

## CHAPTER SIX

# SUPRA-CIVIC LANDOWNING AND SUPRA-CIVIC EUERGETIC ACTIVITIES OF URBAN ELITES IN THE IMPERIAL PELOPONNESE

A.D. RIZAKIS

## INTRODUCTION

The Roman conquest brought an upheaval to the Greek world at both the political and the socio-economic level. Unlike the great Hellenistic powers who wanted only to preserve their political influence on the Greeks, Roman domination had broader objectives, since it introduced new standards to land property, thus affecting the legal and socio-economic status as much as the everyday life of the subjected populations.

The idea that the Roman authorities sought, as did the Hellenistic monarchs before them, the support of the *possidentes* both for the conquest and consolidation of their power in the East and for the local government entrusted completely to the members of this class is universally accepted. For their part the notable ones, whose authority had been disputed and threatened for a long time during the Hellenistic period, saw in Rome a faithful and unexpected ally. It is thus that an understanding was reached between the Roman and Greek elites, a reciprocity, a “harmony of interest”.<sup>1</sup> This collaboration evolved and took on a new form upon the creation of the Roman Empire, since local elites could henceforth be integrated more easily into, and form part of, the Empire.<sup>2</sup> Important Peloponnesian families certainly did not oppose the new geo-political order of the peninsula introduced by the *Princeps* and responded spontaneously to its appeal for the restoration of the damage caused by the civil wars to property and to tradition. They therefore undertook a series of initiatives at the local level not only in support of the restoration, proclaimed by Augustus, of cults and temples but also by the introduction of the imperial cult, which is the ultimate expression of their loyalty to the Emperor.<sup>3</sup> Rome was not

---

<sup>1</sup> The formula is that of Galtung 1971 cited by Alcock 1993, 19 n. 23 with all references to this matter. For the social unrest in this period and the difficult position of the leading class in many Peloponnesian cities during the Hellenistic period, see Briscoe 1967; Ste Croix 1981, 300-326.

<sup>2</sup> On the notables' attitude towards Rome, see Brunt 1976, 161-173; Quass 1982, 188-213.

<sup>3</sup> Apart from individuals, groups of citizens could still contribute through collective donations (*epidoseis*) to the restoration of public or sacred buildings. In Messene, numerous members of the local aristocracy contribute to the attempt to restore temples and other public monuments that had been destroyed following the appeal of the Roman emperor for the revival of the tradition and *pietas* (see Migeotte 1985. For Arcadia, see Jost 1985, 126-127). The introduction of the imperial cult, which

indifferent to these new signs of loyalty and rewarded them by granting certain individuals the status of *civitas romana*.<sup>4</sup> Their close association with the imperial cult was to become the key for the strategy of these urban groups, since the execution of the priesthood of the imperial cult diminished the distance between them and the Roman nobility and opened the doors for Roman careers. Thus, around the middle of the first century AD, the first Peloponnesian, originating from Corinth, was admitted to the equestrian order, although the way to the Senate opened up only in the middle of the second century.<sup>5</sup> The number of notable Peloponnesians admitted to the Senate is extremely limited and they originate from Sparta and Messenia. Only one of them succeeded in becoming consul.<sup>6</sup>

#### COSMOPOLITANISM AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF INTER-CIVIC NETWORKS

The mobility of the elites was, within the context of Greek cities, restricted by numerous obstacles of a political or legal nature, which were removed or overcome by the Roman Empire. Needless to say, the movement of goods and of people was greatly facilitated by the Roman peace, which offered the privileged of the provinces new powers, prestige and wealth. This situation led, *mutatis mutandis*, to the formation of a cosmopolitan class, whose ambitions surpassed the limited civic framework.

However, the realisation of such ambitions depended greatly on the connections and support that each family possessed, both within the city and beyond its borders. These connections were obviously not handed ready to an individual. Instead, they were built through a slow and continuous effort involving contacts and exchanges, the creation of a network of aristocratic friends, relations, employers or clients and, finally, the political affiliations occasionally created through marriage.

---

was initiated by members of this class, reflects the confidence in the *princeps* and expresses the loyalty to him by promoting him as the new point of reference, see Alcock 1993, 198-199; for the date of the introduction of the Imperial cult in the various Peloponnesian cities, see M. Kantirea, 2001-2002.

<sup>4</sup> For the diffusion of the *civitas romana* during the Julio-Claudian dynasty, see Hoet 1996; Rizakis 2001a and 2007.

<sup>5</sup> For the list of *equites* originating from Peloponnesian cities, see Rizakis 2001a, 188 n. 53 and 2001b, 46 and n. 39.

<sup>6</sup> Two Spartan families, the C. Iulii of the Euryclids (Halfmann 1979, 125-126 no. 20; Quass 1982, 191; Cartledge-Spawforth 1989, 98-99 and 110-112; Rizakis et al. 2004, *LAC.* 462) and the Ti. Claudii Brasidae (Halfmann 1979, 188-189 no. 111; Spawforth 1985, 227; Cartledge-Spawforth 1989, 120; Rizakis et al. 2004, *LAC.* 274) and one from Messene, the Ti. Claudii Saethidae (see Halfmann 1979, 174 no. 93; 196, no. 126 and 127; Rizakis et al. 2004, *MES.* 157). The only consul who originated from the Peloponnese was Ti. Cladius Frontinus, member of the illustrious Messenian family of Saethidae, see Halfmann 1979, 174 no. 93; Rizakis et al. 2004, *MES.* 142.

