

Imperialism and Localism in *provincia Asia*: The
Development of Roman Provincial Administration,
133 BCE – c. 20 CE



Bradley Jordan

Merton College

c. 98,850 words

A thesis submitted for the degree of *Doctor of Philosophy in Ancient History*

Trinity Term 2019

Abstract

This thesis contributes to the study of Roman imperialism, providing an investigation of the development of Roman provincial administration in western Asia Minor in the period between 133 BCE and c. 20 CE. It investigates the evolving institutional and ideological frameworks put in place by the Roman state and its representatives and local reactions to them.

Chapter 1 focuses on the institutions which the Roman state established in the province of Asia. Employing models of institutional dynamics from the social sciences, it argues that Roman approaches to provincial administration were initially ad hoc and situational and that 'governance' developed in an unplanned fashion. The critical role played by individuals such as L. Cornelius Sulla and C. Iulius Caesar, whose influence and power allowed them more flexibility in dealing with institutional constraints, is emphasised.

Chapter 2 examines the role of Roman official communication in creating an imperial ideology. It stresses that the establishment of Roman hegemony interrupted long-standing modes of interaction between *poleis* and Hellenistic rulers and argues that structural factors hindered the establishment of a new framework for negotiating power.

Chapter 3 shifts the perspective to the responses of Asian communities to these institutional and ideological realities of Roman rule. It argues that in the absence of a secure discursive framework and faced with an evolving institutional landscape, *poleis* experimented to maximise their own agency. Addressing the specific strategies of issuing honorific decrees, engaging in diplomacy and monumentalising Roman normative documents, it suggests that communities played a critical role in integrating themselves within a Roman administrative framework.

Overall, this thesis makes the case that the Roman state had minimal administrative ambitions vis-à-vis *provincia Asia*. Consequently, institutional and ideological developments establishing governance were driven by combination of individual Roman actors and, in the longer term, local responses to empire.

Acknowledgements

As I will not have to tell anyone reading these, the production of a thesis is a laborious and grinding process, even when you love what you are doing. Without the assistance of many people it would not have been possible.

The graduate community in Ancient History at the University of Oxford has been a locus of support for several years and many questions, comments and general advice, emerging from discussion in and after the weekly Work-in-Progress seminars, have shaped the final product. The thoughts of Leah Lazar, Andy Stiles and Dylan James have been particularly influential.

I am indebted to Aneurin Ellis-Evans and Peter Thonemann, both of whom allowed me to consult relevant work ahead of its publication. I am also grateful to the Fondation Hardt for hosting me in Geneva for two blissfully productive weeks in the spring of 2018.

Thanks to everyone at Society, JCT and the Missing Bean for tolerating my near constant presence, especially during the last few months. Without the excellent coffee and relaxed surroundings, I do not know how I would have been able to write. Similarly, I cannot adequately express my gratitude towards Harriet McAtee, Adam English and Venetia Adamson for their support and for creating a space to which I could always return and focus on selfcare and life outside of my thesis.

I'm extremely appreciative to Lina Girdvainyte for reading over the full manuscript, and Kim Webb, Bec McEwen and Harry Morgan for engaging with sections of it. Their comments were invaluable in bringing the project to a close.

Finally, and most importantly, I must thank my supervisor, Georgy Kantor. He has proved a source of unending support, offering insightful comments, encouragement and advice throughout my time at Oxford. It may be clichéd, but it is also entirely accurate to note that this thesis would not have emerged without him.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Introduction.....	1
0.1: Thesis Aims	1
0.2: Why Asia? Why Now?.....	2
0.3: Methodological frameworks (i): States and Institutions	9
0.4: Methodological Frameworks (ii): Ideology and ‘Speech-Act’ Theory	13
0.5: Scope of Study	17
0.6: Thesis Structure	19
1. <i>Provincia Asia</i>: The Construction of Roman Province.....	20
1.1: The Aims of Roman Government: Initial Organisation	20
1.2: Fear and Loathing in Late Republican Asia.....	62
1.2.1: The <i>Conventus iuridici</i>	85
1.2.2: The origin of the provincial <i>koinon</i>	97
1.2.3: Civic freedom in Republican <i>provincia Asia</i>	113
1.3: The Civil Wars and their Impact.....	121
1.4: The Principate and the New Administration of Asia.....	142
1.4.1: Cities and Augustus’ <i>Procuratores</i>	147
1.4.2: The Imperial <i>koinon</i>	150
1.4.3: Augustus and Asian provincial government	157
1.5: Conclusions	167
2. Rome and the <i>poleis</i>: The Creation of an Imperial Discourse	171
2.1: The Context of Roman Communication in Asia Minor	171
2.1.1: The Roman background in Asia Minor	176
2.2: Rome and the ἐλεύθεραι <i>poleis</i> , 133 – 88 BCE	185
2.3: The Republican <i>provinciae</i> , 85 – 44 BCE	200
2.4: The Personalisation of Imperial Discourse, 44 – 30 BCE	215
2.5: The Early Principate: A New Form of Administration?	236
2.6: Conclusions	252
3. The Cities of Western Asia Minor and Rome: Local Responses to Roman Power	256
3.1: Dialogues between Rome and the <i>poleis</i> of Asia	256
3.2: ‘The Politics of Honour’: Civic Decrees between Rome and Asian <i>poleis</i>	259
3.2.1: Non-honorific civic decrees and Rome	260
3.2.2: Honorific Decrees and Roman Magistrates	267
3.3: Diplomacy and Civic Privilege: Learning a New Set of Rules.....	289
3.3.1: Speaking to Roman power: Civic Embassies.....	290

3.3.2: Informal dialogues.....	312
3.4: Imperial Power and Local Agency: The Display of Roman Documents.....	325
3.5: Conclusions	345
Conclusions	353
Reference List	361

Introduction

0.1: Thesis Aims

This thesis focuses on institutional and ideological aspects of the Roman state's imposition of provincial administration on the communities of western Asia Minor, concentrating on the period between 133 BCE and c. 20 CE.¹ This topic holds crucial implications for understanding how the Roman state came effectively to establish and maintain control over a vast Mediterranean empire. Though the province of Asia was not the first province to be incorporated into the empire, nor even the first to be made up of existing *polis* communities, it was unique. The region was the first to be integrated *in toto* from a pre-existing unified state, through the testament of Attalus III.² Most *poleis* within the Attalid kingdom accepted Roman authority immediately.³ Moreover, Asia is often posited by scholars as a model for the organisation of new provinces by Cn. Pompeius Magnus in the 60s. It may also have foreshadowed the tendency of later Principes to reduce allied kingdoms to provinces after the death of their existing rulers.⁴ Critically, the 'provincialisation' of Asia occurred in a transitional period for the Roman state's central

¹ All dates BCE unless otherwise indicated.

² Contrast Sicily, split between Syracusan and Carthaginian hegemony with numerous independent communities before the establishment of a *provincia*; Spain, which, though fanning out from former Punic territory, encompassed areas belonging to several tribal groups; and Macedonia, which included, in some way, responsibility for issues in Greece proper (e.g. *Syll.*³ 684; *pace* Kallet-Marx 1995, 70-73, 127-128; see now Girdvainyte 2019, 210-216).

³ Though Aristonicus, seeking to seize the monarchy, drew support from non-*polis* groups, such as Macedonian colonies and former regime officials. Mileta 1998, 48-51; Daubner 2006, 158-186, with references.

⁴ Pompeius: Morrell 2017, 79-82 with references; allied kingdoms: E.g. Galatia (CD. 53.26.3; Strabo 12.5.1, 6.5), Cappadocia and Commagene (Tac. *Ann.* 2.56.4); cf. Tiersch 2015.

institutions. Traditional periodisations of Roman history emphasise the Gracchi as catalysts for the end of the Republic. However, the Principate did not emerge fully formed with the victory of Octavian at Actium.⁵ Several decades of experimentation and evolution ensued before the new system became entrenched. From the Gracchi to the death of Augustus this institutional uncertainty affected the governance of the provinces and has important implications for the developmental trajectory of Roman administration.

0.2: Why Asia? Why Now?

Asia's unique history, moving from allied kingdom to regularly assigned *provincia*, through the Mithridatic invasion of 88, to a reconquered and reorganised territory under Sulla, raises interesting questions. The late Republican and early imperial picture of robust institutions has been projected into the earliest period.⁶ The region's long history of autonomous civic diplomacy and its impact on Roman choices further render the province an interesting example. Comparatively well-excavated, Asia's rich epigraphy lends itself to detailed study. Indeed, *provincia Asia* has a claim to be one of the most-studied Roman provinces. That said, basic points regarding its administrative history remain contested.

The subject of Roman *provincia Asia* touches on a wide range of topics and the relevant literature is vast. Beginning with Foucart's *La formation de la province romaine d'Asie* in 1903 and Chapot's *La province romaine proconsulaire d'Asie* in 1904, tracking through Magie's, still

⁵ E.g. Syme 1939, 12-13; Badian 1972. On the role of periodisation in shaping enquiry in Roman history: Flower 2009.

⁶ E.g. Mitchell 1999.

useful, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* in 1950, to Mitchell's *Anatolia* in 1993 and Marek's 2010 *Geschichte Kleinasiens in der Antike*, accounts of its formation have generally focused on the narrative political history of the region framed by the Late Republican historiography.⁷ Most recent scholarship on the governance of *provincia Asia* during the Republican period has tended to fit within this well-worn tradition.⁸ In 1995, however, Kallet-Marx mounted a new challenge to this topic, arguing that the administration depicted in the late Republican sources for Asia – an extractive regime, aimed at maximising public and private revenue flows to the imperial centre, aided and abetted by governors using their judicial powers to interfere in local affairs – was largely a result of the First Mithridatic War. He claimed that the commitment of major military forces under L. Cornelius Sulla proved the catalyst for a new emphasis on the profits of empire, while highlighting the previously ad hoc arrangements for Roman *provinciae*.⁹ Santangelo also emphasised the critical role of Sulla in altering the balance of Roman hegemony in the Greek-speaking east. Focusing more specifically on the agency of local elites and their engagement with Roman commanders, he argued that the reorganisation of Asia represented one part of a coherent plan to stabilise and exploit provincial territory.¹⁰ It has been long recognised that, in practice, the Roman provincial administration depended on incorporating regional elites and offering significant autonomy. This was partially dictated by practicality. The tyranny of distance, prior to modern communications, required that most decisions were taken and implemented at the

⁷ Foucart 1903; Chapot 1904; Magie 1950; Mitchell 1993; Marek 2010.

⁸ E.g. Daubner 2006, 191-261.

⁹ Kallet-Marx 1995.

¹⁰ Santangelo 2007, esp. 50-66, 107-132.

local level, if within a framework authorised by the ruling power.¹¹ However, scholarship addressing the political and administrative arrangements of Asia forms only one element of the relevant material.

The broader debate surrounding Roman imperialism and the provincial experience has advanced extensively over the last half-century. Badian's *Foreign Clientelae*, despite sustained critique, remains a seminal text for the formation of Roman *provinciae*.¹² He argued that provincial administration arose out of client-patron relationships established at the conquest or annexation of a region. When communities submitted to Rome through the process of *deditio* or were named *amici et socii*, they became *clientes* of the Roman people.¹³ Badian suggested that initially these communities tended to be granted *libertas* but, after the defeat of Perseus of Macedonia in 167, the Romans began to collect revenues originally due to the ruler.¹⁴ By contrast, Harris argued for greater Roman intention, seeing the process as part of a systemic imperialist agenda, aimed at assuming and maintaining control, shifting from a largely indirect to a more direct schema over time.¹⁵ Gruen comprehensively rejected the *clientela* model as applying to inter-state relations. He argued that Roman action in the Greek East, up to and including the formation of the first *provinciae* is best understood within a pre-existing Hellenistic framework.¹⁶ He also asserted, *contra* Harris, that Rome did not

¹¹ Generally, Runciman 2011, 103; Crooks & Parsons 2016, 18-27. For the ancient context: e.g. Jones 1940, 11; Brunt 1990 [1976], 270-272; Ma 2009, 125-127. Compare the situation in the Spanish Americas in the 16th century CE (Storrs 2016, 296-305).

¹² See recently Jehne & Pina Polo (eds.) 2015, esp. Pina Polo 2015, 19-22.

¹³ Badian 1958, 1-13.

¹⁴ Badian 1958, 97. Cf. Brunt 1979, 172-175.

¹⁵ Harris 1979, 133-162.

¹⁶ Gruen 1984, 158-200, esp. 191-200.

seek to conquer territory for its own sake. He suggested that Rome had no consistent policy of annexation or non-annexation of defeated states but responded on a case-by-case basis.¹⁷ A consensus has arisen that the language of friendship, rather than *clientela*, was employed and afforded the Romans a broad latitude in its dealings with communities in the eastern Mediterranean.¹⁸

More recently, the view that the Roman state did not rule over or seek a territorial empire in the Greek East until the first century BCE has attracted some support. Doyle's categorisation of different modes of rule provides a useful heuristic. For Doyle, 'empire' exists only where one state exercises effective control over internal policies and external relationships of another polity; if the nature of that control, whether formal or informal, extends only to foreign policy, then it should be defined as 'hegemony'.¹⁹ Kallet-Marx emphasised the importance of this distinction for understanding Roman expansion in the Eastern Mediterranean, arguing that local interest in leveraging Roman power played a key role in the development of empire.²⁰ Recent studies highlighting the relative disinterest of the Roman state in maximising revenue or establishing robust governance complement these findings.²¹ However, this position has not achieved broad acceptance in current literature, which continues to emphasise the role of sweeping measures, implemented by magistrates serving the interests of the state, in shaping the administration of *provincia Asia*.

¹⁷ Gruen 1984, 273-287.

¹⁸ E.g. Gruen 1984; Burton 2011.

¹⁹ Doyle 1986, 30-45, esp. 40; Donnelly 2006, 157-159.

²⁰ Kallet-Marx 1995. Cf. Eckstein 2018, 231-236.

²¹ State revenue: Tan 2017. Absence of governance: Gargola 2017.

In the following study, I build consciously on the views of Kallet-Marx. Consequently, the investigation starts from the hypothesis that, before 133, the Roman state was uninterested in establishing empire, preferring to exert a loose hegemony in the eastern Mediterranean.

Mitchell provides one highly influential treatment of the Roman administration of Asia. He argued that, from the earliest days of the *provincia*, the Roman state imposed new organisational structures, such as the *conventus iuridici* (assize districts), and established new roads in the region.²² For him, such decisions were immediate, deliberate and arose from a commission sent to aid M'. Aquilius in establishing the province in the early 120s. However, recent scholarship has contested the view that the provinces of the late second and early first centuries were vehicles for Roman administration. Most compellingly, Gargola has established that *provincia Africa* existed only in an abstract sense between the destruction of Carthage in 146 and the outbreak of the Jugurthine War in 112, perhaps even into the 70s.²³ However, by the mid-first century, Cicero could refer to *provinciae sine imperio*, geographical spaces existing outside of an *imperium*-holder's responsibility.²⁴ While the creation of a *provincia* did not correspond to the modern concept of 'annexation', it is important to recognise that the presence of Roman officials, at a minimum, contributed to a reorganisation of local interests into a hierarchy centred on Roman power, which, over time, came to resemble an 'administration'.²⁵

²² Mitchell 1999; cf. Ando 2010, 31-40; Kantor 2014, 254-259.

²³ Gargola 2017. See Richardson 2008, 17, 25 (*contra* Brennan 2000, 182-190), 43-49, 54-62.

²⁴ Richardson 2008, 81-83 with references.

²⁵ Kallet-Marx 1995, 18-29, 275-282; Merola 2001, 195-197; Hermon 2010, 25.

New theoretical approaches are opening avenues of enquiry. Postcolonial critiques of the 'Romanisation' paradigm have problematised viewing the creation of imperial identities as a centrally directed process. Instead variances in local social structures, and attitudes on the part of both locals and Romans, resulted in diverse responses to empire and the construction of multiple, though occasionally overlapping, hybrid identities.²⁶ While imbalances of power affected how communities and individuals responded to Roman rule, its limits were subject to resistance.²⁷ Similarly, the recent focus on globalising tendencies and increasing connectivity in the ancient world raises similar issues.²⁸ The application of globalisation theory to the Roman world has heuristic value insofar as it reveals the multicentric aspect of cultural, social and legal exchange in an increasingly networked world. As Pieterse emphasises, while empire encouraged greater connectedness, these links were multidirectional, between Rome and the provinces, and between these peripheries themselves.²⁹ In the Hellenistic East, such connections already existed through inter-*polis* institutions and established modes of discourse, but the advent of Roman administration caused a reorientation of existing networks of interaction.³⁰ Even within *provincia Asia*, recognising the diversity of experiences for communities, based on contextual factors, is crucial. This thesis attempts to be mindful of such discrepancies in understanding and practice, as the region adapted to Roman rule.

²⁶ Webster 2001; Whitmarsh 2010, 3-4 *pace* Ando 2010, 17-21. Compare Morrison 2001, 255-260.

²⁷ Gardner 2013, 4-6.

²⁸ Pitt & Versluys 2014, 10-13, with literature; Hodos 2014, 241-244.

²⁹ Hingley 2009, 57-64; Pieterse 2015, 232-235. See Czajkowski's discussion (2019) on legal pluralism.

³⁰ E.g. προξενία (Mack 2015, 235-280). On the peer-polity engagement between communities, Ma 2003.

Elite adaptation to and negotiation with imperial rule continues to form a productive area of enquiry for scholars of Roman Asia Minor. Substantial studies have just emerged treating the interaction between local elites at Ephesus and Pergamum and the Roman state.³¹ Edited volumes tackling issues as diverse as citizenship, property ownership, civic honours have also appeared recently.³² Scholarship on the so-called *koinon* of Asia has moved forwards substantially in the last decade, through the works of Vitale and Edelmann-Singer, and its links to the imperial cult under Augustus and his successors has been the subject of extensive investigation.³³ Simply put, it is desirable to reassess the mechanisms through which Rome established its power over the communities of the region, in light of these recent publications. With the emergence of new evidence for widespread Greek ‘freedom’, most importantly the inscription for Apollonius of Metropolis, revisiting the unique status of Asia in the late second century as an inherited, rather than conquered, addition to the empire can only be beneficial.³⁴ In short, this thesis employs Asia as a case-study for two reasons: first, the existence of significant, relatively new evidence encouraging a fresh look at the questions raised; and the absence of a recent study assessing the development of Roman provincial government in Asia Minor.

³¹ Kirbihler 2016; Ventroux 2017.

³² Heller & Pont 2012; Lerouxel & Pont 2016; Heller & van Nijf 2017.

³³ Vitale 2012; Frija 2012; Edelmann-Singer 2015; Kolb & Vitale 2017.

³⁴ *I.Metropolis* 1A with comments of Dreyer & Engelmann 2003; Jones 2004.

0.3: Methodological frameworks (i): States and Institutions

The concepts of 'state' and 'power' are central to this study. For the former, I draw on Scheidel's recent synthesis of definitions, which emphasises the existence of central rule-making institutions, backed by coercive force, exercised over a territory and autonomous vis-à-vis its neighbours. The 'state' is treated here as the aggregate of its institutions.³⁵ Consequently, I accept that the Roman *res publica* operated as a state during the period of study. The position of Greek *poleis* in Asia Minor is more difficult, but insofar as they retained formal autonomy, they can be considered state-based communities.³⁶ The interactions between the Roman 'state' and *poleis* in Asia Minor therefore shift from the sphere of diplomacy to internal administration through the course of the period of study. However, the distinction between the two conditions is not especially meaningful in considering the practical relationship between Roman and local actors.³⁷ The changes accompanying the extension of Roman power over the *poleis* of Asia were of degree rather than essence. From a practical perspective, 'Government' and 'administration' both stand in this thesis exclusively for 'the process of organising or controlling territories or people' avoiding analogies with modern bureaucracies.

³⁵ Scheidel 2013, 5-9; cf. Anderson 2009, 5-8. This fits within the neo-Weberian model (Weber 1978, 31-36); compare Mann 1986, 37; Haldon 1993, 32-33.

³⁶ Following Anderson 2009, 9-19 *contra* Berent 2000, 257-289. Cf. Ma 1999, 150-151; Hansen 2002, 32-36. Cf. Reynolds 2006, 151-152.

³⁷ Millar 2004 [1996], 229-246; Eck 2009, 194-207. The concept of 'sovereignty', integral to modern definitions of statehood, is not useful in an ancient context and I avoid it. The term has been employed as a shorthand for 'autarchic self-government', though see Ma (1999, 153-160).

Fundamentally, power is a social relationship. W.G. Runciman defines power as the ‘capacity to influence actions, thoughts and feelings, through inducements and sanctions, derived through institutional means’.³⁸ This characterisation functions for individuals or groups as both powerholders and subjects. My discussion focuses explicitly on ‘state power’, that exercised through institutions and representatives of the (Roman) state.³⁹ This has three dimensions: political, economic and ideological.⁴⁰ The political dimension represents the capacity of the state to organise a territory through institutionalised rules; the economic dimension is located in the ability to extract and mobilise resources; and the ideological dimension surrounds the ability of the state to shape norms and create consensus.⁴¹ Given that power is a relationship, its extent is always contested, varying from moment to moment and responsive both to external circumstances and the choices of relevant actors.

The question of how Roman provincial government emerged in Asia can be framed in terms of design, development and application of institutions and their elements. In the 1950s and 1960s, social scientists viewed ‘institutions’ as monolithic, persistent entities structuring political and social interaction. In recent decades, however, more nuanced approaches, stressing the flexibility of institutions over time, have become standard. These ‘New Institutionalisms’ offer insights into the complex interactions between structuring forces and human agency.⁴² There are two common definitions of an ‘institution’: first, as a

³⁸ Runciman 1989, 1-2. Cf. Foucault 2000 [1979], 324-325.

³⁹ I.e. the German *Herrschaft* rather than *Macht*. Weber 1978, 53-54; Mann 1986, 6-7; Foucault 2000a [1978], 219-222. In a Roman context see Harris 2017, 1.

⁴⁰ Runciman 1989, 61-64 *pace* Mann 1986, 10-11, 22-32.

⁴¹ Discussion at Mann 1986, 22-28.

⁴² Hall & Taylor 1996, 936-957; Fioretos, Falletti & Sheingate 2016, 3-10.

‘concrete organisational form’, frequently though not always implicated in state administration.⁴³ Second, and more important for this enquiry, ‘institutions’ are ‘rules’ imposed and acknowledged as legitimate by a community which regulate social behaviour. These can be formal, such as laws or regulations, or informal.⁴⁴ Critically, institutions are dynamic and socially embedded. They evolve in response to changing circumstances and are shaped by the norms and behaviours of their social community. That is, embeddedness works two ways: as institutions guide social behaviour, so social behaviour and existing institutions affect their evolution.⁴⁵ Moreover, individual polities are constituted by mosaics of institutions created at different times and for divergent purposes, each responding to their own internal logic, adding a further level of complexity to the state structure.⁴⁶

While historical institutionalism privileges the role of structural elements in shaping political developments in a given context, it simultaneously allows analysis of personal and group agency.⁴⁷ One core tenet holds that institutional change, though persistent, is incremental, since, in most cases, rapid evolution would harm powerful interest groups. Social costs act as a brake on the pace of changes. Evolution is largely ‘path-dependent’; framed by historical context, even where agents propose specific changes. Crucially, as Levi asserts, ‘once a country or region has started down a track, the costs of reversal are very high’. Cognitive elements also hinder the creation of truly novel alternatives.⁴⁸ However,

⁴³ Skoda 2012, 44-45.

⁴⁴ North 1995, 15-16; Greif 2006, 14, 30-32; Mackil 2013, 13.

⁴⁵ Orren & Skowronek 1994, 325-326; Wendt 1999, 184-189; Greif 2006, 187-208.

⁴⁶ Orren & Skowronek 1994, 320-330; 2004, 108-118.

⁴⁷ Katznelson 1997, 104-105.

⁴⁸ Levi 1997, 28-29; Pierson 2004, 22-48; Greif 2006, 189-208.

during moments of political or social crisis, when existing institutions break down completely, there is greater scope for agents to innovate.⁴⁹ In such ‘critical junctures’, the relative cost of inaction climbs substantially and the inadequacies of the existing system offer a menu of potential improvements. If actors with sufficient power and political capital hold particular views on the role of institutions then significant change can occur swiftly, though not without cost.⁵⁰

Historical institutionalism offers heuristic value in explaining how imperial structures evolved in Roman Asia over the period. For example, Emily Mackil’s recent investigation of *koinon* formation in Classical and Hellenistic Greece applied these ideas in a constructive way, showing how the development of common norms through religious and economic interaction facilitated the creation of formal political institutions when external conditions changed.⁵¹ By contrast, I apply these ideas to an imperial context, with structural power imbalances and several overlapping cultural and political contexts. Evaluating the evidence in this way helps to elucidate the relative significance of institutional inertia and human agency in the Roman imperial project.

⁴⁹ Capoccia & Keleman 2007, 348; Capoccia 2016, 91-92, drawing on Berlin 1974, 176. The criticism of Peters, Pierre & King (2005, 1287-1290) that the model relies on notions of ‘punctuated equilibria’ mischaracterises the bulk of recent scholarship which emphasises gradual changes (Pierson 2004, 50-53, 153-157; Fioretos, Falletti & Sheingate 2016, 12).

⁵⁰ Capoccia 2016, 96-98. C. Iulius Caesar presents an archetypal ancient example. His position was sufficiently unchallengeable that he could introduce major reforms. However, various interest groups resisted, and after his assassination some of his decisions were reversed.

⁵¹ Mackil 2013. Her preliminary treatment of Boiotia (15-17) is instructive.

0.4: Methodological Frameworks (ii): Ideology and ‘Speech-Act’ Theory

Ideology, channelled through institutions, played a critical role in the establishment of Roman administration. Several important studies have analysed central communiqués to peripheral regions as a manifestation of power in ancient states; most obviously, Millar’s scholarship on the governance of the Roman Principate, which posited that government primarily reacted to petitions from individuals and communities to the Emperor and his representatives, without having wider administrative ambitions.⁵² More recent studies by Ma and Ando, focused on Antiochus III and civic communities in Asia Minor and the provinces of the Roman Principate respectively, draw heavily on sociological perspectives, especially ‘speech-act’ theory, as formulated by Austin. Some communicative acts convey more than information, pursuing an objective which will not occur without the success of the communicative act itself. This ‘purposive object’ could be the affirmation of a shared understanding, the prohibition of an activity or an exhortation. The fact of the communication allows the recipient to perform or refuse to perform the required act based on three distinct criteria: both the authority and the sincerity of the original communicator, and the existential pre-conditions of the communication.⁵³ Official communiqués from an imperial power to subordinate communities rarely contain only information: more often they contain instruction, whether specific or general regarding ‘right action’. Should the power be regarded as legitimate, then even where communiqués do not contain explicit

⁵² For the ‘petition-and-response model’, Millar 2002 [1966] and 2004a [1967] are crucial, supplemented by 2004b [1998], 23-46 and 2004c [1983], 342-350. Note now the critique of Ando (Forthcoming; cf. Edmondson 2014, 127-155), who proposes a parallel ‘order-and-obey’ model.

⁵³ Austin 1975, esp. 14-16. Cf. Habermas 1984, 286-309.

instructions, their origin imbues their content with a normative force allowing us to define them as 'speech-acts' with purposive objects of defining a shared understanding.

Habermas enriched 'speech-act' theory, integrating it within a broader sociological framework which posits individuals drawing on: (1) their personal subjective experience; (2) their social inter-subjective experience with other individuals; and (3) their objective experience of the external world; to create meaning. Society integrates individual members to the extent that their experiences are based around shared convictions regarded as unproblematic. These principles form the basis of societal *mores*, which develop constantly in a dynamic and incremental fashion. Collective traditions co-ordinate interpersonal action through systemic (e.g. economic exchange, non-linguistic) and social (linguistic) structures.⁵⁴ This is a useful hermeneutic precisely because it describes a process of generating a common understanding. While not denying the importance of non-linguistic elements, the content and framing of official communication provides one of the most direct ways for a government to affect the attitudes of local political actors: the utterances of legitimate wielders of authority constitute a means by which to generate and reinforce an official world-view.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ Summarised at Habermas 1991, 231-238, building on Habermas 1984, 1987. Cf. Bourdieu 1977, 167-168, 187-189; Dodd 1994, 333-336.

⁵⁵ This raises the problem of audience for normative and instructional documents. Ando (2000, 101-105) constructs a plausible model for achieving wide-spread familiarity with normative documents among provincial communities in the imperial period and sees a strong motive for central government to consciously encourage this. However, in my view, he moves beyond the available evidence. Compare Meyer (2004, 184-187), who rightly emphasises local imitation and Roman standards as explaining the process of centralisation. This debate over the reception of documents is explored in greater depth in Ch. 3.

Within Habermas' framework then, successful speech-acts, affirming a shared worldview, push individuals into a common society. The greater the extent to which individuals regard the views of the political elite as normative, legitimate and unproblematic, the more integrated that society. In turn, having strong group-identity engenders relative social stability. Common understanding of the 'rules of engagement', 'political grammar' and 'syntax' limits the realm of acceptable dialogue and provides a framework within which negotiation can safely take place.⁵⁶ Regular repetition is crucial; encouraging individuals to reaffirm their commitment to shared values and norms. While these norms are never static, they are socially embedded and evolve incrementally.⁵⁷ Imperial examples are a notable exception: even where, as in the early years of Roman Asia, no military conquest has taken place, a cultural distance can exist between the imperial and subject communities. Both Ma and Ando highlight the role of consistency in language and format in facilitating engagement between local communities and the imperial elite. Similarly, Pocock has stressed the role of common adoption of concepts and terms in creating discourse.⁵⁸ Correspondingly, I propose that where a gap in understanding existed, such as that between Roman elites and the communities of Asia in 133, uniformity, regularity and reproducibility of communicative formats and language would more

⁵⁶ Bourdieu 1977, 187-189; Foucault 1980, 93-96; Habermas 1984, 70-71; Pocock 1987, 20-27. Cf. Ma (1999, 191-194) and Ando (2000, 20-21, 28-29) for applications to the ancient world. N.b. A commonly accepted framework does not *ipso facto* guarantee a positive outcome. Chaniotis 2015, 89.

⁵⁷ Cf. Mackil 2013, 11.

⁵⁸ Which he terms 'a language': Pocock 1987, 29-36. Cf. Chaniotis 2015, 88-89.

efficiently generate and maintain the common ground necessary to engage with imperial discourse.

Moreover, the realities of a large, heterogenous and culturally distinct audience could create issues of meaning. Taking into account the divergent context, knowledge and assumptions they held, individuals and communities, as an audience for Roman power, could challenge, reject or reframe the norms, language or content of official discursive acts.⁵⁹ Attempts by a central figure or institution, in our context the Senate or Princeps, to communicate directly with inhabitants on the periphery of the empire would suffer from problems of interpretation, beyond the immense practical challenges. The social, hierarchical, spatial and cultural distance between the author(s) of such a message and its recipients was vast.⁶⁰ The conventions of different communicative media further hindered attempts to convey an official version.⁶¹ When issued to hundreds of communities scattered across the culturally fragmented landscape of western Asia Minor, this gap in context between the ruler and each recipient left room for myriad divergent local readings. Notwithstanding the complexity of this situation, following Hall, potential responses can be

⁵⁹ Hall (1980, 128-138) argues that, in instances of mass communication, messages alter at several stages: first, the conventions of the communicative medium and language limit the creator; second, a mass audience, by definition heterogenous, holds differing knowledge and assumptions from the creator and one another, changing the context within which the message is interpreted; finally, those who disseminate the message also engage in an interpretative dialectic with the creator. For an application of this approach in Roman history, see Lenski's (2017, 8-12) recent discussion of the role of the Christogram and Staurogram on Constantinian coinage.

⁶⁰ The paradigm for Rome and the Hellenistic East is the encounter between the Aetolians and M'. Acilius in 191 (Polyb. 20.9.10-12; Liv. 36.27-29). A vast bibliography exists, see esp. Eckstein 1995, 271-288 *contra* Gruen 1982, 50-68; Burton 2009, 237-252.

⁶¹ Jauss & Benziger 1970, 8; Iser 1972, 279; Pocock 1989 [1971], 21-22; Brems & Ramos Pinto 2013, 142-144.

grouped into three broad categories: ‘hegemonic’, broadly accepting the dominant discourse; ‘negotiated’, allowing some premises of the author but challenging or ignoring others; and ‘oppositional’, interpreting the missive in a separate, more favourable social framework.⁶² In simple terms, though administrative structures can appear rigidly hierarchical, political communicators, even more than in the modern world, lost control of their message the moment it was issued. More importantly, a context wherein communities had the capacity to make public pronouncements afforded the opportunity to negotiate or creatively interpret imperial communiqués. The constant change in language and channels of Roman official pronouncements during this period, along with the reframing required by changes in political context created conditions encouraging divergent readings. I argue here that, generally, the communities of Asia sought to engage constructively with Rome to create and constitute a new shared ‘language’ of empire and interaction. However, where expedient, some actors explored the utility of negotiated or oppositional readings of Roman discourse. Both approaches irrevocably altered the path of Roman administrative arrangements in the *provincia*.

0.5: Scope of Study

The commencement of this study at the death of Attalus III in 133 may be self-evident but the closing limit, c. 20 CE, requires explanation. This thesis is concerned with structural elements (of state power, institutions and ideologies) which do not neatly map onto political

⁶² For this formulation: Hall 1980, 134-138.

narratives. The succession of Tiberius to the Principate in 14 CE marks a moment of seismic political importance, actualising the monopoly of power by the Julio-Claudian dynasty and transforming it from a political position to a permanent institution.⁶³ However, the beginning of Tiberius' reign is marked by subtle changes in the exercise of centralised power which, though moulded by the Augustan political project, laid the foundations for the future developments. Finally, Germanicus' mission to the eastern provinces in 18/19 CE marked the end of the period in which holders of the highest authority in the state were routinely present in Asia.⁶⁴

This study focuses on local communities as single units, and thereby on 'political elites' in a loose sense. This does not deny the importance of sub-elite groups to civic policy-making, or suggest that decision-making bodies within the *poleis* of western Asia Minor were homogenous or monolithic. The boundary between political, economic and cultural elites in late- or sub-Hellenistic *poleis* was often blurred, while the well-attested persistence of local democratic institutions well into the imperial period demonstrates the continued diffusion of civic political power.⁶⁵ That said, as a hermeneutic, the concept of a constantly evolving but culturally and politically coherent audience of local powerbrokers within each community has immense utility in exploring how attitudes and approaches toward Roman rule evolved across the period.

⁶³ Cooley (Forthcoming). See Maier 2000, 807; Flower 2009, 12-19.

⁶⁴ After Germanicus, the next imperial visit was undertaken by Hadrian in 124 CE.

⁶⁵ E.g. Fernoux 2011; Zuiderhoek 2017, 122-130.

0.6: Thesis Structure

This study consists of three chapters. First, it investigates the institutions which the Romans established in the region across the period in question, concentrating on the processes of coercive control and surplus extraction. Drawing on models of institutional dynamics from contemporary political science, I emphasise the role of critical junctures in shaping administrative outcomes. I interrogate the degree of intentionality and forward-planning on the part of Roman rulers and highlight the extent to which changes affecting local communities were ad hoc responses to political or personal circumstances. Subsequently, I investigate the impact of Roman communication in creating an ideology of empire. The critical questions, considered here, are how extensively the Republican interlude disrupted the status quo and how intentional the process of replacing it was. Finally, the third chapter inverts the perspective, looking at how individual communities responded to the effects of Roman actions. Combining the earlier themes, I interrogate the ways in which local communities were affected by Roman administration, and how they responded to the shifting reality of Roman rule. I focus on three specific topics: local decrees as a medium for communication; embassies to Romans; and the publication of Roman documents in local contexts. Taken together these examples reveal a variety of strategies for engaging with Rome and Romans.

1. *Provincia Asia*: The Construction of Roman Province

1.1: The Aims of Roman Government: Initial Organisation

In spring 133, Eudemus of Pergamum arrived in Rome and informed the Senate that Attalus III had died unexpectedly. Under the terms of the *basileus'* will, the *populus Romanus* would be his heir.⁶⁶ The specifics of this arrangement are unclear, but subsequent events show this entailed receipt of his property and kingdom.⁶⁷ This royal act, and its acceptance by the Senate and People, brought the Roman Republic permanently into western Asia Minor. Though magistrates had been active in the region during the early second century conflict with Antiochus III, the state retained no territory as a result its military victory. The Romans sought hegemony not empire.⁶⁸ Attalus' sudden passing fundamentally altered this situation and, despite violent disagreement at Rome over the disposition of the will's contents, the sources make clear that its acceptance was never in doubt.⁶⁹ As a direct consequence, for the first time a Roman magistrate was regularly sent out with *imperium* over and responsibility for much of western Asia.

This chapter investigates the practical impact of Roman administration between 133 BCE and 20 CE, focusing on how Rome 'ruled' in this period, if it can be said to have at all. It

⁶⁶ Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* 14.1; Livy, *Per.* 58.3; Flor. 1.35.2. On the will: Liebmann-Frankfort 1966, 80-90; Braund 1983, 21-23; Kantor 2014, 253.

⁶⁷ Braund 1983, 16-30, 44-53. Compare Cyrenaica after 95 (Sall. *Hist.* 2.41 (McGushin); App. *BCiv.* 1.111. Reynolds 1962, 101-103; Oost 1963, 11-22; Daubner 2006, 47-51); and Cyprus after 58 (Badian 1965, esp. 110-113, 119-120, with references).

⁶⁸ For terminology, p.5 *supra*.

⁶⁹ Now demonstrated by *I.Metropolis* 1A. Jones 2004, 485 *contra* Gruen 1984, 599-602; Kallet-Marx 1995, 104-105.

asks to what extent Roman governance was intrusive, extensive and/or ambitious, and draws attention to changes over time. I begin by establishing what steps were taken in the initial organisation of the new *provincia*. I argue that Roman aims had limited scope before the First Mithridatic War, avoiding administrative responsibility where possible and allowing local *poleis* significant judicial and fiscal autonomy. While incipient debates at Rome over the extraction of profits of empire affected the region, rampant fiscal exploitation did not form the basis of Roman goals at this time. Subsequently, I address the substantive changes after the re-establishment of Roman hegemony by L. Cornelius Sulla, before reassessing the impact of Roman rule in the period of relative stability for provincial institutions before the outbreak of civil war in 49. Finally, I investigate the staccato series of changes which took place during this round of conflict and the Triumviral period, culminating in the establishment of Augustus' new imperial order.

The Attalid kingdom bequeathed to Rome in 133 emerged from the loose Seleucid control of western Asia Minor in the late third century. In 238, Attalus I, hereditary dynast of Pergamum, named himself *basileus* after defeating the Galatians in a major battle at the Caïcus river.⁷⁰ Irrespective of this success, his 'kingdom' consisted only of the *polis* itself and its immediate surroundings.⁷¹ The decision of Attalus, and his successor Eumenes II, to vigorously pursue a Roman alliance led to a swift upsurge in their fortunes after Antiochus III's defeat. Under the terms of the peace of Apameia in 188, the Romans awarded most Seleucid territory north and west of the Taurus to the Attalids, increasing the size of the

⁷⁰ Polyb. 18.41; Strabo 13.2.4. Allen 1983, 302.

⁷¹ Thonemann 2013, 1-2.

kingdom nearly tenfold.⁷² The boundaries of the kingdom remained undefined, with the single exception of the southern border: the river Maeander marked the beginning of Rhodian hegemony.⁷³ Even so, the degree of control exerted by the Attalid *basileis* over their newly acquired territory seems limited. Polybius notes that *poleis* not previously subject to Attalus were not required to pay tribute to Eumenes, provided they had sided with the Romans against Antiochus, implying that civic freedom pervaded the region.⁷⁴

The relative weakness of Attalid claims of legitimacy vis-à-vis their royal competitors explains their different practices of power and administration. Unable to credibly justify their rule through military prowess, they turned to civic benefaction within and beyond their kingdom to establish their influence.⁷⁵ Meanwhile, structurally, their administration became more localised and direct than that of their Seleucid predecessors. The Attalid state had a flatter hierarchy: centrally appointed officials, with responsibility for relatively small areas, maintained direct access to the monarch.⁷⁶ Meanwhile, less urbanised areas were subjected to semi-hereditary officials with greater autonomy, though the limits of their powers remain unclear.⁷⁷ Given the absence of pre-existing bonds between local elites and Attalid rulers, Thonemann's characterisation of this arrangement as an 'exercise in power-

⁷² Polyb. 21.22.13. Allen 1983, 66-68, 76-80; Thonemann 2013, 2-3.

⁷³ Polyb. 21.43.1-46.11; Livy 38.38.1-39.16. Allen 1983, 86-87; Dreyer 2007, 347-362.

⁷⁴ Polyb. 21.24.4-8; 45.3. Kay 2014, 126.

⁷⁵ Dreyer 2009, 35-36; Thonemann 2013, 31-44.

⁷⁶ Allen 1983, 100-109.

⁷⁷ SEG 44.1108; 46.1434; 57.1109.

sharing' seems apt. When tied to evidence linking wealthy, localised landowners to political positions, it reveals a devolved but intensive administrative system.⁷⁸

Attalid taxation reinforces this view: the kingdom operated a complex and extensive fiscal system. A 'tithe' on produce (δεκατή), a customs tax, poll-taxes and a fixed tribute from communities are all attested.⁷⁹ Collection, in keeping with political arrangements, was devolved to civic communities, perhaps explaining the Attalid emphasis on city-foundation in marginal areas.⁸⁰ These numerous revenue-streams contributed to the Attalid rulers' proverbial wealth, and supported their attempts to maintain panhellenic levels of euergetism and benefactions, upon which their rule depended.

Outside of the civic communities, βασιλική χώρα (or γή, 'royal land') further framed the Attalid state's organisation. Attested across the major Hellenistic kingdoms, Bickerman held that the βασιλική χώρα was akin to the monarch's private property, on the twin grounds that no other ownership rights were upheld within the 'royal land' and that land granted to beneficiaries first had to be attached to the territory of a *polis*.⁸¹ More recently, scholars have viewed βασιλική χώρα as land directly subordinate to decisions of the *basileus* and administratively separate from other private or public forms of land.⁸² The current

⁷⁸ Thonemann 2013, 12-17.

⁷⁹ E.g. RC 54.7-8 (Amlada); SEG 39.1180.36, 68 (Roman *lex portorii* referring to Attalid practice); *Griechische Mauerbauinschriften* 1.76.10-14 (poll-tax at Telmessos, see Ashton 1994, 57-60); App. BCiv. 5.4. Kay 2014, 71-72. Note that the δεκατή, despite its name, could be much higher than 10% in practice (Aperghis 2004, 122-123; Monson 2015, 190 with SEG 47.1745.43-47).

⁸⁰ As at Toriaion (*I.Sultan Daği* 1.393). Thonemann 2013, 18-20. Compare, later, Cn. Pompeius in Pontus-Bithynia: Højte 2006, 15-17; 2009, 95-97; Madsen 2014, 75-76, 80-81.

⁸¹ Bickerman 1938, 180-184; Aperghis 2004, 101-107. E.g. *I.Ilion* 33.18-25, 44-46, 70-72.

⁸² E.g. Aperghis 2004, 87-89; Capdetrey 2007, 136-144; Mileta 2008, 63-78.

communis opinio sees the βασιλική χώρα as defined negatively, as land that did not fall within a city territory, and it is likely no single precise definition existed for contemporaries.⁸³

This does not mean that βασιλική χώρα was sparsely inhabited or economically marginal. Even outside of civic territories, the Seleucids and Attalids established numerous settlements inhabited by κάτοικοι (military settlers), while non-urbanised groups continued to interact sporadically with royal officials.⁸⁴ Crucially, in these areas, where royal authority was strong, claims on revenue could be far more extensive than on civic territories. For example, one fragmentary royal document from near Magnesia-under-Sipylos refers to taxes on orchards, beehives and hunted animals.⁸⁵ Perhaps due to the greater bureaucratic visibility of κάτοικοι, a poll-tax is attested at the military settlement of Apollinoucharax.⁸⁶ Royal possessions within *polis* territories were also regarded as ‘royal land’. Royal estates, city properties, as well as economic assets such as mines, forests and other natural resources, such as salt-works, all fell within βασιλική χώρα.⁸⁷ Taken together, this demonstrates both the economic significance and non-contiguous nature of royal territory within western Asia Minor. At the death of Attalus III, the territory he ruled over, though diverse, had a coherent administration rooted in the personal connection of the *basileus* to

⁸³ Capdetrey 2007, 138-139. Compare Mileta (2008, 41-52), deducing a triple meaning: ‘Reichsgebiet’, ‘untertäniges Binnenland’ and ‘königliches Gebiet’.

⁸⁴ E.g. Sotas, *philos* of Attalos, who became a royal official from a local warlord: Thonemann 2013, 13-16.

⁸⁵ SEG 33.1304. Aperghis 2004, 146-147; Kaye 2013.

⁸⁶ SEG 61.982α.22-24 (Apollinoucharax). Compare Segre 1938, #190.1-4, 10-12.

⁸⁷ E.g. Ma 1999, 130-131; Aperghis 2004, 152-157. E.g. SEG 39.1283, 1285; Livy 37.56.1.

local officials and a complex fiscal system. The question facing the Roman state was whether, and how, to adjust this system to match their own requirements.

The arrival of Eudemus in Rome with news of the bequest was ill-timed: tension between the tribune of the *plebs*, Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, and his opponents had made the city a tinderbox. Gracchus threatened separately to use the *concilium plebis* to (1) appropriate the private fortune of the *basileus*; and (2) settle the affairs of the *poleis* within the kingdom in a way designed to maximise public profit, which could fund his expansive agrarian legislation.⁸⁸ In the event, his murder by his opponents, including P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica, brought an end to debate. The Senate took charge, despatching a commission of five senatorial *legati*, led by Nasica, to Pergamum, where they had arrived by early 132 and set about negotiating with local powerbrokers.⁸⁹

Events in Asia had overtaken them, however. Coins from Ephesus show that that city had already struck coins with a new civic era in late 134/133. Though this action could indicate that Attalus pre-emptively freed the *polis*, more likely it was a unilateral action after his death in spring 133, before the Romans could have acted.⁹⁰ A Pergamene civic decree also explicitly states that the will guaranteed the city's freedom, before the Romans had intervened:

⁸⁸ Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* 14.1-2; Livy, *Per.* 58.2. Badian 1972, 712-713.

⁸⁹ IGR 4.1681; Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* 21.4; Val. Max. 5.3.2e; *de vir. ill.* 64.9. Schleussner 1976, 103-112; Rigsby 1979, 39-40; Wörrle 2000, 566; Jones 2004, 484. On the dispatch of *legati* to settle disputes or organise *provinciae*: Schleussner 1978, 9-100; Yarrow 2012, 168-183.

⁹⁰ Rigsby 1979, 39-40; Adams 1980, 313-314; Leschhorn 1993, 204-208; Kirbihler 2016, 22-23 n.8.

[ἐπε]ῖ βασιλεὺς Ἀτταλος | Φιλομήτωρ καὶ Εὐεργέτης μεθιστάμενος ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀπολέλοιπεν τῇ [πατρ]ίδι ἡμῶν ἐλευθέραν, | προσορίσας αὐτῇ καὶ πολε[ιτική] χώραν, ἣν ἔκριν[εν], | δεῖ δὲ ἐπικυρωθῆναι τὴν διαθήκ[η]ν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ... ('since the *basileus* Attalus Philometor and Euergetes, passing from the world of men, left our city free, having added to it the civic territory, as he judged it, and it is necessary for the will to be confirmed by the Romans ...').⁹¹

The object of this political act, however, was the general safety of the community: it went on to grant citizenship rights to loyal members of the *πάροικοι*, the *κάτοικοι* and mercenary forces serving the city, as well as groups called Macedonians, Mysians and Masdynians.⁹² These grants indicate rising social tensions within the *polis* and the will was contested immediately by Aristonicus, the illegitimate son of Eumenes II, who claimed the Pergamene throne as Eumenes III.⁹³ While lacking support in the major centres of the kingdom, he experienced initial successes at Phocaea and Myndos before a defeat inflicted by an Ephesian fleet forced him into the interior. Even so, he succeeded in killing the first Roman commander sent against him, P. Licinius Crassus Dives (*cos.* 132), before being defeated and captured by his successor M. Perperna (*cos.* 131) at Stratonicea-on-the-Caicus in winter 130/129.⁹⁴ Even then, the inscriptions from Caria imply fighting continued for some time.⁹⁵ A growing corpus of inscriptions from across the region attests to the

⁹¹ OGIS 338.3-7. Most accept this as a Pergamene decree though note Rigsby (1988, 130-137), opposed by Gauthier (*BÉ* 1989, #249).

⁹² OGIS 338.10-19.

⁹³ For a full account of Aristonicus' revolt see Daubner 2006, 53-190 with references. Compare Jones 2004, 469-485. The royal name: Eutropius 4.18, 20. Robinson 1954, 1-8; Kleiner & Noé 1977, 103-106; Collins 1981, 39-43.

⁹⁴ Strabo 14.1.38. Daubner 2006, 119-131 with references. See now coinage attesting his fifth regnal year at Stratonicea (Naumann 53 (7/5/2017), #297; 79 (7/7/2019), #177; with Ellis-Evans (Forthcoming), 12 n.48).

⁹⁵ Strabo 14.1.38. Collected by Briant, Brun & Varinlioğlu 2001, 252-259.

prolonged presence of Roman troops and the direct involvement of several allied *poleis*.⁹⁶

The allied rulers of Pontus, Bithynia, Paphlagonia and Cappadocia also intervened underscoring the significance of the conflict.⁹⁷ Mileta's claim that Aristonicus had support from large sections of Attalid society goes beyond the available evidence but his point that this was more than a 'slave revolt' is compelling.⁹⁸ Aristonicus' attempt to continue the Attalid line was significant, threatening both Roman hegemony and local claims to freedom and subsequent developments must be placed firmly in this context.

Meanwhile, in Rome, the Senate passed a resolution responding to the situation: the so-called *senatusconsultum Popillianum*. Wörrle's recent autopsy of the stone confirmed the presiding magistrate as [Πό]πλιος Ποπίλλιος Γαίου υἱός (P. Popillius, C.f., [Laenas]), firmly dating the text to late in his consulship in 132.⁹⁹ The text issued ἐντολαί ('instructions') [τοῖς εἰς | Ἀσίαν πορευομένοις στρατηγοῖς ('for the praetors crossing over into Asia'), which Kallet-Marx persuasively suggests extended to all future commanders in Asia. Specifically it enjoined commanders to respect [δι]ωρθώθη ἔδωρήθη ἀφέθη ἐζημιώ[θη] ('items amended, given, taken away; penalties imposed') by Attalus III until one day prior to his death.¹⁰⁰ It did

⁹⁶ Brun 2004, 44-52 for references. See already Broughton 1938, 505-507.

⁹⁷ Strabo 14.1.38. Daubner 2006, 103-107.

⁹⁸ Delplace 1978, 37-53; Kirbihler 2016, 21-25 *pace* Mileta 1998, 52-64.

⁹⁹ Wörrle 2000, 567. Early editors dated it to 133, after news of Attalus' testament but before Aristonicus' revolt, as a necessary procedural step in creating a new province (e.g. Foucart 1904, 313; Sherck 1969, 61-62). Magie believing that the summoning of the Senate by a *praetor* required the consuls to be absent, proposed 129 (Magie 1950, 1033-1034; Gruen 1984, 603-604); Wörrle's reading is now decisive.

¹⁰⁰ *RDGE* 11.5-10, with Wörrle 2000, 543. Compare *OGIS* 436.8-9, with Drew-Bear 1972, 79-81. Kallet-Marx 1995, 354.

not, *pace* Kay, ‘refuse the commissioners the right to change these arrangements’.¹⁰¹ The extant document is concerned only with ensuring the legal validity of Attalus’ acts vis-à-vis Roman justice.¹⁰² The decisions of *legati*, past, present or future, were not constrained by this ordinance. Nevertheless, the document’s display was likely intended to bolster the community’s claim to benefits granted under the terms of Attalus’ testament, including its ἐλευθερία.¹⁰³ The *senatusconsultum Popillianum* was not prescriptive legislation but a starting-point for a future relationship between Rome and the cities of Asia.

An honorific inscription from Pergamum for Menodorus reveals his role converting the city from royal seat to Roman ally in the transitional period:

μεταπεσόντων τε τῶν πραγμάτων εἰς δημοκρατίαν | [κα]ὶ τοῦ δήμου συνέδρους
χειροτονήσαντος τῶν ἀρίστων ἀνδρῶν κατεσ[τ]άθη[η] καὶ Μηνόδωρος καὶ μετὰ
ταῦτα ἐν τῷ κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν νομοθεσίαν βουλευτηρίῳ γενόμενος διὰ τὴν
πρὸς τὴν πατρίδα εὖνοιαν πολλὰ τῶν συμφερόντων | συνήργεσεν ἀεὶ ὑγιῇ καὶ
καθαρὰν ἐκτιθέμενος κρίσιν (‘Since further, when the state (πραγμάτων)
changed to a democracy, and the people chose a council (συνέδρους) of the best
men, he, Menodorus, was chosen, and becoming a member of the council
(βουλευτηρίῳ) in accordance with the Roman legislation (νομοθεσίαν),
through his goodwill he brought about many useful things for the Fatherland,
always exercising reason and good sense’).¹⁰⁴

¹⁰¹ Kay 2014, 62. Nor, as Mileta (1990, 436-437) would have it, imply the adoption of existing Attalid administrative structures.

¹⁰² Restorations of ll.19-20 to read that στρατηγοί were not ‘to disturb the testament’ or ‘disturb anything to no good purpose’ (e.g. Dittenberger 1905 (*OGIS*), 435; Sherk 1969, 60) are unconvincing. In this sense, it is not unlike the ‘Great Repeal Bill’ proposed by the UK government regarding Brexit. It would confirm previous decisions as having standing in British law; but does not preclude (procedurally legal) alterations. Institute for Government 2018.

¹⁰³ Drew-Bear 1972, 77.

¹⁰⁴ *SEG* 50.1211.11-15.

The city honours Menodorus for three distinct acts involving the Romans, which form the decree's core narrative. First, he acted as a συνέδρος for the city after its transition to 'democracy'. Wörrle accordingly deduced a structural transformation of civic organisation.¹⁰⁵ Other συνέδρια existed in Asia at this time, offering models for the *polis* in its transition from royal capital to free community. The appearance of homonymous bodies in Greece, aristocratic councils with oversight of proposals put to the *demos*, is strongly associated with the Roman settlements after the Third Macedonian and Achaean Wars, which may suggest interference by the *legati* in the internal affairs of the *polis*.¹⁰⁶ However, Chankowski demonstrated that στρατηγοί already fulfilled this role at Pergamum under the Attalids and continued to into the 60s.¹⁰⁷ The role of the συνέδριον, consequently, cannot be reconstructed. In the absence of further Republican attestations, a plausible if unprovable suggestion is that served as an interim aristocratic body to propose changes to the Pergamene constitution. Though the *polis* placed great emphasis on its newfound ἐλευθερία and δημοκρατία, this does not imply that existing civic elites were not keen to control the transition process.

¹⁰⁵ Δημοκρατία here seems to stand for the absence of royal (or Roman) rule, i.e. almost as a synonym for ἐλευθερία, rather than implying anything about the form of constitution. The distinction between συνέδριον and βουλή would imply a classically oligarchic *polis*. Wörrle 2000, 564-565; Lehmann 2000, 228-230; Ventrux 2017, 36-37 n.44. Compare: AvP 8.2.413.

¹⁰⁶ E.g. Thessaly in 197 (Livy 34.51.6), Macedonia in 167 (Polyb. 31.2.12; Livy 45.32.2), then the Achaian *koinon* in 146 (Paus. 7.16.9). As Piérart demonstrates (2013, 27) the transition at Argos can now be dated firmly to 146. Earlier: Gruen 1984, 523-525; Ferrary 1988, 206-210. Compare Lycia under Claudius (SEG 51.1832.a26-28 with Jones 2001, 161-168).

¹⁰⁷ Chankowski 1998, 180-190; Ventrux 2017, 86-87. Compare Ephesus, where the στρατηγοί, γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς and προέδροι introduce decrees to the ἐκκλησία together (I.Eph. 8.17-22 in 86. Rhodes 1997, 357-367; Kirbihler 2016, 114-116).

Second, Menodorus served as a member of a βουλευτήριον in accordance with τὴν Ῥωμαικὴν νομοθεσίαν, an unparalleled phrase. Given that the decree places this before his activity as στρατηγὸς τῆς πόλεως which coincided with Aquillius' command (129-126), it must relate to the commission of Scipio Nasica, present in Pergamum from mid-132. Wörrle characterises the νομοθεσία as 'die grundlegende römische Rechtsordnung für das Attalidenreich' – the *lex provinciae*. However, the commission could not have issued a binding pronouncement in the absence of a serving magistrate *cum imperio*.¹⁰⁸ The prevailing view presents the βουλευτήριον as an assembly of delegates from the *poleis* of the former kingdom. Some take this as a nascent provincial assembly, though this pushes the evidence too far.¹⁰⁹ The possibility that this refers to a reformed, local institution should be considered. The text does not suggest that Menodorus left Pergamum, which would normally be mentioned to indicate service as an ambassador. More significantly, the term βουλευτήριον does not describe parallel assemblies in Macedonia or Achaëa. Consequently, a plausible argument would see the συνέδριον as a temporary expedient, set up to reconstitute the *polis*' political organs and the βουλευτήριον as a permanent aristocratic council, selected in line with the wishes of the Roman *legati*. Both actions helped establish the former royal capital as a Rome-friendly, if functionally independent, *polis*.

Beyond this, the decree also highlights Menodorus' service as στρατηγὸς τῆς πόλεως, during which he negotiated directly with Aquillius and the commission. The decree

¹⁰⁸ By analogy with SEG 38.1462.111 (with Wörrle 1988, 77-100). Wörrle 2000, 568. Kirbihler (2016, 26-27) and Ventroux (2017, 38) are equivocal. See pp.34-35 *infra*.

¹⁰⁹ By analogy with Macedonia in 167: Livy, 45.29.1, 32.1-7, with Papazoglou 1988, 58-64. E.g. Wörrle 2000, 569-570; Daubner 2006, 98-103; Edelman-Singer 2011, 89-95; 2015, 60-61; Ventroux 2017, 37-38.

emphasises Menodorus' παρρησία ('outspokenness') on behalf of the *polis*. Though details are lacking, this should mean, at least, a robust exchange of views. Its employment stresses both the importance of persuasion and the licence with which local powerbrokers felt able to approach their Roman hegemon. Given the limited intervention of Aquillius and his commission in civic affairs, Wörrle's suggestion connecting this with the events culminating in the *senatusconsultum de agro Pergameno* seems reasonable.¹¹⁰

Another decree, for Apollonius of Metropolis, who had perished fighting against Aristonicus, dated to May 132, summarises the reasons for the ongoing conflict in terms which relate explicitly to civic freedom:¹¹¹

νῦν τε τοῦ μὲν Φιλομήτορος βασιλέως μεταλλάξαντος Ῥωμαίων δὲ τῶν κοινῶν εὐεργετῶν τε καὶ σωτήρων ἀποδόντων, καθάπερ ἐδογμάτισαν, τὴν ἐλευθερίαν πᾶσιν τοῖς πρότερον τασσομένοις ὑπὸ τὴν Ἀττάλου βασιλείαν, Ἀριστονίκου δὲ παρα|γεγονότος καὶ βουλομένου παραιρεῖσθαι τὴν ἀποδεδομένην ἡμῖν ἐλευθερίαν ὑπὸ τῆς συγκλήτου... ('Now, when King Philometor had died, and the Romans, common saviours and benefactors, had **restored**, as they had **decreed**, freedom to all those formerly making up the kingdom of Attalus, since Aristonicus arrived and wished to take away again our ἐλευθερία, **restored** by the Senate ...').¹¹²

The text stresses through repetition that ἐλευθερία had been granted (ἀποδόντων; ἀποδεδομένην) and that a *senatus consultum* had been passed to that effect (ἐδογμάτισαν; ὑπὸ

¹¹⁰ SEG 50.1211.18-22; compare esp. SEG 39.1243-1244. Wörrle 2000, 571-573. See also Quass 1993, 135-137.

¹¹¹ Date: Jones 2004, 478-482; Eilers 2005, 253-254 *contra* Dreyer & Engelmann 2003, 66-79.

¹¹² I.Metropolis 1A.13-17.

τῆς συγκλήτου).¹¹³ The unusual qualification that the freedom extended to πᾶσιν τοῖς πρότερον τασσομένοις ὑπὸ τὴν Ἀττάλου βασιλείαν ('all those formerly making up the kingdom of Attalus') demonstrates conclusively that this was a universal grant.¹¹⁴ While individual exceptions to this rule existed, including Phocaea which openly supported Aristonicus, no strong reason favours rejecting the accuracy of the Metropolitans' claim.¹¹⁵

Roman attitudes towards just treatment of allies and friendly communities clarify this situation. Not denying the propensity of the Senate and its representatives to manipulate situations to their own advantage, Roman self-presentation and imagination saw a strong ethos of honourable conduct governing their relationships with non-Romans. The near-contemporary example of C. Hostilius Mancinus, handed over to the Numantines when the Senate and *populus Romanus* refused to ratify his treaty with them in 136, shows the seriousness with which the Romans took the appearance of right action during this period.¹¹⁶ Given the apparent absence of an overt Roman presence in contemporary Africa, it would be significant if such a burden were placed on free allies who had not transgressed against Roman interests, and in many cases, had actively assisted in the suppression of anti-Roman unrest.¹¹⁷

¹¹³ Chaniotis 2014, 151. See Snowden (2008, 378-391) on the sense of 'freedom' as both atavistic and innate to civic identity, even where the community may not have previously possessed it.

¹¹⁴ Dreyer 2005, 59-62; Vitale 2012, 44; already Broughton 1938, 509.

¹¹⁵ Daubner 2006, 151-152; Kirbihler 2016, 23 n. 12 contra Bernhardt 1985, 285-294. It does not follow from Metropolis' attempts to use the Roman governor in local disputes (SEG 39.1244.1.50-2.7) that it became subject almost immediately contra Dreyer 2005, 65-67; 2009, 38-41.

¹¹⁶ Generally, Drexler 1959, 97-140; Brunt 1979, 175-178; Burton 2009, 240-241, 248-252.

¹¹⁷ Gargola 2017, 331-361. Compare Macedonia (Kallet-Marx 1995, 42-96); and Cyrenaica (Daubner 2006, 51). This does not deny the existence of competing views (Santangelo 2009, 57-61).

Critically, the text proves that this minor *polis*, previously directly subject to Attalus, had already received *ἐλευθερία ex senatusconsulto* as part of a universal grant in mid-132. Preserving that freedom provided a powerful motivation for co-operating with Rome against the uprising: self-interest was a major factor in generating a coalition of *poleis* to resist the pretender. A victory for Aristonicus would mean a return to the *status quo ante bellum*, where active support for Rome would lead more easily to the retention of freedom. However, the narrative recorded here implies that the news had arrived before Aristonicus.¹¹⁸ One of the first administrative decisions taken by the Senate was to grant *ἐλευθερία en masse* to all cities formerly subject to, and taxed by, the Attalid monarchs, which should be taken to include the dependent *poleis* within the earlier kingdom.¹¹⁹

The meaning of *ἐλευθερία* in this context is complex. A.H.M. Jones argued that Rome, embodied by the Senate and its magistrates, fully appropriated the Hellenistic concept of *ἐλευθερία*: it was granted unilaterally and consisted of several elements, including, but not limited to, *αὐτονομία* (the community's right to use its own laws and customs), *ἀφορολογησία* (freedom from taxation), and being *ἀφρούρητος* (free from garrisons), any number of which might be granted individually to create a complex and individualised hierarchy of freedoms.¹²⁰ By contrast, Bernhardt argued that grants of freedom by the Roman state entailed exemption from regular Roman taxation (*immunitas*) from the

¹¹⁸ Rigsby 1979, 46-47; *pace* Jones 2004. The memory of Apameia, where Roman allies were given freedom and enemies were subjected to Eumenes II or Rhodes probably also contributed (Polyb. 21.45.1-11; Livy 38.39.7-17).

¹¹⁹ Dreyer & Engelmann 2003, 30; Marek 2010, 321.

¹²⁰ Jones 1939, 103-117. Earlier, Mommsen 1887³ 3.683.

Republic through to Late Antiquity. He dealt with clear examples in which free cities made financial contributions to the Roman state by positing a higher status of immunity (known in Greek as ἀλειτουργησία) which exempted recipients from all financial imposts including the provision of supplies and billeting from Roman troops. However, this position requires modification.

Buraselis, in an extensive critique, adduced several objections: most importantly, he cited two passages of Appian describing Roman commanders exacting money from free cities. However, both refer to contexts of political stress and commanders with immediate and pressing fiscal needs: Sulla in the aftermath of the First Mithridatic War in 85 and M. Antonius after Philippi in 41.¹²¹ These should not be taken as indicative of normal practice, especially since the earliest clear evidence of tribute-paying *civitates liberae* dates to the Principate.¹²² However, his argument that, by the Augustan period, ἀτέλεια could be celebrated by cities on autonomous coinage which already possessed freedom holds some weight, and his observation that Cicero and Pliny's use of the term *immunitas* differs heavily is also convincing.¹²³ Given that institutions are not static, it is reasonable to question whether Roman conceptions of *libertas* in the late second century, specifically, seemed to entail *immunitas*.

¹²¹ App. *BCiv.* 1.102, 5.6.

¹²² Jones (1971², 60) cites Ilium in 89, but see Bernhardt (1980, 198); Wallace (2014, 56-57). Otherwise, the earliest strong evidence is for Cos in the Augustan period (Strabo 14.2.19, with Buraselis 2000, 134-135 on freedom).

¹²³ Buraselis 2000, 136-137 n.75, drawing on Jones 1939, 103-117; Ferrary 1988, 7-9.

Recently, Dmitriev has argued strongly that the Roman conception of *libertas* and its cognates had key differences from the Hellenistic model and required a period of adjustment. In non-Greek contexts, community statuses imposed by Rome were restricted to *libera* ('free'), *foederata* ('secured by treaty') or *stipendiaria* ('tribute-paying'), implying that the former entailed *immunitas*. Dmitriev concludes that the complicating factor in the Greek East is the employment of this framework in parallel and in interaction with existing Hellenistic models without consistency over an extended period.¹²⁴ However, at least in the earliest period, unqualified ἐλευθερία should correspond with *libertas*, and therefore the complete set of Hellenistic freedoms.¹²⁵ It may be objected here that Livy describes the tribute-paying *poleis* of Macedonia as *liberae* in the aftermath of Paullus' settlement in 167.¹²⁶ However, these polities had been defeated enemies, where the communities of Asia had formed part of an allied kingdom with no record of transgression against Rome. In this sense they were more akin to the cities of Lycia, freed from Rhodian rule in 167, who did not pay tribute to Rome.¹²⁷ Consequently, ἐλευθερία, in the Apollonius decree, should translate the Latin *libertas* and include *immunitas* from Roman taxation.

Central to most accounts of the organisation of *provincia Asia* is the concept of the *lex provinciae*, supposedly passed by Aquillius after the conclusion of the Aristonican War,

¹²⁴ Dmitriev 2017, 203-207. Proculus' famous passage on *postliminium* (Dig. 49.15.7) is not relevant here – since it refers only to non-subject peoples.

¹²⁵ Note the similar argument for the correspondences between συνέδριον and *senatus* in Greece at Piérart 2013, 28-31.

¹²⁶ Liv. 45.29.4; Diod. 31.8.1. Bernhardt 1999, 58-61.

¹²⁷ Polyb. 30.5.12-16; Liv. 45.25.6. Dahlheim 1977, 255-277; Bernhardt 1980, 190-207; 1999, 55-68; Ferrary 1999, 71, n.8.

before his return to Rome in late 126.¹²⁸ This is understood as an early task of the first Roman magistrate in a new province, laying down the basic framework for administration. Often, but not always, the formulation of this statute would be facilitated by the presence of several *legati*, normally ten.¹²⁹ Where evidence exists for *leges provinciae* they cover various topics, including the framework for judicial actions between the inhabitants of diverse provincial communities, the organisation of the grain supply, both attested in Sicily, and the constitutions of local civic communities, as in Pontus-Bithynia. However, none appear to interfere with local laws, beyond constitutional arrangements.¹³⁰ Critically, the *lex provinciae*, for all its emphasis in modern scholarship, was no more than a local regulation issued by a magistrate, as a *lex data* or an *edictum*. It was not, strictly, binding on his successors, even where convention and the *auctoritas* of the *legati*, where present, strongly encouraged compliance.¹³¹ Hoyos advocates retaining the term for convenience to represent the general organisation imposed by Rome on a new territory. However, as Lintott stresses, no substantial difference existed between the establishment of a new *provincia* and a post-*bellum* settlement.¹³² Given the apparently minimalist Roman approaches to governance in Africa, Cilicia and Cyrenaica, it begs the question to assume that a single ordinance was passed.¹³³

¹²⁸ MRR 1.509.

¹²⁹ E.g. Marquardt 1881, 1.500-501; Mommsen 1887³, 2.685, 692.

¹³⁰ Sicily: Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.15-16, 90, 3.92. Pontus-Bithynia: Strabo 12.3.1; Plin. *Ep.* 10.79, 112, 114; CD. 37.20.3. Marshall 1968, 104-106; Hoyos 1973, 49-50; Coudry & Kirbihler 2010, 133-138.

¹³¹ Badian 1956, 116 n.4; Hoyos 1973, 50-53; Lintott 1993, 28-32; Yarrow 2012, 177-183.

¹³² Lintott 1981, 58-61; Freeman 1986, 254-257, *Pace* Hoyos 1973, 53.

¹³³ Africa: Gargola 2017, 331-344; Cilicia: Freeman 1986, 253-258; Cyrenaica: Oost 1963, 11-22.

Despite the importance placed on the *lex provinciae*, few hints attest to its existence in Asia. Strabo provides the clearest evidence for an identifiable *lex provinciae*: Μάνιος δ' Ἀκύλλιος ἐπελθὼν ὕπατος μετὰ δέκα πρεσβευτῶν διέταξε τὴν ἐπαρχίαν εἰς τὸ νῦν ἔτι συμφέρον **τῆς πολιτείας σχῆμα** ('Manius Aquilius, as consul, arriving with ten *legati*, organised the province to **the form of government** which even now endures').¹³⁴ However, ambiguity abounds. The phrase τῆς πολιτείας σχῆμα cannot support claims that Aquilius established institutions such as the *conventus iuridici* or provincial *koinon*.¹³⁵ Given the numerous well-attested territorial and administrative changes within the *provincia*, it presents, at best, a convenient shorthand. It may refer to the establishment of a *formula provinciae*, a catalogue of communities within the *provincia*, grouped geographically, and their privileges vis-à-vis Rome. This seems to have been a simple document, in list form, without implying that the state had firm administrative grasp on their territorial boundaries. At least one city, Aphrodisias, was not included in the *formula* during the imperial period; however, this appears to have been a privilege beyond free status. Consequently, Dalla Rosa's claim that inclusion within the *formula* subjected communities to the *imperium* and *iurisdictio* of the governor should not hold, at least for the Republican period.¹³⁶ Richardson argued that *formulae provinciarum*, as conceived by modern scholars,

¹³⁴ Strabo 14.1.38.

¹³⁵ E.g. Mommsen 1906 [1899], 68 n.1; Magie 1950, 171-173; Mitchell 1999, 22-26; Dreyer 2015, 208. On the *conventus*, generally: Robert 1949, 223-238; Burton 1975; Haensch 1997, 307-312. On the *koinon*: Deininger 1965; Vitale 2012, 60-65; Edelmann-Singer 2015, 60-71.

¹³⁶ *IAph2007* 8.33.2-3; 34.13-14. Pace Dalla Rosa 2014, 31-33. Compare Cottier et al. 2008 ad l.89, referring to communities ἔξω διοικήσεως (*extra formulam conventus?*), resembling the description of second-century Colophon as 'outside the *provincia*'.

are an imperial innovation – certainly, in Asia before 85, such a list would not have been especially informative, given the prevalence of ἐλευθερία.¹³⁷ However, this ignores the existence of some form of administrative organisation, presumably dividing the *provincia* into groups of communities, attested in the *lex de provinciis praetoriis* already in 100. This statute, in allocating a *provincia Cilicia* to a praetor, reaffirmed that the ἐπαρχεία Λυκαονία remained subject to the governor of Asia.¹³⁸ A regional structure based on groups of communities provided a basis for more complex administration, even if limited to organising assizes for Romans conducting business in the *provincia*, or deciding which regions should be assigned to which commanders. It finds a ready parallel in the *formula togatorum*, outlining the obligations of the Italian allies, and did not impinge on the freedoms granted to the *poleis*. The framework it provided, however, was critical to implementing all later changes. The most plausible interpretation takes τῆς πολιτείας σχῆμα literally as the ‘form of government’, that is, the regular, though not necessarily permanent, presence of a Roman magistrate, rather than encompassing specific acts of Aquillius.¹³⁹

Regarding the commission’s decisions, the evidence stresses the definition of territorial borders. The clarification of the extent of the new *provincia* predominates, though internal boundaries between civic territories and the former βασιλική χώρα likely held more significance from a state perspective. A significant portion of the Attalid kingdom was pared away, granted to allied rulers who helped defeat Aristonicus. The sons of Ariarathes V of

¹³⁷ Richardson 2011, 2-3.

¹³⁸ RS 12.Cnidus.3.22-27.

¹³⁹ Compare references to annual magistrates as shorthand for Roman hegemony, or the phrase *in formam provinciae redactam*. Gargola 2017, 335-341.

Cappadocia received Lycaonia and Pisidia; Mithridates V of Pontos, 'Greater Phrygia'.¹⁴⁰

However, these arrangements did not last. On Aquillius' return he was arraigned for extortion, prosecutors alleging he had accepted bribes in return for favourable arrangements. Despite his acquittal, the commission's decisions were steadily reversed. Phrygia was brought into Asia sometime after the death of Mithridates V in 123, while the *lex de provinciis praetoriis* clearly refers to Lycaonia as a constituent element of the *provincia*.¹⁴¹ Taken together this shows the wide scope afforded to the proconsul and the commission of ten *legati* from 129, but also the flexibility reserved by the Senate to alter elements of the settlement which it deemed imprudent.

Against this background, a *lex Porcia*, most likely dating to the 120s, further strengthened the identification of *provinciae* with specific geographic borders.¹⁴² Referred to in the *lex de provinciis praetoriis*, it explicitly stated that commanders were not to assemble an army, nor proceed ἐκτὸς τῆς ἐπαρχείας ('outside the *provincia*'), except when authorised by the Senate, for reasons of transit or *pro rei publicae*.¹⁴³ This injunction created a range of new offences which provincial governors could commit and, crucially, demonstrates that in precisely the period in which magistrates were first sent regularly to Asia, it became necessary for them to be aware of the territorial limits of their authority.¹⁴⁴ Crucially, the

¹⁴⁰ Nicomedes of Bithynia may have been rewarded but is seen contesting Mithridates' Phrygian possessions in 124 (Gell. NA 11.10). App. *Mith.* 57; Just. *Epit.* 37.1.2. Strabo 14.1.38; Eutrop. 4.20.

¹⁴¹ Phrygia: App. *Mith.* 11-12, 15; Just. *Epit.* 38.5.3; OGIS 436. Lycaonia: RS 12.Cnidus.3.22-41. On the date of Mithridates V's death, Ramsay 1999, 236-242. Cf. Mitchell (1999, 20), leaving the question open, while Drew-Bear (1972, 82-83); McGing (1980, 35-42) and Sherwin-White (1984, 96), prefer later dates.

¹⁴² Date: Ferrary 1998, 152-157 *contra* Lintott 1976, 81; Drogula 2011, 91-92.

¹⁴³ RS 12.Cnidus.3.3-15.

¹⁴⁴ Lintott 1981, 91-92; Drogula 2015, 281-284.

phrasing echoes that of the contemporary Colophonian decree for Menippus, discussed *infra*, though the *lex Porcia*'s concern appears to be military in nature – magistrates were not barred from visiting the territory of free cities in general. Moreover, the establishment of these limits may have been more in theory than fact: detailed knowledge of the limits of provincial territory by the Senate cannot be assumed. In Asia, which mostly bordered allied territory, the *lex Porcia* itself was largely moot. Nevertheless, it, together with other unambiguous references in the late second century to *provinciae* and ἐπαρχεῖαι in a geographic sense, demonstrates a clear trend towards spatial organisation of Roman *provinciae*.¹⁴⁵

More broadly, Ando has argued that the *lex de provinciis praetoriis* demonstrates a high level of administrative ambition by the Roman state. Not only did it establish the make-up of different *provinciae* in the eastern Mediterranean, but also extended administration and taxation to conquered regions north of Macedonia and crafted a policy against piracy in the region.¹⁴⁶ However, this ignores the document's unique and unrepresentative nature. The text, which included several overt restrictions on gubernatorial action and required senators to take an oath to uphold its provisions seems strongly associated with L. Appuleius Saturninus, and Ferrary's dating of the statute to February 100 is convincing.¹⁴⁷ That the law

¹⁴⁵ Compare: RS 2.55; 12.2.12-15, Delphi.B.20-21, 27-30, Cnidus.3.3-12, 22-27, 35-37, 4.24-33; Delphi.c.8, Cnidus.5.4, 6. Richardson 2008, 40-45, though he makes little of this. We should expect administrative documentation to run ahead of literary material in terms of day-to-day usage.

¹⁴⁶ Ando 2000, 81-82.

¹⁴⁷ Ferrary 1977, 627-628; cf. Hassall, Crawford & Reynolds 1974, 218-220; Lintott 1976, 66-69 *contra* Giovannini & Grzybek 1978, 33-47; Giovannini 2008, 96. See, already, Colin (1924, 58-96) for Saturninus' involvement.

contains several unrelated measures *per saturam* and shows concern with the efficient imposition of taxation on newly subjugated regions should be linked to his controversial agenda and specifically his need to increase state income to fund his expensive agrarian and grain measures.¹⁴⁸ This statute ran counter to the senatorial consensus, and while indicating the increasing conflict at Rome over fiscal policy in this period, cannot be taken as straightforward evidence of Roman administrative practice.

A corpus of 11 milestones bearing Aquillius' name reveals another early concern of the first Roman governor. These fall into a series of distinct groups: four clustered between Ephesus and Tralles, two near Pergamum, four in southern Phrygia, near modern Yeşilova, and one 5 km west of Side in Pamphylia.¹⁴⁹ Based on distances recorded on the stones, French and Mitchell deduced that Aquillius marked several roads from two *capita viae* during his command: Ephesus, for roads towards Pergamum, Sardis and Laodicea on the Lycus (via Tralles); and Pergamum, for the main road running east to Side, via Sardis and Laodicea.¹⁵⁰ Mitchell asserts that this reveals 'the geo-political thinking which lay behind the creation of the new province'. However, this should be framed as 'Roman presence' rather than 'province' per se. These milestones almost certainly did not line new routes. Instead they rebranded existing 'trackways', serving the additional purpose of signifying Roman

¹⁴⁸ Compare Tan 2017, 152-170, on the Gracchi.

¹⁴⁹ RRMAM 3.1-10. Compare Thonemann (2003, 95-96), who discusses an earlier Attalid distance marker (*I.Eph.* 7.2.3601) from the Cayster valley, which he terms a *dekastadion*.

¹⁵⁰ Mitchell 1999, 19-20, 24; Campanile 2003, 281-284; French 2012, 9-11 *pace* Rigsby 1988, 137-141.

hegemony.¹⁵¹ Some Attalid geographical divisions continued to be employed within the new *provincia*, giving further evidence of the limited nature of active Roman changes.¹⁵²

Aquillius and the commission left a *provincia* encompassing the western littoral of Asia Minor, stretching from the southern border of Bithynia, near Cyzicus, to the northern bank of the Maeander, and reaching inland only to the fringes of the Anatolian plateau. Given the enthusiastic participation of Carian cities in the war against Aristonicus, the region south of the Maeander, which had never been subject to the Attalid *basileis*, likely remained outside the *provincia* at this time.¹⁵³ This is equally true of cities in the northern Troad, including Cyzicus and Lampsacus, which were also independent of the Attalid kingdom.¹⁵⁴ Aquillius' *provincia* covered a restricted geographic area and his reported activities do not suggest large-scale intervention.

The frequency of Roman magistrates assigned to *provincia Asia* in the early period carries important implications for understanding the impact of Roman rule on the local communities. The text of *IPriene*² 75 preserves the names of four Roman magistrates in Asia, who were visited by a Prienean ambassador between 133 and approximately 95, the praetors C. Atinius Labeo (*pr.* 122?), L. Calpurnius Piso (*pr.* 115?), M. Plautius Hypsaeus (*pr.* 100?), and a *quaestor*, L. Licinius(?) Murena.¹⁵⁵ *Cistophori* were also minted at Ephesus under the

¹⁵¹ French 1997, 179-187. There is no evidence of paved roads until the construction of the *via Sebaste* from Perge to Lystra, after 6 CE.

¹⁵² Mileta 1990, 438-444; Dreyer 2015, 208-210 *pace* Mitchell 1999, 24-25. Cf. Hatzopoulos' argument (1996, 248-260) that Paullus' division of Macedonia into four states was based on an Antigonid model.

¹⁵³ Baronowski 1996, 241-248; Dmitriev 2005, 110-115.

¹⁵⁴ Jones 1971², 53; Dmitriev 2005, 81-82 *contra* Campanile 2003, 274. See Thornton (1999, 497-508) on Cyzicus; Ellis-Evans (Forthcoming) on Lampsacus.

¹⁵⁵ Eilers 1996, 175-182, with earlier literature; accepted by *IPriene*² 75.

authority of Atinius, uniquely in this period, though the motives are unclear.¹⁵⁶ Several other magistrates are attested in inscriptions from the Aegean islands, which have traditionally been ascribed to *provincia Asia*, including Cn. Papirius Carbo (*I.Délos* 1550.4-6; *pr.* 116?); Ser. Cornelius Lentulus (*I.Délos* 1845.1-5; *pr.* 110); Cn. Aufidius (*IG* 12.5.722.5-7; *pr.* 108?); C. Billienus (*I.Délos* 1854; *pr.* 107?); C. Rabirius (*I.Délos* 1859; *pr.* 106); C. Cluvius (*I.Délos* 1679). This list, though difficult to arrange into a narrative, provides crowded *fasti* for the first three decades of the province's existence, demonstrating consistent appointment of commanders to the region.¹⁵⁷ However, this presence seems unrelated to any military commitment. The Romans relied heavily on allied contingents in the Aristonicus incident, while resistance to Mithridates VI of Pontus in 88 was led by *poleis*, if co-ordinated by Roman magistrates.¹⁵⁸ Commanders were accompanied by small units, but it appears that the Senate trusted the system of alliances cultivated with local rulers. No Italian troops were deployed until the First Mithridatic War, implying that the regular commanders in Asia relied more on persuasion than coercive force in their administration. The early physical presence of the Roman state in *provincia Asia* was limited.

Most scholars suggest that after consolidating control in the 120s, Rome took advantage of existing Attalid taxation arrangements to increase its own state revenues. Indubitably, Roman *publicani* were active in the region soon after news of Attalus' death reached Rome. Lucilius, in a passage traditionally dated to 131, envisaged economic

¹⁵⁶ Stumpf 1991, #1; discussion, 6-13.

¹⁵⁷ *I.Priene*² 75. Ferrary 2000, 162-193.

¹⁵⁸ E.g. *I.Aph*2007 8.2, 3.

opportunities within the new *provincia*: *publicanus vero ut Asiae fiam, ut scripturarius* | *pro Lucilio, id ego nolo et uno hoc non muto omnia* ('I do not wish, in truth, to become a *publicanus* in Asia, as a collector of *scriptura* instead of Lucilius; I am not changing everything for this single thing').¹⁵⁹ Additionally, the *senatusconsultum de agro Pergameno*, usually dated to 129, refers to a dispute between the *polis* and *publicani* over civic boundaries.¹⁶⁰ Velleius also states outright that Perperna, in 130, *Asiam ... capto Aristonico, fecit tributariam* ('after capturing Aristonicus, made Asia tributary'). However, as Gargola has emphasised, the imperial author is generalising, and, in this passage incorrectly equates the creation of *provinciae* explicitly with stipendiary status.¹⁶¹

However, other evidence speaks against immediate large-scale exploitation of the region's economic resources. The unique status of *provincia Asia* in the late second century, a region primarily constituted of staunchly allied communities with no record of transgression against Rome, often passes without comment.¹⁶² As noted, the universal ἐλευθερία of the Metropolis inscription should correspond to Roman conceptions of *libertas*,

¹⁵⁹ Lucil. 650-651 (Warmington). Tibiletti 1957, 137. Kay (2014, 62-65) goes too far in labelling it a late insertion.

¹⁶⁰ RDGE 12. Though the surviving text does not preserve the full names of the consuls, one is firmly identified as [Μάνιος Ἀκ]ύλλιος (M.' Aquillius) offering two options (129 or 101). Elsewhere another magistrate [—]νιος has been identified with the second consul in 129 (C. Sempronius). However, it remains unclear whether this individual should be identified as a consul (Magie 1950, 1055-1056; Mattingly 1972, 412-423). On the balance of probabilities, an earlier date seems more likely. Rostovtzeff 1941, 811-813; Sherk 1969, 71-72; Dmitriev 2005, 75-77; Tan 2017, 158, n. 61, with literature.

¹⁶¹ Vell. 2.38.5. Gargola 2017, 341-344, compare 335-341 on Appian's use of annual magistrates as a similarly problematic shorthand.

¹⁶² E.g. Sherwin-White 1984, 93-94; Santangelo 2007, 108-111. See, now, Eckstein's discussion (2018, 237-238) of Rome's relationship with Greek communities after the Treaty of Apameia in 188.

and include immunity from Roman forms of taxation. Appian bolsters this claim having M.

Antonius state to the assembled representatives of Asia in 41:

‘Υμᾶς ἡμῖν, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες, Ἀτταλος ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑμῶν ἐν διαθήκαις ἀπέλιπε, καὶ εὐθὺς ἀμείνονες ὑμῖν ἦμεν Ἀττάλου· οὐς γὰρ ἔτελεῖτε φόρους Ἀττάλῳ, μεθήκαμεν ὑμῖν, μέχρι, δημοκόπων ἀνδρῶν καὶ παρ’ ἡμῖν γενομένων, ἐδέησε φόρων (‘You, Hellenes, Attalus, your king, left to us in his will, and immediately we were better to you than Attalus was. For those taxes (φόρος) which you were assessed by Attalus, we released you from, until when demagogues arose among us and made taxes necessary’).¹⁶³

Following Appian, Antonius claimed that among the first acts of the Roman administration of Asia was the ending of the sophisticated Attalid taxation regime. Were revenue extraction their goal, the Romans could have maintained existing structures as in Sicily.¹⁶⁴ The imposition of a new harsher system of taxation would not only cut against the accepted practice that *libertas* entailed *immunitas*, but the ideology of just treatment of provincials. In a critical passage attacking Verres’ regime in Sicily, Cicero drew a distinction between the taxes levied on communities peacefully incorporated into Roman *provinciae* and those collected from regions absorbed through conquest:

inter Siciliam ceterasque provincias, iudices, in agrorum vectigalium ratione hoc interest, quod ceteris aut impositum vectigal est certum, quod stipendiarium dicitur, ut Hispanis et plerisque Poenorum, quasi victoriae praemium ac poena belli, aut censoria locatio constituta est, ut Asiae lege Sempronia: Siciliae civitates sic in amicitiam fidemque accepimus ut eodem iure essent quo fuissent, eadem condicione populo

¹⁶³ App. BCiv. 5.4.

¹⁶⁴ Compare also Roman taxation in Macedonia, halving royal tax rates (Livy, 45.29.5). Prag 2014.

Romano parerent qua suis antea paruissent. Perpaucae Siciliae civitates sunt bello a maioribus nostris subactae ... praeterea omnis ager Siciliae civitatum decumanus est, itemque ante imperium populi Romani ipsorum Siculorum voluntate et institutis fuit... non modo eorum agris vectigal novum nullum imponderet, sed ne legem quidem venditionis decumarum neve vendundi aut tempus aut locum commutarent, ut certo tempore anni ut ibidem in Sicilia, denique ut lege Hieronica venderent ('Between Sicily and the other provinces, Judges, there is a difference in this matter of the revenue from the lands; since in some, either the imposed tribute is fixed, which is called stipendiary, as in the Spains or many of the Carthaginian regions, just as if a prize of victory or punishment for war; or it is decided through the *locatio* of the censors, as for Asia by the *lex Sempronia*: but the communities of Sicily we received into friendship and alliance so that they were under the same laws as they were before, being subject to the Roman people in the same way which they were subject to those before. Very few of the Sicilian communities were subdued by our ancestors in war ... Moreover, all the land of the Sicilian communities is subject to the *decuma*, as again it was by the will and decisions of the Sicilians themselves before the *imperium* of the Roman people...not only, did they impose no new tribute on their lands, but did not even alter the law of selling the contracts for the *decuma*, nor the time or place for selling them, so that at a fixed time of year, and again, in Sicily, in short, just as under the *lex Hieronica* they are sold'.)¹⁶⁵

While this presents a problematic narrative of Roman taxation in Sicily, the attitudes evinced by Cicero are enlightening. He states that, since most Sicilian communities were absorbed into the Roman *provincia* as free allies, they retained their privileges vis-à-vis their former rulers, the Hieronids of Syracuse. As the Sicilians already paid a tithe on agricultural produce, they retained their own system of collection.¹⁶⁶ Crucially, Cicero contrasts this right with the levy of *vectigal stipendiarium* on Africa and Spain, described *quasi victoriae*

¹⁶⁵ Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.12-14.

¹⁶⁶ Dubouloz & Pittia 2009, 101-107; Prag 2014, 168-173; Corvino 2016, 156-159.

praemium ac poena belli ('as if a prize of victory or punishment for war').¹⁶⁷ Cicero's distinction between peaceful incorporation into empire and conquest implies that popular opinion would recognise the application of correspondingly lighter or heavier tax burdens as manifestly just.¹⁶⁸ Following Ñaco del Hoyo, in Spain during this period, even these 'prizes' or 'punishments' tended to be ad hoc, situational and not centrally directed.¹⁶⁹ The Attalids levied a δεκάτη on agricultural produce, but weight of evidence suggests that, rather than continuing to collect this, the new Roman rulers actively dismantled the pre-existing system. These sources emphasise that the initial response to the riches of Asia was to minimise the potential state income from the new province.

Appian's Antonius argued that 'demagogues' made the re-introduction of taxation in Asia necessary, which, taken with Cicero's statement that the *decuma* in Asia was collected under a *lex Sempronia de provincia Asia*, has led some to argue that Roman taxation was extended to the *poleis* of the region by C. Sempronius Gracchus in 123.¹⁷⁰ The βασιλική χώρα, however, lay outside of this civic territory. Cicero implies that, in most cases, royal lands were incorporated into the *ager publicus*, whose rents were farmed by *publicani*.¹⁷¹ This royal

¹⁶⁷ On the term *stipendiarius*: Soraci 2010, 43-80, esp. 72-80; Ñaco del Hoyo 2019, 70-87. France's suggestion (2007, 176-182) that this discussion refers to all Sicilian taxes is unconvincing.

¹⁶⁸ Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.12. Yakobson 2009, 61-66; Kay 2014, 64. Compare the fragmentary speech *de rege Alexandrino* and *de lege agraria* (2.43-25) and *de imperio Gnaei Pompei passim*, all of which imply a just approach to war requires defence. This does not exclude the possibility that by 67 other provinces, e.g. Cilicia, had adopted this model.

¹⁶⁹ Ñaco del Hoyo 2007, 228-230 *contra* France 2007, 182.

¹⁷⁰ Broughton 1938, 511-512; Magie 1950, 1005-1006; Mattingly 1972, 412-423; Daubner 2006, 227-229; Kay 2014, 59-83. Even earlier: Migeotte 2014, 412-413.

¹⁷¹ Cic. *Leg. agr.* 2.50. Daubner (2006, 216-217) carefully distinguishes between the 'free cities' and the remaining land, though he does not emphasise its title. Rostovtzeff 1910, 283-285; Magie 1950, 1047-1048; Merola 2001, 183-186 *contra* Frank (1927, 148-149) and Broughton (1934, 207-208), who draw a

property was non-contiguous and included industrial concerns within otherwise civic territory. In at least one case, this situation was further complicated by the decision of a Roman magistrate to return some of this land to the custody of a temple.¹⁷² The principle that territories of free cities were, in some way, separate from the *provincia* and the authority of the Roman governor is well-established.¹⁷³ Instead, the *lex Sempronia* most probably originally regulated the collection of revenue from the former βασιλική χώρα, the non-civic land within the *provincia* which had unambiguously fallen into the purview of the Roman state. This solution explains what happened to the large royal estates and interests which lay outside the purview of the newly liberated cities and reconciles the presence of *publicani* in Asia from the outset of Roman rule with Appian's claim that royal taxation of cities was ended.

The operation of Roman taxation, however, reveals the attitudes underpinning the late second-century empire. Cicero's contextualisation of Sicilian taxation in the *Verrines* provides the best evidence for the situation in Asia. By contrast with former Carthaginian territories and Sicily, Cicero is explicit, for the *decuma* of Asia *ensoria locatio constituta est... lege Sempronia* ('was established by a *locatio* of the censors ... under the *lex Sempronia*').¹⁷⁴ This legislation must form part of C. Gracchus' program in 123/122. The precise scope of this law remains unclear though suggesting that it levied direct taxes on the hitherto free and

contrast between the treatment of royal estates and 'crown-lands' which is not borne out by the evidence.

¹⁷² Strabo 14.1.28.

¹⁷³ E.g. SEG 39.1244.2.1-7, with Ferrary 1991, 574-577 – see discussion pp.50-54.

¹⁷⁴ Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.12.

immune *poleis* of Asia, given the controversy of Gracchus' fiscal proposals at Rome, is difficult to fathom. However, nothing speaks against the *lex Sempronia* regulating the collection of rents from the former βασιλική χώρα, now *ager publicus*.¹⁷⁵ In this passage, Cicero draws a distinction between the provinces only based on the methods of assessment and collection. Rather than introducing a new charge, Gracchus' intent may have been to enshrine in law a precise method of collection.

The concept of *ager privatus vectigalisque*, mentioned in the *lex agraria* of 111, offers an elegant possibility. According to Roselaar, this statute rendered *ager publicus* in Africa private property, on the payment of a *vectigal*, likely in practice a tithe (*decuma*) – thereby alienating it from state control, while retaining for the state the former income.¹⁷⁶ The effect of parcelling out the former βασιλική χώρα as *ager privatus vectigalisque* would be to guarantee revenue from these lands in the longer-term, allowing it to offset ongoing spending measures, such as those in Gracchus' legislative programme. I propose that the *lex Sempronia* gave the *ager publicus* in Asia this status, assigning it to existing tenants as a private concern, complicating future attempts to appropriate this land for other uses which could deprive the state of the necessary revenues to support Gracchus' programme.

This argument also explains the apparent absence of *ager publicus* in Asia in 63, when the tribune P. Servilius Rullus attempted to appropriate large swathes of public land in the Roman East for his *lex agraria*. Cicero lists the lands Rullus sought to seize, including the *regii*

¹⁷⁵ App. *BCiv.* 1.7. Roselaar 2010, 90-93.

¹⁷⁶ RS 2.48-49, 63-66. Compare Festus 516.14-16L. Rathbone 2003, 152-154; Roselaar 2010, 233-236. On this concept: Mommsen 1905 [1862], 127-128; De Martino 1956, 557-579; Lintott 1992, 257; De Ligt 2007, 89-94.

agri, i.e. βασιλική χώρα, of the Macedonian kings Philip V and Perseus, the Bithynian rulers, Mithridates VI of Pontus and Ptolemy Apion in Cyrenaica. The only Attalid lands mentioned are those in the (Thracian) Chersonesus, outside of *provincia Asia*.¹⁷⁷ Given the exhaustive scope of Rullus' appropriation of available land, it is implausible to suggest that he would have passed the former Attalid possessions in Asia over: consequently, their absence must be accounted for.¹⁷⁸ One solution sees them alienated from the *ager publicus* at an early date, but few plausible candidates for effecting this exist: tribunes of the *plebs* tended to focus on lands in Italy to settle colonists, while the mass alienation of the only state revenue-producing lands in Asia cuts against the interests of a typical tribune. Aquilius presents the most likely alternative, considering the ongoing contest over the fiscal policy at Rome in this period. Plausibly some former royal land was allocated to communities as a reward, as the case of the lakes at Selinousia indicates, but the large-scale divestment of all royal property was unprecedented and radical.¹⁷⁹

I further suggest that the legislation also regulated the means by which the *vectigal*, the *decuma* from *provincia Asia* was to be collected: that is, by a single *societas publicanorum*.¹⁸⁰ The fragmented nature of the territory to be regulated lent itself to exploitation by tax-farmers.¹⁸¹ By insisting on the method of *ensoria locatio*, C. Gracchus benefitted from

¹⁷⁷ Cic. *Leg. agr.* 2.50-51. Compare 1.5-6.

¹⁷⁸ *Contra* Magie 1950, 1047-1048.

¹⁷⁹ Strabo 14.1.26.

¹⁸⁰ Comparative evidence demonstrates that taxes were auctioned as single concerns within specific *provinciae*: compare the situation in Sicily in the 70s (Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.171); Asia and Bithynia in the 50s (Cic. *Fam.* 13.9, 65, with Cotton 1986; *Att.* 11.10.1). Broughton 1938, 511; Badian 1972a, 106-107; Cotton 1986, 367-373; Nicolet 2000 [1979], 301-303; Daubner 2006, 226-227; Poitras & Geranio 2016, 103-104.

¹⁸¹ Tan 2017, 42-44.

immediate payment of a proportion of the contracted amount, allowing immediate return to the treasury and ensuring the swifter realisation of his policy goals.¹⁸² The *lex Sempronia* while reorganising the collection of the *decuma* in Asia to favour C. Gracchus' goals, did not impose new and unprecedented dues upon the free cities of Asia.

The flexibility of Republican taxation statutes further supports this view: for example, the *lex portorii Asiae* generally had recourse to indefinite pronouns with verbs of obligation (e.g. ἐν οἷς τόποις κατὰ δόγμα συγκλήτου ἢ κατὰ νόμον | [ἢ κατὰ δήμου κύρωσιν δεῖ τειμευτὴν ἢ ὕπ]ατον [τ]ελωνείαν ἐκμισθῶσαι 'in whatever places by decree of the Senate or *lex* or *plebiscitum*, it is necessary for the censor or consul to lease out the *portorium*'). This, alongside copious reference to current *leges locationis*, left the annual or quinquennial administration of the legislation overwhelmingly to the magistrates in office.¹⁸³ The most likely formulation of the *lex Sempronia*, like near contemporary examples such as the *lex portorii Asiae*, laid out the basic conditions and geographic applicability of the law, before leaving its specific administration to each iteration of magistrates. Consequently, as I discuss *infra*, the new 'subjection' of many cities in Asia after 85, would make it 'appropriate' for the *decuma*, and likely the *scriptura*, of their territories to be included by magistrates in the text of the *locatio*. This is critical as changes in administrative status of land and the decisions of

¹⁸² *ILLRP* 518; Cic. *Planc.* 136; *Att.* 1.17.9. Badian 1972a, 75-78; Kay 2014, 77-82. Given the complex ecosystem of finance and exchange around public contracts, up-front payment through loans would not have been difficult to achieve and would broaden the appeal of this legislation to the elite writ large. See Polyb. 6.17. Nicolet 1966, 326-339.

