

Roman Power and the Memorial Turn in Civic Honourability in Western Asia Minor, ca 85 BCE-14 CE

Marcus Chin

DANS **DIALOGUES D'HISTOIRE ANCIENNE** 2023/SUPPLÉMENT26 (S 26), PAGES 201 À 224
ÉDITIONS **PRESSES UNIVERSITAIRES DE FRANCHE-COMTÉ**

ISSN 0755-7256

DOI 10.3917/dha.hs26.0201

Article disponible en ligne à l'adresse

<https://www.cairn.info/revue-dialogues-d-histoire-ancienne-2023-Suppl%C3%A9ment26-page-201.htm>



CAIRN.INFO
MATIÈRES À RÉFLEXION

Découvrir le sommaire de ce numéro, suivre la revue par email, s'abonner...

Flashez ce QR Code pour accéder à la page de ce numéro sur Cairn.info.



Distribution électronique Cairn.info pour Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté.

La reproduction ou représentation de cet article, notamment par photocopie, n'est autorisée que dans les limites des conditions générales d'utilisation du site ou, le cas échéant, des conditions générales de la licence souscrite par votre établissement. Toute autre reproduction ou représentation, en tout ou partie, sous quelque forme et de quelque manière que ce soit, est interdite sauf accord préalable et écrit de l'éditeur, en dehors des cas prévus par la législation en vigueur en France. Il est précisé que son stockage dans une base de données est également interdit.

ROMAN POWER AND THE MEMORIAL TURN IN CIVIC HONOURABILITY IN WESTERN ASIA MINOR, CA 85 BCE-14 CE¹

Marcus CHIN
Wadham College, Oxford, United Kingdom
marcus.chin@wadham.ox.ac.uk

As Rome imposed itself on the eastern Mediterranean over the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE it increasingly made itself felt in the cultural practices of its numerous Greek cities. The most notable and archaeologically visible of these is the honouring of civic benefactors, a phenomenon that is particularly well attested in western Asia Minor, especially in the years around the establishment of Roman Asia in 129. One example of this engagement is an honorific decree for Apollonios of Metropolis, a leading citizen who died fighting for his city alongside Rome in an early phase of the war against Aristonikos (133-129 BCE).² The account of his service at this critical moment, his role in stirring sentiment against Aristonikos, and his preparations for battle and final heroic encounter with the enemy, are deeply shaped by Metropolis' loyal attachment to Rome, which is conceived throughout as the ultimate guarantor of its freedom (l. 13-25). So much so, in fact, that the posthumous honorific statue for Apollonios would bear an inscription commemorating his goodwill to the affairs of the Romans, in the first instance, and only secondly to the city.³

Civic honours present the viewpoint of the city, and thus inevitably elide realities of domination and obscure the voice of the hegemonic power, unlike inscribed official letters of kings and Roman magistrates, or *senatus consulta*, for instance. At the same time, however, they allow us to observe how imperial power was represented

¹ All translations are by the author.

² *I.Metropolis* 1 A.

³ *I.Metropolis* 1 A, l. 38-40: Ὁ δ[ῆ]μος Ἀπολλώνιον Ἀττάλου τοῦ Ἄνδρωνος ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν καὶ εὐνοίας ἧς ἔχων διετέλει πρὸς τὰ Ῥωμαίων πράγματα καὶ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν.

in local discourse, and indeed thereby embody an important aspect of the reality of this power. This is not to suggest that civic honorific response was simply reactionary, merely reflecting the “true” power of the imperial power, in this case the Roman Republic. Rather the contrary: the Metropolitans’ incorporation of the Roman state as a source of local honourability was a choice, and reveals how they actively shaped and integrated Roman power into locally understood ethical terms.⁴ Apollonios’ very honorific monument, as a statue accompanied by two lengthy decrees summarising his public career, is of a piece with a broader late 2nd-century BCE movement in honorific epigraphy in the region, by which citizens were honoured with lengthy career-decrees, and prominent symbolic awards, as well-known dossiers from Priene, Klaros, Sestos, and elsewhere show;⁵ this surge in honorific representation focussed on elite local citizens, many of whom were both key figures of their cities and ambassadors of their interests before Rome, coincides closely with the onset of Roman provincialisation, and arguably forms a direct and contingent ideological product of that provincialisation.⁶

The following essay studies, however, a later phase in civic honorific representation in western Anatolia under Roman rule. It examines the period roughly spanning 85 BCE to 14 CE, which witnessed a number of conflicts (the Mithridatic and Civil Wars), entailing political and economic hardship for the cities in the region, before making way for the establishment of peace, and a new imperial order, in the principate of Augustus. At this time individual Roman officials, and ultimately the emperor himself, received honours on a larger scale than before. Our aim here is to suggest that these honours existed in a state of interactive and competitive dynamism with honours for local citizens, and that developments in the latter must be read in light of developments in the former.⁷ The first section examines the decades roughly 85-31 BCE, during which the proliferation of honours for Roman officials enhanced the honourability of ambassadorial contact with the Senate, and instigated an elevation

⁴ The interaction between Rome and civic honorific culture, beyond studies of Roman influence on civic political institutions more generally, has only more recently been the subject of more focussed scrutiny; the major exception is civic patronage: Eilers 2002, Ferrary 1997b, p. 105-113, Canali de Rossi 2001; see now Heller and Van Nijf 2017. For good introductions to the long-standing debates on Rome’s relationship with *polis* institutions, see Dmitriev 2005, Hamon 2005, 2009, p. 373-378; Heller 2009, 2013.

⁵ *E. g. I.Priene*² 64-65; *I.Sestos* 1; *SEG* 39, 1243-1244 (Klaros); *IGR* IV, 134 (Kyzikos); *SEG* 50, 1211 (Pergamon); *SEG* 34, 1198 (Gordos); *SEG* 44, 867 (Bargyilia); *SEG* 51, 1495 (Bargasa).

⁶ See Forster 2018, p. 229-233, 247-326.

⁷ For a similar approach applied to the imperial period, Buraselis 2017.

in honorific status of citizen ambassadors and intermediaries. The second studies the emergence of statue-hierarchisation for local notables in the Augustan principate, as seen in the proliferation of a titular mindset to honour, as a result of the establishment of imperial cult and its formalisation of the province as a framework for honourability. The overall result of these developments, as the third section argues, is a subtle change in honorific mentality over this period, by which the individual memorability of an honorand's deeds, rather than just their value as a source of replicable ideals, becomes the primary focus of honorific exemplarity.

I- COMPARABILITY IN THE HONOURS FOR ROMAN OFFICIALS AND LOCAL NOTABLES AS CIVIC INTERMEDIARIES

From the early 2nd century BCE onwards, the Romans were described as “common benefactors”, and even received cult through the goddess Roma. Honours for individual Romans, however, are rare before the 1st century.⁸ In western Asia Minor, the establishment of the province of Asia provoked the Pergamenes to honour Manius Aquillius with cult in 129, but few honours for other Roman magistrates are known from the decades immediately following. From the 90s BCE, such honours do begin to survive, in statue-bases honouring governors, quaestors, legates, military officers, and even proliferate in the years 85-31 BCE. Of the 56 such monuments known from Asia to the end of the Republican period, only five date securely to before 85 BCE.⁹ The chronological coincidence of this surge almost certainly relates to the increasingly formalised nature of Roman administration in Asia in the years after the first Mithridatic war.¹⁰

Crucially, the vast majority of these statue-bases commemorating individual Roman euergetism are frustratingly vague as to the precise character of the benefactions and services provided. The Milesian base for M. Pupius Piso Frugi (63 BCE) for example, honours him merely for having been “legate of the Romans, the patron and

⁸ Romans as οἱ κοῖνοι εὐεργέται: Erskine 1994; cults of Roma: Mellor 1975.

⁹ As counted in the collections of Tuchelt 1979 and Erkelenz 2003, with the latest list of Jordan 2019, p. 332-335, discounting honours for family members and major *imperatores* like Pompey and Caesar. The predominance of statue-bases, and near absence of decrees, is striking, although this was certainly also a period when the inscription of decrees begins to decline in general.

