bestowed favor on cities with gifts of imported marble (Rome [especially the Pantheon]: Boatwright 1987, 46 and 237; provincial cities: Boatwright 2000, 160-161).

\(^{656}\) See ch. V.3.c. supra p. 164.

\(^{657}\) See ch. V.4.a. The Temple of Tellus, supra p. 170.
slopes of the hillside that falls away to the south. The primary entrance to the sanctuary was on the east side of the courtyard—located on the side away from the road that led past the templo and into the plaza south of the macellum. Visitors may therefore have needed to travel around nearly the entire building in order to access the space.

This difficulty of access may well have related to the restrictive nature of the cult of Liber Pater, which included initiatory rites and sacred dramas. Another access point for the temple’s visitors might have been at the base of the auditorium; by climbing the steps of the cavea the visitor could enter through the doorway that communicated between the two structures, a trip that must have restricted the focus of the visitor to the back of the courtyard and the central cella, at least at first. A visitor in the east forum area may well have been able to see the back of the Templo in the gap between the macellum and the Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury, but the main thing such a visitor would have seen was the back wall of the precinct and perhaps the roofs of its cellae. Unlike other temples in the east forum area, the Templo did not face toward or communicate with the shrine of Massinissa; instead, they connected, somewhat indirectly, with the other nearby structures—the temple of the Maedii, the macellum, and the Temple of Tellus.

---

658 Poinssot 1961, 256-260. The detailed topographic plan of the site (INP 2008d) indicates that the macellum’s floor is at an elevation of 539.01 m, while the courtyard of the Templo is at 540.55 m; the street along the southern edge of the theatrical area lies as much as eight m lower than the courtyard.

659 There must have been an alleyway, at least, running from the north near the east forum to the entrance to the courtyard precinct, but to the south the access to the entrance is blocked by (later?) houses or other structures built up to the odeon’s exterior wall.

660 Saint-Amans 2004, 290, with earlier bibliography.

661 At a later date, the construction of the Temple A immediately to the northeast of Temple B’s main cella would have blocked even that view as well, perhaps, as making access to Temple B’s courtyard even more difficult from the plaza south of the macellum or from the east forum area (Brouquier-Reddé and Saint-Amans 1997, 188 for sequence of construction of Temples A, B, and C).
Many features of this building suggest that it was an architectural announcement of a new, major player in Thugga’s benefactory scene. By communicating only indirectly with the buildings east of the forum area and the macellum, the Templa established a new identity as a public space not intimately connected with the earlier public areas of the city. They also demonstrated in this way that the Gabinii were not interested in associating themselves closely with the building programs of previous benefactors (as, for example, the other Hadrianic benefactors had done with their choice of locations and divinities for their temples in the east forum, the Temple of Pietas and the Temple of Fortune, Venus Concordia, and Mercury).

The templa’s architecture and inscriptions indicate that the Gabinii were, in fact, interested in establishing themselves as the newest and most generous of Thugga’s donors and patrons: their templa were dedicated to more gods than those of other benefactors (at least four, perhaps five, rather than the three gods of the temple of the Maedii); they were decorated more extensively with inscribed texts, and fitted with exotic materials including multi-colored marble and monolithic columns (compared with black-and-white mosaic of the temple of the Maedii). The templa were far larger than previous buildings, creating a physical presence at a grand scale. The structure also offered a new type of public area, a theater or auditorium, into which at least some citizens of Thugga must have gained entry. With this building, the Gabinii opened a new chapter in Thugga’s urban development.

Thugga’s citizens recognized their importance to the city’s development and responded with multiple dedications to these generous donors. This building complex is the earliest at Thugga from which we have clear evidence of the later commemoration of the donors, who were celebrated in a small forest of statues with inscribed bases (nos. 42-47). Though their findspots are not all inside Temple B, they may derive from its
court yard or the auditorium. The six inscriptions were set up by different entities. The conductores, contracted managers of the imperial land near Thugga, honored Aulus pater (no. 43). The citizens of Thugga (pagus and civitas) recognized Aulus filius and Bassus with a pair of inscriptions of (approximately) the same size, style, and wording (nos. 44, 47), and each of the younger men also received at least one additional statue from another (unknown) source (nos. 42, 45). The wife of Aulus pater, Gabinia Beata, mother (?) of the other two donors, received a statue from her grandson (no. 46), though it is not clear whether this statue base is contemporary with the others.662 This new pattern of commemoration, with statues and inscribed bases as well as the inscriptions on the building themselves, marked the importance of the donation to the city’s continuing development, a practice that may have begun with this building complex and persisted through the second and third centuries.

3. The Apex of Public Building During the Antonine Era

In the Antonine period (138-192 C.E.), Thugga, like many other cities in Africa, experienced tremendous growth in its public urban infrastructure (fig. 51). In preceding chapters I have discussed Antonine-period developments at other sites, including the Shrine of Concordia Panthea at Gigthis663 and the aqueduct and fountains of Flavius Tullus at Sabratha. At Thugga, as at those other sites, donors of the Antonine period worked to re-form existing sites like the forum, where earlier benefactors had played such an important role in creating a central public space. And though we know of no private donor at Thugga who created a new infrastructure in the same way that

---

662 Poinssot and Lantier (1925c, 270) suggested that it might be later, but without much discussion of this point.
663 See ch. II.2.b. The Shrine of Concordia Panthea, supra p. 51 and ch. III.3.a. The Aqueduct and Fountains of Flavius Tullus, supra p. 100.
Flavius Tullus did at Sabratha, euergetism at Thugga played a crucial role in opening new spaces to further development and delimiting the extent of the urban area.

Many of the trends I have discussed already at Thugga continued and accelerated in the second half of the second century. In particular, municipal magistrates and priests, especially the *flamines*, grew even more important in the practice of euergetism. I suggested earlier\(^{664}\) that the reliance on official euergetism, euergetism *ob honorem*, came about as a result of the major first-century families failing to establish lasting traditions of “voluntary” benefaction. In the second century this continued and intertwined with the establishment of familial traditions, especially in the case of the Gabinii, who donated their *templa* southeast of the *macellum* in the Hadrianic period and continued to make additional donations regularly over the next century. The municipal officials of Thugga encouraged this continuing tradition through regular appointments of the members of this family to positions as magistrates, *flamines*, or patrons of the *pagus* and the *civitas*. Our epigraphic sources do not provide insight into whether these appointments, and the accompanying donations of physical structures, were willingly undertaken or not, but their lasting effect was to recreate Thugga’s urban space in a new image.

a. Forum Porticoes

In the early Antonine period, another Gabinius family donor brought attention back to the forum, site of so many earlier donations, and began a new round of building that ultimately recreated the space in the image of an imperial-type forum. This first donation paved the way by refocusing the space away from the Shrine of Massinissa and toward the *macellum* and the Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury. Like earlier donations in the forum, the construction of porticoes helped to recreate the

\(^{664}\) See ch. V.5. Concluding Thoughts, supra p. 176.
forum of Thugga in the image of that in Carthage. And just as the donation of porticoes in the forum responded to earlier benefactions, it also attracted later donations that helped to transform the area over the next generations.

Archaeological evidence from the portico was discovered during the excavations in the forum of 1912 (figs. 52-53). The seven extant columns were made of multicolored marble, red-veined, perhaps deriving from the quarries at Simitthus (Chimtou).\(^{665}\) The columns’ bases and Corinthian capitals were carved in white marble. The floors of the portico were paved with a plain white mosaic.\(^{666}\) The shape that the porticoes described was not rectangular; the long sides on the south and north were straight (though not precisely parallel), while the short end of the portico at the west curved slightly (fig. 52). This curvature was required in order to translate between pre-existing buildings at the western edge of the forum (especially the temple of Saturn\(^ {667}\)) and the long sides of the portico, whose alignment differed quite markedly from that of the earlier buildings (west-southwest to east-northeast for the porticoes, and southwest to northeast for the earlier buildings).

One long inscription ran above the portico’s column on all three of its sides. Written in lapidary capitals 23-24 cm tall, the inscription covers approximately thirty limestone blocks in a single line. The blocks are all approximately 2.5 m long, more or

---

\(^{665}\) The initial publication of the porticoes (Poinssot 1912, ccxliv) makes no mention of the material of the columns. A subsequent publication focusing on the inscriptions mentions that they topped “un beau portique aux colonnes de marbre” (L. Poinssot 1913-1916, 53 no. 38). In later works the excavator mentioned that the columns were polychrome marble, but provided no additional details (L. Poinssot 1919, 185). C. Poinssot (1958, 38) described the red veins but made no mention the base color; he surmises their origin at Chimtou/Simitthus. Photographs in Khanoussi (1998, 28 no. 13) show that the base color is light, perhaps yellow or white.

\(^{666}\) Poinssot 1958, 38.

\(^{667}\) See ch. V.2.a. Postumius Chius, supra p. 144.
less, and 70 cm tall. Most of the blocks were built into the Byzantine fortress’ south wall or its ancillary buildings.\footnote{DFH, 73.}

48. South Portico: [Pro sal]ute Imp(eratoris) T(iti) Ael(i) Ha[dr]iani Antonin[i Augusti Pii liberor]umq(ue) eius ///
West Portico: Q(uintus) Gabinius M(arci) fil(ius) Quir(ina) Felix Fa[ustianus cum Dato et P]rocessa fil(i)s suis ///
North Portico: Porticus fori [co]lumnis et contign[ati]one et lacunaribus omniq(ue) cultu parietum sua [pec(unia) ornat]as pago patriae ded(it).

For the health of Emperor Titus Aelius Hadrian Antoninus Augustus Pius, father of the fatherland, and of his children. Quintus Gabinius Felix Faustinianus, son of Marcus, with his children Datus and Processa, gave, with his own money, to the pagus his country, the porticus of the forum with its columns, roof,\footnote{Contignatio is here somewhat ambiguous. Saastamoinen (2010, 171 note 903) cited Vitruvius (De arch 2.9.6: though Saastamoinen apparently misunderstood this passage) and translated it as “floor” while Maurin in DFH (2000, 76 no. 29) translated it as “charpente,” meaning the roof joists.} and ceiling panels, and with its walls decorated by every adornment.

The text began on the eastern edge of the south portico, continued onto the west portico, and concluded at the eastern edge of the north portico. The inscription dictates this arrangement of the text by its distribution onto blocks whose length matches the varying intercolumniations of the south (12 lintels), west (9 lintels), and north (12 lintels) porticoes.\footnote{DFH, 73 no. 29.} In addition, the lintels include uninscribed spaces at the beginning and end of each portion of the text. These uninscribed spaces centered the text over each portico and indicate that the spacing and organization of the text was carefully planned.

The epigraphic evidence of imperial titulature, fragmentary though it may be, demonstrates that the porticoes of the forum were built during the reign of Antoninus Pius, 138-161.\footnote{Kienast 1996, 138. The omission of the title pater patriae may suggest a date very early in Antoninus Pius’ reign, but it could also represent a deliberate choice or an error on the part of the inscription’s author.} Other epigraphic evidence also supports this dating, since the donor, Quintus Gabinius Felix Faustinianus, named himself as the son of Marcus Gabinius.

\textit{DFH}, 73; CIL, 26524; AÉpig 1914, 175; L. Poinssot 1913-1916, no. 38.
This Marcus is presumed to have been the same Marcus Gabinius Bassus who was instrumental in donating the *templa* during the reign of Hadrian. Gabinius Felix Faustinianus was, therefore, a member of the family of benefactors who so markedly announced their intentions to become the new benefactors *par excellence* with the *templa* built in the Hadrianic period, and he continued the practice of euergetism with this donation a few years later.

The forum porticoes, built by a third generation of the Gabinii, are the first hard evidence at Thugga that a familial tradition of benefaction was, in fact, becoming well-established there. Gabinius Felix Faustinianus chose to emphasize this tradition by mentioning his two children, Gabinius Datus and Gabinia Processa, in the dedicatory inscription, though the phrasing of their names “*cum Dato et Processa filiis suis*, with his children Datus and Processa” suggests that their actual participation was probably minimal, like that of the earlier dedications in the forum made by previous donors. Unlike the Gabinii who donated the *templa*, however, Gabinius Felix Faustinianus did not list any municipal offices in his inscription. The last phrase of the text, “*pago patriae ded(it), gave to the pagus, his homeland,*” might suggest an official affiliation with the structures of power, but nothing in the text indicates what the affiliation might have been. Perhaps this (apparently) voluntary contribution was designed to influence the selection of future magistrates. And the nature of this contribution strongly suggests

673 So the stemma of Poinssot (1913-1916, 59) and Brouquier-Reddé and Saint-Amans (1997, 180); the stemma presumes that Gabinius Felix’s son Datus was named after his great-grandfather or great-uncle, one of the Auli Gabinii Dati. Another Marcus Gabinius, Aequus, is epigraphically attested, but since he also probably dates to the Hadrianic period he does not present any difficulties in dating Quintus Gabinius Felix Faustinianus (Brouquier-Reddé and Saint-Amans 1997, 181, citing *CIL*, 26882 = 27348).

674 Saastamoinen (2010, 375-377) is unable to detect differences in meaning between inscriptions using the formula “*cum aliquo*” and those using “*in nomine alicuius*.” For earlier examples, see ch. V.2.d. supra p. 151.
that euergetism was a familial virtue prized by the Gabinii, even in the absence of office-holding that would have made such donations more nearly compulsory.

The construction of the forum porticoes bears some resemblance to the earlier Gabinius donation, emphasizing the familial continuity between the two structures. The porticoes made extensive use of marble ornamentation, just as the *Templa* did. This expensive material contrasted sharply with the prevailing limestone apparently used for most earlier constructions, and emphasized the Gabinius family’s wealth and generosity in a visible way. These porticoes became the first thing that visitors to the forum saw upon entering the space; they presented a uniform and decorative façade and masked the many different functions that the area’s buildings served. The location of the donor’s own name on the western end of the portico suggests that many people entered the forum from the east, approaching the space from the plaza of the *area macelli*. The significant change in elevation between the east forum plaza and the forum itself ensured that the name of Quintus Gabinius Felix Faustinianus could be seen easily by people entering the forum.

Khanoussi has written that the late date of the porticoes’ construction, more than a century after the forum first evolved into the center of civic life in Thugga, indicates how haphazard and uneven was the development of that area. Rather, I think a case can be made that the porticoes’ construction demonstrates exactly the opposite. The new alignment of the porticoes may have been in response to or in anticipation of a major new plan for building along the eastern edge of the Forum (e.g., the Capitolium,

---

675 This positioning of the donor’s name may lend weight to the hypothesis that the *arcum et gradus* built by Caius Caesetius Perpetuus (see ch. V.2.b. Caesetius Perpetuus, supra p. 147, inscription no. 28) in the first century was located on the eastern edge of the forum and formed an important entry point.

676 The difference in elevation between the east forum area and the forum proper is at least two m, so the upper part of the portico and inscription would almost certainly have been the most visible portion to approaching visitors.

677 Khanoussi 2003, 147.

678 In this I follow the suggestion of L. Maurin in *DFH*, 76 no. 29.
and probably also the basilica immediately south of the Capitolium temple. This new orientation, which communicated between the older temples and buildings on the west side and the new plan for construction on the east side, partially ignored the previous central focus of the forum, the shrine of Massinissa. That is, the portico’s construction may not have destroyed the shrine, but also did not allow the shrine of Massinissa to dictate its entire arrangement. The porticoes’ primary alignment was toward the east forum area and the site of the Capitolium, and only the north wall of the new construction shifted to accommodate the earlier Numidian building. Instead, this new alignment sought to incorporate the new (planned) buildings on the forum’s east side, the Capitolium and basilica, by regularizing the appearance of the forum area and communicating between newer and older structures. In constructing his porticoes, Quintus Gabinius Felix Faustinianus set the stage for all the donations in this area that came after his, for the rest of the century.

The renovation of the forum at Thugga echoed contemporary activity in the forum of Carthage, as earlier donations there had also done. Carthage’s forum was damaged by fire in the late 140s, and in the wake of that damage extensive reconstruction took place on the Byrsa. Other public monuments, outside the forum, were also constructed or renovated during the years of Antoninus’ reign, including a huge bathing complex and the theater. On the Byrsa hill, site of the forum at Carthage, a large, three-aisled basilica was constructed on the eastern side of the platform, designed as an extension of the porticoes that surrounded the platform’s other

---

679 Basilica: its date of construction is unknown, but the space immediately south of the Capitolium has been identified as a three-aisle basilica with an apse at the southern end (Hiesel and Strocka 2002, 73), and it follows the same orientation as the forum porticoes and the Capitolium. I hypothesize that it was approximately contemporary with the other new constructions in the forum (ca. 150-170 C.E., perhaps) and echoed work in Carthage at approximately the same date, where a new basilica was built on the eastern side of the Byrsa plateau in the 150s C.E. (Gros 1985, 45-46 and 140-146).

680 Gros 1985, 140-146.

681 For the theater, see Ros 1996; for the Antonine baths, Picard 1946-1949.
sides. Just like earlier donors had done in the first elaboration of Thugga’s forum, Gabinius Felix Faustinianus looked to Carthage as a model for the architectural form that his donation should take.

We have no indication that Gabinius Felix Faustinianus received any formal commemoration of his donation, as his ancestors did for their donation of the templum. I have suggested that the practice of erecting statue bases to donors may have been related to the growth in importance of ob honorem, or practically compulsory, euergetism. In cases of voluntary donations, however, like that of Gabinius Felix Faustinianus, there may have been a preference to let the monument itself stand as commemoration (as we have seen at, for example, Lepcis Magna’s theater-temple complex). Gabinius’ name, written in 24-cm-tall letters and placed in a prominent position in the central public space of the city, reinforced the generosity of its donor, and his participation in a continuing tradition of euergetism. The fact that his donation was voluntary, unattached to required payment for an office, likened him to earlier donors in the forum, as did the location of his donation and his inscribed name.

b. The Temple of Minerva II

The Temple of Minerva II is located on the northwest edge of Thugga’s urban zone, close to later structures like the Circus (fig. 51). It is outside the central area of Thugga, but the presence of later structures such as the Circus indicate that the area of the temple became, in later years, part of the urban fabric. This temple’s dedication and architectural style responded to the works of earlier benefactors, even as its location helped to define the outer reaches of the city, a process which continued slowly over the next century.

---

682 Gros 1985, 45.
The Sanctuary of Minerva II consists of a large rectangular courtyard, approximately 35 x 50 m, with porticoes on three sides, with a *cella* at its far end (fig. 54). The sanctuary is oriented east-southeast, facing toward the urbanized zones at lower levels. The complex is placed nearly at the top of the ridge, at an elevation substantially higher than that of the forum and the Capitolium.\(^{684}\) Its position provided a commanding view over the urban area of ancient Thugga.\(^{685}\) The courtyard, whose structures were built of white limestone,\(^{686}\) was constructed on a large terraced platform in the side of the hill, with its primary access on the eastern side, through a small gateway approached by a short flight of stairs (fig. 55). The *cella* was constructed on a high podium, approached by a tall staircase and accessible only from the front, via the courtyard (figs. 55-56). Eingartner’s reconstruction\(^ {687}\) places the temple above and behind the portico on the west side, on a higher terrace; it was accessed via a monumental stairway, whose presence would have dominated the view of the visitor as he approached the sanctuary. Through the entryway, the visitor could glimpse an inscription, probably placed over the door of the building. This fragmentary inscription was found in four pieces, scattered between this temple and the Temple of Caelestis to the south. Saint-Amans has proposed that it might have served as the lintel over the temple’s door or the entryway into the courtyard.\(^ {688}\) The limestone lintel is 4.5 m long and 48 cm tall, with letters 15.5 cm tall in its first line and 16.5 cm tall in its second.

49. *M[i]nerva[e] Aug(ustae) sac(rum)*
    *[Iulia P]aula La[e]natiana flaminik(a) pe[rp(etua) s(ua) pec(unia) f(ecit).]* \(^{689}\)

---

\(^{684}\) The difference in elevation is approximately 20 m, according to the topographic plan (Institut National du Patrimoine 2008d).

\(^{685}\) Or at least its rooftops.

\(^{686}\) Eingartner 1992, 218-224; Saint-Amans 2004, 340; Carton 1893, 357.

\(^{687}\) Eingartner 1992, 222-223, fig. 128-129; see plates 53-54.

\(^{688}\) Carton 1895, 166 no. 303; Saint-Amans 2004, 341-342 no. 77-78.

\(^{689}\) *CIL*, 26490; *ILAfr* 518; Poinssot 1913-1916 no. 3; Saint-Amans 2004, no. 79.
Consecrated to Minerva Augusta. Julia Paula Laenatiana, perpetual flaminica, built this with her own funds.

Only after entering through the gateway into the courtyard would the visitor have seen the long frieze inscriptions on his right and left (see fig. 57). Pieces of two identical inscriptions were found over a wide area, from the courtyard of the Temple of Minerva to the Temple of Caelestis to the Capitolium, and some were built into the Byzantine fortress wall. Each inscription’s original length was more than 48 m long and 59 cm tall, with letters 15.5 cm high.

For the health of Emperor Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrian Antoninus Augustus Pius and his children. Julia Paula Laenatiana built a temple to Minerva on her own land, in response to her election to the perpetual flaminate; … in response to its dedication she gave gifts to the decurions of the pagus and the civitas and to the whole populace she gave oil for the baths and a banquet. Asicius Adiutor and M. Terentius Gell served as curators.

For the health of Emperor Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrian Antoninus Augustus Pius and his children.

---

690 Eingartner’s (1992, 223 fig. 129-130) reconstruction, curiously enough, does not place the inscriptions at all, though he mentions their existence. I have here combined Saint-Amans’ suggestions about how they were placed with Eingartner’s reconstructed plan.

691 The fragments were originally published as a single inscription, but recent research has demonstrated conclusively that the pieces come from two identical texts (Saint-Amans 2004, 341-342).

692 Saint-Amans 2004, no. 77-78.

693 CIL, 26525; ILAfr 522; Carton 1895, 166-167 no. 303; Saint-Amans 2004, no. 77.

694 CIL, 26525; ILAfr 522; Carton 1895, 166-167 no. 303; Saint-Amans 2004, no. 78.
baths and a banquet. Asicius Adiutor and M. Terentius Gell—served as curators.

Julia Paula Laenatiana is known only from her work on this building. The inscriptions leave no doubt as to the building’s date: the reign of Antoninus Pius, 138-161 C.E., according to the imperial titulature on the portico inscriptions (nos. 50-51). The inscriptions also make clear the donor’s reason for constructing the building. The texts mention her position, perpetual flaminica, in the doorway inscription, and the phrase “ob honorem flaminatus sui perpetui, as a condition of her office of perpetual flamen,” in the portico inscriptions. The phrase “ob honorem” makes it clear that this donation came as a result of her election to the priesthood; in fact, it seems likely that the donation of a temple was the price of this office.\(^695\)

Julia Paula Laenatiana’s position as flaminica, priestess of the imperial cult, connected her Temple of Minerva with the tradition of other flaminicae who built temples at Thugga, namely Licinia Prisca, and Maedia Lentula and her father Maedius Severus. This temple to Minerva followed some of the patterns established by donations of previous flaminicae. The building was dedicated to a female deity with clear connections to Rome, and like Licinia Prisca’s Temple of Venus Concordia, it was built in Italic style, elevated and accessible from the front by a staircase.

Julia Paula Laenatiana’s building, however, departs from that tradition of flaminicate buildings in several important respects. First, both of those earlier temples were built in the central area of Thugga, and focused their attention on the shrine of Massinissa, as I have shown above. By contrast, Julia Paula Laenatiana’s temple of Minerva has no special relationship by orientation with the shrine of Massinissa or with any other extant structure; the later Circus lies near it at the rear, but no other

\(^{695}\) See ch. I.4.b. Historical and Epigraphic Studies on Euergetism or Benefaction, supra p. 16 for discussions of the various types of benefactions.
contemporary or earlier structures are known from that area of the city. This sanctuary looks at, but stands aloof from, most of the urban area of Thugga. Second, the earlier buildings both referenced the imperial cult through dedications to Venus Concordia. Licinia Prisca’s dedication to Venus connected her indirectly with the imperial household. The temple built by the Maedii, dedicated to Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury, followed in the pattern established by Licinia Prisca and aggrandized their own contribution by reference to that earlier temple by Thugga’s first flaminica. This third flaminica’s temple, to Minerva, broke the pattern by dedicating the building to a different deity entirely. Laenatiana’s temple connected her, and her position as priestess of the imperial cult, with Rome, where Minerva was an important figure in the Capitoline triad. But it tied her less directly with imperial virtues, such as Concordia, than did the earlier temples. Perhaps by this time the flaminicate, which had been celebrated for nearly a century at Thugga, served that function well enough on its own, without additional references to deities who enjoyed imperial favor under Antoninus Pius, leaving Laenatiana free to emphasize other aspects of her own identity through the architecture and inscribed texts.

The choice of the Temple’s location was apparently dictated by Laenatiana’s land-holdings; the portico inscriptions (nos. 50-51) mention that she built the Temple of Minerva “solo privato, on private land.” Constructing the building on land that the donor owned was not unusual at Thugga: in the Hadrianic period both the Temple of Pietas and the templum of the Gabinii were constructed on the donors’ own lands. The Temple of Minerva’s location at the apparent edge of the settlement, near the top of the

---

696 The large Roman-period cisterns of Aïn Mizeb (Khanoussi 1998, 59 no. 39; Poinssot 1958, 70 no. 33), fed by a 200-m long aqueduct, are near this temple to the south, but as far as I know they have not been closely dated.
697 See ch. V.3.c., supra p. 164.
ridge and far from other public buildings (fig. 51), was unusual, as the earlier donations on private land had congregated near the center of the city. This location suggests that Laenatiana’s land was previously suburban or rural. Donating a temple in that area extended the urban zone and marked its northwestern boundary, as the earlier Temple of Minerva I had done in the south, and as the Temple of Mercury at Gigthis did, though that time on public land. And in later periods this boundary became an important locus of daily life in Thugga, as well as a new urban zone.

The inscriptions also mentioned the concurrent gifts that Laenatiana made, something that had not appeared in earlier official donations, when the building (and the land on which it stood) were the sole gifts. The portico texts include details about those gifts: “[--- et ob dedicatione]m pago et civi[tati decu]rionibus sportulas et [universo populo] gimnasium et epulum dedit, … in response to its dedication she gave monetary gifts to the decurions of the pagus and the civitas and to the whole populace she gave oil for the baths and a banquet.” The additional gifts that Laenatiana gave to celebrate her temple’s dedication emphasized her generosity to the whole community of Thugga and her membership in the elite, her peers among the official leaders of Thugga’s two political communities. Unlike the earlier flaminicae, Laenatiana did not reference Thugga’s Numidian past along with its present through her temple’s architecture, but her inscriptions did underscore her participation in the lives of both citizen and non-citizen residents of the city.

---

698 The large Roman-period cisterns of Ain Mizeb, near the temple to the south, were probably also at the edge of the urban space, in a position analogous to the La Malga cisterns at Carthage, which sit at the crossroads between the urban and rural cadastrations of the colonia Iulia Concordia Karthago (Rakob 2000, 74).
700 See ch. II.2.a. The Temple of Mercury, supra p. 41.
701 See ch. VII.2.d. The Circus, infra p. 284.
As far as our evidence demonstrates, Laenatiana received no honorific statue for her work in constructing the Temple of Minerva II. Given the poor state of preservation of the building and its related inscriptions, it is difficult to be certain whether this lacuna reflects historical reality or the vagaries of the archaeological record. If she received no statue, that somewhat undermines my suggestion that such public commemorative statues were related in some way to “official” euergestism, as I have suggested for the *templa* of the Gabinii and the honorific statues displayed there. Perhaps the position of *flaminica* did not receive such commemoration in the same way that the *flamines* did, or the tradition of commemoration was established only slowly over the course of the second century.

c. The Monument of Dar Lacchab (Temple of Aesculapius ?)

The monument of Dar Lacchab,\(^{702}\) which Saint-Amans has identified as a Temple of Aesculapius,\(^{703}\) was built in the south-central area of the city, south of the forum and at a lower topographic level than those monuments (fig. 51). It was not far from the forum and the Temple of Tellus. Its unusual architecture and position set it apart from those central buildings, though details of its dedication and decoration make it clear that the monument’s benefactor participated in the official tradition of euergestism at Thugga just as Julia Paula Laenatiana did with her Temple of Minerva II, and responded as well to earlier donations by other members of Thugga’s elite.

The archaeological remains, which were cleared during early excavations,\(^{704}\) show that the building was once an enclosed rectangular courtyard 22.4 m wide and 40 m long, oriented northeast to southwest, opening almost directly onto the road to the

\(^{702}\) The monument takes its modern name from the surname of the Arab family whose house was constructed inside the courtyard (Saint-Amans 2004, 310; Khanoussi 1998, 49 no. 31). In early reports, it was identified variously as a temple, a *macellum*, or a bath building (see Saint-Amans 2004, 310, with earlier bibliography).

\(^{703}\) Saint-Amans 2004, 308-312.

\(^{704}\) Carton 1898.
north. The entryway’s façade was a shallow porch supported by two fluted Corinthian columns with square bases, approached by two shallow steps along the entire front of the building. The interior of the building had Corinthian porticoes along its east and west sides; a similar portico at the south also existed, but its remains have disappeared.\textsuperscript{705} Above the columns of the portico, a long inscription was carved on the frieze. The inscription is made up of 34 fragments, with a total reconstructed length of more than 63 m. The text is written in a single line, in letters 18.5 cm high.


For the health of Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Augustus, conqueror of the Armenians, and of his children, and of Emperor Caesar Lucius Aurelius Verus Augustus, conqueror of the Armenians. Lucius Calpurnius, [in his own name] and in the names of his father Faustinus and of Faustinus his brother, and in the names of his children, built this building with his own funds [in response to his election to an office?], out of his promised 100,000 sesterces and with 50,000 sesterces added to that sum for the love of his \textit{civitas}. He dedicated this building with an exceptional display of games lasting three days, and gave money gifts to the decurions, and to everyone he gave wine and oil for the baths.

The paved courtyard had four rectangular enclosed spaces, set off by grooved pavements and probably also fenced or walled with wooden or marble barriers; two enclosures stood in the northern part of the courtyard and two in the southern part. The function of these areas is unclear.\textsuperscript{707} Recent excavations at the base of the southern portion of the monument have revealed evidence of a small temple built on deep

\textsuperscript{705} Saint-Amans 2004, 310.
\textsuperscript{706} Saint-Amans 2004, 313 no. 43; \textit{CIL}, 26527; \textit{ILTun} 1404; Poinssot 1913-1916 no. 45.
\textsuperscript{707} Saint-Amans 2004, 310; Carton 1898, 236; Merlin 1901, 383-384.
foundations, probably housing a single *cella*.\textsuperscript{708} The initial excavations in the structure brought to light finds including plaques of green marble and red porphyry, which may have been used to decorate the walls or floors of the sanctuary.\textsuperscript{709}

The epigraphic corpus from this building allows us to date it and identify its donor; yet the evidence allows only a tentative identification of the deity to whom it was dedicated. Saint-Amans has proposed to identify this monument as a sanctuary of Aesculapius on the basis of several ex-voto stelae inscribed to that god found in the area, including one used in the construction of the Lacchab house inside the courtyard.\textsuperscript{710} In addition, she has assigned to this monument a limestone doorway lintel, 2.76 m long, in three fragments, based on the similarities of paleography between this text and no. 52, the benefactory inscription from the portico. She notes, too, that this inscribed block and the doorway lintel are practically identical in size.\textsuperscript{711} The fragments were found built into an unmortared wall in a modern structure around 100 m west of the sanctuary.