¹⁸³ Cottier et al. 2008 ll.9-11, also, 28-29, 32-34, 40, 42-45, 48-50, 56, 69-71, 72-78. Cf. the *lex agraria* of 111 (RS 2.85-90), with Lintott 1992, 272-275. Spagnuolo Vigorita 1997, 157-158.

magistrates on the ground could have a significant impact even in the absence of legislative change.

This administrative system still allowed pervasive corruption and profiteering. The *publicani* had an interest in maximising their own profits. However, their leverage was limited: their actions were resisted by commanders (e.g. Q. Mucius Scaevola in c. 99-97)¹⁸⁴, and more commonly by the Senate.¹⁸⁵ Though equestrian control of the *repetundae* courts put pressure on magistrates, as shown by the well-attested conviction of the famously upright P. Rutilius Rufus, Scaevola's *legatus* in the 90s, this did not effectively translate into leverage over the Senate as a body.¹⁸⁶ Taken together, the evidence would suggest that the initial organisation of *provincia Asia* was unconcerned with public, or indeed private, profits at a state level.

Beyond his *imperium*, a Roman magistrate also possessed *iurisdictio*, the right to oversee judicial proceedings involving Roman citizens or subjects.¹⁸⁷ Indeed, writing in the late 60s, Cicero noted that, in his opinion: *non sane magna varietas esse negotiorum in administranda Asia, sed ea tota iuris dictione maxime sustineri* ('there is not really a great variety of business in the governing of Asia, but this whole province depends greatly on the

¹⁸⁴ Diod. Sic. 37.6; Cic. *Planc.* 33; *Att.* 5.17.5; 6.1.15; *Fam.* 1.9.26; Livy, *Per.* 70.8; Val. Max. 8.15.6. Badian 1972a, 89-92; Ferriès & Delrieux 2011, 207-230; Ferrary 2018, 11-21. On the date of Scaevola's command: Ferrary 2012, 157-179 with full literature nn.1-8) *contra* Badian 1956, 104-125.

¹⁸⁵ E.g. *RDGE* 12; *I.Priene*² 67.14, 21, 134-149.

¹⁸⁶ Badian 1972a, 90-92, with references. Kallet-Marx (1990, 123-126) highlights the prominence of Rutilius himself in crafting this tradition and the close ties between Cicero, a major source, and Scaevola. The role of the *publicani* in orchestrating the trial is incontestable, however. On the courts: Sherwin-White 1982, 18-31; Davenport 2019, 75-93.

¹⁸⁷ Summaries at Mommsen 1887³, 1.116-161; Lintott 1993, 54-59, 65-69.

administration of justice').¹⁸⁸ In the earliest days of the Roman *provincia*, however, the exercise of this power was complicated by the general prevalence of civic ἐλευθερία. Two honorific decrees at Claros, published in 1989, overturned the consensus on Roman practices of power by providing unequivocal evidence for extensive privileges granted to the *polis* of Colophon. The texts, for Polemaeus and Menippus, emphasise the complexity of local realities and their impact on Roman judicial practice. Both men undertook multiple embassies to Rome and Roman officials in the course of lengthy careers, spanning the latter half of the second century, i.e. the transitional period from Attalid possession to Roman protectorate.¹⁸⁹

Polemaeus journeyed to the Roman praetor on two occasions. First, when a Colophonian citizen had been condemned Ῥωμ(α)ϊκῷ κριτηρίῳ ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχείᾳ ('by a Roman judgement in the *provincia*'), he succeeded in overturning the decision. The text uses stark rhetoric to diminish the agency of the magistrate, claiming that the ambassador τὸ <v> γένομενον ἄκυ|ρον ἐποίησεν ('made him [sc. the commander] powerless').¹⁹⁰ Though, in practice, this need not mean more than reminding him of the community's free status, dramatic language was a feature of decrees during this period. Later, Polemaeus persuaded a Roman commander against issuing a πρόσταγμα (sc. *edictum*) which would have

¹⁸⁸ Cic. QFr. 1.1.20.

¹⁸⁹ SEG 39.1243-1244. Robert & Robert 1989, 17-18; Rigsby 2005, 112-115. Given that Menippus was active in the Aristonican war (SEG 39.1244.2.7-8, 33), his embassies date to the late second century; consequently, the Q. Mucius Scaevola appearing in the text (2.42-46) is more likely 'the Augur', governing c. 120/119, than his descendant, who governed c. 99-97. Robert & Robert 1989, 98-99; Ferrary 1991, 557-558; Lehmann 2000, 223-224 *contra* Canali De Rossi 1991, 646-648; Eilers 2002, 127.

¹⁹⁰ SEG 39.1243.2.51-58.

compromised Colophon's legal autonomy: *πάλιν | τε προστάγματος ἐνεχθέντος | ἐναντίου τοῖς νόμοις κατά τι|νων, ἐπελθὼν ἔπεισε τοὺς | ἡγουμένους ὡς δεῖ τὰ κριτήρια [—?]* ('once again, when an edict was passed contrary to the laws, against certain men [sc. Colophonian citizens], going forth, he persuaded the hegemony that it was necessary to [reverse?] the judgements').¹⁹¹ In any case, these examples highlight the extent to which local elites were prepared to challenge robustly Roman decision-making during this formative period, both verbally and in official pronouncements aimed at a Greek audience.

The career of Polemaeus' fellow-citizen, Menippus, underscores the tension between Roman and local jurisdiction. He embarked on five embassies to Rome, of which the final two hold particular significance for legal issues. The fourth dealt with governors taking on cases which pertained to local issues and demanding surety from Colophonian citizens; the fifth with an accusation levelled against the city before the consuls, and the arraignment of a Colophonian on a capital charge in Rome.¹⁹² As his honorific inscription makes clear, his diplomatic skill had extensive repercussions:

τοὺς δὲ κατοικοῦντας τὴν πόλιν ἡλευθέρωσε κατεγγυήσεων | καὶ στρατηγικῆς ἐξουσίας, τῆς ἐπαρχείας ἀπὸ τῆς | αὐτονομίας χωρισθείσης· κυρίου δὲ τοὺς νόμους | τετήρηκεν ἐπὶ παντὸς ἐγκλήματος καὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς | Ῥωμαίους, τῆς συγκλήτου δεδογματικείας καὶ τὸν | ἀδικοῦντα καὶ τὸν ἐγκαλοῦντά τινα τῶν

¹⁹¹ SEG 39.1243.2.58-62. Compare Menodorus' *παρησία* with M.' Aquillius: SEG 50.1211.20.

¹⁹² SEG 39.1244.1.23-31. The clause *ἐπὶ Ῥωμαϊκῷ θανάτῳ* historically provoked much controversy. The Roberts (1989, 87) saw this straightforwardly as referring to the murder of a Roman citizen, but Ferrary (1991, 568) objected that the previous embassy established the primacy of local law in all cases. An increasingly popular explanation, first proposed by Lehmann (1998, 162-168; 2000, 234-238; accepted by Sánchez (2010, 41-60), Hamon (2011, *BÉ* #509); Laffi (2010, 15-18) and Ferrary (2017*, 180)), is that this refers to 'execution in the Roman style' (i.e. flogging and decapitation). In either case, a discrepancy existed between Roman and Colophonian expectations of the legal process.

ἡμε|τέρων πολιτῶν Ῥωμαῖον κρίνεσθαι παρ' ἡμῖν, τόν | τε κατηγιαμένον πολίτην ἐπὶ Ῥωμαϊκῷ θανάτῳ | καὶ μετάπεμπτον γενόμενον πρὸς ἔγκλημα κεφαλ|κὸν καὶ κριτηρίῳ παραδιδόμενον ἅμα τῇ πόλει μετὰ | τῶν νόμων ἀνασέσωκεν ('The inhabitants of the city, he freed from judicial summons and the power of the commander; he separated the province from the *autonomia*. He protected the authority of the laws over all accusations, and even those from the Romans, when the Senate decreed that a Roman, whether committing a crime or bringing an accusation against one of our citizens should be judged among us, and he saved the citizen, who was accused of a crime with a Roman punishment and summoned on a capital charge, and should submit to judgement in the city in accordance with the laws').¹⁹³

These events reinforce the sense that Roman magistrates lacked detailed knowledge regarding the rights of ἐλεύθεραι *poleis* in Asia and did not show much diligence in following them up. Given the Apollonius decree implies that the initial senatorial grant referred only to ἐλευθερία without further definition, this is understandable.¹⁹⁴ In this case, the city had already received clarification on its local juridical primacy. Yet still Menippus' fifth embassy was necessary. Crucially, the rights of Colophon secured by their ambassador, as viewed by the community, 'freed the residents of the city' from the power of the governor and provincial courts including in cases when Romans were the plaintiff or defendant. This extends far beyond the rights enjoyed by contemporary Sicilian communities.¹⁹⁵ Even more striking, when, it seems, a governor had been asked by the Metropolitans to intervene in a dispute with Colophon, Menippus travelled to Rome and returned with a *senatusconsultum* stating in no uncertain terms that: διότι τῆς ἐπαρχείας ἐκτὸς οὔτε κρίνειν οὔτε

¹⁹³ SEG 39.1244.137-48.

¹⁹⁴ Kallet-Marx 1995, 115-117; Boffo 2003, 231-235; Fournier 2010, 431. See Czajkowski's comments (2019, 115) on the likelihood that Roman officials did not behave differently in different *provinciae*.

¹⁹⁵ Kantor 2010, 194-199.

πολυπραγμονεῖν τῷ στρατηγῷ καθήκει ('it is not appropriate for the governor to judge or to interfere outside of the province').¹⁹⁶ This statement reasserts the basic principle that the city of Colophon lay outside the purview of Roman magistrates in *provincia Asia*.

The point at issue is the propensity of Roman commanders to exercise their own *iurisdictio* and disregard local laws. The decision of the Roman Senate to confirm the right of residents to a trial at Colophon under local law in cases involving Roman citizens is critical here. This corresponds to rights agreed through treaties between *poleis* in Asia Minor, including that between Sardis and Ephesus, brokered by Q. Mucius Scaevola.¹⁹⁷ Moreover, the text states that the Romans affirmed a principle that the *polis* was distinct from and external to the *provincia*.¹⁹⁸ This reinforces the view that the Senate initially respected the independence and territorial integrity of local communities in Asia. In this context specifically, however, the judicial ramifications of this decision become clear. If communities stood outside of the purview of the Roman administration, then, Roman magistrates held no legitimate jurisdiction over their citizens in intra-civic disputes.¹⁹⁹ Pace Fournier, who argues that these privileges were exceptional to Colophon, this was the logical consequence of Roman respect for the political ἐλευθερία confirmed by the Senate

¹⁹⁶ SEG 39.1244.2.5.

¹⁹⁷ Ager 1996, 501-502; Laffi 2010, 19-24, from *I.Priene*² 8.6-11 & Laffi 2010a D/E.2-8.

¹⁹⁸ SEG 39.1244.1.38-39.

¹⁹⁹ Compare the clause from a *senatusconsultum* of 60, later included in the *lex Iulia de repetundis*, explicitly forbidding governors from exercising their *iurisdictio* in matters of debts contracted by free cities to Roman moneylenders (Cic. *Prov. cons.* 6-7, 57; *Att.* 1.19.9, 2.1.10. Morrell 2017, 148-151). These empire-wide acts established the principle for communities, e.g. in Sicily, beyond those which already enjoyed the use of their own law in disputes with Romans.

after 133: a free city stood beyond the *imperium* and *iurisdictio* of a Roman commander.²⁰⁰

However, the potential benefits of imposing Roman jurisdiction offered clear incentives to contest civic status. The collection of *vadimonium* (ἐγγύας) from individuals could be lucrative and effective means for locals to hold magistrates to account were lacking.²⁰¹ Powerful incentives also existed for Roman citizens at law to encourage gubernatorial intervention or at least the application of Roman law in their cases. Similarly, the *publicani* had the direct motivation of greater profits encouraging them to roll back or ignore the boundaries of the civic territories.²⁰² While most *poleis* would already *stricto sensu* have possessed the right to use their own laws, the epigraphic evidence highlights the contested nature of that judicial autonomy.

Scaevola's governorship in the early 90s offers another view of this exchange. The sources uniformly present him as an *exemplum* of virtuous government. Two especially praiseworthy qualities were his non-interference in the judicial affairs of the *poleis* and his defence of the populace of Asia against abuses perpetrated by the *publicani*. The most complete source is Diodorus Siculus, who may have drawn on the work of Posidonius of Apamea, a contemporary resident of Asia.²⁰³ He emphasises that Scaevola's conduct was notable for its strict application of the law: he dismissed false accusations, appointed honest judges and both issued and exacted the correct penalty, even in capital cases. He also

²⁰⁰ Laffi 2010, 31-32; *pace* Fournier 2010, 429-430. Boffo 2003, 238-247; Dmitriev 2017, 203-206 *contra* Guerber (2010, 451-453) who believes a specific treaty was necessary. Though note the incident with Scaurus *infra*.

²⁰¹ Ferrary 1999, 78-82.

²⁰² Czajkowski 2019, 121-122.

²⁰³ Kallet-Marx 1995, 143.

ensured that the rights of *poleis* to use their own laws were respected, a trait echoed by Cicero in 51/50, if with a degree of scorn.²⁰⁴ In this, Scaevola appears exceptional, as his reception by later authors demonstrates.²⁰⁵

The internal dynamics of Roman elite society further contributed to this conflict: the power of an individual commander within his *provincia* was substantial but choosing to oppose wealthy and influential *negotiatores* or *publicani* could bring dire consequences.²⁰⁶ Famously, Scaevola and his staff faced bitter recriminations on their return to Rome, with his *legatus*, P. Rutilius Rufus charged with extortion and sent into exile.²⁰⁷ The concern for balancing justice for allies and self-preservation was a live issue throughout the period and will be returned to below. The Senate as a collective body was less subject to the pressures than individual commanders: as an institution representing the collective will of the former magistrates, its utterances demanded respect. It is, in this sense, unsurprising that so many commanders took refuge in referring cases of allied discontent back to the Senate.

Even so, commanders on the ground could act on their own initiative. Five fragments, discovered at Pergamum, produced two near-identical letters from Scaevola himself, described as ἀνθύπατος Ῥωμαίων, to two cities, and a treaty between the cities of Ephesus and Sardis.²⁰⁸ The letters focused on a dispute between the two *poleis* which had disrupted the planned institution of new penteteric games in the governor's honour.²⁰⁹ Scaevola writes

²⁰⁴ Cic. *Att.* 6.1.15

²⁰⁵ Ferrière & Delrieux, 2011, 218-219.

²⁰⁶ Meier 1966, 82-86; Davenport 2019, 84-93.

²⁰⁷ See n.186 *supra*.

²⁰⁸ Laffi 2010a, for previous editions, 15; Ferrière & Delrieux 2011, 218-219 *contra* Rigsby 1988, 141-142.

²⁰⁹ For the Σωτήρια καὶ Μουκιεῖα, see Rigsby 1988, 145-149; Thériault 2011, 377-380.

that he had been told that both Ephesus and Sardis had withdrawn from the planned celebration as a result.²¹⁰ The commander sent an *amicus*, an Athenian, to persuade the two cities to come to an agreement, and the treaty appears to have been the result.²¹¹ The clauses regulating judicial relations between the two cities are significant insofar as they underscore the point that Roman (pro)magistrates would not normally be expected to intervene in cases of a local character. This further highlights Kantor's point that, in this period, inter-community lawsuits were governed by existing inter-civic agreements, rather than mediated through Roman courts.²¹² Instead, the treaty between Sardis and Ephesus should be taken as evidence for the continued vibrancy of inter-civic judicial relations, even if with the mediation of Roman officials.²¹³

A final example emerges from Cicero's prosecution of Verres, in which he recounts an incident involving the *quaestor* M. Aurelius Scaurus and the city of Ephesus, most likely in the mid-90s:²¹⁴

nuper M. Aurelio Scauro postulante, quod is Ephesi se quaestorem vi prohibitum esse dicebat quo minus e fano Dianae servum suum, qui in illud asylum confugisset, abduceret, Pericles Ephesius, homo nobilissimus, Romam evocatus est, quod auctor illius iniuriae fuisse arguebatur. ('Recently, when M. Aurelius Scaurus demanded it, because he said that as *quaestor* at Ephesus he was prevented by force from retrieving his slave from the temple of Artemis, where he had fled for asylum,

²¹⁰ Laffi 2010a 2.A+B.1-8.

²¹¹ Laffi 2010a 2.C.1-14. Ager 1996, 501.

²¹² Kantor 2010, 195-196.

²¹³ Scaevola perhaps had input, but the treaty was more likely mediated by Pergamum without significant interference. The outcome, not the process, held most importance (*pace* Laffi 2010a, 113-114).

²¹⁴ Sumner 1973, 79-82; Badian 1984a, 298-301 (cf. 1964, 86-87).

Pericles the Ephesian, a most noble man was summoned to Rome, since he was accused of being the author of that injury’).²¹⁵

Crucially, Cicero here contrasts the ‘appropriate’ severity of Scaurus in defending the dignity of his magistracy with Verres’ failure to prosecute the ringleaders of a riot in Lampsacus.²¹⁶ Pericles may even have been charged formally, before Ephesus became officially subject to the *iurisdictio* of the commander; while the Colophon inscriptions demonstrate the willingness of the Senate to intervene, they show that magistrates had fewer qualms. Cicero does not adduce any punishment for Pericles, however, and a diplomatic intervention, like that of Menippus, may have saved him from further consequences.²¹⁷

Though the Roberts correctly emphasised the critical role of persuasion in both Colophonian cases, it does not follow that the Roman state had firmly asserted its authority over local jurisdiction.²¹⁸ Instead, the regularity with which the two Colophonians achieved success suggests that legal autonomy was the norm. The shift in significance between embassies to commanders, undertaken by Polemaeus, and embassies to the Senate, as pursued regularly by Menippus, points towards a burgeoning understanding of the Roman institutional hierarchy and its limiting factors. Given that magistrates tended to have limited exposure to provincial administration and Asia itself, any given governor could fail

²¹⁵ Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.85.

²¹⁶ Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.63-85. Steel 2004, 233-251.

²¹⁷ Ferrary’s characterisation (1991, 573) of this incident as evidence of ‘un net déclin de l’autonomie des cités libres’ is uncertain; compare Laffi 2010, 36-40. Compare Timotheus of Dyme: SEG 45.417.24-27. Kallet-Marx 1995a, 140.

²¹⁸ Robert & Robert 1989, 39. Compare *I.Priene*² 67.117, 139-142.

to appreciate the unique jurisdictional arrangements of the *provincia*. While an individual commander might agree to respect Colophon's freedoms, his successor could, through ignorance, choose not to.²¹⁹

Based on the evidence, the substance of Roman administration between 133 and 89 remained, theoretically, limited. Civic communities escaped taxation, although the former βασιλική χώρα continued to be exploited as *ager publicus* by the state. Though the *publicani* did attempt to rezone parts of civic territory and assets for taxation, the Senate seems to have taken objections seriously. From a judicial perspective, similar principles applied. Civic jurisdiction over cases involving local citizens, as aggressively asserted by Menippus of Colophon, was contested by individual Romans and governors alike. However, again, the Senate appears to have respected local claims. The grant of ἐλευθερία to the communities of the former Attalid kingdom had significance in the Roman state consciousness, but simultaneously created an unusual and confusing legal environment for governors to negotiate. Internal pressures, from *publicani* and other interested Romans, pushed commanders to favour their own countrymen, but the resulting administration in this period was not extensive or especially intrusive.

²¹⁹ The interests of *publicani* and the Roman diaspora provided a pull factor. Lintott 1993, 44-45; Kallet-Marx 1995, 115-117; Boffo 2003, 231-235 contra Corvino 2016, 161-163. Rigsby's solution (2005, 112-115) is unnecessarily elaborate.

1.2: Fear and Loathing in Late Republican Asia

In 89 the Roman presence in western Asia was abruptly challenged. Goaded by the collusion of Roman officials with his enemy, Nicomedes III of Bithynia, Mithridates VI Eupator invaded the province in force.²²⁰ Brushing aside poorly organised resistance, Mithridates drove Roman officials out of Asia entirely. In the absence of a Roman military presence, most *poleis* co-operated with his demands. Shortly afterwards, Mithridates ordered the massacre of Romans and Italians remaining in western Asia Minor: again, many communities followed this command resulting in allegedly 80,000 deaths.²²¹ Traditionally, scholars have explained the collaboration in terms of Roman brutality.²²² However, as I have argued, the abuses of governors and the *publicani*, though real, were limited in the period before the so-called ‘Asian Vespers’. Without minimising the trauma experienced by individuals and communities the weight of abuses fell disproportionately outside the *poleis*. Instead, Bernhardt rightly emphasises the importance of the immediate circumstances to the cities’ decisions. One decree passed at Ephesus in late 86 or early 85, in a bold attempt to rewrite recent history, claimed that Mithridates ἐκράτησεν (‘conquered’) the city, [τῷ] τε πλήθει τῶν δυνάμεων καὶ τῷ ἀπροδοκίῳ τῆς ἐπιβολῆς ... (‘through the vastness of his [Mithridates’] forces and the suddenness of his attack’).²²³ Even within Mithridatising communities, significant pockets of opposition existed. Several cities would revolt swiftly,

²²⁰ Sherwin-White 1984, 112-120, with references.

²²¹ Cic. *Imp. Pomp.* 7; App. *Mith.* 21-22; Memnon *FGrH* 434 F22.9; Vell. Pat. 2.18.2; Plut. *Sull.* 24.4; Val. Max. 9.2.ext.3.

²²² Magie 1950, 176; Bowersock 1965, 1; Amiotti 1980, 132-139; Thornton 1998, 271-290.

²²³ *I.Eph.* 8.7-8. Amiotti 1980, 133; Bernhardt 1985, 33-64; Kallet-Marx 1995, 153-158, 284-285; Buraselis 2000, 122-123.

when the opportunity arose.²²⁴ Given the swift evaporation of resistance and the overwhelming force of Mithridates, it was far from clear that Roman hegemony would be re-established in Asia.

After four years of conflict, L. Cornelius Sulla achieved strategic success, despite civil war breaking out with his opponents in Rome. Eager to confront his antagonists, he concluded an agreement with Mithridates at Dardanus in 85, returning the geo-political situation to the *status quo ante bellum* in exchange for the payment of an indemnity and the loan of a fleet. This restored Macedonia, Greece and Asia to Roman hegemony and re-established the allied rulers of Bithynia and Cappadocia, whom Mithridates had deposed. Plutarch emphasises the restiveness of Sulla's troops, partly due to Mithridates' lenient treatment, partly the Pontic ruler's retention of the spoils of Asia. The sources stress that Sulla's compact with Mithridates aimed at acquiring resources for his return to Italy.²²⁵ Irrespective of whether either party viewed the arrangement as temporary, it offered Sulla, in the short-term, space to organise his Italian campaign.²²⁶

After Dardanus, Sulla, though still beset by civil war, had the opportunity to reinvent fundamentally the administration of Roman Asia. The collaboration of most *poleis* with Mithridates made the recovery of the region by Roman arms almost a conquest and afforded

²²⁴ Note the presence of pro-Roman individuals and groups within Asia from 88-85, including Chaeremon of Nysa (*RDGE* 48; *RC* 73b-74) and Pyrrha[kos] of Alabanda (*SEG* 60.1073). McGing 1986, 108-118; Marek 1988, 294-302; Campanile 1996, 146-173; Buraselis 2000, 15-18 on Cos; Niebergall 2011, 7-20; 2011a, 67-70.

²²⁵ Memnon *FGrH* 424 25.2-26.4; App. *Mith.* 56-58; Vell. Pat. 2.23.6; Plut. *Sull.* 22.1-24.4. Cf. Livy, *Per.* 83.7; Strabo 13.1.28. Critically, the agreement was never ratified by the Senate: Glew 1981, 109-130.

²²⁶ E.g. Kallet-Marx (1995, 262-265) infers that Sulla did not insist on Mithridates' compliance with all aspects of the agreement.

the proconsul a free hand in dealing with many individual communities. Late that year, Sulla summoned civic representatives to Ephesus and took three major decisions, one political and two financial. First, some named *poleis* were to be ‘free’: the logical corollary, most cities were not.²²⁷ This had an immediate symbolic effect and encapsulated the shift in power-dynamics – Sulla could not allow the *poleis* to go unpunished, irrespective of his own fragile position, with a chastened but undefeated Mithridates on the horizon, a disaffected army and opponents in Rome mobilising forces against him. The incorporation of southern Caria and the Troad into *provincia Asia* should be dated to this period, after some *poleis*, notably Caunus, collaborated with Mithridates.²²⁸ Second, he imposed an extra-ordinary exaction, equivalent to five-years of tribute and his war-expenses on the subject cities, which Plutarch calculates at 20,000 talents.²²⁹ Finally, he despatched troops to the cities to collect the money, with instructions that they should be billeted at local expense and paid a hefty allowance of

²²⁷ Appian (*Mith.* 61) names Rhodes and Lycia (both outside the province), Chios, Ilium and ‘Magnesia’, adding ‘some others’; epigraphic evidence confirms Carian Stratonicea, Tabae, Alabanda, Aphrodisias and Astypalaea; and Cicero’s *Verrines* implies strongly that Lampsacus was free (*Verr.* 2.1.81). Santangelo (2006, 133-134) and Kinns (2006, 41-48) both identify Appian’s Magnesia as Magnesia-on-the-Sipylos (Livy, *Per.* 81.2). Strabo may imply Cyzicus retained its freedom even before its heroics during the Third Mithridatic War (12.8.11, with Heller 2006, 71-76). Santangelo discusses Byzantium, Sardis, Halicarnassus, Apollonis and Smyrna as possibilities, while Buraselis (2000, 17-20 with *I.Cos* 229.7-9) adds Cos. Finally, Guerber (1995, 409 n.60) suggests that *I.Eph.* 1201-1202 could indicate that it retained its freedom or, more likely, had it restored before the end of the first century BCE. See Jones (1971², 62-64), and table of Santangelo (2007, 122-123) with references.

²²⁸ Marek 1988, 302-308; Dmitriev 2005, 103-106; Vitale 2012, 84-85.

²²⁹ Plut. *Sull.* 25.2; *Luc.* 4.1; App. *Mith.* 62. Böttcher 1915, 56-62; Broughton 1938, 561; Santangelo 2007, 114. It should be noted here that there is no necessary requirement that the ‘tribute’ (φóρος) pre-dated this period, especially considering the new *discriptio* upon which this was based (Cassiod. *Chron.* p. 130 (Mommson); Cic. *Flacc.* 32, *QFr.* 1.1.33. Merola 2001, 108-109, 177-179).

4 tetradrachms *per diem* and other benefits; *tribuni militum* received 50 drachms.²³⁰ The outrageous allowance for his troops served twin purposes of assuaging their desire for plunder while incentivising swift collection on the part of the *poleis*.²³¹ Both the fine and the soldiers' allowance were tied to his immediate military needs and were an ad hoc response to his particular circumstances. After three years of warfare with no support from Rome and about to embark on a potentially protracted civil war, Sulla needed his troops' loyalty and a war-chest, especially given his reluctance to forage in Italy.²³² With the absence of earlier systemic exploitation, the explanation that Sulla sought to re-establish Rome's revenues holds little water.²³³ While his opponents held Rome, the orderly extraction of taxes was irrelevant: he needed cash on hand. State-level fiscal considerations were almost certainly not germane to his decisions: political and military exigencies explain Sulla's attested policies perfectly well.

However, some evidence hints at a political project to streamline government in Asia. Though Giovannini has disproved persistent suggestions that Sulla, as dictator, promulgated a *lex Cornelia de provinciis* aimed at reforming provincial government across the empire, references to *leges Corneliae* in Asia continue to be linked to his actions.²³⁴ Specifically, Santangelo suggests they derive from a *lex* or *leges datae* issued at, or shortly after, the

²³⁰ Plut. *Sull.* 25.2. Magie (1950, 1115) and Kallet-Marx (1995, 266-267) rightly highlight that the demands were unusually high. Note further Sallust's claim that Sulla's troops were corrupted by the wealth of Asia (*Hist.* 1.13; *Cat.* 11.5-6). Cf. Mastrocinque 1999, 91; Santangelo 2007, 108, 113.

²³¹ See: Keaveney 2005, 297-298.

²³² Plut. *Sull.* 27.3. Zoumbaki 2018, 354-357.

²³³ E.g. Santangelo 2007, 112; Dreyer 2015, 209-210.

²³⁴ Giovannini 1983, 75-101, with references to Mommsen's original argument in favour of the suggestion (1887³, 94-97). More recent discussion: Santangelo 2007, 117-118, with nn.42-45; Coudry & Kirbihler 2010, 138-169.

council at Ephesus. The *lex Valeria* of 82, retroactively recognising the validity of Sulla's *acta*, placed these decisions on a firmer footing.²³⁵ Three references may pertain to Sullan provincial legislation. In 9/8, when the provincial calendar was reorientated around Augustus' birthdate, the *koinon* of Asia decreed that local elections should continue to take place within the first ten days of the tenth month, under the terms of a *lex Cornelia*.²³⁶ However, this rule could be ascribed to other Cornelii who governed Asia. In fact, the concern with standardising local political calendars fits more neatly into an Augustan context, as I will argue *infra*, suggesting P. Cornelius Scipio, governor in c. 12-10 as a potential author.²³⁷ At Thyatira, a *lex Cornelia* regulating a διάταξις is cited, though the context leaves the precise meaning unclear.²³⁸ Finally, Cicero, while governor in Cilicia, reminded communities in Phrygia Epictetus to respect a *lex Cornelia* which limited expenditure on embassies. Santangelo suggests that Cicero consciously drew on provincial legislation for Asia due to its effectiveness. However, the location of this community in Phrygia may be significant. Certainly, it formed part of *provincia Asia* before 56.²³⁹ Suggestions that the passage cited by Cicero formed part of a comitial law *de repetundis* or *de maiestate* are equally

²³⁵ Frederiksen 1965, 189; Santangelo 2007, 120.

²³⁶ RDGE 65.d.82-84. On this decree and date, see n.604 *infra*. Leschhorn (1993, 216-221, followed by Santangelo 2007, 121 n.59 *contra* Coudry & Kirbihler 2010, 163-164) argues prudently that the adoption of the Sullan era was a spontaneous local development rather than imposed by Sulla. Cf. Heller (2014, 230), who characterises it as an 'acte de contrition et d'allégeance'.

²³⁷ On the date: Eilers 2001, 201-205.

²³⁸ IGR 4.1188; though, given the references elsewhere in the document to fiscal issues, it should pertain to local finances (Coudry & Kirbihler 2010, 143-146). Compare the letter at Thyatira dealing with fiscal issues (RDGE 66.4-8), often ascribed to the aforementioned P. Cornelius Scipio, which might indicate another candidate.

²³⁹ Cic. *Fam.* 3.10.6. Morrell (2017, 240 n.16) notes that Cicero did not insist that the communities follow the *lex*, *pace* Santangelo 2007, 119-120. If Kantor's view (2013, 155-156) is accepted, conceivably, they remained part of Asia in some sense.

plausible.²⁴⁰ These examples neatly show the range of potential legislation which could have been introduced by Sulla during his command, which directly regulated local political and fiscal action, though, significantly, not legal practice.²⁴¹ Evidence linking these examples specifically to Sulla is limited; nevertheless, they collectively indicate the capacity of late Republican governors to have a significant impact on local institutions.²⁴²

In funding his own military activities through co-ordinated extraction of communities' wealth across the province, Sulla was engaging in something new: typically, at the conclusion of the campaign, a defeated opponent may have agreed to an indemnity as the price of peace; as Mithridates appears to have done after Dardanus.²⁴³ However, in imposing a collective penalty on the inhabitants of the *provincia*, which had, by-and-large, abandoned Mithridates, and collecting it systematically with his troops, Sulla inaugurated a new era of Roman extortion of allied communities.²⁴⁴ In the lead-up to and aftermath of civil wars in the first century, a procession of commanders extracted coin from communities in the eastern provinces to finance their war efforts. Pompeius' forces in 49/48 and those of Brutus and Cassius in 43/42 appropriated funds from allied and provincial communities, the latter sacking those which resisted.²⁴⁵ More directly comparable are the settlements of victors in civil wars. Caesar in 48 and Antonius in 41 both followed Sulla's lead in summoning

²⁴⁰ Ridley 1975, 100; Campanile 2001, 254.

²⁴¹ Hoyos 1973, 49-50.

²⁴² Contra Coudry & Kirbihler 2010, 156-169.

²⁴³ For indemnities as a proportion of state income in the second century: Frank 1933, 127-138.

²⁴⁴ Abandoning Mithridates: *I.Eph.* 8; App. *Mith.* 48. Sulla: Cic. *Off.* 2.26-27. Kallet-Marx 1995, 273-276, 335-336. Cf. Sall. *Cat.* 11.5-7.

²⁴⁵ Pompeians: Caes. *BC.* 3.31-33, 105; Brutus and Cassius: App. *BCiv.* 4.63-82; CD. 47.31.1-4, 33.1-34.6; Plut. *Brut.* 30.1-32.4; Val. Max. 1.5.8; Vell. Pat. 2.69.6.

representatives of the provincial communities to Ephesus, deciding their punishments and rewards, before levying money upon them.²⁴⁶ Cicero also mentions cities which had paid to be granted *immunitas*, later removed by the Senate.²⁴⁷ Sulla's response to the specific set of circumstances facing him, namely provincial communities which had aided (or failed to resist), an enemy of Rome, restive troops and further conflict on the horizon, led him to systematically extract resources from the cities of Asia, and laid down a blueprint for his emulators in the following generation.

When Sulla addressed the assembled representatives of Asia at Ephesus, no framework to collect such large sums of cash existed and, in any case, Roman social and financial networks had been disrupted by the 'Asian Vespers'.²⁴⁸ Accordingly, Sulla designed an ad hoc system, by dividing the *provincia* into 44 *regiones*.²⁴⁹ This is insufficient to represent the number of *poleis* within Asia, while the earliest evidence for the *conventus* implies that there were 12 districts, which precludes an easy identification with this organising principle.²⁵⁰ Given that these necessarily contained varying numbers of *poleis*, of differing prosperity, this Sullan *discriptio* may well reflect a more efficient or negotiated means of dividing the penalty. This *formula* was employed by later commanders, notably Cn. Pompeius Magnus and L. Valerius Flaccus, but does not relate obviously to the collection of provincial

²⁴⁶ Caesar: *Caes. BCiv.* 3.105; *App. BCiv.* 2.92; *CD.* 42.491-50.5; *Antonius: App. BCiv.* 5.4-6; *Plut. Ant.* 23.1-24.5; *Joseph. BJ* 1.242. Octavian may also have done so during one of his three visits between late 31 and early 29, but direct evidence is lacking.

²⁴⁷ *Cic. Off.* 3.87. Mastrocinque 1999, 92. Cf. *Sall. Hist.* 1.77.20; *RDGE* 23.41-42.

²⁴⁸ Brunt 1990a [1956], 1-8 *contra* Delplace 1977, 246-247.

²⁴⁹ *Cassiod. Chron.* 670 p. 132 (Mommsen). Fröhlich (*RE* s.v. Cornelius 392); Magie 1950, 1117-1118, with criticism of earlier literature.

²⁵⁰ Broughton 1938, 518-519; Magie 1950, 1116; Merola 2001, 177-179 *pace* Gray 1978, 971-974; Mitchell 1999, 29-30; Kantor 2014, 256-257.

taxes.²⁵¹ This reflects Sulla's unprecedented position and need for haste. His exactions from Asia were not regular contributions to the state, but an irregular and spontaneous levy to satisfy his needs.

Nevertheless, the decision to strip most *poleis* in *provincia Asia* of their freedom, and subject them to direct Roman rule for the first time, was far-reaching. It exposed their citizens and territories to regular Roman taxation in the form of the *decuma* and *scriptura* for the first time.²⁵² Unlike in 133, by the late 80s and early 70s Rome's finances were in a parlous state, partially due to a litany of ongoing wars.²⁵³ Crucially, as argued above, the *lex Sempronia* already regulated the *decuma* in Asia, mandating the auction of this tax as a single concern to *publicani* by the censors at Rome, and continued to do so until at least 61.²⁵⁴ However, the aforementioned flexibility of Roman legislation ensured that the vast increase in communities affected did not materially undermine its application. Given that the *lex Sempronia* most likely restricted itself to outlining the basic scope of the law before leaving its specific administration to each iteration of magistrates, the new 'subjection' of many cities in Asia, made it 'appropriate' for the *decuma* of their territories to be included by magistrates in the text of the *locatio*.

²⁵¹ Cic. *Flacc.* 32-33. Bertrand 1978, 803-804; Merola 2001, 64-65; Le Teuff 2010, 208 *pace* Santangelo 2007, 116-117.

²⁵² App. *Mith.* 118. Kallet-Marx 1995, 265-266. Though, as Migeotte notes (2014, 420), 'on ignore dans quelle mesure elle s'appliquait aux cités grecques'.

²⁵³ Highlighted by the measure of Philippus to reinstate taxation on communities exempted by Sulla (Cic. *Off.* 3.87). Cf. App. *BCiv.* 1.111.

²⁵⁴ Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.13. On the *lex Sempronia*'s citation in 61: Frank 1933, 345-346, with references.

This explanation accounts for the unusual employment of *publicani* to collect taxes directly gathered by *poleis*, rare before this period. It was not Sulla's intended outcome, but the interaction of his decisions with existing legislation as enforced by later magistrates. Here, Caesar's reduction of Asian tax-rates by 1/3 in 48 is particularly instructive. It coincides with the removal of the *publicani* from their privileged position in Asia and the reintroduction of local collection. Thus, it should represent, at minimum, the publican profit-margin and expenses of the city-based system which replaced it.²⁵⁵ Simply put, there was another more effective and less punitive means of taxing Asia, the *discriptio* introduced to collect the φόρος levied in 85. After Sulla's departure for the west, no censorial *lustrum* was completed until 70: interim arrangements were necessary. The *lex portorii Asiae* describes a consular *lex locationis* issued by the consuls of 75. That this clause relates specifically to the farmers of the *decuma*, may suggest that the process changed at this time.²⁵⁶ After the *societates publicanorum* had acquired this position, normalised after Sulla's retirement from public life, structural factors made it immensely difficult to change. The *publicani* and other *equites* held a critical position not only as regards returning magistrates – note here their key role as jurors in the *quaestio de repetundis* from 123–81 and again, though less pronounced, from 70 – but also in facilitating an individual's rise to office in the first place.²⁵⁷ The model of institutional path dependency, which emphasises the reality that such

²⁵⁵ App. BCiv. 5.4; CD. 42.6.3; Plut. *Caes.* 48. Brunt 1990b, 380–381; Tan 2017, 55 *contra* Badian 1972a, 116–117.

²⁵⁶ Daubner 2006, 226.

²⁵⁷ Davenport 2019, 75–84. Cf. Cicero's argument in *Imp. Pomp.* 14–17, grounded in the physical and financial interests of the *equites*.

changes, once implemented, are difficult to reverse, when against the interests of actors with leverage, reinforces this point.²⁵⁸ Even after the restoration of the tribunate later that decade, it would be a brave consul or tribune of the *plebs* who sought to alter this arrangement.²⁵⁹ The new province-wide tax-farm was the worst of all possible worlds. If its introduction resulted from an ad hoc process based on Sulla's personal motives then the anomaly is explained, with the further implication that the state itself did not seek to maximise its income at the expense of the provinces.

I argue that the result of Sulla's 'settlement' in Asia was a major shift in the dynamics of Roman imperialism and the economic networks within the Mediterranean. Prior to this, in the second century, the Roman state placed no emphasis on extensive wealth extraction: it ran contrary to the senatorial fiscal consensus. The implementation of a tax-farm for the *decuma* of civic communities let at Rome had no precedent at this time. Given that most *poleis* had previously not paid direct taxes to Rome and the underlying (agricultural) wealth of the region, irrespective of the cut taken by the *publicani*, we can surmise a significant increase in public revenue deriving from the Sullan settlement. Consequently, Rome's fiscal, and therefore political, gaze focused more closely towards the East.

²⁵⁸ North 1995, 15-20; Pierson 2004, 20-21.

²⁵⁹ Compare Tan's recent assessment (2017, 149-156) of the violent resistance to the Gracchi, emphasising the threat to vested interests both of the reforms themselves and the framework they provided to delegitimise the status quo. More generally, on escalating factors of political violence: Tilly 2003, esp. 75-77. See also, the famous cases of P. Rutilius Rufus (n.186) and L. Licinius Lucullus (p.77), who also opposed the interests of the *publicani* and *equites*.

Indeed when, in 66, Cicero spoke in favour of Cn. Pompeius Magnus' appointment to the command against Mithridates, he stressed the importance of the revenues of *provincia Asia* to the *res publica*.

nam ceterarum provinciarum vectigalia, Quirites, tanta sunt ut eis ad ipsas provincias tuendas vix contenti esse possimus, Asia vero tam opima est ac fertilis ut et ubertate agrorum et varietate fructuum et magnitudine pastionis et multitudine earum rerum quae exportentur facile omnibus terris antecellat... nam cum hostium copiae non longe absunt, etiam si inruptio nulla facta est, tamen pecua relinquuntur, agri cultura deseritur, mercatorum navigatio conquiescit. ita neque ex portu neque ex decumis neque ex scriptura vectigal conservari potest ... ('For the revenues of the other provinces, Romans, are such that we can scarcely derive enough from them for the protection of the provinces themselves. But Asia is so rich and so productive, that in the fertility of its soil, the variety of its fruits, the vastness of its pasture lands, and in the multitude of all those things which are exported, it is greatly superior to all other lands... For when the troops of the enemy are not far off, even though no actual irruption takes place, still the flocks are abandoned, agriculture is relinquished, the sailing of merchants is at an end. And accordingly, neither from customs dues (*portoria*), nor from tithes (*decuma*), nor from the tax on pasture lands (*scriptura*), can any revenue be maintained ...').²⁶⁰

Cicero describes three pillars of the Asian revenues: the *decuma*, the *scriptura* and the *portoria*.²⁶¹ As discussed, the *decuma* was regulated by the *lex Sempronia* passed in 123/122. One important element of the *decuma*'s administration, and presumably also the *scriptura*, was the *pactio*, an agreement between *publicani* and taxpayers on the amount to be paid. This was a legally binding contract, negotiated ahead of the harvest, most likely in five-year

²⁶⁰ Cic. *Imp. Pomp.* 14-15.

²⁶¹ The same formulation at Cic. *Flacc.* 19. *Scriptura* were fees collected from individuals grazing animals on *ager publicus*. Plaut. *Truc.* 141-151. Rathbone 2003, 167-170.; Roselaar 2010, 92; Kay 2014, 163.

blocks to coincide with censorial *lustra*. In Asia, these contracts came to be concluded by communities collectively. This denied *publicani* opportunities to employ violence and intimidation at the individual level, while allowing *poleis* more leverage with the governor.²⁶² Some factors, especially evidence for the large-scale transportation of grain by the *publicani*, suggest that they collected the *decuma* in kind. However, the well-attested practice of *poleis* paying multiple years' taxes at once demonstrates that at least some payments were made in cash. The apparently widespread issue civic debt further supports this view.²⁶³ It seems likely, in practice, that both systems operated in parallel: while the entrepôts of the western littoral would have little difficulty in converting grain to cash, smaller, agrarian settlements, such as those in the former βασιλική χώρα, would have struggled. It behoved the *publicani* to operate flexibly, as this created more opportunities for profit. Cicero shows that governors were intimately involved in the process. On his departure for Cilicia in 51/50, he evinced relief that the *pactiones* for the *provincia* had already been concluded.²⁶⁴ Similarly, in providing unsolicited advice to his brother, during the latter's Asian command, he emphasised the governor's role in ensuring both sides adhere to the contract. Less equitably, he stressed to Quintus the utmost importance of maintaining good relations with *publicani*

²⁶² Unlike in Sicily for example (Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.112). The precise date at which communities came to take responsibility for *pactiones* remains unclear, though Cicero (*QFr.* 1.1.34) implies that the bargaining was done at the civic level. Certainly, they were the norm in Cilicia, Syria and Bithynia. Broughton 1938, 536-537 (though note Rostovtzeff 1902, 357-358; 1941, 811-813); Merola 2001, 102 n.2; De Ligt 2002, 57 *contra* Lintott 1993, 77; cf. Badian 1972a, 79-81; Brunt 1981, 161; 1990b, 365. Five-year contracts: see discussion at Tan 2017, 53 n.71.

²⁶³ Grain: Cottier et al. 2008 l.75, with Nicolet 2000a [1994], 290-291; taxes and debt: Cic. *Att.* 6.2.5. Tan 2017, 53, with nn.71-72. See also, Merola 2001, 105; De Ligt 2002, 55-57.

²⁶⁴ Cic. *Att.* 5.13.1, 14.1.

and suggests that he persuade the locals to not push for the *lex locationis* to be respected.²⁶⁵

This presents a dichotomy between an insistence on good faith in negotiated agreements, but a flexibility in interpreting central regulations, which further emphasises the personal involvement of the governor in the process. Overall, administration of the *decuma*, after the institution of a major tax-farm in the 70s, increasingly impinged upon the attention of Roman magistrates in Asia.

The most important evidence for taxation in late Republican Asia is the *lex portorii Asiae*. This document dates to 9 July 62 CE, when records from the Basilica Iulia in Rome were copied for translation and eventual inscription at Ephesus.²⁶⁶ The text outlines the regulations for the collection of customs dues (*portoria*) on imports and exports from Asia by land and by sea and incorporated earlier legislation.²⁶⁷ A reference to a *lex locationis* issued by the consuls of 75, L. Octavius and C. Aurelius Cotta, the earliest date in the document, led the original editors to date the *lex* to this year, or shortly afterwards.²⁶⁸ Subsequently, every addition to the statute is introduced with the names of the year's consuls and the aorist προσέθηκάν 'they added'.²⁶⁹ However, Mitchell has argued that the original legislation, which he considers to be clauses 1 to 30 (ll. 7–72), dates to the earliest period of the post-Attalid settlement adducing three pieces of evidence. First, he notes four occasions on which

²⁶⁵ Cic. *QFr.* 1.1.35. Badian 1972a, 80–81.

²⁶⁶ Corbier 2008, 212–216; on the ambitions of central government in publishing this statute: Rowe 2008, 243–248.

²⁶⁷ Nicolet (2000b [1991], 353–357) adequately refutes the suggestion of the original editors (*ad* ll. 71–74) that the text regulated the *decuma* or *scriptura*.

²⁶⁸ Cottier et al. 2008, ll. 73, 75; 36, 68 (buildings); 27, 69 (royal land and subjects). Engelmann & Knibbe 1989, 160–162. Cf. Merola 1996, 281.

²⁶⁹ Spagnuolo Vigorita 1997, 133–134.

this section authorises *publicani* to use Attalid-era buildings, or refers to Attalid administration, asserting that this should allow only a brief gap in their use. Second, he highlights the inclusion of four Pamphylian ports among the customs stations of Asia, noting that, from 102 onwards, commanders responsible for the *provincia Cilicia* were regularly present in Pamphylia.²⁷⁰ Consequently, he asserts that the statute must pre-date the establishment of a *provincia Cilicia*. Finally, he states that the inclusion of Byzantium and Calchedon within the Asian customs zone requires that it pre-date the organisation of the province of Bithynia in 74.²⁷¹ Accepting this argument, Kay strongly proposed 123 and associated the *lex* with the programme of C. Gracchus.²⁷²

However, each of these assertions is vulnerable to challenge. First, the survival of buildings over a sixty-year period is not unreasonable in the ancient world. These customs-posts appear to have been located within civic territories and it is not inconceivable that they were reused during the intervening period. An additional clause requiring *publicani* to use these buildings where they existed reinforces this point.²⁷³ References to former ‘royal land’ and ‘cities and tribes not subject to Attalus’ are descriptive and had not lost relevance across this period. In fact, the integration of non-Attalid subjects into the provincial tax regime implies a date after the Sullan settlement.²⁷⁴ The inclusion of Pamphylian and

²⁷⁰ Ferrary 2000, 167-170; Mitchell 2008, 188-190; Migeotte 2014, 417 *contra* Merola 1996, 294-296.

²⁷¹ Mitchell 2008, 198-200. Also ruling out Nicolet’s (2000c [1993], 383-384) suggestion that lines 72-74 refer to the *lex Terentia-Cassia* of 73.

²⁷² Vell. Pat. 2.6.3. Kay 2014, 73-75, already, Frank 1933, 255.

²⁷³ Cottier et al. 2008, ll.36-38. Spagnuolo Vigorita 1997, 160 n.135.

²⁷⁴ Cottier et al. 2008, 126 (*ad* ll.67-72), defending an early date, offer the possibility that these lines are a post-Sullan supplement.

Bosporan ports with those of Asia in a single customs-zone does not pose an insurmountable problem.²⁷⁵ The definition of the law's extent, in Mitchell's reconstruction, as the boundaries of Asia with Cappadocia, Galatia and Bithynia would accurately describe the situation before the death of Nicomedes III in 74. Merola notes that the inclusion of Byzantium and Calchedon implies that they had lost their free status, placing the law after 85.²⁷⁶ While this *lex* demonstrably defines territorial limits for tax purposes, it does not follow that these affected commanders on the ground. The fact that Cilician governors were routinely active outside of Pamphylia, e.g. in the coastal waters of Rough Cilicia, in Cappadocia, or in Isauria, and the continuity of non-territorial definitions of *provincia* into the first century further emphasises the probability that Pamphylia remained in some way attached to *provincia Asia* in this transitional period.²⁷⁷

Instead, returning to Heil's suggestion, clauses 31 to 36 (ll. 73–84) should also be considered part of the original legislation, since the organic inclusion of later material is unlikely.²⁷⁸ Clauses 35 and 36, providing exemptions for private use and by treaty, seem pertinent to the original function of the law.²⁷⁹ The first addition to the statute occurred under the consuls of 72, providing a firm *terminus ante quem*. Heil's attempt to connect the *lex* with the regulation of Bithynia after the death of Nicomedes IV in 74 does not follow.

²⁷⁵ Returning to the suggestion of de Laet (1949, 273–277); accepted by Heil 1991, 11 *pace* Nicolet 2000c [1993], 377–382.

²⁷⁶ Merola 1996, 285–290; Mitchell 2008, 170–172; *pace* Santangelo 2007, 123 n.72. See Merola 2001, 125 n.103 on Byzantium's travails.

²⁷⁷ E.g. M. Antonius in 102/101 (Magie 1950, 1161–1163, with references); Sulla in the 90s (Livy, *Per.* 70; Plut. *Sull.* 5.3–4); and P. Servilius Isauricus from 78–74 (Sherwin-White 1984, 152–158; Dmitriev 2000, 350–352, with references), respectively.

²⁷⁸ Heil 1991, 9–11 *pace* Cottier et al. 2008, 10.

²⁷⁹ Mitchell 2008, 198–200.

Instead the inclusion of Byzantium and Calchedon, paired with the absence of other Bithynian harbours implies that the news of Nicomedes' death had not yet reached Rome.²⁸⁰ Moreover, if we assume annual consular *leges locationum* in lieu of regular censorships, the reference to the consuls of 75, provides positive evidence for that year.²⁸¹ This year also saw the first attempt to collect revenues from Cyrenaica, which Sallust links to problems with the grain supply, but may be linked to the fraught fiscal situation in this year.²⁸² In sum, this statute most likely dates to 75, after the Sullan 'settlement', but before the outbreak of the Third Mithridatic War.

The implications of the new *lex portorii* for inhabitants of Asia were less radical than the expansion of the *decuma*. As internal references make clear, the statute effectively reintroduced an Attalid tax and relied on existing infrastructure. However, the underlying landscape had fundamentally changed. Most obviously, the scope of the new law extended far beyond the former Attalid kingdom, into the northern Troad, southern Caria and the Bosphorus. The identity of the 'free cities', which lay outside of either the kingdom or the *provincia* and hence the customs zone, had radically changed both as a result of the original universal declaration of ἐλευθερία and Sulla's subsequent 'settlement'.²⁸³ No islands are included among the ports subject to the *lex*, which the original editors took as evidence that

²⁸⁰ McGing 1995, 283-285; Merola 1996, 272-290; Mitchell 2008, 182 *contra* Heil 1991, 9-14; cf. Merkelbach 1990, 100.

²⁸¹ On the desuetude of the censorship under the Sullan constitution. Astin 1985, 182-184; Steel 2014, 335-336.

²⁸² Cyrenaica: Sall. *Hist.* 2.43-44 (McGushin). Compare Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.18, noting a *senatusconsultum* transferring the auction for Sicilian tithes on wine, oil and fruits to Rome in the same year (Badian 1972a, 95; Brunt 1988, 167). Generally, Kay 2014, 245-258.

²⁸³ For 'free cities' located outside of the custom's zone, Mitchell 2008, 186-187; Kaye 2013.

they were not considered part of the *provincia* at that time. Dreher emphasised the fact that most were explicitly free, and consequently immune from taxation. However, Mitchell highlights the high level of bureaucratic effort necessary to regulate a transmarine customs zone and convincingly proposes that the drafters were content to simply charge all traffic between the islands and mainland.²⁸⁴ Though *publicani* were required to employ Attalid-era buildings, these would not necessarily have existed in convenient places.

From a local fiscal perspective, there were also radical changes. The lucrative Bosporan tolls, previously contested between local powers, were consolidated into a single charge and nominated collection point, namely Calchedon.²⁸⁵ From the perspective of individual traders, this likely simplified the process of navigating the straits, but certainly robbed the *poleis* of significant revenue. Moreover, the explicit authorisation granted to Termessus in Cilicia, on the restoration of its *libertas*, to collect its own *portoria*, provided Roman *publicani* were exempt, implies that subject cities were routinely denied this right.²⁸⁶ In 61, Cicero remarks on the financial plight of subject Asian communities who were struggling to pay Roman taxes. He notes that only two means of raising money existed: borrowing or exacting *tributum*, which should mean local taxation.²⁸⁷ However, the inability to collect customs dues on goods moving through territory removed a crucial lever from *poleis'* revenue-raising toolbox, limiting their reach to property and transactions within

²⁸⁴ Mitchell 2008, 192-193 *contra* Engelmann & Knibbe 1989, 62; Dreher 1996, 118-127.

²⁸⁵ Cottier et al. 2008, *ad* ll.13-15. On these tolls: Merola 2001, 124-125; Mitchell 2008, 181-182.

²⁸⁶ RS 19.2.31-36. Ferrary 1996, 340; Merola 2001, 139-141.

²⁸⁷ Cic. *Flacc.* 20. On local taxes: Broughton 1936, 134-136 (referring to Cic. *Flacc.* 91 *contra* Rostovtzeff 1941, 41); Merola 2001, 116-121.

their territory.²⁸⁸ This newly circumscribed tax-base contributes an explanation as why after Sulla's fine and the imposition of Roman taxation, so many communities spiralled into debt. According to Plutarch, by 70, the interest on original fine of 20,000 talents, which had been paid off through loans, had grown to 120,000 talents. This prompted aggressive intervention by L. Licinius Lucullus, limiting interest to 12% p.a., total interest to 100% of the principal, and repayments to 25% of debtors' incomes. From a state perspective, this intervention had a substantial effect on local economies, allegedly clearing this original debt. However, his checking of the moneylenders, often Romans of consequence, resulted in a backlash at Rome.²⁸⁹

Cities also now had to respect Roman grants of immunity to individuals. The *senatusconsultum de Asclepiade*, issued in 78, confirmed privileges for three Greek naval captains as a reward for service during the Social War. Two of these men, Asclepiades of Clazomenae and Meniscus of Miletus, were citizens of *poleis* within *provincia Asia*. Consequently, the document offers an insight into Roman governance soon after Sulla's changes. Significantly, they were to be ἀλειτούργητοι καὶ ἀνείσφοροι ἐν ταῖς ἑαυτῶν πατρίσιν, ('exempt from civic contributions or taxes within their own cities'). This does not include Roman taxes but does seem to imply immunity from contributions to the cities

²⁸⁸ Both wealthy locals and merchants had the opportunity to avoid these charges by relocating, potentially creating a 'race to the bottom' between *poleis*. Note the Aphrodisian citizens, Dionysus and Hierocles, Trallians by birth (*IAPH2007* 2.503; compare Canali De Rossi 2005, 106 n.40; Kokkinia 2008, 56-57).

²⁸⁹ Plut. *Luc.* 20.4. Cf. *Sull.* 25.2; Cic. *Acad.* 2.3. On borrowing, including from locals: App. *Mith.* 63 with Migeotte 1984, 339-341; *LCos* 193 with Buraselis 2000, 127-128.

which could be used to pay them. Given Sulla's fine, this was an important concession.²⁹⁰ By contrast, the document does grant exemption from directly levied Roman taxation elsewhere in the document. Here, however, the text is even more specific, ordering both: εἴ τινα χρήματα αἱ πόλεις αὐτῶν δημοσίου ὀφείλωσιν, μή τι εἰς ταῦτα τὰ χρήματα δοῦναι ὀφείλωσιν | ἄρχοντες ἡμέτεροι, οἵτινες ἂν ποτε Ἀσίαν Εὐβοίαν μισθῶσιν ἢ προσόδους Ἀσία Εὐβοία ἐπιτιθῶσιν, φύλαξωνται μή τι οὗτοι δοῦναι ὀφείλωσιν ('if their cities owe any public debt, they are not to be obliged to contribute towards these debts; our magistrates, any of those who let out or assign the revenues for Asia and Euboea, are to take care that these men are not obliged to give anything').²⁹¹ The injunction here is upon the magistrates letting out the contracts, rather than the commander in the field, who might logically be approached by the grantees in the event of a dispute. This could be taken as further evidence that the taxes for Asia and Greece were being collected via short-term measures in this period, rather than by *publicani*.

The biggest winners were the *societates publicanorum*: this arrangement provided little incentive for the Senate or the serving magistrates of the Roman *populus*. The profits flowed through to private (primarily non-senatorial) individuals, with some benefits for commanders willing to smooth their path. The direct corollary was the consistent maltreatment of provincials by Roman citizens – put another way, the intense unhappiness of the local population directly attributable to Rome and Romans.²⁹² When Cicero spoke in

²⁹⁰ CIL 6.40890.12. Raggi 2001, 89-90. Cf. Santangelo 2007, 56.

²⁹¹ CIL 6.40890.22-23.

²⁹² Tan 2017, esp. 77-78.

favour of the *lex Manilia* in 66, he dwelt on the private, as well as the public, impact of an invasion of Asia: the threat to property, wealth and lives of Roman *negotiatores*, as well as *publicani*.²⁹³

The revenues of Asia catalysed the formation of new interest-groups among the *equites*. However, a distinct set of circumstances allowed them to acquire and entrench their power. When the kingdom of Attalus III was originally organised as a province, entrepreneurial groups could lobby for a favourable outcome, but their leverage over the Senate, or individual senators, was limited. The *lex Sempronia de provincia Asia* created an ongoing concern and C. Gracchus' alterations to jury composition and the *lex repetundarum* gave the *publicani* and their backers institutional power vis-à-vis individual magistrates.²⁹⁴ The archetypal example is the conviction of Rutilius Rufus. That said, the tendency of the Senate to support local communities in disputes with the *publicani* in this period highlights the limits of equestrian influence.²⁹⁵ Their capacity to generate positive legislative change was also limited. However, after Sulla's decisions interacted with existing legislation, Asia's taxation was set up in a manner which favoured private interests. Institutional inertia and the power of established interest groups to resist change took over.²⁹⁶ Despite growing concerns among the Senate over the exploitation of the provinces during 60s and 50s, the costs of an individual stance could be grave. For example, Lucullus' attempts to ameliorate the economic crisis gripping Asia is often linked to his removal from the Mithridatic

²⁹³ Kay 2014, 255-257; Eberle & Le Quéré 2017, 10-12.

²⁹⁴ Brunt 1988, 150-156.

²⁹⁵ E.g. *RDGE* 12; *I.Priene*² 67; Strabo 14.1.26. Tan 2017, 45-54. Cf. Wallace 2014, 50-62.

²⁹⁶ Levi 1988, 85-93.

command. Similarly, A. Gabinius' resistance to *publicani* in Syria, condemned by Cicero may have contributed to his conviction in the *repetundae* court.²⁹⁷

Even governors who avoided legal action walked a fine line when mediating between *publicani* and provincials. Cicero privately praised P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther for his conduct in Cilicia from 56-54. However, he expressed his dismay that the latter had not managed to accommodate the interests of the *publicani*, who were now attacking his decisions publicly.²⁹⁸ Similarly, in his correspondence with Quintus, Cicero repeatedly emphasised the importance of cultivating positive relationships with *publicani*, even where this existed in tension with his injunction to treat locals fairly.²⁹⁹ For example, he anticipates delegates from various *poleis* in response to a disagreement about *portoria*, which Quintus had referred to the Senate against his advice.³⁰⁰ It seems *publicani* were charging *portoria* twice on goods which had been brought into one port and then moved to another, in contravention of a clause in the *lex portorii Asiae*.³⁰¹ Indeed, Cicero berated his brother at length in one letter for forcing him to put out numerous *eques*-related fires at Rome and insisted that he pay more attention to the requests incumbent upon him.³⁰² During his own tenure as provincial governor, in Cilicia in 51/50, Cicero did try to strike a balance. As he

²⁹⁷ Generally, Badian 1972a, 59-66, 85-109; Brunt 1988, 152-153. On Lucullus: Plut. *Luc.* 20.5, 24.3; Keaveney 1992, 114-115; though note the caution of Tröster 2008, 86 n.42. On Gabinius: Cic. *Prov. cons.* 10; *Pis.* 41, 48; Val. Max. 4.2.4; App. *BCiv.* 2.24; CD. 39.55.4-56.6. Braund 1983a, 241-243.

²⁹⁸ Cic. *Fam.* 1.9.26.

²⁹⁹ Cic. *QFr.* 1.1.

³⁰⁰ Cic. *Att.* 2.16.4.

³⁰¹ Cottier et al. 2008, ll.16-20.

³⁰² Cic. *QFr.* 1.2. Similarly, Cotton (2013, 43-46) argues that letters of recommendation played an essential role in the conduct of administration during the late Republic, and highlights that their typical language allowed governors to refuse politely. However, this underplays the extent of political and social pressures exerted on individuals to favour their acquaintances.

reported proudly, he managed to secure full repayment of tax arrears by some *poleis* by offering them an opportunity to repay at 12% p.a. interest, rather than the agreed rate, if they paid immediately. This equitable policy, he crowed, endeared him to provincials and *publicani* alike.³⁰³

However, the orator did not completely avoid this tension. The most significant example involves a debt contracted by the city of Salamis on Cyprus in 56. A consortium involving the influential M. Iunius Brutus offered a loan with 48% compound interest p.a. and secured two *senatusconsulta* exempting this arrangement from an existing *lex Gabinia*.³⁰⁴ Ap. Claudius Pulcher, Cicero's predecessor and Brutus' father-in-law, had granted one M. Scaptius a position as *praefectus* and troops to exact repayment. After he had besieged the Salaminian council-house and caused five deaths, Cicero arrived in the *provincia* and revoked his position.³⁰⁵ Seeking to mediate between the parties in February 50, he proposed his standard compromise, allowing the Salaminians to pay back the loan immediately at 12% *pa*. However, under pressure from Scaptius over Brutus' involvement, Cicero chose not to make a ruling, despite admitting privately that his successor would favour Brutus.³⁰⁶ Throughout these exchanges, Cicero sought to rationalise his decisions within the framework of his relationships with other members of the political class. He justified his decision not to accord Scaptius a *praefectura* on the grounds that he has denied several other requests from

³⁰³ Cic. *Att.* 5.21.7, 6.1.6-7, 16. Cf. Badian 1972a, 114-115.

³⁰⁴ Cic. *Att.* 5.21.10-11. On the Salamis affair: Magie 1950, 394-395; Lintott 2008, 263-265, with references. Compare *IG* 5.1.1146 at Gytheum for the same interest rate, with Santangelo 2009a, 363; Girdvainyte 2019, 149-150.

³⁰⁵ Cic. *Att.* 6.1.5, 2.8-9.

³⁰⁶ Cic. *Att.* 5.21.12, 6.1.7.

eminent *amici*. Despite his intent to govern justly by the inhabitants of the province, Cicero's frame of reference for conflict-resolution was based the reception of his conduct at Rome.³⁰⁷ Ultimately, the goodwill and esteem of the Salaminians held less weight than those of Brutus. During the Late Republic, provincial elites lacked the leverage to ensure positive outcomes in marginal cases.

Beyond the mismanagement of financial matters, direct gubernatorial action could have an equally large impact. The favouring of Romans in legal disputes which came before the governor and his representatives, as in the Salamis affair, could have dire consequences for locals. Giving moneylenders and their agents official status and troops to collect added an element of violence to the economic hardship already inflicted.³⁰⁸ Another common practice involved making extortionate demands on communities for the upkeep of the proconsul and his staff, something theoretically limited by the *lex Iulia de repetundis* in 59. Cicero also praises his brother for ending the practice of forcing Asian *poleis* to contribute funds for aedilician games, noting the resistance this had generated in some quarters.³⁰⁹ Finally, most egregiously, some larger *poleis* would pay bribes to avoid the possibility that soldiers would be billeted in their territory.³¹⁰

From the 60s onwards growing evidence exists for concern among the elite for the protection of provincials from abuses. This appears prominently in the self-aggrandising

³⁰⁷ Rauh 1986, 21-30.

³⁰⁸ N.b. Cicero eventually consented to Scaptius' request and sent him to bother Ariobarzanes of Cappadocia: Cic. Att. 6.1.4.

³⁰⁹ Cic. QFr. 1.1.26. Cf. Att. 6.1.21.

³¹⁰ Cic. Att. 5.21.7.

rhetoric of Cicero's Cilician correspondence, but similar themes appear in the early *de imperio Cn. Pompei*: Pompeius' moral character and its effect on local populations is emphasised more than his military qualities.³¹¹ We have evidence from this period for the increasing prominence of the 'Stoic' rhetoric of just empire in public discourse. Most notably, Cicero and Cato present provincials as akin to citizens and worthy of protection, though their views seem to reflect a broader consensus.³¹² However, above all, Cicero levels practical arguments in favour of just treatment in his public pronouncements. Restraint prevented rebellion and disaffection, as well as ensuring prompt payment for the *publicani* themselves. In this context, it is unsurprising that one of Caesar's first actions upon achieving military dominance was to unilaterally remove the tax-farm for the Asian *decuma*. Throughout its operation, this system had a significant impact on Roman fiscal and political development, greatly increasing public revenues and reorientating Rome's geopolitical focus towards the East.

1.2.1: The *Conventus iuridici*

Originally, *conventus civium Romanorum* stood for a collective of Roman citizens in a foreign community. Numerous inscriptions from second- and first-century Greece and the Aegean use the term in this sense to denote the source of honorific statues.³¹³ In an administrative

³¹¹ R  the 1978, 60-66; Tr  ster 2009, 25-27; Morrell 2017, 59-62, 71-72, 77-82. Cf. Gruber 1988, 243-258.

³¹² Griffin 1989, 34-37; Asmis 2005, 407-412; Morrell 2017, 99-101.

³¹³ Note also the consistent employment of *conventus* by late Republican authors as shorthand for Roman communities in the provinces (e.g. Cic. *Lig.* 24; *Verr.* 2.2.32; 5.94; *Caes. BCiv.* 2.19; 3.9, 40; see Hatzfeld 1919, 261; Broughton 1938, 546-548). A link between ο  κατοικο ντες / π αγματε  μενοι 'Ρωμα  ι vel *sim.* (resident Romans / Roman *negotiatores*) and *conventus civium Romanorum* is attested

context, however, it came to designate the group with access to gubernatorial jurisdiction, and swiftly came to mean the court assemblies held by a Roman magistrate. In time, the word *conventus* also acquired a geographic meaning, designating the region for which assizes were held in a specific community, i.e. the administrative structure of the court. The prevailing view sees this structure as established by M'. Aquilius between 129–126, or shortly afterwards.³¹⁴ However, this geographic element translated into Greek as διοίκησις, a word with strong fiscal implications which has no easy Latin equivalent.³¹⁵ Consequently, several scholars have argued that the early Roman administration repurposed an underlying Attalid system.³¹⁶ The strong correlation between *conventus* centres and Attalid mint authorities reinforces this suggestion. The minting authorities which issued *cistophori* (Pergamum, Ephesus, Tralles, Sardis, Apamea, Laodicea and likely Synnada) each eventually achieved this status.³¹⁷ These authorities are confirmed by a set of uniform countermarks on Pamphylian Attic-weight tetradrachms, along with others; namely, Adramyttium, Stratonicea-on-the-Caïcus, Sala and Toriaion.³¹⁸ The last three do not appear as *conventus*

in the Greek East (e.g. SEG 36.1200; Magie 1950, 1051–1053; Delplace 1977, 240–241; Kirbihler 2007, 20 with fig. 2; Thonemann 2010, 169–170) N.b. Girdvainyte (2019, 151–157) highlighting the difference from the local perspective.

³¹⁴ E.g. Mitchell 1999, 20–22; Fournier 2010, 62–66; Vitale 2012, 43–45; Kantor 2014, 254–255. Cautiously, Haensch 1997, 311–315; Campanile 2003, 277–284.

³¹⁵ Ameling 1988, 16: ‘dort aber kein Äquivalent besitzt’; Mileta 1990, 443–444; Burton 1975, 92; Fournier 2010, 41–46.

³¹⁶ Wilamowitz *ap.* Schulten 1892, 12 n.2; Ameling 1988, 14–18; Mileta 1990, 427–444; Fournier 2010, 64.

³¹⁷ On Attalid mint authorities: Kleiner & Noé 1977, 120–122; Gray 1978, 975; Mitchell 1999, 24–25; Kantor 2014, 257–258. Thonemann (2008, 55–58) plausibly identifies the authority abbreviated as KOP as Cormasa.

³¹⁸ Bauslaugh (1990, 39–64) on the countermarks; Thonemann (2008, 43–53) identifying Toriaion, also noting a single specimen of an eleventh authority (ΕΛΗΣ), potentially the Hellespontine district (58–60).

centres and Kantor offers plausible explanations: the former punished for siding with Aristonicus, and the latter two losing significance prior to the establishment of the *provincia*.³¹⁹ However, Strabo complicates this picture. In characterising the ethnic and social groups in the upper Maeander valley, he emphasises that the Romans ignored earlier arrangements in their administrative choices:

εἰς δὲ τὴν σύγχυσιν ταύτην οὐ μικρὰ συλλαμβάνει τὸ τοὺς Ῥωμαίους μὴ κατὰ φύλα διελεῖν αὐτούς, ἀλλὰ ἕτερον τρόπον διατάξαι τὰς διοικήσεις, ἐν αἷς τὰς ἀγοραίους ποιοῦνται καὶ τὰς δικαιοδοσίας ('To this confusion, no little has been contributed by the fact that the Romans did not divide them according to *phyla* (tribe), but organised their *diokeseis* in a different way, within which they hold their assemblies and their courts').³²⁰

Ando argues that this passage reflects a deliberate Roman policy of disrupting pre-existing local networks through new administrative organisation.³²¹ However, despite Strabo's earlier claim to the finality of Aquillius' settlement, it is not clear that the situation described reflected the original organisation of the *provincia*. During the late Republican and Augustan periods, several changes were made to the *conventus* organisation, and these possibly went beyond the designation of different centres.³²² The method by which the

³¹⁹ Kantor 2014, 258.

³²⁰ Strabo 13.4.12. Radt 2002-2011 *ad loc.* is unhelpful here; compare Syme 1995, 122-123.

³²¹ Syme 1979 [1939], 125; Ando 2010, 33-34. Cf. Mitchell 2000, 120-122.

³²² See Table 1, discussed *infra*. Gruen 1984, 604-605; Kallet-Marx 1995, 117. As will be clear from my argument so far, I believe that debate over which *polis* should be considered the 'capital' of Asia is not especially meaningful. Haensch's concept of a 'Provinzialhauptstadt' attains relevance only under the Principate (1997, 11-17). Governors, throughout the period, were mobile and divided their time between the major centres of the *provincia* – including Ephesus and Pergamum. Evidence collected by Rigsby shows governors acting in both cities. Pergamum's association with Attalid power explains why, initially, Roman magistrates seem to have based themselves there (1979, 137-141. Cf. SEG 64.1302,

Roman *provincia* mapped onto the underlying geographic assumptions also holds significance. Territorial limits in the ancient world tended towards ambiguity, while obvious natural boundaries, such as rivers and mountain ranges, often served as major routes or zones of local exchange.³²³ Consequently, Roman modes of organisation evolved to prioritise distinguishable communities. Pliny the Elder's geographic account of the *poleis* of Asia seems to reproduce, for example, an Augustan version of the *formula provinciae*, i.e. the list of communities comprising the province. This demonstrates that by the late first century BCE, Asia was organised locally into *conventus* districts, as lists of communities administratively subordinated to the assize centre, and subsequently into larger units.³²⁴

Across the period the cities making up the *conventus* varied. As illustrated in Table 1, between the late 60s and the Flavian period, 16 different cities are attested as *conventus* centres in *provincia Asia*, though never more than 13 at one time. Without strong evidence, it is unclear which political body decided these issues during the Republican period. Linking decisions on constituent elements of provinces to the allocation of magistrates' *provinciae* seems most plausible, which would ordinarily give the Senate the central role. However, the

1303, Augustan governors' letters from Pergamum and Ephesus respectively). However, the practical advantages of Ephesus' location, made it an attractive seat – by the 50s, it seems to have become the main centre of Roman rule (e.g. Cic. *Att.* 5.13.1, 20.10; *Fam.* 13.55.1, 57.2), and Sulla, Caesar and Antonius all summoned civic representatives to meet there. However, the institutionalisation of this reality happened slowly.

³²³ Lintott 1981, 54–58; Mitchell 1993, 5–11; 1999, 32–33; Drogula 2015, 252. Routes: Purcell 1990, 179–181; mountain ranges: Horden & Purcell 2000, 80–82.

³²⁴ Plin. *HN.* 5.105–106, 109, 111, 120, 122–123, 126. Marshall 1966, 234–236; Habicht 1975, 69; Shaw 1981, 425–430; Ameling 1988, 16–17; Nicolet 1988, 201–206; Vitale 2012, 349–351; Dalla Rosa 2014, 31–33. 'Maps' as representation of physical territory only became common in Europe in the 16th century, and the earliest territorial treaty supplemented with a map is conventionally dated to 1718 (Clark 1947, 144; Biggs 1999, 376–383). Compare Dmitriev's observation (2000, 350) that individual geographic labels could be used in several different senses.

lex de provinciis praetoriis, assigning Cilicia to a praetor in 100, states clearly that the ἐπαρχία Λυκαονία should remain subject to the governor of Asia, demonstrating that comitial legislation could also affect the make-up of *provinciae*.³²⁵ Accordingly, it is impossible to be specific in any given context. Cicero provides the earliest evidence for the provincial *conventus* organisation, referring to several Asian *poleis*, which correspond to later assize centres, as the site of gubernatorial activity in his *pro Flacco*. Moreover, when seeking to emphasise the breadth of Rullus' agrarian proposal in 63, he refers to six cities as constituting *tota Asia*.³²⁶ Together they provide a list of nine potential *conventus* centres for this period.

³²⁵ RS 12.Cnidus.3.22-27.

³²⁶ Cic. *Flacc.* 68; *Leg. agr.* 2.39. On Cyzicus, add Cic. *Fam.* 13.53 with Campanile 2004, 140-142; Thonemann 2008, 59 *contra* Robert 1949, 231-232; Habicht 1975, 70-71. Ameling (1988 11-14) stresses that these locations held an administrative importance for inter-civic groups: Asian Jewish communities appear to have collected taxes bound for Jerusalem here without Roman prompting.

Table 1: Attested *conventus* centres by date

63/61 BCE Cicero, <i>Leg. agr.</i> Cicero, <i>Flacc.</i>	28/27 BCE <i>RDGE</i> 52	17 BCE Cottier et al. 2008	Augustan Pliny <i>NH</i> 5	c. 38/39 CE <i>I. Didyma</i> 148	Flavian <i>I. Eph.</i> 13
Pergamum	Pergamum	Pergamum	Pergamum	Pergamum	Pergamum
Ephesus	Ephesus	Ephesus	Ephesus	Ephesus	-
Adramyttium	Adramyttium	Adramyttium	Adramyttium	Adramyttium	-
Smyrna	Smyrna	Smyrna	Smyrna	-	Smyrna
Miletus	Miletus	Miletus	-	Miletus	Miletus
Apamea	(Apamea) ³²⁷	Apamea	Apamea	Apamea	Apamea
Laodicea ³²⁸	(Laodicea)	Laodicea	Laodicea	Laodicea	-
-	(Synnada)	Synnada	Synnada	Synnada	-
-	Alabanda	- ³²⁹	Alabanda	Alabanda	-
Tralles	Tralles	-	-	-	-
-	-	Sardis	Sardis	Sardis	Sardis
-	Mylasa	-	-	-	-
-	-	Halicarnassus	-	Halicarnassus	Halicarnassus
Cyzicus	-	Cyzicus ³³⁰	-	Cyzicus	-
-	-	Cibyra	Cibyra	Cibyra	-
-	-	Philomelium ³³¹	Philomelium	Philomelium	-

The earliest epigraphic evidence derives from two copies of a letter found at the *bouleuterion* in Miletus and near the *agora* in Priene. The first part of the text is extremely fragmentary, neither the author nor addressee survive, but the final 23 lines can be

³²⁷ Parentheses indicate *dioceses* attached to the *provincia Cilicia* from 56-50 and likely part of Amyntas' Galatian kingdom from 41-25 (p.85 *supra*).

³²⁸ Laodicea-on-the-Lycus.

³²⁹ Likely missing through a mason's error. Haensch 1997, 308.

³³⁰ Robert 1950, 229-231. In Cottier et al. 2008 Cyzicus is referred to διοίκησις Ἑλλησποντία and Philomelium as διοίκησις Λυκαονική. Campanile 2004, 132-142, argues that the Hellespontine district was formed in the 50s.

³³¹ From Cicero (*Fam.* 13.67.1) it appears Lycaonia was, in the 50s, considered a regular diocese of Cilicia. Syme 1979 [1939], 132-133; Mitchell 1999, 20-22; Kantor 2013, 154-155.

reconstructed with a high level of confidence. Crucially, it contains a list of recipients of the letters, which largely corresponds with Cicero's *conventus* centres.³³² This list omits three Phrygian communities, Apamea, Laodicea and Synnada, which, we know from Cicero's correspondence, formed part of the *provincia Cilicia* between 56 and 50.³³³ Prevailing opinion identifies the author as Q. Minucius Thermus, governor in Asia in 51, drawing support from the appearance of a Cicero, usually identified as the famous orator, in the text.³³⁴ However, Bowersock offers a viable alternative: suggesting the orator's son (cos. 30), the governor of Asia from 29, as the named Cicero, he proposes Octavian as the author. He stresses that while the Phrygian dioceses were within *provincia Asia* in 44, their subsequent fate is unknown. Considering the large tracts of formerly provincial territory granted to local rulers by M. Antonius and dismemberment of *provincia Cilicia* during the 30s, the Phrygian dioceses were likely assigned to Amyntas of Galatia until that kingdom's dissolution in 25.³³⁵ The appearance of Mylasa in the text presents a problem for this interpretation, since the *communis opinio* links its disappearance from the record in favour of Halicarnassus,

³³² I.Priene² 13 (incl. Milet 1.2.3).

³³³ Cic. *Fam.* 13.67.1. Kantor 2013, 155.

³³⁴ Sherk 1969, 275, with references; Merkelbach 1995, 73-76; Blümel & Merkelbach 2014, 34. Canali De Rossi (2000, 164-171, cf. Strabo 14.1.7), argues that the use of Magnesian ambassadors to carry the letter implies that the author was not present in the *provincia*: he proposes Cn. Pompeius Magnus. Though he offers no date, the rarity of magistrates writing to *poleis* outside their *provincia* would imply that Pompeius held the consulship, i.e. 52. Canali De Rossi's explanation (2000, 166) that Cicero and his brother Quintus were involved as they served as *patroni* in some capacity is unconvincing, while his emendation of l. 37 to read: Κοῖν[τ]ου Τ[ύλλιο] creates an inconsistency in forms of address, with his brother referred to as: [Μάρ]κω]ι Κικέρ[ων]ι in ll. 38-39. Compare Oppius making use of Aphrodisian ambassadors at the conclusion of the First Mithridatic War (IAph2007 8.2.i.25-28), who was still within the *provincia*, on Cos, when he received the Aphrodisian delegation.

³³⁵ Bowersock 1970, 226-227; Syme 1979 [1939], 141-144. Cf. Magie 1950, 418, 1271-1272; Täuber 1991, 207 *contra* Bickerman 1947, 354-359.

confirmed by 17, to its devastation by Q. Labienus and the Parthians in 40/39. However, the strength of this objection is limited. Even allowing a connection between the prosperity of a settlement and its suitability as a judicial centre in the eyes of Roman administrators, it does not follow that such a step was taken immediately. The uncertainty of the triumviral period favours a later decision.³³⁶ Accepting Canali De Rossi's speculative reconstruction of a *formula valetudinis* in the early lines would further hint at a later date.³³⁷ Overall, weight of evidence supports the dating of this document of the period after Actium but before the Octavian's settlement of the *res publica* in 27.

The *lex portorii Asiae* includes a list of the Asian διοικήσεις in the year 17. As noted, Halicarnassus replaces Mylasa and the three Phrygian dioceses are restored. The list also includes Sardis (presumably at the expense of the absent Tralles, devastated by an earthquake in 27/26), Philomelium and Cyzicus.³³⁸ The apparently near-contemporary list drawn from Pliny omits Miletus, Halicarnassus and Cyzicus but is incomplete in any case.³³⁹ Two epigraphic finds provide later evidence. An inscription from Didyma records the appointment of νεοποιοί (temple-works overseers) for the construction of a temple to Gaius (37 – 41 CE). The list of appointees apportions one νεοποιός per city, which Robert identified as representing a wider διοίκησις. These mostly come from the *conventus* centres, though Ephesus, Cibyra and Synnada appear to have been represented by citizens of other *poleis*

³³⁶ Halicarnassus: SEG 39.1180.39. Bowersock 1970, 226-227; Habicht 1975, 69-72. Contrast Haensch (1997, 308-310) prioritising administrative geography.

³³⁷ Canali De Rossi 2000, 165.

³³⁸ Cottier et al. 2008, ll.88-91. Tralles: Strabo 12.8.18; CD. 54.31.3; Euseb. *Chron.* p.164 (Helm); Agathias 2.17; SEG 49.1447 with Jones 2011, 107-115.

³³⁹ Robert 1949, 224-227, with references.

within their district.³⁴⁰ Finally, a Flavian inscription lists a series of communities ordered by their διοίκησις, together with amounts of currency and rubrics.³⁴¹

Across the period, the *conventus* appear in diverse administrative contexts. The earliest evidence prioritises its judicial function. In the Republican period this did not equate to a fixed ‘circuit’. Instead, the governor’s preferences dictated which centres would be visited. For example, Cicero, during his Cilician command in 51/50, reports two rounds of assizes. First, *en route* to the eastern part of the province he stopped for a number of days at Laodicea-on-the-Lycus, Apamea, Synnada and Philomelium for this purpose.³⁴² Second, on his return to Laodicea, he held assizes for all districts north and west of the Taurus between 13 February and 1 May 50.³⁴³ Finally, he sent his *legatus*, Q. Volusius, to Cyprus to hold the assizes for that island, constrained by an earlier *lex data* which protected its inhabitants from judicial summons to the mainland.³⁴⁴ The two and a half months set aside for the assize at Laodicea has contributed to the impression of a heavy judicial workload for late Republican governors.³⁴⁵ However, there are grounds to question this position. First, Cicero held a special interest in appearing a diligent governor and a prolonged *conventus* bolstered this impression. Second, an extended session allowed litigants from distant *dioceses* to make the

³⁴⁰ *I.Didyma* 148; cf. 107. Robert 1949, 223-226; Habicht 1975, 70; Herrmann 1989, 191-196.

³⁴¹ Habicht 1975, 66.

³⁴² Cic. *Fam.* 15.4.2.

³⁴³ Cic. *Att.* 6.2.4. See Haensch (1997, 705-707) for a full list of attested *conventus* sessions.

³⁴⁴ Cic. *Att.* 5.21.6. Given Cicero’s later reference to a *lex P. Lentuli* relevant to Cyprus (*Fam.* 13.48), Badian thought that Lentulus Spinther issued this regulation when incorporating it into *provincia Cilicia* (1965, 113-118; cf. the treatment of the Caenice in RS 12.Cnidus.4.1-31) *contra* Zarecki 2012, 46, 48-49..

³⁴⁵ E.g. Lintott 1993, 43-69.

journey with less fear of missing the governor due to unanticipated delays.³⁴⁶ Finally, Laodicea, the venue chosen for this major session was well-connected with Rome and close to hot springs at Hierapolis.³⁴⁷ In any case, Cicero's arrangements demonstrate that, despite his complaints that his plans to conduct all judicial business in winter were overturned, there was no established circuit or calendar for the *conventus* of this province at this time.³⁴⁸

The appearance of διοικήσεις in the *lex portorii Asiae*, however, demonstrates their utility in non-judicial contexts. In this case, they are used to enumerate the constituent parts of *provincia Asia*.³⁴⁹ An intriguing point here is provided by an apparent exception found in the clause immediately following. The text on the stone reads: εἰ μὴ αὐταὶ ἀγοραὶ εἰσιν [sc. δικῶν], i.e. 'unless they are *conventus* centres'. The editors of the comprehensive recent edition are split on its interpretation: Crawford, Reynolds and Ferrary see the inscription of μὴ as an error for <καὶ>, rendering the translation, 'and <also> if they are *conventus* centres'. Their colleagues Cottier, Crowther and Mitchell, prefer to accept the reading on the stone.³⁵⁰ Mitchell suggests that this restriction ensured that *conventus* centres which were not otherwise exempted could not claim to be outside of the *formula* of the other διοικήσεις, but this interpretation is difficult to accept. Even if the centres themselves stood at the head of

³⁴⁶ Compare Cic. *Fam.* 3.8.4-5.

³⁴⁷ Lintott 2008, 262-263.

³⁴⁸ Cic. *Att.* 5.14.1 (plans); 5.21.9, 6.2.4. Caesar's experience indicates a similar flexibility: Caes. *BGall.* 1.54.3, 6.44.3, 7.1.1, 8.46.5. Burton 1975, 99; Fournier 2010, 56-58, 86-87; Kantor 2013, 155 *pace* Habicht 1975, 68.

³⁴⁹ Showing continuity with the identification of second-century Colophon as 'outside the *provincia*'. See pp.50-54 *supra*. Cottier et al. 2008, *ad* 89; Dalla Rosa 2014, 40-42.

³⁵⁰ Cottier et al. 2008, *ad* l.91.

the *formulae*, they were still included within it implicitly.³⁵¹ Either reading presents problems. The first implies that *conventus* centres, irrespective of their formal status, were now exempt from the *portorium*: that is, that they possessed a customs-free zone starting from eight *stades* within their own territory. This would indicate that the *res publica* was willing to forego the customs revenue from several major ports without tax-exempt status due to their importance from a judicial perspective. Mitchell's alternative, that this is a legal redundancy, is therefore preferable. In turn, this shows that by 17, the *conventus* was used to organise fiscal as well as judicial administration.

Similarly, the rubrics of *I.Eph.* 13, though dating to the Flavian era, show continued integration of the *conventus* into provincial administration. One approach sees a religious subtext to the document, linking it to the organisation of a new festival or temple under the aegis of the provincial *koinon*.³⁵² By contrast, Gschnitzer thought that the inscription summarised local charges for producing records in different communities throughout the province. He sees the governor, or perhaps the *koinon* of Asia as erecting this document to facilitate interregional exchange.³⁵³ More persuasive, however, are claims that it relates to taxation. The rubrics, though obscure, do seem to cover several areas subject to indirect taxes: property, customs charges, market transactions, movement of people, and a variety of registrations. Knibbe saw it as a summary of provincial taxes linked to the obscure *fiscus Asiaticus*. Though he viewed this as an institution administering tax collection within the

³⁵¹ Pace Mitchell 2008, 197. E.g. *I.Eph.* 13 explicitly includes the centres within the list of communities within their own διοίκησις.

³⁵² Herz 1997, 250-252; Edelman-Singer 2012, 175; 2015, 239-242, 245-247.

³⁵³ Gschnitzer 1989, 391-403; Merola 2001, 152-159.

provincia Asia directly responsible to the Princeps, it is possible that it referred to a gubernatorial institution.³⁵⁴ Most rubrics occur with amounts listed in *denarii* or without denomination, though a single appearance of τετραχαλκία highlights the continuing flexibility of Roman administration.³⁵⁵ In all, the rubrics in themselves are too divorced from their context to be certain of their translation. However, a province-wide fiscal motivation seems most likely.³⁵⁶

Overall, the *conventus* in Asia seems to have developed gradually. Though the disjunction between the Latin and Greek terms implies either a basis in an original Attalid institution, a fiscal function, or both, I suggest that the initial *conventus* served purely as a judicial structure, with relevance to Roman citizens only, emerging between 129 and 89 in major centres associated with the former Attalid administration due to convenience.³⁵⁷ After the Sullan ‘settlement’ and the formal subjection of most *poleis* to the governor’s jurisdiction, the organisation acquired more formality. It seems likely, on account of the Greek διοίκησις, that an earlier form of organisation, linked to Attalid taxation was repurposed. However, particularly in regions which had not previously been subject to Attalid rule, the Sullan *discriptio* may have formed a basis for the districts, assigning different numbers of *regiones* to the new διοικήσεις. The Roman diaspora and *publicani* were active in the newly regulated region and had recourse to a familiar legal structure in disputes. Since

³⁵⁴ Knibbe 1987, 78-93 Cf. Jones 1960 [1950], 107-108; Herrmann & Polatkan, 1969, 27-28; Brunt 1990c [1966], 136-138.

³⁵⁵ Habicht 1975, 64; Burnett, Amandry & Ripollès Alegre 1992, 370.

³⁵⁶ Migeotte 2014, 421.

³⁵⁷ Kallet-Marx 1995, 116, 135-137 *pace* Merola 2001, 172-181.

the governor was the fundamental source of law in his *provincia*, by means of his *edictum* and his *ius iurisdictionis*, the *conventus* structure appears to have been a formalisation of the natural process by which all disputes could be referred to him.³⁵⁸ Certainly, throughout this period, the growing Roman presence in the region gave an increasing importance to the regional *conventus*.³⁵⁹ Once established, notwithstanding their potentially irregular employment by commanders, they proved a convenient means of co-ordinating other elements of provincial administration, including communication with individual *poleis* and arranging provincial taxation.

1.2.2: The origin of the provincial *koinon*

The *koinon* of Asia, a group which, under the Principate, played a crucial role in co-ordinating the imperial cult and served as a mutual forum for the civic communities of *provincia Asia*, also had its roots in the Republican period. The name of this institution passed through several forms, starting with οἱ δῆμοι οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ καὶ τὰ ἔθνη ('the cities and peoples in Asia'), attested from the early first century, to the κοινὸν (ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας) τῶν Ἑλλήνων ('the community of the Greeks in Asia'), from the middle of the first century, through to the κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας, which appears from the Triumviral period onwards.³⁶⁰ The earliest title appears once in a collective decree, discussed *infra*, and five times in honorific contexts: once for Q. Mucius Scaevola at Olympia, and four times in local contexts – at

³⁵⁸ Including those between locals: e.g. Cic. Att. 6.1.15. Compare Bryan 2012, 775-785.

³⁵⁹ Debord 1985, 351; Kallet-Marx 1995, 134-137; Merola 2001, 172-181; Marek 2010, 330-333.

³⁶⁰ Full discussion in Mellor 1975, 80-82; Laffi 2010a, 31-37 and *infra*.

Poimananon, twice at Ephesus, and once at Pergamum. Each is dated without controversy to the first quarter of the first century based on the connection to Scaevola's governorship in the early 90s.³⁶¹ This raises the question who comprised the group which referred to itself as the δήμοι καὶ ἔθνη. Laffi suggests it referred to the communities of Asia acting in concert, with *poleis* described as δήμοι and less urbanised groups as ἔθνη.³⁶² The inclusion of 'free' cities in this group, on which Laffi is equivocal, must be possible, on the basis that the vast majority of *poleis* were free during this period. In honorific inscriptions, the δήμοι καὶ ἔθνη were joined by other groups, as that for Herostratus of Poimananon makes clear: οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ δήμοι κα[ὶ τ]ὰ ἔθνη|| καὶ οἱ κατ' ἄνδρα κεκριμένοι ἐν τῇ πρὸς | Ῥωμαίους φιλίας καὶ τῶν ἄλλων οἱ εἰρη|μένοι μετέχειν τῶν Σωτηρίων καὶ | Μουκιείων ('The cities and peoples in Asia and those judged, individually, to be in friendship with the Romans and the rest who are agreed to participate in the *Soteria* and *Moukieia*').³⁶³ The intriguing formulation of οἱ κατ' ἄνδρα κεκριμένοι ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους φιλίας, which the *senatusconsultum de Asclepiade* translates as *qui in amicorum formulam relati sunt* ('those included in the *formula amicorum*' [i.e. the list of individual Roman friends]), demonstrates that membership of the nascent organisation was not limited to communities. In turn, this implies a degree of separation between the communities themselves and those on the *formula*.³⁶⁴ Critically, this formulation

³⁶¹ OGIS 439, 438; *I.Eph.* 615A, 205; *IGR* 4.921.

³⁶² Laffi 2010a, 35-37; Cf. Merola 2001, 186-191.

³⁶³ OGIS 438.3-5. Parallels to this phrase: OGIS 439; *IGR* 4.921. Laffi (2010a, 46 n.44) argues that the two names represented a single festival against suggestions that the new name Μουκιεῖα was attached to a pre-existing festival, the Σωτήρια (Pfister (*RE* s.v. Σωτήρια, 1228-1229); Brennan 2000, 550; Thériault 2011, 379-380). See now Buraselis (2012, 247-258) on the broader phenomenon of double festivals in the Hellenistic period.

³⁶⁴ Parallels at Laffi (2010a, 32-34). Raggi 2010, 148-150.

implies an initial choice joining in the institution, outside of a core group, by participating in the penteteric festival decreed for Scaevola by the more precisely defined group [τῶν ἐν τῇ]ι φιλίας κριθέν[των]| δήμων τε καὶ ἔθνων] ‘the cities and peoples judged to be in friendship [sc. with the Romans]’.³⁶⁵ That said, the active involvement of the honorand in reconciling the contentious cities of Ephesus and Sardis indicates that pressure from individual magistrates may have played an important role in facilitating this novel religious movement.³⁶⁶

The religious purview of the δήμοι καὶ ἔθνη and later *koinon* has significance. The earliest evidence all pertains to honours based around the new festival, the Μουκίεία, which the assembled communities participated in. The body defined itself by reference to the festival. Beyond this, however, other early evidence points to a religious focus. Plutarch attests that, after Lucullus’ reforms to alleviate the impact of Sulla’s levies in the 70s, the *poleis* of Asia celebrated a festival, the Λευκόλλεια, in his honour.³⁶⁷ Moreover, Cicero, defending L. Valerius Flaccus, refers to a festival honouring his client’s father, commander in Asia in the late 90s.³⁶⁸ He asserts that the money for the festival had been assembled *a tota*

³⁶⁵ Laffi 2010a, 38-44; Vitale 2012, 62-63.

³⁶⁶ Honouring Roman magistrates with festivals is attested in Greece from the early second century (T. Quinctius Flamininus at Gytheum, *Αἴ* 1929, #99). For a comprehensive list: Erkelenz 1999, 44-45 n.9; for Asia, with discussion: Thériault 2011, 377-384. For Asian governors offered cult: pp.263-264 *infra*.

³⁶⁷ Plut. *Luc.* 23.1; cf. App. *Mith.* 76. Mileta (2008a, 104-106) suggests this entails full cult honours, though note Tröster’s more reserved stance (2008, 38, 132-136). Thériault (2011, 381) theorises a gap of some years between the establishment of a local festival at Cyzicus and the provincial festival.

³⁶⁸ While other, civic, festivals are attested, these are the only ‘provincial’ examples. Note Rigby’s suggestion (1988, 148-149) that the provincial Εὐεργέσια celebrated at Pergamum was the same festival as the Σωτήρια καὶ Μουκίεία and Φλάκκεια is unconvincing. Given Cicero (*Verr.* 2.2.51; cf. [Asc.] 202, 262 Stangl) explicitly notes the survival of the Μουκίεία through the Mithridatic Wars, the festival retained this name. The Λευκόλλεια shows that other commanders received the named

Asia (from all Asia), strong evidence that one of Scaevola's immediate successors also received a common festival funded by *poleis* within the *provincia*.³⁶⁹ Unlike Scaevola or Lucullus, there is no evidence to suggest that Flaccus *père* was regarded as a paragon. Instead, this should be imply that the honour of a provincial festival was not limited to exceptional individuals, but was, on that occasion, employed as a strategy by the provincial community to engage with the governor.³⁷⁰ These examples emphasise the extent to which the earliest provincial organisation of communities was concerned with the creation and administration of common religious events to celebrate Roman officials within a traditionally Greek context.³⁷¹

Mackil argued that shared religious festivals allowed communities to create and articulate social bonds. Concentrating on pre-Roman Greece, she contended that regular rituals practiced together can forge a group identity.³⁷² Shared festivals generate networks of interaction across the involved communities and strengthen social contact between the participants.³⁷³ Though this was unambiguously an elite phenomenon – the delegates from any given city probably had significant standing to be selected – these networks facilitated

festivals and a 'generic' festival runs against such honours' purpose – to leverage favour with a specific commander. Erkelenz 1999, 49; Ferrary 1997, 217 n.46; Thériault 2011, 379.

³⁶⁹ Cic. *Flacc.* 54-59. Maselli 2000, 176-178. On the financial implications of this passage: Erkelenz 1999, 51-57 *contra* Edelmann-Singer 2015, 67-68.

³⁷⁰ Thériault 2011, 380 Pace Frija 2012, 90-91. The only other evidence for his command is a single bland honorific inscription from Claros: Tuchelt 1979, 161, comments from Ferrary 2000, 337-338.

³⁷¹ Drew-Bear 1972, 461-462; Mileta 2008a, 109-111 (with caution); Laffi 2010a, 31-32.

³⁷² Mackil 2013, 183-191, 215. Anthropological studies: Geertz 1973, 87-125; 1983, 29-30, 124-125; note, the critique of Thomson 1990, 130-135.

³⁷³ Mackil 2013, 242.

integration between the upper-social strata of diverse *poleis*.³⁷⁴ Regular contact also allowed individuals to build influence among their peers and may have nurtured the slow growth of an inter-civic or provincial elite, encompassing men like Diodorus Zonas, and perhaps, Hierocles and Dionysus, dual-citizens of Tralles and Aphrodisias.³⁷⁵ This group almost certainly shared priorities in navigating Roman governance, increasing the centripetal factors for participants. Economic issues appear to have been at the forefront, but retention of the local status-quo must also have loomed large. The participation in communal rituals affirming a common relationship with Rome through physical acts and utterances could also instantiate a feeling of community.³⁷⁶

However, state-formation, or the formation of inter-community institutions, requires a process of negotiation to ‘balance and articulate unobjectionable power-relationships and legitimacy’. Since individual communities possess their own interests and agency, involvement in larger organisations, even if mutually beneficial involves trading away some autonomy over aims, strategy and action.³⁷⁷ The insistence of the earliest inscriptions on the constitutive framing of the institution may indicate precisely this process of negotiation and balancing. Herostratus’ inscription also mentions a συνέδριον, which may indicate the formation of broader institutions within the group.³⁷⁸ The socialisation and renewal of the

³⁷⁴ Ando 2000, 337. van Nijf (2001, 306-318) notes the participants in contests shared this social background.

