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ON THE USE OF “ΚΑΤΑΣΚΕΥΑΣΕΙΝ” IN BUILDING INSCRIPTIONS

Hüseyin UZUNOĞLU *

ABSTRACT

Based upon the recent discussions concerning the construction chronology of the monumental fountain building (nymphaeum) at Side, this contribution makes some suggestions concerning the other possible meaning(s) of the verb of “κατασκευάζειν”, which is not infrequently attested in building inscriptions. To this end, a total of nine

* Res. Assist., Akdeniz University, Faculty of Letters, Department of Ancient Languages and Cultures, Antalya/TURKEY. E-posta:huseyinuzunoglu@akdeniz.edu.tr.
case studies sourced from different regions and over a wide time-span, from the Hellenistic to the Late Antique Period, were assembled and interpreted. Two of these examples are recorded from mainland Greece, i.e. the theatre building at Delphi and an unidentifiable building at Athens. The other documents concern the Laodike fountain at Teos mentioned in the inscription of Antiochus III, the Pataran road monument (Monumentum Patarense), the governor edicts enacted for the protection and upkeep of the Aristion aqueduct at Ephesos, the donations of Opramoas of Rhodiapolis in the aftermath of the severe earthquake in Lycia in 141 A.D. (regarding in particular the bath-houses), the inscription of *hydreion* of Menandros at Ephesos and lastly the Neronic/Vespasianic bath from Patara. By scrutinizing all of the above evidence, this article maintains that the initial construction phase of those buildings whose inscriptions carry the verb of “κατασκευάζειν”, may not provide the exact date when the inscription was carved, contrary to what is widely believed in current scholarship. It is thereby emphasized that the verb of “κατασκευάζειν”, synonymous occasionally with “ἐπισκευάζειν”, is not limited in its meaning “to construct”, but rather, it has a wide range of meanings, such as: to reconstruct, to repair, to renovate or even to enlarge the buildings. It is therefore proposed that the dating of the constructions, if they are made relying only upon the epigraphic evidence (i.e. upon the presence of the verb of “κατασκευάζειν”), may result in faulty interpretations.

**Keywords:** κατασκευάζειν, ἐπισκευάζειν, building inscriptions, nymphaeum at Side, Greek epigraphy, restoration, construction.

**Introduction**

A noteworthy part of the corpus of Ancient Greek inscriptions concern building inscriptions and they may serve a number of functions in respect to many issues, particularly in matters such as ascertaining the function of the building remains which cannot otherwise be identified or are hardly identifiable typologically from the existing archaeological evidence; as well as determining the sponsor(s) of the building or of renovation or restoration works. While the verbs of ποιεῖν, δέμειν, οἰκοδομεῖν are occasionally preferred in these inscriptions, we mostly find the verb of “κατασκευάζειν” employed for the initial construction phase of the building and the verb of “ἐπισκευάζειν” implying restoration and renovations works made to a building. Therefore, epigraphists, while expressing their opinion as to the chronology of a construction on the basis of an inscription carrying the verb “κατασκευάζειν”, justifiably comment upon it in such a way that the buildings in question were erected at the same time as the inscription was carved. So, current scholarship suggests in this respect that the building were made *de nihilo* if the inscription carries the formula “(…[the name of the financer] κατεσκεύασεν … [the name of the building]). In this contribution, I will attempt to question this particular meaning of the verb using nine epigraphic examples attested from various regions, settlements and periods and thereby to show the reasons for the necessity of caution when determining the construction chronology of a specific building relying exclusively upon the epigraphic evidence,
i.e. on the use of the verb κατασκευάζειν.

To begin with, one has to underline that it is evident that the verb of “ἐπισκευάζειν” means “to restore, to renovate”. κατασκευάζειν is, on the other hand, given in dictionary entries as having the meaning of: “to make, to build, to construct” and doubtlessly plays an important role in the above-mentioned idea of epigraphists concerning the establishment of building chronologies. Nonetheless, back in 1921, the French researcher Fernand Courby put forward a striking proposal in one of his articles on the topography and dating of the sanctuary of Apollon Delios that this verb is not necessarily used only in the context of “constructing something” but that it also could signify an extensive restoration. His suggestion, far from being objected to and refuted, was adopted and even enriched by several scholars such as Vallois, Garlan, Herrmann, Michaud, Knoepfler, Nollé – Schindler, Migeotte, Hellmann, Corsten, Winter and Cramme. Despite the gravity and the significance of this suggestion, surprisingly it has not been taken sufficiently into account by epigraphists, and is simply ignored, especially when they provide the first editions of new building inscriptions. As far as I could determine, only Johannes Nollé referred to it as an argument for his idea concerning the dating of nymphaeum at Side, but he was criticized by Chr. Gliwitzky in her book entitled “Späte Blüte in Side und Perge” published in 2010. Before arguing the issue, I first go into the details of this recent discussion.