¹⁰ Kallet-Marx 1995, p. 261-290.

benefactor of the city, on account of his virtue and goodwill towards it”.¹¹ Only nine examples offer more detail about the honorand’s benefactions, although these do largely comprise major services to the political rights of a community.¹² It is likely that many of the 47 remaining cases involved similar accomplishments, so that we should not underestimate the significance of this surge in Roman honours, and the weightiness of generalising phrases like ἀρετῆς καὶ εὐνοίας ἕνεκεν sometimes qualifying such statue-base captions.¹³ Indeed, the majority of these honours, 31 of 56 examples, grant the title εὐεργέτης (σωτήρ is also granted, but rarer), while seven honour the individual as πατρων alone.¹⁴ All but four are inscribed in Greek alone.¹⁵ One viable conclusion is therefore that Roman honorands were regarded in the same terms as influential foreign citizen benefactors. At the same time, Roman officials were hardly normal citizen benefactors, with their designations as ἀνθύπατος, πρεσβευτής, or ταμίας. Indeed, the very vagueness in many of these statue-bases of the benefactions provided suggests that these Roman offices were regarded in the main as the “benefactions” themselves. These honours, then, were also a means of representing Roman office-holding in civic terms.¹⁶ In this

¹¹ *Milet* I.3 173: ὁ δῆμος ὁ Μιλησίων | Μαᾶρκον Πούπιον Μαᾶρκου | υἱὸν Πείσωνα Φρούγι πρεσβευτήν Ῥωμαίων, τὸν πατρῶ|γα καὶ εὐεργέτην τῆς πόλεως, | ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν καὶ εὐνοίας | τῆς εἰς ἑαυτὸν.

¹² *I.Illion* 71 (L. Julius Caesar saves Athena Ilias from *publicani*, 89); *IG XIV*, 1121 (G. Salluvius Naso protects Abbaeians and Epiktetes from Mithridates during the war); *I.Pergamon* 410 and *IGR IV*, 401 (L. Antonius administers justice in the province, 50/49); *I.Pergamon* 413 (Servilius Isauricus restores political rights to Pergamon, 46-44); *I.Magnesia* 142 (Servilius Isauricus, for benefaction to Artemis Leukophryene 46-44); *I.Stratonikeia* 509 (Marcus Cocceius Nerva regains freedom and political rights, 38/37); *SEG* 49, 1512 (M. Titius is benefactor of Apollo Klarios, 34/32); exceptionally, *IGR IV*, 420 (L. Cornificius for goodwill towards a Neon Boubas, 38/37).

¹³ *E. g.* *SEG* 60, 908, l. 7-8; *I.Priene*² 233, l. 4-6.

¹⁴ For data on titles, Erkelenz 2003, p. 253-255, 281-282, 289, 305-306, 310 and Jordan 2019, p. 332-335; L. Licinius Lucullus may have been κτιστής or κηδεμών at Thyateira (*TAM V.2*, 918, l. 4); cf. Heller 2020, p. 28, n. 41. Of the 18 cases not exhibiting titles or designation as πατρων, ten include some qualification of the honorand in traditional terms, either for accomplishing a εὐεργεσία, or in praise ἀρετῆς καὶ εὐνοίας ἕνεκεν; the remaining eight have mitigating factors: three are either bilingual or in Latin (*SEG* 52, 1174; *IG XIV*, 1121; *AE* 1990, 938), three are fragmentary (*I.Magnesia* 123, M. Popillius Laenas, 155, Marcus (?), *TAM V.2*, 920, L. Antonius), one honours L. Sestius, also honoured at Pergamon as benefactor (*I.Pergamon* 406-407); only L. Julius Caesar (*I.Illion* 71) receives no honorific title, but his benefactions are detailed (n. 12).

¹⁵ In Latin only: *IG XIV*, 1121 (although set up at Nemi); the others are bilingual: *SEG* 52, 1174; *CIL III*, 7160; *AE* 1990, 938.

¹⁶ Frijia 2014b, p. 86-90 even posits a “routinisation” of honours for Roman officials.

very quality of honouring officials of Rome, however, honours for Roman officials fundamentally differed from honours for earlier hegemonic rulers, like Hellenistic kings. Whereas royal power had been straightforwardly concentrated in the person of the king, so that an Antiochos III or Eumenes II *was* the ruling power, Roman power (“the Senate and People of Rome”) was not straightforwardly personified (beyond cults to Roma), so that Roman officials, and even the highest ranking in Asia, governors, were at best only *representatives* of the ruling power. The result is that Roman officials could be co-opted even more distinctly as civic benefactors than earlier royal officials and governors: where the latter were sometimes even praised for their goodwill towards the king, or their acting in accordance with the *προαίρεσις* of the king,¹⁷ Roman officials never seem to have been praised for services towards the “Roman state”, and were grounded primarily as contributors to the city in question alone. They were thus acknowledged as individuals endowed with the magisterial authority of “Rome”, but also as intermediary-figures between Rome and the honouring city.

The significance of this conceptual difference for the present argument is that it made Roman officials potential “ambassadors” of civic interests, who could therefore achieve benefactions comparable to those of citizen ambassadors. It is this “ambassadorial” quality to Roman euergetism that arguably underpins the existence of civic *πατρωνεία*. Although the concept was intrinsically Roman, it is likely that such relationships were instigated by the cities, even if they differed qualitatively from similar traditional awards like *proxenia*, in being a function that had to be accepted by the potential patron.¹⁸ Civic patronage is almost entirely known from honorific statue-bases for Romans designated as *πατρων*, and the chronological spread of such bases thus coincides precisely with that of Roman honours overall (only 3 certain instances before 85, and 35 from 85-31 BCE).¹⁹ Moreover, a large proportion of attested patrons were Roman officials (25 of 35 cases), even if it is the case that not all Roman officials seem to have become patrons (25 of 56 honorific bases).²⁰ What this would suggest is that the very intermediary character of Roman officials, as conduits between cities

¹⁷ Ma 2002, p. 230-232, and especially 231, n. 151 for examples.

¹⁸ *I.Aphrodisias 2007* 8.2, l. 9-24, with Eilers 2002, p. 23-25; *proxenia* qualitatively different: Ferrary 1997a, p. 211, Ferrary 1997b, p. 109-110.

¹⁹ Eilers 2002, p. 137-138, 145-146, Santangelo 2007, p. 129-132; this does not mean civic patronage did not already exist in the 2nd century already: *Syll.*³ 656, l. 22-24, *SEG* 39, 1244 III, l. 10-13 and Bloy 2012.

²⁰ Evidence for patrons: Eilers 2002, p. 208-220, 222-254.

and the Senate, was increasingly seen by the cities of Asia as a source of potential usefulness—by co-opting such Romans as patrons, cities gained “ambassadors” for their interests. Thus, Q. Oppius in ca 85 BCE promised the Aphrodisians that he would relay news of their good deeds to the Senate.²¹ Πάτρωνεία was not ubiquitous, and not all Roman officials accepted it. It is nonetheless the most visible sign that Romans were increasingly represented in honorific monuments as representatives of civic interests. In the syntactical rhetoric of the extant statue-bases, the designation as πατρων is usually to be read as part of the honorand’s civic titles, and not with the Roman office: Piso at Miletos, for instance, was “patron and benefactor”, not “legate and patron”.²² Πάτρωνεία was thus *presented* as an honorific obligation, and, with the honorands being members of the ruling power, would have implied its primacy as a form of ambassadorial connection to the Senate, over the sorts of connections entertained by local notables.

Honours for Roman officials, sometimes even as patrons, were necessary expedients in the tumultuous decades after 85 BCE, when many cities underwent considerable political and economic hardship as the result of indemnities, Roman demands on local resources for military provision, and the rapacity of *publicani*.²³ The presence of Romans as civic representatives, however, arguably had ramifications for the ambassadorial activities of civic notables. For instance, the only praiseworthy ambassadorial service of the prominent Mylasan notable Iatrokles seems to have been his journey to the new governor M. Junius Silanus on his arrival in the province (ca 76 BCE) to confirm him as the city’s patron: that is, Silanus’ status as Mylasa’s patron before the Senate placed him in a superior conceptual position to a local notable like Iatrokles, whose ambassadorial remit seems to have been thereby confined to the province.²⁴ There were also consequences for honorific status and visibility. At

²¹ *I.Aphrodisias* 2007 8.2, l. 11-15.