³⁷⁵ Mileta 2008a, 112. Cf. Jones (2012, 214-217) for imperial examples.

³⁷⁶ Compare Ando (2000, 199-205) on imperial acclamations.

³⁷⁷ Mackil 2013, 216.

³⁷⁸ Though this could post-date the Mithridatic Wars. Raggi 2010, 148. Cf. Kaufmann & Stauber 1992, 58-60.

ritual bonds brought about by the penteteric repetition of the new Μουκίεία, which persisted even through Mithridates' control of Asia, laid the foundations for later and more coherent action by the group.³⁷⁹ The increasing propensity of the emerging group to honour individuals with inscriptions further supports this view.³⁸⁰

The most compelling evidence for the consolidation of this loose body from a collective focused on festivals to a more politically minded institution is a decree, issued by a body calling itself the κοινὸν τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἑλλήνων ('the *koinon* of the Greeks in Asia'). This document, as Drew-Bear demonstrated, must date to the Republican period: the content and specifically the reference to the 'utmost despair' wrought by δημοσιῶναι (sc. *publicani*) gives a firm date between the re-establishment of *provincia Asia* in the late 80s and Caesar's removal of Roman tax-farmers of the *decuma* in 48.³⁸¹ The decree honours two statesmen, Dionysius and Hierocles, citizens of both Tralles and Aphrodisias, who had undertaken an embassy to Rome διὰ τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον τῶν Ἑλλήνων ('for the common good of the Greeks'). Following their success, the *koinon* voted them golden crowns and bronze statues.³⁸² This inscription raises several pertinent questions regarding the form, date, nature and aims of the *koinon* as a body.

The issuing body names itself in several ways within the text. The full title, given above, appears once (ll.24-25). More commonly, the abbreviated version of κοινὸν τῶν

³⁷⁹ On the Μουκίεία under Mithridates: Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.51.; cf. [Asc.] 202, 262 Stangl. Mileta 2008a, 103-104.

³⁸⁰ E.g. *OGIS* 438.

³⁸¹ Drew-Bear 1972, 469-471.

³⁸² *IAph2007* 2.503. We should not see their involvement as evidence that Aphrodisias paid Roman taxes in this period, *pace* Buraselis 2000, 125. Rather tax-avoidance may explain their residence: n.287 *supra*.

Ἑλλήνων is used (ll.4, 21, 22). However, twice, and crucially when laying out the text to be inscribed beneath the statues decreed for the honorands, the body refers to itself as οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ δῆμοι καὶ τὰ ἔθνη ('The peoples and tribes in Asia'; ll.23-24, 28). This echoes the titlature of the group which organised the Σωτήρια καὶ Μουκιεῖα, demonstrating a link between the so-called peoples and tribes of Asia and the institutional form of the *koinon*.³⁸³ This document presents a transition between the two modes of reference. However, beyond this decree for Hierocles and Dionysus all attestations of the κοινὸν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας τῶν Ἑλλήνων date to the Augustan period or later.³⁸⁴

The text demonstrates conclusively that representatives of this body could meet, and did so at Ephesus, though whether this was a regular or irregular occurrence the text leaves unclear. It resembles contemporary civic decrees, containing motivation clauses and a rationale, before ending with a resolution clause. Self-evidently the body had a reasonable expectation that its membership would respect its utterances: the bronze statues for the ambassadors, not insignificant honours, were to be erected παρ' ᾧ ἂν βούλωνται δῆμῳ ἢ ἔθνει ('among whatsoever people or tribe [the honorands] wish').³⁸⁵ Moreover, this decree is predicated on previous decisions taken by the group, namely to dispatch ambassadors on behalf of the collective group to the Senate in Rome, to give an account of the issue and beg for protection. The decree also refers to officials (πρόεδροι), tasked by the original meeting to send letters to Aphrodisias in order to locate Dionysus and Hierocles, and a γραμματεὺς,

³⁸³ Vitale 2012, 62-64.

³⁸⁴ E.g. RDGE 65 (Paullus, 9/8 BCE); *I.Sardis* 8 (Menogenes, 1-5 CE); AvP 8.3.19 (L. Calpurnius Piso, c. 5-12 CE).

³⁸⁵ *IAph2007* 2.503.27.

though, *contra* Edelmann-Singer, the existence of officials should not be taken to imply a permanent staff at this early stage.³⁸⁶

Scholars have generally dated the decree before 71 and Lucullus' actions against the *publicani* in Asia.³⁸⁷ This claim originates with Drew-Bear's treatment of the decree which, while showing due caution in noting the *termini ante* and *post quem*, then asserts without argument 'probablement avant les réformes opérées par Lucullus en 71'.³⁸⁸ This date is routinely reproduced without qualification and warrants scrutiny.³⁸⁹ Drew-Bear's reasoning appears to be based on Lucullus' well-attested alleviation of the financial crisis gripping the *poleis* of Asia. However, the fiscal situation of provincial communities remained marginal across the period. Cicero, defending Flaccus in 59, implies a fierce resentment of Roman taxes. Similar sentiments appear in his correspondence with his brother.³⁹⁰ His own later experience in Cilicia demonstrates the speed with which conditions could fluctuate. The power of the governor to set and enforce provincial rates of interest could have a major impact on the solvency of communities.³⁹¹ Despite Lentulus Spinther's resistance to the *publicani* before 54, on Cicero's arrival in the province in 51, civic finances were in a sorry state.³⁹²

³⁸⁶ Though framing her stance through careful negatives; that a permanent staff existed is inherently less probable than that the position rotated through or was selected through the active civic representatives. Vitale 2012, 62 *contra* Edelmann-Singer 2011, 89; 2015, 67-68.

³⁸⁷ On these actions: Tröster 2008, 86, with references.

³⁸⁸ Drew-Bear 1972, 471.

³⁸⁹ E.g. Ferrary 2001, 25 ('sans doute, des années 70'); Edelmann-Singer 2015, 64-67.

³⁹⁰ Cic. *Flacc.* 19. Cf. Cic. *QFr.* 1.1.33-34.; 1.2.6.

³⁹¹ E.g. Cic. *Att.* 5.21, 6.1.

³⁹² Cic. *Fam.* 1.9.26; *Att.* 5.16.2-3.

Crucially, the proposed date does not leave much time for an appeal to Rome based on the activity of *publicani* specifically. Immediately after Sulla's reorganisation, the *societates publicanorum* were not active in Asia, and the system of *ensoria locatio* may not have been revived until 75. If so, one would expect, if the decree had been produced before Lucullus' arrival, emphasis to be laid on the suddenness or novelty of the crisis. Instead, the text underscores the longstanding nature of the problems facing the cities. Cn. Pompeius Magnus, who held responsibility for Asia from 66 to 62, likewise had crafted a reputation as a commander sensitive to the hardships of provincials and his command would seem an odd context for the *koinon*'s action.³⁹³ Moreover, given that Lucullus' long service in Asia afforded him a pre-existing, and largely positive, reputation, it would be unusual to see a direct approach to the Senate preceding his actions which did not leverage his name and authority.³⁹⁴ Instead, the situation described in the decree better suits the late 60s, under Flaccus, or, more likely, the 50s.³⁹⁵

The second 'Republican' attestation of the *koinon* often cited appears in the letter preserved at Miletus and Priene, which, I have already argued above, dates rather to the post-Actian period. Here the *koinon* appears only as addressee, alongside the *conventus* centres of the *provincia*. Even so, this illustrates that the body was sufficiently well-established to receive, and presumably act on, correspondence from Roman officials. It suggests a means of simplifying Roman administrative practice. As noted *supra*, the

³⁹³ Morrell 2017, 70-76.

³⁹⁴ Keaveney 1992 (29-30); Tröster 2008, 81-82.

³⁹⁵ Compare Canali De Rossi (2005, 101-108) contextualising this decree in a slew of cases in the early 50s (Cic. *Flacc.* 52-53, 98).

distribution of significant correspondence through major centres to other communities reduced the demand on the system: it handballed responsibility for administrative communication to the communities themselves. Though speculative it could be observed that this process fits well with the style of governance introduced by the triumvir M. Antonius, who was also the first attested magistrate to write to the *koinon*, no earlier than 41.³⁹⁶ In a period where the institutional basis of collective government was dissolving, it would be plausible for Antonius to actively reduce the number of moving parts with which he had to communicate. However, though the advent of the *koinon* as a coherent mouthpiece of the assembled *provincia* presented a means for Roman officials to reduce their own responsibilities, this was an outcome, rather than carefully formed intention.

Exogenous factors also played their role in pushing the communities of Asia into ever-closer union. The shared trauma of the First Mithridatic War, whether experienced through devastation inflicted by either side or the decisions of Sulla, offered participants common ground over which to bond. The abuses of the *publicani* and other fiscal travails were mutual difficulties for most *poleis* in *provincia Asia* after Dardanus.³⁹⁷ Unrestrained Roman acquisitiveness provided a real threat, encouraging communities to surrender more of their individual agency to ensure the leverage of the collective, and consequently their own advantage in the longer term. Both Campanile and Edelmann-Singer argued that a major

³⁹⁶ RDGE 57.

³⁹⁷ This holds for even for free cities (e.g. RDGE 70). Even where the intentions of Sulla were clear, *publicani* could, and did, attempt to maximise their own return. This continues the trend from the early *provincia* where most *poleis* were unambiguously free, yet the *publicani* remained a significant nuisance.

factor in the *koinon*'s engagement with Roman administration was to provide a direct conduit for communal concerns to be communicated to the Senate in Rome. Rather than many *poleis* besieging the *curia* with complaints or a cacophony of discordant voices, the *koinon* provided a clear channel for the whole province to speak. This afforded the Senate the luxury of responding definitively to a single list of complaints at the cost of offering more leverage and *gravitas* to the ambassadors, as seems to have been the case in the imperial period.³⁹⁸ However, the evidence is ambiguous for the Republican manifestation of the *koinon*. Beyond the decree for Hierocles and Dionysus, little evidence of province-wide co-ordination exists. Though Cicero states that the accusation levelled against Flaccus for illegally collecting money for a fleet was a *commune totius Asiae crimen*, in contrast to those brought by individual cities, this need not mean that it was brought by the *koinon*. The involvement of all, or even most, of the communities represented in the suit would adequately explain this remark.³⁹⁹ Such a development was not obviously in the interests of the Senate. The staple Roman strategy of *divide et impera*, which Strabo notes as underpinning the basic organisation of *provincia Asia*, cuts against a policy of giving a single

³⁹⁸ Campanile 2007, 130-134; Edelmann-Singer 2015, 69-71.

³⁹⁹ Cic. *Flacc.* 34. Note Cicero's pains to dismiss this group here and elsewhere as unrepresentative of the province or individual civic bodies (Cic. *Flacc.* 18, 34, 42-43, 45, 52).

voice to a diverse range of communities.⁴⁰⁰ More tellingly, there is no evidence of another provincial *koinon* until the Augustan era.⁴⁰¹

Furthermore, Ferrary highlights the increasing frequency over the course of the first century of collective phrases including οἱ Ἕλληνες to describe the benefactors of Roman magistrates in honorary contexts. Rejecting Raubitschek's suggestion that the rush of inscriptions honouring Caesar in collective terms derived from a decree of the Delphic Amphictiony, he links it explicitly to the emergence of the *koinon*.⁴⁰² Ferrary cites two crucial earlier examples; first, an inscription for Q. Cicero at Claros describing him as εὐεργέτην ὄντα | τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ | πάτρωνα τοῦ δήμου ('benefactor of the Greeks and patron of the *demos*').⁴⁰³ Assuming the dedication took place during or soon after his governorship offers

⁴⁰⁰ Strabo 13.4.12. Knoepfler (2010, 700-705), notes the phenomenon of *koinon*-revivals on the Greek mainland during the late second and early first centuries. He adduces a decree of Chalcis celebrating a Πώμια with the κοινὸν τῶν Εὐβοιῶν, dated by him to after 146, an honorary inscription from Olympia, which he dates to after 122, and the re-establishment of the κοινὸν τῶν Βοιωτιῶν, which he places soon after Sulla's reconquest of Greece in 86. None of these dates, however, are uncontroversial, and the traditional dates for the first two examples fall in the first half of the second century. Each institution already existed and had interacted with the Roman state in an earlier period. This distinguishes them from this example, the formation *ex novo* of a coalition of relatively significant cities into a single institutional entity. Cf. Mackil 2013, 139-143.

⁴⁰¹ Fernoux (2004, 180-183 *contra* Deininger 1965, 16-19; Marek 1993, 73-82) emphasises that Augustus' concession of the right to erect a temple to Rome and himself at Nicomedia, as reported by CD. (51.20.6-7), does not itself demonstrate preceding existence of a κοινὸν τῶν ἐν Βιθυνίᾳ Ἑλλήνων (*koinon* of the Greeks in Bithynia). Instead, he draws on the evidence of CIL 6.1508, which he dates to 31-29 and attests the patronage over several Bithynian *poleis* by a certain 'Rufus', as counting against the existence of a *koinon*, while suggesting Augustus' reorganisation of Asia and Bithynia in 20 may have included its establishment (cf. CD. 54.7.4-5). The broader argument holds even if accepting Eilers' earlier date of pre-44 (2002, 254-256; cf. Eck 1984, 209). The next attested provincial *koinon* is that of Galatia (cf. Mitchell 1993, 103-104; Vitale 2012, 117-118). The assumption of Burrell (2004, 166) that this was established in the 20s with the *provincia* itself is unsupported by evidence.

⁴⁰² Ferrary 2001, 20-24 *contra* Raubitschek 1954, 74-75.

⁴⁰³ BÉ (1958) #390. See now: SEG 49.1511.

a date c. 60 and demonstrates a collective impact for Q. Cicero's actions.⁴⁰⁴ As governor, he showed an interest in reducing financial hardship for local communities, eliminating the levies paid to support a fleet based in the *provincia* and contributions to aedilician games at Rome.⁴⁰⁵ M. Cicero's semi-public and private injunctions to his brother treat the *publicani* with caution may indicate further sympathy for locals in exercising his juridical responsibilities.⁴⁰⁶ A statue-base from Priene for M'. Aemilius Lepidus, *proquaestor*, is less overt. Most commentators identify this individual with the consul of 66, giving a date of 80/79 assuming his election *suo anno* to both magistracies.⁴⁰⁷ The Prienean *demos* honours Lepidus ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν καὶ εὐνοίας | καὶ εὐεργεσίας τῆς εἰς ἑαυτὸν | καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Ἕλληνας ('for his excellence, goodwill and benefactions to them and the other Greeks').⁴⁰⁸ This is the earliest appearance of this shorthand for a collective of Greek communities relating themselves to Roman magistrates and may indicate an increasing group identity as a result of the longer-term co-operation in organising festivals or the more sudden collective imposition of direct and intrusive Roman rule. Ferrary's argument, however, that the two inscriptions depend in some way on a collective decision, or indeed, decree of the *koinon*, while not implausible, lacks positive evidence. In both cases the honouring city seems to act on its own initiative. Q. Cicero is explicitly highlighted as the civic patron of

⁴⁰⁴ For Q. Cicero's governorship: *MRR* 2.181, 185, 191; Magie 1950, 381-383, 1244. A dedication during his transit of Asia as *legatus* during his brother's command in Cilicia in 51-50, though possible, is less likely.

⁴⁰⁵ *Cic. Flacc.* 33; *QFr.* 1.1.26.

⁴⁰⁶ *Cic. QFr.* 1.1.33-34, 2.6.

⁴⁰⁷ Ferrary (2001, 24) adduces *I.Délös* 1659 and 1953, which honour Lepidus at Delos under the ἐπιμελητής Nicanor to further bolster this date, but note Mattingly's (1979, 166-167) suggestion of 65/64.

⁴⁰⁸ *I.Priene*² 233.

Colophon, while Lepidus is honoured by the Prieneans for services to their city first. These examples stand contrast with documents of the δήμοι καὶ ἔθνη which explicitly enumerate the collective membership of the group participating, eliding individual identities in favour of solidarity.⁴⁰⁹

A series of honorific statues erected for Caesar in cities of Asia after Pharsalus, some of which explicitly mention the *koinon* offer more evidence of this phenomenon. Raubitschek drew attention to a dedication to Caesar's father on Samos, which emphasised his qualities καὶ κοινῶς πρὸς πάντας τοὺς Ἑλληνας καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς ἑαυτῶν ('both in common to all the Greeks and in a private capacity to our own [city]').⁴¹⁰ At Pergamum, a statue base regards Caesar as σώτηρ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπάντων ('saviour of all the Greeks'), while Raubitschek identified three pairs of statues at Kartheia, Pergamum and Chios, in which the local aspect of honours as 'saviour' of the city was paralleled by a global aspect, as σώτηρ τῆς οἰκουμένης in the first instance, and by the κοινὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων in the latter two.⁴¹¹ Most of Raubitschek's corpus, like the Pergamene inscription, date to specifically to late 48 and Dobesch added examples from Delos, Phocaea and Samos.⁴¹² The connection to a supra-civic body would offer a strong explanation for this explosion of global references, which Ferrary plausibly identified as the *koinon*.⁴¹³ More intriguingly, these examples are the

⁴⁰⁹ Vitale's insistence (2012, 32-33, 38-39; 2014, 287-308) that ἔθνος and *koinon* are two sides of the same two coin cuts against the deliberate framing of the nascent organisation as δήμοι καὶ ἔθνη.

⁴¹⁰ IGR 4.970.

⁴¹¹ IG 12.5.556-557 (Kartheia); IGR 4.303, 307 (Pergamum); IGR 4.928-929 (Chios). Raubitschek 1954, 74.

⁴¹² SEG 14.502 (Delos); 15.748 (Phocaea); 14.557 (Samos). Dobesch 1996, 61; 2001, 20-24; Kirbihler 2012, 141-142.

⁴¹³ Compare Mileta 2008a, 107.

first for which the κοινόν appears explicitly mentioned alongside *poleis*. Edelman-Singer argued that the choice to emphasise the constituent groups of the *koinon* in the Caesarean honorific bases must be deliberate and that the explicit use of *poleis*, for the first time here, speaks to the greater freedoms bestowed upon them by Caesar.⁴¹⁴ However, Laffi stresses that individual free communities did not necessarily think of themselves as external to the province in the Late Republic and may not have seen the *koinon* as a ‘provincial’ organisation.⁴¹⁵

The interesting question arises from this discussion as to who comprised the *koinon* in practice. When Caesar was victorious, how practical was it to assemble delegates and vote through a decree of this nature? Pharsalus took place on 9th August, and Caesar arrived in Alexandria on 2nd October, which leaves an improbably short window for a decision of the *koinon* to be have been agreed by all constituent members, passed and presented to the dictator during his flying visit to the province.⁴¹⁶ Perhaps more plausibly, these dedications postdate the departure of Caesar, but the titulature requires that they fall within the Roman year 48. Intriguingly, no similar examples appear in the final three years of Caesar’s life. This, more than any other detail, points to a supra-civic decision to honour Caesar as a collective body.

A letter of M. Antonius addressed to the *koinon* in 41 emphasises the shifting perceptions of the institutions. The triumvir writes that he was asked to confirm the existing

⁴¹⁴ Syll.³ 760. Edelman-Singer 2015, 65–66.

⁴¹⁵ Laffi 2010a, 36–37.

⁴¹⁶ Rawson 1994, 433, with references.

privileges of the association of wreath-bearers for the sacred games and inform the *koinon*, both of which he had proceeded to do.⁴¹⁷ The crucial implication of this document, which does not require its own publicisation or dissemination, is that the petitioners viewed the *koinon* as the peak, or only, body to guarantee their privileges. In turn, this implies a broad oversight of common festivals within Asia, rather than specifically those celebrating Romans: a stark contrast with the earliest honorific documents, which stress their connection with the Μουκικία. Similar grants to the guild of Dionysiac artists by Sulla in the 80s had been sent directly to cities.⁴¹⁸ This letter illustrates neatly that while the *koinon*'s focus remained collective, religious and honorific, it was becoming more institutionalised vis-à-vis the communities of Asia throughout the 40s.

In sum, the *koinon* originated as a collective assembly of local communities in *provincia Asia* based around the celebration of common religious festivals honouring individual Roman magistrates. First attested in the 90s, it slowly coalesced into a venue for collective action and began serving as a co-ordinating body for common complaints to Rome. However, when compared to Roman management of other provincial communities in the late second and early first centuries, the prevailing view that it emerged from imperial planning is unlikely. Though certainly acknowledged as a legitimate organisation and later employed by Roman administrators to simplify communication with *poleis* and co-ordinate the provincial imperial cult, this evolution in form and responsibilities is more likely to have

⁴¹⁷ RDGE 57. Date: Kenyon 1893, 477; Magie 1950, 1279; Sherk 1969, 292. Brandis's suggestion (1897, 516-518) of 33/32 is unconvincing.

⁴¹⁸ RDGE 18.2-4.

occurred during the chaos of the civil wars in the 40s and 30s. Instead the κοινόν presents an example of local agency and self-organisation to deal with Roman power.

1.2.3: Civic freedom in Republican *provincia Asia*

The position of the remaining ἐλεύθεραι *poleis* presents a final, critical, element of late Republican Asia: the effects of the broader changes in civic status on the meaning of ἐλευθερία in *provincia Asia* were not insignificant. The *senatusconsultum de Stratonicensibus* provides a key example. Passed in 81, it accorded eleven specific privileges to the city, mostly senatorial confirmations of Sulla's own decisions in the field. Most prominent were the renewal of *amicitia et societas* (l.69) and the guaranteed use of their own laws as before the war (νόμοις ἐθισμοῖς τε ἰδίοις πρότερον, l.91).⁴¹⁹ Crucial, however, was the assignment of several communities (πολιτεῖαι) and their revenues (προσόδους) to the *polis*. These revenues recur three times in the extant text: first, Themessos, Keramos and a third community are listed, together with the χωρία [κώμας λιμένας προσόδους τε τῶν] πόλεων ('lands, villages, harbours, and revenues of the *poleis*'), which Sulla had assigned them.⁴²⁰ Later, they appear only as πολιτείας ('communities').⁴²¹ Heller notes the novelty of this situation, wherein the communities themselves, though subordinate to Stratonicea, retained their own identities and *polis*-status.⁴²² Importantly, the *senatusconsultum* also includes the clause that Sulla was

⁴¹⁹ Heller 2006, 65.

⁴²⁰ *RDGE* 18.55-58.

⁴²¹ *RDGE* 18.106-108.

⁴²² Heller 2006, 66-68. Kallet-Marx (1995, 276), takes it as a rule that the remaining free cities were assigned new territories. Santangelo's caution (2007, 123 n.71) seems justified. Keramos, at least, seems to have broken free swiftly (*I.Keramos* 18, 27, 31 with Gabrielsen 2000, 167-168).

to decide on: ἐπιγνῶι διατάξῃ[ι ὅσας ἐκάσῃ] | προσόδους Στρατονικεῦσιν τελεῖν ('decide how much revenue each was to pay to Stratonicea'). Having done so Sulla was enjoined:

πρὸς ταύτας τὰς πολιτείας, ἃς Στρ[ατονικεῦσιν] | προσώρισεν, γράμματα ἀποστείλει, ἵνα τοσοῦτον τ[έλος] | Στρατονικεῦσιν τελεῶσιν | [τ]οῦτό τε, οἵτινες ἄν ποτε αἰεὶ Ἀσίαν τὴν τε Ἑλλάδα ἐπαρχείας | [δια]κατέχωσιν, φροτίζωσιν διδῶσιν τε ἐργασίαν, ἵν[α ταῦτα] | οὕτως γίν[ω]νται ('to send letters to those communities which he assigned to the Stratoniceans, that each will pay such an amount to the Stratoniceans; and that those who, at any time, are in charge of Asia or Greece shall consider and ensure that things are done in this way').⁴²³

This reveals the intimate personal involvement of the dictator in the decision-making process and the details of how, from the perspective of the communities, this new arrangement would operate. Rather than taking all the lands and revenues of a given city, which would be impractical to enforce without the erasing the existing *polis*-community, Sulla would define a (presumably annual) 'contribution' due to the dominant *polis*, Stratonicea.

The fragmentary *senatusconsultum de Tabenis* bolsters this picture. The stone suffered substantial damage in key places at lines 7 and 10-11: Sherck restored the text to relate to villages (κώμας) allocated to the city by Sulla, and 'the right to use their own laws' ([αὐτ]οἱ αὐ]τοῖς τοῖς νόμοις αἰρέσεσιν). The more conservative text of Crawford-Reynolds simply confirms the grants of Sulla including the [ἀρίσ]τοις τοῖς νόμοις αἰρέσεσιν ('the right to the best laws and conditions').⁴²⁴ These two *senatusconsulta* emphasise that, in the aftermath of

⁴²³ RDGE 18.107-112.

⁴²⁴ RDGE 17.10-11 with Crawford & Reynolds 1974, 289-293.

the First Mithridatic War, freedom was supplemented by the grant of lands and revenues from neighbouring, presumably, less loyal communities.

An honorific decree from Alabanda further clarifies this period of transition. The text, for Pyrrha[kos], refers to several embassies he undertook, including to the Romans and an unnamed *basileus*. The date remains disputed: some scholars identify the king as Eumenes II, suggesting a date in first half of the second century.⁴²⁵ However, a reference to fiscal immunity (ἀφορολογησία) decreed by the Senate suits the aftermath of the First Mithridatic War better.⁴²⁶ Pyrrha[kos] engaged in at least two exchanges with representatives of the *res publica*. First, he is reported to have renewed οἰκ[ειό]τητα καὶ φιλίαν (‘kinship and friendship’) and ποιήσασθαι συμμαχ[ίαν] (‘made an alliance’), while assisting Roman forces in the region.⁴²⁷ Afterwards, he went on an embassy to the Senate περὶ φόρων (‘concerning the tribute’) and returned with a decree of ἀφορολογησία (‘*immunitas*/fiscal immunity’).⁴²⁸ Santangelo, persuasively, takes this as evidence for Alabanda’s freedom, without commenting on the explicit foregrounding of fiscal matters.⁴²⁹ This highlights the extent to which, after the inclusion of southern Caria in *provincia Asia*, even free communities had to reassert their rights vis-à-vis the *publicani*. It may also present early evidence for the separation of *libertas* from *immunitas* in the Roman administration of Asia.

⁴²⁵ SEG 60.1073. Cousins & Diehl 1886, 299-306; Canali De Rossi 1992/1993, 35-40; Errington 2010, 125-130.

⁴²⁶ Willrich 1899, 305-311; Marek 1988, 294-302; Santangelo 2007, 54-55; 2009, 67.

⁴²⁷ SEG 60.1073.11-15.

⁴²⁸ SEG 60.1073.25-34.

⁴²⁹ Santangelo 2007, 123. Later, Plin. *HN* 5.109.

The *lex Antonia de Termessibus*, promulgated (on the most likely dating) in 68 BCE, provides the best evidence for the implications of *libertas* in Asia Minor in the post-Sullan era.⁴³⁰ This statute granted several privileges to the inhabitants of Termessus Maior in Pisidia, including declaring them *leiberi amicei socieique populi Romani* ('free, friends and allies of the Roman People').⁴³¹ Though Ferrary persuasively ascribes the *polis* to *provincia Cilicia*, the text nevertheless reveals broader trends in Roman attitudes towards freedom in the post-Sullan period.⁴³² The *communis opinio* sees Termessus as subjected to direct rule and having its territory confiscated in the aftermath of the First Mithridatic War and its freedom restored for resisting the invasion of the Pontic commander Eumachus in 73. However, this *libertas* was specifically defined. The legislation, though explicitly enrolling the Termessians as *amici et socii*, represents a simple grant of privileges, which could be revoked unilaterally.⁴³³ These privileges included protection from magistrates or *legati* from billeting troops, except at the discretion of the Senate, or requisitioning supplies except under the terms of the *lex Porcia*.⁴³⁴ The *polis* was also authorised to collect local customs duties, the *portoria*, provided that they were not levied on Roman *publicani*.⁴³⁵ The surviving text does

⁴³⁰ This statute was based on an earlier *senatusconsultum*, probably passed, from internal evidence, in 72. RS 19.1.1-4. Griffin 1973, 210-211; Ferrary 1985, 439-442 *contra* Mattingly 1997, 68-78.

⁴³¹ RS 19.1.4-8.

⁴³² RS 19.1.22. Ferrary 1996, 338.

⁴³³ This fits the 'surrender and grant' model proposed by Bickerman (1932, 56-61; 1938, 14-17, 133-141; 1939, 344-345) to explain relationships between *poleis* and Hellenistic kingdoms. According to this view, at the moment of surrender, a *polis* formally ceased to exist as a political entity before being reconstituted by the grace of the ruler. Subsequently, any rights, up-to and including full ἐλευθερία, flowed directly from the ruling power and could be revoked at any time (compare the archetypal example: *I.Priene*² 1). Ma 2000, 111-113; Kantor 2014, 249-251.

⁴³⁴ RS 19.2.6-17. On requisitions, which could be heavy, even on free communities, compare IG 5.1.1146.32-40 with Santangelo 2009a, 361-366; *I.Sagalassos* 3; Linderski 2007 [1999], 309-318.

⁴³⁵ RS 19.2.31-36.

not preserve any explicit reference to *immunitas*, though it is admittedly incomplete. The question of whether these rights were specific to Termessus, or a general package of rights which could be granted to any *polis* along with *libertas* remains unclear. References within the document to islands and maritime *portoria*, when Termessus' territory was almost certainly landlocked, prompted Magie to see this as a general formula.⁴³⁶ However, while an existing formula may have offered a model, other elements, including references to the *lex locationis*, carried immediate and historically contingent implications.⁴³⁷

Important testimony for the continued variability of rights for ἐλεύθεραι *poleis* during this period comes from a letter of an Augustan proconsul to Chios, which cites a *senatusconsultum* from 80:

ἡ σύγκ[λη]τος εἰδικῶς ἐβεβαίωσε ὅπως νόμοις τε καὶ ἔθεσιν καὶ δικαίοις χ[ρῶν]ται ἃ ἔσχον ὅτε τῇ Ῥωμαίων φιλίᾳ προσῆλθον, ἵνα τε ὑπὸ μηθ' ᾧτινι[οῦν] | τύπῳ ὧσιν ἀρχόντων ἢ ἀνταρχόντων· οἳ τε παρ' αὐτοῖς ὄντες Ῥωμ[αῖ]οι τοῖς Χείων ὑπακούουσιν νόμοις ('The Senate specifically confirmed that they might enjoy their laws and customs and rights which they had when they entered into the friendship with the Romans, so that they might be subject to no written directive whatsoever of Roman magistrates or promagistrates; and that the Romans among them may be subject to the laws of the Chians').⁴³⁸

The reference to interstate 'friendship' appears to offer a terminal limit at which these privileges were fixed, and perhaps constrained future constitutional and judicial innovation.

⁴³⁶ Magie 1950, 1176-1177; Ferrary 1996, 338; Merola 2001, 118-119. Cf. Heberdey 1929, 5-15.

⁴³⁷ E.g. RS 19.1.22 (restored as: e[x] l[ege Ciliciae locandae dicta]). Ferrary (1996, 338) notes that this clause of the statute deals with the restitution of confiscated property to the Termessians, including *ager publicus* which may have been contracted out in the *ensoria locatio* of 70.

⁴³⁸ RDGE 70.14-18.

Two territorial disputes between Greek communities mediated by the Senate in the second century offer comparanda. During the first, involving Priene and Magnesia-on-the-Maeander, the Senate instructed the Mylasans, as arbitrators, to award the disputed lands to the community which possessed it ὅτε εἰς τὴν φιλίαν τοῦ Ῥωμαίων παραγένετο ('when the city entered into the friendship of the Roman people').⁴³⁹ Similarly, in c. 140, representatives of two Thessalian *poleis*, Melitaia and NARTHAKION, sought to argue to the Senate that they possessed disputed territory at the time at which they acquired *amicitia* with Rome.⁴⁴⁰ Most commentators assert that this represents the common practice of the Senate during this period, though Kallet-Marx cautions that these are the only two examples of this formula being employed in this context.⁴⁴¹ Critically, however, the date at which *amicitia* was established could be contested, while Ager highlights that the Mylasans avoided any reference to *amicitia* in their decision.⁴⁴² Practicality suggests that Roman officials did not exercise oversight of Chian law-making on a regular basis. However, that does not preclude this clause serving as a potential justification for Roman interference in the case of regime-change within Chios.

Beyond the typical privilege of using their own laws (αὐτονομία; *uti suis legibus*), the Chians received confirmation of an existing right to exercise local jurisdiction over resident Romans. Kantor persuasively classifies this as 'the use of Chian law in Chian courts' and

⁴³⁹ RDGE 7.51-55.

⁴⁴⁰ RDGE 9.21-22, 46-48.

⁴⁴¹ Kallet-Marx 1995, 174; *pace* Marshall 1980, 648; Ager 1996, 27.

⁴⁴² Ager 1996, 327; Snowden 2014, 428-429, 432-439.

raises the pertinent issue of whether this applied for citizens of the *polis* outside the island.⁴⁴³

The surviving text would imply the negative, though the author's paraphrase likely only contained information relevant to the issue at hand: most likely a dispute between a Roman landowner/s and the *polis* in which his predecessor had interfered.⁴⁴⁴ Notwithstanding the possibility that the original *senatusconsultum* included more details, the fact remains that the rights and privileges of free cities, during this period, were variable and decided on a case-by-case basis.⁴⁴⁵

Of further interest, a stele containing two letters from Sulla regarding the privileges of the Ionian and Hellespontine guild of Dionysian artists. The second letter, which seems to have been written c. 84 established privileges and honours, including ἀλειτουργησία ('exemption from public services'), which the Senate and magistrates have already bestowed upon the artists, before adding a tax-exemption (μήτε τινὰ [εἰσφορὰν ἢ δαπά]|νας εἰσφέρητε) and other privileges.⁴⁴⁶ Its companion, written by Sulla in 81, sanctioned the right of the guild to erect a stele recording the privileges granted by the dictator himself, ratified *ex senatusconsulto*.⁴⁴⁷ This raises the interesting point that in referring back to earlier decisions of the Senate, Sulla verifies that that body and magistrates felt no qualms about interfering in the local administration of ostensibly free cities to exempt individuals and groups from local charges. In each case discussed, the involvement of the Senate in the final

⁴⁴³ Kantor 2010, 196-197.

⁴⁴⁴ Marshall 1969, 262-269.

⁴⁴⁵ Thornton (1999, 520-521) plausibly concludes that this decree belongs in the context of other *senatusconsulta* confirming Sullan grants of privileges, e.g. to Stratonicea, Tabae, Thasos.

⁴⁴⁶ RDGE 49.B.8-11.

⁴⁴⁷ RDGE 49.A.8-15.

instance conferred a broader legitimacy to the provincial actors beyond the simple fact of the *acta* themselves. The specific grants here are largely concerned with reward of cities which had supported Rome. The result defined privileges far more precisely than in previous eras, tightening the leeway afforded even to loyal allies.⁴⁴⁸

Within three and a half decades of Sulla's reorganisation of Asia, government in the region had been radically altered. The catalyst was the subjection of most *poleis* to the *imperium* and *iurisdictio* of the Roman governor after 85. Suddenly, communities were liable for Roman taxes, previously restricted to the former βασιλική χώρα, and open to gubernatorial oversight of local legal cases. Existing Roman institutions played an expanded role in the post-Sullan period. Since the establishment of a regular *provincia*, governors had always exercised *iurisdictio* over the *conventus civium Romanorum* in any given city and had the capacity to issue *leges datae* affecting provincial communities. However, with the addition of most *poleis* in Asia to the province, these institutions adapted to new circumstances. The primacy of Roman jurisdiction over local courts resulted in the formalisation of regional courts, the outlining of a *conventus* structure. This likely followed an earlier Attalid form of organisation, given the co-optation of the Greek term διοίκησις, but this does not rule out changes based on the *formula provinciae* at this time. Similarly, governor's decisions, whether expressed as *edicta*, *constitutiones* or *leges datae* affected most inhabitants in Asia for the first time, providing a new framework for Roman rule. While no

⁴⁴⁸ Cf. *RDGE* 44: letters to the Isthmian-Nemean guild, renewing privileges and exemptions from local liturgies, and, though extremely fragmentary, to the Ionian-Hellespontine guild. Sherwin-White 1978, 140 claims Sulla's 'language [is] of advice rather than command'. By contrast, Buraselis (2000, 128-129) sees Sulla's intervention as decisive and intrusive.

major increase in the number of Roman troops in the *provincia* occurred, magistrates and their associates could deploy their small entourages as leverage on communities.⁴⁴⁹ Consequently, the Roman state, after Sulla, effectively extended the coercive and fiscal elements of its power in Asia, existing institutions evolving to support the new situation.

1.3: The Civil Wars and their Impact

The collapse of central government in early 49 as civil war broke out between C. Iulius Caesar and Cn. Pompeius Magnus had a radical effect on relations between the inhabitants of *provincia Asia* and the Roman state. Most notably, despite widespread support for the Pompeian cause by communities and allies in the East, tales of exploitation by commanders in this period abound.⁴⁵⁰ While the rump Senate persisted with a semblance of government as normal, their defeat at Pharsalus heralded the demise of traditional processes of decision-making at Rome. Caesar's assassination within four years triggered further rounds of blood-letting and institutional innovation, while *provincia Asia* was devastated by a Parthian invasion led jointly by Q. Labienus and Pacorus in 40/39.⁴⁵¹ Though the division of the Roman world between the *tresviri rei publicae constituendae* provided short-term stability, with Asia beneath the remit of M. Antonius, the difficult relationship between the wielders of the *summum imperium*, culminating in the Actium campaign, required major adjustments to the Roman administrative system. For nearly two decades the imperial centre and its officials

⁴⁴⁹ Cic. *Imp. Pomp.* 66.

⁴⁵⁰ On exactions of the Pompeians: Marek 2010, 375.

⁴⁵¹ App. *BCiv.* 5.10; CD. 48.24.3–26.1. Further references: Sherwin-White 1984, 298–304.

were in a state of flux: this central instability prompted an environment in which sudden changes in allegiance, process and policy could be expected, though, from the local perspective, their direction was unpredictable.

After Pharsalus, with his authority unchallenged, Caesar fundamentally changed the fiscal administration of *provincia Asia*. Though precision is difficult, the sources agree that after arriving in Asia in pursuit of the defeated Pompeius, Caesar abolished the tax-farm for the Asian *decuma* and reduced tax-rates by one third.⁴⁵² Merola suggested that the tithe was abolished and replaced with a fixed annual tribute. Though appealing, *prima facie*, the strongly positive view of variable rates offered by Appian's Antonius counts against this position.⁴⁵³ Regardless, these related decisions demonstrate the fundamental inequity and inefficiencies of collection by the *publicani*. The new reality of Caesar's unhindered power allowed him to remake the fiscal system from the ground up, and his personal interests pushed him further in this direction. Like Sulla, Caesar needed coin immediately, to reward his troops, facilitate his pursuit of Pompeius and win the loyalty of his erstwhile enemies. While Dio states that Caesar exacted an immediate contribution from the *poleis*, the permanent reduction of tax rates allowed him to present a strong contrast with Sulla and his contemporary opponents, allowing him to 'win hearts and minds'.⁴⁵⁴

The civil war and its consequences present a 'critical juncture' in the history of the *res publica*. Contemporary institutions had proven unable to contain the ambitions of its leading

⁴⁵² Literature: n.255 *supra*. Whether this decision took effect in 48 by virtue of Caesar's personal authority or only after legislated in Rome in 47/46 is an open question (Morrell 2017, 149).

⁴⁵³ Tan 2017, 56; *pace* Merola 2001a, 461-472. Note, judiciously, Corbier (AÉ 2001, #1863).

⁴⁵⁴ CD. 42.6.1. Contrast [Caes.] *BAfr.* 90, 97, where his exactions targeted Roman citizens.

figures and had broken down. The concentration of authority in the person of Caesar and the manifest inadequacy of the existing system afforded him, like Sulla a generation earlier, an opportunity to remodel the state in his preferred image. Unlike his predecessor as dictator, Caesar's programme remained incomplete at his death, however. Accordingly, it is critical to recognise that structural factors, particularly the collapse of central authority, catalysed the profound institutional changes in the relationship between the communities of Asia and the Roman state. Caesar's decision to remove responsibility for collecting the *decuma* from the *publicani* provides an excellent example. His victory and the authority it granted also allowed him to bypass the vested interests of the *publicani*, as well as the *equites* and senatorial class more generally, and act, as he saw it, in the interests of the state. His position minimised factors leading to institutional inertia and afforded him the space to implement bold proposals.⁴⁵⁵ Certainly, these reforms improved the lot of the Asian *poleis* and their taxpayers; possibly even the state treasury.⁴⁵⁶ This change to the *decuma* in Asia highlight how dangerous inefficiencies, baked into state structures could be solved by the confluence of events and interests which resulted from Caesar's victory.

During his short period of dominance, between campaigns across the Mediterranean, Caesar altered the relationship between Rome and the *poleis* in several other ways. Significantly, he granted ἐλευθερία to several communities and the sources underscore the

⁴⁵⁵ E.g. Capoccia 2016, 96-98.

⁴⁵⁶ Brunt (1990, 380-381), followed by Tan (2017, 55), deems it implausible Caesar intentionally reduced state revenue given his fiscal needs, though his immediate concerns likely took priority over broader fiscal planning. He may also have barred the *publicani* from Judaea and other provinces (Joseph. AJ. 14.202-210. Rostovtzeff 1941, 1000-1001; Braund 1983a, 243-244). However, *publicani* were retained for indirect taxes, such as the *portoria*.

role of Greek associates in encouraging these decisions. Plutarch emphasises the role of Theopompus in ensuring Cnidus' freedom, and his son, Artemidorus may also have had a strong relationship with Caesar.⁴⁵⁷ Certainly this grant had been made by August 47, when the author of the *Bellum Alexandrinum* records *in Asiam iter facit omniumque earum provinciarum de controversiis cognoscit et statuit; iura in tetrarchas, reges, civitates distribuit* ('[Caesar], making the journey into Asia, became acquainted with and ruled on disputes of all of those provinces; he assigned rights to the tetrarchs, kings and cities').⁴⁵⁸

Pergamum, too, benefitted from the close association of a leading citizen with the dominant power in the Roman world. Mithridates, who had been involved in the trial of Flaccus in 59, subsequently led reinforcements to Caesar in Alexandria, before being sent by the dictator to take control of the allied kingdom on the Crimean Bosphorus.⁴⁵⁹ An inscription dated to Caesar's second dictatorship praised him for restoring τοῖς θεοῖς τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν ('the city and its territory to the gods'), which could stand for the city's freedom, but more likely ἀσυλία.⁴⁶⁰ Given that honorific inscriptions for Mithridates use the same phrase and that he was subsequently honoured at Pergamum as Φιλέταιρον νέον κτίστην ('the founder, new Philetaerus'), Robert argued that he personally persuaded the dictator to act.⁴⁶¹

However, later evidence complicates this dating. From 46–44, P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus held the command in Asia. Servilius, epigraphically, is the best-attested

⁴⁵⁷ Plut. *Caes.* 48.1, 65.1. See Strabo 14.2.15; Thériault 2003, 232–239, 247–248.

⁴⁵⁸ [Caes.] *BAlex.* 78.

⁴⁵⁹ Strabo 13. P.625; [Caes.] *BAlex* 26–28, 78; CD. 42.42. Heller 2011, 239–242; Ventroux 2017, 57–61.

⁴⁶⁰ *IGR* 4.397+1682, 4.304+1677.

⁴⁶¹ *RDGE* 54. Robert 1937, 227–230; Sherk 1969, 283.

Republican governor, due to the high number of honours accorded to him by a wide range of cities.⁴⁶² Crucially, at Pergamum, he was honoured as σωτήρ καὶ εὐεργέτης for his actions towards the *polis*, specifically: ἀποδεδωκότα τῇ | πόλει τοὺς πατρίους νόμους καὶ τὴν δημοκ[ρα]τίαν ἀδούλωτον ('he restored to the city the ancestral laws and unenslaved democracy').⁴⁶³ For Magie and Bernhardt, this proves that Servilius was responsible for implementing the grant of ἐλευθερία, though there is no barrier to seeing the honours for Mithridates as arising in this context.⁴⁶⁴

Servilius proved a popular governor among the communities of Asia. He served as the relevant authority in cases of dispute between *poleis* and Roman citizens and the evidence shows his propensity to intervene on the side of the former. As early as 60, he had been involved in attempts to protect provincials from extortionate demands by Romans.⁴⁶⁵ One document preserved at Pergamum, described as an ἐπίκριμα (*edictum*), dealt with a dispute between a Roman citizen and the community over the ἀσυλία of the Asclepeion, the monumentalisation of which implies local success.⁴⁶⁶ The heading of another letter survives at the end of the *senatus consultum Popillianum* and hints at a wider dossier of correspondence displayed at Pergamum which has been lost.⁴⁶⁷ Several conferrals of religious privileges are also attested across the *provincia*.⁴⁶⁸ His protection of local interests was recognised by

⁴⁶² Dates given by Cic. *Fam.* 13.68.1 (Sept. 46, in Asia), 12.2.1 (Sept. 44, at Rome). Inscriptions collated at Kirbihler 2011, 255-256, based on Robert 1948, 38-42.

⁴⁶³ AvP 8.2.413.

⁴⁶⁴ *Contra* Magie 1950, 405-406.

⁴⁶⁵ Cic. *Att.* 1.19.9, 20.4, 2.1.10. Morrell 2017, 149.

⁴⁶⁶ RDGE 55. N.b. Sherk's comments (1969, 287).

⁴⁶⁷ RDGE 11, 20-21. Drew-Bear 1972, 76; Haensch 2009, 185.

⁴⁶⁸ See Robert 1948, 38-39, with references; Kirbihler 2012, 128-129.

Roman observers: Cicero, writing in 45, expresses his happiness that Servilius has been sent *istam partem rei p(ublicae) male adfectam tueri* ('to protect that part of the *res publica* which has been badly treated'), implying a concern with recovery of a devastated region.⁴⁶⁹ Moreover, a letter from Caesar to Servilius has recently come to light in an inscription at Aezani. This text, discussed in more detail *infra*, provides direct instructions from the dictator to the governor, providing a sharp contrast with surviving material regarding Sulla's decisions. Instead of the careful employment of senatorial authority to bolster the unambiguous supreme *imperium* of the dictator, here we see the dictator's authority enhancing the provincial commander's actions on the ground. Caesar acted through Servilius, as the Senate and People would ordinarily act through magistrates on the ground. Despite this, on a local level, Servilius' personal services were significant enough to merit cult at Ephesus, which persisted into the first century CE.⁴⁷⁰ Despite the close collaboration between Caesar and the governor, communities were nevertheless motivated to publicly honour Servilius, emphasising the extent to which the local implementation of policy was crucial to the experience of Roman government.

Evidence from Mytilene demonstrates Caesar's declared respect for the rights of the ἐλεύθεραι πόλεις, even those closely associated with his opponents.⁴⁷¹ In late 48, the newly appointed dictator responded to an embassy by reassuring them of his benevolent intentions. Another letter, from 46, introduced a *senatusconsultum* confirming the privileges

⁴⁶⁹ Cic. *Fam.* 13.68.2.

⁴⁷⁰ Friesen 1993, 9-10, esp. n. 11, with references; Ferrary 1997, 207.

⁴⁷¹ Kirbihler 2012, 135: 'Il n'existe pas en Asie d'exemple de suppression d'une liberté de cité par César'.

conceded to the *polis*.⁴⁷² This document also reaffirmed the principle that individuals should not receive grants from Roman magistrates of immunity from civic taxes: Caesar responded that, cognisant of this, he intended not to grant this privilege to anyone.⁴⁷³ This statement reveals that, despite their existing status as free allies, granted by Pompeius as a favour to his associate Theophanes in 62, the decisions of Roman magistrates continued to constrain local government. Though these arrangements possibly pre-dated the restoration of their freedom, Caesar's undertaking to refrain from making new grants would be odd in this context. As already noted, Sulla had no qualms about instructing the Coans to respect the privileges of the guild of Dionysiac artists. In sum, this reveals the growing impact of Roman decisions on free cities.

The series of treaties (*foedera*) concluded between Caesar's Rome and communities in and around *provincia Asia* present another innovation.⁴⁷⁴ From the third century onwards, treaties formed a common, though not universal, element of Rome's relationships with polities in the eastern Mediterranean.⁴⁷⁵ Currently, published epigraphic texts preserve

⁴⁷² RDGE 26.a-b.

⁴⁷³ RDGE 26.b.27-34.

⁴⁷⁴ Latin *foedera* or *iusiuranda*; Greek συνθήκαι or ὀρκωμόσια. Mitchell 2005, 178.

⁴⁷⁵ Derow's view (1991) that the Roman state aggressively employed treaties to exert control over polities is unsustainable. The prevailing view emphasises the role of informal *amicitia* in Roman imperialism within the Greek East (Eckstein 1999, 2006; Kallet-Marx 1995, 184-197; Burton 2011), disassociating *foedera* from friendship and suggesting that they were not a necessary condition of 'alliance' with Rome (Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.13 on Sicilian communities. Heuss 1933, 53-59; Gruen 1984, 47-55; Ferrary 1990, 217-224 *contra* Zack 2001, 167-242). That said, the existence of standard formulae for treaties implies a regular phenomenon (Schuler 2007, 64-66). While not excising Roman motivations and agency completely, the view that the small communities which most extant texts relate to benefitted more from direct association with Rome than vice versa has weight. Most examples from the early period of Roman involvement in Asia should derive from local agency (Kallet-Marx 1995, 184-193 *pace* Gruen 1984, 49-50; Schuler 2007, 64-66).

elements of eleven treaties, of which four pertain to *poleis* in Asia and two to the Lycian *koinon*. Another six unambiguous attestations of treaties exist, of which three involved Asian communities.⁴⁷⁶ The corpus shows remarkable consistency, first emphasised by Täubler, who concentrated on the literary evidence. He identified four common elements. A general statement of alliance involving perpetual friendship between the two parties; a neutrality clause whereby neither party should assist actively or passively the enemies of the other; a defensive alliance clause, mandating that each party help the other against attack, if requested; and a final clause laying out the circumstances in which the treaty may be altered, namely if both parties agreed.⁴⁷⁷ The epigraphic material confirms Täubler's analysis. While some examples add elements to this formula, these clauses served as the basis of formal Roman relationships with allied communities.⁴⁷⁸

However, *foedera*, particularly during this transitional period, do vary. The agreement with the Lycian *koinon* in 46, for example, presents several additions to Täubler's bare structure. It includes clauses regulating the movement of goods from Roman to Lycian customs zones (ll.26-32), the trying of capital (ll.32-38) and private cases (ll.38-43) involving citizens from both states, and arrangements for pledges, return of captives and restitution

⁴⁷⁶ Mitchell (2005, 173-175) and Schuler (2007, 67-74) for references. For a discussion of literary attestations, beginning in the fifth century and continuing until the 160s, see Täubler 1913, 188-317. A comprehensive modern list at: Kehne 2003, 338-438.

⁴⁷⁷ Täubler 1913, 47-62, discussed at Mitchell 2005, 185-187. Note de Libero's claim (1997, 304-305) that the standard clause, *ut eosdem quos populus Romanus amicos atque hostes habeant* / τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐχθροὺς καὶ φίλους νομίζειν ('that they regard as friends and enemies those who the Romans do'), represented a unilateral assertion of 'hegemony'.

⁴⁷⁸ Though the standardised elements do not present a standard lexicon. Compare e.g. RDGE 18.

of goods (ll.43-52).⁴⁷⁹ Finally, the treaty explicitly confirms the territory to be possessed by the Lycian *koinon*.⁴⁸⁰ This last clause is paralleled in the early Augustan treaty with Mytilene which recognises the territorial claims of the *polis* both on Lesbos and the mainland.⁴⁸¹ Moreover, Sánchez plausibly suggested that the Mytilene treaty contained clauses regulating judicial practice between the signatories. The length of this document is at least the same as the Lycian example, and therefore much longer than the standard texts such as the earlier Lycian treaty from Tyberissos.⁴⁸²

The designation of some *foedera* as *aequa* ('equal, equitable') reveals a contemporary view that such agreements could be inequitable. Proculus, during the mid-first century CE, explored the relevance of this qualification to *postliminium* in a well-known passage:

Liber autem populus est is, qui nullius alterius populi potestati est subiectus: is foederatus est item, sive aequo foedere in amicitiam venit sive foedere comprehensum est, ut is populus alterius populi maiestatem comiter conservaret. Hoc enim adicitur, ut intellegatur alterum populum superiorem esse, non ut intellegatur alterum non esse liberum: et quemadmodum clientes nostros intellegimus liberos esse, etiamsi neque auctoritate neque dignitate neque viri boni nobis praebunt, sic eos, qui in maiestatem nostram comiter conservare debent, liberos esse intellegendum est. ('A free people is one which is not subject to the control of any other people; it is also a *civitas foederata*, if it has entered into friendship either under a *foedus aequum* or under a treaty which includes the provision that this people should with goodwill preserve the *maiestas* of the Roman people. It must be added that that one people is to be understood as superior, not that the other people is not free; and

⁴⁷⁹ For a detailed discussion of these clauses: Mitchell 2005, 195-209 (with comments of Ferrary & Rousset, *BE* 2006, 143); Sánchez 2007, 365-380; Schuler 2007, 74-78; Rousset 2010, 135-141; Raggi 2010a, 45-67; Fournier 2010, 447-456; Kantor 2013a, 219-224.

⁴⁸⁰ *SEG* 55.1452.52-64.

⁴⁸¹ *RDGE* 26.d.18-27. Ellis-Evans 2019, 252-258. Compare Ferrary 1990, 232-233; Baronowski 1990, 350.

⁴⁸² Cautiously, Sánchez 2007, 380-381; compare Mitchell 2005, 195. Tyberissos: *SEG* 57.1664, with Schuler 2007, 59-60.

insofar as we regard our clients to be free, even if they are not our equals in authority, dignity or power, so also are those who are bound to preserve our *maiestas* with goodwill are to be understood as free’).⁴⁸³

Proculus articulates a distinction between those communities with treaties which are *aequum* and those including a so-called *maiestas*-clause. Crucially, this is not relevant to the free status of a community. However, the text indicates that, by the imperial period, there was an observable hierarchical difference between those polities explicitly required to uphold the *maiestas* of the Roman people and their counterparts.⁴⁸⁴ The Lycian treaty of 46 features just such a clause unambiguously requiring the signatories to uphold the authority of Rome:

τὴν τε ἐξουσίαν καὶ ὑπεροχὴν τὴν Ῥωμαίων | [βεβαί]ας καθὼς πρέπον ἐστὶν διατηρεῖτωνσαν Λύκιοι διὰ παντὸς ἄξιος ἑαυτῶν τε [καὶ τ]οῦ δήμου τοῦ Ῥωμαίων (‘let the Lycians observe the power and pre-eminence of the Romans [firmly], as is proper, in all circumstances in a manner worthy of themselves and of the Roman people’).⁴⁸⁵

Such injunctions are known from earlier treaties imposed on defeated enemies, notably the Aetolian League in 189.⁴⁸⁶ Cicero attests that a treaty imposed on the city of Gades included a clause: *maiestatem populi Romani comiter conservanto* (‘let them maintain the *maiestas* of the Roman People willingly’).⁴⁸⁷ He goes on to emphasise that this clause did not

⁴⁸³ Dig. 49.15.7.1.

⁴⁸⁴ Baronowski 1990, 346-352.

⁴⁸⁵ SEG 55.1452.9-10.

⁴⁸⁶ Polyb. 21.32.2 = Liv. 38.11.10. Kallet-Marx 1995, 26-29; Baronowski 1990, 347-350, 368-369.

⁴⁸⁷ Cic. *Balb.* 35-37.

appear in every treaty. As such its insertion into an agreement with a notionally free ally and partner appears dissonant. Other examples can be restored in the Cnidus and Mytilene treaties, both of which had ἐλευθερία restored prior to the conclusion of their *foedera*.⁴⁸⁸ Ferrary, writing without the benefit of the recent Lycian texts, viewed the inclusion of a *maiestas*-clause in the treaty with Mytilene as reflecting a change in Roman practice, incorporating elements from a unilateral grant of privileges to a subordinate or defeated power into a bilateral agreement. This, he argued, had the effect of situating communities more firmly within Rome's geopolitical grasp.⁴⁸⁹ While Mytilene retained its freedom, it was constrained by mutual agreement to recognise the power of Rome and respect its decisions. As per the definition offered by Doyle, *maiestas*-clauses definitively established Rome's hegemony over its partners. The publication of the Lycian treaty from Tyberissos, perhaps dating to the 80s, which Schuler has shown cannot contain a *maiestas*-clause, confirms Ferrary's view.⁴⁹⁰ Later treaties with free allies, which included open acknowledgement of Rome's superior status, also more carefully delineated the rights of the inferior signatory. The archetypes are the Lycian treaty of 46 and the Mytilenean documents. Both concern themselves with protecting the rights of the signatories to legal autonomy which in earlier

⁴⁸⁸ E.g. Täubler's ambitious restoration of *IKnidus* 33.11-13 (1913, 450); see Famerie 2009, 273-277. On Mytilene add Ferrary 1990, 232 *contra* Sherk 1969, 157.

⁴⁸⁹ Ferrary 1990, 226-235, esp. 233-234: 'un mélange d'un traité bilatéral de neutralité et d'alliance défensive, et de décision unilatérale garantissant aux Mytiléniens un certain nombre de privilèges, mais fixant par cela même leur statut l'intérieur de l'empire romain'.

⁴⁹⁰ Schuler 2007, 66. Mitchell (2005, 189) is strictly correct to point out that the Lycians were not in Ferrary's terms 'within the Roman empire', but this does not invalidate Schuler's broader point. Cf. Doyle 1986, 40.

period had been unexpressed, ad hoc or contested.⁴⁹¹ Generally, despite the bold assertion of Roman hegemony embodied in the *maiestas* clauses, treaties from the period of Caesar's dominance onwards appear to have routinely defined the rights of local communities vis-à-vis Rome.⁴⁹²

Finally, some scholars frame treaties between Rome and friendly communities as constraining local action, reflecting a broader assumption that Roman diplomatic action was predicated on establishing control and hierarchy.⁴⁹³ While, *prima facie*, a reasonable hypothesis, on closer inspection it does not reflect the evidence. Across the first century there is a movement towards unilateral grants of rights to communities, such as the *lex Antonia de Termessibus*. As noted, this grant, while explicitly enrolling the Termessians as *amici et socii*, is not a *foedus*, nor is there an implication that a *foedus* would be necessary. The text, through strictly defining the privileges of the *polis* limits and constrains the community in exchange for their protection.⁴⁹⁴ However, it belongs to a different genre of normative acts.

The older treaties in the epigraphic corpus, those not including *maiestas*-clauses, tend to be generic and constrained their signatories in ways which did not *ipso facto* establish Roman hegemony. The reciprocal defence, neutrality and alliance clauses were mutually

⁴⁹¹ E.g. the Claros inscriptions for Menippus and Polemaeus (SEG 39.1243-1244) and the Augustan letter to Chios (RDGE 70).

⁴⁹² Schuler 2007, 64-67; Fournier 2010, 446-459.

⁴⁹³ E.g. Eckstein 1999, 395-398. Cf. Harris 1979, 133-136; Mattingly 2011, 6, 76-81; Dmitriev 2017, 203-207.

⁴⁹⁴ RS 19.2.6-17, 31-36. Ferrary 1985, 455-457.

binding, even if the power distribution was asymmetric.⁴⁹⁵ By contrast, later treaties were indubitably more specific and detailed. The Lycian treaty of 46 provides an archetype but the second fragment of the Cnidus text of 45 alludes to questions of law and the space in the Mytilene treaty from 25 implies a more complex formula.⁴⁹⁶ Specific clauses and language naturally constrained the action of the signatories, including the Romans themselves. In the Lycian case, the legal clauses were reciprocal according the citizens of each group proportionate rights.⁴⁹⁷ This is not to say that the agreement applied equal burdens, however. Roman citizens accused in capital cases were to be tried before the *praetor peregrinus* in Rome rather than before a proconsul, placing a much higher burden on Lycian plaintiffs.⁴⁹⁸ This echoes, in a more restricted fashion, the situation at Colophon in the early second century, guaranteeing *forum domicilii* to Roman and Lycian citizens, though not defining the situation for the non-citizen inhabitants of either polity. Unlike the earlier case, however, these guarantees are enshrined in a bilateral document.⁴⁹⁹ Given the uniqueness of this example, caution is necessary. However, it seems that Caesarian and Augustan *foedera* were intended to protect the rights of the cities through explicit definition, rather than constrain their action. Since both Caesar and Augustus presented themselves as concerned

⁴⁹⁵ Gruen 1984, 46-53; Schuler 2007, 65-67.

⁴⁹⁶ *I.Knidus* 33B.4-6. Famerie 2009, 279-280.

⁴⁹⁷ Compare *SEG* 55.1452.11-14 and 17-22. The Lycians appear to have obligations to Rome's allies which are not reciprocated to Lycia's allies, but later clauses do refer to Lycian allies: Mitchell 2005, 190.

⁴⁹⁸ Raggi 2010, 45-47, 58-67.

⁴⁹⁹ *SEG* 39.1244.1.37-39. For discussion and further examples: Kantor 2010, 194-199. A letter to Chios (*RDGE* 70), discussed *infra*, provides a different perspective.

for provincial well-being, it would be unsurprising were *foedera* to move into a more explicit preventative role.⁵⁰⁰

This is not to claim that treaties were always respected: as Yarrow has noted, from the provincial perspective, Roman magistrates on the ground disregarded agreements made with the state or other representatives on a regular basis.⁵⁰¹ The tradition that Sulla had agreed at Dardanus to respect the freedom of the Asian *poleis*, deriving from Memnon, runs counter to Roman self-presentation.⁵⁰² Meanwhile, L. Licinius Murena's argument that Mithridates' agreement with Sulla did not bind him was tendentious, even allowing that it had not been ratified by the *populus Romanus*.⁵⁰³ Memnon's, admittedly parochial, construction of the relationship between Heraclea Pontica and Rome highlights the extent to which the limits of treaties and agreements were contested, though, in the 80s, the city was able to cite conflicting obligations to refuse aid to Rome without suffering consequences in the aftermath of that war.⁵⁰⁴

Foedera, then, were a tool which could be employed by communities to attempt to formalise a relationship with Rome.⁵⁰⁵ While not necessary to enjoy 'friendship and alliance', a *foedus* entailed a more formal element which offered a mote of security to the relationship between a 'free' *polis* and Rome. The evidence, though lacunose, implies that the junior

⁵⁰⁰ E.g. Tan 2017, 55-58.

⁵⁰¹ Yarrow 2006, 250-254. Compare the instability of treaties in the Hellenistic East more generally in Eckstein 2006, 101-102.

⁵⁰² Memnon *FGrH* 434 F25.2. Magie 1950, 229, 240 *contra* Sherwin-White 1984, 143 n.48.

⁵⁰³ App. *Mith.* 64. Pace Kallet-Marx 1995, 263.

⁵⁰⁴ Memnon *FGrH* 434 F27.5. Kallet-Marx 1995, 196.

⁵⁰⁵ See Buis' useful discussion (2014, 151-185) highlighting both the Greek antecedents and the impact of the obvious power imbalance between Rome and local partners.

partners, the communities of the east, were the driving force behind most treaties. The existence of a standard format until the early first century indicates that this was not a rare occurrence: well-worn modes of discourse already existed. However, the corpus hints at a shift, at least by the early 40s, whereby *foedera* became more specific. Given the absence of evidence, concrete conclusions are impossible, though the concern of Caesar and Augustus with presenting their treatment of provincials and allies as just and equitable may provide a measure of explanation.

The last of Caesar's decisions epigraphically attested, an *edictum* dated securely to 4th March 44, shows the centralisation of power under the dictatorship. This text granted ἀσυλία to several Sardian shrines, modelled on that of the Ephesian Artemision. Unlike Hellenistic grants, Caesar's, following his Roman predecessors, clearly applied only to the temples themselves, not the whole civic territory.⁵⁰⁶ Consequently, references to tax-farmers (δημοσιῶναι), possibly civic, and freedom from the *fascēs* (ῥάδων) should be correspondingly limited.⁵⁰⁷ Crucially, however, Caesar explicitly links the grant of these privileges, through his dictatorial *imperium*, to the Sardians' consistent loyalty to the Roman state. Overall, Mitchell emphasises Caesar's skill in aggrandising a position as the legitimate representative of the Roman People. By rewarding erstwhile opponents through guaranteeing their status, eventually through treaty, he created new allies, directly beholden to him and his Senate.⁵⁰⁸

⁵⁰⁶ SEG 39.1290.45-59. Rigsby 1996, 21-22.

⁵⁰⁷ SEG 39.1290.62-69. This latter clause should describe freedom from gubernatorial *iurisdictio* and *imperium* rather than prevent governors from entering this territory. Cf. Herrmann 1989a, 149-153.

⁵⁰⁸ Mitchell 2005, 235.

The renewed outbreak of hostilities after Caesar's assassination in 44 created significant new problems for communities in the Greek East. His sudden murder negated any ambitions he may have had to reform the imperial structure in a more holistic fashion and ushered in a new wave of bloodletting and attendant extortion.⁵⁰⁹ While Sulla's swift retribution after Dardanus had pushed *poleis* to remain loyal to Rome in subsequent conflicts with Mithridates, no framework existed for dealing with two Roman factions, each claiming to represent the legitimate authority of the Senate and *populus*. While Caesar's defeat of Pompeius was fait accompli before his arrival in the region, the self-styled 'Liberators', having overwhelming military superiority in the region by mid-43, sought to extract funds and support from the cities. As in 88, the fraught political situation generated intra-civic conflict, as elements of the political elite championed the benefits of supporting the Liberators or the divided political heirs of their benefactor. All choices carried a high-level of risk: Lycia and Rhodes, after seeking to remain neutral, were confronted by the troops of Brutus and Cassius respectively, sparking internal dissension over the best course of action.⁵¹⁰ Later, the contest between Antonius and Octavian generated similar dynamics, best attested at Tarsus.⁵¹¹ These examples demonstrate that the violent convulsions seizing the central organs of the *res publica* had a significant impact on the internal dynamics of communities in the Greek East, which must have affected the exercise of Roman power during this period.

⁵⁰⁹ On Caesar's institutional ambitions: Jehne 1987, 372-422; Welch 1990, 53-69.

⁵¹⁰ App. *BCiv.* 4.65-73; CD. 47.33.1-4; Plut. *Brut.* 30.3-32.4; Val. Max. 1.5.8; Vell. Pat. 2.69.6. Börm 2016, 101-120, on Rhodes specifically, 106-112.

⁵¹¹ Strabo 14.5.14.

Nevertheless, the establishment of *tresviri rei publicae constituendae* on 27th November 43 provided a new framework for administrative practice within the *provinciae*. On his arrival in Asia, Antonius, like Sulla before him, summoned the representatives of the cities to Ephesus and insisted that they pay him ten years taxes, within 12 months, in lieu of further punishment. According to Appian, after the representatives complained of their inability to meet this demand, highlighting the exactions by Brutus and Cassius in the previous year, this was reduced to nine years' worth payable in two years.⁵¹² This should be the context for Plutarch's anecdote that Hybreas of Mylasa persuaded Antonius not to exact a second tax in a single year, and it emphasises how communities could negotiate directly with Roman powerbrokers.⁵¹³ We also learn that Anaxenor of Magnesia, a citharoede, was appointed by Antonius as a φορόλογος ('collector of φόρος') for four cities. This should not mean a typical collector of Roman taxes. Instead, like Sulla's own makeshift arrangements in 85, Antonius implemented ad hoc measures, employing local actors, albeit supported by Roman troops.⁵¹⁴ Drawing on existing repertoires of both Sulla and Caesar, Antonius forged his own path in dealing with the post-war landscape.

One revealing document about the triumviral approach to *provincia Asia* appears in a papyrus fragment from Alexandria. The leaf preserves a letter of M. Antonius to the *koinon* of Asia regarding privileges for the association of wreath-bearers for the sacred games. The text, dated to 41, records that, while at Ephesus, the triumvir was visited by M. Antonius

⁵¹² App. *BCiv.* 5.4-5; CD. 48.2.2, 30.2.

⁵¹³ Strabo 14.2.24.

⁵¹⁴ Strabo 14.1.41; Plut. *Ant.* 24.2; Syll.³ 766. Gray 1978, 973; Syme 1979a [1963], 571; Buraselis 2000, 131.

Artemidorus, his friend and ‘trainer’, and the eponymous priest of the association. The two requested confirmation of the association’s former privileges, in addition to freedom from military service, immunity from liturgies, freedom from billeting, the right of ἀσυλία and to wear the ‘purple stripe’ and truces during games. They also asked Antonius to write to the *koinon*, and separately, to be allowed to dedicate a bronze tablet.⁵¹⁵ The text highlights the personal nature of government in Antonius’ east. Neither the Senate nor other magistrates are referred to. In this respect, it provides a stark contrast with other grants of privileges to associations, which derive from commanders in *provinciae*.⁵¹⁶ The decision to address the *koinon* may be linked to the religious topic of the letter. However, that the privileges involved affected the communities of Asia generally implies that, in the aftermath of two quickfire civil wars, the *koinon* had become the most efficient means through which to disseminate information to the *poleis* of the *provincia*. This has two further implications. First, that the *koinon* now consisted of all the major civic communities in Asia: disseminating such a command to only a limited number of cities would not achieve Antonius’ goal in delineating the privileges of the association. Second, it raises questions about the practical engagement between Rome and the *koinon*: how did the organisation process correspondence and did it operate from a fixed location? During the early Principate, when the organisation became tied to the imperial cult, the Temple of Augustus and Rome was

⁵¹⁵ RDGE 57. The text may be abbreviated. A very fragmentary inscription from Tralles seems to reproduce the first lines of this text but adds προέδροι to the addresses. Keil 1911, 123-127; see Sherk 1969, 292; Kirbihler 2016, 96-97.

⁵¹⁶ E.g. Sulla, in two letters confirming privileges for the Dionysiac artists (RDGE 49), explicitly refers to decisions of the Senate, earlier magistrates and his own *consilium*.

based in Pergamum, though the leadership positions rotated through the cities. I do not find suggestions that the well-attested irregular summons of civic representatives to Ephesus by Roman commanders indicates the location of the *koinon*'s headquarters in this period persuasive.⁵¹⁷ It seems more credible that the necessity of intense contact between participants in different cities had resulted in the slow development of established lines of communication, similar to the letter-carriers of the *publicani* for Roman travellers.⁵¹⁸ In either case, it seems that Antonius' decision was based on a principle of economy of effort, rather than implying a fundamental and deliberate change in the structure of the institution.

Most surviving documentary evidence for the triumviral period refers to the invasion of Labienus and the Parthians in 40/39. With Antonius distracted by the aftermath of the Perusine War in Italy, most of Caria was overrun.⁵¹⁹ During this invasion, the *polis* of Mylasa suffered particularly: having initially accepted a garrison from Labienus, the orator Hybreas roused the populace to resist with the result that the city was sacked.⁵²⁰ A fragmentary letter of an unknown magistrate, dated to the 30s, discusses the economic crisis which the city had fallen into after the sack. Among other hardships, the city had been forced to use loans from private citizens to pay their taxes, alongside selling the rights to collect them.⁵²¹ While these individuals appear to have been locals, rather than Romans, the potential for debts and

⁵¹⁷ E.g. Kirbihler 2016, 67-68.

⁵¹⁸ Cf. Broughton 1938, 539, with references.

⁵¹⁹ Magie 1950, 430-432.

⁵²⁰ Strabo 14.2.24; CD. 48.26.4. Curran 2007, 47-48 for details. On Hybreas, *I.Mylasa* 534-536; Noé 1996; Delrieux & Ferrière 2004, 51-68.

⁵²¹ RDGE 59. Sherk 1969, 309. Canali De Rossi (2000, 178-181) speculates that Antonius was the author.

obligations to spiral out of control persisted.⁵²² Indeed, prevailing opinion holds that the damage and subsequent failure to recover from Labienus' activities led directly to Mylasa's loss of status as a *conventus* centre.⁵²³ Evidence from Stratonicea and Miletus indicates that these cities had their ἐλευθερία restored in 39, which likely refers in the latter case to liberation from Labienus rather than juridical status.⁵²⁴ Nevertheless, in these grants of civic privileges they explicitly solicited senatorial involvement.

The best documented *polis* during the triumvirate is that of Plarasa-Aphrodisias, which, in the third century CE, inscribed several documents relating to this period on an 'archive wall' documenting their relationship with Rome.⁵²⁵ A letter of Octavian dated to 39/38 provides context for the wider dossier of triumviral documents, commending the community's ambassador, Solon, and referring to the latter's happiness with οἰκονόμια which have been made. Robert takes this term as meaning judicial decisions, but Reynolds persuasively assigns it the broader meaning referring to the series of official acts outlining the privileges of the city which had been given to Solon: an *edictum*, *senatusconsultum*, *foedus* and *lex*.⁵²⁶ The *edictum* and *senatusconsultum* both survive largely intact. The former was issued only by Octavian and Antonius, without their colleague Lepidus, and seems to have concerned relief for cities effected by the pre-Philippi manoeuvres of Brutus and Cassius. The text is fragmentary, but the document confers privileges on the Rhodes, Lycia, Tarsus,

⁵²² Cic. QFr. 1.1.31. Magie 1950, 442.

⁵²³ See pp.86-87 *supra*.

⁵²⁴ Stratonicea: ILS 8780 with RDGE 27; Miletus: *Milet.* 1.3.126, (cf. OGIS 193).

⁵²⁵ Kokkinia 2015–2016, now crucial.

⁵²⁶ Robert 1969, 269–270; Reynolds, 1982, 45. Cf. LSJ s.v. οἰκονομία.

Syrian Laodicea and Aphrodisias.⁵²⁷ Appian describes these communities, excluding Aphrodisias, as receiving tax relief and territory in 41, which raises the question of the date. Since the letter of 39/8 must post-date the *edictum*, there is no need to suppose with Reynolds that Octavian lobbied for the inclusion of Aphrodisias after the fact of Antonius' decision. Instead, it is probable that the city was one of the original recipients.⁵²⁸

The *senatusconsultum de Aphrodisiensibus* can be dated from the consuls' names to October 39. The document shows that the consuls proposed a motion renewing *amicitia* and alliance with the community and granting it freedom and *immunitas*, in addition to bestowing a number of specific privileges: exemption from levies, freedom from billeting or provision of supplies, ἀσυλία for the temple of Aphrodite, freedom from liturgies and the right *suis legibus uti*.⁵²⁹ Despite the Republican appearance of these proceedings, however, the document also emphasises the presence of both Octavian and Antonius, who spoke in favour of the motion. Moreover, the Senate explicitly pre-authorises any other privileges already granted or to be granted in the future by the two named *tresviri*, which Appian extends to a general right.⁵³⁰ The accent here is on Republican form operating alongside and in addition to the innovative magistracy designed to preserve peace in that time.

⁵²⁷ Mitchell (1984, 295 *pace* Reynolds 1982, 51) argues that Syrian Laodicea is more likely than Laodicea-on-the-Lycus, as it fits the pattern of communities mistreated by Brutus and Cassius (App. *BCiv.* 4.62).

⁵²⁸ App. *BCiv.* 5.29-30. The relative unimportance of Aphrodisias may account for Strabo's failure to mention the city, though Appian's omission may not require an elaborate explanation. Reynolds 1982, 51; Jones 2017, 355.

⁵²⁹ *IAPH2007* 8.27.32-51, 58-62.

⁵³⁰ *IAPH2007* 8.27.48-51; App. *BCiv.* 5.75.

Ultimately, the triumvirate was unstable and experimental. Its sudden genesis and short duration meant that norms in the process of being established, never solidified fully. The treatment of individual cases by a *triumvir*, each with diverse preferences could result in very different outcomes, as the comment of Octavian of Stephanos, that in Aphrodisias μίαν πόλιν ταύτην | ἐξ ὅλης τῆς Ἀσίας ἑμαυτῷ εἴληπα ('this one city out of all Asia have I taken as my own'), reveals.⁵³¹ Nevertheless, it seems clear that, generally, the *tresviri* built on the autocratic regime of Caesar in dealing with matters of provincial administration. The capacity for *poleis* to deal with one or two individuals created opportunities to advance their positions within the provincial hierarchy at a stroke. These new prospects, however, bore new risks: siding with one powerful magistrate against another could have catastrophic ramifications.

1.4: The Principate and the New Administration of Asia

The defeat of Antonius at Actium left Octavian with the power to reshape the institutions of the Roman state and its empire. Over the remainder of his life he carved out a pre-eminent position for himself alongside a semblance of the traditional Republican structure. Through a series of incremental 'settlements', in 27, 23 and 19, Augustus acquired a constitutional basis to exercise his supreme power at Rome.⁵³² Crucially, from 27, the existing provinces were divided between *provinciae publicae*, to be administered by

⁵³¹ *IAph*2007 8.29.3-4.

⁵³² The bibliography for the Augustan settlements is vast. Recent influential works include: Ferrary 2001a, 101-154; Cotton & Yakobson 2002, 193-209; Rich 2012, 37-121; Dalla Rosa 2014, esp. 269-310; Vervaeke 2014, 253-275.

proconsuls, chosen by lot from eligible ex-magistrates, and *provinciae Caesaris*, governed by *legati pro praetore* chosen personally by Augustus. The overwhelming majority of the legions were concentrated in the latter, granting the Princeps, ultimately, their command.⁵³³ Asia, unthreatened by war, was to be a *provincia publica* and, in the new schema devised by Augustus, to be governed by a consular, at least five years after the expiration of his magistracy.⁵³⁴ These substantive changes to the organisation of the state had a commensurate impact on the institutions through which the empire was governed. The evolution of Augustus' powers and their contestable limits were, consequently, an important factor in the experience of Roman rule in Asia.

The accumulating powers and unparalleled *auctoritas* of Augustus allowed him to act even within ostensibly public *provinciae*. Two documents found on a single stone at Cyme emphasise the influence of Augustus' pronouncements over proconsuls shortly after Actium.⁵³⁵ The first, a Greek text, issued by Augustus with his consular colleague M. Agrippa, escapes easy categorisation. It specifies that public and sacred property should not be alienated, and if this has happened, it should be restored to public ownership. The second is a proconsular letter from P. Vinicius to the Cymeans, in Latin and in Greek translation, issuing specific instructions to the archons of Cyme to investigate whether a shrine of Dionysus had become the property of one Lysias. If so, they should ensure he accepted the offered price and restored it. Moreover, they should inscribe upon the shrine: *Imp. Caesar*

⁵³³ Ferrary 2001a, 108-115; Vervaet 2014, 254-255. See Hurlet 2006, 147-158 on the continued military capacity of proconsuls.

⁵³⁴ CD. 53.12.4, 14.2.

⁵³⁵ Crook (1962) offers the best text. Compare: SEG 18.555; BÉ 1961, #97; RDGE 61; *I.Kyme* 17.

Deivi f. Augustu[s] re[stituit] ('Imperator Caesar, son of the god, Augustus restored [sc. this shrine]').⁵³⁶ Finally, in the event Lysias refused to comply, he should pay a *vadimonium* and Vinicius would decide the case.

The two texts were intended to advertise the success of the petitioners, the *thiasoi* of Dionysus, though they had wildly different scopes.⁵³⁷ The opening lines of the first text pose problems: [Α]ὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ θεοῦ υἱὸς Σεβαστὸς [vac?] | Μ]ᾶρκος Ἀγρίππας Λευκίου υἱὸς ὕπατοι vac ἐ[—c. 7—] ('Imperator Caesar, *divi filius*, Augustus, M. Agrippa, son of Lucius, consuls ...').⁵³⁸ The title of Augustus seems to date the utterance to 27, though the possibility of stonecutters updating the text to match contemporary reality cannot be excluded.⁵³⁹ The erosion of the final word makes it difficult to determine the document's genre: for an *edictum* one would expect λεγοῦσιν, which is definitively ruled out. The *editio princeps* ἐ[κέλευσαν] ('commanded') preserves this sense, though Crook's ἐ[πέκριναν] ('decided'), on the basis that ἐπίκριμα is one translation of *edictum*, seems most plausible.⁵⁴⁰ One approach to this problem is to assess the possible types of document against the text. A letter of the consuls, perhaps quoting from a *senatusconsultum*, presents an interesting possibility but the elision of the addressee(s) is difficult to fathom.⁵⁴¹ Assuming that the two documents are in dialogue, the reference to a *iussum Augusti Caesaris* likely reflects the local interpretation of

⁵³⁶ Crook 1962, ll.19-20.

⁵³⁷ Dignas 2003, 124 n.71.

⁵³⁸ Crook 1962, ll. 1-2.

⁵³⁹ Compare, e.g. *IAph2007* 8.26.1, 32.1. Crook 1962, 24.

⁵⁴⁰ Crook, 1962, 24-25. Alternatives include a *lex* (Kunkel 1962, 595; Oliver 1963, 121-122); and a consular letter (Atkinson 1960, 237-244; Arangio-Ruiz 1961, 326-332, 338; Charbonnel 1979, 212-225). Alternatively, Engelmann 1976 restores ἐ[νέχυρα] and integrates it into the main text, followed by Dignas 2003.

⁵⁴¹ Atkinson 1960, 237-244; Charbonnel 1979, 212-225; Giovannini 1999, 95-106.

the first document. Given that *poleis* were, by this period, familiar with the genre of *senatusconsulta*, such a construal would be difficult to explain. Most plausibly this is a consular *edictum* issued jointly by Augustus and Agrippa.⁵⁴²

Another issue emerges from the potential breadth of the *edictum*. The ruling refers ambiguously to sacred lands [—] πόλεως ἐκάστης ἐπαρχείας. Natural word order would imply an *edictum* with force in every *provincia*; but this creates problems vis-à-vis the extent of Augustus' power, post-settlement of 27. The alternative reading, that the document pertains to 'each city of the province (sc. Asia)', also raises issues, regarding Augustus' propensity to interfere in *alienis provinciis*.⁵⁴³ However, there are three strong reasons suggest this instruction was particular to Asia. First, Crook notes that the use of the singular πόλεως implies it agrees with ἐκάστης. This remains true in with any of the restorations proposed for the end of line 3 — the omission of τῆς before ἐπαρχείας through haplography seems more likely than an error of number.⁵⁴⁴ Second, the Cyrene edicts provide a parallel for Augustus issuing administrative rulings in public provinces.⁵⁴⁵ Though, in 27, he was yet to acquire his full suite of powers, he retained the consulship with its *summum imperium auspiciisque*, and hence the capacity to issue binding *edicta* with relevance across the empire. Augustus was at perfect liberty to rule on the subject of sacred land in Asia, even if

⁵⁴² Dalla Rosa 2014, 121-123. Earlier, Crook 1962, 24-25; Bowman 1993, 406-407; Giovannini 1999, 104-106; Ferrary 2001a, 134; Hurlet 2006, 204-208. Dalla Rosa (2014, 124-129): '[The omission of Agrippa] non modifica nulla della natura dell'ordinanza'.

⁵⁴³ I reject the suggestions of Arangio-Ruiz (1961, 330-332), Oliver (1963, 113-115) and Bertrand (1991, 127-135) that ἐπαρχεία could mean 'district' or 'prefecture' rather than '*provincia*' in this context. Stasse 2009, 165-168.

⁵⁴⁴ Crook 1962, 25 n.1; Bowersock 1970, 227; Dalla Rosa 2014, 123-124.

⁵⁴⁵ RDGE 31.

the exercise of this power to bind promagistrates *cum imperio* was unusual.⁵⁴⁶ Finally, Augustus' own *Res Gestae* refer to a similar initiative, undertaken after Actium: *in templis omnium civitatum provinciae Asiae victor ornamenta reposui, quae spoliatis templis is cum quo bellum gesseram privatim possederat* ('as victor, I restored to the temples in all the cities of provincia Asia the ornaments which my opponent in the war, when he had despoiled the temples, appropriated for private use'). That, in his own aggrandising account, the Princeps focused attention on a single provincia is suggestive.⁵⁴⁷ The date of the *edictum*, a mere four years after Actium, and the legal struggle described by Vinicius, fits the context well.

Granting that the *iussum Augusti* of Vinicius' letter is the preliminary *edictum*, the elision of Agrippa, his consular colleague and co-author of the document requires explanation. The simplest means of explaining this omission is as part of an ongoing shift in the local perception of Roman political hierarchies. While the process of administration resembled that under the Republic, with general instructions issued by the Senate, and local implementation left to the commander on the ground, new expectations and norms were emerging. The litigants' assumption that the *iussum Augusti* would solve their problem, and Vinicius' apparently unprompted decision to stress the agency of Augustus, point to a fundamental shift in the practical government of provincia Asia.⁵⁴⁸

⁵⁴⁶ Ferrary 2001a, 134-138 *pace* Vervaeke 2014, 275-276 n.192. On consular *edicta* under the Republic, Pina Polo 2011, 84-87, 277, 280-281.

⁵⁴⁷ RGDA 24.1. Stasse 2009, 167-168 *contra* Atkinson 1960, 232; Charbonnel 1979, 199-201; Giovannini 1999, 103-104.

⁵⁴⁸ E.g. Ferrary 2001a, 134-135.

Finally, the end of Vinicius' letter presents another odd formulation. Following Crook, this sentence should not undermine the decision already reached, namely, that Lysias should restore the shrine to the *thiasoi* on the payment of the inscribed price. Consequently, the restoration of the lacunose sections should read: *[sei] autem Lusiam contradeicit quae Apollonides po[su]ll[it et vadi]monium ei satisdato ubi ego ero Lusiam prom[it]ll[tere vult]s probo* ('but if Lysias disputes what Apollonides demands and if you wish Lysias to give security to appear where I shall be, I approve').⁵⁴⁹ This would mean that Vinicius, while delegating the role of enforcing his decision to the archons of Cyme, allowed them the option of referring the matter back to his authority, should Lysias prove reluctant.⁵⁵⁰ Consequently, we witness the proconsul making an initial ruling, though remaining sensitive to the possibility that, by employing civic officials to enforce its strictures, the aggrieved party may contest it.

1.4.1: Cities and Augustus' *Procuratores*

The powers and prominence of Augustus were not the only challenge for governors to negotiate in the early Principate: this period also saw the emergence of imperial *procuratores*. This office never became a recognised *honoris* and, crucially, at the beginning of the period, it possessed no formal powers beyond acting as the representative of the Princeps.⁵⁵¹ Consequently, notwithstanding Augustus' immense prestige, governors in Asia

⁵⁴⁹ Crook 1962, ll. 20-22.

⁵⁵⁰ *Contra* Atkinson 1960, 251-252, followed by Oliver 1963, 119.

⁵⁵¹ Taking on the role of Republican *procuratores*, 'whom a Roman empowers to administer his property or act in court' (Brunt 1983, 52). Aubert 1994, 106-110; Eich 2005, 86-89; Dalla Rosa 2018, 499-501.

ought not to have had their range of activity unduly constrained. It has often been asserted that procurators in public provinces were restricted to administering imperial property, rather than public funds as elsewhere.⁵⁵² However, Wörrle's recent reading of a proconsular letter from Aezani, dating to the penultimate decade of the first century, emphasises the influence that early imperial procurators did have.⁵⁵³ The proconsul of Asia, C. Norbanus Flaccus, recounted that the community's representatives had presented him with a letter from Augustus, in which the Princeps confirmed that: συνκεχωρηκέναι ὑμῖν ἐκκλησίαν | συνάγειν Ὀφίλι[ο]ν Ὀρνᾶτον ἐπίτροπον [π]ερὶ [ἀ]τε[λ]είας τῷ [ι]εῖ θυσῶν ἕνεκα, μὴ συνχωρήσειν δ' ἄλλα συντελεῖν τῇ | πόλιν ('Ofilius Ornatus, procurator, had allowed your assembly to come together concerning the *ateleia* of the priest of sacrifices, but will not allow that the city offer anything further').⁵⁵⁴ Norbanus goes on to state that he accepts the decision of Augustus before the text breaks off. This letter stresses both the degree to which multiple sources of authority existed in late first century Asia, and the ambiguity of the procurator's role. It appears that the Aizanetans had consulted Ofilius before granting ἀτέλεια to a local priest, which Dalla Rosa plausibly associated with the cult of Augustus.⁵⁵⁵ Crucially, it represents the accommodation of an innovation in the structure of the state, based around Augustus' unparalleled and unprecedented position: this marks the beginning

⁵⁵² Sherwin-White 1939, 14-15; Pflaum 1957 *RE* s.v. *procurator*; Jones 1960a, 123; Eich 2005, 104-105. See Brunt (1983, 69) for an indicative list of attested imperial *procuratores*. On the development of imperial estates in Asia: Dalla Rosa 2017, 110-114.

⁵⁵³ Wörrle 2011, 357; Dalla Rosa 2018, 508. A date of 18-16 seems most likely: Atkinson 1958, 321-322; Wörrle 2011 362 n.22 *contra* Smallwood 1970, 309-310.

⁵⁵⁴ *SEG* 61.1134, updating *MAMA* 9.13. See now Dalla Rosa (2018, 509) identifying Ofilius' cognomen as Verus.

⁵⁵⁵ Dalla Rosa 2018, 510-511.

of the institutionalisation of a formerly private position. The tension between Ofilius as *procurator Augusti* and Norbanus as governor is a prime example of the phenomenon of intercurrency – whereby institutions formed at different times operate at cross-purposes due to their own internal logic.⁵⁵⁶ Post-Actium, Augustus had the means and motivation to reinvent state structures to favour his own position. However, in Asia, Republican magistracies continued to operate and the relationship between new and old institutions was yet to be fully established.

P. Vedius Pollio may provide the earliest example of a procurator acting as an agent of Augustus within Asia. Three times, while reorganising the finances of the Artemision at Ephesus, the Claudian proconsul Paullus Fabius Persicus refers to *constitutiones* (‘decisions’) of Vedius as precedents.⁵⁵⁷ Moreover, a coin series issued at Tralles bears his portrait opposite that of Augustus, identified through two distinct legends ΠΩΛΛΙΩΝ and ΟΥΗΙΔΙΟΣ.⁵⁵⁸ Finally, two honorific inscriptions, without titles, commemorate his relationship with Ilion and Miletus.⁵⁵⁹ Given his equestrian status, he cannot have served as a formal magistrate and scholars are divided between two possibilities: that he served either in an extraordinary capacity as interim governor, entitled as *praefectus* between 31 and 27; or as a procurator after the first settlement in 27.⁵⁶⁰ The former position cannot be excluded,

⁵⁵⁶ Orren & Skowronek 1994, 108.

⁵⁵⁷ *I.Eph.* 17-19. For detailed discussion of Persicus’ actions: Dignas 2002, 151-156. Earlier: Atkinson 1962. On Vedius himself: Syme 1961, 23-30; Kirbihler 2017, 129-152.

⁵⁵⁸ *RPC* 1.2634-9. Discussion at Kirbihler 2017, 135-144.

⁵⁵⁹ *I.Ilion* 101; *I.Didyma* 146.

⁵⁶⁰ *Praefectus*: Kreiler 2006a, 200-202; Erkelenz 2003, 255; procurator, or personal representative: Skramkiewicz 1976, 2.138-139; Wörrle 2011, 370. See now: Kirbihler (2017, 133-152), attempting to reconcile the contradictory evidence.

especially in light of parallel examples from the 40s and 30s.⁵⁶¹ However, Norbanus' letter renders Dio's claim that procurators were employed by Augustus from 27 plausible.⁵⁶² While probably not fulfilling the role played by later patrimonial procurators, the institutional malleability of the post-civil war period encouraged experimentation by Augustus and his representatives on the ground.⁵⁶³ It is unnecessary to assume that Vedius or Ofilius possessed normatively defined authority. Instead, testing the limits of their position as the Princeps' representatives vis-à-vis magistrates, they shaped a new set of norms; a new institutional reality. The fact that *procuratores Augusti* from the same formative period in the West were already engaged in a wider range of state fiscal activities supports this claim.⁵⁶⁴ While Augustus' constitutional position was evolving, wider state structures, including those central to provincial governance adapted over a lengthier period.

1.4.2: The Imperial *koinon*

The *koinon* of Asia, during Augustus' lifetime, came to play a prominent role mediating between the imperial centre and individual communities: the orientation and purpose of the institution were radically altered after the establishment of the imperial cult at Pergamum in 29. Tacitus and Dio both stress the collective action of the province in

⁵⁶¹ E.g. Q. Caecilius Atticus: *AE* 1991, 1503 (with Jones 1999, 90); C. Proculeius *RPC* 1.1359-1362. Compare Pomponius Macer at Priene (*I.Priene*² 244) and C. Iulius Demetrius at Cyprus (CD. 48.40.6).

⁵⁶² CD. 53.15.3. Note earlier scholars' judicious scepticism: e.g. Pflaum 1968, 386; Eck 1995-1998, 1.43-46.

⁵⁶³ Dalla Rosa 2018, 506-507.

⁵⁶⁴ E.g. Licinus in Gaul (CD. 54.21.3-8). Strabo 3.4.20. Dalla Rosa 2018, 512-516

dedicating a temple to Augustus and Rome.⁵⁶⁵ This community coalesced around a single festival based at the temple in Pergamum, though eventually this honour was accorded to other *poleis*.⁵⁶⁶ Discussions of *koina* in the Imperial period focus on the role they played in perpetuating the imperial cult, though, crucially, they performed important administrative functions.⁵⁶⁷ That said, the leading officials of the *koinon* in the early Principate are ἀρχιερεῖς θεᾶς Ῥώμης καὶ Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος θεοῦ υἱοῦ Σεβαστοῦ ('high-priests of Roma and Emperor Caesar *divi f.* Augustus').⁵⁶⁸ This close connection between the institution, its titulature and the worship of the Princeps emphasises the extent to which religious considerations framed the *koinon*'s functions. However, some evidence shows it acting as a conduit between the central state and its constituent communities.⁵⁶⁹

The *koinon*'s internal organisation remains opaque in this period. Deininger argued the title of ἀρχιερεὺς (high-priest), denoted the annually elected leader of the institution from the beginning of the imperial period and was synonymous with that of ἀσιάρχης.⁵⁷⁰

⁵⁶⁵ Tac. *Ann.* 4.37; CD. 51.20.6-7. Compare Suet. *Aug.* 52; Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F125. Deininger 1965, 16-19; Price 1984, 66-67; Madsen 2016, 24-34. Kirbihler (2016, 359-381) argues that the *tresviri* adopted a conscious policy of promoting Caesar's cult in Asia from the late 40s, but Frija (2012, 32-34) notes the significant conceptual distance between this and the imperial cult. See also, Prignitz (2011, 210-212) plausibly redating SEG 58.578, which refers to a local priesthood of Roma and Augustus in Macedonia, from 88/89 CE (Actian era) to 28/27 (Macedonian era).

⁵⁶⁶ See *I.Eph.* 7.2.3801. Price 1984, 104-107. For the subsequent development of the cult and its infrastructure: Burrell 2004, esp. 346-347.

⁵⁶⁷ E.g. Guerber (2009, 81) sees its purpose as 'pour encourager les Grecs à jouer un rôle dans l'administration de leur province'. Compare Deininger 1965, 156-169; more cautiously, Burrell 2004, 2; Vitale 2012, 31-32.

⁵⁶⁸ *Sardis* 7.1.8.75, 83, 99. See Campanile 1994, #4, 3 and 1 respectively; other early examples #2 and 5-7.

⁵⁶⁹ E.g. Burrell 2004, 2-3; Guerber 2009, 80-82; Frija 2016, 161-164. Note also the swift expansion of local civic cults: Frija 2012, esp. 34-41; Ventroux 2017, 120-123 at Pergamon.

⁵⁷⁰ Deininger 1965, 41-50, followed by Campanile 1994, 18-22; Carter 2004, 41-68; Vitale 2014, 287-294. Criticised by Kearsley 1986, 183-192; 1989, 57-65; Friesen 1999, 275-290.

Despite persistent critiques, new evidence from Phrygian Hierapolis seems to confirm that by the mid-second century CE the ἀρχιερεῖς were elected from the ranks of the ἀσιάρχεις, the heads of neocorate temples in Asia.⁵⁷¹ However, this new insight shed little light on the Augustan period. Moreover, Strabo seems to demonstrate that during the first century BCE ἀσιάρχης was a title which stood outside the *koinon*'s purview and the date at which it was co-opted cannot be reconstructed.⁵⁷²

However, a large monument from Sardis for Menogenes does preserve some crucial evidence for the organisation of the *koinon* during the Augustan period. The stone, a single stele found near the temple of Artemis, contains eleven documents which date between 5 and 1. The preface to the inscription accentuates how the content emerges from *koinon*, the *demos* and the *γεπουσία* of Sardis. The arrangement of the documents, however, seems to be strictly chronological.⁵⁷³ Of the documents which concern us here, the two letters occur first, followed immediately by the two decrees. The first letter is sent by the ἀρχιερεύς Charinus:

Χαρῖνος Χαρίνου Περγαμηνός, ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς θεᾶς Ῥώμης καὶ Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος θεοῦ υἱοῦ Σεβαστο[ῦ, Σαρδιανῶν] | ἄρχουσι βουλῇ δήμῳ χαίρειν· ἐκκλησίας, ἀρχαιρετικῆς συναθροίσεως καὶ συνελθόντων τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν [πόλεων ἐ]κατὸν κ(αὶ) ν' ἀνδρῶν τιμᾶν ἐπηνέχθησαν ἄθροοι τὸν καθ' ἔτος ἔκδικον τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσί[ας Ἑλ]λήνων Μηνογένην Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ Μηνογένους τὸν πολεῖτην <ύ>μῶν, διὰ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν [εὐδη]λον εὐνοίαν καὶ διὰ τὸ τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτὸν τετελεκέναι καθαρῶς καὶ συμφερόντως,

⁵⁷¹ Ritti's plausible restoration (2017, 463-471 (texts and commentary at 372-375, 437-448), see Jones 2018, 924) of the two preambles identifies one Ti. Claudius Miletus as both ἀσιάρχης and ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς Ἀσίας ναοῦ τοῦ ἐν Ζμύρνῃ. Given both decrees involve a single ἀρχιερεύς and three ἀσιάρχαι, Ritti returns to Magie's earlier suggestion (1950, 1298).

⁵⁷² E.g. Strabo 14.1.42, 14.2.24; cf. Acts 19:31.

⁵⁷³ Buckler & Robinson 1914, 337-339.