The strategy followed by the noble families of the province of Achaëa is illustrated in the literature of the period, and especially by Plutarch's dialogues, in which the vast network of relations which bound the local aristocrats, their gatherings, their conversations and their interests is magnificently presented.<sup>7</sup> These complex horizontal or vertical accounts, reconstructed thanks mainly to inscriptions that have been discovered, are found in the *stemmata* of certain influential families of Sparta and Epidaurus, as studied by A. Spawforth.<sup>8</sup> The analysis of the kinship ties of the families of Peloponnesian cities in their entirety, as presented in the two volumes of the *Roman Peloponnese*, confirms what Spawforth has already brilliantly shown, in view of the complex network of these kinship ties which unite the provincial *nobiles gentes* to one another, and adds other examples for connections of Peloponnesian families with illustrious Greek ones or to the Roman *nobiles gentes*.<sup>9</sup>

## THE MOBILITY OF THE ELITES: TRANSFER OF RELIGIOUS, CHARITABLE AND POLITICAL ACTIVITIES TO OTHER CITIES

The development of a supra-local aristocracy within the Empire facilitated the expansion of the traditional scope of aristocratic social and economic activity, which was until then limited to the boundaries of individual cities. The extension of the

---

<sup>7</sup>This is what is indicated in the dialogues of Plutarch (see Jones 1971, 39-40); the same thing goes for the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius: see F Millar 1981b, 69. We note, for example, that Lucius of Corinth, a local notable, placed relatives and friends (e.g. Plutarch) in several provincial cities. According to Plutarch any aspiration to a political career required loyalty to Rome and, above all, the favour of an influential Roman family, the support of which was capable of promoting the interests of its dependants (see *Moralia* 814C).

<sup>8</sup> A. Spawforth (1974; 1978; 1980; 1984; 1985; 1986; Spawforth and Walker 1986) showed the complex strategies employed by the most important families of Laconia and Epidaurus (Memmii - Statilii, Voluseni - Statilii). These connections as well as others are illustrated in the two volumes of the *Roman Peloponnese*. For the connections of the Spartan Iulii with the Mytilenaeen family of Pompeii (Rizakis et al. 2001, *ARC.* 138; Rizakis et al. 2004, *LAC.* 468 and stemma VIII) and the Memmii of Laconia with the Statilii of Epidaurus, see also Rizakis et al. 2004, 350-51, *LAC.* 543; 370-71, *LAC.* 574; for the relationship between the Voluseni of Laconia and the Statilii of the Argolis, see Rizakis et al. 2001, 228-229, *ARG.* 242; Rizakis et al. 2004, 473-74, *LAC.* 731. Analogous examples are known from other areas of the Empire, quoted by Larsen 1953; Mitchell 1974; Oliver 1971.

<sup>9</sup> For the relationship of the Spartan Iulii with the royal house of Commagene, see Rizakis et al. 2004, 299-300 no. 469 and stemma VIII; for the connections of the Corinthian Vibulii with the Athenian family of Hipparchus, see Rizakis et al. 2004, 525-26, *EL.* 343; Rizakis et al. 2004, 174, *LAC.* 270 and stemma VIII; for the Spartan Pompeii with the Arcadian Voluseni, see Rizakis et al. 2001, 150, *ARC.* 172; Rizakis et al. 2004, 402-03, *LAC.* 621 and finally, for the Spartan Memmii and the Messenian Aelii, see Rizakis et al. 2001, 415, *EL.* 8; Rizakis et al. 2004, 345-346, *LAC.* 537 and 481-82, *MES.* 3. For the connections of the Ti. Claudii of Messene with the Cornelii of Epidaurus, see Rizakis et al. 2004, 508, *MES.* 123 and 515-16, *MES.* 142; the C. Iulii (descendants of Eurycles) with Roman noble families, see *PIR*<sup>2</sup>, *R* 68: Q. Roscius Coelius Murena Silius Decianus Vibull(i)us Pius Iulius Eurykles Herc(u)lanus Pompeius Falco.

economic area and the accumulation of the wealth gave notables the means of undertaking charitable activities in other cities, thus consolidating their local power and increasing the influence and the regional prestige of the family in question. To be fair this kind of activity is not completely new as *euergetism* was one of the major characteristics of Greek social life, especially during the Hellenistic period when kings and other eminent individuals tried to extract the maximum benefit from this activity- mainly prestige, glamour and socio-political influence. But such a tendency was reinforced during the final phase of the Hellenistic period, when political power ends up in the hands of a very small minority of rich families who monopolise wealth, power and social influence. This development widens the gap between the ordinary citizen and the notable and renders the latter a man of providence, the protector and guarantor of the established order as well as of the cities and the people.<sup>10</sup>

Among the areas within which the elite were able to perform this activity, the most important was that of religion, whose role was privileged in the cities.<sup>11</sup> This restricted circle of the noble families which assumed the important civic and religious magistracies, changed at the commencement of the Empire. New families were added, thanks to connections with the imperial power, who now, along with the old families, also assumed expensive priesthoods and who contributed to the construction, restoration or embellishment of urban or rural temples and enhanced the glitter of the feasts and festivals. If the enthusiasm deployed for the imperial worship was greater, the other traditional worships and sanctuaries were not to be ignored.<sup>12</sup> The numerous religious events throughout the year now offered the elite a unique opportunity for exposure, so as to enhance their prestige and their influence on civic matters. The impact on their reputation was even greater when their activity centred around the large Panhellenic sanctuaries (e.g., Delphi, Olympia), as well as around others of lesser importance, which, nevertheless, attracted large crowds of worshippers (e.g., Lycosoura, Epidauros). Sometimes, as noted by S. Alcock, the shared interest in a particular cult contributed to closer and tighter bonds among aristocratic families. The example of the temple of Despoina at Lycosoura in Arcadia in the *chōra* of Megalopolis, is notable in this respect. Among the families who set

---

<sup>10</sup> The domination of this social order was then a total one and Gauthier 1985, 72 accurately says that “l’euergetisme devient peu a peu l’équivalent d’un système de gouvernement”. Into this system the *demos* of the cities put upon the notables all his hopes for protection and prosperity. This is clear in the honorific decrees of the period: see Gauthier 1985, 57-58 and Lafond 2006, *passim*.