²² Other examples of this collocation: *MAMA* IV, 52 (Lucullus, Synnada); *IG* XII, 4, 857 (M. Popillius Laenas, Kos); *I.Pergamon* 406 (L. Sestius); *I.Kaunos* 111 (G. Fonteius Capito). In seven cases the honorand was praised only for Roman office and as πατρων: *SEG* 49, 1506 (G. Valerius Flaccus, 95); *SEG* 49, 1507 (L. Valerius Flaccus, 92); *SEG* 49, 1510 (L. Valerius Flaccus, 62); *I.Labraunda* 63 (L. Cornelius Lentulus, 82); *I.Nyssa* 279 (L. Aelius Tubero, 61-58); *I.Ephesos* 663 (Gn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, 32/31); *SEG* 37, 959 (M. Valerius Messalla Potitus, 38-35).

²³ Indemnities after Sulla: Santangelo 2007, p. 107-133; military requisitions in the Civil Wars: Kirbihler 2013, p. 352-359; the harshness of the *publicani*: Delrieux 2010.

²⁴ *I.Mylasa* 109, l. 16-17; see also Heller 2006, p. 49 in relation to Krates of Priene. At Ephesos, a, L. Calpurnius Piso (84/60 BCE) was honoured as a patron for aiding the city’s ambassadors at Rome: *I.Ephesos* 630 B, l. 1-3.

some cities, like Kaunos for instance, Roman benefactors dominated local honorific landscapes, so that local notables are practically invisible in the 1st century BCE.²⁵ One overall effect of the growing prevalence of Roman honorands who served as representatives of civic interests, however, was arguably that the achievements of citizen ambassadors who did manage to establish direct connections with the Senate were exalted more highly than before. Where the influential Menippos of Klaros of the late 2nd century received a statue after a career spanning numerous embassies to Rome, alongside other services at Kolophon, an Artemidoros of Ephesos, around 100 BCE, seems to have been honoured with a gilt statue solely (*ἀντί δὲ τούτων*) for defending the Artemision from *publicani* at Rome.²⁶ Over the 1st century BCE, further examples are known of statues that seem to have been conferred solely for leading embassies to Rome. Shortly after 85, Pyrrhakos of Alabanda received a bronze statue mainly for his ambassadorial accomplishments, including affirming Alabanda's goodwill with Rome before the Senate.²⁷ Some extant 1st-century statue-bases record such services as the primary, indeed lone, motivation for the honour.²⁸ Furthermore, some civic ambassadors were even accorded posthumous honours on the occasion of their deaths during service, like a Posidippos of Stratonikeia, who was buried by the city after he had died at Rome while on embassy to the Senate.²⁹ Direct ambassadorial contacts with the Senate were thereby increasingly inscribed into civic memory, and established as major civic benefactions.

Some even received cultic honours. Diodoros Pasparos of Pergamon, most notably, had travelled to Rome, thereby alleviating exorbitant tax- and interest-rates

²⁵ *I.Kaunos* 104, 106-113, 120-122, with Stoop 2017, p. 29-30; see also Klaros' Sacred Way: Ferrary 2000, p. 334-368.

²⁶ Strabo, *Geography*, XIV, 1, 26, with Ampolo 2008.

²⁷ *I.Nordkarrien* 211, l. 1-25; with Gauthier 2005, p. 87, n. 9 for the dating.

²⁸ Hermias of Stratonikeia was honoured by Daulis with two statues solely for having interceded with Roman authorities: *FD* III, 4 69, l. 17-20; from the later 1st century BCE, the athlete Hippolochos and philosopher Apollophanes at Pergamon, and Menekles (?) at Miletos, were praised for diplomatic services at Rome: *IGR* IV, 495; Jacobsthal 1908, p. 408, n. 38, *Milet* VI.3, 1091.

²⁹ *I.Stratonikeia* 1206, l. 4-6. The funeral epigram for a Damodika of Kyme specifies that her husband Hermogenes, who had been ambassador to Rome at the time, had been unable to be at her dying side: *I.Kyme* 46, l. 8-9; further, a 1st-century CE Chian decree records the embassy to Rome of the honorand's ancestor Chairylos as the only deed worthy of mention: *IG* XII, 4, 1036, l. 5-9, with Buraselis 2000, p. 13-20.

imposed on the city, and retrieving property lost in the Mithridatic war.³⁰ For this he received in return five honorific statues, and cult in the form of an eponymous heroic shrine, a priesthood, an eponymous tribe, as well as posthumous funeral honours.³¹ The creation of living cult was clearly modelled on the honours for the Attalid kings,³² although this does not mean it was an attempt to “revive” Attalid rule: rather, Diodoros’ cultic honorific status was part of a competitive honorific environment in early 1st century Pergamon, where other Romans, in fact, had received major honours, in statues, and even cult, like Lucullus and Mucius Scaevola.³³ The deeply local character of his dossier, in an eponymous shrine and tribe (the Diodoreion, Paspareis), served to present him as a Pergamene representative on par with the city’s powerful Roman benefactors. Crucially, the sacrifices offered on his behalf were qualified as being second only to Manius Aquillius, thus implicitly expressing the parity of the conceptual standing of his cult to that of later Romans like Scaevola or Lucullus.³⁴ It is unsurprising that Diodoros’ later public service was heavily involved in the refurbishment of the gymnasium, the seat of civic identity.³⁵

In the years after Diodoros Pasparos, some civic representatives even transcended the roles of civic ambassadors to become close confidants and advisors of powerful Romans in the Civil War period, and received extraordinary honours at their home cities.³⁶ Theophanes of Mytilene obtained the freedom of his native city in 67 BCE through intercession with his friend Pompey, for which he ultimately received divine honours, perhaps after his death, being assimilated to Zeus Eleutherios, and obtained

³⁰ *IGR* IV, 292, l. 1-14 with Jones 1974, p. 191-197. For his career, see also Chankowski 1998.

³¹ *IGR* IV, 292, l. 21-54.

³² Gauthier 1985, p. 62-63, and Virgilio 1993, p. 85-94 and 1994.

³³ Statues for M. Junius (75/74) and P. Cornelius Dolabella (68, as εὐεργέτης): *I.Pergamon* 408, 405; for Scaevola and Lucullus’ honours, Ferriès, Delrieux 2011, p. 210-224 and Plutarch, *Life of Lucullus*, XXIII, 2; Pergamon as Asia’s leading city Pergamon is likely to have hosted other festivals for governors, for which see Thériault 2012, p. 377-381.

³⁴ *IGR* IV, 293, II, l. 24-25.

³⁵ Diodoros’ gymnasial euergetism: *IGR* IV, 293, I and II, l. 45-78, *IGR* IV, 294, with Chankowski 1998, p. 169-180.

³⁶ This may also have been the case with Diodoros Pasparos, who is described as having “influence among the Romans”: *IGR* IV, 293, II, l. 15-16 (ἐκ τῆς παρὰ τοῖς | ἡγουμένοις [ἐντρ]οπής).

the titles of saviour, benefactor, and second founder of the city.³⁷ Two decades later, Mithridates of Pergamon, a political successor to Diodoros Paspáros, reclaimed civic territory through his friendship with Caesar, and was honoured with two statues as high-priest and priest of Dionysos Kathegemon (thereby emphasising his civic functions, even though he had recently fought under Caesar, and would soon be appointed Galatian tetrarch and king of the Bosporos), and “new founder after Pergamos and Philetairos” (μετὰ Πέργαμον καὶ Φιλέταιρον νέον κτίστην).³⁸ Around the same time Theopompos and his son Artemidoros of Knidos, also intimates of Caesar, freed their city, with the former being hailed as saviour,³⁹ while Artemidoros even received cultic honours described as ἰσόθεοι τιμαί, in nine statues, intramural burial, a statue erected in the temple of Artemis Hyakinthotrophos, and an eponymous penteteric festival.⁴⁰ It is noteworthy that at each of these three sites—Mytilene, Pergamon, Knidos—Pompey and Caesar, the powerful Roman patrons of these four individuals (through whom their benefactions to their cities were achieved) were also honoured, and in ways that distinguished them from the honorific status of their citizen-clients. At Knidos, Caesar was lauded as patron and benefactor—but not, seemingly, as saviour, a title which was accorded to Theopompos.⁴¹ Likewise, at Pergamon Caesar was hailed as saviour and benefactor for similarly restoring the city’s territory and constitution; while these titles are absent in Mithridates’ honours, this was compensated for by his hyper-local designation as “new founder”.⁴² Most striking, however, is the relationship between the statuses of Pompey and Theophanes at Mytilene. The former was widely honoured as saviour and founder, but not as a god; it would seem that the elevation of Theophanes

³⁷ *IG XII*, 2, 163 B with Tacitus, *Annals*, VI, 18. Coins presenting Θεοφάνης θεός (reign of Tiberius): *RPC I* 2342. For Theophanes generally, see Robert 1969, Gold 1985, and Santangelo 2018.