53. *Aesculapi[o Aug(usto) sacr(um) […]* \textsuperscript{712}

Consecrated to Aesculapius Augustus …

The portico inscription, no. 52, includes imperial titulature that makes the building’s date clear: the early years of the reign of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, after both had taken the title “*Armeniacus*, conqueror of the Armenians.” This corresponds to the

\textsuperscript{708} Saint-Amans (2004, 311) proposed that the plan of the temple might have followed the tripartite African-style pattern, but the Institut National du Patrimoine (2008a) reports that excavations (apparently unpublished) have revealed evidence of a single-cella building at the southern side of the portico.

\textsuperscript{709} Carton 1898, 237.

\textsuperscript{710} Saint-Amans 2004, 311 and 314-315 nos. 44, 45, 46.

\textsuperscript{711} Saint-Amans 2004, 312 no. 42.

\textsuperscript{712} Saint-Amans 2004, 312, no. 42; *CIL*, 26456; Poinssot 1906 no. 240.
years 164-165,\textsuperscript{713} situating the temple’s construction at least a few years later than the construction of the Temple of Minerva II in the reign of Antoninus.

The benefactor, Lucius Calpurnius, was a member of a distinguished family known for several generations at Thugga from other epigraphic evidence.\textsuperscript{714} This building was built by Calpurnius alone, but his inscription mentions several other members of his family, including his father and brother, both named Calpurnius Faustinus, and his children, who are not named separately ("liberorumque suorum"). Oddly, the deity to which the temple was dedicated was not mentioned in this portico inscription; if Saint-Amans’ supposition about the doorway lintel’s provenance, no. 53, is correct, the god’s name was displayed prominently over the doorway of the courtyard instead, and perhaps a similar lintel was positioned at the interior doorway into the cella. The phrasing of the portico text, however, makes the motivation behind the construction apparent. Calpurnius mentioned a promise of 100,000 sesterces, to which he added a further 50,000 sesterces to complete the project ("ex prom\]issis HS C m\[il(ibus) a\[diectis H\]S L m\[il(ibus)]"). Promises of this sort mentioned in inscriptions, and especially promises with additional funds added afterward, nearly always derived from a summa honoraria offered to the town as payment for a political office.\textsuperscript{715} This promised sum, 100,000 sesterces, was well beyond the normal price even for important offices in Africa,\textsuperscript{716} and the promise must therefore have been intended to emphasize the donor’s excessive generosity toward his fellow citizens.

\textsuperscript{713} Kienast 1996, 139, 144: Verus received the title Armeniacus in fall 163, while Aurelius assumed the same title in 164; both carried other honorific titles by 166.
\textsuperscript{714} Aounallah and Benzina Ben Abdallah 1997, esp. 94.
\textsuperscript{715} Saastamoinen 2010, 337-347.
\textsuperscript{716} Duncan-Jones (1982, 107-108 no. 324) records a payment of 90,000 sesterces for the office of aedile at Carthage early in the second century, but the median cost recorded for summae honorariae for African offices far less (around 10,000 sesterces).
Like the portico inscriptions of Julia Paula Laenatiana in the Temple of Minerva II, Calpurnius’ text records celebrations to mark his temple’s dedication: three days of games, monetary gifts to the decurions, and oil for bathing and wine for every citizen (“edito spectaculo ludorum tri duo --- lui decurionibus sportulas et universis vinum et gymnasia dedit”). The close similarities between these two building dedication celebrations, celebrations of a sort not recorded for previous donated buildings, suggest a clear connection between the two donations. Lucius Calpurnius sought to exceed the generosity of Julia Paula Laenatiana, aggrandizing his fellow-citizens’ opinion of his own generosity in the process. He echoed her actions and her words, but expanded on them. The similarities between Calpurnius’ inscription and that of Laenatiana suggest that he, like Laenatiana herself, donated the building in response to election to a high office, perhaps that of perpetual flamen. As such, this monument represents another example of the pattern of official euergetism that held such an important place in the urban development of Thugga, beginning with the work of Licinia Prisca and following also the donations of the Maedii and the templum of the Gabinii, as well as the temple built by Julia Paula Laenatiana.

Architecturally and topographically, the monument of Dar Lacchab (the Temple of Aesculapius ?) responded to several previous buildings. These responses were fairly subtle, though, and left the temple standing on its own in other important respects. The use of red- and green-colored marble decorations recalled the interior decoration of the templum of the Gabinii, where red and green marble were used in decorations of floors and walls.717 Like those earlier templum, this temple employed exotic imported materials to emphasize the high cost of its construction, and the great generosity of its donor. The initial promised funds for Calpurnius’ temple, 100,000 sesterces, were double that

717 See this ch. VI.2.c. The Templum of Concordia, Frugifer, Liber Pater, and Neptune, supra p. 190.
promised by the Gabinii in their inscription; the use of similar materials for interior
decoration may have been intended to call to mind a comparison between the two
buildings and their donors.

This courtyard sanctuary building also responded directly to the Temple of
Minerva II, as I have mentioned. This building was constructed a few years after
Laenatiana’s temple, and both the building itself and its dedicatory inscription were
markedly similar to that earlier building. The plan of the courtyard sanctuary with a
cella at the other end is nearly identical to that of the temple of Minerva, though their
orientations and internal arrangements differ. The inscriptions were erected in the same
place, above the columns of the portico that surrounded each building on three sides.
Laenatiana’s temple, and the gifts she gave at its dedication, celebrated her office,
flaminica of the imperial cult. Lucius Calpurnius probably intended to do the same thing
with his temple building. The shape, decoration, and celebration of Calpurnius’
benefaction compared to others of its type made his position, and its meaning, clear.
d. Capitolium and Theater

After donations outside the core of the urban area by two individuals in official
positions among Thugga’s elite, the construction of the Capitolium and the theater
focused attention again on the town’s central area. These two buildings were
constructed by two brothers, and they recalled earlier donations by multiple members
of a single family, such as the first-century works of the Licinii and the more recent
monuments built by the Gabinii. The Capitolium and the theater combined elements of
both official euergetism and familial traditions to leave a lasting mark on Thugga’s
urban development.

The Capitolium, one of Thugga’s most recognizable monuments, was built in the
space between the forum proper and the east forum area. The temple was built on
higher ground than the forum proper, and the total structure is more than 17 m tall (fig. 60). The standing remains belong to an Italic-style pseudo-peripteral temple on a high podium, oriented north-south, facing toward the south, and reached by 11 stairs from the plaza directly in front of it (the “area ante Capitolium”). On its southern façade is a tetrastyle porch supported by fluted limestone columns (approximately 8 m tall) and Corinthian capitals (fig. 61). The pediment above the porch contains a relief sculpture of a man carried on the back of an eagle, usually interpreted as an apotheosis scene of Antoninus Pius. Beneath the pediment, the architrave frieze bears a dedicatory inscription, which remains in situ. Carved in limestone, the lintel measures approximately 13 m long and 0.85 m tall; and the letters of all three lines are about 25 cm tall.


Consecrated to Jupiter Optimus Maximus, Juno Regina, and Minerva Augusta. For the health of the emperors Marcus Aurelius Augustus and Lucius Verus Augustus, defeaters of the Armenians, defeaters of the Medes, and greatest defeaters of the Parthians, Lucius Marcius Simplex and Lucius Marcius Simplex Regillianus built this with their own funds.

The second inscription, which also remains in situ, sat above the doorway from the temple’s porch into the cella proper. Carved in the same limestone as the building materials, this lintel is 6 m. long and the letters of its two line inscription are also approximately 25 cm high.

55. L(ucius) Marcius Simplex et L(ucius) Mar

---

718 See, e.g., Khanoussi 1998, 28 no. 12.
719 DFH, 87 no. 31; the dimensions of the block are based on estimates made by Saladin 1892, 512-513.
720 DFH 31; CIL 15513; Poinssot 1906 no. 1 and no. 238.
Lucius Marcius Simplex and Lucius Marcius Simplex Regillianus built this with their own funds.

The *cella* inside is a single room, nearly square, 13 m x 14 m, with three niches in the back wall. Excavation in the crypt below the Capitolium (added during the building’s later history, probably when it was converted to a Christian church) recovered a colossal head of a male deity carved in white marble, which is thought to have belonged to the cult statue of Jupiter. In addition to the sculpted head of Jupiter, a fragmentary inscription, on a statue base, was found reused in a wall of the crypt. Its dimensions are 73 cm tall and 30 cm wide; the letters are of “monumental” size, about 11 cm in each line. The size of the letters and their fine carving led the excavator to surmise that this inscription might have belonged to a cult statue.

56. *M[inervae]*

_A[uug(ustae) sacr(um)]_

_pa[agus et civitas]_

_Thuggensis_  

Consecrated to Minerva Augusta, the *Pagus* and *Civitas* of Thugga …

The imperial titulature of the main, exterior inscription (no. 54) provides clear evidence for the date of the building. Marcus Aurelius did not take the titles “Medicus” and “Parthicus maximus” before 166; Lucius Verus, his co-emperor, died in early 169. We have, therefore, a space of two or three years in which the building was likely constructed.

---

721 *DFH* 32; *CIL* 15514; Poinssot 1906 no. 2.
723 C. Poinssot 1967, 171.
726 Maurin (in *DFH*, 88-90, nos. 31-32) suggests that the building might have been dedicated in 168, a year in which the *pagus* (and perhaps also the *civitas*) received some additional rights from the emperor.
The benefactors, Lucius Marcius Simplex and Lucius Marcius Simplex Regillianus, were father and son belonging to a well-attested family at Thugga. The inscriptions of the Capitolium provide little evidence for why Simplex and Simplex Regillianus may have chosen to build such a large building; there is no mention of official positions in the Capitolium inscriptions. We may therefore tentatively conclude that the donation was voluntary, as Gabinius Felix Faustinianus’ donation of the forum porticoes had been.

In contrast with the Capitolium, located at the heart of the urban area, the theater lies near the eastern edge of the city, its cavea facing south-southwest. Built into the side of the plateau of Thugga, the cavea’s preserved height is around 15 m above the level of the orchestra. The eastern side of the cavea is supported by three cisterns that extended the curvature of the plateau. The diameter of the hemicycle is 63.5 m; the cavea had 21 tiers in three levels, with stairways and balustrades to separate the seating into sections. Sear estimates that it had a capacity of 2550-3150 spectators.

At the back of the cavea, a wide portico formed an upper gallery, with an arcaded colonnade bearing an inscription, parts of which were found in the upper reaches of the
The inscription’s total length is estimated at more than 79 m, with the text written in a single line. The letters are 29 cm tall.

For the health of Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Augustus and Lucius Aurelius Verus Augustus, conquerors of Armenia, conquerors of the Medes, greatest conquerors of the Parthians, and of their whole divine house. Publius Marcius Quadratus, son of Quintus, in the Arnensis tribe, flamen of divine Augustus, priest of the colonia Julia Carthage, elected to the council of five by Emperor Antoninus Augustus Pius, on account of his office of perpetual flamen built for his hometown this theater, equipped with all its ornaments, with his own funds, and he gave it, too, with a banquet given for the decurions.

Access to the upper gallery came through a central doorway on the center axis of the cavea. The exterior of the building may have borne an inscribed frieze that was found on the lower terrace of the theater, which, Poinssot suggested, would have been visible to those entering the theater from the upper plateau into the cavea. The text, perhaps around 31 m long and supplemented on either end by uninscribed blocks, was written in two lines, the first in letters 35 cm tall, the second in letters around half that size, 17.5 cm.

---

735 DFH, 91; CIL 26528; Poinssot 1906, 182-183, no. 70; Carton 1902, 27 no. 1.
736 Poinssot 1906, 183-187, no. 70.
737 CIL, 26528; Poinssot 1906, 187 no. 70; Carton 1902, 26 no. 1.
738 Carton 1902, 22-28 no. 1 and pl. 1, no. 1.
739 Poinssot 1906, 188-194 no. 71; DFH, 92; Carton 1902, 86-87 no. 14.
740 DFH, 92.
Publius Marcius Quadratus, son of Quintus, in the Arnensis tribe, flamen of divine Augustus, priest of the colonia Julia Carthage, elected to the council of five by Emperor Antoninus Augustus Pius, on account of his office of perpetual flamen built for his hometown the theater, from the ground up, with its basilicas, its portico, its xysti, and its scaena with its curtains, and all its decorations, from his own funds. And he dedicated it, with plays produced and gifts given, along with a banquet and oil for the baths.

Inside the building, the scaenae frons itself took the form of a tall, aedicular façade, supported by thirty-two Corinthian columns nearly 5 m tall. In each of the three aediculae, doorways were flanked by two columns supporting a small roof. The scaena inscription ran above the columns on the first level of the façade; inscribed lintels were placed only on the forward parts of the façade, and not on the recessed portions. The architrave frieze, inscribed on limestone like the other texts, was written in two lines on seven lintels; the first line’s letters are around 17.5 cm tall, and the second line is slightly smaller, around 16.5 cm. The inscription’s total length is around 22 m.; some uninscribed blocks interrupted the text on receding parts of the scaena façade.

Publius Marcius Quadratus, son of Quintus, in the Arnensis tribe, flamen of divine Augustus, priest of the colonia Julia Carthage, elected to the council of five by Emperor Antoninus Augustus Pius, on account of his office of perpetual flamen, built for his hometown the theater, from the ground up, with its basilicas, its portico, its xysti, and its scaena with its curtains, and all its decorations, from his own funds. And he dedicated it, with plays produced and gifts given, along with a banquet and oil for the baths.

---

741 CIL, 26607; ILTun 1435; Carton 1902, 86-87 no. 14a; Poinssot 1906, 188-194 no. 71.
742 Carton 1902, 62-65.
743 Carton 1902, 66-69, fig. 18, 74-76 no. 13, and pl. 1 no. 2.
744 DFH 90-91 no. 33; Poinssot 1906, 195-198 no. 73. Poinssot gives different figures for the height of the letters: line 1, 19 cm, line 2, 15.5 cm.
745 DFH, 90-92, no. 33; CIL, 26606; ILTun 1434; Carton 1902, 75 and pl.1 no. 2.
curtains, and all its decorations, from his own funds. And he dedicated it, with plays produced and gifts given, along with a banquet and oil for the baths.

Passages led from the edges of the cavea past the scaena on either side, opening into a small gallery or portico behind (i.e. to the south of) the scaena. The portico formed the façade of the theater and extended the length of the scenae frons, supported by 14 columns similar in appearance to those of the scaena. South of the portico, a semi-circular space, unpaved, extended out about 7 m; it was accessible via a staircase on the western side. A final dedicatory inscription may have originally been displayed on the southern façade of the theater, above the colonnade of the portico. This fragmentary text was found at the lower terrace of the theater, mixed with the fragments of text no. 58. Made of limestone, its letters are 35 cm tall, inscribed in a single line.


For the health of Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Augustus and Lucius Aurelius Verus Augustus, conquerors of Armenia, conquerors of the Medes, greatest conquerors of the Parthians, and of their whole divine house. Publius Marcius Quadratus, on account of his office of perpetual flamen …

The texts of these inscriptions give detailed information about the donor, Publius Marcius Quadratus, another member of the Marcius gens at Thugga, and holder of several major offices in Thugga and Carthage: flamen of Augustus, priest, member of the council of five. Quadratus’ inscriptions proclaim that he built the theater “ob honorem

---

746 Carton 1902, 45-50.
748 Carton 1902, 90-91.
749 Carton 1902, 85-86 no. 14; Aounallah in DFH, 92.
750 CIL, 26528a; ILTun 1405; Poinssot 1906, 195 no. 72.
flaminatus sui perpetui, in response to his office of perpetual flamen." Like several of Thugga’s other second-century donors, including Gabinius Datus and Gabinius Bassus, and Julia Paula Laenatiana, Marcius Quadratus paid for a high office with a generous building donation. Unlike Laenatiana and other holders of the flaminate from Thugga, however, Quadratus gave not a temple but an entirely different sort of building.751 The texts, though fragmentary, also provide clear indication of the date of the theater’s construction: the co-emperors Aurelius and Verus both held the imperial titles “Armeniacus, Medicus, Parthicus maximus” from 166 until Verus’ death in 169.752 The titulature indicates that Quadratus built the theater in the same time period during which his brother Simplex built the Capitolium, but unlike Simplex, whose inscriptions on the Capitolium (nos. 54 and 55) are sparsely worded, Quadratus took pains to advertise his high political status in his inscriptions.

Though the two structures were separate, and were separately funded by different members of the same family, it is worth considering the impact of the Capitolium and the theater as if they were part of the same building project, in much the same way that Suphunibal’s Temple and the Theater in Lepcis Magna were parts of the same complex.753 They were built at about the same time; their donors were close relatives; they employed the same building materials, especially limestone; and the donor of the Capitolium received an honorific statue in the theater, as did other members of the familia of the Marcii. The two structures were visibly connected in these ways.

751 Multiple flamines built buildings at Thugga before Quadratus built this theater; his inscription is the second to explicitly state that his building is the result of election to the post, after Laenatiana. Others whose works were likely ob honorem dedications were: Licinia Prisca, the Temple of Venus Concordia (see ch. V.3.b. Licinia Prisca’s Temple of Venus Concordia, supra p. 162); Maedia Lentula and Maedius Severus, the Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury (this ch., VI.2.a. The Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury, supra p. 181). Later builders included this information with increasing frequency.
752 Kienast 1996, 139 and 144.
753 See ch. III.2.d. The Theater-Temple Complex, supra p. 84.
ways. Taken as a sort of building complex, the donations of the Marcii comprised a theater and a temple, and responded to the earlier structures in the city, especially the recent works of the Gabinii. As I have shown with earlier buildings, the donations of the Marcii also responded to urban development that took place in Carthage in the 140s and 150s C.E.; the capital city continued to hold considerable architectural influence. The two structures, standing separate, extended their impact through both the urban core and the eastern edge of the city, influencing development in both spaces for generations to come.

The Capitolium responded in numerous ways to pre-existing buildings of the forum, both the recent forum porticoes and earlier structures, including the shrine of Massinissa. Most importantly, as others have already noted, the building’s orientation followed that of the forum porticoes, and not that of the other forum structures such as the Curia and the Temple of Saturn on the forum’s western side. I argued above, with the forum porticoes, that the shifted orientation of the forum porticoes signalled that the Shrine of Massinissa would no longer serve as the central focus of the forum area. Instead, the Capitolium, which rose adjacent to and above the shrine, took that place. By showing its western façade, rather than its main entrance, to the forum, the Capitolium initiated a shift toward the east, toward the new temple and the new basilica. Two decades later, renovation of the area macelli completed this adjustment by creating a second forum-like space on the east of the Capitolium. The dedication of the Capitolium to the Roman Capitoline triad, Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva, reiterated that shift, as did its architectural style. The temple has a strongly Italic character, with frontal entry and a high podium and niches for three gods in a single cella. By

754 e.g. Khanoussi 2003.
755 See this ch. VI.3.e. The East Forum Area, the Macellum, and the Temple of Mercury, infra p. 241.
comparison, other temples at Thugga dedicated to multiple divinities followed a plan that was African in character, with multiple *cellae* opening off of a courtyard, as in the cases of the Temple of Tellus and the *templa* of the Gabinii. Unlike in other African-style tripartite temples at Thugga, the deities were strongly Italic in character, and associated directly with Rome. The pedimental sculpture of the Capitolium, picturing a man on the back of an eagle, also bears direct comparisons with Rome. The scene is usually interpreted as an apotheosis scene of Antoninus Pius, and can be compared, at least in general, to the column base of Antoninus Pius that was erected in Rome (fig. 63a-b), where similar imagery depicted the emperor’s apotheosis along with his wife Faustina.

At the same time that the Capitolium rejected the previous dominance of Thugga’s past through its new orientation and its dedication to Roman deities, the building still proclaimed its connection to Thugga’s local history in its architectural fabric. The building’s yellow limestone walls and fluted columns must have contrasted sharply with the forum’s porticoes with their smooth, colorful marble columns (figs. 60-61). Marble was a recent innovation in building at Thugga, appearing in the *templa* of the Gabinii, in the forum porticoes, and in at least small quantities in the monument of Dar Lacchab (Temple of Aesculapius?), but apparently not in earlier structures. By employing this more modest material, the Marcii made visible, non-verbal connections between their new building and earlier structures in the forum, where limestone had

---

756 Saint-Amans 2004, 134-140. See also Cadotte 2007 for the essential African nature of many of the divinities celebrated at Thugga.

757 Saint-Amans (2004, 134-135) notes that the donation of two colossal statues of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (*CIL*, 26529; *ILAfri* 561) by Nanneia Instania Fida in 173 C.E., would have reinforced the imperial imagery of the apotheosis scene in the Capitolium’s pediment. The statues may have been erected in the southwest corner of the forum, where the image of the reigning emperor, and his deified brother and father, created a “dynastic ensemble” ("*un ensemble dynastique*": Saint-Amans 2004, 134).

758 *Templa* of the Gabinii: see this ch. VI.2.c, supra p. 190; forum porticos, this ch. VI.3.a, supra p. 206; Temple of Aesculapius?, this ch. VI.3.c., supra p. 218.
been an important building material. And though their temple was dedicated to Roman incarnations of the Capitoline deities, Minerva at least may have had some local significance, as dedication of two temples to her in previous decades suggests.

In similar manner, the theater also communicated its connection with Thugga’s past as well as its future. Marcius Quadratus’ theater consciously sought to respond to the earlier donation of a theatrical area, attached to the templa built by the Gabinii, in several ways. First, and perhaps most obvious from our historical perspective, was the use of descriptive language that echoed that used in the earlier building dedication. Marcius Quadratus mentioned all the parts of his theater complex in the interior inscriptions (nos. 58-59): “theatrum cum basilicis et porticu et [x]ysti[s] et scaena cum siparis et or[namen]tis omnibus, the theater with its basilicas and its porticus and its xysti and its scaena with curtains and all its adornments.” The word “xystus, promenade space” is highly unusual in texts from Africa, as Brouquier-Reddé and Saint-Amans have noted: it is used only in inscriptions from these two buildings, the theater and the templa at Thugga, and nowhere else in the African epigraphic corpus. Marcius Quadratus must have consciously chosen this unfamiliar word for his inscription in order to call to mind the earlier example of “xysti” down the hill to the southwest of his theater building. Similarly, the use of so many inscriptions in the theater copies the style of the heavily inscribed templa of the Gabinii, which had at least five building inscriptions (rather than the two or three more common building inscriptions, as at temple buildings like Capitolium, the Temple of Minerva outside the walls, and other

---

759 For earlier buildings in the forum that used limestone for their structures, see ch. V.2.2. The First Benefactions in the Forum, supra p. 142. It is important to note, however, that interior decorations in the Capitolium may have employed marble; very little information is published about the building’s interior furnishings in the Roman period. C. Poinsot (1958, 35) mentions that the interior walls probably were covered in some way, but he does not provide evidence to support this assertion.


761 Saint-Amans and Brouquier-Reddé 1997, 189.
recent constructions). This use of many inscriptions may have been related to the structures’ large size and the likelihood that viewers would have seen only one or two of the texts at the same time. Finally, it is clear that the theater, though larger than the auditorium constructed by the Gabinii, served much the same purpose as the earlier structure, complementing its use by providing a larger, and more publicly-accessible (?) space, for theatrical performances and public events. In building the theater, Marcius Quadratus responded not only to the local urban environment but also to urban development in Carthage, where the theater was built (or, more likely, rebuilt) in the mid-second century C.E. Like the Capitolium, construction of the theater sought to remake Thugga in the urban image of the capital city.

The construction of the theater changed the character of the area around it, probably in the same way that Julia Memmia’s baths helped to transform a domestic neighborhood in Bulla Regia into a monumentalized, public space. Built on the eastern side of the city, at the edge of the rocky plateau, the theater became a highly visible monument in the city’s makeup. The neighborhood of the theater remains largely unexcavated and it is difficult to tell what the area was like before the theater was constructed in the decade of the 160s. After its construction, however, the neighborhood may have undergone additional changes and become, like the neighborhood of the theater at Lepcis Magna, a magnet for additional public structures in its environs and for additional benefactions and honorific statues inside the theater itself. In the former category, a small Temple of Sol was dedicated in the late

---

762 Ros 1996, 481-484.
third-century, built one insula west of the theater. Excavated evidence from the theater demonstrates that the area became a civic gallery, with honorific statues of emperors, citizens of Thugga, and members of the family of the Marcii erected inside the theater.

The epigraphic evidence for honorific statues of the Marcii in the theater is extensive, including honors for the donors of the Capitolium as well as for the theater. Several members of the family received honorific statues on account of Simplex’s donation of the Capitolium; his father Maximus and his brother Clemens both received statue bases that were discovered during excavations of the theater. The statue base for Marcius Maximus, father of Simplex and of Quadratus, was found in the scaena of the theater. Made of limestone, it stood 1.27 m tall and 0.57 m wide, with letters ranging from 6.5 cm (line 1), to 4.5 cm (lines 2-3) to 3.5 cm (lines 4-10) in height.

---

765 Mention might also be made of the unlocated Temple (or temples) of Ceres, attested epigraphically in two texts of the Licini (see ch. V.3. The Licini in the Area East of the Forum, supra p. 159) and in a dedication by Marcii Quadratus (CIL 26465 = ITun 1388 = Saint-Amans 2004, 287 no. 14), which can be restored as “[Cereri Prata(cerum)] Aug(ustae) sac[rum] | [P(ublius)] Marcius Qu[adratus] | ---, Consecrated to Ceres Augusta in the Meadows. Publius Marcii Quadratus … “ Despite earlier hypotheses that this Temple of Ceres might have been built in the portico of the theater (e.g. Carton 1902, 144; Hanson 1959, 61 fig. 24) later research has shown that the Temple of Ceres could not have been built into the theater itself (C. Poinsso 1963). Most persist in locating the temple of Ceres in the same neighborhood as the theater, however, based on the findspots of the inscriptions and the agency of Marcii Quadratus in the theater’s construction (e.g. C. Poinsso 1963, 52; Saint-Amans 2004, 284-285).

766 Texts from the cavea: Carton 1902, 40-45, nos. 2-11. Honorific texts cover a range of dates, as evidenced by two imperial statue bases honoring Lucius Verus (161-169) (Carton 1902, 44, no. 8) and Probus (276-282 C.E.) (Carton 1902, 43 no. 6). Other texts, perhaps from the scaenae frons building’s upper levels: Carton 1902, 96-105 nos. 16-24.

767 Carton 1902, 40-45, nos. 2-6 and 96-105, nos. 16-24. Some of these texts might have been set up in the upper portion of the monument (Carton 1902, 95) but their exact provenance is unknown.

768 C. Poinsso (1958, 32) suggested that the honorific inscriptions found near the theater were probably moved to that space from the forum in late antiquity. By analogy with the theater at Lepcis Magna, however, we might expect to find honorific statues of many different local notables in the theater, which served as an important arena for civic display; a similar pattern of civic display is evident in the templum of the Gabinii, where multiple statue bases were probably placed, honoring the donors and their family (see this ch. VI.2.6. The Templum of Concordia, Frugi(e), Liber Pater, and Neptune, supra p. 190). I am inclined to believe that the statue bases found in the theater—and their statues—were originally erected in the theater (in the scaenae frons, or the upper gallery?) rather than in the portico of the forum. Such a forum gallery was discovered at Gigthis, but Gigthis had no theater to serve as a focus for civic display.

769 DFH 203-205, no. 81 (Q. Marcius Maximus); DFH 205-207 no. 82 (C. Marcius Clemens).
61. Q(uinto) Marcio Quir(ina)  
Maximo ob munifi  
centiam L(uci) Marci Sim  
plicis fili(i) eius et ob  
ipsius merita pagus et  
civitas Thuggensis  
post mortem d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) p(ecunia) p(ublica)  
curatoribus C(aio) Modio  
Rustico L(ucio) Numissio Honorato  
Iulio Macro Sallustio Iuliano Q(uinti) f(ilio).\textsuperscript{770}

To Quintus Marcius Maximus, of the Quirina tribe, on account of the generosity of Lucius Marcius Simplex, his son, and on account of his own merits, the pagus and the civitas of Thugga (erected this statue) after his death, by a decree of the decurions and at public expense. Caius Modius Rusticus, Lucius Nimissius Honoratus, and Iulius Macer Salustius Julianus, son of Quintus, served as curators.

The second honorific inscription, to the brother of Simplex and Quadratus, was found immediately south of the theater, perhaps in a reused context. A statue base in limestone, missing its lower portio (preserved height 68.5 cm, width 28.5 cm), its letters range from 6 cm to 2 cm in height, with the largest letters in the first line.\textsuperscript{771}

62. C(aio) Marcio Q(uinti) f(ilio)  
Arn(ensi) Clementi  
flamini divi  
Vespasiani c(oloniae) I(uliae) K(arthaginis) in  
quinque decurias  
adlecto ab Imp(eratore) Anto  
nino Aug(usto) Pio ob munifi  
centiam L(uci) Marci Sim  
plicis fratis eius et ho  
norem memoriae  
pagus et civitas Thugg(enium) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) p(ecunia) p(ublica)  
[curato]rib(us) C(aio) Modio Rustico  
[L(ucio) Numissio H]onorato Iulio  
[Macro Sallustio Iuliano Q(uinti) f(ilio)].\textsuperscript{772}

To Caius Marcius Clemens, son of Quintus, of the Arnensis tribe, flamen of divine Vespasian of colonia Julia Carthage, elected to the council of five by emperor Antoninus Augustus Pius, on account of the generosity of Lucius Marcius Simplex, his brother, and the honor of his memory, the pagus and

\textsuperscript{770} DFH, 203-205, no. 81; CIL, 26605; Carton 1902, 98 no. 17.  
\textsuperscript{771} DFH, 205-206 no. 82.  
\textsuperscript{772} Carton 1902, 99 no. 18; DFH, 205-206 no. 82.
the *civitas* of Thugga (erected this statue), by a decree of the decurions and at public expense. Caius Modius Rusticus, Lucius Numissius Honoratus, and Iulius Macer Salustius Julianus, son of Quintus, served as curators.

Marcius Simplex himself also received an honorific statue whose inscribed limestone base was reused in the construction of a private dwelling; Carton theorized that it, like those of his father and brother, may have originally been placed in the theater. Made of limestone, the base is 1.53 m tall, 52 cm wide, 60 cm deep, and inscribed in African capitals, whose letters decrease in size from 6.5 cm in the first line to 2 cm in the last:

63. *L(ucio) Marcio Q(uinti) f(ilio)*

*Arn(ensi) Simplici*

*pat[rono pago et]*

*civitatis flami[ni] [*

*perpletuo flami[ni]*

*[divi Aug(usti) c(oloniae) I(uliea) K(arthaginis) aed[i]s] [*

*[in qu]inqu[e decu]rias]*

*[ab I]mp(erator) Antonino [Aug(usto)]*

*[adlec]to ob egregiam el[ius]*

*[munificentiam pagus et c[ivi]*

*[tas Th]ugg(ensium) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) p(ecunia) p(ublica) curator[ib(us)]*

*[C(aio) Mod]io Rustico L(ucio) Num[issio]*

*[Hon]orato Iulio Macr[o]*

*[S]allustio Iuliano Q(uinti) f(ilio)].