<sup>11</sup> The places of worship of a city were closely bound to the elites. Hereditary priesthood was monopolised since the beginning of times by a small number of old families which continue to finance and manage spiritual activity. For other signs of elite pre-eminence, see Paus. 10.32, 15; cf. Small 1987 cited by Alcock 1993, 212 n. 52. For Laconian examples, see Cartledge and Spawforth 1989, 194-195.

<sup>12</sup> Alcock 1993, 198-99.

up consecrations, the Voluseni of Sparta may be mentioned, a wealthy family whose ties to the noble families of Epidaurus and Athens are well known, as well as the tycoon Athenian, Philopappos. Although the Voluseni's attachment to this small temple may be explained by their alleged ties to Euryclides, who probably owned property in the *chōra* of Megalopolis, Philopappos' presence in this small rural temple of Arcadia was more surprising. This was so until the moment when an inscription revealed Philopappos' kinship to the Euryclid family. S. Alcock saw more direct motives, of personal or family nature, for the interest in certain small rural temples.<sup>13</sup> A typical example is the interest in the cult worship of Demeter and Kore at Helos, where several Spartan families, especially the family of Eurykles, owned land. Hereditary priests of the cult included the family of senator Brasidas. The participation in large religious ceremonies- e.g. ritual processions towards rural sanctuaries, which continued to play an important role in the liaison thanks to massive participation- gave the elites the chance to appear at festivals and competitions at the head of processions organized by the sanctuaries, as a result of the elites' own contributions.<sup>14</sup> All these activities in the regional religious domain offered another link in the construction of an aristocratic network at regional and even provincial level (e.g. Ti. Claudius Crispianus).<sup>15</sup>

Naturally, this was not sufficient. Prestige and influence beyond the boundaries required other concrete actions in support of the extra-civic communities, such as the financing of civil or religious constructions and other gestures of generosity in the form of donations or services. These activities are sometimes described but mostly suggested in the inscriptions. They could, in certain cases, attract the attention of the governor and even of the emperor. We can adduce some examples. Eurycles and his descendants are praised in dedications erected by several Peloponnesian cities. This comes as no surprise at all, since it is known that outside of Sparta Eurycles and his family carried out charitable activity in several Peloponnesian towns, namely Asopos and Messene.<sup>16</sup> In Corinth, where he financed the construction of baths employing porphyry from Krokea, which recalled, to "the experts, at least, the origin of the stone and the personality of the donor", according to the words of R. Baladié. At Epidaurus, Eurycles was honoured with a statue as patron of some unknown charity.<sup>17</sup> Other inscriptions provide evidence of the active presence of the family in neighbouring cities, such as Mantinea and Corinth. His descendant, C. Iulius Fabia Eurycles Herculanus L. Vibullius Pius, the first Spartan senator, was honoured with a statue in Mantinea for his charitable activity in this

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Alcock 1993, 210-211.

<sup>14</sup> Alcock 1993, 212; a typical example concerning processions is that of Ephesus illustrated by an exceptional text: see Rogers MacLean 1991.

<sup>15</sup> Spawforth, 2001, 101-07; Rizakis, et al. 2004, 512-14, *MES*. 136.

<sup>16</sup> Asopos (*IG V 1*, 971). Gytheion (*IG V 1*, 1172) and Messene (Makres [forthcoming], no. 24).

<sup>17</sup> Epidaurus (*IG IV<sup>2</sup> 1*, 592); Baladié 1980, 329-33.

small city, where he probably owned property. The same person appears in many Corinthian inscriptions.<sup>18</sup> We have already mentioned that another Spartan family, the Voluseni, is present in Arcadia, especially at Lycosoura where one of its members, Volusena Iusta, was honoured with a statue around 150 BC.<sup>19</sup>

This extra-civic charity is not the endowment of the Greeks. The Romans, whether either only partly or wholly integrated in the cities, participated in contributions towards the restoration of cults and public buildings during the early years of the Empire and, like Greek aristocrats, were devoted to charitable activities in favour of other cities: L Licinius Anterus, a Roman citizen of Corinth, exchanged his services with the city of Methana, for the distinction that it granted him, such as *proxenia* but especially for the privilege of *egktēsis* which enabled him to buy land and pasture. Another such case is that of T. Arminius Tauriscus, a Roman proprietor from Megalopolis possessing goods and probably land in the area, constructed the bridge of Helisson at Megalopolis and received the right of grazing for all his cattle, and the right of harvesting.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, this exchange of services could sometimes be unequal and lead to conflict. The example of Cloatii at Gytheion shows “at what excessive interest rates the cities ended up paying the appropriations for which they were accountable to the wealthy Romans”.<sup>21</sup>

As have been already noticed by S. Alcock, J.R. Patterson<sup>22</sup> has defined “elite mobility” as a “transferral of activities by existing elites to new and more prestigious locations”. In fact, the exercise of this activity in a large urban centre, often the capital of the province, offered ambitious aristocrats more prestige and opportunities for personal promotion and access to even more important functions at the provincial and imperial levels. Contemporary literature and epigraphy indicate that Corinth was a great cosmopolitan centre which attracted the local aristocrats with its facilities, amenities for daily life and the presence of other rich and cultivated families, “the centre of *Romanitas* in Greece, a city with grand

---

<sup>18</sup> SEG 31, 1981, 349; cf. Kahrstedt 1954, 134; Rizakis et al. 2001, ARC. 105 [1]) by the people of Mantinea: IG V 2, 311=Rizakis et al. 2001, ARC. 105[2]). On the charitable work of Eurycles in Laconia and Corinth, see Baladié 1980, 329-330. The names borne by the members of the family of the Euryclids are significant; they indicate geographical realities or claims (e.g. Lacon, Spartiaticus, Argolicus) or a comparison with mythology (e.g. Rhadamanthus, Herculanus).