ἰκόνι γραπτῇ ἐνόπλῳ <ἐ>πιχρ[ύσῳ] | ἦν καὶ ἀνατεθῆναι ἐν ᾗ ἂν βούληται πόλει τῆς Ἀσίας, ἐφ' ἧς καὶ ἐπιγραφῆναι οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἑλ<λ>ηνες ἐτίμησ[αν] | Μηνογένην Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ Μηνογένους Σαρδιανόν, ἔκδικον, τελέσαντα τὴν ἀρχὴν κα<θ>αρῶς καὶ σ[υν]||φερόντως τῇ Ἀσίᾳ δι' ὃ καὶ γεγράφαμεν ὑμῖν περὶ τῶν τιμῶν αὐτοῦ ἵνα ἰδῆτε ('Charinus, son of Charinus, of Pergamum, High-priest of the goddess Roma and of Imperator Caesar, *divi f.*, Augustus, to the archons, *boule* and *demos* of the Sardians, greetings. An assembly for the selection of officials being held, and the 150 men from the cities meeting, they were moved to honour, unanimously, Menogenes, son of Isidorus, grandson of Menogenes, this year *ekdikos* for the *koinon* of the Greeks in Asia, your citizen, on account of his conspicuous goodwill towards Asia and his completion of this office with integrity and for the public good, with a gilded equestrian statue, to be set up in whichever city of Asia he wishes, on which should be inscribed: "the Greeks of Asia honoured Menogenes, son of Isidorus, grandson of Menogenes, of Sardis, *ekdikos*, who completed this office with integrity and for the public good of Asia." For this reason, we have written to you about his honours, for your information.')⁵⁷⁴

Several elements, echoed in the other relevant documents, command attention. Most significant is Menogenes' position as ἔκδικος for the *koinon*, reprised for a second and third time in the two decrees. This term generally indicated a public advocate, though its employment is haphazard. A letter of Cicero from 51/50 suggests that ἔκδικοι were legally authorised by *poleis* to conduct negotiations with creditors; by contrast, typical ambassadors, termed *legati* or πρεσβευταί, were restricted to petitioning.⁵⁷⁵ Fournier argues that ἔκδικοι in the Hellenistic period were akin to σύνδικοι, irregular officials elected to represent a city's interests in a legal case involving an external power.⁵⁷⁶ However, the

⁵⁷⁴ *Sardis* 7.1.8.75-82.

⁵⁷⁵ *Cic. Fam.* 13.56.1-2.

⁵⁷⁶ Fournier 2007, 26. On σύνδικοι: 9-17. Prior to the Roman *provincia*, these mediated with other *poleis* but with increasing Roman control their focus shifted to questions arising from imperial administration. For the imperial period: Dmitriev 2005a, 213-216.

Menogenes dossier makes clear that this was an annual office; his remit appeared to extend to representing the interests of the *koinon* at Rome, though in a more general fashion than Cicero would recognise.⁵⁷⁷ It underscores that, while the abolition of the *decuma* tax farm in Asia brought down gross taxation rates, it did not eradicate corruption and abuse of provincials and provincial communities.⁵⁷⁸ As Fournier highlights, the scope of this office far exceeded the role of representative: in one *koinon* decree associated with Paullus' dossier, ἑκδικοὶ of the organisation are enjoined to ensure the display of the proconsul's *edictum* (δελτογράφημα) together with the ψήφισμα itself.⁵⁷⁹

Furthermore, Menogenes' honorary decree demonstrates that, by the mid-Augustan period, established practices provided for regular, annual election to a number of positions. The letter of Charinus mentions an ἐκκλησίας ἀρχαιρετικῆς συναχθείσης καὶ συνελθόντων τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν [πόλεων ἐ]κατὸν καὶ ἑνὶ ἀνδρῶν ('assembly for the selection of magistrates and meeting of the 150 men from the cities').⁵⁸⁰ The following letter of Demetrios simplifies this to ἀρχαιρέσια ('election').⁵⁸¹ Aside from the interesting point that the letters show lexical variation – the language of the institution had not become static and over-ritualised – this illustrates that a meeting of a set number of representatives, 150, took place at regular intervals, probably annually. This raises the question of how the representatives were allocated among the communities of the *provincia*. The neatness of the number 150

⁵⁷⁷ Fournier 2007, 25–26. Earlier: Magie 1950, 648; Dmitriev 2005a, 214.

⁵⁷⁸ Brunt 1961, 189–223.

⁵⁷⁹ RDGE 65.d.64. Fournier 2007, 27. See, by contrast, the well-attested ἑκδικοὶ of civic *gerousiai* in the Imperial period (e.g. *I.Eph.* 26.21). Robert 1958, 28–29.

⁵⁸⁰ *Sardis* 7.1.8.76–77.

⁵⁸¹ *Sardis* 7.1.8.85.

makes it unlikely that it corresponded to the number of *poleis* which made up the *koinon*; nor is the total easily divisible by the number of *conventus* districts (13) or the number of Sullan *regiones* (44). Consequently, a more complicated method to arrive at this number of delegates was necessary. The example of Lycia and the division of representatives based on the size and significance of the community on a scale from three to one offers a simple explanation.⁵⁸² The appearance of four different ἀρχιερεῖς over four years from different *poleis* strongly suggests that this position was one of those elected by the representatives, and hints that some principle of rotation operated within the minds of the delegates, though this is, admittedly, speculative.⁵⁸³ The use of χειροτονηθεῖς to describe Menogenes' appointment to his second term implies that this was also a regularly elected office. The shorthand employed by Demetrios implies a familiar process and prioritises the electoral aspect of the meeting, where Charinus' language could imply a wider forum for discussion.⁵⁸⁴ This text shows a comprehensive, functional regional structure within which communities had traded agency for co-operation and stability.

The honours, voted in four consecutive years, exceed those offered to his forebears Hierocles and Dionysus. On each occasion he was granted the right to a gilded equestrian statue (ἐνόπλος); significantly beyond the bronze statues (ἰκόνας χαλκᾶς) accorded to his

⁵⁸² Strabo 14.3.3. The ratio of *poleis* to representatives in Asia would be far lower than in Lycia – perhaps not every *polis* had the right to participate. The *Album Canusinum* (223 CE) provides another potential comparandum. Given the tidy number of 100 representatives, Salway (2000, 126-133) proposes that additional members were adlected to the *ordo decurionum* on an ad hoc basis to fill gaps.

⁵⁸³ Campanile 1994, 17.

⁵⁸⁴ Again, compare Strabo 14.3.3.

predecessors.⁵⁸⁵ Menogenes continued to have the choice of *polis* in which his honours were to be erected and, in the final case, this was extended explicitly to sacred precincts.⁵⁸⁶ The militaristic connotations of an equestrian statue seem at odds with an ambassadorial role. In earlier periods, equestrian statues were reserved for Hellenistic *basileis* and Roman commanders.⁵⁸⁷ However, the inflation of honours in Asia over the course of the first century, for local magnates and Romans, may explain this difference in scale.⁵⁸⁸ Nevertheless, that Menogenes was repeatedly honoured for apparently regular missions in his institutionalised role as an advocate for the *provincia* is striking. One plausible reason for this development would see civic and, later, provincial elites as valuing the role of ἑκδικος as a protector of the *provincia* and its constituent communities on a scale commensurate with earlier royal or Roman actors. This final *koinon* decree added the right to display Menogenes' honours on marble stele, presumably the surviving monument. It also affords Isidorus, Menogenes' son, the right to his own gilded statue. Isidorus is presented not as a citizen of Sardis, but as an Ἀσιανός ('citizen of Asia'), further pointing to the strengthening group identity of the elites of the *provincia*. Menogenes retained control of the placement of his son's honorific monument and this could present evidence of increasing heritability of honour and office.⁵⁸⁹ The number of honours granted to Menogenes also gave him options

⁵⁸⁵ On portraits, see Ng 2016, 235-260. On the types of honorific inscriptions: Ma 2013, 24-39.

⁵⁸⁶ *Sardis* 7.1.8.118-119. Whether this is on account of shorthand in the other instance or a new honour needs checking.

⁵⁸⁷ As at the Amphiarion at Oropos (Ma 2013, 139-140). Generally, Gauthier 1985; Ma 2013a, 167-169.

⁵⁸⁸ Heller & van Nijf 2017, 10-15.

⁵⁸⁹ See Fernoux 2007, 179-191. Compare: *LKnidos* 51-61, with Thériault 2003, 240-242; *SEG* 46.1709, with Hall, Milner & Coulton 1996, 121-143.

in terms of display. He could choose to concentrate them in one *polis* or spread them across several increasingly interconnected provincial hubs. His apparently exceptional success requires that caution be applied in using him as an exemplum. However, this dossier offers some insight into how a provincial elite began to coalesce through progressively stronger regional institutions and connectivity.

The *koinon* of Asia in the Augustan period suggests an increasing institutionalisation of the existing organisation. While the establishment of the imperial cult at Pergamum pushed the body into a role co-ordinating religious activity in honour of the Princeps, this did not involve a change in purpose, only in intensity. While the temple of Roma and Augustus at Pergamum offered the novelty of a single physical focal point for the *koinon*, its magistracies continued to rotate through a range of civic communities. By the turn of the first century CE, the organisation possessed several officials, both religious and administrative, together with a complex annual electoral process and an assembly with the authority and legitimacy to issue honorific decrees with broad relevance across the *provincia*.

1.4.3: Augustus and Asian provincial government

After wintering in Samos in 21/20, Augustus travelled through the eastern provinces, including Asia, personally interfering in some aspects of their administration. Cyzicus presents the most obvious example: Augustus stripped the *polis* of its ἐλευθερία due to its

role in flogging and killing some Roman citizens during a period of internal unrest.⁵⁹⁰ The Princeps' decision highlights the detachment of status from loyalty in military contexts, which had been the norm in earlier periods. Instead, failure to observe the special status of Roman citizens resulted in the unilateral revocation of privileges.⁵⁹¹ Dio's account perhaps implies that the Cyzicenes, as a community, executed these Romans in a judicial context.⁵⁹² If so, this could explain the swift and summary outcome, while also shedding light on the limits of civic freedom under the new regime.

The well-known letter of Augustus to the free city of Cnidus further underscores changes in hierarchies of jurisdiction. In the second half of 6, an embassy arrived in Rome and presented Augustus, then consul designate, with a decree. Notably, the Senate is not mentioned here, perhaps intimating that this embassy was directed to the Princeps personally. If so, this demonstrates the evolution of central institutions during Augustus' lifetime.⁵⁹³ The ambassadors accused two Cnidian residents, Euboulus, son of Anaxandrides, and his wife, Tryphera, of murdering Euboulus, son of Chrysippus, during an armed dispute. The couple fled to Rome rather than face local judgement and in the interim the husband

⁵⁹⁰ CD. 54.7.6; Euseb. *Chron.* p.165 Helm. Dio adds that Tyre and Sidon, in Syria, a *provincia Augusti*, were similarly punished, though without any suggestion of Romans coming to harm. Possibly alluded to by Suetonius (*Aug.* 47.1). Jones 1971², 86-87; Fournier 2010, 492-494. Cf. Tiberius' relationship with Cyzicus (*Tac. Ann.* 4.36.2-3; *Suet. Tib.* 37.7; CD. 57.24.6. Edmondson 2014, 142) and CD. 60.17.3, with *Suet. Claud.* 25.3; SEG 44.1205.a.11-27 on Lycian stasis and political turmoil leading to provincialisation under Claudius.

⁵⁹¹ Guerber 2009, 73-74.

⁵⁹² CD. 54.7.6. Ferrary 1991, 569; Thornton 1999, 509-516 *contra* Magie 1950, 1052; Marshall 1969, 261 n.23.

⁵⁹³ RDGE 67.5-6. Cnidus' freedom granted by Caesar (*Plut. Caes.* 48.1; *Strabo* 14.2.15); maintained in Augustan period: *Plin. HN.* 5.104.

died.⁵⁹⁴ It seems clear that no trial process had preceded the defendants' escape. On receiving the embassy, Augustus recounts that he deputed an *amicus*, Asinius Gallus, to investigate, through torturing the household's slaves.⁵⁹⁵ Subsequently, having formed his own opinion, Augustus gives a reconstruction of the events, asserting his belief that the murder was committed in self-defence and castigating the Cnidians for pursuing, as he saw it, the wrong party.⁵⁹⁶ He ends his missive with a strong statement that Tryphera and her husband committed no crime at all (ἡδίκηκότων δὲ οὐδ' ἔστ[ιν ὅ τι]) and requiring that the city adjust their public records (τὰ ἐν τοῖς δημ[οσίοις] | ὑμῶν ὁμολογεῖν γράμματα) to reflect his decision.⁵⁹⁷

This cannot have been an instance of *appellatio* (appeal) in a formal sense, both as no trial had taken place to be appealed and no participant appears to have held Roman citizenship.⁵⁹⁸ Instead, this seems to be an ad hoc process instituted in response to an impasse reached by the defendants' flight. The Cnidians, here a group of local powerbrokers, unable to assert jurisdiction outside their territory sought the Princeps' assistance in achieving 'justice'. However, in the absence of established mechanisms for dealing with conflicting jurisdictional principles, the Princeps, on the participants' invitation, involved himself. The Cnidian gamble backfired, and the document's appearance at Astypalaea

⁵⁹⁴ RDGE 67.8-10. Oliver 37; Sherk 1969, 344.

⁵⁹⁵ On the torture of slaves in Roman law: Watson 1983, 56-59. Compare Athens: Hunter 1994, 91-95.

⁵⁹⁶ RDGE 67.13-36.

⁵⁹⁷ RDGE 67.

⁵⁹⁸ Viereck 1888, 10 *contra* Mommsen 1903-1904⁹, 5.324; Wankel 2009, 11-12, citing *Dig.* 49.15.7.2. Compare Jones 1960b, 53-55; Millar 1977, 443, 509-510.

indicates that Tryphera likely did not return to the city.⁵⁹⁹ The involvement of the *Princeps* bears some resemblance to the role of the Senate in mediating territorial disputes during the second century. As a powerful player and source of extra-civic authority, communities and individuals were tempted to involve them for their own purposes.⁶⁰⁰ Over time, through increasing use, this process became institutionalised, fundamentally altering the balance of jurisdictional power between *Princeps* and communities in the Greek East, irrespective of their status.

Further evidence emerges from the famous dossier of Paullus Fabius Maximus, governor of Asia in 9/8, which consists of six documents: an *edictum* of the proconsul in Latin, with an appendix; Greek translations of both; and two decrees of the *koinon* of Asia. The *edictum* contains a long justification of Paullus' proposal that the whole *provincia* reform its calendar so that the year commence on Augustus' birthday.⁶⁰¹ The text also notes that a ψήφισμα of the *koinon* was required to execute this plan. That is, Paullus deemed the written decision of representatives of the provincial community necessary before implementing his idea.⁶⁰² The first decree recorded in the dossier echoes the proconsul's praise of Augustus before organising the standardised calendar for the provincial communities. This moved beyond Paullus' original suggestion, hinting at the representatives' zeal to be seen as

⁵⁹⁹ Viereck 1888, 10; von Wilamowitz 1902, 257–58.

⁶⁰⁰ Kallet-Marx 1995, 161–177; see now Czajkowski (2016, 483–486) on Herod's employment of Roman actors to bolster his own decision-making. Note her judicious caution over use of the word 'trial' in these contexts.

⁶⁰¹ *RDGE* 65, with *SEG* 56.1233. For this date Stern 2012, 275–276 *contra* Buxton & Hannah 2005, 290–306. On the new calendar, Stern 2012, 276–279; Thonemann 2015, 123–125.

⁶⁰² *RDGE* 65.A.21–23, 26–28. Heller (2014, 222–223) argues that Augustus himself may have prompted this innovation; more cautiously, Stern 2012, 278.

honouring the Princeps. The intent of the reform was not practical, but honorific; to publicly exhibit collective loyalty to Augustus. In the second decree, as noted *supra*, the *koinon* reiterated that the changes to the calendar were not to contravene the existing *lex Cornelia*.⁶⁰³ In both instances, the *koinon* appropriated a legislative function over *provincia Asia* as a whole. Notwithstanding its patchy adoption, the calendar continued in use until at least the fifth century CE.⁶⁰⁴ Paullus' recommendation and the *koinon*'s decision to fundamentally reinvent the calendar of the whole region must be read in the context of the development of new institutional norms. The overwhelming influence of Augustus, whether directly exercised, mediated through the Senate, or in case of provincials, the governor, dictated that he be honoured to maximise the potential privileges. Even so, in this case, the exercise of Roman governance was at a distance – the calendrical reform within *provincia Asia*, a major undertaking, resulted from and was driven by a local organisation.

A proconsular letter to Chios provides another insight into the shifting administrative landscape for free cities in this period. Though the author is unknown, a reference to his predecessor, Antistius Vetus, allows a secure date of c. 5 CE.⁶⁰⁵ From the surviving text, it appears that a land dispute between resident Romans on the island and the *polis* had been referred, on at least three occasions, to the governor. Bitner contextualises these exchanges

⁶⁰³ RDGE 65.D.79-84. Santangelo 2007, 118. See pp.62-63 *supra*.

⁶⁰⁴ As Thonemann notes (2015, 125), Καῖσαρ did not generally displace the Seleucid-Macedonian name of the opening month, Δίος, and (129-131) calendrical variation certainly continued in parts of Asia. Testimonia for the use of Paullus' calendar collected at (126-129), advancing Laffi 1967, 75-81.

⁶⁰⁵ RDGE 70, with AÉ 2014, #1254 correcting l.11. For the date, Marshall (1969, 255 n.2, followed by Atkinson 1958, 328; Badian 1969, 200-204; Bitner 2014, 648-650) against Forrest, arguing for 64/65 CE (SEG 22.507).

within the framework of the assize court and uses the document to investigate procedural elements of the gubernatorial *conventus*. However, this is not uncontroversial – the Chians, we learn from this document, were, from the time of Sulla, not subject to the τύποι ('written directives') of Roman magistrates. They enjoyed their own laws and customs, which applied even to resident Romans.⁶⁰⁶ Accordingly, the elements of the process initiated by the Chians should have initially stood outside any legal process, instead forming a standard diplomatic approach to the governor.⁶⁰⁷ However, it is possible that the original decision of Antistius did take place in a legal context: the complex and varying realities of each community's privileges make gubernatorial 'misunderstandings', wilful or otherwise, comprehensible.⁶⁰⁸

This document reveals three important elements of gubernatorial practice during the Augustan period. First, the author seems to have rejected the initial request of the Chians on the grounds that his predecessor had already done so. This reflected the general practice of the late Republic that magistrates would respect existing decisions.⁶⁰⁹ It also emphasises that a written version of this decision was available to the new governor, highlighting the role of archives, or its provision to the parties involved in the original dispute.⁶¹⁰ Second, the

⁶⁰⁶ Bitner 2014, 647-648. *Pace* Marshall (1969, 257-259), whose rendering 'written documents used in a legal procedure' begs the question. *IAph2007* 8.33.3 and 11.412.23 show τύπος could be employed in the phrase τύπος τῆς ἐπαρχείας to mean *formula provinciae*, though context makes this meaning unlikely here (Bitner 2014, 662 n.84; *pace* Thornton 1999, 522).

⁶⁰⁷ See Cotton (2013, 45-46) on legal disputes not necessarily leading to court action. On the analogy of Roman administration as diplomacy: Eck 2009, 193-207. Compare Cicero's emphasis on governor's availability outside of formal court proceedings (e.g. *QFr.* 1.1.7-9; *Att.* 5.13.1; 6.2.5. Bérenger 2011, 176-179).

⁶⁰⁸ Sherk 1969, 353 n.2.

⁶⁰⁹ *RDGE* 70.1-7. Bitner 2014, 651 n. 49 (drawing on Lewis 1999, 47). Generally, Haensch 1992, 232 n.60; Lintott 1993, 65-66; Meyer-Zwiffelhofer 2002, 268-277.

⁶¹⁰ Bitner 2014, 652, 655-656, though note Plin. *Ep.* 10.58-60, 65-66; Burton 1975, 103; Eck 1995-1998, 64.

author makes clear that he has settled upon his own procedure for judging disputes, stressing that his decision to respect Vetus' ruling is κατακλουθῶν τῇ καθολικῇ μου ('following my general procedure'), while a request of both parties for further documentation is κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν συνήθειαν ('in accordance with my customary procedure').⁶¹¹ Placing this strong emphasis on his personal practice underscores the agency which governors continued to hold in this period. Despite the increasing centralisation of the levers of empire, proconsuls retained the capacity to personally decide judicial and diplomatic matters in the field. Indeed, their consular rank, in Asia, divorced provincial government from the politics of entrenched vested interests.⁶¹² Finally, based on the text's publication that, disregarding his own preliminary decision, the author eventually overturned Vetus' judgement when confronted with documentary evidence. This reinforces the impression that the proconsuls of Asia in the Augustan period continued to hold a wide discretion on their conduct of affairs.

This text demonstrates that, in 26, Augustus had reconfirmed by letter that the *polis* retained its ἐλευθερία, almost certainly on the same terms as the earlier *senatusconsultum*.⁶¹³ That Augustus' correspondence is cited here, and not a ratifying senatorial decree, marks another change from the post-Mithridatic period.⁶¹⁴ It is possible that, in view of the Princeps' position, his *ipsissima verba* were considered by the Chians to hold more weight,

⁶¹¹ RDGE 70.4,

⁶¹² Consular commanders no longer relied on equestrian support in elections. By the end of the first century innovations in the *repetundae* court had also strengthened the hand of governors (RDGE 31).

⁶¹³ RDGE 70.18-20

⁶¹⁴ The corpus of documents attesting Sulla's grants to communities in Asia Minor consists exclusively of *senatusconsulta*, even where covering letters are included (RDGE 18, 19, 20).

though more likely that any *senatusconsultum* had not been preserved.⁶¹⁵ In any case, the use of the letter in this context, a mere two decades into the Principate, reiterates the striking extent to which administrative practice and the relations of communities to the empire at large hinged on Augustus' pronouncements and decisions.

A final document neatly capturing the dynamics of this period is a response from Augustus to a Samian request to be granted ἐλευθερία. Like the Cnidian letter, this text is unusual in preserving the denial of a civic request and appears to have been adduced by Aphrodisias to demonstrate their strong relationship with the Princeps.⁶¹⁶ The actual decision must pre-date the winter of 20/19, when Augustus did grant the island its freedom. Reynolds' suggestion that the war in which Aphrodisias was captured was that against Labienus, rather than the prelude to Actium, has much to recommend it. However, this does not exclude that the initial request was made after Antonius' defeat, even if Bowersock's suggestion dating the document to the late 20s is implausible.⁶¹⁷

This text reveals two crucial points. First, that ἐλευθερία now lay in the imperial gift. The intercession of Livia in the Samians' favour emphasises the personal element to the decision and the use of the first person throughout elides any role for the institutions of the *res publica*.⁶¹⁸ This does not mean that a grant would not be confirmed by a later *senatusconsultum*, but rather that the pretence that the decision of the Senate could overrule

⁶¹⁵ E.g. *IAph2007* 8.25 implies that Aphrodisias did not have copies of the documents provided to its ambassador Solon.

⁶¹⁶ *IAph2007* 8.32.

⁶¹⁷ Kokkinia 2015–2016, 30. Reynolds 1982, 105; *pace* Bowersock 1984, 52; Badian 1984a, 166–168; Toher 1985, 201–202.

⁶¹⁸ Compare CD. 54.7.2, for similar 'personal' grants.

or contradict that of Augustus disappears. Second, the Princeps explicitly links ἐλευθερία to immunity from Roman taxation, stating, for the record, that fiscal considerations did not affect his decision. Instead, he asserts a principle of reciprocity guiding his choices – as yet, the Samians had not performed actions worthy of reward with τὸ πάντων μέγιστον φιλόνηθρον ('greatest privilege of all').⁶¹⁹ This demonstrates that Augustus, at least, saw the privilege of freedom in its complete sense as including *immunitas*. As an assertion of a general principle, this could not be clearer, even if exceptions existed. Both details highlight the evolution of the Roman state.⁶²⁰ The unique, unequalled position of the Princeps approached that of Hellenistic *basileis* transforming the nature of provincial administration. Though the Republican framework of rule persisted, the introduction of an autonomous player at the pinnacle of the state hierarchy greatly affected the practicalities of Roman rule.

However, no major innovations appear to have taken place in the fiscal sphere. Though Brunt contended that the introduction of *procuratores* implies a shift in state collection practices, moving from the extraction of a lump sum to a percentage cut of farmed taxes, it is unlikely that this occurred under Augustus.⁶²¹ The *publicani* continued to collect the *portoria*, and perhaps the *decuma* and *scriptura* from ex-civic territories.⁶²² Similarly,

⁶¹⁹ *IAph2007* 8.32.4-7. The language and ideological aspects are discussed in detail in Chapter 2 *infra*.

⁶²⁰ Bernhardt 1980, 192. See pp.31-34 *supra* – it implies that the divorce of *libertas* and *immunitas* post-dated the conquest of Egypt, which fits neatly with a view that Augustus was responsible for this decision. Given the Princeps' involvement with state finances and his control over grants of privileges he had a strong motive to do so and the emphasis placed on revenue here hints at a broader concern. From a practical perspective, Augustus may have implemented this change after the conquest of Egypt, in the settling of the eastern empire while returning to Rome, though this remains a hypothesis.

⁶²¹ Eich 2005, 105, 119-120 *pace* Brunt 1990b, 384-386.

⁶²² De Laet 1949, 370-383; Brunt 1990b, 390-391. See *AE* 1968, #483.

sources attest to the continuation of communal assessment and local collection of civic taxes.⁶²³ There is no reason to assume that the level of corruption on an individual level decreased to any significant degree, though the state now had greater leverage and stronger interest in controlling it.⁶²⁴

Proconsuls retained significant discretion within their *provincia* and the capacity to intervene in the domestic affairs of subject communities. A fragmentary letter ascribed to P. Cornelius Scipio, proconsul c. 12–10, discovered at Thyatira, demonstrates the continuity in practical administration under the early Principate.⁶²⁵ While the surviving text is extremely mutilated, it contains references to sacred funds (ἱερῶν χρημάτων), loans at excessive rates (ὑπερῶνηθεῖσι) and a deposit (παραβόλιον).⁶²⁶ Given the apparent brevity of the document, which seems to run to only ten lines, and its commemoration by the Thyatirans, it seems reasonable to posit that the commander became involved in the dispute after a petition by a group of local inhabitants. In this sense, we see continuity with earlier decisions of Roman commanders *in provincia*, emphasising the need for caution in approaching the incremental changes in administrative practice in the Augustan period.⁶²⁷

Augustus interfered in *provincia Asia* irrespective of a distinction between *provinciae publicae* and *Caesaris*. This reflects the way in which the *respublica* had fundamentally changed and continued to evolve. Augustus' position was unprecedented and over the course of his

⁶²³ Strabo 10.5.3; 14.2.19.

⁶²⁴ Brunt 1961, 198–223; Tan 2017, 62–66.

⁶²⁵ On the date: Eilers 2001, 201–205, with bibliography. N.B. Marek (2006, 289–290, commenting on *I.Kaunos* 106) has raised the possibility that the author may be P. Cornelius Sulla, governor in 67.

⁶²⁶ *RDGE* 66.4–8.

⁶²⁷ Sherk 1969, 340.

reign became institutionalised through praxis. Consequently, the observable tension between imperial and gubernatorial powers and jurisdiction makes sense. Moreover, it seems clear that cities and the increasingly assertive *koinon* also took advantage of structural ambiguities to enhance their own position vis-à-vis the organs of the Roman state. That said, the longevity of Augustus helped to stabilise a particular mode of power relations, which then laid the foundations for the subsequent evolution of the Principate.

1.5: Conclusions

I have argued in this section that *provincia Asia*, at its inception, was not a single contiguous territorial entity. Instead, after 133, the Attalid kingdom became a patchwork of *ager publicus* and autonomous, allied cities. Put simply, the evidence suggests strongly that the Roman state had limited administrative ambitions within Asia. While Roman magistrates were often present, the scope of their administration was narrow. They had jurisdiction over Roman citizens and individuals without a *polis* citizenship but had no fiscal responsibilities vis-à-vis the cities. The new *provincia* presented a unique gubernatorial challenge and both Roman and local actors needed to learn the limits of freedom and authority. Though this process was contested, the *publicani* and early governors represented an annoyance, rather than a scourge to the cities of Asia.

The events of the First Mithridatic War formed a critical juncture for Roman administration in the region, however. The existing template of hegemony was swept away in the invasion and subsequent massacre of Italians in 88. This collaboration of many *poleis*

with the *basileus* offered Sulla an opportunity to reset the relationship. Constrained by his own immediate needs, the commander took two specific actions which had a massive impact on the subsequent development of Roman administration in Asia: stripping most *poleis* of their ἐλευθερία and imposing a 20,000-talent fine. This was not the result of careful fiscal planning, but rather the contingent circumstances of civil war. Nevertheless, these decisions subjected the bulk of the region's civic communities to the jurisdiction of Roman magistrates and taxation of the Roman state for the first time. Consequently, the Senate and magistrates sought to regularise the newly extended political and economic elements of state power in the region, constrained by roads already taken. The post-Sullan Republic was formative for later institutions of *provincia Asia*, including the tax-farm for the *decuma*, the *conventus* and the provincial *koinon*, but these did not spring into being fully formed. Rather, they emerged slowly and dynamically from pre-existing circumstances and continued to evolve across the period in response to changing political conditions at Rome and locally.

The eruption of Mediterranean-wide civil war sparked another crisis of central institutions. Caesar's stunning successes concentrated enough power and authority in his person to disrupt existing frameworks of governance. His eradication of the publican role in the collection of the *decuma* and apparent emphasis on enshrining the rights of free cities in treaties highlight the administrative innovation his position made possible. His political heirs, the triumvirate, continued to oversee a concentration and personalisation of state power, which altered the balance between the bodies of the central state and its leaders in establishing and implementing policy, perhaps accounting for the relative absence of provincial governors from the literary and documentary evidence of the period. Even so,

the uneasy alliance between Antonius and Octavian came to a swift and summary end at Actium in 31.

Augustus' accession to supreme authority within the Roman world afforded the communities of Asia more certainty in the field of policy developments. The institutionalisation of his control and influence had a significant impact on the practice of provincial government. The use of imperial *procuratores* alongside governors introduced new actors into the world of governance, while the establishment of the imperial cult cemented both the ideological basis of Augustan power and the role of the provincial *koinon* in local affairs. Though the institutions of provincial administration continued to change across the reign of the first Princeps, they shifted back into a more normal rhythm of incremental, rather than abrupt, developments. The longevity of Augustus and his pre-eminence provided central stability which allowed local administrative conditions to settle into their new pattern of evolution.

Overall, I have sought to demonstrate that the cognitive shift which took Roman hegemony in Asia to empire occurred as a result of circumstances after Sulla's settlement. There was initially no state-directed drive to exploit the new province. Indeed, the instability at the heart of the Republic made the development of coherent institutional approaches difficult. As the field of authoritative actors narrowed across the first century, the motivation for leaders to develop structures to efficiently govern – balancing fiscal extraction against local resentment – became more pronounced. However, institutions present only one element of Roman government in Asia. Its corollary, the ideological bases of power, are considered in Chapter 2.

2. Rome and the *poleis*: The Creation of an Imperial Discourse

2.1: The Context of Roman Communication in Asia Minor

This chapter poses questions of the role of Roman official pronouncements in creating an imperial discourse. Earlier studies on the relationship between government and official communication in the ancient world have demonstrated how these discourses mediate and construct the reality of administration and power.⁶²⁸ To date, however, this insight has not been applied to the period of transition from Republican empire to Principate. I address this gap by focusing on how the public utterances of the Roman state and its representatives, between the late second century and the end of the Julio-Claudian dynasty, created and altered the discourse of Roman power and authority. First, I focus on official communiqués of the Roman state: *senatusconsulta* and *leges*, issued by the political organs of the *res publica*, the letters and *edicta* of magistrates on the ground and, later, the *Principes*. I begin by analysing the extent to which the language and structure of Roman communication disrupted pre-existing modes of interaction between Hellenistic *basileis* and *poleis* in Asia Minor. Subsequently, drawing on Habermas' interpretation of 'speech-act' theory, as outlined in the introduction, I explore the evolution of official documents between the death of Attalus III and the Julio-Claudian empire, commenting on the cohesiveness of the corpus and questioning the effectiveness of Roman discourse creation during the Republican

⁶²⁸ E.g. Ando (2000), Ma (2000), and Burton (2011) have suggested methodologies for approaching discursive strategies in ancient imperial contexts.

period.⁶²⁹ I link this back to my discussion of institutional and political changes in chapter 1 and highlight the role of normative instability in generating diverse outcomes.

Modern scholars often emphasise that Roman magistrates drew on Hellenistic royal traditions in their own correspondence. However, this appropriation of existing models was not seamless: Hellenistic royal exempla formed part of a sophisticated cultural complex. Ma demonstrated how, despite the significant administrative and coercive power of the Seleucid state, the correspondence of its rulers with the *poleis* of western Asia Minor operated in dialogue with civic honorific decrees. These two genres were distinct, but complementary, directly responding to one other. They depended on a common set of assumptions and were heavily formulaic. They shared, in his terms, a grammar and a syntax.⁶³⁰ A reproducible repertoire of language expressed coherent concepts. Royal letters tended to generalise in space and, more commonly, in time, establishing a record of benefaction for the wider community of οἱ Ἕλληνες ('the Greeks') across an extended period and promoting the impression of consistent moral behaviour. Benefactions were framed against precedent and conditionally offered for the future through 'contract clauses', to use Ma's term, which explicitly linked the continual goodwill (εὐνοία) of cities to the prospect of further privileges, a system of reciprocity which bound together the overt institutional elements of Seleucid rule.⁶³¹ The very formalisation and circumscription of this discourse

⁶²⁹ Habermas 1991, 231-238 and pp.13-14 *supra*.

⁶³⁰ Ma 1999, 182-194. See also Bencivenni 2010, 160-161; Virgilio 2013, 243-251.

⁶³¹ See Ma 1999, 179 n. 4-5 for references. E.g. *I.Mylasa* 963.7-11: τῇμ πᾶσαν πολυωρίαν ποι|σόμεθα ὑμῶν ὅσωιπερ ἄν εὐ|ν[ο]έστεροι καὶ προθυμότερο[ι] | φαίνησθε εἰς τὰ τῶι βασιλεῖ | Ἀντιόχῳ συμφέροντα ('we will show all consideration to you, insofar as you show yourselves to be better disposed and more eager towards the interests of *basileus* Antiochus').

presented different, but compatible, interpretations to both parties.⁶³² Extending civic honours to the *basileus* allowed *poleis* to aggrandise their own position; asserting their agency vis-à-vis the hegemonic power. However, by engaging directly with the ruler in honorific terms and requesting privileges from him, communities validated and legitimised the imperial regime.⁶³³ Such structures resemble, at least superficially, those operating under the Roman Empire. The Princeps responded directly to petitioning communities in an ostensibly personal relationship, granting privileges in return for honour and the corresponding implied consent to his authority such requests offered.⁶³⁴ These studies present peripheral communities as actively pursuing a range of strategies in engaging with communiqués from a hegemonic, monarchic empire.

After the treaty of Apamea, the Attalids became the dominant power in the region. However, the dynasts' newfound authority was insecure, resting on the decision of the Roman Senate, a distant body without an ongoing presence in Asia. As noted *supra*, Eumenes II and his successors solved the critical problem of their legitimacy by inverting Seleucid power structures, decentralising their administration and consciously retreating from military prowess as a basis for charismatic leadership.⁶³⁵ By contrast, the Attalids favoured emphasising their position as general εὐεργέται to the Hellenic world. Given their

⁶³² Ma 1999, 194-242.

⁶³³ Ma 1999, esp. 235-242. Note, Welles (1934, xl) and Bencivenni (2010, 154-161) see an honorific element to the publication of royal missives.

⁶³⁴ E.g. Millar's petition-and-response model (esp. 2002 [1966], 271-291; 2004 [1967], 3-22)); in a religious context, Price 1984, 65-77. More recently, Ando 2000; (Forthcoming); Edmondson 2014, 127-155; Lenski 2017.

⁶³⁵ Thonemann 2013, 3-7, 11-17.

subordination vis-à-vis Rome, Eumenes II and his successors relied on a claim to moral excellence, exemplified through their benefactions, to legitimise their kingship.⁶³⁶ This ideological development arose out of the same *do ut des* premise manifest in Antiochus' correspondence. However, due to this shift, obvious contract clauses appear less often in Attalid correspondence.⁶³⁷ Many letters end with no explicit extension of the exchange into the future; with instructions, rather than dialogue.⁶³⁸ Nevertheless, the basic relationship between monarch and community perpetuated Seleucid models. Despite changes in emphasis, *basileus* and *polis* continued to trade εὐεργέσια for the veneer of legitimacy, received through increasingly grandiose honours.⁶³⁹ This depended partly on operating within the same linguistic and conceptual repertoire as Antiochus. While some tinkering took place with the form of royal letters, the dialogue between city and ruler simply acquired a new interlocutor.⁶⁴⁰

Consequently, when Rome acquired hegemony over western Asia Minor in 133, the pattern of imperial interactions with communities had a well-established format: a

⁶³⁶ Robert 1937, 83-89; Zuiderhoek 2009, 71-78; Thonemann 2013, 35-44; Gotter 2013, 211-213. Erskine (1997, 32-33) notes that Rome did not, initially, sponsor Hellenic culture in this way, but sees references to Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ κοῖνοι εὐεργέται (collected by Ferrary 1988, 125-128, building on Robert 1969a, 57-61;) as evidence for communities treating them as successors to the Attalid tradition. On this epithet, generally: Wehrli 1978, 479-496; Ferrary 1988, 124-132; Erskine 1994, 70-87.

⁶³⁷ Only 8 contract clauses appear in 16 surviving letters (see Bencivenni 2014, 169-170). Eumenes II's letters to Toriaion (*I.Sultan Daği* 1.393), for example, retain them though the creation of a new community as precisely the moment for a monarch to define the terms of a relationship (cf. Dmitriev 1999, 410-411; Ma 1999, 248). Compare Virgilio (2013, 251-253) who sees growing absence of 'diplomatic' language in Attalid correspondence.

⁶³⁸ Bencivenni 2014, 169-171, A27-28.

⁶³⁹ See OGIS 332, with Chin 2018, 121-136.

⁶⁴⁰ The establishment of cults to Πώμη and other Roman institutions may reflect an attempt to treat the political entity of Rome as a Hellenistic king. Mellor 1975, 20-26, 134-164; Errington 1987, 99-102 (describing cult as 'institutionalisierte Danksagung'); Erskine 1997, 25-27.

reciprocal, continuous dialogue which granted concessions to civic communities in return for honour offered to the ruling power through local decrees. The system was flexible: local agency and autonomy were preserved while the tacit acknowledgement of the monarch's pre-eminence and legitimacy satisfied both parties. A formal vocabulary and syntax allowed discourse to be familiar, reproducible and consistent.⁶⁴¹ Negotiation through embassies remained inherent to this process and a common understanding of the 'rules of the game' allowed a significant continuity between Seleucid and Attalid rule.

However, the *res publica* differed fundamentally in structure from its Hellenistic forebears. Its institutions were fluid and multifarious, its political organs held overlapping powers.⁶⁴² Generally, Roman magistrates possessed immense power within their *provincia* through their *imperium* and *iurisdictio* but their time-limited terms and their vulnerability to later prosecution served as a check on their activity.⁶⁴³ Meanwhile, the Senate, generally responsible for diplomatic activity in the Late Republic, *stricto sensu* had only an advisory function.⁶⁴⁴ Statutory law passed independently by the assemblies was less common and usually more limited in scope.⁶⁴⁵ The dynamism of this period notwithstanding,

⁶⁴¹ Ma 1999, esp. 182-194.

⁶⁴² Lintott 1999; Boffo 2003, 231 on the implications for civic communities. Compare the distinction between early modern monarchic empires and their contemporary, the Venetian republic: Elliot 1992, 48-71; O'Connell 2009, 2.

⁶⁴³ Not that threat of prosecution was effective at ensuring good governance (e.g. Brunt 1961, 189-196; Morrell 2017, 11-13), but the possibility could restrain behaviour.

⁶⁴⁴ On the Senate as the locus of diplomatic activity, Pina Polo (2013, 247-248), noting that the single attested example of a foreign representative being brought before an assembly is the abortive attempt of C. Memmius in 111 to question Jugurtha of Numidia before the *concilium plebis* (Sall. *Jug.* 30-31, 33-34).

⁶⁴⁵ Meyer 2004, 98-99, 111. The *comitia* could, and often did, ratify senatorial decisions (e.g. *RS* 19; *SEG* 55.1452). See Kunkel & Wittmann 1995, 617-625.

communities were faced with the dissolution of the simple hierarchy of a monarchy, possessing a single figurehead and his nominated aides as a focal point for communicative action, into a morass of different functions, authorities and interest-groups.

2.1.1: The Roman background in Asia Minor

In 193 the *polis* of Teos asked the Senate to recognise their city and territory as ἱερὰ καὶ ἄσυλα ('sacred and inviolable') through a decree delivered by Menippus, an ambassador of Antiochus III. The Senate ordered the praetor M. Valerius Messala to respond, assenting to the Tean request.⁶⁴⁶ This letter, one of the earliest extant letters from a Roman magistrate to a Greek *polis*, was inscribed upon a stele and erected in public view. Scholars have treated the text and structure as paradigmatic, making an analysis of the whole letter desirable.

vac 'Ρωμαίων' vac | Μάρκος Οὐαλάριος Μάρκου στρατηγὸς καὶ | δήμαρχοι καὶ ἡ
σύνκλητος Τηίων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ | δήμῳ χαίρειν' vac Μένιππος ὃ τε παρ'
Ἀντιόχου τοῦ βασιλέως ἀποσταλεῖς πρὸς ἡμᾶς πρεσβευτής, προ|χειρισθεὶς καὶ
ὕψ' ὑμῶν πρεσβεῦσαι ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως | τὸ τε ψήφισμα ἀνέδωκεν καὶ αὐτὸς
ἀκολούθως τούτῳ | διελέχθη μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας ἡμεῖς δὲ τόν τε ἄνδρα
ἀπεδεξάμεθα φιλοφρόνως καὶ διὰ τὴν προγεγενη|μένην αὐτῷ δόξαν καὶ διὰ
τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν καλοκά|γαθίαν περὶ τε ὧν ἡξίου διηκούσαμεν εὐνόως' καὶ ὅτι
| μὲν διόλου πλεῖστον λόγον ποιούμενοι διατελοῦ|μεν τῆς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς
εὐσεβείας, μάλιστα' ἄν τις στο|χάζοιτο ἐκ τῆς συναντωμένης ἡμεῖν εὐμενείας |
διὰ ταῦτα παρὰ τοῦ δαιμονίου' οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἄλ|λων πλείονων πεπείσμεθα

⁶⁴⁶ Two other examples of letters written by a magistrate explicitly on behalf of the Senate and tribunes of the plebs exist: RDGE 38 and 39, in 189 and 186 respectively; though the *lex de provinciis praetoriis* (RS 12.Cnidus.3.28-41. Delphi.B.8-14) mentions consular letters on behalf of the SPQR. The appointment of a praetor to draft the letter reflects the necessity of speaking with a single voice. By contrast, the tendency for the senate to issue *senatusconsulta* in response to requests for honours or decisions, reflects a more complex process of debate and drafting, involving multiple participants (Bonnefond-Coudry 1989, 439-444, 570-573): e.g. RDGE 7, 9, 10.

συμφανῇ πᾶσι γεγονέναι | τὴν ἡμετέραν εἰς τὸ θεῖον προτίμιαν· διὸ καὶ διὰ τε
 ταῦτα καὶ διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς εὐνοίαν καὶ διὰ τὸν ἡξιω[μέν]ον | πρεσβευτὴν
 κρίνομεν εἶναι τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώ|ραν ἱεράν, καθὼς καὶ νῦν ἐστίν, καὶ ἄσυλον
 καὶ ἀφορο|λόγητον ἀπὸ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ῥωμαίων καὶ τὰ τε εἰς | τὸν θεὸν τίμια
 καὶ τὰ εἰς ὑμᾶς φιλάνθρωπα πειρασό|μεθα συνεπαύξειν, διατηρούντων ὑμῶν
 καὶ εἰς τὸ | μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς εὐνοίαν· *vac* ἔρρωσθε (‘Of the Romans.
 Marcus Valerius, son of Marcus, praetor, and the tribunes of the *plebs* and the
 Senate, to the *boule* and the *demos* of the Teans, greetings. Menippus, the
 ambassador sent to us by King Antiochus, chosen also by you as ambassador
 concerning your city, presented the decree and himself spoke with all zeal in
 accordance with it. We received the man kindly both on account of his previous
 reputation and on account of his innate good character, and we listened
 favourably to his requests. And that we continue always to value most highly
 piety towards the gods one might best understand from the favour which for
 these reasons we have met from the divine. We are convinced, moreover, that
 the special honour we show to the divine has become thoroughly clear to all
 from many other things as well. Wherefore, for these reasons and on account
 of our good-will towards you and on account of the esteemed ambassador, it is
 our decision that your city and land are to be sacred, as is even now the case,
 and inviolable and free from tribute to the *demos* of the Romans, and we shall
 try to increase both the honours to the god and our kindnesses to you, so long
 as you maintain your good-will towards us even after this. Farewell.’)⁶⁴⁷

Messala’s letter strictly adheres to Hellenistic royal convention. The text contains
 strong structural parallels with Antiochus III’s correspondence: it begins by acknowledging
 the Tean embassy and praising the ambassador; it moves to discuss Roman motives and their
 decision, before ending with a clear contract clause.⁶⁴⁸ Three potential complications arise,
 however. First, the emphasis on Roman piety and their subsequent divine favour has been

⁶⁴⁷ RDGE 34; Rigsby 1996, #153.

⁶⁴⁸ Piejko 1991, 24.

interpreted as an innovation.⁶⁴⁹ Second, the apparently presumptuous acknowledgement of Teos' status as ἀφορο|λόγητον ἀπὸ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ῥωμαίων ('free from tribute to the *demos* of the Romans').⁶⁵⁰ Finally, the explicit inclusion of a contract clause, exactly paralleling those found in Hellenistic royal correspondence.⁶⁵¹ A letter of 201/200 from the Athamanian rulers, Theodorus and Amynder, also confirming Tean ἀσουλία, offers a solution to all three points. Not only does their response contain a similarly unusual grant of ἀφορολογησία, but Driediger-Murphy has highlighted parallels in language. The most likely scenario is that both the Athamanians and Messala consciously adopted or copied an *exemplum*, probably the original response of Antiochus to Teos.⁶⁵² Messala's letter also shows the first clear evidence of a Greek *polis* treating Rome, embodied by the Senate, as a Hellenistic ruler and, vice versa, the Senate responding to a civic petition in Hellenistic royal language. Crucially, in this, the earliest engagement in Asia Minor, the Roman state adopted pre-existing, local practices of power.

Why did Messala, writing on behalf of the Senate, affect a Hellenistic royal style? Accepting the author used a specific *exemplum* implies that local needs and desires, conveyed by the ambassador Menippus, dictated the format and language used. Other possible factors include a lack of confidence with Greek language or in employing the epistolary genre. In each case, the use of a model allowed Messala to achieve his task without requiring

⁶⁴⁹ E.g. Welles 1934, 155; Brunt 1979, 165; Ma 1999, 101. Chaniotis (2015, 93-95) persuasively states Romans placed a new emphasis on an existing concept.

⁶⁵⁰ RDGE 34.20-21.

⁶⁵¹ RDGE 34.19-22.

⁶⁵² SEG 38.1227. Driediger-Murphy 2014, 116-118 *contra* Errington 1980, 279-284. See further: Ferrary 1988, 153 n.88; Rigsby 1996, 283 n.19, with literature and discussion.

innovation. However, the employment of this format also assimilated the Senate with the figure of *basileus*. As the main, though not exclusive, body for receiving embassies, this made practical sense, but Messala's framework also placed it in the same honorific space. Within the existing discourse of power in western Asia, the Senate emerges from this text as a εὐεργέτης confirming the requested ἀσυλία, but also positioning itself as worthy of similar honours to the *basileis*. By contrast with peer polities which could and did respond to similar requests, the adoption of royal language elevated the *res publica* vis-à-vis its interlocutor. Moreover, the text allowed Rome to appeal to existing discourses of authority and establish its own legitimacy in a new cultural space. Though an increasingly influential political actor in the Aegean and Asia Minor, Rome's military and especially cultural impact was limited. The use of familiar forms of dialogue and discourse ensured its acceptance by local actors, up to and including Antiochus III.

If Messala's adherence to Hellenistic royal models can be explained more by Teian needs than Roman internalisation of existing norms, then clear differences should be visible between this and other letters. Strikingly, no other Roman magistrates' letter contains a contract clause. For example, the letter of L. and P. Cornelius Scipio to Heraclea-under-Latmos in 190, our earliest communication from a commander in the field communicating with an Asian *polis*, though echoing the language of Hellenistic chancellery, lacks this crucial element for generating and maintaining traditional Seleucid power structures.⁶⁵³ The letter follows local norms: the brothers articulate their εὔνοια towards the Heracleans in general

⁶⁵³ Sherk 1969, 200-201; Gruen 1984, 151-152.

terms, stressing their concern for all the Greeks and the timelessness of that attitude. The Scipiones restored ἐλευθερία, αὐτονομία and the possessions of the Heracleans after their surrender, in full keeping with the surrender-grant model underpinning Seleucid, and indeed Roman, power.⁶⁵⁴ However, though the brothers assert that πειρασόμεθα εὐχρηστοῦντες ὑμῖν αἰεὶ τινος ἀγαθοῦ | [παραίτ]ιοι γίνεσθαι ('[they] will always try to be the authors of some good') for the Heracleans, the anticipated reciprocity of that goodwill is nowhere made explicit.⁶⁵⁵ Other surviving letters of Roman magistrates from this period similarly frame their desire to advance the interests of their interlocutors in unilateral terms.⁶⁵⁶ Instead Chaniotis highlighted how the vocabulary of preservation, continuation and maintenance of πίστις/*fides* (towards Rome) came to dominate communiqués in this period.⁶⁵⁷ This change in structure crucially and consciously rejected the premise of explicit reciprocity, which underpinned, to this point, the relationship between the hegemon and the local community.⁶⁵⁸ As Roman magistrates came to be more involved in the region, communities had to adjust to a new language of power.

One factor behind this development was the replacement of the personal relationship between the ruling monarch and an individual city with the authority of Rome, divided between commanders, the Senate and the People.⁶⁵⁹ The *basileus* could make a credible

⁶⁵⁴ See n.433 *supra*.

⁶⁵⁵ RDGE 35.6-10. Chaniotis (2015, 95-96) on how this became formulaic.

⁶⁵⁶ E.g. RDGE 37.8-9 (with Piejko 1985, 617 = SEG 35.474); 38.22-23.

⁶⁵⁷ Chaniotis 2015, 90-99.

⁶⁵⁸ E.g. Ma 1999 does not comment *ad* #45. Similarly: Bourdieu 1977, 172.

⁶⁵⁹ For example, several documents emphasise *poleis* approaching commanders (e.g. *I.Priene*² 67.14, 21, 130-136; 75.21-24; Eck 2009, 197); however, the Senate commonly received embassies from provincial communities (e.g. RDGE 12, see: Bonnefond-Coudry 1989, 294-320). The *populus* was a necessary participant in formal *foedera* (e.g. Polyb. 6.13-14; Sall. *Iug.* 39; Cic. *Balb.* 34-35; Brunt 1982, 138-141), as

promise of future benefactions – thereby rendering explicit, ongoing and contingent reciprocity a viable means of maintaining and constructing a concrete relationship. By contrast, notwithstanding the potential of client-patron relationships, the turnover of commanders and their relative weakness vis-à-vis the organs of Republican state restricted the role of personal links between benefaction and loyalty.⁶⁶⁰ While the substitution of the Senate for *basileis*, as Messala's letter attempts, could have had interesting implications, its impersonal and divided nature precluded such a possibility. While strongly 'factional' interpretations of second century politics should be rejected, the sources present numerous examples of strong debates within the Senate on matters of 'foreign policy'.⁶⁶¹ Irrespective of a comfortable elite consensus around key elements of government, individual senators held strong opinions and debated questions of policy which had a significant impact across the Mediterranean.

Increasing Roman participation in political dialogue brought problems of its own. The discrepancies between language and forms of communication required that communities learn a new means of managing their relationship. The power of Rome, which *prima facie* resembled a *polis*, placed it in the same bracket as a Hellenistic monarchy, but the problem of relatability remained prominent.⁶⁶² The Senate often received embassies, but it possessed

well as having the formal capacity to rule on matters in the diplomatic sphere, if consulted by a tribune of the *plebs* (e.g. *RS* 12, discussed *infra*; Yakobson 2009, 45-46, 53-54; note also Mouritsen 2017, 58-61, with caution). Compared to the simple hierarchy of the Seleucid and Attalid kingdoms, this situation required a complex series of social decisions by communities and their representatives.

⁶⁶⁰ Pace Bérenger 2011, 172-173.

⁶⁶¹ E.g. Eckstein 2006, 226-229. Cf. Gruen 1984, 391-398; Sherwin-White 1984, 13-14.

⁶⁶² Erskine 1997, 30-35; Davies 2013, 417-419.

two means of responding: by letter or a *senatusconsultum*. The former required designating an individual to draft a response, as in Messala's case.⁶⁶³ However, in these examples, the magistrate assigned the task tended to simply report the decision of the Senate, even if the single, named author occluded that collective source. By contrast, *senatusconsulta* more clearly resulted from a formal process of cooperative drafting. They report a collective decision and carry the weight of influence from the assembled body of ex-magistrates. The three extant examples of letters by magistrates on behalf of the Senate all date to the early second century. After this, our examples imply that *senatusconsulta* were directly sent on to relevant parties: this makes sense, since the intermediate process of a letter added nothing to the actual outcome. Providing the text of the *senatusconsultum* allowed direct interpretation of the Senate's words. However, this marked a significant change in practice, as *senatusconsulta* are candidly decisions, rather than part of an ongoing dialogue. Even where elements of the diplomatic process were preserved, as in the *senatusconsultum de agro Pergameno*, the appearance and language of the decree placed it in a distinct genre, carrying with it connotations of command rather than negotiation.⁶⁶⁴

This is also true of other normative texts, such as the *edicta* of magistrates and *leges* passed in different assemblies. Representing pronouncements made by magistrates or the various subsets of the Roman citizen body, they were not couched in terms of dialogue, but of command.⁶⁶⁵ That said, Ando convincingly identifies a communicative function in the

⁶⁶³ There are two other clear examples, both pertaining to mainland Greece: *RDGE* 38 & 39, dating to the mid-180s.

⁶⁶⁴ Ando (Forthcoming).

⁶⁶⁵ E.g. *RS* 19; *I.Sagalassos* 3. Ando (Forthcoming).

despatch of these ‘administrative’ decisions to provincial communities. The wide range of topics covered by the surviving corpus hints that it became increasingly standard to inform local political elites of relevant decisions.⁶⁶⁶ However, each type of decision had its own set of norms, standards and language, alien to communities brought into the Roman world. The process of learning these multiple new cultural codes was not automatic – only repeated exposure and engagement with the various types would allow successful strategies of reading and responding to be developed.⁶⁶⁷ The existence of competing authoritative media with distinctive traditions inevitably complicated this process. Having several genres made the cognitive effort required to understand and engage effectively with imperial communiqués much greater: the reproducibility and repeatability of language and structure inherent to the Seleucid model ran contrary to existing Roman practice. These core institutional barriers to creating one coherent discourse in the manner of Seleucids raise the question of how intentional this consistent communication was.⁶⁶⁸

This feeds into the broader institutional differences underlying magistrate’s letters as compared to their royal predecessors and imperial successors. Generally, individual magistrates possessed less overt control over state apparatus of power than a Hellenistic *basileus* or Roman *princeps*. Gubernatorial decisions were neither unconstrained nor immutable: decisions affecting the province outside of the judicial setting, e.g. *leges datae*, were underpinned only by the *auctoritas* of their issuer, and not of the *populus Romanus*. They

⁶⁶⁶ Haensch 1992, 215-219, 245-254; Nicolet 1994, 151-152; Ando 2000, 80-90.

⁶⁶⁷ Meyer 2004, 44. Compare Ma 1999, 188-194; Ando 2000, 80-130.

⁶⁶⁸ Ando (2010, 20-22; (Forthcoming)) interprets this as deliberate policy aimed at creating an informed elite (and thereby populace). I resist this view, see esp. Chapter 3.4 *infra*.

could be altered by *lex*, *senatusconsultum* or even a successor's decision.⁶⁶⁹ Consequently, Republican magistrates' correspondence contrasted heavily with the *prima facie* similar models before and after this period. Commanders emphasised their personal and limited capacity to intervene. For example, M'. Acilius Glabrio wrote to Delphi in 190 that: *πειράσο[μαι ἐν Ῥώμῃ (?) κατὰ | τ]ὰ ἐμ[α]υτοῦ φροντίσαι ἵνα ὑμῖν κατάμονα ἦι τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπάρχοντα πάτρ[ια σωζομένης (?) τῆς] | τῆς πόλεως καὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ αὐτονομίας* ('I shall try, in Rome, with all my power, to ensure that your ancestral rights that existed from the beginning will be yours forever, and the autonomy of your city and temple protected').⁶⁷⁰ The letter of the Scipiones expresses similar sentiments. This development is crucial, reflecting an acknowledgement by magistrates that, unlike Hellenistic rulers and their representatives, they could not offer long-term assurances to communities regarding their decisions and were unwilling to claim otherwise.

Consequently, the advent of Roman hegemony presented structural challenges for local communities, beyond the potential for cultural and linguistic misunderstanding. Established means of communicating with the dominant power were rendered inadequate and inappropriate. Though most *poleis* could count on courtesy from magistrates and the organs of the Roman state, through their formally free status, the finely balanced mechanics

⁶⁶⁹ Yarrow 2012, 177-183. Two instructive examples: Verres' choice to ignore the *lex Rupilia*'s rulings on Sicilian judges, curiously not highlighted by Cicero (*Verr.* 2.2.39-40); and Cn. Pompeius Magnus' reversal of several decisions made by Lucullus during the Third Mithridatic War (Plut. *Luc.* 36.1; *Pomp.* 31.1-5, with Tröster 2008, 143-148). Decisions made in a judicial context appear to have been binding, provided the process was completed within the governor's term of office (Gai. *Inst.* 4.104-105, with de Zulueta 1953 2.277-278). Note also the complication of when *imperium* ceased to be valid: Cic. *Att.* 5.16.4; *Fam.* 3.4; Marshall 1972, 895-898; Delrieux 2010, 515.

⁶⁷⁰ RDGE 37. 8-10.

of reciprocity were upset. As Roman attention concentrated on western Asia, communities were forced to adapt to new imperial discourses of power.

2.2: Rome and the ἐλεύθεραι *poleis*, 133 – 88 BCE

Few official documents from Roman authorities survive from the immediate post-Attalid period. Most significant are five letters from Roman magistrates to communities in Asia Minor. Each dates between 99 and 85, exposing discourse in specific circumstances. The interlocutors are: Q. Mucius Scaevola to Ephesus, Sardis and Pergamum, between 99 and 97; L. Cassius Longinus to Nysa in 88; L. Cornelius Sulla, then L. Licinius Lucullus to Mopsuestia in 87; and C. Oppius to Plarasa-Aphrodisias in 85.⁶⁷¹ Three *senatusconsulta* and the lengthy text of the *lex de provinciis praetoriis*, all of which date to 100 or earlier, supplement these.⁶⁷² This presents a meagre corpus for analysis; however, it offers an opportunity to potentially uncover personal voices in the letters, and reflect on the distinctiveness of *senatusconsulta* and legislation. Focusing closely on the texts, I hope to reveal the disruption of pre-existing models of interaction in Roman Asia.

The five letters vary considerably in subject, structure and language. Cassius' reveals the least, simply reporting to the political bodies of Nysa that their citizen, Chaeremon, had offered grain to his forces and that he will report this to the Senate in Rome.⁶⁷³ The document's context, during the earliest manoeuvres of the First Mithridatic War, suggest

⁶⁷¹ Laffi 2010a; *RDGE* 48; *SEG* 44.1227; *IAph*2007 8.2.

⁶⁷² *RDGE* 11 (corrected by Wörrle 2000, 576), 12 & 13; *RS* 12.

⁶⁷³ *RDGE* 48. The future tense in l.13 suggested by Hiller von Gaertringen & Mommsen 1891 and retained by Sherk.

that Cassius intended to highlight that the Roman state would know of Chaeremon's, and Nysa's, tangible assistance at this juncture, with the implication of gratitude. However, as with earlier examples, this potential reciprocity is entirely occluded within the text.⁶⁷⁴ The Greek text, moreover, contains multiple Latinisms, which Sherk takes as evidence that either Cassius or a member of his *consilium* produced the translation rather than a local.⁶⁷⁵ Unlike earlier examples, this letter provides information without accompanying instructions or grants. Similarly, it pre-empts any official engagement on the part of the *polis*. In its word-choice, style and content, RDGE 48 finds no precedent in the corpus of Roman official documents in Asia.

Two letters to Mopsuestia concern a more traditional topic, an ἀσυλία-request for their temple of Isis and Sarapis.⁶⁷⁶ The end of the first letter, identified as coming from L. Cornelius Sulla, emphasises that he made his decision in accordance with his *quaestor*'s, L. Licinius Lucullus', recommendation and in keeping with the decision of, presumably Seleucid, *basileis*. The second, more complete, letter, written by Lucullus himself, stresses his personal agency.⁶⁷⁷ He immediately moves to his decision on the matter, described as following the αὐτοκράτωρες before him, eschewing any mention of an embassy. However, Thonemann has demonstrated that Lucullus must have been in Greece at the time of the

⁶⁷⁴ Complicating matters, this letter was inscribed in an honorific context, accounting for the unusual content of the letter compared to comparanda: it was selected to show Chaeremon's, rather than Nysa's loyalty to Rome. Quass 1984, 211; Rigsby 1988, 152; Santangelo 2007, 55; Campanile 2014, 233.

⁶⁷⁵ Sherk 1969, 262. N.b. cautiously, Adams & Swain (2002, 3): 'A bilingual text, or [a translation] cannot necessarily be taken at face value as an indication of the writer's bilingual competence'.

⁶⁷⁶ SEG 44.1227. Note the possibility that the letters were inscribed during a later dispute over ἀσυλία (e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 3.64-65 *pace* Sayar, Täuber & Siewert 1994, 114).

⁶⁷⁷ Given the text explicitly refers to the *quaestor*'s recommendation (πα[ρ]άκλησιν) this should mean that the *autokratores* mentioned are Sulla and L. Licinius Murena, *pro praetore* in Greece.

letter and, consequently, an embassy should have taken place.⁶⁷⁸ Lucullus' concern that the priest be rewarded hints at the possibility that he participated in that embassy. Importantly, these texts record Roman action at the fringes of their influence, in a period during which no organised administration existed in Asia: Mopsuestia had not previously been subject to the authority of a Roman commander. Consequently, these documents have more in common with the letters of the early second century than the current corpus. Even so, the shift in political context and increasing familiarity of Roman magistrates with governing in the East makes them useful comparanda.

Prima facie, it appears that Lucullus, as a representative of the *res publica*, was asked to approve Mopsuestia's claim in the guise of a Hellenistic *basileus*. However, the response, due to the nature of Roman government, is highly unusual. First, Lucullus secured the agreement of his commander, Sulla. In this sense, his position is similar, though not analogous, to that of subordinates to the Hellenistic kings, including Zeuxis, who wielded authority over western Asia Minor in the late third century.⁶⁷⁹ The failure to mention the embassy, however, is unusual, nor does the discussion of Diodotus' potential reward find an easy parallel in Hellenistic correspondence. Meanwhile, the limited survival of the text on the stone makes an analysis of the language difficult. Unlike earlier Roman grants of ἀσυλία, these letters stress the decision-making capacity of the magistrates approached, especially Lucullus. While context of civil war may sufficiently explain the absence of the Senate, this

⁶⁷⁸ Thonemann 2004, 80-82 *contra* Sayar, Siewert & Täuber 1994, 118-120; Kreiler 2006a, 73-82. It would be unusual for this fact to be recorded later in the text. See *IAph2007* 8.2 (discussed *infra*) for typical structure.

⁶⁷⁹ On Zeuxis and his position, Ma 1999, 123-130.

emphasis on the *quaestor*'s role is unparalleled. Indeed, this is the only extant document written by a *quaestor* dating from the Republican period.⁶⁸⁰ Lucullus' choice to frame his contribution to the issue as a decision (κ[εκρίκα]), together with Sulla's acknowledgement of his παράκλησις, accentuates the role of individuals in dealing with Mopsuestia's petition. Such self-aggrandising language does not survive in the letters of Zeuxis, or for that matter of Laodice, Antiochus' consort.⁶⁸¹ Similarly, a concentration on αὐτοκράτορες rather than the Senate makes these documents unique. Though the upheaval of the First Mithridatic War and civil conflict at Rome limit their value for assessing the broader circumstances, these letters nevertheless reinforce the shifts in epistolary practice from the pre-Roman period and the variability of Roman period.

Scaevola's letter to Sardis, Ephesus and Pergamum is critical for contextualising Roman power in early *provincia Asia*. Introducing the treaty agreed between Sardis and Ephesus, Scaevola reflects on the reasons for his letter, the two *poleis*, due to their dispute, had withdrawn from a festival in his honour.⁶⁸² Scaevola frames the reported disruption to the carefully planned honours for him by the collective provincial community as prompting his intervention. The display of the treaty and the covering letter within the *poleis* affected by the commander's actions underscore the practical impact of Roman power. In the

⁶⁸⁰ Though n.b. *I.Ilion* 10.3-6 which records a *quaestor*'s presence (L. Iulius Caesar) in an official capacity, though he did not formally act; and Joseph. *AJ.* 14.235, which presents a letter from L. Antonius, *pro quaestore pro praetore*, clearly making an independent decision (ἔκρινα). The changed circumstances after the *lex Pompeia de provinciis*, however, which required governors to step down and leave a subordinate in their place explain this apparent anomaly (Marshall 1972, 898-911).

⁶⁸¹ See, SEG 39.1284, RC 38 (with Ma, Derow & Meadows 1995, 71-80), *I.Mylasa* 963, *I.Iasos* 4.A.3-32; SEG 37.859.b; *Sardis* VII.7-9.

⁶⁸² Laffi 2010, 2A+B.1-8.

absence of specific details caution is necessary, but, at the very least, the text served as a reminder of Scaevola and his successors' capacity to impose goodwill on cities within the region through direct intervention.⁶⁸³

Paradoxically, of the surviving specimens of Late Republican magistrates' correspondence, Q. Oppius' letter to Plarasa-Aphrodisias most resembles Hellenistic royal and early Roman models. First, Oppius responds directly to an embassy, which presented him with a decree. Though the nature of this document is obscure, given Oppius describes that it reported χαίρειν ὑμᾶς με|γάλως ἐπὶ τῇ ἐμῇ παρουσίᾳ ('that you rejoiced greatly at my presence') an honorific decree seems most plausible.⁶⁸⁴ The proconsul gives an account of Aphrodisian loyalty during the recent conflict, both to him personally and Rome. This serves as the rationale for a decision clause:

δι' ἃς αἰτίας, vac | φροντίζω [καὶ ἐν ἀρ]|χῇ καὶ ιδιώβ[ιω], vac [ὅ]|περ ἂν
σωζομέν[ης] | τῆς ἐμῆς πίστ[ε]|ως, ποιῆσαι ὑμεῖν δύ|νωμαι τοῖς τε δημολ[ο]ίοις
πράγμασιν ὑ[μ]ε|τέροις εὐχρηστῆσαι | καὶ ἀεὶ τινος ἀγαθοῦ | παραίτιος γενέσθαι,
| ὅπως τε τῇ συνκλήτῳ | τῷ τε δήμῳ τὰ ἀφ' ὑμῶν | πεπραγμένα ἐστὶν | ὅταν εἰς
Ῥώμην παρα|γένωμαι διασαφήςω ('For these reasons, I am taking care, both as
magistrate and in a private capacity, to do what I can, while preserving my good
faith, to help you and your public affairs, and always preserve your advantage;
and shall see to it that after I come to Rome, I make clear to the Senate and
People the things, which have been done on your part').⁶⁸⁵

⁶⁸³ Ager 1996, 501. Pace Frijia's (2012, 89-91) recent characterisation of Scaevola, see esp. Diod. 37.5-6, with Ch.1, p.49, 54-56.

⁶⁸⁴ *IAph2007* 8.2.i.11-12.

⁶⁸⁵ *IAph2007* 8.2.ii.34-49.

Oppius emphasises his personal decision to help the community deal with various organs of Roman government, while prudently stressing his limited influence.⁶⁸⁶ This is the most overt example of a Republican magistrate responding to an honorific decree with a promise of personal support, and, superficially at least, it represents a return to more traditional approaches. While not a classic contract clause, Oppius links his present and future goodwill to the Aphrodisians' past actions in a way which jars with other post-Messala examples. The use of αἰεὶ makes the clause timeless and the lack of conditionality attending Oppius' future benefactions aligns more neatly with early second century practice.

Immediately following this, however, a final clause sheds light on the evolving relationship between communities and representatives of Rome:

οἱ αὐτοὶ πρεσβεῖς παρεκάλεσαν ὅπως ἐξῇ τῇ | [ἐ]μῇ πατρωνίᾳ καὶ ὑμεῖν |
 χρῆσθαι τούτους ἐγὼ | ἀνεδεξάμην καταλογῆς ἔνεκεν τῆς ὑμετέρας πόλεως,
 ἐμὲ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ ὑμετέρου πατρωνα vac ἔσεσθαι vac ('The same ambassadors
 also asked that it might be possible that you should enjoy my patronage and I
 accepted those men, on account of my regard for your city so that I (undertook)
 to be *patron* of your people').⁶⁸⁷

According to the text, the ambassadors further requested from Oppius that he act as the city's *patron*. Civic patronage was, fundamentally, a Roman institution.⁶⁸⁸ Though alien to the Hellenistic world, it shared with royal practice the establishment of a personal

⁶⁸⁶ Compare *RDGE* 37, discussed *supra*.

⁶⁸⁷ *IAph*2007.8.2.2.16-24.

⁶⁸⁸ On patronage, note esp. Badian 1958, 1-14; Brunt 1988a, 382-442; Eilers 2002, 1-17; Nichols 2014, 70-75, 207-224.

relationship between an individual and *poleis*. Chaniotis asserts that this suits the vocabulary of subordination he detects in the civic decrees from this period.⁶⁸⁹ However, the distinction between the two modes of communication should be maintained. It is not clear that the request for Oppius' patronage should imply a subordinate role. The institution appears, here, as a formal, consensual relationship; Oppius' letter shows unambiguously that honours were not given to the governor in expectation of benefactions during his command: rather, the opposite was true.⁶⁹⁰ Other early examples from the East support this, presenting ambassadors as actively negotiating in Rome to engage their *patroni*.⁶⁹¹ Nichols argues that the exchange between community and civic patron was couched in vague terms to emphasise the anticipated continuity of benefaction and honour.⁶⁹² However, patronage cannot be seen as a continuation of royal practice by others means, or the appropriation of

⁶⁸⁹ Chaniotis 2003, 252.

⁶⁹⁰ Eilers 2002, 28-32 *pace* Nichols 2014, 72-73

⁶⁹¹ *Syll.*³ 656.20-27; *SEG* 39.1243.2.24-31; *SEG* 39.1244.3.5-13. The *editio princeps* dated *Syll.*³ 656 to the aftermath of the Third Macedonian War (c. 166) based on Abdera's sack by Q. Hortensius in 170 (Diod. Sic. 30.6.1; Livy 43.4.8-10; Pottier & Hauvette-Besnault 1880, 52-54). This identified the Thracian monarch Cotys, named in the text, with Perseus' ally and his ambassadors with those who ransomed his captured son (Polyb. 30.17.1; Livy 45.42.5). Chiranky (1982, 461-481) and Eilers (2002, 114-119) redated it to the early first century, making two plausible arguments: that context made unlikely the detail that Cotys, a recent enemy, sought Roman approval to seize territory from Abdera; and that a high date would make this the earliest instance of the Latin loanword *πάτρων* by c. 70 years. Marek (1997, 173-177; *SEG* 47.1646) published another Abderan decree at Teos, which he connected both to *Syll.*³ 656 and the Third Macedonian war. The bottom of this stone, in preparation for publication by Peter Thonemann & Mustafa Adak, shows unparalleled levels of aid provided by Teos to Abdera, explicitly in the context of a war, certainly the Third Macedonian War. This included defending the integrity of the city's territory against the claims of Maroneia. The first decree, while generous with praise, is less effusive in recounting the long history of Tean benefaction suggesting that it fell earlier in the relationship. Cotys likely took advantage of Abdera's weakness to claim some of its territory, perhaps without realistic hope of success. Crucially, the circumlocution to describe the Roman custom of *salutatio* and the employment of the unparalleled loanword *ἀτρίον* (*atrium*) suggest strongly a lack of familiarity with Roman culture which suits an earlier context (Ferrary 1978, 761; Bloy 2012, 168-201; Erskine 1994a, 49-51; Chaniotis 2015, 101-102).

⁶⁹² Nichols 2014, 314.

previously royal roles by magistrates, especially since patrons were often not magistrates when acting as on behalf of their client *poleis*.⁶⁹³ As Oppius carefully highlights, he will act in the interests of Aphrodisias, both as a magistrate and in a private capacity.

Crucially, Oppius' letter is our only Republican evidence for a process by which civic patronage came about. Though Mitchell saw the patronage request as an afterthought, Eilers conclusively demonstrated that the document's structure outlines its centrality to the embassy.⁶⁹⁴ Oppius presents patronage as an independent issue, complete with its own request, motive and decision clauses: it is treated as a serious and deliberate political choice exercised by the *polis*, and assessed on its own merits.⁶⁹⁵ However, Eilers' insistence on employing this text paradigmatically cannot be accepted: given the degree of institutional flux in this period, the lack of other evidence makes this untenable. Nevertheless, Oppius' letter drives home the distinctiveness and variability of communiqués between Roman actors and communities in Asia Minor.

The structure and language of these letters privatises the relationship between cities and officials, collapsing the paradigm governing earlier relationships. The Senate is absent from these texts, intimating that a Republican heterarchy replaced Hellenistic royal discourse with a cacophony of distinct narratives, which cities, in turn, were forced to react to. Where Cassius' letter appears in a clear honorific context and the Mopsuestia letters relate directly to privileges, Scaevola's letter is more ambiguous, especially in the context of

⁶⁹³ Given how divine honours were treated, these roles seem to have fallen upon local elites in the first instance: Price 1984, 40-52; Chankowski 1998, 159-161; Rowe 2002, 126-127; Kuhn 2017, 317-318.

⁶⁹⁴ Eilers 2002, 23-27 *contra* Mitchell 1984, 291-297.

⁶⁹⁵ Eilers 2002, 28-32; Zuiderhoek 2004, 265.

display in Sardis or Ephesus, the two cities initially at odds. The surviving text presents Scaevola as primarily concerned with his own honour, underscoring his agency in bringing resolution to the conflict. By contrast, Oppius revivifies an earlier schema by which magistrates engaged in an honorific dialogue with *poleis*, albeit framing it in a new, and particularly Roman, way. Collectively, these letters show little homogeneity in the use of language and structure and imply the absence of a consistent linguistic repertoire.

Beyond these letters, official documents issued by central institutions played a role in the construction of an imperial discourse. As discussed, these tend not to engage in a dialogue with local communities. The *senatusconsultum Popillianum*, that regulating Phrygia, and the *lex de provinciis praetoriis* were all administrative documents which gave instructions to commanders, even where they significantly affected local communities.⁶⁹⁶ The first responded to the question posed by P. Popillius Laenas about the ἐντολαί (instructions) to be given to the magistrates sent out to Asia, vis-à-vis existing decisions made by Attalus III.⁶⁹⁷ Though only a single clause can be reconstructed in detail from the *senatusconsultum* concerning Phrygia, it see reproduces almost exactly the language of this earlier decision, though substituting Mithridates V of Pontus, on the motion of the magistrate C. Licinius Geta.⁶⁹⁸ Their purpose was to give the decisions of Attalus III and Mithridates V of Pontus validity for Roman jurisdiction. This was not a matter for discussion or negotiation yet both texts were inscribed and erected locally.⁶⁹⁹

⁶⁹⁶ RDGE 11, 13; RS 12.

⁶⁹⁷ RDGE 11.5-10.

⁶⁹⁸ RDGE 13.6-10.

⁶⁹⁹ On this point, Chapter 3.4 *infra*.

While these documents neither constituted a direct grant of privileges or a response to local petition, both carried a perceptible authority by virtue of their source, the Senate. Communities would be familiar with this body as the normal recipient of embassies and consequently, the decision-maker on issues referred to Rome.⁷⁰⁰ From the perspective of Hellenistic representatives and as the *senatusconsultum Popillianum* demonstrated the Senate's decrees shaped magistrates' decisions rather than vice versa. The format of these documents framed senatorial decisions recognisably, emphasising both the individual role of the proposing magistrate and the collective decision of its membership. Unlike the letters, stylistic consistency is obvious. Consequently, even where a decision did not refer to a specific privilege, the weight of senatorial *auctoritas* could be invoked in a similar fashion to a royal grant or decision.

Where a community directly approached the Senate, as in the case of the *senatusconsultum de agro Pergameno*, stronger echoes of Hellenistic practice emerge. The ambassadors from Pergamum were referred to at the outset in typical diplomatic language, even where the decree culminated in a series of detailed instructions to Roman magistrates on the implementation of the Senate's decision. Unlike earlier documents settling boundary disputes between *poleis*, the arguments put forward by each party appear to have been omitted.⁷⁰¹ This implies that the Senate's focus fell not on the reasons, but rather on the fact of the decision. This meshes neatly with the general attitude displayed in earlier

⁷⁰⁰ See the earlier examples of *I.Priene*² 11-12; with *RDGE* 7, 9. Gruen 1984, 96-131; Kallet-Marx 1995, 161-183.

⁷⁰¹ E.g. *RDGE* 9. Snowden 2014, 422-427.

senatusconsulta addressing territorial issues. Though copies of this document appear at several later *conventus* centres, a Roman instruction to inscribe this decree is unlikely. Instead, local factors predominantly pushed communities to permanently record communiqués from the imperial centre. Even where the Senate, the peak institution dealing with local communities issued decisions in a tone of command, intentionality of display in a local context from the centre cannot be taken for granted.

As a medium, *senatusconsulta* present a more uniform and Roman form of communication. There are few concessions to Hellenistic convention. However, by 133, *senatusconsulta* were a familiar type of document within western Asia Minor. Following their own form, they offered clarity in terms of the proposal, its author and the final decision. Simply put, *senatusconsulta* were comprehensible and useful documents to communities. The existence of competing bodies with influence, institutional authority and legitimacy provided multiple options for *poleis* to secure their privileges.⁷⁰²

One final document, the *lex de provinciis praetoriis*, highlights the confusing nature of the Republic's political structure. The genre of *leges*, binding statutes issued by the assembled populace, differed markedly from *senatusconsulta*. Most obviously, the assemblies comprised very different political bodies, representing a broader range of interest-groups than the Senate, including *publicani*, *negotiatores* and the urban populace. These bodies had less exposure to embassies, since traditionally, these approached the Senate. The conventions of drafting also differed markedly: where *senatusconsulta* could reach a

⁷⁰² E.g. proconsular decisions (*I.Priene*² 67.14-15, 21-22) or *leges* (RS 19).

relatively high level of specificity, *leges* could be particularly complex.⁷⁰³ In this case, the promulgator was almost certainly a tribune opposed to the senatorial consensus.⁷⁰⁴ The scope of this statute is significantly wider than the typical *senatusconsultum*, making this an imposing novelty. Rather than responding to one issue, the surviving text covers issues as diverse as imposing tax-collection at the edge of *provincia Macedonia* and assigning a praetor to *provincia Cilicia*. Uniquely among the surviving texts, this statute includes a clause ordering the text's dissemination and publication. Intriguingly, this restricts itself to the cities of *provincia Asia*, despite its wider geographic relevance. Moreover, the text's requirement that the *praetor* in Asia write to τὰς τε πόλεις καὶ πολιτείας πρὸς οὓς κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν νόμον ... δεῖ ('the cities and states (to whom) it is appropriate under this statute'), implies a degree of discretion to the magistrate, but also must be limited to his own area of command, i.e. *provincia Asia*.⁷⁰⁵ It seems curious that the author wanted the text displayed here but not elsewhere, implying that, despite the wide geographic scope of the legislation, the envisaged public audience was circumscribed.⁷⁰⁶ One potential reason for publication within Asia specifically is that the vast majority of *poleis* within the *provincia* remained, formally, free allies of the Roman people, rather than subordinated to a Roman commander: they may have merited explicit notification. Finally, the statute's justification of the administrative decision to create a *provincia Cilicia* underscores the apparent concern of the

⁷⁰³ Williamson 2005, 80–82, commenting on the *lex agraria* of 111 (RS 2). Compare Lintott 1999, 64.

⁷⁰⁴ Ferrary 1977, *passim*, esp. 654–660; Crawford 1996, 237.

⁷⁰⁵ RS 12.Delphi.B.21–22.

⁷⁰⁶ The question of the origin of the Delphi copy also occurs: Ferrary (2008, 101–114) argues that the Macedonian commander erected it to demonstrate his power over the Caeni and Chersonesos. The matter remains open.

Roman *populus* with appearances.⁷⁰⁷ This indicates an author conscious of the necessity to engage in a dialogue with his audience: this law gives motivations for its decisions, rather than acting in a purely informative fashion. However, this document did not skirt around the fact that it was a decision, not part of a dialogue. Overall, the publication of these documents emphasises the keen engagement of Asian *poleis* with the pronouncements of the Roman state and the significant break in continuity with previous models of interaction in the region.

The comparative quantities of types of communiqué sheds further light on this situation. The surviving evidence occupies a tiny proportion of the original documentation and caution is necessary in approaching quantitative figures. As Burton notes, the surviving documents for the imperial period, by their nature, privilege the reactive capacity of magistrates and Principes over their normative function, and are likely unrepresentative.⁷⁰⁸ Nevertheless, some inferences can be made about the relative frequency with which communities in Asia Minor were exposed to different types of documents, i.e. *senatusconsulta*, *leges*, *edicta* and magistrates' letters. Fundamentally, *leges* passed at Rome (*leges rogatae*) affecting, and therefore worth communicating to, provincial communities, form a very small subset of attested public statutes.⁷⁰⁹ Exclude those statutes which confirmed either a *senatusconsulta* or a treaty and the pool sinks to one: the *lex de provinciis*

⁷⁰⁷ RS 12.Cnidus.3.28-37.

⁷⁰⁸ Burton 2002, 249-251; Ando (Forthcoming). Burton (2002, 251-264) also provides some quantitative analysis, see Eck (2014, 127-136) on bronze documents.

⁷⁰⁹ Williamson 2005, 36-46.

praetoriis.⁷¹⁰ The Senate, by contrast with the *comitia*, was the object of foreign embassies seeking intervention by the organs of the Roman state over matters ranging from territorial disputes to the status of the community and its sub-sections.⁷¹¹ Simply put, the Senate dealt more commonly with requests from provincials which necessitated action and thereby generated relevant documents at a higher rate.

Communication with the magistrate in command of a *provincia*, however, likely generated the highest proportion of documents. Embassies to Rome were costly and time-consuming exercises, involving real danger for the participants. In situations where gubernatorial authority could be leveraged, there were strong reasons for a *polis* to attempt this course. A Prienean decree for Crates, for example, suggests several attempts to engage governors before approaching the Senate.⁷¹² Responses to embassies were rarely limited to the verbal, but usually accompanied by a written decision, in both Hellenistic and Roman practice.⁷¹³ That documents pertaining to *polis* business were assembled and formed into archives is well attested: that some of ostensibly limited applicability were widely circulated, at least by the Augustan period, emerges from a response of Augustus to Samos, denying them ἔλευθερία, published at Aphrodisias, whose relationship with Rome and Augustus himself is referenced approvingly in the text.⁷¹⁴ The existence of a wide body of normative

⁷¹⁰ RS 12.

⁷¹¹ E.g. territorial disputes: *RDGE* 7; status of the community: RS 19; status of sub-groups: Joseph. *AJ*. 14.241-242, 244-246. Rate of embassies: Millar 1977, 410-434; Eck 2009, 197-198.

⁷¹² *LPriene*² 67, with Wallace 2014, 50-56. Compare the Salaminian embassies to Cicero: see pp.78-79 *supra*.

⁷¹³ Compare: *SEG* 41.1003 (Antiochus III to Teos) with *IAph2007* 8.2 (Oppius' response to Aphrodisias).

⁷¹⁴ *IAph2007* 8.32. On archives: Ando 2000, 85-98; Meyer 2004, 184-187.

material in civic archives, ranging from Roman statutes to the personal communication of magistrates to individual cities, raises the probability that multiple imperial discourses co-existed within communication to any given community. Indeed, the diffusion and acquisition of new 'languages' entails a process of learning, which the existence of multiple traditions undermined.⁷¹⁵

The absence of a coherent Roman discourse and fragmentation of dialogue between multiple parties affected the capacity of Asian communities to protect and increase their privileges. Both the Hellenistic royal model and its imperial Roman successor depended on a continuous reciprocal dialogue between the ruler and community, which offered honorific capital and legitimacy in return for tangible privileges. The cohesiveness of imperial society and the capacity of communities to exert agency arose, in both cases, from a common understanding of 'the rules of the game'.⁷¹⁶ The absence of such an understanding implies a deterioration on both counts. Under the Republic, the personal link to the decision-maker necessary to maintain such a model dissolved as the most powerful administrator, the Senate, contained several hundred members with competing preferences, interests and individual relationships.⁷¹⁷ Confronting any embassy was a group of foreign elites of which few would have had direct contact with their community before: while some personal ties could be generated through civic patronage and personal familiarity over time, the dispersed nature of Roman power immensely complicated this process.

⁷¹⁵ Pocock 1987, 34-38.

⁷¹⁶ Ma 1999, esp. 211-214; Ando 2000, 78-108. Cf. Pocock 1987, 20-38.

⁷¹⁷ E.g. Ferrary (2007, 113-122) emphasises the importance of magistrates in shaping senatorial policy. Pina Polo (2011, 276-284; 2013a, 434-444) extends this to magistrates designate.

While recognition of senatorial legitimacy bore institutional significance; from the perspective of an individual senator, the stakes were far lower. This does not require that embassies were despatched with less frequency than in earlier or later periods, or that the Senate did not vote to protect or increase privileges for some *poleis*; rather structural disincentives existed for the Republican government vis-à-vis its monarchic counterparts in engaging in a beneficent relationship with individual communities. Significantly, even magistrates were disincentivised from assisting *poleis* by the legislation surrounding the *repetundae* court.⁷¹⁸ Roman rule fundamentally disrupted the existing cycle of reciprocal honour and benefaction sustained by Hellenistic royal discourse and the institutional structure of the *res publica* precluded its easy replacement. The separation of authority and the capacity to communicate directly with communities between diverse bodies and magistrates, each with their own ‘language’ hindered the development of a working understanding of the ‘rules of the game’ and therefore of effective strategies to protect their own interests in their interaction with the state.

2.3: The Republican *provinciae*, 85 – 44 BCE

In 88, Mithridates’ invasion forced the Romans out of Asia Minor entirely for a short period. As explained in chapter 1, after peace was agreed at Dardanus, Sulla established a new basis for provincial government in Asia. Importantly, in context of his civil war, he fundamentally altered the nature of the Roman relationship with communities and the

⁷¹⁸ That equestrian juries could be persuaded to convict individuals who prioritised locals over Roman citizens is proved by the case of P. Rutilius Rufus. Sherwin-White 1982, 22-23; Morrell 2017 129-132.

provincia, not to mention reshaping central institutions upon his final victory in 81. Named dictator, he held *imperium maius* vis-à-vis other magistrates and legislated extensively, shifting the balance of policy-making power from the *comitia* to the Senate.⁷¹⁹ A *lex Valeria* promulgated by the *interrex* L. Valerius Flaccus ratified all his *acta* during the years between 88 and 82.⁷²⁰ Even so, several *senatusconsulta* confirming his grants survive, conferring greater legitimacy in specific cases, and this probably reflected a broader practice.⁷²¹ Though Sulla's position ensured none could gainsay him, this fact reemphasises the interrelationship between magistrates and the other bodies in authority and perceived legitimacy from the Roman side.

Although many cities suffered direct subjection to Roman *imperium*, some, which offered consistent support to Roman interests, were granted extensive privileges by Sulla. A *senatusconsultum* of 81, introduced by letters from the dictator, confirmed these for Stratonicea in Caria.⁷²² This document takes a familiar form, starting with the acknowledgement of the Stratonicean embassy and an account of their requests, before giving a series of motivation clauses, followed by the resolution, granting eleven specific privileges to the community. In form and language, this document is unexceptional; in the scale of the grant and in the primacy accorded to Sulla, however, a seismic shift appears. The *senatusconsultum*, while formally sanctioning the privileges offered within it, explicitly

⁷¹⁹ On Sulla's program, e.g. Keaveney 1982, 169-181; Hantos 1988, esp. 69-161; Hurlet 1993, 135-164.

⁷²⁰ Cic. *Leg. agr.* 3.2.5. Vervaeke 2004, 43-44 *contra* Keaveney 1982, 160.

⁷²¹ The example of Stratonicea is discussed below; compare RDGE 17 & 19, for Tabae and Cormi respectively, which exist only as fragments.

⁷²² RDGE 18 with SEG 52.1059. Jones 1939, 112-115; Magie 1950, 233-235; Santangelo 2007, 50-54.

delegates to Sulla the right to decide the extent to which revenues from subordinate communities were directed to Stratonicea, should he have chosen to accept.⁷²³ The document reconfigured senatorial authority around the will of the dictator. Rather than acting as a check on magisterial action (or inaction) in the region, the Senate explicitly confirmed any decision Sulla wished to make on named matters.⁷²⁴ The diametric shift in how different organs of state power interacted must have disrupted local understandings of Roman power. Though Sulla's dictatorship was a high-profile and, ultimately, brief anomaly, his constitutional reforms fundamentally altered the relationship between political bodies and magistrates across the following decade.⁷²⁵ The construction of new forms of legitimacy based around the dictator foreshadowed both the rise of powerful proconsular commanders, such as Pompeius and Caesar in the 60s and 50s, and the eventual dictatorships of the latter.

Sulla's letters also reveal subtle changes in emphasis. The first starts abruptly, reporting the words of the Stratonicean embassy regarding the *polis*' ancestral loyalty, their recent resistance to Mithridates and the dangers which it caused them.⁷²⁶ Sulla stresses the εὐνοία shown by the *polis* in sending embassies, probably to other *poleis* in Asia. While the text breaks off, the letter exemplifies the *in medias res* style typical of the period. Again, εὐνοία formed the moral basis of the relationship between local community and Rome, here

⁷²³ RDGE 18.103-112. Kallet-Marx (1995, 270-273) on the widespread phenomenon of embassies to confirm privileges (e.g. RDGE 20; RDGE 70, with Bitner 2014, 641-648).

⁷²⁴ Recalling the *lex Valeria*: Vervaet 2004, 49-50, n.46.

⁷²⁵ E.g. Santangelo 2006, 7-22; 2014, 1-27; Pina Polo 2011, 225-248; Steel 2014a, 657-668.

⁷²⁶ Chaniotis (2015, 90-91) argued persuasively that such summaries were an important interface for cultural transfer between sender and recipient. Compare Blanco-Pérez (2019, 43-44) on this phenomenon in the imperial period.

joined to δικαιοσύνη.⁷²⁷ The second letter simply reads: ‘I have given this decree to your ambassadors’, followed by the text of a *senatusconsultum*. In its brevity, it reveals a different attitude to conventional Republican government. As dictator, Sulla held an unprecedented position at the apex of Roman politics. Earlier comparanda focus, like most magisterial correspondence, on the personal agency of the official. However, this mostly occludes their involvement in the decree itself.⁷²⁸ In these examples, though the pre-eminent position of Sulla caused a radical shift in relative power between central institutions of the *res publica*, an interrelationship between Senate and dictator remained central to legitimacy and authority. Despite Sulla’s *summum imperium*, senatorial sanction retained its value as a means of further guaranteeing the measures which he had enacted as commander in the East.

The earliest section of the *lex portorii Asiae* sheds further light on this period. In content and language, this appears unexceptional. The *lex* begins by describing the geographic limits of its effects, defining these negatively through the neighbouring kingdoms of Cappadocia, Galatia and Bithynia, before explicitly including the territories (χωραί) of Byzantium and Calchedon.⁷²⁹ It then succinctly summarises the basic premise of the statute through exhaustively listing potential authorities and using a third-person imperative:

⁷²⁷ RDGE 18.5, 15.

⁷²⁸ E.g. RDGE 7; see also RDGE 20, 23.

⁷²⁹ Cottier et al. 2008, ll.7–9.

ἐν οἷς τόποις κατὰ δόγμα συνκλήτου ἢ κατὰ νόμον | [ἢ κατὰ δήμου κύρωσιν δεῖ
 τειμευτὴν ἢ ὕπ]ατον [τ]ελεωνεῖαν ἐκμισθῶσαι, ἐν τούτοις τοῖς τόποις, ἃ ἂν κατὰ
 θάλασσαν εἰσάγῃται, ἐξάγῃται κατὰ πέραν | [καὶ ἃ ἂν κατὰ γῆν εἰσκομίζεται,
 εἰσελεύνηται κ]αὶ ἃ ἂν κατὰ γῆν ἐκκομίζεται ἐξελεύνηται, ἐξάγῃται, τὸ
 τεσσαρακοστὸν μέρος τῷ τέλωναι δίδωτω{ι} ('in whatever places by
senatusconsultum or by *lex* [or by plebiscite it is obligatory for a censor or consul] to
 lease out the *portorium*, in those places, whatever is imported by sea or exported
 overseas, [whatever is conveyed in or driven in by land], and whatever is
 conveyed out, driven out, or exported by land, let them give a fortieth part to
 the collector').⁷³⁰

Following Rowe, the emphasis on different sources of authority is not egregious, exemptions to customs legislation were authorised by several groups during the first century.⁷³¹ Such clauses subsumed various bodies of law within a single framework but cannot have assisted provincial understanding. After this, the text focuses on specific elements, exemptions and practicalities of implementation. Like other Roman statutes, its language is carefully generic affording the broadest possible latitude to interpreting magistrates, while third-person imperatives are employed throughout. The *lex* is an administrative document, of value primarily to magistrates. The compilation of the document in 62 CE and its publication at Ephesus does seem to have been based on its informative capacity, though the imperial context provided different impetus than its Republican antecedent.⁷³² Like documents

⁷³⁰ Cottier et al. 2008, ll.9-11, following Crawford's suggestion *ad loc.*

⁷³¹ Rowe 2008, 240-241; e.g. RDGE 23 (Oropus; Senate & dictator, with *senatusconsultum*); SEG 31.952 (Ephesus, *senatusconsultum* or *edictum*); IAPH2007.8.27 (Aphrodisias, *senatusconsultum* and *lex*); RS 36 (Cos, *edictum*, then *senatusconsultum* and *lex*); Raggi 2006 (Rhodus, *edictum* with pre-authorisation by *lex*).

⁷³² Rowe 2008, 243-248.

associated with Sulla's *acta* in Asia, the *lex portorii Asiae* underscores the complex interrelationship between competing sources of legitimate authority within the *res publica*.

By contrast, the *lex Antonia de Termessibus* is extremely abrupt. After the initial formula introducing the *rogatores*, led by C. Antonius, and the abbreviated formula *de s(enatus) s(ententia)*, the text immediately proceeds to a series of detailed clauses outlining the new status of Termessus. The initial *senatusconsultum* seems, based on internal dates, to have been passed in 72, under the consuls L. Gellius Poplicola and Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Clodianus. Senatorial involvement is attested elsewhere and highlighted the close interconnection between these two political bodies in normal circumstances.⁷³³ However, the full restoration of tribunician powers in 70 perhaps offered a further practical reason to enshrine the decision of the Senate in statute.⁷³⁴ To an extent, that this *lex* survives only as a bronze tablet at Rome renders its utility in establishing imperial discourse more limited than might otherwise be the case. The *lex Antonia* and *senatusconsulta* confirming various *acta* of Sulla perform similar functions but present their decisions differently. Each aligns perfectly with the conventions of their medium and the changes in the political scene between 81 and 68 account for the use of different processes. Nevertheless, this serves to highlight the diversity of communicative acts despatched to cities in the provinces in this period. The use of diverse media naturally hindered familiarity with form, style, convention and language of Roman public communication from developing.

⁷³³ RS 19.1-4. Compare RS 36.4-5, with Mattingly 1997, 77.

⁷³⁴ Sulla dramatically reduced the legislative powers of the tribunes of the *plebs*. Livy, *Per.* 89; App. *BCiv.* 1.60. For their restoration: Cic. *Leg.* 3.22, 26; Sall. *Cat.* 38; App. *BCiv.* 2.29. Kondratieff 2009, 334-347.

The *senatusconsultum de Asclepiade*, granting private privileges to three Greek naval commanders, presents a contrast. Issued in recognition of their service in the Social War, these were authorised by the Senate on the motion of the consul Q. Lutatius Catulus.⁷³⁵ The text is inscribed in Latin, then in Greek translation, on a single side of a reused bronze tablet, and includes the right of dedicating such a tablet on the Capitol.⁷³⁶ That the tablet is reused, includes a Greek translation and the names of the three named recipients in Greek at the bottom of the text, suggests that it was a private copy.⁷³⁷ While the numerous Latinisms imply an official translation, a personal copy, which could be shown to both to local authorities and Roman commanders, would have been valuable as an additional guarantee of their privileges.⁷³⁸ Unlike other surviving *senatusconsulta*, the copy did not engage in a dialogue with other elements of imperial discourse. Nevertheless, the existence of copies further reinforced the Senate's capacity to interfere in the civic life of provincial *poleis*.

The *senatusconsultum de agris Mytilenorum*, though fragmentary, provides a further insight into political communication in this period. Lines 1-4 name Cn. Pompeius Magnus the proponent of the decree, which indicates he acted as consul. An apparent reference to Servilius Isauricus as censor dates the document to 55. Pompeius had firm links to Mytilene, through the offices of its citizen Theophanes, a companion during his Mithridatic campaigns.⁷³⁹ The surviving text implies that the *senatusconsultum* exempted some

⁷³⁵ See esp. the edition of Raggi 2001 (CIL 6.40890).

⁷³⁶ CIL 6.40890.25 (G); 17-18 (L). See Williamson 1987, 165-167; Meyer 2004, 99-100, 110-111.

⁷³⁷ Raggi (2001, 88), seeing this as original rather than a Flavian copy (84-86) *contra* Gallet 1937, 264-265.

⁷³⁸ García Domingo 1976, 395-411. See *L.Priene*² 13, discussed pp.221-223 *infra*.

⁷³⁹ On Pompeius and Theophanes, see pp.301-304 *infra*.

Mytilenean territory from the *lex locationis* and thereby exploitation by the *publicani*.⁷⁴⁰ The directive likely reaffirms the boundaries of civic territory à la *senatusconsultum de agro Pergameno* rather than confirming the freedom originally conferred by Pompeius in 62.⁷⁴¹ It was an administrative act deploying senatorial *auctoritas* against Roman citizens behaving badly in the territory of Mytilene. Once again, the structure and language employed meshes neatly with existing norms. As restored, the format proceeds from a senatorial *sententia* on the motion of Pompeius and the report of a *consilium*, expanding upon the idea of senatorial consensus.

Josephus reproduces several documents issued by magistrates concerning Jewish communities in Asia Minor in the 40s, providing further evidence for competing modes of discourse. Though their authenticity has been questioned, their formulae are accurate, they can be corroborated from other sources and the details are plausible.⁷⁴² However, Josephus' list is chronologically confused.⁷⁴³ One consular *edictum* of L. Cornelius Lentulus Crus (cos. 49), which permitted Jews with Roman citizenship at Ephesus to avoid military service, repeatedly occurs in the passage. This example of a magistrate's direct intervention in a provincial context, where a *senatusconsultum* might be expected, was prompted by its unusual context early in the conflict between Caesar and his opponents, who had already fled to Greece.⁷⁴⁴ Contingent circumstances forced representatives of the state to adapt

⁷⁴⁰ RDGE 25.9-12. Sherk 1963, 225-226; Ellis-Evans 2019, 251-252.

⁷⁴¹ Sherk 1963, 220-221.