³⁸ Hepding 1909, p. 330, n. I, l. 4-6; p. 331, n. II, l. 3-5, with Heinen 1994. For the concrete details, Segre 1938.

³⁹ *I.Knidos* 51-55, especially 52 l. 7.

⁴⁰ *I.Knidos* 59. See also Thériault 2003, p. 242-246.

⁴¹ *I.Knidos* 41.

⁴² Caesar: *I.Pergamon* 379, l. 2-6; *I.Pergamon* 380, l. 1-5; see also *I.Pergamon* 413, l. 3-6 for Servilius Isauricus. These statues were also erected in the Upper Agora, while Mithridates’ were set up in the gymnasium, reflecting a distinction between Roman and local honorands observable at Pergamon: Mathys 2009, p. 234-239.

to divine status, and specific designation as *second* founder, reflects a conscious attempt to distinguish him from Pompey, Mytilene's Roman benefactor.⁴³

These last four cases exceptional honours of cult and statuses as founder and saviour were undoubtedly granted for services in exceptional circumstances. They also form, however, the most outstanding instances of the honorific elevation of civic intermediaries, which should be partly accounted for, as this section has argued, by the essential *comparability* of honours for Roman benefactors, who were equally conceived as civic "representatives" before Rome. Pompey, and even Caesar, were still ultimately conceived as representatives of the Roman state, and not that state itself. The honorific elevation of citizen ambassadors was therefore a means of likewise expressing the continued viability of citizen representatives, in the face of increasingly dominant Roman euergetism; this was further compounded in the case of Theophanes, Mithridates and Theopompos and Artemidoros, who transcended their ambassadorial roles to become close personal contacts of their Roman patrons.

II- IMPERIAL CULT, THE PROVINCIAL FRAMEWORK, AND HONORIFIC HIERARCHISATION

A later wave of leading citizens can be traced in the 30s—men like Hybreas of Mylasa, Epikrates of Miletos, Xenon of Thyateira, Kallikrates of Aphrodisias, or Potamon of Mytilene, who remained loyal to Rome during the invasion of Labienus, and obtained major privileges for their cities as their ambassadors. The first four even obtained Roman citizenship from Octavian. At their cities, they were honoured richly, receiving heroic honours, and sometimes even the titles of founder, burial in the gymnasium, and eponymously named heroic shrines.⁴⁴ These were benefactors who followed the precedents set by Theophanes, Mithridates, and Artemidoros, but a subtle difference is perceptible. None seem to have transcended their official roles as civic ambassadors to become close friends to powerful Romans; even those who entertained personal friendships, like Epikrates and Potamon, seem to have pursued careers largely centred on Asia and their home-cities. Moreover, some of these figures lived into the principate to witness a new political order, and one that also had important ideological effects in the sphere of civic honourability. As will be seen in this section, the advent of

⁴³ *IG XII*, 2, 163 A and B, with Heller 2020, p. 32-33.

⁴⁴ Hybreas: Marasco 1992, p. 37-59; Noè 1996 and Delrieux, Ferriès 2004a; 2004b; Epikrates: Herrmann 1994; Ferrary 2005, p. 58-61; Xenon: *TAM* V.2, 1098; Strubbe 1984-1986, p. 299; 2004, p. 327; Kallikrates: *L.Aphrodisias* 2007 12, 103; 12, 402; 12, 701; Fröhlich 2013, p. 267-273; Potamon: Parker 1991, p. 115-121; Thériault 2011.

Roman autocracy (in particular the creation of imperial cult in 29) did not put a halt to the process of honorific elevation in the late Republic traced earlier, that had emerged out of competitive interaction with Roman honours; rather, the principate channelled this process into new forms, as most notably seen in the rising interest in honorific titles, and a heightened interest in the province as a sphere for honorific interaction.

The granting of cultic honours as founder may even have been increasingly granted for non-ambassadorial services alone. Diodoros Paspáros had been hailed as “second founder” for his later gymnasiarchy, as a further honour enhancing the cultic honours he had earned as ambassador,⁴⁵ but a L. Vaccius Labeo at Kyme, soon after 2 BCE, seems to have been honoured with this status solely for his gymnasiarchy, in which he had built baths, and donated estates to the gymnasium for their upkeep.⁴⁶ He was offered the title of κτίστης, cultic honours and burial in the gymnasium. Intriguingly, the decree recording this notes that Labeo publicly rejected the first two of these honours:⁴⁷

[...] Eagerly accepting the judgement of the city, Labeo, acting in conformity with his earlier bearing and measuring his fortune by what is fitting for man, rejected the honour both of the consecration of a cultic shrine and the title of founder as excessive, and fitting only for the gods and those alike them; he considered it sufficient that he had witnessed the decision and goodwill of the people, and joined in assenting with happy grace to honours fitting for good men [...].

We can read this astonishing admission in two ways. The first is to take it at face-value. Labeo seems to have acknowledged the existence of an upper limit to local honourability, in the inadmissibility of honours “fitting only for the gods and those alike them” (τὰν μὲν ὑπερβαρέα καὶ θεοῖσι καὶ τοῖς ἰσοθεοῖσι ἀρμόζουσιν). This is almost certainly a guarded reference to the existence of the imperial cult, which had been instituted in 29 BCE by the province of Asia in honour of Octavian (later Augustus):⁴⁸ while this was not the first province-wide cult for an individual Roman, its sheer scope and pervasiveness was new, with numerous cities subsequently replicating at the local level; by 9 BCE, it could be assumed that each *conventus* city in Asia possessed a Kaisareion, at which a *koinon* decree establishing Augustus’ birthday as new year’s

⁴⁵ IGR IV, 293, II, l. 62-63, with Heller 2020, p. 28-30.

⁴⁶ I.Kyme 19, l. 37-44.

⁴⁷ I.Kyme 19, l. 12-20.

⁴⁸ For the inception of imperial cult in Asia in 29 BCE, see especially Campanile 2001; Friesen 1993, p. 7-15; Edelmann-Singer 2015, p. 86-89; Madsen 2016.

day might be publicly displayed.⁴⁹ The rhetorical characterisation of Augustus in this so-called “Calendar Decree” was also novel, casting him as the product of a Stoic Providence, as a benefactor of not only divine, but even cosmic origins, placing the *princeps* on a conceptual level beyond the reach of other Roman officials.⁵⁰

It is likely that this new dominance of the emperor, as a monarchical hegemonic personality somewhat recalling the euergetic persona of the Attalids and Seleukids, reduced the competitive interaction between honours for Romans and honours for citizens, as actuated around ambassadorial representation of civic interests. This was not only because the emperor increasingly embodied the “Roman state” in ways that earlier Romans had not, and could serve as the main point of ambassadorial focus (somewhat to the diminishment of the Senate),⁵¹ but also because the scale of imperial cult placed conceptual limits on honorific status, and levelled, to some extent, the distinctions between non-*princeps* Roman honorands and citizen honorands. Indeed, while honours for governors do continue well into the imperial period, and in fact experience a brief spike under Augustus, the number of honours for officials of lower ranks generally diminish drastically in the early imperial period.⁵² Although the title of εὐεργέτης continues to be conferred on Roman officials, titles like σωτήρ and πατρων become much rarer; πατρωνεία all but disappears from the epigraphic record by the late 1st century CE.⁵³ The major point of comparison for citizen honours was thus increasingly the emperor, not other Roman officials.

⁴⁹ *I.Priene*² 14, l. 64-67. For early civic temples and priesthoods to imperial cult, Price 1984, p. 254, 257-258, 259, 260, 262 and Frijia 2012.

⁵⁰ *I.Priene*² 14, l. 32-39; some Hellenistic kings also had their birthdays honoured as the beginning of a new year: Savalli-Lestrade 2010, p. 76-82; Heller 2014, p. 226-227; none however were rhetorically represented in this way as cosmic beings: Price 1984, p. 54-57.

⁵¹ Ziethen 1994, p. 148-177; Millar 1977, p. 375-385, 410-447.