<sup>19</sup> IG V 2, 544; Kahrstedt 1954, 134; Rizakis et al. 2001, ARC. 172.

<sup>20</sup> The decree honouring Anterus (IG IV, 853) was ratified by thirty citizens of Methana, a number which shows the poor demography of the city. About the date (AD 1-2) of a contemporaneous inscription, see A.J. Gossage, “The date of IG V 2, 516 (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup>, 800)”, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 49 (1954): 51-56; cf. BE 1956, 50; Baladié 1980, 314-315. For Tauriscus, see IG V 2, 456; cf. Baladié 1980, 327-328.

<sup>21</sup> Baladié 1980, 328.

<sup>22</sup> Patterson 1987 cited by Alcock 1993, 223-224.

gravitational pull for the province's magnates" and "one major node in the overarching elite network".<sup>23</sup>

An essential aspect of the preliminary work was that of culture and the maintenance of the bonds with influential Corinthian families and, naturally, with the entourage of the governor of the province. Families from the cities of Sparta, Athens, Epidaurus and finally of Pellene play an important part in this field. A spectacular example is that of Cn. Cornelius Pulcher of Epidaurus, friend of Plutarch, a distinguished gentleman from Roman Greece, who was useful to Corinth as *duovir quinquennalis* and organiser of the Isthmian games. Thereafter he was to exercise several functions at the provincial level- helladarch (Head of the Greeks) of the Achaean League, high-priest of the province, priest of Hadrian Panhellene, Panhellenic archon, imperial procurator, military tribune and *iuridicus* in Egypt and Alexandria.<sup>24</sup> Similarly several members of the family of the Euryclids of Sparta moved to Corinth and transferred their political activities there. C. Iulius Laco, the son of Eurycles was appointed *duovir* of Corinth and then procurator of Claudius. His son, C. Iulius Spartiacus, was citizen of both Sparta and Corinth and followed a career at Corinth, becoming the first high priest of the imperial cult of the Achaean League. He was also *procurator* of Nero and Agrippina between 54 and 59, according to H.-G. Pflaum.<sup>25</sup>

#### ELITES, SUPRA-CIVIC LAND OWNERSHIP AND MAJOR LAND OWNERS

It is no coincidence that the families who carried out various charitable activities or extra-civic politics had parallel economic interests in these areas. The glory obtained as a result of such acts was to them, according to Baladié<sup>26</sup> "as important as the profit but this was, in general, sufficient so as not to leave them indifferent". In some cases such activities are accompanied by property investments in land that was up till then considered foreign. In fact the aristocrats of Peloponnesian cities already owned large parcels of land in the Hellenistic period<sup>27</sup> and from the second century in particular the Achaean *koinon* had facilitated, by way of the epigamy and *egktēsis*, the acquisition of land beyond civic borders.<sup>28</sup> This period of open civic

<sup>23</sup> The first citation is due to Cartledge and Spawforth 1989, 104 and the second one to Alcock 1993, 156.

<sup>24</sup> Rizakis et al. 2004, 188-89, *ARG.* 117.

<sup>25</sup> Meritt and West, 1931, 2 no. 68; Pflaum 1960-61; for the date, see Amandry 1988, 74 n. 563.

<sup>26</sup> Baladié 1980, 327.

<sup>27</sup> Baladié 1987; Rizakis 1995.

<sup>28</sup> Larsen 1971. The concentration of resources was done to the advantage of the rich local families whose control was reinforced within the Empire by the collection of imperial and civic taxes. This development was further reinforced, and even precipitated, with the Roman domination and, within the Empire, few powerful families from each city have the control of a large part of the natural

borders did not last long enough, because of internal problems within the League with the rebellious members and with social problems. The Roman conquest again offered investment opportunities, especially in territory belonging to other cities.<sup>29</sup> Land was the best domain of investment for traditional aristocracies.<sup>30</sup>

The Italian or Roman *negotiatores* are classified as being among the first investors in Peloponnesian land. They settled as early as the first century BC, either in groups or separately in numerous cities, namely Gytheion, Megalopolis, Elis, Argos, Kleitor, Patra, Aigion and Sikyon.<sup>31</sup> Whether their preferred activities were commerce or banking, land would prove in many cases to be a necessary investment for economic and social reasons. Its acquisition via normal means required the privilege of *egktēsis*, which was now more easily granted. In certain areas these owners of Greek land were organized in *conventus*, like *engaiountes* of Elis or those of the rich plain of Messenia, designated as *δῆμος τῶν Ρωμαίων* and classified in a separate tribe. The amount of tax which they were required to pay indicates the possession of large landed properties.<sup>32</sup>

The colonial Romans were very active in land investment outside colonial territory. We evoked the example of the Corinthian C. Licinius Anterus who does not belong to the first generation of the colonists. In Patrae, on the other hand, it is the colonists themselves, perhaps of the first generation, who invest on land in neighbouring cities. This is how the presence of C. Vireius C. f. Gallus, who died in Kynaitha at the end of the first century BC or at the beginning of the first century AD,<sup>33</sup> may be explained. The same applies in regard to Ti. Claudius Antipater, who appears in a bilingual grave inscription, found in the area of Kalavryta, if this person really originated from Patrae. On the other hand, it is not very probable, despite what Kahrstedt believed, that the Roman citizens who appear in a list of Kleitor in

---

resources. Eager for more wealth, power and, indeed, prestige some of them cross the tight civic framework and extend their fortune, power and influence beyond the civic borders.