⁷⁴² Bickerman 1980 [1955], 24-43; Pucci ben Zeev 1996, 359-368; Eilers 2009, 306, 309-310. Commentary in Pucci ben Zeev 1996, 22-356.

⁷⁴³ Joseph. AJ. 14.187. Pucci ben Zeev 1996, 3-5.

⁷⁴⁴ E.g., Caes. BCiv. 1.27-30; Cic. Att. 9.14.3, 15.6.

quickly: again, the flexibility of Republican political structures presented new channels of communication for provincial communities to negotiate.

A letter to Ephesus from T. Ampius Balbus, *legatus pro praetore* in Asia in 50, appears alongside Josephus' reference to Lentulus' *edictum*. Balbus had previously served as proconsul in Asia, in 58, possibly explaining his intervention.⁷⁴⁵ The document, concerning a subset of the civic population, Jewish inhabitants with Roman citizenship, is addressed explicitly to the archons, *boule* and *demos*, underscoring the crucial role of these bodies in implementing of Roman instructions.⁷⁴⁶ Balbus notes the involvement and consent the consul, the incoming governor, C. Fannius, and the *proquaestor pro praetore*, L. Antonius, to his request on behalf of the Jewish community.⁷⁴⁷ He concludes by reaffirming his own wish (βούλομαι) that the Jews be left undisturbed. The courtesy shown through the avoidance of terms of command might indicate a deliberate choice to employ diplomatic language; however, it might equally reflect Balbus' incapacity to interfere in Fannius' *provincia*.⁷⁴⁸ The correspondence of Balbus, if genuine, provides a window into a further type of communication, namely that from individual Romans without, *stricto sensu*, authority over a community.

⁷⁴⁵ Joseph. AJ. 14.228-230, 234. On Antonius: MRR 2.260; Fannius: MRR 2.262; and Balbus: MRR 2.266.

⁷⁴⁶ Pucci ben Zeev 1996, 151-152.

⁷⁴⁷ Pucci ben Zeev 1996, 165-166.

⁷⁴⁸ The *lex Pompeia de provinciis* of 52 set term limits beyond which commanders were expected to vacate their *provincia* and cease exercising their *imperium*. Cic. Att. 5.16.4; Fam. 3.6.4; 8.8.8. Marshall 1972, 890-900; Steel 2012, 91, n.38.

Josephus also records a letter of Fannius to the archons of Cos and one from L. Antonius to the archons, *boule* and *demos* of Sardis.⁷⁴⁹ In the first case, Fannius informed the Coans that Jewish ambassadors asked for copies of *senatusconsulta* affirming their rights. Fannius requires that they are treated hospitably while at Cos, implying that they were not inhabitants of the *polis*; however, the attachment of the documents to the letter suggests they had a local relevance. Most likely, the ambassadors came from another *polis* within Asia.⁷⁵⁰ By contrast, Antonius, notwithstanding his junior status as *pro quaestore pro praetore*, based his instructions on his personal decision, without reference to higher authority: τοῦτό τε αἰτησάμενοις ἵν' ἐξῇ ποιεῖν αὐτοῖς τηρῆσαι καὶ ἐπιτρέψαι ἔκρινα ('since they requested that they be permitted to do these things, I decided that they might be maintained, and permitted them to do so').⁷⁵¹ Whether this attitude rose from his temporary charge of the whole *provincia* is unclear, but the parallel with Lucullus' earlier attitude in his correspondence with Mopsuestia is suggestive.⁷⁵² These two letters further emphasise the continued complexity of official communication from Republican officials drawing on distinctive genres to give prominence and legitimacy to decisions to which local communities were expected to adhere.

Epigraphic evidence supplements the Josephan picture: sections of a letter from Servilius Isauricus to the archons, *boule* and *demos* of Pergamum survives. Though introduced on the stone as an ἐπίκριμα (decision), it clearly takes the form of a response to

⁷⁴⁹ Joseph. AJ. 14.233, 235.

⁷⁵⁰ Joseph. AJ. 14.233.

⁷⁵¹ Joseph. AJ. 14.235.

⁷⁵² Compare SEG 44.1227. Sherk 1969, 377; Pucci ben Zeev 1996, 179.

an embassy. Servilius begins by listing the names, patronymics and offices held by the ambassadors, before noting in traditional polite terms their excellence. The impressive list, included five archons, the prytanis, a priest, gymnasiarch and the γραμματέυς of the *demos*.⁷⁵³ The proconsul moves on to discuss the topic of their embassy, a dispute over the ἄσουλία of the Asclepeion involving a Roman citizen, M. Fannius.⁷⁵⁴ At this point, the stone breaks off, but the document's display speaks to a favourable outcome.⁷⁵⁵ Josephus may also preserve a letter from Servilius to the Milesians.⁷⁵⁶ Having been informed by a local citizen that the *polis* was not complying with his wish that Jewish residents be allowed to practice their faith in security, the author declares his decision (ἐπέκρινα) to this effect. These examples speak to the continuity of letters from magistrates to communities as forming the basis of government through the civil war period.

The legally sanctioned supremacy of C. Iulius Caesar, like Sulla before him, had commensurate effects on the framing of local dialogues. His dictatorships yield numerous letters to communities in Asia Minor, as well as several treaties. Throughout the surviving epigraphic record, Caesar's correspondence employs what modern scholars term a *formula valetudinis*: 'If you are well it is good, I and my army am in good health'.⁷⁵⁷ While such

⁷⁵³ RDGE 55.5-12.

⁷⁵⁴ RDGE 55.12-18.

⁷⁵⁵ Sherk 1969, 287.

⁷⁵⁶ Joseph. AJ. 14.244-246. The manuscript tradition produces the author as Πόπλιος Σερούλιος Ποπλίου υἱὸς Γάλβας, which Saulnier (1981, 172 n.49) emends to Οὐατίας; Wilhelm (1905, 242, followed by MRR 2.172; Eilers 2009, 309 n.33) restores Γλόβλος (P. Servilius Globulus (*pr.* 64)). Kirbihler's attempt to read Isauricus into Ἰούλιος Γάιος at Joseph. AJ. 14.210 is unconvincing.

⁷⁵⁷ E.g. Cic. *Fam.* 15.1, 2: *s(i) v(aletis) v(os) b(ene est), e(go) e(xercitus)q(ue) v(alemus)*. The earliest example in Roman official correspondence is the truncated version in the introductory letter to the *senatusconsultum de Oropiis* (RDGE 23.2): εἰ ἔρρωσθε, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι. See: Sherk 1969, 189. The occurrences

invocations were common in official correspondence between commanders and the Senate, Caesar's letters to Pergamum and Mytilene in 48/47 represent their earliest occurrence in documents intended for Asian *poleis*. This could imply that Caesar sought to maintain an aura of military command while in the field and provides a contrast with Sulla's frank acknowledgement that his dictatorship was Rome-centric, focused on restoring the central institutions of the *res publica*. While the former letter is extremely fragmentary, the latter preserves significant detail.⁷⁵⁸ After the health formula, Caesar immediately moves to discuss his motives in terms reminiscent of Hellenistic rulers:

[βουλόμενος] εὐεργετεῖν τὴν πόλιν καὶ οὐ μόνον | φυλάττειν τὰ φιλόανθρωπα
 ἃ διεπράξ[α]σθε δι' ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ συναυ[ξάνειν | αὐτὰ ---]ΟΣ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν,
 φιλίας δόγ[ματος | τοῦ ἡμῖν συγκεχωρημένου δι]απέπομφα πρὸς ὑμᾶς τὸ
 ἀ[ντίγραφον] ('[wishing] to benefit your city and not only | [to protect the
 privileges which you acquired] through us, but also to assist in increasing |
 [them ---] leadership, | I have sent you a [copy] of the decree of *amicitia* [which
 has been passed]').⁷⁵⁹

Caesar explicitly cites the *senatusconsultum* as evidence of his goodwill towards the *polis*, subsuming the functions of the state into his own personal sphere of action.⁷⁶⁰ The *senatusconsultum* follows, before Caesar concludes the letter by referring to a previous dialogue with the *polis*, in which he had promised to prevent individuals claiming immunity

of ἐπρώσθε in Welles' collection of Hellenistic Royal letters (1934, 399, s.v. ῥώννυμι) shows that *basileis* tended to use the *formula valetudinis* only in personal correspondence.

⁷⁵⁸ Ambitiously restored at RDGE 54.

⁷⁵⁹ RDGE 26.b.9-12.

⁷⁶⁰ Rowe 2002, 140 (incorrectly citing column a).

from local taxation. Reminded of this by the envoys, Caesar positively affirms his position, before concluding, like earlier Roman magistrates, with a unilateral declaration of his *euergesia*.⁷⁶¹

Two letters from Caesar at Aezani have been recently published. Little detail can be reconstructed, but the former is clearly issued to the *polis*, while the latter is addressed to an [ἀντι]στρατηγός.⁷⁶² The appearance of a Πόπλιος in the first letter, and the dictator's titlature identify the date as between May and November 46 and the addressee as Servilius Isauricus.⁷⁶³ Though fragmentary, the text reveals that an Aezanetan ambassador persuaded the dictator to make concessions related to the local temple of Zeus. Neither document has space for a *formula valetudinis*, though both seem to end with a cordial farewell. One possible, though speculative, reason could be Caesar's presence in Rome as consul, rather than in the field. The pair of documents also provides an intriguing window into the relationship between Caesar, as dictator, and provincial commanders. Aside from the addressee, little separates the language of the second letter from those sent directly to communities. The apparent use of θέλω (l.16) and the participle of συγχωρέω (l.17) recalls the typical language of command employed by Roman officials.⁷⁶⁴ The later monumentalisation of this missive, likely originally written in Latin, implies its inclusion in the civic archives of Aezani, itself surprising. It emphasises the extent to which Caesar demonstrated his concern through publicising his instructions to the responsible magistrate.

⁷⁶¹ RDGE 26.b.27-34.

⁷⁶² AÉ 2009, #1429.1-2, 13-14.

⁷⁶³ Wörrle 2009, 413-418.

⁷⁶⁴ Ando (Forthcoming).

This also presents a significant shift in the presentation of Roman rule. Caesar's consular colleague in 48, Vatia had an established record of interest in the welfare of provincial communities.⁷⁶⁵ That the language of command is employed by Caesar, in public-facing but essentially private instructions to a magistrate with consular *imperium* in his own right, stresses the increasing normalisation of his position at the head of the *res publica*. The letters' structure, granting privileges to the *polis* of Aezani, presents a new hierarchy of authority, framing the dictator as the legitimate source of grants, without senatorial confirmation. These are enacted by the provincial governor, Servilius, as his predecessors would enact the instructions of the Senate and People. The language reflects and draws attention to that shift. In this letter we observe central and provincial exercise of power coalesce with the personalisation of central authority, fitfully developing with the breakdown of Republican constitutional norms.

Caesar's *edictum* at Sardis might hint at his intentions moving forward.⁷⁶⁶ Intriguingly, this *edictum*, issued through his dictatorial *imperium*, makes no reference to his consulship, unlike earlier letters. This should reflect his recently commenced dictatorship *perpetuo*, first attested epigraphically here, and might echo broader changes in progress the constitution of the Roman state.⁷⁶⁷ The decision to inscribe this document, without reference to senatorial confirmation, on a boundary-stone of the sanctuary of Artemis, may imply that

⁷⁶⁵ Morrell (2017, 149-151) goes too far in denying any role for Caesar in provincial reform, though Kirbihler's (2011, 250) insistence on Vatia's subordination to the dictator's policy aims is similarly lacking in nuance.

⁷⁶⁶ SEG 39.1290.

⁷⁶⁷ SEG 39.1290.31-33; contrast Joseph. AJ. 14.211. Herrmann 1989a, 139-141; Fernoux 2011a, 91.

originally it did not exist. The final paragraph – restating Caesar’s grant in the third person – could, however, be a local paraphrase of the later *senatusconsultum* confirming the dictator’s acts after his assassination.⁷⁶⁸ The ἐπεὶ-clause encapsulates a universalising discourse: Caesar’s decision is premised on general agreement (συμφωνεῖται) that Sardis has always (διὰ παντός) been in friendship and alliance with the Roman people; and shown good faith (πίστις, *fides*) towards the Senate and People.⁷⁶⁹ Caesar elides the problematic civil war and envisions Sardis’ attitude as continuously loyal to the state. In doing so, he continued to promote a Roman framework, prioritising consistent loyalty over reciprocity, even where his own policy of pardoning his enemies’ supporters ran counter to this.⁷⁷⁰

Overall, the documents from post-Sullan Asia Minor represent several genres, each with their own traditions and conventions. Throughout, however, a strong sense of interrelationship between the various elements of Republican government is detectable. Through Sulla’s employment of *senatusconsulta* to reinforce his *acta* as proconsul, the *lex Antonia* confirming provisions laid out in a *senatusconsultum*, and the decision of Balbus to seek a consular *edictum* confirming the exemption from military service of Jewish Roman citizens at Ephesus, a preference for employing multiple sources of legitimate authority emerges. Partly on account of the evolving political situation, the institutions employed in each case varied significantly. This attests to the flexibility of Republican government – also witnessed in the typical framing of *leges* as authorising several plausible magistrate or

⁷⁶⁸ App. BC. 3.5. Rigsby 1996, 436; Kirbihler 2011, 265.

⁷⁶⁹ SEG 39.1290.33-37. Herrmann 1989a, 141-142.

⁷⁷⁰ Chaniotis 2015, 90, 98-99.

political bodies to implement its provisions – but simultaneously created ambiguities in decoding imperial discourse.⁷⁷¹ The situation as the *res publica* slipped into civil war exacerbated this tendency, forcing magistrates to adapt to shifting realities in novel ways, and take on more personal responsibility in the absence of functioning central institutions.

2.4: The Personalisation of Imperial Discourse, 44 – 30 BCE

The chaos after Caesar's assassination further weakened central institutions and facilitated the rise of a new cabal of *imperium*-holders, the *tresviri rei publicae constituendae*, Octavian, M. Antonius and M. Aemilius Lepidus. Wielding authority by virtue of their connections to the slain dictator and the troops under their command, they remade the political institutions of the *res publica* in their own interests. In Rome, magistracies and commands became their gift, while each took responsibility for a separate set of provinces; broadly, Octavian the western Mediterranean and Italy, Antonius, the eastern Mediterranean, and Lepidus, Africa.⁷⁷² The invention of the triumvirate had a significant impact on relationships between the state and communities. The introduction of a new college of magistrates, with *imperium consulare* but wider scope of action and *auctoritas*, added a further layer of complexity to the administration. However, the concentration of effective executive power among a small group of commanders with longer tenure allowed the winnowing of some competing discourses. Though the triumvirate disintegrated within scarcely more than a decade, this period provides numerous documents for analysis,

⁷⁷¹ Davies 2013, 417.

⁷⁷² The standard account, Pelling 1996, 1-69, see also Welch 2012, esp. 1-33, 291-312.

including 11 letters from *tresviri* or other magistrates, three *edicta*, two *senatusconsulta* and fragments of an unusual *lex*. While these are concentrated unevenly within the *provincia* and cannot be considered a profusion of documents, nevertheless they offer sufficient texts to elucidate changes in language, structure and framing during the era of civil wars.

The continuing complexities of Roman authority emerge from a document at Ephesus. Initially interpreted as an *edictum* from one of the *tresviri*; Bringmann alternatively suggested that the stone preserved extracts from three interrelated *senatusconsulta*.⁷⁷³ The document was monumentalised the Trajanic period, but a reference to *portoria* in Italy provides an original date of 42–39.⁷⁷⁴ From autopsy, Laffi argued the two fragments do not join, proposing a gap of at least 9 lines, and that both a *senatusconsultum* and *edictum* could be contained.⁷⁷⁵ This emphasises the degree to which we remain dependent on formal elements to identify document types. Laffi's emendation at line 5 created a clause instructing consuls, praetors or tribunes to refer a matter to the *populus* or *plebs*.⁷⁷⁶ These instructions to magistrates suit a context of a *senatus consultum* as, even in this period, triumphal *edicta* seem to be more circumspect. Finally, each fragment mentions a διάταγμα (*edictum*): however, in the first instance the text speaks of a future conditional: ὅταν τις τῶν τριῶν ἀνδρῶν | ἐπὶ τῆς καταστάσεως τῶν δημοσίων πραγμάτων | ἐπιγνώρῃ διατάγματι δηλῶσαι δεδόχθαι ... ('if ever one of the *tresviri rei publicae constituendae* should consent to

⁷⁷³ Bringmann 1983, 53–69 *contra* Knibbe 1981, 1–10.

⁷⁷⁴ SEG 56.1219.15–17. Bringmann 1983, 71–72.

⁷⁷⁵ Laffi 2006, 472–484, 490.

⁷⁷⁶ Laffi 2006, 468–472.

make known with an edict ...').⁷⁷⁷ By contrast, in the second fragment, the mode has shifted: [ὅ]πως περὶ τούτου τοῦ πράγματος διατάγματι δηλώσομεν καλῶς ἔχον ἔστιν ('so that, concerning this matter we will make clear through an edict what is right').⁷⁷⁸ This should be taken as self-referential and indicate a triumviral edict. This association of an *edictum* and *senatusconsultum* recurs on the Potamoneion, with the two documents framed by a letter of Caesar to the Mytileneans. In both cases, the Senate explicitly invited powerful magistrates, the dictator or the *tresviri*, to act, providing an overarching and pre-emptive legitimacy, should they have chosen to.⁷⁷⁹ Accordingly, the dossier contained two different contemporary documents and, in this case, suggests that the *tresviri* operated within the norms of a Republican framework.⁷⁸⁰

Another triumviral *edictum* appeared on the archive wall at Aphrodisias. The issuing magistrates were probably Octavian and Antonius.⁷⁸¹ Here, their title and the operative verb (λέγουσιν) are unambiguous.⁷⁸² The joint *edictum* again underscores the bolstering of individual authority through consensual decision-making and shows the two most powerful actors in the Roman world operating together. Moreover, the rationale offered for the grant highlights changing relationships after the period of civil war. The motive clause of the *edictum* notes the zeal (σπουδή) of the subjects for the empire ([ἡγε]μονίας) of the Roman

⁷⁷⁷ SEG 56.1219.7-9.

⁷⁷⁸ SEG 56.1219.12-14.

⁷⁷⁹ Laffi 2006, 503-504. See App. BCiv. 5.75.

⁷⁸⁰ SEG 56.1219.13-15.

⁷⁸¹ The text of Reynolds has Octavian referred to as Augustus ([Σ]εβαστός), which she explains as an editorial choice at the inscription of the text in the mid-third century CE (1982, 49-50). However, Bowersock (1984, 51-52) and Kokkinia (2015-2016, 25) convincingly argue that this fragment is misplaced. In any case, note Lepidus' exclusion from this process: see CD. 48.22.2.

⁷⁸² IAPH2007 8.26.1.

People and, prominently, their attachment to ‘our faction’ (μ[ά]λιστα τοῖς ἡμετέροις μέρεσι[ν]).⁷⁸³ Assimilating their own interests with those of the Roman People, the *tresviri* did not shy away from the reality that the rewarded communities were loyal primarily to their group. This public declaration demonstrates that the benefactions result from past choices to support their alliance in a civil war – that is, demonstrating πίστις or *fides* towards them personally – and, while no overt claim to future actions is made, it extends the possibility of similar rewards to other communities for personal loyalty. The choice of an *edictum* helps clarify the message. It presents the words of the two men collectively and directly. There is no mediation through another body. The two *edicta* used differing strategies to construct legitimacy; where the former consciously interacted with existing modes of discourse, the latter forewent these and emphasised the consensus of the new rulers of the Roman world. This experimentation and inconsistency are characteristic of the material for this period and stress the degree to which institutions remained in flux.

The *senatusconsultum de Aphrodisiensibus* further illustrates the dramatic shifts in discourse under the *tresviri*. First, though the consuls spoke concerning the matter under discussion, the resolution is overshadowed by Octavian and Antonius. The consuls were responsible for the final section of the *senatusconsultum* dealing with hospitality and honours for the ambassador but the substantive issues, the freedom and immunity of the city and other key privileges are explicitly framed as arising from proposals by the two *tresviri*.⁷⁸⁴ The

⁷⁸³ *IAph2007* 8.26.2-3. Contrast with the decree of Aphrodisias from 88 (*IAph2007* 8.3), discussed below Ch. 3.

⁷⁸⁴ *IAph2007* 8.27.26-32. Osgood 2006, 228-229.

Senate's role was simply to agree and confer additional legitimacy.⁷⁸⁵ Contrasting with earlier practice, the Aphrodisian requests are extremely compressed, in favour of a lengthy exposition of the senatorial process and decision, presumably, in part, to highlight the role played by the two key leaders of the Roman world. Critically, the Senate appeared to grant *carte blanche* to Octavian and Antonius to make future grants, to be treated as if authorised by a senatorial decree.⁷⁸⁶ This went beyond the right to decide on *minutiae* afforded to Sulla in the case of Stratonicea, discussed in Chapter 1. According to the literary sources, the Senate had already granted a general right to make decrees with senatorial sanction.⁷⁸⁷ However, the additional confirmation of this fact gave further legitimacy to the provisions of the decree.

Another *senatusconsultum* relating to Stratonicea underscores both the destructiveness of the Parthian conflict and the multiple levels of authority operating in this period.⁷⁸⁸ The first section includes the prescript of the decree, dating it to 15 August 39, under the consuls L. Marcius Censorinus and C. Calvisius.⁷⁸⁹ It lists the ten witnesses present at the drafting, following earlier examples, giving an impression of senatorial consensus. References to the city's loyalty (πίστεως) and endangerment during the war (ἐν ᾧ πολέμῳ τὰ τ[ε] μέ[γιστα] κекινδυνευ[ε]ν) suggest that the embassy sought privileges to relieve the

⁷⁸⁵ E.g. *IAph2007* 8.27.39, 42.

⁷⁸⁶ *IAph2007* 8.27.48-51.

⁷⁸⁷ CD. 46.53.3. Dalla Rosa 2014, 104. Compare Reynolds 1982, 83.

⁷⁸⁸ *Ambasceria* 453b, c. Canali de Rossi (1997, 399) argued convincingly against Hatzfeld's (1927, 59-61) separating them.

⁷⁸⁹ *Ambasceria* 453b.3-4.

difficult situation, such as the tax relief recently granted to several cities.⁷⁹⁰ The second fragment confirms earlier benefactions and refers directly to the Temple of Zeus at Panamara, most likely confirming ἀσυλία.⁷⁹¹ The linguistic parallels with both the *senatusconsulta de Stratonicensibus* (81) and *de Aphrodisiensibus* (35) are striking and demonstrate the extent to which the framework of senatorial action remained intact.⁷⁹² This may show institutional memory in action at Rome; the survival of praxis among the *scribae* involved in assisting magistrates with administrative tasks, for example.⁷⁹³ In any case, this document further underscores how, despite the increasing personal power of the *tresviri*, the institutions of the *res publica* interacted in traditional ways with provincial communities.

Correspondence relating to Octavian's relationship with Aphrodisias further illustrates shifts in praxis and discursive strategies. Of five surviving letters, however, only one was personally addressed to the *polis* by Octavian. Dated to 39/38, it follows a familiar format: after addressing the archons, *boule* and *demos* of Aphrodisias, and including a *formula valetudinis*, Octavian turns to the ambassador, Solon.⁷⁹⁴ Here, however, the language becomes unusual. Rather than praising Solon's zeal and eloquence in prosecuting his city's case, Octavian, stresses his attention paid to the matter at hand (ἐπιμελέστατα) and focuses on the substance of his requests. Noting Solon's satisfaction with the 'administrative arrangements' (οἰκονο[μῆ]μασιν) decided, Octavian highlights the further request for

⁷⁹⁰ *Ambascerie* 453b.19, c.8-10, 15. Sherk 1969, 161; Osgood 2006, 225.

⁷⁹¹ *Ambascerie* 453c.15-17. Rigsby 1996, 426-427.

⁷⁹² Sherk 1969, 173.

⁷⁹³ Purcell 2001, 647-654; 671-672, on their desuetude.

⁷⁹⁴ *IAph2007* 8.25.11-20.

documents relating to Aphrodisias: ἐπὶ κρίματος καὶ δόγματος καὶ ὀρκίου καὶ νόμου (*edictum*, (*senatus*)*consultum*, *foedus* and *lex*). The requests themselves (ἐφ' οἷς) appear to prompt Octavian's praise of Solon.⁷⁹⁵ Moreover, the framing of his success is non-standard: the *triumvir* grants him privileges and regards him as an 'acquaintance' (γεινωσκόμενοις).⁷⁹⁶ This underscores the increasing personalisation of power under the *tresviri*, emphasising how personal knowledge and access to individual rulers could itself become a valuable honour; one worth recording in an official letter from a magistrate to a *polis*. These γεινωσκόμενοι need not represent a formal group, with a defined membership and specific privileges. The very informality and variation in language between letters reinforce the extent to which this was a period of experimentation.

Critical to interpreting the dossier is a semi-private letter from Octavian to Stephanus, a representative of Antonius operating from Laodicea-on-the-Lycus.⁷⁹⁷ Unlike Antonius, whose sphere of responsibility included *provincia Asia*, letters represented Octavian's main form of agency. Even so, the permanent presence of a representative, in the person of Stephanus, in the vicinity of Aphrodisias allowed actions implemented efficiently, by either *triumvir*. The text reads:

⁷⁹⁵ *I Aph2007* 8.25.33-42.

⁷⁹⁶ Reynolds (1982, 46) drawing on Robert (1989 [1966], 46 n.1; himself referring to 1937, 227-228) noted the repeated use of γινώκειν and cognates to mean 'official acquaintances', tracing it to Hellenistic court practice. She adduced the parallel of *notus* in Latin and emphasised Seneca's reference to C. Gracchus hierarchising his friends for the *salutatio*, suggesting that this was the earliest attestation of a common practice. Compare Paterson (2007, 129-131) and his references to Hellenistic practice.

⁷⁹⁷ Reynolds 1982, 97, 99-100; De Chaisemartin 2017, 333.

vac Καῖσαρ Στεφάνω vac χαίρειν' vac | ὡς Ζωΐλον τὸν ἐμὸν φιλῶ ἐπίστασαι τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ ἡλευθέρωσα καὶ Ἀντωνίῳ συνέστησα | ὡς Ἀντώνιος ἄπεστιν δὸς ἐργασίαν μὴ τις αὐτοῖς ἐπιβάρησις γένηται μίαν πόλιν ταύτην | ἐξ ὅλης τῆς Ἀσίας ἐμαυτῷ εἴληπκα τούτους οὕτω θέλω φυλαχθῆναι ὡς ἐμοὺς πολεῖτας' | vac ὄψομαι ὡς τὴν ἐμὴν σύνστασιν ἐπὶ πέρας ἀγάγῃς vac ('Caesar to Stephanus, greetings. You know of my affection for my *amicus* Zoilos, I have freed his home city and recommended it to Antonius. Since Antonius is absent, give your attention that no burden falls on them: this one city from all of Asia I have taken for my own. I wish for these people to be protected as if they were my own townsmen. I will see that you carry out my recommendation to the full').⁷⁹⁸

This letter employs an unambiguous commanding tone throughout, unsurprising given Stephanus' (lack of) status, as a Greek agent, vis-à-vis Octavian.⁷⁹⁹ The imperative (δός, l.3), use of θέλω (l.4), and implication of close observation (l.5) emphasise the simple hierarchical relationship. Octavian as *triumvir*, though *sans* title, commanded, and Stephanus obeyed. The letter's subject is Aphrodisias' ongoing well-being; however, the two ὡς-clauses at the missive's opening contextualise the later instructions. Octavian privileges (Gaius Julius) Zoilos, likely Caesar's freedman and a well-attested civic benefactor at Aphrodisias, as the reason for his interest.⁸⁰⁰ Laignoux astutely notes that Solon, for instance, the named ambassador in other documents, does not seem to have received similar benefactions from Octavian.⁸⁰¹ Crucially, Octavian uses the unambiguous φίλος/*amicus* rather than the more oblique 'acquaintance'. As with Seleucus of Rhodus, discussed *infra*, Octavian's attention is

⁷⁹⁸ *IAph2007* 8.29.

⁷⁹⁹ On his position, p.213 *infra*.

⁸⁰⁰ For Zoilos' life and activity: Robert 1989 [1966], 32-56; Reynolds 1982, 156-164; Smith 1993, 4-13; Heller 2011, 229-234. *IAph2007* index 'Names attested at Aphrodisias' s.v. Ζωΐλος. Chaisemartin 2017, 337.

⁸⁰¹ Laignoux 2017, 230.

on the *polis* for the sake of individuals, rather than on the political community writ large.⁸⁰²

As Heller stressed, this marked a radical change from the *senatusconsultum de Asclepiade*, issued in 78, which makes no suggestion that the beneficiaries would form a continuing link with the imperial centre to their homeland's benefit.⁸⁰³

The document's language emphasises both the author's agency and the communities' position as passive recipients of imperial favour. First, the singular ἡλευθέρωσα frames the freedom of Aphrodisias as a personal action, where the *senatusconsultum* privileged the involvement of his colleague, Antonius, and the Senate.⁸⁰⁴ Allowing that Octavian provided the impetus for the decision, the choice to present the outcome thus reflects the personalisation of power and discourse under the *tresviri*. The strong personal voice continues throughout the letter, climaxing in the declaration that μίαν πόλιν ταύτην | ἐξ ὅλης τῆς Ἀσίας ἐμαυτῷ εἴληπα ('this one city from all of Asia I have taken for my own'). The natural meaning of λαμβάνω suggests ownership or seizure, perhaps from Antonius, but underscores the reality that Plarasa-Aphrodisias was territory to be owned or ruled, irrespective of the 'freedom' bestowed.⁸⁰⁵ The communiqué's personal nature may account for the more overt language, which does not reflect a broader trend. This raises the question of the text's origin, since its appearance on the archive wall implies that a copy existed in the civic archive. Two possibilities exist: that Stephanus forwarded the missive on himself,

⁸⁰² Osgood 2006, 276. Compare Badian's caution (1984a, 158).

⁸⁰³ Heller 2011, 234-237.

⁸⁰⁴ *IAph2007* 8.29.2. Badian 1984a, 162-163. Compare the use of first-person plural in the joint *edictum* offering Plarasa-Aphrodisias privileges elsewhere: *IAph2007* 8.26.6, 9, 13. Osgood 2006, 229.

⁸⁰⁵ As in Frija's (2017, 198) translation as 'prise'. Note Chaniotis' (2003, 253-254) perceptive observation that this creates a distance between Aphrodisias and other *poleis* in Asia.

accompanying his own letter; or that a copy was kept in Rome, and sent on later at a local request.⁸⁰⁶ While Badian noted that the public-facing language suggests that the letter was intended as a public document, it does not automatically entail that Stephanus would forward it on.⁸⁰⁷ Intended and likely audiences must remain distinct. That Aphrodisias may have received the letter had obviously occurred to Octavian but probably was not his object. Since Stephanus was Antonius' agent, it remains possible that the eastern *triumvir* also received a copy. Without additional evidence, any answer is speculative, but the authority lent by Octavian's express wishes to Stephanus' own decisions furnishes a powerful motive to do so.

A letter of Stephanus himself to Plarasa-Aphrodisias also survives. He begins noting that ambassadors arrived, bearing decrees, before listing his actions in supporting their efforts to track down escaped slaves, and collaborators with Labienus.⁸⁰⁸ Stephanus acts as representative of Antonius in western Asia, though the extent of his authority cannot be established. Given his lack of *tria nomina*, he is likely not a citizen; his position was necessarily informal, foreshadowing the *procuratores* of the early Principate, his power deriving fully from his relationship with Antonius.⁸⁰⁹ While he seems to have had a broad remit, akin to Zeuxis, the representative of Antiochus III, the institutional weakness of his

⁸⁰⁶ Ando 2000, 84-86. See Coudry (1994, 66-70) on senatorial documents; magistrates' correspondence may have been a grey area – though official, it remained the responsibility of the individual. The utility for the administration of Empire is obvious, but we cannot assume it was collected for public use.

⁸⁰⁷ Badian 1984a, 158-159.

⁸⁰⁸ *IAph2007* 8.30.

⁸⁰⁹ Reynolds (1982, 99-100) posited that he is Antonius' freedman, or a local; Badian (1984a, 160-161) preferred to view him as a slave. Note the employment of similar agents by Antonius: Dalla Rosa 2017, 107-110.

position requires caution in interpreting this document within the nexus of Roman official correspondence. Notably, however, Stephanus acts in line with Octavian's commands and stresses the assistance he rendered to Aphrodisias' ambassadors, culminating in the return of a golden crown, looted during the Parthian invasion.⁸¹⁰ Two reasons suggest themselves, either Stephanus sought to underscore his superior's concern for Aphrodisias, or, perhaps more likely, his personal role in the administration of Asia. Again, this was an anomalous situation, at least vis-à-vis the Republican constitution, which offered opportunities for actors to distinguish themselves in novel ways.

Octavian's letter to Ephesus reveals further elements of personalising discourse. This text's catalyst is a report from Solon to Octavian concerning the damage to Plarasa-Aphrodisias during the Parthian War of 40/39.⁸¹¹ Octavian explicitly notes that he has sent letters (ἐντολαί) to Antonius about Aphrodisias, drawing, perhaps on his colleague's more present authority. Similarly, in urging Ephesus to assist Aphrodisias, Octavian avoids the language of command, or even an overt suggestion, noting only that they are εὐκαίρῳ ('well-situated') to help.⁸¹² The statue further complicates the situation: a golden Eros, set up in the temple of Aphrodite at Aphrodisias by Caesar had been looted by Labienus and the Parthians, but had later been rededicated as an offering to Artemis at Ephesus. How the Artemision acquired it is not stated. The circumspect nature of Octavian's language may be

⁸¹⁰ *IAph2007* 8.30.8-10. Osgood 2006, 230.

⁸¹¹ *IAph2007* 8.31.4-6, 13-18.

⁸¹² *IAph2007* 8.31.7-12. Reynolds 1982, 102-103 *contra* Chaisemartin 2017, 334. Despite the high imperial use of the word to describe imperial *mandata* delineating governor's responsibilities and how administration should be carried out. However, the term reflected evolving practice: like *procurator*, *mandatum* had a private meaning before being taken into the public sphere (Buckland 1963³, 514-521).

explained through his intervention in his colleague's *provincia*. Instead, he offers moral capital as a motive, suggesting that the Ephesians would καλῶς ποιήσετε καὶ ἄξιος ('act well and rightly') to return the statue.⁸¹³ Drawing on the repertoire of civic virtue, Octavian sought to leverage reasons beyond political authority to ensure success. Even so, he offers the further ironic suggestion that Eros was an inappropriate offering to Artemis.⁸¹⁴

The letter concludes with an unusually overt declaration of Octavian's own motives, hearkening to royal models: ἀνάγκη γάρ μοι [[Ἀφροδισιέων]] ποιεῖσθαι πρόνοιαν οὓς τηλικάυτα εὐεργέτηκα ἦν καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀκούειν νομίζω ('for it is necessary for me to show care for the Aphrodisians, upon whom I have conferred such benefits, about which I judge you too have heard').⁸¹⁵ The force of this sentence lies in the opening phrase: Octavian is constrained to act on behalf of the Aphrodisians, due to his role as εὐεργέτης. This should not be considered a form of patronage in a technical sense, nor a legal bond.⁸¹⁶ Rather, Octavian invokes moralising language to give force to his actions. He constructs himself as a protector of the interests of his city and invites the Ephesians to consider his actions towards the Aphrodisians as consistent, repetitive and morally correct. In this, he returns openly to a more regal style of communication.⁸¹⁷ Despite or, perhaps, due to his relative weakness Octavian engages in a meaningful dialogue with Ephesus presenting his wishes,

⁸¹³ *IAph2007* 8.31.16. Note the tensions between Aphrodisias and Ephesus: Pont 2012, 322-323.

⁸¹⁴ Reynolds 1982, 103; Osgood 2006, 230.

⁸¹⁵ *IAph2007* 8.31.19-20. Compare Badian 1984a, 164-165.

⁸¹⁶ *Pace* Reynolds 1982, 103; Badian 1984a, 163-164.

⁸¹⁷ See chapter 2.1.

reasons and offering reasons for the *polis* to comply. In this sense, the letter is something of an anomaly, though its record at Aphrodisias attests to the likely success of this ploy.

Documents relating to two separate grants of citizenship in the East, the dossier of Seleucus of Rhosus and the *lex Fonteia*, found at the Asklepieion on Cos, illustrate the institutional and discursive uncertainty of the Triumvirate. The Rhosus dossier includes four documents: a letter from Octavian to the *polis*, instructing them to deposit the attached materials in their civic archives; an *edictum* of Octavian, as a *triumvir res publicae constituendae*, granting citizenship and other privileges to Seleucus; a second letter of Octavian responding to a Rhosian embassy led by Seleucus; and a third letter reaffirming the relationship between Octavian and Seleucus to the benefit of Rhosus.⁸¹⁸ The *edictum* records that Octavian [κατὰ ν]όμον Μουνάτιον καὶ Αἰμίλιον πολιτείαν καὶ ἀνεισφορίαν πάντων τῶν | [ὑπαρχόντ]ων ἔδωκαν εἰς τούτους τοὺς λόγους ('in accordance with the *lex Munatia Aemilia*, gave citizenship and tax-exemption on all property, in these words').⁸¹⁹ Octavian's covering letter demonstrates that the communiqué's purpose was to provide a record for the civic archive. Consequently, the absence of a ratifying statute implies that such a document was never issued: reinforcing the personal link between Octavian and the beneficiary.⁸²⁰

By contrast, the *lex Fonteia*, granting similar privileges to an unnamed citizen of Cos, appears to have been a *lex populi Romani*, promulgated by C. Fonteius Capito, between 41 and

⁸¹⁸ Raggi 2004, 127. See Raggi 2006; for previous editions, 19-23, with references. On Seleucus' social status: 191-193; Heller 2011, 231.

⁸¹⁹ Raggi 2006 ll.9-11. Raggi (2006, 98-99; already, Reynolds 1982, 23, 45) noted that the edict, beyond the prescript, is consistently in the first-person plural, where the three letters use the singular and concludes that the *edictum* was issued on behalf of all the *tresviri*.

⁸²⁰ Raggi 2006 ll.5-8.

34. Fonteius' description in the prescript as *pontifex* rather than magistrate presents a constitutional riddle. However, the motivation clause refers to the opinion (γνώμη) of a *triumvir*, whose name has been erased, with his *consilium*, and Antonius' judgement (τὴν Ἀντωνίου κρίσιν). Consequently, Fonteius presented the measure on behalf of the absent *triumvir*, emphasising the latter's central role in the bill.⁸²¹ Like other *leges* the language is formulaic and comprehensive. No personality is discernible. The privileges are unremarkable; consistent with those granted to Seleucus, the text emphasises the exemption of the recipient (and his descendants) from customs dues on goods export from or imported [εἰς ἐπαρχεῖαν Ἀσίαν ἢ νῆσόν τινα Ἀσία[ς]] ('to *provincia Asia* or any island of Asia'), as well as the choice of juridical procedure if arraigned.⁸²² However, placed alongside the *senatusconsultum de Asclepiade* and the Rhosus dossier, this provides a complete set of potential granting bodies of Roman citizenship within a (broadly) Republican framework: a *senatusconsultum*, a *lex* and magistrate's *edictum*, empowered by a *lex*. Like the *lex Antonia de Termessibus*, the *lex Fonteia* explicitly notes its origin in a *senatusconsultum*: ἐκ συνκλήτου γνώ[μης].⁸²³ As noted, the *lex Aemilia Munatia* gave the *tresviri* the authority to unilaterally create *cives Romani*: a simple pronouncement outlining the scope of privileges would suffice.⁸²⁴ The motivation behind recourse to a *senatusconsultum* and *lex*, when the decision of Antonius had the same legal force, must reflect a desire to ratify the privileges through

⁸²¹ RS 36.1.8, 12. Crawford et al. 1996, 504; Buraselis 2000, 25-30. On Fonteius: Ferrière 2007, 401-403, speculating that he held the tribunate.

⁸²² RS 36.2.1-24. Buraselis observed (2000, 28) that Cos must have held free status at the time of the *lex*'s passage.

⁸²³ RS 36.1.4-5.

⁸²⁴ E.g. RDGE 58.2.9-72.

the consensus of the *populus* and Senate.⁸²⁵ Again, powerful actors invoked the central institutions of the *res publica* to give further legitimacy to their actions. Though the lacunose text does not allow speculation whence the impetus of the *lex Fonteia* emerged, local interest in securing of their privileges against central instability plausibly played a role.⁸²⁶ Together the Seleucus of Rhosus dossier and the *lex Fonteia* emphasise experimentation with the format of communiqués to provincial communities and the continuing overlap and complexity between central institutions of the *res publica*.

Octavian's letters to Rhosus hold further interest. All three, by contrast with their Republican counterparts, contained *formulae valetudinis* and, explicitly, references to the army.⁸²⁷ Octavian exercised *imperium as triumvir* in a technical sense from late 43 through to his consulship in 27, so probably continually had some troops with him, especially post-Actium.⁸²⁸ The second letter responds to a Rhosian embassy, including Seleucus, in 31 and reprises several features of Hellenistic royal correspondence.⁸²⁹ First, Octavian responds positively to the embassy's honours.⁸³⁰ Then, he states his intent to benefit Rhosus and protect their existing privileges in traditional terms. Unusually, Octavian also telegraphed his own presence in the eastern Mediterranean, noting that he received the ambassadors at Ephesus and would attempt to assist Rhosus ἐπὶ τοὺς τόποις ἐλθὼν ('when I come to those

⁸²⁵ RS 36.1.1.3-7.

⁸²⁶ Herzog (1922, 212) presented it as a loss of sovereignty for the tyrant Nicias of Cos, Antonius may simply have been as more concerned with the appearance of institutional legitimacy than Octavian.

⁸²⁷ In the standard form: εἰ ἔρρωσθε, καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι. καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος ὕγιανον. See Raggi 2006 ll.4-6, 75-76, 86-87.

⁸²⁸ Vervaeke 2004, esp. 80-82, 98-104.

⁸²⁹ On the number of ambassadors, Raggi 2006, 72 *contra* Sherk 1969, 108.

⁸³⁰ Raggi 2006 l.79.

places’).⁸³¹ The physical and spatial element of euergetism had, to this point, remained largely unexpressed on the Roman side.⁸³² However, Augustus’ de facto pre-eminence and the diminishing authority of central institutions exacerbated a situation in which it already behoved *poleis* to approach individual commanders in hope of benefaction. In a unipolar world, proximity greatly facilitated diplomatic activity and hosting a travelling ruler in a grand style could have a significant impact.⁸³³ To an extent unparalleled in earlier emanations of the Roman state, this document openly gestured towards a personal, ongoing relationship between a community in the Roman East and an individual commander.

Octavian’s final letter to Rhosus presents more novelty. Written in 30, the correspondence appears unprompted. After the standard preface and *formula valetudinis*, Octavian recounts the virtuous actions of Seleucus on his behalf and connects these to the privileges he received.⁸³⁴ Curiously, he then recommends Seleucus to his native city, on the grounds that such men increased εὐνοία towards their homelands. Octavian then closes with a remarkable injunction: ὥς οὖν ἐμοῦ πάντα δυνατὰ ποιήσοντος ὑμεῖν ἴδει[ον διὰ Σέ]λευκον, θαρροῦντες περὶ ὧν ἄν βούλησθε πρὸς με ἀποστέλλετε (‘therefore, since I will do everything possible on my part to please Seleucus, be confident in approaching me concerning those things which you wish’).⁸³⁵ This clause invited the Rhosian civic elite to engage in a relationship with Octavian as a εὐεργέτης but placed the onus specifically on

⁸³¹ Raggi 2006 l.77, 80-81. Compare *IAph*2007.8.2b.7-9.

⁸³² Compare *SEG* 39.1244.2.42-46 (120s); Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.86. Pont 2009, 185-188. Contrast with Attalid ceremonial: Robert 1987 [1984], 460-477; Chin 2018, 121-137.

⁸³³ See pp.300-301 *infra*.

⁸³⁴ Raggi 2006 ll.87-91.

⁸³⁵ Raggi 2006 ll.91-93.

them. That is, the *polis* is explicitly encouraged to request benefactions, allowing the ruler the option to accept, reject or modify the request. To quote Millar, here, ‘Octavian writes as a monarch’.⁸³⁶ A unilateral grant may have had a similar effect; however, this statement encouraged the commencement of an ongoing dialogue. By contrast with Hellenistic letters, and those of second century promagistrates and Oppius, the relationship with Octavian is grounded in his personal relationship with Seleucus. The motivation clause for the *triumvir*’s acceptance of the embassy concentrates explicitly on the navarch: διὰ Σέλευκον τὸν ναύαρχόν μου (‘on account of Seleucus, my navarch’). Octavian’s repetition throughout both letters of Seleucus as ναύαρχος ἐμός (‘my navarch’), and the styling of his service as συνεστρατευμένος (‘soldiering with’) simply underscores the highly personal undertone of the public documents. He is more often associated with Octavian than with the *polis* itself.⁸³⁷ This letter encouraged the *polis* to move towards an emphatically individualised interaction, relying on Seleucus to engage with Octavian and continued the emerging trend towards mediation between specific commanders and their local favourites.

Other magistrates’ letters similarly underline shifting ideological emphases. A letter to Mylasa from Octavian, designated consul for the third time and therefore dated securely to late 31, is instructive. The unusual phrase ὕπατος τε τὸ τρίτον καθεσ|ταμένος (‘made consul for the third time’), should be explained by a stonecutter’s error and emended with <τε τὸ τέταρτον> (‘and for the fourth’), ensuring the letter belongs to the post-Actian

⁸³⁶ Millar 2002c [1973], 254. See also, Millar 1968, 263-264.

⁸³⁷ Raggi 2006 ll.76, 81, 88. Ferrary 2005, 70; Heller 2011, 235-236.

period.⁸³⁸ The missive begins with a *formula valetudinis*, including the army, perhaps in the context of the Actium campaign. Octavian responds to a Mylasan embassy, noting his encounter with an earlier Mylasan embassy concerning their misfortune (τύχης), which, given the second fragment offers an account of the city's sacking, must refer to Labienus' invasion.⁸³⁹ However, the clauses referring to the embassy's subject are absent, making it likely that it was prompted by Octavian's victory. First, by foregrounding his previous connection with the city, the erstwhile *triumvir* integrates Mylasa within his own euergetic network, de-emphasising ties of loyalty to Antonius. Osgood attractively conjectures that Octavian's intense focus on the abject condition of Mylasa may have been intended to remind the local elite of his rival Antonius' excesses and failures.⁸⁴⁰ There is a strong parallel here with Caesar's initial response to embassies from Asia Minor after Pharsalus – while communities may have sided with their adversaries, both viewed the aftermath of conflict as a period to re-establish ties with communities in the east.

Within this framework, it is intriguing that the motivation clause which ends the extant text follows immediately on from this recounting of the city's suffering some eight years previously. Following Sherk's text, Octavian even asserts an understanding of their position (συνε[ι]δον), further implicating him personally in the decision, and stresses their consequent desert of every honour.⁸⁴¹ Given the embassy places the letter firmly in the late

⁸³⁸ *I.Mylasa* 602. Millar 2002b [1973], 254, already assumed by Sherk 1969, 311, contra Canali De Rossi 1997, 401, who argues for 39 BC (accepted by Delrieux & Ferriès 2004, 499-503).

⁸³⁹ Sherk 1969, 311 contra Millar 2002b [1977], 254.

⁸⁴⁰ Osgood 2006, 226.

⁸⁴¹ *RDGE* 60.b.10-13.

30s, during a particularly fraught period, the direct connection between Labienus and Octavian's benefactions to Mylasa should be seen as a deliberate strategy by the author. Time and political considerations are consciously and successfully elided to exclude the problematic intervening period. Such ambiguity cements the link between Rome and Mylasa, before, presumably, substituting Octavian in place of the former. As consul designate and victor at Actium, he positioned himself as the fount of euergetism for Asia Minor for the future.

Augustus's letter to the *koinon* and *conventus* centres of Asia reinforces the discursive evolution after Actium. The text evokes a similar generalising and moralising tone to Hellenistic royal correspondence. The central concern of the remaining text with the ἀναιδεία (shamelessness) of certain, unnamed individuals contrasts strongly with the care (ἐπιμελῶς) taken by Cicero's interlocutor on behalf of the letter's author, to protect his settlement. This corresponds well to Octavian's post-Actian arrangements in Asia.⁸⁴² The unusually prescriptive publication clause further shows the unique nature of this document: the author requires that each *polis* despatch copies of his letter to the other communities in their διοικήσις, the earliest employment of this administrative term in a Roman epigraphic context, and display the letter: ἔν τε τῷ ἐπ[ι]φανεστάτῳ τόπῳ ἐν στυλοπαραστάδι ἐπὶ | λίθου λευκοῦ ἐνχαρχθῆναι ('engraved in the most conspicuous places, on a stele of white

⁸⁴² *I.Priene*² 13.41-42. Their identity varies with the dating: Sherk (1969, 276) assumed the *publicani*; Merkelbach (1995, 73-76) argued for L. Antonius; Canali de Rossi (2000, 170-171), Aeschines of Miletus. The latter two cases seem to be ruled out by the plural (τινῶν). None hold for the early 20s, the friends and associates of M. Antonius, à la Boethus of Tarsus (Strabo 14.5.14), provide an alternative suggestion.

stone’).⁸⁴³ While this instruction is echoed for *senatus consulta*, the requirement for display of a letter, rather than deposition in archives, is highly unusual.⁸⁴⁴

The motivation clause stresses the broad context considered by the author: ἵνα κοινῶς πάσῃ τῇ ἐπαρχείᾳ[ι τὸ] δίκαιον ἐσταμένον ἥι εἰς τὸν αἰεὶ χρόνον, αἵ τε ἄλλαι πᾶσαι πόλεις καὶ δῆμοι τὸ αὐτὸν παρ’ αὐτοῖς ποιήσωσιν (‘so that in common for all the province justice might be established for all time, and that all the other cities and peoples might do the same things among themselves’).⁸⁴⁵ The emphasis on the timelessness of his judgement sits uneasily with the temporary nature of a commander’s position and the contingent nature of his decisions, further suggesting an author of greater authority.⁸⁴⁶ This passage contains several generalising phrases, extending the justice of the decision rendered to the whole *provincia*, for all time and ‘all the other cities and peoples [sc. in Asia]’. The adverbial κοινῶς hearkens to Hellenistic models, but these earlier uses emphasised the distinction between a *polis*, as a civic community, and individual citizens.⁸⁴⁷ Here, the author widens that sense of community to include the whole province, i.e. the group of communities subject to the commander in Asia, establishing a single Roman standard. This interfaces neatly with the use of the *koinon* as a conduit to facilitate communication between the imperial centre and local *poleis*. Such sentiments are unparalleled in earlier examples and suggest the

⁸⁴³ *I.Priene*² 13.47-49.

⁸⁴⁴ Pace Ando 2000, 83. Ulpian (*Dig.* 14.3.11.3; cf. Valerius Probus, *de iuris notarum* (Keil *GL* 4, p.273)), in a 3rd century CE juristic context, demonstrates that the formula *unde de plano recte legi possit* had wider application, but the requirement of inscription is unusual.

⁸⁴⁵ *I.Priene*² 13.50-53.

⁸⁴⁶ Kokkinia 2009, 192; Blanco-Pérez 2019, 42.

⁸⁴⁷ Compare Ma 1999, 188, with examples n.35.

author's conscious intent to frame the inhabitants of the whole *provincia* as a single unit. Finally, the explicit foregrounding of the author's own use of the Greek language, in his words, 'to avoid confusion', provides a hint that in normal circumstances official communication from Roman magistrates in Asia to local communities was conducted in Latin.⁸⁴⁸ However, exceptions clearly occurred: P. Licinius Crassus allegedly conducted his tribunals in Asia in whatever dialect the petitioner used.⁸⁴⁹ More intriguing is the acknowledgement here that misinterpretation of central instructions could be a problem.

Though the Triumviral period saw a personalisation of communication between communities and the Roman state, various genres of document persisted through the period. We have examples of *senatusconsulta* and *leges*, though most extant normative documents are admittedly more direct, *edicta* and letters. The mutual reinforcement of the various genres, witnessed throughout the Republican period, continues but the instability of central institutions resulted in greater experimentation. The prominence of Octavian within the material presents another change. This may be on account of a retrospective eagerness to transcribe them, however, there are sufficient utterances surviving from the junior partner to construct a view of his style, and it is striking that even between his communiqués there is a distinctive lack of consistency, reproducibility and uniformity. The common element across the period is the increasing emphasis on the importance of local individuals and their relationship to powerful Romans as a layer of mediation between Rome and communities. Though perhaps an accident of our material, it is notable that our

⁸⁴⁸ *I.Priene*² 13.54-57.

⁸⁴⁹ Val. Max. 8.7.6.

evidence for civic patronage seems to drop off at this time.⁸⁵⁰ Overall, the official communiqués of the Roman state, during this period of internal flux, continued to move towards an individualised basis though coherence in scope, language and format failed to materialise.

2.5: The Early Principate: A New Form of Administration?

Octavian's success at Actium and the subsequent conquest of Egypt left him without rivals in the Roman world. Over the next twelve years, he acquired a series of powers which cemented his position at the apex of Roman society. The Republican constitution was redesigned, placing the newly entitled Augustus and his family at the centre of the state. In outline, the consolidated Augustan Republic came to resemble the Hellenistic kingdoms: power flowing from a limited in-group around the Princeps, down into a hierarchical court structure around the Imperial household. Though the Senate and other social groups such as the *equites* and *plebs urbana* retained formal influence and prestige, provincial communities increasingly relied on their relationship with the Princeps, mediated through governors or, occasionally, the Senate.

The honorific monument for Potamon of Mytilene, which displayed several official documents relating to his career, including *senatusconsulta* and letters from magistrates, provides an early example.⁸⁵¹ While the texts were selected to aggrandise Potamon's

⁸⁵⁰ Eilers 2002, 160-165, 172-181.

⁸⁵¹ On the monument: Parker 1990, 115 n.2. On Potamon's career and family: Robert 1969b, 740-745; Parker 1990, 115-121.

reputation, rather than illustrate the relationship between Rome and Mytilene, they shed important light on the language, structure and use of official communiqués in this period. Among the documents are two *senatusconsulta* dated securely to 25.⁸⁵² The first responds to a Mytilenean embassy: the document is structurally consistent with earlier examples, noting the consuls, date and location of the meeting, as well as the senators present at the drafting of the decree.⁸⁵³ The second, framed as an addendum to the first, omits the consuls and begins with the date and drafters.⁸⁵⁴ In both cases, the consul, M. Iunius Silanus gave the *relatio*, though Augustus' absence in Spain facilitated his exercise of traditional consular prerogatives.⁸⁵⁵ However, this document illustrates the sea-change in political practice at Rome under the early Principate. In the first decree Silanus recommends that: [ἐπὶ Αὐτοκράτορα Καίσαρα Σεβασ]τὸν [τ]ὸν συνάρχοντα γράμμ[ατα δεῖν πεμφθῆναι] ('letters should be sent to Emperor Caesar Augustus, his colleague').⁸⁵⁶ This explicit intent to consult Augustus vis-à-vis the acceptance of the Mytilenean request for benefactions, including a treaty, despite Augustus' symbolic return of the *fascēs* in 28 to his consular colleague, Agrippa, demonstrates the evolution of the exercise of Roman power. It emphasises the Princeps' centrality to decision-making in an ongoing transitional period. It remained unclear in the mid-20s how the Roman state would sort itself out and the Mytilenean ambassadors' initial approach to the Senate illustrates the confusion which the evolving

⁸⁵² RDGE 26.B.i.36-C.26.

⁸⁵³ RDGE 26.B.i.37-44.

⁸⁵⁴ RDGE 26.C.9-16.

⁸⁵⁵ Labarre 1996, 111-112; Arrayás Morales 2010, 138, with references.

⁸⁵⁶ RDGE 26.C.1-2.

regime created for its interlocutors. The promulgation of the two decrees closely followed one another: the first must date between 16 May and 13 June 25, the second to 28 June 25. Evidence from the monuments' other documents and the presence of Crinagoras, another Mytilenean ambassador, in Tarraco implies that the embassy travelled directly to consult the Princeps.⁸⁵⁷ This additional jaunt went unmentioned in the text of the decree, which focuses explicitly on the obligations and actions of the Senate and magistrates. Even allowing the overt deference showed to Augustus, the practical scope of these *senatusconsulta* does not appear to have altered vis-à-vis earlier documents.

Outside of Asia, Augustus' fifth Cyrene edict and its enclosed *senatusconsultum* highlight the construction of a new world order. Critically, though the latter does the heavy lifting, supplying the legislative specifics, it is given weight through Augustus' pronouncement. Noting his own presence and involvement in the drafting process, Augustus claims that he was motivated to demonstrate of his (and, less importantly, the Senate's) concern for provincials' well-being.⁸⁵⁸ This *senatusconsultum* was a general change in legislation affecting every province, apparently extending the scope of *repetundae* to cover any appropriation of property. The framing of this decree as the product of the Senate and Princeps in concert presents a fundamental shift from the imperial discourse of the Republic. This practice of embedding senatorial pronouncements in imperial *edicta* became commonplace under the later Principes, though this was never exclusively the case.⁸⁵⁹ The

⁸⁵⁷ IG 12.2.44; Quint. Inst. 6.3.77; Anth. Pal. 9.419, 516, 599. Arrayás Morales 2010, 144-145. On Crinagoras: Gow & Page 1963, 2.210-13; Bowersock 1965, 36-7.

⁸⁵⁸ RDGE 31.72-73.

⁸⁵⁹ E.g. the *senatusconsultum de Cn. Pisone patre* in 29 CE (Eck, Caballos & Fernández 1996).

Princeps' position as the incontestable source of legitimate authority, while in its infancy in the last years of the millennium, simplified the situation for *poleis* in understanding and responding to imperial power.

The *edictum* of Paullus Fabius Maximus, discussed in chapter 1, provides a further perspective.⁸⁶⁰ The document opens with a lengthy panegyric praising Augustus for rescuing the state from civil war.⁸⁶¹ Consequently, Fabius suggests that: πασῶν τῶν πολειτηῶν εἶναι μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν νέαν νουμενίαν | τὴν τοῦ θηοτάτου Καίσαρος γενέθλιον, ἐκείνη τε πάντας εἰς τὴν | ἀρχὴν ἐνβαίνειν ('all the communities celebrate the new year on one and the same day, the birthday of the most divine Caesar, and that all magistrates enter office on that day').⁸⁶² Heller noted that the introduction of the new calendar had the effect of 'Romanising' time for provincials. Certainly, it had an significant impact: the regularisation of time across the *provincia* in ideologically charged terms echoed the unity of imperial rule, while Stern has highlighted the parallels between the simplicity of autocratic rule and the predictability of the Julian calendar.⁸⁶³ However, the outcomes do not require that Roman actors were motivated in these terms. As Burrell stated, the edict's tone is 'hortatory rather than imperative'.⁸⁶⁴ Fabius does not, or cannot, require that the *poleis* alter their calendars, but justifies his proposition by reference to Augustus' manifest good qualities. Through the καὶ ἐπεὶ clause, Fabius attempts to establish not only that Augustus' birthday is a day of good

⁸⁶⁰ RDGE 65. Further commentary in Laffi 1967, 5-98; see now Dreyer & Engelmann 2006, 175-182.

⁸⁶¹ RDGE 65.A.1-9.

⁸⁶² RDGE 65.A.21-23.

⁸⁶³ Stern 2012, 222-227; Heller 2014, 228.

⁸⁶⁴ Burrell 2004, 371.

fortune, but also that the change involved would not be that great.⁸⁶⁵ Fabius frames his decision as a proposal rather than a command (δοκεῖ μοι), noting that the impetus and process should come from the *koinon*: ψήφισμα δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῆς Ἀσίας δεή|σει ... ἵνα τὸ ἐπινοη|θὲν ὑφ' ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν τειμὴν τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ μείνῃ αἰώνιον ('A decree of the *koinon* of Asia is necessary... so that our plan for the honour of Augustus may remain forever').⁸⁶⁶ The proconsul's decision is mediated through the *koinon*'s action.⁸⁶⁷ Overall, Fabius' *edictum* places the commander in an intriguing position. While the communal response is analysed in chapter 3, Fabius unambiguously frames this decision as beyond his own remit and connives at elevating Augustus' reputation within the *provincia*.⁸⁶⁸

The *edictum* of Sex. Sotidius Strabo Libuscidianus, *legatus pro praetore* of Galatia, most likely from 14–15 CE, concerning the requisitioning of transport by public officials provides a useful comparandum for the ideological changes associated with the Principate.⁸⁶⁹ Sotidius' decree reasserted that the *polis* of Sagalassos was required to provide transportation in specific cases, in return for a fixed rate of payment. The text implies that prior to his intervention private individuals were insisting on their right to use the service, while others were refusing payment. The imperial authorities on the ground reacted to information rather than spontaneously implementing policy.⁸⁷⁰ The text appears in both

⁸⁶⁵ Thonemann (2015, 123–124) noted that the *koinon* decrees assume calendars of Asia were already synchronised, something demonstrably untrue.

⁸⁶⁶ RDGE 65.A.26–28. Pace Heller (2014, 223), δοκεῖ μοι should not translate to 'je décrète'.

⁸⁶⁷ Heller 2014, 225.

⁸⁶⁸ E.g. the inclusion of the adjective θεϊότατος to describe Augustus in the Greek copy (Sherk 1969, 337).

⁸⁶⁹ On the date: Mitchell 1976, 113; 1982, 99–100; Rémy 1989, 137–138 *contra* Coşkun (2009, 159–161) who favours a date after 20 CE. Note: Levick 2000, 109–110.

⁸⁷⁰ Mitchell 1976, 111–112.

Latin and Greek translation and provides instructions for its display in the *πολεῖς καὶ κώμαι* of Sagalassos' territory. Indeed, the governor explicitly links knowledge of the *edictum* to its observation.⁸⁷¹ Crucially, the text overtly draws on the Princeps and his predecessor to bolster gubernatorial authority:

ὅν τηρήσω οὐ μόνον δι' ἑμαυτοῦ, ἀλλὰ ἐὰν δεῇ καὶ τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος Σεβαστοῦ δεδωκότος μοι | περὶ τούτων ἐντολ[άς] προσπαραλαβὼν θειότητα ('which I will ensure not only with my own [*potestas*] but, if this is neglected, bringing in as support the *maiestas* of the saviour Augustus, who gave me *mandata* concerning these things').⁸⁷²

Sotidius states his reluctance to intervene at all in the prescript to his pronouncement, noting the 'injustice' (*iniquissimum/ἄδικον*) of his tightening of regulations which are already cared for diligently by *Augusti alter deorum alter principum | maximus* ('the *Augusti*, one the greatest of gods, the other of *Principes*').⁸⁷³ Instead, he offers a clear hierarchy of administrative practice and imperial authority. Both Augustus and Tiberius have shown the greatest care about the provision and use of vehicles, implying that a pronouncement or *edictum* had been issued to regulate practice.⁸⁷⁴ The current Princeps had also issued ἐντολαί (Lat. *mandata*, Eng. 'instructions') to the commander delineating his responsibilities and how administration should be carried out.⁸⁷⁵ The Greek, at least, implies specific

⁸⁷¹ SEG 26.1392.5-6=29. This copy seems to have been displayed in such a secondary context, though note my discussion at pp.326-328, *pace* Mitchell 1976, 110-111, 116.

⁸⁷² SEG 26.1392.29-31; compare 6-7.

⁸⁷³ SEG 26.1392.3-4

⁸⁷⁴ Edmondson 2014, 133.

⁸⁷⁵ Compare n.812 *supra*.

reference to this issue (περὶ τούτων ἐντολ[ὰς]).⁸⁷⁶ Finally, the commander himself, in the *provincia*, has seen that these regulations are not being enforced adequately, and has issued this *edictum* to clarify matters, while ensuring that the specifics of his decision are publicly displayed in several places throughout the relevant civic territory.

Unlike earlier commanders, Sotidius emphasises the legitimacy of his right to decide on this issue, invoking the *Principes* deliberately. This might indicate a tendency for aggrieved individuals to appeal gubernatorial decisions to central authorities. Domitius Corbulo's letter to Cos, under Claudius, similarly attempted to head off potential appeals by underlining the crucial role of the *Princeps* in crafting imperial policy.⁸⁷⁷ While proconsular commanders maintained *stricto sensu* the same *imperium* and *iurisdictio* as their Republican counterparts, that is, their right to make legally binding decisions within their *provincia*, the realities of the *Princeps*' unchallenged authority created problems of legitimacy within the provincial context. For *legati*, this situation was exacerbated by their direct, legal subordination to him – the receipt of their *imperium* by delegation under his *auspicia*.⁸⁷⁸ Though provincial communities had a long history of appealing to the Senate, they appear to have quickly adjusted to the *Princeps*' central position. The perception that legitimate power proceeded from Augustus and his successors provoked a shift in emphasis from magistrates and appointed officials. Rather than issuing ordinances secure in their own

⁸⁷⁶ This is the earliest example of a magistrate referring to imperial *mandata* in his own *edictum*, but it seems reasonable to extend this practice further back into Augustus' reign, at least for his *legati*: Mitchell 1976, 116.

⁸⁷⁷ SEG 29.751.6–10.

⁸⁷⁸ Vervaeke 2014, 20; Drogula 2015, 355–356 *contra* Dalla Rosa 2011, 260 n.67.

authority, increasingly they appealed to their relationship with the Princeps. In turn, this institutionalised the situation, further marginalising provincial commanders.⁸⁷⁹

The Cyme dossier, already discussed in Chapter 1, sheds further light on this process. The language of the consular *edictum* issued by Augustus and Agrippa, is strongly prohibitive; consisting of a series of negative imperatives: e.g. μηδεὶς ... αἰρέτω μηδὲ ἀγοραζέτω μηδὲ ἀπὸ μηδενὸς δῶρον λαμβανέτω ... ('let no-one take, nor buy, nor accept from someone as a gift ...').⁸⁸⁰ The topic, the restoration of sacred lands which have become privatised in the course of the civil wars, represents a specific concern of Augustus, as *Res Gestae* 24.1 shows, the only provincial act mentioned in that text.⁸⁸¹ Vinicius' letter to Cyme raises different issues. The elision of Cymaeian institutions, in simply addressing the archons, is striking, as is the fact that letter arises out of a local disagreement. Here, however, the crucial elements are the language and formulae used by Vinicius. First, he employs the abbreviated Latin formula *e(go) v(olo) v(os) c(urare) ...* ('I want you to ensure...').⁸⁸² Though precisely how this was rendered in the Greek copy remains unclear, the clause constructs an implied hierarchy between the proconsul and Cyme. Though avoiding direct imperatives, the use of *volo* leans on his authority as a Roman magistrate. It establishes a standard of behaviour based on will rather than normative documents. That said, the letter ends by invoking a Roman system of justice and mediation if the local authorities wish to use them. This framework asserts linguistically the power of Roman magistrates to subvert the normal

⁸⁷⁹ See Kokkinia 2009, 191-194.

⁸⁸⁰ Crook 1962, ll.5-8.

⁸⁸¹ *RGDA* 24.1.

⁸⁸² Crook 1962, l.17.

relationships between local communities and their own citizens. Both elements illustrate a shift towards a more concrete and hierarchised relationship between local political communities and Roman authorities during this period.

Intriguingly, Vinicius' instructions exceed the requirements implied by the consuls' *edictum*, raising the question of how the two documents relate to one another. The *edictum* is not specific to Cyme, though limited to *provincia Asia*, and Vinicius likely cited it in his correspondence to give weight to his own decision. However, given that the *edictum*, identified as a *iussum Augusti*, was raised, initially, by the plaintiffs, the *thiasoi* of Dionysus at Cyme, it seems more plausible that the decision to include the *edictum* occurred at a local level.⁸⁸³ Most interesting is Vinicius' requirement that when restored, the shrine be inscribed with *Imp. Caesar deivi f. Augustus restituit* ('Imperator Caesar, son of the god, Augustus restored [sc. this shrine]'). This echoes Augustus' rhetoric in the *Res Gestae* but does not appear in the *edictum*, suggesting the proconsul acquired these instructions elsewhere.

Changes in administrative practice also effected the discourse of Roman power. In the penultimate decade of the first century, C. Norbanus Flaccus, *pro consule* in Asia, wrote to the archons, *boule* and *demos* of Aezani in response to an embassy from the city. In language typical of a Hellenistic dynast, Norbanus notes his reception of Aezani's ambassadors and his personal wish to increase the privileges (φιλόανθρωπα) of the city. However, unlike other examples, he received not a local decree, but a letter from Augustus.⁸⁸⁴

⁸⁸³ Hurler 2006, 208; Dalla Rosa 2014, 128-129. See Chapter 3.4.

⁸⁸⁴ Though compare C. Cornelius Dolabella receiving a *senatusconsultum* in c. 80: RDGE 21.4.

Ἐκ Περγάμου | Γάϊος Νωρβανὸς Φλάκκος ἀνθύπατος Αἰζανειτῶν | ἄρχουσι,
 βουλῇ, δῆμῳ vac χαίρειν | Μενεκλῆς καὶ Ἱέραξ καὶ Ζήνων οἱ πρεσβευταὶ ὑμῶν
 | ἀνέδωκάν μοι Σ[ε]βαστοῦ Καίσαρος ἐπιστολὴν, ἐν ἣ[ι] | ἐγγράπτο
 συνκεχωρηκέναι ὑμῖν ἐκκλησίαν | συνάγειν Ὀφίλι[ο]ν Ὀρνᾶτον ἐπίτροπον
 [π]ερὶ [ἀ]τε[λ]είας τῶι [ι]ε[ρ]εῖ θυσιῶν ἕνεκα, μὴ συνχωρήσειν δ' ἄλλα συντελεῖν
 τῇν | πόλιν· vac ἐγὼ οὖν συναύξειν βουλόμενος τὰ φιλά[νθρω]πα τῆς πόλεως
 ὑμῶν ἐπιτρέπω κατὰ τὸ συνχώρημα | τοῦ Καίσ[α]ρος --- | ---] δε διαταξ[ιν?...]
 ('From Pergamum. Gaius Norbanus Flaccus, proconsul, to the archons, council
 and people of the Aezanetans, greetings. Menecles, Hierax and Zeno, your
 ambassadors, gave me the letter of Augustus Caesar, in which he wrote that
 Ofilius Ornatus, procurator, had allowed your assembly to come together
 concerning the *ateleia* of the priest of sacrifices, but will not allow that the city
 offer anything further. Therefore, I, wishing to increase the privileges of your
 city, yield (?) to the decision of Caesar ... *edictum*(?) ...')⁸⁸⁵

This fascinating letter encapsulates the tension between traditional and novel discourses of power during the period under investigation. In its structure and the personal motivation offered by Norbanus, the document closely follows the model of earlier Roman magistrates and, ultimately, of Hellenistic kings. However, the references to a letter of Augustus and decision of a procurator highlight the existence of competing sources of authority. This inverts the traditional structure of civic-gubernatorial interactions. Rather than the civic community making their own resolution and engaging in dialogue with the commander, the Aezanetans or the procurator Ofilius had already consulted the Princeps directly and received a response, prompting the embassy. Nevertheless, Norbanus' response appropriates themes and language from an earlier era. He evokes his personal wish to increase the privileges of the city in the same format as second-century commanders: ἐγὼ

⁸⁸⁵ SEG 61.1134, updating MAMA 9.13.

οὖν συναύξειν βουλόμενος τὰ φιλά[νθρω]πα τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν ('therefore, I wish to increase the privileges of your *polis*') and commits to uphold the concessions granted by Augustus (ἐπιτρέπω κατὰ τὸ συνχώρημα | τοῦ Καίσαρος).⁸⁸⁶ As noted *supra*, the verb ἐπιτρεπεῖν has a wide semantic range. Unfortunately, the stone breaks off, leaving limited clues to Norbanus' intent. A final hint may be preserved in the final extant line with the appearance of διαταξ---, almost certainly διάταξις, possibly an *edictum* either from the imperial centre, or, more likely, from the commander himself.⁸⁸⁷

The letter's subject further alludes to the major administrative changes underway in this period. That a procurator interfered in the internal civic process of a *polis* subject to the *imperium* of the proconsul of Asia so early into Augustus' principate is striking. Wörrle notes that this implies not only that *procuratores* had a strong personal relationship with the Princeps which could be adduced to lend authority to their actions, but also that from the beginning of the Principate they had an implied mandate to act beyond imperial estates, offering Augustus (indirect) agency in the *provinciae* while he consolidated his power.⁸⁸⁸ Given Tiberius' later statement that Lucilius Capito, as procurator in Asia, was restricted to operating in imperial domains, it seems clear that this was an informal development based on networks and implication than a statutorily defined capacity of the office.⁸⁸⁹ In any case, Ofilius' decision, authorised by Augustus before offered to Norbanus for approval

⁸⁸⁶ SEG 61.1134.9-11.

⁸⁸⁷ SEG 61.1134.12. Compare TLG s.v. διάταξις. Note, however, IGR 4.1188 and OGIS 484.36-37, referring to local documents and regulations.

⁸⁸⁸ Wörrle 2011, 367-371.

⁸⁸⁹ See discussion pp.140-142 *supra*.

demonstrates ongoing evolution in hierarchies and discourse. While his letter was published at Aezani, it stresses, in practice, the proconsul's excision from the decision-making process: Norbanus acts only to lend his approval to a *fait accompli*. By contrast, the text emphasises his own agency so far as possible. Nevertheless, this gloss cannot but reinforce the critical role played by both procurator and Princeps in deciding the fate of the civic reform. This represents a highly visible direct action by the Princeps in a small *polis* in rural Phrygia. Augustus' rise to clear supremacy had not only fundamentally altered the shape of the central Roman constitution, but also had a commensurate impact on the lived experience of Roman rule and the emissions of the Roman state in a provincial setting.

The Chian letter of an Augustan proconsul provokes further reflection on the shifting and coalescing imperial discourse under the early Principate. The text revolves around a dispute which had impinged upon the ἐλευθερία of the island, originally awarded by Sulla and confirmed *ex senatusconsulto* in 80, providing an overview of the decision-making progress, discussed *supra*.⁸⁹⁰ Crucially, here, the governor states clearly that he has settled upon his own method for judging disputes: the emphasis placed on κατακλουθῶν τῇ καθολικῇ μου ('following my general procedure') is particularly striking. First, he has recourse to precedent in the form of his predecessor's decisions.⁸⁹¹ Later, further evidence was adduced in the form of a δόγματος συνκλήτου ἀντισφράγισμα ('sealed copy of a *senatusconsultum*') of 80 and a letter of Augustus from 26.⁸⁹² While the text becomes lacunose,

⁸⁹⁰ App. *Mith.* 61; RDGE 70.15-18.

⁸⁹¹ RDGE 70.2-4. Marshall 1969, 257.

⁸⁹² RDGE 70.10-13. On the word ἀντισφράγισμα, Bitner 2014, 662.

this commander chooses not to obviously privilege the opinion of Augustus ahead of other institutions: the decisions of his predecessors and *senatusconsulta*.⁸⁹³ Strictly, in this case, the point is moot: the documents appear to have agreed substantially, but the distinctive framing of this letter stands in contrast to other Augustan era *edicta* and letters. Finally, the Chians here understood and engaged directly with Roman ideology, submitting for consideration documents which would appeal to the sense of Roman legal propriety and respect for precedent, a point explored in more detail in chapter 3.⁸⁹⁴

By contrast with earlier periods, during the early Principate there is a dearth of popular *leges* in Asia. While never common, this plausibly was based in changes in the constitutional make-up of the *res publica*. The pre-eminence of Augustus, first as consul, then simply as *princeps* altered the balance between the various elements of Roman government. While consuls and tribunes of the *plebs* retained the formal right to promulgate *leges*, the Senate offered a forum within which the Princeps could act and be seen to act in a consultative and respectful fashion.⁸⁹⁵ This period likely saw a decline in the number of *leges* issued in line with this new constitutional reality. At some point in the Imperial period, *senatusconsulta* acquired the force of a *lex*, further reducing the efficacy and necessity of these instruments.⁸⁹⁶ The record attests to several consular and Princeps driven *leges* in the

⁸⁹³ Dalla Rosa 2014, 119-121.

⁸⁹⁴ Bitner 2014, 662-664.

⁸⁹⁵ RGDA 6.2. Rowe 2002, 49-50.

⁸⁹⁶ Talbert (1984, 431-435) for the fullest discussion, with a tabulated list of all evidence following (435-458). The jurists imply that *senatusconsulta* had acquired the force of law without a formal measure investing them with legal authority (e.g. Gai. *Inst.* 1.4. Cf. Ulp. *Dig.* 1.3.9; Pomp. *Dig.* 1.2.12). Crifò (1968, 55-104) and Nicolet (1978, 373-384) have highlighted that even under the Republic some senatorial decisions had acquired normative force; however, the *populus* retained a role as late as the 20s CE confirming *senatusconsulta* (37.TS.B.2.27-31; Rowe 2002, 6). Talbert therefore stressed the presence and

Augustan period, however, these primarily dealt with issues of relevance to society at large, as, for example, the *lex Papia Poppaea* of 9 CE.⁸⁹⁷ Even under the Republic, *leges* containing explicit publication clauses seem to be limited. The *lex de provinciis praetoriis* remains unique in its insistence on own dissemination. Similarly, the bronze tablet containing the *lex Antonia de Termessibus* was found in Rome. Even if a local physical copy existed, nothing in the text implies that this should be inscribed on stone.⁸⁹⁸ Consequently, in light of the declining number of these *leges*, their limited relevance to the Asian *poleis*, and the general absence of instructions requiring their monumentalisation, the absence of *exempla* is unsurprising.

Another important aspect in the development of Roman power in Asia is the physical presence of the Princeps or official representatives in the region. Significantly, the number of visits declined sharply as the new system became more established. Immediately after Actium, Octavian visited *provincia Asia* on three occasions: crossing to the province in late 31; visiting Italy for a brief period before returning in early 30; and wintering in the province after the final defeat of Antonius and Cleopatra in 30/29.⁸⁹⁹ Agrippa held proconsular *imperium* in the provinces east of the Adriatic from 23/22, and wintered at Mytilene.⁹⁰⁰ Augustus too, visited the *provincia* personally in 21/20 and returned in 20/19.⁹⁰¹ According to Dio, despite the presence of a proconsul, the Princeps had no qualms about interfering,

involvement of the Princeps as crucial to the acceptance of senatorial pronouncements as legally binding.

⁸⁹⁷ E.g. Matthews 2006, 484-485.

⁸⁹⁸ RS 19.

⁸⁹⁹ CD. 51.4-5, 18.

⁹⁰⁰ See Joseph. *AJ.* 15.350: πέμπεται δὲ Ἀγρίππας τῶν πέραν Ἰονίου διάδοχος Καίσαρι ('Agrippa was sent as the representative of Caesar for the places beyond the Ionian Sea'); Suet. *Aug.* 66.3; Vell. 2.93.2.

⁹⁰¹ Kirbihler 2012, 126, with references.

up to and including removing the freedom of Cyzicus.⁹⁰² He spent the winter at Samos before returning to Rome, via Athens, and this contributed to his decision to award the island freedom.⁹⁰³ From 17-13, Agrippa again exercised power in the east. After his death in 12, however, the communities of Asia did not see a member of the imperial family with official status until a flying visit by Gaius Caesar in 1, en route to Syria and Armenia.⁹⁰⁴ After this, the next official visit was by Germanicus two decades later, again, as a stopping point on the way to Syria at the end of the period of this study.⁹⁰⁵

These visits move beyond the verbal and textual elements of ideological construction, but their impact was significant. Though the evidence for actions undertaken during these visits is limited, it seems clear that communities took advantage of the presence of high-ranking members of the burgeoning imperial court to petition them, successfully or otherwise.⁹⁰⁶ This diverges slightly from the more typical reorganisation narrative which emerges from Octavian's initial success. Following the pattern established by Sulla, Caesar and Antonius, the victor made several decisions regarding the status of local rulers and communities, alternately rewarding and punishing on the basis of their past behaviour.⁹⁰⁷ No positive evidence indicates that Octavian summoned representatives to a single location, as Sulla (Ephesus, 85), Caesar (Ephesus, 48; Tarsus, 46) and Antonius (Ephesus, 41) all chose

⁹⁰² CD. 54.7.4-6. Magie 1950, 474.

⁹⁰³ CD. 54.9.7-10.

⁹⁰⁴ Suet. *Tib.* 11.2; CD. 55.10.18-19. Tiberius' retirement to Rhodes does not meet my criteria, as he had no official status (Suet. *Tib.* 12.1; Vell. Pat. 2.99.1-4).

⁹⁰⁵ Tac. *Ann.* 2.54-55.

⁹⁰⁶ Edmondson 2014, 146-147.

⁹⁰⁷ CD. 54.1.

to do, though it cannot be ruled out. This absence is intriguing, but ultimately highlights the problems with drawing conclusions from a limited basis of the surviving material.

Finally, Augustus' response to the Samian request for ἐλευθερία reinforces the changing discourse of empire. In emphasising the unique status of Aphrodisias, Augustus' use of the first person is not coincidental, if misleading. As noted, the Aphrodisian archive includes the *senatusconsultum* granting ἐλευθερία to their community, which drew on a recommendation by both Octavian and Antonius.⁹⁰⁸ Though dating this response after Actium provides a strong motive for this framing, other examples from this dossier emphasise that such personalising discourse was already a feature of official correspondence. More importantly, from an ideological perspective, Augustus explicitly affirms a principle of reciprocity governing his decisions on matters of civic privilege, albeit rooted in a distinctively Roman framework: οὐ γάρ ἐστιν δίκαιον τὸ πάντων μέγιστον φιλάνθρωπον εἰκῇ καὶ χωρὶς αἰτίας χαρίζεσθαι ('for it is not right to grant the greatest privilege of all at random and without cause').⁹⁰⁹ Freedom, including immunity from Roman taxation and removal from the *formula provincia*, cannot be taken for granted, but required commensurate displays of loyalty (*fides*).⁹¹⁰ The specific framing of the sack of Aphrodisias by Labienus as ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τὰ ἐμὰ φρονήσας δοριάλωτος διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς εὖνοιαν ('taking my side in the war, on account of goodwill towards us, [the city] was captured by storm') personalised the experience of empire.⁹¹¹ In Augustus' contentious narrative, for the

⁹⁰⁸ *IAPH2007* 8.32.2-3. Contrast 8.25.26.

⁹⁰⁹ *IAPH2007* 8.32.4.

⁹¹⁰ Chaniotis 2015, 89-90.

⁹¹¹ *IAPH2007* 8.32.3.

consumption of the Samians at least, Aphrodisias was not rewarded for its suffering in service to Rome, but to him alone. The cue provided by this letter is unmissable. Even Livia's support was insufficient to ensure imperial benefaction. The public expression of loyalty through action must precede Augustus' euergetism. The Princeps, through his correspondence, established a new framework for the Samians, and other communities, to relate to the state; one based on personal loyalty in return for civic privileges.

Overall, Augustus' new position as the *de facto* head of the *res publica* inaugurated a new phase in the dialogue between the Roman state and provincial communities. Though the organs of the Republican state, the Senate, People and magistrates, continued to exist and operate, the presence of an unambiguous authority provided a focal point for petitions, embassies and requests.⁹¹² The formation of new policy-making institutions around the Princeps allowed a greater consistency of language, policy and action to develop. This marked the definitive commencement of a new type of dialogue, between Augustus, representing the Roman state, and communities, seeking redress or favour, in line with Millar's 'petition-response' model.

2.6: Conclusions

This chapter has investigated the role played by official Roman communiqués in formulating and supporting a discourse of provincial administration. The advent of Roman rule disrupted existing modes of interaction between *poleis* and their rulers, but the creation

⁹¹² Note the Principes' capacity for direct action and to pressure the Senate or instruct governors. Edmondson 2014, 131-137; Ando (Forthcoming).

of new frameworks was neither simple nor co-ordinated. At the fundamental level the structural differences between the Roman Republic and the Attalid monarchy had a profound effect. In place of a single perceived locus of legitimate normative documents, the *basileus* and his subordinates, the *respublica* dispersed power and authority through different state institutions; the Senate, *comitia* and magistrates. The impracticalities of co-ordinating policy and, especially, language across these institutions ensured that an emergent Roman discourse of power was slow to coalesce. A personal relationship based on reciprocity, such as that between *polis* and *basileus*, was impossible in the Republican system – but the new ‘rules of the game’ had not been compiled. Crucially, the *respublica* itself was caught in the throes of its own evolution during this period, further complicating the task of the Asian *poleis*.

Before the First Mithridatic War, the evidence shows a wide range of administrative topics raised by representatives of the Roman state with communities. Largely, these reacted to events on the ground or a request by a free community, though this varied by genre. The small group of magistrate’s letters privatised their relationships within the *provincia*, even where highlighting their engagement with other arms of government. By contrast, *senatusconsulta* were literally administrative documents of the state – instructions for magistrates, not part of a conversation with civic communities. The *lex de provinciis praetoriis* while reflecting its author’s intentions to communicate their text to the *poleis*, was the product of a smaller group of drafters and, again, couched as information and instruction, not dialogue. This diversity, of language, genre and state control hindered *poleis*

from understanding and engaging productively with the inchoate discourse of Roman power.

The radical transformation prompted by Sulla's reorganisation of Asia had a significant impact on the official communication between the state and local communities. The evidence reveals greater interconnectedness between different genres, with extant *leges*, *senatusconsulta* and magistrates's decisions consciously interacting to create a complex composite of legitimacy and authority. This flexible deployment of Republican institutions shows, from a Roman perspective, the system working – the Senate, People and magistrates operating collectively to authorise specific outcomes. However, from a civic perspective, such diversity continued to create problems of interpretation.

Caesar's dictatorship and the Triumviral period witnessed the continued personalisation of legitimate authority: though the Senate and People continued to issue administrative documents, increasingly, the surviving evidence takes the form of *edicta* and letters. The experimental nature of triumviral rule saw innovations in practice, and the singular example of Octavian shows that consistency and reproducibility was not the natural result of an increasingly circumscribed group of authors. However, as the Principate became consolidated, Augustus came to be viewed as the unambiguous, ultimate source of authoritative rulings. The relative institutional stability provided by Augustus' reign and the increasing concentration of legitimate authority in his person created conditions in which imperial discourse became coherent and *poleis* had the time to learn a new language of engagement. The strategies employed by them across the period are the subject of Chapter 3.

3. The Cities of Western Asia Minor and Rome: Local Responses to Roman Power

3.1: Dialogues between Rome and the *poleis* of Asia

The preceding chapter has shown how, after the Roman Republic came to rule the former Attalid kingdom, the existing means for communities to relate to the imperial authority broke down, in part due to the heterarchy of Republican institutions. This chapter asks how local communities approached this problem, attempting new strategies to accommodate and mould Roman power to their own advantage. My primary focus is on the public utterances of the *poleis* of Asia, their public actions, and undertakings of citizens on their behalf.⁹¹³ The questions posed in this chapter are how Roman discourse was received, interpreted and responded to by the *poleis* of Asia and how a new dialogue emerged amid the political vicissitudes of the first century.

As shown in Chapter 1, Roman administration in Asia was a delicate balancing act, creating the institutions necessary to maintain hegemony over the region, while extracting resources to support its power and dissuading the locals from revolting. Like most empires, its rule was predicated on the existence and exploitation of difference – fundamentally, in this period, that between Roman citizens and *socii*.⁹¹⁴ However, the practicalities of

⁹¹³ This limits the scope to civic decrees (utterances); creation of new buildings, statues, involvement in conflict (actions); citizens influencing individual Romans or the Senate, whether despatched as an embassy, or through their own initiative (e.g. Theophanes of Mytilene).

⁹¹⁴ Crooks & Parsons 2016, 5-8. Ando (2016, esp. 22-25) on the *constitutio Antoniniana*'s (212 CE) implications for imperial ideology and administration.

provincial government, including the tyranny of distance and the relatively small numbers of officials present at any given moment ensured that the implementation, operation and evolution of institutions was contested and negotiated with local elites. Throughout the first century, an inherent tension between central control over the means of coercion, persuasion and production, as exercised through institutions, the agency of local power-brokers – mostly local elites, increasingly individuals and, from Augustan period, those with citizenship – and the role of central administrators on the ground affected the nature of Roman rule.

As established in Chapter 2, Roman institutions and officials issued normative documents to communities on a regular basis throughout the period. However, beyond the question of whether a consistent language of administration existed lie the issues of interpretation and audience. As Hall has argued, the communication of ideas is subject to distortion through the twin lenses of the social assumptions of the communicator and recipient at moments of ‘encoding’ and ‘decoding’. Where communiqués are directed at mass audiences, this problem is magnified, producing potentially myriad readings of a single message.⁹¹⁵ These responses can be grouped into three broad categories: ‘hegemonic’, which generally accept the dominant discourse of the communicator; ‘negotiated’, which contest certain assumptions; and ‘oppositional’, which interpret the text within a new, subversive framework. Simply, the message can be reinterpreted by its recipients in creative ways which inform their response. In *provincia Asia*, communities could respond to Roman

⁹¹⁵ Hall 1980, 128-138 and pp.15-16 *supra*.

missives in several ways – some text-based, others action-based. I suggest that Asian *poleis* used all three frameworks to protect and improve their own positions and this had a significant impact on the development of Roman administration in Asia.

This chapter addresses three separate strategies of engagement employed by communities approaching Roman imperial discourse between 133 BCE and c. 20 CE. First, direct communication with Roman institutions and representatives through civic decrees, both honorific and constitutive. This represents the most direct continuation of existing practices, notwithstanding the change in interlocutor and new, culturally distinctive modes of communicating power. This strategy overlaps with the second, the employment of ambassadors to communicate with the Roman state, its representatives and other powerbrokers. During the Hellenistic period, they operated in concert. As Ma highlighted, the dialogue between civic decrees and royal letters was conducted through embassies. However, under Roman rule, embassies to Rome itself or approaches to Roman magistrates in the region were increasingly divorced from the process of handing on civic decrees. The nature of the exchange was fundamentally different. Consequently, I treat the two phenomena under separate headings. The third strategy involves the dissemination, publication and use of Roman normative documents in local contexts. While Ando proposed a high degree of central intentionality, that is, he sees the publication of documents in Asia as consistent and centrally directed, the evidence points to a more complex picture.⁹¹⁶ Local considerations explain most decisions to publish perfectly well. In turn, this raises

⁹¹⁶ E.g. Ando 2000, 81-94; (Forthcoming). Contrast, Kokkinia 2009, 196-209; Cooley 2012, 159-179.

interesting questions concerning the aims of the communities and the outcomes of their choices. Finally, I draw these threads together to explore how *poleis* managed to assert agency in their interactions with Roman institutions and imperial discourse as the system of provincial rule became more concrete.

3.2: ‘The Politics of Honour’: Civic Decrees between Rome and Asian *poleis*

Civic decrees, decisions of the political institutions of a *polis*, most directly articulate the voice of a civic community. Though varying in language and initiating bodies, decrees of the late Hellenistic and Roman period tended to follow a standard format. Generally, this began with preamble including a dating formula and an expression of the responsible body or bodies, sometimes naming the proposing officials. After this, the decree opened with a motivation clause, introduced by ἐπεὶ or ἐπειδὴ, giving the reasons behind the decision. Occasionally, a hortative clause followed, describing the intent of the decree in broad terms, introduced by ὅπως or ἵνα. Finally, the impersonal ἔδοξε or δεδόχθαι presented the resolutions themselves.⁹¹⁷ Though these texts purport to offer a bald statement of the will of the community, as finished products they elided disagreement and debate in the process.⁹¹⁸ Most often, the voice preserved was not the product of negotiation within the assembly but one which had been referred *en bloc* from the *boule*.⁹¹⁹ We cannot assume that

⁹¹⁷ The framing and terminology are Ma’s (1999, 183-184); this structure persisted into the imperial period: Zuiderhoek 2008, 418-419.

⁹¹⁸ Rhodes & Lewis 1997, 511; Zuiderhoek 2008, 422-423; Chaniotis 2013, 747-748.

⁹¹⁹ Rhodes & Lewis 1997, 475-497; Fernoux 2011, 223-226

the decree, as recorded, represented a voice beyond one which commanded the support of a majority of attendees at the moment of passage.⁹²⁰

However, were decrees primarily directed at an internal or external audience, and to how wide a group? As noted, honorific civic decrees and Seleucid royal letters formed a coherent dialogue and extensive evidence shows the importance of physical copies in this process.⁹²¹ The letter of Q. Oppius to Aphrodisias, discussed *supra*, follows exactly this model, despite the complexity of Roman administration.⁹²² However, the overwhelming majority of the texts in our surviving corpus were inscribed in public contexts within civic communities, prioritising local audiences and bringing these honorific acts into the local memory. The extent to which this affected the *poleis* of Asia warrants exploration.

3.2.1: Non-honorific civic decrees and Rome

Non-honorific decrees complicate this picture. While having authority within their community of origin, they had no legitimacy beyond its territory.⁹²³ These appear targeted at the citizens of the originating *polis* but, even here, the limits of the imagined audience are not clear-cut. Decisions enacted by a community determined the nature of its relationship with Rome and some evidence suggests that drafters of certain decrees envisaged a Roman audience. By contrast, honorific decrees had multiple audiences, including those within the

⁹²⁰ E.g. Livy's account (32.22), based on Polybius, of the divisions in the Achaean assembly in 198, with the delegates from Argos, Dyme and Megalopolis leaving the meeting. Compare Cicero *Flacc.* 16-17.

⁹²¹ Ma 1999, 201-202. Note also this pattern under the High Empire: Men. Rhet. 2.12.4, with Blanco-Pérez 2019, 41.

⁹²² *IAph2007* 8.2.b.1.2-12.

⁹²³ Compare Low (2007, 87) emphasising how local practice affected neighbouring communities.

civic space and the honorand themselves. Public recognition of an individual's worth to and within the *polis* community had significant implications. While the positive judgement of the *demos* and/or *boule* offered recipients political and social capital, its acceptance and, increasingly, permanent inscription reasserted the primacy of civic institutions as the gatekeepers of honour. At least initially, most recipients were local citizens; minor benefactors, who remained members of the *demos* and were contained within it, even if tension inevitably existed between social competitiveness and the communitarian ethos of the *polis*.⁹²⁴ This dialectic also proved a useful mechanism for wrangling with powerful, external figures – namely Hellenistic rulers and Romans. Ma's description of the relationship between Antiochus III and the *poleis* of Asia, discussed in the introduction, presents a robust paradigm for the former.⁹²⁵ Traditional Roman notions of aristocratic honour tended to be more personally and less publicly constructed. However, amid the competitive environment of the late Republican political elite, individuals did not shirk the opportunity presented by the civic honorific practice. As Roman power became increasingly concentrated and the institutions of the Principate coalesced, the civic decree became an integral part of the imperial system. The 'politics of honour', as the title of recent volume puts it, were integral to local strategies for co-opting Roman assistance and goodwill.⁹²⁶

⁹²⁴ Veyne's (1976) argument that the expansion and physical commemoration of honours increasingly pushed *poleis* into oligarchy from the fourth century was comprehensively challenged by Gauthier (2011 [1984], 315-340) proposing a date in the second century. Ma's position (2013, 49-55 70-75) that civic institutions retained a remarkable degree of control over the nature of the award into the imperial period has significant merit.

⁹²⁵ Ma 1999, 179-242. See now Heller & van Nijf (2017, 1-8) generally and Chin (2018, 121-137) on Attalus III.

⁹²⁶ Heller & van Nijf 2017, 10-13.

Non-honorific civic decrees from the Republican period are scarce, echoing the broader pattern of the Hellenistic period. This implies that, generally, communities and citizens prioritised memorialising individual contributions to the community over their own collective speech-acts. However, a few crucial examples emphasise the extent to which this could shape a relationship with Rome at the local level. First, a decree found near Eleaea, dating to immediately after the Aristonican War, highlights the speed with which overtly pro-Roman sentiments seeped into public pronouncements. It arranges for the public display of a treaty concluded by the *polis* and Rome. After the preliminaries, the ἐπεὶ-clause opens by claiming that the community had always maintained εὖνοια towards the Romans.⁹²⁷ This consciously evokes the language of Hellenistic *basileus-polis* interaction, though it is unclear whether the decree was intended for a specific Roman audience. The text makes clear that several copies were to be inscribed, two on bronze tablets, and two on marble stelai which would hold them, to be placed in two prominent locations: in the temple of Demeter and in the *bouleuterion*, next to the statue of Democracy. However, that a copy would be sent to a Roman representative or the Senate is not implied. The language and monumentalisation of the decree primarily affected a local audience, though this does not exclude occasional Roman readers.

More overtly, an especially emphatic decree, dating to the early part of the First Mithridatic War, comes from the theatre at Aphrodisias.⁹²⁸ The community had received

⁹²⁷ Syll.³ 694.11-12. Compare *I.Amyzon* 15.9-10, 19.5; *I.Carie* 166.1-3.

⁹²⁸ Though inscribed in the third century CE. Kokkinia 2015-2016, 37-38 *contra* Reynolds 1982, 16, 18, 24.

word from the proconsul, Q. Oppius, that he was besieged at Laodicea-on-the-Lycus and the *demos* resolved to send military assistance. Ambassadors were appointed to inform Oppius of the city's policy towards the Romans and to receive his instructions.⁹²⁹ In context, the text's strong emotional language was directed primarily at the Roman commander.⁹³⁰ The decree evokes the common formulation of the Romans as σωτῆρας καὶ εὐεργέτας ('saviours and benefactors'), though in this case, the claim is restricted to Plarasa-Aphrodisias itself. The decree closes with the claim that:

πᾶς ὁ δῆμος ἡμῶν σὺν γυναιξὶ | καὶ τέκνοις καὶ τῷ παντὶ βίῳ ἔτ<οῖ>μος
 παραβάλλεσθαι ὑπὲρ | Κοῖντου καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων πραγμάτων καὶ ὅτι χωρὶς τῆς
 | Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίας οὐδὲ ζῆν προαιρούμεθα ('our whole *demos*, together with
 our wives and children and all our property, is ready (?) to risk all for Quintus
 and the Roman cause; and that without the hegemony of the Romans we do not
 choose even to live').⁹³¹

This clause, significantly, emphasises the strength of the Aphrodisian attachment to Rome and to Oppius personally. It should be stressed that Oppius became patron to Plarasa-Aphrodisias in the aftermath, so this text may have shaped his attitude towards the city. The assertion that life was less important than Roman hegemony presents an intensity difficult to reconcile with attitudes preserved in other material. Nevertheless, Chaniotis has stressed the extent to which emotional display can explain or legitimate action and, in this instance,

⁹²⁹ *IAph2007* 8.3.

⁹³⁰ Chaniotis 2013, 748; 2014, 153-158; 2015, 87-103

⁹³¹ *IAph2007* 8.3.b.2.11-14.

we might detect a zeal compensating for the difficult debate which the request for aid provoked.⁹³²

The extent to which civic decrees were inward- or outward-facing is debatable, though some examples *prima facie* sought dialogue with a Roman audience. In late 86 or early 85, the Ephesian *demos* declared war on Mithridates VI of Pontus. A single marble stele, broken at the top and bottom, preserves the conclusion of one decree and beginning of another passed by the *demos* at the critical moment. The second deals with the practical consequences of the decision to oppose Mithridates. The language of unanimity is invoked in the motivation clause: ἐπεὶ τῶν μεγίστων κινδύνων ἐπαγομένων ... τὴν τε πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν, ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστι πάντας ὁμονοήσαντας ὑ[πο]στῆναι τὸν κίνδυνον ('since the greatest dangers have befallen ... the city and its territory, it is necessary for all with one voice to bring an end to the danger').⁹³³ Moreover, the city offered citizenship to those inhabitants, ἰσοτελεῖς, πάροικοι, sacred slaves, freedmen and foreigners, who took up arms in defence of the *polis*.⁹³⁴ Ephesus' decision had a significant impact on the practice of politics and the social make-up of the city, emphasising the fragility of the community's position at this juncture.