To Lucius Marcius Simplex, of the tribe Arnensis, patron of the *pagus* and the *civitas*, perpetual *flamen*, *flamen* of Deified Augustus of *colonia Julia Carthage*, aedile, elected into the council of five by the Emperor Antoninus Augustus, on account of his exceptional generosity, the *pagus* and the *civitas* of Thugga (set this statue up) with public funds, by a decision of the councilors. Caius Modius Rusticus, Lucius Numissius Honoratus, Julius Macer, and Sallustius Julianus, son of Quintus, served as curators.

The other donor of the Capitolium, Lucius Marcius Simplex Regillianus, may have received a statue of his own, but it has not been recovered.

---

773 Carton 1902, 99 no. 19.
774 *DFH* 207, no. 83.
775 *DFH* 83; *CIL*, 26609; Poinssot 1906 no. 132.
In addition to the honorific statues of members of the Marcii, the name of the donor Marcius Quadratus was visible all over the theater. Inscriptions in enormous letters decorated the exterior of the building at both north (top) and south (bottom) (nos. 58, 60) and the large size of the building and its monumental inscriptions would have made the donor’s name visible from a long way off. Such visibility of his name and his family connections continued inside the theater in both directions, where the name Marcius Quadratus was visible from the cavea (looking toward the scaena inscription, no. 59: plate 64) and from the scaena or the entrances to the theater at orchestra-level (looking toward the internal portico inscription, no. 57: fig.65). Commemorative statues of his family members, including his father and two brothers, continued this pattern of visibility. Images and names of the Marcii were placed all over the theater; the donor’s name and family affiliation were visible to any who entered the theater, whether actors, spectators, or casual visitors.

As an official donation, the theater’s construction was due to Marcius Quadratus’ position as perpetual flamen (see nos. 57, 58, 59, 60) and his dedication of the building followed a pattern that earlier flamines had already established, celebrating with extensive—and probably costly—events including a banquet for the decurions (no. 57), performances, monetary handouts, and a distribution of oil (nos. 58-59). These

---

776 Carton theorized that a statue base found reused in a modern dwelling behind the scaena might belong to Simplex Regillianus, but no name is preserved in that text (Carton 1902, 103 no. 20). There was an honorific statue base, however, erected at public expense, for his wife:

...[in sol]acium L(uci) M[arci] | [Sim]pl i ci s R egil i [ani] | [munic]ipis et patr[oni] | [pagi] marit i ei u[s] | [d(ecreto)] d(ecurionum) p(ecunia) p(ublica) p(osuit).

In sympathy for her husband, Lucius Marcius Simplex Regillianus, citizen and patron of the pagus; by a decree of the decurions [the pagus] set this up with public funds (CIL 08, 26610; Gascou 1999). Poinssot (1906, 275 no. 134) noted that it was found in a reused context in a late antique building south of the east forum. Gascou (1999) proposed to amend the restoration suggested by Poinssot, so as to obviate the existence of an otherwise unattested position of princeps of the pagus, in favor of the reading “[munic]ipis, citizen,” an emendation which I follow here.

777 The lettering of the first line of the exterior portico inscription, no. 58 above, is more than twice as large as the largest lettering in the exterior inscription from the theater at Lepcis Magna (maximum height of 15.7 cm; see ch. III.2.a. The Theater Building, supra p. 77), so presumably it was designed to be read from at least twice as far away.
celebrations echoed the festivals given by earlier flamines, like Julia Paula Laenatiana and Lucius Calpurnius. These celebrations added to the cost of the theater’s construction. Its cost is unrecorded, but may have been several hundred thousand sesterces. The donor, Marcius Quadratus, celebrated his assumption of the flaminate with an extravagant gift, one that may have been many times more costly than those of other flamines (the Monument of Dar Lacchab (the Temple of Aesculapius?) of Lucius Calpurnius cost 150,000 sesterces: see inscription no. 52).

The generosity of the theater’s donor is even more remarkable when it is considered along with the construction of the Capitolium, undertaken by Quadratus’ brother and nephew, Marcius Simplex and Marcius Simplex Regillianus, almost simultaneously. The cost of that building, too, is unrecorded. Marcius Simplex recorded no official position as the cause of his dedication of the Capitolium in the building’s inscriptions (nos. 54-55) though his honorific statue base included both local and Carthaginian flaminates in his cursus (no. 63). In fact, I doubt whether the local flaminate was, in fact, what prompted his donation of the building, since the building inscriptions made no mention of the office. Instead, we might suppose that Marcius Simplex, like many first-century donors before him, made a donation to Thugga with his son as co-benefactor in order to promote his son as an important citizen of the city and to promise further involvement from his heirs in the succeeding generations. Like

---

778 Duncan-Jones (1982, 91, nos. 27-28) recorded costs of 375,000-400,000 sesterces for two theaters in Africa. The theater at Thugga was built on a hillside, reducing the need for major support structures in concrete and stone. At Madauros, where the theater’s donor reported a promise of 375,000 sesterces for its construction in the Severan period (ILAlg 1.2121), the theater required more extensive substructures for support, but its size was much smaller than the theater at Thugga (Sear 2006, 282-283). At Calama, a patron of the mid-second or early third century paid 400,000 sesterces (CIL 17495) for a theater of similar dimensions to that of Thugga, similarly built into a hillside (Sear 2006, 277). Despite the cost-saving building techniques that were employed there, Thugga’s theater must have come at a high price.

779 Duncan-Jones (1982, 90 nos. 6, 13, 17 and 114, notes 6 and 17) recorded costs of 24,000-100,000 sesterces or more for Capitolia.
so many donor families before him, however, the Marcii apparently did not participate in euergetism on a large scale in later decades; the implicit promise may have remained unfulfilled.780

Though their remains are more visible archaeologically than earlier structures built by benefactors in Thugga, examination of the Capitolium and theater at Thugga reveals that the Marcii, Simplex, Simplex Regillianus, and Quadratus, followed established patterns in constructing new public spaces for the citizens of Thugga. In expressing their own identity through their buildings, the donors sought to balance the elements of Thugga’s past and its future with reference to previous urban developments in Thugga itself, the growth patterns of the city of Carthage, and connections with Rome. Honorific statues for the donors and their family members, erected in the theater, served to emphasize the importance of that space as an area of civic gathering and collective memory. The honorific statues and inscriptions themselves emphasized the importance of Marcius Simplex’s donation—the Capitolium—rather than the theater built by Quadratus (e.g. no. 61 to Q. Marcius Maximus, “ob munificentiam L(uci) Marci Sim/plicis fili(i) eius, on account of the generosity of Lucius Marcius Simplex, his son,” and a similar statement in no. 62). The honorific statue of Marcius Simplex himself (no. 63), which included Simplex’s cursus honorum, contrasted with the building inscriptions, where that information was purposefully suppressed to create an impression (real or imagined) of voluntary generosity from Marcius Simplex toward the citizens of Thugga. The honorific statues and inscribed statue bases nuanced the messages of the buildings, their inscriptions,

780 Simplex Regillianus may have played other roles in Thugga’s civic life (see n. 776 above) but we have no record of additional buildings that he constructed or promised. It is possible that the statue base for his wife (see n. 776) may have been constructed in response to other buildings that they constructed for which the evidence is lost.
and their topographic positions in the city. At the same time, though, the honorific statues, erected at public expense, testified to the importance of both the donors and the donations to the urban development of Thugga.

e. The East Forum Area, the *Macellum*, and the Temple of Mercury

Renovations to the central core of Thugga continued after the construction of the Capitolium, resulting in the creation of a space on the east side of that Temple that mirrored the forum area to its west. Two families of donors participated in these renovations, both with the intention of creating themselves as heirs to the first-century Licinii and their successors among the *flamines* who had already invested in the development of the same area. Like earlier donors, the donors of the renovated *area macelli* and its neighboring structures looked to Thugga’s past as well as to its present, but the past that these buildings connected with was not Thugga’s pre-Roman history (embodied in the Shrine of Massinissa in the forum) but the history of Roman-period Thugga embodied in earlier acts of euergetism in and around the forum and the *area macelli*.

The improvements in the area east of the forum covered four separate spaces (fig. 66): the *macellum’s* south side and its northern end; the open space east of the forum, the *area macelli*; and the northern border of the *area*, just east of the Capitolium. The eastern edge of the *area* was already occupied by two buildings, the Temple of Pietas and the Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury. On the western edge of the space, the Capitolium and the basilica rose on either side of the entryway into the main forum area. The forum had already been reoriented to focus on the Capitolium, with the addition of the forum porticos on three sides.\footnote{See this ch. VI.3.a. Forum Porticoes, supra p. 206.} The construction and renovation that
took place in the east forum area were designed to mimic the new orientation of the forum and present a similar façade on the Capitolium’s eastern side.

On the northern side of the *area macelli*, one of the four major contemporary projects was the construction of the Temple of Mercury just east of the Capitolium. This building was an African-style temple with three *cellae*, oriented north-south on the same axis as the Capitolium, with its primary entrance on the south side (see fig. 67). Unlike other African temples at Thugga,782 this sanctuary did not have an enclosed courtyard separating it from surrounding space. Instead, it stood on a low podium approached by four steps; a shallow porch supported by 10 columns formed the building’s façade. Above the columns of the portico, an inscribed architrave frieze, composed of nine limestone lintel blocks, proclaimed the temple’s dedication and its donors. Some fragments of the inscription were built into the eastern wall of the Byzantine fortress (figs. 68-69), and others were excavated from the open area of the east forum. The text’s total length is approximately 19.8 m; it is written in two lines, with letters 10 cm high in each line. The lettering is elongated in the style known as “African capitals,” taller and thinner than lapidary capitals of the first and early second centuries.783

64. Q(uintus) Pacuvius Saturus fl(amen) perp(etuus) augur c(oloniae) I(uliae) K(arthaginis) e[t] Nahania [Victor]ia fl(aminica) p(er)p(etua) ad [opus]s templi Mercuri quot M(arcus) Pacuvius Felix Victorianus filius eorum codicillis suis HS L mil(ibus) fieri iussit [amplius] ipsi ob honorem fl(llammonii) perp(etuus)] HS LXX mil(ibus) pollicitis [sum]nis templum M[e]rcuri et cellas duas cum [statuis et porticum et ab[side]]---

[[omnique cultu]] ampliata pecunia fecerunt item porticum et [area]n macelli pago patr[i]ae extruxerunt et excoluerunt item civitati Thugg(ensi) HS XXV mil(iac) Q(uintus) Pacuvius Saturus fl(amen) perp(etuus) daturum se pollicitus est ex cuius summae restitit quotannis decurionibus[s sport][i]ae darentur et ob diem [mun]eris ludus scaenicos et sport[u]las decurii[ob]nimbus utriusque ordinis et un[i]verso populo [dedi...784

782 See ch. V.4.a. The Temple of Tellus, supra p. 170, and this chapter, VI.2.c. The *Templa* of Concordia, Frugifer, Liber Pater, and Neptune, supra p. 190.

783 DH, 93-98 no. 34, with chart recording findspots of individual fragments.

784 DH no. 34; CIL, 26482; ILAfr 516; Poinssot 1913-1916, no. 13 and no. 207.
Quintus Pacuvius Saturus, perpetual *flamen*, augur of colonia Julia Carthage, and Nahania Victoria, perpetual *flaminica*. Toward the construction of the temple of Mercury which Marcus Pacuvius Felix Victorianus, their son, had ordered to be built with 50,000 sesterces in his will, additionally they themselves, having promised 70,000 sesterces in response to their election to the perpetual flaminate, they built the temple of Mercury and two *cellae* with statues, and the portico and the apses, and all its equipment, having paid additional funds. They also renovated and improved the porticus and the plaza of the *macellum* for the *pagus* of their hometown. And, for the *civitas* of Thugga, Q. Pacuvius Saturus, perpetual *flamen*, promised that he would give 25,000 sesterces, from the return on which sum each year monetary gifts will be given, and in honor of the dedication day, he gave theatrical shows and sportulae to the decurions of each order and to the whole citizenry …

The portico of the temple ended in an exedra at each end, west and east. Each of the three *cellae* were approachable from the porch, but were not interconnected. The central, rectangular *cella*, with a niche at the back, is about twice as large the other two; the side *cellae* are semi-circular, substantially smaller.\footnote{Gauckler 1905a, clxxi-clxii.} In the western *cella*, a low statue base or altar (about 44 cm tall and 88 cm wide) was discovered *in situ* against the back wall. The letters of the text are inscribed in two lines, each 5.5 cm tall.

65. *Mercurio Silvio Sacrum.*\footnote{Saint-Amans 2004, 333 no. 67; CIL, 26486; ILTun 1397; Gauckler 1905b, 288 no. 6; Gauckler 1905a, clxxii.}

Consecrated to Mercury Silvius.\footnote{Dedications in the building to both Mercury Augustus and Mercury Silvius highlight the dual Roman-African nature of this deity and his importance in the Romano-African pantheon (Cadotte 2007, 113-164).}

A second limestone statue base, traditionally associated with this building, was discovered during excavations just north of the Byzantine fortress. It may have originally stood in the central or eastern *cellae* of the temple. Broken at the bottom, the preserved height of the base is 63 cm. The text is inscribed in at least three lines; the first line is 6.5 cm tall and the others are 4 cm tall.\footnote{Saint-Amans 2004, 333.}
Consecrated to Mercury Augustus; [...] adorned the cella in the place given by the civitas, and set up the statue of Mercury.

The portico of the temple was paved with bluish limestone, and the walls of the cellae were decorated with marble and stucco. One final inscription, a plaque which may have been installed in a wall of the temple, was found in multiple fragments, some of which came from the forum and one from the temple itself. The text is a modified version of the building dedication. The slab was perhaps 60-70 cm tall. The letters of the first line are 5.5 cm tall and written over the entire width of the stone; those of the remaining lines are 4.5 cm, distributed in two columns of nine lines each.

---

66. *Mercurio Aug(usto) sac(rum)*  
Loco a civitate dato cella<m>  
Exornavit et M<ercurii signum ...  
... posuit.*

67. *Pagus et [civitas Aureli]a Thugga ob meritum sua pecunia fecerunt decreto d(ecurionum)]*  
*quod M(arcus) Pacuvian Felix Victoria[nus] Q(uinti) Pacu*  
*vi Satur[i et Nahaniae Victor[ia]e] fil(ius) cod[ici]*  
*cilli sui templum Mercur[i] HS L m(ilibus) fie*  
*[ri iussit, ipsi ampl[ius] ob honorem]*  
*[flam(onii) perp(etui) HS LXX m(ilia) poolliciti sunt ex quib(us)]*  
*[templum Mercuri et cellas duas cum sta]*  
*[tuis et porticum et absides]*  
*[fecerunt item porticum aream macelli]*  
*[pago patriae extruxerunt et exolerunt]*  
*item [civitati] Thuggae HS XX[V mil(ia) Q(uintus) Pacuvius]*  
*[Saturus fl(amen) perp(etuius) dat(urum se pollicitus est)]*  
*[ex quorum reditu quotannis decurionibus sportulae]*  
*[praestarentur] et ob diem munerus ludos scae]*  
*nicos et sportulas dec(urionibus) utriusque ordinis*  
et universo populo dedit  
[---]  
[---]  
*Sex(to) Egnatio Pri[mo …*
The pagus and the civitas of Thugga have built this (plaque) at their own expense, by a decree of the decurions, because Marcus Pacuvius Felix Victorianus, son of Quintus Pacuvius Saturus and Nahania Victoria, directed in his will that a temple of Mercury be built, with 50,000 sesterces. They themselves promised 70,000 sesterces and more in honor of their perpetual flaminate, from which sums they built the temple of Mercury and its two cellae with statues, and the porticus, and the apses; they also renovated and improved the porticus and the plaza of the macellum for the pagus, their hometown; and to the citizens of Thugga, Quintus Pacuvius Saturus, perpetual flamen, promised that he would give 25,000 sesterces, from the return on which sum each year sportulae will be presented to the decurions, and on the day of the dedication he gave theatrical performances and sportulae to the decurions of each order and to the whole citizenry … Sextus Egnatius Primus [was the curator].

The central space of the east forum area is thought to have received improvements at the same time that the temple was constructed. The area, rectangular with an apse or hemicycle on one end, was paved in while limestone and surrounded on three sides by porticoes (including the façade of the temple of Mercury to the north and the portico of the macellum to the south). The curved east side was designed to accommodate the orientation of the Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury, which was built on the previous orientation of the forum and east forum buildings, facing the shrine of Massinissa, as I have mentioned above. The hemicycle mimics the curvature of the forum’s western portico, which also accommodated the orientation of previous buildings. In the northwest corner of the paved space, about 3 m from the walls of the Temple of Mercury and the Capitolium, an inscription in the pavement describes a circular compass rose (see fig. 66), divided into 24 segments, with the names of the 12 winds inscribed around its outer edge. Paleographically the inscribed letters of the winds’ names, written in African capitals, bear a strong resemblance to the portico

---

793 C. Poinssot 1958, 32-33 no. 4.
794 See this ch. VI.2.a. The Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury, supra p. 181.
inscription of the Temple of Mercury. This similarity of lettering, along with the mention of improvements to the “area[m macelli, the plaza of the macellum” in the inscription of the Temple of Mercury (no. 64) and in the honorific inscription erected nearby (no. 67), indicate that the two spaces were constructed at the same time, probably by the same donors.

At the south side of the area, renovation of the macellum’s northern end created a new façade and front entrance for the building (fig. 70). This change required the removal of the northern row of shop spaces, reducing the usable space in the building. In their place, a portico, 4.25 m wide, was erected. The portico’s floor was paved in grey stone, contrasting with the earlier paving of the macellum’s courtyard, in white stones. Like the porch of the Temple of Mercury, this portico was supported by 10 columns; only their bases survive. The architrave frieze of the portico was mostly reused in the eastern wall of the Byzantine fortress. Like that of the Temple of Mercury, the text was inscribed on nine lintels in two lines. The first line (which has been recarved over an earlier text that was erased) is inscribed in letters 13.5 cm tall, while the second line’s letters are shorter, around 10 cm tall.


For the health of Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Commodus Augustus Pius, conqueror of the Sarmatae, greatest conqueror of the Germans,
conqueror of the Britons, father of the fatherland. Quintus Pacuvius Saturus, perpetual *flamen*, augur of colonia Julia Carthage, and Nahania Victoria, perpetual *flaminica*, constructed the porticus (and the ?) of the market for the *pagus* of their hometown, and dedicated it.

Four entry doors led from the portico into the *macellum*: one into each of the interior porticoes, and the two central doors into the courtyard of the *macellum*. I propose to restore two inscribed lintels above these portico doors. One such inscribed lintel, made of limestone, was recovered during the excavation of the east forum area. The stone’s lower face has been polished, and it has notches on the back side at the left, where an additional lintel block was attached at a right angle to this one. Poinssot originally assigned this block and its companion text, no. 70, to the Temple of Mercury, but the architectural fittings carved on this block suggest that they come instead from the *macellum*’s west portico door. The block is 45 cm tall and 1.9 m long, broken off on the right side; L. Poinssot estimated its total length to be around 3.10 m. The text is inscribed in 2 lines, with letters 6 cm tall in each.

69. *Q(uintus) Pacuvius Saturus fl(amen) [perp(etuus) augur C(oloniae) I(uliae) K(arthaginis)] [et] Nahania Victoria [eius fl(aminica) (perpetua) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(ecerunt)].*

Quintus Pacuvius Saturus, perpetual *flamen*, augur of colonia Julia Carthage, and Nahania Victoria, his wife, perpetual *flaminica*, built this with their own funds.

A second lintel, made of pink stone, was reused in the Byzantine wall and in a private house. Like no. 69, the stone’s lower face has been polished, and it has notches on the

---

802 As far as I know, no scholar has proposed a solution to this problematic lacuna. I wonder if the text could refer to the porticoes of the plaza and of the *macellum* separately, yielding “porticum [et porticum] macelli,” though analogy with other texts from the same construction project (nos. 64, 67) suggests that the construction was more likely “porticum [et area]m macelli” and the preserved “um” is either a mistake on the part of the carver or a misreading of the stone.

803 L. Poinssot 1913-1916, 105-106 no. 48. He suggested, with substantial reservations, that these texts might have come from the sides of the *macellum*’s portico; Maurin and Saint-Amans (in *DFH* 97 no. 34, n. 94) seem to accept this suggestion despite the size differences in the blocks.

804 L. Poinssot 1906, 141 no. 23.

805 CIL 26484; *ILTun* 1396; Gauckler and L. Poinssot 1905, clxviii; L. Poinssot 1906, 140-141 no. 23; L. Poinssot 1913-1916, 105-106 no. 48.
back side at the right, where an additional lintel block was attached at a right angle to this one. This block was originally assigned to the Temple of Mercury, but it probably belongs instead with the *macellum*.\(^{806}\) I propose to restore this text as a lintel over the eastern doorway from the portico into the *macellum*. The stone is at least 2.80 m long, 51 cm tall, with letters 15 cm tall in the first line and 13 cm tall in the second.\(^{807}\)

70. [Q(uintus) Pa]cuvius Saturus fl(amen) perp(etuus) augur C(oloniae) I(uliae) K(arthaginis) [et] Nahania Victoria eius fl(aminica) (perpetua) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(ecerunt).\(^{808}\)

Quintus Pacuvius Saturus, perpetual flamen, augur of colonia Julia Carthage, and Nahania Victoria, his wife, perpetual flaminica, built this with their own funds.

Renovation of the southern side of the *macellum* also took place, probably at the same time as the renovations of the northern side. During this second phase of its history, the *macellum* received a large apse at its southern end, with a radius of approximately 4.5 m,\(^{809}\) increasing the useable space on the southern end of the market building just as construction of the portico on the northern end reduced the available space there.\(^{810}\) The apse is symmetrically placed in the building and on an axis with the central *cella* of the Temple of Mercury, to the north across the plaza. The staircases on the southern end of the building remained in place, opening into the porticoes on either side of the apse. Clearance of the *macellum* revealed an inscribed statue base just south of the wall of the apse; it is thought to have come from the apse and may have supported a cult statue.\(^{811}\) This inscription, now broken, was perhaps 50 cm tall and 28 cm wide; the lettering, in African capitals, is uniformly 4-4.5 cm tall in each line.

\(^{806}\) Poinssot 1913-1916, 105-106 no. 48.
\(^{807}\) Poinssot 1906, 141 no. 24.
\(^{808}\) Poinssot 1906, 141-142 no. 24; Poinssot 1913-1916, 105-106 no. 48.
\(^{809}\) Merlin 1919, cxxxi.
\(^{810}\) DFH, 97; Merlin (1919, cxxxi) did not, however, note any permanent structures for stalls or shops in the apse.
\(^{811}\) Merlin 1919, cxxxi.
Consecrated to Mercury, genius of the market. Caius Modius Rusticus and Modius Licinianus set this up and dedicated it.

The date of these many renovations to the east forum area is furnished by the fragmentary inscription of the *macellum* (no. 68 above), whose first line has the (recarved) imperial titulature of the emperor Commodus; the honorific titles correspond to a date later in the emperor’s reign, ca. 184-192, though given that the text has been recarved at a later period (after the rehabilitation of Commodus under Septimius Severus), the original text could have dated to any time during Commodus’ reign, that is 180-192. Because the same donors financed the buildings on both edges of the plaza, the entire complex is probably contemporary, dating to the period a decade or two after the construction of the Capitolium.

The epigraphic corpus of this building project provides us with a wealth of information about the donors and their motivations for donating such a complex of new and renovated buildings. The two major donors of the Temple of Mercury were Quintus Pacuvius Saturus and his wife Nahania Victoria; both held important offices at Thugga, including the perpetual flaminate, and Pacuvius Saturus was also an official at Carthage (nos. 64, 67). According to those inscribed texts, their son, Marcus Pacuvius Felix Victorianus, made the initial promise of a temple; his parents took over the project, and expanded its scope and its costs, after his death. Both the Pacuvii and the Nahanii are well-attested familiae at Thugga; Pacuvius Saturus and Nahania Victoria are the

---

812 *DFH*, 274 no. 141; *ILAfri*, 548; Saint-Amans 2004, 336 no. 74; Poinssot 1919, 146-147 no. 2.
813 Kienast 1996, 147-149.
814 Kienast 1996, 147-149.
only ones—besides their deceased son Pacuvius Felix Victorianus—who participated in such large-scale benefaction through building.\textsuperscript{815}

A second family group of benefactors, the Modii, who dedicated the statue base for Mercury, genius of the \textit{Macellum} (no. 71), are known from other inscriptions at Thugga: Modius Rusticus served as a curator for the erection of the statues that commemorated the building activity of the Marcii, who built the the Capitolium and theater.\textsuperscript{816} Though he was involved tangentially in the development of the urban space by other benefactors, this single donation of an inscribed statue base and its statue was apparently the extent of Modius Rusticus’ own participation in civic euergetism at Thugga. The modest scale of this donation contrasts markedly with the rest of the building project, donated by Pacuvius Felix, Pacuvius Saturus and Nahania Victoria, at a substantial cost (at least 145,000 sesterces: no. 64).

These further developments in the \textit{area macelli}, or the “place de la rose des vents,” as the excavators termed it, perhaps had little impact on the way that traffic and people moved through the city, but certainly conveyed important meanings to those who viewed the new and improved buildings. The Temple of Mercury was a new construction that closed the access to the plaza. The road leading from the theater turned to travel west past the north side of the forum to the western city gate; construction of this temple reduced access to the plaza from that street, and most likely required that all visitors from the north entered the area at the northeast corner, near the Temple of Pietas.\textsuperscript{817} The construction of the porticoes on the east and south sides probably did not significantly restrict or change the access from those neighborhoods

\textsuperscript{815} DFH, 98; see also DFH, 280 no. 147 for the funerary epitaph of Quintus Pacuvius Saturus.
\textsuperscript{816} See this ch. VI.3.d. Capitolium and Theater, supra p. 223, inscription nos. 61, 62, 63.
\textsuperscript{817} There may have been an alley that allowed access to the plaza from the north, between the Temple of Mercury and the podium of the Capitolium; construction of the Byzantine fortress has, however, blocked that space and prevented study of that area.
into the east forum area, and may, in the case of the *macellum*, have actually improved access to the space. Visitors to the *macellum* could, after the renovation that added the portico and the northern doors, enter from the lower level at the south via staircases and then exit into the plaza on the north side of the building.

Although the access points to the plaza did not change significantly in the renovation, the look of the space altered dramatically following this construction project. The space, which had been disparate, with the facades of several buildings showing, developed into a unified forum area, with matching porticoes on three sides. In this respect, and in its shape, the east forum became an echo of the forum on the west: colonnaded, with a curved short end that mediated between older and newer buildings on different orientations.

The older buildings in the *area macelli* are, I argue, the key to understanding this building complex of the Pacuvii. The donors did not choose to build in the already-crowded east forum area because they held land there, as was the case, for example, with the temple of Pietas built by Pompeius Rogatus; indeed the text of the statue base, no. 66, makes it clear that the land on which the temple was built was previously held by the public, “Loco a civitate dato, in the place given by the *civitas*.” Since the donors did not hold the land personally, there must have been another reason that they, and the leadership of the *civitas*, chose that particular place to site their temple: the two strong and related traditions of benefaction that had initially created this public space.

The benefactory inscriptions from the Temple of Mercury (no. 64) and the *macellum* (nos. 68, 69, 70) mention, repeatedly, that the buildings were constructed by two people who held the perpetual flaminate. The inscription of the temple of Mercury

---

818 Though the name of the donor’s brother, Caius Pompeius Nahanius, suggests that Nahania Victoria might have had a connection with that family.
states, even more explicitly, that they funded the construction of the temple and the renovations of the *macellum because of* their election to that position: *ipsi ob honorem fl(amonii) perp(etui)]. The site of the Temple of Mercury is situated between two temples built by earlier holders of that office, the Temple of Venus Concordia built by Licinia Prisca, just northeast,\(^{819}\) and the Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury, by Maedius Severus and in the name of Maedia Lentula,\(^ {820}\) almost next door. The temple of Mercury further emphasized the connection with the earlier building by dedication to one of the same gods, Mercury, who was also honored in the earlier temple built by the Maedii. The multiple *cellae* of the Mercury temple may have echoed a similar plan in the temple of the Maedii, though the choice to honor one god, apparently in three different aspects, was novel. The *macellum* was originally constructed by Licinius Rufus, another *flamen*.\(^ {821}\)

The choice to build in this area must have been at least partially motivated by a desire to connect to these earlier buildings, in order to emphasize the high status of the current builders. Building the porticoes that stitched all three east forum buildings together created a visual and physical link between the buildings and also between their donors. The porticoes provided another level of connection to earlier building projects, since they mimicked quite closely the shape of the forum porticoes, built by the Gabinii, another important family whose members had held the flaminate in previous decades.\(^ {822}\) The porticoes of the Temple of Mercury and the *macellum* may have echoed those of the forum in their use of marble monoliths.\(^ {823}\)

---

\(^{819}\) See ch. V.3.b. Licinia Prisca’s Temple of Venus Concordia, supra p. 162.

\(^{820}\) See this ch. a. The Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury, supra p. 181.


\(^{822}\) See this ch. VI.3.a. Forum Porticoes, supra p. 206.

\(^{823}\) Gauckler (1905a, clxxii) reported that the columns which supported the doorway lintels of the smaller *cellae* of the Temple were “*de superbe marbre rouge, veiné de quartz émeraude*, of superb red marble, veined with green quartz.” He makes no mention of the material of the porch’s columns, but images
The celebrations in honor of the temple’s dedication day, recorded in the Temple’s dedicatory inscription (no. 64) and the honorific text (no. 67), also followed the pattern established by previous flamines and benefactors at Thugga, particularly Paula Laenatiana and Marcus Quadratus, donors of the Temple of Minerva and of the theater, who gave substantial celebrations themselves. The celebrations given by Pacuvius Saturus were even more remarkable, encompassing not only theatrical games and sportulae (as Marcus Quadratus had given), but also an endowment for an annual distribution of sportulae. This endowment, 25,000 sesterces, was apparently the first established at Thugga,\(^{824}\) and its continuing distributions of sportulae to the decurions of the civitas would have preserved the memory of this particular benefactor and his donations well beyond the dedication day.