<sup>29</sup> On the example of L. Anterus, see *supra* n. 20; on the family of Voluseni in Arcadia, see Spawforth 1978; Lloyd 1991, 191. Although the investment of capital in land and beyond the civic borders is a current practice of the elites of the Roman epoch, it should not be believed that the evoked examples should be regarded as typical cases but rather, as stated by Alcock (1993, 78) like “*the extreme end of the landowning spectrum which was undoubtedly narrower now than in the preceding Classical epoch*”. It is true that the literary and epigraphic sources often refer to it indirectly, but they do not leave scope to comprehend neither the geographical extension nor the extent of the phenomenon. The identity of large *villae rusticae* which we find in the cities- the sole exception being that of Atticus in Eva- does not betray the identity of the owner; moreover the extent of their diffusion is much less important than was supposed by U. Kahrstedt 1954, *passim* and map (*in fine*).

<sup>30</sup> Fernoux 2004.

<sup>31</sup> Alcock 1993, 75-76 and fig. 25; Zoumbaki 1998-1999; Rizakis 2001c, 83-84 and n. 125.

<sup>32</sup> Alcock 1993, 74 n. 55. For the famous land tax, the *octobolos eisphora*, at Messene, see *IG V* 1, 1432-1433; cf. Wilhelm 1914; L. Migeotte 2008, 229-243. For the date of this document, see Migeotte 1997, 51-61; Rizakis 2001c, 82 and n. 100; Grandjean 2003, 252-253; Doyen 2004, 27-36; *id.*, 2005, 39-48.

<sup>33</sup> *CIL* III 1 *Suppl.* 7252; *Achaïe* II, 366; cf. Rizakis et al. 2001, *ARC*. 171.



Arcadia, have anything to do with the colony of Patrae.<sup>34</sup> Moreover, the names of these persons indicate that the text dates to the middle of the third century AD.<sup>35</sup>

The largest landowner in this category of people was, as previously, the emperor himself, but there is little direct testimony regarding the presence of imperial estates in the Peloponnese.<sup>36</sup> A Corinthian inscription informs us that following his exile in AD 33, C. Iulius Laco, the son of Eurycles had been declared *duovir* of Corinth and procurator of Claudius.<sup>37</sup> His son, C. Iulius Spartiaticus, also had a career at Corinth and assumed the procuratorship for Nero and Agrippina, between 54 and 59, according to H.-G. Pflaum. The information in the Corinthian text states that Spartiaticus was promoted to the equestrian order with the support of Claudius: *[ex]ornato a divo Claudio*.<sup>38</sup> The nature of this procuratorship of the family of the Euryclids has caused disagreement among historians.<sup>39</sup> For my part, I will devote a little more time to defining the character of the procuratorship of the Euryclid family more precisely. H.-G. Pflaum was certainly right in saying that this office was probably connected with the administration of the private estates belonging to the Emperor.<sup>40</sup> The crucial issue is, as noted by Pflaum, the location of the Spartan territory managed by the Euryclid family.<sup>41</sup> Balzat is right when he says (p. 301) that

<sup>34</sup> *ILGR* 40 no. 73; Rizakis 1998, 306 no. 376; Rizakis et al. 2001, *ARC*. 62a.

<sup>35</sup> The majority of the persons cited in this list bear the nomen Aurelius followed by a Greek cognomen and their patronymic; there also some Iulii and Claudi: see *IG* V.2, 369A+B and the new editions of this document by Pikoulas 1981, 107-113=SEG 31, 1981, 347; id., 1985, 87-88 no 2=SEG 35, 1985, 350 (369B); cf. Kahrstedt 1954, 155.

<sup>36</sup> On this question, see Alcock 1993, 74-75.

<sup>37</sup> Meritt and West 1931. 2, no. 67

<sup>38</sup> Meritt and West 1931. 2, no. 68: *duovir quinquennales* (for the date see Amandry 1988, 74 n. 563) and assumed the procuratorship on account of Nero and Agrippina (Meritt and West 1931. 2, No 68); the text indicates that Spartiaticus had been promoted to the equestrian order with the support of Claudius: *[ex]ornato a divo Claudio* Kahrstedt (Démougin 1988, 190). In 54 AD Spartiaticus was the first high-priest for life of the imperial cult of the Achaean *Koinon* (A.B. West, *Corinth* II no. 68; cf. also *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 3538; for the dating, see Spawforth 1994, 211-32). The Emperor Claudius proved to be very sensitive to promotions of individuals belonging to the new Spartan elite, like the Euryclids (Démougin 1988, 202) or the old one, like the family of Brasidae; cf. Rizakis 2007.

<sup>39</sup> According to L.R. Taylor and A.B. West (1926, 398), "Gaius Iulius Lacon ruled Sparte under the aegis of the Emperor, while his title of procurator was being finalised to the position which Euryclide occupied in Sparta". This explanation, founded on parallelism between the Euryclids and the princes customers seemed to support the idea suggested by the currencies and Strabon that the family of the Euryclids formed a dynasty of princes customers in Sparta (ref. in Balzat 2005, 299 n. 43). I will not dwell on this point, which was correctly dealt with recently by Jean Sebastien Balzat 2005, 299-301.

<sup>40</sup> H.-G. Pflaum 1960-61, 64. The idea of Pflaum that Laco and Spartiaticus then managed in this capacity a "principality of Sparta" was justifiably disputed by A.J. Spawforth who asked himself how the famous city could be property of the Emperor and yet be termed a "principality of Sparta", as stated by Jean-Sebastien Balzat. Pflaum meant "private properties of the Emperor located on the territory of the city" (Balzat 2005, 300).