The first decree provides an Ephesian-centric account of the First Mithridatic War. In 88, as Roman opposition to Mithridates dissolved, the city offered no resistance and participated willingly in the 'Asian Vespers' later that year.⁹³⁵ Strikingly, the text stresses

⁹³² Chaniotis 2013, 745-755.

⁹³³ *I.Eph.* 8.22-24.

⁹³⁴ *I.Eph.* 8.43-47. On the social implications: Herz 2001, 185-207.

⁹³⁵ *App. Mith.* 23.

the preservation of εὔνοια towards the Romans and frames the (current) declaration of war against Mithridates as an opportunity, subtextually the earliest, to provide active aid to Rome. The narrative boldly refashions Ephesus' involvement in the conflict.

[ἐπειδὴ, τοῦ δήμου | φυλάσσον]τος τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους τοὺς κο[ινοὺς σωτῆρας πα|λαιὰν εὔνοιαν καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐπιτασσομέ[νοις προθύμως | πειθαρχ]οῦντος, Μιθραδάτης Καππαδοκί[ας βασιλεύς παρα]βὰς τὰς π]ρὸς Ῥωμαίους συνθήκας καὶ συναγαγὼν τὰς δυνάμεις ἐ[πεχείρη]σεν κύριος γενέσθαι τῆς μηθὲν ἑαυτῷ προ[σηκούσης | χώρα]ς, καὶ προκαταλαβόμενος τὰς προκειμένας ἡμῶν πό[λεις ἀ]πάτ]η, ἐκράτησεν καὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας πόλεως καταπληξάμενος | [τῷ] τε πλήθει τῶν δυνάμεων καὶ τῷ ἀπροδοκῆτῳ τῆς ἐπιβολῆς, | [ὁ] δὲ δῆμος ἡμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς συνφυλάσσων τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαί[ο]υς εὔνοιαν, ἐσχηκὼς καιρὸν πρὸς τὸ βοηθεῖν τοῖς κοινοῖς πράγμα|σιν, κέκρικεν ἀναδεῖξαι τὸν πρὸς Μιθραδάτην πόλεμον ὑπὲρ | τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίας καὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἐλευθερίας, ὁμο|θυμαδὸν πάντων τῶν πολιτῶν ἐπιδεδωκότων ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τοῦ[ς | π]ερὶ τούτων ἀγῶνας ('[Since the *demos*, preserving] the [ancient] goodwill towards the Romans, [common saviours], and in all matters [willingly] obedient to commands issued, when Mithridates, [*basileus*] of Cappadocia, [violating] the treaty with the Romans and gathering [his forces, made an attack] to become master over [lands] that did not [belong to him] and, after taking the [cities] before us [by deceit], he conquered our city, through the vastness of his forces and the suddenness of his attack; and our *demos*, preserving from the beginning goodwill towards the Romans, having the opportunity to help in common action, decided to declare war against Mithridates on behalf of the hegemony of the Romans and common freedom; all the citizens with one voice giving themselves over to the struggle for this end').⁹³⁶

This document highlights several intriguing elements of civic self-representation vis-à-vis the Roman administration. Though an independent actor, the Ephesians frame their

⁹³⁶ *I.Eph.* 8.1-14.

polis as being tied by bonds of utter loyalty to Rome.⁹³⁷ The Ephesians assert their continuous loyalty by framing their capitulation as the seizure of a defenceless city. Emphasising the injustice of Mithridates' designs on the Roman *provincia*, though leaving ambiguous the territorial rights of Rome, the decree dwells on the vast size of the *basileus*' forces and the suddenness of his appearance. Crucially, the authors carefully explain that the *polis* was always obedient ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐπιτασσομέ[νοις] ('in all things to the orders given [sc. by Roman magistrates]'). The declaration of war on Mithridates, the ostensible purpose of the decree, is de-emphasised in the extant text by the intense focus on crafting a narrative of loyalty to Rome. While rewriting history to shape civic memory provides one motive, a more immediate goal would be publicising the *polis*' enduring support for their hegemon. As Chaniotis stressed, this decree contained no specific measures. Its sole function was to present a new narrative for the *polis* community and, Kallet-Marx has suggested, possibly Roman commanders or the institutions of the *res publica*.⁹³⁸ If the Ephesians did aim to assuage Roman irritation at their late defection, they were ultimately unsuccessful. Like most Greek *poleis* in Asia, they appear to have lost their freedom during Sulla's reorganisation of Asia and were explicitly subordinated to the Roman administrative framework.⁹³⁹

These limited examples exhibit some consistency in their Rome-centric approach. The Aphrodisian and Ephesian declarations prioritise their close bond with and respect for

⁹³⁷ Compare *I Aph2007* 8.3.b.11-14.

⁹³⁸ Kallet-Marx 1995, 284-285; Chaniotis 2013, 749-750; 2014, 152-153; cf. Kirbihler 2016, 64-68. On civic memory: Jones 2001, 11-18; Ma 2013, 7-10; Chaniotis 2014, 132-161.

⁹³⁹ Magie 1950, 234-235; Guerber 1995, 388-409; Kallet-Marx 1995, 265; Kirbihler 2016, 64.

the Romans as hegemons, disingenuously or not. Why Rome-centric decrees predominate and why these examples all pre-date Sulla's reorganisation of Asia loom as important questions. It may be that our limited evidence preserves an unrepresentative sample. However, the documents' tone suggests that they played an important and conscious role in shaping civic memory.

3.2.2: Honorific Decrees and Roman Magistrates

Throughout the late Republic and early Principate, *poleis* passed honorific decrees and erected public statues for Romans, co-opting the official representatives of the hegemonic power into their existing networks of honour. However, for the most part, our evidence derives from statue-bases, which provide a truncated summary of the interaction between community and individual. The standard formula, ὁ δῆμος τὸν δεῖνον τοῦ δεῖνου ἀρέτης ἔνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας (ἐτίμησεν) ('The *demos* (honoured) X son of Y, on account of his excellence and goodwill'), tend to elide differences between the actions of individual honorands.⁹⁴⁰ By contrast, monuments for local benefactors more often preserve the full honorific decree with several motivation clauses, followed by the hortative clause and resolution, even where a statue was the result.⁹⁴¹ Understandably, the *poleis* of Asia placed a lower priority on commemorating, in precise and detailed terms, benefactions of external actors vis-à-vis

⁹⁴⁰ Ma (2013, 45-63) demonstrates that even this bland formulation reveals something of civic agency. Compare Frija 2014, 86-90; 2017a, 272-273.

⁹⁴¹ Thereby presenting a full civic-orientated account of an individual's career and encouraging its integration into local memory and history. E.g. the Claros decrees for Menippus and Polemaeus (*SEG* 39.1243-1244). Santangelo 2009, 68-73.

their own citizens. Frija argues that the absence of motivation clauses from monuments for Roman benefactors, and the reduced size of the honorific vocabulary employed, afforded *poleis* flexibility in dealing with officials. The vague moral qualities invoked allowed them to honour a typical Roman commander simply for his administrative competence, or, in a pinch, his presence. In her view, these changes mark the introduction of basic honours for Roman commanders linked to their administrative position.⁹⁴² However, though we lack examples of full decrees for Romans in this period, the similarity between the predominant statue base inscriptions for officials and typical civic benefactors suggests that such longer documents routinely existed, even if they were not monumentalised.⁹⁴³

In either case, this process echoes the spirit of the earlier dialogue between *basileus* and *polis*.⁹⁴⁴ Critically, however, unlike their Hellenistic forebears or Imperial successors, Republican commanders directly competed with one another for prestige in the form of political success at Rome. A magistrate's reputation within his *provincia* could have a significant impact on their subsequent career. Without claiming that the threat of *repetundae* charges successfully restrained rapacious governors, honorific decrees promoted a rapport between community and honorand, making later prosecution less likely. Furthermore, local honorific decrees could be adduced by a defendant as evidence that the prosecution was promoted by individual malcontents, rather than the *polis* writ large.⁹⁴⁵

⁹⁴² Frija 2014, 81-90.

⁹⁴³ See Ma's astute observation (2013, 55-62) that statues necessarily were grounded in the context provided by the awarding decree.

⁹⁴⁴ See esp. Ma 1999, 194-235.

⁹⁴⁵ Esp. Cic. (*Flacc.* 10-11, 17-19, 34-38, 42, 45, 52-54, 5) and Tac. (*Ann.* 15.20) on Claudius Timarchus. Compare Laignoux (2017, 214-218), analysing this phenomenon in triumphal Asia.

Governors had a direct interest in soliciting honours. In turn, pressure from magistrates, combined with the increasing personalisation of influence through the spread of patronage, promoted innovation in the honorific system. Governors could pressure communities indirectly, through their presence, absence, responsiveness to their petitions, or directly, through the use and abuse of their power. However, crucial to generating this climate of innovation was the competition between cities to establish and maintain meaningful relationships with governors. Levers available to *poleis* were limited to direct gifts, technically prohibited, or honorific decrees.⁹⁴⁶ Given the logical proliferation of the latter, the question of how to approach governors posed itself to the communities and they responded with a variety of strategies.

The corpus of honorific inscriptions relating to Roman officials or their family members originating from *poleis* in *provincia Asia* between 133 BCE and 20 CE amounts to 130 texts relating to 64 individual officials, with an increasing number of inscriptions, though not honorands, under the Augustan regime. While most Romans honoured by Asian communities were promagisterial commanders, several *legati* and *quaestores* also received statues. During the Republican period, governors and their immediate family are attested as receiving honours on 27 occasions, *quaestores* on 16 occasions and *legati* on 15 occasions.⁹⁴⁷ In subsequent decades the ratio of gubernatorial to other recipients increases substantially. For the Augustan period, a survey suggests 43 governors, one potential *legatus* and only five

⁹⁴⁶ Bérenger 2011, 174. E.g. Cic. Att. 5.21.11.

⁹⁴⁷ Evidence for this section is collected in Table 3, displayed at the end of this chapter. Compare Erkelenz 2003, 52-53.

honorific decrees for *quaestores*. The reduced roles for *legati* and provincial *quaestores* under the Augustan regime explains this evolution: the fact that neither could serve as replacement governor reduced the opportunities available to become useful to *poleis*.⁹⁴⁸ The overwhelming majority of these inscriptions originated with the *demos*, though there are five examples of the *boule* being involved in the process and five of wider communities.⁹⁴⁹ This reiterates the extent to which civic assemblies retained some control over the award, and the dialogue around, honour during this period.

Honours for family members make up a quarter of the dossier (35/130) underscoring their importance as a conduit for *poleis* to exploit.⁹⁵⁰ Communities thereby expanded the opportunities available to them: it provided a means to increase the visual and spatial impact of honours for a given governor, without having multiple statues for the same person. The variance between individual communities is striking. Magnesia-on-the-Maeander honoured family members alongside all three gubernatorial honorands; relatives were associated with all Republican commanders memorialised at Cos and 50% of Romans praised at Pergamum and Samos.⁹⁵¹ Outside these communities, the phenomenon was more limited. Though the prevailing view holds that female family members did not accompany their male relatives to the *provincia*, comparative evidence would suggest caution is

⁹⁴⁸ Erkelenz (2003, 52-55), though he believes that the extant record for governors in the Republican period is artificially low. On *legati* and *quaestores* as interim Republican governors, see Cic. Att. 6.4.1, 5.3, 6.3-4; Fam. 2.15.4, 18.2-3. Thompson 1965, 375-376

⁹⁴⁹ See *infra*.

⁹⁵⁰ This includes individual and larger family monuments like Milet 6.3.1123 (on which, Kuhn 2015, 189-192).

⁹⁵¹ At Pergamon, 8 of 16; at Samos 2 of 4.

warranted.⁹⁵² Hellenistic queens, for example, generally had real, if limited, agency to act beneficently in their own right, while the well-known example of Archippe at Cyme shows that local women could be honoured as benefactors.⁹⁵³ By contrast, under the Julio-Claudian dynasty, the growing dynastic role of imperial women facilitated a rapid increase in the number of their statues, a phenomenon which cannot explain Republican developments.⁹⁵⁴ Overall, the assembled material presents a diverse range of civic approaches to honouring Roman magistrates.

After the establishment of a permanent *provincia Asia*, honours for Roman officials become more frequent on the mainland. However, euergetic language underwent noticeable changes. Of the seven Asian documents dating to before the First Mithridatic War only one, for the *legatus* M. Popillius Laenas on Cos, used a traditional Hellenistic title: εὐεργέτης ('benefactor'). However, this was paired with the transliterated Latin term πάτρων (*patron*).⁹⁵⁵ Eilers and Milner plausibly supply the epithet πάτρων τῆς πόλιος ('*patron* of the city') in another Coan statue base, honouring Q. Mucius Scaevola's son.⁹⁵⁶ An Ephesian statue-base, dedicated to Scaevola's wife, Caelia, also seems to name him πάτρων.⁹⁵⁷ The brothers C. and L. Valerius Flaccus were similarly honoured at Claros.⁹⁵⁸ The other two

⁹⁵² E.g. Raßelberg 2007, 53-54; Frija 2017a, 272-278.

⁹⁵³ E.g. Ma 1999 #26; Van Bremen 2008, 357-382 on Archippe.

⁹⁵⁴ Flory 1996, 299-301.

⁹⁵⁵ *I.Cos* 225. Compare *AE* 1995, #1538.

⁹⁵⁶ *SEG* 45.1128. Eilers & Milner 1995, 78-79. Though they admit uncertainty, the parallels cited are convincing.

⁹⁵⁷ *I.Eph.* 630a. Eilers & Milner 1995, 80-81, 83. On Scaevola's honours: Ferriès & Delrieux 2010, 210-216.

⁹⁵⁸ Though the texts are identical, the monuments differ markedly, suggesting that they were produced separately. Ferrary 2000, 334-337. Compare *I.MagnesiaM* 144-146, which *pace* Erkelenz (2003), likely date to the 60s.

examples, for Popillius at Magnesia-on-the-Maeander and Scaevola, again via his son, at Nysa include no titles, simply honouring both in traditional terms for their ἀρετή and εὐνοία.⁹⁵⁹

Despite the small sample size, the use of the transliterated Latin term *patron* rather than the existing repertoire of honorific language holds significance. Neither Greeks nor Romans viewed the term as synonymous with existing Greek labels. This represented the deliberate deployment of a Roman concept to honour Roman magistrates.⁹⁶⁰ However, *ipso facto*, this amalgamated civic honorific practice and Roman social institutions in a novel way. Patronage, for Roman aristocrats, was not in itself, an honorific position: though having numerous and significant individuals in one's *clientela* demonstrated one's worth and influence within the political community, the patron-client relationship was, often, a formal consensual agreement. This was equally true of civic communities. Here the language of patronage was co-opted into a new concept, drawing on the Classical and Hellenistic institution of προξενία, to construct a Roman-specific honorific relationship.⁹⁶¹ This is, perhaps, unsurprising, given that the services provided by πάτρωνες in the earliest Greek decrees, from Teos and Colophon, are precisely grounded in helping ambassadors navigate

⁹⁵⁹ *IMagnesiaM* 123; *SEG* 57.1104. Raßelnberg (2007, 52-54) working from the large size of the monument convincingly suggests it honoured other family members, including the proconsul himself.

⁹⁶⁰ Ferrary 1997, 208-212; Eilers 2002, 110-112; Bloy 2012, 181-183.

⁹⁶¹ Προξενία, though rooted in the same ideals of benefaction and reciprocity, was an inter-*polis* institution, in which one community honoured an individual from another community, who would assist their citizens in their activities within his place of residence. While often involving the grant of specific privileges, proxeny did gain an honorific element. Mack 2015, 22-25, 81-89; Domingo Gygax 2016, 109-114.

the unfamiliar Roman institutional and political landscape.⁹⁶² The choice of *poleis*, from the 90s, to use a novel technical term *πάτρων* to honour Roman magistrates represents a negotiated outcome arising from Roman social discourse and local practice.⁹⁶³ However, the upheaval generated by Mithridates' invasion of Asia in 88 disrupted these early moves towards a standard practice.

After Dardanus, communities were forced to adapt to a new administrative reality. Despite most *poleis* being subjected to gubernatorial jurisdiction and regular taxation, their capacity to honour individuals through civic decrees remained untouched. As one of few remaining levers to generate favourable outcomes, it is unsurprising to see cities continuing to elevate commanders, who had their own reasons to encourage the practice. One intriguing consequence of this change was the revival of traditional Hellenistic honorific language.⁹⁶⁴ Of 29 extant honorific inscriptions for Roman governors between the denouement of the First Mithridatic War and Augustus' consolidation of power in the early 20s, only five use the title *πάτρων*, three of which belong to Q. Cicero: at Claros and twice at Samos. A fourth example, also from Claros, honoured L. Valerius Flaccus, his predecessor, and hereditary *πάτρων* through his father. The final example is a shadowy L. Cornelius Lentulus, attested at Labraunda.⁹⁶⁵ All but the last were also called *εὐεργέτης*, a title which appears in nine other inscriptions, five times alongside *σωτήρ*. Honours for *legati* and

⁹⁶² *Syll.*³ 656; *SEG* 39.1243, 1244.

⁹⁶³ Bloy 2012, 182-183.

⁹⁶⁴ Nichols (1990, 81; 2014, 71) notes this resurgence of traditional titulature compared to civic patronage without analysis.

⁹⁶⁵ Q. Cicero: Ferrary (2000a), #6, *Kajava* #24a, *IGR* 4.1713; L. Flaccus: Ferrary (2000a), #5; L. Lentulus: *I.Labraunda* 63.

quaestores during the same period exhibit a similar pattern, albeit including greater proportion of *πάτρωνες*. The numbers for *quaestores* and *legati* are close to identical: in the period, for each group 13 inscriptions (of 15, in the former, and of 16 in the latter case) include *εὐεργέτης*; ten *πάτρων*; and four *σωτήρ*. Given that these officials had less scope to materially benefit *poleis*, more substantial links might be expected.⁹⁶⁶ In the quaestorian case, of the ten surviving inscriptions for *patroni*, four belong to L. Antonius, brother of the later *triumvir*, during his period of temporary governorship in 49, and two to Lucullus, which may hint at a more limited phenomenon.⁹⁶⁷

These Hellenistic titles had diverse origins and implications, offering *poleis* the opportunity to differentiate between recipients. The generic *εὐεργέτης* originally implied admission to a category of non-citizens with privileged status within a civic community, akin to *πρόξενος*.⁹⁶⁸ Nevertheless, it was consistently employed as an honorific title from at least the fifth century.⁹⁶⁹ By contrast, *σωτήρ* was originally applied to divine figures, and *κτίστης* to semi-divine or legendary founders. Both came to be applied to Hellenistic rulers in an honorific capacity.⁹⁷⁰ Bloy suggests that this titulature allowed *poleis* to better articulate their relationship with Roman magistrates: expressing a connection in terms of

⁹⁶⁶ Table 3. Of the attested *quaestores*, at least, L. Antonius served as interim governor after the departure of Q. Minucius Thermus in 50, under the terms of the *lex Pompeia de provinciis* (Marshall 1972, 898-911, with Cic. *Fam.* 2.18.2-3), while C. Scribonius Curio, who was still returning to Italy in July 53, seems likely to have done so (Cic. *Fam.* 2.6.1.).

⁹⁶⁷ Interestingly, outside of two instances (Lucullus in the 80s and Q. Aemilius Lepidus in 15-13), every combination *σωτήρ καὶ πάτρων* occurs between 50 and 37 and was awarded to a *quaestor* or *legatus* (P. Licinius Crassus Damasippus, L. Caninius Gallus, L. Antonius, M. Cocceius Nerva). This could indicate that the goodwill of a Roman official was particularly sought after in this period of instability.

⁹⁶⁸ Gauthier 1985, 22-24, 33-39, 134-136; Domingo Gyax 2016, 111, 230-231.

⁹⁶⁹ Gauthier 1985, 141-143; Domingo Gyax 2016, 51.

⁹⁷⁰ Mortensen 2015, 231-233.

προξένια or εὐεργέσια became inappropriate when the power asymmetries became clear. While he fails to recognise the revival of Hellenistic titulature after the First Mithridatic War, Bloy's model has heuristic value. The sudden deterioration of civic status in the post-Sullan era radically altered the balance of power between magistrates, their representatives and local communities. As most cities were now directly subject to the governor's jurisdiction, the impact of each individual officeholder on civic affairs was amplified. Given this increasing significance, titles previously employed for Hellenistic rulers became appropriate for individual Romans who had contributed to the community's well-being in a tangible way.⁹⁷¹

Only one Republican magistrate, L. Licinius Lucullus as *quaestor*, received a Hellenistic honorific title beyond πάτρων, σωτήρ or εὐεργέτης: at Thyatira, a statue-base honours him as κτίστης.⁹⁷² Even during the Augustan period, only one other magistrate received this title, Augustus' nephew, Sex. Appuleius, at Claros in the late 20s. Appuleius was widely honoured, appearing in nine extant inscriptions from Asia distributed across the province. His titles vary widely across these inscriptions. Two examples, at Cyme and Pergamum, declare him σωτήρ καὶ εὐεργέτης and three, two at Pergamum, one at Miletus, as simple εὐεργέτης, otherwise each decree is unique: κτίστης at Claros, πάτρων at Samos, and σωτήρ at Metropolis.⁹⁷³ This variation encourages caution in approaching the evidence – if more texts

⁹⁷¹ The rapid turnover of Roman magistrates and the diffuse nature of Roman authority inevitably contributed to honorific inflation vis-à-vis the Hellenistic period. E.g. Frijia 2012, 83-90.

⁹⁷² IGR 4.1191.

⁹⁷³ Cyme (I.Kyme 18), Pergamon (AvP 8.2.418-420), Claros (Ferrary (2000a) #9), Samos (IGR 4.1719), Metropolis (I.Eph. 3435), Aphrodisias (IAph2007 12.301); Miletus (Milet 6.3.1123, with Kuhn 2015, 189-192).

for any individual governor had survived, perhaps we would observe a similar inconsistency. However, that Appuleius would be the object of special treatment would be unsurprising, both in terms of the number of honours received and their nature, given his relationship to the Princeps and position within the Augustan regime – he was *consul ordinarius* with Augustus in 29 and proconsul in Spain before his Asian command. Honours were extended to several of his family members, including his mother, Octavia Major, at Pergamum, his wife, son and daughter at Cyme, and, following Kuhn, his brother *inter alios* at Miletus. C. Vibius Postumus’ heroisation at Samos, while proconsul in Asia in 6–9 CE, presents a further anomaly, though, given the significant realignment of social hierarchies as the Principate took hold, experimentation is unsurprising.⁹⁷⁴

In this context, civic cult honours presented another potential tool for communities to employ vis-à-vis governors. However, evidence suggests that this remained an extraordinary honour during the Republic. The earliest attested example is a priesthood of M’. Aquillius at Pergamon, which served as a model for a local benefactor’s cult in the 60s. Though the circumstances remain obscure, this likely arose from his role in securing Pergamene ἐλευθερία while organising the initial *provincia*.⁹⁷⁵ According to Appian, the Cyzicenes continued to celebrate a local Λευκόλλεια in the second century CE, which was established after he relieved the city from Mithridates’ siege in 73.⁹⁷⁶ Likewise, Servilius Isauricus’ cult at Ephesus, probably relating to his widely praised governorship during 46–

⁹⁷⁴ IGR 4.963. This is among the latest examples of divine honours for non-members of the imperial family. Price 1984, 51; Thériault 2001, 92–93.

⁹⁷⁵ MDAI(A) 1907, #4.38–40.

⁹⁷⁶ App. *Mith.* 76.

44, persisted well into the imperial period.⁹⁷⁷ More unusually, an inscription from Mylasa, dated securely to before 2 CE, records a priest of L. Munatius Plancus, the governor of Asia who signally failed to defend the city from Labienus and the Parthians in 40.⁹⁷⁸ Across the whole Republican period, civic festivals for governors presented a viable strategy for communities to honour exceptional commanders.

During the Augustan period, the primacy of the imperial family devalued the benefits of offering such privileges to other Romans, though again this involved a learning process: Cyme offered cultic honours to L. Vaccius Labeo, a resident Roman, which he, likely mindful of Augustus' own policies, courteously refused.⁹⁷⁹ Indeed, civic cult for members of the imperial family became commonplace, starting with Caesar and Augustus, before extending to the wider imperial house. As Frija has shown, this innovation appears to have been driven by locals with Roman citizenship.⁹⁸⁰ However, this does not necessarily indicate imperial involvement. The experience of an Aezanetan family may prove instructive: following Wörrle, the brothers Menecles and Metrodorus seem to have driven the establishment of cults for Augustus, his children, Livia, Nero (Tiberius) and Drusus and C. and L. Caesar, Agrippa (Postumus) and Nero (Germanicus?).⁹⁸¹ However, this does not seem to have resulted in a grant of citizenship, despite the family's continued leadership in dialogue with the Principes. While Wörrle sees this as requiring explanation, it seems preferable to

⁹⁷⁷ *I.Eph.* 702, 3066. Robert 1948, 40-41.

⁹⁷⁸ *I.Mylasa* 134. Delrieux & Ferriès (2004, 71 n.105) present multiple theories.

⁹⁷⁹ *I.Kyme* 19, with Kuhn 2017, 202-205.

⁹⁸⁰ Predominantly C. Iulii, but n.b. esp. M. Antonius Meleager at Alabanda and M. Tullius Cratippus at Pergamum. Frija 2012, 36-41. Full list of attested civic cults during Augustus' lifetime at 34-36.

⁹⁸¹ Wörrle 2014, 447-453.

emphasise the limits of citizenship grants in this period. While substantially more common than during the Republic, they were still rare.⁹⁸² Overall, cult presented another honorific tool for *poleis* to employ in negotiating with imperial representatives, which the advent of imperial rule blunted.

More broadly, under Augustus, the political revolution at the imperial centre and the consequent changes to provincial administration, discussed in Chapter 1, affected the honorific landscape. Only five officials below the level of governor were honoured: none can be dated with certainty. The *legatus pro praetore* [C. Pac]ius Balbus was honoured as *πάτρων* at Cos; the *quaestores* Cn. Domitius Corbulo as *εὐεργέτης* at Ephesus and P. Numicius Pica as *πάτρων* of the whole province. P. Quinctilius Varus, as *quaestor* was honoured twice, without titles, at Pergamum, and once at Tenos as *πάτρων καὶ εὐεργέτης*. Outside this group, P. Vedius Pollio, who may have acted as interim governor, is honoured as *εὐεργέτης* by Miletus and without title at Ilion.⁹⁸³ By contrast 44 inscriptions for proconsular magistrates from this period exist, 27 of which produce one or more titles. Only four of these do not name their honorand *εὐεργέτης* implying a standardisation of honorific language. Only five record the title *σωτήρ*, three of which honour Sex. Appuleius, discussed *supra*; though the other two recipients, Q. Aemilius Lepidus at Cibyra, and C. Marcius Censorinus at Mylasa seem less obvious candidates. Despite the well-worn narrative of decline in civic patronage under the Principate, 11 individual governors, in 14 inscriptions, are entitled *πάτρων*, suggesting an enduring honorific value during the reign of Augustus. This forms a strong contrast with

⁹⁸² Compare Crinagoras of Mytilene (p.307 *infra*). Pace Wörrle 2014, 469–470.

⁹⁸³ Full references in Table 3.

intermediate period, where *legati* and *quaestores* were regularly attested as patrons and governors tended not to appear. In turn, we might infer that the gubernatorial patronage actually grew in symbolic importance under the early Augustan regime, in the absence of lower-ranked officials with political weight in Rome, before declining slowly as the institution's utility waned.⁹⁸⁴ Alternatively, based on the absence of Hellenistic titulature, except εὐεργέτης, under Tiberius and his successors, the concerns of Augustus with preserving his unique authority offers another explanation. As Nichols highlights, σωτήρ and κτίστης had their roots in royal titulature and, like the award of ἰσόθειοι τιμαί, could be held to challenge the position of the new ruler.⁹⁸⁵ Overall, under Augustus, the relative number of surviving inscriptions slightly increases, but the number of individuals receiving such honours decreases, which may suit a narrative of routine two-year commands, giving governors greater opportunity to make an impact, and a regularisation of the *conventus* districts, making governors more visible on a province-wide basis.

The existence of diverse epigraphic cultures within the *provincia* is another factor, with Ephesus presenting the clearest example. Erkelenz has shown that the number of extant honorific inscriptions for Romans at Ephesus sharply increased during the Augustan period and continued to grow during the Principate.⁹⁸⁶ By contrast, elsewhere in Asia, the long-term trend, from the Republican period, was decline. The earliest dedication to a

⁹⁸⁴ Pace Eilers 2002, 161-166.

⁹⁸⁵ Nichols 1990, 86; Delrieux & Ferriès 2011, 430-438. Bowersock (1965, 119-121) suggests the retrospective nature of εὐεργέτης rendered it more acceptable.

⁹⁸⁶ Pace Arrayás Morales (2013, 527-532), arguing that Ephesus relied heavily on Roman magistrates, rather than local *euergetes* during the post-Mithridatic period.

Roman official by the Ephesian *demos* dates to the reign of Gaius. Four earlier examples, from the Augustan and Tiberian periods, involve the *publicani* or private individuals on their own behalf, even if in one case, they identify themselves as civic *prytanis*.⁹⁸⁷ Inscriptions for *legati* follow this trend: M. Cocceius Nerva was honoured twice, but by the *Italici* and *conventus c(ivium) R(omanorum) qui Ephesi negotiantur* ('the Italians and *conventus* of Roman citizens at Ephesus').⁹⁸⁸ For Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus the honouring body is left unstated, though he is explicitly honoured as *πάτρωνα ὄντα διὰ | προγόνων τοῦ τε ἱεροῦ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ τῆς πόλεως* ('ancestral patron of the Temple of Artemis and the city'), setting him apart from all the other examples, except for a restoration of the same formula in a similar inscription for the *proquaestor* Lucullus.⁹⁸⁹ One final example, for the *quaestor* Cn. Domitius Corbulo, in the early first century CE, proves an exception, honouring him as *εὐεργέτης* of the city 'in all things' and authorised by the *demos* and *boule*.⁹⁹⁰ This disjunction requires explanation. The comparative wealth of evidence from Ephesus renders it implausible that the dearth of honours for governors there is simply a product of the evidence profile. More likely this phenomenon was a distinctively Ephesian response to the circumstances of its tense relationship with the Roman state after the First Mithridatic War.

Delos also had a distinctive local practice. Although not administered by the Roman commander in Asia, it lay on the most convenient route to the province and provides 17

⁹⁸⁷ *I.Eph.* 659a; 706; 3022; 3023; 3024. Compare Q. Publicius, *pro quaestore pro praetore*: *AE* 1983, #920.

⁹⁸⁸ *I.Eph.* 658; *AE* 1990, #938. On *negotiator/negotiari* standing simply for membership of the Roman diaspora rather than as an economic marker: Eberle 2017, 324-331.

⁹⁸⁹ *I.Eph.* 663; 2941. On *πάτρων διὰ προγόνων* as 'ancestral' patron, rather than 'hereditary' patron: Eilers 2002, 61-83.

⁹⁹⁰ *I.Eph.* 2059.

inscriptions for officials active in the *provincia*.⁹⁹¹ Only two originated with the Delians, both naming their recipients, M. Antonius, after his election as censor in 97, and C. Iulius Caesar in the late 90s, *πάτρων τᾶς πόλιος*.⁹⁹² Only one inscription grants its honorand a Hellenistic title: the *legatus* C. Valerius Triarius, commanding in the Aegean during the Third Mithridatic War, whose troops constructed fortifications on the island, is called *σωτήρ*.⁹⁹³ Similarly, though the evidence is limited, Sardis apparently avoided public honours for Roman officials. A dedication for L. Munatius Plancus, *legatus* in the 80s, was arranged by *Italici qui Sardibus negotiantur*, while the single example of a governor being honoured, M. Plautius Silvanus in 5/6 CE, derives from the *γεπουσία*.⁹⁹⁴ By contrast, Caunus shows a remarkable consistency: across eleven inscriptions for various officials, including three proconsuls and three *quaestores*, between 85 and the Augustan period every honorand was titled *εὐεργέτης* and four *πάτρων*.⁹⁹⁵ In sum, while broad trends are detectable across the period within the province as a whole, diverse practices between civic communities remained a crucial element of the burgeoning provincial culture.

Texts erected outside the honouring community provide a revealing contrast. The earliest example is a decree of Pisidian Prostanna for the *pro quaestore pro praetore* M. Antonius at Delos.⁹⁹⁶ Though producing the standard honorific formula, it reveals a significant expense on the part of a remote Pisidian community to honour a *quaestor*, albeit

⁹⁹¹ Kantor 2009, 138-149 (French summary: *AE* 2009, #1373); Pawlak 2016, 187-198.

⁹⁹² *I.Délos* 1700, 1701.

⁹⁹³ *I.Délos* 1621.

⁹⁹⁴ *AE* 1996, #1453; *Sardis* 32. On the dating of Silvanus' governorship: Wörrle 2014, 443-444.

⁹⁹⁵ See Table 3, under place Caunus.

⁹⁹⁶ *I.Délos* 1603

with delegated *imperium praetorium*.⁹⁹⁷ It further indicates an interest in Roman government on the part of the community, which may have been reciprocated, raising interesting, though unanswerable, questions about whether or how Antonius intervened in the region.⁹⁹⁸ Similarly, an inscription erected by the Mysian Abbaeidae before the temple of Diana at the lake Nemi in Latium honours C. Salluvius Naso, a *legatus* of Lucullus, for defending them during the Third Mithridatic War.⁹⁹⁹ The text is bilingual, Latin followed by Greek, and speaks to the increasing engagement between Asia and Italy during this period. The Mysian Abbaeidae are rarely attested acting as a community and their choice to make a collective dedication at Nemi, rather than in their own territory, raises questions of agency. Salluvius is an obscure figure, though onomastic data may indicate an Apulian *origo*.¹⁰⁰⁰ If so, the dedication at Nemi, an important Latin religious centre, is intriguing. Should we posit Salluvius as dictating the location, or did the community have a voice? The evidence is insufficient to draw conclusions; however, the strong Latin connection and the prominence of the shrine may indicate a strategic attempt on Salluvius' part to increase his standing within the Roman elite.

A statue-base for Q. Mucius Scaevola at Olympia, apparently offered by the δήμοι καὶ ἔθνη in Asia and an inscription at Rome for P. Numicius Pica, on behalf of the *provincia Asia*, offer further examples.¹⁰⁰¹ In each of the above examples, the choice of location appears

⁹⁹⁷ Prostanna stands c. 35km NW of Sagalassos.

⁹⁹⁸ On Pamphylia and Pisidia in this period: Sherwin-White 1976, 3-4; Dmitriev 2005, 81.

⁹⁹⁹ *OGIS* 445.

¹⁰⁰⁰ Silvestrini 1996, 282. However, note the examples are all imperial and a link with the Salluvii of southern Gaul is possible (Strabo 4.1.3).

¹⁰⁰¹ *OGIS* 439; *CIL* 6.3835.

significant. The sanctuary of Apollo on Delos held global significance in the Hellenistic world and the island had a growing Roman community from the mid-second century, while Olympia boasted the panhellenic sanctuary of Zeus. The temple of Diana Nemorensis held great importance for the Latin community, if not more broadly, and Rome was the centre of power. In the latter three instances, the decree emerged from a collective entity which could indicate that the site of the inscription or statue was subject to negotiation between the various members.¹⁰⁰² These four statues match the pattern of dedications made in Asia but suggest a deliberate concern with visibility beyond the confines of the honouring community – i.e. they were, in some sense, outward-facing documents. Irrespective of whether the recipient solicited the grant or influenced the location, these groups chose to advertise their relationship with individual Romans in well-trafficked and highly meaningful locations. Consequently, we should view this small group of inscriptions as attempts by the dedicants to articulate publicly their relationship with Rome and its representatives.

Several innovations in titulature appear from the 60s: Cn. Pompeius Magnus, for example, was honoured as τρίς αὐτοκράτωρ (*‘imperator for the third time’*) across Asia Minor. Though this titulature, unique to Pompeius himself, was perfectly accurate, using it to supplant traditional forms, such as ἀνθύπατος, evoked a sense of distance between this commander and his rivals. Though the use of αὐτοκράτωρ or transliteration ἱμπεράτωρ as

¹⁰⁰² Compare the processes discussed by Mackil 2013, 145–258.

titles for Roman magistrates is not unparalleled, they occur in ambiguous contexts.¹⁰⁰³

Strikingly, the Colophonian *demos* honoured Q. Cicero as εὐεργέτην ὄντα | τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ | πάτρωνα τοῦ δήμου ('benefactor of the Greeks and patron of the *demos*').¹⁰⁰⁴ The extension

of honour beyond the civic body into the broader realm of the 'Greeks [sc. of Asia]' speaks

to a growing sense of community between *poleis* in this period. Similarly, in 39, M. Cocceius

Nerva was honoured at Teos as: τὸν κοινὸν | εὐεργέτην καὶ σωτῆρα τῆς ἐπαρχίας | καὶ τῆς

πόλεως πάτρωνα ('the common benefactor and saviour of the province, and the patron of

the city').¹⁰⁰⁵ This again, contrasts the position of Nerva vis-à-vis the province as a whole and

Teos specifically. Though the contexts were significantly different – Cicero governed the

provincia for three years during the height of the *publicani*'s influence, while Nerva as *legatus*

played a key role in forcing the Parthians out of Caria – this implies that the *poleis* were

happy to present the two men as serving a community beyond their own borders.¹⁰⁰⁶ This

could speak of the influence of the emergent *koinon* during this period. The *provincia* itself

begins to honour governors during the Augustan period as this body became more

institutionalised.¹⁰⁰⁷ Outward-facing and innovative honorific grants highlight the strategic

exploration of new ground by communities in managing their relationship to Rome and

¹⁰⁰³ E.g. L. Licinius Murena: *IG* 5.1.1454 (Messene); 12.1.48 (Rhodes): ἡμεράτωρ. *IKaunos* 31 and 103: αὐτοκράτωρ. The term could be applied either generically for a commander (*SEG* 44.1227) or as a title enabling a magistrate to apply for a triumph (*RDGE* 23.36). Given Murena's well-attested triumph in 81, he must have held a *provincia* and *imperium suis auspiciis*. Pace Frija 2012, 84.

¹⁰⁰⁴ *SEG* 37.958.5–8. Laffi (2010, 37), adducing as comparanda *IPriene*² 233 (M'. Aemilius Lepidus (c. 80/79) and honours for Caesar (*I.Eph.* 251). Ferrary (2001, 19–35) sees the *koinon* as responsible.

¹⁰⁰⁵ *Carie* 2.103. Compare *ILS* 8780. On Nerva: Delrieux & Ferrière 2011, 421–452.

¹⁰⁰⁶ On the title of 'common benefactors' applied to an individual: Erskine 1994, 87 n.64; Delrieux & Ferrière 2011, 437–438.

¹⁰⁰⁷ E.g. Antistius Vetus (*IGR* 4.778); Numicius Pica (*CIL* 6.3835).

Romans. Both represent attempts to engage effectively with imperial power, to the benefit of the dedicants. They illustrate the extent to which such experimentation was possible within the parameters of the traditional reciprocal honorific exchange.

Beyond civic attempts to integrate Romans into their culture of honour, the advent of Roman rule affected practice vis-à-vis local benefactors. Most obviously, in the late second and early first centuries, honorific decrees came increasingly to focus on their recipients' dealing with Rome and its representatives.¹⁰⁰⁸ While adhering to traditional formulae and language, as the Roman presence intensified, more decrees refer to governors or institutions, as the extensive evidence from Priene demonstrates. The texts highlight the importance of personal and institutional connections between the *polis* and its representatives, on the one hand, and Roman officials or the Senate, on the other.¹⁰⁰⁹ However, after the First Mithridatic War, new trends emerged. Evidence suggests an inflation of honours for citizen benefactors took place, concurrent with a renewed emphasis on locally directed euergetism as opposed to diplomatic action. At Priene, A. Aemilius Zosimus was repeatedly honoured for achievements across a lengthy career. However, Zosimus' relationship with individual Romans or Rome goes unmentioned: on this evidence, he undertook no embassies and received no visitors.¹⁰¹⁰ The well-known dossier of Diodorus

¹⁰⁰⁸ E.g. Brun's dossier (2004, 44-52) for the Aristonican War.

¹⁰⁰⁹ E.g. *IPriene*² 64, 67, 71, 75 all refer to embassies to governors or the Senate and date between 133-88. Compare *SEG* 39.1243-1244; *ILlioni* 73.1-3. Santangelo 2009, 75-77.

¹⁰¹⁰ *IPriene*² 68-70. Zosimus' status remains controversial: his name, Ἀῖμιλῖος Σέξτου Ζώσιμος, led some to view him as a freedman (e.g. Magie 1950, 256) or an Italian immigrant, based on his *tria nomina* and filiation (Kah 2012, 62-69; Blümel & Merkelbach 2014, 183). However, that it was quite possible for the father of a newly enfranchised citizen to bear a Latin name through his own enfranchisement, (e.g. L. Cornelius Balbus (*cos. suff.* 40) recorded on the *fasti Colotiani* as L.f. (*InscrIt* 13.1.18.16; Münzer (*RE* s.v. Cornelius 69, 1260-1261)). Rumschied's claim (2002, 82) that Zosimus a

Pasparus at Pergamum, firmly dated between 85 and 65, reinforces this view.¹⁰¹¹ While he served as an ambassador to Rome and drew on his personal connections to secure privileges for the *polis*, throughout his extensive dossier his localised actions including his reconstruction of the *gymnasion* and the funding of festivals are emphasised.¹⁰¹² Strikingly, language and honours previously restricted to members of the Attalid dynasty are employed. The earliest decree, dated by Chankowski to before 73, granted Diodorus an ἄγαλμα, implying cultic honours, and also hailed him as εὐεργέτης and σωτήρ.¹⁰¹³ More significantly, he seems to have been recognised as having achieved the benefits for [πασίν?] τοῖς τὴν ἐπαρχεῖαν κατοικοῦσιν ('[all?] those resident in the *provincia*'), recalling the generalising tone used of Seleucid benefactions and the strategic assertion by Attalid monarchs to be benefactors *par excellence*.¹⁰¹⁴ This claim is circumscribed by the administrative geography of the Roman *provincia*. Rather than referring to the Greeks at large, the decree focuses in on the region subjected to the same Roman official as Pergamum itself. This may partially reflect the reality that his embassy had effective implications only for those *poleis* suffering from the decisions of Sulla in the aftermath of Dardanus.¹⁰¹⁵ However, it might also reflect a growing solidarity among the communities of Asia during

member of the Prienean elite is most persuasive. Kah (2012, 63-65) suggests an Augustan date, though Hamon (BÉ 2013, #362) notes 'pas d'argument décisif en ce sens'.

¹⁰¹¹ On the date: Jones 1974, 190-205; 2000, 6-12 *contra* Musti 1998, 4-40; 1999, 325-333. Chankowski (1998, 194) notes that two texts are literally copies, raising the possibility that the quantity of monuments, rather than decrees per se, was growing during this period.

¹⁰¹² Personal connections: IGR 4.293.2.11-16.

¹⁰¹³ IGR 4.292.15-16, 32, 42. Chankowski 1998, 167-169. A later fragment grants a second ἄγαλμα for local euergetic activity (184-190). An ἄγαλμα did not automatically equate to ἰσοθελιοὶ τίμαι but did represent an inflation of local honours (Ma 2013, 20-21).

¹⁰¹⁴ IGR 4.292.2-3, 15-16.

¹⁰¹⁵ Compare Virgilio 1994, 303-304.

this period. Similarly, evidence for Theophanes and Potamon at Mytilene, though extensive, does not include civic decrees referring explicitly to their personal contact or connection with the powerful Romans who granted their *polis* privileges. Both men were widely and multiply honoured, yet, within the civic space, this truth remained hidden.

The relative decline of the celebration of embassies to Roman officials in decrees for citizens requires explanation.¹⁰¹⁶ As noted, honorific decrees for citizens likely targeted a civic, internal audience.¹⁰¹⁷ Embassies may simply have become less important to *poleis* during the late Republic. However, the proliferation of letters and *senatusconsulta* during the Triumviral period and under Augustus contradicts this interpretation. Alternatively, ambassadors may have met less success in making their requests to the Senate. But this explanation too collapses in the face of the evidence. Diodorus was clearly successful, yet most extant texts focus on his local benefactions. Leaving aside the probability that our evidence is insufficient to provide the requisite standard of proof, the most likely explanation is that local civic discourse had shifted due to the economic crisis provoked by Sulla's actions. Within communities, locally focused euergetism displaced ambassadorial tasks as the main driver of prestige. Zuiderhoek, focusing on Imperial Asia Minor, argued that civic euergetism provided local actors with symbolic capital, that is political and social legitimacy. Though his model has been criticised for underplaying economic aspects, the

¹⁰¹⁶ Ferrary (1997a, 112) misspeaks when he talks of a senatorial policy concerning patronage vis-à-vis traditional Hellenistic honours.

¹⁰¹⁷ Compare, e.g. the dispute between Aeschines (3.32-48) and Demosthenes (18.120-121) over announcing honours in front of the foreigners at Dionysia.

nexus of these two elements explains the shift in local narratives.¹⁰¹⁸ The value of hard financial contributions to the upkeep of the *polis* became more important than attempts to solicit senatorial intervention. Instead, focus moved to communal attempts at persuasion alongside honorific competition for gubernatorial attention. Plutarch's account of Lucullus' palliative action frames them in the context of the *provincia* writ large.¹⁰¹⁹ Similarly, Q. Cicero's description as εὐεργέτης τῶν Ἑλλήνων is given greater prominence by the disappointment voiced by his brother over his treatment of Roman *negotiatores*.¹⁰²⁰ The trend towards common approaches to Rome through collectively chosen representatives, mediated through the nascent *koinon*, rendered individual embassies less efficacious.¹⁰²¹ They still happened, as in the case of Pasparus, but could be regarded as having broader implications. Given these practical changes, local civic discourse moved away from praise for interaction with Rome's representatives, which began to be conducted through regional organisations, and recentred themselves on the practical contributions of citizens to civic life.

The surviving decrees from Asian *poleis* reflect the transformation of their relationship with Rome as the hegemonic power became increasingly implicated in the region. Active decrees emphasise the depth of respect and feeling of communities for their foreign hegemon. However, as the Ephesian decree demonstrates, this need not be sincere. Rather, these documents provided opportunities for elites to gloss over division and through

¹⁰¹⁸ Zuiderhoek 2009, esp. 117-153 *contra* Jones 2011a, 773-775; Kalinowski 2011, 148-152.

¹⁰¹⁹ Plut. *Luc.* 20.

¹⁰²⁰ SEG 37.958.5-8. Cic. *QFr.* 1.2.4-14.

¹⁰²¹ *IAph2007* 2.503.

their publication shape civic memory over the long term. While Roman audiences may have been exposed to these messages, they were not the primary audience. By contrast, honorific decrees for Romans were undoubtedly intended for individual magistrates. In form they resemble exchanges with Hellenistic rulers, but, as argued in Chapter 2, the framework underpinning this dialogue had fundamentally changed. The evidence shows a diversity of practice within Asia, though the exclusive emphasis on patronage before the First Mithridatic War and the return to more diverse Hellenistic titles after this conflict is revealing, perhaps indicating the greater capacity of magistrates to impact the well-being of communities. Finally, the shifting language and structure of honours for citizens further reflects the evolution of the dynamic between Rome and local communities. As negotiation and dialogue became more crucial in dealing with the imperial centre, the role of individuals became more significant. Diplomacy became central to civic success.

3.3: Diplomacy and Civic Privilege: Learning a New Set of Rules

Diplomatic activity was crucial to shaping the relationship between the cities of Asia and Rome. Formal embassies, conducted by πρεσβευταί appointed by the *demos*, spoke with the voice of the community in dialogue with the Roman state and its representatives. They could convey civic decrees and speak in their support, but also had the capacity and authorisation to innovate and negotiate.¹⁰²² Ambassadors remained central to the relationship between individual communities and the imperial centre throughout, and well

¹⁰²² Conveying decrees: Syll.³ 601; *IAph*2007 8.2. Negotiating: Syll.³ 656, *SEG* 39.1243/1244.

beyond, the period of this study.¹⁰²³ However, informal contacts and exchange were critical to *polis*' strategies for dealing with Roman power. This discussion focuses first on the nature of official embassies, their objects and their targets. How did Greek communities draw on existing frameworks to interact with the new hegemonic power? What were they concerned with acquiring and how had this changed from earlier periods? What relationships did they manage to construct with permanent Roman institutions? How much agency did *poleis* have in the process of articulating these relationships? It then investigates how private individuals formed personal relationships with Rome and Romans to the benefit of their home *polis*. The extent to which these figures cultivated such contacts with a view to local rather than imperial issues is an important question. Overall, I seek to elucidate the diplomatic strategies employed by communities in Asia to relate to Roman power.

3.3.1: Speaking to Roman power: Civic Embassies

Embassies were the most common means by which civic communities engaged with Roman institutions and officials. Asian *poleis* had a lengthy history of communicating via ambassadors and the establishment of Roman hegemony did not lessen their enthusiasm for the medium. Diplomatic contact existed from the late third and early second centuries. However, the extinction of the Attalid line and establishment of a permanent *provincia Asia* altered the dynamic. Literary sources give an impression that the Senate was besieged by

¹⁰²³ E.g. Millar 1977, 375-385; Eck 2009, 193-207; Lenski 2017, 15-16.

Greek embassies, especially during the month of February.¹⁰²⁴ The epigraphic record, though fragmentary, offers some corroboration, with embassies attested both for cities, especially Priene, Ephesus and Mylasa, and for individual ambassadors, notably Menippus of Colophon, Diodorus Paspurus of Pergamum and Potamon of Mytilene.

While the evidence accentuates embassies to the Senate, there are numerous examples of approaches to provincial commanders. These embassies stand apart from general requests for military aid. Two early decrees, for Machaon at Cyzicus and Menas at Sestus, praise the honorands for missions seeking assistance, during the turbulent transition from Attalid to Roman control, to the commander in Macedonia.¹⁰²⁵ These fit into a broader category of embassies to powerful regional actors in perilous circumstances, like approaches to Roman commanders in the region during the early second century.¹⁰²⁶ An honorific decree from Mysia Abbaeitis also fits into this group, while the military exploits of Apollonius of Bargasa in the war against Aristonicus are mentioned alongside his embassy to dissuade the consul M'. Aquillius from billeting his troops on the city.¹⁰²⁷ Finally, the embassy of Plarasa-Aphrodisias to Q. Oppius when besieged at Laodicea-on-the-Lycus, already discussed, was also a practical strategic decision.¹⁰²⁸

¹⁰²⁴ E.g. Cicero writes to his brother (QFr. 1.2.4) that he has personally placated embassies from Dionysopolis, Apameia, Antandros, Smyrna and Colophon.

¹⁰²⁵ *IGR* 4.134.9-11; *I.Sestos* 1.16-23. Potter (1988, 293-295) takes this as evidence for a Thracian origin for Aristonicus' insurgency.

¹⁰²⁶ E.g. Champion 2007, 265-270; Burton 2011, 84-88, 229.

¹⁰²⁷ *SEG* 34.1198, 8-13; 51.1495.18-21.

¹⁰²⁸ *IAph2007* 8.3.

Our best evidence for gubernatorial embassies comes from Priene's important epigraphic corpus, which begins before a formal Roman administrative framework. The prominent Moschion, whose career included embassies to the Seleucid kings, Demetrius I (r. 160-152) and II (r. 145-139, 129-126), was sent to Pergamum in 130, after M. Perperna had written to the *demos*.¹⁰²⁹ Another Prienean decree honours an unknown citizen for his missions to several Roman officials present in Asia in the late second century.¹⁰³⁰ Significantly, the Roman embassies are given prominence here, though a subsequent list of his embassies to Greek *poleis* provides context. Though the text implies the Roman embassies were singular, or at least limited, the honorand visited Miletus, and probably also Magnesia on the Maeander, πολλάκις ('often'), together with a list of specific missions undertaken to a range of cities.¹⁰³¹ Neither example provides reasons for the embassies, but they imply that Roman governors were worth engaging with on a regular basis.

Two further decrees underscore the relative importance of gubernatorial embassies compared with trips to Rome. The first, honouring Crates, mentions at least two embassies to Roman commanders, to L. Iulius Caesar and L. Lucilius. The second, for Heraclitus, mentions another embassy to Caesar.¹⁰³² The dating within these documents, particularly of Caesar's command, remains controversial. Outside this decree, only fragments of an Augustan *elogium* record his governorship, which appears to place it chronologically before

¹⁰²⁹ *I.Priene*² 64.227-231. He may have been accompanied by one Herodes (*I.Priene*² 65.91-94).

¹⁰³⁰ *I.Priene*² 75.

¹⁰³¹ *I.Priene*² 75.24-35.

¹⁰³² *I.Priene*² 67.14, 21, 136, 147; 71.48-49. Though, note the reference to a proconsul at 71.17. Wallace 2014, 45-46. Pace Rousset (*BÉ* 2016, #98), there is no reason to reject the overlap in the careers of the two men at this point.

his service on a Saturninan agrarian commission, i.e. before 101.¹⁰³³ However, Sumner argued forcefully from this text that Caesar was Lucilius' immediate predecessor, governing for three years from 93/92.¹⁰³⁴ By contrast, Ferrary highlighted that the second reference to Caesar in the Crates decree appears in the genitive and cannot be taken as evidence for a second embassy. He emphasised the recurrence of local dating formulae, involving the στεφανηφόροι and argued that the first 166 lines of the inscription amount to a summary of Crates' career, with each new stephanophorate signalling a new year. Based on the six occurrences of this dating formula and the lengthy *lacunae* in the surviving text, Ferrary proposed a return to the high date for Caesar's command.¹⁰³⁵ Wallace has recently challenged this position, noting that the final three stephanophorates are held by the same man, Acrisius, and only one other holder of the office, Sosicrates, can be identified by name. He notes that the change in structure theorised by Ferrary is unparalleled in contemporary documents.¹⁰³⁶ However, his argument for the low date is unconvincing: Zosimus' honorific decrees cannot serve as an apt parallel for Crates, given the radically different context after the First Mithridatic War. Wallace's submission that Crates and Heraclitus held an office akin to the ἐπιμεληταί at Delphi, while intriguing, pushes the evidence beyond its limits.¹⁰³⁷

¹⁰³³ *Inscr. It.* 13.3.75a. Ferrary 2000a, 175-176. Earlier authors proposing the high date: Frank 1937, 89-93; Coarelli 1982, 445; the low date: Broughton 1948, 323-330; Badian 1964, 87-88; Sumner 1978, 147-149.

¹⁰³⁴ Sumner 1978, 148-150.

¹⁰³⁵ Ferrary 2000a, 175-179; Brennan 2000, 553 n.230.

¹⁰³⁶ Wallace 2014, 39-42.

¹⁰³⁷ Rousset (*BÉ* 2016, #98) *contra* Wallace 2014, 42-48, citing *Syll.*³ 672, not 306 as per his text.

While the embassies' substance is discussed Chapter 1, Crates undertook at least four embassies to two Roman commanders in Asia and the Senate, across three different Prienean years concerning disputes with the *publicani* and Miletus.¹⁰³⁸ After Lucilius referred the former case to the Senate, Crates went to Rome to speak for the *polis*.¹⁰³⁹ Heraclitus, similarly, was involved in two embassies to Caesar.¹⁰⁴⁰ Together, these examples, even allowing for Ferrary's interpretation, emphasise the frequency of embassies to commanders and highlight two key themes: disputes with their neighbours and poor behaviour by Roman citizens.

The reaction of both Roman governors to the entreaties of Crates and Heraclitus shows their reluctance to close cases in favour of the cities on their own authority. As discussed *supra*, these decisions were consistently referred to the Senate, probably due to the structural weakness of praetorian commanders vis-à-vis the *publicani*. Though Caesar and Lucilius released territory back to Priene in the interim, it seems likely that this was not strongly enforced.¹⁰⁴¹ As far as commanders were concerned, referral to Rome may have bought time for their term to expire, making the fallout their successors' problem. Cicero reveals another dynamic provoked by Verres' pillaging of the Samian Heraion. Ambassadors sent by Samos to the commander in Asia, C. Claudius Nero, were informed: *eius modi querimonias, quae legatos populi Romani pertinerent, non ad praetorem sed Romam deferri oportere*

¹⁰³⁸ Note, with caution, the discussion of Wallace (2014, 48-53) of the relative chronology of the disputes.

¹⁰³⁹ *I.Priene*² 67.136-143.

¹⁰⁴⁰ *I.Priene*² 71.20-21, 45-47.

¹⁰⁴¹ *I.Priene*² 67.116, 136-143.

(‘complaints of this sort, which pertained to *legati* of the Roman People, ought to be brought not before a praetor, but to Rome’).¹⁰⁴² Even had Nero wanted to punish Verres, he had little authority over his colleague’s *legatus*. The only recourse in this instance was a *repetundae* trial in Rome. This underscores the key theme, evoked in Chapter 2, of the Roman Republic’s distributed power and the problems it could cause for communities. While the governor had the capacity to resolve most problems, the influence wielded by the Senate and internal dynamics of the Roman state frequently resulted in their own recusal.

The decrees for Polemaeus and Menippus at Claros shed additional light on this phenomenon. Polemaeus was explicitly honoured for two embassies to Roman commanders in Asia. On both occasions his presence before the magistrate is made explicit. First, he convinced a magistrate to overturn a judgement made against a Colophonian citizen, contrary to normal practice. Second, he persuaded another magistrate not to issue an *edictum* which would have abrogated Colophon’s local laws.¹⁰⁴³ In both instances, the rhetoric employed in the decree is striking and framed the *polis* as an equal participant in dialogue with the Roman governor. Menippus’ decree parallels that of his older contemporary. His five embassies to Rome and the Senate are central: visits to Roman commanders and *quaestores*, as well as those to Attalid *basileis* and other cities, are explicitly subordinated to his senatorial missions.¹⁰⁴⁴ By contrast, these are explored in detail. During the first two: τηρήσας ἄθραυστα τὰ τοῦ δήμου φιλόανθρωπα (‘he preserved, undiminished,

¹⁰⁴² Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.50.

¹⁰⁴³ SEG 39.1243.51-61.

¹⁰⁴⁴ SEG 39.1244.1.13-19. On the odd formulation of τὴν Ἀτταλικὴν βασιλείαν, see Robert & Robert 1989, 69.

the privileges of the city’).¹⁰⁴⁵ The third concerned a territorial dispute, the antagonist in which is unclear but could plausibly be Roman *publicani* contesting the boundaries of civic territory.¹⁰⁴⁶ The last two, discussed in greater detail in Chapter 1, dealt with issues of jurisdiction, culminating in the recognition by the Senate that Colophon lay outside of the power of Roman promagistrates and could administer its own laws over Romans accused or accusing Colophonian citizens.¹⁰⁴⁷ Both men undertook embassies on similar topics. However, Polemaeus was able to wrangle a decision directly from the commander on the ground, where Menippus was forced to undertake multiple journeys to Rome. One explanation would see both Romans and locals adapting to regular interaction. As the *publicani*’s exploitation of *ager publicus* became more pronounced and the Roman diaspora within Asia burgeoned, the potential for Roman citizens invoking the governor grew. The unusual situation within Asia where most *poleis* were ἐλεύθεραι likely caused confusion, wilful or not, among both commanders and citizens as to the limits of Roman authority. The increasing leverage of non-senatorial groups after 123 must also have played a role.¹⁰⁴⁸ Over time, several factors led to an increasing emphasis on the Senate as the object of civic entreaties.

¹⁰⁴⁵ SEG 39.1244.1.21-22.

¹⁰⁴⁶ Robert & Robert 1989, 71-85, on the territory referred to. Comparanda at Wallace (2014, 56-62, with references), though his subsequent citation of the *senatusconsultum de Oropiis* is incorrect.

¹⁰⁴⁷ SEG 39.1244.1.37-48.

¹⁰⁴⁸ On the diaspora: Eberle & Le Quèrè 2017, 29-38, 50-53.

A final example offers a distinctive view on the strategies for engaging directly with Roman commanders. An honorific decree of the Otorkondeis at Mylasa, for Iatrocles in c. 100 provides a novel reason for his service:

πρεσβευτής τε αἰρεθεὶς καὶ αὐτὸς πρὸς] | Μάρκον Ἰούνιον Δεκόμου υἱὸν
 Σιλανόν, στρατηγόν, πάτρωνα τῆς πόλεως, διαβαίνοντα εἰς τὴν] | Ἀσίαν,
 ἐξῆλθεν καὶ ἔπεισεν ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ ἐποίησεν
 εὐεργε[τικώ]τερον διατεθῆναι πρὸς τὸν σύμπαντα δῆμον, αὐτόπτην γενόμενον
 τῆς σπουδῆς τῶν [πολι]τῶν τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν τε καὶ τὸν Ῥωμαίων δῆμον ('He was
 also chosen as ambassador and he went to Marcus Iunius, D.f., Silanus, praetor,
 patron of the city, who was arriving in Asia,¹⁰⁴⁹ and persuaded the man to come
 to our city and made him more beneficently disposed towards the whole
 people, so that he became a witness to the esteem of the citizens towards both
 him and the Roman people').¹⁰⁵⁰

Iatrocles' embassy appears to have had the singular purpose of persuading the governor to visit Mylasa. This provides an interesting twist on the typical narrative of gubernatorial visits as something to be endured by allies rather than celebrated, demonstrating that the presence of the governor could be actively sought, to make a positive impression.¹⁰⁵¹ It seems Silanus already had ties to the city, named here as πάτρων, and perhaps *polis* representatives sought to re-affirm these personal ties with the praetor. Why Silanus required persuasion to visit Mylasa has implications for understanding the administration of Asia. The *polis* was a *conventus* centre by 29, at the latest, though it had lost

¹⁰⁴⁹ For this meaning of διαβαίνω: Robert 1940, 54-55, with comparanda; add now, SEG 39.1243.49-51.

¹⁰⁵⁰ *IMylasa* 109.14-18. On the date: Ferrary 2000a, 172-174, esp. n. 61 *contra* Eilers 1999, 80-86.

¹⁰⁵¹ As even the Scaevola visit seems to have been in Menippus' decree. Compare the self-conscious claims of Cicero of his own moderation: e.g. *Att.* 5.16.3; 21.4, 7.

this privilege by 17.¹⁰⁵² Most scholars assume that the list of cities within which proconsuls held assizes remained relatively stable, leading to the plausible view that Mylasa was one of the original cities designated as such.¹⁰⁵³ Although, during the Republic, a fixed schema for a gubernatorial assize tour can be ruled out, this status would imply that Mylasa was more frequently visited by Roman commanders than typical *poleis*. Two possible reasons for Iatrocles' embassy arise. First, if the decree pre-dates the First Mithridatic War, Mylasa, like most of southern Caria, lay beyond the formal scope of the Asian command and *conventus* structure. Second is Silanus' position as civic patron. The decree implies that he already held this position before arriving in Asia as governor. One explanation would suggest Mylasan ambassadors to Rome had engaged his assistance in an earlier matter, though the nature of this connection must remain obscure. The existence of *patroni* for nearby Teos from the mid-second century shows that an ongoing relationship could exist without necessarily arising from a prior visit.¹⁰⁵⁴ It also speaks to the importance of a governor's presence for communities to demonstrate effectively their regard to the individual and Rome.¹⁰⁵⁵ Presence was a crucial element to official communication between state representatives and local communities. Roman magistrates in *provinciae* were rarely static. Polemaeus' inscription emphasises the corollary of this point: he was honoured for taking on the expense of hosting the governor Q. Mucius Scaevola and his entourage when they arrived at

¹⁰⁵² *I.Priene*² 13.44-45; Cottier et al. 2008, ll.88. See pp. 86-87 *supra*.

¹⁰⁵³ E.g. Burton 1975, 92-93; Habicht 1975, 67-70; Mitchell 1999, 22-28; Kantor 2013, 156.

¹⁰⁵⁴ *Syll.*³ 656.20-27.

¹⁰⁵⁵ E.g. Quass 1993, 138-139.

Colophon.¹⁰⁵⁶ The movement and presence of governors had a practical and ideological significance. It facilitated communication between the governor and the local populace: Béranger emphasises that a commander could only effectively mediate between the distinct interest groups active within a *provincia* with local contacts. Physical presence enabled those contacts on a larger and more intimate scale.¹⁰⁵⁷ At a practical level, the proximity or otherwise of the governor allowed *poleis* in dispute with one another to pre-empt or out-petition their rivals.

The turnover of Roman governors and their different nature vis-à-vis Hellenistic royal officials highlight another important factor. Unlike Achaeus or Zeuxis, regent-like figures responsible for administering most Seleucid territory in Asia Minor, Roman magistrates, at least initially, expected to exercise authority within the smaller boundaries of the former Attalid kingdom. By contrast, Attalid officials were more circumscribed as their rulers inverted the pre-existing Seleucid power structure to place more emphasis on local authorities.¹⁰⁵⁸ The transition to Roman rule made powerful officials more accessible than under previous regimes, due to these spatial factors. The absence of established places associated with the exercise of Roman power, an administrative capital, meant that commanders were more likely to travel directly to trouble-spots. Over time, consistent association of Roman commanders with fixed locations, often major *poleis* with significant

¹⁰⁵⁶ Compare *I.Cos* 180, in which the priest of Heracles Callinicus is exempted from ‘providing hospitality to the Romans’ and *Syll.*³ 748, on the Cloatii at Gytheum entertaining *legati* of the governor. Hennig 1997, 363-368.

¹⁰⁵⁷ Béranger 2011, 171-176.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Thonemann 2013, 11-17.

communities of Roman citizens, began to form the basis of an administrative geography.¹⁰⁵⁹

That said, problems with information flow between governor and city should not be under-emphasised. It was not always possible for communities to have up-to-date information on magistrates' whereabouts, which may explain Iatrocles' embassy to Silanus.¹⁰⁶⁰

By contrast, embassies to the Senate were a more significant undertaking, involving greater time, expense and danger. Nevertheless, several factors prompted communities to resolve issues at the heart of the Roman state. Foremost among these was the phenomenon of commanders on the ground referring disputes to senatorial oversight. Roman citizens could also draw on their personal connections to force cases to Rome. The summoning of Pericles of Ephesus to trial in Rome by M. Aurelius Scaurus for resisting the latter's violation of the asylum at the Artemision provides a key example.¹⁰⁶¹ Similarly, Cicero wrote to Q. Minucius Thermus, during the latter's governorship of Asia, asking him to compel several *poleis* to send *ecdici* to Rome to settle a dispute with Cluvius of Puteoli.¹⁰⁶² However, communities could also take their grievances and requests to the Senate of their own accord. The examples of Menippus, cited above, and several attested disputes with the *publicani* do not suggest earlier attempts to solicit decisions from magistrates in Asia.¹⁰⁶³ Evidence also exists for individual provincials taking action at Rome in a private capacity.¹⁰⁶⁴

¹⁰⁵⁹ E.g. Cic. *Flacc.* 68, 71.

¹⁰⁶⁰ Particularly in this early period, though by the High Empire, it seems, a fixed rotation was the norm. See Plin. *Ep.* 10.81. Fournier 2010, 59.

¹⁰⁶¹ Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.85, with pp.56-57 *supra*.

¹⁰⁶² Cic. *Fam.* 13.65.

¹⁰⁶³ E.g. *RDGE* 12; Strabo 14.1.26.

¹⁰⁶⁴ E.g. Cic. *Flacc.* 47-50.

Consequently, while many embassies could be referred by governors to the Senate, the sheer volume seen under the Late Republic makes it more likely that many requests were despatched without an initial consultation.

Cicero's correspondence emphasises both this frequency and the variety of topics which embassies addressed in the late 60s and 50s. Writing to his brother, during the latter's command in Asia from 61–59, he lists ambassadors from five *poleis* whom he claims to have conciliated despite Quintus' intemperate actions. By contrast, ambassadors from Magnesia-under-Sipylos, in 54, praised his decision in their favour during a suit brought by a Roman citizen.¹⁰⁶⁵ In neither case can we reconstruct the specific catalyst of diplomatic action and Cicero's engagement took place in unofficial contexts. Perhaps, in the former case, the embassies intended to address the Senate on Quintus' conduct, but the latter example demonstrates the Magnesians acted outside their mission to build goodwill with an influential consular. In the same letter, Cicero mentions that a delegation from Tenedos had lobbied the Senate for a grant of *libertas* and been rejected out of hand, despite support from himself and M. Calpurnius Bibulus. Cicero also refers to embassies from Caunus, seeking to be removed from subjection to Rhodes and integrated into the province of Asia, and a delegation of *legati* sent from Mylasa to deal with a fiscal dispute.¹⁰⁶⁶ Finally, he anticipates delegates from various *poleis* responding to a disagreement about *portoria* which Quintus had referred to the Senate. This last case appears unambiguously general: the *publicani* were charging *portoria* twice on goods which had been brought into one port and then moved to

¹⁰⁶⁵ Cic. *QFr.* 1.2.4; 2.10.2, with *Har. Resp.* 34.

¹⁰⁶⁶ Caunus: Cic. *QFr.* 1.1.33; Mylasa: *Fam.* 13.56.1.

another.¹⁰⁶⁷ Cicero assumes that multiple embassies would arrive and speak on the same topic.

This might explain Strabo's report that Xenocles of Adramyttium defended the province against accusations of Mithridatism before the Senate. The text does not suggest that Xenocles represented the nascent *koinon*, the collective body of the province. Instead, he may have appeared in Rome as ambassador for an individual *polis*, probably Adramyttium, and launched a general defence of provincial communities when challenged in the Senate.¹⁰⁶⁸ The Milesian embassy co-opted by Cicero as witnesses against Verres provides a strong parallel.¹⁰⁶⁹ More ambiguous is Diodorus Zonas from Sardis, whom Strabo describes as ἀνὴρ πολλοὺς ἀγῶνας ἡγωνισμένος ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἀσίας ('a man who spoke in many cases on behalf of Asia'), whose *floruit* also dates to the Mithridatic period.¹⁰⁷⁰ A decree of the *koinon* itself, discussed in Chapter 1, honours two ambassadors, who spoke in Rome on behalf of the collective in the late 60s or 50s.¹⁰⁷¹ These examples stress the unpredictability of the ambassador's task when speaking to Roman power and the growing collective identity of communities in Asia after Sulla's reorganisation of the province after 85.

Cicero's blunt admonishment of Quintus over his treatment of certain *poleis* highlights the phenomenon of civic embassies complaining about governors' conduct to the Senate,

¹⁰⁶⁷ Cic. *Att.* 2.16.4. Cottier et al. 2008 ll.16-19.

¹⁰⁶⁸ Str. 13.1.66.

¹⁰⁶⁹ Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.90. The characterisation of the ambassadors as *mensem Februarium... expectant* shows that they had official business beyond the Verres case.

¹⁰⁷⁰ Strabo 13.4.9.

¹⁰⁷¹ *IAph2007* 2.503.

which often escalated to legal action.¹⁰⁷² A well-known Samian inscription honouring Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus as τοῦ δοθέντος ὑπὸ συνκλήτου πάτρωνος τῷ δήμῳ ('patron, assigned to the *demos* by the Senate') must derive from a legal context: likely referring to Ahenobarbus' appointment as a prosecutor in a *quaestio*, perhaps in a *repetundae* case.¹⁰⁷³ Allowing this, it must pre-date the *lex Sempronia de repetundis* in 123, which fits into the general picture that even in the earliest stages of Roman commands in Asia embassies from *poleis* would address the Senate directly with complaints about gubernatorial conduct.¹⁰⁷⁴

This leads to a related problem. In his collection of literary and epigraphic attestations of Greek embassies to Rome and Romans, Canali De Rossi includes references to witnesses in *repetundae* trials present in Rome without overt consideration of the circumstances.¹⁰⁷⁵ However, were witnesses to be considered official ambassadors? The key evidence appears in Cicero's forensic speeches, especially in *Verrem* and *pro Flacco*. Cicero consistently uses the Latin *legati* and *legatio* to describe the witnesses despatched by *poleis* to give evidence.¹⁰⁷⁶ Between the two texts, Cicero gives positive and negative views of their appointment, varying his argument based on his respective clients, the wronged provincials in the former case and the accused governor in the latter. At *Verr.* 2.2.161, Cicero carefully explains that the whole community repudiated the honorific statues and embassies they had

¹⁰⁷² Cic. *QFr.* 1.2.4.

¹⁰⁷³ *IGR* 4.968. Eilers 1991, 167-169; more cautiously, Ferrary 1997a, 105-107.

¹⁰⁷⁴ E.g. Cic. *Flacc.* 98 (with Maselli 2000, 196 n.187); Gell. *NA.* 10.3.5; App. *BCiv.* 1.92.

¹⁰⁷⁵ Canali De Rossi 1997.

¹⁰⁷⁶ E.g. Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.13 (only one city sends *publice legati* to support Verres), 114 (cities accuse Verres *publice litteris, legationibus, testimoniis*); 120 (lists four cities by name (Centuripa, Halaesa, Catina, Panormus) and others as sending embassies); 156 (Hortensius' accusation that Artemo of Centuripa was not a *legatus* but *accusator*).

disseminated during Verres' command. He stresses that *senatus decrevit populusque iussit* ('the *boule* decreed and the *demos* commanded') that *Romam mandata legatosque misissent* ('letters and ambassadors be sent to Rome') to testify.¹⁰⁷⁷ However, in defending Flaccus, Cicero emphasises the role played by prosecutors in encouraging these embassies. Contrasting his own case against Verres with that of his young adversary, D. Laelius, he states: *ego testis a Sicilia publice deduxi: verum erant ea testimonia non concitatae contionis, sed iurati senatus* ('I myself summoned witnesses from Sicily at public expense: but truly this was evidence not from an excited public meeting but sworn to by *boulai*').¹⁰⁷⁸ He underlines the relative influence of prosecutors in assembling a case.

Adulescens bonus, honesto loco natus, disertus cum maximo ornatissimoque comitatu venit in oppidum Graecorum, postulat contionem, locupletis homines et gravis ne sibi adversentur testimoni denuntiatione deterret, egentis et levis spe largitionis et viatico publico, privata etiam benignitate prolectat. ('A virtuous youth, born of honourable rank, and eloquent arrives, with a very large and distinguished company, in a town of the Greeks. He demands a *contio*; he terrifies the wealthy and men of authority from opposing him, by summoning them to testify; he incites the needy and insignificant through hope of largesse and of travelling expenses on the public purse, or through his private benevolence').¹⁰⁷⁹

The crux of Cicero's argument is that the 'embassies' against Flaccus are not legitimate representatives of the civic community, as they are appointed by assemblies

¹⁰⁷⁷ Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.161.

¹⁰⁷⁸ Cic. *Flacc.* 17 (with Maselli 2000, 162). On Laelius: Steel 2016, 216-217. On Cicero's own collection of evidence: Lintott 2008, 86-87. Thirteen embassies spoke at the *actio prima*, 17 more are attested as present in the *actio secunda*, see: Lintott 2008, 93, n.44 for references.

¹⁰⁷⁹ Cic. *Flacc.* 18.

alone without the oversight by the *boule*. He warms to this theme when treating the specific charges levelled against Flaccus, highlighting the absence of respected, for which we may read aristocratic, voices from the Trallian delegation and stressing the exclusive and unrepresentative nature of the embassy from Temnus.¹⁰⁸⁰ This echoes his attempt to dismiss the supporters of Verres as those *iniussu populi ac senatus* ('uncommanded by *demos* and *boule*').¹⁰⁸¹ Though Cicero's ulterior motives must be acknowledged here, this speaks to a set of expectations on the part of Roman jurors as to how witnesses could be deemed 'official'. Cicero consistently asserts that a vote of the *senatus* and *populus*, i.e. *boule* and *demos*, would distinguish witnesses as representing the community. This corresponds to expectations surrounding embassies to the Senate, which, when referred to in these works, are described in exactly the same language of *legati* and *legationes*.¹⁰⁸² Cicero would suggest that witnesses in *repetundae* trials, for the post-Sullan period, shared descriptors and a status with ambassadors to the Senate.

Through the latter part of the period, communities also began to communicate directly with powerful individual Romans. Though Caesar and Augustus both held official status, their power, authority and influence lay outside the traditional *cursus honorum*. This phenomenon became particularly apparent after Pharsalus, when Caesar's pursuit of Pompeius through the eastern Mediterranean was besieged by embassies from his opponent's erstwhile supporters. His lenient treatment of Mytilene may have encouraged

¹⁰⁸⁰ Cic. *Flacc.* 42-43, 52-53.

¹⁰⁸¹ Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.14.

¹⁰⁸² E.g. Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.50.

other *poleis* to seek absolution.¹⁰⁸³ During Caesar's Alexandrian sojourn, the governor of Asia, Servilius Isauricus, a directly appointed representative, formed the focal point of diplomatic activity, rather than the Senate.¹⁰⁸⁴ Under Augustus, this slowly became the norm. The Mytilenean embassy, seeking a renewal of their treaty in 25, after reaching the Senate, then approached the Princeps, in Spain, directly.¹⁰⁸⁵ By 6, Augustus could describe his encounter with a Cnidian embassy in terms typical of a Hellenistic *basileus*: οἱ πρέσβεις ὑμῶν ... ἐνέτυχον ἐν Ῥώμῃ μοι καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα ἀποδόντες ('your ambassadors... met me in Rome and gave me your decree').¹⁰⁸⁶ One reason was practical. As the power dynamics of the Roman state evolved, it behoved communities to seek favours first from the most authoritative actor possible. Furthermore, the institutions of the *respublica* itself changed during this period to place Augustus, and subsequently the imperial house, at the centre of the ideological, as well as the practical, networks of power.

The advent of the Triumvirate and, eventually, the Principate fundamentally altered the nature of the dialogue between the Roman state and Asian *poleis*. While, strictly speaking, Republican institutions remained in place, the reality of power increasingly concentrated in the hands of a few individuals did not go unrecognised by local actors. For example, as noted in Chapter 2, the *senatusconsultum de Aphrodisiensibus* refers to an embassy which approached the Senate in entirely traditional terms, before granting several

¹⁰⁸³ Caes. *BCiv.* 3.102.4; Plut. *Pomp.* 75.2. Cf. Pelling (1996, 11-12) on Antonius' conduct after Philippi.

¹⁰⁸⁴ Kirbihler 2016, 88.

¹⁰⁸⁵ *IGR* 4.38; *Anth. Pal.* 9.559; cf. *RDGE* 26.c.1-5.

¹⁰⁸⁶ *RDGE* 67.5-7.

privileges moved jointly by the *tresviri* Octavian and Antonius.¹⁰⁸⁷ A separate letter from Octavian to the *polis* personalises this context: He notes his own relationship with the ambassador, Solon, praising his diligence, and a request made for copies of several documents, which he has provided.¹⁰⁸⁸ Similarly, Octavian's unsubtle emphasis of his personal regard for Seleucus in his communication with Rhosus was unlikely to avoid 'correct' interpretation for long.¹⁰⁸⁹ As the nature of Roman power swiftly changed, it is unsurprising to find communities innovating in their attempts to improve their situations.

The Augustan proconsular letter to Chios provides an important example of local adaptation. While procedural and discursive elements have already been discussed, this document also reveals something of the Chians' strategy.¹⁰⁹⁰ Initially, an embassy approached Antistius, who gave a decision against them. Undeterred, the Chians sent a second embassy, after his departure to his successor. This too was brushed aside, as the governor took a conservative line on decisions rendered by his predecessor. Nevertheless, in opaque circumstances, the governor allowed both parties to present their arguments with ἐπιμελέστερα γεγράμμενα ... ὑπομνήματα ('more carefully written documents') to support them. Normally, ὑπομνήματα would mean documents held by the court or magistrate, i.e. *memoranda* in Latin; though Bitner accepts this reading, he admits that it is unparalleled.¹⁰⁹¹ However, the Chians took advantage of this request to present at least two Roman normative

¹⁰⁸⁷ *IAph2007* 8.27.16-23.

¹⁰⁸⁸ *IAph2007* 8.25.16-39, 55-59.

¹⁰⁸⁹ *RDGE* 58.81-84, 92-93.

¹⁰⁹⁰ *RDGE* 70.

¹⁰⁹¹ *Memoranda* normally translates to γράμματα or ἐπιστολαί. Bitner 2014, 656-657.

documents which offered specific and detailed conditions of their ἐλευθερία, regulating their relationship with the Roman state. The first of these, described as ‘a sealed copy of a very old *senatusconsultum*’, dating to 80, rewarded the islanders for their resistance to Mithridates, confirmed their enjoyment of their laws, customs and rights (as they stood when they came into the friendship of the Roman people), guaranteed their freedom from written instructions of Roman magistrates and, contentiously, made Romans subject to Chian law.¹⁰⁹² The second document’s provisions, a letter of Augustus in 26, are largely lost, though they related to the freedom of the *polis*.¹⁰⁹³ These were demonstrably not arguments or records but new, and apparently convincing, evidence to be adduced. Bitner questions why, were this the case, they had not been brought forward at an earlier stage, suggesting plausibly that the initial decision against the Chians took place through a written response to a Roman citizen’s petition.¹⁰⁹⁴ However, the *senatusconsultum* explicitly states that Chios was to remain immune from any decision by a Roman magistrate, implying that neither Antistius, nor his successor, were initially aware that Chios held this status. The Chians, who appear to have held this status continuously since 80, may have simply assumed the Romans were conversant with their situation. If true, this could suggest that the Chians themselves originally sought the aid of Antistius in enforcing a local ruling on a Roman citizen resident, as per their privileges under the *senatusconsultum*.¹⁰⁹⁵ While Bitner astutely presents the

¹⁰⁹² RDGE 70.11-13.

¹⁰⁹³ RDGE 70.18-20. Bitner’s claim (2014, 663) that this may not have resulted from an embassy is unlikely.

¹⁰⁹⁴ Marshall 1969, 264-265; Bitner 2014, 661-662.

¹⁰⁹⁵ Marshall 1969, 258-259.

judicial processes through which the case proceeded, I contend that what we are dealing with here is a Chian sleight of hand, together with a lack of understanding by the Roman governor. If the *senatusconsultum* and letter of Augustus were as unambiguous as they appear, and were well-known, how could Antistius and his successor decide in favour of their opponents? I would suggest rather that the original embassies did not travel with documentary evidence of Chios' status; rather, the governor(s) may initially have been petitioned by Roman residents, resulting in a favourable decision which the Chians sought to overturn. At a request to submit more careful documents, the Chians took the opportunity to locate and add their documentary evidence. As Bitner concludes, 'the Chians used their knowledge of Roman... legal documents... to gain an advantage'.¹⁰⁹⁶ At the third time of asking, the Chians understood and chose to submit as evidence documents in line with Roman legal practice, appealing to the strong Roman preference to follow precedent.¹⁰⁹⁷ Allowing this reconstruction of events emphasises the extent to which communities had to learn and adopt Roman modes of thinking to successfully achieve their goals.

Norbanus' letter to Aezani provides a further example of the realignment of civic strategies for engaging with Roman magistrates in the Augustan period. Though redolent of Hellenistic royal language, Norbanus' communiqué responds to a letter of Augustus presented to him by the ambassadors, rather than an honorific decree.¹⁰⁹⁸ The Aizanetans

¹⁰⁹⁶ Bitner 2014, 664; *pace* Meyer-Zwiffelhofer 2002, 269.

¹⁰⁹⁷ Meyer 2004, 122, 169-206; Bitner 2014, 662-664.

¹⁰⁹⁸ AÉ 2011, #1303.

cite Augustus, as in the Chian example, as a source of authority vis-à-vis the governor. However, by contrast, the Aezanetans appear to have deliberately solicited the Princeps' confirmation of a decision made on the ground by the procurator Ofilius; the earliest example of a procurator interfering in the internal, fiscal affairs of a *polis*.¹⁰⁹⁹

This letter further demonstrates awareness among Asian *poleis* of competing sources of Roman authority. First, the procurator himself, whose decision precipitated the entire diplomatic exchange. How and why Ofilius issued instructions to Aezani requires consideration. The text implies, that in Norbanus' view, the concession of civic autonomy to grant ἀτέλεια to the priest of sacrifices was a privilege, which might reflect an earlier procuratorial instruction to desist from making such grants.¹¹⁰⁰ Alternatively, Ofilius may have been given explicit instructions to regulate civic finances within the region, as Vedius Pollio appears to have been for the Artemision at Ephesus.¹¹⁰¹ In either case, the Aezanetans treated the procurator's decision seriously. However, it does not seem to have been regarded as secure. The existence of Augustus' letter suggests, though does not prove, a civic embassy to confirm Ofilius' action, before approaching Norbanus. This recognition of the overarching authority of Augustus, echoes both his invocation at Chios and the language of proconsuls themselves, as shown in Chapter 2. Finally, after receiving a written response, the Aezanetan embassy witnessed in the letter visited the governor directly. Given that he held his position under the Senate's authority, one would expect that he held unchallenged authority within

¹⁰⁹⁹ CD 53.15.3. Wörrle 2011, 365-370.

¹¹⁰⁰ Compare Caesar's instruction to Mytilene during his third dictatorship: *RDGE* 26.27-29.

¹¹⁰¹ Wörrle 2011, 371-372; Kirbihler 2017, 133-134.

his *provincia*, and his insistence on his personal wish to benefit the *polis* emphasises his own agency. As mentioned, his choice of the verb ἐπιτρεπεῖν to concede approval could support this point. Overall, the complex manoeuvring seen in this text point to a growing understanding by the inhabitants of one *polis* of the tensions between the structural elements of Roman power. It seems that Aezani intended to confirm the grant of privileges by an imperial procurator with the Princeps before raising the issue with the typical authority, the proconsul of Asia. The unprecedented primacy of Augustus offered new opportunities for leverage within imperial governance, and communities were not hesitant to utilise them.

Civic diplomatic missions across the period were diverse, but some broad comments are possible. Generally, they were proactive, strategic and targeted. While our evidence represents a meagre fraction of the original material, difference in attitudes and approaches are detectable both over the period and from *polis-to-polis*. This complements a second observation: almost all the surviving evidence pertains to individual communities acting in their own interests. Few examples of collective action exist for the Late Republic; the decree of the *koinon* from Aphrodisias stands as exceptional. While not denying that communities often co-operated when it was in their interests – embassies from different *poleis* were essential in *repetundae* cases, such as that against L. Valerius Flaccus, for example – but the evidence suggests that, first and foremost, each city engaged in direct dialogue with Rome and its representatives.¹¹⁰²

¹¹⁰² E.g. Canali De Rossi's (2005, 101-103) summary of the diverse civic embassies complaining about Flaccus.

3.3.2: Informal dialogues

Outside formal diplomatic missions, communities and individuals could employ less-formal ties to their own advantage. As discussed, the rise of Roman power brought about fundamental structural changes to the ways in which *poleis* could engage with the hegemonic state. Most obviously, the existence of a granular and constantly evolving executive and legislature, by comparison to Hellenistic kingdoms, provided opportunities and challenges.¹¹⁰³ Where royal benefaction could ultimately depend upon the mood of a single individual, the distributed power structure of the Republic required the formation of coalitions within the senatorial elite to realise preferred outcomes. As noted *supra*, the Romans did not engage with the Greek institution of προξενία, through which *poleis* would establish relationships with a network of individuals based among their peer-polities, who could assist their citizens on public or private business. However, this may have provided a cognitive framework for communities interacting with specific Romans.¹¹⁰⁴ Over time, alternative tools such as formal civic patronage became more significant as levers. However, the corollary was the increasing prominence of personal connections for informing Roman attitudes towards provincial communities. Though these informal contacts did not represent public or, necessarily, officially sanctioned exchanges, they had significant effects on the well-being of communities. Important questions include: to what extent these were publicly minded, intentional actions on behalf of the *polis* as opposed to personal actions;

¹¹⁰³ See the discussion in Chapter 1 and Chapter 2.1 *supra*.

¹¹⁰⁴ Mack 2015, 249–281.

did they form part of the developing imperial discourse and present an effective means of civic agency; and most significantly, how did the effectiveness of informal interaction with Rome and Romans affect the internal political and social dynamics of the communities of Asia?

Even from the earliest period of the Roman *provincia* the line between personal and public influence was blurred. The Claros inscriptions for Polemaeus and Menippus both reveal the importance of personal relationships to their diplomatic successes. Though framed in the unfamiliar, Roman language of patronage, the decrees demonstrate the extent to which face-to-face contacts underlay relationships between Greek communities and Rome. Polemaeus:

ἐνέτυχεν | μὲν τοῖς ἡγουμένοις Ῥωμαίοις | καὶ φανεῖς ἄξιος τῆς ἐκείνων | φιλίας
τὸν ἀπὸ ταύτης καρπὸν | τοῖς πολεῖταις περιποίησεν | πρὸς τοὺς ἀρίστους
ἄνδρας τῇ | πατρίδι συνθέμενος πατρωνείας ('...met with leading Romans, and becoming known as worthy of their friendship, obtained the fruit from this for our citizens, securing patronage with the best men for the city').¹¹⁰⁵

This clause stresses that, from the civic perspective, Polemaeus' individual qualities were the key driver of Roman interest in Colophon. The ambassador is praised explicitly for turning a personal relationship to the city's advantage. He served as a proxy for the worth of the whole community. Since Polemaeus was worthy of Roman friendship (φιλία) on an individual level, those parties were more willing to countenance a formal relationship

¹¹⁰⁵ SEG 39.1243.2.24-31.

through the medium of civic patronage with his homeland. Given this text comes directly from a civic decree, representing the official narrative of the community, the stress on the role that personal connections played is striking. While honorific decrees for ambassadors often draw attention to their personal prowess, such a foregrounding of relationships is rare in earlier examples.¹¹⁰⁶ Roman hegemony required ambassadors to emphasise different elements of their skill set.

Menippus' inscription is more revealing:

τοι|γαροῦν διὰ τὴν ἐμ πᾶσιν ἀρετὴν τοῖς μεγίστοις | Ῥωμαίων συσταθεὶς αὐτός
 τε πρεσβεύων ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν καὶ πίστεως ἀξιούμενος ἐπίσημος | γέγονε παρὰ
 πολλαῖς τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πόλε|ων, τῆς τε πόλεως γνησίους αὐτοὺς πεποιη|κῶς
 πάτρωνας χρησιμώτατος παρὰ τοῖς ἡγου|μένοις γέγονε τῷ δήμῳ παρ' οἷς
 ἀναγκαιόταται | πᾶσιν εἰσὶν ἀνθρώποις χρειαῖ (‘Therefore, on account of his
 excellence in all things, recommended by the greatest Romans, he served as
 ambassador on behalf of them, and being worthy of their trust (sc. *fides*),
 became famed among many Greek cities, and he procured for the city genuine
 patrons, became most useful to the *demos* through the leaders, from whom were
 the most necessary benefits for all men’).¹¹⁰⁷

Like Polemaeus before him, Menippus was praised for his close ties to leading Romans. The decree claims that he was so valued that he was employed by them to conduct embassies on their behalf to other Greek communities. Though this recalls the use of the homonymous Menippus, ambassador of Antiochus III, by Teos in their dealings with Rome in 193, Ferrary convincingly proposes that this involved only the communication of decisions from the

¹¹⁰⁶ E.g. Hegesias of Lampsacus (Syll.³ 591).

¹¹⁰⁷ SEG 39.1244.3.5-15.

Senate rather than active negotiation. Nevertheless, this demonstrates how a Greek envoy could benefit personally from his high reputation among the Romans.¹¹⁰⁸ Again, the Colophonians honoured Menippus for turning his personal reputation to the advantage of the broader community.

Both men were also praised for their entertainment of Romans visiting Colophon. Polemaeus was commended for personally paying the expenses of lodging unnamed Romans.¹¹⁰⁹ It is possible that these were *publicani* or *negotiatores*, though much more likely that they were Romans on official business. Plentiful evidence shows governors and their staff lodging with local magnates, not necessarily civic officeholders.¹¹¹⁰ The evidence for Menippus is more concrete:

παραγενομένου δὲ εἰς τὴν πόλιν οὐχ ἅπαξ καὶ τοῦ | Ῥωμαίων στρατηγοῦ
Κοίντου Μουκίου καὶ τοῦ ταμί|ου καὶ χιλιάρχων πάντας ὑπεδέξατο, τὰς παρὰ
τῆς | πόλεως διδομένας δαπάνας ἀναπέμψας τῇ πό|λει ('and, more than once,
when the praetor of the Romans, Q. Mucius, arrived in the city with the *quaestor*
and tribunes, he received them all into his home, giving back the expenses paid
out by the city').¹¹¹¹

The decree states explicitly that Menippus hosted Q. Mucius and his staff during multiple visits to Colophon. This Q. Mucius, certainly a Scaevola, could be the consul of 117,

¹¹⁰⁸ Ferrary 2009, 138-142 *pace* Robert & Robert 1989, 101. Though whether the Romans viewed it in terms of honour or convenience is another issue. Note the use of Rhodian ambassadors to communicate with the Hellenistic kingdoms in the *lex de provinciis praetoriis* of 100 (RS 12.Delphi.b.12-18); the use of Aphrodisian ambassadors by Q. Oppius (IAph2007 8.3) and Magnesians ambassadors in 29 (IPriene² 13.6-8).

¹¹⁰⁹ SEG 39.1243.4.20-23.

¹¹¹⁰ E.g. IG 5.1.1146.32-40; Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.63-84; *Att.* 5.16.3. Quass 1984, 205-206; Bérenger 2011, 179-187.

¹¹¹¹ SEG 39.1244.2.42-45.

who commanded in Asia in 120/119, or the consul of 95, who commanded between 99-97. The Roberts argued that, on the basis of Menippus' attested Attalid embassies, the former is more likely, providing a relative date for his career of c. 140-120.¹¹¹² The inscription also highlights that the civic treasury would ordinarily bear this cost, with Menippus returning the funds voted by the *polis*. Crucially, this lodging had an important secondary function, providing an opportunity for the host to create useful relationships on a civic and a personal level. Notwithstanding the risks inherent in a poor impression, illustrated by Verres' alleged judicial murder of Philodamus of Lampsacus and his son, the face-to-face elements of administration shared by Roman and Hellenic elite society, together with the crucial reciprocity afforded more opportunities for co-operation when based on a pre-existing personal connection.¹¹¹³ Menippus' positive reputation among Romans was likely founded, at least partially, on his hospitality within Asia. Scaevola's naming here, by contrast with Polemaeus' more generic text, may indicate that Menippus did not host other commanders, suggesting that this 'honour' rotated through the members of the civic elite who could afford it.¹¹¹⁴ Nevertheless, both inscriptions together imply the presence of the Roman commander in Colophon on a semi-regular basis. This hints at the growing weight of personal qualities and connections of individual ambassadors in the late second century. Confronted by a rotating cast of influential senators and commanders, it seems that the

¹¹¹² Robert & Robert 1989, 98-99; Ferrary 1991, 557-559 contra Canali De Rossi 1991, 646-648; Eilers 2002, 125-128.

¹¹¹³ On Lampsacus: Steel 2004, 233-251.

¹¹¹⁴ Pace Robert & Robert 1989, 102.

Colophonians, at least, recognised the critical role of skilled individuals in cultivating a strong bond with specific leaders, beyond appealing directly to the Senate.

Perhaps the most notable example of a provincial using his personal Roman connections to benefit his home city is Theophanes of Mytilene. A well-known intellectual, he accompanied Cn. Pompeius Magnus on his eastern campaigns after 67, of which he produced a history.¹¹¹⁵ He is attested as a Roman citizen in 62, which Raggi identifies as unusual for Greek allies of this period, taking the name Cn. Pompeius Theophanes.¹¹¹⁶ The ambiguity over whether individuals could hold a non-Roman citizenship alongside the *civitas Romana* has important implications for Theophanes' social status.¹¹¹⁷ Heller has emphasised that while Greek self-identity in this period was based on language and shared culture, the Roman ideal focused more closely on participation in the citizen community.¹¹¹⁸ After 62, the evidence places him either at Rome or in the vicinity of Pompeius, which speaks to his close attention to Roman political games.¹¹¹⁹ Accordingly, Ferrary has argued that the mid-first century saw ambition relocated from the civic to the imperial sphere for select elite allied individuals. Direct personal relationships with Romans could secure honour and privileges beyond those offered by service within the community.¹¹²⁰ In this respect, Theophanes stands as a harbinger of imperial Greek elites and in subsequent decades his

¹¹¹⁵ Plut. *Pomp.* 37.2-3. Pédech 1991, 74-78; Santangelo 2018, 129; Ellis-Evans 2019, 256-25.

¹¹¹⁶ Cic. *Arch.* 24. Raggi 2010, 149; Santangelo 2018, 131-133. Cf. Gold 1985, 312-313. Val. Max. 8.14.5.

¹¹¹⁷ Cic. *Caec.* 100; *Balb.* 29-30; *Nep. Att.* 3.1: each shows this was a matter of legal debate at Rome, irrespective of how communities in the provinces reacted. Ferrary 2005, 68-70; Fournier 2012, 85-88. Compare members of the Athenian *boule* with Roman citizenship in the mid-first century (Habicht 1997, 345).

¹¹¹⁸ Heller 2011, 227-229.

¹¹¹⁹ Santangelo 2018, 133-143. Compare Nicias of Cos: Herzog 1922, 190-216; Bowersock 1965, 45-46.

¹¹²⁰ Ferrary 1997, 204; Santangelo 2018, 144; Ellis-Evans 2019, 258.

family continued to enjoy an elevated status: his son, Pompeius Macer, was an imperial procurator in Asia and his grandson, Q. Pompeius Macer, the earliest attested Greek senator.¹¹²¹

Though the evidence suggests that civic benefaction was no longer his sole or primary concern, he was honoured extensively at Mytilene.¹¹²² Plutarch is explicit that Theophanes persuaded Pompeius to restore freedom to the *polis*, which it had lost following the First Mithridatic War, and it seems clear that this benefaction underpinned his honours.¹¹²³ Absent evidence for specific actions on Theophanes' part, as well as his apparent absence from Mytilene, it is unlikely that he played a prominent role within the civic community. However, this does not mean that he did not press for other benefits from Rome and Romans on behalf of the city. The literary sources, understandably, focus on his role in Roman political life, but a monument at Mytilene honoured him alongside Pompeius and Potamon, the prominent ambassador from the 40s onwards. In doing so, the monument drew a link between the Roman agent responsible, the local catalyst and a contemporary who continued to defend civic independence strongly:

Γναίω Πονπη|ῖω Γναίω υἱῶ | Μεγάλω, αὐτο|κράτορι, τῶ εὐ|εργέτῃ καὶ σω|τῆρι
καὶ κτιστῇ || Θεῶ Δι| [Ε]λε|υθε|ρίω φιλοπάτριδι | Θεοφάνη, τῶ σωτῆρι καὶ
εὐεργέ|τῃ καὶ κτιστῇ δευ|τέρω τᾶς πατρίδος || Ποτάμωνι | Λεσβώνακτο[ς] | τῶ

¹¹²¹ Suet. *Aug.* 56.7; Strabo 12.2.3; Tac. *Ann.* 1.72.3, 6.18.2. Syme 1982, 79-80; Buraselis 2001, 61-63. For the family's links to the Euryclids of Sparta, whose relationship with the Roman state had a similar trajectory: Bowersock 1961, 116-117. On the growing importance of dynastic relationships: Quass 1984, 212-214.