Construction that improved the macellum, a building originally given by an important member of the “first family” of Thugga, as I have identified them above, allowed Pacuvius Saturus and Nahania Victoria to declare themselves as connected to this first family. Their work to improve the earlier building connected their names, perhaps quite graphically, with that of the patron Licinius Rufus, whose name and positions were inscribed somewhere on the macellum.\(^{825}\)

This identification between the Licinii and the Pacuvii was reinforced when the pagus and civitas set up an honorific statue and base for Licinius Rufus, probably around the same time as they set up the honorific plaque for Pacuvius Saturus and Nahania Victoria (no. 67). The statue’s original context is unknown; the base was built into the north wall of the Byzantine fortress (fig. 69). The base (incomplete at top, bottom, and

---

824 Wesch-Klein (1990, 13) has noted that endowed foundations were rare in comparison to other types of euergetism in North Africa.

left) stands 0.75 m tall; its preserved width is 0.31 m (original size around 0.5 m?). The limestone base is carved in lettering appreciably different from the wide lapidary capitals of other first-century inscriptions from the initial construction of the macellum; on paleographic grounds it dates to the second century or even later. The letters of the first line are 7 cm tall, and those of the remaining lines are 6 cm.

72. [M(arco) Licini[o] Rufo praefecto [alae Bosphor]iana in Syria [flam(i) perp(etuo)] Aug(usti)] c(oloniae) C(oncordiae) I(uliae) K(arthaginis) patrono pagi [et civitatis] [pagus Thugg(ensis) ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)] [fe]cit. 828

To Marcus Licinius Rufus, prefect of the Bosphoran unit in Syria, flamen perpetuus of Augustus of the colonia Concordia Julia Carthage, patron of the pagus and the civitas, the pagus of Thugga set this up from a decurial decree.

C. Poinssot has suggested that the extant base—which apparently dates substantially later than the known activity of the honoree—represents a reinstallment of the honorific statue in the second or third century, and has further suggested that this continuing honor shows the high esteem in which the citizens of Thugga held their generous patron and donor. 829 I suggest, rather, that this statue base, and the honorific statue that it supported, was newly erected for the first time in the late second century. Such a statue, funded publicly and decreed by the same groups who funded the honorific plaque for the current donors, brought the earlier patron back into the public eye and tied his work, construction of the macellum, to their renovation of the structure and its adjacent areas. 830

827 C. Poinssot 1969, 223.
828 C. Poinssot 1969, text F, 223-225 and fig. 5.
829 C. Poinssot 1969, 225.
830 C. Poinssot 1969, text F, 223-225 and fig. 5; Maurin and Saint-Amans in DFH, 97 no. 34.
The final element of the donations in the east forum area, the statue dedicated to Mercury that was erected in the apse of the *macellum*, bore some resemblance to the works of the other donors in this space. Modius Rusticus and his son participated—in a small way—in a much larger scheme to renovate the space, connecting their small efforts to the larger renovation scheme in several ways. First, the dedication to Mercury links the *macellum* even more intimately with the other buildings in the area where the god’s cult was celebrated: the buildings of the *flamines* to the north and east of the *macellum*. The apse of the *macellum*, where Mercury’s statue was probably placed, was built on the same axis as the Temple of Mercury, and it aligns directly with the central cella. The topographic and cultic connections emphasized the connections between the donors, Modius Rusticus and Pacuvius Saturus and Nahania Victoria. In this way a quite modest donation of a single cult statue became part of a much larger project, and the donors’ names became associated with both. The association worked both ways: Modius Rusticus became connected with the much more generous building project financed by Pacuvius and Nahania, while Pacuvius and Nahania’s benefaction seemed to include an additional largess in the form of a cult statue in the *macellum*.

The works of these late second-century donors responded to an urban environment that had already been largely formed by the ideas of previous benefactors. In crafting their architectural identity, Pacuvius Saturus, Nahania Victoria, Modius Rusticus, and Modius Licinianus relied on the identities of those donors who had already contributed to the urban infrastructure in the central city, much in the way that the Ummidii, donors of the Shrine of Concordia Panthea at Gigthis, did: adding their

---

831 Though no cost was recorded in the text of Mercury’s statue (no. 71), Vinnicius Genialis’ cult statue of Minerva (see ch. V.4.b. The Temple of Minerva I, supra p. 172, inscription no. 33) cost 9500 HS, and we might expect a cost on a similar scale for the donation of the Modii; Duncan-Jones (1982, 78) recorded a median cost for statues around 5000 HS.
meaning to the whole, but not directing the shape of the urban space in the same way that earlier donors at Thugga, like Gabinius Felix Faustinanus, donor of the forum porticoes, had done.

Like earlier benefactors, the Pacuvii created an identity that was enmeshed with Thugga’s previous history. First and early second-century donors had done this by focusing their buildings on the Shrine of Massinissa in the northeast corner of the forum.832 With the construction of the Capitolium, however, that earlier shrine had been supplanted both in topographic influence and also in meaning. The Temple of Mercury and the renovated porticus of the macellum followed the alignment of the Capitolium and looked not to Thugga’s pre-Roman past for their inspiration, but to the early days of the city’s Roman community. The honorific statue of Licinius Rufus (no. 72) erected at the time of the building program of the Pacuvii reinforced an association that the Pacuvii themselves sought, connecting them with the familia of that important first-century donor and marking them as heirs to the Licinii.

4. Concluding Thoughts

The second century, particularly beginning in the reign of Hadrian (118 C.E.) and continuing through the reign of Commodus (192 C.E.), shaped Thugga’s urban space into a recognizably Roman-style town. But this reshaping was funded almost exclusively by private donations from its citizens. As they had done in the early first century, individual benefactors played a crucial role in creating an urban environment and imbuing it with meaning.

[832 See ch. V.2. The First Benefactions in the Forum, supra p. 142 and V.3. The Licinii in the Area East of the Forum, supra p. 159.]
First-century donors had already elaborated the city’s central core, and in the later first and early second centuries donors sought to delimit the edges of Thugga’s urban area through new buildings. This process had begun already with Vinnicius Genialis’ Temple of Minerva I in the Flavian period, and it accelerated in the second century with the donation of Julia Paula Laenatiana’s Temple of Minerva II (nos. 49-51) on the city’s northwestern edge and with the construction of Lucius Calpurnius’ monument of Dar Lacchab (the Temple of Aesculapius?), in the southern area of the city (no. 52). The theater of Marcius Quadratus (nos. 57-60), built at the eastern extremity of the ridge, also followed this pattern, extending and marking out the urban space. Each of these structures may have marked only a temporary limit to the urban environment, as later constructions, both privately- and publicly-financed, crowded around them.\textsuperscript{833}

I argued above, in chapter five,\textsuperscript{834} that the increasing prominence of “official” euergetism—that is, donations \textit{ob honorem}, in response to an office like the municipal flaminate—marked a reality of life in Roman Thugga: that the city could not depend on families offering multiple donations over generations. Their response to this was to encourage (or require) donations in response to offices, and the result in the second century was a major overhaul of the urban environment. Such official donations included the Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury (no. 34), the \textit{templa} of the Gabinii (nos. 37-41), the Temple of Minerva II (no. 49-51), the Temple of Aesculapius? (no. 52), the theater (nos. 57-60), and the Temple of Mercury, \textit{area macelli}, and renovation of the \textit{macellum} (nos. 64 and 68). Few of these structures’ inscriptions made any implicit promise of additional euergetism through the naming of younger

\textsuperscript{833} See ch. VII.2.c. The Temple of the Victories of Caracalla, infra p. 279, and ch. VII.2.d. The Circus, infra p. 284, for discussion of these buildings constructed near Dar Lacchab and the Temple of Minerva II; I have mentioned already (ch. VI.3.d. Capitolium and Theater, supra p. 223) the third-century construction of the Temple of Sol in an insula near the theater.

\textsuperscript{834} See ch. V.5. Concluding Thoughts, supra p. 176.
family members, as the first-century donors had regularly done, suggesting that the appearance of familial commitment to additional benefactions was no longer of great importance to the community at Thugga.

Indeed, the successful implementation of an “official” tradition of euergetism seems to have largely supplanted such a voluntary tradition of benefaction. It did not, however, replace that tradition entirely, nor devalue the importance of familial support and participation in building donations. The story of second-century euergetism at Thugga is one of two co-mingled traditions: official euergetism by individuals, and voluntary donations by family groups. Donations at Thugga that may not have been prompted by office-holding include the Temple of Pietas (no. 36), the forum porticoes (no. 48), and the Capitolium (nos. 54-55). In these building dedications, multiple members or generations of a family featured prominently: two brothers built the Temple of Pietas; a father built the forum porticoes in the name of his children; and father and son together constructed the Capitolium. These building inscriptions, and the implicit promise memorialized there, echoed the works of Thugga’s early first-century donors. The result of those promises may have also echoed the earlier ones: only in the case of the Gabinii did euergetism, voluntary or otherwise, develop into a long-term family pattern. Other familial efforts, like the striking buildings of the Marcii, the Capitolium and theater, may have followed the pattern established by the Licinii in the mid-first century, with multiple buildings in a single generation and then no further contributions to the city’s urban development. One cannot help but wonder whether the costs of the first generation’s donations precluded additional benefactions in later years.

Whether the donors participated in a long familial tradition or offered a single addition to the urban landscape, they did so in the context of a meaningful and communicative environment. Donors regularly considered the meanings expressed by
the buildings around them and sought to create connections between those meanings and their own. This sometimes took the form of elite competition, as in the case of the auditorium of the Gabinii and the later, and larger, theater built by Marcius Quadratus, which employed similar descriptive language to describe both buildings in their dedicatory inscriptions and invited comparison between the appointments of the two structures. This also could take the form of association, when a donor sought to connect his own modest efforts to a larger building program, such as happened between the statue of Mercury, Genius Macelli of the Modii (no. 71) and the building program of Pacuvius Saturus and Nahania Victoria (nos. 64, 68). This connection also looked to Thugga’s past, with donors declaring themselves, through their buildings’ dedications, topographic connections, or architecture, heirs to earlier donors. This happened regularly in the second century, from Maedius Lentulus’ Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury to the renovation program of Pacuvius Saturus and Nahania Victoria. But as the century progressed, the connections between Thugga’s past and its present shifted so that by the end of the second century those connections were focused on Thugga’s early Roman heritage rather than its pre-Roman history.

Donors also sought to reaffirm connections between Thugga and Carthage. This became particularly evident in the later second century, when Carthage saw massive renovation in its central areas after a damaging fire. Though Thugga had not, apparently, experienced any such cataclysm, nevertheless its forum received a major facelift patterned after Carthage’s. The result of this extensive program of renovation at the urban core was the creation of a unified central space, one that must have looked much like the civic center of Carthage on the Byrsa hill, with colonnades and new official buildings on every side.
The creation of new civic spaces for public interaction also created new opportunities for the development of collective memory. Maintaining a civic memory of the generosity of donors appears to have become an important consideration for the citizens of Thugga, particularly in response to creation of new spaces for gathering and entertainment. Thus, the auditorium and tempa of the Gabinii, the theater, and the renovated area macelli became sites not only of public gathering but also of public recognition of the donors and their families. This practice of erecting public statues in honor of donors apparently developed only in the second century, but it became important enough that the citizens of Thugga applied it retroactively to the first-century donor and patron Licinius Rufus. The honor of public statues appears to have been reserved for those who contributed significant amenities to the city, structures that changed both the urban landscape and the daily patterns of urban life. Thus, the Gabinii who built Thugga’s first theatrical area received honorific statues erected nearby (nos. 42-47). A few decades later, the donors of the Capitolium and the theater, whose buildings remade both the center of the city and one of its margins, received similar honorific statues for their work, erected inside the theater (nos. 61-63). The donors of the renovated area macelli received recognition (no. 67) at the same time as the earlier donor of the macellum, Licinius Rufus (no. 72). But public recognition with inscriptions and statues appears to have been reserved for donations with major impact, not just major expense. A similar pattern was visible at Sabratha, for example, where Flavius Tullus received multiple honorific inscriptions following his donation of an aqueduct and twelve fountains around the urban area.835 Though at other sites (like Gigthis) donors of

835 See ch. III.3.a. The Aqueduct and Fountains of Flavius Tullus, supra p. 100.
temples also received statues in public locations,\textsuperscript{836} at Thugga, construction of temples and cult statues did not merit the public honor of a statue and inscribed base, although in some such cases the donations were undoubtedly costly. Beginning in the second-century, public commemoration of euergetism at Thugga underscored the impact of such donations on public life. Inscribed statue bases and repeated images of benefactors and their family members reinforced the messages of connection between those elite individuals and the city, a process that continued as Thugga’s urban space continued to evolve in the third century.

\textsuperscript{836} See ch. II.2.a. The Temple of Mercury, supra p. 41 and ch. II.2.b. The Shrine of Concordia Panthea, supra p. 51.
CHAPTER SEVEN:
THE SEVERAN PERIOD, THE THIRD CENTURY C.E., AND EUERGETISM IN THE
CHRISTIAN PERIOD AT THUGGA

1. Introduction

In the Severan period, multiple donors contributed new buildings to Thugga’s urban layout (fig. 71), demonstrating many of the same concerns that had been important to their predecessors. Official donations related to municipal office-holding played a continuing role in the development of the urban landscape; euergetism unconnected to office may have ceased completely by the late second century, so that official buildings constituted the overwhelming majority of third-century offerings. Donors still sought to make connections with Thugga’s past as well as its future and to respond to the works of previous benefactors with their own structures. In the third century, the changes that those structures wrought had less impact on the urban landscape than donations of previous centuries, however, and the donations of this era focused especially on the urban margins rather than on new constructions in the built-up center. As the third century progressed, fewer new donations appeared in the urban landscape, but donors continued to participate in the renovation and repair of public space, not all of which was undertaken at public expense.

The Christian period is not well-represented at Thugga, but euergetism continued to play a role in the development of the urban environment, even at that late date. Though official euergetism disappeared, the importance to donors of expressing their identity through both epigraphic and visual media persisted. The maintenance of the tradition of euergetism at Thugga demonstrates how important the practice was to the creation of the public urban environment throughout the Roman period and beyond.
2. The Severan Period

Euergetism at Thugga in the Severan period (193-238 C.E.) kept pace with the donations of previous decades, and continued the patterns that were visible in the Antonine period, particularly with regard to the importance of the flaminate and the role of official euergetism. Unlike the second-century builders, donors of the Severan period focused more extensively on the city’s margins, extending the urban area through new construction and new elaboration of sites already in use.

a. The Temple of Saturn

The Temple of Saturn, perched on the edge of the plateau at the city’s northeastern edge, stood apart from the urban core. Unlike the Temple of Saturn at Ammaedara, this Temple of Saturn was still part of the urban environment, and it participated in Thugga’s tradition of euergetism in several meaningful ways. As a temple dedicated to a deity with a long tradition in Roman Africa, the Temple of Saturn connected powerfully and overtly with Thugga’s past. And as an official donation, the Temple and its donor responded to the works of other recent donors including Julia Paula Laenatiana, Marcius Quadratus, and Pacuvius Saturus and Nahania Victoria.

The remains of the Temple of Saturn stand far to the northeast of the city, about 160 m north of the theater, outside the ancient city walls. The site has a complex history, which has been studied in several different excavation campaigns.\(^{837}\) These several excavations revealed evidence of a long occupation, beginning in the second century B.C.E., when the temple was an open-air sanctuary dedicated to Baal.\(^{838}\) The evidence

---

\(^{837}\) Excavations and study included work by Carton in the 1890s, by L. Poinssot in the 1920s, and by C. Poinssot in 1954.

\(^{838}\) The location(s) of worship for Baal Saturn have posed a problem of interpretation for more than a century, stemming from the discovery of multiple inscriptions mentioning cult places of the god. At
recovered from this phase of the temple’s history includes votive stelae inscribed in neo-Punic, and other artifacts dedicated to Baal.\textsuperscript{839} Pensabene compared this phase of the sanctuary to a Tophet, a traditional Punic sanctuary site.\textsuperscript{840} Most of the evidence of this early phase came from two \textit{favissae} in the temple’s courtyard, in which the stelae and other artifacts were placed during a later renovation of the building; other artifacts from this period were reused in later walls in the sanctuary.\textsuperscript{841} Activity continued at the site during the first and second centuries C.E., as abundant stelae found in the \textit{favissae} demonstrate.\textsuperscript{842}

In its second phase,\textsuperscript{843} the sanctuary was renovated into the three-\textit{cellae}-courtyard (African-style) temple that was popular at Thugga (e.g. the \textit{Templa} of the Gabinii, the temple of Tellus, and the Temple of Mercury; fig. 72).\textsuperscript{844} The complex faced northeast, looking away from Thugga’s urban core out over the valley. The sanctuary’s porticoed courtyard was large (approximately 31 m x 26 m); its entryway, added later on the east

---

\textsuperscript{839} LeGlay 1961, 210; C. Poinssot 1955.
\textsuperscript{840} Pensabene 1989, 255.
\textsuperscript{841} LeGlay 1961, 210; Carton 1896, 397.
\textsuperscript{842} LeGlay 1961, 210; Poinssot and Lantier 1941-1942b.
\textsuperscript{843} Saint-Amans (2004, 349-351) prefers to see all of these inscriptions as deriving from multiple phases of a single temple, this one in the eastern part of the city. I have deep reservations about the likelihood that spolia from this suburban temple would travel as far as the forum, for use in the fortress wall, and about the possibility that work at this temple site in the first century would have been recorded on inscriptions erected near the forum. Therefore, I prefer, for now, to accept the two-temple solution that places cult activity for Saturn (Baal) in both the forum and in this suburban sanctuary.

\textsuperscript{844} Poinssot and Lantier 1941-1942a.
side of the complex, enclosed the sanctuary and restricted access to the space. The courtyard was paved, and its portico was supported by Corinthian columns. A large benefactory inscription placed as the colonna’s frieze named the donor of the renovation. The blocks of the frieze were discovered in the courtyard of the temple; they were originally erected above the colonnade on the south, west, and north sides of the portico, opposite the enclosed entryway. The text is inscribed in a single line on 27 limestone lintels (of which 22 are extant). In total, the reconstructed inscription measures more than 66 m in length, with letters, painted red, 16.5 cm tall.

73. (South portico): Pro salute Imp(eratoris) Caesaris L(uci) Septimi Severi Pertinacis Aug(usti) Parthici Arabic[i] Parthici Adiaben[i] co(n)s(ulis) III co(n)s(ulis) II p(atris) p(atriae) [et Decimi Clodii Septimi Albini Caes(aris)] et Iul[iae] [Domnae Au(gustae)] matris castrorum opus templi Saturnii

(West portico): quod L(ucius) O(ctavius) Victor Roscianus [---] ex summa honoris [---]

(North portico): taxatis HS quinquaginta mili(b/us) n(ummmum) m[---] Julis suis ad perficiendum id opus HS centum mill(ia) n(umnum) legavit qu[a] summa ab heredibus [sol]uta et publice inlata pagus et civitas Thuggensis d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) dedicavit.

For the health of Emperor Caesar Lucius Septimius Severus Pertinax Augustus, conqueror of the Parthians of Arabia, conqueror of the Parthians of Assyria, chief priest, with tribunician power for the third time, consul for the second time, father of the fatherland, and of Decimus Clodius Septimius Albinus Caesar, and of Julia Domna, Augusta, mother of the army. The work of the temple of Saturn, which Lucius Octavius Victor Roscianus [had promised to build] out of a summa honoraria, [along with] an assessment of 50,000 sesterces, ... he left in his will an additional 100,000 sesterces for the purpose of finishing this project, with which amount, collected by his heirs and transferred to the public treasure, the pagus and the civitas of Thugga dedicated this building by a decree of the decurions.

---

845 Pensabene 1989, 258.
846 Pensabene 1989, 258; Carton 1896, 379.
847 DFH, 111 no. 38.
848 Carton 1896, 379-381.
849 DFH, no. 38; CIL, 26498; Poinssot 1909b, no. 18.
At the eastern side of the sanctuary lie three rectangular *cellae*, all with the same basic dimensions; those on the ends have a small apse in the back.\(^{850}\) Finds from the sanctuary, in addition to the Neo-Punic stelae from the favissa, included a sculpted head (made of marble) of a male figure wearing a mural crown, recovered in the southern *cella*. Previous excavations had revealed a togate statue body, also carved in marble, that belongs with the sculpted head (fig. 73a).\(^{851}\) Poinssot identified the statue as a representation of the *Genius Thuggensis*, perhaps with portrait features of a benefactor; the *Genius Thuggensis* probably had a cult space in the southern *cella*, since that is where the statue was discovered.\(^{852}\) The central *cella* was probably the central cult space for the worship of Saturn; fragments of a life-sized statue of Saturn, in white marble, were found in a cistern in the courtyard of the sanctuary (fig. 73b).\(^{853}\) The cult statue and other objects from the temple may have been deliberately placed in the cistern when the temple went out of use, probably by the end of the fourth century.\(^{854}\) At that time, some of its blocks were used as building material for a nearby Christian church.\(^{855}\)

The imperial titulature of the portico’s dedicatory inscription, which gives the tribunician and consular years of the emperor Septimius Severus, indicate that the portico was dedicated early in the reign of the emperor, probably in the years 194-195, when he held the third tribunician power. Another indication of the relatively early date of the building is the name, erased but still legible on the stone, of the Caesar Decimus Clodius Albinus, whom Septimius Severus defeated in 195 C.E.\(^{856}\) The statue of Saturn, found in the cistern of the courtyard, dates stylistically to the late second or

\(^{850}\) Pensabene 1989, 259; LeGlay 1961, 211-212.
\(^{851}\) C. Poinssot 1955, 49; Carton 1896, 386-387 and fig. 9.
\(^{852}\) Pensabene 1989, 262; C. Poinssot 1955, 49-74 (esp. 74); Carton 1896, 386-387 and fig. 9.
\(^{853}\) C. Poinssot 1955, 32-36: the fragments included a head, right arm, and both feet; LeGlay 1961, 212 no. 1.
\(^{854}\) C. Poinssot 1955, 32 and fn 4.
\(^{855}\) See this ch. VII.4.a. The Church of Victoria, infra p. 309; Saint-Amans 2004, 352; see also Poinssot and Lantier 1925a, 231.
\(^{856}\) *DFH*, 113 no. 38; Kienast 1996, 161.
early third centuries C.E., bearing resemblances to the statue of Lucius Verus found in the theater of Thugga, and to portraits of the emperor Septimius Severus. Thus several lines of evidence point to an extensive project of renovation and improvement in the late second century C.E., most likely funded by the donation of Octavius Victor Roscianus.

Octavius Victor Roscianus was a citizen of Thugga; his name appeared, with that of his wife Venustina, in an earlier dedicatory inscription of another shrine at Thugga, probably during the time of Commodus. The dedicatory inscription from the Temple of Saturn states that he made the donation as payment for election to office, “ex summa honoris;” Benzina Ben Abdallah has suggested that the office, whose name is missing from the preserved text of the inscription, was probably the flaminate or another high position. The benefactor did not live to see the results of his donation, however; the inscription also mentions that he designated in his will an additional sum of 100,000 sesterces to be used to complete the project, “ad perficiendum id opus HS centum mil(ia) n(ummum) legavit.” The text of the inscription, fragmentary as it is, indicates that Octavius Victor Roscianus participated in the tradition of official euergetism at Thugga, a tradition that, as we have seen, played a critical role in forming the urban environment, especially during the second century.

Victor Roscianus began this construction project, apparently, as a response to two different building traditions. He participated, but only tangentially, in the building activity that was appropriate for flamen: constructing a temple with a courtyard, as had

857 C. Poinssot 1955, 36: he notes the “emploi abusif et presque exclusif” of the running drill in creating the curls of hair and beard.
858 No archaeological remains, however, have been associated with this donation. The text is CIL, 26500: Pro salute(m) Imperatoris Caesaris M(arci) Aure(i) Commodi Antonini(?) | L(ucius) Octavius Victor Roscianus | Venustinae uxoris suae | deauravit et aedem M...
859 Benzina Ben Abdallah in DFH, 113 no. 38.
become the norm at Thugga over the past century.\textsuperscript{860} His donation encompassed an enormous sum of money, at least 150,000 sesterces, as the inscription records.\textsuperscript{861} The donation was, therefore, appropriately lavish for one who wished to participate in the tradition of increasingly expensive donations. Roscianus, however, did not provide any additional funds to celebrate the day of the temple’s dedication, as several of his predecessors had done. And his heirs chose to participate only minimally in the execution of the donation after his death; they passed the money and the responsibility for the project both to the \textit{pagus} and the \textit{civitas}, and allowed the \textit{pagus} and \textit{civitas} to dedicate the building. The heirs’ reluctance to complete Roscianus’ donation shows clearly in the fact that their names are not listed in the text of the inscription. This further suggests a complete or nearly complete separation between the tradition of official euergetism at Thugga and the familial tradition of benefactions that some families had sought to establish and that the Gabinii successfully implemented.

The other important tradition to which Victor Roscianus responded was the long history of the cult of Saturn at the site where he built his temple. Earlier cult activity on the eastern slopes of Thugga’s plateau dictated the choice of building site and the orientation of the sanctuary and its \textit{cellae}, and probably the presence of the unusual rooms on the southern side of the portico as well (see fig. 72). Some features of cult activity at the site may have been added during Roscianus’ renovation, such as the worship of the Genius Thuggensis (for which there is no previous evidence at this site). But the overall shape and site of the Temple of Saturn respond not to the actions and efforts of other known individuals, but rather to the strong tradition of worship of a  

\textsuperscript{860} Maedia Lentula (perhaps); the Gabinii; Julia Paula Laenatiana; Lucius Calpurnius (perhaps); and even, in a sense, Pacuvius Saturus and Nahania Victoria, who certainly built both a temple and a porticus. See ch. VI.3.e. The East Forum Area, the \textit{Macellum}, and the Temple of Mercury, supra p. 241.

\textsuperscript{861} The cost is one of the highest recorded at Thugga (\textit{DFH}, 113-114, no. 38), but by the early third century it may not have been an unusually large contribution; the construction of the theater probably cost at least double that amount (see ch. VI.3.d. Capitolium and Theater, supra p. 223).
particular deity. This response to earlier tradition sets the Temple of Saturn in a class of its own at Thugga, and makes this building comparable to other sites with long histories of cult, such as the Temple of Saturn at Ammaedara.\footnote{See ch. II.3.a. The Temple of Saturn, supra p. 64.} Donations to Saturn, a deity particularly favored in the African provinces, connected the donors intimately with the past through traditions of worship that had existed in the landscape for centuries. At the same time, a donation to this deity in response to an official position—especially if the donation came in response to the imperial priesthood, the flaminate—emphasized the importance of more recent cultural practices; this may have been the genesis of the worship of Genius Thuggensis, a figure wearing a Roman toga, in the space originally dedicated primarily to Baal – Saturn.

The nature of this particular donation, as a testamentary gift, provides an opportunity to study how the city responded to this gift and nuanced the messages of continuity and tradition that Victor Roscianus communicated through his donation. I have already mentioned that the pagus and civitas dedicated the building after Victor Roscianus’ heirs transferred money into the public treasury. The dedicatory inscription of the portico (no. 73) featured Roscianus’ name near the left end of the western portico, directly opposite the entryway, much more prominently than it featured the name of the deity, whose name was inscribed near the right end of the southern lintel (a position that would render it difficult if not impossible to see on first glance). The pagus and the civitas followed a practice like that of other donors, placing the donor’s name in a prominent position, just as, for example, Julia Paula Laenatiana had done with her inscription in the Temple of Minerva II.\footnote{See ch. VI.3.b. The Temple of Minerva II, supra p. 212.}
Poinssot has suggested that the face of the statue of *Genius Thuggensis* could be a portrait of a benefactor, though he identified that benefactor as one other than Victor Roscianus.\(^{864}\) The fact that Victor Roscianus may not have received a statue in honor of his donation follows a pattern that we have already noted:\(^{865}\) public statues were apparently erected only for donors who had the greatest impact on the development of the urban landscape at Thugga. Its presence at the site also suggests that the Temple of Saturn became another locus for clusters of *euergetism* after Victor Roscianus' donation, just like the forum, the *area macelli*, and the theater had done before.

b. The Rostra of Asicia Victoria

Though many of the donations of the Severan period focused on the edges of the city, the gift of Asicia Victoria embellished further the center of Thugga's urban space, the forum, but its physical footprint was apparently quite small in comparison to its urban impact. The donor built it as a coda, or perhaps even an afterthought, to accompany a large and extremely generous financial contribution to the city's treasury; improving the Rostra, it seems, was a way for the donor to participate nominally in the “normal” pattern of benefaction in the city.

The primary evidence for this benefaction comes from an inscription, found in the early excavations in the forum: two pieces were found just south of the Capitol, while the third fragment came from the area west of the Capitol (that is, near the shrine of Massinissa; see fig. 74).\(^{866}\) The text is written in letters 11 cm tall on two limestone blocks, 181-190 cm long and each about 95 cm tall and 22-27 cm deep. The function of the blocks, or where they were intended to be displayed, is unclear; perhaps they were

\(^{864}\) On the grounds that the statue appears later in date than the temple (C. Poinssot 1955, 72-74 and n. 192).

\(^{865}\) See ch. VI.4. Concluding Thoughts, supra p. 256.

\(^{866}\) Poinssot 1906, 254-255 no. 113; Poinssot 1907, ccxix-ccxx.
set up as a facing for the exterior of the rostra (?), because the blocks are rather shallower than other statue bases from Thugga.⁸⁶⁷

74. Res publica municipii
Septimi Aureli Liber
Thugg(ensis) cancellos
aereos quos
Asi[c]ia Victo[rial] fl(aminica) p(erpetua) h(onestae) m(emoriae) f(eminia)
[ad] ornamentum rostrorum
ex poll(icitatione) HS XX (milibus) n(ummum) fieri voluit
additis a se quattuor can
cellis ampliata pecunia ded(icavit).⁸⁶⁸

The city of Municipium Septimius Aurelius Liber Thugga dedicated the bronze balustrades which Asicia Victoria, perpetual flaminica, a woman of noble memory, wished to be built to embellish the rostra, with her promised funds of 20,000 sesterces. The municipium built these four balustrades itself, with additional monies.

Archaeological evidence for the rostra in the forum is minimal. The topographical excavations of the early twentieth century revealed structures immediately west of the Capitolium that were initially identified as a tribunal or rostra.⁸⁶⁹ More recent research has revealed that the structures immediately west of the Capitolium, built at a lower level than the forum porticoes, represent the remains of the shrine of Massinissa,⁸⁷⁰ not the rostra embellished by Asicia Victoria. The location of the rostra has, since then, been a matter of speculation (fig. 74). C. Poinssot suggested that it was the podium at the south-east corner of the forum, just south of the steps leading down from the Capitolium to the forum;⁸⁷¹ others have labeled as a “tribunal” a small rectangular structure on the northern side of the forum area, just south of the course of the portico.⁸⁷² No trace of the bronze balustrades themselves has ever come to light.