<sup>41</sup> Cartledge-Spawforth 1989, 102; cf. Pflaum 1960-1961, 9.

one should not necessarily seek these estates in Sparta itself. They could have been located elsewhere in the Peloponnese<sup>42</sup> as for example, on the island Cythera granted to Eurycles. Maybe this possession had been taken away from the Euryclids under Tiberius, following the disgrace and exile of Eurycles' family, thus becoming the personal property of the emperors. It is unlikely that Claudius and Nero would have changed this situation. Cythera must certainly later have been returned to Sparta, since an epigraphic text attests the presence of a *Κυθηροδίκας*.<sup>43</sup> But, outside of Cythera the imperial estates are more likely to have been in the territory of Megalopolis, as several inscriptions suggest.<sup>44</sup>

The acquisition of land was greatly facilitated now by the mobility and marriages between members of the important families. The descendants of these unions inherited the land in both cities in question. Among the great landowners who fall outside the norm both in terms of the geographical extension of their property and their importance are, for example, the family of Eurycles and that of Herodes Atticus. The Euryclids had possessions in several Peloponnese cities by imperial gift, marriage or acquisition. During his stay in Sparta, in 21 BC, Augustus offered to Eurycles, son of Lachares, in appreciation for his services during the last civil war, large properties in Laconia, such as the island of Cythera which he received, as Strabo says "as private property".<sup>45</sup> Several inscriptions attest the commitment of this family, outside Sparta itself, to the Laconian cities of Gytheion, Asopos and Tainaron. The discovery not far from ancient Asopos of an epitaph which gives us the name of two of its superintendents, confirms the existence of large fields in this area entrusted to those *liberti* of the family.<sup>46</sup> The presence of another Spartan family of Voluseni in Arcadia, especially at Lycosoura, may be associated with some property. Atticus finally, the largest magnate, had properties, apart from those in

---

<sup>42</sup> Balzat 2005, 301.

<sup>43</sup> The title is mentioned in the *cursus honorum* of the Spartan citizen, C. Iulius Theophrastos: see Woodward 1926, 227-228, l. 13; cf. also 233 (*AE* 1929, 20; *SEG* 11, 1950, 492; Ameling 1983 II, 79-80 no. 51. For the *cursus honorum* of this person see Rizakis et al. 2004, 329-332, *LAC*. 510.

<sup>44</sup> *IG* V 2, 435, 525 and 457=*CIL* III 13691; cf. Kahrstedt 1954, 134.

<sup>45</sup> According to Strabo (8.5.1=C. 363; see also Dio Cassius 54.7.2; cf. Baladié 1980, 293) Augustus gave to Eurycles the island of Cythera; Baladié (1980, 329 n. 182) compares this *donatio* to Eurycles to that from which, according to Strabo 10.2.13=C. 455, C. Antonius, Marc Antony's uncle, profited who, undoubtedly, had received from Caesar the whole island of Cephalonia with personal title deeds. Augustus proceeds to a territorial reorganisation which is very advantageous for Sparta. According to Pausanias (4.30.2, 4.31.2; the date of 27 BC is more probable according to Kjellberg 1920-21, 44-58) as he gives her the towns of Thouria and Kardamyle (Paus. 3.26.7; cf. Baladié 1980, 292 n. 48: inscriptions and *antico rosso*), that had belonged to Messenia. Leuctra, Gerenia, Alagonia, Pharai became simultaneously part of the *Koinon* of the Eleutherolaconians (see Baladié 1980, 292) as was the isle of Kaudos South of Crete (see Robert 1972).

<sup>46</sup> Lane 1962, 396-98; cf. *Bullepigr* 1964, 191; cf. Baladié 1980, 329 and ns 184-185; Bowersock 1981; Cartledge and Spawforth 1989, 104; Spawforth 1978, 251-252.

Italy and Egypt, in five places within Attica and at least two in the Peloponnese, at Corinth and Cynouria. His family also had properties on the island of Euboea and on Keos.<sup>47</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS

One of the important new features of the period is the great mobility of the elites and the opening of their socio-political scope beyond traditional civic borders. This new idea of cosmopolitanism rests on multiple bonds of friendship and common interests among the important Peloponnesian families at the local, provincial and even imperial levels. These bonds were forged by means of marriage, political alliances and support for the cities in difficult times. This opening of the elites is illustrated by the engagement in various activities in favour of other cities, the expansion of the economic area of cities thanks to the acquisition of land, and by the transfer eventually of the political activities to the provincial capital. This is not the only way, but the known examples show that it was the most secure one, since in the end the way was opened for a career in the provincial and even imperial administration. Finally, before we close, it is necessary to note two things: the first is that here, as elsewhere, the number of families active at this level is to be counted on the fingers of one hand. The second is that these families held the monopoly on prestige, power and influence for two centuries.

## REFERENCES

- Alcock, S.E. 1993. *Graecia Capta. The landscapes of Roman Greece*, Cambridge.
- Amandry, M. 1988. *Le monnayage des duovirs corinthiens*, Paris.
- Ameling, W. 1983. *Herodes Atticus II: Inschriftenkatalog*, Hildesheim.
- Baladié, R. 1980. *Le Péloponnèse de Strabon. Étude de géographie historique*, Paris.
- . 1987. "Grands domaines dans le Péloponnèse sous le Principat d'Auguste", in *Actes du VIIIe Congrès International d'Épigraphie grecque et latine II*, Athens: 35-38.
- Balzat, J.-S. 2005. "Le pouvoir des Euryclides à Sparte", *Les Études Classiques* 73, 289-301.
- Bernhardt, R. 1972. *Imperium und Eleutheria. Die römische Politik gegenüber den freien Städten des griechischen Ostens*. Hamburg.
- Bowersock, G. W. 1961. "Eurycles of Sparta", *Journal of Roman Studies* 51: 112-18.

---

<sup>47</sup> IG XII 5, 631: SEG 14, 1957, 542; Ameling 1983, 93; Day 1942, 235-236 and n. 321-27; Dunant-Thomopoulos 1954; Graindor 1930.