¹¹²² *Syll.*³ 753, 755; Robert 1969, pp.52-53; SEG 42.755; BMC *Troas, Aeolis, Lesbos* #158-160; Tac. *Ann.* 6.18.5. Magie 1950, 1230; Bowersock 1965, 1-13; Santangelo 2018, 133-143.

¹¹²³ Plut. *Pomp.* 42.43.3. Gold 1985, 324.

εὐεργέτα καὶ σωτῆρος | καὶ κτιστᾶ τᾶ[ς] | πόλιο[ς]· ('To Gnaeus Pompeius, son of Gnaeus, Magnus, *imperator*, benefactor and saviour and founder. || To the god Zeus Eleutherios, the country-loving Theophanes, saviour and benefactor and second founder of the city. || For Potamon, son of Lesbos, benefactor and saviour and founder of the city').¹¹²⁴

This inscription associates Theophanes with the figure of Zeus Eleutherios, suggesting that it was posthumous, and emphasises his role in securing the city's freedom.¹¹²⁵ Significantly, neither Pompeius nor Potamon is granted divine status and the reference to him as κτίστης δευτέρος, where his two fellow honorands receive the epithet κτίστης without qualification (founder, preserver) is also suggestive. Theophanes presents a crucial evolution in the relationship between Romans and Greeks. He was the first prominent inhabitant of Asia to leverage his personal service to a Roman commander to benefit his home city without having been active as an official ambassador on their behalf. Santangelo's persuasive argument that the bulk of Theophanes' utility to Pompeius was in a Roman political mode rather than his literary output complicates the account of his assistance. As a Roman citizen, living and operating at Rome, Theophanes, in a practical sense stood outside the Mytilenean community. Yet, as this monument reinforces, he commanded reverence and respect from his home *polis*.

Such dual roles become increasingly visible in the 40s and 30s. Perhaps the most explicit examples are the father and son Theopompus and Artemidorus of Cnidus.¹¹²⁶ The

¹¹²⁴ *Syll.*³ 752-754.

¹¹²⁵ Compare *BMC Troas, Aeolis, Lesbos* #158-160, Tiberian coins of Mytilene bearing the legend Θεοφάνης Θεός. Robert 1969a, 48-51; Santangelo 2018, 143 *contra* Anastasiadis 1995, 9-10.

¹¹²⁶ On these figures: Hirschfeld 1886, 286-290; Thériault 2003, 232-253.

literary sources emphasise that Caesar made Cnidus a *civitas libera* to gratify Theopompus, memorably dismissed by Plutarch as μύθων συναγωγή, ('a collector of stories'). The parallels between Theopompus and Theophanes are strong: both members of the provincial elite of Asia, both plucked from among the literati and both connected to a powerful Roman who arranged for their *polis* to receive its freedom.¹¹²⁷ Theopompus' citizenship is well-attested and, like Theophanes, the sources imply that he was more active at Rome than in Asia.¹¹²⁸ Ferrary stresses that while Theopompus and his son may have been a major factor in Cnidus' freedom and were present at the oaths for the treaty between Rome and Cnidus, they were explicitly not a part of the embassy to Caesar.¹¹²⁹

More generally, evidence collected by Strubbe implies that most recipients of near-divine honours (ἰσόθεαι τιμαί) in the period were Roman citizens prominent in their own communities: for example, C. Iulius Hybreas at Mylasa, C. Iulius Epicrates, with his father C. Iulius Apollonius, at Miletus, and C. Iulius Xeno at Thyatira.¹¹³⁰ A key question arising here, is what made these figures worthy of (near-)divine honours? Prima facie, their successes, while significant, were no more impressive than other members of the Asian civic elites who

¹¹²⁷ Plut. *Caes.* 48.1; Strabo 14.2.15; *I.Knidos* 51-52.

¹¹²⁸ Most evidence for the two places them explicitly in Rome, and Artemiodorus plays a role in Plutarch's and Appian's assassination narratives in 44: Cic. *Att.* 13.7.1; *Phil.* 13.33; Plut. *Caes.* 65.1-4; App. *BCiv.* 2.116; Cic. *QFr.* 1.2.9, 2.11.4. Theopompus was also honoured with Roman nomenclature at Delphi (*Syll.*³ 761C), Rhodes (*IG* 12.1.90), Cos (*AE* 1934, 91) and Syrian Laodicea (*I.Knidos* 58): see Thériault 2003, 233-236.

¹¹²⁹ *I.Knidos* 56.7-9. Ferrary 2005, 56-57 *contra* Thériault 2003, 239.

¹¹³⁰ Strubbe 2004, 320-328. Hybreas: Noë 1996, 50-64; Delrieux & Ferriès 2004, 49-71, 499-515; Epicrates and Apollonius: *Milet* 6.1.156, 159; *SEG* 44.942; Herrmann 1994, 229-234; Xeno: *TAM* 5.2.1098.1-4; Strubbe 1984-1986, 299. The potential exceptions are Euthydemus at Mylasa, (e.g. Cic. *Fam.* 13.56.1; Delrieux & Ferriès 2004, 54-64) and possible ἀσιάρχης (*I.Mylasa* 151, 531; Campanile 1997, 243-244); and Asclepiades of Cyzicus (*IGR* 4.159.10-13; Robert 1950, 95-96; Strubbe 2004, 324-325). Compare, Iulius Satyrus at Chersonesus (Rostovtzeff 1917, 27-44)

managed to obtain benefactions from the Senate or Roman commanders. Building on Santangelo's recent argument, I argue that the close engagement of some these men in Roman politics and society made them fundamentally different from their predecessors and contemporaries. Through their citizenship and their intimate relationships with especially powerful Romans, they began to move from being the seekers of *beneficia* to agents of benefaction. As Theophanes and Artemidorus were Roman citizens, based in Rome, providing advice to late Republican powerbrokers, they served as semi-permanent lobbyists on their homelands' behalf rather than official representatives. One plausible model, albeit impossible to prove positively, would envisage Theophanes and Artemidorus as encouraging a consistent series of benefactions over a long term through their continued influence with figures at Rome. Though Hybreas seems to have remained in Asia, he too, according to the sources developed a strong relationship with both Antonius and Octavian.¹¹³¹ The evidence for Epicrates and Apollonius, by contrast, seems to place them as active participants in civic life.¹¹³² Moreover, several of these figures, including Hybreas, Epicrates and Xeno were the first civic ἀρχιερεῖς for the imperial cult in their *polis*, further implicating them with the regime.¹¹³³ As the rule of Augustus and his successors became more entrenched, however, the grant of divine honours for civic benefactors swiftly disappeared.¹¹³⁴

¹¹³¹ Delrieux & Ferrière 2004, 64-71, 509-515.

¹¹³² Epicrates was *stephanophoros* in 40/39, prophet at Didyma from either 33/32-27/26 or 20/19, and *archiereus* of Augustus at Miletus in 6/5 (*Milet* 1.2.7). Herrmann 1994, 204-206, 221-222; 1996, 7-10.

¹¹³³ Edelmann-Singer 2016, 228-230.

¹¹³⁴ See discussion of *I.Kyme* 19.3-20, on the refusal of ἰσόθιοι τιμαί by L. Vaccius Labeo. Price 1984, 47-52; Strubbe 2004, 328-329; Kuhn 2017, 199-205. See the overlap with common imperial policy: Tac. *Ann.* 4.38; *SEG* 11.922.17-21; *P.London* 1912.

By contrast, provincial figures in the following period have comparatively less success. Though C. Iulius Zoilos at Aphrodisias and Seleucus of Rhosus were both granted citizenship and served as a conduit between their home cities and Octavian/Augustus, the Roman world was changing, while the civic social scene remained conservative. Both Zoilos and Seleucus had provided service to Augustus, the dossiers at Aphrodisias and Rhosus emphasise that the two had permanently resettled in their own *poleis*.¹¹³⁵ Their forebears, such as Theophanes, appear to have been engaged in the cut and thrust of Republican politics, providing avenues of communication to the ‘great men’ they supported and advice in times of need. By contrast neither Zoilos nor Seleucus is envisaged as providing a similar service in the future, possibly the result of the shrinking arena of political life with Augustus’ growing supremacy.¹¹³⁶ Moreover, both men seem to have emerged from less exalted backgrounds than typical members of the elite.¹¹³⁷

In this respect, Zoilos and Seleucus seem to have more in common with figures like Athenodorus of Tarsus, a tutor of Augustus who, according to Strabo, was intimately involved in the government of his own *polis* without receiving Roman citizenship.¹¹³⁸ These men achieved local influence through their central connections, rather than vice versa. This reflects the trend visible in the eastern empire under Antonius’ triumvirate, where

¹¹³⁵ Heller 2011, 229-231; De Chaisemartin 2017, 337-341.

¹¹³⁶ Pace Robert 1989 [1966], 43-45.

¹¹³⁷ Raggi 2006, 191-193; Heller 2011, 229-231.

¹¹³⁸ Strabo 14.5.14. Note also, Nestor of Tarsus, teacher of Marcellus and προέστη τῆς πολιτείας. Bowersock 1965, 32-36. Compare, though speculative, Grimal 1945-1946, 261-273, 62-79.

administrative functions, including tax-collection, were outsourced to individuals.¹¹³⁹ This dynamic evolved as the Principate became entrenched, becoming more focused on the civic role of individuals while concurrently encouraging the creation of a provincial elite through institutions like the *koinon* of Asia.¹¹⁴⁰

However, this narrative does not explain every case, which Crinagoras of Mytilene neatly illustrates. A distinguished contemporary of Potamon and participant in multiple embassies to Caesar and Augustus, in 25, he visited the latter in Spain.¹¹⁴¹ His epigrams, collected in the Palatine Anthology, stress his closeness to the Imperial family between this date and his death sometime after 11 CE.¹¹⁴² No evidence for his enfranchisement survives, suggesting a long residence at Rome, familiarity and intimacy with members of the imperial house, ranging from Marcellus to Tiberius, without being accepted fully into a Roman community. By contrast with Theophanes or Potamon, Crinagoras does not appear to have been particularly feted within Mytilene, which might suggest a less active or successful role in promoting the agenda of the city.¹¹⁴³ Though, in Crinagoras' case, this could be an accident of survival, it illustrates the point that not every prominent individual mediating between Rome and their community received the same rewards. Though a broad trend pushed local

¹¹³⁹ E.g. Anaxenor of Magnesia or Stephanus at Aphrodisias. More generally, Antonius evinced a preference for appointing trusted allies to govern territory, simplifying the process of ruling and limiting the amount of resources expended on direct administration of justice and taxation.

¹¹⁴⁰ E.g. Smith 1993, 6; Edelmann-Singer 2016, 233-235.

¹¹⁴¹ Strabo 13.2.3; *IGR* 4.38; *Anth. Pal.* 9.559. Bowersock 1965, 36-37; Sherk 1969, 157.

¹¹⁴² Gow & Page 1968, 2.210-213.

¹¹⁴³ Parker 1991, 115.

magnates towards Roman citizenship and civic leadership this was a granular and uneven process.

Across the period the *poleis* of Asia employed a variety of diplomatic, to use the term loosely, strategies in engaging with the power of Rome. From the outset, traditional embassies to the Senate or commanders in Asia were sent to deal with practical problems which attended the assertion of Roman *imperium* over the region. Some were concerned with establishing ties of patronage with individual Romans. Certain embassies from ἐλεύθεραι *poleis* also solicited and received *foedera* which established the bilateral nature of their relationship with Rome. Finally, over time, more personal relationships between individual Greek elites and Roman commanders predominated. These were pursued with different intensity as the broader geo-political situation changed. After Sulla's arrangements in 85, there is limited, though growing evidence for collective embassies in response to particularly widespread problems. However, the most important implications arise from the personalisation of relationships between the centre and provincial communities, on both sides. The increasing value of links such as those between Theophanes and Pompeius or Zoilos and Augustus subverted existing institutions. Civic patronage and diplomacy became less useful levers for communities, as success came to depend more on private relationships than public ones. This is not to say that these institutions fell into a sharp immediate decline, but the evidence shows that shrewd communities would employ as ambassadors those favoured by prominent Romans, and Octavian himself encouraged the citizens of Rhodus to approach him through his admiral Seleucus. Interestingly, the unchallenged supremacy of Augustus prompted a new institutionalisation of relationships,

fostered by a new security and stability within the empire.¹¹⁴⁴ Due to the centralisation of power, this held a very different structure to Republican models and formed the basis for imperial-provincial interaction under the Principate.

3.4: Imperial Power and Local Agency: The Display of Roman Documents

Across the period Asian *poleis*, increasingly, inscribed and displayed prominently Roman normative documents, that is, utterances of the Roman state or its representatives. Key questions concern the degree to which this reflected local choice and whether this phenomenon produces evidence of independent agency within the overarching framework of Roman power. Local communities could engage meaningfully with Roman communiqués through display or archiving the text and many extant Republican documents survive in the form of Asian copies, demonstrating the breadth of this practice. Accordingly, Ando argued for the pervasive and regular dissemination of imperial documents to provincials. He suggested publication was normally required by Roman authorities, citing the *lex de provinciis praetoriis*, which contains an explicit ‘publication’ clause, as evidence.¹¹⁴⁵ Cities were to ensure that:

εἰς δ<έλ>τον χαλ|κῆν γράμματα ἐνκεχαραγμέ[να, εἰ δὲ μὴ ἢ ἐν λίθῳ μαρμαρίνῳ ἢ κ|αὶ ἐν λευκώματι, ὅπως ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι ἐκκέ[ηται ἐν ἱερῷ] ἢ ἀγοραῖ φανερώς, ὅθεν δυνή|σονται ἐστακότες ἀναγινώσ[κειν ὁρθῶς] (‘the letters, engraved on a bronze tablet, [or if not either on a marble slab or even] on a whitened board,

¹¹⁴⁴ Smith 1993, 8-10; Ventroux 2017, 165-166.

¹¹⁴⁵ Ando 2000, 81-83. Contrast, Ferrary’s emphasis (2009, 127-138) on local implementation of Roman decisions during the Republic with Nelis-Clément’s account of the early Principate (2006, 141-148).

be openly [published] in the cities [in a sanctuary] or *agora*, in such a way that people shall be able to read (them) [properly] from ground level’).¹¹⁴⁶

However, Ando, as noted in Chapter 1, glosses over the document’s uniqueness. First, the *lex* resulted from a fraught period of legislative politics at Rome amid Saturninus’ third tribunate. Second, it knitted together several unconnected issues into one measure (*per saturam*) making the text’s relevance to its wider audience any given point tenuous at best. Last, crucially, this clause does not mandate the publication of *lex* in all relevant areas.¹¹⁴⁷ One extant clause presents a detailed set of instructions regarding the taxation of a newly conquered area north of Macedonia, but the ‘publication’ clause applies explicitly and exclusively to the *poleis* of Asia. I have argued in Chapter 1 that this can be explained due to the *poleis* of Asia having ‘freedom’ during this period. The ‘publication’ clause facilitated dialogue with a set of free allies, more efficiently than despatching ambassadors (as with the allied monarchs, who received letters). Ando’s second pillar is the letter of an unknown magistrate found at Miletus and Priene.¹¹⁴⁸ He used the date typically attributed to this text of the 50s, but as argued *supra*, the early 20s seem more plausible.¹¹⁴⁹ This letter requires that its recipients, the *koinon* and nine cities which head the διοικήσεις, forward copies to other

¹¹⁴⁶ RS 12.Delphi.B.24-26. Compare Colin’s original supplements (1924, 80) offering the same sense. Crawford et al. (1996, 19-20) take this as a standard formula, based on the Greek translation of the Latin formula *unde de plano recte legi possit*, but recognise that *leges* generally mandate publication of documents associated with them, rather than the statutes themselves. I avoid the debate on whether Roman laws in bronze were intended to be read, save noting that, *pace* Ando (2000, 101), (il)legibility does not detract from the significance of display (Williamson 1987, 160-183; Cooley 2012, 170-171).

¹¹⁴⁷ Despite Crawford’s (1996, 263) retreat from this position, taken originally by Hassall, Crawford & Reynolds (1974, 197-200), the framing is unambiguous. Ando 2000, 82; Cooley 2012, 164-165.

¹¹⁴⁸ Ando 2000, 83.

¹¹⁴⁹ See pp.85-86 *supra*.

polities within their district and engrave it on white stone in the most conspicuous place (ἐπιφανέστατος τόπος). Ando treats this, together with the *lex de provinciis praetoriis*, as evidence for standard practice – to my mind, however, the fact that the author feels the need to spell this out, when the formulation itself is unparalleled in magistrate’s correspondence from the Republican period, suggests the opposite.¹¹⁵⁰

The incongruity of Ando’s position is demonstrated most clearly by two early *senatusconsulta*. The first, the *senatusconsultum Popillianum*, declared the decisions of Attalus valid, up to a day before his death, thereby giving them standing within Roman jurisdiction.¹¹⁵¹ A near complete copy, though out of context, survives at Pergamum, plausibly taken as an assertion of the *polis’* ἐλευθερία based on the king’s testament.¹¹⁵² An analogous document, the *senatusconsultum Licinianum*, which similarly brought over the decisions of Mithridates V for use in a Roman framework, has also been found at Arizli, a modern village around 35km southeast of Synnada, as yet unidentified with an ancient community.¹¹⁵³ Extracts from both texts recur in third fragment from Arizli, identified as a magistrate’s letter.¹¹⁵⁴ This document seems to distil important elements from both bills into a single format, raising questions over the date, provenance and purpose of these

¹¹⁵⁰ Eilers 2009, 305 *contra* Ando 2000, 82-83. The text is ambiguous on whether the secondary recipients of the letter, including Priene, were required to inscribe it. That the *demos* decided to do so is insufficient evidence that the author intended to have every community in Asia reproduce it, though admittedly the generalising language, may support this view.

¹¹⁵¹ RDGE 11.

¹¹⁵² Merola 2001, 26.

¹¹⁵³ RDGE 13.

¹¹⁵⁴ SEG 28.1208.

inscriptions. Importantly, there is no obvious local audience for these documents, so why did communities choose to inscribe them, and what impact did this have?

Corcoran's observations regarding the publication of Roman official documents from the fourth to seventh centuries CE offer a valuable comparison. In that period, generic *edicta* outnumber letters from magistrates or imperial *rescripta*. Based on the tendency of later Emperors to state bluntly their wishes that all inhabitants of the empire be aware of and understand the law as issued, Corcoran assumes that the *impetus* to publish these documents was imperial, deriving from the governor or ruler directly.¹¹⁵⁵ Though he highlights the Republican origins of this tradition in the injunction contained in *leges populi Romani* and *senatusconsulta* that they be published *unde de plano recte legi possit*, this formula was not generally reproduced in the Roman East during this transitional period, and the region had no existing tradition of disseminating general legislation beyond a few Seleucid προτάγματα.¹¹⁵⁶ In these examples, no publication clause survives: though inconclusive in itself, it is highly suggestive without an existing impetus to monumentalise central legislation. Drew-Bear emphasises the later date for the inscription of the Arizli fragments, perhaps first or second century CE.¹¹⁵⁷ This demonstrates the decision's continuing importance in the context of later changes to the Roman administration. The decrees' general nature divorces them from local concerns over civic privileges. Though the absence of context for the finds makes it impossible to reconstruct the way in which these two

¹¹⁵⁵ Corcoran (2018, 5-12), citing also the *res gestae divi Augusti* and *senatusconsultum de Cn. Pisone patre*, on which see pp.326-327 *infra*.

¹¹⁵⁶ Bencivenni 2014, 148-151.

¹¹⁵⁷ Drew-Bear 1978, 3, 5. See SEG 28.1208.

documents interacted with one another, the shared orthography would imply that they consciously did so, that is, they were (re?)inscribed at the same time for a similar purpose.

Though recognisably reproducing the same information, the wording of the documents at Pergamum and Arizlı differs, raising further issues. Lines 15-19 of the *senatusconsultum Popillianum* read:

[ὅ]σα τούτων ἐγένετο πρὸ μιᾶς [ἡμέρας πρὶν ἢ | Ἀττ]αλον τελευτῆσαι, ὅπως ταῦτ[α κύρια ἢ στρατη]γοί τε οἱ εἰς Ἀσίαν πορευόμεν[——]ην, ἀλλὰ ἐῷσι κύρια μένειν [ἅπαντα καθὼς ἡ σύνκλη]τος ἐπέκριν[εν] ('Those things which have come about up to one day before the death of Attalos, so these things are legally binding, and the commanders sent out to Asia [——] but should remain legally binding, all of them, just as the Senate decreed.')

By comparison the Arizlı fragment adds [---]τὰ Ἀττάλου φυλάσσηται ('that the [---] of Attalus be protected'). Drew-Bear takes this variation as occurring in the translation of the *senatusconsultum*. However, this fragment most likely derives from a magistrate's letter.¹¹⁵⁹ If so, then this change might represent an editorial statement by the magistrate, elaborating on the text of the decree. Other changes are limited to word order or cosmetic variations of translation from the original Latin.¹¹⁶⁰ Consequently, it seems preferable to me to view the additional clause as part of the magistrate's decision, reinforcing the extent to which local

¹¹⁵⁸ RDGE 11.15-19.

¹¹⁵⁹ The most likely restoration of l.9 is [εὐτυχ]εῖτε ('farewell'), though slightly ambitious given the remainder of the text almost exclusively reproduces *senatusconsulta* and leaves little space at the end for a decision. Drew-Bear 1978, 7.

¹¹⁶⁰ OGIS 435.16 (ὅπως ταῦτα κύρια ἢ) v. SEG 28.1208.1 ([restored] ὅπως ταῦτα κύρια μένει); OGIS 435.17 (ἐῷσι κύρια μένειν [ἅπαντα]) v. SEG 28.1208.2-3 ([ἐῷσι | ἅπαντα] κύρι[α] μένειν); OGIS 436.8 ([ὅσα βασιλεὺς Μιθράδατη]ς) v. SEG 28.1208.5-6 (ὅσα βασιλεὺς Μιθρά[δατης περὶ] τῆς Ἀσίας).

communities retained control over the creation of the text and monument in their own civic context.¹¹⁶¹

Why did the inhabitants of Pergamum and a small Phrygian *polis* go to the significant expense of inscribing these generic documents, which arrived with no explicit involvement on their part? For Pergamum, as the centre of the former kingdom which retained significance within the new Roman administrative schema, the display of the document may have been intended to convey continuity between the two regimes.¹¹⁶² Moreover, existing elites, as a group, had a vested interest in maintaining the status quo within the *polis*. Given their access to the royal court and its participants, Pergamum and its inhabitants would have been affected by a greater proportion of regal decisions than elsewhere. The *polis* may have sought to emphasise the universal confirmation of Attalus' *acta*. Though the text simply brought these decisions across into a Roman framework, within which magistrates could interact with them, a simple reading of the Greek does not contradict this view. The gap between the purpose of the *senatusconsultum* and its reception is entirely plausible.

The Arızlı copies are more difficult to explain, especially given the appearance of both decrees. It is possible that, again, the *polis* was attempting to secure specific grants from either or both of Attalus III and Mithridates V, perhaps pertaining to its lands, or even its

¹¹⁶¹ As Corcoran (2018, 9) insists for Asia in the early fourth century CE. While the impetus for the display of Diocletian's price edict appears to have been imperial rather than local, note the wide range of variations in display, framing and text between Aphrodisias, Stratonicea and Aezani.

¹¹⁶² E.g. Sherk 1969, 62. On Hellenistic practice, wherein royal letters generally reacted to a local drive: Bencivenni 2010, 154.

status as a community.¹¹⁶³ If so, it raises the question of audience. The chances that a Roman magistrate, or even a representative, would visit a small community in the vicinity of the much more significant Synnada, which became a *conventus* centre during the first century, are small.¹¹⁶⁴ Our account of Cicero's journey through Cilicia makes clear that he rarely visited communities outside *conventus* centres.¹¹⁶⁵ While allowing for changes in practice, it seems reasonable that the proportion of time spent by Roman magistrates in smaller communities was minimal. If so, the small Phrygian *polis* cannot have been directing its publication of these documents at Rome or its representatives in any meaningful sense.

One possibility is that the display of a document dating from the earliest days of the *provincia* allowed the community to define itself. I have argued above that the three Phrygian *dioceses* of Asia and Cilicia may have been integrated into the Galatian kingdom of Amyntas between 36 and 25. By publicly erecting monuments emphasising the early establishment of a relationship, even a generic and subordinate one, with Rome, the *polis* and its neighbours drew on and created a civic memory which set them apart from other Galatian settlements. Competition between the constituent communities of empire was crucial to the strategy of imperial rule and had roots far deeper than Roman involvement in the region. While far less significant than the disagreements over *neokoroi* and titulature of

¹¹⁶³ E.g. Drew-Bear (1978, 9) concluded that the publication arose from the important practical implications for the local inhabitants.

¹¹⁶⁴ Thonemann 2011, 54-56; Kantor 2013, 153-155. On Synnada: Belke & Mersich 1990, 393-394. Modern Arızlı lies in a mountain pass between the two major routes east from Phrygian Apamea, the first via Synnada and Philomelium, the second via Antioch in Pisidia. Equidistant between the two, the chances that it entertained Roman governors on a regular basis must be slim.

¹¹⁶⁵ Cic. *Att.* 5.16.2, 20.1; *Fam.* 15.4.2. Hunter 1913, 81-94; Marshall 1966, 231-246.

the major centres of the *provinciae* of the High Empire, these documents could have arisen from a similar phenomenon.¹¹⁶⁶ Another possibility, in a similar vein, is that smaller communities emulated the practice of their larger neighbours.

Though, as noted, the practical impact on Roman officials, institutions and policy was limited, the local choice to publish these generic *senatusconsulta* had important effects. First, it offered locals the chance to assert elements of self-definition and self-determination: by producing documents which appeared to define their relationship with the imperial metropole in clear and favourable terms, *poleis* could advertise to their own citizens that their position had not worsened with the permanent arrival of Roman magistrates. In this respect, as Cicero recognised, the appearance was more significant than the reality.¹¹⁶⁷ Second, by choosing to inscribe these documents, at significant expense, and place them permanently, as sizeable monuments, in a public space alongside the political pronouncements of the *demos* and the honours decreed for local benefactors, the *poleis* placed the official utterances of the Senate on a par with the most important acts of the community itself. It normalised the format, text, and appearance of Roman documents. It granted them normative force and assimilated them with the local elite's own decisions. As Ma notes, in societies which display authoritative documents monumentally, the epigraphic medium itself can instantiate legitimacy. Even beyond this, the inscriptions themselves locate the source of their authority precisely: in the institutions of the Roman state rather

¹¹⁶⁶ E.g. Heller 2006, 28–51.

¹¹⁶⁷ Cic. Att. 6.1.15. Compare Leg. 3.25.

than local practice.¹¹⁶⁸ In the treatment of Roman normative documents, there are elements of previous approaches to royal letters: however, this was a very different, and difficult, learning process. By publishing these documents, local institutions granted legitimacy to Roman norms and normative actions, but, crucially, civic elites made active and judicious choices in which and how many Roman documents to publicise in this fashion.

The *senatusconsultum de agro Pergameno*, already discussed in Chapter 1, offers a different conundrum. Unlike the generic decrees discussed above, the Senate issued this response directly to a Pergamene embassy's petition on a specific issue, the boundaries of their territory vis-à-vis the surrounding *ager publicus*. Considering the success in carrying out their task, the monumental display of this text at Pergamum is unexceptional. However, further copies have been discovered at Adramyttium, Smyrna and Ephesus. As Robert stressed, the last cannot have been directly affected by the Roman decision, as its territory cannot have bordered Pergamum's. Instead, noting that the four copies emerge from *conventus* centres, he proposed that Roman administrators sought to publicise the decision to the *provincia* at large.¹¹⁶⁹ However, despite this interpretation's popularity, there are two clear objections.¹¹⁷⁰ First, it remains unlikely that the *conventus* existed in its fully developed form when the document were produced. Second, there seems no clear motive for the Senate to insist on the publication of a specific decision on Pergamum's civic boundaries for a general provincial audience. Ferrary cogently approached this issues by positing a later

¹¹⁶⁸ Bertrand 1990, 108-115; Ma 2012, 141.

¹¹⁶⁹ Robert 1969c, 612, n.3.

¹¹⁷⁰ E.g. Mitchell 1999, 27; Kay 2014, 67.

date for the inscription of the decree. The greater concern with ostentatious good governance during the civil war period, he argued, provides a more plausible context for the dissemination and advertisement of a decision against the interests of the *publicani*.¹¹⁷¹ However, this does not solve the problem. After 48, the *publicani* became a much less visible element of provincial life. Substituting Caesar for the Senate, the significance of one highly localised decision for the *provincia* writ large remains unclear. While the dictator showed clear concern for provincial well-being, the sentiment expressed in *I.Priene*² 13, that publication would ensure ἵνα κοινῶς πάσῃ τῇ ἐπαρχείᾳ[ι τὸ] | δίκαιον ἑσταμένον ἥι εἰς τὸν αἰεὶ χρόνον ('that justice be established in common for the whole province and for all time'), was a later development.¹¹⁷² Finally, while the *senatusconsultum de agro Pergameno* shows the Senate intervening against the *publicani*, the text did not represent the assertion of any strong principle and an explicit publication clause seems unlikely.

Inscription in the document's original context seems more reasonable. Two potential scenarios suggest themselves. First, that the *poleis* received a copy of the *senatusconsultum* and convention or assumptions of Roman wishes led them to publish it. The evidence consistently demonstrates the large-scale dissemination of information by the Roman state and, upon the organisation of the *provincia*, the despatch of *senatusconsulta* to a wider group of communities than those immediately effected is plausible. In the preceding century, royal letters were strong normative documents which warranted record and

¹¹⁷¹ Ferrary 2009a, 71-72, with references to earlier literature. Jones 2001, 11-18; Morrell 2017, esp. 237-268.

¹¹⁷² *I.Priene*² 13.50-51.

display.¹¹⁷³ Roman communiqués, when received by ‘free’ *poleis*, held a similarly significant status: though, crucially, almost exclusively in response to a petition or embassy. In the earliest days of the *provincia*, the drive to publicise Roman decisions may have been greater than later evidence would suggest.

The second option would posit a local drive to publish the *senatusconsultum*. While the document appears in multiple locations, we have no way of mapping the spread of its monumentalisation. Imitation may have played a role. Though, strictly, the decision pertained only to Pergamene territory, *poleis* may have seen this as articulating a general principle and sought to redeploy the decree in their own disputes with the *publicani*. This would posit a Roman audience, though a limited one, for the display.¹¹⁷⁴ The transitional period from kingdom to province, notwithstanding the general freedom granted, would have been particularly fraught with disagreements over the territorial limit of publican responsibility. In this respect, the publication of the *senatusconsultum de agro Pergameno* would be aimed at asserting the support of the Senate for the territorial integrity of the free cities in a general sense - a particularly important goal in the earliest days of the new system.

A further factor may have been a desire to locate the community more solidly within an imagined Roman polity. That is, the display of this statement by the apparatus of the Roman state was intended to highlight to diverse audiences the acknowledgement of Rome’s real, and now asserted, power over the former Attalid kingdom. I agree with Ando that

¹¹⁷³ Bencivenni 2014, 146-148.

¹¹⁷⁴ Tibiletti 1957, 138; Sherk 1965, 365; Merola 2001, 33-34. See Mitchell 1999, 27, for the decree’s exemplary character.

display of normative documents generated over time a sense of legitimacy and hierarchy.¹¹⁷⁵

What I argue here is that the impetus could and often did arise from the local communities, rather than the state itself.

A later example reinforcing how local motives often lay behind the reproduction of Roman documents is the dossier associated with Paullus Fabius Maximus' reform of Asia's calendar in 9/8. The universalising discourse present in Paullus' *edictum* and extension of the new calendar across the whole *provincia*, irrespective of whether this was enforced, offer a crucial instance of a text which was applicable to a wide audience.¹¹⁷⁶ Indeed, the dossier appears in multiple copies scattered across the province: fragments are found at Priene, Maeonia, Phrygian Apamea, Dorylaeum, Eumeneia and Metropolis. However, like the implementation of the decision, the choice to publish the document widely was mediated by the *koinon* of Asia. Paullus himself notes that he will only: προστάξω | δὲ χαραχθὲν <ἐν> τῇ στήλῃ τὸ ψήφισμα ἐν τῷ ναῷ ἀνατεθῆναι, προστάξας τὸ διάταγμα ἑκατέρος γραφέν ('order this decree, inscribed on a stele, to be set up in the temple [of Augustus and Roma at Pergamum], having commanded that the *edictum* be written in both languages').¹¹⁷⁷ Given that the decision was taken by the governor and *koinon* to honour Augustus collectively, the choice to place a permanent monument to that process at the centre of the burgeoning imperial cult in Asia makes a powerful statement. However, this is as far as Paullus'

¹¹⁷⁵ Ando 2000, 75-110, see Eilers 2009, 301-304. In this case, it inverts the trend observed by Ma (1999, 241) that in the Hellenistic period, 'the ideological autarky and local identity of the *polis* were strongly affirmed... even under political subordination'. Conceptually, see Anderson 1991, 5-7.

¹¹⁷⁶ On (non-)compliance: Magie 1950, 481, Thonemann 2015.

¹¹⁷⁷ RDGE 65.A.28-30.

instructions extend. By contrast, the *koinon*, after providing for both Paullus' *edictum* and their own decree to be monumentalised in exactly this fashion, states:

προνοῆσαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς καθ' ἔτος ἐκδίκους ὅπως | ἐν ταῖς ἀφηγουμέναις τῶν
διοικήσεων πόλεσιν ἐν στήλαις λευ|κολίθοις ἐναραχθῇ τό τε δελτογράφημα τοῦ
Μαξίμου καὶ τὸ τῆς Ἀσίας | ψήφισμα, αὗται τε αἱ στήλαι τεθῶσιν ἐν τοῖς
Καيسαρήοις ('moreover, the *ekdikoi* for the year are to ensure that in the leading
cities in each *dioikesis*, the *edictum* of Maximus and the decree of Asia are
inscribed on marble steles, and these steles set up in the shrines to the
Caesars').¹¹⁷⁸

This example is particularly revealing, highlighting the extent to which non-Roman groups retained agency in the publication of ostensibly Roman documents. The enforceability of the *koinon*'s unilateral decision remains unclear. However, this command insists on the recognition of that power, assimilating the *koinon* inextricably with Paullus' original action.¹¹⁷⁹ Stern astutely notes that the *koinon*'s instructions for implementing the new schema also contradict the proconsul's instructions, aligning fully with the Julian calendar at use in Rome.¹¹⁸⁰ This stresses both that the organisation was more attuned to the details of the policy than the governor and that they saw no incompatibility in introducing changes. Only one copy derives from a *conventus* centre suggesting that other communities actively wanted to demonstrate their enthusiasm for the new Princeps.¹¹⁸¹ Finally, the Metropolis copy, consisting of Paullus' decree and the first decree of the *koinon*, was

¹¹⁷⁸ RDGE 65.D.62-67.

¹¹⁷⁹ Cooley 2012, 165; Ma 2012, 142-143.

¹¹⁸⁰ Stern 2012, 276.

¹¹⁸¹ Magie 1950, 480-481 *pace* Heller 2014, 225.

excavated in situ in the courtyard of the local *presbyterion* rather than a public context. Though Dreyer argues that this shows the practical impact of the changes – the *presbyteroi* needed this information to hand – it seems more plausible that this was a simple expression of local loyalty.¹¹⁸² Once again, the broad monumentalisation of these Roman documents is tied to regional agents and local concerns.

That said, the community retained control over their display. Beyond the active choice to display a text, the location, size and material of a monument had a bearing on its reception. Even where Roman documents did insist on their reproduction, for the most part they restricted their instructions to display in the ἐπιφανέστατοι τόποι ('the most prominent locations'). The careful ambiguity of this phrase, often employed in local honorific decrees of the second and first centuries, disguises the intense contestability and mutability of public space.¹¹⁸³ No single place fulfilled this criterion, as shown by the ubiquitous plural. Instead it offered the locals a further opportunity to frame the audience and interpretation of the document. Unfortunately, problems such as reuse, lack of provenance or lack of co-ordinated excavation prevent a complete study of the space and positioning of Roman documents within Asian communities.¹¹⁸⁴ However, some hints suggest how location could be used to reinforce or shape the messaging of a Roman text.

¹¹⁸² Dreyer & Engelmann 2006, 175-176, 182; Dreyer 2007, 347.

¹¹⁸³ Ma 2012a, 246-248; 2013, 67-69 (note his important observation that the placing of a monument in a location *ipso facto* alters the perception of that space); Chaniotis 2014, 135-136; Rouché 2014, 136.

¹¹⁸⁴ Instances like the archive wall at Aphrodisias (on which, Kokkinia 2015-2016, 11-22), allowing a full landscape to be reconstructed, are exceedingly rare.

A decree of Pergamum responding to the conclusion of a treaty with Rome in 129, provides an intriguing example. The text states: καθήκει καὶ | [πα]ρ' ἡμ[ῖν] ἀναγραφῆν[αι] αὐτὰ εἰς πίνακας | [χ]αλκοῦς δύο καὶ τεθῆναι ἔν τε τῷ ἱερῷ | [τ]ῆς Δήμητρος καὶ ἐν τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ | [παρ]ὰ τὸ ἄγαλμα τῆς [Δημοκ]ρατίας ('and it is right that these [documents] are inscribed by us on two bronze tablets and erected both in the temple of Demeter and in the *bouleuterion* next to the statue of *Demokratia*').¹¹⁸⁵ Following Cooley, the matter of publication is framed positively as a local choice: the words of the community obscure any suggestion of Roman commands or requests.¹¹⁸⁶ The text's display in two named locations underscores the symbolic importance of place. Neither the interior of the temple of Demeter, nor the *bouleuterion* were likely to have been highly trafficked locations by most of the citizen body. The precise importance of the temple of Demeter is unclear, though Ma has suggested that it was one of the limited number of locations at which honorific statues were regularly placed.¹¹⁸⁷ The implications of the *bouleuterion*, the political centre of the newly independent community, are much easier to grasp. The strong link between δημοκρατία and ideas of 'freedom' in this period are similarly well attested. The Pergamenes, in their decision to inscribe and display the treaty with Rome in these locations, were utilising a Roman document to make a clear ideological statement of their own crafting.

¹¹⁸⁵ IGR 4.1692.27-31.

¹¹⁸⁶ Cooley 2012, 163.

¹¹⁸⁷ Ma 2013, 102-103.

Paullus' *edictum*, discussed *supra*, also makes clever use of place, permanently commemorating the change of calendar, honouring Augustus, within the shrine dedicated to the Princeps and Rome. The threads drawing together the Princeps, time, the province as a whole and the divine could not have been more overt. Similarly, the choice of the *koinon* to reproduce this text, with their own decree, in temples to the deified Caesar created a dynastic element, which was entirely absent from Paullus' original text.¹¹⁸⁸ Kokkinia has recently proven how the layout of the archive wall at Aphrodisias particularly drew attention to the Augustan magnate C. Iulius Zoilos, on whose theatre the inscription was carved, but otherwise documents praising individuals were removed to the edges.¹¹⁸⁹ Each of these examples reinforces the degree to which local decision-makers could coax a locally flavoured narrative from imperial texts through controlling the nature of its display.

Finally, a crucial subset of Roman documents appears in funerary contexts. These focus attention on the role of individuals and stand at odds with the communitarian aspects of civic life. Three examples were erected within the period of study, recorded in Table 2 along with two later analogous cases. Earliest is a monument for Chaeremon of Nysa, preserving the letter of L. Cassius informing the *polis* of his aid to the Roman forces in the First Mithridatic War, alongside two letters from Mithridates himself calling for his apprehension or summary execution. Unlike the other examples discussed, this monument was demonstrably authorised by the *demos* and *boule*. However, the texts' purpose was to perpetuate knowledge of Chaeremon's deeds: the inscription subverts the language and

¹¹⁸⁸ RDGE 65.D.64-68. Unmentioned by Laffi (1967, 66), Sherk (1969, 336-337) or Price (1984, 53-56).

¹¹⁸⁹ Kokkinia 2015-2016, 42-51.

content of Mithridates' missives, as well as those of Cassius', to memorialise a great citizen. This monument preserves Mithridatic rhetoric in a civic context, including his ironic description of the Romans as τοὺς κοινοῦ[ς πολέ]μους ('the common enemies').¹¹⁹⁰ The less than flattering portrayal of Nysa's hegemons in this monument directly results from the honorific motive.

Later examples may not have depended on public recognition. Potamon of Mytilene's huge monument, dating to the late first century, shows a marked lack of concern for the communitarian ethos of the *polis*. Though the blocks are no longer in situ, having been reused in the walls of a Medieval citadel, they have produced numerous documents pertaining to Potamon's activities representing the *polis*. At least seven are Roman in origin, providing an invaluable insight into the relationship between Rome and Mytilene during this period.¹¹⁹¹ However, no evidence suggests that this was a public monument and its aggrandising nature suggests a private context. Seleucus of Rhosus' dossier, discovered in that community's necropolis, may have fronted his tomb.¹¹⁹² The primacy afforded him in the documents, when combined with his comparatively humble origins would again push away from a public honour. Despite Wörrle's scepticism, the dossier of the 'Menophilus family' at Aezani likely fronted a family tomb.¹¹⁹³ The famous mausoleum of Opramoas at Rhodiapolis provides a final example, preserving 70 documents, 38 of which involved Roman

¹¹⁹⁰ *Syll.* ³ 741. Santangelo 2009, 65-66.

¹¹⁹¹ Parker (1991, 115 n. 2) provides a list of existing fragments. Sherk (1969) collects the Roman documents as *RDGE* 25-26, 51, 73-78.

¹¹⁹² Roussel 1934, 33; Eck 1995-1998, 2.372.

¹¹⁹³ Jones 2000a, 456-457; Haensch 2009, 184-185 *pace* Wörrle 2014, 469-470. On the stemma: Wörrle 2011, 362-363.

administrators.¹¹⁹⁴ Each monument appropriated Roman official documents not for administrative reasons, but to add lustre to the memory of an individual in a local context. They are transformative, taking normative documents out of their typical context and reframing them as honorific.¹¹⁹⁵ However, in doing so, they still monumentalise and bring these texts firmly into the public sphere at a local level. To serve their honorific purpose, the reader must already accept that the opinions of Roman magistrates or the Senate are authoritative and convey recognition *ipso facto*. They leverage the legitimacy of Roman power and administrative structures into a new context with localised implications for civic memory, which did not, for the most part, extend beyond the individual community. As a contrast to these private monuments, the honorific stele of the *koinon* of Asia for Menogenes at Sardis, preserves twelve normative documents from non-Roman bodies. Each derived from local institutions of the *polis* or the *koinon* – and the Roman citizens mentioned are explicitly framed as participants in civic or provincial life.¹¹⁹⁶ This may indicate a deliberate reaction on the part of the assembled Greek communities in Asia, an attempt to frame honours in a self-consciously and distinctively local way in opposition to private use of imperial documents.

¹¹⁹⁴ Kokkinia 2000. Compare Junia Theodora at Corinth (SEG 18.143), whose monument includes two decrees and a letter from the Lycian *koinon*; a decree of Patara, a letter of Myra and a letter of Telmessos (Friesen 2013, 204–205).

¹¹⁹⁵ Eck 1995–1998, 2.372–373, providing several later examples at 369–372, 374–378.

¹¹⁹⁶ Sardis 7.1.8.

Table 2: Funerary monuments for private citizens containing Roman public documents

Date	Place	Person	Roman Documents	Reference
c. 80	Nysa	Chaeremon	One proconsular letter Two royal letters (Mithridates)	RDGE 48 RC 73, 74
c. 30	Rhosus	Seleucus	Three imperial letters (Augustus) One <i>Senatusconsultum</i>	RDGE 70
c. 25	Mytilene	Potamon	At least four letters, three from Caesar Two <i>Senatusconsulta</i> One Treaty	RDGE 25, 26, 51, 73- 78
c. 55 CE	Aezani	Menophilus 'family'	Four letters, two proconsular, two imperial (Tiberius, in Augustus' lifetime; Nero)	SEG 64.1302- 1306
c. 123- 153 CE	Rhodiapolis	Opramoas	26 letters from imperial officials 12 imperial <i>rescripta</i>	Kokkinia, <i>Opramoas</i>

Beyond their textual content, the physical characteristics of these monuments are significant. Surviving documents are primarily inscribed on stone, with a few cases, exceptional in the East, of bronze documents.¹¹⁹⁷ However, as Eck stresses, the overwhelming majority of 'published' documents in the cities of the Roman empire were produced on perishable materials, the best attested in the Greek world being painted black lettering on whitened boards.¹¹⁹⁸ This was an inexpensive and, when combined with public announcements, relatively efficient means of communicating directly with a community. Eck notes their easy reuse and presumably swift turnover – one Claudian *edictum* explicitly requires its display for 30 days – suggesting that the scale of documents under the empire

¹¹⁹⁷ The continuation of traditional practice in the Greek East of inscribing normative documents on stone rather than converting to the Roman practice of bronze is discussed extensively by Eck 2014, 139-147. See Gagarin 2008, 122, 227-231.

¹¹⁹⁸ Wilhelm 1909, 239-249; Eck 2010 [1997], 275-286. Attestations of whitened boards collected by Wilhelm at 246-247; RS 12.Delphi.B.24-15.

necessitated judgement to be exercised over which to display, when and for how long.¹¹⁹⁹ By contrast, to inscribe a document on stone or bronze implied permanence: the expense, time and skills necessary to produce a monument set these texts apart from the norm.¹²⁰⁰ This provides another strong reason not to read between the lines of texts which do not explicitly require their monumentalisation.¹²⁰¹ More importantly, within the broader traditions of civic government in Asia Minor, the inscription of Roman documents treated them in the same fashion as the utterances of the *polis* community itself or the Hellenistic monarchs of the earlier period.¹²⁰² The choice by civic leaders to memorialise Roman communiqués imbued these with a status equal to those from most significant political actors, which *poleis* were familiar with.

The reproduction of Roman normative documents within the communities of Asia in symbolic ways played a substantial role in socialising civic elites to accept Roman power. Individuals who consciously engaged with the documents, as texts or otherwise, were exposed to the interplay between Roman and local systems of authority. Ando perceptively emphasised that these texts carried significant force and, by interacting with local frameworks of power, created a sense of legitimacy around Roman ideology and state

¹¹⁹⁹ Eck 2010 [1997], 282-283.

¹²⁰⁰ Ferrary 2009a, 59-60.

¹²⁰¹ E.g. Sotidius Strabo does not (*pace* Mitchell 1976, 116-117) ‘carefully provide for the [permanent] publication of his edict’ at *I.Sagalassos* 3.5-6/29-30, but indicates only that he has arranged for their display.

¹²⁰² Note here the possibility that the Roman statutes in Greek contexts consciously resembled the format and layout of an original official translation. The observations of Decorte (2015, 246-253) point in this direction, though he admits that the number of Greek examples of Roman statutes by his definition are limited.

action.¹²⁰³ However, that this was intentionally cultivated by the Roman state and its representatives in the late Republican period does not follow. The limited evidence for publication clauses, when placed alongside the evidence for the *res gestae Divi Augusti* in Galatia and the *sentusconsultum de Cn. Pisone patre* in Spain and Noricum, highlight the restricted aims of the central state and the significant leeway afforded to magistrates and communities when it came to communicating directly with the inhabitants of the provinces.¹²⁰⁴ This is not to say that the Roman state did not despatch large volumes of written correspondence and instructions to provincial communities; or, indeed, that a significant proportion of this was not displayed publicly in some impermanent media. However, the control of this documentation and the choice to monumentalise it, establishing it firmly within civic memory lay within the purview of local powerbrokers.

3.5: Conclusions

With the accession of Tiberius in 14 CE, the Roman state completed a remarkable transformation. In less than 150 years, the *res publica* had gone from the fiercely oligarchic inward-facing polity of the Gracchi to a hereditary monarchy evincing a universalising ambition to administer its subjects. Throughout the period the *poleis* of *provincia Asia* were adapting to the expectations and realities of Roman hegemony and, later, empire. Their

¹²⁰³ Ando 2000, 78-79, 101-106.

¹²⁰⁴ On the *Res Gestae*: Cooley 2009, 6-22; on the Spanish evidence: Eck, Caballos & Fernández 1996, 279-288; Noricum: Bartels 2009, 1-9. If accepted, the suggestion of Thonemann (2012, 285-288) that *Sardis* 7.201 is a fragment of another copy of the *Res Gestae* (criticised by Judge 2014, 3-8; 2016, 135-140), though significant, does not invalidate the overall point that the *Res Gestae* were not published uniformly on the basis of commands from Rome.

public pronouncements and actions indicate that most strategies grew out of existing honorific conventions and exchanges with Hellenistic *basileis*, though the shifting structure of the Republican polity forced *poleis* to continually innovate to ensure they remained relevant.

The three main means through which communities could respond publicly to Roman institutional and discursive power were civic decrees, diplomatic activity and the display of Roman documents. None of these strategies were monolithic within the province or static across the period. Epigraphic culture varied not only from region to region, but from community to community. This is most evident from Ephesian examples and illustrates the crucial point that *polis* elites retained control over their own public epigraphy. Local decrees, both honorific and otherwise, and Roman normative documents were inscribed and erected in civic spaces only with the assent of the *demos*. In some ways, this seems self-evident, but Ma has recently re-iterated the significance of this point for understanding agency and relationships from the perspective of local communities.¹²⁰⁵

The monumental and epigraphic landscape of a city played a significant role in shaping civic memory and, consequently, the self-identity of the *polis* community. While not the only factors, the choices the *demos* made when inscribing texts, including the material, location and the content, imparted elements of a local discourse and influenced their reception by individual readers. Even where the message itself did not spring from the local elite, it constructed the framework through which it was interpreted. Remembrance of

¹²⁰⁵ Ma 2013.

modes and examples of interaction helped inculcate attitudes among the community and shaped future generations' normative behaviour.¹²⁰⁶ The integration of Roman officials and their families into the honorific landscape, therefore, memorialised positive interactions with representatives of the state.

Significantly, cities retained control over the language used in their public utterances responding to Roman power. Language itself affected civic memory, providing a new narrative or by invoking emotions to support a specific reading of a situation.¹²⁰⁷ Moreover, in honorific inscriptions, the formula itself constructs a relationship between honorand and dedicant, which remained throughout the period primarily orientated in favour of the awarding community. In the case of Roman documents, this control extended even beyond the decision to publish. The content could be and was manipulated to present beneficial narratives. Documents from Arızlı and Aphrodisias highlight that communities could extract and excerpt useful elements from Roman documents for permanent display. There also seems to be good evidence that translations were carried out locally, affording communities another means of influencing the reading.

All of this shows that local communities in Asia Minor engaged in the construction of new rules around their relationship with Rome through trial and error on an individual basis.¹²⁰⁸ Given the local control over the inscription and monumentalisation of documents, the appearance of material presenting the Romans in an ambiguous fashion invites us to

¹²⁰⁶ Ando 2000, 19-23.

¹²⁰⁷ Chaniotis 2003, 251-256.

¹²⁰⁸ Similarly, Chaniotis 2015, 91-92.

consider a subversive reading, running counter to the dominant discourse. For example, the Ephesian decree of 86/85 implies, through omission, that the Romans were at fault in failing to protect the city from the invasion of Mithridates. Additionally, the exclusive employment of the term *πάτρων* to refer to Roman recipients of honorific decrees prior to the First Mithridatic War was potentially an attempt to exclude them from traditional categories of euergetic honour, especially considering the later return to typical Hellenistic titles. In a similar vein, it is interesting to note that where individual citizens received *ισόθιοι τιμαί*, such as Theophanes at Mytilene, such honours do not seem to have been extended to Pompeius, the Roman author of Mytilenean freedom.

Overall, lacking a static and comprehensible framework for engaging with the Roman state and, after the First Mithridatic War, needing to build a relationship urgently, the communities of Asia innovated. These three areas show a variety of strategies, each of which built on local experiences but responded to Roman institutions and ideology. Across the period personal relationships took on increasing importance, first to ensure support among large diverse political structures, and later based on the shifting balance of Roman constitutional developments. Each of these strategies aimed at enhancing the benefits flowing to individual communities, particularly their autonomy, but paradoxically, also drew the region inexorably into the Roman imperial orbit.

Table 3: Honorific Inscriptions for Roman Magistrates in and around *provincia Asia*

Date	Place	Honorand	Position	Titles	Source	Reference
113	Prostanna*	M. Antonius	Q	-	D	<i>I.Delos</i> 1603
100	Cos	M. Popillius Laenas	L	PE	D	<i>I.Cos</i> 225
100	Magnesia-on-the-Maeander	M. Popullius Laenas	L	-	BD	<i>I.MagnesiaM</i> 123
c. 99-97	Ephesus	Q. Mucius Scaevola (wife)	PC	P	D	<i>I.Eph</i> 630a
c. 99-97	Cos	Q. Mucius Scaevola (son)	PC	P?	D	<i>AE</i> 1995, #1440
c. 99-97	Nysa	Q. Mucius Scaevola (son)	PC	-	D	<i>SEG</i> 57.1104
c. 99-97	Oinoanda (Lycia)	Q. Mucius Scaevola (son)	PC	PE	D	<i>AE</i> 1995, #1538
95	Colophon (Claros)	C. Valerius Flaccus	PC	P	D	Ferrary (2000a), #1
92	Colophon (Claros)	L. Valerius Flaccus	PC	P	D	Ferrary (2000a), #2
post 89	Ilium	L. Iulius Caesar	CS	-	D	<i>I.Ilion</i> 71
post 89	Ilium	L. Iulius Caesar (daughter)	CS	-	BD	<i>I.Ilion</i> 72
85/84	Halicarnassus	L. Cornelius Sulla	PC	E	D	<i>ILS</i> 8771
85-81	Caunus	L. Licinius Murena	PC	SE	D	<i>I.Caunos</i> 103
85-81	Caunus	L. Licinius Murena (son)	PC	SE	D	<i>I.Caunos</i> 104
85-80	Ephesus	L. Licinius Lucullus	Q	PE	-	<i>I.Eph.</i> 2941
85-80	Thyatira	L. Licinius Lucullus	Q	SKE	D	<i>IGR</i> 4.1191
85-80	Synnada	L. Licinius Lucullus	Q	PE	D	<i>MAMA</i> 4.52
82	Euromos	A. Terentius Varro (mother)	L	-	D	<i>ILS</i> 8773
82	Labraunda	L. Cornelius Lentulus	PC	P	D	<i>I.Labraunda</i> #63
c. 84-78	Priene	M'. Aemilius Lepidus	Q	E	-	<i>I.Priene</i> 2 233
75/74	Pergamum	M. Iunius Iuncus (father/son?)	PC	-	D	<i>AvP</i> 8.2.408
74	Ephesus	Q. Publicius	Q	E	-	<i>AE</i> 1983, #920
74/73	Mysia, Abbaitai*	C. Salluvius Naso	L	-	Mysians	<i>CIL</i> I ² 743
73-68	Acmonea	C. Sornantius Barba	L	-	BD	<i>MAMA</i> 6.260
73-69	Andros	L. Licinius Lucullus	PC	-	D	<i>SEG</i> 60.908
73-69	Colophon (Claros)	L. Licinius Lucullus	PC	SE	D	Ferrary (2000a) #3
73-69	Pergamum	C. Sornantius Barba	L	E	D	<i>AvP</i> 8.2.431
68/67	Pergamum	P. Cornelius Dolabella	PC	E	D	<i>AvP</i> 8.2.405
67	Miletus	L. Manlius Torquatus	L	E	-	<i>ZPE</i> 68, 275/276
63	Claros	P. Servilius Globulus	PC	PE	koinon Ionion	<i>SEG</i> 60.1247
62/61	Colophon (Claros)	L. Valerius Flaccus	PC	P	G	Ferrary (2000a), #5
62/61	Magnesia-on-the-Maeander	L. Valerius Flaccus (mother)	PC	-	-	<i>I.MagnesiaM</i> 144
62/61	Magnesia-on-the-Maeander	L. Valerius Flaccus (wife)	PC	-	-	<i>I.MagnesiaM</i> 145
62/61	Magnesia-on-the-Maeander	L. Valerius Flaccus (daughter)	PC	-	D	<i>I.MagnesiaM</i> 146
61-58	Tralles	L. Aelius Tubero	L	P	gerontes	<i>SEG</i> 54.1171
60	Caunus	L. Afranius (son)	L	E	D	<i>I.Kaunos</i> 112
67	Caunus	P. Cornelius Sulla	PC	PE	D	<i>I.Kaunos</i> 106
61-59	Colophon (Claros)	Q. Tullius Cicero	PC	PE	D	Ferrary (2000a) #6

61-59	Samos	Q. Tullius Cicero (wife)	PC	-	D	IG 12.6.1.354
61-59	Samos	Q. Tullius Cicero (son)	PC	-	D	IG 12.6.1.355
c. 54/53	Caunus	C. Scribonius Curio (wife)	Q	E	-	I.Kaunos 108
c. 54/53	Caunus	C. Scribonius Curio (son)	Q	E	-	I.Kaunos 107
54	Pergamum	L. Sestius	Q	PE	D	AvP 8.2.406
54	Pergamum	L. Sestius	Q	-	-	AvP 8.2.407
50/49	Ephesus	L. Antonius	Q	PE?	-	I.Ephesos 614a
50/49	Magnesia-under-Sipylos	L. Antonius	Q	E	-	I.MagnesiaS. 3
55-53	Pergamum	C. Claudius Pulcher	PC	E	-	AvP 8.2.409
50/49	Thyatira	L. Antonius	Q	-	BD	TAM 5.920
50/49	Thyatira	L. Antonius	Q	PE	D	TAM 5.919
50/49	Pergamum	L. Antonius	Q	SP	D	AvP 8.2.410
50/49	Pergamum	L. Antonius	Q	SP	D	IGR 4.401
49/48	Apamea	P. Licinius Crassus Damasippus	L	SEP	BD	AÉ 1890. #76
49	Miletus	M. Pupius Piso Frugi	L	PE	D	Milet 1.3.173
49/48	Pergamum	Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius	L	SE	D	AvP 8.2.411
49/48	Pergamum	Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius (daughter)	L	-	D	AvP 8.2.412
49	Samos	M. Pupius Piso Frugi	L	PE?	D	IGR 4.1709
49-45	Nysa	Cn. Domitius Calvinus	PC/L	PE	?	SEG 59.1228
46-44	Pergamum	P. Servilius Isauricus	PC	SE	D	AvP 8.2.413
46-44	Pergamum	P. Servilius Isauricus (daughter)	PC	SE	D	AvP 8.2.414
46-44	Cos	P. Servilius Isauricus (wife)	PC	-	D	AÉ 1934, #84
46-44	Mytilene	P. Servilius Isauricus (wife)	PC	-	D	IG 12.suppl.60
46-44	Magnesia-on-the-Maeander	P. Servilius Isauricus (father)	PC	E	-	I.MagnesiaM 142
44/43	Ephesus	M. Appuleius (wife and father-in-law)	Q	-	-	I.Eph. 1547
40?	Caunus	M. Barbatius Pollio	Q	PE	?	I.Kaunos 110
40?	Caunus	L. Caninius Gallus	PD/PF	SEP	?	I.Kaunos 109
40/39	Nysa	M. Vinicius	PCD	-	?	SEG 59.1229
38/35	Colophon (Claros)	M. Valerius Messalla Potitus	Q	P	D	Ferrary (2000a) #10
38/37	Lagina	M. Cocceius Nerva	L	SEP	D	I.Stratonikeia 509
38/37	Teos	M. Cocceius Nerva	L	SEP	D	SEG 4.604
38/37	Pergamum	L. Cornificius	L	E	D	IGR 4.420
40/33	Caunus	C. Fonteius Capito	L	PE	D	I.Caunos 111
35/34	Colophon (Claros)	M. Titius	L	-	-	Ferrary (2000a) #7
35/34	Samos	M. Titius (wife)	L	P	D	IGR 4.1716
32/31	Ephesus	Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus	L	P	-	I.Eph. 663
32/31	Labraunda	Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus	L	E	D	I.Labraunda #62
32/31	Samos	Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus	L	-	-	IGR 4.968
31/29	Ilium	P. Vedius Pollio*	PA	-	BD	I.Ilion 101
31/29	Miletus	P. Vedius Pollio*	PA	E	D	I.Didyma 146
23	Samos	C. Stertinius & C. Asinius Pollio	CN	-	D	SEG 1.389
23-21	Pergamum	Sex. Appuleius	PC	E	demos Kotiaeon	AvP 8.2.418
23-21	Pergamum	Sex. Appuleius	PC	E?	-	AvP 8.2.420

23-21	Pergamum	Sex. Appuleius (mother)	PC	SE	D	AvP 8.2.419
23-21	Aphrodisias	Sex. Appuleius	PC	-	D	<i>I.Aph</i> 2007 12.301
23-21	Colophon (Claros)	Sex. Appuleius	PC	K	D	Ferrary (2000a) #9
23-21	Metropolis	Sex. Appuleius	PC	S	D	<i>I.Eph.</i> 3435
23-21	Samos	Sex. Appuleius	PC	P	D	<i>IGR</i> 4.1719
23-21	Cyme	Sex. Appuleius (& wife, daughter, parents)	PC	SE	D	<i>I.Kyme</i> 18
23-21	Miletus	Sex. Appuleius (& brother)	PC	E	D	<i>Milet</i> 6.3.1123, with Kuhn 2015
22?	Pergamum	P. Quinctilius Varus	Q	-	D	AvP 8.2.424
22?	Pergamum	P. Quinctilius Varus	Q	-	D	<i>IGR</i> 4.419
22?	Tenos	P. Quinctilius Varus	Q	PE	D	<i>OGIS</i> 463
c. 22/21	Stratonicea	M. Iunius Silanus	PC	PE	?	<i>I.Stratonikeia</i> 1510
20	Cos	M. Valerius Messalla Potitus	PC	PE	?	<i>SEG</i> 58.860
21-19	Magnesia-under-Sipylos	Potitus Valerius Messalla	PC	PE	D	<i>IGR</i> 4.1338
21-19	Miletus	Potitus Valerius Messalla	PC	PE	D	<i>I.Didyma</i> 147
21-19	Pergamum	Potitus Valerius Messalla	PC	-	D	AvP 8.2.417
c. 18-16	Pergamum	C. Norbanus Flaccus	PC	E	-	AvP 8.2.416
15-13	Cibyra	Q. Aemilius Lepidus	PC	SEP	D	<i>IGR</i> 4.901
15-13	Colophon (Claros)	Q. Aemilius Lepidus	PC	-	D	Ferrary (2000a) #12
15-13	Halicarnassus	Q. Aemilius Lepidus	PC	PE	D	<i>I.Kaunos</i> 111
12-10	Miletus	P. Cornelius Scipio	PC	-	D	<i>Milet</i> 1.9.333
9/8	Pergamum	Paullus Fabius Maximus	PC	-	D	AvP 8.2.421
1/3	Miletus	C. Marcius Censorinus	PC	PE	D	<i>Milet</i> 1.7.255
1/3	Mylasa	C. Marcius Censorinus	PC	SE	P	<i>I.Mylasa</i> 410
1/3	Pergamon	C. Marcius Censorinus	PC	-	D	AvP 8.2.422
2/4	Apameia	C. Antistius Vetus	PC	P	P	<i>IGR</i> 4.778
2/4	Pergamum	C. Antistius Vetus	PC	PE	D	AvP 8.2.423
2/4	Thyatira	C. Antistius Vetus (son)	PC	-	D	Robert (1937) p.128
5/6	Caunus	M. Plautius Silvanus	PC	PE	?	<i>I.Kaunos</i> 114
5/6	Sardis	M. Plautius Silvanus (wife)	PC	-	G	<i>Sardis</i> 32
5/6	Ephesus	M. Plautius Silvanus (daughter)	PC	-	BD	<i>I.Eph.</i> 707
6/9	Samos	C. Vibius Postumus	PC	HE	D	<i>IGR</i> 4.963
6/9	Magnesia-on-the-Maeander	C. Vibius Postumus (brothers)	PC	-	BD	<i>I.MagnesiaM</i> 152
6/9	Teos	C. Vibius Postumus (brother)	PC	E	D	<i>IGR</i> 4.1564
7/12	Andros	P. Vinicius	PC	PE	D	<i>IG</i> 12.5.756
7/12	Cnidos	P. Vinicius	PC	-	D	<i>SEG</i> 12.452
7/12	Smyrna	P. Vinicius	PC	-	D	<i>I.Smyrna</i> 2.1.633
7/12	Aphrodisias	P. Vinicius	PC	E	D	<i>AE</i> 1984, #880b
8/12	Pergamum	L. Volusius Saturninus (mother)	PC	-	D	AvP 8.2.427
9/10	Mytilene	L. Calpurnius Piso	PC	E	D	<i>IG</i> 12.2.219
9/10	Stratonicea	L. Calpurnius Piso	PC	PE	D	AvP 8.3.40
9/10	Pergamum	L. Calpurnius Piso	PC	-	D	<i>IGR</i> 4.411
9/10	Pergamum	L. Calpurnius Piso	PC	E	D	AvP 8.2.425
9/10	Pergamum	L. Calpurnius Piso (wife)	PC	-	D	AvP 8.3.19

9/10	Samos	L. Calpurnius Piso (wife)	PC	-	D	<i>IG 12.1.364</i>
9/10	Keramos	L. Calpurnius Piso (unknown relative)	PC	-	D	<i>SEG 53.1203</i>
1st C	Tenos	L. Quinctius Rufus	PC	SE	-	<i>IG 12.5.924</i>
Aug.	Asia	P. Numicius Pica Caesianus	Q	P	P	<i>CIL 6.31742</i>
Aug.	Cos	[C. Pac?]ius Balbus	L	P	D	<i>AE 1934, #85</i>
Aug.	Ephesus	Cn. Domitius Corbulo	Q	E	BD	<i>OGIS 768</i>

Key:

Position: Q(uaestor); L(egatus); P(ro)C(onsul); C(en)S(or); C(o)N(sul)

Titles: P(atron); E(uergetes); S(oter); K(tistes); H(eros)

Source: D(emos); B(oule); G(erousia); P(rovince)

Conclusions

This study has investigated the development of Roman administration in *provincia Asia* from its initial establishment to the early Principate, with significant implications for interpreting Roman imperialism during this period. It focused on three specific features of Roman state power and its exercise over the diverse communities of western Asia Minor. First, it focused on the mechanics of Roman rule in the region. It asked what institutions the Roman state introduced, when and how these were implemented, concentrating particularly on matters of jurisdiction and taxation. It assessed questions of the intensity, extent and intrusiveness of Roman administration across the period. Second, it investigated official communication, analysing how the Roman state engaged in a dialogue with local communities and elites. It explored the state's role in establishing a discourse of power which was mutually intelligible to its own representatives and subject groups and emphasised the importance of the learning process on both sides. Finally, it queried how local communities developed strategies to deal with imperial power and situated themselves alongside and within the evolving Roman empire. Stressing the precariousness of *poleis* during periods of central instability, it explained the role of local agency in the slow evolution of a stable provincial administration. Overall, I have argued that the late Republican Roman state had a limited capacity to develop a coherent set of administrative institutions and supporting ideological bases in *provincia Asia*, forcing local elites to innovate continuously to protect their own position.

The first chapter argued that, given institutions are dynamic, incrementally evolving and socially embedded phenomena, initial conditions played an outsized role in shaping their evolution. In *provincia Asia*, the unusual fact that the *poleis* were immediately granted ἐλευθερία by the Roman state created a unique set of conditions informing subsequent developments. At the outset, the state's administrative aims were extremely limited – civic communities lay outside of gubernatorial jurisdiction and the nascent tax structure – and were driven by officials on the ground, responding to and constrained by political contexts and the developing institutional complex. This study identified three critical junctures, at which the breakdown in political institutions allowed significant innovation: Sulla from 85-80, Caesar from 48-44 and Augustus, especially from 31-27, had the temporary capacity to ignore vested interests and systematically reshape the governance of Asia and the state more broadly. Consequently, I argued that the shift between Roman 'hegemony' and 'empire' in western Asia Minor happened later than is commonly assumed. Most institutions which framed provincial administration, including the *conventus iuridici* and the provincial *koinon*, emerged only after Sulla's re-organisation of the region. These did not spring fully formed from a Roman head but evolved over time and in interaction with provincial stakeholders to fill needs of Roman magistrates. This does not deny that Roman administration was heavily contested by citizens, provincials and magistrates on the ground across the period, or that, especially after 85, it was sometimes ruthlessly imposed: the sources are quite clear that this was the case. However, such observations can function alongside the argument that, at the conceptual level, the Roman state, embodied in the Senate, People and magistrates, did not implement a clear vision of provincial government,

whether as an intrusive extractive regime or, indeed, at all. As power became increasingly centralised, the state had more motivation to act on growing concerns with good governance.

Where traditional narratives emphasise the role of the Roman state or individual magistrates in shaping the framework of Roman provincial government, I have argued that the constraints placed by institutions on human action are essential to interpreting the development of empire. If my proposal that provincial institutions, such as the *koinon*, *conventus* and tax-systems, emerged only in the 70s holds, this would stress the limited sense of the word *provincia* before Sulla. In this respect, late second century Asia had more in common with Cyrenaica after 75 than contemporary Macedonia. Finally, it highlights the importance of central instability and the personal interests of governors in shaping this process of administrative change. We should not assume that individual actors pursued state interests at all, or even most, times during the organisation of provinces – the obvious, if soon-to-become passé, comparison, with current Brexit negotiations looms here. This thesis urges scholars not to treat decisions regarding provincial government as if they were divorced from personal and internal Roman politics.

The second chapter argued that Roman rule dissolved existing Hellenistic frameworks governing the interaction between *poleis* and the state. The comparative complexity of the Republican state, dividing responsibilities between the Senate, People and magistrates, hindered attempts by communities to learn the new language of power. Both bodies and individual magistrates could engage in official communication with inhabitants of Asia making lack of co-ordination a major factor, while the near-continual flux of central

institutions during this period also complicated the process. The growing personalisation of Roman discourse and reduction in the number of major players at Rome from the 40s onwards, however, introduced greater coherence and co-ordination, providing a more conducive environment for learning. Ultimately the reduction in the number of sources of legitimate state communication provided a firm basis for understanding. By Augustus' death in 14 CE, a framework for dialogue between the centre and provincial communities, with a common language, rules and assumptions, was emerging.

These findings emphasise that no direct connection exists between Hellenistic and Roman imperial modes of engaging with *poleis* in Asia. Instead the Republican interlude resulted in the complete deconstruction and slow rebuilding of an effective framework for negotiation. Despite the similarities noted by Ma, Ando and Lenski, the two institutions evolved independently of one another. Partly, this emerged from the fact that Roman governors during this period were much more circumscribed than either Hellenistic *basileis* or their own early second-century counterparts.

One further implication of this argument carries weight. If the complexity of the Republican empire fatally undermined civic attempts to engage meaningfully with the state, as compared to the monarchic empires which preceded and succeeded it, then it provides a further robust explanation for the sudden rise and collapse of civic patronage. Eilers has noted the explosion in the number of acknowledged patrons in the 90s, suggesting that *poleis* were adopting this strategy *en masse* after some decades of confusion under Roman rule. Equally, the resumption of a direct and coherent dialogue with an individual in the late first century rendered widespread civic patronage less useful than previously. This implies that

Republican empires have inherently less control over public discourse than their monarchic counterparts. In one sense, this is an obvious point: generally, the greater the number of moving parts and sources of authority or legitimacy, the greater the variance in messaging. However, it bears stating as a to-date underemphasised point in approaches to provincialisation in the eastern Mediterranean.

The third chapter examined the agency of *polis*-communities in the process of empire-formation. In lieu of a consistent framework for engaging with the Roman state, Asian communities were forced to innovate. After the Sullan reorganisation, the increasing intrusiveness of Roman jurisdiction and economic extraction added to the urgency. Evidence from civic decrees demonstrates that cities sought to establish an ongoing written dialogue with representatives of the Roman state, that is individuals, rather than its constitutive bodies. In the 90s and 80s patronage loomed large as the most common means for engaging with Romans. After the First Mithridatic War, however, as cities sought to bolster their own position vis-à-vis an increasingly dominant state, a return to Hellenistic honorific language and, more broadly, inflation of honours took place. Civic diplomacy in this period also yielded significant ground to informal relationships between locals and Roman commanders: private bonds of reciprocity came to replace public ones in some key cases. Finally, I argued that the inscription of Roman normative documents in civic contexts was driven by local concerns. Even so, it had three important effects on provincial society: it normalised Roman official discourse; it placed the communities' relationship with Rome at the centre of civic memory; and it encouraged readers to construct a mental structure of empire encompassing the individual and community. Each of these strategies aimed at

promoting local agency, but each also had the effect of implicating the region more deeply in the Roman empire.

Two important implications arise from these observations. First, that both the use of civic decrees to approach the representatives of the Roman state and direct diplomacy were affected by the aforementioned centralisation of power at Rome. These processes encouraged a privatisation of dialogue which reached its logical conclusion under the Principate: a public dialogue, resulting in a personal euergetic relationship, between cities and the emperor. Second, the appropriation of official documents for local uses and the absence of central planning did not undermine their central role in establishing the legitimacy of Roman rule.

The study has demonstrated that the Roman state, during the late second and early first century had limited administrative ambitions vis-à-vis the communities of western Asia Minor. Under Doyle's schema it pursued hegemony, not empire. Even Sulla's re-organisation in the aftermath of the First Mithridatic War did not change the fact that Roman power to interfere in local affairs was not pursued to its capacity. The near-contemporary experiences of Macedonia and Achaëa provide examples of Roman-led constitutional innovation, which is unparalleled in Asia, resulting initially from the grant of ἐλευθερία in Attalus III's will. Though Sulla stripped most *poleis* of this freedom, fundamentally altering the power dynamic, there is little evidence of his intervention in local politics, limiting the realm of potential action for later governors. The complex structure of the *res publica*'s central institutions hindered the establishment of a common, coherent language of administration, prompting communities to pursue strategies centred on individuals within

the Roman state rather than specific institutions. Through establishing ties of patronage and other less formal personal connections *poleis* were able to slowly discern the shape of the evolving Roman *imperium*. As central power became more concentrated over the course of the first century BCE, imperial discourses became more coherent, and a greater concern with the potential benefits of administration emerged. Consequently, the relationships between the communities of Asia, the Roman state and its representatives were central to the development of the institutions of empire during the late Republic and early Principate.

This research has important implications for understanding Roman empire-building. Appreciating the minimalist nature of Roman government, deep into the first century, requires adjusting our notion of how the Roman political elite viewed the provinces. Even in the second century, Romans were not shy about personally profiting from empire, but this did not translate into attempts to maximise public profits. However, by pushing back the date at which a more extractive attitude towards government predominated, it telescopes this into the emergence of a discourse of ethical government in the 70s and 60s. Given that institutions emerge from historically and socially contingent processes, it should be expected that each provincial administration be distinctive. In the case of Asia, the unique circumstances of its bequest to the Roman people moulded its experience, and even the multiple moments of institutional crisis did not leave a blank slate. The Roman Republic was largely unambitious: the rise of the Principate created conditions in which state legibility and uniformity was of far greater interest.

This research raises several other questions of import, which could inform future studies. Most obviously, how did internal civic dynamics interact with the processes of

empire-building in Asia? Where this study has focused on the actions of *polis*-communities as units, the evidence points to a vibrant local political scene, which impinged at times, upon Roman judicial and gubernatorial horizons.¹²⁰⁹ The ways in which other actors, such as Roman allied rulers or sub-Hellenistic *basileis*, navigated between cities and the Roman state warrants further examination. Herod the Great's benefactions in and visits to Asia during the Augustan period emphasise the extent to which these rulers could mediate between *poleis* and powerful Romans.¹²¹⁰ This could provide another perspective on how relationships between actors instantiated the Roman empire.

¹²⁰⁹ See esp. Cic. *Flacc.*; *QFr.* 1.1, 2.

¹²¹⁰ E.g. Joseph. *BJ.* 1.422-425; *AJ.* 16.18-19, 24-26.

Reference List

- Adams, J.N. & Swain, S., 2002, 'Introduction', in Adams, J.N. & Swain, S. (eds.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word*, Oxford, 1–20.
- Adams, J.P., 1980, 'Aristonikos and the Cistophoroi', *Historia* 29(3): 302–314.
- Ager, S.L., 1996, *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337–90 B.C.*, Berkeley.
- Allen, R.E., 1983, *The Attalid Kingdom: A Constitutional History*, Oxford.
- Ameling, W., 1988, 'Drei Studien zu den Gerichtsbezirken der Provinz Asia in Republikanischer Zeit' *EA* 12: 9–24.
- Amiotti, G., 1980, 'I greci ed il massacro degli Italici nell'88 a.C.', *Aevum* 54(1): 132–139.
- Anastasiadis, V.I., 1995, 'Theophanes and Mytilene's Freedom Reconsidered', *Tekmeria* 1: 1–14.
- Anderson, B., 1991, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, 2nd Edition, London.
- Anderson, G., 2009, 'The Personality of the Greek State', *JHS* 129: 1–22.
- Ando, C., 2000, *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*, Berkeley.
- 2010, 'Imperial Identities', in Whitmarsh, T. (ed.), *Local Knowledge and Mircoidentities in the Imperial Greek World*, Cambridge, 17–45.
- 2016, 'Sovereignty, Territoriality and Universalism in the Aftermath of Caracalla', in Ando, C. (ed.), *Citizenship and Empire in Europe 200–1900: The Antonine Constitution after 1800 years*, Stuttgart, 7–27.
- (Forthcoming), 'Petition and response, order and obey: Contemporary models of Roman government', in Baker, H.D., Jursa, M., Palme, B., Procházka, S. & Tost, S., *Governing Ancient Empires*, Vienna.
- Aperghis, G.G., 2004, *The Seleucid Royal Economy: The Finances and Financial Administration of the Seleukid Empire*, Cambridge.
- Arangio-Ruiz, V., 1961, 'L'iscrizione Leidense di Augusto', *BIDR* 64: 323–342.
- Arrayás Morales, I., 2010, 'Diplomacy in the Greek *Poleis* of Asia Minor: Mytilene's Embassy to Tarraco', *C&M* 61: 127–149.
- 2013, 'Elites en conflicto. El impacto de las guerras mitridáticas en las *poleis* de Asia Menor', *Athenaeum* 101(2): 517–533.
- Ashton, R., 1994, 'The Attalid Poll-Tax', *ZPE* 104: 57–60.
- Asmis, E., 2005, 'A new kind of model: Cicero's Roman constitution in *de Republica*', *AJPh* 126: 377–416.
- Astin, A.E., 1985, 'Censorships in the late Republic', *Historia* 34(2): 175–190.
- Atkinson, K.M.T., 1958, 'The Governors of the Province of Asia in the Reign of Augustus', *Historia* 7: 300–330.

- 1960, '«*Restitutio in integrum*» and «*iussum Augusti Caesaris*» in an Inscription at Leyden', *RIDA* 7: 227–272.
- Aubert, J.-J., 1994, *Business Managers in Ancient Rome: A Social and Economic Study of Institores, 200 B.C. – A.D. 250*, Leiden.
- Austin, J.L., 1975, *How to Do Things with Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*, 2nd ed., Oxford.
- Badian, E., 1956, 'Q. Mucius Scaevola and the Province of Asia', *Ath* 44: 104–125.
- 1958, *Foreign Clientelae (264–70 B.C.)*, Oxford.
- 1964, 'Notes on Provincial Governors from the Social War down to Sulla's Victory', in Badian, E., *Studies in Greek and Roman History*, Oxford, 71–104.
- 1965, 'M. Porcius Cato and the Annexation and Early Administration of Cyprus', *JRS* 55: 110–121.
- 1969, 'Two Roman Non-Entities', *CQ* 19: 198–204.
- 1972, 'Tiberius Gracchus and the Beginning of the Roman Revolution', *ANRW* 1.1: 668–731.
- 1972a, *Publicans and Sinners: Private Enterprise in the Service of the Roman Republic*, Oxford.
- 1984, 'Three non-trials in Cicero', *Klio* 66: 291–309.
- 1984a, 'Notes on Some Documents from Aphrodisias Concerning Octavian', *GRBS* 25(2): 157–170.
- Baronowski, D.W., 1990, 'Sub umbra foederis aequi', *Phoenix* 44: 345–369.
- 1996, 'Caria and the Roman Province of Asia,' in Hermon, E. (ed.), *Pouvoir et imperium (III^e av. J.-C.–I^{er} ap. J.-C.)*, Naples, 241–249.
- Bartels, J., 2009, 'Der Tod des Germanicus und seine epigraphische Dokumentation: Ein neues Exemplar des *senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre* aus Genf', *Chiron* 39: 1–9.
- Bauslaugh, R., 1990, 'Cistophoric countermarks and the monetary system of Eumenes II', *NC* 150: 39–66.
- Belke, K. & Mersich, N., 1990, *Phrygien und Pisidien*, Vienna.
- Bencivenni, A., 2010, 'Il re scrive, la città iscrive. La pubblicazione su pietra delle epistole regie nell'Asia ellenistica', *SE* 24: 149–178.
- 2014, 'The King's Words: Hellenistic Royal Letters in Inscriptions', in Radner, K. (ed.), *State Correspondence in the Ancient World: From New Kingdom Egypt to the Roman Empire*, Oxford, 141–171.
- Bérenger, A., 2011, 'Les relations du gouverneur avec les notables provinciaux: cérémonial et sociabilité', in Barrandon, N. & Kirbihler, F. (eds.), *Les gouverneurs et les provinciaux sous la république romaine*, Rennes, 171–187.
- Berent, M., 2000, 'Anthropology and the Classics: War, Violence and the Stateless polis', *CQ* 50: 257–289.

- Berlin, I., 1974, 'Historical Inevitability', in Gardiner, P. (ed.), *The Philosophy of History*, Oxford.
- Bernhardt, R., 1980, 'Die *immunitas* der Freistädte', *Historia* 29(2): 190–207.
- 1985, *Polis und römische Herrschaft in der späten Republik*, Berlin.
 - 1999, 'Entstehung, *immunitas* und *munera* der Freistädte. Ein kritischer Überblick', *MedAnt* 2: 41–68.
- Bertrand, J.-M., 1978, 'Rome et la Méditerranée orientale au Ier siècle avant J.-C.', in Nicolet, C. (ed.), *Rome et la conquête du monde méditerranéen*, Paris, 789–845.
- 1990, 'Formes de discours politiques: décrets des cités grecques et correspondance des rois hellénistiques', *CCG* 1: 101–115.
 - 1991, 'À propos d'une inscription de Kyme', in Hermon, E. (ed.), *Gouvernants et gouvernés dans l'imperium Romanum (III^e s. av. J.-C.–I^{er} s. ap. J.-C.)*, Quebec, 127–135.
- Biggs, M., 1999, 'Putting the State on the Map: Cartography, Territory, and European State Formation', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 41(2): 374–405.
- Bikerman, E.J., 1934, 'Alexandre le Grand et les villes d'Asie', *REG* 47: 346–357.
- 1938, *Institutions des Seleucides*, Paris.
 - 1939, 'La cite grecque dans les monarchies hellénistiques', *RPh* 13: 215–259.
 - 1947, 'Syria and Cilicia', *AJPh* 68(4): 353–362.
 - 1980 [1955], 'Une question d'authenticité: Les privilèges juifs', in Bikerman, E.J., *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*, Leiden, 2: 24–43.
- Bitner, B.J., 2014, 'Augustan Procedure and Legal Documents in RDGE 70', *GRBS* 54: 639–664.
- Blanco-Pérez, A., 2019, 'Imperial responses to urban crisis in the Roman Empire: a conceptual approach', in Andreu, J. & Blanco-Pérez, A. (eds.), *Signs of weakness and crisis in the Western cities of the Roman Empire (c. II–III AD)*, Stuttgart, 37–45.
- Bloy, D., 2012, 'Roman Patrons of Greek Communities before the Title *πάτριων*', *Historia* 61(2): 168–201.
- Blümel, W., 1992, *Die Inschriften von Cnidos*, Bonn.
- Blümel, W. & Merkelbach, R., 2014, *Die Inschriften von Priene*, 2 vols, Bonn.
- Boffo, L., 2003, 'La «libertà» delle città Greche sotto i Romani (in epoca repubblicana)', *Dike* 6: 227–249.
- Bonnefond-Coudry, M., 1989, *Le sénat de la république romaine de la guerre d'Hannibal à Auguste: pratiques délibératives et prise de decision*, Rome.
- Börm, H., 2016, 'Hellenistische Poleis und römischer Bürgerkrieg. Stasis im griechischen Osten nach den Iden des März (44 bis 39 v. Chr.)', in Börm, H., Mattheis, M. & Wienand, J. (eds.), *Civil War in Ancient Greece and Rome: Contexts of Disintegration and Reintegration*, Stuttgart, 99–125.
- Böttcher, K. 1915, *Die Einnahmen der römischen Republik im letzten Jahrhundert ihren Bestehens. Ein Rekonstruktionsversuch*, Diss. — Leipzig.

- Bourdieu, P., 1977, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge.
- Bowman, A.K., 1993, 'Imperial Pronouncements', *CR* 43(2): 406-408.
- Bowersock, G., 1961, 'Eurycles of Sparta', *JRS* 51: 112-118.
- 1965, *Augustus and the Greek World*, Oxford.
 - 1970, 'Review: *Roman Documents from the Greek East. Senatus Consulta and Epistulae to the Age of Augustus*, by Robert K. Sherk', *AJPh* 91(2): 223-228.
 - 1984, 'Review: Joyce Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome*', *Gnomon* 56(1): 48-53.
- Brandis, C.G., 1897, 'Ein Schreiben des Triumvirn Marcus Antonius an den Landtag Asiens', *Hermes* 32(3): 509-522.
- Braund, D.C., 1983, 'Royal wills and Rome', *PSBR* 51: 16-57.
- 1983a, 'Gabinius, Caesar, and the *publicani* of Judaea', *Klio* 65(1): 241-244.
- Brems, E. & Ramos Pinto, S., 2013, 'Reception and Translation', in Gambier, Y. & van Doorslaer, L. (eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies*, vol. 4, Amsterdam, 142-147.
- Brennan, T.C., 2000, *The Praetorship in the Roman Republic*, 2 vols, New York.
- Briant, P., Brun P. & Varinlioglu, E., 2001, 'Une inscription inédite de Carie et la guerre d'Aristonikos', in Bresson, A. & Descat, R. (eds.), *Les cités d'Asie Mineure occidentale au IIe siècle.C.*, Bordeaux, 241-259.
- Bringmann, K., 1983, 'Edikt der Triumvirn oder Senatsbeschluß? Zu einem Neufund aus Ephesos', *EA* 2: 47-76.
- Broughton, T.R.S., 1934, 'Roman Landholding in Asia Minor', *TAPA* 65: 207-239.
- 1936, 'On Two Passages of Cicero Referring to Local Taxes in Asia', *AJPh* 57(2): 173-176.
 - 1938, 'Roman Asia,' in Frank, T. (ed.), *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, vol. 4, Baltimore, 499-916.
 - 1948, 'The *Elogia* of Julius Caesar's Father', *AJA* 52: 323-330.
- Brun, P., 2004, 'Les cités grecques et la guerre: l'exemple de la guerre d'Aristonikos', in Couvenhes, J.-C. & Fernoux, H.-L. (eds.), *Les Cités grecques et la guerre en Asie Mineure à l'époque hellénistique*, Tours, 21-54.
- Brunt, P.A., 1961, 'Charges of Provincial Maladministration under the Early Principate', *Historia* 10(2): 189-227.
- 1979, 'Laus Imperii', in Garnsey, P. & Whittaker, C.R. (eds.), *Imperialism in the Ancient World*, Cambridge, 159-191.
 - 1981, 'The Revenues of Rome', *JRS* 71: 161-172.
 - 1982, 'The Legal Issue in Cicero's *Pro Balbo*', *CQ* 32(1): 136-147.
 - 1983, 'Princeps and Equites', *JRS* 73: 42-75.
 - 1988, 'The equites in the Late Republic', in Brunt, P.A. (ed.), *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*, Oxford, 144-194.

- 1988a, 'Clientela', in Brunt, P.A. (ed.), *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*, Oxford, 382–442.
 - 1990 [1976], 'The Romanization of the local ruling classes in the Roman Empire', in Brunt, P.A. (ed.), *Roman Imperial Themes*, Oxford, 267–281.
 - 1990a [1956], 'Sulla and the Asian Publicans', in Brunt, P.A. (ed.), *Roman Imperial Themes*, Oxford, 1–8.
 - 1990b, 'Publicans in the Principate', in Brunt, P.A. (ed.), *Roman Imperial Themes*, Oxford, 354–432.
 - 1990c [1966], 'The "Fiscus" and its Development', in Brunt, P.A. (ed.), *Roman Imperial Themes*, Oxford, 134–162.
- Bryan, A.Z., 2012, 'Judging Empire: Courts and Culture in Rome's Eastern Provinces', *Law and History Review* 30(3): 771–811.
- Buckland, W.W., 1963, *A Text-Book of Roman Law from Augustus to Justinian*, 3rd ed., Cambridge.
- Buckler, W.H. & Robinson, D.M., 1914, 'Greek Inscriptions from Sardis V: Decrees of the League of the Greeks in Asia and of Sardians honouring Menogenes', *AJA* 18(3): 321–362.
- Buis, E.J., 2014, 'Ancient Entanglements: The Influence of Greek Treaties and in Roman "International Law" under the Framework of Narrative Transculturation', in Duve, T. (ed.), *Entanglements in Legal History: Conceptual Approaches*, Frankfurt, 151–185.
- Buraselis, K., 2000, *Kos: Between Hellenism and Rome: Studies on the Political, Institutional and Social History of Kos from ca. the Middle Second Century B.C. Until Late Antiquity*, Philadelphia.
- 2001, 'Two Notes on Theophanes' Descendants', in Salomies, O. (ed.), *The Greek East in the Roman Context*, Athens, 61–70.
 - 2012, 'Appended Festivals: The Coordination and Combination of Traditional Civic and Ruler Cult Festivals in the Hellenistic and Roman East', in Rasmus Brandt, J. & Iddeng, J.W. (eds.), *Greek and Roman Festivals: Content, Meaning, & Practice*, Oxford, 247–266.
- Burnett, A.M., Amandry, M. & Ripollès Alegre, P.P., 1992, *Roman Provincial Coinage*, vol. 1, London.
- Burrell, B., 2004, *Neokoroi: Greek Cities and Roman Emperors*, Leiden.
- Burton, G.P., 1975, 'Proconsuls, Assizes and the Administration of Justice under the Empire', *JRS* 65: 92–106.
- 2000, 'The Resolution of Territorial Disputes in the Roman Empire', *Chiron* 30: 195–216.
 - 2002, 'The Roman Imperial State (A.D. 14–235): Evidence and Reality', *Chiron* 32: 249–280.

- Burton, P.J., 2009, 'Ancient International Law, the Aetolian League, and the Ritual of Surrender during the Roman Republic: A Constructivist View', *The International History Review*, 31(2): 237–252.
- 2011, *Friendship and Empire: Roman Diplomacy and Imperialism in the Middle Republic (353–146 BC)*, Cambridge.
- Buxton, B. & Hannah, R., 2005, 'OGIS 458, the Augustan Calendar, and the Succession', in Deroux, C. (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History XII*, Brussels, 290–306.
- Campanile, D., 1994, *I sacerdoti del koinon d'Asia (I sec. a.C.–III sec. d.C.): contributo allo studio della romanizzazione delle élites provinciali nell'Oriente greco*, Pisa.
- 1996, 'Città d'Asia Minore tra Mithridate e Roma', *Studi Ellenistici* 8: 145–173.
- 1997, 'Un nuovo asiarca da Milasa', *ZPE* 119: 243–244.
- 2001, 'Provincialis molestia. Note su Cicerone proconsole', *Studi Ellenistici* 13: 243–274.
- 2003, 'L'infanzia della provincia d'Asia: l'origine dei "conventus iuridici" nella provincia', in Bearzot, C., Landucci, F. & Zecchini, G. (eds.), *Gli stati territoriali nel mondo antico*, Milan, 271–288.
- 2004, 'I distretti giudiziari d'Asia e la data d'istituzione del distretto ellespontico', in U. Laffi, F. Prontera, B. Virgilio (eds.), *Artissimum memoriae vinculum: Scritti di geografia storica e di antichità in ricordo di Gioia Conta*, Florence, 129–142.
- 2007, 'L'assemblea provinciale d'Asia in età repubblicana', in Urso, G. (ed.), *Tra Oriente e Occidente: indigeni, Greci e Romani in Asia Minore*, Pisa, 129–140.
- 2014, 'Cheremone, Pitodoro, Pitodoride', in Cassia, M., Giuffrida, C., Molè, C. & Pinzone, A. (eds.), *Pignora Amicitiae: Scritti di storia antica e storiografia offerti a Mario Mazza*, vol. 1, Rome, 231–257.
- Canali De Rossi, F., 1991, 'Review: *Claros I: Décrets Hellénistiques*', *Athenaeum* 69: 646–648.
- 1992/1993, 'Morte di un ambasciatore di Alabanda', *Scienze dell'Antichità* 6/7: 35–40.
- 1997, *Le ambascerie dal mondo greco a Roma: in età repubblicana*, Rome.
- 2000, 'Tre epistole di magistrati romani à città d'Asia' *EA* 32: 163–181.
- 2005, 'Flacco, Minucio Termo e il koinòn dei greci d'Asia', *EA* 38: 101–108.
- Capdetrey, L., 2007, *Le pouvoir séleucide: territoire, administration, finances d'un royaume hellénistique, 312–129 avant J.-C.*, Rennes.
- Capoccia, G., 2016, 'Critical Junctures', in Fioretos, O., Falleti, T.G. & Sheingate, A. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism*, Oxford, 89–106.
- Capoccia, G. & Kelemen, D.R., 2007, 'The Study of Critical Junctures: Theory, Narrative and Counterfactuals in Institutional Analysis', *World Politics* 59(3): 341–369.
- Carter, M., 2004, 'Archiereis and Asiarchs: A Gladiatorial Perspective', *GRBS* 44: 41–68.
- Champion, C., 2007, 'Empire by Invitation: Greek Political Strategies and Roman Imperial Interventions in the Second Century B.C.E.', *TAPA* 137(2): 255–275.

- Chankowski, A.S., 1998, 'La procédure législative à Pergame au 1^{er} siècle au J.-C.: à propos de la chronologie relative des décrets en l'honneur de Diodoros Paspáros', *BCH* 122: 159–199.
- Chaniotis, A., 2003a, 'The Perception of Imperial Power in Aphrodisias: The Epigraphic Evidence', in de Blois, L., Erdkamp, P., Hekster, O., de Kleijn, G. & Mols, S. (eds.), *Representation and Perception of Roman Imperial Power. Proceedings of the Third Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, 200 B.C. – A.D. 476)*, Amsterdam, 250–260.
- 2013, 'Affective Epigraphy: Emotions in Public Inscriptions of the Hellenistic Age', *MedAnt* 16(2): 745–760.
- 2014, 'Mnemopoetik: die epigraphische Konstruktion von Erinnerung in den griechischen Poleis', in Dahly, O., Hölscher, T., Muth, S. & Schneider, R. (eds.), *Medien der Geschichte. Antike Griechenland und Rom*, Berlin, 132–169.
- 2015, 'Affective Diplomacy: Emotional Scripts between Greek Communities and Roman Authorities during the Republic', in Cairns, D. & Fulkerson, L. (eds.), *Emotions between Greece and Rome*, London, 87–103.
- Chapot, V., 1904, *La province romaine proconsulaire d'Asie*, Paris.
- Charbonnel, N., 1979, 'A propos de l'inscription de Kymé et des pouvoirs d'Auguste dans les provinces au lendemain du règlement de 27 av. n. è.', *RIDA* 26: 177–225.
- Chin, M.J.H., 2018, 'OGIS 332 and Civic Authority at Pergamon in the Reign of Attalos III', *ZPE* 208: 121–137.
- Chiranky, G., 1982, 'Rome and Cotys: Two Problems', *Athenaeum* 60: 461–481.
- Clark, G.N., 1947, *The Seventeenth Century*, 2nd ed., Oxford.
- Colin, G., 1924, 'Traduction grecque d'une loi romaine (de la fin de 101 av. J.-C.): Projets de politique orientale des démocrates et de Marius?', *BCH* 48: 58–96.
- Collins, F., 1981, 'Eutropius and the Dynastic Name Eumenes of the Pergamene Pretender Aristonicus', *AncW* 4: 39–43.
- Cooley, A., 2007, 'The publication of Roman official documents in the Greek East', in Lomas, K., Whitehouse, R.D. & Wilkins, J.B. (eds.), *Literacy and the state in the ancient Mediterranean*, London, 203–218.
- 2009, *Res Gestae divi Augusti: text, translation, and commentary*, Cambridge.
- 2012, 'From Document to Monument: Inscribing Roman Official Documents in the Greek East', in Davies, J. & Wilkes, J. (eds.), *Epigraphy and the Historical Sciences*, Oxford, 159–182.
- (Forthcoming), 'From the Augustan Principate to the Invention of the Age of Augustus', *JRS* 109.

- Corbier, M., 2008, 'The *Lex Portorii Asiae* and Financial Administration', in Cottier, M., Crawford, M.H., Crowther, C.V., Ferrary, J.-L., Levick, B.M., Salomies, O. & Wörrle, M. (eds.), *The Customs Law of Asia*, Oxford, 202–235.
- Corcoran, S., 2018, 'Less of the Same? Continuity and Change in the Official Epigraphy of the Late Empire', in Destephen, S., Dumézil, B. & Inglebert, H. (eds.), *Le Prince Chrétien: de Constantin aux royautés barbares*, Paris, 3–27.
- Corvino, R., 2016, 'Circumscribing Imperium: Power and Regulation in the Republican Province', in Armstrong, J. (ed.), *Circum Mare: Themes in Ancient Warfare*, Leiden, 145–163.
- Coşkun, A., 2009, 'Das Edikt des Sex. Sotidius Strabo Libuscidianus und die Fasten der Statthalter Galatiens in augusteischer und tiberischer Zeit', *Gephyra* 6: 159–164.
- Cottier, M., Crawford, M.H., Crowther, C.V., Ferrary, J.-L., Levick, B.M., Salomies, O. & Wörrle, M. (eds.), 2008, *The Customs Law of Asia*, Oxford.
- Cotton, H.M., 1986, 'A Note on the Organization of Tax-Farming in Asia Minor (Cic. *Fam.*, XIII, 65)', *Latomus* 45(2): 367–373.
- 2013, 'The Evolution of the So-Called Provincial Law, or: Cicero's Letters of Recommendation and Private International Law in the Roman World', in de Kleijn, G. & Benoist, S. (eds.), *Integration in Rome and in the Roman World: Proceedings of the Tenth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Lille, June 23–25 2011)*, Leiden, 43–55.
- Cotton, H.M. & Yakobson, A., 2002, 'Arcanum imperii: the powers of Augustus', in Clark, G. & Rajak, T. (eds.), *Philosophy and Power in the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Miriam Griffin*, Oxford, 193–209.
- Coudry, M., 1994, 'Sénatus-consultes et *acta senatus*: Rédaction, conservation et archivage des documents emanant du sénat, de l'époque de César à celle des Sévères', in Demougin, S. (ed.), *La mémoire perdue: A la recherche des archives oubliées, publiques et privées, de la Rome antique*, Paris, 65–102.
- Coudry, M. & Kirbihler, F., 2010, 'La *lex Cornelia*, une *lex provinciae* de Sylla pour l'Asie', in Barrandon, N. & Kirbihler, F. (eds.), *Administrer les provinces de la république romaine. Actes du colloque de l'Université de Nancy II, 4–5 juin 2009*, Rennes, 133–169.
- Cousin, G. & Diehl, C., 1886, 'Inscriptions d'Alabanda en Carie', *BCH* 10: 299–314.
- Crawford, M.H. (ed.), 1996, *Roman Statutes*, London.
- Crawford, M.H., Ferrary, J.-L., Moreau, P. & Hallof, K., 1996, 'Lex Fonteia (Cos Fragments)', in Crawford, M.H. (ed.), *Roman Statutes*, London, 497–506.
- Crawford, M.H. & Reynolds, J., 1974, 'Rome and Tabae', *GRBS* 15(3): 289–293.
- Crifò, G., 1968, 'Attività normativa del senato in età repubblicana', *BIDR* 71: 31–115.