⁵² Following Erkelenz 2003, p. 255-258, 281-283, 289-290, 305-307, 58 honorific statue-bases (35 of Augustan date) for 30 governors (excluding family members) from Augustus to Nerva are known (12 statue-bases for 11 individuals from 85-29 BCE), only five for proconsular legates (22, 133-29 BCE), two for quaestors (16, 133-29 BCE), and three for prefects (6, 133-29 BCE).

⁵³ Εὐεργέτης from ca 29 BCE to 98 CE: 28 of 68 statue-bases (32 of 56, 133-29 BCE); σωτήρ: 5 of 68 (12 of 56, 133-29 BCE); πατρων: 19 of 68 (23 of 56, 133-29 BCE). For the decline of πατρωνεία, see Eilers 2002, p. 162-165, 172-181.

Furthermore, cultic honours for individuals other than the emperor, including posthumous heroic honours, become rare after the reign of Augustus.⁵⁴ In this regard it is significant that the honours for Hybreas, Epikrates, and Xenon were specifically designated as “heroic”, with each named as ἥρωες on public honorific inscriptions.⁵⁵ The last known cultic honours for a governor in Asia, for L. Vibius Postumus (6/9 or 12/15 CE), also call him a ἥρωες.⁵⁶ There was of course nothing new in presenting deceased relatives as heroes,⁵⁷ but the concerted interest in specifying heroic status on *public* honorific inscriptions, all deriving from the reign of Augustus, arguably represents an anxiety over articulating distinctions between divine, ἰσὸθῆοι, honours for the emperor, and “heroic” ones for lesser benefactors, both Roman and citizen. The conceptual positioning of Potamon on a triptychal dedication alongside Theophanes and Pompey as “only” a saviour, benefactor and founder,⁵⁸ whereas Theophanes was further divinised and called a “second founder”, is in this light an adroit manoeuvre, recognising both his primal place in Mytilenian history, while carefully avoiding imputations of divinity comparable to that of the emperor.

Labeo’s rejection of cultic honours therefore marks, on the one hand, a denial of the honorific comparability between Roman and citizen honorands we have observed in the decades 85-31: where both Diodoros Paspáros and Mucius Scaevola, for instance, had been granted honours defined as ἰσὸθῆοι τιμαί,⁵⁹ Labeo’s act sharply minimised the propriety of such honours for local notables and Romans alike—proprieties of which he is likely to have been more aware than others, as a resident Roman. Yet in this apparent curtailing of honorific elevation, a new conceptual space for honorific status was created. The very inscription of the refusal may be seen as an additional “honour” —

⁵⁴ The closest are probably the Καπιτωναία festival honours for Gn. Vergilius Capito at Miletos in the mid-1st century CE: *I.Didyma* 278, l. 5-6; the Βαλβιλλῆα of Ti. Claudius Balbillos were not set up in his honour, but an eponymous benefaction requiring the approval of Vespasian: Cassius Dio, *History*, LXV, 9, 2; see also Thériault 2001, p. 92-95. The title κτιστής becomes rare in the imperial period: Pont 2010, p. 311-320.

⁵⁵ *I.Mylasa* 534, l. 2; 535, l. 2; 536, l. 3; *SEG* 44, 938, l. 1; *TAM* V.2, 1098, l. 4; for Potamon’s heroic honours, see *IG* XII, 2, 29, l. 10 with Thériault 2011, p. 62-64. Another local notable of the Augustan period, Athenodoros of Tarsos, also received honours worthy of a ἥρωες: Lucian, *Macrobioi*, 21.

⁵⁶ *IG* XII, 6, 365.

⁵⁷ See Jones 2010, p. 48-53, for the Hellenistic period.

⁵⁸ *IG* XII, 2, 163 C.

⁵⁹ *IGR* IV, 293, II, l. 39, Diodoros Siculus, *Library of History*, XXXVII, 5-6.

the Kymians could equally have chosen simply to omit Labeo's gesture. For one, it safeguarded Labeo against future accusations of immoderateness.⁶⁰ It also evoked the precedent of imperial *recusatio*,⁶¹ suggesting how the example of the emperor could now generate new ways of defining local status. Moreover, Labeo's rejection of cultic honours and the title of founder meant that he accepted the substantial remaining honours, of crowning, multiple statues, and public funeral and burial, even within the gymnasium. He would still be named *εὐεργέτης*, but the original addition of *κτίστης* is strikingly commuted into a new title focussed on loyalty to Kyme, *φιλοκύμαιοις*, "Kyme-lover".⁶² The recognition of the *princeps*' honorific status at cities like Kyme thus entailed both the suppression of elements in local honorific repertoire, but also the creation of new ones.

Indeed, Labeo's title of *φιλοκύμαιοις* relates to a broader development in honorific language, by which adjectives of praise formed on *φιλο*-compounds, most notably *φιλόπατρις*, attained the status of honorific titles from the latter half of the 1st century BCE; the principate sees the formation of emperor-loving titles (*φιλοσεβαστος*, *φιλόκαισαρ*).⁶³ Other honorific adjectives, like *εὐσεβής*, and formulations like *υἱὸς τοῦ δήμου/τῆς πόλεως*, are also increasingly conferred as titles.⁶⁴ This process reflects a complex and wide-ranging change in the political role of civic assemblies, with many of these titles most likely originating in popular acclamations.⁶⁵ Nevertheless, the establishment of honours for the emperor arguably contributed to this trend towards honorific titularisation. One reason is that the conceptual limit imposed by imperial cult encouraged honorific gradation beneath the emperor. In Labeo's case, the status of *κτίστης* had implied exclusivity (founder vs non-founder citizens); its replacement,

⁶⁰ Kuhn 2017, p. 202-205.

⁶¹ For example, Augustus' refusal of triumphal honours in 29 BCE: Cassius Dio, *History*, LI, 20, 4; Charlesworth 1939, p. 5-6 for linguistic parallels with later acts of imperial refusal.

⁶² *I.Kyme* 19, l. 24-52.

⁶³ Earliest cases of *φιλόπατρις* are *I.Didyma* 231, II, l. 2 (59/52), *I.Sardis* 27, l. 6 (third quarter of 1st century BCE). For the proliferation of titles in the late 1st century generally, see Heller 2020, p. 55-56, 124-138.

⁶⁴ For "son of the city", Canali de Rossi 2007.

⁶⁵ Robert 1938, p. 140 for a Chian benefactor *φιλόπατρις φωνηθείς*, and *I.Didyma* 248, l. 12: *ἀποδει[χ]θείς φιλόπατρις*; for acclamation in practice, Dio Chrysostom, *Orations*, XLVIII, 10; see also Heller 2020, p. 57-82.

φιλοκύμαιοι would have instead suggested a distinction between shades of Kyme-love, in effect comprising a superior version of a comparable title like φιλόπατρις.

This implication of hierarchy is borne out by the award of emperor-loving titles like φιλοσέβαστος and φιλόκαισαρ. Although it is likely that in many cases these were granted as the result of specific benefactions associated with the emperor, in service to the imperial cult, or conducting an embassy to the emperor,⁶⁶ they could, once granted, effectively function like other civic honorific titles as status-markers, articulating distinctions of honorific status between civic notables. Thus, at Ephesos, which presents our earliest evidence for emperor-loving titles from the late 1st century BCE, the *prytanis* Hieron Aristogeiton displayed his title of φιλοσέβαστος on his dedication of the theatre's entrance-way: he had likely obtained it for an earlier benefaction relating to the emperor, but now disposed it as a superior form of φιλόπατρις, somewhat analogous to Labeo's φιλοκύμαιοι.⁶⁷ Over the 1st century CE this character of emperor-loving titles as markers of civic status becomes clearer still, and is most visible in the few cases where both φιλοσέβαστος and φιλόκαισαρ were conferred on the same individual.⁶⁸ G. Stertinius Xenophon at Kos, a physician of Claudius, received both, as well as other emperor- and Rome-loving titles (φιλονέρων, φιλοκλαύδιος, φιλορώμαιοι), and civic titles (φιλόπατρις, δάμου υἱός, εὐσεβής, ἥρωις, εὐεργέτας τᾶς πατρίδος), as a Kalymnian base fully outlines.⁶⁹ The fine distinctions that are implied across this impressive array must allude to specific benefactions, but also had the cumulative effect of defining his superiority within a Koan honorific hierarchy.⁷⁰

As well as encouraging the phenomenon of honorific titles in itself, the honouring of the emperor emphasised the provincial framework as an arena for honourability, with imperial cult having been initiated by the *koinon* of Asia. The opening lines of

⁶⁶ See Veligianni 2001, p. 69-76, although the connection with the imperial cult is somewhat over-emphasised.