---

⁸⁶⁷ Compare no. 61, the statue base of Marcius Maximus, which is 60 cm deep.
⁸⁶⁸ Poinssot 1913-1916, 190-192 no. 80; CIL, 26593; ILAfr 534b; AÉpig 1908, 163; Poinssot 1909b, 159-161 no. 85.
⁸⁶⁹ Poinssot 1919, 179-180; Merlin 1908, ccxxvi; Poinssot 1907, ccxxix-ccxxx; Poinssot 1909b, ccxi-ccxii.
⁸⁷⁰ Khanoussi 2003, 140-142 and fig. 6.
⁸⁷¹ C. Poinssot 1958, 39 and fig. 2, structure “r.”
⁸⁷² Tribunal on the north side of the forum: central area plan, Institut National du Patrimoine (2008c).
Given the findspot of the inscription, it seems likely that the rostra were built in the forum, but their exact location remains uncertain.\textsuperscript{873}

The text of the rostra inscription provides a date for the dedication, in the time after Thugga was elevated to municipium status under the emperor Septimius Severus, an event that occurred in the year 205; the renovation of the rostra must have taken place in 205 or later, since this inscription makes no mention of the double community (pagus and civitas) into which the municipal community had been divided for centuries.\textsuperscript{874} Asicia Victoria’s purpose in erecting the bronze balustrades is unclear, though the text mentioned her position as fl(eminica) p(erpetuua) and we might assume that the 20,000 HS she designated for the ornamentation of the rostra served as (part of) her summa honoraria for the office. The sum, however, was not sufficient to complete the bronze balustrades: the city treasury added additional funds to finish the project (“ampliata pecunia”), and the city dedicated the structure and erected the inscription (no. 74). The fact that the city completed the dedication of the building, like it had done with the Temple of Saturn after the death of Victor Roscianus,\textsuperscript{875} and the use of the phrase “h(onestae) m(emoriae) f(eminae), a woman of noble memory,” to describe Asicia Victoria in the inscription, suggest that she may have died before completing her promise to renovate the rostra of the city.

Though I have suggested that honorific statues were granted only to donors who made major impacts on the urban landscape, Asicia Victoria’s case challenges that assumption, if our evidence preserves a full record of her work in the city. Two honorific inscriptions for this woman, on statue bases, have come to light, and they offer

\textsuperscript{873} At Gighis, Constans (1916, 36-37) identified a tribunal in the south portico adjacent to the basilica as the rostra. This may provide some support for Poinssot’s hypothesis that the rostra at Thugga was located in the southeast corner of the forum, near the basilica.
\textsuperscript{874} C. Poinssot 1958, 12; see also ch. IV.1. The Site of Thugga in Africa Proconsularis, supra p. 129.
\textsuperscript{875} See this ch. VII.2.a. The Temple of Saturn, supra p. 263, inscription no. 73.
significant additional information about her role as a benefactor to the city of Thugga. Unlike earlier donors, Asicia Victoria did not build a new structure; her donation for the bronze balustrades of the rostra was not consecrated to any particular deity; it did not make significant reference to Thugga’s past. Its sole purpose was to elaborate a minor, existing civic structure. But Asicia Victoria’s main donation was not, in fact, the bronze balustrades of the rostra, but rather a large monetary gift, for which she received the honorific statues.

The first, a limestone statue base, was found reused, in the courtyard of a house east of the Temple of Aesculapius? (Dar Lacchab). It is nearly complete, with a total height of 1.53 m and width of 53 cm. The letters of the first four lines are 5 cm, those in lines 5-6 are 4 cm, and lines 7-10 are 3-3.5 cm tall.

75. Asiciae Victoriae
Fl(aminicae) Thuggenses ob munificentiam (!) et singula
rem liberalitatem eius
in rem p(ublicam) quae ob flamonium
[V]ibiae Asicianes fil(iae) suae HS C
mil(ia) n(ummum) pollicitast ex quorum re
decurionibus darentur d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)
utriusque ordinis posuer(unt).\(^{876}\)

To Asicia Victoria, flaminicia, on account of her munificence and unique generosity toward the state. She promised, in response to the flaminate of Vibia Asicia, her daughter, 100,000 sesterces, from the return on which sum theatrical performances and sportulae would be given to the decurions. The people of Thugga, by a decree of the decurions of each order, set this up.

A second limestone statue base, 89 cm tall and around 150 cm wide, 32 cm deep, was found in fragments, most of which were found in the area of the theater.\(^{877}\) The stone is inscribed with two side-by-side texts. The letters of text A are 6 cm tall, slightly larger than those of text B, which are 5 cm tall.

\(^{876}\) CIL, 26590.
\(^{877}\) DFH, 188 no. 73; Carton 1902, 97.
76. A. Vibia[e Asicia]neti
fl(aminicae) perp[etuae] et
disciplina[e singul]aris
statuam qua[m u]terq(ue)
ordo decre[ve]rat
res publ(ica) mun(icipii) [T]hugg(ensis)
posui[t]

B. Asiciae V[i]ctoriae coniugi [---]V[---]A[---]
ob munifi[c]entiam lib[er]a[l]e[m et singulare[m in cives suos]
et patriam [su]am quae probo a[ni]mo et exim[io exemplo prae
ter summa[m] flamontii perp(etui) sui honorar[iam ampliatam]
etiam filiae [su]ae Asicianes singulari s[plendore ob flam(onium)]
HS C mil(ibus) n(ummum) patriae suae donaverit ex [quorum re
dec(urionibus)]
utriusq(ue) [o]rdi[nis sportulae curiis e[pulas et uni
ero]
portuq[g]y[mnasia praesentur lu[dique scaenic] dentur]
statuam q[u]um uteq[ue] ordo decre[v]erat
res publ(ica) mun(icipii) [Se]pt[imi] Aur[eli] lib(e)ri Thugg(ensis) pos[uit].

a. To Vibia Asiciane, perpetual flaminica and a woman of exceptional
learning, the city of Municipium Thugga set up this statue which each
order had decreed.

b. To Asicia Victoria, wife of [?], on account of her lavish and exceptional
generosity toward her fellow citizens and her hometown, a woman of
noble spirit and exceptional virtue, in addition to increasing the summa
honoraria of her own perpetual flaminate, who moreover, with an
exceptional degree of lavishness, gave to her hometown 100,000 sesterces
for the flaminate of her daughter Asiciane, from the interest on which
sum, sportulae will be offered to the decurions of each order, banquets to
the members of the curiae, and oil for the baths to the whole citizenry, and
theatrical productions will be given. The city of Municipium Thugga set
up this statue which each order had decreed.

In addition to these publicly-decreed texts, a statue base for the father of Asicia
Victoria, Asicius Adiutor, paid for by Asicia Victoria and her husband, came to light in
the excavations of the theater. A third statue base for Asicia Victoria herself, erected

---

878 DFH 188-192 no. 73; CIL, 26591; ILTun 1427; Poinssot 1906, 259-260 no. 120.
879 CIL, 26580, DFH, 186-187 no. 71: Asicio Adiutori | statuam publice | decretam | M(arcus) Vibius Felix
Mar|cianus et Asicia | [V]ictoria|alcius | [--- op]timo. To Asicius Adiutor, a statue decreed by
the public. Marcus Vibius Felix Marcianus and Asicia Victoria, his wife, [to an] excellent [father].

-274-
by her grandson, was found in a reuse context near the Temple of Saturn.\footnote{CIL, 26592, DFH, 187-188 no. 72: [As]ciae Vict[or]iae | aviae | [---]ius Minervian[us] | [pal]tronus pagi [et] | [c]ivilitatis posuit. To Asicia Victoria, his grandmother, [---]ius Minervianus, patron of the pagus and the civitas, set this up.} Taken together with the rostra inscription (no. 74), these honorific texts are tremendously important for contextualizing Asicia Victoria’s gift and her place in Thugga’s society of benefactors.

These statue bases help to clarify the date at which Asicia Victoria gave her donation to the city, because they mention both the double community, the pagus and the civitas, and the res publica of the municipium. Victoria had specified that the decurions of each order (i.e. civitas and pagus both) would receive sportulae from the interest on her gift. The statue associated with inscription no. 75 was erected by the decurions of both orders, while in inscription no. 76, the decurions of each order decreed that they would erect a statue, and the combined government carried out the recommendation (“statuam q[u]am uterq(ue) ordo decr[everat] res p(ublica) mun(icipii) [Se]pt(imi) Aur(eli) lib(eri) Thugg(ensis) pos[uit.”) Following Aounallah and Maurin, the shifting municipal structures evidenced by these texts indicated that Asicia Victoria’s gift was probably given in 204-205 C.E., and the statues erected shortly thereafter (205-206); the statue of no. 75, for Asicia Victoria alone, probably was erected earlier than the statues of the donor and her daughter recorded in no. 76.\footnote{DFH, 192 no. 73.}

Her benefaction was one of the most generous recorded at Thugga at that time: 100,000 sesterces in addition to the summae honorariae for two flaminate positions, her own and her daughter’s; this may have been the 20,000 sesterces promised for the balustrades of the rostra (no. 74). Other previous donations had matched or exceeded
that sum.\textsuperscript{882} The difference in this case was that Asicia Victoria gave money to the city’s treasury directly, rather than erecting another public building. The honorific texts (nos. 75-76) indicate that some of the annual income was reserved for regular donations to various groups (the decurions, the \textit{curiae}, and the citizenry) and for specific purposes (money handouts, banquets, oil for the baths, theatrical productions), but presumably the remainder of the income—probably not inconsequential, given the size of the endowment—would have been available to the civic treasury for necessary expenses.\textsuperscript{883} This type of endowed gift contrasts sharply with the previous donations of earlier benefactors at Thugga, who spent lavishly on large buildings. Like the donation of Flavius Tullus at Sabratha, which included both a physical gift—the twelve fountains and aqueduct—and an endowment for the maintenance of the water supply,\textsuperscript{884} the monetary donation of Asicia Victoria must have had a considerable impact on the city’s future development.

The celebrations associated with Asicia Victoria’s gift—sportulae, banquets, gymnasia, games—seem to have been, by the early third century, quite traditional parts of the benefactions given by \textit{flamines} in Thugga, since many of the priests of recent decades had made similar celebrations in honor of their donations.\textsuperscript{885} Even endowed foundations were not unknown at Thugga, as Pacuvius Saturus had set up one to celebrate the anniversary of his building dedications.\textsuperscript{886} But Pacuvius Saturus spent a

\textsuperscript{882} E.g. Lucius Calpurnius, 150,000 HS for the temple of Aesculapius (?) (see ch. VI.3.c. The Monument of Dar Lacchab (Temple of Aesculapius ?), supra p. 218) and Victor Roscius, at least 150,000 for the Temple of Saturn (see this ch. VII.2.a. The Temple of Saturn, supra p. 263).

\textsuperscript{883} Duncan-Jones (1982, 81) has estimated a return of 5-12\% annually for endowments, depending on whether the income was based on land usage fees or interest on cash loans. See also Wesch-Klein 1990, 13-23.

\textsuperscript{884} See ch. III.3.a. The Aqueduct and Fountains of Flavius Tullus, supra p. 100.

\textsuperscript{885} See ch. VI.4. Concluding Thoughts, supra p. 256; Victor Roscius did not offer similar celebrations for his donation of the Temple of Saturn, perhaps because he did not actually dedicate the building (see this chapter, VII.2.a. The Temple of Saturn, supra p. 263).

\textsuperscript{886} See ch. VI.3.e. The East Forum Area, the \textit{Macellum}, and the Temple of Mercury, supra p. 241.
large sum (more than 70,000 sesterces) on his temple, and a comparatively small sum
(25,000 sesterces) on his foundation; Asicia Victoria reversed that pattern, with a small
donation for a building but a vast sum put into her endowment.

The texts provide us with very little information about Asicia Victoria’s decision
to spend the bulk of her donation on an endowed foundation rather than a physical
structure. It is unclear whether she chose this unusual arrangement on her own
initiative, or whether her endowment was given in response to a crisis in the city’s
treasury or another donor’s similar gift, or whether she wished to celebrate the
establishment of municipium Thuggensis with a foundation to fund an annual festival.
Whatever the motivation, the end result was a benefaction that had a very small
physical footprint—new bronze screens on an existing rostra in the forum.

The small physical footprint of Asicia Victoria’s huge donation is quite unusual
in the pattern of commemoration for other donors in the city; I have noted that in other
cases, the city erected honorific statues only for what seem to have been the most
important new structures, those that had the greatest impact on the developments of
urban life in the city: the templa and auditorium of the Gabinii, the Capitolium, the
theater, the renovated area macelli and its associated buildings. But the physical impact
of Asicia Victoria’s donation was probably quite minimal, without the major landscape
and lifestyle changes brought about by the other, earlier donors. Nevertheless, she
received three honorific statues, and her father also received a public statue, a pattern of
familial commemoration that we have seen earlier with the families of the Gabinii and
the Marcii. This pattern of honorific statues, mostly at public expense, places Asicia
Victoria in the forefront of Thugga’s donors despite her gift’s small physical footprint.

---

887 See ch. VI.4. Concluding Thoughts, supra p. 256.
Capitolium and Theater, supra p. 223.
The establishment of the foundation must have had a major impact on civic life in the new municipium, even if we are unable to mark it specifically in the urban landscape.

At least one of the statues, along with those of her daughter and her father, was erected in the theater (no. 76; n. 879). We have already seen that the theater served as a central space for civic display from the time immediately after its construction, when the donor of the Capitolium and other notables of Thugga received honorific statues there. The original location of the two statues of Asicia Victoria herself is unclear. The findspot of the first, no. 75, suggests that that statue was probably erected in the central area of the city, not in the theater; we might speculate that the statue was placed in the forum, near the rostra, though this presents some difficulties of chronology. The reuse location of the statue erected by her grandson, in the Temple of Saturn, does not preclude that it may have originally been erected in the theater. At any rate, it is worthwhile to note that Asicia Victoria received more substantial commemorative presence in the city than did many other donors—and this must be related to her unusual style of donation. After all, a gift to the city’s treasury did not come with an inscribable surface on which to advertise her generosity, like the buildings of other benefactors did. Taken in this light, we can see that Asicia Victoria’s donation of the rostra balustrades was perhaps a kind of afterthought that proclaimed her name on a built surface, as a way to participate more fully in the patterns of benefaction that had been developed at Thugga in the preceding decades.

890 Based on the language of the inscriptions, I prefer to see Asicia Victoria’s benefactions in the following order: donation of 100,000 sesterces; erection of central city statue; erection of theater statues; donation of rostra balustrades.
891 Supra n. 880. Blocks from the theater were reused in the construction of the Church of Victoria, adjacent to the Temple of Saturn; see this ch. VII.4.a. The Church of Victoria, supra p. 309.
c. The Temple of the Victories of Caracalla

Though Asicia Victoria’s donation concentrated physically on the center of the city, the gifts of the benefactor Gabinia Hermiona followed more normal patterns of the Severan period building donations at Thugga: she built a temple inside the city, and donated land on the outskirts of the city for the Circus (see fig. 71). Though both these gifts opened new areas of the city to public access, neither did so in a way that significantly changed the urban area; Gabinia Hermiona followed in traditions of benefaction that had been established by her ancestors, but blazed no new ground with her actions. Her donations were rooted in two related traditions: official euergetism and the familial patterns of benefaction maintained by several generations of the Gabinii at Thugga, recalling the city’s past and again connected it into the wider Roman world of the present.

The site of the first of these buildings, a temple, lies to the west of the monument of Dar Lacchab (the Sanctuary of Aesculapius?), in an urban insula about 100 m southwest of the Forum (figs. 71 and 75). The sanctuary occupies a long, narrow space at the northwest corner of the insula (41 m x 14 m), and sits on a podium that compensates for the fall of a hill toward the south. The insula also contains the remains of the Maison de Venus, a private house, on the east side, as well as remains of a monumental public fountain at the northern edge (fig. 75).

The temple complex is composed of a small courtyard and a temple with a porch. The temple is oriented to the south, facing in the opposite direction from the temple in

---

892 The excavators suggest that the Maison de Venus may have been the residence of Gabinia Hermiona (Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005a, 37), on the basis of the close stratigraphic connections between the Temple and the house.

893 The fountain is dated both epigraphically and stratigraphically to the late second century, a couple of decades earlier than the Temple immediately to its south (Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005a, 35; Khanoussi 1998, 54 no. 34).
the Sanctuary of Aesculapius, east of this building. On the exterior, at the west side of the building, along the road, the cella was decorated with seven engaged half- or quarter-columns in Tuscan order; the courtyard was enclosed by a blank wall. Visitors could enter into the sanctuary from the road that bordered the temple on the west; they passed through a small gate, supported by two columns—like the entryway to the sanctuary of Aesculapius-Dar Lacchab—and emerged into a small, square courtyard with paved walkways. To the north, a flight of stairs led up the podium to the porch, with an inscribed frieze supported by four Tuscan columns (fig. 76). The inscribed blocks of the Temple’s southern frieze were reused in modern houses on the site of the Temple mentioned by the text. The inscription was carved on five limestone lintels, with a total (reconstructed) length of around 14 m; the text is carved in three lines, with letters 14.5 cm tall in the first line, and 14 cm tall in the remaining two.


For the health of emperor Caesar, son of deified Septimius Severus Pius, conqueror of the Arabs, conqueror of Adiabene, greatest conqueror of

---

894 Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005a, 33-35.
895 Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005a, 39-44.
897 Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005a, 46 fig. 27, 49-51, 52-53 figs. 35-36, and 65.
898 *DFH*, 114-117 no. 39.
899 *DFH*, 113-117 no. 39; *CIL*, 26546 + 26650 + 26639; *ILAfr*, 527; Kallala 1997, 141-153 no. 1. The restoration of the temple’s name follows the suggestions of Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005a, 38-39.
Parthia, greatest conqueror of Britain, grandson of deified Marcus Antoninus, conqueror of the Germans, conqueror of Sarmatia, great grandson of deified Antoninus Pius, descendant of deified Hadrian, descendant of deified Trajan, conqueror of the Parthians, descendant of deified Nerva, Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Pius Felix Augustus, greatest conqueror of the Parthians, greatest conqueror of the Britons, greatest conqueror of the Germans, chief priest, holder of tribunician power for the 17th time, acclaimed Imperator for the third time, consul for the fourth time, father of the fatherland, proconsul, and of Julia Domna Pia Felix Augusta, mother of Augustus and of the army and the senate and the fatherland, and of their whole divine house, this Temple of the Augustan Victories of our lord, which Gabinia Hermiona had commanded by her will to be built out of a sum of 100,000 sesterces, was completed and dedicated; she established by her will that, on the day of the dedication and thereafter each year, a banquet would be given to the decurions by her heirs. And also she left to the city that field, called the Circus, for the entertainment of the people.

Inside, the cella was decorated with two stories of limestone Tuscan columns, with inscribed texts, and with statues of divinities placed on inscribed bases in niches between the columns (fig. 77). At least four of these statue bases have been recovered; the excavators postulate that probably 15 deities, in addition to the three Victories, were featured inside the temple. The cella's interior walls were originally covered with marble plaques, and at the back wall an inscribed architrave frieze affirmed the dedication of the space.


Consecrated to the August Victories.

The exterior text (no. 77) furnishes a date for the construction of the temple, based on the detailed imperial titulature: 214 C.E., year of Caracalla’s 17th tribunician power.901 But the inscription gives no clue as to her motivation in providing such a generous benefaction for the citizens of Thugga: a temple that cost about 100,000 sesterces, land on which to build the temple, and land that had already been given over

900 Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005a, 56-64.
901 Kienast 1996, 163.
to public use ("agrum qui apellatur Circus, the field known as the Circus") before it was given into public ownership. The authors of the recent study on this building suggest that the donation was made by Gabinia Hermiona in fulfilment of a promise made ob honorem that she did not complete during her lifetime.902 The further terms of her will enlisted her heirs to celebrate the anniversary of her temple’s dedication with future gifts to the decurions ("q[luo testamento die dedicationis et dei[nceps] quodannis epulum decurionibus ab her[e]dibus suis dari praecipit"). This injunction to the heirs to celebrate and remember regularly her gift suggests that this was, indeed, an official act of euergetism; at Thugga, other flamines had made provision to establish continuing festivals in celebration of their donations (e.g. Pacuvius Saturus and Nahania Victoria,903 Asicia Victoria904) Gabinia Hermiona’s decision to require her heirs to celebrate this annual event, however, was unusual at Thugga, where others transferred assets to the civic treasury earmarked for that purpose. This difference suggests that Gabinia Hermiona sought to involve other members of her family in her donation and to incorporate younger generations of her family into the practice of euergetism, marrying the two traditions of official euergetism and familial generosity which were a hallmark of the efforts of the Gabinii at Thugga.

Gabinia Hermiona’s Temple of the Victories of Caracalla appears to have emphasized Thugga’s close ties to Rome: the layout of the inscription text on the temple’s façade makes it clear that the emperor, whose name is featured at the beginning of both the first two lines, was the primary honoree in this temple, even if it was nominally dedicated to his personified victories (whose names are buried at the end of the second line, far from the most important part of the text). The plan of the

902 Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005a, 37.
903 See ch. VI.3.e. The East Forum Area, the Macellum, and the Temple of Mercury, supra p. 241.
904 See this ch. VII.2.b. The Rostra of Asicia Victoria, supra p. 270.
temple, with a single *cella* on a high podium, is canonically Italic in its design, in contrast to other temples erected by donors at Thugga.\textsuperscript{905}

Yet inside the temple, the presence of multiple deities bearing Roman names—texts bearing the names of Liber Pater, Minerva, Neptune, Mercury, and Apollo are all preserved\textsuperscript{906}—nevertheless recalled religious traditions with strong African roots; all of these deities had both Roman and African aspects.\textsuperscript{907} The interior decoration of the temple, in contrast to its exterior, presented a more complex interpretation of religious identity, a message that encompassed both the Roman and the African features of life at Thugga. The temple’s architecture did not follow the pattern of construction projects like that of Victor Roscianus and his African-style temple to Baal-Saturn, and of Pacuvius Saturus and Nahania Victoria with their similar temple to Mercury. Gabinia Hermiona’s temple to the Victories of Caracalla may well have been a de facto location of imperial cult activity, situated outside the forum but still in the central part of the city. At the same time, however, the building’s interior furnishings emphasized the balance between Rome and Africa that had been evident for much of Thugga’s history.

The temple of the Victories was established in a neighborhood of mixed use, cheek-by-jowl with houses and with other monumental public buildings such as the monument of Dar Lacchab (the Temple of Aesculapius?) and a nymphaeum to the north (fig. 75). These earlier structures had already served to monumentalize the neighborhood; the process continued after the construction of the sanctuary, when a triumphal arch was added to the street near the façade of the temple.\textsuperscript{908} The new temple

\textsuperscript{905} E.g. the *templa* of the Gabinii (see ch. VI.2.c. The *Templa* of Concordia, Frugifer, Liber Pater, and Neptune, supra p. 190), the Temple of Mercury (see ch. VI.3.e. The East Forum Area, the *Macellum*, and the Temple of Mercury, supra p. 241), and the Temple of Saturn (this ch.VII.2.a. The Temple of Saturn, supra p. 263).
\textsuperscript{906} Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005a, 59-60.
\textsuperscript{907} Cadotte 2007.
\textsuperscript{908} Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005a, 70-72.
constructed by Gabinia Hermiona, like the baths of Julia Memmia at Bulla Regia, contributed to changing the character of the neighborhood in which it was constructed, but did not fundamentally alter its character. Indeed, the Maison de Venus, next door to the temple (fig. 75), underwent minimal renovations when the sanctuary was constructed, and the building retained its domestic character throughout its use. Like the baths of Julia Memmia, which may have been intended for use primarily by those in the neighborhood, this temple may have offered residents of Thugga a new, nearby space for the worship of an extensive pantheon of deities, some of whom certainly had other temples within the city’s urban zone.

The dedicatory text on the temple’s façade (no. 77) was one of the longest erected at Thugga. Following Sartori’s principles of alignment, the most important pieces of information in the text were the phrase “Pro salute Imp(eratoris) Caes(aris) . . . ,” the name of the emperor (“M(arci) Aureli Antonini Pii Felicis”), and the name of the donor (“quod G[abinia Hermiona testamen[to suo”), all of which were aligned at the left side of the inscription. But because her temple apparently made no major change in the development of the urban landscape, Gabinia Hermiona may have received no public honor outside the careful placement of her name.

d. The Circus

In the wake of Gabinia Hermiona’s donation of the parcel of land called the Circus (no. 77), probably in about 214 C.E., additional donations at the site of the

910 The main change was that a door was blocked, prohibiting access from the house into the sanctuary (Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005a, 36-37 fig. 12).
911 Khanoussi 1998, 50 no. 20, dates the active phases of the house from the second century to the fifth.
913 Kallala 1997, 141 no. 1.
915 As imperial titulature in the dedicatory inscription (no. 77) suggests.
Circus on the northwest edge of the urban area created a formal venue for chariot racing out of Gabinia Hermiona’s field. These improvements, made jointly by four officials at Thugga, followed the pattern of official euergetism at Thugga and contributed to the town’s development in the image of Carthage, the capital city.

Both epigraphic and structural remains contribute to our understanding of the development of the Circus. The Circus was built at the northwest edge of the city site, outside the walls, north and west of the Temple of Minerva built by Julia Paula Laenatiana (see fig. 71). A road led to the site at the top of the rocky plateau, exiting the city through a northwest gate; the gate has been destroyed by later activity at the site.916 The architectural remains of the circus (fig. 78) belong primarily to the central spina and to enclosure walls that delineated the space along its long north and south sides; many of the blocks from the Circus were reused in construction of the Byzantine city wall. The central barrier, or spina, had two metae, one at each end, with inscribed texts that provided details about the date and the benefactors of this architectural elaboration.917 The inscription from the southeast meta of the Circus, was found primarily in reuse contexts in the Byzantine city wall and to the south of the Circus; one fragment was found in situ. The blocks were placed so that the text curved around the semi-circular meta. The letters are slightly larger than those of the northwest meta inscription (no. 80, below), about 17 cm tall in the first line and 16 cm tall in the second line.918

79. [Pro salut]e M(arci) Aureli S[everi Al]exandri Pii [Fel(ici)] Aug(usti) p(atris) p(atiae) pont(ificis) m(aximi) [---]VG N
[---] pos[tulant]e populo u[niverso] promise[runt] M(arcus) Aebutius [--- f(ilius)] Honoratus et P(ublius) Labonius P(ubli) f(ilius) Instit[or IIvir(i)].919

---

916 Carton 1895, 230.
917 Humphrey 1986, 327.
918 Poinssot 1906, 229-231 nos. 94-94bis.
919 CIL, 26550.
For the health of Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander Pius Felix Augustus, father of the fatherland, chief priest, [|---| VG N [|---| they had promised at the request of the citizenry, Marcus Aebutis --- Honoratus and Publius Labonius son of Publius Institor (built this).

The second text was found largely in situ on the northwestern *meta* of the Circus, where it curved around the end of the *spina*. The text is carved in two lines, with letters in each line around 12 cm tall. The limestone blocks, around 35 cm tall, preserve a length of nearly 7 m.\(^{920}\)

\[\text{Pro salute I}mp(eratoris) Caes(aris) M(arci) Aur[eli] Severi [[Alexandri]] Pii Fel(icius) Aug(usti) pont(ificis) max(imae) tri[b(unicia) pot(estate)] III co(n)s(uli) p(atris) p(atriae) et [[L(uici) Sei Caes(aris) [soce]r]] Aug(usti) [nostri] [---] Aug(ustae) totiusq(ue) divin(ae) dom(us) eor(um) [quod p]o[s]tulan[t[e univ]erso populo promiserunt P(ublius) Laboniuss P(ubli) [f(ii)] Institor et M(arius) Aebuti[u]s --- H[onoratus] --- P]acatianus aediles s(ua) p(ecunia) f(ecerunt) et ded(icaverunt).^{921}\]

For the health of Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander Pius Felix Augustus, chief priest, holder of tribunician power for the third time, consul, father of the fatherland, and of Lucius Seius Caesar, father-in-law of our Augustus, and of the Augusta, and of their whole divine household. The building which they had promised because of the demands of the people, Publius Labonius Institor, son of Publius, and Marcus Aebutis Honoratus [duumvirs(?), and --- and] Pacatianus, aediles, built this with their own funds and dedicated it.

Little evidence remains of built seating for spectators; most people probably sat on the rocky slopes in order to watch the races. Humphrey has suggested that most spectators sat parallel to the spina, on the long side of the Circus, and that few spectators probably gathered at the curved end, given the topography of Thugga’s Circus.\(^{922}\) If this was the case, however, we must wonder at the placement of the inscribed texts on the *metae* at the ends of the spina, and their intended audience. Certainly the larger letters of the southeast *meta* inscription (no. 79) suggest that more people could have read it than the corresponding text on the northwest (no. 80), but if

\(^{920}\) DFH, 39-40 no. 15; Poinssot 1906, 225-229 no. 93.

\(^{921}\) CIL, 26549; DFH, 39-42 no. 15; ILTun, 1413.

\(^{922}\) Humphrey 1986, 322-325; Carton 1895, 230.
the majority of the audience sat parallel to the spina one wonders why the donors would not have erected inscribed texts along the sides of the barrier itself rather than at the turning posts. Those texts, if they once existed, may have been reused in other building contexts and not yet rediscovered.

A third inscription, of uncertain provenance, has been assigned to the Circus based on comparison with inscriptions 79-80, the meta inscriptions. The blocks were found reused in structures more than 2 km from the Circus itself. The limestone lintel is fragmentary; about half of the stone is preserved, and its total preserved length is 3.76 m, with letters 8-8.5 cm tall throughout. It features a different set of names than the meta inscriptions, and in this text the aediles’ names must have been listed before those of the duumvirs. Poinssot suggested that this text might have been placed on the exterior of the Circus. The small size of the letters of this text (8-8.5 cm tall) suggests that it was meant to be viewed from only a short distance away.

81. Pro salute Imperatoris Caesaris M(arci) Aureli [[Severi [Alexandri]]] Pii Felicis Aug(usti) [---]
[[Iul[iae] Mamaeae A]ug(ustae) [[matris]] Aug(usti) [[et Cn(aeae) Se[iae
Her]enniae Sallustiae Bar[biae] ---]]
ius quod postulante universo populo p[romiserunt] A(ulus) Vitellius Priva[itus].

For the health of the Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander Pius Felix Augustus [and of] Julia Mamaea Augusta, mother of Augustus, and of Gnaea Seia Herennia Sallustia Barbia, [---]ius, this building which they had promised at the request of the citizenry, Aulus Vitellius Privatus ...

---

923 DFH 38-39 no. 14, with findspots of individual blocks at Aïn el Ksar and Ksar Ben Tralah, hamlets 2-4 km northwest of the Circus. It is not clear why these blocks were removed to such comparatively distant locations when other stones from Thugga appear not to have traveled so far, or when they were transported to their secondary contexts.
924 DFH 38-39 no. 14; Poinssot 1909b, 122-123 no. 43.
925 Poinssot 1909b, 122-123 no. 43.
926 Compare the exterior inscription of the theater (see ch. VI.3.d. Capitolium and Theater, supra p. 223, inscription no. 58), whose letters were 35 cm tall.
927 DFH, 38-39 no. 14; CIL, 26548; Poinssot 1909b, 122-123 no. 43; Poinssot 1913-1916, 155 no. 62bis.
Although Gabinia Hermiona’s donation of the land happened around 214, the architectural elaboration of the Circus took place around a decade later, in the early years of the reign of Alexander Severus. The three texts all mention the emperor, with his titulature preserved in the northwestern meta text (no. 80). That text also mentioned his first wife, the Augusta, Orbiana, and the emperor’s father-in-law Lucius Seius. Their names, now erased from the text but still legible, provide a terminus ante quem for the erection of the texts, since Severus Alexander repudiated both wife and father-in-law by 227 C.E.