- Crook, J.A., 1962, 'An Augustan Inscription in the Rijksmuseum at Leyden: (S.E.G. XVIII, no. 555)', *CCJ* 8: 23–29.
- Crooks, P. & Parsons T.H., 2016, 'Empires, Bureaucracy and the Paradox of Power', in Crooks, P. & Parson, T.H. (eds.), *Empires and Bureaucracy in World History: From Late Antiquity to the Twentieth Century*, Cambridge, 3–28.
- Czajkowski, K., 2019, 'The limits of legal pluralism in the Roman Empire', *Journal of Legal History* 40(2): 110–129.
- Dahlheim, W., 1977, *Gewalt und Herrschaft. Das provinziale Herrschaftssystem der römischen Republik*, Berlin.
- Dalla Rosa, A., 2012, 'Praktische Lösungen für praktische Probleme: Die Gruppierung von *conventus* in der Provinz Asia und die Bewegungen des Prokonsuls C. Iulius Severus (*procos.* 152/153)', *ZPE* 183: 259–276.
- 2014, *Cura et tutela: le origini del potere imperiale sulle province proconsolari*, Stuttgart.
 - 2017, 'Propriété familiale, pouvoir imperial: origine et gestion du patrimonium d'Auguste en Asie Mineure', in Cavalier, L, Ferrière, M.-C. & Delrieux, F. (eds.), *Auguste et l'Asie Mineure*, Bordeaux, 101–116.
 - 2018, 'Note sui primi procuratori della provincia d'Asia sotto Augusto', *Index* 46: 498–516.
- Daubner, F., 2006, *Bellum Asiaticum: Der Krieg der Römer gegen Aristonikos von Pergamon und die Einrichtung der Provinz Asia*, 2nd edition, Munich.
- Davenport, C., 2019, *A History of the Roman Equestrian Order*, Oxford.
- Davies, J.K., 2013, 'Words, Acts, Facts', *Studi Ellenistici* 27: 413–420.
- Debord, P., 1985, 'La Lydie du nord-est', *RÉA* 87(3/4): 345–358.
- De Chaisemartin, N., 2017, 'Octavien/Auguste et Aphrodisias: certitudes et perplexités', in Cavalier, L, Ferrière, M.-C. & Delrieux, F. (eds.), *Auguste et l'Asie Mineure*, Bordeaux, 331–343.
- Decorte, R., 2015, 'Publishing Laws: An Investigation of Layout and Epigraphic Conventions in Roman Statutes', *ZPE* 195: 243–254.
- Deininger, J., 1965, *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit von Augustus bis zum Ende des dritten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.*, Munich.
- De Laet, S.J., 1949, *Portorium. Étude sur l'organisation douanière chez les Romains, surtout l'époque du Haut-Empire*, Bruges.
- De Libero, L., 1997, 'Ut eosdem quos populus Romanus amicos atque hostes habeant: Die Freund-Feind-Klausel in den Beziehungen Roms zu Griechischen und Italischen Staaten', *Historia* 46(3): 270–305.
- De Ligt, L., 2002, 'Tax Transfers in the Roman Empire', in de Blois, L. & Rich, J. (eds.), *The Transformation of Economic Life under the Roman Empire: Proceedings of the Second Workshop*

- of the International Network Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, c. 200 B.C.-A.D. 476), Nottingham, July 4-7, 2001, Amsterdam, 48-66.
- 2007, 'The Problem of *ager privatus vectigalisque* in the Epigraphic Lex Agraria', *Epigraphica* 69: 87-98.
- Delplace, C., 1977, 'Publicains, trafiquants et financiers dans les provinces d'Asie Mineure sous la République', *Ktema* 2: 233-252.
- 1978, 'Le contenu social et économique du soulèvement d'Aristonikos: opposition entre riches et pauvres?', *Athenaeum* 56: 20-53.
- Delrieux, F. & Ferriès M.-C., 2004, 'Euthydème, Hybréas et Mylasa: Une cité grecque de Carie dans les conflits romains de la fin du Ier siècle A.C.', *RÉA* 106(1/2): 49-71, 499-515.
- 2011, 'Stratonicea de Carie et Nerva "savour d'Asie"', *Topoi* 17(2): 421-467.
- De Martino, F., 1956, '*Ager privatus vectigalisque*', in Volterra, E. (ed.), *Studi in onore di Pietro De Francisci*, Milan, 555-579.
- Derow, P.S., 1991, 'Pharos and Rome', *ZPE* 88: 261-270.
- Dignas, B., 2002, *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, Oxford.
- Dmitriev, S., 1999, 'Three Notes on Attalid History', *Klio* 81(2): 397-411.
- 2000, 'Observations on the Historical Geography of Lycaonia', *GRBS* 41(4): 349-375.
 - 2005, 'The History and Geography of the Province of Asia during its first hundred years and the Provincialization of Asia Minor', *Athenaeum* 93: 71-133.
 - 2005a, *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, Oxford.
 - 2017, 'The Status of Greek Cities in Roman Reception and Adaptation', *Hermes* 145(2): 195-209.
- Dodd, L.C., 1994, 'Political Learning and Political Change: Understanding Development Across Time', in Dodd, L.C. & Jillson, C. (eds.), *The Dynamics of American Politics: Approaches & Interpretations*, Boulder, 331-364.
- Domingo Gyax, M., 2016, *Benefaction and Rewards in the Ancient Greek City: The Origins of Euergetism*, Cambridge.
- Donnelly, J., 2006, 'Sovereign Inequalities and Hierarchy in Anarchy: American Power and International Society', *European Journal of International Relations* 12(2): 139-170.
- Dubouloz, J. & Pittia, S., 2009, 'La Sicile romaine, de la disparition du royaume de Hieron II à la réorganisation augustéenne des provinces', *Pallas* 80: 85-126.
- Doyle, M.W., 1986, *Empires*, Ithaca.
- Dreher, M., 1996, 'Die *lex portorii Asiae* und der Zollbezirk Asia', *EA* 26: 111-128.
- Drew-Bear, T., 1972, 'Three *senatus consulta* concerning the Province of Asia', *Historia* 21(1): 75-87.
- 1978, *Nouvelles inscriptions de Phrygie*, Zutphen.
- Drexler, H., 1959, '*Iustum Bellum*', *RhM* 102: 97-140.

- Dreyer, B., 2005, 'Rom und die griechischen Polisstaaten an der westkleinasiatischen Küste in der zweiten Hälfte des zweiten Jahrhunderts v. Chr. Hegemoniale Herrschaft und lokale Eliten im Zeitalter der Gracchen', in Coşkun, A. (ed.), *Roms auswärtige Freunde in der späten Republik und im frühen Prinzipat*, Göttingen, 55–74.
- 2007, 'Neue Quellen zum Hellenismus: Bestand, Kontexte, Intentionen', in Weber, G. (ed.), *Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus: Von Alexander dem Großen bis Kleopatra*, Stuttgart, 333–354.
 - 2009, 'City elites and the administration of the Attalid kingdom after the Peace of Apameia: Evidence, research and methodological thoughts, in Greek History and Epigraphy', in Mitchell, L. & Rubinstein, L. (eds.), *Greek history and epigraphy: Essays in honour of P.J. Rhodes*, Swansea, 33–45.
 - 2015, 'Königliche Herrschaft und römische Präsenz. Römische Imperiumsträger als Nachfolger attalidischer Administration,' in Baltrusch, E. & Wilker, J. (eds.), *Amici – socii – clientes? Abhängige Herrschaft im Imperium Romanum*, Berlin, 199–223.
- Dreyer, B. & Engelmann, H., 2003, *Inschriften von Metropolis I*, Bonn.
- 2006, 'Augustus und Germanicus im ionischen Metropolis', *ZPE* 158: 173–182.
- Driediger-Murphy, L.G., 2014, 'M. Valerius Messala to Teos (Syll.³ 601) and the Theology of Rome's War with Antiochos', *ZPE* 189: 115–120.
- Drogula, F.K., 2011, 'The *lex Porcia* and the Development of Legal Restraints on Roman Governors', *Chiron* 41: 91–124.
- 2015, *Command and Commanders in the Roman Republic and Early Empire*, Chapel Hill.
- Eberle, L.P., 2016, 'Law, Empire, and the making of Roman Estates in the Provinces during the Late Republic', *Critical Journal of Law* 3(1): 50–69.
- 2017, 'Making Roman Subjects: Citizenship and Empire before and after Augustus' *TAPA* 147(2): 321–370.
- Eberle, L.P. & Le Quéré, E., 2017, 'Landed Traders, Trading Agriculturalists? Land in the Economy of the Italian Diaspora in the Greek East', *JRS* 107: 27–59.
- Eck, W., 1984, 'CIL VI 1508 (Moretti, *IGUR* 71) und die Gestaltung senatorischer Ehrenmonumente', *Chiron* 14: 201–218.
- 1995–1998, *Die Verwaltung des Römischen Reiches in der Hohen Kaiserzeit: Ausgewählte und erweiterte Beiträge*, 2 vols., Basel.
 - 2009, 'Diplomacy as Part of the Administrative Process in the Roman Empire', in Eilers, C. (ed.), *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World*, Leiden, 193–208.
 - 2010 [1997], 'Öffentlichkeit, Monument und Inschrift', in Eck, W. & Ameling, W. (eds.), *Monument und Inschrift: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur senatorischen Repräsentation in der Kaiserzeit*, Berlin, 275–298.

- 2014, 'Documents on Bronze: A Phenomenon of the Roman West?', in Bodel, J. & Dimitrova, N. (eds.), *Ancient Documents and their Contexts: First North American Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy*, Leiden, 127–151.
- Eck, W., Caballos, A. & Fernández, F., 1996, *Das Senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre*, Munich.
- Eckstein, A.M., 1995, 'Glabrio and the Aetolians: A Note on *Deditio*', *TAPA* 125: 271–289.
- 1999, 'Pharos and the Question of Roman Treaties of Alliance in the Greek East in the Third Century B.C.E.', *CP* 94(4): 395–418.
- 2006, *Mediterranean Anarchy, Interstate War and the Rise of Rome*, Berkeley.
- 2018, 'Rome, Empire, and the Hellenistic State System', in Ñaco del Hoyo, T. & López Sánchez, F. (eds.), *War, Warlords, and Interstates Relations in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Leiden, 231–253.
- Edelmann-Singer, B., 2011, 'Die Provinzen und der Kaiserkult. Zur Entstehungen und Organisation des Provinziallandtages von Asia', in Ebner, M. & Esch-Wermeling, E. (eds.), *Kaiserkult, Wirtschaft und spectacula: zum politischen und gesellschaftlichen Umfeld der Offenbarung*, Göttingen, 81–102.
- 2012, 'Die finanzielle und wirtschaftliche Dimension der Provinziallandtage in der Römischen Kaiserzeit', in Günther, S. (ed.), *Ordnungsrahmen antiker Ökonomien: Ordnungskonzepte und Steuerungsmechanismen antiker Wirtschaftssysteme im Vergleich*, Wiesbaden, 165–179.
- 2015, *Koina und Concilia: Genese, Organisation und sozioökonomische Funktion der Provinziallandtage im römischen Reich*, Stuttgart.
- 2016, 'The Provincial Elite in the Provincial Assemblies: Eastern *koina* and their Influence on Provincial Identity', *C&M* 65: 227–239.
- Edmondson, J., 2014, 'The Roman emperor and the local communities of the Roman empire', in Ferrary, J.-L. & Scheid, J. (eds.), *Il princeps romano: autocrate o magistrato? Fattori giuridici e fattori sociali del potere imperiale da Augusto a Commodo*, Pavia, 127–155.
- Eich, P., 2005, *Zur Metamorphose des politischen Systems in der römischen Kaiserzeit: Die Entstehung einer "personalen Bürokratie" im langen dritten Jahrhundert*, Berlin.
- Eilers, C., 1996, 'Silanus <and> Murena (I. Priene 121)', *CQ* 46(1): 175–182.
- 1999, 'M. Silanus, Stratoniceia, and the Governors of Asia under Augustus', *Tyche* 14: 77–86.
- 2001, 'The Proconsulship of P. Cornelius Scipio (cos. 16 B.C.)', *CQ* 51(1): 201–205.
- 2002, *Roman Patrons of Greek Cities*, Oxford.
- 2005, 'Review: B. Dreyer and H. Engelmann, *Die Inschriften von Metropolis 1*', *JRS* 95: 253–254.
- 2009, 'Inscribed Documents, Uninscribed Documents and the Place of the City in the *Imperium Romanum*', in Haensch, R. (ed.), *Selbstdarstellung und Kommunikation die*

- Veröffentlichung staatlicher Urkunden auf Stein und Bronze in der römischen Welt, Munich, 301–312.
- Eilers, C. & Milner, N., 1995, 'Q. Mucius Scaevola and Oenoanda', *AS* 45: 73–89.
- Elliot, J.H., 1992, 'A Europe of Composite Monarchies', *P&P* 137: 48–71.
- Ellis-Evans, A., 2019, *The Kingdom of Priam: Lesbos and the Troad between Anatolia and the Aegean*, Oxford.
- (Forthcoming), 'The Late Hellenistic Tetradrachms of Parion and Lampsakos', *AJN*.
- Engelmann, H., 1976, *Die Inschriften von Kyme*, Bonn.
- Engelmann, H. & Knibbe, D., 1989, 'Das Zollgesetz der Provinz Asia. Eine neue Inschrift aus Ephesos', *EA* 14: 1–206.
- Erkelenz, D., 1999, 'Cicero *pro Flacco* 55–59. Zur Finanzierung von Statthalterfesten in der Frühphase des Koinon von Asia', *Chiron* 29: 43–57.
- 2003, *Optimo Praesidi: Untersuchungen zu den Ehrenmonumenten für Amtsträger der römischen Provinzen in Republik und Kaiserzeit*, Bonn.
- Errington, R.M., 1980, 'Rom, Antiochos der Grosse und die Asylie von Teos', *ZPE* 39: 279–284.
- 1987, 'Θεὰ Πώμη und römischer Einfluß südlich des Mäanders im 2. Jh. v. Chr.', *Chiron* 17: 97–118.
- 2010, 'Alabanda und Rom im 2. Jh. v. Chr.', *EA* 43: 125–130.
- Erskine, A., 1994, 'The Romans as common benefactors', *Historia* 43(1): 70–87.
- 1994a, 'Greek Embassies and the City of Rome', *Classics Ireland* 1: 47–53.
- 1997, 'Greekness and Uniqueness: The Cult of the Senate in the Roman East', *Phoenix* 51(1): 25–37.
- Étienne, R., 1990, *Tenos II*, Paris.
- Fabiani, R., 2015, *I decreti onorari di Iasos*, Munich.
- Famerie, É., 2009, 'Le traité d'alliance romano-cnidienne 45 av. J.-C.', *CCG* 20: 265–280.
- Fernoux, H.-L., 2004, *Notables et élites des cités de Bithynie aux époques hellénistique et romaine: IIIe siècle av. J.-C.-IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.: Essai d'histoire sociale*, Lyon.
- 2007, 'L'exemplarité sociale chez les notables des cités d'Asie Mineure à l'époque impériale', in Fernoux, H.-L. & Stein, C. (eds.), *Aristocratie antique: Modèles et exemplarité sociale*, Dijon, 175–200.
- 2011, *Le Demos et la Cité: Communautés et assemblées populaires en Asie Mineure à l'époque impériale*, Rennes.
- 2011a, 'Les ambassades civiques des cités de la province d'Asie envoyées à Rome au I^{er} s. av. J.-C.: législation romaine et prérogatives des cités', in Barrandon, N. & Kirbihler, F. (eds.), *Les gouverneurs et les provinciaux sous la République romaine*, Rennes, 77–99.
- Ferrary, J.-L., 1977, 'Recherches sur la législation de Saturninus et de Glaucia', *MEFRA* 89(2): 619–660.

- 1978, 'Rome, les Balkans, la Grèce et l'Orient au II^e av. J.-C.', in Nicolet, C. (ed.), *Rome et la conquête du monde méditerranéen, 729–788*.
- 1985, 'La lex Antonia de Termessibus', *Athenaeum* 73: 419–457.
- 1988, *Philhellénisme et impérialisme: aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique, de la seconde guerre de Macédoine à la guerre contre Mithridate*, Paris.
- 1990, 'Traités et domination romaine dans le monde hellénique', in Canfora, L., Liverani, M. & Zaccagnini, C. (eds.), *I trattati nel mondo antico. Forma, ideologia, funzione*, Rome, 217–235.
- 1991, 'Le statut des cités libres dans l'Empire romain à la lumière des inscriptions de Claros', *CRAI* 135: 557–577.
- 1996, 'The lex Antonia de Termessibus', in Crawford, M.H. (ed.), *Roman Statutes*, London, 331–340.
- 1997, 'De l'évergétisme hellénistique à l'évergétisme romain', *Actes du Xe Congrès International d'épigraphie grecque et latine*, 199–225.
- 1997a, 'The Hellenistic World and Roman Political Patronage', in Cartledge, P., Garnsey, P. & Gruen, E.S. (eds.), *Hellenistic Constructs: Essays in Culture, History and Historiography*, Berkeley, 105–119.
- 1998, 'Chapitres tralatites et références à lois antérieures dans les lois romaines', in Humbert, M. & Thomas, Y. (eds.), *Mélanges de droit romain et d'histoire ancienne: hommage à la mémoire de André Magdelain*, Paris, 151–167.
- 1999, 'La liberté des cités et ses limites à l'époque républicaine', *MedAnt* 2(1): 69–84.
- 2000, 'Les inscriptions du sanctuaire de Claros en l'honneur de Romains', *BCH* 124: 331–376.
- 2000a, 'Les gouverneurs des provinces romaines d'Asie Mineure (Asie et Cilicie), depuis l'organisation de la province d'Asie jusqu'à la première guerre de Mithridate (126–88 av. J.-C.)', *Chiron* 30: 161–193.
- 2001, 'Rome et la géographie de l'hellénisme: réflexions sur "Hellènes" et "Panhellènes" dans les inscriptions de l'époque romaine', in Salomies, O. (ed.), *The Greek East in the Roman Context: Proceedings of a Colloquium Organized by the Finnish Institute at Athens, 21 and 22 May 1999*, Helsinki, 19–35.
- 2001a, 'À propos des pouvoirs d'Auguste', *CCG* 12(1): 101–154.
- 2003, 'Réflexions récentes sur la loi du *portorium* d'Asie', *CCG* 14: 314–315.
- 2005, 'Les grecs des cités et l'obtention de la *civitas Romana*', in Fröhlich, P. & Müller, C. (eds.), *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique*, Geneva, 51–75.
- 2007, 'Les ambassadeurs grecs au Sénat romain', in Sot, M. (ed.), *L'audience: rituels et cadres spatiaux dans l'Antiquité et le haut Moyen Âge*, Paris, 113–122.

- 2008, 'Retour sur la loi des inscriptions de Delphes et de Cnide (Roman Statutes no 12)', in Caldelli, M.L., Gregori, G.L. & Orladi, S. (eds.), *Epigrafia 2006: Atti della XIVe Rencontre sur l'Epigraphie in onore Silvio Panciera con altri contributi di colleghi, allievi e collaboratori*, Rome, 101–114.
 - 2009, 'After the Embassy to Rome: Publication and Implementation', in Eilers, C. (ed.), *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World*, Leiden, 127–142.
 - 2009a, 'La gravure de documents publics de la Rome républicaine et ses motivations', in Haensch, R. (ed.), *Selbstdarstellung und Kommunikation die Veröffentlichung staatlicher Urkunden auf Stein und Bronze in der römischen Welt*, Munich, 59–74.
 - 2012, 'Quelques remarques à propos de Q. Mucius Scaevola (cos. 95 av. J.-C.), et en particulier de la date de son gouvernement en Asie', *Ath* 100: 157–179.
 - 2017* = 1991 reprinted with additional comments in Ferrary, J.-L. & Rousset, D. (eds.), 2017, *Rome et le monde grec: choix d'écrits*, Paris, 161–180.
 - 2018, 'Una vita nel cuore della Repubblica. Saggio di biografia politica', in Ferrary, J.-L., Schiavone, A. & Stolfi, E. (eds.), *Qvintvs Mvcius Scaevola: Opera*, Rome, 3–27.
- Ferrière, M.-C., 2007, *Les Partisans d'Antoine: (des orphelins de César aux complices de Cléopâtre)*, Bordeaux.
- Ferrière, M.-C. & Delrieux, F., 2011, 'Quintus Mucius Scaevola, un gouverneur modèle pour les Grecs de la province d'Asie', in Barrandon, N. & Kirbihler, F. (eds.), *Les gouverneurs et les provinciaux sous la république romaine*, Rennes, 207–230.
- Fioretos, O., Falleti, T.G. & Sheingate, A., 2016, 'Historical Institutionalism in Political Science', in Fioretos, O., Falleti, T.G. & Sheingate, A. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism*, Oxford, 3–28.
- Flory, M.B., 1996, 'Dynastic Ideology, the *domus Augusta*, and Imperial Women: A Lost Statuary Group in the Circus Flaminius', *TAPA* 126: 287–306.
- Flower, H.I., 2009, *Roman Republics*, Princeton.
- Foucart, P.F., 1903, *La formation de la province romaine d'Asie*, Paris.
- Foucault, M., 1980, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*, New York.
- 2000 [1979], 'Omnes et singulatim: Towards a Criticism of "Political Reason"', in Fabion, J.D. (ed.), *Power: Essential Works of Foucault*, vol. 3, New York, 298–325.
 - 2000a [1978], 'Governmentality', in Fabion, J.D. (ed.), *Power: Essential Works of Foucault*, vol. 3, New York, 201–222.
- Fournier, J., 2007, 'Les syndikoi, représentants juridiques des cités grecques sous le Haut-Empire romain', *CCG* 18: 7–36.
- 2010, *Entre tutelle romaine et autonomie civique: l'administration judiciaire dans les provinces hellénophones de l'empire romain*, 129 av. J.-C. – 235 apr. J.-C., Athens.

- 2012, 'L'essor de la multi-citoyenneté dans l'Orient romain: problèmes juridiques et judiciaires', in Heller, A. & Pont, A.-V. (eds.), *Patrie d'origine et patries électives: les citoyennetés multiples dans le monde grec d'époque romaine*, Bordeaux, 79–98.
- France, J., 2007, 'Deux questions sur la fiscalité provinciale d'après Cicéron, *Ver.* 3.12', in Dubouloz, J. & Pittia, S. (eds.), *La Sicile de Cicéron: Lectures des Verrines*, Besançon, 169–184.
- Frank, T., 1927, "“Dominium in solo provinciali” and “ager publicus”", *JRS* 17: 141–161.
- 1933, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, vol. 1, Baltimore.
- 1937, 'The New Elogium of Julius Caesar's Father', *AJPh* 58(1): 90–93.
- Frederiksen, M.W., 1965, 'The Republican municipal laws: errors and drafts', *JRS* 55: 183–198.
- Freeman, P.W., 1986, 'The Province of Cilicia and its Origins', in Freeman, P.W. & Kennedy, D.L. (eds.), *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East*, Oxford, 253–275.
- French, D.H., 1997, 'Pre- and early-Roman roads of Asia Minor. The earliest Roman paved roads in Asia Minor', *Arkeoloji Dergisi* 5: 179–187.
- 2012, *Roman Roads and Milestones of Asia Minor*, vol. 3.1, London.
- Friesen, S.J., 1993, *Twice Neokoros: Ephesus, Asia and the cult of the Flavian Imperial Family*, Leiden.
- 1999, 'Asiarchs', *ZPE* 126: 275–290.
- 2013, 'Junia Theodora of Corinth: Gendered Inequalities in the Early Empire', in Friesen, S.J., James, S.A. & Schowalter, D.N. (eds.), *Corinth in Contrast: Studies in Inequality*, Leiden, 203–226.
- Frija, G. 2012, *Les prêtres des empereurs: le culte impérial civique dans la province romaine d'Asie*, Rennes.
- 2014, 'Les Grecs et l'autorités romaines au Ier siècle av. J.-C.: réflexions sur l'évolution du langage honorifique', in Dubouloz, J., Pittia, S. & Sabatini G. (eds.), *L'imperium Romanum en perspective. Les savoirs d'empire dans la République romaine et leur héritage dans l'Europe médiévale et moderne*, Paris, 81–94.
- 2016, 'Les cultes impériaux dans les cités d'Asie Mineure: des spécificités provinciales?', in Kolb, A. & Vitale, M. (eds.), *Kaiserkult in den Provinzen des römischen Reiches: Organisation, Kommunikation und Repräsentation*, Berlin, 159–172.
- 2017, 'Auguste et la concession de la citoyenneté romaine: enquête sur les Iulii en Carie', in Cavalier, L., Ferriès, M.-C. & Delrieux, F. (eds.), *Auguste et l'Asie Mineure*, Bordeaux, 191–206.
- 2017a, 'Les honneurs des cités d'Asie aux proches des gouverneurs', in Heller, A. & van Nijf, O. (eds.), *The Politics of Honour in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire*, Leiden, 272–290.
- Gabrielsen, V., 2000, 'The Rhodian Peraia in the Third and Second Centuries B.C.', *C&M* 51: 129–185.

- Gagarin, M., 2008, *Writing Greek Law*, Cambridge.
- Gallet, L., 1937, 'Essai sur le sénatus-consulte "De Asclepiade sociisque"', *RHDFE* 16: 242–293, 387–425.
- García Domingo, E., 1976, 'Uso de las partículas en la versión griega de S.C. de Asclepiade y sus correspondencias en latín', *CFC(L)* 11: 395–411.
- Gardner, A., 2013, 'Thinking about Roman Imperialism: Postcolonialism, Globalisation and Beyond?', *Britannia* 44: 1–25.
- Gargola, D.J., 2017, 'Was there a Regular *provincia Africa* in the Second Century?' *Historia* 66(3), 331–361.
- Garnsey, P. & Rathbone, D., 1985, 'The Background to the Grain Law of Gaius Gracchus', *JRS* 75: 20–25.
- Gauthier, P., 1985, *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*, Athens.
- 2011 [1984], 'Les cités hellénistiques: épigraphie et histoire des institutions et des régimes politiques', in Gauthier P., *Études d'histoire et d'institutions grecques. Choix d'écrits*, Geneva, 315–350.
- Geertz, C., 1973, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*, New York.
- 1983, *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretative Anthropology*, New York.
- Giannakopoulos, N., 2013, 'The Gerousia of Akmonia', *Gephyra* 10: 13–31.
- Giovannini, A., 1983, *Consulare imperium*, Basel.
- 1999, 'Les pouvoirs d'Auguste de 27 à 23 av.J.-C.: une relecture de l'ordonnance de Kymè de l'an 27 (*IK* 5, N° 17)', *ZPE* 124: 95–106.
- 2008, 'Date et objectifs de la *lex de provinciis praetoriis* (Roman Statutes, no 12)', *Historia* 57(1): 92–107.
- Giovannini, A. & Grzybek, E., 1978, 'La *lex de piratis persequendis*', *MH* 35(1): 33–47.
- Girdvainyte, L., 2019, *Law and Citizenship in the Roman Greek East: The Provinces of Macedonia and Achaia (c. 146 BCE – 212 CE)*, Diss. — Oxford.
- Glew, D.G., 1981, 'Between the Wars: Mithridates Eupator and Rome, 85–73 B.C.', *Chiron* 11: 109–130.
- Gold, B.K., 1985, 'Pompey and Theophanes of Mytilene', *AJPh* 106(3): 312–327.
- Gotter, U., 2013, 'The Castrated King, or: The Everyday Monstrosity of Late Hellenistic Kingship', in Luraghi, N. (ed.), *The Splendors and Miseries of Ruling Alone: Encounters with Monarchy from Archaic Greece to the Hellenistic Mediterranean*, Stuttgart, 207–230.
- Gow, A.S.F. & Page, D.L., 1963, *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip and some Contemporary Epigrams*, 2 vols, Cambridge.
- Gray, E., 1972, 'Rome and the Greek States', *CR* 22(1): 87–93.

- 1978, 'M'. Aquillius and the Organization of the Roman Province of Asia', in Akurgal, E. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Xth International Congress of Classical Archaeology*, Ankara, vol. 2, 965–977.
- Greif, A., 2006, *Institutions and the Path to the Modern Economy: Lessons from Medieval Trade*, Cambridge.
- Griffin, M.T., 1989, 'Philosophy, politics, and politicians at Rome', in Griffin, M.T. & Barnes, J. (eds.), *Philosophia Togata*, Oxford, 1–37.
- Grimal, P., 1945–1946, 'Auguste et Athénodore', *RÉA* 47–48: 261–273, 62–79.
- Gruber, J., 1988, 'Cicero und das hellenistische Herrscherideal', *WS* 101: 243–258.
- Gruen, E.S., 1982, 'Greek πίστις and Roman fides', *Athenaeum* 60: 50–68.
- 1984, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*, Berkeley.
- Gschnitzer, F., 1989, 'Beurkundungsgebühren in Römischen Kaiserreich. Zu IvE Ia 13', in Thür, G. (ed.), *Symposion 1985: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Ringberg, 14.–26. Juli 1985)*, Cologne, 389–403.
- Guerber, E., 1995, 'Cité libre ou stipendaire? A propos du statut juridique d'Éphèse à l'époque du haut empire romain', *RÉG* 108(2): 388–409.
- 2009, *Les cités grecques dans l'empire romain: les privilèges et les titres des cités de l'orient hellénophone d'Octave Auguste à Dioclétien*, Rennes.
- Habermas, J., 1984, *The Theory of Communicative Action*. vol. 1, *Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, Cambridge.
- 1987, *The Theory of Communicative Action*. vol. 2, *Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*, Cambridge.
- 1991, 'A Reply', in Honneth, A. & Joas, H. (eds.), *Communicative Action: Essays on Jürgen Habermas' The Theory of Communicative Action*, Cambridge, 214–264.
- Habicht, C., 1975, 'New Evidence on the Province of Asia', *JRS* 65: 64–91.
- 1997, *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, Cambridge.
- 2001/2002, 'Zum Gesandtschaftsverkehr griechischer Gemeinden mit römischen Instanzen während der Kaiserzeit', *Archaionomia* 11: 11–28.
- Haensch, R., 1992, 'Das Statthalterarchiv', *ZSS-Rom* 109: 209–317.
- 1997, *Capita Provinciarum: Statthaltersitze und Provinzialverwaltung in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Mainz.
- 2009, 'Die Städte des griechischen Ostens', in Haensch, R. (ed.), *Selbstdarstellung und Kommunikation die Veröffentlichung staatlicher Urkunden auf Stein und Bronze in der römischen Welt*, Munich, 173–187.
- Haldon, J., 1993, *The State and the Tributary Mode of Production*, London.
- Hall, A.S., Milner, N.P. & Coulton, J.J., 1996, 'The Mausoleum of Licinnia Flavilla and Flavianus Diogenes of Oinoanda: Epigraphy and Architecture', *AS* 46: 111–146.

- Hall, P.A. & Taylor, R.C.R., 1996, 'Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms', *Political Studies* 44: 936–957.
- Hall, S., 1980, 'Encoding/Decoding', in Hall, S., Hobson, D., Lowe, A. & Willis, P. (eds.), *Culture, Media and Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972–79*, London, 117–127.
- Hansen, M.H., 2002, 'Was the polis a state or a stateless society?', in Nielsen, T.H. (ed.), *Even More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, Stuttgart, 17–47.
- Hantos, T., 1988, *Res publica constituta: Die Verfassung des Dictators Sulla*, Stuttgart.
- Harris, W.V., 1979, *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome, 327–70 B.C.*, Oxford.
- 2017, *Roman Power*, Cambridge.
- Hassall, M., Crawford, M.H. & Reynolds, J., 1974, 'Rome and the Eastern Provinces at the End of the Second Century BC', *JRS* 64: 195–220.
- Hatzfield, J., 1919, *Les trafiquants italiens dans l'Orient hellénique*, Paris.
- 1927, 'Inscriptions de Panamara', *BCH* 51: 57–122.
- Hatzopoulos, M.B., 1996, *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings: A Historical and Epigraphic Study*, Athens.
- Heberdey, R., 1929, *Termessische Studien*, Vienna.
- Heil, M., 1991, 'Einige Bemerkungen zum Zollgesetz aus Ephesos', *EA* 17: 9–18.
- Heller, A., 2006, *Les bêtises des grecs: Conflits et rivalités entre cités d'Asie et de Bithynie à l'époque romaine, 129 a. C.-235 p. C.*, Pessacs.
- 2011, 'Des Grecs au service des *imperatores* romains, ou comment rester Grec tout en devenant romains', in Couvenhes, J.-C., Crouzet, S. & Péré-Nouguès, S. (eds.), *Pratiques et identités culturelles des armées hellénistiques du monde méditerranéen*, Bordeaux, 227–244.
- 2014, 'Domination subie, domination choisie: les cités d'Asie Mineure face au pouvoir romain, de la République à l'Empire', *Pallas* 96: 217–234.
- Heller, A. & Pont, A.-V. (eds.), 2012, *Patrie d'origine et patries électives: les citoyennetés multiples dans le monde grec d'époque romaine*, Bordeaux,
- Heller, A. & van Nijf, O. (eds.), 2017, *The Politics of Honour in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire*, Leiden.
- Heller, A. & van Nijf, O., 2017, 'Introduction: Civic Honours, from Classical to Roman Times', in Heller, A. & van Nijf, O. (eds.), *The Politics of Honour in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire*, Leiden, 1–27.
- Hennig, D., 1997, 'Die Beherbergung von "Statsgästen" in der hellenistischen Polis', *Chiron* 27: 355–368.
- Hermon, E., 2010, 'Administrer les provinces romaines républicaines: approches historiographiques et acquis récents', in Barrandon, N. & Kirbihler, F. (eds.),

Administrer les provinces de la république romaine: actes du colloque de l'université de Nancy II, 4-5 juin 2009, Rennes, 21-30.

- Herrmann, P., 1989, 'Ein Tempel für Caligula in Milet?', *MDAI(I)* 39: 191-196.
- 1989a, 'Rom und die Asylie griechischer Heiligtümer: eine Urkunde des Diktators Caesar und Sardeis', *Chiron* 19: 127-164.
 - 1994, 'Milet unter Augustus. C. Iulius Epikrates und die Anfänge des Kaiserkults', *IstMitt* 44: 203-236.
 - 1996, 'Milet unter Augustus. Erkenntnisse aus einem Inschriften-Neufund', in Strubbe, J.H.M., Tybout, R.A. & Versnel, H.S. (eds.), *ENEPTEIA: Studies on Ancient History and Epigraphy presented to H.W. Pleket*, Amsterdam, 1-18.
- Herrmann, P. & Polatkan, K.Z., 1969, 'Das Testament des Epikrates und andere neue Inschriften aus dem Museum von Manisa', *SB Wien Phil.-hist. Klasse* 265(1): 7-63.
- Herz, P., 1997, 'Herrscherverehrung und lokale Festkultur im Osten des römischen Reiches (Kaiser/Agone)', in Cancik, H. & Rüpke, J. (eds.), *Römische Reichsreligion und Provinzialreligion*, Tübingen, 239-264.
- 2001, 'Das Bürgerrechtsdekret von Ephesos: *Inschriften von Ephesos* 8: Gedanken zur Gesellschaft im spätrepublikanischen Kleinasien', in Bellen, H. & Heinen, H. (eds.), *Fünfzig Jahre Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei an der Mainzer Akademie 1950-2000: Miscellanea zum Jubiläum*, Stuttgart, 185-207.
- Herzog, R., 1922, 'Nikias und Xenophon von Kos', *HZ* 125: 188-247.
- Heuss, A., 1933, *Die völkerrechtlichen Grundlagen der römischen Aussenpolitik in republikanischer Zeit*, Leipzig.
- 1937, *Stadt und Herrscher des Hellenismus in ihren staats- und völkerrechtlichen Beziehungen*, Leipzig.
- Hiller von Gaertringen, F. & Mommsen, T., 1891, 'Das Denkmal Chäremón's von Nysa', *AthMitt* 16: 95-106.
- Hingley, R., 2009, 'Cultural Diversity and Unity: Empire and Rome', in Hales, S. & Hodos, T. (eds.), *Material Culture and Social Identities in the Ancient World*, Cambridge, 54-75.
- Hirschfeld, G., 1886, 'C. Iulius Theupompus of Cnidus', *JHS* 7: 286-290.
- Højte, J.M., 2006, 'From Kingdom to Province: Reshaping Pontos after the Fall of Mithridates VI', in Bekker-Nielsen, T. (ed.), *Rome and the Black Sea Region: Domination, Romanization and Resistance*, Aarhus, 15-30.
- 2009, 'The Administrative Organisation of the Pontic Kingdom', in Højte, J.M. (ed.), *Mithridates VI and the Pontic Kingdom*, Aarhus, 95-108.
- Hodos, T., 2014, 'Global, Local and In Between: Connectivity and the Mediterranean', in Pitt, M. & Versluys, M.J. (eds.), *Globalisation and the Roman world: world history, connectivity and material culture*, Cambridge, 240-253.

- Horden, P. & Purcell, N., 2000, *The Corrupting Sea: A Study of Mediterranean History*, Malden.
- Hoyos, D., 1973, 'Lex provinciae and Governor's Edict', *Antichthon* 7: 47–53.
- Hunter, L.W., 1913, 'Cicero's Journey to his Province of Cilicia in 51 BC', *JRS* 3: 73–97.
- Hunter, V.J., 1994, *Policing Athens: Social in Attic Lawsuits, 420–320 B.C.*, Princeton.
- Hurlet, F., 1993, *La dictature de Sylla: monarchie ou magistrature républicaine? Essai d'histoire constitutionnelle*, Rome.
- 2006, *Le proconsul et le prince d'Auguste à Dioclétien*, Bordeaux.
- Institute for Government, 2018, 'EU Withdrawal Act', <https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/explainers/eu-withdrawal-act>, accessed on 8 Aug. 2019.
- Iser, W., 1972, 'The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach', *New Literary History* 3(2): 279–299.
- Jauss, H.R. & Benziger, E., 1970, 'Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory', *New Literary History* 2(1): 7–37.
- Jehne, M., 1987, *Der Staat des Dictators Caesar*, Cologne.
- Jehne, M. & Pina Polo, F. (eds.), 2015, *Foreign clientelae in the Roman Empire: a reconsideration*, Stuttgart.
- Jones, A.H.M., 1939, 'Civitates liberae et immunes in the East', in Calder, W.M. & Keil, J. (eds.), *Anatolian Studies Presented to William Hepburn Buckler*, Manchester, 103–117.
- 1940, *The Greek City: From Alexander to Justinian*, Oxford.
- 1960 [1950], 'The Aerarium and the Fiscus', in Jones, A.H.M., *Studies in Roman Law and Government*, Oxford, 101–114.
- 1960a, 'Procurators and Prefects in the Early Principate', in Jones, A.H.M., *Studies in Roman Law and Government*, Oxford, 117–125.
- 1960b, 'I Appeal unto Caesar', in Jones, A.H.M., *Studies in Roman Law and Government*, Oxford, 53–65.
- 1971, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, 2nd ed., Oxford.
- Jones, C.P., 1974, 'Diodoros Paspáros and the Nikephoria of Pergamon', *Chiron* 4: 183–205.
- 1999, 'Atticus in Ephesos', *ZPE* 124: 89–94.
- 2000a, 'Nero Speaking', *HSCP* 100: 453–462.
- 2001, 'Memories of the Roman Republic in the Greek East', in Salomies, O. (ed.), *The Greek East in the Roman context: Proceedings of a Colloquium organised by the Finnish Institute at Athens, May 21 and 22, 1999*, Helsinki, 11–18.
- 2001a, 'The Claudian Monument at Patara', *ZPE* 137: 161–168.
- 2004, 'Events surrounding the bequest of Pergamon to Rome and the Revolt of Aristonicos: new inscriptions from Metropolis', *JRA* 17: 469–485.
- 2011, 'An Inscription seen by Agathias', *ZPE* 179: 107–115.

- 2011a, 'A model of euergetism for Asia Minor', *JRA* 24: 773–775.
 - 2012, 'Joys and Sorrows of Multiple Citizenship: The Case of Dio Chrysostom', in Heller, A. & Pont, A.-V. (eds.), *Patrie d'origine et patries électives: les citoyennetés multiples dans le monde grec d'époque romaine*, Bordeaux, 213–219.
 - 2017, 'Strabo and the "Petty Dynasts"', in Cavalier, L., Ferrière, M.-C. & Delrieux, F. (eds.), *Auguste et l'Asie Mineure*, Bordeaux, 349–356.
 - 2018, 'The Institutional History of Hierapolis', *JRA* 31: 921–927.
- Judge, E.A., 2014, 'Was the *Res Gestae* of Augustus Copied at Sardis?', *Classicum* 40(2): 3–8.
- 2016, 'Was a Greek *Res Gestae* authorised for Sardis?', in Lieu, S.N.C. & McKechie, P. (eds.), *Aspects of the Roman East: Papers in Honour of Professor Fergus Millar*, Turnhout, 128–145.
- Kah, D., 2012, 'Paroikoi und Neubürger in Priene', in Günther, L.-M., (ed.), *Migration und Bürgerrecht in der hellenistischen Welt*, Wiesbaden, 51–71.
- Kalinowski, A., 2011, 'Review: Arjan Zuiderhoek, *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire. Citizens, Elites and Benefactors in Asia Minor*', *AHB Online Reviews* 1: 148–152.
- Kallet-Marx, R., 1990, 'The Trial of Rutilius Rufus', *Phoenix* 44(2): 122–139.
- 1995, *Hegemony to Empire: The Development of the Roman Imperium in the East from 148 to 62 B.C.*, Berkeley.
 - 1995a, 'Quintus Fabius Maximus and the Dyme Affair (Syll.³ 684)', *CQ* 45(1): 129–153.
- Kantor, G., 2009, 'Острова Эгейского моря и провинция Азия (The Aegean Islands and The Province of Asia)', *VDI* 2: 138–149. (French Summary: *AE* 2009, #1373).
- 2010, 'SICVLVS CVM SICVLO NON EIVSDEM CIVITATIS: Litigation between Citizens of Different Communities in the *Verrines*', *CCG* 21: 187–204.
 - 2013, 'Law in Roman Phrygia: Rules and Jurisdictions', in Thonemann, P. (ed.), *Roman Phrygia: Culture and Society*, Cambridge, 143–167.
 - 2013a, 'SEG LV 1452, ll. 32–34, and the Crime of *plagium* in the Late Republic', *ZPE* 184, 219–224.
 - 2014, 'Roman legal administration in the province of Asia: Hellenistic heritage vs. innovation', in Dubouloz, J., Pittia, S. & Sabatini G. (eds.), *L'imperium Romanum en perspective. Les savoirs d'empire dans la République romaine et leur héritage dans l'Europe médiévale et moderne*, Paris, 243–268.
 - 2015, 'Greek Law under the Romans', in Harris, E.M. & Canevaro, M. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Law* [Online], <https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199599257.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199599257-e-25>, accessed 19 Aug. 2019.

- Katznelson, I., 1997, 'Structure and Configuration in Comparative Politics', in Lichbach, M.I. & Zuckerman, A.S. (eds.), *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure*, Cambridge, 81–112.
- Kaufmann, F.-M. & Stauber, J., 1992, 'Poimanenon bei Eski Manyas? Zeugnisse und Lokalisierung einer kaum bekannten Stadt', in Schütte, A. (ed.), *Studien zum antiken Kleinasien II*, Bonn, 43–85.
- Kay, P., 2014, *Rome's Economic Revolution*, Oxford.
- Kaye, N., 2013, 'Taxation in the Greco-Roman World: The Hellenistic East', *Oxford Handbooks Online*,
<https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935390.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199935390-e-36>, accessed 19 Aug. 2019.
- Kearsley, R., 1986, 'Asiarchs, Archiereis, and the Archierea of Asia', *GRBS* 27(2): 183–192.
- 1989, 'Asiarchs: Titulature and Function. A Reappraisal', *StClass* 26: 57–65.
- Keaveney, A., 1982, *Sulla: The Last Republican*, London.
- 1992, *Lucullus: A Life*, London.
- 2005, 'Sulla the Warlord and Other Mythical Beasts', in de Blois, L., Bons ton Kessels, J. & Schenkeveld, D.M. (eds.), *The Statesman in Plutarch's Works: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference of the International Plutarch Society, Nijmegen/Castle Hernen, May 1–5, 2002*, vol. 2, Leiden, 297–302.
- Kehne, P., 2003, '1000 ausgewählte Internationalverträge (Staatsverträge) der griechisch-römischen Antike', *DNP* 16: 338–438.
- Keil, J., 1911, 'Die Synodos der ökumenischen Hieroniken und Stephaniten', *JÖAI* 14: 123–134.
- Kenyon, F.G., 1896, 'A Rescript of Marcus Antonius', *CR* 7(10): 476–478.
- Kinns, P., 2006, 'A New Didrachm of Magnesia on the Maeander', *NC* 166: 41–47.
- Kirbihler, F., 2007, 'Die Italiker in Kleinasien', in Meyer, M. (ed.), *Neue Zeiten – Neue Sitten. Zu Rezeption und Integration römischen und italischen Kulturguts in Kleinasien*, Vienna, 19–35.
- 2011, 'Servilius Isauricus, proconsul d'Asie: un gouverneur populaire', in Kirbihler, F. & Barrandon, N. (eds.), *Les gouverneurs et les provinciaux sous la République romaine*, Rennes, 249–272.
- 2012, 'César, Auguste et l'Asie: continuités et évolutions de deux politiques', in Devillers, O. & Sion, K. (eds.), *César sous Auguste*, Bordeaux, 125–144.
- 2016, *Des Grecs et des Italiens à Éphèse: Histoire d'une intégration croisée (133 a.C.–48 p.C.)*, Bordeaux.
- 2017, 'Les problèmes d'une mission publique entre République et Empire: P. Vedius Pollio en Asie', in Cavalier, L., Ferriès, M.-C. & Delrieux, F. (eds.), *Auguste et l'Asie Mineure*, Bordeaux, 129–152.

- Kiser, E. & Kane, D., 2007, 'The perils of privatization: how the characteristics of principals affected tax-farming in the Roman Republic and Empire', *Social Science History* 31(2): 191–212.
- Kleiner, F.S. & Noé, S.P., 1977, *The Early Cistophoric Coinage*, New York.
- Knibbe, D., 1981, 'Qvandocvmqve qvis trivm virorvm rei pvblicaе constitvndae: Ein neuer Text aus Ephesos', *ZPE* 44: 1–10.
- 1987, 'Zeigt das Fragment IvE 13 das steuer technische Inventar des *fiscus Asiaticus*?', *Tyche* 2: 75–93.
- Knoepfler, D., 2010, 'Le fédéralisme antique en question: renouveau et transformation des confédérations hellénistiques sous la domination de Rome', *Annuaire du Collège de France* 109: 691–706.
- Kokkinia, C., 2000, *Die Opromoas-Inschrift von Rhodiapolis. Euergetismus und soziale Elite in Lykien*, Bonn.
- 2004, 'Ruling, Inducing, Arguing: How to Govern (and Survive) a Greek Province', in De Ligt, L., Hemelrijk, E.A. & Singor, H.W. (eds.), *Roman Rule and Civic Life: Local and Regional Perspectives*, Amsterdam, 39–58.
- 2008, 'Aphrodisias' "rights of liberty": diplomatic strategies and the Roman governor', in Ratté, C. & Smith, R.R.R. (eds.), *Aphrodisias Papers 4. New Research on the City and its Monuments*, Portsmouth, RI., 51–60.
- 2009, 'The Role of Individuals in Inscribing Roman State Documents: Governor's Letters and Edicts', in Haensch, R. (ed.), *Selbstdarstellung und Kommunikation die Veröffentlichung staatlicher Urkunden auf Stein und Bronze in der römischen Welt*, Munich, 191 – 206.
- 2015–2016, 'The design of the "archive wall" at Aphrodisias', *Tekmeria* 13: 9–55.
- Kolb, A. & Vitale, M. (eds.), 2016, *Kaiserkult in den Provinzen des römischen Reiches: Organisation, Kommunikation und Repräsentation*, Berlin.
- Kondratieff, E.J., 2009, 'Reading Rome's Evolving Civic Landscape in Context: Tribunes of the Plebs and the Praetor's Tribunal', *Phoenix* 63(3/4): 322–360.
- Kreiler, B., 2006, *Statthalter zwischen Republik und Prinzipat*, Frankfurt.
- 2006a, 'Der Prokonsul Lentulus, der Imperator Murena und der Proquästor Lucullus', *Tyche* 21: 73–82.
- Kuhn, A.B., 2017, 'Honouring Senators and Equestrians in the Greco-Roman East', in Heller, A. & van Nijf, O. (eds.), *The Politics of Honour in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire*, Leiden, 317–338.
- Kuhn, C.T., 2015, 'Honours for M. Appuleius in Miletus', *ZPE* 193: 189–192.

- 2017, 'The Refusal of the Highest Honours by Members of the Urban Elite in Roman Asia Minor', in Heller, A. & van Nijf, O. (eds.), *The Politics of Honour in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire*, Leiden, 199–219.

Kunkel, W., 1962, 'Über die Leidener Augustus-Inschrift aus Kyme (zugleich ein Beitrag zur *aestimatio possessionis*', in *Studi in onore di Emilio Betti*, vol. 2, Rome, 591–620.

Labarre, G., 1996, *Les cités de Lesbos: aux époques hellénistique et impériale*, Paris.

Laffi, U., 1967, 'Le iscrizioni relative all'introduzione nel 9 a.C. del nuovo calendario della provincia d'Asia', *SCO* 16: 5–98.

 - 2006, 'L'iscrizione di Efeso sui privilegi, di insegnanti, sofisti, medici (*I. Ephesos*, 4101)', *Studi Ellenistici* 19, 453–521.
 - 2010, 'Cittadini romani di fronte ai tribunali di comunità alleate o libere dell'Oriente greco in età repubblicana', in Mantovani, D. & Pellicchi, L. (eds.), *Eparcheia, autonomia e ciuitas Romana. Studi sulla giurisdizione criminale dei governatori di provincia (II sec. a. C. – II d. C.)*, Padua, 14–40.
 - 2010a, *Il trattato fra Sardi ed Efeso degli anni 90 a.C.*, Pisa.

Laignoux, R., 2017, 'Reconnaître Octavien et ses concurrents en Anatolie: les allégeances asiatiques durant les guerres civiles de la fin de la République', in Cavalier, L., Ferrière, M.-C. & Delrieux, F. (eds.), *Auguste et l'Asie Mineure*, Bordeaux, 211–239.

Lehmann, G.A., 1998, "Römischer Tod" in Kolophon/Klaros. *Neue Quellen zum Status der „freien“ Polisstaaten an der Westküste Kleinasiens im späten zweiten Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Göttingen.

 - 2000, 'Polis-Autonomie und römische Herrschaft an der Westküste Kleinasiens: Kolophon/Klaros der Aufrichtung der provincia Asia', in Mooren, L. (ed.), *Politics, Administration and Society in the Hellenistic and Roman World*, Leuven, 215–238.

Lenski, N., 2017, *Constantine and the Cities: Imperial Authority and Civic Politics*, Philadelphia.

Le Quèrè, E., 2015, *Les Cyclades sous l'Empire romain: histoire d'une renaissance*, Rennes.

Lerouxel, F. & Pont, A.-V. (eds.), 2016, *Propriétaires et citoyens dans l'Orient romain*, Bordeaux.

Leschhorn, W., 1993, *Antike Ären: Zeitrechnung, Politik und Geschichte im Schwarzmeerraum und in Kleinasien nördlich des Tauros*, Stuttgart.

Le Teuff, B., 2010, 'Les recensements dans les provinces de la République romaine: aux origines de la réforme augustéenne', in Barrandon, N. & Kirbihler, F. (eds.), *Administrer les provinces de la république romaine. Actes du colloque de l'Université de Nancy II, 4–5 juin 2009*, Rennes, 195–211.

Levi, M., 1988, *Of Rule and Revenue*, Berkeley.

 - 1997, 'A Model, a Method, a Map: Rational Choice in Comparative and Historical Analysis', in Lichbach, M.I. & Zuckerman, A.S. (eds.), *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure*, Cambridge, 19–41.

- Liebmann-Frankfort, T., 1966, 'Valeur juridique et signification politique des testaments faits par les rois hellénistiques en faveur des Romains', *RIDA* 13: 73–94.
- Linderski, J., 2007 [1999], 'Transitus: Official Travel Under the Sign of Obelus', in Linderski, J., *Roman Questions II: Selected Papers*, Stuttgart, 307–318.
- Lintott, A.W., 1976, 'Notes on the Roman Law Inscribed at Delphi and Cnidos', *ZPE* 20: 65–82.
- 1981, 'What was the *imperium Romanum*?', *G&R* 28(1): 53–67.
 - 1992, *Judicial Reform and Land Reform in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge.
 - 1993, *Imperium Romanum: politics and administration*, London.
 - 1999, *The Constitution of the Roman Republic*, Oxford.
 - 2008, *Cicero as Evidence: A Historian's Companion*, Oxford.
- Low, P., 2007, *Interstate Arbitration in Classical Greece: Morality and Power*, Cambridge.
- Ma, J., 1999, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford.
- 2003, 'Peer polity interaction in the Hellenistic Age', *P&P* 180: 9–39.
 - 2009, 'Empire, Statues and Realities', in Parker, R., Papazarkadas, N. & Ma, J. (eds.), *Interpreting the Athenian Empire*, Oxford, 125–148.
 - 2012, 'Epigraphy and the Display of Authority', in Davies, J. & Wilkes, J. (eds.), *Epigraphy and the Historical Sciences*, Oxford, 133–158.
 - 2012a, 'Honorific Statues and Hellenistic History', in Smith, C. & Yarrow, L.M. (eds.), *Imperialism, Cultural Politics, & Polybius*, Oxford, 230–251.
 - 2013, *Statues and Cities: Honorific Portraits and Civic Identity in the Hellenistic World*, Oxford.
 - 2013a, 'The History of Hellenistic Honorific Statues', in Martzavou, P. & Papazarkadas, N. (eds.), *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-Classical Polis: Fourth Century BC to Second Century AD*, Oxford, 165–180.
- Ma, J., Derow, P. & Meadows, A., 1995, 'RC 38 (Amyzon) reconsidered', *ZPE* 109: 71–80.
- Mack, W., 2015, *Proxeny and Polis*, Oxford.
- Mackil, E., 2013, *Creating a Common Polity: Religion, Economy and Politics in the Making of the Greek Koinon*, Berkeley.
- Magie, D., 1950, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor: to the end of the third century after Christ*, 2 vols, Princeton.
- Madsen, J.M., 2014, 'An insider's view: Strabo in Amaseia on Pompey's Pontic Cities', in Bekker-Nielsen, T. (ed.), *Space, Place and Identity in Northern Anatolia*, Stuttgart, 75–86.
- 2016, 'Who Introduced the Imperial Cult in Asia and Bithynia? The Koinon's Role in the Early Worship of Augustus', in Kolb, A. & Vitale, M. (eds.), *Kaiserkult in den Provinzen des Römischen Reiches: Organisation, Kommunikation und Repräsentation*, Berlin, 21–36.
- Maier, C., 2000, 'Consigning the twentieth century to history: Alternative narratives for the modern era', *AHR* 105(3): 807–831.

- Mann, M., 1984, 'The Autonomous Power of the State: its Origins, Mechanisms and Results', *EJS* 25(2): 185–213.
- 1986, *The Sources of Social Power: Volume 1: A History of Power from the Beginning to A.D. 1760*, Cambridge.
- Marek, C., 1988, 'Karien im ersten Mithridatischen Krieg', in Kneissl, P. & Losemann, V. (eds.), *Alte Geschichte und Wissenschaftsgeschichte. Festschrift für Karl Christ zum 65. Geburtstag*, Darmstadt, 285–308.
- 1993, *Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pont-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia*, Tübingen.
- 1997, 'Teos and Abdera nach dem dritten makedonischen Krieg: Eine neue Ehreninschrift für den Demos von Teos', *Tyche* 12: 169–177.
- 2006, *Die Inschriften von Kaunos*, Munich.
- 2010, *Geschichte Kleinasiens in der Antike*, Munich.
- Marquardt, J., 1881–1885, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, Leipzig.
- Marshall, A.J., 1966, 'Governors on the Move', *Phoenix* 20(3): 231–246.
- 1968, 'Pompey's organization of Bithynia-Pontus: two neglected texts', *JRS* 58: 103–109.
- 1969, 'Romans under Chian Law', *GRBS* 10(3): 255–271.
- 1972, 'The *lex Pompeia de Provinciis* (52 BC) and Cicero's *imperium* in 51–50 BC: Constitutional Aspects', *ANRW* 1.1: 887–921.
- 1980, 'The Survival and Development of International Jurisdiction in the Greek World under Roman Rule', *ANRW* 2.13: 626–661.
- Maselli, G., 2000, *In difesa di Lucio Flacco: (Pro L. Flacco)*, Venice.
- Mastrocinque, A., 1999, *Studi sulle guerre Mitridatiche*, Stuttgart.
- Matthews, J., 2006, 'Roman Law and Roman History', in Potter, D.S. (ed.), *A Companion to the Roman Empire*, Malden, 477–491.
- Mattingly, D., 2011, *Imperialism, Power, and Identity: Experiencing the Roman Empire*, Princeton.
- Mattingly, H.B., 1972, 'The Date of the *senatus consultum de agro Pergameno*', *AJPh* 93: 412–423.
- 1979, 'L. Julius Caesar, Governor of Macedonia', *Chiron* 9: 147–168.
- 1985, 'Scipio Aemilianus and the Legacy of Attalus III', *LCM* 10: 117–119.
- 1997, 'The Date and Significance of the *lex Antonia de Termessibus*', *Scholia* 6(1): 68–78.
- McGing, B.C., 1980, 'Appian, Manius Aquillius, and Phrygia', *GRBS* 21(1): 35–42.
- 1986, *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI Eupator King of Pontus*, Leiden.
- 1995, 'The Ephesian Customs Law and the Third Mithridatic War', *ZPE* 109: 283–288.
- Meier, C., 1966, *Res Publica Amissa: Eine Studie zu Verfassung und Geschichte der späten römischen Republik*, Wiesbaden.
- Mellor, R., 1975, *Θεά Ρωμῆ: The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World*, Göttingen.

- Merkelbach, R., 1990, 'Hat der Bithynische Erbfolgekrieg im Jahr 74 oder 73 begonnen?', *ZPE* 81: 97–100.
- 1995, 'L. Antonius, gladiator Asiaticus, und der Brief des Q. Minucius Thermus an die Diözesen von Asia', *EA* 25: 73–76.
- Merola, G.D., 1996, 'Il Monumentum Ephesenum e l'organizzazione territoriale delle regioni asiatiche', *MEFRA* 108(1): 263–297.
- 2001, *Autonomia locale governo imperiale: fiscalità e amministrazione nelle province asiatiche*, Bari.
- 2001a, 'Il sistema tributario asiatico tra repubblica e principato', *MedAnt* 4: 459–472.
- Meyer, E.A., 2004, *Legitimacy and Law in the Roman World: Tabulae in Roman Belief and Practice*, Cambridge.
- Meyer-Zwiffelhofer, E., 2002, *Πολιτικῶς ἀρχεῖν: zum Regierungsstil der senatorischen Statthalter in den kaiserzeitlichen griechischen Provinzen*, Stuttgart.
- Migeotte, L., 1984, *L'Emprunt public dans les cités grecques. Recueil des documents et analyse critique*, Paris.
- 2014, *Les finances des cités grecques aux périodes classique et hellénistique*, Paris.
- Mileta, C., 1990, 'Zur Vorgeschichte und Entstehung der Gerichtsbezirke der Provinz Asia', *Klio* 72: 427–444.
- 1998, 'Eumenes III und die Sklaven. Neue Überlegungen zum Charakter des Aristonicosaufstandes', *Klio* 80: 47–65.
- 2008, *Der König und sein Land. Untersuchungen zur Herrschaft der hellenistischen Monarchen über das königliche Gebiet Kleinasien und seine Bevölkerung*, Berlin.
- 2008a, 'Die offenen Arme der Provinz: Überlegungen zur Funktion und Entwicklung der prorömischen Kultfeste der Provinz Asia (erstes Jahrhundert v. Chr.)', in Rüpke, J. (ed.), *Festrituale in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Tübingen, 89–114.
- Millar, F., 1968, 'Two Augustan Notes', *CR* 18(3): 263–266.
- 1977, *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC- AD 337)*, London.
- 2002 [1966], 'The Emperor, the Senate and the Provinces', in Cotton, H.M. & Rogers, G.M. (eds.), *Rome, the Greek World and the East*, vol. 1, Chapel Hill, 271–291.
- 2002a [1984], 'State and Subject: The Impact of Monarchy', in Cotton, H.M. & Rogers, G.M. (eds.), *Rome, the Greek World and the East*, vol. 1, Chapel Hill, 292–313.
- 2002b [1973], 'Triumvirate and Principate', in Cotton, H.M. & Rogers, G.M. (eds.), *Rome, the Greek World and the East*, vol. 1, Chapel Hill, 241–270.
- 2004 [1996], 'Emperors, Kings and Subjects: The Politics of Two-Level Sovereignty', in Cotton, H.M. & Rogers, G.M. (eds.), *Rome, the Greek World and the East*, vol. 2, Chapel Hill, 229–246.

- 2004a [1967], ‘Emperors at Work’, in Cotton, H.M. & Rogers, G.M. (eds.), *Rome, the Greek World and the East*, vol. 2, Chapel Hill, 3–22.
 - 2004b [1998], ‘Trajan: Government by Correspondence’, in Cotton, H.M. & Rogers, G.M. (eds.), *Rome, the Greek World and the East*, vol. 2, Chapel Hill, 23–46.
 - 2004c [1983], ‘Empire and City, Augustus to Julian: Obligations, Excuses and Status’, in Cotton, H.M. & Rogers, G.M. (eds.), *Rome, the Greek World and the East*, vol. 2, Chapel Hill, 336–370.
- Mitchell, S., 1984, ‘Review: Joyce Reynolds: *Aphrodisias and Rome*’, *CR* 34(2): 291–297.
- 1993, *Anatolia: Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor*, 2 vols., Oxford.
 - 1999, ‘The Administration of Roman Asia, 133 BC to AD 250’, in Eck, W. & Müller-Luckner, E. (eds.), *Lokale Autonomie und römische Ordnungsmacht in den kaiserzeitlichen Provinzen vom 1. Bis 3. Jahrhundert*, Munich, 17–46.
 - 2000, ‘Ethnicity, Acculturation and Empire in Roman and Late Roman Asia Minor’, in Mitchell, S. & Greatrex, G. (eds.), *Ethnicity and Culture in Late Antiquity*, London, 117–150.
 - 2005, ‘The Treaty between Rome and Lycia of 46 BC (MS 2070)’, in Pintaudi, R. (ed.), *Papyri Graecae Schøyen*, Florence, 165–208.
 - 2008, ‘Geography, Politics, and Imperialism in the Asian Customs Law’, in Cottier, M. et al., *The Customs Law of Asia*, Oxford, 165–201.
- Mommsen, T., 1887, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, 3 vols., Leipzig.
- 1905 [1862], ‘*Lex agraria*’, in Mommsen, T. (ed.), *Gesammelte Schriften: Juristische Schriften*, Berlin, 65–145.
 - 1906 [1899], ‘Senatsbeschluss über Pergamon’, in Mommsen, T. (ed.), *Gesammelte Schriften: Historische Schriften*, Berlin, 63–68.
- Monson, A., 2015, ‘Hellenistic Empires’, in Scheidel, W. & Monson, A. (eds.), *Fiscal Regimes and the Political Economy of Premodern States*, Cambridge, 169–207.
- Morrell, K., 2017, *Pompey, Cato, and the Governance of the Roman Empire*, Oxford.
- Morrison, K.D., 2001, ‘Coercion, resistance, and hierarchy: local processes and imperial strategies in the Vijayanagara empire’, in Alcock, S., D’Altroy, T.N., Morrison, K.D. & Sinopoli, C.M. (eds.), *Empires: Perspectives from Archaeology and History*, Cambridge, 252–278.
- Mortensen, E., 2015, ‘*Ktistes*: Mythical Founder Hero and Honorary Title for New Heroes’, in Fejfer, J., Moltesen, M. & Rathje, A. (eds.), *Tradition: Transmission of Culture in the Ancient World*, Copenhagen, 213–238.
- Mouritsen, H., 2017, *Politics in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge.
- Muhs, B., 2016, *The Ancient Egyptian Economy: 3000–30 BCE*, Cambridge.
- Muir, J.V., 2009, *Life and Letters in the ancient Greek World*, London.

- Müller, H. & Wörrle, M., 2002, 'Ein Verein im Hinterland Pergamons zur Zeit Eumenes' II', *Chiron* 32: 191-235.
- Musti, D., 1998, 'I Nikephoria e il ruolo panellenico di Pergamo', *RFIC* 126: 5-40.
- Ñaco del Hoyo, T., 2003, *Vectigal Incertum: Economía de Guerra y fiscalidad republicana en el occidente romano: su impacto histórico en el territorio (218-133 a.C.)*, Oxford.
- 2007, 'The Late Republican West: Imperial Taxation in the Making?', in Hekster, O., de Kleijn, G. & Slootjes, D. (eds.), *Crises and the Roman Empire: Proceedings of the International Network Impact of Empire (Nijmegen, June 20-24, 2006)*, Leiden, 219-231.
- 2019, 'Rethinking stipendiarius as tax terminology in the Roman Republic', *MH* 76(1): 70-87.
- Ng, D.Y., 2016, 'Monuments, Memory and Status Recognition in Roman Asia Minor', in Galinsky, K. (ed.), *Memory in Ancient Rome and Early Christianity*, Oxford, 235-260.
- 2017, 'The Salutaris Foundation: Monumentality through Periodic Rehearsal', in Longfellow, B. & Perry, E.E. (eds.), *Roman Artists, Patrons, & Public Consumption: Familiar Works Reconsidered*, Ann Arbor, 63-87.
- Nichols, J., 1990, 'Patrons of Greek Cities in the Early Principate', *ZPE* 80: 81-108.
- 2014, *Civic Patronage in the Roman Empire*, Leiden.
- Nicolet, C., 1966, *L'ordre équestre a l'époque républicaine (312-43 av. J.-C.)*, Paris.
- 1978, *Rome et la conquête du monde méditerranéen, 264 - 27 avant J.-C.*, 2 vols., Paris.
- 1988, *L'inventaire du monde: géographie et politique aux origines de l'Empire romain*, Paris.
- 2000 [1979], 'Deux remarques sur l'organisation des sociétés de publicains à la fin de la République romaine', in Nicolet, C. & Lefebvre, S. (eds.), *Censeurs et publicains: Économie et fiscalité dans le Rome antique*, Paris, 297-319.
- 2000a [1994], 'Dîmes de Sicile, d'Asie et d'ailleurs', in Nicolet, C. & Lefebvre, S. (eds.), *Censeurs et publicains: Économie et fiscalité dans le Rome antique*, Paris, 277-293.
- 2000b [1991], 'Le Monumentum Ephesenum et les dîmes d'Asie', in Nicolet, C. & Lefebvre, S. (eds.), *Censeurs et publicains: Économie et fiscalité dans le Rome antique*, Paris, 353-366.
- 2000c [1993], 'Le Monumentum Ephesenum et la délimitation du portorium d'Asie', in Nicolet, C. & Lefebvre, S. (eds.), *Censeurs et publicains: Économie et fiscalité dans le Rome antique*, Paris, 367-384.
- Niebergall, A., 2011, 'Die lokalen Eliten der griechischen Städte Kleinasiens und Mithridates VI Eupator zu Beginn des ersten römisch-pontischen Krieges', *Hermes* 139(1): 1-20.
- 2011a, 'Lokale Eliten unter hellenistischen Herrschern. Mithridates VI. Von Pontos und die griechischen Eliten Kleinasiens und Griechenlands', in Dreyer, B. & Mittag, P.F. (eds.), *Lokale Eliten und hellenistischen Könige. Zwischen Kooperation und Konfrontation*, Berlin, 55-79.

- Noè, E., 1996, 'Un caso di mobilità sociale nelle tarda repubblica: il caso di Ibrea di Milasa', in Gabba, E., Desideri, P. & Roda, S. (eds.), *Italia sul Baetis. Studi in memoria di Fernando Gascò*, Turin, 50–64.
- North, D.C., 1990, *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance*, Cambridge.
- 1995, 'Five Propositions about Institutional Change', in Knight, J. & Sened, I. (eds.), *Explaining Social Institutions*, Ann Arbor, 15–26.
- Oliver, J.H., 1963, 'The Main Problem of the Augustus Inscription from Cyme', *GRBS* 4(2): 115–122.
- Oost, S.I., 1963, 'Cyrene, 96–74 B.C.', *CP* 58(1): 11–25.
- Orren, K. & Skowronek, S., 1994, 'Beyond the Iconography of Order: Notes for a New Institutionalism', in Dodd, L. & Jillson, C. (eds.), *The Dynamics of American Politics: Approaches and Interpretations*, Boulder, 311–330.
- 2004, *The Search for American Political Development*, New York.
- Osgood, J., 2006, *Caesar's Legacy: Civil War and the Emergence of the Roman Empire*, Cambridge.
- Papazoglu, F., 1988, *Les villes de Macédoine a l'époque romaine*, Athens.
- Parker, R.W., 1991, 'Potamon of Mytilene and his Family', *ZPE* 85: 115–129.
- Paterson, J., 2007, 'Friends in high places: the creation of the court of the Roman emperor', in Spawforth, A.J.S. (ed.), *The Court and Court Society in Ancient Monarchies*, Cambridge, 121–156.
- Pawlak, M.N., 2016, 'From Independence to Dependence: The Administrative Status of the Aegean Islands from 129 BC to 294 AD', *Electrum* 23: 187–214.
- Pédech, P., 1991, 'Deux Grecs face à Rome au I^{er} siècle av. J.-C.: Métrodore de Scepsis et Théophraste de Mitylène', *REA* 93(1): 65–78.
- Pelling, C., 1996, 'The Triumviral Period', *CAH*² 10: 1–69.
- Peters, B.G., Pierre, J. & King, D.S., 2005, 'The Politics of Path Dependence: Political Conflict in Historical Institutionalism', *Journal of Politics* 67(4): 1275–1300.
- Piejko, F., 1985, 'Review: J. et L. Robert, *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie, I: Exploration, monnaies et inscriptions*', *Gnomon* 57(7): 608–621.
- 1991, 'Antiochus III and Teos Reconsidered', *Belleten Türk Tarih Kurumu* 55: 13–69.
- Piérart, M., 2013 'Penser Rome en Grec... Penser Rome en grec', in Curty, O. (ed.), *Épigraphie romaine et historiographie antique et moderne*, Fribourg, 21–34.
- Pierson, P., 2004, *Politics in time: history, institutions, and social analysis*, Princeton.
- Pieterse, N., 2015, 'Ancient Rome and Globalisation: Decentring Rome', in Pitt, M. & Versluys, M.J. (eds.), *Globalisation and the Roman world: world history, connectivity and material culture*, Cambridge, 225–239.
- Pina Polo, F., 2011, *The Consul at Rome: The Civil Functions of the Consuls in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge.

- 2013, 'Foreign Eloquence in the Roman Senate', in Steel, C. & van der Blom, H. (eds.), *Community and Communication: Oratory and Politics in Republican Rome*, Oxford, 247–266.
- 2013a, 'The Political Role of the *consules designati*', *Historia* 62(4): 420–452.
- 2015, 'Foreign *clientelae* revisited: a methodological critique', in Jehne, M. & Pina Polo, F. (eds.), *Foreign clientelae in the Roman Empire: a reconsideration*, Stuttgart, 19–41.
- Pitt, M. & Versluys, M.J., 2014, 'Globalisation and the Roman world: Perspectives and opportunities', in Pitt, M. & Versluys, M.J. (eds.), *Globalisation and the Roman world: world history, connectivity and material culture*, Cambridge, 3–31.
- Pocock, J.G.A., 1987, 'The Concept of a Language and the *métier d'historien*: Some Considerations on Practice', in Padgen, A. (ed.), *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe*, Cambridge, 19–38.
- 1987a, 'Texts as Events: Reflections on the History of Political Thought', in Sharpe, K. & Zwicker, S.N. (eds.), *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England*, Berkeley, 21–34.
- 1989 [1971], 'Languages and Their Implications: The Transformation of the Study of Political Thought', in Pocock, J.G.A., *Politics, Language and Time: Essays on Political Thought and History*, Chicago, 3–41.
- Poitras, G. & Geranio, M., 2016, 'Trading of Shares in the *societates publicanorum*', *Explorations in Economic History* 61: 95–118.
- Pont, A.-V., 2009, 'Rituels civiques (*apantēsis* et acclamations) et gouverneurs à l'époque romaine en Asie Mineure', in Hekster, O., Schmidt-Hofner, S. & Witschel, C. (eds.), *Ritual Dynamics and Religious Change in the Roman Empire*, Leiden, 185–211.
- 2012, 'Aphrodisias, Presque une île: la cité et ses réseaux d'Auguste à 249/250', *Chiron* 42: 319–346.
- Potter, D.S., 1988, 'Where did Aristonicus' Revolt Begin?', *ZPE* 74: 293–295.
- Pottier, E. & Hauvette-Besnault, A., 1880, 'Décret des Abdéritains trouvé à Téos', *BCH* 4(1): 47–59.
- Prag, J.R.W., 2014, 'Cities and Civic Life in Late Hellenistic Roman Sicily', *CCG* 25: 165–208.
- Price, S., 1984, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge.
- Prignitz, S., 2011, 'Ein Augustuspriester des Jahres 27 v. Chr.', *ZPE* 178: 210–214.
- Pucci ben Zeev, M., 1996, *Jewish Rights in the Roman World: the Greek and Roman documents quoted by Flavius Josephus*, Tübingen.
- Purcell, N., 1990, 'Maps, Lists, Money, Order and Power', *JRS* 80: 178–182.
- 2001, 'The *ordo scribarum*: a study in the loss of memory', *MEFRA* 113(2): 633–674.
- Quass, F., 1984, 'Zum Einfluss der römischen Nobilität auf das Honoratiorenregime in den Städten des Griechischen Ostens', *Hermes* 112(2): 199–215.

- 1993, *Die Honoratioren-schicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens: Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Entwicklung in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*, Stuttgart.
- Radt, S.L., 2002–2011, *Strabons Geographika*, Göttingen.
- Raggi, A., 2001, 'Senatus consultum de Asclepiade Clazomenio sociisque', *ZPE* 135: 73–116.
- 2004, 'The Epigraphic Dossier of Seleucus of Rhosos: A Revised Edition', *ZPE* 147: 123–138.
- 2006, *Seleuci di Rhosos. Cittadinanza e privilegi nell'Oriente greco in età tardo-repubblicana*, Pisa.
- 2010, 'La scomparsa degli οἱ κατ' ἄνδρα dall'assemblea provinciale d'Asia', *ZPE* 172: 148–150.
- 2010a, 'Praetor qui inter peregrinos et cives ius dixit nel trattato tra Rome e Lici (46 a.C.)', in Mantovani, D. & Pellechi, L. (eds.), *Eparcheia, autonomia, civitas Romana*, Pavia, 45–67.
- 2016, 'L'integrazione delle élites cittadine asiatiche sotto Tiberio: le concessioni di cittadinanza romana', in Slavazzi, F. & Torre, C. (eds.), *Intorno a Tiberio 1: Archeologia, cultura e letteratura del Principe e della sua epoca*, Florence, 68–74.
- Ramsay, J.T., 1999, 'Mithridates, the Banner of Ch'ih–Yu, and the Comet Coin', *HSCP* 99: 197–253.
- Raßelnberg, A.L., 2007, 'Ehrung für einen Q. Mucius Scaevola in Nysa', *EA* 40: 52–54.
- Rathbone, D., 2003, 'The Control and Exploitation of *ager publicus* in Italy under the Roman Republic,' in Aubert, J.-J. (ed.), *Tâches publiques et entreprise privée dans le monde romain*, Geneva, 135–178.
- 2008, 'Nero's Reforms of *vectigalia* and the Inscription of the *lex portorii Asiae*', in Cottier, M. et al., *The Customs Law of Asia*, Oxford, 251–278.
- Raubitschek, A.E., 1954, 'Epigraphical Notes on Julius Caesar', *JRS* 44: 65–75.
- Rauh, N., 1986, 'Cicero's Business Friendships: Economics and Politics in the Late Roman Republic', *Aevum* 60(1): 3–30.
- Rawson, E., 1994, 'Caesar: Civil War and Dictatorship', *CAH*² 9: 424–467.
- Reynolds, J.M., 1962, 'Cyrenaica, Pompey and Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus', *JRS* 52: 97–103.
- 1982, *Aphrodisias and Rome: Documents from the excavation of the theatre at Aphrodisias conducted Professor Kenan T. Erim, together with some related texts*, London.
- Reynolds, S., 2006, 'Empires: a problem of comparative history', *Historical Research* 79(204): 151–165.
- Rhodes, P.J. & Lewis, D.M., 1997, *The Decrees of Greek Cities*, Oxford.
- Rich, J., 2012, 'Making the Emergency Permanent: *Auctoritas*, *potestas* and the Evolution of the Principate of Augustus', in Riviere, Y. (ed.), *Des réformes augustéennes*, Rome, 37–121.

- Richardson, J.S., 2008, *The Language of Empire: Rome and the Idea of Empire from the Third Century BC to the Second Century AD*, Cambridge.
- 2011, 'Fines provinciae', in Hekster, O. & Kaizer, T. (eds.), *Frontiers in the Roman World: Proceedings of the Ninth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire* (Durham, 16–19 April 2009), Leiden, 1–12.
- Ridley, R.T., 1975, 'Cicero and Sulla', *WS* 88: 83–108.
- Rigsby, K., 1979, 'The Era of the Province of Asia,' *Phoenix* 33(1): 39–47.
- 1988, 'Provincia Asia', *TAPA* 118: 123–153.
 - 1996, *Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley.
 - 2005, 'Agathopolis and Doulopolis', *EA* 38: 109–115.
- Ritti, T., 2017, *Hierapolis di Frigia IX: Storia e istituzioni di Hierapolis*, Istanbul.
- Robert, L., 1937, *Études Anatoliennes. Recherches sur les inscriptions grecques de l'Asie Mineure*, Paris.
- 1940, *Hellenica. Recueil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques*, vol. 1, Paris.
 - 1948, *Hellenica. Recueil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques*, vol. 6, Paris.
 - 1949, *Hellenica. Recueil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques*, vol. 7, Paris.
 - 1950, *Hellenica. Recueil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques*, vol. 8, Paris.
 - 1958, 'Inscriptions grecques de Sidè en Pamphylie', *RPh* 32: 15–53.
 - 1969, 'Inscriptions', in des Gagniers, J., Devambez, P., Kahil, L. & Gionouvès, R. (eds.), *Laodicée du Lycos: Le nymphée, campagnes 1961–1963*, Quebec, 247–389.
 - 1969a, 'Théophraste de Mytilène a Constantinople', *CRAI* 113(1): 42–64.
 - 1969b, 'Inscriptions grecques d'Asie Mineure', *OMS* 1: 611–632.
 - 1987 [1984], 'Un décret de Pergame', in Robert, L., (ed.), *Documents d'Asie Mineure*, Athens, 460–477.
 - 1989 [1966], 'Inscriptions d'Aphrodisias', *OMS* 6: 1–56.
- Robert, L. & Robert, J., 1989, *Claros I: Décrets Hellénistiques*, Paris.
- Robinson, E.S.G., 1954, 'Cistophoroi in the Name of King Eumenes', *NC* 14: 1–8.
- Roselaar, S., 2010, *Public Land in the Roman Republic: A Social and Economic History of ager publicus in Italy, 396–89 BC*, Oxford.
- Rostovtzeff, M.I., 1902, *Geschichte der Staatspacht in der Römischen Kaiserzeit bis Diokletian*, Leipzig.
- 1910, *Studien zur Geschichte der römischen Kolonates*, Leipzig.
 - 1917, 'Caesar and the South of Russia', *JRS* 7: 27–44.
 - 1941, *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, Oxford.
- Röthe, C., 1978, *Humanitas, Fides und Verwandtes in der römischen Provinzialpolitik: Untersuchungen zur politischen Funktion römischer Verhaltensnormen bei Cicero*, Berlin.

- Rouché, C., 2014, 'Using Civic Space: Identifying the Evidence', in Eck, W. & Funke, P. (eds.), *Öffentlichkeit – Monument – Text: XIV Congressus Internationalis Epigraphiae Graecae et Latinae 27. – 31. Augusti MMXII: Akten*, Berlin, 135–158.
- Roussel, P., 1934, 'Un Syrien au service de Rome et d'Octave', *Syria* 15(1): 33–74.
- Rousset, D., 2010, *De Lycie en Cabalide: la convention entre les Lyciens et Termessos près d'Oinoanda*, Geneva.
- Rowe, G.D., 2002, *Princes and Political Cultures: The New Tiberian Senatorial Decrees*, Ann Arbor.
- 2008, 'The Elaboration and Diffusion of the Text of the *Monumentum Ephesenum*', in Cottier, M. et al., *The Customs Law of Asia*, Oxford, 236–250.
- Rumscheid, F., 2002, 'Den Anschluß verpaßt: Priene in der (frühen) Kaiserzeit', in Berns, C., von Hesberg, H., Vandeput, L. & Waelkens, M. (eds.), *Patris und Imperium. Kulturelle und politische Identität in den Städten der römischen Provinzen Kleinasien in der frühen Kaiserzeit. Kolloquium Köln, November 1998*, Leuven, 77–87.
- Runciman, W.G., 1989, *Confessions of a Reluctant Theorist*, New York.
- 2011, 'Empire as a Topic in Comparative Sociology', in Bang P. & Bayly, C. (eds.), *Tributary Empires in Global History*, Cambridge, 99–107.
- Sánchez, P., 2007, 'La convention judiciaire dans le traité conclu entre Rome et les Lyciens (P.Schøyen I 25)', *Chiron* 37: 363–381.
- 2010, 'ΕΠΙ ΡΩΜΑΙΚΩΙ ΘΑΝΑΤΩΙ dans le décret pour Ménippos de Colophon: «pour la mort d'un Romain» ou «en vue d'un supplice romain»?', *Chiron* 40: 41–60.
- Santangelo, F., 2006, 'Magnesia sul Meandro alla vigilia della prima guerra mitridatica. Nota sulla cronologia di I.Magn. 100b', *EA* 39: 133–138.
- 2007, *Sulla, the elites and the empire: a study of Roman policies in Italy and the Greek East*, Leiden.
- 2009, 'With or Without You: Some Late Hellenistic Narratives of Contemporary History', *SCI* 28: 57–78.
- 2009a, 'What did the Cloatii do for Gytheum? A note on Syll.³ 748', *Historia* 58(3): 361–366.
- 2018, 'Theophanes of Mytilene, Cicero and Pompey's Inner Circle', in van der Blom, H., Gray, C. & Steel, C. (eds.), *Institutions and Ideology in Republican Rome: Speech, Audience and Decision*, Oxford, 128–146.
- Saulnier, C., 1981, 'Lois romaines sur les juifs selon Flavius Josèphe', *Revue Biblique* 88: 161–198.
- Sayar, M.H., Siewert, P. & Täuber, H., 1994, 'Asylie-Erklärungen des Sulla und des Lucullus für das Isis- und Sarapisheiligtum von Mopsuestia (Ostkilikien)', *Tyche* 9: 113–130.
- Scheidel, W., 2013, 'Studying the State', in Bang, P.F. & Scheidel, W. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the State in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean*, Oxford, 1–57.

- Schleussner, B., 1976, 'Die Gesandtschaft P. Scipio Nasicas im Jahr 133/2 v. Chr. und die Provinzialisierung des Königreichs Pergamon', *Chiron* 6: 97–112.
- 1978, *Die Legaten der Republik. Decem legati und ständige Hilfsgesandte*, Munich.
- Schuler, C., 2007, 'Ein Vertrag zwischen Rom und den Lykiern aus Tyberissos', in Schuler, C. (ed.), *Griechische Epigraphik in Lykien: Eine Zwischenblick*, Vienna, 51–79.
- Schulten, A., 1892, *De conventibus civium romanorum: sive de rebus publicis civium romanorum mediis inter municipium et collegium*, Berlin.
- Segre, M., 1938, 'Iscrizioni di Licia', *Clara Rhodos* 9: 179–208.
- Shaw, B.D., 1981, 'The Elder Pliny's African Geography', *Historia* 30(4): 424–471.
- Sherk, R.K., 1963, 'Senatus Consultum de agris Mytilenorum', *GRBS* 4(4): 217–230.
- 1969, *Roman Documents from the Greek East*, Baltimore.
- Sherwin-White, A.N., 1939, 'Procurator Augusti', *PBSR* 15: 11–26.
- 1976, 'Rome, Pamphylia and Cilicia, 133–77 BC', *JRS* 66: 1–14.
- 1982, 'The *lex repetundarum* and the political ideas of Gaius Gracchus', *JRS* 72: 18–31.
- 1984, *Roman Foreign Policy in the East: 168 B.C. to A.D. 1*, London.
- Sherwin-White, S.M., 1978, *Ancient Cos: an historical study from the Dorian settlement to the imperial period*, Göttingen.
- Silvestrini, M., 1996, 'Dalla «nobilitas» municipale all'ordine senatorio: esempi da Larino e da Venosa', *CCG* 7: 269–282.
- Skoda, H., 2012, 'A Historian's Perspective on the Present Volume', in Dresch, P. & Skoda, H. (eds.), *Legalism: Anthropology and History*, Oxford, 39–53.
- Skramkiewicz, R., 1976, *Les gouverneurs de province à l'époque Augustéene*, 2 vols., Paris.
- Smallwood, E.M., 1970, *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium*, 2nd edition, Leiden.
- Smith, R.R.R., 1993, *The Monument of C. Iulius Zoilos*, Mainz.
- Snowdon, M., 2008, 'Commemorating Freedom: I.Metropolis and the Restoration of Freedom', *Mouseion* 8(3): 377–393.
- 2014, '"In the Friendship of the Romans": Melitaia, Narkhion and Greco-Roman Interstate Friendship in the second century BCE', *Historia* 63(4): 422–444.
- Soraci, C., 2010, 'Riflessioni storico-comparative sul termine *stipendiarius*', in Cataudello, M., Greco, A. & Mariotta, G. (eds.), *Strumenti e tecniche della riscossione dei tributi nel mondo antico*, Padua, 43–80.
- Spagnuolo Vigorita, T., 1997, 'Lex portus Asiae: un nuovo documento sull'appalto delle imposte', in *I rapporti contrattuali con la pubblica amministrazione nell'esperienza storico-giuridica: congresso internazionale sul tema*, Torino, 17–19 ottobre 1994, Naples, 113–190.
- Stasse, B., 2009, 'Ἐπαρχεία: le cas du *iussum Augusti* de 27^a (I.Kyme, 17)', *L'Antiquité Classique* 78: 161–168.

- Steel, C., 2004, 'Being Economical with the Truth: What Really Happened at Lampsacus?', in Powell, J. & Paterson, J. (eds.), *Cicero the Advocate*, Oxford, 233–251.
- 2012, 'The *lex Pompeia de provinciis* of 52 BC: A Reconsideration', *Historia* 61(1): 83–93.
 - 2014, 'The Roman Senate and the post-Sullan *res publica*', *Historia* 63(3): 323–339.
 - 2014a, 'Rethinking Sulla: The Case of the Roman Senate', *CQ* 64(2): 657–668.
 - 2016, 'Early-career Prosecutors: Forensic Activity and Senatorial Careers in the Late Republic', in du Plessis, P.J. (ed.), *Cicero's Law: Rethinking Roman Law of the Late Republic*, Edinburgh, 205–227.
- Stern, S., 2012, *Calendars in Antiquity: Empires, States, & Societies*, Oxford.
- Storrs, C., 2016, 'Magistrates to Administrators, Composite Monarchy to Fiscal-Military Empire: Empire and Bureaucracy in the Spanish Monarchy, c. 1492-1825', in Crooks, P. & Parson, T.H. (eds.), *Empires and Bureaucracy in World History: From Late Antiquity to the Twentieth Century*, Cambridge, 291–317.
- Strubbe, J.H.M., 1984–1986, 'Gründer Kleinasiatischer Städte Fiktion und Realität', *AncSoc* 15–17: 253–304.
- 2004, 'Cultic Honours for Benefactors in the Cities of Asia Minor', in de Ligt, L., Hemelrijk, E.A. & Singor, H.W. (eds.), *Roman Rule and Civic Life: Local and Regional Perspectives: Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop of the International Network: Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, c. 200 B.C. – A.D. 476): Leiden, June 25 – 28, 2003*, Amsterdam, 315–330.
- Stumpf, G.R., 1991, *Numismatische Studien zur Chronologie der römischen Statthalter in Kleinasien (122 v. Chr. – 163 n. Chr.)*, Saarbrücken.
- Sumner, G.V., 1973, *The Orators in Cicero's Brutus: Prosopography and Chronology*, Toronto.
- 1978, 'Governors of Asia in the 90s B.C.', *GRBS* 19: 147–153.
- Syme, R., 1939, *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford.
- 1961, 'Who was Vedio Pollio?', *JRS* 51: 23–30.
 - 1979 [1939], 'Observations on the Province of Cilicia', *Roman Papers* 1: 120–148.
 - 1979a [1963], 'The Greeks under Roman Rule', *Roman Papers* 2: 566–581.
 - 1982, 'Tacitus: Some Sources of his Information', *JRS* 72: 68–82.
 - 1995, *Anatolica: Studies in Strabo*, Birley, A. (ed.), Oxford.
- Talbert, R.J.A., 1984, *The Senate of Imperial Rome*, Princeton.
- Tan, J., 2017, *Power and Public Finance at Rome, 264–49 BCE*, New York.
- Täuber, H., 1991, 'Die syrische-kilikische Grenze während der Prinzipatszeit', *Tyche* 6: 201–210.
- Täubler, E., 1913, *Imperium Romanum: Studien zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des römischen Reichs*, Berlin.
- Thériault, G., 2001, 'Remarques sur le culte des magistrats romains en Orient', *CEA* 37: 85–95.

- 2003, 'Évergétisme grec et administration romaine: La famille cnidienne de Gaios Ioulios Théopompos', *Phoenix* 57(3/4): 232–256.
 - 2011, 'Culte des évergètes (magistrats) romains et agônes en Asie Mineure', in Konuk, K. (ed.), *Stephanèphoros. De l'économie antique à l'Asie Mineure. Hommages à Raymond Descat*, Bordeaux, 377–388.
- Thompson, J.B., 1990, *Ideology and Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication*, Cambridge.
- Thonemann, P., 2003, 'Hellenistic inscriptions from Lydia', *EA* 36: 95–108.
- 2004, 'The Date of Lucullus' Quaestorship', *ZPE* 149: 80–82.
 - 2008, 'Cistophoric Geography: Toriaion and Kormasa', *NC* 168: 43–60.
 - 2010, 'The Women of Akmoneia', *JRS* 100: 163–178.
 - 2011, *The Maeander Valley: A Historical Geography from Antiquity to Byzantium*, Cambridge.
 - 2012, 'A Copy of Augustus' *Res Gestae* at Sardis?', *Historia* 61(3): 282–288.
 - 2013, 'The Attalid State, 188–133 BC', in Thonemann, P. (ed.), *The Attalid State*, Oxford, 1–47.
 - 2015, 'The Calendar of the Roman Province of Asia', *ZPE* 196: 123–141.
- Thornton, J., 1998, 'Μίσις Ῥωμαίων οὐ φόβος Μιθριδάτου? Echi storiografici di un dibattito diplomatico', *MedAnt* 1(1): 271–309.
- 1999, 'Una città e due regine. Eleutheria e lotta politica a Cizico fra gli Attalidi e i Giulio Claudi', *MedAnt* 2(2): 497–538.
- Tibiletti, G., 1957, 'Rome and the *ager Pergamenus*: The *acta* of 129 B.C.', *JRS* 47: 136–138.
- Tiersch, C., 2015, 'Von personaler Anbindung zu territorialer Organisation? Dynamiken römischer Reichsbildung und die Provinzialisierung Zyperns (58 v. Chr.)', in Jehne, M. & Pina Polo, F. (eds.), *Foreign Clientelae in the Roman Empire: A Reconsideration*, Stuttgart, 239–260.
- Tilly, C., 2003, *The Politics of Collective Violence*, Cambridge.
- Toher, M., 1985, 'The date of Nicolaus' Βίος Καίσαρος', *GRBS* 26: 199–206.
- Tröster, M., 2008, *Themes, Character, and Politics in Plutarch's Life of Lucullus: The Construction of a Roman Aristocrat*, Stuttgart.
- 2009, 'Roman hegemony and non-state violence: a fresh look at Pompey's campaign against the pirates', *G&R* 56: 14–33.
- Tuchelt, K., 1979, *Frühe Denkmäler Roms in Kleinasien: Beiträge zur archäologischen Überlieferung aus der Zeit der Republik und des Augustus*, Tübingen.
- Van Bremen, R., 2008, 'The date and context of the Kymaian decrees for Archippe', *REA* 110(2): 357–382.
- Van Nijf, O., 2001, 'Local Heroes: athletics, festivals and elite self-fashioning in the Roman East', in Goldhill, S. (ed.), *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, Cambridge, 306–334.

- Ventrone, O., 2017, *Pergame: Les élites d'une ancienne capitale royale à l'époque romaine*, Rennes.
- Vervaeke, F.J., 2004, 'The *lex Valeria* and Sulla's Empowerment as dictator (82–79 BCE)', *CCG* 15: 37–84.
- 2008, 'The Secret History: The Official Position of Imperator Caesar Divi Filius from 31 to 27 BCE', *AncSoc* 40: 79–152.
- 2014, *The high command in the Roman Republic: the principle of the summum imperium auspiciumque from 509 to 19 BCE*, Stuttgart.
- Veyne, P., 1976, *Le pain et le cirque*, Paris.
- Viereck, P., 1888, *Sermo Graecus quo senatus populusque Romanus magistratusque populi Romani usque ad Tiberii Caesaris aetatem in scriptis publicis uti sunt examinatu*, Oxford.
- Virgilio, B., 1994, 'La città ellenistica e i suoi «benefattori»: Pergamo e Diodoro Pappas', *Athenaeum* 82(2): 299–314.
- 2013, 'Forme e linguaggi della comunicazione fra re ellenistici e città', *Studi Ellenistici* 27: 243–261.
- Vitale, M., 2012, *Eparchie und Koinon in Kleinasien von der ausgehenden Republik bis ins 3. Jh. n. Chr.*, Bonn.
- 2014, 'Il sommo sacerdozio federale del culto imperiale nell'oriente romano. Un riesame generale della documentazione epigrafica e numismatica', *MedAnt* 17(1): 287–308.
- Wallace, C., 2014, 'Ager Publicus in the Greek East: I. Priene 111 and Other Examples of Resistance to the publicani', *Historia* 63(1): 38–78.
- Wankel, V., 2009, *Appello ad Principem: Urteilsstil und Urteilstchnik in kaiserlichen Berufsentscheidungen (Augustus bis Caracalla)*, Munich.
- Watson, A., 1983, 'Roman Slave Law and Romanist Ideology', *Phoenix* 37(1): 53–65.
- Weber, M., 1978, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretative Sociology*, New York.
- Webster, J., 2001, 'Creolizing the Roman Provinces', *AJA* 105(2): 209–225.
- Wehrli, C., 1978, '«Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ κοινοὶ εὐεργέται πάντων» («Les Romains, communs bienfaiteurs de tous») dans les inscriptions grecques de l'époque républicaine', *SicGymn* 31: 479–496.
- Welch, K., 1990, 'The *Praefectura Urbis* of 45 BC and the Ambitions of L. Cornelius Balbus', *Antichthon* 24: 53–69.
- Welles, C.B., 1934, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy*, New Haven.
- Wendt, A., 1999, *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge.
- Whitmarsh, T., 2010, 'Thinking Local', in Whitmarsh, T. (ed.), *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World*, Cambridge, 1–16.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von, 1902, *Griechisches Lesebuch*, Berlin.

- Williamson, C., 1987, 'Monuments of Bronze: Roman Legal Documents on Bronze Tablets', *CA* 6(1): 160–183.
- 2005, *The Laws of the Roman People: Public Law in the Expansion and Decline of the Roman Republic*, Ann Arbor.
- Willrich, H., 1899, 'Alabanda und Rom zur Zeit des ersten Krieges gegen Mithradates', *Hermes* 34: 305–311.
- Wörle, M., 1988, *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien: Studien zu einer agonistischen Stiftung aus Oinoanda*, Munich.
- 2000, 'Pergamon um 133 v. Chr.', *Chiron* 30: 543–576.
- 2009, 'Neue Inschriftenfunde aus Aizanoi V: Aizanoi und Rom I', *Chiron* 39: 409–444.
- 2011, 'Neue Inschriftenfunde aus Aizanoi VI: Aizanoi und Rom II', *Chiron* 41: 357–376.
- 2014, 'Neue Inschriftenfunde aus Aizanoi VII: Aizanoi und Rom III. Der julisch-claudische Kaiserkult in Aizanoi', *Chiron* 44: 439–512.
- Yakobsen, A., 2009, 'Public Opinion, Foreign Policy and 'Just War' in the Late Republic', in Eilers, C. (ed.), *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World*, Leiden, 45–72.
- Yarrow, L.M., 2006, *Historiography at the End of the Republic: Provincial Perspectives on Roman Rule*, Oxford.
- 2012, 'Decem Legati: A Flexible Institution, Rigidly Perceived,' in Smith C. & Yarrow, L.M. (eds.), *Imperialism, Cultural Politics, & Polybius*, Oxford, 168–183.
- Zack, A., 2001, *Studien zum "römischen Völkerrecht": Kriegserklärung, Kriegsbeschluss, Beeidung und Ratifikation zwischenstaatlicher Verträge, internationaler Freundschaft und Feindschaft während der römischen Republik bis zum Beginn des Prinzipats*, Göttingen.
- Zarecki, J., 2012, 'The Cypriot Exemption from *evocatio* and the Character of Cicero's Proconsulship', *G&R* 59(1): 46–55.
- Zuiderhoek, A., 2004 'Review: C. Eilers, *Roman Patrons of Greek Cities*', *JRS* 94: 264–266.
- 2008, 'On the Political Sociology of the Imperial Greek City', *GRBS* 48: 417–445.
- 2009, *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire: Citizens, Elites and Benefactors in Asia Minor*, Cambridge.
- 2017, *The Ancient City*, Cambridge.
- De Zulueta, F., 1953, *The Institutes of Gaius*, 2 vols., Oxford.
- Zoumbaki, S., 2018, 'Sulla, the Army, the Officers and the poleis of Greece: A Reassessment of Warlordism in the First Phase of the Mithridatic Wars', in Naco del Hoyo, T. & López Sánchez, F. (eds.), *War, Warlords, and Interstates Relations in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Leiden, 351–379.