1 For a similar and comprehensive study regarding the divergence between the epigraphic statement and the architectural reality in Latin building inscriptions from the Latin West with a special focus on the use of verbs such as “restituere or reficere” connoting the revival or the improvement of the building, rather than indicating a completely new construction indicated by the verb ‘facere’, see Thomas – Witschel 1992. They mostly deal with rebuilding recorded in inscriptions on completely new buildings and seek to explain the possible reasons for this ‘constructing the reconstruction’ phenomenon. In contrast, this article collected evidence only from the ancient Greek inscriptions of the Greek East and concentrates upon the verb of “κατασκευάζειν” signifying a paradoxical use of the term for already-existing buildings which were for some reason demolished or destroyed and therefore required either repair or reconstruction.

2 LSJ, s.v. ἐπισκευάζω; Maier 1960, 85.
3 See for instance LSJ, s.v. κατασκευάζω.
4 Courby 1921, 174-241, especially see 224.
5 Vallois 1924, 426-427.
6 Garlan 1965, 346, fn. 4.
7 Herrmann 1965, 74-75.
8 Michaud 1969, 76, fn. 1.
9 Knoepfler 1986, 75.
10 ISelge, 93, fn. 24.
11 Migeotte 1992, 333.
12 Hellmann 1992, 196-197; Hellmann 1994, 176 = SEG 44, no. 1681.
13 IPrusa ad Olympum II, 94.
14 Winter 1996, 188, fn. 1717.
15 Cramme 2001, 82-83.
between these two scholars, which led to this research\(^{16}\).

**The nymphaeum at Side and its construction date**

We have four inscriptions in total which are directly or indirectly associated with the fountain buildings at Side\(^{17}\); two of them are long honorary inscriptions, documented not exactly at Side, but at the neighbouring settlements of Karallia and Kasai\(^{18}\). Both of these inscriptions, which were discovered by G. Bean and T. B. Mitford during their researches in East Pamphylia and Rough Cilicia in 1960s, provide complementary information concerning the construction or restoration works of the Sidetan nymphaeum. One of these inscriptions was found on the Aydolin Castle situated in the territory of Karallia\(^{19}\), and concerns the public services and benefactions of a certain Aurelius Mandrianus Longinus. Longinus apparently not only took part in the political life of his own homeland, but also spent some time in neighbouring Side and became a council member at Side, as well as in his home of Karallia\(^{20}\). As well as distributing money to the citizens and also to the councillors of Side, he fulfilled the offices of *agonothesia* and *agoranomia* which required spending a substantial amount of money suggesting that he was a very wealthy person\(^{21}\). According to the inscription, one of the offices that Longinus undertook at Side was ἐπιμελητὴς τοῦ ύδρείου (= curator of the *hydreion*)\(^{22}\). The inscription dates to after A.D. 212 because of the gentile name Aurelius (*terminus post quem*) and dates to before A.D. 243 because the regional isopythian agon, whose *agonethetes* was our Longinus, was still only entitled Φοιβεῖος in the inscription (*terminus ante quem*). The agon after being promoted to the international category by the privilege of Gordianus III, was thereafter mentioned in the Sidetan inscription as ὁ ὀικουμενικὸς, which was certainly not the case in our inscription\(^{23}\).

---

\(^{16}\) Gliwitzky 2010, 103-105.

\(^{17}\) ISide II, no. 105; 190; Bean – Mitford 1970, no. 21 = ISide I, no. Tep. 4; Bean – Mitford 1970, no. 19 (ed. pr.) = ISide I, no. Tep. 1 = Hagel – Tomaschitz 1998, no. Ayd 3.

\(^{18}\) Bean – Mitford 1970, no. 21 = ISide I, no. Tep. 4; Bean – Mitford 1970, no. 19 (ed. pr.) = ISide I, no. Tep. 1 = Hagel – Tomaschitz 1998, no. Ayd 3.

\(^{19}\) For the city of Karallia see Nollé 1987, 235-250.

\(^{20}\) It is a well attested phenomenon that the citizens of smaller cities held offices in the neighbouring cities, see Wörle 1998, 49-51; ISide I, s. 197.

\(^{21}\) ISide I, p. 197.

\(^{22}\) On the identification of the *hydreion* mentioned in this inscription with the monumental fountain building (nymphaeum) at Side see Weiss 1981, 341-343; ISide I, p. 206; Dorl-Klingenschmid 2001, 244; Gliwitzky 2010, 97. Therefore, I would rather prefer to use the term *nymphaion* instead of *hydreion* in the article. In the famous inscription mentioning the repairing the aqueduct of Side by Bryonianus Lollianus (ISide II, no. 105), this fountain building is termed, ναός Νυμφάων (= the temple of the nymphs), so I do not hesitate to term it the nymphaeum. It is commonly believed that all types of monumental fountain are called nymphaea, which is a false description in terms of the ancient terminology. On the reasons why, see Richard 2012, 14-26; Uzunoğlu 2017, 306-307.