- . 1984. "Augustus in the East: the problem of succession", in Millar, F. and Segal E., eds., *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*, Oxford, 169-88.
- Briscoe, J. 1967. "Rome and the class-struggle in the Greek states: 200-146 BC", in M.I. Finley (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Society: Past and Present Series*. London and Boston, 53-73.
- Brunt, P.A. 1976. "The Romanization of the local ruling class in the Roman Empire", in D.M. Pippidi (ed.) *Assimilation et résistance à la culture gréco-romaine dans le monde ancien*, Paris: 161-173.
- Cartledge, P. and Spawforth, A. 1989. *Hellenistic and Roman Sparta: A Tale of Two Cities*, London.
- Crawford, M.H. 1967. "Rome and the Greek world", *Economic History Review* 30: 42-52.
- Day, J. 1942. *An Economic History of Athens under the Roman Domination*, New York.
- de Ste Croix, G.E.M. 1981. *The Class-struggle in the Ancient Greek World, from the Archaic Age to the Arab conquests*. London.
- Démougin, S. 1988. *L'ordre équestre sous les Julio-Claudiens*, Rome.
- Doyen C. 2004. Autour d'*oktovolos eispheora* de Messène. Mémoire présenté en vue de l'obtention du grade de licencié en langue et littératures classiques. Louvain-la-Neuve.
- . 2005. "Triobole éginétique réduit et drachme symmachique", *Revue belge de numismatique et de sigillographie* 151: 39-48.
- Dunant, C. and Thomopoulos, J. 1954. "Inscriptions de Céos", *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 78: 316-48.
- Engels, D. 1990. *Roman Corinth: An Alternative Model for Classical City*, Chicago.
- Fernoux H.-L. 2004. *Notables et élites des cités de Bithynie aux époques hellénistiques et romaines (III<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C.-III<sup>e</sup> siècle ap. J.-C.)*. Essai d'histoire sociale, Lyon.
- Galtung, J. 1971. "A structural theory of imperialism", *Journal of Peace Research* 8: 81-117.
- Garnsey, P. and Saller, R. 1987. *The Roman Empire: Economy, Society, and Culture*, London.
- Gauthier, Ph. 1985. *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*. Paris.
- Gossage, A.J. 1954. "The date of IG V<sup>2</sup> 516 (SIG<sup>3</sup> 800)", *Annual of the British School at Athens* 49: 51-6.
- Graindor, P. 1930. *Un milliardaire antique : Hérodes Atticus et sa famille*, Cairo.
- Grandjean, C. 2003. *Les Mésseniens de 370/369 au I<sup>er</sup> siècle de notre ère. Monnayage et histoire*, *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique Supplément* 44. Athens-Paris.
- . ed. 2003. *Le Péloponnèse d'Épameinondas à Hadrien*. Colloque de Tours, 6-7 Octobre 2005 (Bordeaux 2008).

- Halfmann, H. 1979. *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.*, Göttingen.
- Hoet-van Cauwenberghe, C. 1992. *Rome et la société provinciale du Péloponnèse sous le Haut-Empire (31 av. J.-C.-235 ap. J.-C.)*, Unpubl. Ph.D. Paris.
- . 1996. "Diffusion de la citoyenneté romaine: notes sur les gentilices impériaux en Laconie et en Messénie", in A. Chastagnol, S. Demougin et C. Lepelley (eds.), *Splendissima civitas. Etudes d'histoire romaine en hommage à François Jacques*. Paris: 133-149.
- Jones, A.H.M. 1971. *Plutarch and Rome*, Oxford.
- . 1978. "Three foreigners in Attica", *Phoenix* 32: 222-34.
- Jost, M. 1985. *Sanctuaires et cultes d'Arcadie*. Paris.
- Kahrstedt, U. 1954. *Das Wirtschaftliche Gesicht Griechenlands in der Kaiserzeit (Kleinstadt, villa und domäne)* Berne.
- Kantirea, M. 2001-2002. *Πρακτικά του σ' Διεθνούς συνεδρίου Πελοποννησιακών Σπουδών*, Athens 2001-2002 (*Peloponnesiaka Supplement* 24,) 423-32.
- Kjellberg, E. 1920-21. "C Iulius Eurykles", *Klio*, 16-17: 44-58.
- Lafond, Y. 2006. *La mémoire des cités dans le Péloponnèse d'époque romaine. Ile siècle av. J.-C.-IIIe ap. J.-C.* Renne.
- Lane, E. 1962. "An unpublished inscription from Lakonia" *Hesperia* 33: 396-398
- Larsen, J.A.O. 1953. "A Thessalian family under the Principate", *CPhil* 48: 86-95.
- . 1971. "The rights of cities in the Achaean confederacy", *Classical Philology* 66. 2, 81-86.
- Lloyd, J.A. 1991. "Farming the highlands: Samnium and Arcadia in the Hellenistic and Early Roman periods", in Barker and Lloyd, eds., 180-93.
- Makres, A. (forthcoming) *Inscriptions from the Gymnasium of ancient Messene*. Athens.
- Meritt, B.J. and West A.B., 1931. *Corinth VIII: Greek Inscriptions and Latin Inscriptions*. Cambridge, MA.
- Migeotte, L. 1985. "Réparations des monuments publics à Messène au temps d'Auguste", *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 109: 597-607.
- . 1997. "La date de l'*oktōvolos eisphora* à Messène", in *Topoi* 7: 51-61.
- . 2008. "L'organisation de l'*oktōvolos eisphora* à Messène", in Grandjean 2008, 229-243.
- Millar, F. 1981. *The Roman Empire and its Neighbours* (second ed.), London.
- . 1981b. "The world of the golden ass", *Journal of Roman Studies* 71 : 63-75.
- Mitchell, S. 1974. "The Plancii in Asia Minor", *Journal of Roman Studies* 64: 27-39.
- Oliver, J.H. 1971. "Epameinondas of Acraephia", *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 14: 221-37.
- Patterson, J.R. 1987. "Crisis: what crisis? Urban change and rural development in Imperial Apennine Italy", *Papers of the British School at Rome* 55: 115-146.