Though their names are at least partially preserved, little is known about the men who funded the architectural improvements to the Circus in the years following Gabinia Hermiona’s donation. We know at least parts of four names: Publius Labonius Institor, Marcus Aebutius Honoratus, --- Pacatianus, and Aulus Vitellius Privatus. The men held positions as aediles and duumvirs of the city. Since aediles held the responsibility for public entertainments in Roman cities, it seems likely that the construction of the Circus’s permanent structures was connected to their offices. Thus, we have another possible example of official euergetism in the Circus.

Like many of the examples of official euergetism that we have seen at Thugga, this building work, which erected formal architectural structures at the Circus, probably had a minimal impact on urban development around the site. It is clear from the language of Gabinia Hermiona’s inscription (no. 77: “item agrum qui appellatur circus ad vol[u]ptatem populi rei pub[licae] remisit, And also she left to the state that field, called

---

928 DFH 40, no. 15, notes that there is debate whether a fourth tribunician power might have been indicated in the missing text that precedes the number. Alexander Severus’ third tribunician power was in 224, his fourth in 225 (Kienast 1996, 178).
930 DFH, 42 no. 15 and The names of the duumvirs (?), P. Labonius Institor and M. Aebutius Honoratus, are at least partially preserved in both meta texts, while the names of the aediles are partially preserved in one meta text and one text that probably derives from elsewhere on the building.
the Circus, for the entertainment of the people") that the field had already been in use for chariot racing before the formal structures were build; patterns of activity and movement around and toward it were already established. As the formal built structures of the Circus were limited primarily to the spina and the exterior enclosure wall, visitors probably did not have an intimate connection with the donors as they did in the theater, where they sat on seats built by him and saw his name wherever they looked. Though the cost of the Circus’ construction may well have been high the impact of the built structures on established behaviors was probably minimal. The architectural elaboration of the Circus, then, must have had other purposes, since chariot races already took place in the field before its formalization.

The purpose of this donation by Labonius Institor, Aebutius Honoratus, Pacatianus, and Vitellius Privatus, may well have been to place Thugga into the ranks of the major cities like Carthage, Utica, and Lepcis Magna, which all had monumental arenas, as recent scholars have suggested. I suspect, rather, that this donation was not meant to create Thugga as a rival to Carthage (especially since this Circus differs substantially in its level of monumentality from those of the major sites) but to bring amenities available to the citizens of Carthage into the urban life at Thugga. This pattern has appeared repeatedly through the donations of private citizens, and it evidently continued even in the decades after Thugga’s creation as an independent municipium and end of the city’s formal, political connection with Carthage. Carthage’s Circus may have been constructed in the early second century CE, but limited evidence from excavations there suggests that it was improved and renovated over the course of several centuries; perhaps the formalization of the Circus at Thugga responded to one

---

931 Humphrey 1986, 327.
932 Aounallah and Maurin, in DFH, 41 no. 15; Humphrey 1986, 295.
such renovation at Carthage, in much the same way that the construction of Thugga’s
theater appears to have echoed a major renovation in the theater at Carthage.934

e. The Sanctuary of Caelestis

One final Severan-period donation, The Sanctuary of Caelestis, was a large
suburban sanctuary built by a family group of donors. Its position at the western edge
of the town (see fig. 71) accelerated the development of that area of urban space,
development which had begun with Julia Paula Laenatiana’s construction of the temple
of Minerva and had continued with the formalization of the Circus. The addition of a
major new sanctuary south of these earlier buildings added new public space to an area
formerly used primarily for agriculture and for burial. The project, which was funded
by members of the Gabinius family in response to an elected office, underscored the
growing links between official and familial traditions of euergetism among the
wealthiest families of Thugga.

The sanctuary takes the form of a large, semicircular precinct about 80 m wide on
the western edge of the city (fig. 79). Paved roads led to the entries to the sanctuary, on
the east and west corners.935 The entryways were identical, monumental, and bore brief
inscriptions on both interior and exterior surfaces. These four texts were each inscribed
on 50-cm tall limestone lintels, in letters 10.5-9.5 cm tall, matching the lettering on the
temple’s pediment (no. 86) and from the frieze of the portico (no. 87). The total original
length of each doorway inscription is approximately three m. The exterior western
inscription (no. 82) was found in reused contexts near the sanctuary; the western
interior inscription (no. 83) was found inside the temple precinct.936

82. C[aelest]i Aug(ustae) sacr(um)

935 Gauckler 1905a, clxiii.
936 Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005b, 162 nos. 3-4.
Consecrated to Caelestis Augusta, Quintus Gabinius Rufus Felix Beatianus increased the generosities of his parents, finished the building, and dedicated it.

83. *Q(uintus) Gabinius Rufus Felix Beatianus liberalitas parentum multiplicavit excoluit ded(icit).

Quintus Gabinius Rufus Felix Beatianus increased the generosities of his parents, finished the building, and dedicated it.

The exterior inscription from the eastern entryway (no. 84) was found around the sanctuary; the several fragments of the interior inscription (no. 85) were found in the east forum area and near the Temple of Aesculapius Dar Lacchab.

84. *Caelestis Augusta sacr(um)

*Q(uintus) Gabinius Rufus Felix Beatianus liberalitas parentum multiplicavit excoluit ded(icit).

Consecrated to Caelestis Augusta, Quintus Gabinius Rufus Felix Beatianus increased the generosities of his parents, finished the building, and dedicated it.

85. *[Q(uintus Gabii]nius Rufus Felix Beatianus liberali]

*tates parentum multiplicavit, excoluit, ded(icit).

Quintus Gabinius Rufus Felix Beatianus increased the generosities of his parents, finished the building, and dedicated it.

Inside the precinct, an Italic-style peripteral temple rises on a high podium, facing to the south. The temple was peripteral, with freestanding columns on all four sides and a hexastyle porch at the southern end; the Corinthian columns were made of local limestone. Unusually, the pediment on the southern (front) façade of the temple

---

937 CIL, 26460; Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005b, 162 no. 3.
938 CIL, 26461; Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005b, 162 no. 4.
940 Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005b, 161-162 no. 1; CIL, 26459.
941 Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005b, 162 no. 2; CIL, 26462.
942 Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005b, 115-117 and fig. 44, and 132 fig. 74.
was inscribed with a dedicatory text. The blocks of the pediment were found in reused contexts, ranging from the theater on the eastern side of the city to the precinct of the sanctuary itself. The inscription was carved on limestone blocks, with an original size of 3.30 m long at the triangular base and 1.65 m tall. The text was written over four lines, in letters ranging from 15 cm tall to 12 cm tall. The cognomen and titles of the emperor were erased from the text but later recarved in a slightly different lettering style.

86. **Cælestis Augusta**

   **pro salute Imp(eratoris) Caes(aris) M(arci) Aurelii(!)**

   **Severi [[Alexandri Pii Felicis [Aug(ustae)]]]**

   **[et [[Iuliae Mama]eae A[ug(ustae)]]] matris Aug(usti)]**

   **[et castrorum et senatus et patriae].**

Consecrated to Cælestis Augusta, for the health of Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander Pius Felix Augustus, and of Julia Mamaea Augusta, mother of Augustus and of the armies and of the senate and of the country.

Opposite the temple to the south at the edge of the precinct, in the paved courtyard, a large platform may be the remains of the sanctuary’s altar.

A portico follows the curved sides of the precinct walls, north from the western entryway to the eastern entryway; at each entrance to the portico, a large niche about 1.8 m tall was carved into the wall. The early excavators also found, in the porticoes, two headless “municipal” (togate?) statues made of white marble, which might have originally been placed in the niches at the portico’s entryways. A few other statue fragments came to light as well: an imperial torso; a divine torso, perhaps Aesculapius;

---

943 Most pediments of temples at Thugga appear to have been left blank; the Capitolium was unique in its sculptural decoration.
945 Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005b, 126; *IL* *Turn* 1485; *CIL*, 26457; *CIL*, 26554; Poinssot 1913-1916, 12-14 no. 8.
948 Gauckler 1900, cxviii-cxix.
and fragments that may have belonged to the statue of the goddess Juno Caelestis.\footnote{Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005b, 104.}

The portico’s floor was decorated with a scallop-shell-patterned white mosaic; its exterior wall may not have been covered or decorated in any way.\footnote{Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005b, 155-157.} The portico’s colonnade was surmounted by two inscribed texts. The lower dedication, on the portico’s architrave, was inscribed on 25 lintels and had a total length of about 63 m.\footnote{Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005b, 183.}

The text was inscribed in a single line in letters 12-13 cm tall.

87. at Deas Caelestes argenteas fabricanda[s II, ex hs tot mil(ibus) n(ummum) qu]ae A[bburni]us Avii[l]ius [Fe]lix testamento suo ab heredibus suis praestari volvit [Reip(ublicae)] ded[erunt]; templum Deae Caelestis Aug(ustae), ex] pollicitat[ione Gi]abini Ruf[i patris ob] honorem flamoni[et]i itemq(ue) Iul[iae Gallit]atae matris, ex HS LX mil(ibus) n(ummum) coeptum est inlatis q(uo)q(ue) reip(ublicae) Thuggensium ante diem dedicationis HS XXX mil(ibus) [n(ummum)] die ded[ictionis reip(ublicae) n(ummum) ex] testamento Avilliae[ae --- f(iliae)] Venustae ex quorum re]dito sportulae et ludi praest(e)ntur Q(uintus) Gabinius Rufus Felix Beatianus multiplicata a se pecunia ob honorem parentum su(or) m HS tot mil(ibus) n(ummum) ad orna[men]tum patriae suae [ae sua liberalitate constitutis, [p]erfecti excoluit et cum status ceterisq(ue) solo privato dedicavit ludis editis, datis sportulis et epulo et gymnasio.\footnote{CIL, 26458; ILAfr 514; Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005b, 201.}

As to the two statues of the goddess Caelestis, made in silver, worth [?] thousand sesterces, which Aburnius Avillius Felix desired, by his will, to be made by his heirs, they gave these to the city; the temple of Goddess Caelestis had been begun, out of 60,000 sesterces transferred to the treasury of the city of Thugga before the day of the dedication, from a promise of Gabinius Rufus, his father, in honor of his perpetual flaminate and that of his mother Julia Gallitta; on the day of the dedication, 30,000 sesterces were transferred to the public treasury from the will of Avillia Venusa, from the return on which sum monetary gifts and games will be presented. Quintus Gabinius Rufus Felix Beatianus, having increased the money from his own funds, on account of the honor of his parents, and having added ? sesterces for ornamenting his own hometown by his generosity, he completed and developed the temple, with its statues and other furnishings, and dedicated it, presenting the games, giving monetary gifts, and a banquet and oil for the baths.
A series of inscribed limestone cornice blocks was placed above the long architrave inscription. The text is carved on the fascia in letters four cm tall, originally painted red. Of 60 blocks of the cornice, at least eight were inscribed with names of provinces or cities, one per block:

88. Dalmatia; Hispania; Iudaea; Karthago; Laeodicia; Mesopotamia; Syria; Thugga.953

The text of the pediment inscription (no. 86), furnishes a date range for the building’s construction, during the reign of Alexander Severus, 222-235; the text was modified in 235 and recarved in 238 or later, when the emperor and his mother were rehabilitated.954 Later changes in the building may date to the period when the Byzantine fortress was built, or to a slightly earlier period; little datable stratigraphic evidence of these phases remains, except for an apse that suggests the sanctuary might have been converted into a Christian church.955

The donors of the building and its furnishings were numerous. They came from two different family groups, as the text of the portico inscription (no. 87) indicates. The financial details included in the portico’s inscription suggest that this project was extremely costly, perhaps beyond the resources of a single individual or family; it required participation from many different sources in order to complete the sanctuary. The first donors, Gabinius Rufus pater and his wife Julia Gallita, made a promise of 60,000 sesterces. Their son, Gabinius Rufus Felix Beatianus, made an additional donation in order to complete the construction of the temple. Avillia Venusa made a testamentary donation of 30,000 sesterces as an endowment to fund the dedicatory celebrations, while Aebutius Avillius Honoratus made a testamentary donation of additional money for silver statues of the goddess Caelestis.

953 Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005b, 140-142; CIL, 26651; ILAfr 542.
954 Kienast 1996, 177-178 and 180.
955 Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005b, 177-180.
The portico’s inscribed architrave (no. 87) provides a wealth of detail about at least some of the donors and their reasons for building such a large new sanctuary. The initial promise of funds came about as a result of office-holding: both Gabinius Rufus and his wife Julia Gallitta held the flaminate, and their donation was expressly given in response to their election \((ob\ [honorem\ flamonii\ perp(eti)\ itemq(ue)\ Iuliae\ Gallittae\ matris)\). But this sanctuary just as clearly drew strongly on the familial tradition of euergetism among the Gabinii, as Gabinius Rufus Felix Beatianus apparently held no official position at Thugga. Unlike the heirs of Victor Roscianus, who transferred responsibility for completing his Temple of Saturn to the city upon his death, Gabinius Rufus Felix Beatianus chose to maintain his family’s connection to the building after his parents’ deaths, and this may well have been because of his clan’s history of voluntary as well as official euergetism.\(^{956}\)

The Avillii appear not to have had such familial traditions of benefaction. The portico inscription (no. 87) provides no indication of their motivations for supporting the construction of the Sanctuary of Caelestis, with gifts of money to make the cult statues and to celebrate the temple’s dedication. Both donations were testamentary, and neither were overtly connected to office-holding, as Gabinius Rufus’ initial donation had been. Donation of a cult statue separate from a building was a standard act of euergetism; but, as we have seen from earlier examples,\(^{957}\) at Thugga this may have been an opportunity for Aebutius Avillius Felix to make a voluntary donation (unassociated with office-holding) on a smaller scale than a gift of an entire building. Avillia Venusa’s donation of a foundation to fund the dedication-day celebrations, however, bears more similarity to donations of an official nature. These celebrations,

which included “sportulae et ludi, monetary handouts and games,” resembled similar acts by other recent donors (e.g. Pacuvius Saturus, Asicia Victoria) who had given funds in official acts of euergetism for the flaminate. Regardless of whether the gifts were given in response to office or out of some other motivation, though, the gifts of the Avillii depended on the donation of other benefactors for their success, for without the temple of Caelestis financed by the Gabinii, neither the cult statues nor the dedication-day celebrations of the Avillii would have been possible.

Caelestis was a popular goddess in Africa, where she frequently received gifts similar to those given to Punic Tanit, the consort of Baal. In the Severan period, she had received further attention outside of Africa under the emperor Elagabalus. Dedicating a building to this African deity emphasized the links of the Gabinii with Thugga’s African heritage, complementing the renovation of the Temple of Saturn with another extramural site to worship divinities with deep roots. The construction of a new building for Caelestis’ cult, however, and its Italic-style architecture (frontal, peripteral temple on a high podium), marked the structure as separate from other African sanctuaries in the town. The building’s architectural references to Italic-style temples in the city (such as the Temple of Minerva II, the monument of Dar Lacchab (Temple of Aesculapius?), Capitolium, and Temple of the Victories of Caracalla) placed it squarely in a tradition of flaminate donations. Like many of Thugga’s donors, Gabinius Rufus Felix Beatianus sought to create a mixed identity for himself and his family through reference to both Thugga’s Roman present and its African past.

---

958 See ch. VI.3.e. The East Forum Area, the Macellum, and the Temple of Mercury, supra p. 241.
959 See this ch., VII.2.b. The Rostra of Asicia Victoria, supra p. 270.
961 The emperor chose Caelestis to marry his preferred god, Elegabalus, and required the Carthaginians to send a statue of her to Rome along with a dowry for the wedding (Cass. Dio 80.12; Herodian 5.6.3-5).
The organization of the sanctuary and its inscribed texts focused attention on the Gabinii, particularly the major donor Gabinius Rufus Felix Beatianus, whose name greeted those entering or exiting the space from either the city, at the eastern entry (nos. 84-85), or the rural area at the western doorway (nos. 82-83). The visitor who walked across the courtyard would have caught a glimpse, at least, of the portico inscription (no. 87), but only one who walked outside the portico, following it all the way around the sanctuary from the west side to the east, would have been able to comprehend the meaning of the whole long portico text. The texts that conveyed the most essential information were those over the entry doors (nos. 82 and 84), where the names of the deity and the donor were featured on the exterior; after entering the sanctuary, the donor’s name was repeated on the opposite door’s interior lintel (nos. 83 and 85). From a visitor’s perspective, the portico inscription (no. 87) was designed to be impressively monumental, rather than to be read as a complete text. It was the only known text from the sanctuary that mentioned the names of the Avillii; the entryway texts name only Quintus Gabinius Rufus Felix Beatianus, and mention the contributions of his parents but not their names. The prominence of the single name, Gabinius Rufus Felix Beatianus, repeated in multiple positions around the sanctuary, emphasizes his important role in financing, completing, and dedicating the Sanctuary.

The discovery of “municipal” statues at the site suggests that one or more of the donors was honored with statues inside the sanctuary, though no honorific statue bases have come to light. The presence of niches in the portico’s ends (fig. 81b) likewise suggests that statues could have been placed there. If the statues featured the donor, Gabinius Rufus Felix Beatianus, or his parents, Gabinius Rufus and Julia Gallitta, such images would have emphasized even more substantially their contributions to the sanctuary’s construction. If these statues featured the Avillii, instead, the message
changed to a more inclusive, less self-aggrandizing one, that emphasized the contributions of all five donors to the sanctuary project: the Gabini in inscribed texts over the entryways, and the Avillii in images nearby, at the ends of the porticoes. Given the pattern at Thugga of commemorating donors whose gifts had the greatest impact on the physical development of the city,\textsuperscript{962} I suggest that honorific statues were probably erected for the Gabinius donors who built the structure rather than the Avillius donors who contributed to its dedication.

The Sanctuary of Caelestis was built southwest of the triumphal arch of Alexander Severus, not far from the cisterns of Aīn el Hammam (fig. 79). The arch, erected at a western gate to the city, was approximately contemporary with the sanctuary’s construction.\textsuperscript{963} The cisterns, which collected and stored water from the 12-km aqueduct of Aīn el Hammam, date to the period when the aqueduct was constructed, during the reign of Commodus (180-192), and thus predate the Sanctuary of Caelestis by several decades.\textsuperscript{964}

\textsuperscript{962}E.g. statues of the Marcii (see ch. VI.3.d. Capitolium and Theater, supra p. 223) and Asicia Victoria (see this ch., VII.2.b. The Rostra of Asicia Victoria, supra p. 270).

\textsuperscript{963}Khanoussi 1998, 58 no. 38; Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005b, 99-100, Saint-Amans 2004, 275. The sanctuary was noted by earlier travelers and has recently been the subject of extensive architectural and epigraphic study (Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005b).

\textsuperscript{964}The aqueduct’s construction was accomplished at public expense, as an inscription on the fountain (\textit{DFH}, 102-109 no. 35 = \textit{CIL}, 26534 = C. Poinssot 1966, 772-774) shows:

\textit{[Pro salute Imperatoris] Caes(aris) M(arci) Aurelii Commodi Antonini Aug(usti)] Pi[i] Sarm(aticis) Germanicis max(i)mi Britannicis p(atris) p(atriae) civitas Aurelia Thugga [aquam conduxit e fonte -]occolitan(o) a milliario septimo [sua] pecunia induxi[t et] lacum fecit M(arcus) Antonius Zeno proc(onsul) Africae dedic(avit) curatore L(ucio) Terentio Romano].

For the health of Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Commodus Anoninus Augustus Pius, conqueror of the Sarmatians, greatest conqueror of the Germans, conqueror of the Britons, father of the country. The \textit{civitas} Aurelia Thugga built the aqueduct from the spring of [-]occolitan(o), and brought it from the seventh milestone with its own (public) funds, and built the fountain. Marcus Antonius Zeno, the proconsul of Africa, dedicated it. Lucius Terentius Romanus was the curator.

The \textit{lacus} mentioned in the text was the fountain built north of the Temple of the Victories of Caracalla (see plate 75). A statue base to L. Terentius Romanus was found in excavations of the Temple of the Victories, praising him for his work in overseeing the construction of the aqueduct (\textit{DFH} no. 37 = \textit{AÉpig} 1966, 512):

\textit{L(ucio) Terentio Romano | patri carissimo | cui cum populus Thugg(ensis) ob aquae | curam pro meritis eius ex aere | conlato tunc statuam ponere | dam obtulisset | C(aius) Terentius Pap(iri) | Sabinianus fl(amen) perp(etuus) v(ir) e(gregius) | de suo posuit loco a re p(ublica) d(ato).}
The construction of this Temple of Caelestis was a major step in the development of the western side of Thugga’s urban space. There is no evidence that the sanctuary to Caelestis was built on the site of an earlier cult space, as was the temple of Saturn on the eastern edge of the city. Instead, this was a new sanctuary space that sprung up on an area that had previously been dedicated to agricultural and funereal uses; the western necropolis of the city lies to the north of this sanctuary (fig. 71). The construction of this temple, as well as the contemporary construction of the triumphal arch of Alexander Severus at the western gate of the city, indicate that the western suburbs of the city were rising in their importance. A new sanctuary would have drawn more traffic to the western gate and out through it, to the new cult site. We can suppose that the agricultural land that was thus turned to a new use belonged to the Gabinii, on analogy with the land to the north that was given by Gabinia Hermiona to the city for use as a circus. This clan must have had substantial holdings of land, some of which at least were concentrated on the western side of the city, outside the walls, and which were increasingly made available to public use by the familia’s successive acts of euergetism.

To Lucius Terentius Romanus, a most beloved father, to whom, though the people of Thugga then had offered to erect a statue from bronze collected by subscription, for his merits in the administration of the aqueduct, Caius Terentius Iulianus Sabinianus, of the Papiria tribe, perpetual flamen, knight, set this statue up out of his own funds in the place assigned by the state. The use of a civic statue to honor the curator of the aqueduct’s construction underscores the major impact of that publicly-funded project, in the same way that the statues and inscriptions of Flavius Tullus celebrated his water supply project’s impact on the urban development of Sabratha (see ch. III.3.a. The Aqueduct and Fountains of Flavius Tullus, supra p. 100).

For the archaeological remains of the aqueduct and its associated cisterns, see de Vos 2000, 29-34.

963 See this ch., VII.2.a. The Temple of Saturn, supra p. 263.

966 Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005b, 106.
3. The Third and Fourth Centuries

After the Severan period, epigraphic evidence for benefactions at Thugga is scarce, as it is also at other sites in Africa and across the Roman world.\textsuperscript{967} Sears has recently commented\textsuperscript{968} on the so-called “crisis of the third century,” the apparent decline of public building and euergetism in the third century, hypothesizing—quite sensibly—that the Antonine and Severan periods, when the pace of public building was probably unsustainably high, were anomalous, and that the third century C.E. represented a return to more normal levels of public building. The causes for this slowdown may have been due to a number of factors, including shifting economic patterns, the reduction in imperial support for African cities after the end of the Severan dynasty, or changes in epigraphic practice (the decline of the “epigraphic habit”).

Indeed, several sources of epigraphic evidence suggest that at Thugga euergetism continued, with donors consciously responding to the works of earlier benefactors through their inscribed texts and probably also their buildings’ architecture and furnishings.\textsuperscript{969} But early excavations of the city focused on earlier structures, considering third- and fourth-century buildings impediments to their understanding of the most important periods, the Julio-Claudian and Antonine eras. These buildings were frequently cleared or removed entirely, skewing our understanding of the continuities and changes in urban life in the third and fourth centuries, and contributing to the interpretation of this period as one of stark decline after the zenith of urbanism in the Antonine period. At the same time, however, Thugga’s municipal authorities appear to have taken increasing responsibility for the construction and maintenance of some public buildings. Such buildings included the Temple of Fortuna, Venus

\textsuperscript{967} MacMullen 1982, 243-244.
\textsuperscript{968} Sears 2011, 98-114.
\textsuperscript{969} See, e.g., Lepelley 1981, 219-220.
Concordia, and Mercury, originally built by Maedius Severus and renovated by the city in the late Severan period.\textsuperscript{970} I will discuss the only two buildings of the third century that have reasonable epigraphic and archaeological evidence to support their interpretation, the Temple of Tellus and the Porticus of Felix Julianus.\textsuperscript{971} The trends that I have previously identified, though, continued even at a slower pace: donors sought to connect themselves to Thugga’s past and to its present through architectural and topographic references, and the flaminate continued to provide important impetus for donations.

a. The Renovated Temple of Tellus

The Temple of Tellus was apparently first built in the Flavian period or the early second century, and I have suggested previously that it was constructed by a private donor.\textsuperscript{972} The sanctuary’s second phase, constructed in the reign of Gallienus in the second half of the third century, is somewhat better documented, both archaeologically and epigraphically. The evidence of this second phase of the building suggests that its donor, Botria Fortunata, rebuilt an existing sanctuary not only to renovate a building in need of repair, but also to communicate to her fellow citizens her position in the tradition of benefactors and her role in the development of urban life at Thugga.

\textsuperscript{970} See ch. VI.2.c. The \textit{Templa} of Concordia, Frugifer, Liber Pater, and Neptune, supra p. 190. The Antoninian Baths were apparently built at imperial expense in the late second century (Thébert 2003, 177; Christol 1979, 219); renovation in the late fourth century may have been at the hands of a private donor (DFH 124 no. 42; so also Dietze 2004, 690), but according to Lepelley (1979, 190), the \textit{curator} named in the reconstruction text was unlikely to have been also its donor.

\textsuperscript{971} Other fourth century buildings and renovations, such as the Temple of the Genius Patriae (DFH, 269-272 no. 139) attested by epigraphic evidence, has not been convincingly identified with a specific building in Thugga’s monumental landscape; likewise the fountain improved by L. Napotius Felix in the late fourth century (DFH, 124-127 no. 43) cannot, with certainty, be identified with the fountain adjacent to the Temple of the Victories of Caracalla and thus little can be said, archaeologically speaking, about the donor’s choices. The fourth-century renovation of the Antoninian baths was probably accomplished at public expense rather than by a private donor who sought to improve that important public structure.

\textsuperscript{972} See ch. V.4.a. The Temple of Tellus, supra p. 170.
As I mentioned earlier, the Temple of Tellus was an African-style temple, with three cellae preceded by a courtyard; the main entry to the temple was on the southeast side, near the southern entrance to the macellum. A small, square portico, with four columns on each side, enclosed the courtyard (fig. 42), with a dedicatory inscription on the architrave frieze of the colonnade. The inscription, written on twelve limestone lintels, totaled approximately 24 m in length, and the text was written in a single line in letters 12.5 cm tall. Poinssot suggested, based on the findspot of the blocks, that the inscription may have begun on the north side of the courtyard, in front of the cella, and continued along the east, south, and then west sides.

89. Pro salute Imp(eratoris) Caes(aris) P(ubli) Licini Egnati Gallieni Germanici Pii Fel(icitatis) Aug(usti) pont(ificus) max(imi) Germanici [maximi tribunicia po]test(ate) X co(n)s(ulis) IIII p(atris) proco(n)s(ulis) et Corneliae Salo[niae Aug(ustae)] totiusque divinae domus eorum Botria Fortunata Victoris filia flaminica perpetua templum Tellu[ris ob summam honoris flaminatus sua pecunia a sol[o] extruxit excoluit et [d]edicavit sportulis d[atis decurionibus et e]pul[i]s universo popul[o].

For the health of Emperor Caesar Publius Licinius Egnatius Gallienus Germanicus Pius Felix Augustus, chief priest, greatest conqueror of the Germans, with tribunician power for the tenth time, consul for the fourth time, father of the fatherland, proconsul, and of Cornelia Salonia Augusta, and of their whole divine household. Botria Fortunata, daughter of Victor, perpetual flaminica, built this temple of Tellus from the ground up from her own funds, on account of the honor of her flaminate. She completed it and dedicated it with monetary gifts given to the decurions and a banquet for the whole citizenry.

The central cella apparently housed the goddess Tellus, as a short lintel inscription, written in two lines, suggests. The total length of the lintel was at least 2 m; the letters were 6 cm tall in each line.

90. [Telluri Aug(ustae)] sacrum [Botria For]tunata flaminica perpetua

---

974 Poinssot 1919, 152; Saint-Amans 2004, 362 no. 106; DFH, 117-120 no. 40.
975 DFH, 117-120 no. 40; CIL, 26558; IL Afr 530; Poinssot 1919, 149-153 no. 6.
976 Poinssot 1919, 149-153 nos. 5-6.
Consecrated to Tellus Augusta. Botria Fortunata, perpetual flaminica (built this).

In addition to Tellus, the goddess also mentioned in the doorway lintel inscription of the first century, finds and building furnishings suggest that the other two deities worshipped here were Ceres and Pluto. The westernmost cella floor was decorated with an image of a piece of grain and the name “Apona;” the easternmost cella contained an inscribed altar dedicated to Pluto, apparently in situ, and a small statue of that god, enthroned.

The date of the building is somewhat problematic. The imperial titulature of the portico inscription (no. 89) provides clear evidence that the inscription was erected in 261, during Gallienus’ tenth tribunician power. The paleography of the cella lintel, no. 90) also accords well with a date in the third century. The architectural style of the building, however, and the paleography of the exterior doorway inscription suggest a much earlier date. Thugga’s other African-style tripartite temples were all much earlier than this Temple of Tellus; even the sanctuary of Saturn, built in the early Severan period, was dedicated nearly 70 years before Botria Fortunata’s temple, while the sanctuary to Caelestis, a goddess with a strongly African identity, was built with an Italic-style temple. The late use of this type of archaizing architectural plan suggests that Botria Fortunata rebuilt an earlier structure following its original plan. In this scheme, she may have made use of some earlier decorative elements for the temple in

977 ILAfr 553; Saint-Amans 2004, 363 no. 107.
978 See ch. V.4.a. The Temple of Tellus, supra p. 170, inscription no. 32.
979 Poinssot 1919, 153 no. 7.
980 Saint-Amans 2004, 360; Merlin 1918, cxl-cxlii; Poinssot 1919, 144-159.
982 See ch. V.4.a. The Temple of Tellus, supra p. 170, inscription no. 32.
983 See this ch. VII.2.a. The Temple of Saturn, supra p. 263.
984 Cadotte 2007, 65-111.
985 See this ch. VII.2.e. The Sanctuary of Caelestis, supra p. 290.
her reconstruction, thus incorporating the earlier doorway lintel (no. 32) with its first or second-century decorations, into the rebuilt structure. But this picture of the temple’s reconstruction is complicated by the text of the portico inscription (no. 89), which explicitly states that the donor built the temple “a solo, from the ground up.” Botria Fortunata’s reconstruction must have been almost entirely confined to the interior of the sanctuary, the portico and the cellae, and not to the exterior entryway or the precinct wall. If the building had been badly damaged by age or neglect, renovation might have been extensive and could have justified the claim that she built the structure from the ground up.