\(^{23}\) Weiss 1981, 332-334; ISide I, p. 196 and 206.
The other inscription regarding the nymphaeum at Side is attested from Taşahır Castle (= in the territory of ancient Kasai). It reveals that a certain Marcus Aurelius Obrimianus Konon was honoured by the boule and the demos of Kasai and it also informs us of the offices held by him at Side. Amongst these the eponymous office of demiourgos stands out, as well as the offices of gymnasiarkhos and agonothetes which were performed after the re-organization of the above-mentioned agon by Gordianus III indicating a date obviously after A.D. 243 as terminus post quem (see above). Apart from its date, the importance of the inscription lies in the critical information provided in lines 31 to 35, which record that Obrimianus Konon donated 5000 denarii for the construction or the restoration (?) of the nymphaeum.

Aside from these inscriptions, two statue bases, on which the emperor Caracalla was honoured, were discovered at the nymphaeum and thereby imply a strong connection between the construction of nymphaeum and the emperor himself. Gathering all this evidence, J. Nollé concluded that the initial construction was accomplished at latest in the reign of Caracalla and stated that the donation of Obrimianus Konon for the κατασκευή of the nymphaeum might have related to a compulsory repair, probably due to earthquake damage at the time. In the light of this commentary, one can say that Longinus was appointed as the curator of nymphaeum for its maintenance and security after the completion of construction. The biggest challenge to Nollé’s proposal is obviously the terminology used in the second inscription (i.e. ἰς τὴν κατασκευὴν τοῦ ὑδρείου τοῦ κατασκευαζομένου). Referring to Knoepfler and Herrmann, Nollé attempted to solve the problem, pointing out that κατασκευάζειν/κατασκευή has an ambiguous meaning which can also be understood to mean simply “a restoration”. Yet, the remarks of Nollé on the issue were not accepted by Chr. Gliwitzky, completely.

24 Bean – Mitford 1970, no. 21 = ISide I, no. Tep. 4: ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος τῆς Κασαϊτῶν πόλεως ἐτείμησεν Μαρκὸν Αὐρήλιον Ὀβριμιανὸν Κόνωνα νέον …., φιλοτειμησάμενον δὲ καὶ ἰς τὴν κατασκευὴν τοῦ ὑδρείου τοῦ κατασκευαζομένου = The council and the people of the city of Kasai honoured young Marcus Aurelius Obrimianus Konon,…. who donated 5000 silver denarii for the construction (= restoration) of the hydreion, which is being constructed (= restored) in the most splendid and notable city of the Sidetans.

25 ISide I, nos. 39 and 40.

26 Nollé (ISide I, p. 82, fn. 39), referring to the depiction of Caracalla’s wife Plautilla with a nymph (?) on a coin in Imhoof-Blumer 1902, no. 19, pl. XI 24, suggests the city of Side might have celebrated the marriage of Caracalla and Plautilla in 202 A.D. by putting the nymphaeum into service and declared it on the coins. Nollé supported his idea by citing Settis 1973, 685-688, who maintains that nymphaeae were the places where marriage rituals took place. According to Nollé, the part of a relief discovered at the nymphaeum having the theme of gods’ marriages fits well with this idea. See contra Gliwitzky 2010, 108, fn. 139.

27 ISide I, p. 101, fn. 216; p. 207.

28 Referring to Liebenam 1900, 384-386, Gliwitzky (2010, 103) is of the opinion that the duty of the epimeletai is to ensure the buildings to be erected under their responsibility, but it is known that they served in some instances for the protection and the upkeep of buildings.

29 ISide I, s. 207, fn. 58: “Der in dieser Inschrift verwendete Begriff der κατασκευή ist nicht eindeutig: Mit ihm kann auch ‘Reparatur’ gemeint sein.”
rejected, mainly for the four reasons abridged and given as follows:\textsuperscript{30}:

a) If the inscription had dealt with any restoration of the nymphaeum, it would have been provided with a much more explicit terminology of ἐπισκευή/ἐπισκευάζειν.

b) The terminological use of κατασκευάζειν/κατασκευή both as substantive and participle suggests that we are faced here with a building whose constructional works were spread over a long period of time.

c) From the archaeological point of view, the nymphaum façade having a single, homogenous style, provides no traces of large-scale restoration work.

d) The statue bases, which were alleged by Nollé to be a proof for the completion of the nymphaeum under Caracalla, might have been transported to the nymphaeum from another place, because it is hard to conceive that all the statue bases in the nymphaeum can belong to it. However, if we would have to associate the statue bases and their honorary inscriptions with the nymphaeum, we could think that they were erected posthumously for the emperor Caracalla, who issued an edict (Constitutio Antoniniana) granting citizenship to all free men residing all across the empire and was therefore immensely popular amongst the people.