⁶⁷ *I.Ephesos* 2033.

⁶⁸ *I.Magnesia* 156, l. 11-12, *I.Iasos* 616, l. 2-3 (with *I.Iasos* 602, l. 10), *IG XII*, 4, 638 (φιλόκαισαρ and φιλοσέβαστος); another case may be *I.Ephesos* 716, l. 8-9: φιλοκαίσαρος καὶ φιλο[σεβάστου], although φιλο[πάτριδος] is also possible; cf. Ferrary 2001b, p. 813, n. 48.

⁶⁹ *Tit.Cal.* 111, l. 11-16. For Xenophon, Herzog 1922, p. 216-247; Buraselis 2000, p. 66-110.

⁷⁰ Emperor-loving titles seem to have been unusually common at Kos; the most frequent is φιλόκαισαρ; *IG XII*, 4, 822, 825, 838, 839, 939, 941, 999, 1030, 1055, 1058, 1059 (φιλόκαισαρ and φιλορώμαιοι), 1062 (φιλοσέβαστος), 1148 (two honorands φιλοσέβαστος and φιλόκαισαρ respectively), 1156, 1159, 1162, 1166.

the late 1st century BCE decree for G. Julius Epikrates of Miletos, for example (whose career was alluded to briefly above), praise him in novel ways, as being “embellished by his good birth (εὐγενήα), distinction and renown, honourable both for all his virtue, being among the first (πρωτεύων) not only in his fatherland, but also across all of Asia”.⁷¹ Epikrates’ primacy within the province of Asia evokes the high-priesthood of the imperial cult he had held,⁷² although the idea of provincial primacy in itself was not the product of imperial cult alone. It can be traced already in the 70s BCE, when two Aphrodisian ambassadors of the then-inchoate *koinon* were praised as being “among the first and most honoured men of the province”;⁷³ this was a natural development, and projection onto the provincial level, of agonistic behaviour around primacy, that had been a core aspect of political culture in the *polis* since the archaic period. The difference was that the provincial sphere may have engendered a more widespread rhetorical application of the idea of being “first”. Alongside the concretisation of the *koinon* as a civic conglomerate in the decades after the Mithridatic wars, it is only from the later 1st century BCE that we begin to find claims to being the “first” within cities, almost as a further sort of honorific title.⁷⁴ Notably, Epikrates’ contemporary Xenon of Thyateira, who was also an early high-priest of Asia, was equally hailed as “first of the Greeks”.⁷⁵

One notable by-product of this sharpening of the notion of honorific primacy within the provincial framework was the sense that some benefactors were “greater” than others, and that their familial lineages deserved special recognition. This is the implication of the emphasis of Epikrates’ decree on his noble birth, εὐγένεια. While in the late 2nd century powerful citizens like Moschion of Priene could be praised for being worthy of his ancestors (καταξίως τῆς τῶν προγόνων ἀρετῆς), this did not amount

⁷¹ *SEG* 44, 940, l. 7-10.

⁷² As we learn from another inscription: *SEG* 44, 938, l. 8.

⁷³ *I.Aphrodisias* 2007 2, 503, l. 7-8. Pythodoros of Nysa and Euthydemos of Mylasa (of this time) were also regarded as being among the “first” men in Asia: Strabo, *Geography*, XIV, 1, 42; XIV, 2, 24.

⁷⁴ Examples from the late 1st century BCE to 1st century CE: *I.Sardis* 22, l. 5; *I.Assos* 16, l. 3; *MAMA* IV, 151, l. 4; *I.Priene*² 305, l. 5; *SEG* 32, 1243, l. 16; *I.Assos* 26, l. 12; *I.Erythrai* 85, l. 5; the first Romans holding office at Apameia in 45/46: *IGR* IV, 792; see Heller 2020, p. 50-53. For the 1st century development of the *koinon*, Campanile 2007; Edelmann-Singer 2015, p. 60-71.

⁷⁵ *TAM* V.2, 1098, l. 11. See also, in the 1st century CE, *I.Magnesia* 158, l. 5-6 (first high-priestess of Asia), *I.Didyma* 296, l. 6-11 (fifth senator from Asia).

to the claim that his family was more honourable than others;⁷⁶ in the 1st century, however, such claims of elitism are increasingly made. Around the time of the Aphrodisian ambassadors, a Ploutarchos of Maionia (61/60 BCE) was praised as being of the “first family”.⁷⁷ *Εὐγένεια*, however, seems to appear in public honorific language only from the late 1st century BCE onwards. Epikrates’ slightly later contemporary, Menogenes of Sardeis, was also honoured at his home-city as *εὐγενής* (ca 2/1 BCE), but only in his last decree, after devoted service to the *koinon*: he had thrice been *ekdikos*, in which capacity he had represented it before Augustus as ambassador, including once to convey Sardeis’ decree of honours for Gaius Caesar on his ascension to manhood in 5 BCE.⁷⁸ Indeed, the *koinon*’s last decree honouring him after his third year as *ekdikos* also honours his son Isidoros solely for the fact of his filiality, as one “born with fairest hopes”.⁷⁹ It is striking that a near-contemporary, the *prytanis* Kleanax of Kyme, was also honoured as a father alongside his son Sarapion, who received the title of “father-lover”, *φιλοπάτωρ*.⁸⁰ Like Menogenes, Kleanax had earned distinction in the *koinon* by hosting its Kaisareia at Kyme, and was also praised by his city as *εὐγενής*.⁸¹ That is to say, the formalisation of the provincial framework through the institution of imperial cult may have encouraged notions of familial elitism. The close chronological coincidence between the honours for Menogenes and Kleanax’s sons and Augustus’ own promotion of his adopted sons Gaius and Lucius might suggest, moreover, that they were local imitations of imperial precedent, in much the same way that Labeo at Kyme had imitated imperial refusal. Needless to say, *εὐγένεια* becomes an important honorific virtue in itself without specific associations with imperial cult, even if later attestations do strikingly continue to be tied to it.⁸²

⁷⁶ *I.Priene*² 64, l. 19-20; see also *e. g.* *SEG* 33, 1037, l. 10-11; *I.Illion* 52, l. 1-2; *I.Mylasa* 110, l. 5; 871, l. 6-8; *IG XII*, 9, 235, l. 3-4.

⁷⁷ *TAM V.1*, 514, l. 3-4.

⁷⁸ *I.Sardis* 8, l. 122.

⁷⁹ *I.Sardis* 8, l. 113-114, followed by the civic authorities (l. 129-130, 132-139); this decree also praises Menogenes for his descent from “a most distinguished family” (l. 102: *γένους ἐνδοξοτάτου*).

⁸⁰ *SEG* 32, 1243, l. 23-28.

⁸¹ *SEG* 32, 1243, l. 4-5, 40-45.

⁸² See *e. g.* in the 1st century CE *I.Aphrodisias* 2007 12, 206, l. 5, 23; *I.Magnesia* 163, l. 3, 8-12; *I.Kaunos* 140, l. 4.

III- A MEMORIAL TURN

The last two sections have suggested that the imbrication of Roman power within the euergetic ideology of the cities of western Asia Minor over the 1st century BCE had consequences for the honorific status of local notables. By way of summarising these developments, this third section draws attention to a subtle shift in the ethos of civic honouring across the period roughly 85 BCE to 14 CE, and implicated in the examples we have studied here, resulting from the elevation, and then hierarchisation, of the honorific status of local citizens. In short, the ethos of social replication that had underpinned the granting of monumental honour in the Hellenistic period gradually made way for a mindset whereby such honour was intended mainly to commemorate the individual uniqueness, and implicit inimitability, of the honorand.

This can be observed in two main ways. The first is a change in the motivation around honour. Across the Hellenistic period a near-ubiquitous feature of honorific decrees is the so-called “hortatory clause”, typically appended at the end of the decree’s considerations, shortly before its honouring clauses, outlining the exemplary function of the decree. One of its fullest instantiations is that in the decree for the gymnasiarch Menas of Sestos of the 120s BCE:⁸³

In order then that the people may be seen honouring fine and good men, and receiving in proper measure those who have been from the earliest manhood zealous for our common affairs and dedicated to seeking fame, and that others, observing the honours conferred by the people on those who are fine and good, may become emulators of the finest deeds, and be encouraged towards virtue, and so that our common affairs may be increased when all are striving to achieve glory and are always securing something honourable for the fatherland [...]