Like many others who donated buildings, Botria Fortunata’s inscription makes it clear that she constructed the temple as a summa honoraria for her position as a flaminica. She followed the pattern of many other office-holders in donating a religious building. Unlike many previous donations, her work was not a new building but instead a renovation. The text did not mention a specific sum, as some of the earlier texts had done, nor did Botria Fortunata apparently add money in excess of the summa honoraria, as had earlier donors like the Gabinii in the Sanctuary of Caelestis. This donation, then, was probably a comparatively modest one.

The text makes no mention of the temple’s presumably poor state of preservation prior to its renovation, and so Botria Fortunata’s choice to invest in this particular building is somewhat mysterious. Its dedication to an African triad of deities tied her

---

986 Saastamoinen (2010, 393, 400) noted that the phrase “a solo” is the most common adjective used to describe third-century buildings; we need not take the description entirely literally.
987 Ferchiou 1989, 331; DFH, 120 no. 40; Saint-Amans 2004, 108.
988 In other cases, as at the Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury in the east forum, however, the inscriptions mention that the building was extensively renovated because of damage due to age, “vetus[late consumptam, respublica municipii ... r[estituit].” See ch. VI.3.a. The Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury, supra p. 181, inscription no. 35.
989 Pacuvius Saturus and Nahania Victoria had renovated the macellum, but also built a new temple; Victor Roscianus built or vastly expanded a sanctuary that had previously been an open-air precinct.
more securely to the city’s roots, even as the inscription’s use of imperial titulature connected it firmly with the continuing importance of the imperial cult and the role of the official priesthood in Thugga’s civic life. I suspect that Botria Fortunata chose to repair this temple as a way to place herself among the important benefactors of previous centuries (fig. 82). The Temple of Tellus was located between the Temple of the Victories of Caracalla, donated by Gabinia Hermiona and her heirs, the monument of Dar Lacchab (the Temple of Aesculapius?), built by Lucius Calpurnius, and the much older Templo of Frugi, Concordia, Liber Pater, and Neptune built by Gabinius Datus and Gabinius Bassus. It sat nearly connected to the macellum, built by Licinus Rufus and improved in the later second century by donors from two different families. And the Temple of Tellus itself had apparently been an early donation from a first-century donor. This topographic network of donated buildings allowed Botria Fortunata to place her name and her influence among a series of buildings that reflected the important role of many donors, especially holders of the office of flamen, in creating the urban landscape. In this context, her claim that she built the Temple “a solo, from the ground up,” (no. 89) appears as a response to these numerous buildings that had been constructed by donors from their foundations. Botria Fortunata’s building identified her as an important donor through its topographic relationships with the structures around it.

b. The Portico of Felix Julianus

In addition to Botria Fortunata’s renovation of the Temple of Tellus, a second flamen also donated a public, civic building during the reign of Gallienus: a portico

---

990 See this ch. VII.2.c. The Temple of the Victories of Caracalla, supra p. 279.
built, or reconstructed, by Felix Julianus. The archaeological evidence for this portico is scant; nearly all the fragments of eleven lintels of the portico’s dedicatory inscription were built into the northwest corner of the Byzantine fortress. The text is inscribed in two lines of African capitals; letters in the first line are 19 cm tall, those in the second line 13 cm tall.994

The fragmentary inscription reads:

91. [Pro salute [...] Caes(aris) P(ubli) Licini Gallieni] P(ii) F(elicis) A ug(usti) Germanici pont(ificis) max(imi) trib(unicia) pot(estate) XIII [...] I mp(eratoris) XII I co(n)s(ulis) VI p(atris) p(atriae) pr[o]co(n)s(ulis) et [... ] Corneliae Salo[ninae] Aug(ustae) [... ] cur(ator) rei pub(liae) porticum f[---] I mp(eratoris) XII I co(n)s(ulis) VI p(atris) p(atriae) pr[o]co(n)s(ulis) et [... ] Corneliae Salo[ninae] Aug(ustae) [... ] cur(ator) rei pub(liae) porticum f[---]

For the health of Emperor Caesar Publius Licinius Gallienus Pius Felix Augustus, conqueror of the Germans, chief priest, with tribunician power for the 13th (?) time, acclaimed imperator for the 12th time, consul for the 6th time, father of the country, proconsul, and of Cornelia Salonina Augusta ...

The rest of the text is confusing, but the general sense is:

• An unnamed official dedicated the building, a porticus (of the forum?), in celebration of the foundation of the colony by the Augustus, Gallienus.

• The emperor donated 50,000 sesterces to the city (for the building? Or for the celebration of its dedication?).

• A donor, Felix Iulianus, knight, perpetual flamen, and former (or honorary) duumvir, paid a summa honoraria for the flaminate of 50,000 sesterces. The summa honoraria

994 DFH, 163-164 no. 62, with diagram of findspots.
995 DFH no. 62; CIL, 26559; ILTun 1416; Poinssot 1913-1916, 156-163 no. 65.
funded festivities including monetary handouts and a banquet for the decurions of the city, and theatrical performances for the whole population.\textsuperscript{996} The imperial titulature of the dedication furnishes a date of 264-265 C.E.,\textsuperscript{997} but the fragmentary nature of the text does not offer other important information about the building. For example, there is little evidence to suggest whether the portico was a new construction\textsuperscript{998} or a restored building.\textsuperscript{999} Also unclear is whether Felix Julianus built the portico, and gave additional sums to fund the dedicatory celebrations, or whether the portico’s construction was financed imperially or by the public treasury and Felix Julianus’ donation only supported the festivities for its dedication.

The findspots of the inscribed lintels strongly suggest that the portico was built near the northwest corner of the forum, but where, precisely, is unclear.\textsuperscript{1000} In addition to the lintels of the portico, a series of inscribed bases for imperial statues of “good” emperors (Augustus, Livia, Claudius, Vespasian, Trajan, Hadrian, and Marcus Aurelius) was apparently recarved and installed in a portrait group associated with the portico (based on the paleographic similarities with the portico’s dedicatory inscription and the proximity of their findspots to the lintels).\textsuperscript{1001} The reinstalled portrait statues and bases may have become a second “gallerie de mémoire” in Thugga, commemorating imperial personages, and stood as a connection to Thugga’s early imperial-period past. The portrait statues certainly pointed to this connection, and the portico’s presumed location adjacent to the forum may have also recalled the importance of imperial cult in the early development of the forum. By building a portico, like the one built earlier by

\textsuperscript{996} I am grateful to Dr. Peter van Minnen and David Schwei for their assistance with this fragmentary text.
\textsuperscript{997} Kienast 1996, 219.
\textsuperscript{998} As Maurin in \textit{DFH}, 168.
\textsuperscript{999} As Jacques 1983, 371 no. LXXII; Dupuis 1992, 270 no. 16.
\textsuperscript{1000} \textit{DFH}, 168; Poinssot 1913-1916, 157, suggested that it was either a little north or a little west of the forum.
\textsuperscript{1001} \textit{DFH}, 168 and 164 fig. 113
Gabinius Felix Faustinanus, the donor of the portico (Felix Julianus or ?) situated himself visually as connected to earlier donors who had embellished the forum. With his donations of sportulae and theatrical performances, Felix Julianus participated in the by-now-traditional celebrations associated with building donations by flamines and official builders. His actions therefore had similar motives and outcomes as those of Botria Fortunata, donor of the rebuilt Temple of Tellus.

4. Epilogue: The Christian Era at Thugga

Evidence for the Christian period at Thugga is limited and difficult to date. A number of Christian inscriptions testify to continued occupation at Thugga after the reign of the emperor Constantine. Archaeological evidence of Christian worship practices includes late-antique changes to the Temple of Caelestis, where an apse was added at the north end of the temple, and to the Capitolium, where a crypt was dug beneath the church and the cult statues apparently removed from the cella. On the eastern edge of the city, a new structure was built for Christian cult, using stones removed from the Temple of Saturn and the theater. Even in this late period, euergetism played a role in developing the space. The motives behind the donation of built structures had changed somewhat, but the importance of private benefactions and their impact on urban life continued despite changing cultural patterns in the Christian period.

---

1003 E.g. MAD, 571 nos. 1523 (found near baths of Ain Doura, southwest urban area), 1524 (found in Church of Victoria), 1525 (found reused west of Capitolium).
1004 See this ch. VII.2.e. The Sanctuary of Caelestis, supra p. 290.
1006 Ben Abdallah and Ghaddab in DFH, 129 no. 45: the church of Victoria is "un témoignage tardif de la persistance de l’esprit évergétique qui avait si fortement contribué à édifier la ville sous l’Empire romain, a late example of the persistence of the spirit of euergetism which had so strongly contributed to the construction of the town during the Roman empire."
a. The Church of Victoria

The Church of Victoria, located outside the city on the eastern edge of the plateau, east of the Temple of Saturn, is a striking example of the benefactory spirit which persisted into the Christian period at Thugga; the building is the only purpose-built Christian structure that has been identified at Thugga, and the latest example of euergetism at the site.\footnote{Excavations at the site: Poinssot and Lantier 1925a.} It received donations from at least two separate groups of people, inviting comparisons between this small, religious building and larger civic spaces built much earlier in Thugga’s history, such as the forum and the *macellum*. These examples demonstrate that the tradition of euergetism in Thugga during the late Roman period had new motivations and new objects.

Located within the eastern necropolis of the city, the Church of Victoria is a small, irregular building facing toward the east, following nearly the same orientation as the much larger Temple of Saturn just above it (fig. 83). Spoliated blocks from the Temple of Saturn and also from the theater were used to construct the building, suggesting that by the time of its construction those structures were no longer used regularly.\footnote{Blocks from the theater include parts of the *scaena* inscription (Poinssot and Lantier 1925a, 231; Poinssot 1909b, 108-110 no. 31) and column bases and capitals from the *scaena*, among others. Blocks from the Temple of Saturn include column bases and reused funerary stele as well as fragments of the courtyard cornice.} The building’s basic plan is that of a three-aisle basilica, with several small rooms and additions opening off of the main structure on both north and south (fig. 84).\footnote{Poinssot and Lantier 1925a, 231-235.} In the southern apse of the building, an inscribed text was found on a white marble plaque. The plaque is about 13 cm deep, 33 cm tall and 62 cm wide. The text, in five lines of letters about 4-4.5 cm tall, was painted red; a red painted band also bordered the field of text.\footnote{*DFH*, 128-130; Merlin 1908, ccxxvii.}
92. In nomen(!) dei
   et in nomen(!) martororu(m)
   Exupius reddit votum
   hunc port[i]cu[m basilicae(?)]
   s{luis sumptib]u[s extruxit(?)].1011

   In the name of God and in the name of the martyrs, Exupius completed
   his vow; he built this portico of the basilica(?) at his own expense.

   No nave or porch of the church is preserved, which might be due to the steep
   slope that falls away from the building to the east.1012 Outside the building, a wall marks
   the limits of a small Christian cemetery around the church and in an underground crypt
   to the south-west, where Christian sarcophagi and tomb mosaics were found.1013 A
   second text, found below the church to the east, also apparently derives from the
   building or its annexes.1014 The limestone block, 74 cm long and 30-33 cm tall with an
   uneven, stepped profile, probably was a reused piece of spolia from another building. It
   was found several meters below the church of Victoria, and probably comes from the
   church or one of its annexes. The text is inscribed on the tallest face in seven lines; the
   letters of the first line are 4 cm tall and those of the remaining lines 3 cm.1015

93. Sancti ac baeatissimi martures
   petimus in mente habeatis ut do
   nentur vobis [[......]] Simposium
   Mammari Graniu(m) Elpidefo
   rum qui haec cub(icula) IIII a[.] C P M
   suis sum(p)itus et suis operibus
   perfecerunt.1016

   Saints and most blessed martyrs, We pray that you hold in mind, because
   they will give you (these things), Simposius, son of Mamarius (?), Granius,
   Elpideforus who built these four rooms, A C P M, at their own expense
   and under their own direction.

1011 DFH, 128-130 no. 45; Duval 1982, 39-41 no. 17; CIL, 27332.
1012 Poinssot and Lantier 1925a, 231; Duval 1982, 40.
1013 Khanoussi 1998, 17 no. 3; Poinssot and Lantier 1925a, 240-247.
1014 Findspot: Monceaux 1908, 87; Merlin and Poinssot 1907, ccdv-ccxlvi; Duval 1982, 35 no. 16.
1015 Monceaux 1908, 89-90.
1016 Duval 1982, 34-39 no. 16; CIL, 27333; Merlin and Poinssot 1907, cclxv-cclxvi. Monceaux 1908, 90, offers
   a different reading of the text.
The translation of the text is fraught with difficulty due to odd grammatical constructions, the erasure of a word in the third line, the several possible meanings of the word “Simposium,” (which could be translated as “a banquet hall” or as a proper name), and the abbreviation “A C P M.” Furthermore, it is unclear which of the rooms in the church’s annexes should be identified with the “cubicula” mentioned in text no. 93.

The date of the building is difficult to establish based on the inscribed texts, which provide no convenient date marker. If the restoration of no. 92’s dedicated object, “hunc port[icu]m basilicae(?),” this portico of the basilica is correct, the use of the word basilica to describe the building may suggest a fourth-century date. The mention of cubicula, dining couches, in no. 93, offers no further precision of the date, since banquets in celebration of the saints were an integral part of the cult of the saints from its fourth-century beginnings. It is also not clear whether the texts, which appear to relate to annexes of the main basilical church, are contemporary with that earlier structure, or if they are later in date than the initial construction of the building. The paleographic style of the text suggests that the inscriptions, and thus the buildings that they relate to, are probably from the very late fourth or fifth century C.E.

Several benefactors apparently contributed these structures to the church: Exupius, Simposius son of Mammarius (?), Granius, and Elpideforus. Exupius made his donation on his own (no. 92); the others worked in concert (no. 93). Unlike earlier

---

1017 Duval (1982, 37-39 no. 16) offered several possible suggestions as to the precise meaning of the abbreviation, and favored slightly the interpretation A C P M = “apud corpora martyrum, at the graves of the martyrs.” Monceaux (1908, 93-94) offered a different sense, where A C P M = “ad convivia pro martyrribus, for banquets in honor of the martyrs.” The basic nature of the text, as an ex-voto inscription that mentions a private donation to a public place, remains clear, however, regardless of how the specific challenges of the translation are addressed.

1018 Duval 1982, 39; Poinssot and Lantier 1925a, 236 n. 2, 238, 240.

1019 Duval 1982, 41; 584-586 (names of parts of church buildings); 538-542 (banquets for saints).

1020 Duval 1982, 39 and 41; DFH, 129 no. 45; Poinssot and Lantier 1925a, 240; Monceaux 1908, 98-102.

1021 But see above, n. 1017, for possible alternatives to this interpretation.
building donors at Thugga, these men did not build in honor of an office that they held, nor out of a sense of familial duty. Exupius noted in his inscription that he built his portico in fulfilment of a vow, “*reddit votum.*” But despite the fact that Exupius did not hold a particular office to celebrate with a construction project, his vow bears some similarities to the promises of earlier donors at Thugga, such as Maedius Severus and Maedia Lentula, whose dedicatory inscription recalls that “*templum quod ex sestertium LXX milibus facturum se promiserat …,* Maedius Severus had promised to build this temple out of 70,000 sesterces.”¹⁰²² I am uncertain whether each man made promises to his god(s) or to his community, but in both the early and the later cases they completed their promises with a building dedicated to worship and community activity.

The multiple donors of the *cubicula* (no. 93), whose inter-relationships are not mentioned in the text of their inscription, perhaps gave their donations in order to ensure divine favor or the intercession of the saints on their behalf; this is certainly the general suggestion implicit in the confusing phrases “*petimus in mente habeatis ut donentur vobis,* We pray that you hold (these men) in mind, because they will give to you (or, so that they will give to you?) ….”¹⁰²³ The general pattern of building in return for a future favor recalls that of some earlier buildings at Thugga. An implicit request for additional favors in response to a building donation is present in many of the texts that mention a second generation of potential donors, such as the inscription of the Forum porticoes, built by Quintus Gabinius Felix Faustianus in his own name and those of his children Datus and Processa.¹⁰²⁴ This inscription, and the project of the church’s new cubicula, also recalls the joint efforts of multiple, related, donors who funded the

¹⁰²³ Monceaux 1908, 91-92, takes “*ut donentur vobis*” as a result clause, “so that they (the rooms, or the couches?) will be given to you,” and refers to it as a contract of sorts. Duval (1982, 37) sees it as a causal clause instead, with the sense “Watch over these men, because they will give you ….”
construction and ornamentation of the Temple of Caelestis, a case in which no single donor was able to afford the entire cost of the project. The donation of these two structures, even though they are difficult to identify concretely or understand fully, thus followed patterns that had long since been established for building donations at Thugga. Though the site of public activity had shifted away from the forum and toward the church, it was nevertheless true that private individuals played a role in shaping and improving the space. And the reasons for their donations were similar as well: to honor promises made, or in return for favors granted in past or future. One key difference, of course, was the apparent absence of official euergetism: none of the donors mentioned holding a position of authority in the church community, and their inscriptions suggest that the donations were voluntary. This certainly was not unknown in Thugga, but official euergetism had supplanted the voluntary practice in most cases long before.

A second key difference between the acts of euergetism toward the church and the older temples and civic structures lies in the ways that the donors celebrated their generosity. The practice of self-advertisement on donated buildings continued: both Exupius (no. 92) and the consortium (no. 93) displayed their names on their donations, just as the earlier donors had inscribed their names outside—and inside—their own buildings. But the style of the Christian inscriptions buries the donors’ names in the center of multiple lines of text, in small letters (3-4 cm tall) that would have been visible only from a short distance away. The texts might have been placed at eye level—certainly, these are no grand lintel inscriptions—or installed next to particular features related to the donation (e.g., on the wall of the portico or cubiculum), but the donors’ names were not prominently featured. The goal of these texts may have been less about

1025 See ch. VII.2.e. The Sanctuary of Caelestis, supra p. 290.
making sure that their fellow citizens knew the names of the donors than about first ensuring that the dedicatees, God and the blessed martyrs, understood whose generosity embellished their place of worship. The purpose of the act of benefaction might have changed, but the act of donation still carried powerful meaning even at this late date.

5. Concluding Thoughts

As they had done in previous centuries, donors at Thugga continued to play an important role in the city’s urban development and its maintenance in the Severan period, the third century, and beyond. The donors’ works expressed their membership in an elite group through both text and visual communication. Throughout the Roman period the flaminate provided the primary impetus for encouraging donations to the city, but familial tradition also played a role in determining who donated buildings and where their donations were located. During the Christian period, however, official euergetism had apparently largely disappeared, replaced by new motivations. The importance of donations in creating particular spaces for activities continued unabated, though, as did the practice of situating donations in clusters.

Like earlier benefactors, donors of the later imperial and Christian periods expressed their identities as members of Thugga’s elite both through written text and through the use of visual clues in their works. The inscribed monumental texts of the buildings provided significant information to readers, such as the connection of each building to the office of flamen (e.g., at the Temple of Caelestis) or to other offices (e.g., to the aedileship at the Circus). Moreover, even for viewers with limited literacy, the monumental scale of many of the inscribed texts communicated information about the donors’ wealth and generosity. The portico text of the Temple of Caelestis (no. 87), for
example, communicated specific amounts given by each donor to fund the construction of the temple, but would have been illegible as a whole text from most positions within the sanctuary’s precinct. The text was designed primarily as a visual cue, a shorthand for the donors’ generosity in the construction of the building. A similar effect occurred at Gabinia Hermiona’s Temple of the Victories of Caracalla, where a very long dedicatory inscription (no. 77) featured an essential piece of information at the start of each long, closely-written line: the formula “pro salute,” the emperor’s name, and the donor’s name. The rest of the text communicated information, but the casual viewer would likely have been struck primarily by the sheer length of the text (longer by far than the dedicatory inscription of any other public building in the city) rather than by its contents. At the Circus, dedicatory inscriptions (nos. 79-80) on the metae of the central spina would have been difficult for spectators to read: the texts curved around each meta, probably away from spectators’ eyes, and blocked at least partially from those eyes by passing chariots. The image of monumental text, along with its content, was clearly important to these third-century donors. And the image of inscribed text retained its importance in the Christian period; the dedicatory texts of portions of the Church of Victoria (nos. 92-93) were carved in tiny letters, quite different from the monumentally-sized texts of the nearby Temple of Saturn and theater. The small text would have been difficult to read from far away, but the act of erecting an inscribed plaque or stone still carried meaning outside the content of the words themselves.

Like in earlier periods, the architectural and topographic connections between buildings expressed their donors’ identities in relation to Thugga’s current position in the Roman empire and its earlier roots. Several of the third-century donations to the city connected Thugga closely with the imperial rulers of Africa or with Africa’s capital city, Carthage. Gabinia Hermiona’s Temple of the Victories of Caracalla expressly celebrated
the emperor; his full imperial titulature appeared in the dedicatory inscription, and a triumphal arch was erected immediately next to the Temple. A similar connection between Thugga and Rome’s imperial leaders was made later in Felix Iulianus’ portico near the forum, where the structure was dedicated for the health of the founder of the colonia, the emperor Gallienus, and where images of previous emperors were reinstall ed in a gallerie de mèmoire.

Meanwhile, the architectural elaboration of the Circus, with the addition of permanent spina, metae, and other features, may have been intended to align Thugga once more with the urban development of the provincial capital, Carthage. That city had probably had a circus for generations, but construction of the elaborate new Odeon there during the reign of Septimius Severus1026 focused renewed attention on the city’s entertainment buildings. In the wake of this construction at Carthage, Thugga’s donors must have decided that their arrangements for popular entertainment, too, needed attention, and this resulted in formalizing a space already in use for chariot racing into a structure more like the one at Carthage.

Half of the Severan and third-century dedications I have examined in detail were temples to deities with long histories in Africa: the Temple of Saturn, the Temple of Caelestis, and the Temple of Tellus. The renovations and enhancements at the Temple of Saturn and at the Temple of Tellus indicate that even in the third century, elite members of Thugga’s society who held high positions in the civic administration, flamines of the public imperial cult celebrated in the central city, sought to cultivate connections between themselves and vestiges of earlier cult practice for deities with pre-Roman origins like Baal-Saturn.

The construction of a new Temple of Caelestis (pre-Roman Tanit) highlights this preference for connection to Thugga’s roots even more clearly, since Tanit-Caelestis apparently did not have a regular cult place in the city before the third century. Creating a new sanctuary for this deity meant that donors consciously sought connections with a goddess from Africa rather than an Olympian; there was no possibility of seeking connections with earlier donors rather than the goddess herself, as Botria Fortunata, renovator of the Temple of Tellus, may have done. And yet the architectural vocabulary of the Temple of Caelestis spoke in the language of Thugga’s more recent past, with an independent, frontal temple on a podium, enclosed in a colonnaded precinct like those of earlier flamines (e.g. Julia Paula Laenatiana’s Temple of Minerva II). The use of an inscription in the pediment of the temple, an otherwise-unattested practice at Thugga, called to mind another unique pediment on another frontal temple: the Capitolium. These visual references may have elided the difference between Juno, worshipped in the Capitol, and Caelestis, worshipped in this new sanctuary on the west side of town. Even in a much later period, connections to the physical past were visible in the Church of Victoria. Built partially out of spolia from other buildings in the area, especially the defunct Temple of Saturn, the use of building materials from other buildings created connections between the Church and its worshippers and earlier buildings and their inhabitants, drawing on their roots in Thugga’s history to create their identity in the present.

In large measure, donors of the Severan period, the third century, and late antiquity focused their attention on the fringes of the city, where previous generations of donors had not invested much effort. Donations in the central area of the city had

1027 During this period, deities outside the traditional Roman pantheon, particularly Caelestis, had received imperial attention at Rome, however (supra n. 961), which may have allowed the donors of the new temple at Thugga to highlight connections with Rome as well as with Thugga’s African past.
smaller footprints than those erected on the city’s periphery. For example, Asicia Victoria’s donation to embellish the rostra in the forum (no. 74) renovated an existing structure and probably contributed minimally to changes in daily activity at the site. Similarly, Botria Fortunata’s renovation of the Temple of Tellus may have changed the structure only in limited ways, preserving patterns of use that had existed at the temple since at least the first century. Gabinia Hermiona’s new construction, the Temple of the Victories of Caracalla, though built in an urban insula near the center of the city, nevertheless was designed to fit carefully into a small space, between existing structures like the Maison de Venus to the east, the fountain to the north, and the street on the Temple’s west side. Furthermore, its placement within an area that had already been monumentalized with earlier temples meant that urban life probably did not change significantly as a result of the Temple’s construction, and changes to the city’s fabric were minimal. One exception to this practice of limited intervention in established urban patterns in the central city, the portico of Felix Julianus, is difficult to characterize. If the structure was a new construction rather than a renovation, and if it was located in the area north or west of the forum, the construction of a new portico—an extention to the forum—may have altered access to or traffic patterns in the urban core, perhaps in a symbolic “refounding” of the forum when the city became a *colonia*. But this exception (if it truly was a new building rather than a renovation), built at a time of political change at Thugga, underscores the increasing central control over the city’s urban core, where most third-century buildings were constructed with public financing (e.g. Arch of Severus Alexander;\textsuperscript{1028} Temple of Sol;\textsuperscript{1029} Antoninian baths\textsuperscript{1030}).

\textsuperscript{1028} Khanoussi 1998, 53 no. 38.
\textsuperscript{1029} Khanoussi 1998, 63 no. 44.
\textsuperscript{1030} Khanoussi 1998, 37 no. 21.
On the margins of the urban area, however, private donors continued to play important roles in extending and developing the city’s territory. Several buildings of the Severan period were built in or near Thugga’s necropoleis (Temple of Saturn; Circus; Temple of Caelestis). The buildings on the western side of the city, the Circus and the Temple of Caelestis, were apparently constructed on what had been agricultural land, opening new space to public access at the Temple, and formalizing the public nature of the space at the Circus, which had already been in limited public use prior to its donation to the city and its architectural elaboration (see inscription no. 77). Construction of these structures on the fringes of the city, in some sense paved the way for construction of the Church of Victoria in a similar space. Though the church was apparently built on the eastern side of the city because martyrs may have been buried in the area, the earlier extension of urban activity to site of the Temple of Saturn reinforced a pattern of worship on the margins, which continued when the Church was built nearby.

As in previous periods, traditions of benefaction played a large role in donors’ choices and in the creation of their public identities. These traditions included the importance of the flaminate and other official positions as drivers of euergetism, but also familial patterns. In the Severan period, to a greater extent than at other times in Thugga’s past, heirs and descendants participated in donations promised by older family members, especially among the Gabinii: both the Temple of the Victories of Caracalla and the Temple of Caelestis required participation by multiple generations to complete and dedicate the buildings after their original donors died. But this pattern appears to have been limited to a single generous clan with a very long history of euergetism in Thugga. The heirs of Victor Roscianus, donor of the Temple of Saturn, handed responsibility for the completion of his temple to the civic authorities, and
Asicia Victoria’s donation of balustrates for the rostra was also dedicated by the citizens of Thugga rather than her heirs.

In addition to familial traditions of benefaction, donors also sought to place themselves physically within a network of euergetism, connecting their work to the work of donors who had previously contributed to the city. This was particularly evident in the buildings (re)constructed during the reign of Gallienus, the Temple of Tellus and the Portico of Felix Iulianus. The Temple of Tellus, especially, was located in the midst of a series of donations that connected Botria Fortunata not only to generous donors of recent date (such as Gabinia Hermiona) but also to donors who had shaped the city in previous centuries such as Licinius Rufus, Pacuvius Saturus and Nahania Victoria, and the Hadrianic-period Gabinii. Felix Julianus’ portico may have followed similar patterns. And other donors chose projects that connected them with larger buildings and larger efforts, most notably the Avillii who contributed to the sculptural decoration of and dedicatory celebrations for the Temple of Caelestis (see no. 87). But this practice also appeared in benefactory inscriptions at the Church of Victoria, where multiple donors contributed to the construction of annexes and structures, and received commemoration of their gifts, after the structure was built.

Commemoration of benefactors in public spaces continued to be limited in the third century, as it had been in the second century. Most donors received little public recognition of their actions and their primary memorials were the monumental texts erected in their buildings. One donor, Asicia Victoria, and her family received multiple public statues, many of them probably erected in the theater. Though the physical footprint of her donation was, as I have mentioned, quite limited, Asicia Victoria’s gift to Thugga’s treasury of 100,000 sesterces must have had extensive impact on urban life and merited her inclusion among the most important of Thugga’s benefactors. The
statues erected to her and her family invited comparisons between Asicia Victoria and Marcius Simplex and Marcius Quadratus, donors of the Capitolium and the theater that had shaped Thugga’s urban core and its eastern periphery in the second century. Though it is unclear how the city may have used Asicia Victoria’s donation, her public, visual presence in the city’s gallerie de memorie in the theater demonstrates that her gift was among the most important that the city had ever received.
CHAPTER EIGHT: CONCLUSIONS

1. Agency and Identity

Donors in African cities sought regularly to express a double identity through their buildings, drawing connections between themselves and more urbane cities like Carthage and Rome and at the same time between themselves and Africa’s pre-Roman history and existence. These messages of connection were complex and expressed through multiple media. In first-century Lepcis Magna, for example, Annobal Rufus’ Roman-style theater was inscribed with bilingual texts identifying the donor and the building in both Latin and Neo-Punic. The Latin texts on that building, with their focus on Augustus’ imperial titles, invited comparisons between Annobal Rufus and the emperor; the Neo-Punic texts emphasized the donor’s deep roots in Lepcis Magna’s social structure through the use of Punic titles for his municipal offices. And the building’s architecture drew on both Roman and local patterns, following a typical plan for a Roman theater but employing local stone to build the new structure. Other donors portrayed a balanced Roman-African identity in similar ways, for example at the Temple of Caelestis at Thugga. There donors built a new temple to an African goddess, creating a cult location for the Punic deity in the architectural vocabulary of the Italian peninsula: a frontal temple on a high pedestal and dedicatory inscriptions in the Latin language. At Thugga’s Temple of Saturn, reconstruction in the old sanctuary maintained the earlier shape of the building, but added cult areas for the Genius of Thugga, a deity dressed in a Roman toga, and portrayed the god Saturn in a cult statue with many similarities to statues of the emperors of Rome erected elsewhere in the city.

In other cases at Thugga, the evocation of African identity came in more subtle ways. In the first century, buildings in and around the forum took most of their
orientation cues from the shrine of Massinissa, a structure that predated the Roman
presence in Africa. I have argued that Roman imperial cult in the forum may have been
an outgrowth of earlier cult practice at the same site. Even as the early donors took
steps to make the forum into a central space for Roman-style civic activities like the
celebration of public cult and meetings of the curia, Thugga’s pre-Roman heritage
remained a visible feature in the core of the city’s urban landscape.