As a result, Gliwitzky, after expressing the above four objections in detail, put forward the idea that the construction of the nymphaeum began sometime in the first half of the 3rd century and a curator (namely Aurelius Mandrianus Longinus) was then charged with supervising the construction and also implementing all the organisational works. In her opinion, the nymphaeum, which was still under construction for some time after A.D. 243, was completed and put into service shortly before mid-third century A.D.\textsuperscript{31}

As can be seen, it is a very disputable issue and difficult to handle. Given the evidence at hand, it is difficult to make a certain conclusion concerning the building chronology of the nymphaeum. Yet, some weak points in the argumentation of Gliwitzky led me think that the thesis advocated by Nollé appears to be more correct. I do not intend to argue against all the arguments elaborated upon by Gliwitzky (this not being the purpose of this article), I will confine myself to some remarks concerning her arguments, because, in terms of the terminology used in the inscription, the exact construction date of the nymphaeum is of vital importance. Starting from her second argument, I have to say that we do not have any certain proof to show that the construction phase of the nymphaeum took place over such a long time. The participle of κατασκευαζομένου merely indicates that construction/restoration works were still in progress; it hints neither at the size nor the total construction/restoration period of the nymphaeum. According to the view of Gliwitzky, there are no extensive restoration traces observable on the nymphaeum façade. Nevertheless, she admits that comprehensive restoration activity is only seen after the Gothic attacks in 269\textsuperscript{32}.

\textsuperscript{30} Gliwitzky 2010, 100-109.
\textsuperscript{31} Gliwitzky 2010, 109.
\textsuperscript{32} Gliwitzky 2010, 106: “Ohne der noch folgenden ausführlichen Analyse der Bauornamentik allzu sehr
But the question remains unanswered: how can one be certain that these restoration traces belong to the Gothic attacks, and not to the period after the possible earthquake damage in A.D. 243, as J. Nollé suggested? Last but not the least: Gliwitzky’s idea that the scribe of the inscription would have preferred a more clear terminology (i.e. the ἐπισκευή/ἐπισκευάζειν), if he had intended to refer to a restoration, not to a construction, should never be considered a strong argument, because the examples collected for this study, as shown below, indicate both terms may occasionally function as synonyms. Taking all these elements into account, one can tentatively suggest that the construction of the nymphaeum at Side was completed in all probability under Caracalla and that it underwent repairs some time after 243, possibly as a result of seismic damage. To conclude: that the attestation of κατασκευάζειν in the inscription dating to after A.D. 243, yet belonging to a building constructed at the latest during the first quarter of the 3rd century, is in good compliance with the idea of earlier scholars that the verb can carry the meaning of “to repair, to restore,” as well as, “to build, to construct”.33

**Other examples of the “restoration/renovation” sense of κατασκευάζειν**

It should be noted that the primary meaning of κατασκευάζειν/κατασκευή is doubtlessly “constructing something from the foundations”. It is needless to say that we have plenty of examples for this meaning and it is clearly distinguished in this respect from ἐπισκευάζειν/ἐπισκευή34. Yet, the problem arises if we come across such confusing situations as at Side, and one may unsurprisingly wonder whether we have some exceptional uses of the verb, in addition to its primary meaning. And indeed there seem to be several epigraphic examples indicating a semantic similarity between both verbs. In order to concretize and exemplify the issue, this contribution brings together several examples attested from Asia Minor and beyond and these examples are investigated in chronological order.

**The fountain of Laodike at Teos**

The first and the earliest example has been recorded at Teos, one of the most significant cities in the Ionian Region. According to the famous cult inscription (dated 33 See above fn. 4-15.
34 That both verbs are employed together and used in different contexts in the same inscriptions is a good indication of the semantic distinction drawn between them. One can clearly perceive this distinction in a Thasian inscription, see especially Fournier – Prêtre 2006, 488: lines 1-4: [ἀναδέχεται] | τα τε δεόμενα ἐπισκευῆς ἐπισκευάζειν κατασκευής κτ[λ]. Also see IStratonikeia II.1, no. 701, lines 12-13: εἰς ἐπισκευήν κατασκευήν βαλανείου; Lepke et al. 2015, 360, lines 22-23: ἐπεσκευάζεται δὲ καὶ τὰ πρὸς τῇ ἀγορᾷ βαλανείαν, κατασκευάζεται δὲ καὶ τὰ πρὸς τῇ πύλῃ ἔργα.
on historical grounds to 204/203 B.C.), which was discovered during the excavations of Temple of Dionysos and is today exhibited in the garden of the İzmir Museum, the Teians set up a cult in honor of the king Antiochos III and his queen Laodike for exempting them from paying huge amounts of taxation to Attalos I and for granting to their city and its territory the right to be asylos (inviolate) and hiea (holy)35.

The reason for citing this inscription in this paper is the information provided in lines 73 to 74 concerning the renovation made to the fountain building in the agora and naming it after the queen Laodike, as well as dedicating it to her. Peter Herrmann, in the editio princeps of the inscription, claimed that the addition of the article to the expression of τὴν κρήνη τὴν ἐν ὠρᾶς κατασκευάζειν indicates an already known and existing structure which was being altered or extended or maybe at least a structure which was already planned to be constructed or whose construction had just started and had not ended36. Moreover, because the expression ἐπιμεληθήναι τῷ οἴνῳ τῷ ἅρθῳ in lines 71 to 72 (i.e. it should be taken care of leading the water into the fountain) was specifically mentioned, Herrmann assumed that the existing fountain was either no longer intact, or was not connected to any aqueduct system at the time37. Even though his arguments are not impeccable, and were in some points justifiably found unsatisfying by Gliwitzky38, I would be inclined to stand at Herrmann’s side, if we address this issue together with other examples presented below.