The point of exhortation, then, was to encourage onlookers to emulate and replicate the virtuousness of the honorand towards the good of the community. Wording varies from city to city, but the same fundamental ethic can be traced from the late 4th to late 2nd centuries;⁸⁴ a number of examples can be cited from the time of Menas.⁸⁵ In the 1st century, however, decrees become much scarcer, and hortatory

⁸³ *I.Sestos* 1, l. 86-92.

⁸⁴ Hortatory clauses first found in mid-4th century Athens: Henry 1996; Lambert 2011, p. 194-202; for a conceptual overview, Ma 2013, p. 35, 56-59; variations in wording and phrasing on a broadly universal model are discernible across the Hellenistic world: García Ramón 2010.

⁸⁵ *E. g.* *SEG* 39, 1243, V, l. 18-25; *SEG* 39, 1244, III, l. 15-18; *SEG* 53, 1312 B, l. 32-34; *SEG* 33, 1039, l. 25-27; *I.Ephesos* 6, l. 27-28; *I.Mylasa* 101, l. 55-56.

clauses consequently rarer. Moreover, a subtle shift in emphasis is discernible in those that are known. Pyrrhakos of Alabanda's decree still contains a traditional hortatory clause,⁸⁶ but Diodoros Paspáros' cultic honours, for instance, were not conceived as encouragement to others, but rather to serve the eternal memory (πρὸς αἰώνιον μνήμη[ην]) of his deeds.⁸⁷ While this appeal to "eternal memory" is by no means new to the 1st century,⁸⁸ its mention here alongside the grant of cultic honours arguably relates more specifically to the memorability and inimitability of Diodoros' deeds. One of his later honours is even to have sacrifices offered to him, made towards the continued good relations between Pergamon and the Romans: that is, his honorific status was tied to his special role as an intermediary for the city.⁸⁹

By the reign of Augustus, indeed, the hortatory, exemplary, function of honours could co-exist alongside, and even be superseded by, an interest in emphasising the individual's unique memorability. From this time comes a decree from Halikarnassos (the honorand's identity is unclear) purporting to encourage others to virtue, but also preserve the undying memory of the honorand.⁹⁰ The decrees for Menogenes of Sardeis do not feature hortatory clauses, but the one instance of a clause approximating most closely to one, in the *koinon*'s decree of 2 BCE, explains that the decree would not be an example to others, but rather bear witness to him (μαρτυρήσαι τῷ ἀνδρὶ) of his dutifulness to Asia.⁹¹ This language of "bearing witness" also emerges in the decree of his contemporary Kleanax of Kyme, which characterises itself as a witness (μεμαρτύρηται) to his generosity.⁹² L. Vaccius Labeo's decree recording his refusal of cultic honours, and the subsequently modified decision of the city, is moreover intended not to exemplify, but rather to "provide an encompassing testimony" (τὰν παντελέα...μαρτυρίαν ἀπυδεδόσθαι) of the honours suitable to, his virtuosity.⁹³ By the

⁸⁶ *I.Nordkarien* 211, l. 34-40; see also *I.Priene*² 68, l. 128-131.

⁸⁷ *IGR* IV, 292, l. 20-21.

⁸⁸ Already in 2nd century: *SEG* 33, 1039, l. 23-24; *IG* XII, 9, 236, l. 16-17; in the 1st century, note also *OGIS* 438, l. 12.

⁸⁹ *IGR* IV, 293, II, l. 27-29.

⁹⁰ Cousin, Diehl 1890, p. 97-99, n. 4, l. 8-12.

⁹¹ *I.Sardis* 8, l. 107-109.

⁹² *SEG* 32, 1243, l. 9-12; l. 27-28 speaks in similar terms of another decree for his son Sarapion.

⁹³ *I.Kyme* 19, l. 22-24.

late 1st century CE, a posthumous decree from Julia Gordos for a Theophilos son of Thoinetos even instructs that the decree

be read out [at his burial] so that all might see that those nurturing their lives in this way on behalf of their fatherland may obtain such testimony (τοιαύτης τυγχάνουσι μαρτυρίας).⁹⁴

Here a hortatory function is maintained, but the emphasis is now placed firmly on the consequence of such action—namely, the award of a memorial bearing witness to such virtuosity, the *μαρτυρία*, and not only the good deeds that others are encouraged to do: *τοιαύτης τυγχάνουσι μαρτυρίας* replaces a phrase like *ζηλωταὶ τῶν καλλίστων γίνονται*. The emergence of the notion of bearing witness (*μαρτυρῆσαι*, *μαρτυρία*) to an individual's honourability from the Augustan period was therefore not inimical to a notion of exemplarity; indeed, "traditional" hortatory clauses are still to be found, even if rare.⁹⁵ Rather, the primacy of the notion of the honorific monument as a testimonial of one's achievements in the early empire can more specifically be characterised as a change in the locus of exemplarity. Hortatory clauses of Hellenistic decrees typically characterised the exemplarity of their honours in terms of the *transactional* character of honour, in the emphasis on the visibility of the people's gratitude, and its being seen (*φαίνηται*) to award honours; the honorand's qualities were thereby normalised as virtues approved by the community as embodied in the *demos*. With the language of witness and testimonial in the early imperial period, however, greater emphasis is placed on the *monumental* character of honour, and less on its transactionality, so that the exemplarity of the deeds commemorated resided more specifically in the unique achievements of the honorand, and the honorand's striving for this uniqueness. In brief, this was the emergence of "memorability" at the expense of "replicability". In the high imperial period, this ethos further manifests in the practice of inscribing letters and decrees by governors and emperors testifying to the honour-worthiness of an individual.⁹⁶

A second major manifestation of this interest in expressing individual memorability in monumental honour from the late 1st century BCE onwards is a widespread change in epigraphic habit, by which honorific decrees become much less common, while public honour is increasingly inscribed in the form of honorific formulas

⁹⁴ TAM V.1, 687, l. 22-25.

⁹⁵ E.g. *I.Perge* 23, l. 15-17 (reign of Tiberius); see also *IG VII*, 2712, l. 87-89, 97-100 (mid-1st century CE, Akraiphia), somewhat paradoxically encouraging emulation of the virtues of the "first" men (*πολλοὶ τε ζηλωταὶ γείνων[τ]αι τῶν ἀγαθῶν | τῶν εἰς τὴν πόλιν μαρτυρουμένων τῶν πρώτων*).

⁹⁶ Kokkinia 2017.

engraved on statue-bases. This is a well-acknowledged development that has recently been substantiated by a statistical overview of euergetic epigraphy across the Hellenistic and Roman periods.⁹⁷ Where even the lengthy decree (spanning some 400 lines) for Moschion, Priene's leading citizen of the late 2nd century, was summarised in a brief, generalising inscription on his statue-bases ("The people [honoured] Moschion son of Kydimos for his virtue, goodwill, fine character, generosity towards it, and piety towards the gods"),⁹⁸ the honorific inscription on the statue-base for the Sardian notable Iollas, for example, honoured sometime in 50-25 BCE, spanned 22 lines, and related his panoply of honours and civic services: his two gold crowns, 14 statues, and services as civic ambassador, five-times general, gymnasiarch, *agonothetes*, priest of Rome, and other benefactions.⁹⁹ The sheer length of his inscription, although cast as an honorific formula beginning with $\delta\ \delta\eta\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota\mu\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$, suggests this was not simply a distillation of an honorific decree, as with Moschion of Priene's statue-base inscriptions, but rather a highly faithful redaction of the original decree that sought to convey an impression of the uniqueness of Iollas' career: this was not a career that was exemplary because it manifested abstract virtues (like Moschion's virtue, goodwill, fine character, generosity, piety), but because of its unusual, indeed atypical, range, in holding multiple offices, and even some multiple times (as five-times general). One might even wonder whether an earlier honorific decree was actually passed, and if the unusual cumulation of deeds through the honorific formula represents a personal decision of Iollas, perhaps as a result of the fact that he was permitted to set up the statue at his own cost, as some other late Hellenistic civic benefactors were.¹⁰⁰

This style of honorific monument, framed by a statue-base presenting a lengthy honorific formula purporting to summarise a decree, becomes more common in the imperial period; Iollas' base is one of the earliest examples.¹⁰¹ This trend reflects the growing interest in the individuality and uniqueness of the honorand's deeds: one

⁹⁷ Heller 2016, p. 75-79, but already earlier Gerlach 1908, p. 6-8, 43-50, 107-110, and Klaffenbach 1966, p. 65.