Van Bremen has argued, for the Hellenistic and Roman East, that donors and
office-holders were nearly always acting from a basis of family tradition. She writes, “It
is clear from a great many inscriptions that most women acted as members of families
rather than as independent individuals (as did men).”\textsuperscript{1031} In Roman Africa, the situation
appears to have been less regular than the strong family traditions that Van Bremen
identified in Asia Minor. Certainly, some families or familiae followed patterns of
euergetism that crossed generations. At Lepcis Magna, three members of the Tapapii
made donations to complete the theater complex, and the messages conveyed by each
part of the building combined to create a single, coherent theme for viewers of the
structure. At Thugga, the first-century Licinii also followed a pattern of euergetism that
had been established by earlier members of the family, and emphasized their family
connections both in inscribed text and in their buildings’ locations. Beginning in the
second century, the Gabinii developed a strong and persistent tradition of donations
that lasted for a hundred years, and involved multiple generations and branches of this
extensive clan. Each donation made by a Gabinius multiplied the presence of this family
in the physical landscape of the city, so that many public areas, both secular (e.g., the
forum porticoes) and religious (e.g., the templae, the Temple of Caelestis), both on the
margins (the Circus) and in the central city (the Temple of the Victories of Caracalla)

\textsuperscript{1031} Van Bremen 1996, 96.
owed their shape to this clan. Whether we can discern a particular motive for such extended generosity is debatable, but the Gabinii clearly intended to keep their names and the memory of the generosity visible at Thugga.

But many other donations, both at Thugga and at other sites I have examined, apparently did not derive from a family impetus toward euergetism. At Gigthis, though both the Temple of Mercury and the Shrine of Concordia Panthea were donated by family groups—a husband in his name and that of his wife, and a father in the name of his son—neither building seems to have marked the sort of effort made by clans like the Tapapii. Both structures were apparently single donations; we have no evidence that other Servilii or other Ummidii donated additional structures to the town either in the same generation or in subsequent decades. Their donations contributed to the town’s development, but without the long-term, omnipresent visibility of the Gabinii or the Marcii at Thugga. At Thugga a number of buildings were constructed by donors outside of a family program of benefaction. Perhaps we should consider that those donors accomplished their aims through a single benefaction: for example, that Caesetius Perpetuus’ children, Honoratus and Perpetuus, were recognized by the civic authorities in some way and did not feel any need to place their names yet more visibly in the urban landscape. Alternately, we can suppose that the act of donating even a single public structure placed a donor—and his family—into a network of other elite benefactors and that, for many, achieving such a position even one time was enough to situate the family among their desired peers. This was the case at Bulla Regia, where Julia Memmia built a large bath complex for her city. In this light, the multiple donations of the Licinii, the Marcii, or the Gabinii at Thugga can be seen as a

---

1032 The epigraphic record suggests that other members of these families did participate in public life in various ways, such as by serving as councillors (decuriones) or ambassadors on behalf of the town.
mechanism for centering themselves in the network of donors or for placing themselves at the top of the hierarchy of elite citizens.

Beginning in the second century at Thugga, most of the single donations, outside family or clan traditions of benefaction, came about as a result of the donor’s election to office. Before the second century, some benefactors apparently made donations outside of elected positions with *summa honoraria*; *patroni* of the early towns may not have been officially expected to pay for public buildings. The first developments of Thugga as a Roman city came about because of these voluntary donations—the formalization of the forum, the development of the infrastructure for imperial cult practice, the construction of the *macellum* and of temples in the area around the forum. But the sources of such voluntary donations, elite residents of Thugga and citizens of Carthage who were active in civic life in the capital, apparently turned away from Thugga in the later first century.

In the second century the city developed new mechanisms for soliciting donations, chief among these mechanisms being “official” euergetism, buildings built on account of election to civic offices and encompassing the fees paid for such offices. This source became critical to Thugga’s development into a fully fledged Roman city; office-holders, particularly *flamines*, priests of the imperial cult, provided many new or rebuilt temples and civic buildings during the second and third centuries. Marcius Quadratus, donor of the theater, was a perpetual *flamen*; Julia Paula Laenatiana, who built the Temple of Minerva II, held the position of *flaminica*; Octavius Victor Roscianus, donor of the renovated Temple of Saturn, made his testamentary gift in honor of an office. Interestingly, *flamines* frequently built temples, but only infrequently included explicit references to imperial personages in their buildings; Gabinia Hermiona’s temple of the Victories of Caracalla, which may have been erected in response to her flaminate,

---

1033 Warmington 1954 on the roles that *patroni* played in cities.
was a unique exception. Official euergetism also played an important role in the urban development of other African towns, as for example at Gigthis, where Ummidius Sedatus erected the Shrine of Concordia Panthea in response to his son’s election to the decurionate.

Such official euergetism was frequently, though not always, accompanied by additional largess toward the public at Thugga: distributions of oil for the baths, of monetary handouts to the civic leaders, celebration of banquets, and production of theatrical performances. These gifts were rarely given outside of official donations; for example, the dedicatory text of the forum porticoes at Thugga made no mention of such celebrations, but the dedication of Lucius Calpurnius’ temple (of Aesculapius?), the monument of Dar Lacchab, did. This study does not shed light on whether such a custom of additional benefactions developed at other cities, as the examples from other sites, though limited, do not include such celebratory largesses. At other sites, the two types of donation may have been separate and given by different donors. At Thugga, however, it became customary for donors to craft an identity of generosity with these additional gifts, and eventually, with foundations for annual distributions of such gifts like that established by Asicia Victoria in the early third century.

Though donors expressed many elements of both individual and family identities in their buildings and inscriptions, gender played a very small role in that expression, at least among most donors at Thugga. Indeed, in Roman North Africa women’s donated buildings included both religious and civic structures, just like men’s buildings; women identified themselves in their inscriptions with both their families and their offices, in the same way that men did. In some cases, of course, such as at the Temple of Mercury at Gigthis, the woman named in the inscribed text may not have had much influence over the details of the building’s architecture and decoration. But in
other cases, like in Julia Paula Laenatiana’s Temple of Minerva II at Thugga, or in Julia Memmia’s baths at Bulla Regia, the women, as sole donors of the structure, apparently had sole control over such decisions. Nevertheless, it is difficult to point to any particularly “feminine” messages in such buildings; at Thugga, another Temple of Minerva had already been erected by a male donor, and the goddess therefore may not have had particularly strong associations with women in the city. Julia Memmia’s baths similarly looked like a well-appointed civic bath structure, of the sort erected at numerous sites in Africa, and nothing in the preserved decoration of the building has strong messages that telegraph the donor’s gender. Indeed, the symbols of the sodalitates inscribed on the walls of the building point rather in the opposite direction, since such sodalitates were associations connected to the circus and not fully open to women.

In one case we can read a woman’s messages, distinct from ideas put forth by her male relatives, in a building and its decorative program. Supuhinbal’s Temple of Ceres in the first-century theater complex at Lepcis Magna does convey a specifically female identity and message. Supuhinbal’s name as the donor of the building, the dedication to the goddess Ceres, and the image of the recently-deceased Livia portrayed as Ceres combined in that instance to create a message of imperial emulation that corresponded with that of the rest of the theater complex as a whole. At the same time, Supuhinbal’s choice to feature the empress Livia’s face allowed her to communicate a more specific message about her own identity in Lepcis Magna’s society, as first lady in an analogous position to Livia in Rome. This case, unique though it is in the current study, suggests that in some cases women, and indeed men too, may have communicated specific messages about their identity through gender-specific references. Viewers of their buildings in antiquity would have understood those nuanced messages far more easily than archaeologists can, due to incomplete preservation in the archaeological record.
But as it stands now, we can only rarely read such clear messages of gender and social identity in buildings donated by women.

2. Urban Space

There seems to have been little relationship between a benefactor’s time period and the type of his or her gift to a city. Donors gave temples, entertainment buildings, infrastructure, civic buildings, and commercial buildings without any prescribed plan. Annobal Rufus built a theater at Lepcis Magna in the very early first century; Thugga did not receive a theater until the mid-second century. The forum at Thugga was renovated several times in the first, second, and third centuries. At all the sites examined in this study, temples were constructed and renovated by donors throughout the Roman period, beginning at least in the first century and continuing all the way through to at least the mid-third century, if not later. There appears to have been no standard pattern that dictated the order in which buildings were built in the cities.

At Thugga, a topographical pattern may have governed the process of urban development. The earliest works of benefactors in the city focused on the area of the forum and its immediate surroundings. After the city’s central core had been established, further development monumentalized areas outside the center, for example to the south with the construction of the first Temple of Minerva. This process of development repeated several times over Thugga’s history, with donors focusing at the core—the forum and the area macelli—and then shifting their attention to other parts of the city, moving outward to focus on the city’s fringes or on neighborhoods with a mostly domestic, rather than monumental, character. Donors always kept the forum and area macelli at the forefront of their attention; at the beginning of major periods of building the forum was always the first to receive new constructions. In the first century
these attentions included paving the space and creating monumental entryways; in the second century, building the portico around the forum space; in the third century, decorating the rostra. Only after the forum received its monumental constructions or renovations did donors turn to other parts of the city.

Within the framework of Roman cities’ topography, donors appear to have had many choices about where to site temple buildings. Thugga’s temples were built in public zones, around the forum and area macelli, and also in neighborhoods that were largely domestic in character. In one instance, Gabinia Hermiona may have given land for a temple immediately adjacent to her own house, and certainly a number of temples were built in areas where houses also stood. But establishing a temple even in a domestic area of the city may have had little impact on the ways that residents used the space; in most cases at Thugga, single temple buildings attracted few later donations of other structures to their spaces. For example, the Temple of Venus Concordia built by Licinia Prisca north of the forum apparently did not inspire others to build in the same immediate space in later years. Likewise the Temple of Minerva I in the city’s southern area appears to have stood separate from other religious structures. A similar pattern was visible at Gigthis and at Ammaedara, where temples at the edge of the urban zones of those cities stood separate from other structures built by donors. Of course, this provides additional evidence, if any were needed, of the ubiquity of religion in Roman daily life. But their ordinariness meant that they, and their donors, had little influence on the shape of the city in future generations.

Civic structures appear to have had much greater influence on the development of urban spaces; these buildings—locations of entertainment, commerce, and administration—attracted other donations over time to form zones of public buildings.

---

1034 Saint-Amans 2004, 239-264, shows how religious structures were placed in Thugga’s urban fabric.
and create neighborhoods that encompassed both secular and religious activities in the public sphere. We have ample evidence of this process at Thugga in the forum, in the area macelli, around the theater, around the templae of the Gabinii, and perhaps even at the Circus. Initial building at these sites of structures with primarily or partially secular purposes later attracted other donors to build buildings, especially temples, in areas that were already given over to public activity. Thus, the area macelli near the forum became, over time, not just a space where people went for commercial activities, but also a site for cult activities, particularly for celebration of the cult of Mercury. The templae and auditorium of the Gabinii attracted two additional (anonymous) temples to their environs, and in the Severan period an imperially-financed bath complex was built across the street. This pattern also operated at other cities; in Sabratha, Flavius Tullus’ construction of an aqueduct and twelve fountains may have dictated later developments in the urban zone, perhaps including the construction of the city’s monumental theater in an area that had been provided with water by Tullus’ donation.

Another important element of donors’ identity, especially at Thugga, was their connection with the metropolitan, urbane world of Carthage. This was expressed not only in texts but also in the locations and types of buildings that the donors chose to erect. Donors sought such connections with Carthage in order to make their rural town a model of the capital city, from the earliest days of the Roman pagus, with construction of the forum, to the second century when the city underwent a building boom like that at Carthage, until at least the mid-third century when Thugga finally received a built

---

1035 The inscription of Gabinia Hermiona that gave the Circus to the city mentioned that the field was already in use for the races (see ch. VII.2.d. The Circus, supra p. 284). It is not clear for how long such use had occurred; perhaps the field was already in use for chariot racing in the Antonine period when Julia Paula Laenatiana built her Temple of Minerva (see ch. VI.3.212b. The Temple of Minerva II, supra p. 212.

1036 The construction of an odeon attached to the templae of the Gabinii (see ch. VI.2.c, supra p. 190) made that a multi-purpose structure used at least sometimes for entertainment as well as religious activities.
Circus. This mimickry of the capital city helped both the donors and the city at large create or reinforce an image of sophistication. The donors emphasized their connections to the city by modeling for their fellow citizens the structures that had been built in Carthage; their connections to the capital reinforced the donors’ position among the elite residents not only of Thugga but of Carthage itself. It is not clear whether donors in other cities also sought to connect their buildings to developments in Carthage or other major cities like Lepcis Magna, though such emulation may have been in operation at sites like Gigthis in much the same way as it happened at Thugga.

One way that donors influenced the development of urban space at Thugga was by turning private land over to public use. This process increased the area of the urban landscape, especially when the land had previously been under agricultural use on the city’s periphery. The Circus, for example, was built on land given by the benefactor Gabinia Hermiona, land which had previously been used as a field. Even in the central areas of the town, however, the process of donation turned more and more land into public, communal space and contributed to the development of public zones in the city. For example, I have argued that Thugga’s first-century macellum may have been built on land owned by the Licinii, and that their other donations in the same area may also have been built on privately-held land. Decades later, the Pompeii, donors of the Temple of Augustan Pietas, expressly stated that the temple was built on land that Pompeius Rogatus owned privately, land nearly adjacent to the macellum and now given over to public use. Archaeological evidence from other sites indicates that this was a regular result of euergetism; Julia Memmia’s bath complex at Bulla Regia took over lots that had been used for domestic structures and created a monumental new public structure there.
3. Reception

One way of gauging response to donors’ works is to examine the commemoration that they received, especially physical commemoration in the form of statues and other public accolades for their works. African epigraphic corpora are full of statue bases and honorific texts that cite donors’ “liberalitas, generosity,”\(^{1037}\) or their “munificentia, bounty,”\(^{1038}\) as the reason for the city to erect such a statue. But other criteria also played a role in the decision to offer a statue to a donor or patron, as Apuleius’ speech on his own public statue makes clear.\(^{1039}\) Based on the evidence of this study, it seems that each city had its own set of criteria for setting up public statues to donors and other figures. At Thugga, few donors received statues; at Gigthis, many donors did. As Apuleius’ speech demonstrates, the process of setting up a statue was subject to political will; the varying practices of commemoration at different towns in Roman Africa underscore the role of individuals and individual cities in making such decisions.

The process of erecting statues for benefactors was apparently reserved for a few important donors at Thugga. This is not to say that there were few public statues erected around the site; the city’s public spaces were filled with statues to both private

---

\(^{1037}\) See, e.g., ch.VII.2.b. The Rostra of Asicia Victoria, supra p. 270, inscription no. 76.

\(^{1038}\) See, e.g., ch. II.2.a. The Temple of Mercury, supra p. 41, inscription no. 6.

\(^{1039}\) Apul., Flor. 16.34-36: (34) quod honorem meum non minus mereor quam intellego, quod clarissimi et eruditissimi uiri tanto testimonio exulto. (35) Quippe testimonium mihi perhibuit in curia Carthaginiensium non minus splendidissima quam benignissima uir consularis; cui etiam notum esse tantummodo summus honor est, is etiam laudator mihi apud principes Africae uiros quodam modo astitit. (36) Nam, ut comperior, nudiis tertius libello misso, per quem postulabat locum celebrem statuae meae …

“… I deserve this honor [of a public statue in Carthage] no less than I appreciate it, because I exult in the powerful support of a most famous and learned man. A man of consular rank lent me his support in the Carthaginian senate, support that is no less highly glorious than it is extremely kind. Merely to be known by him is an immense honour, but he has also stood by me as my advocate before the chief men of Africa. For I understand that the day before yesterday he sent you a note in which he asked for a public site for my statue …” (trans. J. Hilton 2001).
individuals and political leaders. But among the donors examined in this study, only a handful received public statues, beginning in the second century. Before that time, donors’ monuments may have stood as their primary commemoration; inscribed texts carefully positioned donors’ names and the names of their projects in eye-catching locations, so that viewers readily saw this important information. Such was the case, for example, in Licinius Rufus’ dedicatory inscription on the macellum.

Beginning in the mid-second century, the urban landscape at Thugga grew more and more crowded with dedicatory inscriptions on monumental buildings, as additional donors contributed to the continued development of the city. Beginning in the Hadrianic period, some donors received additional commemoration of their works in the form of statues erected at public expense, often at or near the site of their donation. The criterion for such commemoration at Thugga may have been the impact of the donation (or the perception of its impact) on the further development of urban life. Thus, the Gabinii who built the templo and odeon—the first permanent entertainment building in the city—received statues, as did the donors of the theater and the Capitolium, buildings that reshaped the city’s landscape at both its core and its periphery. This process was even, in at least one case, applied retroactively to commemorate Licinius Rufus’ donation of the macellum, at the same time that other donors renovated that important structure. Asicia Victoria, who made a substantial donation of an endowed foundation for the city’s treasury, also received commemoration in this form; though her physical gift, the balustrades of the rostra, was of limited scope, her impact on the life of the city was apparently extensive and merited
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1040 E.g., statues to patrons such as M. Paccius Silvanus Coreius Gallus Lucius Pullaienus Gargilius Antiquus (DFH no. 64 = CIL 26579); statues to emperors such as those installed in the portico of Felix Julianus in the third century (see ch. VII.3b. The Portico of Felix Julianus, supra p. 305) or the colossal statues of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus erected at the southeastern entry to the forum (DFH no. 7 and ILAfr 561).
commemoration in public. In at least one case, other members of the donors’ family also received public honor in this fashion: both Marcius Maximus and Marcius Clemens, father and brother of the donors of the Capitol and the theater, also received public statues at public expense. In other cases, other members of the families of donors received statues erected on public land at private expense, such as Gabinia Beata, the wife and mother of the Gabinii who built the *templum*. The process by which these particular donors and their family members were granted public statues remains obscure—sponsorship, as Apuleius describes, may well have been involved—but the decurions at Thugga apparently used the impact of a particular donor’s gift as one criterion to determine which of the city’s many benefactors would receive the civic honor of a public statue.

In at least one case, the decision to commemorate donors of a building helped those donors situate themselves within the network of elite euergetism at Thugga. The statue base of Licinius Rufus, donor of the *macellum*, was installed at approximately the same time as his building was renovated by Pacuvius Saturus and Nahania Victoria, who also received a public commemoration of their work. By drawing attention to the first donor of the building, the public acknowledged the relationship between Licinius Rufus and his successors, Pacuvius Saturus and Nahania Victoria, whose names were also displayed on the structure. The juxtaposition of their names with that of Licinius Rufus created links between them and encouraged viewers to recognize Pacuvius Saturus and Nahania Victoria in their place in the social hierarchy, next to the important donor and patron Licinius Rufus. Such connections underscored the importance of the donors who were signalled out for commemoration, and reinforced their identity as members of Thugga’s elite.
Other donors also sought to place themselves in the network of euergetism at Thugga, though many did so without the benefit of additional reinforcement in the form of a public statue. In case after case, donors made choices that allowed them to respond, directly or indirectly, to other benefactors and their works. This response situated them among their peers in Thugga’s elite, even when their contributions may have been relatively limited. For example, a father and son, Modius Rusticus and Modius Licinianus, donated a statue of Mercury, *genius macelli*, which was apparently erected in the apse of the *macellum* at the time of that building’s renovation by Pacuvius Saturus and Nahania Victoria. The connections which Pacuvius Saturus and Nahania Victoria sought with the *macellum*’s previous donor, Licinius Rufus, also situated the other donors, the Modii, in that same network of donors, relating them to all previous benefactors of the building. This process was continual, beginning in the early first century with Caesetius Perpetuus’ arch in the forum, constructed in response to Postumius Chius’ own arch, previously erected at the site. And it was still in operation in the third century, for example at the Temple of Caelestis, where the Avillii contributed to the decoration of the goddess’ temple and the celebrations in honor of its dedication; a similar process occurred when Botria Fortunata renovated the Temple of Tellus. Unlike the patterns of public commemoration, which appear to have been site-specific, the choices of donors to respond to earlier works and place themselves into an elite context were visible in many cities of Africa proconsularis. The theater at Lepcis Magna, for example, was an important building complex that attracted other smaller donations from later donors; contribution to the continuing embellishment of that building allowed those later donors to proclaim themselves as heirs of the Tapapii. Donors of such large public monuments, especially those donors at Thugga who received public statues in thanks for their generosity, became the central nodes in the
network of elite euergetism, and the standards which other benefactors emulated in their own works.

Neither archaeological evidence nor epigraphy can demonstrate this network of inter-relations on its own. Public buildings, unidentified by texts, remain vague locations for a range of activities. Even if iconographic evidence allowed us to identify a Temple of Venus Concordia, for example, such a building would be an isolated example of cult practice without an inscription to identify its donor and her social roles as freedwoman, priestess of the imperial cult, and wife of a patronus of the city. Combining the evidence of the building’s archaeological remains and its location with its dedicatory text, we can see how Licinia Prisca’s identity was expressed through her building’s visual cues as well as through its inscription. Similarly, epigraphic evidence alone would not be enough to fully understand the relationship between the two buildings at Thugga that were described as having “xysti,” the theater and the templo-odeon complex. Since the dedicatory inscriptions of the templo provide little specific detail about the layout of the complex, we might conclude that the xysti of the templo took a different form than those of the theater, a building with a markedly different purpose. But the archaeological evidence from the building complex, where a small odeon was constructed adjacent to the courtyard of the templo, demonstrates that the theater and the templo had overlapping forms and functions. The decision to use the same word to describe the structures was a conscious effort on the part of Marcius Quadratus, donor of the theater, to create connections between himself and the Gabinii, his predecessors. It is only by combining the archaeological and the epigraphic evidence, and by treating epigraphic texts as part of a building’s artifact assemblage, that we can begin to understand how donors communicated messages of identity through their works, and how they influenced the future development of urban spaces.
in Africa proconsularis. The detailed study of a single town, Thugga, over a period of centuries sheds new light on the roles that individual agents played in creating the physical environment and civic life of the Roman African city.
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Figure 2
General plan of Gigthis, showing location of major monuments and topographic layout. After Constans 1916, plate 1.
Plan of the Sanctuary of Mercury at Gigthis, showing approximate findspots of inscriptions.
After Constans 1916, plate 15 and Gauckler 1907, plate 3.

Figure 4
Head of Mercury from Temple of Mercury, Githis.
Gauckler et al. 1910, plate 43 no. 1.
Plan of forum at Gigthis, showing location of Shrine of Concordia Panthea (in box). Gauckler 1907, plate 1.
Figure 7
detail of forum at Gigthis, northeast corner, showing Shrine of Concordia Panthea and findspots of related inscriptions. After Gauckler 1907, plate 1.

General plan of Ammaedara (Haidra), showing location of major monuments. After Baratte and Duval 1974, fig. 2.
Ruins of the Sanctuary of Saturn, Ammaedara, from the southeast. In the background, the Tetrastyle Mausoleum and the urban core of Ammaedara. Baratte and Benzina Ben Abdallah 2000, 53, fig. 2.
Basic plan of Temple of Saturn, Ammaedara.
A = entryway; B = courtyard; C = porticoes?; D = altar; E = cella; F = favissa
LeGlay 1961, 324, fig. 6.
Basic plan of Lepcis Magna, showing location of major monuments and street grid.
After Ward-Perkins 1982, 37, fig. 1.
Figure 13

Plan of theater-temple-quadriporticus complex of Lepcis Magna, showing restored locations of inscribed material. After Caputo 1987, plate VII.
State plan and reconstructed plan of Temple of Ceres in the *summa cavea* of the theater complex of Lepcis Magna. Caputo 1987, plate 152.
General plan of Sabratha, showing major monuments. 
After Ward-Perkins 1982, fig. 2.

Figure 16
Fountain of Flavius Tullus at Sabratha, from west; Antonine temple in background. Bartoccini 1964, plate VIIIa.

b. Specus of aqueduct channel, under modern roadway. Di Vita 1985, fig. 10.
Plan of theater at Sabratha (state in 1930), showing hypothesized location of another *lacus* of Flavius Tullus. After Caputo 1959, plate 60.
Hypothesized *lacus* of Flavius Tullus in the southwest corner of the theater’s *porticus post scaenam*, showing “well” and “tank” features.
Caputo 1959, plate 17, fig. 32.
Plan of Sabratha’s forum area and East Forum Temple, showing location of major drains installed during Antonine refurbishments.
Kenrick 1986, 25, fig. 6.
General plan of Bulla Regia, showing location of major public monuments and excavated domestic structures. Bath buildings are marked in grey.
After Beschaouch et al. 1977, fig. 1.
Restored section of the entry portico of the Baths of Julia Memmia. Broise and Thébert 1993, 22, fig. 27.
The Baths of Julia Memmia in the neighborhood context.
After Broise and Thébert 1993, fig. 353.
General plan of Thugga showing topographic layout and remains of all periods. Dotted areas indicate approximate extent of necropoleis.
After Golvin and Khanoussi (eds.) 2005, fig. 1.
Diachronic plan of Thugga’s central area, showing Roman buildings (black lines) and 6th-century Byzantine fortress (hashed lines).
After C. Poinssot 1958, fig. 2.
Plan of Thugga, showing location of pre-Roman remains.
Figure 29

Thugga’s central area, showing location of shrine of Massinissa (blue box) and inscription findspot.

Approximate findspot of bilingual inscription of shrine of Massinissa.
View of Byzantine fortress from southwest, showing incorporation of second-century Capitolium. Khanoussi 1998, 33, no. 16.
Inscription of Postumius Chius (no. 27) *in situ* in Byzantine fortress south wall. Photo: Allison Sterrett-Krause.

Figure 31
Thugga’s central area, showing location of Postumius Chius’ inscription and possible sites of his building projects (red boxes).
Thugga’s central area, showing findspot of Caesetius Perpetuus’ inscription and two possible sites of his building project (yellow boxes).
Thugga’s central area, showing findspot of Licinius Tyrannus’ inscription and possible area of his building project (green box).
Thugga’s central area, showing donations of first-century donors in the forum. Red = Postumius Chius; Yellow = Caesetius Perpetuus; Green = Licinius Tyrannus. Blue = Hellenistic Shrine of Massinissa.
Plan of Thugga, showing locations of donations by Licinius Rufus and Licinia Prisca.
Location of Licinius Rufus' macellum in the center of Thugga.
Plan of macellum (excavated remains).
After Merlin 1919, cxxx.

Figure 38
Locations of inscriptions mentioning Venus Concordia and probable location of temples of the goddess.
Plan of Thugga showing locations of Flavian- and Trajanic-period donations.
View of Sanctuary of Minerva I, showing apse at western end with statue base (inscription no. 33) in situ. Khanoussi 1998, 47, no. 29.
Plan of Thugga, showing Hadriani-period donations.

Plan of the central area, showing Temple of Augustan Pietas in relation to neighboring structures.
Temple of Augustan Pietas, from northwest, showing relationships between steps of Temple and podium of Temple of Fortuna, Venus Concordia, and Mercury.
Saint-Amans 2004, 347, fig. 72a.

Figure 47
Plan of Thugga, showing known locations of findspots of inscriptions mentioning the *Templa* of the Gabinii.
Complex of Temples A, B, and C, showing location of some inscriptions' findspots. Temple B (cellae, courtyard, and auditorium) is likely location of *Templa* of the Gabinii.
After Poinssot 1961, 256, fig. 1.

Plan of Thugga showing location of private donations made during the Antonine period, ca. 140-192 C.E.
Plan of central area, showing location of forum porticoes inside later Byzantine fortress.
Forum, showing column capitals and shafts from the portico in lower right foreground.

Figure 53
Plan of Temple of Minerva II. Eingartner 1992, 222, fig. 128.
Axionometric reconstruction of Temple of Minerva II, showing porticoed courtyard, staircase, and *cella* raised above courtyard.
Eingartner 1992, 223, fig. 129.
Temple of Minerva II, showing podium of *cella* and re-erected columns of portico. Photo: Allison Sterrett-Krause.
Reconstructed view of Temple of Minerva II, from main entry into sanctuary.
Eingartner 1992, 223, fig. 130.
Plan of Monument of Dar Lacchab (Temple of Aesculapius?).
Saint-Amans 2004, 217, fig. 3b.
Monument of Dar Lacchab (Temple of Aesculapius?), main doorway and view into courtyard. Saint-Amans 2004, 309, fig. 34a.
Capitolium, front view from south, showing pedimental sculpture and inscription.  
*DFH*, 89, no. 32, fig. 53.
Plan of theater, showing findspots of inscriptions (solid lines) and restored locations (dashed lines). After Poinssot 1958, 28, fig. 1.
a. Capitolium, Thugga: Detail of apotheosis scene in south pediment.

b. Rome: Apotheosis scene on column base of Antoninus Pius and Faustina.
Photograph courtesy of Mary Ann Sullivan,
http://www.bluffton.edu/~sullivam/romanpius/base.jpg

Figure 63
Theater: *scaenae frons* with re-erected dedicatory inscription (no. 59).
Photo: Allison Sterrett-Krause.
Theater: view from *scaena* toward *cavea* and portico, showing re-erected dedicatory inscription (no. 57). Photo: Allison Sterrett-Krause.
Plan of central area, showing sites of buildings constructed (or renovated) by Pacuvius Saturus, Nahania Victoria, and the Modii.

Figure 66
Remains of the Temple of Mercury, showing podium of porch, and behind it, three *cellae*. Photo: Allison Sterrett-Krause.

Figure 67
Eastern exterior wall of Byzantine fortress and steps of Temple of Mercury podium, with box highlighting reuse location of limestone lintels of Temple of Mercury exterior inscription (no. 64).
Photo: Allison Sterrett-Krause.
Plan of central area, showing findspots of inscription texts of Pacuvius Saturus, Nahania Victoria, and the Modii.

Figure 69
Plan of macellum, showing location of second-century renovations. After Merlin 1919, cxxx.
Plan of Thugga, showing location of Severan-period donations.
Plan of the Temple of Saturn at Thugga.
Saint-Amans 2004, 217, fig. 3c.
a. Statue of the togate *Genius Thuggensis* wearing the mural crown.
C. Poinssot 1955, plate VI, fig. 20.

b. Head of the cult statue of Saturn, carved in white marble.
C. Poinssot 1955, plate I, fig. 6.
Plan of central area, showing findspots of rostra text. Boxes mark structures that have been identified as the rostra or tribunal.

Figure 74
Detailed plan of the Temple of the Victories of Caracalla, showing its urban context.
Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005b, 34, fig. 5.
Reconstructed elevation of south façade of the Temple of the Victories of Caracalla, and adjacent triumphal arch. Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005a, 46, fig. 27.
Reconstructed elevation of *cella* of Temple of the Victories of Caracalla. Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005b, 57, fig. 46.
Detailed plan of the Circus at Thugga, showing architectural remains and findspots of inscribed texts. Humphrey 1986, 323, fig. 146.
Plan of western monuments, showing Sanctuary of Caelestis in its neighborhood context.
Plan of Sanctuary of Caelestin, showing approximate findspots of inscriptions. Brouquier-Reddé et al. 2005a, fig. 171.
b. Eastern end of sanctuary portico, showing statue niche. Photo: Allison Sterrett-Krause.
Plan of central monuments, showing Sanctuary of Tellus in its neighborhood context.

Figure 82
Plan of Thugga, showing Christian-period Church of Victoria, in its urban context.
Findspot of Exupius’ dedicatory inscription (no. 91)

Findspot of the inscription to the blessed martyrs (no. 92)

Detailed plan of the Church of Victoria, showing findspots of inscriptions. Institut Nationale du Patrimoine 2008a.