The theater at Delphoi

According to two different inscriptions, Eumenes II, the Attalid king of Pergamon, contributed to the restoration of Delphis’s theater. The king’s donations for the theater are reflected in one inscription as περὶ τὸν θεάτρων κατασκευῆς yet in another as, εἰς τὴν ἐπισκευὴν τοῦ θεάτρου, which poses a problem at first glance from the traditional point of view, because both inscriptions are certainly dated to the same year (i.e. 160 B.C.; and even most probably to the last months of the year)39. If the theater did not need a restoration in the subsequent months or even days, as soon as it was completed, we would seemingly have no other option than to consider that both these terms, κατασκευή and ἐπισκευὴ employed in these inscriptions express the same meaning in this context40.

35 For the inscription see Herrmann 1965.
36 Herrmann 1965, 74-75.
37 Herrmann 1965, 74.
38 Gliwitzky 2010, 104.
39 Daux – Salač 1932, no. 237, lines 1-8: ἐπειδὴ βασιλεὺς Εὐμένης οὐκ οὐκ ἐκτίνος καὶ ἐκτάνος ἔν τινες τῶν πόλεως καὶ τὸν ἔργον τῷ θεάτρῳ τὸν κατασκευῆς καὶ ἐπισκευῆς· Daux – Salač 1932, no. 239, lines 11-12: αὐτοῦ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπιστελάκε ἄλλα καὶ ἐπισκευῆς τῷ θεάτρῳ…
40 This idea has been widely adopted by the scholars who worked on the theatre of Delphi. According to
The Roman roads in *Monumentum Patarense*

As we turn from the Hellenistic Period to the Roman Imperial Period, we can find more interesting and illuminating examples. One of which is doubtless the road monument discovered in 1994 in Patara, the capital city of Lycia and known as Stadiasmus Patarensis, or with its more accurate terminology as Monumentum Patarense, which plays a crucial role in asserting the main idea of this study. The monument claims that Claudius built roads all across Lycia through his legatus Quintus Veranius in the aftermath of the provincialisation of Lycia in A.D. 43 and provides a catalogue of a long road list allegedly built within the space of 3 years. While the Pataran monument uses the verb of ποιέω for this activity\(^1\), it is given as περὶ τῆς κατα[σκευής τῶν ὀδῶν in another monument at Bonda Tepesi (in the territory of Limyra), which again concerns the Roman roads in Lycia and is dedicated to the emperor Claudius\(^2\). Both the Pataran and Bonda monuments should not be understood as if there existed no roads prior to the reign of Claudius and that the legatus Q. Veranius constructed them *de nihilo*. However, such a claim is not worth discussion as being quite impossible, and what Claudius and his legatus Veranius actually did was simply renovate, repair and widen the routes already existing in pre-Roman times, even if one cannot rule out the possibility that some new roads were indeed constructed by Claudius himself\(^3\).

\(^1\) Şahin 2014, 43: Τιβέριος Κλαύδιος Δρούσου υἱὸς Καῖσαρ Σεβαστὸς Γερμανικὸς ὁ τῆς οἰκουμένης Αὐτοκράτωρ ὁδοὺς καθ’ ὅλην Λυκίαν ἐποίησεν διὰ τὴν Κοίντου Οὐηρανίου τοῦ ἰδίου πρεσβευτοῦ ἀντιστρατήγου ὑπηρεσίαν ὧν ἐστιν μέτρον τὸ ὑπογεγραμμένον.

\(^2\) Marksteiner – Wörrle 2002, 555-564.

\(^3\) Cf. Marksteiner – Wörrle 2002, 553: “Andererseits ist anzunehmen, daß das frühkaiserzeitliche Straßensystem Lykiens auf dem hellenistischen Bestand aufbaute und es sich bei den inschriftlich genannten Arbeiten häufig nur um Ver- oder Ausbesserungen an bestehenden Verbindungen gehandelt haben mag.”; Rouset 2013, 70: “Ainsi l’observation de l’archéologue tranche-t-elle dans ce cas précis l’ambiguïté du terme même de la dédicace : κατασκευή peut a priori, comme l’avait relevé M. Wörre, désigner aussi bien la réfection ou l’aménagement de l’existant que la construction ex nihilo”. See also Marksteiner – Wörrle, opt.cit. 561, fn. 58; Polla – Rinner 2009, 85; Lebreton 2010, 72-74; Onur 2016a, 97-98; Onur 2016b, 92-93. Even though it is possible that new roads were actually built for some particular routes, it is certainly not conceivable for all the routes given in the monument to have been constructed with this period of time. The monument was erected in the aftermath of the organisation of the region as a Roman province. It is definitely a work of propaganda that aimed to show Roman power and imperialism to the inhabitants of the region. In both the monuments of Bonda and Patara, the terminology of ποιεῖν and κατασκευή may have been deliberately employed to convey the message to the Lycians that Claudius had built all the roads in the whole region, which was not the case.
Aristion Aqueduct