⁹⁸ *I.Priene*² 64, l. 326-328.

⁹⁹ *I.Sardis* 27. For the honorific formula as a whole, Ma 2013, p. 31-38.

¹⁰⁰ Buckler, Robinson 1913, p. 31-33; for late Hellenistic honorands setting up their own statues, Gauthier 2000, p. 48-62.

¹⁰¹ See also *SEG* 31, 899 and *SEG* 63, 1333, of the mid- to late 1st century BCE, and Forster 2018, p. 402-403. Some examples in the 1st century CE: *I.Sardis* II, 337; *I.Magnesia* 163; *MAMA* IV, 142; *I.Aphrodisias* 2007 12, 1006; *I.Kibyra* 41.

reason may be that the caption-like simplicity of the honorific formula lent itself better to the enumeration of services than the somewhat cumbersome narrative style of fully articulated decrees. It is also crucial, however, to see this trend towards memorability and individuality alongside the interactivity between Roman and local honours outlined in the first two sections. Iollas himself was of the same class of citizen as a Theopompos of Knidos or Epikrates of Miletos, and his impressive array of honours symptomatic of the honorific elevation deriving from competition with Roman honours; embassies to Rome may be embedded in the generalising comment that he served many times as ambassador (l. 7: *πολλὰς πρεσβείας τελέσαντα ἐπιτυχῶς*). It is possible that the very nature of honours for Roman officials as commemorations of single-year office-holding, sometimes even deployed at Rome as *laudationes* and *testimonia* towards a senatorial career,¹⁰² encouraged honours for local citizens to become similarly commemorative in character. The enumeration of numerous services through long honorific formulas, as with Iollas' base, might further have formed a conscious counterpoint to the single offices of Roman magistrates: at Miletos, for example, Epikrates' honours would have highlighted the lengthy career of a leading citizen, contrasting with honours like those for M. Pupius Piso Frugi, praised for his single legateship.

The onset of the principate, which entrenched the provincial framework as an arena for honourability, and encouraged status-hierarchisation and familial elitism, can only have enhanced interest in memorialising individual virtues. The very character of honorific titles as essentially personal tags, evoking specific benefactions and forming part of one's public identity, exemplifies this perfectly. Labeo at Kyme was *εὐεργέτης* and *φιλοκύμαιος*; Philistes, a high-priest of the *koinon* briefly named in Menogenes of Sardeis' stele, was a "φιλόπατρις, from Smyrna".¹⁰³ It is unsurprising that Iollas is named *φιλόπατρις* (l. 6: *φιλόπατριν ὄντα*), reflecting one of the earliest examples of the adjective functioning as an honorific title.¹⁰⁴ Moreover, new-style individualising statue-base inscriptions with lengthy honorific formulas may also have been conceived as monuments to familial, and not just civic, honour, in recording the achievements of illustrious forebears. By the late 1st century CE, the statue-base inscriptions for

¹⁰² E.g. Cicero, *Pro Flacco*, 36 (59 BCE, Akmonia's praise of Flaccus); *Letters to Quintus*, II, 10, 2 (54 BCE, Magnesians on the Sipylos praise Quintus); *Letters to Friends*, III, 8, 3 and 5 (Midiaion, Laodikeia, Apameia, Synnada, Philomelion, Ikonion praise App. Claudius Pulcher).

¹⁰³ *I.Sardis* 8, l. 90. For another proposer of a *koinon* decree displaying an honorific title, see *I.Ephesos* 3825, l. 10-11, for a G. Julius Pardal as identified as "son of the Sardian people".

¹⁰⁴ Heller 2020, p. 42-43.

an Attinas Meliton of Aphrodisias, as his decree outlines, would provide “fitting testimony” (μαρτυρία) of his virtuous bearing, and be consonant with his nobility of birth (εὐγένεια).¹⁰⁵ The origins of this attitude should be sought, however, in the tumultuous years of the 40s and 30s BCE, when the granting of major honours to civic heroes, some of whom (like Epikrates of Miletos) may have been directly instrumental in establishing provincial cult, elevated them and their families to new heights, with consequences for the memorability of their deeds and even their honorific monuments. It is especially noteworthy that Epikrates’ honorific statue, damaged in a fire in the mid-1st century CE, was still sufficiently remembered that it was re-erected.¹⁰⁶ More remarkably, the honours for Kallikrates of Aphrodisias, a leading citizen of the triumviral years who was even buried in the gymnasium, were preserved and renewed in the early 2nd century CE by his descendants.¹⁰⁷ Both monuments present long honorific formulas, like that on Iollas’ base, and whether or not this is the form they assumed after their restoration, or represents their original late 1st century BCE layout, the fact of their restoration suggests they were seen to preserve the individual memory of their honorands long after their deaths, and even to constitute a “familial” monument, in Kallikrates’ case. The major honorific standing of such civic heroes, deriving from the upheavals of their times, and forming the dynamic product of interaction with Roman power around them, thereby contributed to an increased interest in emphasising the memorial, to the diminishment of the hortatory, character of civic honour.

IV- CONCLUSION

As this essay has sought to demonstrate, the intensification of Roman rule over western Asia Minor over the 1st century BCE was also accompanied, somewhat paradoxically, by the intensification of civic honorific ideology. The first two sections surveyed the interactivity between honours for Roman officials, and then the *princeps*, and those for local citizens. The euergetism of individual Romans from 85-31, sometimes defined as patrons, intruded upon the remit of civic ambassadors in acting as intermediaries between cities and the Senate, so that such contacts as established between local ambassadors and Roman authorities became more honour-worthy, resulting in an elevation of honours for such citizens—some like Theophanes of

¹⁰⁵ *I.Aphrodisias 2007* 12, 206, l. 9-11, 22-24.

¹⁰⁶ *SEG* 44, 938, l. 17-22.

¹⁰⁷ *I.Aphrodisias 2007* 12, 402, l. 14-17.

Mytilene and Mithridates of Pergamon even became close friends of leading Romans, and obtained cultic honours, otherwise unprecedented for citizen benefactors. This honorific elevation meant that the establishment of Roman autocratic power in the principate, and consequently of imperial cult in 29 BCE, did not quash the honorific visibility of local citizens like Epikrates of Miletos, L. Vaccius Labeo of Kyme, or Menogenes of Sardeis, but rather corralled this into other representational avenues that emphasised inter-elite hierarchy, such as honorific titles, and notions of familial elitism. The third section drew together the developments in the first two, suggesting that a change in the ethos of civic honouring is also perceptible over this period, as seen in the tendency of honorific monuments to identify themselves less as sources of replicable virtues, and more as “witnesses” to the individual accomplishments of their honorands; this was accompanied by a widespread shift in the practice of inscribing public honours, whereby fully articulated decrees increasingly make way for extended honorific formulas engraved on statue-bases.

This process can be read as a function, on the one hand, of the unusually intrusive character of Roman power, in embedding itself in local systems precisely because of its indistinctness—the fact that “Roman power” was actuated and represented by many different annually rotating officials, and moreover manifested in resident Roman populations (L. Vaccius Labeo is the most striking illustration of the latter here, although the impact of the Roman diaspora deserves fuller treatment elsewhere).¹⁰⁸ Rome differed fundamentally from earlier Hellenistic kings, whose honours established clear focal points and standards (in *e. g.* cult, multiple statue-honours) for the representation of imperial power, and discouraged comparability with local citizens. By contrast, the representative quality of Roman structures of authority encouraged comparability between honours for Romans and those for civic notables, and in particular citizen ambassadors. The phenomena outlined here therefore also reflect the considerable dynamism and resilience of the civic practice of honouring benefactors, in adapting to Roman rule, in effect, by consequently empowering and promoting local elite citizens, such that the later honouring of Roman autocracy in the imperial cult continued to be shaped by the need to accommodate elite honourability, as the evidence for honorific hierarchisation suggests. In sum, the turn towards the memorial in civic honorific practice that can be discerned over the 1st century BCE exemplifies one way that Roman rule uniquely mobilised and even accentuated local norms.

¹⁰⁸ For resident Romans and euergetism in our period, see *e. g.* *I.Prienē*² 68-70, *IGR* IV, 1703 (Chios), and more generally Errington 1988, p. 151-153; Kirbihler 2016, p. 239-241, 418-436.