- Paynter, R. 1982. *Models of Spatial Inequality: settlement patterns in historical archaeology*. New York.
- Pflaum H.G. 1960-61. *Les procurateurs équestre sous le Haut-Empire romain*, vol., I.
- Pikoulas, G.A. 1981. "IG VQ 396 B", *Achaiognosia* 2: 107-113.
- . 1985. "Ἐπιγραφὲς ἀπὸ τὴν Ἀρκαδίᾳ", *Horos* 3: 87-88 no 2.
- Price, S.R.F. 1984. *Rituals and Power: the Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge.
- Quass, F. 1982. "Zur politischen Tätigkeit der munizipalen Aristokratie des griechischen Ostens in der Kaiserzeit", *Historia* 31: 188-213.
- Rizakis, A.D. 1995. "Grands domaines et petites propriétés dans le Péloponnèse sous l'Empire", in: *Du latifundium au latifondo: un héritage de Rome, une création médiévale ou moderne Actes de la Table ronde internationale du C.N.R.S., Bordeaux 17-19 decembre 1992*, Paris: 219-238.
- . 1998. *Achaie III. Les inscriptions de Patras: Épigraphie et histoire*. Meletemata 25. Athènes.
- . 2001a. "Ἡγετική τάξη καὶ κοινωνική διαστρωμάτωση στὶς πόλεις τῆς Πελοποννήσου κατὰ τὴν αὐτοκρατορική ἐποχή", in: V. Mitsopoulos-Leon (éd.), *Forschungen in der Peloponnes, Akten des Symposions anlässlich der Feier "100 Jahre Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut Athen"*, Athen 5.3.-7.3, 1998. Athens: 181-197.
- . 2001b. "La constitution des élites municipales dans les colonies romaines de la province d'Achaïe" in: O. Salomies (ed.), *The Greek East in the Roman Context Proceedings of a Colloquium organised by the Finnish Institute at Athens*, May 21 and 22, 1999. Helsinki: 37-49.
- . 2001c. "La cité grecque entre la période hellénistique et l'Empire", in: R. Frei-Stolba et Kristine Gex (eds.), *Recherches récentes sur le monde hellénistique*. Colloque international organisé à Lausanne (20-21 novembre 1998) pour les 60 ans de P. Ducrey. Bern: 75-96.
- . 2007. "Les Ti. Claudii et la promotion des élites péloponnésienes", in Y. Perrin (éd.), *NERONIA VIII: Rome l'Italie et la Grèce. Hellénisme et philhellénisme au premier siècle après J.-C.*, Athènes 21-24 octobre 2004, *Latomus* 27: 183-195.
- Rizakis, A.D., and Zoumbaki S. 2001. *Roman Peloponnese: Roman Personal Names in their Social Context. I: Achaia, Arcadia, Argolis, Corinthia and Eleia*. Athens.
- Rizakis, A.D., Zoumbaki S. and Lepenioti Cl. 2004. *Roman Peloponnese: Roman Personal Names in their Social Context. II: Laconia and Messenia*. Athens.
- Robert, L. 1972. "Ἐπιμελητής ΚΑΥΔΟΥ dans une inscription de Sparte", *Hellenica* I: 109-112.
- Rogers MacLean C. 1991. *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos*. London and New York.

- Rogers, G. 1991. "Demosthenes of Oinoanda and models of euergetism", *Journal of Roman Studies* 81 : 91-100.
- Small, D. 1987. "Social correlations to the Greek cavea in the Roman period", in S. Macready and F.H. Thompson (eds.), *Roman Architecture in the Greek World*. London: 85-93.
- Spawforth, A.J.S. 1974. "The Appaleni of Corinth", *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 15: 295-303.
- . 1978. "Balbilla, the Euryclids, and memorials for a Greek Magnate," *Annual of the British School at Athens* 73: 249-60.
- . 1980. "Sparta and the family of Herodes Atticus: a reconsideration of the evidence", *Annual of the British School at Athens* 75: 203-20.
- . 1984. "Notes on the third century AD in Spartan epigraphy", *BSA* 79: 263-88.
- . 1985. "Families at Roman Sparta and Epidauros: some prosopographical notes", *Annual of the British School at Athens* 80: 191-258.
- . 1986. "A Severan statue group and an Olympic festival at Sparta", *Annual of the British School at Athens* 81: 313-32.
- . 1994. "Corinth, Argos and the Imperial cult: Pseudo-Julian, Letters 198", *Hesperia* 63: 211-232.
- . 2002. "Italian elements among Roman knights and senators from old Greece", in C. Müller, C. Hasenohr (éds.), *Les italiens dans le monde grec: IIème siècle av. J.-C. - Ier siècle ap. J.-C.: circulation, activités, intégration: actes de la table ronde, Ecole normale supérieure, Paris 14-16 mai 1998*. Paris: 101-107.
- Spawforth, A.J.S. and Walker, S. 1985. "The world of the Panhellenion: I. Athens and Eleusis", *Journal of Roman Studies* 75: 78-104.
- Taylor L.R. and West A.B. 1926. "The Euryclids in Latin inscriptions from Corinth", *American Journal of Archaeology* 30: 398-400.
- Touloumicos, I. 1967. *Der Einfluss Roms auf die Staatsform der griechischen Stadtstaaten des Festlandes und der Inseln im ersten und zweiten Jhdt. v. Chr.* Göttingen.
- Wilhelm, A. 1914. "Urkunden aus Messene", *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen* 17: 1-120.
- Woodward, A.M. 1926. "Excavations at Sparta, 1926: The inscriptions", *Annual of the British School at Athens* 27, (1925-26): 210-254.
- Zanker, P. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (translated by Alan Shapiro). Ann Arbor.
- Zoumbaki, S. 1998-99. "Die Niederlassung römischer Geschäftsleute in der Peloponnes", *Tekmeria* 4, 112-159.