At the beginning of 2nd century A.D., Tiberius Claudius Aristion, the imperial high priest, member of the local aristocracy and a significant benefactor in Ephesos, together with his wife Iulia Laterane, provided for his homeland a ca. 40 km long aqueduct, which is named after him by modern researchers. Two identical governor’s edicts regarding the protection and security of this aqueduct were issued and carved on a large marble slab, which is preserved today in the garden of the Tire Archaeological Museum44. The former of the edicts belongs to Aulus Vicirius, the proconsul of Provincia Asia in the era of Trajan, whereas the latter was written by Sextus Subrius Dexter Cornelius Priscus, the proconsul in the era of Hadrian. As is evident from this aqueduct edict and the inscription45 carved on the architrave of the monumental fountain house (incorrectly termed the Nymphaeum Traiani in current scholarship46) constructed in connection with the aforementioned aqueduct by the same sponsors, the building of the aqueduct was already finished during the reign of Trajan. The Trajanic edict enlightens us that the landowners did not abide by the rules, which prohibited ploughing within an area of 10 feet (ἄκαινα) to either side of the aqueduct. The order of Vicirius was apparently disobeyed and it had to be re-ordered by one of his successors Cornelius Priscus, yet this time in a stricter tone. In this new edict, the proconsul repeats the prohibition, asserting that this precaution was essential for the κατασκευή and the ἀσφάλεια (=security against its stumbling). The latter precaution is obviously to keep the aqueduct secure and undamaged during the agricultural activities, while the former is taken as facilitating repair in the event of an emergency situation. Translating this expression to mean, “for the construction of the aqueduct” is beyond doubt not applicable in this case, because it surely does not make any sense in this context to leave a space for construction of an already built aqueduct in the period of Trajan.

The donations of Opramoas in Lycia: The example of bath-buildings

As the remarkable inscription decorating the walls of his funerary monument makes clear, Opramoas of Rhodiapolis spent thousands of denarii on benefactions to many cities in Lycia in the aftermath of the major destructive earthquake of A.D. 14147. The bath buildings took a considerable share of these donations. For example, Opramoas spent on the bath and its bathing pool in Gagai 18 thousand denarii48; on the bath in Oinoanda 10 thousand denarii49 and on the bath in Telmessos 35 thousand

44 IEphesos VII.1, no. 3217 = SEG 31, no. 953 = Scherrer 2006, 54-55, no. 6b.
45 IEphesos II, no. 424 = Scherrer 2006, no. 6a.
46 On the reasons why this terminology is incorrect, see Uzunoğlu 2017, 294-295. For this fountain building see Quatember 2011, passim; Longfellow 2011, 77-95 (who employs the correct terminology ‘the hydrekdocheion of Trajan’ in her book).
47 Kokkinia 2000, passim.
48 TAM II, no. 905, block XIX D, lines 2-5 = Kokkinia 2000, 71.
49 TAM II, no. 905, block XIX B, lines 13-14 = Kokkinia 2000, 71.
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denarii. All these donations are given in the form of “εἰς κατασκευὴν βαλανείου”. However, the intention and the motivation of this benefactor was certainly not to embellish the cities with brand-new buildings, but instead to repair, to renovate and obviously to reconstruct, if this was needed; as it would not be incorrect to think that the top-priority for the cities was to rehabilitate their earthquake damaged buildings.

Nevertheless, the inscription on the monument of Opramoas completely lacks the verb “ἐπίσκευάζειν” or its substantive “ἐπίσκευη”, which is the primary and more closely corresponding equivalent of “to repair, to restore” in Ancient Greek. The inscription employs κατασκευάζειν and κατασκευή instead. Therefore, we can understand from the use of κατασκευάζειν and κατασκευή in the Opramoas inscriptions that it was not only employed for “the construction of entirely new buildings” but also for the “renovating and restoring” of damaged or collapsed buildings.

The hydreion of Menandros at Ephesos

During the reign of Septimius Severus, an asiarch called Titus Flavius Menandros promised a hydreion to his homeland of Ephesos and fulfilled this promise, as the building inscription of the hydreion records: ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων καθὰ ὑπέσχετο τὸ ὑ[δ]ρεῖον τῇ γλυκυτάτῃ πατρίδι κατεσκεύασεν. From the archaeological perspective, scholars are of the opinion that the hydreion was first designed as the heroon of C. Memmius, the grandson of the famous Roman general Sulla and it was converted into a fountain presumably in the Augustan period and at the latest during the Flavian period. If we adopt this view (and there is no reason to object to it), here again we are confronted with the contradicting situation provided by the terminology employed.

50 TAM II, no. 905, block XIX B, lines 7-10 = Kokkinia 2000, 71.

51 Because the cost of repairs recorded in these inscriptions are quite high, it suggests the bath-houses in these settlements were demolished almost completely and needed extensive renovation. The building costs of bath-houses vary due to the size and ornamentation and the period of time itself. We have a limited number of examples to be able to compare the situation in Lycia in the mid-2nd century with the rest of the Asia Minor. In an inscription recorded in the Rough-Cilician city of Iotape (Aytap, Alanya/Antalya) and dated approximately to the same period as Opramoas inscription, a certain Kendeas donated 1025 denarii to the bath house constructed for the common use, see Bean – Mitford 1965, p. 24-25, no. 29a = Hagel – Tomaschitz 1998, 122, no. Iot. 1a. Similarly, in the Carian settlement of Laguna, the Hecate priest Claudius Aineas seems to have contributed 1000 denarii for the restoration of bath-house in late 2nd century – in early 3rd century A.D., which was constructed and dedicated to the city by his grandfather Flavius Aineas: IStratonikeia II, 1, no. 701. On the building, repair and restoration costs of the bath-houses in antiquity, see in general Meusel 1960, 34-101; Nielsen 1993, 122-124.

52 This word, simply meaning a place where the water is stored, can be applied to fountains as well as to water reservoirs. The terminology of all water structures including the fountain buildings is discussed in my on-going dissertation project entitled “Water and Water-Related Constructions in South and South-West Asia Minor in the light of Epigraphic Evidence” supervised by Prof. Dr. N. Eda Akyürek Şahin.

53 IEphesos II, 435.

54 Miltner (1960, 24-25) dates the hydreion to the period of Augustus, while Alzinger (1970, 1606) dates it to the Flavian Period. Dorl-Klingenschmid (2001, 186), Scherrer (2006, 47) and Weiss (2011, 93) find the suggestion of Miltner more convincing because they think that fountain must have been fed by the Augustan aqueduct in Ephesos termed the “Aqua Threessitica.”
Hüseyin Uzunoğlu

C. Dorl-Klingenschmid, who studied thoroughly the fountains of Asia Minor in her dissertation, already agreed upon understanding here a renovation, instead of the construction, of the hydreion of Menandros, remarking that “Die über die genannten Stifter festdatierte Renovierung wurde um 200 n. Chr. durchgeführt.”  

κατασκευάζειν ἐκ θεμελίων

The examples connected with the verb of κατασκευάζειν that I have compiled above reveal that the verb has a far-ranging sense, extending from construction to renovation, repair, embellishment or even the inclusion of further functions or features (rooms etc.) to the building in question. However, the question arises as to how we should approach this issue, if the verb was used together with “ἐκ θεμελίων”. The first idea that almost immediately and justifiably comes to mind is that we would be dealing with a de nihilo construction because we do not even have any foundations. Should such a deduction really be made for each building inscription having this ἐκ θεμελίων expression? Or, one wonders whether sometimes we are dealing with a building that underwent complete reconstruction - renovation, after collapsing or being demolished to the level of its foundations? Extensive epigraphic evidence corroborates that the answer to the second suggestion must be in the affirmative. In this case, we would rather focus on the verb itself, not on the expression of ἐκ θεμελίων, and it would again lead us to discussion above. In the last part of this study, two further examples are investigated, one of them is recorded in the Lycian capital of Patara and the other documented in Athens. In both cases, we find the expression κατασκευάζειν ἐκ θεμελίων, but we find the archaeological remains or elements of the buildings date back to much earlier times than the date of these inscriptions, thereby contributing to a better understanding and clarification of this issue.

The Neronic/Vespasianic Bath at Patara

The Neronic/Vespasianic bath at Patara and its construction chronology has been the subject of intensive discussions, which have focused on the erasure of lines 2 to 5 of the bath inscription and the carving the name of emperor Vespasian in the first line. Sencer Şahin, who asserted that the titles of the emperor were inscribed erroneously on the stone immediately in the aftermath of his accession and then were ordered to be corrected during his visit to the city on his way back to Rome, concluded

---

55 In her opinion, the renovation took place probably in the apsidal dome of the hydreion; see Dorl-Klingenschmid 2001, 186. See Quas’ remarks on this issue demonstrating the terminological confusion in the scholarship, Quas 1993, 217, fn. 799: “Errichtung bzw. Restaurierung des sog. Hydreions durch den Asiarchen und Grammateus T. Flavius Menandros...”.

56 IStratonikeia I, no. 310, lines 43-45: ... ἤν ὁ πατὴρ | αὐτῶν ἐκ θεμελίων ἐπεσκεύασεν; IEphesos II, no. 491: [---]τόπος ἐκ θεμελίων ἐπεσκεύασεν; IGLSyr 13,1, no. 9116, lines 3-4: ἀνενεώθη ὁ | τόπος ἐκ θεμελίων. Concerning the Latin equivalent of this term (= a fundamentis), cf. Thomas – Witschel 1992, 159-162, who convincingly demonstrate that the use of this term may at times be a pure exaggeration and was at times employed in a somewhat misleading manner.

57 TAM II, no. 396; Eck 2008, 269-275; SEG 57, no. 1671.
that the actual titles of the emperor were then added on the erased part of the stone in paint. In response to this claim, Werner Eck maintained that the name and the titles of Nero must have stood on the erasure and the name of Vespasian was later added to the inscription following the damnatio memoriae of Nero. Eck’s idea is essentially based upon the reading of δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας [τὸ ι]α on the hardly decipherable erased part of the stone. The sponsorship of the bath was accordingly attributed to Nero, because the 11th tribunicia potestas had to be associated with Nero due to the fact that the bath was constructed during the legateship of Sextus Marcianus Priscus who governed in Lycia until at the latest mid-A.D. 70 and thus its construction cannot belong to Vespasian.

Irrespective of all these discussions, as to whether Nero or Vespasian built the bath-house at Patara, the inscription provides one further piece of crucial information that the building was constructed from the foundations (ἐκ θεμελίων) together with its ornaments and pools (σὺν τοῖς ἐν αὐτῷ προσκοσμήμασιν καὶ ταῖς κολυμβήθαις). Prior to the start of the excavation at the bath building, M. Koçak and S. Erkoç made detailed and extensive observations and analyses based upon the present physical remains. According to their preliminary report, they managed to determine a room of the bath-house (No. 3) dating prior to Nero’s reign. So, they think that a further room (No. 2) was attached to Room No. 3 during the period of Nero and the last phase was to add another room (which they identified as the frigidarium) at an unknown period of time. However contradictory these observations may appear to the information given in the inscription, the problem will automatically be less confusing when we approach the meaning of κατασκευάζειν within the context of the above discussion. The situation needs to be interpreted by assigning to the verb of κατασκευάζειν the sense of widening the space of the building, adding a new room and embellishing it with pools etc. In this case, we may assume that ἐκ θεμελίων was not applicable to the whole building, but rather was limited to the added room.

An unidentifiable building in Athens

I conclude this article by briefly mentioning one last building inscription on an epistyl recorded in Athens and dated to A.D. 396-401. According to the information obtained from the inscription, Severus Aetius, the proconsul of Achaea, constructed a building from its foundations, the function of which cannot be clearly identified due to the missing letters in the relevant part of the inscription: Σεουῆρος Αέτιος κατεσκεύασεν ἐκ θεμελίων τὸ …… [ -- ca. 9 μετὰ τῶν προπυλαίων]. Long after its publication in IG II² many decades earlier, A. Frantz, after re-examining the building

58 Şahin 2008, 1-32, especially p. 19-26.
59 Eck 2008, 269-275.
60 Koçak – Erkoç 2016. Archaeological excavations have recently begun in the bath-house and may provide us with more accurate results concerning the chronology of the building.
61 Koçak – Erkoç 2016, 498-499.
62 IG II², no. 13292 = Frantz 1979, 198.
itself and its inscription in detail, postulated that the epistyl, having the façade of a structure with its 5.12 m width, served almost certainly as a porch and doubtlessly dated from an earlier time than the inscription\textsuperscript{63}. If the epistyl had not been employed as a spolia in a totally different building in the 4th century A.D. (which is regarded as unlikely by Frantz\textsuperscript{64}), we then would have to consider that κατασκευάζειν ἐκ θεμελίων indicated the rebuilding of a structure that had been destroyed down to its foundations, as already conjectured by Frantz\textsuperscript{65}.

**Conclusion**

This contribution provides several examples of epigraphic evidence from a wide range of time and geographies, and proposes on this basis that κατασκευάζειν does not necessarily mean “to construct a brand-new building from its foundations,” and it does not necessarily indicate the initial construction of a building or structure. It may instead convey a rather broad meaning, synonymous with “ἐπισκευάζειν”, extending from “partial or extensive repair and restorations to the complete renovation of collapsed buildings, their embellishment with further functions, such as adding rooms or spaces to already existing buildings and thereby expanding them, as was the case at Pataran bath-house”. So, in my opinion, researchers should look to the archaeological remains (if they still exist) and to other interdisciplinary evidence as much as is possible and attend to the issues discussed above when editing a building inscription or in attempting to establish building chronologies. If there are no extant physical remains or the remains provide no hint concerning the initial construction date and we read κατασκευάζειν in the building inscription, we should be very cautious in stating this as evidence for the date of initial construction, as there is quite a high probability of drawing the wrong conclusions if based solely upon the use of the word κατασκευάζειν in the epigraphic evidence.

\textsuperscript{63} Frantz 1979, 194-203, especially 199.

\textsuperscript{64} Frantz 1979, 199: “That it belonged originally to the building now restored cannot be stated with certainty but the probability is strong.”

\textsuperscript{65} Frantz 1979, 199. She also admits that the usual term to be expected in this situation was ἔπεσκευάσεν instead of κατασκεύασεν.
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